

ABSTRACTS ONLY

**VOLUME 45
ISSUE 1
WINTER 2025**

CASE RESEARCH JOURNAL

**OUTSTANDING TEACHING CASES
GROUNDED IN RESEARCH**

ERIC DOLANSKY, EDITOR

**PUBLISHED BY THE
NORTH AMERICAN CASE
RESEARCH ASSOCIATION**

**IN PUBLICATION
SINCE 1980**



Outstanding Teaching Cases Grounded in Research

Volume 45 • Issue 1 • Winter 2025

Case Research Journal

Published by the

North American Case Research Association



NACRA

**NORTH AMERICAN CASE
RESEARCH ASSOCIATION**

Editor

**Eric Dolansky
Brock University**

Copyright © 2025 by North American Case Research Association, Inc. (NACRA)
All rights reserved.

Further reproduction by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system must be arranged with the individual copyright holders noted.

Published quarterly by North American Case Research Association, Inc.

Cover design, Lisa Fahey, originables.com.

NACRA membership for individuals is US \$40. Subscriptions to the Case Research Journal are US \$85/year for North American subscriptions and US \$115/year for subscriptions sent outside North America.

To join, register and pay online at: <https://www.nacra.net/>

POSTMASTER: Please send address corrections to:

North American Case Research Association
Christina Tathibana, Editorial Assistant
Case Research Journal
crj.christina@gmail.com

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

ISSN 2328-5095

ISBN: 979-8-9902961-3-8

Editor

Eric Dolansky
Brock University

Associate Editors

Randall Harris, *Texas AM University – Corpus Christi*

Ram Subramanian, *Stetson University*

Meredith Woodwark, *Wilfrid Laurier University*

Editorial Assistant

Christina Tathibana
University of Regina

Editorial Board

William A. Andrews, *Stetson University*
Kathryn J. Aten, *Naval Postgraduate School*
Maria Ballesteros-Sola, *CSUCI*
Mary Barrett, *University of Wollongong*
Erica Berte, *Metro State University*
Heidi M. Bertels, *City University of New York*
Karen Boroff, *Seton Hall University*
Alva Butcher, *University of Puget Sound*
James Carroll, *Georgian Court University*
Sofy Carayannopoulos, *Wilfrid Laurier University*
Danielle Clark, *Hillsborough Community College*
Carolyn Conn, *Texas State University*
Michelle Demoss, *Stetson University*
Lisa Eshbach, *Ferris State University*
Deborah R. Ettington, *The Pennsylvania State U.*
Josep Franch, *ESADE Business School*
John E. Gamble, *Texas A&M - Corpus Christi*
Armand Gilinsky, *Sonoma State University*
Janis Gogan, *Bentley University*
Michael Goldman, *University of San Francisco*
Peter Goulet, *University of Northern Iowa*
Gina Grandy, *University of Calgary*
Randall Harris, *Texas A&M - Corpus Christi*
Sean Hennessey, *U. of Prince Edward Island*
Cynthia Ingols, *Simmons College*
Lynn A. Isabella, *Darden School of Business*
Olga Kandinskaia, *University of Limassol*
Anwar Khurshid, *Labore U. of Mgmt. Sciences*
Anne T. Lawrence, *San Jose State University*
John J. Lawrence, *University of Idaho*
Derek Lehmberg, *North Dakota State University*

Nancy Levenburg, *Grand Valley State University*
Lynda Livingston, *University of Puget Sound*
Francisco J. López Lubián, *IE Business School*
Robert A. MacDonald, *Crandall University*
Charla Mathwick, *Portland State University*
Michael McCollough, *University of Idaho*
Terry McGovern, *University of Wisconsin Parksides*
Charles Mossman, *University of Manitoba*
Kyleen Myrah, *Okanagan College*
Margaret J. Naumes, *University of New Hampshire*
William Naumes, *University of New Hampshire*
Ken Ogata, *York University*
Kay Palan, *University of Alabama*
Juan M. Parra, *INALDE Business School*
Tia Quinlan-Wilder, *University of Denver*
Stephanie Raible, *University of Delaware*
Marlene Reed, *Baylor University*
Glenn Rowe, *Ivey School of Business, Western U.*
Marvin Ryder, *McMaster University*
Kathryn S. Savage, *Northern Arizona University*
Colleen Sharen, *Brescia University College*
Grishma Shah, *Manhattan College*
Jeff P. Shay, *Babson College*
W. Scott Sherman, *Texas A&M - Corpus Christi*
Javier Silva, *IAE Business School, U. Austral*
Ram Subramanian, *Stetson University*
Erin Sullivan, *Suffolk University*
Linda E. Swayne, *U. North Carolina Charlotte*
Sonia Toson, *Kennesaw State University*
Susan White, *University of Maryland*
Meredith Woodwark, *Wilfrid Laurier University*
Vijaya N. Zinnoury, *University of Denver*

