Wine Price Function and its Variables: The Case of Bordeaux Wines

<u>Abstract</u>

The purpose of this study is to identify the variables that influence wine prices. A large database listing all the prices from retailers and different other variables for each bottle (brand name, vintage, ratings, time-series prices, etc.) has been build. For the moment, we only focus on Bordeaux wines and the matrix size is 29.471 lines of Bordeaux wines X 243 prices of retailers. The findings will be presented during the conference since we are restructuring the database in order to exploit it and not to loose information represented by the huge number of missing values. The model used is hedonic price function where hedonic prices will be estimated by regressing wine prices on wine attributes.

Keywords : hedonic price function, retailers, Bordeaux wines

Introduction

When we talk about wine prices, most consumers think about en-primeur prices where every year, the vintage seem to be better and better and seem to be the best vintage ever made (at least according to some wine critics). In the following chart, we can observe that prices of "en-primeur Grand Cru" wines has increased a lot during the last 25 years, especially for the vintage 2005. Unfortunately, the en-primeur database is very weak in term of variables and we cannot explain the price evolution very well except based on the climate of the vintage or the ratings given by the American wine critics Robert Parker. Thanks to the large database made by the group Vinfox, a huge matrix composed of 29.471 lines of Bordeaux wines and 243 prices of retailers will help us providing a better insight on the influence of different variables on wine price.



Chart 1. Price evolution of en-primeur Grand Cru wines during the last 25 years.

1. Literature Review

In order to identify which variables would influence the wine prices, we mainly went through the wine economic literature and we listed the different independent variables that were influencing the price of wine. The following table shows the variables used by the authors in their study in order to determine the wine prices.

| Variables influencing | Lecocq & Visser (2006) | Ashenfelter (2008) | Hadj et al (2008) | Jones & Storchmann (2001) | Miler et al. (2007) | Horowitz et al. (2002) |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Jury grade | Х | | Х | X | Х | X (wine and winery) |
| Sensory variables | 3 | | | | | • |
| Rating | Х | | Х | | | |
| vintages | 1989-1998 | Х | | Х | | Х |
| Vintages (time series analysis) | | | | Х | | |
| Appellations | 4 (Bordeaux) 0 (Burgundy) | | | | | Х |
| Climate | | Temperature Rain | | Х | | |
| grapes | | | | Х | | |
| Scarcity (cases produced) | | | | X | Х | Х |
| Winery established after 1990 | | | | | | Х |
| Storage (drinkable now or later) | | | | | X | |

Table 1. Variables influencing wine prices

The following articles the authors haven't yet in his possession should also be analysed in order to complete this literature review:

- Benfratello, L., M. Piacenza and S. Sacchetto, 2004, "What Drives Market Prices in the Wine Industry? Estimation of a Hedonic Model for Italian Premium Wines," *Ceris-CNR*, Working Paper no.11.
- Chiffoleau, Y and C. Laporte, 2004, La formation des prix: le marché des vins de Bourgogne, *Revue française de sociologie*, vol. 45(4): 653-680.
- Combris, P., Lecocq, S. and M. Visser, 1997, Estimation of an hedonic price equation for Bordeaux wine: does quality matter? *The Economic Journal*, vol. 107, pp. 390-402.
- Combris, P., Lecocq, S. and M. Visser, 2000, Estimation of an hedonic price equation for Burgundy wine, *Applied Economics*, vol. 32, pp. 961-967.
- Costanigro, M., J.J. McCluskey and R.C. Mittelhammer, 2007, "Segmenting the Wine Market Based on Price: Hedonic Regression when Different Prices mean Different Products," *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, vol. 58(3): 454-466.
- Lima, T., 2006, Price and quality in the California wine industry: an empirical investigation, *Journal of Wine Economics*, vol. 1(2): 176-190.
- Oczkowski, E., 2001, Hedonic wine price functions and measurement error, *The Economic Record*, vol. 77(239): 374-382.
- Schamel, G. and K. Anderson, 2003, "Wine Quality and Varietal, Regional and Winery Reputation: Hedonic Prices for Australia and New Zealand," *The Economic Record*, vol. 79 (September): 357-369.

• Lockshin L., "Components of wine prices for Australian wine: how winery reputation, wine quality, region, vintage and winery size contribute to the price of varietal wines, *Australian Marketing Journal*, Vol.11, N°3, 2003.

