

# **CREATING AND MANAGING REGIONAL UMBRELLA BRANDS: A COMPREHENSIVE QUANTITATIVE APPROACH (REFEREED)**

*Ulrich R. Orth, Oregon State University, USA*  
[ulrich.orth@oregonstate.edu](mailto:ulrich.orth@oregonstate.edu)

## *Abstract*

This study introduces an innovative approach for developing, assessing and controlling regional umbrella brands for wine. The model is rooted in several dimensions of wine region equity, measured in terms of benefits desired by consumers. The model was evaluated through an empirical study with data collected in several U.S. states for the purpose to identify drivers of preferences and to determine relationships that may exist between desired benefits, preferences for wine from a number of origins, and consumer lifestyles. The findings suggest six consumer motivational factors: Quality, price, social, emotional, environmental and altruistic benefit. Five of those factors were found to be strong and significant predictors of consumer preferences for wines from three U.S. states (California, Oregon, Washington) and six countries (Australia, Chile, France, Italy, New Zealand, Spain). Linking desired benefits to consumer lifestyle, demographic and behavioral variables allows for tailoring regional umbrella brands closely to markets.

## *Introduction*

In the last three decades, the origin of a product as a potential source of market value has received considerable attention from both marketing researchers and practitioners (Peterson & Jolibert, 1995). Researchers concluded that consumers employ information about the origin of a product to infer its quality (c.f. Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999 for a review), marketers established trademark-like brands (e.g. Champagne) and legal regulations such as EEC 2081/92 (EU 1992) were created protecting the seemingly immutable link between origin and quality. As a result, protected and controlled designations of origin are commonly used and promoted in the wine industry and others around the globe (Thienes, 1995). Recent research evidence, however, suggests that the value consumers associate with specific origins may go far beyond and possibly

even exclude quality and may in fact be grounded in other dimensions such as emotional associations (Von Alvensleben, 2000). Yet, details of what is actually protected and promoted to the consumers remain largely unknown as far as benefits other than quality are concerned.

A related stream of research established dimensions of brand equity for consumer goods. Both, theoretical and empirical literature on brand benefits suggests that, besides quality, dimensions such as price, social acceptance, emotional, environmental, and altruistic benefit influence consumer perceptions and preferences (Woodruff, 1997). Striking similarities were found between how consumers utilize brands and places of origin to evaluate products and to develop preferences (Papadopoulos & Heslop, 2002), leading to an integration of origin and brand equity research as expressed in the concept of country/ place branding.

This paper advances this integrative approach by examining dimensions of wine region equity in terms of benefits consumer desire in wine. Employing a consumer sample, it extends past research on origin effects, brand equity and wine marketing, and establishes links to consumer preferences and lifestyle to provide for customized, and actionable umbrella brand development and control.

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

### **Origin Effects**

An ample body of literature examines country-of-origin effects and reports on consumer perceptions and inferences about products “made in” or associated with a given country (Kirmani & Rao, 2000; Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999; Van Ittersum, Candel & Meulenberg, 2003). An extension of the concept into “place-based” marketing strategies refers to more specific geographic origins such as regions, states, or river basins (Thode & Maskulka, 1998). Past research further indicates that effects of origins can rival the importance of price, brand name or other product attributes in determining preferences (Okechuku, 1994).

Agribusiness and food marketers quickly embraced the concept, establishing almost trademark-style names such as Kentucky Bourbon, Florida Ruby Red grapefruit, New Zealand Kiwi, Vidalia Sweet Onions or simply Champagne. In a wine marketing context, geographic regions such as Bordeaux, Chianti, or Rioja zealously defend use of their regional identity with legal protection for the geographic origin of grapes and wines

added by national and international regulations. For example, the European Commission has acknowledged the importance of geographic product origin as a source of competitive advantage by issuing trademark-style protection. In particular, EEC 2081/92 (European Union 1992) defines Protected Designations of Origin (PDO) and Protected Geographical Indication (PGI). Protected and controlled appellations of wine origin such as French AOC, Italian DOC and DOCG, the German “Gross-“ and Einzel-Lage”, and the AVAs are known all over the world (Thienes, 1995). Retailers, too, acknowledge the importance of origin through their practice of categorizing bottled wine in the shelves by origin. In short, research, wine marketing practice, and legal regulations have created a seemingly immutable link between wine origin and quality.

Although researchers continue to state that consumers rely on the origin of a product to infer its quality (Van Ittersum, Candel & Meulenberg, 2003), there is additional evidence suggesting that corresponding studies focus too narrowly on cognitive processes and neglect to consider the affective side of consumer decision-making, specifically emotions. Reviewing a substantial body of research on origin effects, Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) conclude that the empirical studies almost exclusively examine cognitive processes and neglect to investigate the affective side. Von Alvensleben (2000) goes even further and suggests that the emotions consumers associate with product origins outperform the quality aspects generated through cognitive paths. In support of his position, several studies report that consumers derive emotional (Sheth, Newman & Gross, 1991; Van Ittersum, 1998), environmental (Van Ittersum, Candel & Meulenberg, 2003) and social benefit (Kleine, Kleine & Kernan, 1993) from the origin of a product. In addition, place-based marketing concepts such as fair-traded coffee specifically play on an altruistic dimension, targeting buyers that value fair and mutually sustainable buyer-seller interactions (McDonagh, 2002).

Traditionally, the wine industry views product quality as the key for maintaining or increasing competitiveness. As a result, quality wines nowadays become the rule rather than the exception. Wineries in almost every part of the world achieve objectively high qualities, that is measured e.g. in terms of alcohol content, total dry extract, residual sugar, total acidity, total sulphur dioxide, sterility, etc. Consumers thus find it increasingly easy to switch between wines whose sole message is one of high quality. In light of consumers' inability to perceive differences other than price, producers find themselves exposed to fierce price competition. This is in stark contrast to the finding that a

substantial amount of a wine's mystique or romance - "that capacity to elevate the most common of experiences to a moment of pure pleasure" (Thode & Maskulka, 1998, p.381) - is acquired from a single factor: the land from which the grapes were harvested. Nevertheless, little effort has been made to determine the value that consumers may place on different wine origins with respect to factors other than quality and price for the purpose of further differentiating wines. The choice of corresponding wine origin benefits to communicate would seem to be especially important in situations where consumers may vary widely in the benefits sought, are little or less familiar with brand names, and evaluate origins rather than products. Considering that effective marketing communications must recognize the relationship between a product or a brand and the consumption values or benefits consumers seek (Sheth, Newman & Gross, 1991), the question arises regarding how to conceptualize, measure and exploit consumer perception of wine origins, specifically, the value they may place on dimensions such as emotions, social acceptance, environmental or altruistic aspects.

