

ADAPTATION OF WINE INNOVATION

*Thomas Atkin, Sonoma State University, USA
Rosanna Garcia, Northeastern University, Boston, USA
Larry Lockshin University of South Australia, Australia
Tom.atkin@sonoma.edu*

Abstract

In order to study the diffusion of innovation in the wine industry, an adaptive web survey was developed and administered to 3614 persons in the United States (1691), Australia (1430), and New Zealand (493).

The results were split into three categories of involvement, medium-low, medium-high, and high, as given by the scaled addition of the participants' agreement with the following statements (out of 7 for each and 21 of the total score):

1. I have a strong interest in wine.
2. Wine is important to me in my lifestyle
3. Drinking wine gives me pleasure

A score of 17 or below categorized participants as having medium-low involvement (25.9%) were considered highly involved. A score of 18 to 20 categorized participants as having medium-high involvement (37.3%), while those with a score of 21, the maximum score, (30.9%) were considered to have very high involvement. As expected, increased involvement was exhibited in increased wine drinking frequency, whereby daily consumption constituted 15.6% of participants with medium-low involvement, 34.9% of those with medium-high involvement, and 52.5% of very highly involved participants (see ForExecSum0.xls for more detailed results).

As involvement level increased, so did the preference for the following wine features (in the order of overall preference per feature category, see ForExecSum1.xls):

- Wine Type – dry red wine, aromatic white wine, dry white wine
- Region – United States, France, and South America
- Closure Style – Traditional Cork
- Price – More price category, Maximum price category
- Winery Type – Regional Winery, Small/Boutique

Conversely, as involvement levels decreased, the preference for the following wine features increased:

- Wine type – blush red wine

Getting or seeking information about wine also varied by involvement (see ForExecSum2.xls). As involvement increased so did the following preferences (in the order of most preferred overall):

- Discussing wine with others.
- Selecting wine based on the bottle label
- Selecting wine based on consulting store personnel
- Selecting wine based on store tag shelf
- Selecting wine based on newspaper or magazine
- Selecting wine based on reading books about wine

Purchasing wine was not indicated to be a risky undertaking for any of the involvement groups with scores ranging from 2.4 – 3.3 / 7 (see ForExecSum3.xls).

Other observations

Aside from splitting the data by involvement, differentiating gender and country implicates the following (see ForExecSum3.xls):

- Traditional Cork, Metacork™, and synthetic cork received higher scores from female than male participants but not stelvin, which was better preferred by male participants.
- In the US, Metacork received the second-highest score of 4.2 (compared to traditional cork, synthetic cork, and stelvin, with scores of 5.5, 4.1, and 3.5, respectively)

Further implications regarding the sensual and performance aspects of closure style by country are as follows (see ForExecSum4.xls):

- Participants from the US considered the ritual of opening wine, uncorking and sniffing the cork, and the sound of the cork pop more important than the importance indicated by participants from Australia and New Zealand. The ranks given were in the range of 2.87 – 4.5.
- Regarding the importance in having the ability to easily open a bottle of wine, New Zealand gave the highest ranking (4.8), followed by Australia (4.5), and US (4.2).
- Regarding the importance in having the ability to reseal the wine, New Zealand, again, gave the highest ranking (4.4), followed by US (4.2), and Australia (4.1).

Report		Sensual Aspects			Performance Aspects	
		Uncorking and Sniffing	Sound of Cork "Pop"	Ritual of Opening Wine	Ability to Easily Open a Bottle	Ability to Reseal Wine
US	Mean	3.972	3.449	4.556	4.227	4.188
	N	1412	1412	1410	1408	1406
	Std. Deviation	1.935	1.904	1.862	1.787	1.939
AUS	Mean	3.445	2.869	3.942	4.499	4.057
	N	1210	1210	1207	1200	1207
	Std. Deviation	1.934	1.861	1.960	1.797	1.975
NZ	Mean	3.547	3.002	3.948	4.860	4.488
	N	428	427	424	428	424
	Std. Deviation	1.866	1.718	1.858	1.554	1.701
Total	Mean	3.703	3.156	4.228	4.424	4.178
	N	3050	3049	3041	3036	3037
	Std. Deviation	1.941	1.881	1.925	1.773	1.927