2. Database

The Matrix is composed 29471 lines (Bordeaux wines) X 243 prices of retailers. For each Bordeaux brand, we also have the following information:

- A set of 88 Bordeaux Châteaux with 29471 references;
- The price of Châteaux **vintages** from 1945 to 2007 (only bottle from 700-800ml) sold by each retailer;
- Time-series on the price of each vintage for all Bordeaux Châteaux sold by the retailers (from 1997-2009), variable called **"issued"**;
- The **ratings** coming from the main wine critics: Gabriel, Wine Spectator, Bettane, Coates, Parker, Gault & Millau, Tanzer, Hachette and Vinum;
- And of course, the **price** for each bottle sold by more than **243 retailers**

In other words, for each issue of the Vinfox database: 2009, 2008, 2007... 1996, we have the following data:

- Wine brands (all the Bordeaux Chateaux sold in Switzerland)
- And for each brand:
 - price for different vintages
 - and for each vintage:
 - price per retailer ;
 - ratings of main guides.

3. Identification of main contributions

On the one hand, we have a larger and more complete database in comparison with the ones used in the literature. In other words, next to the wine attributes such as production, ranking and grapes, different ratings can be included in the model. Those ratings come from guides such as: Gault et Millau, Coates, Gabriel, Parker, Tanzer, Wine spectator, Bettane, etc. It will be used to show the price impact of a recommendation system. Furthermore, we also have time-series data for more than 10 years: data in 2009, 2008, 2007, ... 1997.

On the other hand, we will also be able to identify which variables do influence price wine in a very accurate way given the size of the database.

4. Methodology

Based on the hedonic hypothesis that goods are valued for their utility-bearing attributes (Lancaster 1966), hedonic prices are defined as the implicit prices of attributes. The relation between observed prices of differentiated product and their associated attributes is therefore determined by the hedonic prices of the attributes. Consequently hedonic prices can be estimated by regressing product prices on product attributes (Rosen 1974, Horowitz et al.

2002). What is interesting about the current study is that next to the attributes of the product such as production, ranking and grapes, different ratings can be included in the model. Thus from a marketing standpoint it is interesting to show the price impact of a recommendation system.

5. Presentation and selection of the dataset

In order to deal with missing values, we will first describe the whole dataset and then, we will explain which data we will keep for our analysis (reduction of dataset size) and why we choose those data.

A. The whole dataset

The database is composed of 29,471 wines. For each wine, as you can observe in table 2, we have the ratings of the following wine critics. We notice by importance that Gabriel (Swiss critics) has 5900 ratings for the different wines, Wine Spectator 2987 and Parker 2797 ratings.

| Ratings | n |
|---------------------|------|
| 5513-Gabriel | 5900 |
| 5504-Wine Spectator | 2987 |
| 5505-Parker | 2797 |
| 5506-Bettane | 2184 |
| 5509-Coates | 1855 |
| 5512-Tanzer | 1470 |
| 5519-Gault Millau | 931 |
| 5507-Hachette | 67 |
| 5514-Vinum | 50 |

Table 2. Number of ratings per critics for the database.

In table 3, we can also observe that only 7 retailers (out of 243) got a lot of references (more than 3,000) out of the 29,471 references of wine brands for the different vintages and issues. The most important retailer is B, ZH with 9032 references.

| Retailers | n |
|---------------|------|
| 2002-B, zh | 9032 |
| 71-C. BB, zh | 6669 |
| 848-G., zh | 5477 |
| 507-S., lu | 4084 |
| 475-Luc., lu | 3547 |
| 1471-Mag., vd | 3188 |
| 2606-Arc., bs | 3163 |
| | |

Table 3. References by retailers

In the database, we also have 88 different wine brands.