### **Brand Equity**

Businesses cope with the challenge of seemingly or factually homogeneous products by creating brands (Woodruff, 1997). In his seminal article, Srinivasan (1979) demonstrated that the brand adds a value/ utility/ benefit of its own independently from those of the product. Follow-on studies confirmed that the product as well as the brand name are capable of contributing several types of benefit to the consumer (Keller, 1993; Park & Srinivasan, 1994). The major difference between product and brand is that a product is "something that offers a functional benefit" while a brand is "a name, symbol, design, or mark that enhances the value of a product beyond its functional value" (Farquar, 1989, p.24). Past studies examined the impact of brand equity on product perceptions, brand preferences, and purchase decisions (for reviews see Aaker, 1991; Park & Srinivasan, 1994). Keller (1993, p.2) defines brand equity as "the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of a brand". In his conceptual model, brand associations are one component of brand equity that depicts functional and experiential benefits of consuming the product.

The theoretical and empirical literature on consumer-perceived brand benefits suggests classifying the benefits according to a number of basic dimensions: functional benefit (Sheth, Newman & Gross, 1991; de Chernatony, 1993), price (Zeithaml, 1988;

Dodds, Monroe & Grewal, 1991), social benefit (Sheth, Newman & Gross, 1991; Ambler, 1997; Bhat & Reddy, 1998; Long & Schiffman, 2000), and emotional benefit (Sheth, Newman & Gross, 1991; de Chernatony, 1993; Ambler, 1997; Bhat & Reddy, 1998; Long & Schiffman, 2000).

Building on those studies, Sweeney & Soutar (2001) developed PERVAL, a multiple-item scale for assessing customers' perceptions of brand benefits. They designed their scale to determine what consumption values drive purchase attitude and behavior for consumer goods and included both utilitarian and hedonic components. Four distinct benefit dimensions emerged that were termed emotional, social, quality/performance, and price/ value for money. The authors assessed reliability and validity of the scale and found the measure to be reliable and valid in a pre- as well as in a post-purchase context. In a parallel study, Vazquez, del Rio, and Iglesias (2002) developed a similar measurement instrument for the utilities obtained by consumers from the brand and suggested that while the functional utility (satisfying the needs of the physical environment) basically proceeds from the product, other types of utilities (satisfying the needs of the psychological and social environment) emanate essentially from the brand name. Both groups of researchers emphasized the need to adapt their respective scales in line with the specific characteristics of the product, the usage situation, or the type of consumer. Although a detailed conceptualization for brand equity dimensions for fine wine was introduced by Thode and Maskulka (1998), the authors did not offer an empirical evaluation. Nevertheless, the concept also acknowledges the value of symbolic, price, and functional brand associations.

### **Place/ Region Equity**

The recognition that countries, regions, places, and other geographical entities behave rather like brands is gaining acceptance and the value of branding places is now better understood (Papadopoulos & Heslop, 2002). In their seminal article, Leclerc, Schmitt & Dube (1994) effectively combined brand equity research with research examining origin effects. Across multiple product categories, the authors found effects of English versus French brand names on consumer perceptions, attitudes, and even taste. Follow-on studies confirmed that national and other place images are powerful stereotypes that influence behavior in all types of target markets (Papadopoulos & Heslop, 2002).

Wine marketers, too, are at least beginning to understand just how much equity can be added to their brands through the judicious leveraging of their origin (Walker, 2003). After all, consumers have been found to report significantly different purchase likelihoods for a wine when it was labeled as from California, France and Texas (Areni, 1999). Yet, little is known about what it is that is being branded or marketed.

### **Consumer Lifestyle**

Assuming that dimensions of wine region equity can be identified in terms of consumer desired benefits, the question arises as to how to persuasively communicate tailored messages to consumers. Past research established that consumer lifestyle is valuable for predicting and profiling natural segments of users for a number of products and services (e.g. Pitts & Woodside, 1983; Fournier, Antes & Beaumier, 1992; Aaker, 1999; Batra et al., 2000; Moore & Homer, 2000; Orth et al., 2004). Alcohol researchers in particular tied lifestyle to levels and brands of consumption for beer, wine and spirits (Lesch, Hung Luk, & Leonard, 1991).

A few studies have looked at wine consumers and their behavioral and lifestyle characteristics and generally reported that a behavioral segmentation, i.e. based on consumer lifestyle, supports decisions on product/ brand positioning and target marketing (Dodd & Bigotte, 1997; Bruwer, Li & Reid, 2002; Johnson & Bruwer, 2003). In particular, Bruwer, Li & Reid (2001) provided evidence that wine-related lifestyle segments exist in the Australian market that differ with respect to wine consumption situations, ways of shopping, quality attributes, drinking rituals, and consequences of wine consumption. While Orth et al. (2004) demonstrated that links exist between consumer preferences for craft beer brands and lifestyles no corresponding study could be found relating to wine origins.

In marketing practice, a lifestyle-based communication platform is increasingly common to the advertising of beer, distilled spirits, and is somewhat less common for wine (Grimm, 2002). Creatively, these ads originate in lifestyle portraits and studies (Plummer, 1971, Johnson, Ringham, Jurd, 1991). If it is true that wine consumers actually identify with these portrayals, then consumer lifestyle may be a valuable basis for predicting preferences across wine origins. Considerable practical relevance is added through the fact that insight into the lifestyle of consumers with specific wine origin preferences, in conjunction with knowledge of the benefits they seek in wine, will support

managerial decisions on selecting, combining and designing communications, messages, and media. Not only can appropriate media vehicles be identified reaching consumers who enjoy specific lifestyle activities, additionally, corresponding lifestyle themes may also be included in umbrella brand messages and as executional cues.

