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ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to understand Mid-Atlantic wine consumers’ consumption and purchasing attitudes and behaviors, in order to assist winery owners and tasting room operators develop or enhance their marketing strategies. Majority, 71.8%, of participants purchased both “everyday” wines and wines served when entertaining and/or celebrating special occasions. More participants who drank wine at least once a week drank dry wines, while less frequent wine consumers favored sweeter wines. Sixty percent of participants felt somewhat informed about the locations/presence of tasting rooms in their state/local area and 14.0% felt well-informed. A majority (73.5%) who visited tasting rooms with a romantic partner were interested in a single set of samples that the couple could share. Those who visited with groups were interested in a fixed wine flight that would include the same wines and number of samples for each group member (72.9%). Availability of food would motivate participants to visit tasting rooms; light snacks available for purchase (e.g., cheese and crackers) at a winery tasting room and restaurants in the local area were important to participants (60.6% and 63.2%, respectively). The majority (87%) of participants used social media, email, and/or review sites at least once a month with most (94%) using Facebook, of which 64.5% used it to engage with and/or learn about winery tasting rooms. A quarter of survey participants (24.1%) indicated they had applications installed on their mobile device that they used to learn about wine and tasting rooms, with 68.2% interested in an app feature that helped them navigate to the tasting room (e.g., location service, directions, and/or map). Of the 42.1% of survey participants who had attended a wine festival in the past, pleasant weather (shade available if needed) was the positive aspect that was selected by the majority of these participants (60.7%). The negative aspect that was selected by the greatest percentage of festival attendees was crowded, long lines; however, only 33.7%
of festival attendees selected this aspect. Barriers that prevented participants from not attending a festival in the past were: distance needed to travel to the festival (36.4%), price of admission (31.5%), and date and/or time the festival was held (27.4%).
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION
**Introduction to Research**

Many studies have been conducted in the United States (U.S.) pertaining to wine consumer preferences, behaviors, and response to sensory factors, yet little research has been conducted in the Mid-Atlantic region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania), in particular, to learn about residents’ consumption and purchasing patterns. The number of wineries in the U.S. has steadily grown and having a research-based understanding of consumers who reside in specific regions, for example the Mid-Atlantic, would greatly benefit the wine industry. In particular, data needs to be gathered from wine drinkers in the region pertaining to consumption, purchasing, attitudes, and preferences to understand how these sentiments might differ from data collected on a national level. Analyzing such data allows wineries and tasting rooms improve their marketing strategies and engage consumers in a more appropriate way, which may increase wine sales, brand awareness, and loyalty.

The research presented in this thesis is based on data collected through three Internet surveys that targeted wine consumers in the Mid-Atlantic region. Internet surveys have become the most appropriate and minimal cost method of collecting and processing data. Limitations of using such an approach could be the inability to ask participants more clarifying questions, which is possible through face-to-face research. Yet, Internet surveys can reach individuals in distant locations reach, save time and reduce costs associated with mailing questionnaires, and provides the convenience of automated data collection (Wright, 2005).
Outline of Introduction Topics

This introduction will provide an overview of the methods conducted using Internet surveys in 2015 and 2016 to reach wine consumers residing in three states: New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. An overview of the U.S. wine industry is presented followed by information about the wine industries specific to the three states. Previous research methods that involved segmenting wine consumer participants based on consumption profiles, generations, and wine consumption frequency will be mentioned with a description of what methods this research study utilized to segment survey participants. Next, an overview of research on wine tourism in the Mid-Atlantic region, the importance of winery activities, events, and festivals, and methods of communication will be presented. As previous research is limited, the data and outcomes of this research will be of value to the Mid-Atlantic wine industry.

Materials and Methods Overview

Data were collected through three separate 15-minute Internet surveys (Survey 1, 29 November to 1 December 2015; Survey 2, 21 to 23 March 2016; and Survey 3, 28 to 31 March 2016), which were administered to Survey Sampling International, LLC (Shelton, CT) panelists residing in three states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) in the Mid-Atlantic region. Panelists were screened for not being a member of the wine industry, being at least 21 years old, residing in one of the targeted states, and for having purchased and drank wine at least once within the previous year. Panelists were informed of these criteria in an electronic consent statement prior to proceeding with the survey. Those who qualified proceeded to the survey which was developed by the researchers, approved by the Social Science Research at The Pennsylvania State
University (IRB 37365, University Park, PA), and administered using SurveyMoney.com (Palo Alto, CA), an online provider of survey solutions. Surveys were pre-tested on a subset (range of 73 to 98) of the target market. For Survey 1, 1,043 participants opened and attempted the survey with 847 qualifying and completing the questions. Twelve hundred Survey 2 participants opened and attempted the questions with 1,038 qualifying and completing the survey, and Survey 3, which was offered only to participants who completed Survey 2, was opened and attempted by 753 participants, with 714 qualifying and completing the survey. Panelists were provided with an incentive of either cash, points, or by being able to donate to charity to encourage participation. The project “Developing Wine Marketing Strategies for the Mid-Atlantic Region” (GRANT 11091317) was funded by the USDA Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program.

Overview of the United States Wine Industry

The United States (U.S.) wine market is one of the fastest growing markets, for both consumption and production (Hodgen, 2011), and became the largest wine market in the world in 2011 (Franson, 2011). In 2015, the U.S. remained in the lead with 913 million total gallons of wine consumed (Wine Institute, 2016a), and between 2011 to 2014, wine production increased 12.2% resulting in the U.S. ranking fourth in the world for wine production (Wine Institute, 2014). The U.S. wine industry had a total retail value of $55.8 billion in 2016, which has increased annually since 1998 (Wine Institute, 2016b). In January 2017, there were 9,091 wineries in the U.S., a 5% increase since January 2016, with a total annual production of 326,000,000 cases of wine (Wines and Vines Analytics, 2017). The industry as a whole continues to see a positive growth and is expected to continue growing around 2 to 3% each year (Thach, 2015).
Wine Industries in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania

The Mid-Atlantic region in the U.S. includes the following states: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania (Annenberg Foundation, 2016). As with the growth in the number of total wineries in the U.S., the number of wineries in the Mid-Atlantic region has increased. As of January 2017, there were 385 wineries in New York, 229 in Pennsylvania, and under 100 in New Jersey (Wines and Vines Analytics, 2017). New York was ranked fourth in the total number of wineries and Pennsylvania was ranked seventh (Wines and Vines Analytics, 2017). New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania were the main focus of the research presented for the following reasons:

1) Each state has continually increased in the number of wineries and wine production. New Jersey is the seventh largest wine producing state in the nation (1.5 million gallons of wine produced annually) (Coffin, n.d.), New York’s net production in 2017 was 12 million cases of wine and ranked third in the nation, and Pennsylvania ranked tenth for production (850,000 annual cases) (Wines and Vines Analytics, 2017).

2) A large sum of total economic impact was generated from each state’s wine, grape, and related industries. New Jersey had a $231 million economic value in 2011 (Frank, Rimerman, 2013a), $4.8 billion for New York in 2012 (Stonebridge Research Group, 2014), and $1.9 billion in Pennsylvania in 2011 (Frank, Rimerman, 2013b).

3) Each state’s environment is suitable for grape production. Over 40 grape varieties are grown in New Jersey (Coffin, n.d.); 25 varietals of grapes are grown in New York, including Native American varieties and an additional 10 specialized table grape varieties (New York Wines, 2016); and at least 70 varieties are produced in Pennsylvania, which is more than most wine regions (Carroll, 2006).
As the wineries in these three states are producing high-quality, desirable wines, contributing greatly to the states’ economy, and more wineries are being established, research focusing on wine consumers residing in each of the three states would greatly benefit all industry members, specifically wineries and tasting rooms. These owners and operators need access to pertinent information about these wine consumers, their preferences, and consumption behaviors in order to develop marketing strategies that appeal to them and encourage them to visit tasting rooms in the region, try Mid-Atlantic wine, and purchase local wines.

Methods for Segmenting Wine Consumers

By assessing the driving force of the wine industry, the wine consumer, winery owners and tasting room manager gain a more thorough insight of who the U.S. wine consumer is, their wine preferences, purchasing behaviors, and consumption patterns. Currently, over 100 million people in the U.S. drink wine (Vino California, 2015). Of the total U.S. adult population in 2016, 13% were reported as being high frequency wine consumers who drank wine several times a week or more often, 24% drank wine occasionally, 26% did not drink wine but drank other alcoholic beverages, and 37% did not drink alcohol at all (Franson, 2016). With such high percentages of wine consumers (37% of the population age 21 and older), and the potential for attitudes and behaviors to differ within the wine consuming group, it is important to understand what differences may exist in order for wineries to better market their product to specific wine consuming segments. Past research has suggested different methods of segmentation of the wine consuming population with three of these methods described below.
**Consumer Profiles:** A wine consumer research study conducted by Constellation Brands, from 2004 to 2014, segmented wine consumers into six distinct profiles: Price Driven (21% of participants), Everyday Loyal (20%), Overwhelmed (19%), Image Seekers (18%), Engaged Newcomers (12%), and Enthusiasts (10%) (Constellation Brands, n.d.). Each segment was defined by their wine knowledge, drinking patterns, and perception of wine itself (Penn, 2014).

**Generations:** Another possible way to segment wine consumers is by dividing them into groups based on the the U.S. generation of which they are a member, which corresponds to the year they were born. The U.S. adult population can be broken down into five generations: The Millennial Generation (1981 to 1997), Generation X (1965 to 1980), The Baby Boomer Generation (1946 to 1964), The Silent Generation (1928 to 1945) and The Greatest Generation (before 1928) (Pew Research Center, 2016). Although Millennials were the fast-growing group of wine consumers, Baby Boomers still led with the greatest number of high frequency wine drinkers (38%), those who consumed wine more than once a week, than Millennials (30%) (Quackenbush, 2016). Baby Boomers have accounted for the greatest proportion of wine sales for the past 20 years and “still maintain the largest demographic footprint on the business with a 41% share” (McMillan, 2017). Generation X is responsible for the second largest portion of wine sales and their fine wine consumption continues to increase (McMillan, 2017). Although the Millennial generation does not account for a large portion of the total wine sales (17%), they are a “growth cohort and the future of the wine business” (McMillan, 2017). Another generational aspect to note is that due to the long span of the Baby Boomer Generation, the generation has been broken into two subgroups: Early Boomers (1946 to 1954) and Generation Jones (1955 to 1964) (Werde, 2015). The research presented will discuss the similarities and differences between Generation Jones and
Baby Boomers (Early Boomers). Generational segmentation is widely used in marketing to understand how these groups impact the U.S. wine industry, as there are commonalities pertaining to types of wine consumed.

Although national data has been segmented based on U.S. generation, research specific to the Mid-Atlantic region wine consumer is needed. It is important to understand a generation’s wine purchasing and consumption behaviors as there may be similarities between segments, which could help wineries and tasting rooms develop more effective marketing strategies to reach more than one generation of wine consumers.

**Consumption Frequencies:** The third method of segmenting wine consumers was introduced by The Wine Market Council when the association divided wine consumers into groups based on their consumption frequency. In 2008, 10.5% of adults age 21 and older were categorized as super core wine consumers, those who drank wine daily to a few times a week. These consumers drank 82% of all wine sold in the United States. Core consumers accounted for 5.2% of the adult population and drank wine about once a week; and marginal wine consumers, 15.2% of the adult population, drank wine less frequently (Perdue, 2009). Although some research has been conducted to learn about U.S. wine consumers based on their consumption frequency, a theory exists that super core wine consumers, for example, will display certain traits and levels of interest in wine, tasting rooms, and other wine related activities.

**Wine Tourism in the Mid-Atlantic Region**

It is important to understand who engages in wine tourism as well as their motivations, preferences, and likelihood to participate in activities associated with this type of travel (Woodside et al., 2008), as wine tourism is a large portion of the wine industry and
contributes millions of dollars to each state’s economy. Wine regions have found financial benefit in promoting wine tourism and have spent substantial amounts of money to promote wine tourism at their winery by offering a “complete tourism experience” including restaurants, lodging, winery tours, and picnic and recreational facilities (Wines and Balkans, n.d.). As stated earlier, the wine industry in each state had a large economic impact on the state’s economy. In 2011, approximately 100,000 wine tourists visited New Jersey (Frank, Rimerman, 2013a), 5.29 million visited New York in 2012, (Stonebridge Research Group, 2014), and 1.2 million wine tourists visited Pennsylvania in 2011 (Frank, Rimerman, 2013b).

According to a publication written by Dr. Marlene Pratt, Griffith University in Australia, there are four types of wine tourists based on their behavior profiles: 1) the “wine lover,” an individual knowledgeable about wine and enjoys food and wine pairing; 2) “wine interested,” one who is eager to learn about wine and enjoys food; 3) “wine curious,” a tourist who has less of an interest in wine but usually travels for non-wine related reasons; and 4) “disinterested wine,” tourist who usually visits wineries with others and has no interest in learning about wine (2014).

Researchers have also identified aspects of the wine tourism experience that encouraged customers to visit wine regions and tasting rooms. Wine tourists have motivations, preferences, and desires to participate in activities, including visiting wineries. These additional activities and/or events could aid in creating a well-rounded wine tourism experience. A wine tourism study conducted by the Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre (STCRC; 2008) in Australia identified key “enhancement factors” to improve wine tourism experiences including:
• Assess the winery’s business to determine potential options that could offer a desirable wine tourist’s experience.

• Develop “positive service interactions” to appeal to wine tourists. This may include improving tasting room landscape, interior design, or including interactive displays. Including food and wine combination experience may be an alternative and preferable option for tasting rooms (The Sustainable Tourism and Cooperative Research Center, 2008).

A focus on wine tourism through enrichment of consumer values is important, although the process of doing so can be poorly understood by researchers and managers (Carlsen et al., 2015), which is another rational for conducting consumer research and identifying their needs and wants. Research described in this thesis identified aspects offered at a winery tasting room and within the surrounding areas that have a positive impact on consumers’ decisions to visit.

Winery Activities, Events, and Festivals

Winery activities, events, and festivals are effective in attracting tourists to a particular destination and a strategy essential to introduce new wines to consumers (Szabó et al., 2014). Tasting room activities and events can help ensure consumers have a memorable, positive experience and encourage them to visit again. Wine festivals attract a wider, diverse group of visitors, and can reach a potentially new market (Houghton, 2008).

Winery Activities and Events: Past research has explored the importance of creating memorable experiences for customers visiting a tasting room. Several studies (Janney, 2012; Byrd et al., 2016) have noted the importance of tasting rooms to improve brand
loyalty, specifically by improving on-site experience. Activities and events, such as live music, winery tours, and food and wine pairings are examples of on-site experiences. Consumers surveys can help determine what may entice regional tourists to visit a tasting room once or routinely, and marketing strategies can be focused around these key determinants. Examples of these factors may include: a consumption experience with the wine product, aesthetic vineyard and tasting room features, wine educational opportunities, entertainment and events, a relaxing environment, socialization and recreational opportunities, positive customer service, and memberships in wine clubs (Byrd et al., 2016). Yet, little research has been conducted on measuring these potential experiences within the Mid-Atlantic region (Charters et al., 2009).

**Wine Festivals:** Of the various wine tourism activities and events that could be offered, on-site winery festivals offer unique advantages for wineries (Szabó et al., 2014). Motivations that encourage wine tourists to participate in a wine festival include: entertainment, atmosphere, socialization with friends, and wine tastings (Dodd et al., 2006). In Hungary, a survey of consumers who attended Hungary’s largest wine festival reported their satisfaction with the festival and variety of wines tasted (Szabó et al., 2014). Other positive aspects included the festival’s services, organizations, gastronomy, tasting ticket system, signage, and staff hygiene (Szabó et al., 2014). Although emphasis of consumer feedback on festivals is placed on positive aspects, results from Kruger et al. (2013) found attendees were most influenced by a lack of negative experiences. Both studies offer insight into what is important to attendees at wine festivals and highlight the importance of gathering feedback from attendees. Such information can aid wineries, tasting rooms, and festival organizers to develop more effective marketing and execution strategies that minimize potentially negative experiences held by an attendee (Houghton, 2008).
Preferred Methods of Promotional Communication

Making sure that current and potential winery and/or tasting room customers are well-informed about the business, location, wines available, and other general information should be an imperative goal for the industry to accomplish. Social media is an important and effective marketing tool that wineries and tasting rooms should utilize when promoting the business and to increase website traffic, raise brand awareness, create brand identity and positive brand association, and improve communication with targeted audiences (WordStream, n.d.). Overall, social media is used to engage consumers and is not for selling purposes but for building relationships and trust (Bullas, 2010).

In addition to social media marketing, smartphone applications could be another way for wineries and/or tasting rooms to engage wine consumers and serve as a source of information regarding tasting room hours of operation, upcoming activities and events, and sales promotions.

**Social Media:** Each social media platform has its own purpose, yet the overall goal of using social media is to connect with followers and provide information that will help them enjoy wine. In 2017, 88% of the U.S. population had Internet access and 66% of the population actively used social media (Kemp, 2017b). From January 2016 to January 2017, the number of active social media users increased 21% and active mobile social users (those who accessed social media on their mobile devices) increased 30% (Kemp, 2017a). Facebook is the most widely used platform and, in 2016, 68% of U.S. adults and 76% of all Americans visited the site daily (Greenwood et al., 2016). Approximately 30% of a sample of Millennials used Facebook as a source of information on wine and those who used Facebook for information on wine were more likely to drink wine at a party, purchase more wine and spend more on wine each month (Szolnoki et al., 2016).
Additionally, 28% percent of all U.S. adults used Instagram, the second most “engaging” network after Facebook, and 51% of Americans who used Instagram visited the site daily. Slightly fewer, 21%, of U.S. adults used Twitter, with 42% of Americans using Twitter reporting that they visited the site every day (Greenwood et al., 2016). Sixty million people in the U.S. used Snapchat in 2017. While the audience tends to be a little bit younger, the number of users age 25 and older grew two times faster than users under the age of 25 in 2016 (Mediakix, 2017).

**Smartphone Applications:** In 2015, 68% of U.S. adults owned a smartphone with younger consumers more likely to own one than older consumers (Anderson, 2015). It is estimated that between 2014 and 2020 the number of U.S. smartphone users, of all ages, will increase by 50.1% (Statista, 2016). The use of mobile applications “accounted for 80% of all growth in digital media engagement” between June 2013 and June 2016 and younger smartphone users reported spending an average of 93.5 hours during an average month on smartphone applications, with consumers over age 44 using their devices 62.7 hours or less during an average month (ComScore, 2016). Hence, wineries and tasting rooms could find that mobile applications can be used to communicate with customers, encourage them to make purchases, and serve as a way to differentiate the winery and/or tasting room from those who do not offer a mobile application (Velji, 2016).

The use of social media and smartphone applications should be considered by winery owners and tasting room operators when analyzing their marketing plan to better reach targeted markets. Social media network popularity continues to grow as well as the use of mobile applications. Thus, utilizing these tools can greatly aid wineries and tasting rooms increase brand awareness, engage with customers, and build their brand image.
References:


CHAPTER 2. MID-ATLANTIC WINE CONSUMERS PURCHASING AND CONSUMPTION ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS PERTAINING TO EVERYDAY WINES AND THOSE SERVED WHEN ENTERTAINING AND/OR CELEBRATING SPECIAL OCCASIONS
Abstract

Two Internet surveys (Survey 1, 29 November to 1 December 2015 and Survey 2, 21 to 23 of March 2016) were administered to consumers who: were age 21 and older, resided in the three states in the Mid-Atlantic U.S. region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania), were not a member of the wine industry, and purchased and consumed wine within the previous year. Survey 1 participants answered questions about their wine purchasing and consumption preferences and behaviors as they related to “everyday” wine and wine that they served when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion. Survey 2 included questions that asked participants to indicate the price ranges they paid for a 750 ml bottle of wine for both occasions. Differences were explored by several demographic variables: U.S. generation, participants’ gender, and wine consumption frequency. Approximately half of participants in each survey (49.3% for both) were super core wine consumers (drank wine daily to a few times a week), and 71.8% of participants reported purchasing both “everyday” wines that they consumed in their home during an average day and wines they served when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion. But, more super core (76.4%) and core (75.3%) participants purchased wines for both occasions than marginal (62.6%) participants. Also, 92.9% of all participants reported that they drank wine in their home when they were not entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion and 96.9% drank in their home when they were entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion. Pertaining to wine consumed in the home when not entertaining, more marginal participants were likely to favor sweet wines and semi-sweet wines whereas more super core and core participants were likely to favor dry wines. For entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion, more super core and core participants favored dry wines than marginal participants (54.1, 51.9 and 32.8%, respectively). When asked to indicate the
state/region from which they purchased wine, California was selected by more participants than the other options presented for both “everyday” consumption (67.7%) and to consume when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion (64.6%), yet fewer younger generations reported purchasing wines from California compared to older generation for both occasions (range of 44.1 to 86.2%). The price range typically paid for a 750 ml bottle of “everyday” wine that the greatest percentage of participants selected (39.7%) was $8.00 to $10.99, while 32.0% indicated that they typically paid $15.00 to $19.99 for wines served when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion. Results from this research can assist winery and tasting room owners, operators, and the industry as a whole with identifying wine products that would be of interest to wine drinkers based on their wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

Introduction

For several decades, the number of wineries in the Mid-Atlantic, as well as the United States (U.S.), has increased. As of January 2017, there were 385 wineries in New York, 229 in Pennsylvania, and under 100 in New Jersey (Wines and Vines Analytics, 2017). New York was ranked fourth in the total number of wineries and Pennsylvania was ranked seventh (Wines and Vines Analytics, 2017). While the Mid-Atlantic is comprised of the following states: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania (Annenberg Foundation, 2016), New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania were the main focus of the research presented for the following reasons:

1) Each state has continually increased in the number of wineries and wine production. New Jersey is the seventh largest wine producing state in the nation (1.5 million gallons of wine produced annually) (Coffin, n.d.), New York’s net production in 2017 was 12
million cases of wine and ranked third in the nation, and Pennsylvania ranked tenth for production (850,000 annual cases) (Wines and Vines Analytics, 2017).

2) A large sum of total economic impact was generated from each state’s wine, grape, and related industries. New Jersey had a $231 million economic value in 2011 (Frank, Rimerman, 2013a), $4.8 billion for New York in 2012 (Stonebridge Research Group, 2014), and $1.9 billion in Pennsylvania in 2011 (Frank, Rimerman, 2013b).

3) Each state’s environment is suitable for grape production. Over 40 grape varieties are grown in New Jersey (Coffin, n.d.); 25 varietals of grapes are grown in New York, including Native American varieties and an additional 10 specialized table grape varieties (New York Wines, 2016); and at least 70 varieties are produced in Pennsylvania, which is more than most wine regions (Carroll, 2006).

As the wineries in these three states are producing high-quality, desirable wines, contributing greatly to the states’ economy, and more wineries are being established, research focusing on wine consumers residing in each of the three states would greatly benefit all industry members, specifically wineries and tasting rooms. These owners and operators need access to pertinent information about these wine consumers, their preferences, and consumption behaviors in order to develop marketing strategies that appeal to them and encourage them to visit tasting rooms in the region, try Mid-Atlantic wine, and purchase local wines.

**Methods for Segmenting Wine Consumers**

By assessing the driving force of the wine industry, the wine consumer, winery owners gain more thorough insight of who the U.S. wine consumer is, their wine preferences, purchasing behaviors, and consumption patterns. Currently, over 100 million people in the U.S. drink wine (Vino California, 2015). Of the total U.S. adult population in 2016,
13% were reported as being high frequency wine consumers who drank wine several times a week or more often, 24% drank wine occasionally, 26% did not drink wine but drank other alcoholic beverages, and 37% did not drink alcohol at all (Franson, 2016). With such high percentages of wine consumers (37% of the population age 21 and older), and the potential for attitudes and behaviors to differ within the wine consuming group, it is important to understand what differences may exist in order for wineries to better market their product to specific wine consuming segments. Past research has suggested different methods of segmentation of the wine consuming population with three of these methods described below.

**Generations:** One possible way to segment wine consumers is by dividing them into groups based on the U.S. generation of which they are a member, which corresponds to the year they were born. The U.S. adult population can be broken down into five generations: The Millennial Generation (1981 to 1997), Generation X (1965 to 1980), The Baby Boomer Generation (1946 to 1964), The Silent Generation (1928 to 1945) and The Greatest Generation (before 1928) (Pew Research Center, 2016). Although Millennials were the fast-growing group of wine consumers, Baby Boomers still led with the greatest number of high frequency wine drinkers (38%), those who consumed wine more than once a week, than Millennials (30%) (Quackenbush, 2016). Baby Boomers have accounted for the greatest proportion of wine sales for the past 20 years and “still maintain the largest demographic footprint on the business with a 41% share” (McMillan, 2017). Generation X is responsible for the second largest portion of wine sales and their fine wine consumption continues to increase (McMillan, 2017). Although the Millennial generation does not account for a large portion of the total wine sales (17%), they are a “growth cohort and the future of the wine business” (McMillan, 2017). Another generational aspect to note is that due to the long span of the Baby Boomer Generation,
the generation has been broken into two subgroups: Early Boomers (1946 to 1954) and Generation Jones (1955 to 1964) (Werde, 2015). The research presented will discuss the similarities and differences between Generation Jones and Baby Boomers (Early Boomers). Generational segmentation is widely used in marketing to understand how these groups impact the U.S. wine industry, as there are commonalities pertaining to types of wine consumed.

Although national data has been segmented based on U.S. generation, research specific to the Mid-Atlantic region wine consumer is needed. It is important to understand a generation’s wine purchasing and consumption behaviors as there may be similarities between segments, which could help wineries and tasting rooms develop more effective marketing strategies to reach more than one generation of wine consumers.

**Consumption Frequencies:** The third method of segmenting wine consumers was introduced by The Wine Market Council when the association divided wine consumers into groups based on their consumption frequency. In 2008, 10.5% of adults age 21 and older were categorized as super core wine consumers, those who drank wine daily to a few times a week. These consumers drank 82% of all wine sold in the United States. Core consumers accounted for 5.2% of the adult population and drank wine about once a week; and marginal wine consumers, 15.2% of the adult population, drank wine less frequently (Perdue, 2009). Although some research has been conducted to learn about U.S. wine consumers based on their consumption frequency, a theory exists that super core wine consumers, for example, will display certain traits and levels of interest in wine, tasting rooms, and other wine related activities.
**Previous Research on the U.S. Wine Consumer**

**Styles of wine:** Previous research has explored consumer preferences for styles and types of wines to determine consumption trends. One research revealed that U.S. participants drank wine with the following characters: fruity (58%), semi-sweet (57%), and smooth (56%) (Thach et al., 2015). When preferences were compared based on age group, younger participants (age 21 to 44) drank red wine (86%), white wine (79%), sweet/dessert wine (31%), and other sparkling wine (23%) than older wine consumers (over age 44) (Saieg, 2012). Additionally, younger wine consumers spent a greater amount on wine ($11.93 to 23.47 per bottle) than older wine consumers ($10.54 to 20.51 per bottle) (Saieg, 2012). Although information has been collected on wine consumer preferences at a national level, little research has been conducted to determine if wine consumers in the Mid-Atlantic region display similarities or differences when compared to the broader group.

**Wine occasions:** Past research has indicated that consumers participate in a wide variety of wine consumption occasions such as holidays, drinking wine with a meal at a friend’s house, when entertaining guests, while cooking and during activities while at home (Focus Research & Strategy, 2015). Wine occasion is the where and when wine is consumed (Thach, 2011). This is important information for wineries as it can help drive wine marketing strategies tailored to consumers’ purchasing decisions (McGechan, 2013). Segmenting wine consumption behaviors by occasion can be more appropriate for wine placement and promotion than other methods of segmentation such as demographics (Thach, 2011). Segmenting wine occasions into two basic categories, everyday consumption and special occasions, can provide wineries and tasting room with a better understanding of purchasing and consumption patterns for the two occasions.
“Everyday” wine is consumed in the home on occasions when the participant is not entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion. The decision to purchase wine for this occasion could be considered “little involvement” or a “low-risk decision” as the consequences of a “wrong” purchase is perceived as being minor (Fountain et al., 2011). A Colorado research study found that 83% of participants drank wine at home alone, while relaxing, reading or some related activity without food. Seventy-two percent of participants who responded to another survey indicated that they drank wine while cooking (Focus Research & Strategy, 2015), another “everyday” occasion.

Generational differences are found amongst when wine is being consumed. A 2013 wine consumer survey found that Millennials and Generation Xers were consuming more wine at home that occurred at the end of the day, during a casual weekday restaurant dinner, while eating meals alone, at a bar or lounge, during business entertaining, with takeout, and at a ball game or concert compared to older generations (Kirschenmann, 2013).

“Special occasion” wine, selected for a specific gathering, event or holiday, associated as a “high involvement” due to the high emotional attachment of potentially serving or providing a bad wine (Fountain et al., 2011). “Special occasion” wine includes wine purchased and consumed while entertaining guests (friends and/or family), celebrating holidays, and hosting parties and formal events. The importance of “special occasion” wines is shown in one survey of Californians in which the majority of participants purchased and consumed wine during holidays, while entertaining, and other special occasions (Focus Research & Strategy, 2015).

**Price and wine occasions:** Based on a 2015 U.S. survey, price was the primary motivating factor in the decision to purchase wine (72%) (Thatch et al., 2015). In 2013, U.S. wine consumers were more likely to purchased wines under $30 for “casual
weekday dinners” than wines in higher price ranges. When participants were asked how much they would pay for wines to consume during “weekend dinner with friends,” 35% reported purchasing wine priced $50 to $74 and 34% purchased wine priced $30 to $49 (Kirschenmann, 2013). Additionally, a 2012 study conducted by Michigan State University researchers reported how much consumers typically paid per bottle of wine to be consumption in the home. For “everyday consumption” the majority of participants (43%) indicated they paid $9 to $11.99 per bottle. For a “premium bottle,” 55% of participants paid $12 to $19.99 (McCole et al., 2012). By understanding the price range consumers are willing to pay based on consumption occasion, winery owners and tasting room managers can develop products that appeal to wine drinkers at a price appropriate for an occasion.