NB If we run a linear regression with the most representative variables (but there are a lot of missing values...) where the dependent variable is the price of retailer B, ZH and the independent variables are vintage (of the 88 wine brands from 1945), issued (the year the database was issued), ID (the code of the wine and Gabriel (ratings of the Swiss Wine Critics), we observe that all the variables are significant.

| | | Non-Standardi | zed coefficients | Standardized coefficients | | |
|-------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------|------|
| Model | | А | Standard-error | Bêta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constante) | -15866.665 | 4771.620 | | -3.325 | .001 |
| | Vintage | -17.506 | .476 | 598 | -36.773 | .000 |
| | Issued | 24.848 | 2.422 | .162 | 10.260 | .000 |
| | Id | 3.229E-7 | .000 | .130 | 8.336 | .000 |
| | 5513-Gabriel | 52.791 | 3.005 | .281 | 17.571 | .000 |
| a Der | 5513-Gabriel | 52.791 | 3.005 | .281 | 17.571 | |

Table 4. Linear regression with the most representative variables

B. <u>Reducing the size of the database</u>

We decided to reduce the database size from 29,471 references of wine brands to 9,032 (which represents the retailer with the highest number of wine references: B, ZH). Table 5 shows how many times each of the 88 different wine brands are referenced in the database of 9,032 references.

| Table | 5. | Num | ber | of | reference | s for | each | of | the | 88 | Bor | deaux | wine | brands. |
|-------|----|-----|-----|----|-----------|-------|------|----|-----|----|-----|-------|------|---------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Wine brands | Number of references (vintage and issues) per wine brand | Percentage |
|---|--|------------|
| Arche, Château d' (Sauternes);Sauternes | 14 | .2 |
| Armailhac, Château d' = Mouton-Baron- Philippe, Château:Pauillac | 125 | 1.4 |
| Batailley, Château;Pauillac | 78 | .9 |
| Belgrave, Château;Haut-Médoc | 26 | .3 |
| Beychevelle, Château;Saint-Julien | 224 | 2.5 |
| Boyd-Cantenac, Château;Margaux | 53 | .6 |

| Branaire-Ducru, Château;Saint-Julien | 145 | 1.6 |
|---|-----|-----|
| Brane-Cantenac, Château;Margaux | 195 | 2.2 |
| Broustet, Château;Barsac | 5 | .1 |
| Caillou, Château (Barsac);Barsac | 5 | .1 |
| Calon-Ségur, Château;Saint-Estèphe | 120 | 1.3 |
| Camensac, Château;Haut-Médoc | 82 | .9 |
| Cantemerle, Château;Haut-Médoc | 50 | .6 |
| Cantenac-Brown, Château;Margaux | 122 | 1.4 |
| Clerc Milon Rothschild, Château;Pauillac | 119 | 1.3 |
| Climens, Château;Barsac | 18 | .2 |
| Clos Haut-Peyraguey, Château;Sauternes | 8 | .1 |
| Cos d'Estournel, Château;Saint-Estèphe | 238 | 2.6 |
| Cos Labory, Château;Saint-Estèphe | 40 | .4 |
| Coutet, Château (Barsac);Barsac | 36 | .4 |
| Croizet-Bages, Château;Pauillac | 83 | .9 |
| Dauzac, Château;Margaux | 41 | .5 |
| Desmirail, Château;Margaux | 10 | .1 |
| Doisy-Daëne, Château;Barsac | 16 | .2 |
| Doisy-Védrines, Château;Barsac | 56 | .6 |
| Ducru-Beaucaillou, Château;Saint-Julien | 240 | 2.7 |
| Duhart-Milon-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac | 107 | 1.2 |
| Durfort-Vivens, Château;Margaux | 19 | .2 |
| Ferrière, Château;Margaux | 17 | .2 |
| Filhot, Château;Sauternes | 80 | .9 |
| Giscours, Château;Margaux | 135 | 1.5 |
| Grand-Puy Ducasse, Château;Pauillac | 123 | 1.4 |
| Grand-Puy-Lacoste, Château;Pauillac | 170 | 1.9 |
| Gruaud-Larose, Château;Saint-Julien | 147 | 1.6 |
| Guiraud, Château;Sauternes | 39 | .4 |
| Haut-Bages Libéral, Château;Pauillac | 17 | .2 |
| Haut-Batailley, Château;Pauillac | 108 | 1.2 |
| Haut-Brion, Château;Pessac-Léognan | 378 | 4.2 |
| Issan, Château d';Margaux | 53 | .6 |