Drawing on the literature reviewed above, an empirical study was conducted addressing the following objectives:

1. Determine the relations that may exist between the benefits consumers desire in wine and their preferences for wine origins
2. Identify consumer lifestyle segments and profile them according to the benefits they desire in wine.
3. Determine whether preferences for wine origins differ between consumer lifestyle segments.

## **METHOD**

### **Sample and Study Design**

Data was collected from adult consumers in several states of the United States. The selection of California (N=102), Oregon (N=178), Texas (N=58), and Washington State (N=65) was primarily due to the location of wine marketing researchers and their access to consumer data bases. With a research focus on mechanisms and relationships between constructs rather than descriptive results, no additional criteria were employed in the respondent selection process other than making sure that respondents were actual wine buyers (measured in terms of frequency of wine purchase, purchase quantity, and product class involvement). Consumers were contacted by e-mail and invited to participate. As an incentive, participants were offered a \$5 gift certificate for a variety of restaurants and stores. Upon agreement, consumers registered online and accessed a questionnaire measuring wine origin preferences, benefits sought in wine, lifestyle, demographic, and behavioral variables. A total of 413 questionnaires were obtained, 403 of these were judged complete and retained for subsequent analyses. Table I shows a sample summary.

Table I.  
Sample Characteristics

| Variable        | Unit                 | Min. | Max. | Mean | Median |
|-----------------|----------------------|------|------|------|--------|
| Age             | Years                | 18   | 80   | 36.2 | 33     |
| Gender          | 1 = Female, 2 = Male | 1    | 2    | 1.5  | -      |
| Purchase Volume | Bottles per month    | 1    | 60   | 5.9  | 4      |
| Spending        | \$ per bottle        | 2    | 100  | 12   | 10     |
| Expenditures    | \$ per month         | 5    | 400  | 84   | 40     |
| Involvement*    | 7-point scale**      | 1    | 7    | 4.3  | 4.4    |

\* Involvement = a person's perceived relevance of the product based on inherent needs, values, and interests.

\*\* Measured through the ten-item, 7-point Likert Scale introduced by McQuarrie and Munson (1992) with 1 indicating very low involvement and 7 indicating very high involvement.

### Measures

*Preferences.* Adopting a commonly used perceptual measure (Aaker, 1991), the survey employed a preference ranking of nine selected wine origins. Those were (in alphabetical order) Australia, California, Chile, France, Italy, New Zealand, Oregon, Spain, and Washington (state). The respective origins were selected to cover major production areas in the U.S. and around the world, and to include competitors with the highest share of the market (Beverage Marketing 2002). Table II shows the consumer preferences as indicated by mean ratings and standard deviations. Within the sample, California is the most preferred and New Zealand is the least preferred wine origin.

Table II.  
Wine Origin Preferences (N=403). Source: Survey data.

| Origin     | Mean Rank | Standard Deviation |
|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| California | 3.03      | 1.95               |
| France     | 3.88      | 2.49               |
| Italy      | 4.38      | 2.18               |
| Australia  | 4.67      | 2.51               |



|             |      |      |
|-------------|------|------|
| Oregon      | 4.78 | 2.55 |
| Chile       | 5.75 | 2.32 |
| Spain       | 5.87 | 1.98 |
| Washington  | 6.02 | 2.42 |
| New Zealand | 6.51 | 1.89 |

---

Scale from 1 = most preferred to 9 = least preferred

*Desired benefits.* An extended and adapted version of the PERVAL scale (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001) was employed for measuring wine benefits sought by consumers. Adjustments included the addition of an environmental and an altruistic dimension with the corresponding battery items adapted from past research (Bohlen, Schlegelmilch & Diamantopoulos, 1993; Orth et al., 2004). To accommodate the special nature of wine, a few items were re-phrased. The scale was evaluated through a confirmatory factor analysis (Malhotra et al., 2002). Since the initial model fit statistics indicated that the model could be improved, the loadings (consistency within and across constructs) and correlations were examined to determine which exogenous variables should be dropped (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). In the revised model, twenty-two items loaded on six constructs (Table III). The fit statistics for the revised model were considered satisfactory: Chi-square (238) = 299,  $p < .001$ , GFI = .965. Note that the chi-square is high and the  $p$  statistic low because of the large sample size, making them a poor gauge of overall model fit. Accordingly, the revised model was accepted for subsequent use of the constructs *quality*, *price/ value for money*, *social*, *emotional*, *environmental*, and *altruistic benefit*. Ratings on the items were then averaged to generate mean scores for the six dimensions.

Table III.

## Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for the Desired Benefits Model

| Common factor / Statement: My favorite wine ...        | Standardized path coefficient |
|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>Functional benefit/ Quality</b>                     |                               |
| ... has consistent quality.                            | .698 *                        |
| ... is well crafted                                    | .860 *                        |
| ... has an acceptable standard of quality.             | .895 *                        |
| ... has poor craftsmanship (reversed).                 | .682 *                        |
| <b>Price / Value for money</b>                         |                               |
| ... is reasonably priced.                              | .695 *                        |
| ... offers value for money.                            | .752 *                        |
| ... is a good product for the price.                   | .856 *                        |
| ... is very economical.                                | .806 *                        |
| <b>Social benefit/ Enhancement of self-concept</b>     |                               |
| ... helps me feel acceptable.                          | .794 *                        |
| ... improves the way I am perceived by others.         | .751 *                        |
| ... makes a good impression on other people.           | .695 *                        |
| ... gives its owner social approval.                   | .640 *                        |
| <b>Emotional benefit/ Evoke good feelings</b>          |                               |
| ... makes me want to drink it.                         | .651 *                        |
| ... is one that makes me feel relaxed.                 | .793 *                        |
| ... makes me feel good.                                | .851 *                        |
| ... would give me pleasure.                            | .762 *                        |
| ... evokes thoughts of happiness.                      | .765 *                        |
| ... eliminates all anger.                              | .674 *                        |
| <b>Environmental benefit</b>                           |                               |
| ... is produced in an environmentally friendly manner. | .872 *                        |
| ... is made without polluting the environment.         | .721 *                        |
| <b>Altruistic benefit</b>                              |                               |
| ... is made by dedicated individuals.                  | .875 *                        |
| ... is crafted by very special and unique experts.     | .762 *                        |

\* p &lt; .01

*Lifestyles.* A 23-item lifestyle battery was employed to capture the extent to which consumers enjoyed specific activities. The scale has previously been used by Moore and Homer (2000) and was selected for this study because items corresponded with two dimensions of benefit (emotional and social arousal) pertinent to this study. No other lifestyle item batteries were judged to be more suitable, linking lifestyle activities to the remaining benefit dimensions. Response to twenty-three statements pertaining to the activities people enjoyed was measured using a 7-point Likert-style scale ranging from 1 = enjoy not at all to 7 = enjoy very much.