CASE RESEARCH JOURNAL

Ad Hoc Reviewers, 2024-2025

Shalini Aggarwal, *Chardigarh University*
Nicole M. Amos, *Johnson & Wales University*
Mike Annett, *MacEwan University*
Ann Armstrong, *University of Toronto*
Erica Berte, *Metropolitan State University*
Jeff Bowen, *University of Denver*
Fernanda Cahen, *Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing*
Gustavo Calatrava, *Austral University*
Jorge Calvo, *Globis University*
Michael Carillo, *University of Florida*
Majid Eghbali-Zarch, *Memorial University of Newfoundland*
Joseph Gerard, *Western New England University*
Paul Golding, *University of Technology*
Andres Gonzalez Rey, *Universidad Icesi*
Jane Gravill, *Conestoga College*
Charles Hilterbrand, *University of Mississippi*
Sarah M. Holtzen, *Missouri Southern State University*
Charles Kalnbach, *University of Oregon*
Brooke Klassen, *University of Saskatchewan*
Sheri L. Lambert, *Temple University*

Manu Mahbubanihi, *Wilfrid Laurier University*
Ruben Mancha, *Babson College*
Ebrahim Mazaheri, *Wilfrid Laurier University*
Maryam Memar Zadeh, *University of Winnipeg*
Moriah Meyskens, *University of San Diego*
Huy Nguyen, *University of Sussex*
Sandeep Puri, *Asian Institute of Management*
Farzana Quoquab, *Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*
Stephanie Raible, *University of Delaware*
Kumar Ramchandani, *LJ University*
Janet Rovenpor, *Manhattan College*
Achinto Roy, *Deakin University*
Michele Ruiters, *University of Pretoria*
Roberto S. Santos, *University of Massachusetts Lowell*
W. Scott Sherman, *Texas A&M Corpus Christi*
James Spee, *University of Redlands*
Cheri Thomas, *University of Tennessee Southern*
Janice Winch, *Pace University*
Rohan Wright, *The Mico University College*
Fatih Yegul, *Conestoga College*
Cheri Young, *University of Denver*

Thank you as well to the hard-working authors who submitted their cases
to the Case Research Journal for consideration.

NACRA Officers 2024–2025

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Melanie Reed
Thompson Rivers University

Immediate Past President

Olga Kandinskaia
Cyprus International Institute of Management

Vice-President Programs

Mike Annett
MacEwan University

Vice-President Programs-Elect

Clinton Daniel
University of South Florida

Vice-President Communications

Atherine Lee
University of Technology, Jamaica

Vice-President Case Marketing

William Wei
Algoma University

Treasurer

Kathryn Savage
Northern Arizona University (Ret.)

REPRESENTATIVES OF REGIONAL AND AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Canada (ASAC)

Meredith Woodwark
Wilfrid Laurier University

Mexico (ALAC)

Martha Elena Moreno Barbosa
Tecnologico de Monterrey Campus Puebla

Eastern U.S. (CASE)

William Naumes
University of New Hampshire (Retired)

Southeastern U.S. (SECRA)

Susan Peters
University of North Carolina

Southwestern U.S. (SWCRA)

Kendra Ingram
Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Society for Case Research (SCR)

Andy Borchers
Lipscomb University

Western U.S. (WCA)

Melanie Reed
Thompson Rivers University

Caribbean Case Researchers Association

Paul Golding
U Technology – Jamaica

International Case Research Association (ICRA)

William Wei
MacEwan University Business School

Directors at Large

Brooke Klassen
University of Saskatchewan

Ajoy K. Dey

Advisory Council Chair

Randall Harris
Texas AM University – Corpus Christi

Advisory Council Vice Chair

John Varlaro
Johnson & Wales University

***Case Research Journal* Editorial Policy**

North American Case Research Association (NACRA)

