

Winery and wine exhibition visitors' characteristics in the context of wine tourism development

ANITA SILVANA ILAK PERŠURIĆ *, ANA TEŽAK DAMIJANIĆ *, SAFTIĆ DARKO*

Jel Classification: D01, D12

Introduction

The purpose of this paper was to examine winery visitors and wine exhibition visitors in the context of the wine tourism development. The goal of the paper was to determine differences between winery visitors and wine exhibition visitors. The paper consists of five sections: introduction, theoretical background, methodology, results, discussion and conclusion.

The profiles of wine consumers vary a lot depending on their socio-demographic, socio-physical, socio-cultural background creating unique sets of behaviour towards wine as a product. Also wine consumers can be examined through different surroundings like wine cellars, wine fairs, buyers in shops, consumers in restaurants (and other food and drink consumption places), etc.

In order to obtain some socio-demographic profiles of wine tourists and to compare them with our survey we have used literature findings worldwide (see table 1).

The variations of the samples of wine consumers in the literature were evident in each socio-demographic feature; the majority of wine consumers were females, while wine-

Abstract

Wine tourists are a very heterogeneous segment of consumers with diverse socio-demographic, psychographic features and different behaviour towards wine as a product and wine tourism as a selective form of tourism. This paper analyses the influence of socio-demographic features and the behaviour of wine tourists in Croatia. The survey showed that more winery visitors prefer dry wines compared to wine exhibition visitors. In both samples they spend up to € 20 per month, drink mostly dry white wines in 0.75 l bottles. Men and higher educated persons were the majority in both samples. Wine exhibition visitors were a bit younger than winery visitors. Winery visitors spend more money on wine and showed fewer preferences toward dry wines compared to wine exhibition visitors which are more likely to drink wine in places other than home or restaurant. Wine tourism in Istria should hold to existing wine roads and wine quality enhancing the numbers of visitors and volume of sales by implementing new attractive activities and events and by involving cultural, historical and natural resources in the wine destination in Istria.

Key words: wine, tourism, Croatia, quality.

Résumé

Les oenotouristes constituent un segment de consommateurs très hétérogènes qui se distinguent par des caractéristiques socio-démographiques et psychographiques très variées et un comportement différent à l'égard du vin comme produit et de l'oenotourisme comme forme de tourisme sélectif. Dans cet article, nous analysons l'influence des caractéristiques socio-démographiques et le comportement des oenotouristes en Croatie. L'enquête réalisée a montré que les visiteurs des établissements viticoles préfèrent beaucoup plus les vins secs que les visiteurs des salons des vins. En outre, nous avons observé que dans les deux échantillons, les visiteurs dépensent jusqu'à 20 euros par mois et boivent surtout des vins blancs secs en bouteilles de 0.75 L. Les deux échantillons se composent en majorité d'hommes et de personnes avec un haut niveau d'éducation. Les visiteurs des salons des vins sont un peu plus jeunes que les visiteurs des vignobles. Les visiteurs des domaines viticoles dépensent davantage pour le vin et montrent moins de préférence pour les vins secs par rapport aux visiteurs des salons des vins qui, eux, tendent à boire du vin dans des endroits autres que leur maison ou le restaurant. En Istrie, l'oenotourisme devrait tabler sur les routes des vins existantes et la qualité des vins présents et miser sur l'augmentation du nombre de visiteurs et du volume des ventes à travers l'organisation d'activités et d'événements nouveaux, capables d'attirer le public et la valorisation du patrimoine culturel, historique et naturel dans les destinations vitivinicoles.

Mots-clés: vin, tourisme, Croatie, qualité.

ry visitors were in majority males; about the age, the majority were under 35 years of age with exceptions of two wine consumers' samples. Education as a feature was consistent through all samples, as well the occupation (in all samples the majority was employed or self employed).

Theoretical background

In purchase of wine, the aspect of consumers demand depends on the land and continent of origin, the so-called "new" or "old" wine countries (Chrea *et al.*, 2011; Goodman *et al.*, 2007; Lockshin *et al.*, 2009; Veale and Quester, 2008) since different social, historical and cultural surrounding creates behaviours toward wine consumption. Wines have certain attributes, in the literature described as extrinsic and intrinsic attributes, whereas extrinsic qualities are origin, grape variety, packaging, price,

while intrinsic qualities have a value for reputation, expert opinions, tasting ratings, appellation, and sensory values.

Classification of consumers in surveys holds to overall suggestions that price and grape variety have the strongest influence on consumers' choice and purchase, while packaging and labels were of less importance (Mueller Loose and Lockshin, 2008; Veale and Quester, 2008). Consumers tend to reflect the price to the level of quality (and are willing to pay higher price for wines from well known wine regions);

* The Institute of Agriculture and Tourism, K. Hugues 8, Pore, Croatia.