| Kirwan, Château;Margaux | 49 | .5 |
|--|--|--|
| Lafaurie-Peyraguey, Château;Sauternes | 16 | .2 |
| Lafite Rothschild, Château;Pauillac | 399 | 4.4 |
| Lafon-Rochet, Château;Saint-Estèphe | 84 | .9 |
| Lagrange, Château;Saint-Julien | 108 | 1.2 |
| Lagune, Château la;Haut-Médoc | 155 | 1.7 |
| Lamothe Guignard, Château;Sauternes | 5 | .1 |
| Lamothe, Château;Sauternes | 5 | .1 |
| Langoa-Barton, Château;Saint-Julien | 32 | .4 |
| Lascombes, Château;Margaux | 104 | 1.2 |
| Latour, Château;Pauillac | 385 | 4.3 |
| Léoville-Barton, Château;Saint-Julien | 139 | 1.5 |
| Léoville-Las-Cases, Château;Saint-Julien | 261 | 2.9 |
| Léoville-Poyferré, Château;Saint-Julien | 197 | 2.2 |
| Lynch-Bages, Château;Pauillac | 235 | 2.6 |
| Lynch-Moussas, Château;Pauillac | 44 | .5 |
| Malescot Saint-Exupéry, Château;Margaux | 60 | .7 |
| Malle, Château de;Sauternes | 29 | .3 |
| Margaux, Château;Margaux | 366 | 4.1 |
| Marquis d'Alesme Becker, Château;Margaux | 15 | .2 |
| Marquis de Terme, Château;Margaux | 34 | .4 |
| Montrose, Château;Saint-Estèphe | 240 | 2.7 |
| | | |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac | 420 | 4.7 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac | 420 | 4.7 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux | 420 3 224 | 4.7 .0 2.5 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux Pedesclaux, Château;Pauillac | 420 3 224 23 | 4.7 .0 2.5 .3 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux Pedesclaux, Château;Pauillac Pichon Longueville Comtesse de Lalande, | 420 3 224 23 235 | 4.7 .0 2.5 .3 2.6 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux Pedesclaux, Château;Pauillac Pichon Longueville Comtesse de Lalande, Château;Pauillac | 420 3 224 23 235 | 4.7 .0 2.5 .3 2.6 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux Pedesclaux, Château;Pauillac Pichon Longueville Comtesse de Lalande, Château;Pauillac Pichon-Longueville Baron, Château;Pauillac | 420 3 224 23 235 256 | 4.7 .0 2.5 .3 2.6 2.8 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux Pedesclaux, Château;Pauillac Pichon Longueville Comtesse de Lalande, Château;Pauillac Pichon-Longueville Baron, Château;Pauillac Pontet-Canet, Château;Pauillac | 420 3 224 23 235 256 138 | 4.7 .0 2.5 .3 2.6 2.8 1.5 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux Pedesclaux, Château;Pauillac Pichon Longueville Comtesse de Lalande, Château;Pauillac Pichon-Longueville Baron, Château;Pauillac Pontet-Canet, Château;Pauillac Pouget, Château;Margaux | 420 3 224 23 235 235 256 138 7 | 4.7 .0 2.5 .3 2.6 2.8 1.5 .1 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux Pedesclaux, Château;Pauillac Pichon Longueville Comtesse de Lalande, Château;Pauillac Pichon-Longueville Baron, Château;Pauillac Pontet-Canet, Château;Pauillac Pouget, Château;Margaux Prieuré-Lichine, Château;Margaux | 420 3 224 23 235 235 256 138 7 86 | 4.7 .0 2.5 .3 2.6 2.8 1.5 .1 1.0 |
| Mouton-Rothschild, Château;Pauillac Nairac, Château;Barsac Palmer, Château;Margaux Pedesclaux, Château;Pauillac Pichon Longueville Comtesse de Lalande, Château;Pauillac Pichon-Longueville Baron, Château;Pauillac Pontet-Canet, Château;Pauillac Pouget, Château;Margaux Prieuré-Lichine, Château;Margaux Rabaud-Promis, Château;Sauternes | 420 3 224 23 235 256 138 7 86 23 | 4.7 .0 2.5 .3 2.6 2.8 1.5 .1 1.0 .3 |