CASE CONTENT

The *Case Research Journal* (CRJ) publishes outstanding teaching cases drawn from research in real organizations, dealing with important issues in all administration-related disciplines. The CRJ specializes in decision-focused cases based on original primary research – normally interviews with key decision makers in the organization but substantial quotes from legal proceedings and/or congressional testimony are also acceptable. Secondary research (e.g., journalist accounts, high quality website content, etc.) can be used to supplement primary data as needed and appropriate. Exceptional cases that are analytical or descriptive rather than decision-focused will only be considered when a decision focus is not practical and when there is a clear and important gap in the case literature that the case would fill. Cases based entirely on secondary sources will be considered only in unusual circumstances. The Journal also publishes occasional articles concerning case research, case writing or case teaching. Multi-media cases or case supplements will be accepted for review. Contact the journal editor for instructions.

Previously published cases or articles (except those appearing in Proceedings or workshop presentations) are not eligible for consideration. The Journal does not accept fictional works or composite cases synthesized from author experience.

CASE FORMAT

Cases and articles submitted for review should be single-spaced, with 11.5 point Garamond font and 1" margins. Published cases are typically 8-10 pages long (before exhibits), though more concise cases are encouraged and longer cases may be acceptable for complex situations. All cases should be written in the past tense except for quotations that refer to events contemporaneous with the decision focus.

Figures and tables should be embedded in the text and numbered separately. Exhibits should be grouped at the end of the case. Figures, tables, and exhibits should have a number and title as well as a source. Necessary citations of secondary sources (e.g., quotes, data) should be included as endnotes at the end of the case (not at the end of the IM) in APA format. In the IM, necessary citations (e.g., citations of theoretical work from which the analysis draws) should be included using parenthetical author/year embedded in the text (similar to a traditional academic paper) that feeds into a list of references at the end of the IM. Note that the CRJ approaches citations differently in the case and the IM given the differing audiences for which each document is developed (i.e., the case is written for the student while the IM is written for the instructor). In some rare instances, footnotes may be used in the case for short explanations when including these explanations in the body of the text would significantly disrupt the flow of the case, but generally the use of footnotes in the case should be avoided if possible.

The following notice should appear at the bottom of the first page of the manuscript: Review copy for use of the *Case Research Journal*. Not for reproduction or distribution. Dated (date of submission). Acknowledgements can be included in a first page footnote after the case is accepted for publication, and should mention any prior conference presentation of the case.

It is the author(s)'s responsibility to ensure that they have permission to publish material contained in the case. To verify acceptance of this responsibility, include the following paragraph on a separate page at the beginning of the submission:

In submitting this case to the Case Research Journal for widespread distribution in print and electronic media, I (we) certify that it is original work, based on real events in a real organization. It has not been published and is not under review elsewhere. Copyright holders have given written permission for the use of any material not permitted by the "Fair Use Doctrine." The host organization(s) or individual informant(s) have provided written authorization allowing publication of all information contained in the case that was gathered directly from the organization and/or individual.

INSTRUCTOR'S MANUAL

Cases must be accompanied by a comprehensive *Instructor's Manual* that includes the following elements:

1. **Case Synopsis:** A brief (three-quarters of a page maximum) synopsis of the case.
2. **Intended Courses:** Identification of the intended course(s) that the case was written for, including the case's position within the course. Please also indicate whether the case was developed for an undergraduate or graduate student audience.
3. **Learning Objectives:** The specific learning objectives that the case was designed to achieve. For more details on learning objectives, see the article titled "Writing Effective Learning Objectives" at the useful articles link.
4. **Research Methods:** A Research Methods section that discloses the research basis for gathering the case information, including any relationship between case authors and the organization, or how access to case data was obtained. Include a description of any disguises imposed and their extent. Authors should disclose the relationship between this case and any other cases or articles published about this organization by these authors without revealing the author's identity during the review process. If the case has been test taught and this has influenced the development of the case, this should be noted. This section should also indicate who in the organization has reviewed the case for content and presentation and has authorized the authors to publish it (note that this last component is not necessary for cases based on congressional or legal testimonies).
5. **Theoretical Linkages:** In this section please provide a brief overview of the theoretical concepts and frameworks that will ground the analysis/discussion of the case situation in theory and research. Please include associated readings or theoretical material that instructors might assign to students or draw on to relate the case to their field or to the course. In developing this section, recognize that business courses are often taught by adjunct faculty who are business professionals who may not be steeped in the theory of the discipline the way an active researcher might be. Develop this section with the intent of helping that type of instructor effectively apply and teach these theories/frameworks.
6. **Suggested Teaching Approaches:** Suggested teaching approaches or a teaching plan, including the expected flow of discussion with an accompanying board plan. Include a description of any role plays, debates, use of audiovisuals or in-class handouts, youtube videos, etc. that might be used to enhance the teaching of the case. Authors are strongly encouraged to classroom test a case before submission so that experience in teaching the case can be discussed in the *IM*. Authors are discouraged from including websites as integral resources for the teaching plan because websites are not static and the content of the website link may change between the writing of the case and an instructor's subsequent use of the case. This should also include a section on how best to teach the case online / remotely.
7. **Discussion Questions:** A set of assignment/discussion questions (typically three to ten depending on discipline) that can be provided to students to organize and guide their preparation of the case. For most cases, either the final or the penultimate question will ask students for their recommendation on the overarching decision facing the decision maker in the case along with their rationale for that recommendation.
8. **Analysis & Responses to Discussion Questions:** This section of the IM represents the core of the case analysis. Repeat each assignment/discussion question, and then present a full analysis of that question that demonstrates application of relevant theory to the case. Note that the analysis in this section should go beyond what a good student might present as an 'answer' to the question. Write to the instructor with an eye toward helping him or her understand in detail how the theory applies to the case scenario, how discussion of this particular question might be approached with students, where the limitations in the theory might be relative to the case scenario, and how the analysis contributes to the building of an integrated recommendation regarding the decision the case protagonist must make.
9. **Epilogue:** If appropriate, an epilogue or follow-up information about the decision actually made and the outcomes that were realized as a result of the decision made.
10. **References:** Provide full citations (in APA format) for all references that were cited in the Instructor's Manual.

REVIEW PROCESS

All manuscripts (both the case and the instructor's manual) are double-blind refereed by Editorial Board members and ad hoc reviewers in the appropriate discipline. Most submissions require at least one round of revision before acceptance and it is common for accepted cases to go through two or more rounds of revisions. The target time frame from submission to author feedback for each version is 60 days.

DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLISHED CASES

The right to reproduce a case in a commercially available textbook, or instructor-created course pack, is reserved to NACRA and the authors, who share copyright for these purposes. After publication, CRJ cases are distributed through NACRA's distribution partners according to non-exclusive contracts. NACRA charges royalty fees for these publication rights and case adoptions in order to fund its operations including publication of the *Case Research Journal*. Royalties paid are split 50/50 between NACRA and member authors.

MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION

Submit the case manuscript and Instructor's Manual in one document via the *Case Research Journal*/ScholarOne website at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/nacra-crj>. This site provides step by step instructions for uploading your case. You will also be provided the opportunity to upload two case supplements – this is to allow submission of a spreadsheet supplement for the student and for the instructor if needed. No identification of authors or their institutions should appear on either the main case/IM document or on the spreadsheets. All identifying information should be removed from the file properties before submission. If you have audiovisual content to your case, please contact the editor to determine the best way to make this content available to reviewers without revealing the authors' identities.

At least one author must be a member of the North American Case Research Association. Membership dues are included in annual registration for the NACRA conference, or may be paid separately through the main NACRA website.

For questions, contact:
Eric Dolansky, Editor
edolansky@brocku.ca

Adopting *Case Research Journal* Cases for use in your classes

Faculty members can adopt cases for use in their classrooms and gain access to Instructor's Manual through one of NACRA's distribution partners.

NACRA currently has agreements with the following distributors.

- **Harvard Business School Press** (<http://hbsp.harvard.edu/>)
- **Ivey Publishing** (<https://www.iveycases.com/>)
- **The Case Centre** (<http://www.thecasecentre.org/educators/>)
- **Pearson Collections** (<https://www.pearsonhighered.com/collections/educator-features.html>)
- **McGraw Hill Create** (<http://create.mcgraw-hill.com/createonline/index.html>)
- **Study.net** (www.study.net)
- **CCMP [Centrale de Cas et de Médias Pédagogiques]** (<http://www.ccmp.fr>)
- **XanEdu** (<https://www.xanedu.com/>)

If you want to use one of these distributors, but cannot find the CRJ case you want, contact the NACRA VP Case Marketing, William Wei, william.wei@algonau.ca, to see if we can have it added for you.