Research in on the Mid-Atlantic Wine Consumer

Although research has been conducted pertaining to the U.S. wine consumers and their preferences for wine, consumption and purchasing behaviors, occasions when they consume wine, and factors that influence their purchasing decisions, little research has been conducted specific to wine consumers who reside in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Internet surveys have helped reach many wine consumers that would require great travel distances to participate in otherwise, and are an appropriate, minimal cost method of data collection (Wright, 2005). A limitation of Internet based surveys is the inability to ask participants clarifying questions, which is common in face-to-face research. Yet, Internet surveys can include individuals in distant locations away from the research site, save time for researchers, lower costs, and provide convenience associated with automated data collection (Wright, 2005). Information and trends regarding the behaviors of Mid-Atlantic wine consumers would be valuable to regional wineries. The information could be used to better market towards various consumer
segments based on their consumption and purchasing behaviors, wine and price preferences, and factors influencing their decisions to purchase wines for “everyday” and “special occasions.”

**Research Objectives**

- Document Mid-Atlantic (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) consumers’ wine consumption and purchasing attitudes and behaviors in relation to wine consumed and served when entertaining and/or celebrating special occasions.
- Understand how wine preferences for each “everyday” wines versus “special occasion” wines served when entertaining and/or celebrating might differ based on consumption frequency, generation, and gender.
- Determine the factors that influence wine consumers’ consumption and purchasing behaviors pertaining to “everyday” versus “special occasion” wines.
- Understand what influences consumer purchasing decisions when selecting wine for “everyday” versus “special occasion” purchases.

**Materials & Methods**

Data were collected through two separate 15-minute Internet surveys (Survey 1, 29 November to 1 December 2015 and Survey 2, 21 to 23 March 2016), which were administered to Survey Sampling International, LLC (Shelton, CT) panelists residing in three states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) in the Mid-Atlantic region. Panelists were screened for not being a member of the wine industry, being at least 21 years old, residing in one of the targeted states, and for having purchased and drank wine at least once within the previous year. Panelists were informed of these criteria in an electronic consent statement prior to participating in the survey. Those who qualified
proceeded to the survey which was developed by the researchers, approved by the Social Science Research at The Pennsylvania State University (IRB 37365, University Park, PA), and administered using SurveyMoney.com (Palo Alto, CA), an online provider of survey solutions. Surveys were pre-tested on a subset (92 and 98) of the target market. For Survey 1, 1,043 participants opened and attempted the survey with 847 qualifying and completing the questions. Twelve hundred panelists opened Survey 2 and attempted the questions with 1,038 qualifying and completing the survey. To encourage participants, panelists were provided with an incentive of either cash, points, or by being able to donate to charity to encourage participation. The project “Developing Wine Marketing Strategies for the Mid-Atlantic Region” (GRANT 11091317) was funded by the USDA Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program.

**Statistical Analysis**

Data were analyzed with SPSS (Version 23 and 24; SPSS, Chicago, IL). To assess differences between responses, data were segmented by demographic (generation, gender) and wine consumption frequency characteristics. Pearson’s Chi Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests were used to detect differences for categorical and/or multiple-choice questions.

**Results**

A variety of questions were asked in both surveys, primarily in Survey 1, to quantify the consumption and purchasing behavior of wine consumers. Table 2.1 provides an overview of the demographic profiles for Survey 1 and Survey 2 participants. The most common responses to demographic questions for all surveys were female (66.5 and 59.1% respectively); a suburban residence (46.7 and 48.6%); currently married or in a
domestic partnership (60.2 and 64.0%); employed by someone else (53.4 and 55.1%); of the Caucasian race (84.5 and 85.5%); not Hispanic or Latino (91.3 and 90.3%); New York resident (47.4 and 47.5%); lived in a household with no children (64.7 and 60.8%); and lived in a household where one other adult drank wine (55.5 and 55.2%).

Slightly fewer than a quarter of participants belonged to the Older Millennial generation (born in 1981 to 1990) (22.1 and 22.5%); Generation X (born in 1965 to 1980) had slightly more participants (27.3 and 29.0%); while gross household incomes with greater percentages of participants were $25,000 to $49,999 (22.1 and 16.9%), $50,000 to $75,999 (24.3 and 20.5%), and $76,000 to $99,999 (17.4 and 21.1%). Pertaining to level of education, over a third had a Bachelor's degree (36.9 and 35.5%).

Due to the limited number of participants who identified themselves as belonging to the Silent generation and the Greatest generations, compared to the other generations, the two were combined into a new category named The Silent & Greatest generation.
Table 2.1. Demographic characteristics of survey participants who resided in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania (Mid-Atlantic region) and who participated in Internet Survey 1 and Survey 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (1985 to 1990)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>Adult (1991 to 1995)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School Graduate</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Some high school/technical school graduate</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Associate degree/technical school graduate</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Postgraduate degree (e.g., MS, PhD, MD)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 and greater</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Children, age 17 and younger, residing in the household</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (large metropolitan area)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>Urban (large metropolitan area)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban (residential community outside of large metropolitan area)</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>Suburban (residential community outside of large metropolitan area)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area or small town</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>Rural area or small town</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married in a domestic partnership</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>Married in a domestic partnership</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Occupational Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Occupational Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed by someone else</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>Employed by someone else</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time homemaker</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Full-time homemaker</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The two Internet surveys were administered as follows: Survey 1, 29 November to 1 December 2015; Survey 2, 21 to 23 March 2016.

*aSurvey 1 gross household incomes represent 2014 values; Survey 2 gross household incomes represent 2015 values.
Wine Consumption & Purchasing Behavior

Survey 1 and Survey 2 participants were asked to select the frequency which they drank wine: daily, a few times a week, about once a week, two to three times a month, about once a month, a few times a year, and about once a year. Based on responses, participants were assigned to one of three wine consumption categories: those who selected daily or a few times a week became super core participants; participants who drank wine about once a week became core participants; and those who consumed wine less frequently were classified as marginal participants.

Of the Survey 1 participants, 49.3% were super core, 18.8% were core, and 31.9% were marginal wine consuming participants. Similarly, in Survey 2, 49.3% were super core, 18.7% were core, and 32.0% were marginal wine consuming participants.

Participants’ involvement in purchasing wine for consumption in their home was also investigated in Survey 1. Participants were asked to indicate whether they: 1) only purchased “everyday” wines, defined as wines participants’ purchase and consume in their home during an average day (not for consuming when they celebrate special occasions and/or when entertaining in their home); 2) only purchased wines to serve in their home during special occasions and/or when entertaining; or 3) purchased both “everyday” wines and wines for special occasions and/or when entertaining (Table 2.2).
Table 2.2. Survey participants’ involvement in purchasing wine for only “everyday” consumption, only special occasions and/or when entertaining, or for both “everyday” and special occasions and/or when entertaining. Segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.8a 13.3a 14.1a</td>
<td>16.5a 15.6a 16.2a 8.8a 20.3a 17.4a</td>
<td>15.4a 16.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only purchases “everyday” wines that is consumed during an average day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5.8b 11.4b 23.3a</td>
<td>16.5a 11.3a 12.7a 10.5a 11.7a 13.0a</td>
<td>12.0a 13.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only purchases wines that are served when celebrating special occasions and/or when entertaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>76.4a 75.3a 62.6b</td>
<td>67.0a 73.1a 71.2a 80.7a 68.0a 69.6a</td>
<td>72.6a 70.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchases both “everyday” wines consumed during an average day and wines served when celebrating special occasions and/or when entertaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
The majority of all participants (71.8%) reported that they purchased both “everyday” wines and wines for celebrating special occasions and/or when entertaining in their homes. Although, when these data were segmented based on wine consumption frequency, significantly more marginal participants reported only purchasing wines that they served in their home when celebrating special occasions and/or when entertaining (23.3%) compared to super core and core participants (5.8 and 11.4%, respectively). Pertaining to those who purchased wine for both “everyday” and special occasions and/or when entertaining, significantly fewer marginal participants indicated that they did so (62.6%) compared to super core and core (76.4 and 75.3%, respectively). No differences were detected for purchasing occasion when data was segmented by generation or gender.

*Purchasing Everyday Wines*

The majority (92.9%) of participants responded that they consumed “everyday” wine. These participants were then directed to a question asking them to select, from a list of 19 choices, all the factors that influenced them when they purchased a 750 ml bottle of wine for this occasion (Table 2.3). More super core participants (98.8%) reported that they drank “everyday” wine compared to core (92.5%) and marginal (84.1%) participants, and a greater percentage of Older Millennial participants (97.3%) drank “everyday” wine compared to Generation X (90.9%) and Baby Boomer participants (88.4%). Nearly three quarters of participants who drank “everyday” wine at home selected tasted/purchased wine before (72.1%) and price of wine (71.0%) as what influenced their purchasing decision. More males were significantly influenced by tasted/purchased the wine before than female participants (74.9 and 66.4%,
respectively). Pertaining to the price of wine, more core participants selected this as an influence than super core respondents (83.0 and 65.3%, respectively).
Table 2.3. Percentages of survey participants who drink wine in their home when not entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion (everyday wine) and factors that influence everyday wine purchases. Segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Survey Participants Who Consumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Everyday&quot; Wine (no)</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>98.8a (n = 412)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.5b (n = 147)</td>
<td>84.1c (n = 227)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.6ab (n = 103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.3a (n = 181)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.9b (n = 209)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.5ab (n = 110)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.4b (n = 114)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.7ab (n = 66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that Influenced Participants' Purchasing Decision*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasted/purchased the wine before</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>71.4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.6a</td>
<td>74.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of wine</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>65.3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.6ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.8a</td>
<td>73.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.4a</td>
<td>67.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand of wine</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>63.1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.9a</td>
<td>55.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.7a</td>
<td>63.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member/friend recommended the bottle of</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>41.0b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wine</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.5ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.3a</td>
<td>50.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.1ab</td>
<td>35.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varietal (e.g., Chardonnay, Merlot, Riesling)</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3b</td>
<td>39.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.3a</td>
<td>46.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle of wine was on sale</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>35.0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.8a</td>
<td>39.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.9a</td>
<td>33.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food to be consumed with the wine</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>38.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.7a</td>
<td>35.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.5a</td>
<td>34.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle size</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.2b</td>
<td>31.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5b</td>
<td>36.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.9ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.6ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/recommendation from a sales associate</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.0a</td>
<td>28.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.3a</td>
<td>22.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.1ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.1ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (where the grapes were grown)</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>26.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.4a</td>
<td>18.4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.7a</td>
<td>30.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front label</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.2a</td>
<td>21.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.4ab</td>
<td>11.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.2ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on the back label</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3a</td>
<td>15.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0a</td>
<td>17.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality rating assigned by a wine critic</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6ab</td>
<td>10.6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9b</td>
<td>21.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information learned about the wine before the</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>store</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5a</td>
<td>14.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.2a</td>
<td>14.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 Continued. Percentages of survey participants who drink wine in their home when not entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion (everyday wine) and factors that influence everyday wine purchases, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Younger Millennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol content/calorie content per serving</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.9a</td>
<td>15.0a</td>
<td>15.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure type</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.1a</td>
<td>15.6a</td>
<td>13.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintage of wine (year wine was harvested)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.5a</td>
<td>10.9ab</td>
<td>7.9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The varietal/vintage received a medal in a competition (award winning wine)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.0a</td>
<td>5.4a</td>
<td>3.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the wine was displayed in the store/tasting room</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.1a</td>
<td>8.2ab</td>
<td>5.7b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily or a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill. Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
There were quite a few significant differences between wine consumption frequency segments to note. Compared to marginal participants, more super core participants were influenced by the origin (where the grapes were grown) (14.1 and 26.9%, respectively) and a quality rating assigned by a wine critic (7.9 and 18.2%, respectively). Other differences pertaining to factors that influenced “everyday” wine purchases included more super core and core participants (63.1 and 63.3%, respectively) being influenced by the brand of wine than marginal participants (46.7%). Also, more core participants were influenced by a family member/friend recommended the bottle of wine than super core respondents (53.1 and 41.0%, respectively).

For generations, more Younger Millennials reported being influenced by a family member/friend recommended the bottle of wine than Generation X and the Silent & Greatest generation participants (58.3, 40.7 and 33.3%, respectively). Fewer Younger Millennials (23.3%) were influenced by the varietal (e.g., Chardonnay, Merlot, Riesling) compared to all other generations, of which 40.3 to 51.8% of participants in each generation were influenced. More of the Silent & Greatest members (56.1%) were influenced by the bottle size than Younger Millennials, Older Millennials, and Generation X participants (28.2, 31.5, and 25.4%, respectively). Fewer Silent & Greatest generation members (9.1%) were influenced by advice/recommendation from a sales associate compared to all other generations except the Baby Boomers, with 21.1 to 34.0% of each generation being influenced by this factor. Lastly, the front label influenced more Younger Millennials than the Baby Boomer participants (28.2 and 11.4%, respectively).

Although the percentage of men and women were not different in terms of whether they consumed “everyday” wines, there were some statistical differences regarding what influenced their purchase decision. More females were influenced by having tasted/purchased wine before (74.9%), a family member/friend recommended the bottle
of wine (50.5%), and the front label (21.7%) than their male counterparts (66.4, 35.1, and 11.1%, respectively). More males; however, were influenced by the origin of grapes (where the grapes were grown) (30.9%), quality rating given by a wine critic (21.8%), and the vintage of wine (year wine was harvested) (19.5%) than females (18.4, 21.8, and 9.6%, respectively).

*Everyday Wines Preferences*

Participants who responded that they drank “everyday” wine were also asked to select wine and bottle characteristics that best represented the wine they consumed on this occasion. These characteristics included: sweetness/dryness of the wine, type of wine (e.g., white, red, rosé), closure preference, single-varietal or blend, alcohol content, calorie content, and bottle size. Participants had the option to select as many or few choices that were applicable to their “everyday” wine choices (Table 2.4).
Table 2.4. Participant consumption of “everyday” wine based on wine characteristics (e.g., level of sweetness/dryness) and bottle characteristics (e.g., closure type), segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Survey Participants Who Consumed “Everyday” Wine (%)</td>
<td>92.9 (n = 798)</td>
<td>98.8a (n = 412)</td>
<td>92.5b (n = 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetness/dryness level of wine (%)</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>36.4b</td>
<td>39.5ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White wines (e.g., ice wine, late harvest wine, white wines, Port)</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>63.1a</td>
<td>68.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red wine</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>72.1a</td>
<td>68.7ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosé wine</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>30.8a</td>
<td>34.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkling wine (e.g., Champaign, Prosecco)</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>30.6a</td>
<td>25.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessert wine (e.g., Late harvest ice wine)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.3a</td>
<td>16.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortified wine (e.g., Sherry, Port)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.8a</td>
<td>2.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.0a</td>
<td>2.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-varietal wine or blend of wine grapes (%)</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>41.3a</td>
<td>42.2ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-varietal wine made primarily from a single grape (e.g., Sauvignon Blanc, Moscato, Riesling)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>22.3a</td>
<td>11.6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>42.0b</td>
<td>50.3ab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4 Continued. Participant consumption of “everyday” wine based on wine characteristics (e.g., level of sweetness/dryness) and bottle characteristics (e.g., closure type), segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger Millennial</td>
<td>Older Millennial</td>
<td>Generation X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calorie content per glass (5oz) (%)</td>
<td>105 calories</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120 to 135 calories</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140 to 150 calories</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165 to 190 calories</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195 calories</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure (%)</td>
<td>Natural cork</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screw cap</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthetic plastic</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle size (%)</td>
<td>Less than 750ml</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750ml</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger than 750ml</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol content (ABV) (%)</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 11.5%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5 to 13.5%</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5 to 15%</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently.

Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p < .05, SPSS, Version 23, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.

*Alcohol by volume (ABV) measure of how much alcohol is in a given volume of an alcoholic beverage.
More marginal participants indicated that they consumed sweet and semi-sweet wines (47.1 and 46.7%, respectively) compared to super core members (36.4 and 35.7%, respectively); however, more super core and core participants responded that they consumed dry wines (57.3 and 52.4%, respectively) compared to marginal participants (34.4%). Considering the type of wine, only one difference was significant. More super core participants (72.1%) indicated they drank red wines compared to marginal participants (57.7%). When asked if they preferred single-varietal wines or blends, more super core participants reported that they consumed single-varietal wine made primarily from a single grape (e.g., Sauvignon Blanc, Moscato, Riesling) than marginal members (41.3 and 30.8%, respectively), whereas more marginal members responded that they had no preference compared to super core participants (55.9 and 42.0%, respectively). Also, more super core participants consumed wine made from a blend of two or more grape varietals (e.g., Red Bordeaux, Chianti, Hermitage, Rioja) than core participants (22.3 and 11.6%, respectively). The only significance to note about calories per 5-ounce glass was that more super core members consumed wine with 165 to 180 calories than marginal participants (2.9 and 0.4%, respectively).

Pertaining to significant differences for bottle characteristics, more super core participants reported consuming wine with natural cork (53.6%), bottles larger than 750 ml (25.5%), and wine with an alcohol content (ABV) of 13.5 to 15% (10.2%) than marginal participants (43.5, 11.5, and 4.8%, respectively). More super core participants also drank wine with an ABV of 11.5 to 13.5% than both core and marginal participants (22.1, 12.9 and 11.5%, respectively) and more marginal members had no preference concerning the wine’s ABV than super core participants (67.4 and 54.4%, respectively). Significant differences were also detected for the sweetness/dryness and type of “everyday” wine when data was segmented by generation. More participants in the
Silent & Greatest generation indicated that the consumed dry wines (69.7%) compared to Younger Millennials and Older Millennials (46.6 and 37.6%, respectively). The reverse was true for both sweet and semi-sweet wines. Greater percentages of Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants (55.3 and 53.6%, respectively) indicated that they consumed sweet wines compared to Generation Jones, Baby Boomers, and Silent & Greatest members (30.0, 28.9 and 18.2%, respectively). Also, more Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants (47.6 and 52.5%, respectively) consumed semi-sweet wine compared to both Baby Boomers and Silent & Greatest members (26.3 and 18.2%, respectively). Fewer Silent & Greatest participants (9.1%) reported consuming off-dry wines than Older Millennials, Generation Xers, and Generation Jones participants (28.2, 23.4, and 33.6%, respectively).

Significance was also found between generations for types of “everyday” wine consumed. More Baby Boomer participants drank red wine than Generation Jones members (79.8 and 60.9%, respectively). More Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants (43.7 and 40.3%, respectively) reported they drank rosé wine compared to Baby Boomers (21.1%). More Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants (41.7, 35.4 and 30.1%, respectively) drank sparkling wine than Baby Boomers (13.2%). More members of Younger Millennials and Older Millennials also reported drinking dessert wines (26.2 and 21.5%, respectively) than both Baby Boomers and Silent & Greatest participants (9.6 and 7.6%, respectively). Although there were no differences among generations in regards to their preferences for single-varietal wine or blend of wine grapes, significantly more Baby Boomer participants selected the no preference response compared to than the Older Millennial generation (59.6 and 41.6%, respectively).
For bottle characteristics and segmentation based on generation, more Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants drank wine with a screw cap (25.2 and 26.5%, respectively) than Generation Jones members (10.0%). No differences were noted pertaining to bottle sizes. More Older Millennial participants indicated that they drank wine with an ABV above 15% (4.4%) compared to Silent & Greatest generation members which none of these participants selected the option.

Females and males also displayed significant differences with regards to their preference for sweetness/dryness of “everyday” wines they consumed. More women drank sweet and semi-sweet wines (43.2 and 43.6%, respectively) than men (33.6 and 35.1%, respectively), and more females preferred white, rosé, and sparkling wine (64.9, 36.9, and 32.2%, respectively) compared to males (57.3, 24.0, and 22.1%, respectively). However, more male wine consumers preferred reds compared to females (74.8 and 63.5%, respectively). More males indicated that they consumed single-varietal wines made primarily from a single grape than females (46.6 and 34.4%, respectively), while more females had no preference when choosing between single-varietal wines and blends than that of males (52.6 and 37.4%, respectively). Females also had no preference for calorie content per 5-ounce glass of wine (76.6%) than males, while more males indicated they drank wine with 140 to 150 calories per serving than females (10.7 and 5.6%).

Concerning bottle characteristics when segmented by gender, more males consumed wine with natural cork and synthetic plastic closures (56.9 and 8.0%, respectively) and wine in bottles larger than 750 ml (24.4%) than female wine consumers (44.7, 4.2, and 18.2%, respectively). More males also consumed wine with an ABV of 11.5 to 13.5% (22.9%). A greater percentage of females responded they had “no preference” for closures, bottle sizes, and ABV (42.8, 26.3, and 67.4%, respectively).
Countries/States of Origin from Which Survey Participants Purchase “Everyday” Wines

Participants who responded that they drank “everyday” wine were asked to select the countries/states that produced the wine they consumed on this occasion. They had the option to select as many or few choices as they would like (Table 2.5) and responses were segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender. Overall, California was the source that was selected by the greatest percentage of these participants (67.7%), followed by New York and France (39.9 and 38.4%, respectively). All other countries and states were selected by fewer than 30% of those who drank “everyday” wine.
Table 2.5. Participant consumption of “everyday” wine based on countries/states where the wine was produced, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Participants</td>
<td>(n = 786)</td>
<td>(n = 412)</td>
<td>(n = 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Survey Participants Who Consumed “Everyday” Wine (%)</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>69.9a</td>
<td>74.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>69.9a</td>
<td>74.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>39.8a</td>
<td>38.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>44.4a</td>
<td>34.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>31.8a</td>
<td>23.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>29.9a</td>
<td>28.6ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.8a</td>
<td>27.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>30.3a</td>
<td>22.4ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>24.0a</td>
<td>18.4ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.2a</td>
<td>18.4ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.5a</td>
<td>12.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.1a</td>
<td>14.3ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.2a</td>
<td>10.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.7a</td>
<td>9.5ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.9a</td>
<td>11.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5a</td>
<td>6.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6a</td>
<td>6.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.6a</td>
<td>4.8ab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05, SPSS, Version 23, Chicago, Ill. *Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Significant differences were found when participant responses were segmented based on consumption frequencies. More super core and core participants drank California wines than marginal members (69.9, 74.1, and 59.5%, respectively), and compared to marginal participants, more super core participants drank wines from certain origins, for example: France (30.0 and 44.4%, respectively), Spain (21.6 and 31.8%, respectively), Australia (18.1 and 29.9%, respectively), and Chile (13.2 and 30.3%, respectively).

Segmenting data by generation also displayed significant differences for some countries/states as the source of the “everyday” wine participants consumed. Fewer Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants (54.4 and 53.0%, respectively) consumed California wines compared to all other generations, with response percentages ranging from 71.3 to 83.3%. More Older Millennials indicated they consumed wines from: 1) Spain than Generation Jones participants (37.6 and 21.8%, respectively); 2) Pennsylvania than the Silent & Greatest generation participants (32.6 and 15.2%, respectively); and 3) Canada than Baby Boomer members (10.5 and 2.9%, respectively). More Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants drank wine from Australia than the Younger Millennial participants (32.5, 34.8 and 14.6%, respectively).

Concerning gender, a greater percentage of male participants reported drinking “everyday” wines from certain countries/states than females, for example: Spain (24.4 and 33.2%, respectively), Australia (23.8 and 30.9%, respectively), and Chile (27.1 and 28.6%, respectively). The only wine that more women consumed than males was Pennsylvania wine (28.4 and 20.6%, respectively).
Prices for Everyday Wines

Survey 2 also addressed “everyday” wines that participants purchased. Participants were asked to indicate the prices that they typically paid for “everyday” wines by selecting as many or few of the nine price ranges tested (Table 2.6). The three price ranges that were selected by the greatest percentage of participants were: $8.00 to $10.99, $11.00 to $14.99, and 15.00 to $19.99 (39.7, 37.9, and 23.6%, respectively). All other price ranges received less than a 20% response.
Table 2.6. Price range(s) that participants typically paid for a 750 ml bottle of “everyday” wine, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Price Range Paid for a 750 ml Bottle of “Everyday” Wines (%)</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wine Consumption Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core (n = 512)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.00 to $7.99</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.00 to $10.99</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>38.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11.00 to $14.99</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>38.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15.00 to $19.99</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>25.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20.00 to $24.99</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25.00 to $29.99</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30.00 to $35.00</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $35.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 March 2016 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently.

Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson's Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer's V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p < .05. SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Concerning wine consumption frequency groups, there was no significant difference between segmentations for prices under $19.99; however, compared to marginal participants, more super core participants indicated purchasing wines priced $20.00 to $24.00 (6.6 and 11.9%, respectively). Among the significant differences based on generation, more Younger Millennial participants indicated they purchased wine in the $5.00 to $7.99 range than Baby Boomer respondents (28.7 and 11.5%, respectively). While more females reported purchasing wines between $8.00 to $10.99 than males (43.7 and 34.0%, respectively), more males than females bought wines priced as follows: $25.00 to $29.99 (7.1 vs. 3.1%), $30.00 to $35.00 (5.5 vs. 2.5%), and more than $35.00 (5.0 vs. 0.7%).

**Purchasing Wines for Special Occasion and/or When Entertaining**

Survey 1 participants were asked if they drank wine in their home on occasions when they were entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion. The majority (96.9%) of participants responded “yes,” after which these participants were asked to select, from a list of 19 choices, all the factors that influenced them when they purchased a 750 ml bottle of wine for this occasion (Table 2.7). Tasted/purchased wine before, price of wine, and brand of wine were selected by the greatest percentages of these respondents (72.2, 62.2%, and 60.4% respectively).
Table 2.7. Percentage of survey participants who drink wine in their home when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion and factors that influence these wine purchases, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Super Core</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Younger Millennial</th>
<th>Older Millennial</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Generation Jones</th>
<th>Baby Boomer</th>
<th>Silent &amp; Greatest</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Survey Participants Who Consumed Wine when Entertaining and/or Celebrating a Special Occasion (no)</td>
<td>96.9 (n = 620)</td>
<td>97.6a (n = 407)</td>
<td>96.9a (n = 154)</td>
<td>95.9a (n = 259)</td>
<td>96.5a (n = 111)</td>
<td>96.8a (n = 190)</td>
<td>97.4a (n = 224)</td>
<td>96.5a (n = 110)</td>
<td>96.4a (n = 127)</td>
<td>94.2a (n = 65)</td>
<td>97.3a (n = 546)</td>
<td>96.1a (n = 271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that influenced participants' purchasing decision</td>
<td>Tasted/purchased the wine before</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>71.4a</td>
<td>74.8a</td>
<td>71.8a</td>
<td>68.5a</td>
<td>75.0a</td>
<td>71.4a</td>
<td>68.2a</td>
<td>75.6a</td>
<td>72.3a</td>
<td>73.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price of wine</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>65.3b</td>
<td>83.0a</td>
<td>73.6ab</td>
<td>70.3ab</td>
<td>70.0a</td>
<td>55.6b</td>
<td>61.8ab</td>
<td>55.9ab</td>
<td>60.0ab</td>
<td>63.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand of wine</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>63.1a</td>
<td>63.3a</td>
<td>46.7b</td>
<td>67.6ab</td>
<td>53.9b</td>
<td>60.3ab</td>
<td>64.5ab</td>
<td>52.8b</td>
<td>73.8a</td>
<td>58.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family member/friend recommended the bottle of wine</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>41.0b</td>
<td>53.1a</td>
<td>46.5ab</td>
<td>46.8a</td>
<td>46.1a</td>
<td>42.9a</td>
<td>53.6a</td>
<td>40.2a</td>
<td>44.6a</td>
<td>47.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food to be consumed with the wine</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>38.8a</td>
<td>29.9a</td>
<td>30.8a</td>
<td>43.2a</td>
<td>36.7a</td>
<td>37.5a</td>
<td>47.3a</td>
<td>43.3a</td>
<td>53.8a</td>
<td>41.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varietal (e.g., Chardonnay, Merlot, Riesling)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>43.4a</td>
<td>40.8a</td>
<td>39.2a</td>
<td>27.9b</td>
<td>35.0ab</td>
<td>37.1ab</td>
<td>49.1a</td>
<td>51.2a</td>
<td>35.4ab</td>
<td>36.4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottle size</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>35.9a</td>
<td>29.3a</td>
<td>33.5a</td>
<td>26.1b</td>
<td>24.4b</td>
<td>29.0b</td>
<td>32.7b</td>
<td>34.6b</td>
<td>58.5a</td>
<td>31.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottle of wine is on sale</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>35.0a</td>
<td>42.9a</td>
<td>37.4a</td>
<td>27.9a</td>
<td>30.0a</td>
<td>25.9a</td>
<td>31.8a</td>
<td>22.8a</td>
<td>30.8a</td>
<td>27.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advice/recommendation from a wine retailer</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.0a</td>
<td>23.1a</td>
<td>26.0a</td>
<td>29.7a</td>
<td>25.0a</td>
<td>25.0a</td>
<td>33.6a</td>
<td>23.6a</td>
<td>16.9a</td>
<td>27.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Origin (where the grapes were grown)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.9a</td>
<td>23.8ab</td>
<td>14.1b</td>
<td>13.5b</td>
<td>18.3ab</td>
<td>20.5ab</td>
<td>26.4ab</td>
<td>16.5b</td>
<td>36.9a</td>
<td>17.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closure type</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.1a</td>
<td>15.6a</td>
<td>13.2a</td>
<td>12.6a</td>
<td>10.6a</td>
<td>11.2a</td>
<td>16.4a</td>
<td>15.7a</td>
<td>24.6a</td>
<td>12.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality rating assigned by a wine critic</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.2a</td>
<td>13.6ab</td>
<td>7.9b</td>
<td>13.5a</td>
<td>11.1a</td>
<td>14.7a</td>
<td>16.4a</td>
<td>11.0a</td>
<td>16.9a</td>
<td>12.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vintage of wine (year wine was harvested)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.5a</td>
<td>10.9ab</td>
<td>7.9b</td>
<td>14.4a</td>
<td>10.0a</td>
<td>15.2a</td>
<td>13.8a</td>
<td>9.4a</td>
<td>15.4a</td>
<td>10.4b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.7 Continued. Percentage of survey participants who drink wine in their home when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion and factors that influenced these wine purchases, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information learned about the wine before going to the store to buy a bottle</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.3a</td>
<td>15.6a</td>
<td>11.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on the back label</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>17.2a</td>
<td>19.7a</td>
<td>12.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front label</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>16.5a</td>
<td>25.9a</td>
<td>15.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol content/calorie content per serving</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>12.9a</td>
<td>15.0a</td>
<td>15.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the wine was displayed in the store/tasting room</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.1a</td>
<td>8.2ab</td>
<td>5.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The variety/vintage received a medal in a competition (award winning wine)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>7.0a</td>
<td>5.4a</td>
<td>3.5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson's Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer's V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05. SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill. *Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Segmentation of factors by wine consumption frequencies showed significance between participants. Compared to super core respondents, more core participants indicated that the price of wine (65.3 and 83.0%, respectively) and a family member/friend recommended the bottle of wine (41.0 and 53.1%, respectively) influenced wine purchasing decisions. Both super core and core participants selected brand of wine than marginal members (63.1, 63.3, and 46.7%, respectively).