| Rauzan-Ségla, Château de;Margaux | 108 | 1.2 |
|---|------|-------|
| Rayne Vigneau, Château de;Sauternes | 81 | .9 |
| Rieussec, Château;Sauternes | 62 | .7 |
| Saint-Pierre, Château (Saint-Julien);Saint- | 50 | .6 |
| Julien | | |
| Sigalas Rabaud, Château;Sauternes | 24 | .3 |
| Suduiraut, Château;Sauternes | 74 | .8 |
| Talbot, Château;Saint-Julien | 153 | 1.7 |
| Tertre, Château du;Margaux | 42 | .5 |
| Tour Blanche, Château la | 20 | .2 |
| (Sauternes);Sauternes | | |
| Tour Carnet, Château la;Haut-Médoc | 105 | 1.2 |
| Yquem, Château d';Sauternes | 279 | 3.1 |
| Total | 9032 | 100.0 |

In crossing the data (see table 6), we see the retailer B, Zh has a lot of ratings from Gabriel (2579); the retailer C. BB, ZH gas 1488 ratings from Gabriel. So we must use as reference retailer B, ZH and as critics Gabriel.

| | Observations | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------|------|---------|-------|---------|--|--|
| | Va | llid | Miss | sing | Total | | | |
| | Ν | Percent | Ν | Percent | N | Percent | | |
| 2002-B, zh * Id | 9032 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * Vintage | 9032 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * Issued | 9032 | 100.0% | 0 | .0% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 5513-Gabriel | 2579 | 28.6% | 6453 | 71.4% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 5504-Wine | 1074 | 11.9% | 7958 | 88.1% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| Spectator | | | | | | | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 5506-Bettane | 752 | 8.3% | 8280 | 91.7% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 5509-Coates | 754 | 8.3% | 8278 | 91.7% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 5505-Parker | 754 | 8.3% | 8278 | 91.7% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 5512-Tanzer | 476 | 5.3% | 8556 | 94.7% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 848-G, zh | 1362 | 15.1% | 7670 | 84.9% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 1471-M, vd | 1775 | 19.7% | 7257 | 80.3% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 2606-Ar, bs | 1630 | 18.0% | 7402 | 82.0% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 507-Sch, lu | 1670 | 18.5% | 7362 | 81.5% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 71-C. BB, zh | 2960 | 32.8% | 6072 | 67.2% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |
| 2002-B, zh * 475-Luc, lu | 1390 | 15.4% | 7642 | 84.6% | 9032 | 100.0% | | |

Table 6. Cross-data between retailer B,ZH and other variables

6. Exploratory results

Extended results will be presented during the conference since we are restructuring the database in order to exploit it and not to loose information represented by the huge number of missing values.

Here are some examples of regression.

In table 7, we run a regression with B, Zh as dependent variable and we use as independent variables: Id (code of the wine), Vintage (of the wine), Issue (price for each year), C. BB (a retailer) and Gabriel (ratings). We observe that ratings made by Parker are significant whereas ratings made by Gabriel are not. So, prices of retailer B, ZH are influenced by Parker. We can also notice the vintage and the year of editing the catalogue (issue) are influencing the price (they are significant). Finally, id or the brand name is not influencing the price, which seem to be abnormal.

Table 7. Regression 1

| | | Non-Standardi | zed coefficients | Standardized coefficients | | |
|-------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------|------|
| Model | | A | Standard-Error | Bêta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constante) | -4148.736 | 14191.574 | | 292 | .770 |
| | ld | 9.800E-8 | .000 | .046 | .850 | .397 |
| | Vintage | -26.236 | 2.624 | 658 | -10.000 | .000 |
| | Issued | 27.518 | 7.909 | .211 | 3.479 | .001 |
| | 5513-Gabriel | 4.440 | 10.975 | .025 | .405 | .686 |
| | 5505-Parker | 16.080 | 4.660 | .234 | 3.451 | .001 |

a. Dependent variable : 2002-B, zh

In regression 2, we can observe the prices of retailer B, ZH are influenced by the wine brand name (id), the vintage, the issue and the rating of Gabriel is not significant. Finally, there is a relationship between the price of B, ZH and "C. BB", ZH,

Table 8. Regression 2.