## RESULTS

### Desired Benefits and Consumer Preferences

To examine possible relationships that may exist between consumer preferences for wine from different regions and the benefits they desire in wine, a hierarchical stepwise multiple regression analysis was used. The coefficients listed in Table IV indicate the strength of the association between consumer preference for wine from a specific origin and benefits sought in wine with the signs (+/-) indicating the direction of the relationship. A number of significant relationships could be identified.

Table IV.  
Desired Benefits and Origin Preferences<sup>(Significance)</sup>

| Origin      | Motivation             |                        |                        |                       |                        |            | R <sup>2</sup> <sub>adj.</sub> | F     | Sign. |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|
|             | Quality                | Price                  | Social                 | Emotion               | Environm.              | Altruistic |                                |       |       |
| California  |                        | -.243 <sup>(000)</sup> | -.318 <sup>(000)</sup> | .214 <sup>(028)</sup> |                        |            | .42                            | 9.37  | .002  |
| France      | -.184 <sup>(000)</sup> | .264 <sup>(023)</sup>  |                        |                       |                        |            | .11                            | 5.19  | .023  |
| Italy       | .393 <sup>(009)</sup>  |                        |                        |                       |                        |            | .21                            | 7.02  | .009  |
| Australia   |                        | -.406 <sup>(002)</sup> |                        |                       |                        |            | .37                            | 10.17 | .002  |
| Oregon      |                        |                        | .456 <sup>(000)</sup>  |                       | -.251 <sup>(012)</sup> |            | .57                            | 12.50 | .000  |
| Chile       |                        |                        |                        |                       | .283 <sup>(013)</sup>  |            | .03                            | 6.32  | .013  |
| Spain       |                        | .206 <sup>(044)</sup>  |                        |                       |                        |            | .08                            | 4.07  | .044  |
| Washington  |                        |                        | .425 <sup>(000)</sup>  |                       |                        |            | .50                            | 15.99 | .000  |
| New Zealand |                        |                        | -.216 <sup>(011)</sup> |                       |                        |            | .19                            | 6.49  | .011  |

Note: Due to the coding of the preference variable (smaller values indicate higher preferences), the “nominal” relationship between brand preferences and

benefits sought is reversed with positive (negative) coefficients indicating a negative (positive) effect.

Overall, the results provide insights into what desired benefits drive consumer preferences for the selected wine origins. For example, a consumer quality orientation is associated with higher preferences for wine from France, while a price focus leads to higher preferences for wines from Australia and California. Other origins are preferred due to a perception as offering social (California, New Zealand) or environmental benefit (Oregon). In some cases, the coefficients express a significant negative relationship between the benefits consumers seek and origin preferences, indicating that e.g. consumers who value the price, social or emotional dimension shy away from wines originating in France, Oregon and California, respectively. No significant relationship could be established for the altruistic dimension. Overall, the results indicate that there are four more benefits which consumers seek beyond quality: value-for-money (price), social, emotional, and environmental benefit.

### **Consumer Lifestyle and Origin Preferences**

To address objectives 2 and 3 and to establish a taxonomy of lifestyle factors, cluster analysis was employed, grouping respondents who exhibited similar lifestyle patterns. Respondents who scored similarly on the extent to which they did or did not enjoy the various activities became part of a single cluster. For that purpose, first the single linkage method was used to identify subjects who exhibited unlikely extreme values that were then discarded. Next, quick cluster analysis divided respondents into segments with low intra-group variance and high between-groups variance. To further validate the cluster solutions, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and univariate analysis (ANOVA) were conducted. While MANOVA examined the overall differences in lifestyle among the clusters across all lifestyle activities, ANOVA determined on which lifestyle activity the clusters differed. After a careful examination of solutions involving any number of clusters between four and fourteen, it was determined that the eight-cluster solution provided the most meaningful distribution of respondents in terms of substantial differences between clusters and practical significance. Table V portrays the results of this procedure, with group means for each of the eight clusters on each of the 23 lifestyle activities. In addition, the table presents results of the validating MANOVA

and ANOVA procedures and the size of the cluster in terms of percent of the sample. Significant statistical differences were further subjected to a conservative multiple comparison test (Scheffe) to identify pairwise differences. The results indicate that numerous pairwise differences are significant, with highest and lowest values highlighted. Additional demographic and behavioral variables were examined (Table VI) for a more detailed characterization of the clusters.