When divided into generations, many significant differences were detected. More Older Millennial participants were influenced by the price of wine than Generation X participants (70.0 and 55.8%, respectively) and more Silent & Greatest generation members were influenced by the brand of wine (73.8%) than Baby Boomers and Older Millennials (52.8 and 53.9%, respectively). Members of the Silent & Greatest generation also indicated being influenced by the bottle size (58.5%) compared to all other generations whose percentages were between 24.4 and 34.6%. Fewer Younger Millennials (27.9%) were influenced by the varietal compared to both Generation Jones and Baby Boomer members (49.1 and 51.2%, respectively).

Although men and women were not different in their consumption of wines when entertaining and/or celebrating special occasion wines, more males were influenced by the varietal (44.6%) than females (36.4%).

**Entertaining and/or Celebrating a Special Occasion Wine Preferences**

Participants who drank wine when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion were also asked to select wine and bottle characteristics that best represented the wine they consumed on this occasion: sweetness/dryness of the wine, type of wine (e.g., white, red, rosé), closure preference, single-varietal or blend, alcohol content, calorie
content, and bottle size. For each, they had the option to select as many or few choices that were applicable to their wine choices for this occasion (Table 2.8).
Table 2.8. Participant consumption of wine served when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion based on wine characteristics (e.g., level of sweetness/dryness) and bottle characteristics (e.g., closure type), segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Survey Participants</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>97.6a</td>
<td>96.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining and/or Celebrating a Special Occasion (Yes)</td>
<td>(n = 820)</td>
<td>(n = 407)</td>
<td>(n = 154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet wines (e.g., Ice wine, late harvest wine, white wines, Port)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34.9a</td>
<td>33.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-sweet wine (e.g., Gewurztraminer, Moscato)</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>36.1a</td>
<td>46.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-dry wine (e.g., Riesling, Chenin Blanc)</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>30.0a</td>
<td>31.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry wine (e.g., Pinot Grigio, Pinot Noir, Cabernet Sauvignon)</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>54.1a</td>
<td>51.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.8b</td>
<td>8.4ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of wine (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White wine</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>63.1a</td>
<td>71.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red wine</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>72.2a</td>
<td>70.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosé wine</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>27.8a</td>
<td>28.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkling wine (e.g., Champagne, Prosecco)</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>32.7a</td>
<td>27.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessert wine (e.g., Late harvest ice wine)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.7a</td>
<td>13.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortified wine (e.g., Sherry, Port)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.9a</td>
<td>1.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.3a</td>
<td>7.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-varietal wine or blend of wine grapes (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-varietal wine made primarily from a single grape (e.g., Sauvignon Blanc, Moscato, Riesling)</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>38.3a</td>
<td>40.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine made from a blend of two or more grape varieties (e.g., Red Bordeaux, Chianti, Hermitage, Rioja)</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>25.0a</td>
<td>13.0b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>46.2b</td>
<td>51.3ab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.8 Continued. Participant consumption of wine served when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion based on wine characteristics (e.g., level of sweetness/dryness) and bottle characteristics (e.g., closure type), segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calorie content per glass (5oz) (%)</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 calories</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.8a</td>
<td>9.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 to 130 calories</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.8a</td>
<td>13.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 to 150 calories</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.4a</td>
<td>6.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 to 180 calories</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.9a</td>
<td>1.3ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 calories</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2a</td>
<td>0.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>73.2a</td>
<td>77.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural cork</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>51.1a</td>
<td>42.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw cap</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.0a</td>
<td>15.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic plastic</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1a</td>
<td>3.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>37.1b</td>
<td>43.5ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle size (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 750 ml</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.1a</td>
<td>3.9ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 ml</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>49.6a</td>
<td>44.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger than 750 ml</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>31.9a</td>
<td>21.4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>27.0b</td>
<td>40.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol content (ABV) (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.1a</td>
<td>6.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 11.5%</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.2a</td>
<td>12.3ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 to 13.5%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>18.2a</td>
<td>9.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5 to 15%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.1a</td>
<td>5.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7a</td>
<td>1.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>59.0b</td>
<td>69.5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2013 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently.

Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p < .05; SPSS, Version 23, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.

Alcohol by volume (ABV) measure of how much alcohol is in a given volume of an alcoholic beverage.
When responses were segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender some significant differences were revealed. Pertaining to consumption based on sweetness/dryness, more super core and core participants indicated that they consumed off-dry (30.0 and 31.8%, respectively) and dry (54.1 and 51.9%, respectively) wines compared to marginal participants (18.9 and 32.8%, respectively). More red wines were consumed by super core and core participants (72.2 and 70.8%, respectively) than marginal respondents (58.7%). More super core members drank wine made from a blend of two or more varieties than both core and marginal participants (25.6, 13.6, and 15.4%, respectively) and marginal wine consuming participants reported having no preference between single-varietal wines or wines made from a blend of wine grapes compared to super core participants (58.7 and 46.2%, respectively). The only difference concerning calorie content per 5-ounce glass was that more super core members drank wines with 165 to 180 calories per serving than marginal participants (3.9 and 1.2%, respectively).

Several significant differences based on wine consumptions frequencies regarding bottle characteristics were also apparent. More marginal participants responded that they had no preference for the bottle closure type than super core participants (47.1 and 37.1%, respectively). A greater percentage of super core members consumed bottles less than 750 ml than marginal participants (6.1 and 1.2%, respectively) and bottles larger than 750 ml than both members of core and marginal consumption frequencies (31.9, 21.4, and 19.7%, respectively), while more core and marginal participants had no preference for the bottle size than members of the super core segment (40.3, 37.8 and 27.0%, respectively). A majority of all three wine consumption frequency groups indicated that they had no preference regarding wine ABV; however, more core and marginal
respondents selected this response category compared to super core participants (69.5, 68.7, and 59.0%, respectively).

Segmenting data based on generations also showed significance for wine consumed when entertaining and/or celebrating special occasions. A greater percentage of Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants indicated they drank sweet wines (55.9, 45.0 and 35.3%, respectively) and semi-sweet wines (47.7, 54.4, and 42.0%, respectively) than the Silent & Greatest generation participants (13.8 and 16.9%, respectively). Dry wines appeared to be the choice among Silent & Greatest generation members as more of these participants drank this wine (69.2%) than Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, Generation Xer, and Generation Jones participants (range of 38.9 to 47.8%). There were no differences between generations pertaining to white wine consumption; however, more Baby Boomers drank red wine than Older Millennials (76.4 and 60.6%, respectively) and more Older Millennial participants (38.3%) drank rosé than Generation Xers, Baby Boomers, and Silent & Greatest generation participants (25.0, 19.7, and 20.0%, respectively). The only difference pertaining to calorie content per 5-ounce glass of wine was that more Generation Xers indicated they drank wine with 165 to 180 calories per serving than participants of the Silent & Greatest generation (4.0 and 0%, respectively).

There were also some significant differences based on bottle characteristics between generations. While there were no differences between generations pertaining to purchasing bottles of wine with natural cork and synthetic plastic closures, fewer Generation Jones members (3.6%) drank wines with screw caps than Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants (21.6, 21.1, and 14.7%, respectively). More Older Millennials and Generation Xers indicated they drank wine in bottles less than 750 ml (5.6 and 6.3%, respectively) than Generation Jones participants,
of which had none of them purchased wines in this sized bottle. Fewer Silent & Greatest generation participants (13.8%) indicated that they had no preference for bottle size compared to Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, Generation Xer, and Generation Jones participants (38.7, 34.4, 36.2, and 35.5%, respectively). Fewer differences were detected for ABV preference. None of the Silent & Greatest generation participants reported drinking wine with an ABV between 13.5 and 15%, compared to Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, Generation Xer, and Generation Jones participants (range of 7.3 to 11.7%), or wine with an ABV above 15%, which was significantly different than the percentage of Generation Jones who consumed wine with this ABV (4.0%).

Significant differences were detected between females and males. More females reported consuming sweet wines (38.3%) and rosé wines (31.7%) than males (29.5 and 22.9%, respectively), while more males drank red wine (74.2%) and fortified wine (6.3%) compared to females (64.5 and 1.1%, respectively). Both varietal wine made primarily from a single grape and wine made from a blend of two or more grape varieties were selected more by male participants (41.7 and 25.5%, respectively) than their counterpart (33.3 and 17.4%, respectively). While a majority of both genders indicated that they had no preference regarding wine caloric content (79.7 and 70.1%, respectively), more males responded that they drank wines with 105 calories per 5-ounce serving than females (11.4 and 7.0%, respectively).

Relating to wine bottle characteristics, more males drank wine in a bottle with a natural cork than females (53.9 and 43.1%, respectively), while more women indicated they had no preference for closure type compared to men (44.5 and 35.4%, respectively). Relatively few of either gender preferred wine in bottles smaller than 750 ml; however, more females had a preference for these smaller bottles than males (6.6 and 2.9%, respectively). More females indicated they had no alcohol content preference compared
to males (69.6 and 52.8%, respectively). Contrarily, more males reported consuming wine with an ABV of less than 10% through 13.5 to 15% (range of 10.7 to 19.9%) than females (range of 6.4 to 11.4%).

**Countries/States of Origin from Which Survey Participants Purchase Entertaining and/or Celebrating Special Occasions Wines**

Participants who drank wine when entertaining and/or celebrating special occasions indicated the origin of the wines they purchased for this occasion. As with other questions, these participants were able to select as many or few choices based on applicability (Table 2.9). Overall, California was the primary source of the wine they consumed for this occasion, based on the percentage of participants who selected the state (64.6%), followed by France and New York (45.5 and 38.8%, respectively). All other countries and states were selected by fewer than 30% of participants.
Table 2.9. Participant consumption of wine when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion based on countries/states where the wine was produced, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

| Countries/States that Produced the Wine Consumed for Entertaining and/or Celebrating a Special Occasion (%) | All Participants | Super Core | Core | Marginal | Younger Millennials | Older Millennials | Generation X | Generation Jones | Baby Boomers | Silent & Greatest | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| California | 64.6 | 64.1a | 73.4ab | 60.2a | 44.1d | 53.9cd | 54.3bc | 76.4ab | 76.4ab | 85.2a | 62.6a | 68.6a |
| France | 45.6 | 47.7a | 47.4a | 41.3a | 46.8a | 47.8a | 47.3a | 41.8a | 43.3a | 41.5a | 43.4a | 50.2a |
| New York | 38.8 | 36.4a | 39.0a | 42.1a | 37.8a | 37.2a | 35.3a | 51.8a | 36.2a | 40.0a | 38.8a | 37.7a |
| Spain | 29.1 | 31.7a | 24.7a | 27.8a | 27.9a | 35.0a | 28.6a | 28.2a | 28.3a | 21.5a | 28.8a | 30.3a |
| Australia | 28.2 | 31.7a | 32.5a | 20.1b | 21.5a | 23.9a | 29.0a | 32.7a | 32.3a | 33.8a | 26.7a | 31.0a |
| Pennsylvania | 25.1 | 22.4a | 26.8a | 27.4a | 27.0a | 29.4a | 24.6a | 27.3a | 18.1a | 23.1a | 27.1a | 21.0a |
| Chile | 25.0 | 30.0a | 26.0ab | 16.6b | 22.5a | 27.8a | 24.6a | 20.9a | 25.8a | 25.2a | 21.9b | 31.4a |
| Argentina | 23.5 | 28.5a | 20.9ab | 17.4b | 22.5a | 28.9a | 22.3a | 19.1a | 21.3a | 25.2a | 21.4a | 27.7a |
| New Zealand | 18.0 | 22.6a | 16.9ab | 11.6b | 15.3a | 21.7a | 17.0a | 15.5a | 21.3a | 15.4a | 16.5a | 21.4a |
| Germany | 16.8 | 16.4a | 14.9a | 15.4a | 9.0a | 17.2a | 17.9a | 20.0a | 16.9a | 16.9a | 14.9a | 20.3a |
| Washington | 13.4 | 14.7a | 13.0a | 11.6a | 8.1a | 11.1a | 14.3a | 16.4a | 16.5a | 15.4a | 11.7a | 17.5a |
| New Jersey | 13.2 | 14.5a | 11.0a | 12.4a | 15.3a | 18.3a | 12.1a | 11.8a | 9.4a | 9.2a | 13.6a | 12.5a |
| South Africa | 10.5 | 13.0a | 10.4ab | 6.9b | 13.5ab | 13.9a | 10.7ab | 8.2ab | 8.7ab | 3.1b | 9.7a | 12.2a |
| Oregon | 10.0 | 12.8a | 10.4ab | 5.4b | 4.5a | 11.7a | 9.4a | 11.6a | 11.6a | 10.8a | 9.9a | 12.2a |
| Canada | 8.8 | 10.8a | 9.1ab | 5.4b | 9.9a | 10.6a | 9.8a | 9.1a | 5.6a | 4.6a | 7.3b | 11.8a |
| Austria | 7.4 | 9.3a | 8.4ab | 3.9b | 6.3ab | 11.7a | 8.6ab | 7.3ab | 3.1b | 4.6ab | 6.8a | 8.9a |
| Virginia | 6.8 | 6.7a | 5.6ab | 5.5b | 9.9a | 10.6a | 5.8a | 5.5a | 3.1a | 4.6a | 7.7a | 5.2a |

Note: The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drink wine daily or to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p .05, SPSS, Version 23, Chicago, Ill. *Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Segmenting data by wine consumption frequencies displayed many significant differences with more super core participants responding that they consumed wine from a particular state/country than marginal participants, a few of which were: Chile (30.0 vs. 16.6%), Argentina (28.5 vs. 17.4%), New Zealand (22.6 vs. 11.6%), South Africa (13.0 vs. 6.6%), Oregon (12.8 vs. 5.4%), Canada (10.8 vs. 5.4%), Austria (9.3 vs. 3.9%), and Virginia (6.7 vs. 5.5%). Additionally, more super core and core participants drank wine from Australia than marginal members (31.7, 32.5, and 20.1%, respectively).

A few differences can be noted pertaining to generation segments. Fewer Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants drank California wines (44.1 and 53.9%, respectively) than Generation Jones, Baby Boomer, and members of the combined Silent & Greatest generation (76.4, 76.4, and 86.2%, respectively). Another difference was that more Older Millennials indicated they drank South African wine than Silent & Greatest generation participants (13.9 and 3.1%, respectively) and more Austrian wine than Baby Boomer participants (11.7 and 3.1%, respectively).

There were few differences between the percentage of males and females who consumed wines from the countries/states presented. More males drank wine from Chile (31.4%) and Canada (11.8%) than females (21.8 and 7.3%, respectively).

Prices for Special Occasion Wines

Survey 2 also addressed the price range(s) participants who consumed wine when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion paid for a 750 ml bottle (Table 2.10). The price ranges selected by the greatest percentage of participants were: 1) $15.00 to $19.99 (32.0%); 2) $11.00 to 14.99 (30.8%); 3) $8.00 to $10.99 (21.1%); and 4) $20.00 to $24.99 (20.7%).
Table 2.10. Price range(s) that participants typically paid for a 750 ml bottle of wine served when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants (n = 512)</td>
<td>Older Millennial (n = 136)</td>
<td>Younger Millennial (n = 234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Price Range Paid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for a 750 ml Bottle of Wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>served when Entertaining and/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Celebrating a Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.2a</td>
<td>1.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.00 to $7.99</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.3a</td>
<td>6.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.00 to $10.99</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>19.1a</td>
<td>20.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11.00 to $14.99</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>31.4a</td>
<td>33.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15.00 to $19.99</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>29.9a</td>
<td>33.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20.00 to $24.99</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>22.3a</td>
<td>21.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25.00 to $29.99</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.4a</td>
<td>12.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30.00 to $35.00</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.8a</td>
<td>8.9ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $35.00</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.7a</td>
<td>9.2ab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill. *Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Concerning consumption frequency groups, there were significant differences. More super core participants purchased wines priced $25.00 to $29.99 (16.4%), $30.00 to $35.00 (9.8%) and wines priced at more than $35.00 (12.7%) than marginal participants (8.7, 4.8, and 4.8%, respectively).

There were many significant differences between generations; however, there was no noticeable pattern based on responses. Some differences included: a greater percentage of Older Millennials paid $8.00 to $10.99 for these wines than members of Generation X (26.1 and 15.6%, respectively), whereas, more Generation X wine consumers drank wines priced $20.00 to $24.99 than Baby Boomer participants (23.9 and 12.7%, respectively). Fewer Silent & Greatest generation members indicated they consumed wines priced $25.00 to $29.99 wines (3.7%) than Younger Millennial and Generation X participants (19.1 and 17.3% respectively) and fewer wines priced $30.00 to $35.00 (1.2%) than Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants (10.3, 10.3, and 9.3%, respectively). For wines priced more than $35.00, more Older Millennial and Generation X members drank these wines compared to Baby Boomer respondents (15.0, 11.3, and 2.4%, respectively).

The only significance to note pertaining to gender: more males (12.1%) purchased wines consumed when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion priced at more than $35.00 compared to females (7.6%).

**Discussion & Conclusion**

With the growth in the number of wineries comes increased competition. Hence, it is important to acknowledge and understand wine consumers' behaviors and attitudes, especially in a specific target market such as the Mid-Atlantic region. Wineries must
consider certain factors when determining which wines to market for specific occasions, how to advertise and promote different wines, and which prices appeal to consumers for different wine occasions. Better understanding of the differences among wine consumers can be achieved through segmenting the market based on: age, situations when consumers drink wines, consumption frequency, and taste preferences (Lockshin, 2003).

Results provide insight into the purchasing and consumption patterns of consumers residing in the Mid-Atlantic region, specifically for wines they consume during two separate occasions: “everyday” wine to be consumed on an average day and wine consumed on when entertaining and/or celebrating special occasions. Of the Survey 1 participants, 49.3% were super core (drank wine daily to a few times a week), 18.8% were core (drank wine about once a week), and 31.9% were marginal (drank wine less frequently). Similarly, in Survey 2, 49.3% were super core, were 18.7% core, and 32.0% were marginal wine consuming participants. With super core participants accounting for half of participants in both surveys, data can be used to developing marketing strategies that appeal to these “heavy users.” Data gathered from both core and marginal participants assists with identifying factors which may encourage them to increase their consumption, purchasing, and/or other involvement with wine.

The majority (71.8%) of Survey 1 participants indicated they purchased both “everyday” wines and wines to be consumed when entertaining and/or celebrating special occasions. Regarding consumption, a majority of participants drank “everyday” wines (92.9%) and/or wines when entertaining and/or celebrating special occasion (96.6%). Though there were significant differences between wine consumption frequency groups with a majority of super core, core, and marginal participants purchasing and consuming wines for both occasions, the wine industry in the Mid-Atlantic can feel optimistic about
having such a poll of potential customers. Overall, for both “everyday” and wines for entertaining and/or celebrating special occasions, dry wines were favored by the majority of participants, followed by semi-sweet and sweet. Also, for both occasions, red, white, and single-varietal wines were the most popular. These types of wines should be the main focus when marketing wines for “everyday” consumption and for consumption when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion.

Pertaining to what factors influenced participants to purchase wine, the primary reason was that they had previously tasting/purchasing the wine. Wineries and tasting room staff should encourage visitors to taste their wines, especially types of wine and varietals that customers are “less familiar” or “unfamiliar” with, as well as sample their wines that the customer is more familiar with due to the taste differences of types of wine between wineries and wine regions (e.g., a Merlot from Pennsylvania will taste different than a California Merlot (Gardner, 2016)). This provides tasting room staff with the opportunity to educate the customer on regional varietals and why more well-known varietals may taste different based on the region in which they are produced. Allowing customers to taste wines and educating them on the wines could increase tasting room sales. Winey tasting room owners and operators should also investigate opportunities outside the tasting room for consumers to taste their wines. A logical outlet would be a wine festival or a farmers’ market; however, they may have to contend with other wineries and alcoholic beverage providers competing with for the same sale. Wineries that sell through restaurants could consider working with the restaurant staff or sommelier to design samples or tailored wine flights to encourage more restaurant visitors to taste their wines. This may lead to an additional bottle purchase during a meal. For those that produce dessert wines, detailing a dessert flight may be an option on a restaurant’s dessert menu. Or, the winery’s sales representative could work with the restaurant staff
to develop meal and wine pairings or weekly promotions providing free tastes of the local wine. Additionally, staff could pour wines served at events, which would give them the opportunity to describe the wine and the others available to taste and where to purchase bottles, such as the tasting room.

Price of wine was the second most influential factor for the purchasing decision of both “everyday” (71%) and entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion (62.2%) wine. These data are consistent with other studies (Thach et al., 2015; McCole et al., 2012) that identified the importance of price in the decision to purchase. For example, in a 2015 national wine consumer study, price was the top consideration when purchasing wine (72%) (Thach et al., 2015). Based on our research, “everyday” wine should be priced between $8.00 to $14.99. This is comparable to McCole et al. (2012), which reported 43% of Michigan wine consumer participants indicated paying $9.00 to $11.99 and 29% paying $12.00 to $19.99 for wine for everyday consumption. Wineries should consider keep these desirable price points when determining the prices of their wines. For example, a wine made for “everyday” consumption should be priced under $20, which will also keep the price comparable to competitors’ prices as the price range of $11.00 to $14.99 is the strongest price segment in the U.S. wine industry (McMillan, 2017).

In contrast, our data revealed most special occasion wines could be priced between $11.00 to $19.99, which is also comparable to a previous study (McCole et al., 2012), that found 55% of survey participants preferred a similar price point. In addition, 31% of those participants found the $20 or more price point for a “premium bottle” of wine appropriate (McCole et al., 2012), while our study indicated that 20.7% typically paid $20.00 to $24.99; 13.2% paid $25.00 to $29.99; 8.0% paid $30.00 to $35.00; and 9.3% paid more than $35.00 for a bottle of wine for special occasions. For wineries in the Mid-
Atlantic region, it is recommended to consider wines priced in these ranges for special promotions that may resonate with specific times of the year (e.g., holidays, graduation season, weddings, anniversaries, etc.) compared to the wines that are lower in price. Some wineries have been successful in promoting their premium wines in wooden boxes or as gift sets (Santa Barbara Winery, 2009), which increases the amount a consumer may be willing to pay and prepares the wine for a special occasion.

Understanding consumer perceptions concerning price and wine quality and the market demand for bottles of a certain price range could aid in wineries developing a wine portfolio that offers selections of wines that can be produced within a specific price range. While production of $8.00 varietal wines or wine blends may be challenging for wineries with smaller volumes, other product options may be available such as: selling wines in various packages, wine-by-the-glass options in tasting rooms, and selling wine flights in tasting rooms. These options provide an expansion of the winery’s portfolio by addressing availability of product in lower price points that may appeal to regional customers. Nonetheless, Silicon Valley Bank’s 2017 Wine Industry report predicted a growth in demand for wines $12 to $25 as wines priced under $9 a bottle will struggle (McMillan, 2017). While this could be due to the perception of price in relation to wine quality,, often befuddled by consumers (Lee, 2012), this opens opportunities for regional wineries to focus on producing wines or products within this price point for future years.

This study also revealed that “brand” was an influencing factor associated with purchasing behaviors amongst consumers in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. This is similar to a 2015 consumer study In a 2015 wine consumer study (Thach et al., 2015) in which 67% of purchasing decisions were based on the wine’s brand. Brand perception has previously been documented as a strong influence on consumer buying behaviors (Lee, 2012). Thus, wineries and tasting rooms should strongly consider
analyzing their brand’s current image and strive to create an exceptional brand image by exceeding consumer expectations. Altering the tasting room experience through layout, interaction, or even altering label images may appeal to all generations, based on results of our study. Comparatively, brand relationships through social media may appeal to younger generations. Wineries can analyze their brand image through customer research. There are three different techniques commonly used: Likert rating (e.g., how much participant agrees that the brand is good value), ranking (participant chooses which brand is greatest value, second greatest value, etc.), and pick-any technique (select all brand that participant believes are good value) (Driesener et al., 2006). These methods can help display the winery’s brand image, compare its brand to competitors, and reveal ways in which the winery can improve its brand image.

Of particular interest to the Mid-Atlantic region is interest in sparkling wines. Our study found that while less than a third of participants consumed sparkling wine as an “everyday” wine, Millennials and Generation X participants indicated a greater interest in the product than other generations. This is consistent with a 2011 survey of U.S. Millennial wine consumers which found that sparkling wines were the second most popular wine style that they preferred to drink sparkling wines during “non-meal” occasions (Thach, 2011). Additionally, the sparkling wine industry has seen positive growth with sales reports increasing 7% between 2014 and 2015 (Thach et al., 2015). This indicates that sparkling wine is trending towards a wine that is consumed more frequently, as opposed to being isolated for special occasions (Food Weekly News, 2014). This data should encourage regional wineries to consider sparkling products and their subsequent promotions. Integrating price point data from this survey, wineries could even consider developing a few sparkling products available at different price points and subsequently marketed for their prospective occasion: everyday use or for special
occasion events.

While this survey found that California produced wines are still popular amongst regional consumers, both groups of Millennials had significantly fewer consumer of wine from that state. A similar trend was displayed for wine for entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion. A previous study (Caparoso, 2016) found that members of the Millennial generation are considered “more adventurous,” and more likely to agree with statements like, “I think it is fun to try out new wines I am not familiar with” and “I like to try the most unusual wines, even if I’m not sure I will like them” compared to older generations. This opens opportunities for Mid-Atlantic wineries to capture the Millennial market segments with better target marketing and brand efforts, especially as Millennials age. However, with more participants in the older generations, specifically the Baby Boomers, accounting for a greater percentage of wine sales and spending more per bottle than Millennials (McMillan, 2017), wineries and tasting rooms still need to consider these generations in their marketing and sale strategies. For example, it may help to encourage Baby Boomer tasting room visitors to sample Mid-Atlantic wines that are “similar” to popular California wines to help sway them into local wine exploration; this strategy, however, may not work on younger generations. While much attention is focused on the Millennial consumers’ purchasing power, this generation’s share of the wine market is not predicted to “surpass” the older generations until 2026 (McMillan, 2017).

The following study provides factors that may influence a tasting room visitor’s purchasing decision. Understanding differences between purchasing and consumption preferences for “everyday” wines and wines for entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion based on wine consumption frequency segments, generations, and genders could help wineries better market their business and wines while making informed
recommendations to tasting room staff to enhance the visitor’s experience with the
brand. Based on the results from this study, industry members should consider the
following when developing new wine products and promotional strategies: the
occasion(s) when wine is consumed, encourage all visitors to sample wines prior to
purchase, strive to create opportunities for consumers to taste wines outside of visiting
the tasting room, create an exceptional tasting room experience to help bolder their
brand’s image, and encourage satisfied customers to share their expectations with
others. Such efforts, as outlined here, may help increase wine sales for a regional
winery.
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CHAPTER 3: DESCRIBING THE MID-ATLANTIC PURCHASER, THEIR WINE PREFERENCES, AND OCCASIONS AND SITUATIONS DURING WHICH THEY CONSUME WINES
Abstract

An Internet survey was administered (21 to 23 of March, 2016) to consumers who: were age 21 and older, resided in one of three states in the Mid-Atlantic U.S. region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania), were not a member of the wine industry, and purchased and consumed wine within the previous year. Participants answered questions concerning their general wine purchasing and consumption preferences and behaviors and if they ever purchased wine produced in New Jersey, New York, and/or Pennsylvania. Over half, 62.4% (n = 648), of all survey participants responded that they had purchased wines from at least one of these states. These participants were categorized as “Mid-Atlantic wine purchasers” (MAWP) and directed to questions about wine purchases and tasting rooms that they visited in each of the states.

Based on wine consumption frequency, 55.9% of these participants were super core wine consumers, meaning that they drank wine daily to a few times a week; 15.9% were core, drank wine about once a week; and 28.2% were marginal wine consumers, drank wine less frequently. Results indicate that 51.5% of MAWP participants consumed red wines and 35.2% consumed dry wines, with more super core participants responding that they consumed red wines (56.0%) and dry wines (39.3%) than marginal participants (41.5 and 28.4%, respectively). Concerning different types of wine, more super core participants drank table wine daily to a few times a week (26.5%) compared to core (4.0%) and marginal (3.0%) wine consuming participants. Also, more super core MAWP participants drank dessert wine and fortified wine (74.9 and 69.0%, respectively) than marginal participants (62.4 and 50.8%, respectively). Based on the generation these survey participants identified with, a greater percentage of Older Millennial MAWP participants consumed fruit (other than grape) wine daily to a few times a week (22.4%) than Generation Jones, Baby Boomers, and Silent & Greatest generations (5.6, 1.9, and
0%, respectively). When asked to indicate the origin of wines they would purchase for “everyday” consumption, more of these participants indicated they would purchase New York wine to consume “everyday” (63.6%) compared to all other states and regions presented. For wines served when celebrating special occasions and/or when entertaining, wines purchased to give as a gift and/or bring to others’ homes, and wines purchased to a “bring your own (BYO)” restaurant or selected from a restaurant menu, the greatest percentage of MAWP participants would purchase wines from states other than New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania (64.1, 59.9, and 48.4%, respectively).