Textbook authors can also adopt CRJ cases for inclusion in their textbooks for a modest fixed royalty fee. Please contact the NACRA VP of Case Marketing for more information.

From the Editor

Welcome to the first issue of Volume 45 of the Case Research Journal. This issue contains four outstanding cases and one article, about accessibility in case writing. As I am for all issues of the journal, I am proud of this work, which represents the collaborative efforts of decision-makers, authors, reviewers, and the editorial team.

The thing about that list of contributors is that they are all people. This seemingly-odd statement is not coming out of nowhere: instead, it stems from what has become the single most common question I get as editor. Over the past two years or so, I can guarantee that whatever webinar, presentation, workshop, or panel in which I participate will, at some point, include a question about generative artificial intelligence. What is CRJ's policy on GenAI? (it's complicated, see below.) What is my personal opinion on GenAI? (are you sure you want to know?) Clearly this technology has changed the way people work, and therefore it makes sense that it should have an effect on research as well.

Well, yes and no. First off, to admit my own biases: I'm somewhat of a Luddite. Though I'm not literally out there smashing machines, I am slow to adopt new technology and do not like to have to change the way I work. Second, I am an educator in 2025, which to me means that I have to struggle with how much of a student's work is done by that student, further biasing me against GenAI. Third, though, I am a realist: I know that my own opposition to this technology will not, and should not, make any difference in how others use it.

As editor of CRJ I have tried to create an official GenAI policy, getting as far as a set of basic principles (transparency and responsibility for the work) and drafting a version. This is where the challenges presented themselves. Once you put down a set of rules, what you did not include is as important as what you did. Take, for example, reviewing: why should authors be allowed use GenAI to simplify some of their tasks but reviewers not allowed? Well, if an author wants to feed their own work into the latest version of ChatGPT that is their prerogative. If a reviewer feeds the author's work into the AI, that is a breach of intellectual property rights. Furthermore, if the authors write with AI, and the reviewers review with AI, why don't we just cut out the intermediary – people – and leave it all to the machines?

The other complicating factor is that we have distribution partnerships with Harvard Publishing, Ivey Publishing, the Case Centre, and others, and any policy we devise must match theirs. As standards, technologies, and feelings about this tech are constantly changing, accomplishing this feels to me like trying to juggle a set of jugglers.

If you could not tell already, my own feelings on GenAI are mostly negative. I see that many people get value from it, for ideation, for proofreading, for translation, and so on. I think it is ludicrous to ask a non-native speaker of a language to pay a person to clean up their writing in that foreign tongue when there are many programs that will do it for free. But while content is becoming more readable, in my opinion something is lost. To me, the value of the work is in doing the work, not the output. To write the sentences that you are reading right now I had to organize my thoughts, find a way to encode them in interesting and engaging language, and put it all together. I could have used Claude or Copilot (it seems that my computer really, really wants me to use Copilot) and generated something much more quickly, but I am selfish enough to want to get something out of the experience as well. While I am not foolish enough to think that I am such a good writer that no AI can touch me, I enjoy writing and think I'm pretty good at it (I'll let you judge, but please don't tell me), and what you have here is from me, not from something trying to sound like me.

Without me having done the work myself, I would have lost the opportunity to not only tell you about the cases in this issue of CRJ, but to have had the pleasure of rereading them to do so. “Scaling for a Purpose: Homeboy Industries’ Potential Acquisition of B Corp Isidore Recycling,” by Maria Ballesteros-Sola and David Y. Choi, presents a fascinating organization, one that helps the formerly incarcerated find work through its various branches. In this case, CEO Tom Vozzo must decide how to present the potential acquisition of a for-profit social enterprise by Homeboy Industries, a not-for-profit. Both quantitative and qualitative considerations must be included, and students are tasked with creating a presentation to the board. Another thorny dilemma is presented in “To Approve or Not to Approve? That is the Question. The FDA’s Decision on a New Alzheimer’s Drug,” by Reginald J. Harris, Kevin Pan, and Linda E. Swayne. The key decision in this case is whether to recommend approval for a novel medication to treat Alzheimer’s disease, taking into account differing perspectives from Food and Drug Administration (FDA) staff, scientists, and from Alzheimer’s patients and their loved ones. This case, and the suggestions for teaching, includes a recreation of the consultation meeting itself, to help students come to the decision.