Corresponding author anita@iptpo.hr

Table 1 - Socio-demographic features of wine consumers in surveys.					
Author	Socio-demographic features				
	Age	Gender	Education	Occupation	Country
Yuan <i>et al.</i> 2005	Majority had 21-29 years The older the segment the smaller the percentage	Majority females 2/3	Majority with college and higher education	Majority employed and self employed	Wine Festival visitors Indiana, USA
O'Mahony and Lockshin 2008	The largest segment was 25-34 Majority had 25-54 years	Majority females 56.5%	N/A	N/A	Winery Visitors Australia
Galloway <i>et al.</i> 2008	The largest segment 40-49 years.	Slightly prevail males	Majority full time employed	Majority with college and higher education	Winery Visitors Australia
Faugère <i>et al.</i> 2013	The largest segment 35-55 years.	Majority males	N/A	N/A	5 countries
Kolyesnikova <i>et al.</i> 2007	Average age: 41 years.	Slightly more females	N/A	Majority with college and higher education	Winery Visitors USA
Bruwer and Alant 2009	The largest segment 18-35 years.	Slightly prevail males	N/A	N/A	Winery Visitors South Africa
Ilak Peršurić and Sinožić 2012	The majority were in the thirties	Majority males	Majority with University education	Majority employed and self employed	Wine Festival visitors Croatia
Sparks 2007	About half were 45-64 years Half were up to 44 years of age	Majority males (56.2%)	N/A	Most full time employed (39%)	Wine tourists Australia
Charters and Ali-Knight 2002	N/A	Wine connoisseurs were predominantly male	Wine interested had highest education (TAFE degree)	N/A	Wine tourists Australia
Chrea <i>et al.</i> 2011	Majority under 35 Segment 25-34 was dominant	Majority females (over half sample)	Majority bachelor degree	Majority full time employed Minority retired, students	Wine Consumers Australia
Mueller Loose and Lockshin 2008	Majority ≥ 50 years Three quarters of ≥ 35	More females (52%)	With diploma ≥ 51 %	Majority full time (47.7%) Part time (20.3%)	Wine consumers Australia
Getz and Brown 2006	Major segment 50-59 years (33.8%) Majority 40-69 years (78.7%)	More females (51.6)	Majority with university and higher (69.2%)	Majority full time (45.5%) Self employ. (30.1%)	Wine consumers Canada
Pikkemaat <i>et al.</i> 2009	Slightly prevail males	N/A	N/A	N/A	Destination visitors Italy

therefore, most field research is pointed to the attribute price per bottle (Ampuro and Villa, 2006; Outreville, 2011, Rosel and Beckert, 2012).

Wine tourism as a relatively new phenomenon and a selective type of tourism has gained its wider importance since the last decades of the 20th century. Therefore very few surveys were available about the influence of socio-demographic features on buying behaviours of visitor in wine cellars (see table 1.) and about differences according to sociodemographic features of wine tourists (Gomez *et al.*, 2013; Koch *et al.*, 2013).

Wine consumption in the surrounding of wine cellar or wine exhibitions, fairs or events influences a deeper level on the consumer (Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002; Bruwer and Alant 2009; Alebaki and Iakovidou, 2010). Through wine tasting consumers are creating opinions about a certain wine, wine producer, wine cellar or a wider wine growing area or country and their experience affects their purchase behaviour in the future (Lockshin *et al.*, 2009; Cardebat and Fiquet, 2013).

In definitions of Hall and Maciohis (1998) wine tourism is „visitation to wineries, wine festivals and wine shows for which wine tasting and/or experiencing the attributes of a wine region are the prime motivating factor for visitors“. Motivations for wine tourists involve multiple variables like: wine related, attending wine related events, socializing with friends, meeting the wine maker, learning about wine, tour of wineries, visiting attractions in the surroundings, entertainment (Gill and Sanchez, 1997; Getz and Brown 2006; Galloway *et al.*, 2008).

Our paper presents a survey of Istria which is a known Mediterranean tourist destination where the sun and the sea vacation is still the most dominant travel motive (Krešić and Miličević, 2010). Other travel motives e.g. entertainment,

gastronomy, sports and recreation, natural beauties, shopping, cultural heritage and events are becoming more im-

portant but were still chosen by less than 50% of tourists (Čorak, 2008; Krešić and Miličević, 2010). Tourism in Istria County is a highly seasonal phenomenon because more than 65% of total tourists arrivals are achieved during July and August (Istria Tourist Board, 2013; 2014). Around 30% of total tourist nights in Croatia are achieved in Istria County (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2014) but only about 7% of total tourist nights in Istria County are accounted to Istria's inland and 1% of income from wine tourism (Istria Tourist Board, 2014; 2013).

Since the beginning of the 2000s, the main tourism strategy for Istria County focused on special interest tourism (Master plan of tourism, 2003). Istria County can be mostly considered as rural area with some areas which are characterised as urban areas like agglomeration of Pula (municipalities of Pula, Fažana and Medulin) and the four municipalities i.e. Umag, Rovinj, Labin and Novigrad. The County strategy has set to prioritise the development of agriculture and viticulture while tourism strategies (Master plan) are connecting the coast destination tourist offer with inland rural destinations through selective programs of gastronomy and short stays (holidays).