Pertaining to the occasion, when MAWP participants consumed wine, the majority of respondents (77.0%) indicated that they consumed wine at a restaurant in their hometown and/or local community. More of the Younger Millennials participants (70.7%) drank wine at a bar or lounge with or without food than Generation Xer, Generation Jones, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation wine consumers (49.5, 37.9, 34.7, and 32.3%, respectively). When asked to indicate where participants learned about wine, 75.8% indicated they learned from friends and/or family.

These data can assist winery owners and tasting room managers, and the business as a whole, with identifying and marketing their product in a manner that will best appeal to consumers who reside in the Mid-Atlantic region and who purchase wines from the three states. Additionally, variations in responses based on wine consumption frequency, generations, and gender could help businesses enhance their marketing to better appeal to likely buyers and improve their overall marketing strategies.

**Introduction**

Currently over 100 million people in the United States (U.S.) drink wine (Vino California, 2015). Although knowing and understanding the characteristics that describe the U.S. wine consumer are extremely important, keying in on wine consumers who live in the
Mid-Atlantic, can provide better marketing directions for regional wineries. Given that most regional businesses have high direct to consumer sales (McMillan, 2017), understanding the consumers whom have better access to wines produced in the region, can provide very valuable information for the winery. For a business to be successful, owners and operators must be familiar with their customer’s needs and wants, in addition to characteristics that describe consumers demographically, such as age, income, family size, and education level (Dunlap et al., 2010). Demographics can help a winery understand “who” their customers are, while behaviors related to the likelihood of using a product (e.g., consumers who drink wine, consumers who purchase wine produced in certain regions), level of usage (super core, core, and marginal wine consumers), and psychographics (attitudes) describe how consumers “feel” about wine (Riviezzo et al., 2011). Hence, it is important to understand how wine fits within the context of the Mid-Atlantic culture and detect if any subcultures exist, which would warrant even more specific marketing messages, promotions, pricing, and packaging options (Flint et al., 2016).

In the Mid-Atlantic wine industry, New York is ranked third and Pennsylvania is seventh in wine production in the U.S. These two states, in addition to New Jersey, are a part of the Mid-Atlantic wine region. Between January 2016 and January 2017, there was a net growth of 5% of the number of U.S. wineries (Wines and Vines Analytics, 2017). As of January 2017, there were 9,091 wineries in the United States, with 385 located in New York, 229 in Pennsylvania, and under 100 in New Jersey. It is evident that there is a demand for wine as the number of wineries continues to grow in the U.S.

Each of these three states possess an environment that is suitable for grape production. Over 40 grape varieties are grown in New Jersey (Coffin, n.d.); 25 varietals of grapes are grown in New York, including Native American varieties and an additional 10
specialized table grape varieties (New York Wines, 2016); and at least 70 varieties are produced in Pennsylvania, which is more than most wine regions (Carroll, 2006).

With a better understanding of the wine industry in the U.S. we can begin to assess the driving force behind the growth: the wine consumers. In 2015, of all U.S. adults, age 21 and older, 13%, labeled as high frequency wine consumers, consumed wine at least once a week; 24%, labeled as occasional wine consumers, consumed wine less frequently; 26% were non-adopters, they consumed alcohol but not wine; and 37% were abstainers, those who did not consume any type of alcoholic beverages (Franson, 2016). These statistics describe consumption behaviors for the U.S. as a whole, while little research has been conducted to learn about consumption behaviors and attitudes that describe wine consumers in the Mid-Atlantic. An understanding of “who” is purchasing wines from wineries located in the three states can help industry members better market their products and more appropriately engage with current and potential customers.

According to The Upfront Analytics Team (2015), there are five key ways consumer demographic information can be used in a marketing strategy: 1) to understand who the ideal customer is based on their tastes and preferences (e.g., knowing what appeals to super core wine consumers, what Millennials prefer to drink); 2) lowering marketing costs by using the information to target customers more efficiently (e.g., using Facebook as opposed to traditional media to reach younger generations); 3) identify new opportunities based on gaps in the current marketing strategy (e.g., marketing sustainable wine to environmentally-conscious consumers, marketing low-calorie wines to health conscious consumers); 4) create unique selling points through marketing stories that appeal to the target audience (e.g., conveying what the brand represents,
what makes the wine/tasting room unique); and 5) better engagement, by utilizing steps 1 through 4, which can lead to increased sales.

Along with using demographic characteristics as the basis of a marketing strategy, knowing for what occasions wine is purchased, situations when wine is consumed, and how consumers learn about wine are critical in developing marketing strategies that will appeal to specific target markets. A 2011 study (Thach, 2011) of U.S. Millennial wine consumers revealed that special occasions and dining at formal restaurants were the two most common situations when they consumed wine, although these occasions were common times when all generations drank wine. Dining at a friend’s house and while socializing with friends were the third and fourth most popular occasions when wine was consumed, which provides insight into the Millennials’ desire for a balance between work and personal life and their view of wine as more of a “social lubricant” than possibly other generations (Thach, 2011). Another study (Olsen et al., 2006) identified the top two common situations in which wine was consumed as the beverage of choice: while dining at home and while dining at a restaurant. The third most common situation determined by this study was wine consumed while relaxing after work, which what selected by more Millennial and Generation X participants than older generations (Olsen et al., 2006). Thus, there is evidence that there are generational differences based on occasions and situations when consumers drink wine.

There is no question that it is curtail for a business to know their consumer’s specific needs and wants. Certain segments are more likely to pay a higher price for wine than others, may prefer a specific style of wine (e.g., dry vs sweet), or have a preference on how or where the wine is consumed (Thach et al., 2015). To engage different age groups, it may be necessary to utilize different means of communication or present a brand’s message in a unique way. Millennials, for example, love to experiment with wine,
are drawn to hip, modern packaging, and show very little brand loyalty (Singh, 2014), which wineries and tasting room staff could focus on when developing promotional strategies targeted towards the Millennial generation. In contrast, Baby Boomers, currently the highest wine purchasing segment in the U.S. market (McMillan, 2017), is more brand loyal and typically conducts repeat purchases specific to their favorite brands (Reisenwitz et al., 2007). This would help wineries to engage in an alternative marketing strategy in order to include both generations that purchase their wines.

Internet surveys have helped reach many wine consumers that would require great travel distances to participate in otherwise, and are an appropriate, minimal cost method of data collection (Wright, 2005). A limitation of Internet based surveys is the inability to ask participants clarifying questions, which is common in face-to-face research. Yet, Internet surveys can include individuals in distant locations away from the research site, save time for researchers, lower costs, and provide convenience associated with automated data collection (Wright, 2005). Information and trends regarding the behaviors of Mid-Atlantic wine consumers would be valuable to regional wineries. The information could be used to better market towards various consumer segments based on their consumption and purchasing behaviors, wine and price preferences, and factors influencing their decisions to purchase wines for “everyday” and special occasions.

Research Objectives

- Describe Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participant demographic characteristics and wine consumption frequencies.
- Identify Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participant wine preferences (e.g., type of wine, sweetness/dryness level).
• Discuss similarities and differences based on wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender pertaining to table, fruit, sparkling, dessert and fortified wines consumption.

• Understand the states/region from which Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants choose wine for different occasions (e.g., “everyday” wine) and purposes (e.g., to give as a gift).

• Explore situations (e.g., at a restaurant in their hometown and/or local community) when Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants consumed wines produced regionally.

• Determine sources that Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants learned about wine.

Materials & Methods

Data were collected through a 15-minute Internet survey (21 to 23 March 2016), administered to Survey Sampling International, LLC (Shelton, CT) panelists in three states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) in the Mid-Atlantic region. Panelists were screened for not being a member of the wine industry, being at least 21 years old, residing in one of the targeted states, and for having purchased and drank wine at least once within the previous year. Panelists were informed of these criteria in an electronic consent statement prior to proceeding with the survey. Those who qualified were directed to the survey which was developed by the researchers, approved by the Social Science Research at The Pennsylvania State University (IRB 37365, University Park, PA), and administered using SurveyMoney.com (Palo Alto, CA), an online provider of survey solutions. Surveys were pre-tested on a subset (98) of the target market. Twelve hundred survey participants opened and attempted the questions with 1,038 qualifying
and completing the survey. To encourage participation, panelists were provided with an incentive of either cash, points, or by being able to donate to charity to encourage participation. The project “Developing Wine Marketing Strategies for the Mid-Atlantic Region” (GRANT 11091317) was funded by the USDA Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program.

**Statistical Analysis**

Data were analyzed with SPSS (Version 23 and 24; SPSS, Chicago, IL). To assess differences between responses, data were segmented by participant demographic characteristics (generation, gender), and wine consumption frequency groups. Pearson’s Chi Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests were used to detect differences for categorical and/or multiple-choice questions.

**Results**

Of the 1,038 consumers who participated in the March 2016 survey, 648 of them (62.4%) responded that they had purchased wines produced in at least one of the three states: New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, and will be referred to as Mid-Atlantic wine purchasers (MAWP). Table 3.1 includes demographic information that describes all of the Survey Sampling International, LLC who qualified to participate in the survey and those who were identified as MAWP participants.

Though statistical analysis was not conducted to determine differences between demographics of the two groups, there were similarities: a majority of all survey participants and MAWP were married or in a domestic partnership (64.0 and 70.1%, respectively), while slightly over half were female (59.1 and 57.4%, respectively), employed by someone else (55.1 and 58.7%, respectively), lived in a home without children age 17 and younger (60.8 and 55.2%, respectively), but with one other adult
 Approximately half of all survey participants and MAWP lived in New York (47.5 and 49.5%, respectively) and resided in a suburban area (48.6 and 47.5%, respectively).

Pertaining to generation, less than a third of all survey participants and MAWP participants were members of Generation X, born between 1965 to 1980 (29.0 and 30.9%, respectively), or were Older Millennials, born between 1981 to 1990 (22.5 and 24.7%, respectively). Due to the limited number of participants who identified themselves as belonging to the Silent generation and the Greatest generations, compared to the other generations, the two were combined into a new category named The Silent & Greatest generation.

Most of the survey participants and MAWP had either a Bachelor’s degree (35.5 and 34.9%, respectively) or an Associate’s degree/technical degree/or similar degree (30.4 and 31.2%, respectively). Regarding gross household income, the top three categories were: $76,000 to $99,999 (21.1 and 22.1%, respectively), $100,000 to $149,999 (19.9 and 21.0%, respectively), and $50,000 to $75,999 (20.5 and 20.5%, respectively).

Similarities were also apparent between the two groups pertaining to their wine consumption frequency. The majority were super core wine consumers (drank wine daily to a few times a week; 49.3 and 55.9%, respectively) with fewer participants described as core wine consumers (drank wine about once a week; 18.7 and 15.9%, respectively), and marginal wine consumers (drank wine less frequently; 32.0 and 28.2%, respectively) (Table 3.2).

Participants were asked to select the frequency that best described how often they purchased bottles or containers of wine during an average year. Again, while statistical
analysis was not conducted to determine differences between all survey participants and MAWP participants, approximately one quarter (25.9 and 26.2%, respectively) of each group responded that they purchased wine two to three times a month, with slightly fewer indicating that they purchased wine about once a month (24.4 and 21.5%, respectively), about once a week (17.7 and 20.2%, respectively), or a few times a year (20.1 and 16.0%, respectively).
Table 3.1. Demographics of: 1) survey participants who purchased wines produced in one or more of the three Mid-Atlantic states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) and 2) and all Survey 2 participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mid-Atlantic Purchasers</th>
<th>All Survey Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>n=648</code> (</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Millennials (1991 and younger)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Millennials (1981 to 1990)</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X (1965 to 1980)</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Jones (1955 to 1964)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (1946 to 1954)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Silent &amp; Greatest (1945 and older)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Household Income*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 and greater</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area or small town</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

*Gross household incomes represent 2015 values.
Table 3.2. Wine consumption and purchasing frequency segmentation for: 1) survey participants who purchased wines produced in one or more of the three Mid-Atlantic states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) and 2) and all Survey 2 participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchasers*</th>
<th>All Survey Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(no.)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine consumption frequency segmentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine purchasing frequency</td>
<td>648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to three times a month</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. *Mid-Atlantic wine purchasers were participants of the survey who responded that they had purchased wines produced in at least one of the three states: New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The survey had 1,038 participants; 648 were Mid-Atlantic wine purchasers.
Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchaser (MAWP) Participants Wine Preferences

Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser (MAWP) participants were asked to respond to two survey questions to help identify which type of wine (e.g., white, red) and level of sweetness/dryness they consumed most often (Table 3.3). Half (51.5%) responded that they consumed red wine, 31.8% white, and the remaining consumed rosé, sparkling, dessert, or fortified wines (8.2, 4.6, 3.6, and 0.3%, respectively). Pertaining to sweetness/dryness level, 35.2% of MAWP participants selected dry, followed by semi-sweet wines (32.9%).
Table 3.3. Type of wine (e.g., white wine, red wine, rose) and sweetness/dryness level (e.g., sweet wine, semi-sweet wine) that Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants consumed most frequently, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchasers (n = 816)</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core (n = 262)</td>
<td>Marginal (n = 183)</td>
<td>Younger Millennial (n = 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Wine Consumed Most Frequently (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core (n = 262)</td>
<td>Marginal (n = 183)</td>
<td>Younger Millennial (n = 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White wine</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>30.9a</td>
<td>34.0a</td>
<td>33.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red wine</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>56.0a</td>
<td>53.4ab</td>
<td>41.5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosé wine</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.9a</td>
<td>6.8a</td>
<td>11.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkling wine</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3a</td>
<td>4.9a</td>
<td>7.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessert wine</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3a</td>
<td>1.0a</td>
<td>5.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortified wine</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>0.9a</td>
<td>1.1a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sweetness/Dryness Level of Wine Consumed Most Frequently (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Core (n = 262)</th>
<th>Marginal (n = 183)</th>
<th>Younger Millennial (n = 79)</th>
<th>Older Millennial (n = 162)</th>
<th>Generation X (n = 260)</th>
<th>Generation Jones (n = 98)</th>
<th>Baby Boomer (n = 96)</th>
<th>Silent &amp; Greatest (n = 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweet wine</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.7a</td>
<td>13.6a</td>
<td>19.1a</td>
<td>28.0a</td>
<td>20.8ab</td>
<td>25.0a</td>
<td>17.2abc</td>
<td>6.5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-sweet wine</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>27.3b</td>
<td>37.9ab</td>
<td>41.0a</td>
<td>36.0ab</td>
<td>41.5a</td>
<td>33.5ab</td>
<td>23.0b</td>
<td>28.0ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-dry wine</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.9a</td>
<td>13.6a</td>
<td>9.6a</td>
<td>13.3a</td>
<td>9.4a</td>
<td>8.0a</td>
<td>16.1a</td>
<td>11.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry wine</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>39.3a</td>
<td>33.0ab</td>
<td>28.4b</td>
<td>21.3c</td>
<td>27.0bc</td>
<td>33.5abc</td>
<td>42.5ab</td>
<td>50.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure/Don't know</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8a</td>
<td>1.9a</td>
<td>1.6a</td>
<td>1.3a</td>
<td>1.3a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>1.1a</td>
<td>3.2a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
Significant differences were detected when data was segmented by wine consumption frequency, with more super core participants responding that they drank red wine (56.0%) and dry wine (39.3%) than marginal participants (41.5 and 28.4%, respectively), while more marginal respondents indicated they drank semi-sweet wines than super core members (41.0 and 27.3%, respectively).

There were no differences regarding the percentages of participants in each generation who consumed white, red, or rosé wine. While only 4.6% of MAWP participants responded that sparkling wine was the type of wine they consumed most often, more Older Millennial and Generation X participants reported that this was their preferred wine (6.3 and 4.0%, respectively) than Baby Boomers, of which none indicated sparkling wine was the type of wine they consumed most often. While there were no differences among generations pertaining to off-dry wines being the type of wine they consumed most frequently, more Younger Millennials (28.0%) and Generation Xers (25.0%) consumed sweet wines most often than consumers in the Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation (6.5 and 6.5%, respectively). While, more mature generations (42.5% of Generation Jones, 50.5% of Baby Boomers, and 54.8% of Silent & Greatest) drank dry wines most often, this was true for only 21.5% of Younger Millennials. A greater percentage of Baby Boomers also indicated that they preferred dry wines compared to Older Millennial participants (50.5 and 27.0%, respectively). Finally, more Older Millennials indicated they consumed semi-sweet wines more so than Generation Jones participants (41.5 and 23.0%, respectively).

Segmenting data based on gender also showed that there were differences between males and females pertaining to the type of wine consumed. More females indicated that they consumed white (35.0%) and rosé (10.3%) wines than males (27.1 and 5.5%, respectively). Contrarily, more males drank red wines than females (60.8 and 44.7%,
respectively). No significant differences with sweetness/dryness level of wines consumed were found between genders.

**Frequency that Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchaser Participants Consumed Table Wines, Fruit Wines, Fortified Wines, Sparkling Wines, and Dessert Wines**

Participants were asked to indicate the frequency which they consumed table, fruit, fortified, sparkling, and dessert wines. Response categories included: daily, a few times a week, about once a week, two to three times a month, about once a month, a few times a year, about once a year, and I do not consume this type of wine. Responses for those who consumed each type of wine, along with their consumption frequency are listed in Table 3.6. Responses for daily and a few times a week were condensed into one category, as well as two to three times a month with about once a month, and a few times a year with about once a year responses, as individual frequencies for these separate groups were low. Additionally, results were more useful analytically when statistics were conducted on the condensed groups.

While nearly all MAWP participants consumed table wine (94.1%), the greatest percentage of these participants reported drinking the wine two to three time a month to about once a month (45.0%). High percentages of MAWP participants consumed sparkling wines (82.0%), fruit wines (77.9%), dessert wines (69.2%) and fortified wines (61.9%).
Table 3.4. Percentage of Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants who consumed table, fruit, fortified, sparkling, and dessert wines, and the frequency which they consumed them, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchasers (n = 648)</td>
<td>Younger Millennial (n = 75)</td>
<td>Older Millennial (n = 160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consume table wine</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>92.0a</td>
<td>95.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption frequency:</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5a</td>
<td>25.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily to a few times a week</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>21.7a</td>
<td>19.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>41.5b</td>
<td>66.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to three times a month to about once a month</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>10.0b</td>
<td>11.9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year to about once a year</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>96.1a</td>
<td>98.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consume fortified wine</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>69.0a</td>
<td>56.0ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption frequency:</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6a</td>
<td>22.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily to a few times a week</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.5a</td>
<td>19.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>36.8a</td>
<td>34.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to three times a month to about once a month</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>22.8c</td>
<td>40.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year to about once a year</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>92.0a</td>
<td>98.1a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: % values are interpreted as percentages.
Table 3.4 Continued. Percentage of Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants who consumed table, fruit, fortified, sparkling, and dessert wines, and the frequency which they consumed them, segmented by wine consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchasers</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 648)</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 362)</td>
<td>Core (n = 103)</td>
<td>Marginal (n = 183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger Millennial (n = 75)</td>
<td>Older Millennial (n = 160)</td>
<td>Generation X (n = 200)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sparkling wines (%)  
Consumes sparkling wine | 82.0 | 83.9a | 81.2a | 78.7a | 82.7ab | 86.8a | 84.6ab | 73.8ab | 70.8b | 83.9ab | 75.7b | 82.5a |
| Consumption frequency:  
Daily to a few times a week | 11.7 | 17.4a | 6.1b | 2.9b | 6.5bc | 23.2a | 12.7a | 1.6c | 3.2bc | 0c | 7.7b | 16.9a |
| About once a week | 9.8 | 12.8a | 9.8ab | 3.6b | 6.5a | 12.0a | 13.3a | 6.5a | 6.3a | 0a | 7.0b | 13.0a |
| Two to three times a month to about once a month | 29.2 | 30.5a | 31.7a | 25.0a | 58.1a | 27.5a | 32.1b | 25.8b | 6.3c | 15.4bc | 32.0a | 25.5a |
| A few times a year to about once a year | 49.2 | 39.3b | 52.4ab | 68.6a | 29.0b | 37.3b | 41.8b | 68.1a | 84.1a | 84.6a | 53.2b | 44.6a |
| Dessert wines (%)  
Consumes sparkling wine | 69.2 | 74.9a | 61.4ab | 62.4ab | 77.3ab | 83.5a | 76.8ab | 47.1c | 46.7c | 53.3bc | 65.7b | 73.2a |
| Consumption frequency:  
Daily to a few times a week | 13.9 | 20.0a | 3.2c | 5.3b | 18.5abc | 21.2a | 13.8a | 2.5d | 4.8bd | 0d | 10.9b | 17.3a |
| About once a week | 10.9 | 12.8a | 16.1a | 3.5b | 15.5a | 9.8a | 13.2a | 5.0a | 9.5a | 0a | 7.1b | 15.2a |
| Two to three times a month to about once a month | 24.8 | 29.1a | 21.0a | 16.8a | 31.0a | 30.3a | 24.3a | 17.5ab | 7.1b | 25.0ab | 22.3a | 26.9a |
| A few times a year to about once a year | 50.5 | 35.1b | 59.7a | 74.3a | 37.9a | 36.6b | 46.7b | 75.0a | 78.6a | 73.0ab | 59.7a | 40.6b |

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to consumers reading in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05. SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
While there were no differences between groups (wine consumption frequency, generation, or gender) as to the percentage in each who consumed table wine, as might be expected more super core participants drank table wine daily to a few times a week (26.5%) compared to core (4.0%) and marginal (3.0%) wine consumers. Pertaining to generation, a greater percentage of Older Millennials (25.7%) and Generation Xers (20.6%) drank wine based on this frequency compared to those in Generation Jones, Baby Boomers, and Silent & Greatest generations (0 to 8.0%). While none of the members of the Silent & Greatest generations consumed table wine daily to a few times a week, these participants were more likely to consume table wine two to three times a month to about once a month (69.0%), which was significantly more than the percentage of Older Millennials who consumed table wines at this frequency (36.2%). While fewer females drank table wine daily to a few times a week (11.4%) than men (22.5%), there were no difference between the groups for consuming the wine 1) about once a week and 2) two to three times a month to about once a month.

Based on the percentage of participants in each segmentation who consumed fruit, fortified, sparkling, and dessert wine, there was a noticeable difference. Specifically, more super core participants drank dessert and fortified wines (74.9 and 69.0%, respectively) than marginal participants (62.4 and 50.8%, respectively). There were no differences between the percentages of super core, core, and marginal participants who drank sparkling and fruit wines.

When consumption frequency for fruit, fortified, sparkling, and dessert wines were further explored, a greater percentage of super core participants drank each of these wines daily to a few times a week (range of 17.4 to 21.1%) compared to marginal participants (range of 2.9 to 5.3%), and core participants in the case of fruit wines, sparkling wines, and dessert wines (4.9, 6.1, and 3.2%, respectively). Significantly more marginal
participants consumed these four wines a few times a year to about once a year (range of 65.2 to 74.3%) than super core participants (range of 22.9 to 39.3%).

While there were no differences between the percentages of Younger Millennials, Older Millennials, and Generation X participants who consumed fruit wines (86.7, 89.4%, and 83.2%, respectively) a greater percentage of these participants did consume this wine than participants in the Generation Jones, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generations (63.5, 60.0, and 53.3%, respectively). What was noticeably apparent was that a greater percentage of Older Millennial participants consumed fruit wines daily to a few times a week (22.4%) than Generation Jones, Baby Boomers, and Silent & Greatest generations (5.6, 1.9, and 0%, respectively). This was also true for consumption of dessert wines based on drinking the wine daily to a few times a week. While 21.2% of Older Millennials drank dessert wines daily to a few times a week, only 4.8% Baby Boomers drank wine on this basis, followed by 2.5% of Generation Jones and 0% of Silent & Greatest generation members. Generational consumption of sparkling and fortified wines, daily to a few times a week, was very similar with a greater percentage of Older Millennials responding that they drank sparkling wine and fortified wine (23.2 and 26.6%, respectively) on this basis than Generation Jones (1.6, and 2.7%, respectively), Baby Boomers (3.2 and 2.6%, respectively), and Silent & Greatest (0% for both) generations. In addition, fewer Generation X participants drank fortified wine daily to a few times a week (12.2%) than Older Millennials (26.6%).

While an equal percentage of males and females consumed fruit wines, more men consumed this wine daily to a few times a week (20.5%) than their counterparts (8.5%). Males were more likely to consume fortified wine (69.0%) and drink this wine daily to few times a week (20.0%) than females (56.3 and 9.9%, respectively). This same trend was also apparent for: overall sparkling wine consumption (86.2% of males vs. 78.7% of
consumption of sparkling wines daily to a few times a week (16.9% of males vs. 7.7% of females); overall consumption of dessert wines (73.2% of males vs. 65.7% of females); and consumption of dessert wines on a daily to a few times a week basis (17.3% of males vs. 10.9% of females).

**Occasions that Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchaser Participants Would Purchase Mid-Atlantic Wines**

Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants were asked to indicate from which of the three states (New Jersey, New York, and/or Pennsylvania), other U.S. states/regions, and regions outside the U.S. they would purchase wine for four different occasions: 1) “everyday” wine to be consumed in the home during the average day; 2) wine served in the participants' home to celebrate special occasions and/or when entertaining; 3) to give as a gift and/or to bring to others’ homes; and 4) wine brought to a “bring you own” (BYO) restaurant or selected from a restaurant menu. More MAWP participants indicated they would purchase New York wine to consume “everyday” (63.6%) compared to all other states and regions (Table 3.5). Based on purchasing wine for the other three occasions, more participants would purchase wine from other U.S. states/regions, followed by New York wine than those who would purchase New Jersey or Pennsylvania wines. For wines served when celebrating special occasions and/or when entertaining, wines purchased to give as a gift and/or bring to others' homes, and wines purchased to a “bring your own” restaurant or selected from a restaurant menu, the greatest percentage of MAWP participants selected that they would purchase wines from other U.S. states/regions (64.1, 59.9, and 48.4%, respectively) than other states and regions presented.
Table 3.5. States and/or regions Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants reported they purchased wine from to consume during four different occasions (e.g., everyday, to celebrate a special occasion and/or when entertaining), segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchasers (n = 648)</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 362)</td>
<td>Core (n = 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Everyday&quot; wine consumed in the home during an average day (%)*</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.2a</td>
<td>9.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/region from which participants would purchase wine for this occasion:</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.6ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>66.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>46.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other U.S. States/Regions</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>62.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside the U.S.</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>44.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine served in your home to celebrate special occasions and/or when entertaining (%)*</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.5a</td>
<td>14.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/region from which participants would purchase wine for this occasion:</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>46.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>60.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>42.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other U.S. States/Regions</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>64.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside the U.S.</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>61.8a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5 Continued. States and/or regions Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants reported they purchased wine from to consume during four different occasions (e.g., everyday, to celebrate a special occasion and/or when entertaining), segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchasers</th>
<th>Younger Generation</th>
<th>Older Generation</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Baby</th>
<th>Silent &amp; Greatest</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 646)</td>
<td>(n = 75)</td>
<td>(n = 160)</td>
<td>(n = 200)</td>
<td>(n = 87)</td>
<td>(n = 95)</td>
<td>(n = 31)</td>
<td>(n = 369)</td>
<td>(n = 274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine brought to a &quot;bring your own&quot; restaurant or selected from a restaurant menu (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not purchase wine for this occasion</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.0a</td>
<td>9.3a</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.5a</td>
<td>8.4a</td>
<td>9.3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/region from which participants would purchase wine for this occasion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34.2a</td>
<td>42.6a</td>
<td>28.3a</td>
<td>37.7a</td>
<td>36.3a</td>
<td>37.0a</td>
<td>35.8a</td>
<td>22.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>53.0a</td>
<td>57.4a</td>
<td>55.4a</td>
<td>59.4a</td>
<td>47.9a</td>
<td>54.9a</td>
<td>53.9a</td>
<td>60.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.2a</td>
<td>34.0a</td>
<td>43.4a</td>
<td>43.5a</td>
<td>40.4a</td>
<td>42.2a</td>
<td>44.7a</td>
<td>31.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other U.S. States/Regions</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>59.2a</td>
<td>59.6a</td>
<td>61.4a</td>
<td>52.0a</td>
<td>50.7a</td>
<td>64.7a</td>
<td>67.1a</td>
<td>60.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the U.S.</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>53.3b</td>
<td>67.0a</td>
<td>48.6b</td>
<td>49.9a</td>
<td>48.6a</td>
<td>59.5a</td>
<td>56.6a</td>
<td>58.8a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ 0.05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*pParticipants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Significant differences for “everyday” wine consumed in the home during an average day were found when segmented by wine consumption frequencies, generation, and gender. More core participants (49.5%) would purchase New Jersey wines for “everyday” wines than marginal members (33.9%). A greater percentage of both super core and core participants would purchase wines from U.S. states/regions other than New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania than marginal respondents (60.5, 64.1, and 48.1%, respectively). Concerning generations and “everyday” wine purchases, more Generation Jones would purchase wines from: 1) New York (74.7%) than Older Millennials (53.1%); 2) Pennsylvania (58.6%) than members of the Silent & Greatest generation (25.8%); and 3) other U.S. states/regions (71.3%) than Older Millennial participants (48.1%). For gender, the only significant difference for this occasion was that more females would purchase Pennsylvania wines than males (49.1 and 40.5%, respectively).