In “The Mortgage Refinancing Dilemma: A Tale of Two Proposals,” by Michele M. McGowan and Jan M. Serrano, a married couple wrestle with a personal finance decision predicated by an unexpected offer by their wealth management company. Going beyond a financial exercise, elements of behavioural finance are brought into the decision. This is a good opportunity for students to understand how decisions like this work, and that the seemingly-simple calculators to determine the value of the options do not tell the whole story. A different kind of personal decision is being made in “VDart Inc.: Leadership Challenges During Growth,” by Nidheesh Joseph and Abhishek Totawar. CEO Sidd Ahmed founded VDart Inc., a digital talent management and recruitment firm, and had grown it considerably. Once the firm operated in multiple countries and was much larger, Ahmed found his management and leadership style at odds with new policies in place, requiring him to revisit how he led the firm and what changes he might need to make.

In addition to these four cases, we are pleased to publish “The Case for Accessibility: Why It Is Important and What Case Writers Need to Know,” by Leesa Morris and Antoinette Mills, both of The Case Centre. Not only is accessibility an important issue – all students, regardless of disability, have a right to be able to engage with and understand cases used in class – it is quickly becoming a requirement, with many jurisdictions passing or updating laws. This article makes the issue plain and explains what authors can do to not only be compliant with regulations but also improve their work.

Returning to the theme of this editorial: Gemini or Copilot could have written an editorial in seconds. I could have done it with the help of such tools in far less time than I spent on it. But I could also cook risotto in the microwave, and it would take much less time and effort. I don’t know that I would want to eat that risotto, though. And I, personally, would not want to present to you the version of this editorial written by an AI. This is not a judgment of others, who do find value in using these tools; it is simply my perspective, that I’m sharing with you here.

As always, please share information about the cases in this issue, and the fantastic cases that we publish in CRJ throughout the year. If you, or a colleague, would make good use of one of these cases, mention it to them. If you want more information about publishing your own cases in CRJ, feel free to contact me at edolansky@brocku.ca.

Eric Dolansky, Editor
Case Research Journal

**Congratulations to the Curtis E. Tate Jr. Award Winners
(Best Cases Published in 2023 Volume 43 of the Case Research
Journal)**

Curtis E. Tate Award Winner for Volume 43

**Pink, White and Blue: A Transgender Sailor, the U.S. Navy, and a Right vs.
Right Ethical Dilemma by**

Terry Borja

U.S. Navy

Kathryn Aten and Gail Thomas

Naval Postgraduate School

Curtis E. Tate Award Runners-Up

**The Business 2B or Not 2B: Marceco's Dilemma After the T-Mobile – Sprint
Merger by**

Ana C. Gonzales L.

Grand Valley State University

David Den Herder

Marceco

Dr. Wehrheim Winery: To Grow or Not to Grow? by
Marc Dressler

Ludwigshafen University of Applied Sciences

Ram Subramanian

Stetson University

Abstracts Only

ARTICLE

- **Article** **The Case for Accessibility: Why It's Important and What Case Writers Need to Know** 1
 - *Case writing*
 - *Accessibility*
 - *Diversity & Inclusion*
 - *Business Education*
- Leesa Morris, * and Antoinette Mills The Case Centre [Building 3, Cranfield University, Wharley End, Bedford MK43 0JR
[leesa@thecasecentre.org]
- Accessibility is essential for an inclusive society, it drives innovation, and it's good for business. In this article, we're going to be exploring what accessibility means, why it matters from an ethical standpoint, and what your responsibilities are as a case author. We'll also be looking at the legal implications for anyone doing business or creating in our global economy, and what this means for business education.

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

- **Social Enterprise** **Scaling for a Purpose: Homeboy Industries' Potential Acquisition of B Corp Isidore Recycling** 11
 - *Social Impact*
 - *Acquisition*
 - *Nonprofit Management*
 - *Certified B Corp*
- Maria A. Ballesteros-Sola ,* California State University Channel Islands and David Y. Choi, Loyola Marymount University [Camarillo CA, 93012, Maria.Ballesteros-Sola@csuci.edu]
- In early 2017, Tom Vozzo, volunteer CEO of Homeboy Industries (HBI), faced a strategic decision: whether the nonprofit should acquire Isidore Recycling, a certified B Corp aligned with HBI's mission of providing job opportunities to formerly incarcerated individuals. Founded by Father Gregory Boyle in Los Angeles (California), HBI had grown into a \$16.6M organization with multiple social enterprises contributing over a third of its revenue. While Isidore offered quality jobs and shared HBI's social goals, both organizations were operating at a loss, and the acquisition posed operational, financial, and governance risks, including the need for new capital, industry expertise, and board support for an unconventional merger. This case challenges students to assess the financial and social implications of a nonprofit acquiring a for-profit enterprise. It raises critical questions around mission alignment, risk tolerance, impact measurement, and strategic leadership, offering a real-world context to explore nonprofit entrepreneurship and the complexities of hybrid organizational growth.