| | | Non-Standardi | zed coefficients | Standardized coefficients | | |
|-------|--------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------|------|
| Model | | А | Standard error | Bêta | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constante) | -20805.334 | 1840.361 | | -11.305 | .000 |
| | ld | 5.499E-8 | .000 | .036 | 3.367 | .001 |
| | Vintage | -1.113 | .292 | 055 | -3.812 | .000 |
| | Issued | 11.484 | .971 | .129 | 11.825 | .000 |
| | 5513-Gabriel | 2.107 | 1.298 | .019 | 1.623 | .105 |
| | 71-C BB, zh | .989 | .015 | .914 | 67.230 | .000 |

a. Dependent variable : 2002-Badaracco, zh

6. Further research and limits

For the moment, we decided to focus only on Bordeaux wines since they are used in most studies as benchmark; perhaps because of the availability of database proposed by the effective Bordeaux distribution system (wine merchants/négociants).

In the future, we would like to extend our research to one or two regions where Vinfox has a lot of data especially ratings such as Burgundy, Champagne, California or/and Italy. We could compare Bordeaux region with those regions.

The main concern we have is to avoid deleting missing values that could give us a lot of information on scarcity phenomenon for example. So, we must test a lot of alternatives that will be done within the conference. So, we can compare, Wine per Wine, segment of wine per segment (price segmentation) or issue per issue (e.g comparison between issue 1998 and issue 2008).

We could also incorporate different variables easy to collect for each region except sensory ones (due to the lack of references):

- climate of the vintage or quality of the vintage (source: official unions of producers)
- chateaux' production: number of bottles and ha (source: Bettane)
- potential of the bottle (source: Bradfer (2008))
- average price of auctions (source: Bradfer (2008) and choko (2008))
- kinds of grapes (source: Bettane)
- Price of "En-primeur"
- Ranking of 1855

In the model, we will build, we can introduce measurement error for price fluctuation

Finally, some price correction should be made because of the exchange rate fluctuation between currencies.

References

ASHENFELTER O., (2008), "Predicting the quality and prices of Bordeaux wine", *The Economic Journal*, 118, June, F174-F184.

BETTANNE M. & DESSEAUVE T., (2004), *Guide du classement des meilleurs vins de France 2005*, Edition de la Revue Du Vin De France.

BRADFER A., De CLOUET A., MARATIER C., (2008), *La cote des grands vins de France*, Hachette.

CHOKO, (2008), La côte des vins, Editions intemporel.

GERGAUD Olivier & GINSBURGH Victor, (2008) "Natural endowments, production technologies and the quality of wines in Bordeaux. Does terroir matter?, *The Economic Journal*, 118, June, F142-F157.

JONES G. & STORCHMANN K.-H., (2001), "Wine market prices and investment under uncertainty: an econometric model for Bordeaux Crus Classés", *Agricultural Economics*, 26, pp. 115-133.

HADJ ALI H., LECOCQ S. & VISSER M., (2008), "The impact of gurus : Parker grades and en primeur wine prices", *The Economic Journal*, 118, June, F158-F173.

HOROWITZ I. & LOCKSHIN L., (2002), "What price quality? An investigation into the prediction of wine-quality ratings, *Journal of Wine Research*, Vol.13, N°1, pp. 7-22.

LANCASTER, K. J. (1966), "A new approach to consumer theory", *Journal of the Political Economy*, 32, pp. 132-157.

LECOCQ S. & VISSER M., "What determines wine prices: objective vs. Sensory characteristics", *Journal of Wine Economics*, Vol. 1, N° 1, Spring 2006, pp. 42-56.

LIVAT Florine, (2002), « Vins de Bordeaux : où sont les marches? », *Oenométrie IX*, Montpellier, 31 mai-1 juin.

MILLER J., GENC I. & DRISCOLL A., (2007), "Wine price and quality: in search of signalling equilibrium in 2001 California Cabernet sauvignon", *Journal of Wine Research*, Vol.18, N°1, pp.35-46.

ROSEN, S. (1974), Hedonic prices and implicit markets: product differentiation in pure competition, *Journal of the Political Economy*, 83, p. 34-55.

OUTREVILLE Jean-François, (2008), "A market-based pricing model for wines: test over the period 1988-2007", *Abstract presented at Enometrics XV*, Collioure, May 29-May 31.

UNWIN Tim, (1999), "Hedonic price indexes and the qualities of wines", *Journal of Wine Research*, Vol.10, N°2, pp. 95-104.