Regarding wines served when celebrating special occasions and/or when entertaining, more super core would purchase wines from New Jersey than marginal participants (46.1 and 33.9%, respectively). More Generation Xers would purchase wine from other U.S. regions/states than Older Millennial participants (66.5 and 50.6%, respectively). Also, more females would purchase wine from other U.S. regions/states than males for this occasion (66.7 and 57.7%, respectively).

For wine purchased to give as a gift and/or to bring to others’ homes, more core participants (43.7%) would purchase New Jersey wines for this occasion than marginal members (29.0%), and more core respondents would purchase wine from states/regions outside the U.S. than both super core and marginal participants (66.0, 53.0, and 50.8%, respectively). More Silent & Greatest generation members indicated they would purchase wines from other U.S. states/regions than Older Millennial participants (77.4
and 51.3%, respectively). Also, more females would purchase wines from Pennsylvania than males for this occasion (43.6 and 34.3%, respectively).

Pertaining to wines purchased to a “bring your own” (BYO) restaurant or selected from a restaurant menu, no significant differences based on wine consumption frequency were found. Fewer Silent & Greatest generation members (12.9%) would purchase Pennsylvania wines in a restaurant than Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, Generation X, and Generation Jones participants (37.3, 35.0, 35.0, and 37.9%, respectively). For gender, more females indicated they would purchase wines from New Jersey (32.2%), Pennsylvania (36.0%), and states/regions outside the U.S. (42.5%) for this occasion than males (23.7, 28.1, and 32.1%, respectively).

*Situations and Occasions Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchaser Participants Consumed Wine*

Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants were asked to select all the situations and occasions when they consumed wine (Table 3.6). Participants were allowed to choose as many or few options as they desired with a majority of respondents (77.0%) indicating that they consumed wine at a restaurant in their hometown and/or local community followed by dining at a friend or family member’s house (73.1%) and when entertaining and/or celebrating a holiday in their home (70.3%).
Table 3.6. Percentage of Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants who consumed wine during various situations and occasions (e.g., at a restaurant in their hometown and/or local community), segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations and/or Occasions When Survey Participants Consumed Wine(%)*</th>
<th>All Mid-Atlantic Wine purchasers (n = 648)</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core (n = 302)</td>
<td>Core (n = 163)</td>
<td>Marginal (n = 183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a restaurant in their hometown and/or local community</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>82.9a</td>
<td>76.7ab</td>
<td>65.6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When dining at a friend or family member’s house</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>75.4a</td>
<td>72.8a</td>
<td>68.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When entertaining and/or celebrating a holiday in their home</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>71.3a</td>
<td>74.8a</td>
<td>67.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At celebrations such as weddings, birthday parties, bridal showers, bachelor/bachelorette parties</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>70.2a</td>
<td>68.0a</td>
<td>70.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a restaurant while traveling for pleasure or when on vacation</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>72.1a</td>
<td>77.7a</td>
<td>60.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the day in their home to relax</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>69.6a</td>
<td>66.0a</td>
<td>49.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At holiday parties where participant is the guest</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>63.0a</td>
<td>58.3a</td>
<td>61.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When dining at their home with only household members</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>67.7a</td>
<td>63.1a</td>
<td>42.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While watching TV or related activity</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>61.9a</td>
<td>52.4a</td>
<td>35.5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a bar or in a lounge with or without food</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>53.3a</td>
<td>54.4a</td>
<td>37.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While cooking</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>50.8a</td>
<td>43.7a</td>
<td>27.9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At picnics and/or barbecues</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>39.0a</td>
<td>25.2b</td>
<td>23.5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When at a business dinner or event</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>35.9a</td>
<td>35.0ab</td>
<td>23.0b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While attending a sporting event or concert</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18.0a</td>
<td>15.5a</td>
<td>4.9b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05. SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
When data were segmented by wine consumption frequency, more super core participants responded that they drank wine at a restaurant in their hometown and/or local community (82.9%) and when at a business dinner or event (35.9%) than marginal members (65.6 and 23.0%, respectively). More super core and core participants consumed wine in the following situations and occasions than marginal participants: at a restaurant while traveling for pleasure or when on vacation (72.1, 77.7, and 60.7%, respectively), at the end of the day in their home to relax (69.6, 66.0, and 49.7%, respectively), when dining at their home with only household members (67.7, 63.1, and 42.1%, respectively), while watching TV or related activity (61.9, 52.4, and 35.5%, respectively), at a bar or in a lounge with or without food (53.3, 54.4, and 37.7%, respectively), while cooking (50.8, 43.7, and 27.9%, respectively), and while attending a sporting event or concert (18.0, 15.5, and 4.9%, respectively). More super core reported they drank wine at picnics and/or barbecues than both core and marginal members (39.0, 25.2, and 23.5%, respectively).

Between generations, more Silent & Greatest participants drank wine when dining at a friend or family member's house (90.3%) and at celebrations such as weddings, birthday parties, bridal showers, bachelor/bachelorette parties (87.1%) than Older Millennial respondents (63.1 and 64.4%, respectively). More Generation Jones indicated they drank wine when entertaining and/or celebrating a holiday in their home than Older Millennial participants (81.6 and 61.3%, respectively). More of both Generation Jones and Baby Boomer participants reported they drank wine at holiday parties where the participant was a guest than members of the Older Millennial and Generation X generations (75.9, 71.6, 53.8, and 54.0%, respectively). Contrarily, more Older Millennials indicated they drank wine while watching TV or related activity than both Generation Jones and Baby Boomer participants (63.1, 42.5, and 41.1%, respectively).
More Younger Millennials (70.7%) drank wine at a bar or lounge with or without food than Generation Xers, Generation Jones, Baby Boomers, and Silent & Greatest generation participants (49.5, 37.9, 34.7, and 32.3%, respectively). Also, more Older Millennials drank wine at a bar or lounge with or without food than Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants (56.3, 34.7, and 32.3%, respectively). For consuming wine while cooking, more Older Millennials (60.0%) drank wine than Younger Millennial, Generation Jones, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation participants (40.0, 34.5, 18.9, and 22.6%, respectively). Additionally, more Generation Xers indicated they drank wine while cooking compared to both Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation respondents (49.5, 18.9, and 22.6%, respectively) and more Younger Millennials drank wine while cooking than Baby Boomers (40.0 and 18.9%, respectively). More Generation X participants indicated they drank wine when at a business dinner or event than Silent & Greatest members (35.5 and 12.9%, respectively). When attending a sporting event or concert, more Older Millennial participants reported that they drank wine during this occasion than Baby Boomer respondents (20.6 and 7.4%, respectively).

Significant differences between genders was also noted. More females indicated drinking wine during the following situations and occasions than males: when dining at a friend or family member's house (77.2 and 67.9%, respectively), when entertaining and/or celebrating a holiday in their home (76.4 and 63.5%, respectively), at celebrations such as weddings, birthday parties, bridal showers, bachelor/bachelorette parties (75.6 and 62.4%, respectively), at the end of the day in their home to relax (70.2 and 54.4%, respectively), at holiday parties where participant was a guest (68.8 and 52.9%, respectively), at a bar or lounge with or without food (53.4 and 42.7%, respectively), and at picnics and/or barbecues (35.8 and 27.4%, respectively).
Sources Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchaser Participants Learned About Wine

Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants were asked to select all the sources presented that they used to learn about wine (Table 3.7). Three quarters of respondents (75.8%) indicated they learned about wine through friends and/or family. The second most selected response was at wine and liquor stores, including the employees, promotions/advertisements in the store, and/or sent via email or postal mail (65.6%). Less than half of all participants selected any of the other sources presented.
Table 3.7. Percentage of Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser participants who learned about wine from various sources (e.g., friends and/or family), segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchasers Used to Learn About Wine (%)</th>
<th>All Mid-Atlantic Wine Purchasers (n = 648)</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Younger Millennial (n = 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and/or family</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>74.3a</td>
<td>78.6a</td>
<td>77.0a</td>
<td>73.3bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At wine and liquor stores, including the employees, promotions/advertisements in the store, and/or sent via email or postal mail</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>68.2a</td>
<td>64.1a</td>
<td>61.2a</td>
<td>60.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery tasting room staff and/or promotions/advertisements in the tasting room, and/or sent via email or postal mail</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>50.3a</td>
<td>55.3a</td>
<td>37.2b</td>
<td>40.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and cooking magazines (e.g., Sauver, Food &amp; Wine, Bon Appetit, Food Network Magazine, Cooking Light)</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>47.2a</td>
<td>48.6ab</td>
<td>33.9b</td>
<td>46.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General online search using a search engine (e.g., Google, Bing, Yahoo)</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>42.0a</td>
<td>35.9a</td>
<td>33.3b</td>
<td>58.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine focused magazine (e.g., Wine Spectator, Decanter, Wine Enthusiast)</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>40.3a</td>
<td>28.2b</td>
<td>16.9b</td>
<td>21.3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media networks (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Pinterest)</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>32.0a</td>
<td>38.8a</td>
<td>21.9b</td>
<td>42.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television/Radio programs (e.g., cooking channel, local or national news segment)</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>25.1a</td>
<td>20.4ab</td>
<td>13.1b</td>
<td>24.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and/or regional magazines (online or print)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>21.8a</td>
<td>19.4ab</td>
<td>10.9b</td>
<td>8.0cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and/or local newspaper articles (online or print)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.4a</td>
<td>12.6ab</td>
<td>10.4b</td>
<td>12.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational classes (e.g., short duration of 1 to 2 hours, long duration of 2 to 8 hours and/or multiple day workshops of 2 to 5 days)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.2a</td>
<td>4.9a</td>
<td>5.5a</td>
<td>9.3a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week; core represents those who drank wine about once a week; and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and columns (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Responses segmented by wine consumption frequency showed that there were significant differences between super core, core, and marginal participants. More MAWP super core and core participants indicated they learned about wine at winery tasting rooms; which included staff and/or promotions/advertisements in the tasting room, and/or sent via email or postal mail (50.3 and 55.3%, respectively) and social media networks (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Pinterest) (32.0 and 38.8%, respectively) than marginal participants (37.2 and 21.9%, respectively). More super core respondents learned about wine from food and cooking magazines (47.2%), television/radio programs (25.1%), local and/or regional magazines (21.8%), and national and/or local newspaper articles (20.4%) than core members (range of 10.4% to 33.9%). Additionally, more super core participants learned about wine from wine focused magazines (40.3%) than both core and marginal participants (28.2 and 16.9%, respectively).

Pertaining to generation, more members of the Silent & Greatest generation (93.5%) learned about wine through friends and/or family than Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants (73.3, 69.4, and 73.0%, respectively) and more Generation Jones members learned about wine through friends and/or family than Older Millennials (86.2 and 69.4%, respectively). More Younger Millennials and Older Millennials indicated they learned about wine from general online searches using a search engine (58.7 and 50.6%, respectively) and social media networks (42.7 and 40.0%, respectively) than Generation Jones (27.6 and 20.7%, respectively), Baby Boomers (16.8 and 16.8%, respectively), and Silent & Greatest generation members (12.9 and 16.1%, respectively). Also, more Generation Xers learned about wine through general online searches using search engines than Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation members (40.5, 16.8, and 12.9%, respectively). More Generation X participants learned about wine from wine-focused magazines than Younger Millennial,
Generation Jones, and Baby Boomer respondents (41.0, 21.3, 24.1, and 22.1%, respectively). Generation Xers (26.0%) also learned about wine from local and/or regional magazines compared to Younger Millennial, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation participants (8.0, 12.6, and 0%, respectively). More members of the Older Millennial generation learned about wine through local and/or regional magazines than Younger Millennial and Silent & Greatest generation participants (21.3, 8.0, and 0%, respectively).

Significant differences were also found when data were segmented by gender. More females learned about wine through friends and/or family than males (81.6 and 68.2%, respectively), at wine and liquor stores, including the employees, promotions/advertisements in the store, and/or sent via email or postal mail (68.8 and 60.9%, respectively). Additionally, more females learned about wine from winery tasting rooms, including staff and/or promotions/advertisements in the tasting room, and/or sent via email or postal mail (52.6 and 40.5%, respectively). Conversely, more males than females learned about wine from wine-focused magazines (39.1 and 26.0%, respectively), television/radio programs (26.6 and 16.8%, respectively), local and/or regional magazines (23.0 and 15.2%, respectively), and national and/or local newspaper articles (20.1 and 13.6%, respectively).

Discussion & Conclusion

Results provide a more in-depth understanding of the consumption and purchasing habits of participants who resided in the three Mid-Atlantic state and who had purchased wines produced in at least one of these states: New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Mid-Atlantic wine purchaser (MAWP) participants accounted for more than half of those who participated in the survey (n= 648), with more than half of these
participants (55.9%) classified as super core wine consumers. Knowing more about who purchases wine from the three targeted states (New Jersey, New York, and/or Pennsylvania), including their wine preferences (sweetness/dryness level and type of wine), occasions when they frequently consume wine, and how they learn about wines can help wineries strengthen their business strategies and better engage with these purchasers. Consumer knowledge is also imperative when developing more appealing products and crafting more appropriate promotional messages. Wineries and tasting rooms should know their customers in order to help the winery determine unique opportunities to distinguish their winery and wines and communicate that difference through marketing (Flint et al., 2016).

Our study found that almost half of MAWP participants purchased wine regularly, one to three times a month. This data should inspire tasting rooms to focus on the goal of creating repeat customers in hopes to increase sales from visitors purchasing their wine more than once. Educating customers about basics wine information and putting more emphasis towards developing customer-winery relationships provides quality service, which may increase repeat customers and brand loyalty (Dodd, 1999). Repeat customers have been found to spend more money within tasting rooms consistently, according to previous research (Dodd, 1999).

For tasting room staff, initially asking visitors which wine(s) they consume most often and guiding them through the tasting by making individual and specific recommendations may generate a more positive experience than merely handing them a tasting sheet and leaving the decision to the visitor. More participants in the younger generations (Millennials and Generation X) indicated they consumed sweet wine more frequently than Baby Boomers and Silent and Greatest generation members. Hence, as a starting point, winery tasting rooms could market their sweet wines more heavily than
their dryer wines on social media networks to target the younger generations. Then the strategy can be altered based on how consumer response has changed based on promoting sweet wines on Instagram, for example, where the 59% of users are ages 18 to 29 and 33% are ages 30 to 49 (Greenwood et al., 2016).

The majority of participants indicated they consumed various styles of wine (e.g., table, fruit-other-than-grape, fortified, sparkling, and dessert), which provides opportunity for wineries to focus or expand their product portfolio. Generation appeared to have an impact on wine consumption frequency with a greater percentage of younger generation participants (Millennials and Gen Xers) consumed fruit, sparkling, fortified, and dessert wines two to three times a month to about once a month than other generations. Our data is consistent with Saieg (2012), who showed that younger consumers, between age 21 to 44, drink different styles of wines more often than older wine consumers, age 45 and over. Data also supports the fact that younger generations appear to be more adventurous wine purchases (Caparoso, 2016), and wineries could specifically target these consumers and encourage consumption throughout the year. Wineries Tasting room staff could emphasize that the wines their fruit, fortified, sparkling, and dessert wines should not be saved for just holiday or special occasion purposes. Wineries could market towards young adults through packaging wines in more portable packaging (e.g., cans, individual serving glasses, boxes), using labels attractive to younger adults, and advertising younger people enjoying their wines (Thach et al., 2006). Additionally, offering suggestions for pairing wines with specialty foods (Purcell, 2015), food recipes to pair with wine, and wine cocktail recipes are other ways wineries can market their wines towards these generations.

While most MAWP participants were still making heavy wine purchases produced from other states, New York wine was the most selected for wine to consume “everyday” and
was second most popular source for the other three occasions. This could be due to the fact that approximately half of survey participants (49.5%) resided in New York, but shows regional loyalty to New York-produced wines. Based on this information, Mid-Atlantic wineries could develop specific marketing messages to inform and remind consumers that their wines can be served during special occasions, while entertaining, as well as being enjoyed for “everyday” consumption. For example, they could promote that their wine pairs well with holiday meals, snacks typically served during sporting events, and/or desserts/fondue that are served when entertaining. Wineries and tasting rooms could also communicate with customers that their wines could be perfect to give as a gift for many occasions. Mid-Atlantic wines could be perceived as a unique gift as the recipient may not be able to purchase the wine near their residence. Wineries and tasting rooms could promote the restaurants where their wines are served or tasting room staff can suggest a BYO restaurant and then recommend one of their wines to pair with several of the restaurant’s meal specials.

Situations and occasions which wine is consumed are important for to understand and use to better market their product. As shown through this study, the perception and use of wine varies between generations and can be used for various purposes such as relaxation, celebration, socialization, and dining. According to Olsen et al. (2006), a U.S. wine consumer study found the majority of overall participants responded they consumed wine with meals at home or at restaurants. However, more Millennials and Gen Xers who participated in the study indicated they drank wine to relax after work and at formal celebrations. Our study found similar results amongst MAWP participants in that they consumed wine at a local restaurants or while dining at a friend or family member’s house. We found that the Silent & Greatest participants were especially prone to this practice during this situation than Older Millennials and fewer Older Millennials
drank wine when entertaining and/or celebrating a holiday in their home than Generation Jones. Additionally, younger generations (Millennial, Gen Xers, and Generation Jones) consumed wine in less formal and relaxing situations compared to older generation participants. Thus, wineries and tasting rooms should strongly consider the situations and occasions when generations of interest consume wine. For younger generations, connecting wine consumption with socialization activities (e.g., group dinners, happy hours, game nights), relaxation (e.g., movies, crafts, reading), and fun (e.g., outdoor activities, sporting events, concerts) (Thach, 2011) may be more relevant than they would be to older generations. Additionally, wineries and tasting rooms could also focus on marketing their wines as being the perfect beverage for more popular and universally celebrated occasions, such as dining both in and out of the house, entertaining and celebrating occasions. Tasting room staff can assist in this effort by educating customers about food pairings with their wines, suggesting wines that can be given as gifts, recommending wines to pair with holiday meals, and indicating which local restaurants carry their wines, along with suggesting entrees that would pair well with their wines available.

Knowledge about where consumers learn about wine is also insightful for winery marketing teams as this can guide locations for advertisements and promotional messages. Our study found that MAWP participants rely heavily on family and/or friends for wine information, especially in older generations. For this reason, it may be important for tasting room staff to encourage visitors to talk with family and friends about the wines by providing an incentive. For example, tasting room staff could provide visitors with a coupon for a free sample on their next visit and another coupon that they can share with a friend or family member as a way of promoting them to talk about the wines and increase tasting room visits. This, along with creating a memorable tasting room
experience for visitors, may encourage them to talk about their experiences and recommend that their friends and family members also visit. Aspects that have been shown to enhance a customer’s tasting room experience include: Ambiance (e.g., cleanliness, lighting, sounds, view), service (e.g., staff knowledge, friendliness, appearance), tasting protocol (e.g., number and variety of wines offered, tasting fee), tasting experience (e.g., customer’s ability to select wines tasted, waiting time), and retail execution (e.g., wines and merchandise available for purchase, wine quality and price perceptions) (Gomez, 2010). Improving these aspects within the tasting room has been shown to enhance customer experiences and affect word-of-mouth marketing (Wangenheim et al., 2007).

One highlight from this study noted that females found information from retail stores (e.g., wine and liquor stores and winery tasting room staff). Whereas more males indicated learning about wine through more print and broadcasted sources (e.g., magazines, television/radio, newspapers and articles). Therefore, wineries could optimize their advertising strategies to conform with both female and male customers: placing more information or promotional messages where the wines are sold, while also putting resources into more traditional print media. Designing advertisements and promotions with a goal to target a specific gender could help wineries better influence the purchasing decision of potential customers.

Social media networks (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Pinterest) as well as general online searches using search engines (e.g., Google, Bing, and Yahoo) were sources more frequently used by younger generation participants (Millenials and Generation Xers). Thus, the use of social media platforms should be targeted with younger generations in mind, as they are more likely to use these platforms, but without ignoring older generations that may be tuned into these networks. For example, younger
generational targeting could include promoting the forms of engagement with wine they take part in more frequently, but also including meal and wine pairing suggestions, which may appeal to older generations. Focusing on wine trends and situations and occasions that younger generations often engage in while drinking wine, as discussed.

This study found some clear differences pertaining to how MAWP participants interact with wine compared to the common wine-with-meal occasions that have previously been reported upon (Olsen et al., 2006). Understanding the wine consumption and purchasing preferences particular to wine consumers residing in and purchasing Mid-Atlantic wines based on wine consumption frequency segments, generations, and genders could help wineries within the Mid-Atlantic region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) better market their business and wines to current and potential wine consumers in the region. Although previous research (e.g., Saieg, 2012; Thach et al., 2006; Thach, 2011; Olsen et al., 2006) has been conducted on the U.S. wine consumers as a whole, little research has been done to understand the MAWP specifically. Based on results from this study, industry members should consider the following when developing new wine products and promotional strategies: developing customer-winery relationships through quality service and education (Dodd, 1999), engaging with customers to understand their wine preferences and guiding them through wine tastings to make individual and specific recommendations, emphasizing the consumption of fruit, sparkling, fortified, and dessert wines should not be just saved for holidays and special occasions, utilize the understanding of generational differences to market wines in various ways to reach all generations, and promote wines with complimenting foods and activities (e.g., relaxation, celebration, socialization, and dining). Such efforts, as outlined here, may help increase wine sales for a regional winery.
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CHAPTER 4: WINE CONSUMER INTEREST IN TASTING ROOM ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS AND PREFERRED METHODS OF RECEIVING PROMOTIONAL COMMUNICATION
Abstract

Three Internet surveys (Survey 1, 29 November to 1 December 2015; Survey 2, 21 to 23 of March; and Survey 3, 28 to 31 of March 2016) were administered to consumers who: were age 21 and over, resided in one of three states in the Mid-Atlantic U.S. region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania), were not a member of the wine industry, and purchased and consumed wine within the previous year.

Of the 846 participants in Survey 1, 534 (63.1%) indicated that they had visited a winery tasting room in one or more of the Mid-Atlantic region states, with more super core participants responding that they visited a winery tasting room in one or more of these states than both core and marginal participants (69.3, 58.5, and 56.3%, respectively). Survey 2 participants were asked to indicate if they visited winery tasting rooms with someone whom they were romantically involved (e.g., partner, spouse, girlfriend/boyfriend). Of the 1,038 total survey participants, 601 (60.0%) responded “yes,” and of these, the activity/event of interest that was selected by the greatest percentage of participants was a shared wine tasting where couples pay for only one set of wine samples (e.g., five 1-oz samples) (73.5%). Fifty-one percent of participants visited winery tasting rooms with groups of friends and/or family with the greatest percentage (72.9%) of these participants being interested in a group tasting where each participant purchased a predetermined wine tasting flight (e.g., the number of samples tasted and types and varietals of wine will be the same for each participant). Survey 1 were asked to indicate their familiarity with locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area with 60.6% feeling they were somewhat informed while 14.0% responded that they felt well-informed.

Of the 714 Survey 3 participants, 597 (84.0%) responded that they sued some form of online platforms (e.g., social media, email, review sites). Nearly all of the 597
participants used Facebook (94.0%), 75.7% used email, and 66.5% used YouTube, followed by Instagram (45.7%) during an average month. Of the participants who used Facebook in general, 64.5% of them indicated they used Facebook to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms.

While only 24.1% of Survey 3 participants indicated they had applications installed on their mobile device, 68.2% responded that an app with features such as a location service, directions, and/or map to the winery tasting room would be a useful component of an application developed by a winery tasting room. Additionally, 52.8% of participants responded that they would be interested in receiving text messages from wineries and tasting rooms, with a greater percentage of super core participants interested in the text messages than marginal participants (57.5 and 45.2%, respectively).

**Introduction**

Winery tasting rooms should strive to provide their consumers with a memorable, positive experience, as the tasting room experience can be used to build customer relationships and increase confidence in purchases which will give wineries with the opportunity to connect with future consumers that could lead to increased sales and brand loyalty (Janney, 2012). Wineries can create memorable experiences by designing events and tasting room offerings that appeal to visitors and encourage repeat visits (Dodd, 1999). The benefits of offering an experience at the winery include: building brand loyalty, increasing awareness of the brand, improving customers’ knowledge of the brand, and creating a customer association of a positive brand image of both their relationship with the winery and the wine product (Byrd et al., 2016).
The Tasting Room Experience

Understanding what features and activities are likely to attract tourists and encourage them to visit, revisit, and/or recommend the destination to others is an essential component for any winery tasting room marketing plan. Examples of these factors may include: a consumption experience with the wine product, aesthetic vineyard and tasting room features, wine educational opportunities, entertainment and events, a relaxing environment, socialization and recreational opportunities, positive customer service, and memberships in wine clubs (Byrd et al., 2016). Yet, little research has been conducted on measuring these potential experiences within the Mid-Atlantic region (Charters et al., 2009).

Although it is essential for a winery tasting room to offer good quality wines in order to attract consumers, visitors desire an authentic interaction with the winery and the winery staff. A tasting room experience that delights visitors can encourage them to enjoy, stay longer and revisit the tasting room, and desire to become loyal to the brand. But, not all visitors are the same and want the same tasting room experience, which is why tasting room owners must understand what motivates visits and cater to groups with a similar level of interest in the event or activity (Charters et al., 2009).

Making sure that current and potential winery and/or tasting room customers are well-informed about the business, location, wines available, and other general information should be an imperative goal for the industry to accomplish. Social media is an important and effective marketing tool that wineries and tasting rooms should utilize when promoting the business and to increase website traffic, raise brand awareness, create brand identity and positive brand association, and increase interaction with targeted consumers (WordStream, n.d.).
**Social Media Marketing**

Each social media platform has its own purpose, yet the overall goal of using social media is to establish and maintain relationships with followers and provide information that will help them enjoy wine. Overall, social media is used to engage consumers and is not for selling purposes but for building relationships and trust (Bullas, 2010). In 2017, 88% of the U.S. population had Internet access and 66% of the population actively used social media (Kemp, 2017b). From January 2016 to January 2017, the number of active social media users increased 21% and active mobile social users (those who accessed social media on their mobile devices) increased 30% (Kemp, 2017a). Facebook is the most widely used platform and, in 2016, 68% of U.S. adults and 76% of all Americans visited the site daily (Greenwood et al., 2016). Approximately 30% of a sample of Millennials used Facebook as a source of information on wine and those who used Facebook for information on wine were more likely to drink wine at a party, purchase more wine and spend more on wine each month (Szolnoki et al., 2016). Additionally, 28% percent of all U.S. adults used Instagram, the second most “engaging” network after Facebook, and 51% of Americans who used Instagram visited the site daily. Slightly fewer, 21%, of U.S. adults used Twitter, with 42% of Americans using Twitter reporting that they visited the site every day (Greenwood et al., 2016). Sixty million people in the U.S. used Snapchat in 2017. While the audience tends to be a little bit younger, the number of users age 25 and older grew two times faster than users under the age of 25 in 2016 (Mediakix, 2017).

**Smartphone Applications**

In addition to social media marketing, wineries and tasting rooms can use smartphone applications to connect with consumers and be a source they can turn to learn about
wines that are available and other pertinent information. In 2015, 68% of U.S. adults owned a smartphone with younger consumers being more likely to own one than older consumers (Anderson, 2015). It is estimated that between 2014 and 2020 the number of U.S. smartphone users, of all ages, will increase by 50.1% (Statista, 2016). The use of mobile applications “accounted for 80% of all growth in digital media engagement” between June 2013 and June 2016 and younger smartphone users reported spending an average of 93.5 hours during an average month on smartphone applications, with consumers over age 44 using their devices 62.7 hours or less during an average month (ComScore, 2016). Hence, wineries and tasting rooms could find that mobile applications are an effective way to communicate with customers, encourage them to make purchases, and serve as a way to differentiate the winery and/or tasting room from those who do not offer a mobile application (Velji, 2016). However, before making any investment, wineries and tasting rooms should survey customers to learn about their likelihood of using social media and mobile applications to connect with this audience.

This research includes data concerning the use of social media and mobile applications and wine consumer participants’ use of these tools to interact with wineries and/or tasting rooms and learning about wine. Data from this research was collected through Internet surveys, which have become the most appropriate and minimal data collection and processing costs. Limitations of Internet surveys could be the inability to ask participants more clarifying questions, which can be achieved through face-to-face research, yet Internet surveys can reach individuals in distant locations, saving time and lowering costs of mailing questionnaires, and providing the convenience of having data collection using an automated system (Wright, 2005). Data collected from participants can help wineries and tasting rooms better understand the consumers in their market and develop more efficient strategies to reach and engage likely buyers.
Research Objectives

- Document the percentage of survey participants who have visited winery tasting rooms in the three Mid-Atlantic states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania).

- Determine what winery tasting room activities would appeal to survey participants based on visiting a tasting room with someone who they have a romantic relationship with and when visiting a tasting room with groups of family and/or friends.

- Quantify the percentage of participants who were informed about the locations and presence of wineries in their state/local region.

- Identify social media platforms (e.g., Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram) and review sites (Yelp, TripAdvisor) that survey participants use at least once a month and which ones they use to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms.

- Determine mobile application elements (e.g., location service, list of wines available) that survey participants would find useful, and interest in receiving text messages from winery tasting rooms about events, wine tastings, new wine releases, and similar.

