

Appendix C-3: Strategy Analysis Summary (SAS) #3

Case: Van Den Steen, Eric and Lane, David. 2016. *Aldi: The Dark Horse Discounter*. HBSP# 9-714-474

Read the Aldi case and analyze the case using the theories of common strategies of positioning (e.g., differentiation) and how each of those strategies seek to build a competitive advantage to figure out Aldi’s strategy and how it is (or is not) taking the correct actions to fit that strategic positioning. Then use that analysis to answer the following question:

*Identify Aldi’s general strategy it uses for positioning – which one of the major strategies is it pursuing, and is it taking necessary actions to succeed at that positioning strategy? Identify three strategically substantive actions that Aldi does, and argue how each action supports Aldi’s strategic position. The analysis should include how these three actions are also consistent with the tradeoffs being made in the strategic position of Aldi.*

SAS #3 Rubric	E	D	C	B	A
Identification of general strategy of firm (e.g., differentiator) and tradeoff associated with strategic position.	No mention of the strategy.	<b>Incorrectly</b> identifies firm’s strategy and tradeoffs.	<b>Partially accurate in</b> identification of firm’s strategy and tradeoffs.	<b>Mostly accurate</b> identification of firm’s strategy and tradeoffs.	<b>Accurately</b> identifies firm’s strategy and tradeoffs.
Analysis of how Aldi’s actions fit with strategic position and tradeoffs.	<b>No mention.</b>	<b>Inaccurate</b> assessment of fit.	<b>Partially accurate</b> assessment of fit; only one or two actions are a good fit.	<b>Mostly accurate</b> assessment of fit; only some incorrect analysis of one action.	<b>Accurate and insightful</b> assessment of fit, including how each supports the tradeoffs.
Analysis relative to competitors.	No discussion of competitors.	<b>Inaccurately</b> assessed competitor responses due to not identifying important competitors.	<b>Partially accurate</b> competitor analysis that focuses on less important competitors and/or has little theoretical support.	<b>Mostly accurate</b> competitor analysis that focuses on direct competitors, but without entirely accurate use of theory.	<b>Accurate and insightful</b> analysis of competitors; focuses on important competitors and have strong theoretical basis for analysis of competitor responses.
Professionalism of writing	<b>Fails</b> to use proper grammar, eliminate redundancies, and/or use vocabulary accurately.	<b>Multiple</b> grammatical mistakes, redundancies, irrelevant elements, and/or misuse of vocabulary.	<b>More than three</b> grammatical mistakes, redundancies, irrelevant elements, and/or misuse of vocabulary.	<b>One or two</b> grammatical mistakes, redundancies, irrelevant elements, and/or misuse of vocabulary.	<b>No</b> grammatical mistakes, redundancies, irrelevant elements, and/or misuse of vocabulary.
Persuasiveness of writing	<b>No</b> persuasive elements.	<b>Ineffective</b> persuasive elements. All parts of argument are poorly supported by facts or theory.	<b>Partially</b> persuasive but only in parts; most of analysis is vague or poorly supported by facts or theory.	<b>Mostly</b> persuasive overall with almost every argument supported by accurate theoretical analysis and facts.	<b>Very</b> persuasive, even compelling because theory is used to uncover non-obvious support for arguments.