Table V.  
Identification of Lifestyle Clusters

| Lifestyle activity (I enjoy ...) | Cluster           |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   | p   |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|
|                                  | C1                | C2                | C3                | C4                | C5                | C6                | C7                | C8                |     |
| Movies with drama and            | 2.50 <sup>-</sup> | 5.10              | 3.12              | 5.47 <sup>+</sup> | 5.60 <sup>+</sup> | 5.52 <sup>+</sup> | 3.18              | 4.47              | .00 |
| Watching soap operas.            | 4.50 <sup>+</sup> | 1.90              | 1.38 <sup>-</sup> | 4.07              | 1.57              | 3.67              | 1.64              | 1.67              | .00 |
| Exciting movies at the cinema.   | 1.33 <sup>-</sup> | 5.80              | 4.64              | 4.27              | 5.62              | 6.43 <sup>+</sup> | 5.45              | 4.45              | .00 |
| Watching comedies on TV.         | 1.83 <sup>-</sup> | 5.52              | 4.96              | 4.87              | 4.30              | 6.36 <sup>+</sup> | 5.45              | 3.28              | .00 |
| Scary rides at amusement parks.  | 2.67 <sup>-</sup> | 3.48              | 4.32              | 2.80 <sup>-</sup> | 4.30              | 5.81 <sup>+</sup> | 5.47              | 3.21              | .00 |
| Viewing sporting events.         | 2.92 <sup>-</sup> | 4.64              | 4.85              | 4.00              | 3.99              | 5.56              | 5.86 <sup>+</sup> | 2.83 <sup>-</sup> | .00 |
| Listening to news on the radio.  | 2.00 <sup>-</sup> | 3.51              | 3.76              | 5.00              | 5.48 <sup>+</sup> | 4.71              | 5.36 <sup>+</sup> | 4.78              | .00 |
| Watching TV game shows.          | 2.67              | 2.65              | 2.34              | 3.60              | 1.88 <sup>-</sup> | 4.40 <sup>+</sup> | 4.18              | 1.62 <sup>-</sup> | .00 |
| Watching talk shows on TV.       | 2.67              | 2.59              | 2.08 <sup>-</sup> | 3.73              | 2.24              | 4.50 <sup>+</sup> | 4.27 <sup>+</sup> | 2.03 <sup>-</sup> | .00 |
| Singing and dancing.             | 1.83 <sup>-</sup> | 5.03              | 2.54              | 4.07              | 4.74              | 5.69 <sup>+</sup> | 3.55              | 3.93              | .00 |
| Eating at restaurants with       | 2.50 <sup>-</sup> | 6.42 <sup>+</sup> | 5.68              | 5.73              | 6.53 <sup>+</sup> | 6.67 <sup>+</sup> | 5.64              | 6.24              | .00 |
| Partying with friends.           | 2.17 <sup>-</sup> | 6.00              | 5.62              | 3.53              | 5.85              | 6.36 <sup>+</sup> | 5.73              | 5.81              | .00 |
| Entertainment shows with         | 1.67 <sup>-</sup> | 5.16              | 4.12              | 4.07              | 5.12              | 5.86 <sup>+</sup> | 5.27              | 3.16              | .00 |
| Reading quietly and leisurely.   | 2.33 <sup>-</sup> | 5.46              | 3.58              | 5.13              | 6.17 <sup>+</sup> | 5.55              | 4.91              | 5.76              | .00 |
| Bicycle riding / jogging alone.  | 2.33 <sup>-</sup> | 3.75              | 2.93              | 3.40              | 4.13              | 4.44 <sup>+</sup> | 4.27              | 4.25              | .00 |
| Grocery shopping.                | 2.33 <sup>-</sup> | 3.58              | 3.42              | 4.27              | 4.09              | 4.67 <sup>+</sup> | 3.00              | 4.41              | .00 |
| Smelling aroma of freshly baked  | 2.17 <sup>-</sup> | 5.23              | 5.32              | 6.33 <sup>+</sup> | 6.35 <sup>+</sup> | 5.93              | 3.82              | 6.17              | .00 |
| Smelling fragrance of perfumes.  | 2.17 <sup>-</sup> | 4.48              | 3.42              | 4.27              | 3.65              | 5.57 <sup>+</sup> | 2.36 <sup>-</sup> | 5.14              | .00 |
| Going to art galleries.          | 2.67              | 4.16              | 3.18              | 4.67              | 5.22              | 5.00              | 2.36 <sup>-</sup> | 5.48 <sup>+</sup> | .00 |
| Listening to romantic emotional  | 2.67              | 3.81              | 2.38              | 5.27 <sup>+</sup> | 4.63              | 4.98              | 1.91 <sup>-</sup> | 4.33              | .00 |
| Going on a date.                 | 2.00 <sup>-</sup> | 4.61              | 4.68              | 3.80              | 5.97              | 6.31 <sup>+</sup> | 4.36              | 5.59              | .00 |
| Watching horror movies.          | 2.50              | 2.72              | 2.60              | 1.73 <sup>-</sup> | 2.71              | 4.95              | 5.18 <sup>+</sup> | 3.47              | .00 |
| Going to concerts.               | 2.67 <sup>-</sup> | 5.90              | 4.28              | 3.67              | 5.78              | 6.26 <sup>+</sup> | 5.73              | 5.64              | .00 |
|                                  |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   | Multivariate      |                   | .00 |
| Cluster size (%)                 | 2                 | 19                | 14                | 4                 | 30                | 12                | 3                 | 16                |     |

<sup>+</sup> indicates significantly highest score, <sup>-</sup> indicates significantly lowest score with p < .05

For example, Cluster C4 is comprised of individuals who particularly enjoy movies with drama and romance, smelling the aroma of freshly baked bread, and listening to romantic emotional music. Simultaneously, they enjoy certain activities significantly less than respondents in other clusters, particularly scary rides at amusement parks, and watching horror movies. Considering those characteristics along

with the cluster scores for other activities, the lifestyle of individuals in this group appears to gravitate around emotions with a preference for positive feelings and an aversion of thrill. Although cluster C4 only accounts for about four percent of consumers in the sample, it holds appeal to marketers due to respondents' above-average expenditures for wine. Those are caused by comparatively high spending per bottle as well as by high purchase volumes (Table VI).

Table VI.  
Demographic and Behavioral Cluster Profile

| Variable                               | Cluster           |                   |      |                   |                   |                   |                   |              | p    |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|------|
|  | C1                | C2                | C3   | C4                | C5                | C6                | C7                | C8           |      |
| Age (years)                            | 37.0              | 34.7              | 35.3 | 38.6              | 40.4 <sup>+</sup> | 28.8 <sup>-</sup> | 27.7 <sup>-</sup> | 38.1         | .000 |
| Gender (1=female, 2=male)              | 1.67              | 1.43 <sup>-</sup> | 1.74 | 1.47              | 1.41 <sup>-</sup> | 1.40 <sup>-</sup> | 2.00 <sup>+</sup> | 1.50         | .000 |
| Wine purchase behavior                 |                   |                   |      |                   |                   |                   |                   |              |      |
| Expenditures (\$ per month)            | 76                | 54                | 82   | 127 <sup>+</sup>  | 68                | 56                | 39 <sup>-</sup>   | 80           | .001 |
| Spending (\$ per bottle)               | 11.3 <sup>-</sup> | 12.1              | 12.9 | 20.8 <sup>+</sup> | 11.2 <sup>-</sup> | 13.4              | 15.6              | 11.8         | .005 |
| Purchase Volume<br>(bottles per month) | 7.2               | 5.1               | 5.6  | 10.4 <sup>+</sup> | 5.8               | 5.1               | 3.5 <sup>-</sup>  | 6.5          | .092 |
|  |                   |                   |      |                   |                   |                   |                   | Multivariate | .015 |
| Share (%)                              | 2                 | 19                | 14   | 4                 | 30                | 12                | 3                 | 16           |      |

In the next step, MANOVA and ANOVA with Scheffe's test were used to profile the lifestyle segments and to determine whether the consumer groups differed with respect to benefits desired in wine. As can be seen on Table VII, the lifestyle segments differed with respect to the benefits sought overall (MANOVA) as well as with respect to particular benefits (ANOVA). In particular, Cluster 6 exhibited consistently high scores across dimensions while others exhibited distinctively low scores for the quality (C1), price (C7), social (C4, C8), emotional (C7), environmental (C3, C7) or altruistic dimension (C7).