Materials & Methods

Data were collected through three separate 15-minute Internet surveys (Survey 1, 29 November to 1 December 2015; Survey 2, 21 to 23 March 2016; and Survey 3, 28 to 31 March 2016), administered to Survey Sampling International, LLC (Shelton, CT) panelists residing in three states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) in the Mid-Atlantic region. Panelists were screened for not being a member of the wine industry,
being at least 21 years old, residing in one of the targeted states, and for having purchased and drank wine at least once within the previous year. Panelists were informed of these criteria in an electronic consent statement prior to proceeding with the survey. Those who qualified were directed to the survey which was developed by the researchers, approved by the Social Science Research at The Pennsylvania State University (IRB 37365, University Park, PA), and administered using SurveyMoney.com (Palo Alto, CA), an online provider of survey solutions. Surveys were pre-tested on a subset (range of 92 to 98) of the target market. For Survey 1, 1,043 participants opened and attempted the survey with 847 qualifying and completing the questions. Twelve hundred Survey 2 participants opened and attempted the questions with 1,038 qualifying and completing the survey, and Survey 3, which was offered only to participants who completed Survey 2, was opened and attempted by 753 participants, with 714 qualifying and completing the survey. To encourage participation, panelists were provided with an incentive of either cash, points, or by being able to donate to charity to encourage participation. The project “Developing Wine Marketing Strategies for the Mid-Atlantic Region” (GRANT 11091317) was funded by the USDA Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program.

**Statistical Analysis**

Data were analyzed with SPSS (Version 23 and 24; SPSS, Chicago, IL). To assess differences between responses, data were segmented by demographic (generation, gender) and wine consumption frequency groups. Pearson’s Chi Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests were used to detect differences for categorical and/or multiple-choice questions.

**Results**
Table 4.1 provides an overview of the demographic profiles for Survey 1, Survey 2, and Survey 3 participants. The most common responses to demographic questions for all surveys were: female (range of 58.1 to 66.5%); a suburban residence (46.7 to 49.2%); members of Generation X (born 1965 to 1980) (27.3, 29.0, and 30.4%) and the Older Millennial generation (born 1981 to 1990) (22.1, 22.5, and 20.4%); currently married or in a domestic partnership (60.2 to 65.9%); currently employed by someone else (53.4 to 54.9%); of the Caucasian race (84.5 to 86.1%); not Hispanic or Latino (90.3 to 91.1%); New York state resident (46.4 to 47.5%); living in a household with no children (60.8 to 64.7%); and living in a household where one other adult drinks wine (55.2 to 55.5%).

Due to the limited number of participants who identified themselves as belonging to the Silent generation and the Greatest generations, compared to the other generations, the two were combined into a new category named The Silent & Greatest generation.

Approximately half of participants in each survey (48.6 to 49.3%) were super core wine consumers (drank wine daily to a few times a week). The percentage of core wine consumers (drank wine about once a week) ranged from 18.7 to 19.0%, and 31.9% to 32.4% of participants in the three surveys were considered marginal wine drinkers (drank wine less frequently).
Table 4.1. Demographic characteristics of survey participants who resided in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania (Mid-Atlantic region) and who participated in each of three surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th>Survey 3</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th>Survey 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school/high school graduate</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree/technical school graduate</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree (e.g. BA, BS)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate degree (e.g. MS, PhD, MD)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 17 and younger residing in the household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (large metropolitan area)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban (residential/ community outside a large metropolitan area)</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area or small town</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults, age 21 and older, in household who drink wine (including self)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Consumption frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Bar</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Note: The three surveys were administered as follows: Survey 1, 28 November to 1 December 2015; Survey 2, 21 to 23 March 2016; Survey 3, 28 to 31 March 2016. *Survey 1 gross household incomes represent 2014 values; Survey 2 & Survey 3 gross household incomes represent 2015 values. **Survey 1 NHIS child care survey represents 2014 values; Survey 2 & Survey 3 NHIS child care survey represents 2015 values. **Survey 1, 2015; Survey 2, 2016; Survey 3, 2017. ***Survey 1, 2015; Survey 2, 2016; Survey 3, 2017.
Mid-Atlantic Wine Consumers’ Tasting Room Visits

Survey 1 participants were asked to indicate if they had ever visited a winery tasting room in one or more of the Mid-Atlantic region states (New Jersey, New York, and/or Pennsylvania). Of the 846 participants, 534 (63.1%) indicated that they had visited a regional tasting room, after which these participants were asked to select the state(s) where the tasting room(s) were located and whether the visit was within the past year or more than a year ago (Table 4.2). Less than half (40.9%) of participants indicated that they had visited a tasting room in New Jersey within one year of participating in the survey or more than a year prior to participating. Also, for both of these time frames, over half (56.0%) had visited a tasting room in Pennsylvania, and 70.0% of participants responded that they visited a New York tasting room.
Table 4.2. Percentage of survey participants who have visited a winery tasting room at least one of the targeted states (New Jersey, New York, and/or Pennsylvania) and the period when they visited, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period When Survey Participants Visited New Jersey, New York, and/or Pennsylvania Wine Tasting Rooms (%)</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>63.4b</td>
<td>63.5b</td>
<td>63.3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has not visited a tasting room in this state</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>50.0b</td>
<td>67.8a</td>
<td>71.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a tasting room within the past year</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>23.8a</td>
<td>12.2b</td>
<td>13.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a tasting room more than a year ago</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>26.2a</td>
<td>20.0ab</td>
<td>15.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has not visited a tasting room in this state</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>24.2b</td>
<td>34.8ab</td>
<td>38.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a tasting room within the past year</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>44.2a</td>
<td>27.2b</td>
<td>22.8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a tasting room more than a year ago</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>31.6a</td>
<td>38.0a</td>
<td>38.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has not visited a tasting room in this state</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>41.2a</td>
<td>47.3a</td>
<td>47.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a tasting room within the past year</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>34.9a</td>
<td>27.5a</td>
<td>25.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a tasting room more than a year ago</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>23.9a</td>
<td>25.3a</td>
<td>27.7a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
Participant responses were segmented based on consumption frequency, generation, and gender to determine if responses differed regarding tasting room visitations in each state. More super core participants visited a winery tasting room in one or more of these states than both core and marginal (69.3, 58.5, and 56.3%, respectively). More Generation Jones participants responded that they visited a winery tasting room in one or more of the states than Younger Millennials (70.2 and 50.4%, respectively), while there was no difference between the percentage of males and females who visited a winery tasting room in one or more of the targeted states.

Concerning when the winery tasting room visit took place, whether within the past year or more than a year ago, more super core participants visited a tasting room in New Jersey within the past year than both core and marginal participants (23.8, 12.2, and 13.7%, respectively), and more super core wine participants visited a tasting room in New Jersey more than a year before participating in the survey than marginal respondents (26.2 and 15.1%, respectively). For the state of New York, more super core participants visited a tasting room in the state within the past year than both core and marginal participants (44.2, 27.2, and 22.8%, respectively).

Segmenting data by generation also revealed some significant differences. More Younger Millennial participants (54.4%) visited a winery tasting room in New York within the past year compared to both Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants (19.3 and 25.5%, respectively). Additionally, more Older Millennial participants visited a winery tasting room in New York within the past year than Baby Boomer participants (40.7 and 19.3%, respectively). A greater percentage of participants who were Baby Boomers or members of the combined Silent & Greatest generation (48.2 and 55.3%, respectively) responded that their New York tasting room visit was
more than a year before they participated in the survey than members of Younger Millennial and Older Millennial generations (15.8 and 23.9%, respectively). Also, more Generation Jones participants visited New York tasting rooms more than a year before participating in the survey than Younger Millennial participants (41.3 and 15.8%, respectively). For Pennsylvania, more Older Millennial participants responded they visited a winery tasting room in this state within the past year compared to Silent & Greatest generation participants (41.6 and 14.9%, respectively).

Segmenting responses based on gender also displayed significant differences as more males visited a winery tasting room in New Jersey within the past year (25.1%) and more than a year ago (28.1%) than females (15.7 and 19.2%, respectively).

Winery Tasting Room Visitors’ Interest in Visiting a Tasting Room with a Romantic Partner based on Events and Activities Offered

Survey 2 participants were asked to indicate if they visited winery tasting rooms with someone whom they were romantically involved (e.g., partner, spouse, girlfriend/boyfriend). Of the 1,038 total survey participants, 601 (60.0%) responded “yes,” and these participants were then directed to a question that asked them to select all of the activities and events that interested them if offered to couples at a winery tasting room (Table 4.3). The activity/event that was selected by the greatest percentage of participants was a shared wine tasting where couples pay for only one set of wine samples (e.g., five 1-oz samples) and they both taste each of the samples (73.5%). The second most popular activity/event was the ability to purchase appetizers or “small plates” meant for two people to share (65.4%) while also enjoying a glass of wine. The two other activities/events that appealed to at least half of the respondents were: a seated table service that included a meal and wine that paired with the main course
(59.2%) and entertainment such as live music, comedy acts, plays, movies, and other performances (fee charged) (51.0%).
Table 4.3. Percentage of survey participants who visited winery tasting rooms with someone they have a romantic relationship with (e.g., partner, spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend) and their interest in participating in visiting with this person based on activities and events offered, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Participants Who Visited Winery Tasting Rooms with Someone they have a Romantic Relationship with (e.g., Partner, Spouse, Boyfriend/Girlfriend) (%)</td>
<td>(n = 601)</td>
<td>(n = 341)</td>
<td>(n = 114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to purchase appetizers or “small plates” meant for two people to share</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>51.0a</td>
<td>67.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seated table service that includes a meal and wine that pairs with the main course</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>56.8a</td>
<td>64.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment such as live music, comedy acts, plays, movies, and other performances (fee charged)</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>49.2a</td>
<td>56.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate atmospheres available for the wine tasting (e.g., tables for seating are saved out, seating for only couples, private tasting rooms)</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>48.1a</td>
<td>47.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized tour of wine tasting rooms for couples (fee charged) that includes transportation to the tasting rooms, tasting room fees, and wines</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>44.0a</td>
<td>43.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking classes (fee charged) where couples learn how to prepare one or more dishes and taste them with wine</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>37.0a</td>
<td>43.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities held at the winery vineyard where a fee is charged and includes a wine tasting (e.g., classes during which attendees paint/sculpt or make other crafts while drinking wine, wine blending workshop)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.0a</td>
<td>36.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private vineyard or winery tour and tasting (fee charged) for only two people</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>37.0a</td>
<td>41.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal pairings (fee charged) during which tasting room staff talk about and participate in tastings and food pairings (e.g., wine and cheese, wine and chocolates, wine and meat)</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>37.8a</td>
<td>31.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events and activities where couples can meet other couples and interact with them in the tasting room</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>33.7a</td>
<td>36.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating for couples to enjoy wine and/or food while playing board games, video games, or to watch television sporting events</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.2a</td>
<td>26.3a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered to consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drink wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drink wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drink wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05. SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
When data were segmented based on wine consumption frequency, more super core and core participants indicated they visited winery tasting rooms with someone they were in a romantic relationship with compared to marginal participants (67.7, 61.3, and 46.0%, respectively). For generations, more Older Millennial visited winery tasting rooms with someone they were in a romantic relationship (71.2%) with than Younger Millennial, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation respondents (51.1, 51.9, and 44.4%, respectively). Additionally, more Generation X visited winery tasting rooms with someone they were in a romantic relationship with (63.4%) than Silent & Greatest wine consumers. Concerning gender, more males visited winery tasting rooms with someone they were in a romantic relationship with than females (66.7 and 55.2%, respectively).

While there were several differences when data were analyzed based on participant’s gender, with more females interested in the ability to purchase appetizers or “small plates” to share with their significant other (72.4%), seated table service with a meal and wine pairing (65.9%), entertainment such as live music, comedy acts, plays, movies, and other performances for which a fee is charged (57.0%), and a few other activities/events than males (57.5, 50.9, and 45.4%, respectively), responses did not differ based on wine consumption frequency.

There were also some differences when data were segmented based on wine consumption frequency with more Younger Millennials interested in shared wine tastings where couples pay for only one set of wine samples (e.g., five 1-oz samples) and they both taste each of the samples (86.6%) than Older Millennial participants (68.3%). A greater percentage of Younger Millennials (68.7%) were also interested in an intimate atmosphere available for the wine tasting (e.g., tables for seating are spread out, seating for couples only, private tasting rooms) than Generation Xers, Generation Jones, Baby
Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation wine consumers (41.8, 38.4, 37.8, and 33.3%, respectively). More of both Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants (50.7 and 49.1%, respectively) along with Generation Xers (39.0%) were interested in cooking classes (fee charged) where couples learn how to prepare one or more dishes and taste them with wine than Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants (24.4 and 11.1%, respectively). A greater percentage of Older Millennials were also interested in: 1) entertainment such as live music, comedy acts, plays, movies, and other performances (fee charged) (60.2%) than participants who identified themselves as members of the Baby Boomer generation (39.0%); and 1) activities held at the winery/vineyard where a fee is charged that includes a wine tasting (e.g., classes during which attendees paint/sculpt/make other crafts while drinking wine, wine blending workshop) (50.9%) compared to those in Generation Jones, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation (20.0, 26.8, and 16.7%, respectively).

Winery Tasting Room Visitors’ Interest in Visiting a Tasting Room with Groups of Family and/or Friends based on Events and Activities Offered

Survey 2 participants were also asked to indicate if they visited winery tasting rooms with groups (three or more people) of friends and/or family. Of the 1,038 total participants, 509 (51.0%) responded “yes,” hence they were then directed to a question that asked them to indicate their interest in visiting a winery tasting room with groups of family and/or friends based on activities and events offered (Table 4.4). A majority of the participants who visited tasting rooms with groups of family and/or friends (72.9%) were interested in group tasting where each participant purchased a predetermined wine tasting flight (e.g., the number of samples tasted and types and varietals of wine would be the same for each participant) selected by the tasting room staff. The ability to purchase appetizers or “small plates” meant to be shared with other group members was
the second most selected response, with 65.4% of participants indicating that they were interested in this activity/event, followed by entertainment such as live music, comedy acts, plays, movies, and other performances (fee charged; 53.8%), and a seated table service that included a meal and wine that paired with the main course (52.8%).
Table 4.4. Percentages of survey participants who visited winery tasting rooms with groups (three or more people) of friends and/or family and their interest in visiting with this person based on activities and events offered, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Super Core</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Younger Millennial</th>
<th>Older Millennial</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Generation Jones</th>
<th>Baby Boomer</th>
<th>Silent &amp; Greatest</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Participants Who Visited Winery Tasting Rooms with Groups (Three or More People) of Family and/or Friends (%)</td>
<td>51.0 (n = 509)</td>
<td>55.4a</td>
<td>53.0a</td>
<td>42.8b</td>
<td>42.0bc</td>
<td>61.7a</td>
<td>53.0ab</td>
<td>48.7abc</td>
<td>49.4abc</td>
<td>32.5c</td>
<td>52.6a</td>
<td>48.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of These Participants, Their Interest in Visiting a Winery Tasting Room with Groups of Family and/or Friends Based on Activities and Events Offered (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tasting where each participant purchases a predetermined wine tasting flight (e.g., the number of samples tasted and the types and varieties of wine will be the same for each participant) selected by the tasting room staff</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>73.6a</td>
<td>77.6a</td>
<td>69.2a</td>
<td>60.0ab</td>
<td>81.4a</td>
<td>74.2ab</td>
<td>65.5ab</td>
<td>59.0b</td>
<td>46.2b</td>
<td>73.4a</td>
<td>72.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to purchase appetizers or &quot;small plates&quot; meant to be shared with other group members</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>60.6b</td>
<td>73.5a</td>
<td>69.2ab</td>
<td>76.4a</td>
<td>51.7a</td>
<td>65.6a</td>
<td>69.0a</td>
<td>71.8a</td>
<td>61.5a</td>
<td>72.7a</td>
<td>53.6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment such as live music, comedy acts, plays, movies, and other performances (fee charged)</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>52.2a</td>
<td>55.1a</td>
<td>56.4a</td>
<td>60.3a</td>
<td>51.5a</td>
<td>57.6a</td>
<td>51.7a</td>
<td>43.6a</td>
<td>46.2a</td>
<td>56.8a</td>
<td>48.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit down table service that includes a meal and wine that pairs with the main course</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>51.4a</td>
<td>60.2a</td>
<td>50.4a</td>
<td>49.7a</td>
<td>53.4a</td>
<td>51.3a</td>
<td>76.9a</td>
<td>57.5a</td>
<td>45.2b</td>
<td>45.0a</td>
<td>47.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized tour of winery tasting rooms (fee charged) for groups that includes transportation to the tasting rooms, tasting fee, and related</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.8a</td>
<td>44.1a</td>
<td>47.4a</td>
<td>49.2a</td>
<td>51.1a</td>
<td>56.0a</td>
<td>66.6a</td>
<td>46.2a</td>
<td>53.8a</td>
<td>45.0a</td>
<td>47.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasting room setting available for group wine tasting (e.g., tables and seating for groups are spread out, seating that can accommodate small groups, private tasting rooms)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>42.1a</td>
<td>51.0a</td>
<td>43.6a</td>
<td>50.8a</td>
<td>41.7a</td>
<td>53.4a</td>
<td>42.3a</td>
<td>46.2a</td>
<td>50.3a</td>
<td>47.7a</td>
<td>50.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities held at the winery/property where a fee is charged and includes a wine tasting (e.g., classes during which attendees paint/ sculpt) make other crafts while drinking wine, wine blending workshop</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>43.5a</td>
<td>44.9a</td>
<td>39.1a</td>
<td>56.4a</td>
<td>46.6ab</td>
<td>43.5ab</td>
<td>32.8ab</td>
<td>33.3ab</td>
<td>23.1b</td>
<td>46.1a</td>
<td>37.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private vineyard and/or winery tour and tasting (fee charged) for the group</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>38.1a</td>
<td>45.9a</td>
<td>39.1a</td>
<td>39.5a</td>
<td>41.4a</td>
<td>33.8a</td>
<td>44.8a</td>
<td>41.0a</td>
<td>46.2a</td>
<td>43.2a</td>
<td>35.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Girls’ night out&quot; or &quot;Guy’s night out&quot; with a group of friends and/or family members</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>34.9a</td>
<td>43.9a</td>
<td>43.6a</td>
<td>46.1a</td>
<td>41.1a</td>
<td>35.8a</td>
<td>39.7a</td>
<td>35.9a</td>
<td>30.8a</td>
<td>52.0a</td>
<td>18.6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking classes (fee charged) where groups learn how to prepare one or more dishes and tastes them with wine</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>37.1a</td>
<td>41.8a</td>
<td>31.6a</td>
<td>43.6ab</td>
<td>43.2a</td>
<td>37.7ab</td>
<td>34.5ab</td>
<td>24.4b</td>
<td>19.2ab</td>
<td>39.0a</td>
<td>32.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal pairings (fee charged) during which tasting room staff talk about and participate tastes wine and food pairings (e.g., wine and cheese, wine and chocolate, wine and meat)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>37.4a</td>
<td>41.8a</td>
<td>30.1a</td>
<td>36.4a</td>
<td>30.0a</td>
<td>37.7a</td>
<td>36.2a</td>
<td>29.5a</td>
<td>34.6a</td>
<td>37.7a</td>
<td>34.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating for groups to enjoy wine and/or food while playing board games, video games, or to watch televised sporting events</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>29.9a</td>
<td>32.7a</td>
<td>32.3a</td>
<td>49.1a</td>
<td>33.7a</td>
<td>29.8a</td>
<td>32.6a</td>
<td>6.4b</td>
<td>23.1b</td>
<td>34.1a</td>
<td>25.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events where single people can meet other singles and interact with them in the tasting room</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.8a</td>
<td>27.8a</td>
<td>21.8a</td>
<td>40.0a</td>
<td>21.6ab</td>
<td>28.6abc</td>
<td>13.8bc</td>
<td>15.4bc</td>
<td>7.7c</td>
<td>28.0a</td>
<td>23.4a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 21 to 23 of March 2016 to consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s C2-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p < .05; SPSB, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill. *Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
When segmented based on wine consumption frequency, more super core participants indicated that they visited winery tasting rooms with groups (three or more people) of family and/or friends (55.4%) compared to marginal respondents (42.8%). More core participants indicated that they were interested in purchasing appetizers or “small plates” meant to be shared with other group members (73.5%) than super core participants (60.8%). There were no other differences pertaining to the percentage that were interested in each activity/event proposed.

More Older Millennial participants visited winery tasting rooms with groups of friends and/or family (62.7%) than both Younger Millennial and Silent & Greatest generation participants (42.0, and 32.5%, respectively). Additionally, more Generation X participants visited winery tasting rooms with groups of friends and/or family than Silent & Greatest generation members (53.0 and 32.5%, respectively). A greater percentage of Younger Millennial participants were interested in group tasting where each participant purchased a predetermined wine tasting flight (e.g., number of samples tasted and the types of wine will be the same for each participant) selected by the tasting room staff (84.4%) compared to Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants (59.0 and 46.2%, respectively). A greater percentage of these Younger Millennial participants were interested in activities held at the winery/vineyard where a fee would be charged and included a wine tasting (e.g., classes during which attendees paint/sculpt/make other crafts while drinking wine, wine blending workshop) compared to Silent & Greatest generation wine consumers (56.4 and 23.1%, respectively).

There was no difference between the percentage of males and females who visited winery tasting rooms with groups of family and/or friends. However, there were differences based on the percentage of females interested in purchasing appetizers or
“small plates” meant to be shared with other group members than males (72.7 and 53.8%, respectively). More females were also interested in a seated table service that included a meal and wine that paired with the main course (57.5%) and tasting room setting available for a group wine tastings (e.g., tables and seating for groups are spread out, seating that can accommodate groups, private tasting rooms) (50.3%) compared to males (57.5 and 45.2%, respectively). Also, more females were interested in girls’ night out or guys’ night out with a group of friends and/or family members than males (52.9 and 16.8%, respectively).

**How Informed Survey Participants are About Wineries in Their State/Local Area**

Survey 1 participants were asked to indicate how informed they felt they were about the locations, types of wines available, and other information pertaining to wineries in their state/local area (Table 4.5). Participants could choose one of three options: uninformed, somewhat informed, or well-informed. The greatest percentage of participants indicated that they felt somewhat informed about the locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area (60.6%) with 14.0% responding that they felt well-informed.
Table 4.5. Percentages of survey participants who felt uninformed, somewhat informed, or well-informed about the locations, types of wine available, and other general information regarding wineries in their state/local area, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 417)</td>
<td>Core (n = 139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How informed survey participants feel they are about the locations, types of wine available and other general information regarding wineries in their state/local area (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels uninformed about the locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>18.3a</td>
<td>27.7ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels somewhat informed about the locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>61.8a</td>
<td>63.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels well-informed about the locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>20.0a</td>
<td>8.6b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
Responses segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender revealed some significant differences. More super core participants responded that they felt well-informed about the locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area than both core and marginal participants (20.0, 8.8, and 7.8%, respectively).

For generations, more Older Millennial and Generation X participants responded that they felt well-informed compared to Baby Boomer members (18.3, 15.7, and 6.2%, respectively), while more Baby Boomers felt somewhat informed about locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area compared to Younger Millennial wine consumers (69.0 and 49.6%, respectively). Only one difference was found when data was segmented based on gender: a greater percentage of males felt they were well-informed about the locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area (17.8%) than females (12.1%).

**Survey Participants’ General Use of Social Media, Review Sites, and/or Other Online Communication Methods and Use of Platforms to Engage with and/or Learn About Wineries and Tasting Rooms**

Survey 3 participants were asked if they actively used social media (Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram), email, and/or review sites (Yelp, TripAdvisor) at least once a month. Of the 714 participants, 597 (84.0%) responded “yes,” after which they were directed to a question that asked them to select the tools they used at least once during an average month. Nearly all of these participants used Facebook (94.0%), 75.7% used email, and 66.5% used YouTube, followed by Instagram (45.7%) (Table 4.6).

Participants who indicated that they used a particular social media platform/email/review site were then directed to a related question that asked them if they used the particular tool to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms. For example, of the
94.0% who used Facebook at least once during an average month, 64.5% of them indicated they used Facebook to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms (Table 4.6).
Table 4.6. Percentage of survey participants who actively used social media, online tools, and/or review sites at least once a month and the percentage who used each specific tool to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Younger Millennial</td>
<td>Older Millennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Participants Who: 1) Actively Used Select Social Media Platforms (e.g., Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram), Online Tools (email, blogs), and/or Review Sites (Yelp, TripAdvisor) at Least Once During an Average Month and 2) Who Actively Used the Specific Tool at Least Once During an Average Month to Engage with and/or Learn about Wineries and Tasting Rooms (%)</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>82.4a</td>
<td>89.6a</td>
<td>83.0a</td>
<td>94.3a</td>
<td>92.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>94.4a</td>
<td>92.6a</td>
<td>94.2a</td>
<td>95.5a</td>
<td>97.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Facebook to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>66.2a</td>
<td>62.5a</td>
<td>63.3a</td>
<td>63.5ab</td>
<td>76.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>75.5a</td>
<td>81.8a</td>
<td>70.7a</td>
<td>84.8a</td>
<td>81.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Email to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>38.1a</td>
<td>37.4a</td>
<td>29.6a</td>
<td>21.4a</td>
<td>39.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>70.2a</td>
<td>63.6a</td>
<td>62.8a</td>
<td>75.8a</td>
<td>79.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used YouTube to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>38.0a</td>
<td>29.9ab</td>
<td>22.5b</td>
<td>28.0ab</td>
<td>39.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>48.1a</td>
<td>43.0a</td>
<td>44.0a</td>
<td>66.7a</td>
<td>74.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Instagram to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.6a</td>
<td>46.2a</td>
<td>38.1a</td>
<td>36.9a</td>
<td>43.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>49.5a</td>
<td>44.6ab</td>
<td>36.1b</td>
<td>45.6abc</td>
<td>59.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Twitter to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>43.3a</td>
<td>25.9a</td>
<td>27.5a</td>
<td>33.3a</td>
<td>42.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinterest</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>42.5a</td>
<td>36.4a</td>
<td>38.2a</td>
<td>39.4abc</td>
<td>49.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Pinterest to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>40.5a</td>
<td>29.5a</td>
<td>27.4a</td>
<td>23.1a</td>
<td>39.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.0a</td>
<td>37.2a</td>
<td>29.8a</td>
<td>30.3a</td>
<td>29.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used LinkedIn to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>16.5a</td>
<td>6.7ab</td>
<td>1.8b</td>
<td>5.0a</td>
<td>15.0a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 Continued. Percentage of survey participants who actively used social media, online tools, and/or review sites at least once a month and the percentage who used each specific tool to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Younger Millennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TripAdvisor</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>35.5a</td>
<td>21.5b</td>
<td>12.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used TripAdvisor to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>57.1a</td>
<td>97.4a</td>
<td>62.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelp</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>28.1a</td>
<td>32.2a</td>
<td>24.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Yelp to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>52.6a</td>
<td>53.6a</td>
<td>60.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.6a</td>
<td>26.4a</td>
<td>21.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Snapchat to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>25.4a</td>
<td>9.4a</td>
<td>12.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Plus</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>23.6a</td>
<td>14.9a</td>
<td>18.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Google Plus to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>48.5a</td>
<td>27.8ab</td>
<td>25.6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.6a</td>
<td>14.0a</td>
<td>12.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Blogs to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>51.1a</td>
<td>58.6a</td>
<td>45.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periscope</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.6a</td>
<td>2.5a</td>
<td>3.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Periscope to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.6a</td>
<td>33.3a</td>
<td>0a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered to 31-March 2016 consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. 
Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill. 
*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%. 
Post hoc tests were not performed on this generation because an error message occurred due to the group having fewer than two cases.
While there were no differences pertaining to wine consumption frequency as to Facebook, email, YouTube, and Instagram usage, differences were apparent when data were segmented by generation and gender. For example, more Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants indicated they actively used social media and/or review sites at least once a month (94.3, 92.4, and 89.9%, respectively) than members of the Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generations (68.9 and 62.7%, respectively). A greater percentage of participants who were members of the Younger Millennial and Older Millennial generations used: 1) email at least once a month (84.8 and 81.3%, respectively), compared to Baby Boomer participants (61.9%); 2) YouTube (75.8 and 79.9%, respectively), compared to Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants (45.2 and 43.2%, respectively); and 3) Instagram (66.7 and 74.6%, respectively) compared to all the other generations (range of 46.7 to 16.2%). Also, more females (88.0%) actively used social media and/or review sites at least once a month than males (78.4%); however, there were no differences based on gender regarding monthly use of four tools: Facebook, email, YouTube, and Instagram.

Of those who used particular platforms at least once during an average month, more super core participants used YouTube (38.0%), LinkedIn (16.5%), and Google Plus (48.5) to engage with and/or learn about wineries and/or tasting rooms than marginal participants (22.5, 1.8, and 25.0%, respectively). A greater percentage of Older Millennial participants used Facebook to engage with/learn about wineries and tasting rooms (76.9%) than Silent & Greatest participants (38.2%). More Younger Millennial (75.8%) and Older Millennial (79.9%) participants used YouTube at least once a month (45.2 and 43.2%, respectively) with a greater percentage of Older Millennial participants (39.3%) and Generation Xers (33.8%) responding that they used YouTube to engage
with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms than members of the combined Silent & Greatest generation (6.3%).

Regarding Instagram, more Younger Millennial and Older Millennial wine consumers (66.7 and 74.6%, respectively) responded that they used Instagram compared to all other generations, whose responses ranged from 15.5% to 46.7%. Of those who used Instagram at least once a month, more Younger Millennials, Older Millennials, Generation Xers, and Generation Jones participants used the tool (range of 36.8 to 46.2%) to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms than Silent & Greatest participants, of which none of these participants used Instagram for this purpose.

A greater percentage of Older Millennials (59.7%) used Twitter at least once a month compared to Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants (28.6 and 21.6%, respectively), while there were no differences between generations with regard to using the tool to engage with/learn about wineries and tasting rooms.