Intended Courses and Levels

Given the intricacies and uniqueness of a non-profit organization's potential acquisition of a for-profit entity, this case is an excellent fit for upper-division undergraduate and graduate courses on social enterprises, entrepreneurship, and nonprofit management and leadership. To fully maximize learning, we recommend using the case once the students have learned the basics of social enterprises.

Learning Objectives

After preparing and discussing the case, students should be able to

- Analyze the key characteristics of nonprofit social enterprises
- Identify and assess potential social enterprise scaling strategies
- Evaluate and support the decision of a nonprofit company to acquire a for profit venture.

FINANCE

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Finance</i>• <i>Behavioral Finance</i>• <i>Decision Analysis</i>• <i>Loan Evaluation</i> | <p>The Mortgage Refinancing Dilemma: A Tale of Two Proposals 31</p> <p>Michele M. McGowan,* King's College and Jan M. Serrano, Francis Marion University [133 N. River St, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18711, michelemcgowan@kings.edu]</p> |
|--|--|

This case follows Leo and Aggie Holland as they consider whether to refinance their mortgage in response to an unsolicited offer from their current mortgage lender. With a deadline looming, the Hollands weigh two refinancing options that offer potential savings but come with closing costs, fees, and lingering doubts based on past experiences with the lender. Their decision-making process involves more than just comparing interest rates; it requires evaluating financial tools such as amortization tables, payback periods, net present value, and opportunity cost. The couple must also consider behavioral and non-financial factors, such as timing, stress, trust in the lender, and future downsizing plans.

Intended Courses and Levels

This case is ideal for reinforcing core financial management concepts, including the time value of money, opportunity cost, incremental cash flows, valuation, and capital budgeting. The case challenges students to navigate the multifaceted decision-making process of refinancing a mortgage under uncertain economic conditions. Beyond the practical Excel exercises, students are also exposed to common pitfalls in the refinancing process, such as an oversimplified approach that may overlook crucial financial concepts. Additionally, it provides an excellent opportunity to introduce and explore behavioral finance concepts critical to understanding real-world decision-making processes. By integrating these psychological insights, the case encourages a holistic approach, prompting students to balance financial analysis that combines quantitative rigor with behavioral considerations to make a well-informed recommendation.

This case bridges introductory finance to advanced undergraduate finance courses, enabling students to revisit and apply foundational principles while exploring how behavioral biases can impact financial decisions.

In MBA programs, it serves as an effective introductory assignment, particularly for students with non-business backgrounds or those who have not recently completed financial coursework. Behavioral finance elements make it especially valuable in fostering critical thinking and encouraging students to question purely numerical decision frameworks.

This case is also well-suited for financial planning or personal finance courses, where behavioral finance concepts often play a significant role in understanding client behavior. However, students may require additional support with technical concepts such as payback period and net present value (NPV).

Basic Excel proficiency is beneficial for analyzing the financial aspects of the case, and it has been successfully tested in online and in-person classes.

Learning Objectives

Students will be able to:

- Apply financial concepts of the time value of money and opportunity cost, alongside amortization tables, payback period, and net present value, to make informed financial decisions.
- Evaluate financing alternatives by assessing the opportunity cost and incremental cash inflows and outflows associated with different financing options, including refinancing, and their long-term implications.
- Assess the role of behavioral finance principles in financial decision-making.
- Develop a well-supported recommendation that considers financial and non-financial information.