Table VII.  
Benefits Dimensions Profile

| Driver      | Cluster           |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   | p    |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|
|             | C1                | C2                | C3                | C4                | C5                | C6                | C7                | C8                |      |
| Quality     | 4.50 <sup>-</sup> | 5.50 <sup>+</sup> | 5.01              | 5.10              | 5.40 <sup>+</sup> | 5.05              | 4.30 <sup>-</sup> | 5.42 <sup>+</sup> | .000 |
| Price       | 4.88              | 5.49 <sup>+</sup> | 4.87              | 5.13              | 5.35              | 5.46 <sup>+</sup> | 4.57 <sup>-</sup> | 4.97              | .006 |
| Social      | 3.21 <sup>+</sup> | 2.60              | 2.48              | 2.03 <sup>-</sup> | 2.16              | 3.23 <sup>+</sup> | 2.82              | 1.99              | .000 |
| Emotions    | 4.61              | 5.07              | 4.24              | 5.30              | 5.24              | 5.48 <sup>+</sup> | 4.08 <sup>-</sup> | 4.87              | .000 |
| Environment | 3.25              | 3.64              | 3.06 <sup>-</sup> | 3.57              | 3.94 <sup>+</sup> | 4.06 <sup>+</sup> | 3.00 <sup>-</sup> | 3.49              | .008 |
| Altruistic  | 3.67              | 3.96              | 3.49              | 3.84              | 4.21 <sup>+</sup> | 4.33 <sup>+</sup> | 3.30 <sup>-</sup> | 3.65              | .004 |
|             |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   | Multivariate      | .000 |
| Share (%)   | 2                 | 19                | 14                | 4                 | 30                | 12                | 3                 | 16                |      |

### Lifestyle Segments Profiled by Origin Preferences

To address objective 3, consumer lifestyle segments were profiled against the wine origin preferences. Again, MANOVA, ANOVA and Scheffe's test were the analytical tools for determining significant differences. P-values indicate significant (p.05) differences only for the origins California, France, Oregon, and New Zealand (Table VIII). Obviously, the benefit dimensions included in the analysis are not suitable for explaining differences in consumer preferences for wines from the other origins. Two explanations can be offered for this finding: First, relevant wine benefit dimensions have been omitted from the model. This possibility cannot be disregarded. However, the overall significant effects of those dimensions on consumer preferences (Table III) along with the associated relatively high values for explained variance, suggest otherwise. A second explanation is that consumers in the sample perceive differences in wines only for four out of nine regions. This presents marketers in the respective regions with an opportunity to create and communicate favorable benefits to their target markets. For example, the emotional dimension seems to be suitable for a broad array of appealing messages, considering the breadth and depth of human emotions.

Table VIII.  
Origin preferences profile

| Origin      | Cluster           |      |                   |                   |                   |      |                   |                   | p    |
|-------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|------|
|             | C1                | C2   | C3                | C4                | C5                | C6   | C7                | C8                |      |
| California  | 2.00 <sup>+</sup> | 2.62 | 2.40              | 3.67              | 3.30              | 2.60 | 2.64              | 4.22 <sup>-</sup> | .000 |
| France      | 6.67 <sup>-</sup> | 3.87 | 4.32              | 3.93              | 4.07              | 3.50 | 5.27              | 3.05 <sup>+</sup> | .004 |
| Italy       | 4.00              | 4.74 | 4.32              | 4.13              | 4.39              | 4.45 | 3.55              | 4.36              | .790 |
| Australia   | 4.50              | 4.57 | 4.52              | 4.47              | 4.63              | 5.26 | 5.55              | 5.45              | .671 |
| Oregon      | 3.83 <sup>+</sup> | 4.65 | 5.46 <sup>-</sup> | 4.87              | 3.91 <sup>+</sup> | 5.05 | 5.00              | 5.24              | .036 |
| Chile       | 6.83              | 5.83 | 5.40              | 5.27              | 5.82              | 5.95 | 7.00              | 5.45              | .420 |
| Spain       | 6.67              | 6.29 | 5.60              | 5.60              | 6.20              | 5.74 | 4.82              | 5.62              | .196 |
| Washington  | 4.83              | 5.93 | 6.60              | 5.87              | 5.69              | 6.33 | 5.64              | 6.05              | .454 |
| New Zealand | 5.50 <sup>+</sup> | 6.51 | 6.38              | 5.40 <sup>+</sup> | 6.99 <sup>-</sup> | 6.12 | 5.55 <sup>+</sup> | 6.55              | .010 |
|             |                   |      |                   |                   |                   |      |                   | Multivariate      | .085 |
| Share (%)   | 2                 | 19   | 14                | 4                 | 30                | 12   | 3                 | 16                |      |

### Profiling Actionable Consumer Segments

In the final step, consumer lifestyle segments were profiled against the totality of the previously examined variables to support the development of comprehensive marketing communications strategies. Two more segments are briefly characterized to illustrate substantial differences to other clusters and the practical significance of profiling actionable cluster segments.

Lifestyle segment C1 includes two percent of the respondents. Members particularly enjoy watching soap operas; have a strong aversion to social activities such as meeting people, eating with friends at restaurants, or going on a date; and do not enjoy activities that could be considered cultivated (e.g. reading a book, going to concerts, listening to news on the radio). Demographic and behavioral highlights include a relatively high percentage of males and comparatively low spending per bottle. Individuals within this segment do not exhibit a strong quality focus but predominantly seek social benefit in wine. Although this finding seems to contradict the exhibited lifestyle, an explanation may be that while group members seek (or wish for) social interaction, their current lifestyle does not reflect a successful realization. Preferred origins include California, New Zealand, and Oregon while preferences for wine from



France are low. To communicate brand benefits, suitable messages addressed to this segment should emphasize the social benefits of wine from a specific origin, showing the origin to be “hip”, “in” or “fashionable” among wine drinkers within their group. Executional cues in corresponding advertisements, labels, posters, etc. should emphasize wine as an element of social interaction, preferably in a casual setting (at home). TV commercials are the most appropriate communication vehicle for delivering messages.