Aside from more commonly used social media platforms like Facebook, use of lesser known platforms, like Snapchat, were also investigated. Snapchat was only used by 23.5% of participants who used social media, email, and/or review sites in general; however, when segmented by generation, more Younger Millennial wine consumers (60.6%) used the platform at least once a week compared to those who were members of the other generations, with percentages of usage ranging from 2.7% to 35.8%. Of the participants who used Snapchat at least once during an average month, 17.9% used it to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms. When segmented by generation, data showed that more Older Millennials (29.2%) used Snapchat for this purpose than Younger Millennials and Baby Boomers (2.5 and 0%, respectively).
Though only 14.7% of participants responded that they used blogs at least once a month, half (51.1%) of these participants used blogs to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms. While there were no differences pertaining to the percentage of participants who used blogs to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms based on wine consumption frequency or gender, more Younger Millennials, Older Millennials, Generation Xers, and Generation Jones participants (range of 51.6 to 66.7%) used blogs in this capacity than Baby Boomer participants, of which none of these participants used blogs to engage with wineries.

Segmentation by gender displayed differences between male and female responses. More males indicated they used YouTube (39.6%) and Instagram (50.0%) to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms than females (26.5 and 36.3%, respectively). Also, more males used Twitter (53.4%) and LinkedIn at least once during an average month than females (38.0 and 28.5%, respectively). Contrarily, more females (52.4%) used Pinterest at least once during an average month than males (21.1%).

**The Use of Mobile Applications for Wine and/or Winery Tasting Room Information**

Participants were asked to indicate if they had any mobile applications (apps) installed on their smartphone and/or tablet that they used to find information about wine and/or winery tasting rooms (e.g., Delectable, Hello Vino, Drync, Wine Enthusiast’s Tasting Guide). About one quarter of participants (24.1%) responded “yes,” (Table 4.7) after which they were directed to a question that asked them to select five options, from a list of 11, that they felt would be the most useful for a mobile application developed by a winery tasting room to include (Table 4.8). Among the options, location service, directions, and/or map to the winery tasting room was selected by more participants
(68.2%) than the other 10 options. A detailed listing of events held at the winery tasting room (date/time, performer, entrance fee, etc.) was selected by 62.5% of participants, followed by a list of wines available to taste and/or purchase (varietals, price, tasting notes; 60.3%), tasting room sales announcements/digital coupons for tasting and/or purchases (56.1%), and customer reviews of the wine, tasting room, and similar (53.1%).
Table 4.7. Percentage of survey participants who have a mobile application(s) (apps) installed on their smartphone and/or tablet that they use to find information about wine and/or winery tasting rooms, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants (n = 347)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a Mobile Application(s) (apps) installed on their Smartphone and/or Tablet that They Use to Find Information about Wine and/or Winery Tasting Rooms (%)</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core (n = 136)</td>
<td>30.2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core (n = 231)</td>
<td>21.6ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginal (n = 70)</td>
<td>16.4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger Millennial (n = 146)</td>
<td>30.0a</td>
<td>35.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older Millennial (n = 217)</td>
<td>28.5a</td>
<td>19.6ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation X (n = 98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation Jones (n = 122)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomer (n = 61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silent &amp; Greatest (n = 412)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (n = 297)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 28 to 31 March 2018 to consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson's Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer's V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p < .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
Segmentation by consumption frequency, generation, and gender of participants who selected that they have mobile applications installed on their smartphone and/or table that they use to find information about wine and/or winery tasting rooms displayed some significant differences. More super core participants indicated they had mobile applications than marginal respondents (30.2 and 16.4%, respectively). Pertaining to generation, more Younger Millennials and Older Millennials had mobile applications (30.0 and 35.9%, respectively) than Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants (11.0 and 6.7%, respectively). Also, more males had installed these types of mobile applications than females (28.3 and 21.0%, respectively).
Table 4.8. Percentage of survey participants who would be interested in select features that could be included in a mobile application developed by a winery tasting room, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants (n = 347)</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 70)</td>
<td>Older Millennial (n = 146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location service, directions, and/or map to the winery tasting room</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>65.8a</td>
<td>70.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed listing of events held at the winery tasting room (e.g., date, time, performer, entrance fee)</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.6a</td>
<td>59.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of wines available to taste and/or purchase (e.g., variety, price, tasting notes)</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>63.5a</td>
<td>54.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasting room sales announcement/digital coupons for tasting and/or purchases</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56.8a</td>
<td>51.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer reviews of the winery tasting room, and similar</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>52.5a</td>
<td>60.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the winery tasting room fees</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>41.2a</td>
<td>42.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;About&quot; section (e.g., hours of operation, history of the establishment, directory of owners and staff)</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>33.6a</td>
<td>38.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images and videos of the vineyard, winery, and/or tasting room</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.8a</td>
<td>31.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the winery tasting room’s mobile website</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>22.6a</td>
<td>23.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the tasting room’s social media accounts (e.g., Facebook, Twitter)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.3a</td>
<td>17.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online form to sign up for the tasting room’s newsletter and/or wine club</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.6a</td>
<td>19.3a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered 28 to 31 March 2016 to consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily or a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05. SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
While no significant differences were detected when data were segmented based on wine consumption frequency, more males than females indicated that location service, directions, and/or map to the winery tasting room would be useful for a mobile application (72.9 and 64.6%, respectively). Also, more males than females responded that a link to the tasting room’s social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter) would be useful (28.5 and 19.3%, respectively).

Segmenting data based on generation also revealed differences. For example, more Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest participants indicated that a list of wines available to taste and/or purchase (varietals, price, tasting notes) would be useful for a mobile application (72.5 and 83.6%, respectively) than Younger Millennials and Older Millennials, Generation Xers, and Generation Jones participants (54.3, 52.1, 53.7, and 61.9%, respectively). The option of having a description of the winery tasting room fees was selected by more Generation Jones than Older Millennial participants (51.5 and 30.8%, respectively), and more Older Millennial (30.8%) and Generation X (30.1%) participants indicated that a link to the tasting room’s social media accounts (Facebook, Twitter) would be useful for a mobile application than the other generations (range of 10.8 to 14.4%). Also, more Baby Boomers responded that an online form to sign up for the tasting room’s newsletter and/or wine club would be a useful mobile application component than Generation X participants (27.5 and 13.4%, respectively).

**Participant Interest in Receiving Text Messages from Winery Tasting Rooms**

Survey participants were asked if they would be interested in receiving text messages on their cellphone from a winery tasting room that contained information about events, wine tastings, new wine releases, and similar (Table 4.9). About half (52.8%) of the participants responded that they would be interested in receiving text messages. A
greater percentage of super core participants were interested in the text messages than marginal participants (57.5 and 45.2%, respectively). Additionally, More Younger and Older Millennials, Generation Xers, and Generation Jones participants were interested in receiving text messages (range of 52.0 to 64.8%) compared to Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation wine consumers (38.5, and 21.3%, respectively). No differences were found between male and female responses.
Table 4.9. Percentage of survey participants who indicated that they would be interested in receiving text messages from a winery tasting room that contain information about wine tastings, new wine releases, and similar, segmented by wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 347)</td>
<td>Core (n = 136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be Interested in Receiving Cell Phone Text Messages from a Winery Tasting Room that Contains Information about Events, Wine Tastings, New Wine Releases, and Similar (%)</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>57.5ab</td>
<td>53.7ab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 28 to 31 March 2016 to consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
Discussion & Conclusion

This chapter analyzed results from three Internet surveys of Mid-Atlantic wine consumer participants. Results provide a better understanding as to what events and activities held at a winery tasting room would appeal to survey participants who visit with a romantic partner or a group of friends and/or family. Additionally, results provide insight into the use of social media platforms and/or review sites participants use in general and when they want to engage with winery tasting rooms and/or learn about wines. Outcomes also indicate participants’ preferences for mobile applications features and the use of text messages as a means for winery tasting rooms to communicate with Mid-Atlantic wine consumers.

**Group Events at Winery Tasting Rooms**

As not every wine consumer is the same in terms of attitudes and behaviors, understanding the preferences based on engagement in various winery activities and events, for example, may reveal likes and dislikes specific to each group, which in turn can help tasting room staff reach different target consumer segments based on their desired tasting room experience. The majority of Survey 1 participants responded that they had visited a winery tasting room in New York, while fewer participants responded that they had visited a winery tasting room in New Jersey and/or Pennsylvania. This could be due to the percentage of participants who resided in each state, as nearly half of participants resided in New York. These findings indicate winery tasting rooms should strive to increase overall foot traffic by: 1) encouraging current visitors to increase the number of visits to the tasting room within an average year (e.g., special events, wine clubs, newsletters, loyalty programs, and wine promotions throughout the year (Fountain et al., 2008), and 2) entice those who have never visited to come to the tasting room.
(e.g., participate in wine trails, attend wine festivals, host events). Future research may look into opportunities or experiences to try with volunteer wineries and track visitations or gain feedback from a visitor’s experience within the tasting room.

Our research indicated a lot of interested amongst the Older Millennial group for visiting with a romantic partner. Additionally, we identified several activities that appealed to this generation: 1) shared wine tastings within a couple; 2) ability to purchase appetizers or “small plates” meant for two people to share; and 3) live entertainment with the ability to purchase wine during the event. This is consistent with a previous study conducted amongst North Carolina wineries, which found above average interest in eating, drinking, and being entertained for tasting room visitors (Byrd et al., 2016).

Winery owners may want to consider offering food, wine, and entertainment activities/events infrequently or informally to improve in-house promotions. Winery tasting rooms could offer “specialty foods” to differentiate their business from other local wineries. Given the interest by Older Millennials, seeking specialty foods or food presentations of interest to that generation could be beneficial. Based on a 2015 Specialty Food Association report, items that are more likely to appeal to Millennials include pasta, nuts, seeds, dried fruit, and salty snacks; while oils and vinegars, meat, poultry, seafood, salsas and dips appeal to Generation Xers (Purcell, 2015). Winery tasting rooms could create “small plates” with an array of these foods and market their availability to younger generations, especially through social media platforms that the younger generations are in tune with regularly. Also, winery tasting rooms could benefit from offering a variety of entertainment including different styles of music to target diverse tastes among audiences. As with any new strategy, wineries should consider evaluating attendee acceptance of the event(s) before making any necessary changes before the next event is offered.
About half of Survey 2 participants indicated they visited winery tasting rooms with groups of friends and/or family, and activities of interest were similar as to the results indicated with a romantic partner. Additional recommendations that were of interest to slightly fewer survey participants were: tour experiences, accommodations for groups, and activities held at the winery/vineyard with crafts and wine. European tasting room visitors have previously found education, entertainment, and an opportunity to escape (e.g., guided tours through a vineyard) to enhance group experiences with a tasting room visit (Carlsen et al., 2015). Hence, wineries could consider these multi-layer and interactive experiences when designing events and offerings to be held at a winery or tasting room in hopes to create a memorable tasting room experience for all participants.

As to survey participant level of awareness of wineries in their state/local area, the majority of participants responded that they felt somewhat informed about the locations and presence of wineries in their state/local area and fewer felt uninformed and well-informed. These results provide an argument for tasting rooms/tasting trails/industry associations to implement more impactful tasting rooms marketing strategies, which would benefit all industry members as previously noted by Riscinto-Kozub et al. (2012). Emphasis on the enjoyable aspect of wine and the winery setting was important for tasting room visitors. For those who had not visited a winery in the past, barriers that prevented them from visiting a winery for the first time included insufficient information and lack of companions to visit a tasting room with, as well as finding it difficult to imagine the activities that would occur during their visit. These barriers could be addressed with better marketing of the winery and through providing a description of activities offered at the winery and the benefits the visitor would gain from visiting (e.g., socialization and enjoyment). Additionally, providing information on what to expect when
visiting a winery (e.g., wine tasting, tours) and where local wineries are located could help ease any uncertainties of new visitors (Riscinto-Kozub et al., 2012).

**Social Media/Review Site Engagement with Wine Consumers**

Another way to reach a larger audience of current and potential consumers is through the use of social media networks and review sites. Our study found a majority (84.0%), with a greatest percentage of participants in the younger generations, indicated that they used social media and/or review sites at least once a month. Similar to another national survey (Szolnoki et al., 2016), Facebook remained the most frequently used social media site and the majority of wineries believed that their use of Facebook contributed to their brand image in a positive manner and impacted winery revenues. The use of promotions on the site has been successful for wineries in the past as a way to reach additional consumers (Ochs, n.d.). With such a high level of engagement concerning Facebook, wineries and tasting rooms should utilize this platform to inform customers about their business, encourage them to try their wines, promote activities and events held at the tasting room, while emphasizing their brand identity (how their business is perceived).

About half of participants who used social media indicated they used Instagram, both in general and to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting room, with a significantly large portion of those being Younger Millennials and Older Millennials than all of the more mature generations. Wineries and tasting rooms could use Instagram to interact with followers, specifically with younger generations, by sharing photos of events held at a tasting room, their wines, vineyards and tasting room aesthetics, and of visitors enjoying their experience while sampling wines. Instagram contests that encourage followers to comment on and share photos, which have increased the number of
followers for certain businesses (Talbot, 2015), is one way to engage with consumers using the tool.

Snapchat was only used by 23.5% of participants who used social media with more Younger Millennials (60.6%) using the platform than all other generations. Our study found only 17.9% of those who used Snapchat indicated they used it to engage with and/or learn about wineries. While not as widely used as other platforms, use is growing the fastest amongst females ages 35 and older (Rosoff, 2017). With fewer businesses using Snapchat than other social media platforms (Gotter, 2017), wineries and tasting rooms could use it to differentiate themselves from competitors. Specifically, wineries and tasting rooms could use Snapchat as a means to directly engage with followers through “snapping” videos of grape harvests, wine production processes, and events held at the winery.

TripAdvisor and Yelp were used by over one quarter of participants who used social media and of those who used it, over half indicated they used the review site to engage with and/or learn about winery tasting rooms. Positive reviews on these sites can impact businesses as just a one-star increase in ratings can show more than a 500% increase in revenue (Luca, 2011). Wineries could host promotions to encourage customers to leave a review on the sites, as website visitors are able to read others’ reviews and decide to either visit the winery and/or tasting room or pass it by. Thus, wineries and tasting rooms should encourage visitors and customers to provide reviews and thank those who provide positive reviews and address any reviews that are negative.

Our survey data showed that the majority of participants owned a smartphone and/or tablet and of those, about one quarter indicated they have a mobile application (app) installed on their smartphone and/or tablet that they used to find information about wine
and/or winery tasting rooms. Wineries should consider developing a mobile application for their business and include the following desirable features in the application: 1) location service, direction, and/or map to the winery tasting room; 2) a detailed listing of events held at the winery tasting room; 3) a list of wines available to taste and/or purchase; and 4) sales announcements/digital coupons for tasting and/or purchases. Wineries and tasting rooms could add coupons and promotions to their mobile application to increase user engagement encouraging more frequent tasting room visits (Kothari, 2016).

Another way that wineries and tasting rooms could use cellphone technology is by sending customers messages via text. Since not everyone owns a smartphone or desires to use a mobile application to engage with wineries and/or tasting rooms, wineries and tasting rooms could use text messages to send promotional messages, shipping notifications, and other communications that tasting rooms send via text. About half of survey 3 participants indicated they would be interested in receiving text messages on their cell phone from a winery tasting room that contains information about events, wine tastings, new wine releases, and similar. As about half agreed they would be interested in receiving text messages, half would also not want text messages. Sending text messages to customers may not always be a good option for businesses as downsides include the recipient feeling interrupted or invaded with advertisements and the limitation of the use of effective promotional methods through a limited text message size.

One data analysis figure to note is the use of Games Howell post-host tests to analyze result significance. YouTube was also a popular social media site used by participants evaluated in this study. Over half of participants reported using YouTube at least once during an average month with 3.7% of those using it to engage with and/or learn about
wineries and tasting rooms. Of those who used YouTube at least once during an average month, a lower percentage of Generation X (31.8%) responded that they used the site than Baby Boomers (45.2%). Generation X did not differ for the other generations regarding their use of YouTube, though the percentages were much lower compared to the Younger Millennials, Older Millennials, Generation Jones, and Silent & Greatest generation (range of 43.2 to 79.9%). This is due to using the Games Howell post-hoc test in the analysis to indicate significance. This test is designed to be used when variances and sample sizes are unequal. Since the sample sizes are not constant, a greater number of participants in Generation X participants compared to participants in the other generations will result in a larger standard of error between groups (Schlegel, 2016).

This study found some clear differences pertaining to what events and activities held at a winery tasting room would appeal to survey participants who visit with a romantic partner or a group of friends and/or family. Understanding which activities appealed to particular wine consumers residing in the Mid-Atlantic region based on wine consumption frequency segments, generations, and genders could help wineries within the Mid-Atlantic region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) better market their business, events, and wines to current and potential wine consumers in the region. Supported by previous research (Byrd et al., 2016; Carlsen et al., 2015) food, wine, and entertainment activities/events were of most interest to wine consumers visiting a winery. Based on this knowledge, wineries should consider offering food (e.g., specialty foods, wine pairings) and entertainment (e.g., live music events, winery/vineyard tours, education) to accompany the wine consumption of visitors to enhance experiences with a tasting room visit.
Results also provided an insight into the use of social media platforms and/or review sites participants use to engage with wineries and/or learn about wines. It is beneficial for wineries to understand which social media and/or review sites different segments (wine consumption frequencies, generations, and genders) of wine consumers use most often to engage with wineries and/or learn about wine to incorporate these networks into their marketing strategies to better overall market their products and reach current and potential customers. Similar to past research (Szolnoki et al., 2016; Ochs, n.d.), Facebook was the most frequently used social media site and can positively contribute to a winery’s brand image and revenues. This research also showed that Millennials used Instagram more than other generations. Wineries should consider developing their presence on social media platforms to increase engagement with followers and reach additional wine consumers. Examples to increase reach and engagement include: Facebook promotions (Ochs, n.d.) and Instagram contests (Talbot, 2015).
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CHAPTER 5: MID-ATLANTIC WINE CONSUMERS’ WINERY TASTING ROOM AND FESTIVAL EXPERIENCES AND PREFERENCES
Abstract

An Internet survey was administered (29 November to 1 December 2015) to consumers residing in three Mid-Atlantic states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) in the U.S. who: were age 21 and older, were not a member of the wine industry, and purchased and consumed wine within the previous year. Of the 846 participants, 54.8% (n = 464) responded that they had visited winery tasting rooms, with the majority of them responding that they visited with a spouse/partner (72.4%) and that light snacks available for purchase (e.g., cheese and crackers) at a winery tasting room were important in their decision to visit (60.6%). Of the possible events and activities offered in the area, the availability of restaurants was important to 63.2% of participants’ decision to visit a tasting room. More Younger Millennials and Older Millennial participants (60.5 and 58.2%, respectively) were influenced by shopping located near the tasting room than Generation Jones, Baby Boomers, and Silent & Greatest generation participants (range of 32.8 to 35.5%). Of the 42.1% of survey participants who had attended a wine festival in the past, pleasant weather (shade available if needed) was the positive aspect that was selected by the majority of these participants (60.7%). The negative aspect that was selected by the greatest percentage of festival attendees was crowded, long lines; however, only 33.7% of festival attendees selected this aspect. Of the participants who had never attended a wine festival in the past, 73.2% responded that they would consider attending one in the future and that some barriers which prevented them having attended were: distance needed to travel to the festival (36.4%), price of admission (31.5%), and date and/or time the festival was held (27.4%). Data were segmented by U.S. generation, participant’s gender, and wine consumption frequency to determine if tasting room offerings were more likely to appeal to certain groups and what aspects associated with wine festivals were considered positive and negative in an effort to help
organizers develop an event that will encourage wine consumers to attend.

**Introduction**

Wine tourism can contribute millions of dollars to a state’s economy. Approximately 100,000 wine tourists visited New Jersey in 2011 (Frank, Rimerman, 2013a), 5.29 million visited New York in 2012, (Stonebridge Research Group, 2014), and 1.2 million wine tourists visited Pennsylvania in 2011 (Frank, Rimerman, 2013b). Hence it is important to understand who engages in wine tourism, as well as their motivations, preferences, and likelihood to participate in activities associated with this type of travel (Woodside et al., 2008). Wine regions have found financial benefit in promoting wine tourism and have spent substantial amounts of money to promote wine tourism at their winery by offering a “complete tourism experience” including restaurants, lodging, winery tours, and picnic and recreational facilities (Wines and Balkans, n.d.).

According to a publication by Pratt (2014), Griffith University in Australia, there are four types of wine tourist based on their behavior profiles: 1) the “wine lover,” an individual knowledgeable about wine and enjoys food and wine pairing; 2) “wine interested,” one who is eager to learn about wine and enjoys food; 3) “wine curious,” a tourist who has less of an interest in wine but usually travels for non-wine related reasons; and 4) “disinterested wine,” tourist who usually visits wineries with others and has no interest in learning about wine.

Researchers have also identified aspects of the wine tourism experience that encourages customers to visit wine regions and tasting rooms. Wine tourists have motivations, preferences, and desires to participate in activities when planning a trip, suggesting these travelers visit tasting rooms and participate in related activities and/or events could aid in creating a well-rounded wine-tourism experience. A study on wine
tourism conducted by the Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre (STCRC) in Australia identified key “enhancement factors” for wine tourism experiences (2008). Wineries should assess their business, current offerings, and include potential options that could provide an experience wine tourists desire: an authentic, unique tasting room experience that justifies the money they spent. Visitors desire positive interactions with tasting room staff which will make their overall experience more enjoyable. The setting and surrounding of the wineries, including scenery, aids in attracting visitors. Additionally, winery visitors often seek the combination of food and wine to enhance their experience (The Sustainable Tourism and Cooperative Research Center, 2008; Gomez, 2010).

A focus on wine tourism through enrichment of consumer values is important, although the process of doing so can be poorly understood by researchers and managers (Carlsen et al., 2015), which is another rational for conducting consumer research and identifying their needs and wants. Research described in this thesis identified aspects offered at a winery tasting room and within the surrounding areas that have a positive impact on consumers’ decisions to visit.

Winery Activities, Events, and Festivals

Winery activities, events, and festivals are effective ways to attract tourists to a particular destination and a strategy essential to introduce consumers to new wines and the local wine culture (Szabó et al., 2014). Tasting room activities and events can help ensure consumers have a memorable, positive experience and encourage them to visit again. Wine festivals attract a wider, diverse group of visitors, and can have an affected
influence upon winery visitation through reaching a greater audience and potentially a new market (Houghton, 2008).

**Winery Activities and Events:** Past research has explored the importance of creating memorable experiences for customers visiting a tasting room. Several studies (Janney, 2012; Byrd et al., 2016) have noted the importance of tasting rooms to improve brand loyalty, specifically by improving on-site experience. Activities and events, such as live music, winery tours, and food and wine pairings are examples of on-site experiences. Consumers surveys can help determine what may entice regional tourists to visit a tasting room once or routinely, and marketing strategies can be focused around these key determinants. Examples of these factors may include: a consumption experience with the wine product, aesthetic vineyard and tasting room features, wine educational opportunities, entertainment and events, a relaxing environment, socialization and recreational opportunities, positive customer service, and memberships in wine clubs (Byrd et al., 2016). Yet, little research has been conducted on measuring these potential experiences within the Mid-Atlantic region (Charters et al., 2009).

**Wine Festivals:** Of the various wine tourism activities and events that could be offered, on-site winery festivals offer unique advantages for wineries (Szabó et al., 2014). Motivations that encourage wine tourists to participate in a wine festival include: entertainment, atmosphere, socialization with friends, and wine tastings (Dodd et al., 2006). In Hungary, a survey of consumers who attended Hungary’s largest wine festival reported their satisfaction with the festival and variety of wines tasted (Szabó et al., 2014). Other positive aspects included the festival’s services, organizations, gastronomy, tasting ticket system, signage, and staff hygiene (Szabó et al., 2014). Although emphasis of consumer feedback on festivals is placed on positive aspects, results from Kruger et al. (2013) found attendees were most influenced by a lack of
negative experiences. Both studies offer insight into what is important to attendees at wine festivals and highlight the importance of gathering feedback from attendees. Such information can aid wineries, tasting rooms, and festival organizers to develop more effective marketing and execution strategies that minimize potentially negative experiences held by an attendee (Houghton, 2008).

Data from this research was collected through an Internet survey. Internet surveys have become the most appropriate and minimal cost method of data collection and processing with developments in technology. Limitations of Internet surveys could be the inability to ask participants more clarifying questions through face-to-face research, yet Internet surveys can reach individuals in distant locations, saving time and lowering costs of mailed questionnaires, and providing the convenience of having automated data collection (Wright, 2005). Using these data could help wineries and tasting rooms decide what features they should offer at the winery and/or tasting room, what offered in the local area appeals to visitors and should be promoted, what festival aspects have a positive impact on participation, and what aspects participants felt prevent them from attending and should be avoided.

**Research Objectives**

- Identify demographic characteristics of survey participants who visit winery tasting rooms and with whom they visit.
- Pinpoint select features offered at a winery tasting room and in close proximity to the tasting room that were important to these participants when deciding whether to visit.
• Determine how many participants have attended a wine festival in the past and when they last attended a festival.

• Evaluate aspects participants identified as having a positive and/or negative on their past wine festival experiences.

• Determine what barriers prevented participants from attending a wine festival in the past.

Materials & Methods

Data were collected through a 15-minute Internet survey (29 November to 1 December 2015), administered to Survey Sampling International, LLC (Shelton, CT) panelists in three states (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) in the Mid-Atlantic region. Panelists were screened for not being a member of the wine industry, being at least 21 years old, residing in one of the targeted states, and for having purchased and drank wine at least once within the previous year. Panelists were informed of these criteria in an electronic consent statement prior to proceeding with the survey. Those who qualified were directed to the survey, which was developed by the researchers, approved by the Social Science Research at The Pennsylvania State University (IRB 37365, University Park, PA), and administered using SurveyMoney.com (Palo Alto, CA), an online provider of survey solutions. Surveys were pre-tested on a subset (92) of the target market with 1,043 participants opening and attempting the survey, and 846 qualifying and completing the questions. To encourage participation, panelists were provided with an incentive of either cash, points, or by being able to donate to charity to encourage participation. The project “Developing Wine Marketing Strategies for the Mid-Atlantic Region” (GRANT 11091317) was funded by the USDA Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program.
Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed with SPSS (Version 23 and 24; SPSS, Chicago, IL). To assess differences between responses, data were segmented by demographic (generation, gender), and wine consumption frequency groups. Pearson’s Chi Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests were used to detect differences for categorical and/or multiple-choice questions.

Results

Table 5.1 provides an overview of the demographic profiles for survey participants. Over half were female (66.5%), lived in a household without children, age 17 and younger (64.7%), but with one other adult (55.0%), of the Caucasian race (84.5%), and were married or in a domestic partnership (60.2%). In addition, approximately half were employed by someone else (53.4%), lived in New York (47.4%), and resided in a suburban area (46.7%). A third of participants had a Bachelor’s degree (36.9%) or obtained some level of high school education/were a high school graduate (33.7%).

Over a quarter (27.3%) were members of Generation X (born between 1965 and 1980) and 22.1% were members of the Older Millennial generation (born between 1981 and 1990); with a gross household income between $50,000 and $75,999 (24.3%), followed by $25,000 to $49,999 (22.1%), and $76,000 to $99,999 (17.4%).

Due to the limited number of participants who identified themselves as belonging to the Silent generation and the Greatest generations, compared to the other generations, the two were combined into a new category named The Silent & Greatest generation.

Survey participants were segmented into three groups based on their wine consumption frequency. Super core wine consuming participants (49.3%) consumed wine daily to a
few times a week, core participants (18.8%) consumed wine about once a week, and marginal participants (31.9%) were those who consumed wine less frequently.
Table 5.1. Demographic characteristics of survey participants who resided in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania (Mid-Atlantic region) and who participated in an Internet survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey (no.)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey (no.)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey (no.)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Millennials (1991 and younger)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Married or in a domestic partnership</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Millennials (1981 to 1990)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X (1965 to 1980)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Jones (1955 to 1964)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (1946 to 1954)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Silent &amp; Greatest (1945 and older)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Occupational Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Employed by someone else</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Household Incomea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Some high school/high school graduate</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>Full-time homemaker</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Associate degree/technical school graduate</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree (e.g. BA, BS)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Post graduate degree (e.g. M.S., PhD, MD)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>Children, age 17 and younger, residing in the household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 and greater</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (large metropolitan area)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban (residential community outside a large metropolitan area)</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area or small town</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>Adults, age 21 and older, in household who drink wine (including self)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant is single and drinks wine</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Participant is single and drinks wine</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant is only adult in household that drinks wine</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Participant is only adult in household that drinks wine</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant and one adult</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>Participant and one adult</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant and two or more adults</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Participant and two or more adults</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

*aGross household incomes represent 2014 values.
**With Whom Survey Participants Visit Winery Tasting Rooms**

Participants were asked if they visited winery tasting rooms to sample and/or purchase wines, regardless of the state, region, or country where they were located. Of the 846 participants, 464 (54.8%) responded that they had, and more super core participants (63.5%) responded that they had visited winery tasting rooms compared to core (52.2%) and marginal (43.0%) participants (Table 5.2). Regarding generation, greater percentages of Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants (range of 56.5 to 60.9%) visited winery tasting rooms than Baby Boomers (40.3%).