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR

- *Organizational Behaviour*
- *Leadership*
- *International Business*
- *Entrepreneurship*
- *Strategic HRM*

VDart Inc.: Leadership Challenges During Growth

43

Nidheesh Joseph,* Institute of Management Technology Ghaziabad and Abhishek Totawar, Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli [Raj Nagar, Ghaziabad, Delhi NCR – 201001, India, +91-8086520602, njoseph@imt.edu]

VDart Inc. was founded by Sidd Ahmed in December 2007 in Atlanta, Georgia, United States, as a digital talent management and recruitment firm, growing steadily to reach US\$160 million in annual revenue by 2019. That same year, VDart was recognized as the 138th largest and 56th fastest-growing staffing firm in the United States. The company's global servicing hub, located in Tiruchirappalli, India, employed about 380 people and served clients across seven geographic locations. As founder-CEO, Ahmed's leadership, marked by strong people-connect, and purpose orientation, had successfully driven VDart's growth for over a decade. However, as VDart aimed for ambitious growth targets in the coming years, the leadership needs had evolved. Ahmed was challenged to evaluate whether he should change his current leadership style to effectively lead VDart during its growth phase. If so, how should he adapt?

Intended Courses and Levels

The case is suitable for graduate-level courses on organizational behaviour, leadership, international business,

entrepreneurship, strategic HRM and does not require students to have prior work experience. This case should be taught mid-way through the course after the basics of leadership and entrepreneurship have been covered. The case can be taught in an 80-minute session or used as assignment or examination material. The instructor can control the intensity of the case discussion based on the level of work experience of the participants.

Learning Objectives

The case is intended to fulfill the following learning objectives:

- Examine the concept of leadership mindsets and explore their impact on shaping leadership behaviour.
- Recognize the significance of emotions in leadership behaviour, and learn how to channel them effectively to drive organizational progress.
- Analyze the leadership style framework and apply it to a founder-CEO, considering the specific organizational context.
- Formulate recommendations for adapting leadership behaviour in response to the evolving growth requirements of an international organization

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

- | | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Strategic Management</i> • <i>Health Care Management</i> • <i>Business & Government Relations</i> • <i>General Management</i> | <p>To Approve or Not to Approve? That Is the Question . . . The FDA's Decision on a New Alzheimer's Drug</p> <p>Reginald J. Harris,* Samford University, Kevin Pan, Samford University, and Linda E. Swayne [800 Lakeshore Drive, Birmingham, Alabama 35229-0002, rharris9@samford.edu]</p> | <p>51</p> |
|--|--|------------------|

Dr. Patrizia Cavazzoni, Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research for the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), faced an important decision. Biogen, a biopharmaceutical company, submitted an application to the FDA for aducanumab, a novel treatment for Alzheimer's disease, a debilitating medical condition affecting the memory of millions of people. No cure existed for Alzheimer's and any new treatment would bring hope to the patients and their caregiver families for a very debilitating disease that led to death. An external advisory committee of experts reviewed Biogen's studies and voted against approval of the drug, whereas some FDA staff recommended – and patients and their families pleaded for – approval of the drug. Dr. Cavazzoni had to decide whether to side with the outside experts who faulted Biogen's studies or the FDA experts' recommendation plus those most affected by the disease: patients and their caregivers.

Intended Courses and Levels

The case was designed for graduate-level courses in strategic management, offered in MHA (master's in health administration) or MPH (master's in public health) courses. In addition, instructors of courses that discuss stakeholder theory, such as business and society, organizational behavior, and biomedical ethics

courses may find this case helpful, especially when addressing a complex decision involving conflicts among stakeholders.

In studying this case, the students are not expected to evaluate the drug application from a medical or scientific perspective. Rather, the students should assume the reviews done by the advisory committee and by the FDA staff teams were valid, and the students are expected to apply stakeholder analysis to help Dr. Cavazzoni make a decision regarding whether to concur with her staff's recommendation or agree with the external advisory board's recommendation. The case can be taught in a single 75-minute class period. If a role play/recreation of the meeting is used, it can be performed in 30 minutes, and the remainder of the class period used for discussion.

Learning Objectives

After reading, analyzing, and discussing the case, students should be able to:

- Apply stakeholder theory to a complex decision involving multiple stakeholder groups.
- Apply instrumental stakeholder theory and stakeholder salience to prioritize stakeholder groups according to organizational mission.
- Understand how different courses of action would impact various stakeholders and evaluate the pros and cons of alternate courses of action for Dr. Cavazzoni.
- Recommend a course of action for Dr. Cavazzoni and support it with logical reasoning.



NACRA

North American Case Research Association

NACRA is a collaborative organization of approximately 500 researchers, case writers and teachers, mostly in the business disciplines, who support each other's research and writing efforts.



ISBN 979-8-9902961-3-8



9 798990 296138