The second example is segment C8, comprising sixteen percent of respondents. These consumers enjoy lifestyle activities that can be considered cultivated, such as going to art galleries, but do not enjoy sports events or TV game shows. The segment has no outstanding demographic and behavioral characteristics but rather appears to be balanced in its composition with respect to gender, age and wine purchase. Quality is the benefit sought most in wine by consumers in this group, who in addition care little for social acceptance. Accordingly, cluster members exhibit particularly high preferences for wine from France and particularly low preferences for wine from California. Convincing marketing communications messages to address this segment should emphasize the quality dimension, possibly while hinting at the highly individual (in contrast to social) nature of the act of enjoying wine. Similarly, wine consumption should be displayed as an act of sophistication and cultivation. Suitable vehicles will access cluster members, for example at receptions, art gallery openings, and comparable events, which would also be the events to be pictured in advertisements as executional cues.

## **DISCUSSION**

This study examined the relationships between consumer (origin) preferences, benefits desired in wine and lifestyle as key components for developing and controlling regional umbrella brands. A number of significant linkages could be identified supporting managerial decisions on the design of umbrella brands, target segment selection and marketing communications in the wine industry.

Five dimensions were identified as drivers of consumer preferences. Insight into the importance of respective dimensions allows marketers to design place-based umbrella brands by selecting and communicating functional, price, social, emotional and environmental benefits. The knowledge of consumer segments that favor a particular wine origin supports the selection of appropriate target markets and provides a basis for

marketing-controlling activities, that is, monitoring of selected segments on a regular basis. Information on how segments respond to a range of competing origins is essential for positioning insight and activities. It allows researchers to identify wine origins that compete against each other from a consumer perspective and it enables managers to evaluate the competitive position of their region, considering uniqueness and superiority. Knowing the benefits sought by specific segments of the market provides further information on which consumer groups to target with a given umbrella brand design. In addition, it provides managers with the information necessary for successfully tailoring place-based brands to market segments by communicating the particular benefits that consumers within a segment seek. Insight into segment characteristics in terms of lifestyle supports managerial decisions on the selection, combination, and design of communications media. Appropriate media can be identified that reach a particular audience, such as people watching TV, going to the movies, or listening to the radio. Additionally, the lifestyle activities enjoyed by a target audience can be included in the message, appeal and executional cues. For example, when individuals are to be targeted who enjoy going to restaurants, typical consumers should be shown in exactly this situation when wine origin benefits are being communicated through advertisements. Tying all the information together on the relationships between origin preferences, wine benefits sought by consumers and consumer lifestyle provides marketers with a powerful tool for effectively addressing and persuading consumers.

Future research should focus on applying the concept at different scales, for example by comparing equity dimensions for smaller origins such as wine appellations. Another promising avenue could be to examine differences in the relationship between equity dimensions for different wines (e.g. red/ white or by varietal). After all, some grape varieties (e.g. Veltliner, Autrichien) and wine styles (Bordeaux) have received their names from the place where they originated or their name is closely associated with a place (Riesling, Gewürztraminer: Germany) and educated consumers may perceive respective links to be more valuable. The finding that consumer preferences for wine from different origins do not differ significantly with respect to lifestyle raises further questions. If follow-on studies were to confirm this result, future studies should examine possible causes and alternative ways to segment and target markets.

## REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing Brand Equity*. New York, Free Press.
- Aaker, J. L. (1999). The Malleable Self: The Role of Self-Expression in Persuasion. *J. Marketing Research*, 36 (February), 45-57.
- Ambler, T. (1997). How Much of Brand Equity is Explained by Trust? *Management Decision*, 35(4), 283-292.
- Areni, C. S. (1999). An Examination of the Impact of Product Organization and Region Equity on the Comparison and Selection of Wines. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26, 359-364.
- Batra, R., & Holbrook, M. B. (1990). Developing a Typology of Affective Responses to Advertising. *Psychology & Marketing*, 7(1), 11-25.
- Batra, R., Ramaswamy, V., Alden, D. L., Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., & Ramachander, S. (2000). Effects of Brand Local and Nonlocal Origin on Consumer Attitudes in Developing Countries. *J. Consumer Psychology*, 9(2): 83-95.
- Beverage Marketing (2002). *Wine & Spirits in the U.S.* confidential report, Beverages Marketing Corporations of New York, New York, NY, 284 pages.
- Bhat, S., & Reddy, S. K. (1998). Symbolic and Functional Positioning of Brands. *J. Consumer Marketing*, 15(1), 32-43.
- Bohlen, G., Schlegelmilch, B. B., & Diamantopoulos, A. (1993). Measuring Ecological Concern: A Multi-construct Perspective. *J. Marketing Management*, 9, 415-430.
- Bruwer, J., Li, E., & Reid, M. (2001). Wine-related Lifestyle Segmentation of the Australian Domestic Wine Market. *Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry J.*, 16(2), 104-108.
- De Chernatony, L. (1993). Categorizing Brands: Evolutionary Processes Underpinned by two Key Dimensions. *J. Marketing Management*, 9(2), 173-188.
- Dodd, T., & Bigotte, V. (1997). Perceptual Differences Among Visitor Groups to Wineries. *J. Travel Research*, 35(3), 46-51.
- Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of Price, Brand, and Store Information on Buyers' Product Evaluations. *J. Marketing Research*, 28(August), 307-319.
- European Union (1992). *Council Regulation (EEC) No 2081/92 on the Protection of Geographical Indications and Designations of Origin*. Bruxelles, Belgium.