Participants were then asked to indicate, by selecting from a list of eight, who joined them when they visited. The response that was selected by the greatest percentage of participants was their spouse/partner (72.4%), followed by a friend or group of friends (58.0%).
Table 5.2. Percentage of survey participants who visit winery tasting rooms to sample and/or purchase wines, regardless of the state, region, or country where they were located and with whom they visited winery tasting rooms, segmented by consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants Who Visit Winery Tasting Rooms</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>63.2a</td>
<td>43.0b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regardless of the State, Region, or Country where they are Located (%)</td>
<td>(n = 464)</td>
<td>(n = 295)</td>
<td>(n = 83)</td>
<td>(n = 116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With whom survey participants visit tasting rooms with (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/partner</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>75.1 a</td>
<td>67.5a</td>
<td>68.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or group of friends</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.1 ab</td>
<td>68.7a</td>
<td>50.0b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members age 21 and older</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>32.8 a</td>
<td>36.1a</td>
<td>31.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker(s)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.9 a</td>
<td>6.0a</td>
<td>4.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one/self only</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8 a</td>
<td>4.8a</td>
<td>2.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations or clubs that they are a member of</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4 a</td>
<td>4.8a</td>
<td>1.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot tour group that is not associated with a club/organization they are a member of</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4 a</td>
<td>1.2a</td>
<td>0.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members age 20 and younger</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9 a</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>0.9a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p < .05, SPSS. Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Responses were also segmented by wine consumption frequencies, generations, and gender to determine if there were differences between groups pertaining to who they visited winery tasting rooms. More core participants visited with a friend or a group of friends than marginal participants (68.7 and 50.0%, respectively). Though the percentages were relatively low compared to the percent of each generation who visited with a spouse/partner (range 58.6 to 78.8%) and with a friend or group of friends (range of 48.5 to 70.0%), more Younger Millennials, Older Millennials, and Generation Xers (range of 7.1 to 11.5%) visited winery tasting rooms with co-workers than Silent & Greatest generation participants, of which none visited with co-workers. More Younger Millennials (58.6%) visited winery tasting rooms with “family members age 21 and older” than Older Millennials, Generation Xers, Generation Jones, and Baby Boomer participants (range of 20.8 to 33.6%).

Pertaining to gender, more males indicated they visited winery tasting rooms with their spouse/partner than females (83.4 and 66.9%, respectively). Contrarily, more females visited winery tasting rooms with a friend or group of friends than males (63.0 and 47.7%, respectively) and family members age 21 and older (36.7 and 25.2%, respectively).

Factors that Could Influence Future Tasting Room Visits

Participants were asked if certain features offered at a winery tasting room and/or activities/events near the winery tasting room were important in their decision to visit the facility (Table 5.3). The greatest percentage of participants responded that light snacks available for purchase (e.g., cheese and crackers) at a tasting room was important in their decision to visit (60.6%). Other offerings: activities and/or events, a tasting room
restaurant, and gift shop/items for purchase were important to slightly less than half of the participants (range of 41.8 to 46.1%). The factor that was selected by the fewest participants was on-site lodging (25.1%).
Table 5.3. Percentage of survey participants who were interested in select features offered at a winery tasting room and that they were important when deciding to visit, segmented by consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 561)</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 115)</td>
<td>Core (n = 159)</td>
<td>Marginal (n = 230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light snacks available for purchase (e.g., cheese and crackers)</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>62.5a</td>
<td>63.9a</td>
<td>55.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and/or events</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>47.7a</td>
<td>43.6a</td>
<td>45.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>43.8a</td>
<td>45.2a</td>
<td>40.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift shop/items for purchase in addition to wine</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.9a</td>
<td>40.6a</td>
<td>39.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.7a</td>
<td>28.5ab</td>
<td>19.4b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
When responses were segmented by wine consumption frequencies, generations, and gender, the only difference detected based on wine consumption frequency was that more super core participants indicated that lodging located at the winery tasting room was important in their decision to visit (28.7%) than marginal participants (19.4%). More Older Millennial participants responded that light snacks available to purchase (e.g., cheese and crackers) was important in their decision to visit a winery tasting room than Baby Boomer participants (66.7 and 50.0%, respectively). More Younger Millennials, Older Millennials, and Generation X members indicated that activities and/or events (range of 52.2 to 58.6%) and restaurants (range of 46.8 to 54.9%) were important in their decision to visit a winery tasting room than Generation Jones, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation participants (activities and/or events: range of 25.8 to 33.3%; restaurants: range of 26.2 to 30.6%). Also, more Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants responded that lodging was important than Silent & Greatest generation respondents (range of 12.5 to 30.4%).

When data was segmented by gender, more females indicated that light snacks available to purchase (e.g., cheese and crackers) (65.8%), activities and/or events (49.0%), and gift shop/ items for purchase in addition to wine (45.8%) were all important in their decision to visit than males (50.0, 39.6, and 33.0%, respectively).

Participants were also asked to select activities and/or events offered in close proximity to a winery tasting rooms that influenced their decisions to visit (Table 5.4). The availability of restaurants in the local area was selected by 63.2% of participants as being important in their decision, which made it the top factor presented followed by: shopping, lodging, cultural and historical experiences (e.g., art galleries, downtown districts, museums), and tour and sightseeing activities (e.g., waterfalls, guided tours, walking tours, wildlife viewing) (47.2, 45.3, 44.5, and 43.9%, respectively).
Table 5.4. Percentage of survey participants who responded that select activities and/or events located in close proximity to a winery tasting room were important when deciding to visit, segmented by consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 415)</td>
<td>Core (n = 159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features Offered within a Close Proximity to a Winery or Tasting Room that were Important in a Participant’s Decision to Visit (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>65.8a</td>
<td>65.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>50.4a</td>
<td>45.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>50.1a</td>
<td>42.9ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and historical experiences (e.g., art galleries, downtown districts, museums)</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>47.0a</td>
<td>41.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour and sightseeing activities (e.g., waterfalls, guided tours, walking tours, wildlife viewing)</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>46.8a</td>
<td>39.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other winery tasting rooms</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>44.9a</td>
<td>46.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment (e.g., nightclubs, casinos, theater/playhouse)</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>42.0a</td>
<td>35.9ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breweries and/or distilleries</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>41.0a</td>
<td>36.8ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family activities (e.g., zoos, fair/festivals, waterparks, miniature golf)</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>33.2a</td>
<td>33.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor adventure options (e.g., biking trails, hiking trails, parks)</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.6a</td>
<td>28.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recreation (e.g., beaches, boat rentals, kayaking, canoeing)</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.9a</td>
<td>16.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski and snow activities (e.g., skiing, snowboarding, ice skating)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.3a</td>
<td>15.8a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 28 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill. *Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
When responses were segmented by wine consumption frequency, more super core indicated that lodging (50.1%), entertainment (e.g., nightclubs, casinos, theater/playhouse) (42.0%), and breweries and/or distilleries (41.0%) located in close proximity to a winery tasting room were important in their decision to visit than marginal participants (39.5, 30.1, and 27.5%, respectively). More of both super core and core participants indicated that the presence of other winery tasting rooms nearby influenced their visit (44.9 and 46.8%, respectively) compared to marginal respondents (30.4%).

Regarding generation, greater percentages of Younger Millennial, Older Millennial, and Generation X participants (71.7, 70.7, and 68.0%, respectively) indicated that the presence of restaurants was important compared to Baby Boomer respondents (45.2%). Fewer members of Generation X, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generations responded that the availability of shopping nearby influenced their decision (38.0, 35.5, and 32.8%, respectively) than Younger Millennials and Older Millennials (60.5, and 58.2%, respectively). More Older Millennials indicated that the presence of lodging was important compared to Silent & Greatest generation participants (52.7 and 30.3%, respectively) and more Younger Millennial participants responded that cultural and historical experiences located nearby influenced their decision to visit a winery tasting room (55.8%) than Baby Boomers (33.6%). Also, more Younger Millennial participants selected tour and sight seeing as being an important activity/event offered in the local area (57.0%) than Generation Jones and Baby Boomer respondents (37.0, and 32.5%, respectively). A greater percentage of Younger Millennial and Generation X participants responded that the presence of other winery tasting rooms in the region influenced their decision to visit a winery tasting room (46.9 and 46.4%, respectively) than Baby Boomers (28.1%).
More Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants indicated available activities/events were important in their decision to visit a winery tasting room than one or more of the more mature generations. For example, more Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants indicated that entertainment (48.7 and 47.5%, respectively) and family activities (43.4 and 40.6%, respectively) located in close proximity to a tasting room influenced their decision to visit than Generation Jones, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation participants (entertainment, range of 3.1 to 25.5%; family activities, range of 18.8 to 19.6%).

When data were segmented by gender, more females indicated that shopping (52.1%), cultural and historical experiences (48.0%), tour and sightseeing activities (48.3%), and outdoor adventure options (30.7%) located in close proximity to a winery tasting room influenced their decision to visit than males (37.0, 37.0, 34.2, and 23.4%, respectively).

Survey Participant Wine Festival Attendance and Experiences

Slightly more than half of participants responded that they had not participated in a wine festival (57.9%), where several wineries were promoting their wines in one space, and could include music, food, and/or art (Table 5.5), with the remaining responding that they had participated within the past year (20.1%) or attended a festival more than a year before they participated in the survey (22.0%).
Table 5.5. Percentage of survey participants who have and have not attended a wine festival, segmented by consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 417)</td>
<td>Core (n = 159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic Wine Consumers</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>27.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Wine Festival Attendance (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attended at least one wine</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>festival within the past year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attended a wine festival, but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more than a year ago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has not attended any wine</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>festivals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05, SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
When responses were segmented by wine consumption frequency, more super core participants responded that they had attended a wine festival within the past year than both core and marginal respondents (27.6, 15.7, and 11.1%, respectively). Contrarily, more marginal and core participants responded that they had never attended a wine festival than super core members (71.1, 63.5, and 47.2%, respectively). Concerning generations, more Older Millennial and Generation X participants attended at least one wine festival within the past year than Baby Boomers (24.2, 22.2, and 10.9%, respectively). No significant differences were found between genders.

Participants who had attended a wine festival at all (42.1%) were asked to select all the aspects, both positive (10 factors) and negative (11 factors), that influenced their decision to attend. Pertaining to positive aspects (Table 5.6), pleasant weather (shade available if needed) was the most selected aspect (60.7%), followed by price (e.g., felt the festival experience was worth the price of admission) (59.6%), restrooms (e.g., clean, easily available) (55.1%), food options offered (54.8%), and wineries attending (e.g., the specific wineries that were present, the amount of wineries attending was not disappointing or overwhelming) (53.1%). All other aspects were selected by less than half of these participants. Pertaining to negative aspects (Table 5.7), crowded/long lines was the most selected factor; however, only 33.7% of these participants selected it. Slightly less than a quarter (23.3%) of these participants indicated that parking (e.g., inconvenient, not enough) negatively impacted their wine festival experiences.
Table 5.6. Percentage of survey participants who indicated that select aspects had a positive impact on their wine festival experiences, segmented by consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects that Survey Participants Selected as Having a Positive Impact on their Wine Festival Experiences (%)</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 417)</td>
<td>Core (n = 159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant weather, shade available if needed</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>60.9a</td>
<td>55.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (e.g., felt the festival experience was worth the price of admission)</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>57.3a</td>
<td>72.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms (e.g., clean, easily available)</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>56.4ab</td>
<td>65.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food options offered</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>54.5a</td>
<td>60.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wineries attending (e.g., the overall festival and specific wineries that were present was appealing; amount of wineries attending was not disappointing or overwhelming)</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>51.8a</td>
<td>53.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>50.0a</td>
<td>44.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and/or time the festival was held</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>46.4a</td>
<td>50.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance needed to travel to the festival</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.6a</td>
<td>36.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment offered (e.g., found music appealing/pleasant)</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>40.5a</td>
<td>39.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall flow of the festival (e.g., organized well)</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.0a</td>
<td>41.4a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05, SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.*
More core and Younger Millennial participants identified restrooms (e.g., clean, easily available) as a positive aspect (65.5 and 74.0%, respectively) than their counterparts, marginal and Generation X respondents (43.6 and 46.6%, respectively). More Silent & Greatest and Generation Jones members selected distance needed to travel to the festival as a positive aspect (68.8 and 62.5%, respectively) than Generation Xers (29.1%), also more Silent & Greatest participants (68.8%) selected this aspect than Older Millennial respondents (38.1%). No significant differences were found between genders for any of the aspects presented.
Table 5.7. Percentage of survey participants who indicated that select aspects had a negative impact on their wine festival experiences, segmented by consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core (n = 417)</td>
<td>Core (n = 159)</td>
<td>Marginal (n = 270)</td>
<td>Younger Millennial (n = 115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects that Survey Participants Selected as having a Negative Impact on their Wine Festival Experiences (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowded, long lines</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>31.9a</td>
<td>36.7a</td>
<td>34.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (e.g., inconvenient, not enough)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.6a</td>
<td>25.9a</td>
<td>20.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor weather (e.g., wind, rain, cold, heat)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.4a</td>
<td>13.8a</td>
<td>11.5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (did not feel festival experience met the price of admission)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.5a</td>
<td>12.1a</td>
<td>19.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance needed to travel to the festival</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.9a</td>
<td>17.2a</td>
<td>17.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms (e.g., dirty, not enough)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.9a</td>
<td>15.5a</td>
<td>12.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food options offered</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.5a</td>
<td>10.3a</td>
<td>12.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall flow of the festival (e.g., was not organized well)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.9a</td>
<td>6.9a</td>
<td>14.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and/or time the festival was held</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.5a</td>
<td>6.9a</td>
<td>5.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wineries attending (e.g., too many, not enough, did not find wines appealing)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.7a</td>
<td>5.2a</td>
<td>10.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment offered (e.g., not offered, did not prefer style of music)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.7a</td>
<td>3.4a</td>
<td>7.7a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.

*Participants were able to select more than one response category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
Only one significant difference was detected when “negative aspect” responses that impacted their wine festival experiences were segmented by wine consumption frequency. More Generation X participants selected wineries attending (e.g., too many, not enough, did not find wines appealing) as being a negative aspect (8.7%) than Generation Jones members, of which none selected this option. No significant differences were found when data was segmented by wine consumption frequencies or gender.

A majority of participants who had never attended a wine festival in the past, 73.2%, responded that they would consider attending one in the future (Table 5.8).
Table 5.8. Percentage of survey participants who had never attended a wine festival indicated whether or not they would consider attending one in the future, segmented by consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Super Core (n = 417)</td>
<td>Core (n = 156)</td>
<td>Marginal (n = 270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be interested in Attending a Wine Festival in the Future (%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>75.0a</td>
<td>75.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.2a</td>
<td>5.0a</td>
<td>4.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.6b</td>
<td>18.8ab</td>
<td>25.5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily to a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginia represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill.
Pertaining to generation, more Younger Millennials and Generation Xers who had not attended a wine festival in the past would consider doing so in the future (86.2 and 80.3%, respectively) than Baby Boomer and Silent & Greatest generation participants (60.9 and 43.2%, respectively), and more Older Millennials would than Silent & Greatest generation participants (79.2 and 43.2%, respectively). Concerning gender, more females responded that they would consider attending a wine festival in the future (77.4%) than males (63.8%).

Those who had not attended a wine festival in the past were also asked to select, from a list of 14 factors, all the barriers that prevented them from attending (Table 5.9). The barrier that was selected by the most participants was distance needed to travel to the festival (36.4%). Price of admission was the second most selected factor (31.5%), followed by date and/or time the festival was held (27.4%), parking, transportation to and from festival (e.g., designated driver needed) (24.9%), and crowded, long lines (23.5%).
Table 5.9. Barriers that prevented survey participants from ever attending a wine festival, segmented by consumption frequency, generation, and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wine Consumption Frequency</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Super Core (n = 417)</td>
<td>Core (n = 159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance needed to travel to the festival</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>34.7a</td>
<td>36.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of admission</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>33.2a</td>
<td>25.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and/or time the festival was held</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>32.1a</td>
<td>26.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, transportation to and from festival (e.g., designated driver needed)</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>27.6a</td>
<td>28.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowded, long lines</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>26.9a</td>
<td>33.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other family members/ friends would be interested in attending festivals</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>18.9a</td>
<td>18.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in attending festivals</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.3a</td>
<td>18.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for poor weather</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17.8a</td>
<td>14.8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would need to pay for child care/babysitter</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.7a</td>
<td>10.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms (e.g., lack of facilities available)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.2a</td>
<td>9.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food options offered</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1a</td>
<td>8.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wineries attending (e.g., too many, not enough, didn’t find wines appealing)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.6a</td>
<td>4.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of the festival (e.g., reviews from others’ past experiences)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.1a</td>
<td>5.0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment was not offered and/or type of music/entertainment was not appealing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6a</td>
<td>3.0a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survey was administered 29 November to 1 December 2015 to wine consumers residing in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Super core represents those who drank wine daily or a few times a week, core represents those who drank wine about once a week, and marginal represents those who drank wine less frequently. Percentages with different letters within rows and categories (consumption frequency, generation, and gender) represent Pearson’s Chi-Square, Phi and Cramer’s V, and ANOVA followed by Games-Howell tests where values are significantly different, at the level of p ≤ .05; SPSS, Version 23 and 24, Chicago, Ill. *Participants were able to select more than one reason as a category, which is why percentages do not equal 100%.
No significant differences were detected between super core, core, and marginal participants as to what barriers prevented them from attending, although significant differences were found when data were segmented by generation. More Silent & Greatest members selected distance needed to travel to the festival as a barrier than Generation X respondents (59.5 and 24.4%, respectively). More Younger Millennial and Older Millennial participants selected price of admission as a barrier (41.5, and 42.6%, respectively) than Silent & Greatest members (13.5%). More Baby Boomers selected parking, transportation to and from the festival as a barrier (32.6%) than Silent & Greatest generation participants (10.8%). More Older Millennial and Generation X members indicated they would need to pay for child care/babysitter as a barrier (21.8 and 21.3%, respectively) than Generation Jones, Baby Boomer, and Silent & Greatest generation participants (3.0, 0, and 2.7%, respectively). Also, more Older Millennials responded food options offered was a barrier (10.9%) than Silent & Greatest generation which had no selections for this barrier.

Pertaining to gender, more females selected price of admission (36.8%) and potential for poor weather (17.8%) as barriers that had an impact on their decision to not attend a festival in the past than males (19.7 and 10.5%, respectively). More males selected the response that they were not interested in wine festivals than females (28.3 and 10.7%, respectively).

**Discussion & Conclusion**

Results provide understanding about factors that influence Mid-Atlantic wine consumers to visit a winery tasting room, and what could encourage visits. Additionally, this study provided information pertaining to wine festival attendance, along with what aspects had
a positive and negative impact on their festival experience. About half (54.8%) of participants indicated that they visit winery tasting rooms to sample and/or purchase wines, regardless of the state, region, or country where the tasting rooms are located. The majority visited winery tasting rooms with a spouse/partner and/or a friend or group of friends. Wineries and tasting rooms should consider “who” visits when and design events to better appeal to a variety of customers to encourage more group visitation. Offering group tours and tastings, intimate seating for couples, picnic areas, and live entertainment are some ways wineries and tasting rooms can cater to these groups. Many wineries have taken into consideration the full tasting room experience for a variety of guests and have seen success from renovations which improved the overall tasting room aesthetics/activities/accommodations (Danehower, 2014).

Wine tourists may consider certain factors at both the tasting room and the surrounding area when deciding to visit. Of Mid-Atlantic wine consumer participants, 60.6% felt that light snacks available for purchase (e.g., cheese and crackers) were important in their decision to visit a winery tasting room. Olsen et al. (2006) found that U.S. wine consumers believe that wine and food go together and enhance the other. Additionally, Sparks (2007) reported wine region tourists enjoy purchasing wine and locally-made food products while visiting a wine region. Thus, studies support our findings in that food could be an important contribution to tasting rooms. Hence, the availability of food could increase the tourists’ experience and encourage them to spend more time at the tasting room drinking wine and eating food, rather than going off premise to satisfy hunger. Winery tasting rooms could offer wine and food pairing suggestions, different plates of foods with an assortment of foods designed specifically to pair with certain wines, and could even differentiate themselves by offering local foods, specialty foods, and hosting local chefs to come and prepare foods using the wines. Wineries have seen success in
offering food options in their tasting room, particularly wineries located in Sonoma County. These wineries offer more than just cheese and wine pairings and emphasis their use of Sonoma-grown produce and local chef prepared meals (Knight, n.d.).

Activities and/or events was the second most selected factor that was important in the decision to visit a winery tasting room with younger generations. According to The Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Center (2008), wine tourists visiting a wine region seek activities related to wine, sports and other outdoor activities, experiencing culture, and entertainment. Wineries and tasting rooms should offer various activities and events in an effort to appeal to wine consumers looking for recreation or entertainment, which may encourage them to visit frequently if guests were interested in a particular reoccurring theme or performer, and how memorable they felt the experience was. To provide a complete experience, tasting room owners and operators should focus on providing each of the four dimensions of an experience, which include “entertainment,” “education,” “escape,” and “aesthetic” (Carlsen et al., 2015).

As not all wine tourists are the same, and different offerings may appeal to wine consumers located in close proximity to a winery tasting room than those who travel distances to a specific region. The majority of Mid-Atlantic wine consumer participants indicated that restaurants located in close proximity to a winery tasting room were important when deciding to visit. Shopping, lodging, and cultural and historical experiences were also among the top responses amongst regional wine consumers. The proximity to food outlets was also previously documented as an important consideration for potential tasting room visitors in North Carolina (Byrd et al., 2016). Wineries and tasting rooms could appeal to potential visitors by informing them about local dining options, hotels, spas, shopping, events, and recreation in the surrounding area. These can be advertised through creating itineraries, maps, traveling information, blog posts,
videos, and photos (McCue et al., 2013). Wineries and tasting rooms could also partner with local hotels and services that arrange transport to and from tasting rooms to offer exclusive packages.

This study found, 20.1% of Mid-Atlantic wine consumer participants attended at least one wine festival within the past year. Wine festival organizations should strive to provide attendees with an exceptional experience by learning from attendees how they can achieve this desired outcome (Kruger et al., 2013). Positive aspects participants identified they associated with attending wine festival(s) included: pleasant weather, appropriate price, clean restrooms, food options offered, and appealing wineries attending. Whereas, negative aspects included: crowded, long lines, parking, high-priced ticket, poor weather. When designing a wine festival, wineries and tasting rooms should consider these negative influencers, try to prevent those that they have control over, and develop procedures to diffuse negative situations that can result in poor experiences. For example, they should plan for overflow parking should crowds be larger than expected, be sure restrooms are plentiful, clean, and conveniently located, and that shade and shelter are available in case of extreme heat or poor weather. Festival attendees who have a positive experience may return/attend other winery-related functions, and they could encourage others to attend based on what they share about their visit.

Over half of participants (57.9%) indicated they have not attended a wine festival previously. However, our study indicated that of those who had not attended a wine festival, 73.2% responded they would be interested in attending a wine festival in the future. Yet, this study revealed some barriers perceived by potential customers hindering attending in the past: distance needed to travel to the festival, price of admission, date and/or time the festival was held, and parking/transportation. In effort to encourage wine
festival attendance, again, organizers should address these barriers when designing the festival and develop procedures to diffuse negative situations, when applicable, that can result in poor experiences. If price and perceived value is preventing consumers from attending, wineries and tasting rooms could: offer a discount if tickets are purchased at the tasting room, in hopes that the attendees will buy wine during this visit; sell tickets at full-value but offer incentives, such as a discount on wine the attendee purchases from the tasting room’s booth at the festival; or offer attendees who buy multiple tickets a discount on the ticket they purchase for themselves. To address parking concerns, organizers could offer a shuttle service that would take attendees to and from select hotels and satellite parking lots. Organizers should also inform potential attendees that improvements have been made and how barriers have been addressed in order to encourage guests to attend again. An example is the Adirondack Wine and Food Festival which reported their festival success with a large attendance, offering of welcome bags to guests, and chef demonstrations selling food for a charity cause. The report also highlighted the improvements that will be made to the festival for the next year’s event (Adirondack Wine and Food Festival, 2015).

This study found some clear differences pertaining to what factors influence Mid-Atlantic wine consumers to visit a winery tasting room, and what could encourage more visits. Wineries and tasting rooms should consider “who” visits their tasting rooms, when they visit, and design events to better appeal to the variety of customers. This can be achieved through considering creating a full tasting room experience for a variety of guests which includes the aesthetics, activities offered, and accommodations of a tasting room (Danehower, 2014). The incorporation of food is important to many consumers in their tasting room experience (Sparks, 2007; Olsen et al., 2006; Knight, n.d.).
Results also provided information pertaining to wine festival attendance and positive and negative impacts of participants’ festival experiences. Wineries and tasting rooms should address the negative influencers pertaining to wine festivals in hopes to prevent those they have control over (e.g., managing crowds, plenty of parking, appropriate price). Also, organizers can encourage wine festival attendance by addressing any perceived barriers of visitors considering attending a wine festival. By reflecting on past wine festivals held by a winery or organization and highlighting improvements for the next year’s festival, guests will appreciate that they are continually striving to better the festival experience and care about the visitors’ overall enjoyment (Adirondack Wine and Food Festival, 2015).
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CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS
Research Implications & Suggestions for Future Research

Results from Chapter Two showed that 92.9% of Survey 1 participants consumed “everyday” wine and 96.9% drank wine when entertaining and/or celebrating a special occasion, with past experiences, having previously tasted/purchased the wine, being the primary influence in the decision to purchase wine for the two occasions (72.1 and 72.2%, respectively). Wineries and tasting room staff should encourage visitors to taste their wines, especially those customers who mention that they felt less familiar or unfamiliar with a specific wine, in an effort to increase purchases. Winey tasting room owners and operators should also investigate opportunities outside the tasting room where consumers can taste their wines. A logical outlet would be a wine festival or a farmers’ market; however, they may have to contend with other wineries and alcoholic beverage providers competing for the same sale. Wineries that sell through restaurants could consider providing wine samples to diners who order wine to consume with their meal. Or, tasting room staff could actually pour the wine served at off premise events, which would give them the opportunity to describe the wine, highlight the others available to taste, and direct the customers to where to purchase bottles.

Chapter Three focused on survey participants that indicated that they purchased wine produced in one or more of the three targeted states: New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Of the 1,038 consumers who participated in our March 2016 survey, 648 (62.4%) responded that they had purchased wines produced in at least one of the three states, hence, they were referred to as Mid-Atlantic wine purchasers (MAWP). The majority of MAWP participants (77.0%) indicated that they consumed wine at a restaurant in their hometown and/or local community followed by dining at a friend or family member’s house (73.1%) and when entertaining and/or celebrating a holiday in their home (70.3%). More participants in the younger generations (Millennial, Generation
X, and Generation Jones) had consumed wine in more less formal and relaxed situations: watching TV or related activity, at a bar or in a lounge with or without food, while cooking, and while attending a sporting event or concert compared to participant in the older generation. Thus, wineries and tasting rooms should strongly consider the situations and occasions when generations of interest consume wine and even suggest these tasting room visitors consume the beverage during these occasions. Additionally, wineries and tasting rooms should focus on marketing their wines as being the perfect beverage for more popular and universally-celebrated occasions, such as dining both in and out of the house, entertaining, and special occasions. Tasting room staff can assist in this effort by educating customers about foods to pair with their wines, suggesting wines that can be given as gifts, recommending wines to pair with holiday meals, and indicate which local restaurants carry their wines, along with suggesting menu options that pair with the wines.

Additionally, in Chapter Three, three quarters (75.8%) of MAWP participants indicated that they learned about wine from friends and/or family. Wine tasting room staff should encourage visitors to talk with family and friends about the wines by providing an incentive. For example, tasting room staff could provide visitors with a coupon for a free sample to be redeemed during their next visit when they also bring family or friends. This strategy would prompt visitors to talk about the wines encouraging them to visit, which can increase tasting room visits.

Another way to reach a larger wine consuming audience is through the use of social media networks, Internet/email, and review sites, which were explored in Chapter Four. The majority (84%) of Survey 4 participants indicated that they used these sources at least once a month, and, as might be expected, a greatest percentage of participants in the younger generations responded that they used social media, Internet/email, and
review sites than their older counterparts. Of these participants, most (94%) used Facebook in general, with 64.5% of these individuals using it to engage with and/or learn about wineries and tasting rooms. With such a high level of engagement concerning Facebook, wineries and tasting rooms should strongly consider utilizing this platform to inform consumers about their business, encourage them to try their wines, promote activities and events held at the tasting, while emphasizing their brand identity i.e., how their business is perceived. About half of the participants used Instagram in general (45.7%) with a significantly large percentage of Younger Millennials (66.7%) and Older Millennials (74.6%) using this platform than all of the more mature generations. Wineries and tasting rooms could use Instagram to interact with followers, specifically with younger generations, by sharing photos of events held at a tasting room, their wines, vineyards and tasting room aesthetics, and of visitors enjoying their experience while sampling wines. Engaging followers on social media could include asking them to like and share content in exchange for an incentive, such as a coupon for a free tasting.

Chapter Five investigated survey participants’ wine festivals experiences. Twenty percent of Mid-Atlantic wine consumer participants attended at least one wine festival within the past year, and slightly more, 22%, attended a wine festival more than a year prior to participating in the survey. Pleasant weather, shade available if needed (60.7% or participants selecting the response), price (e.g., felt the festival experience was worth the price of admission) (59.6%), restrooms (e.g., clean, easy available) (55.1%), food options offered (54.8%), and wineries attending (e.g., found appealing, the amount of wineries attending was not disappointing or overwhelming) (53.1%) were positive aspects associated with attending wine festival(s). Whereas, negative aspects included: crowded, long lines (33.7%), parking (e.g., inconvenient, not enough) (23.3%), price (did not feel festival experience met price of admission) (18.3%), and poor weather (e.g.,
wind, rain, cold, heat) (18%). When designing a wine festival, organizers should consider these negative aspects, try to prevent those that they have control over, and develop procedures to diffuse negative situations that can result in poor experiences. For example, they should plan for overflow parking should crowds be larger than expected, restrooms should be plentiful, clean, and conveniently located, and shade and shelter needs to be available in case of extreme heat or poor weather. Festival attendees who have a positive experience may return/attend other winery-related functions, and they could encourage others to attend based on what they share about their visit.

In summary, research results described in this thesis can help wineries and tasting rooms located in the Mid-Atlantic region develop a more in depth understanding of wine consumers residing in their home states, consumer wine consumption and purchasing behaviors, and differences or similarities this population of wine consumers share based on wine consumption frequency, generation, and gender. Considering the information made available because of this research, wineries and tasting rooms can enhance their marketing plans and develop more appropriate promotional strategies. With very little prior research specific to wine consumers in the Mid-Atlantic region, results provide a foundation the suggestion that future research aimed at furthering the development of the wine industry in the three states.