- Farquar, P. H. (1989). Managing Brand Equity. *Marketing Research*, 1(September), 24-33.
- Fournier, S., Antes, D., & Beaumier, G. (1992). Nine Consumption Lifestyles. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 19, 329-337.
- Grimm, M. (2002). Wine Ads: A New Sobriety. *American Demographics*, (February), 42-43.
- Hair, J.F. Jr., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Johansson, J.K., Douglas, S.P., & Nonaka, I. (1985). Assessing the Impact of Country of Origin on Product Evaluations: A New Methodological Perspective. *J. Marketing Research*, 22(November), 388-396.
- Johnson, T., & Bruwer, J. (2003). An Empirical Confirmation of Wine-related Lifestyle Segments in the Australian Wine Market. *International J. Wine Marketing*, 15(1), 5-33.
- Johnson, L. W., Ringham, L., & Jurd, K. (1991). Behavioural Segmentation in the Australian Wine Market Using Conjoint Choice Analysis. *International Marketing Review*, 8(4), 26-31.
- Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity. *J. Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Kirmani, A., & Rao, A. R. (2000). No Pain, No Gain: A Critical Review of the Literature on Signaling Unobservable Product Quality. *J. Marketing*, 64 (April), 66-79.
- Kleine, R.E., Kleine, S. S., & Kernan, J. B. (1993). Mundane Consumption and the Self: A Social Identity Perspective. *J. Consumer Psychology*, 2(3), 209-235.
- Leclerc, F., Schmitt, B. H., & Dube, L. (1994). Foreign Branding and Its Effects on Product Perceptions and Attitudes. *J. Marketing Research*, 31(May), 263-270.
- Lesch, W. C., Siu Hung Luk, & Leonard, T. L. (1991). Lifestyle and Demographic Influences on Females' Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages. *International J. Advertising*, 10, 59-78.
- Long, M. M., & Schiffman, L. G. (2000). Consumption Values and Relationships: Segmenting the Market for Frequency Programs. *J. Consumer Marketing*, 17(3), 214-232.
- Malhotra, N., Hall, J., Shaw, M., & Oppenheim, P. (2002). *Marketing Research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Prentice Hall, Frenchs Forest NSW.

- McDonagh, P. (2002). Communicative Campaigns to Effect Anti-slavery and Fair Trade: the Cases of Rugmark and Cafédirect. *European J. Marketing*, 36(5/6), 642-666.
- McQuarrie, E. F., & Munson, J. M. (1992). A Revised Product Involvement Inventory: Improved Usability and Validity. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 19, 108-115.
- Moore, D. J., & Homer, P. M. (2000). Dimensions of Temperament: Affect Intensity and Consumer Lifestyles. *J. Consumer Psychology*, 9(4), 231-242.
- Okechuku, C. (1994). The Importance of Country of Origin: A Conjoint Analysis of the United States, Canada, Germany, and the Netherlands. *European J. Marketing*, 28, 5-19.
- Orth, U. R., Lopetcharat, K., Shellhammer, T., & McDaniel, M. R. (2004). Promoting Brand Benefits to Consumers: The Role of Psychographic and Lifestyle Factors. *J. Consumer Marketing*, 21(2), 97-108.
- Papadopoulos, N., & Heslop, L. (2002). Country Equity and Country Branding: Problems and Prospects. *J. Product and Brand Management*, 9(4-5), 294-314.
- Park, C. S., & Srinivasan, S. V. (1994). A Survey-based Method for Measuring and Understanding Brand Equity and its Extendibility. *J. Marketing Research*, 31(2), 271-288.
- Peterson, R. A., & Jolibert, A. J. P. (1995). A Meta-Analysis of Country-of-Origin Effects. *J. International Business Studies*, 26(4), 883-900.
- Pitts, R. E., & Woodside, A. G. (1983). Personal Value Influences on Consumer Product Class and Brand Preferences. *J. Social Psychology*, 119, 37-53.
- Plummer, J. T. (1971). Life Style and Advertising: Case Studies. *Proceedings of the American Marketing Association*, 11, 290-295.
- Schaefer, A. (1997). Consumer Knowledge and Country-of-origin Effects. *European J. Marketing*, 31(1), 56-72.
- Sheth, J. N., Newman, B. I., & Gross, B. L. (1991). Why We Buy What We Buy: A Theory of Consumption Values. *J. Business Research*, 22(March), 159-170.
- Srinivasan, S. V. (1979). Network Models for Estimating Brand-specific Effects in Multi-Attribute Marketing Models. *Management Science*, 25(1), 11-21.
- Steenkamp, J.-B. E.M. (1990). Conceptual Model of the Quality Perception Process. *J. Business Research*, 21, 309-333.

- Sweeney, J. C., & Soutar, G. N. (2001). Consumer Perceived Value: The Development of a Multiple Item Scale. *J. Retailing*, 77, 203-220.
- Thienes, M. (1995). Tradition and Progress: Registration of Geographic Denominations of Origin. *British Food Journal*, 96(2), 7-10.
- Thode, S. F., & Maskulka, J.M. (1998). Place-based Marketing Strategies, Brand Equity and Vineyard Valuation. *J. Product & Brand Management*, 7(5), 379-399.
- Van Ittersum, K. (1998). Consumer Ethnocentrism and Regional Involvement as Antecedents of Consumers' Preference for Products from the Own Region. AIR-CAT Workshop *Consumer Attitudes Toward Typical Food*, 5(1), 45-51.
- Van Ittersum, K., Candel, M. J. J. M., & Meulenbergh, M. T. G. (2003). The Influence of the Image of a Product's Region of Origin on Product Evaluation. *J. Business Research*, 56(3), 215-226.
- Vazquez, R., del Rio, A. B., & Iglesias, V. (2002). Consumer-based Brand Equity: Development and Validation of a Measurement Instrument. *J. Marketing Management*, 18, 27-48.
- Verlegh, P. W. J., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (1999). A Review and Meta-analysis of Country-of-Origin Research. *J. Economic Psychology*, 20, 521-546.
- Von Alvensleben, R. (2000). Zur Bedeutung von Emotionen bei der Bildung von Präferenzen für regionale Produkte. *Agrarwirtschaft*, 49, 399-402.
- Walker, L. (2003). The Surge from Brand Australia. *Wines & Vines*, 84(7), 28-30.
- Woodruff, R. B. (1997). Customer Value: The Next Source for Competitive Advantage. *J. Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(2), 139-153.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer Perceptions of Price, Quality and Value: Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence. *J. Marketing*, 52(July), 2-22.