Wine in the perspective of tourism came within the frame of wine and gastronomy tourism of more importance since the 90s of the 20th Century. Nowadays Istria has seven wine roads established which are presented as a part of local culture and promoted as attractive destination segment with Malvazija Istarska as a white grape variety and autochthonous wine is most represented in wineries and tourist facilities (Ilak Peršurić *et al.*, 2015). The production figures show that wine production is on the rise especially production of quality autochthonous grapes on 3000 hectares (with Malvazija istarska as leading white grape variety (1697 ha and Teran as red variety on 751 ha; Ilak Peršurić and Težak, 2011).

In a study of the wine fair Vinistra in Croatia (in 2010) socio-demographic features of a sample of visitors showed an average visitor in their thirties, highly educated employee, manager or entrepreneur (Ilak Peršurić and Červar, 2012). Over 85 percent of Vinistra visitors attended wine fairs and 75% wine events at least once a year, while 40% visited more times in a year. The survey about wine roads in Istria (Ilak Peršurić and Sinožić, 2012) shows that Croatian respondents have some knowledge about wine regions in the world and recognize the wine region Istria quite good. Considering the attributes of wines while visiting wine cellars more than 80% of Croatian visitors appreciated the autochthonous wines and high quality of the wines.

However, the potential of wine tourism in Istria County has not yet reached its full potential which may result in different economic benefits to wine producers and local population like increase in sales and employment or decrease in the seasonal character of tourism.

Methodology

A study focused on wineries and wine tourists was a part of a project financed by IPA/EFRR "Malvasia TourIstra" in the Operational Programme Slovenia-Croatia 2007-2013. The survey was conducted from April through December 2014. This research includes three target populations: wine producers, wine exhibition and winery visitors.

A study on wine producers was conducted in April 2014. Data was collected through a structured questionnaire which was filled in by researchers. This questionnaire consisted of five sections: wine production, tasting facilities, Malvasia istarska as autochthonous wine, brand development and characteristics of wine producers. A total of 34 wine producers were included in the sample.

Wine exhibition and winery visitors were analysed as one sample in order to determine the differences and similarities between winery visitors' and wine exhibition visitors' characteristics that might have an impact on the development of wine tourism in Istria County. Both groups of respondents answered mostly the same questions. Only those questions i.e. variables that were the same in both cases were merged into one data set. Respondents visited either a winery or the Vinistra wine exhibition.

A study focused on wine exhibition visitors was conducted in May 2014 on visitors visiting Vinistra wine fair in Poreč. The main criteria for selecting the respondents was age (beyond 18 years). In the process of on-site data collection researchers were stationary while respondents were mobile (Veal, 2006), respondents were approached by authors and trained researchers and asked to participate in the survey. The purpose of the survey was explained and it was anonymous. Data was collected through self-completed questionnaire, a convenient sample was used. The questionnaire consisted of 23 questions which were divided into four sections: 1) respondents' preferences about wine consumption and purchase in general, 2) questions related to Istrian Malvasia as a typical Istrian wine, 3) question focused on certain aspects of wine exhibition and 4) respondents' characteristics (age, gender, education level, occupation, net monthly personal income and town/municipality).

A study focused on visitors visiting wineries was conducted by authors from July through December 2014. The main criteria for selecting the respondents was age (above 18 years of age or older). A total of 30 wineries participated in this research, a convenient sample was used. Since winery visitors in Istria are usually individual visitors they were asked by winery owners to participate in this research (with explanations about the purpose of the survey and warranty of anonymity). For the purpose of gathering data a questionnaire was constructed consisting of 28 questions which were divided into four sections: 1) respondents' preferences about wine consumption and purchase in general, 2) questions related to Istrian Malvasia in the context of tourism, 3) question focused on certain aspects of wineries and 4) respondents' characteristics (age, gender, education level,

occupation, net monthly personal income, and country of origin).

Data were processed using statistical methods i.e. univariate, bivariate statistics and multivariate statistics. Univariate statistics was used for general description of the samples; bivariate statistics was used to determine the differences between wine exhibition and winery visitors while multivariate statistics was used for profiling. In order to determine the differences between the two groups regarding their characteristics, chi square test and t-test were used. Those variables that were significant on bivariate level were later included into logistic regression.

Logistic regression was used in order to obtain a profile of winery and wine exhibition visitors and to avoid the problem of overestimation of significance (Dolnicar, 2008). The respondents were *a priori* grouped based on whether they were visitors who visited winery or wine exhibition. Criterion i.e. dependent variable was binary coded (winery visitors/wine exhibition visitors) so the logistic regression was an appropriate tool (Gujarati, 1988; Field, 2005). Independent variables were: socio- demographic characteristics (gender, age and profession), wine type preferences (dry, sweet, sparkling), monthly expenditure for wine, the most common place of consumption, preferred packaging and travelling party (children, partner and colleagues). Due to small number of respondents in certain categories three variables were re-recorded: profession, place of consumption and packaging.

Results

Results presented in this paper are focused on wine offer through wineries and wine demand (visitors of wineries and wine fairs).

Wine producers' characteristics and tasting facilities

Wineries in Istria are small scale comparing to producers in other Eu countries, with on average 10 hectares on which production of Malvasia Istarska is prevailing (every questioned wine producer made this type of wine). About 2/3 of wine producers made Teran (red wine of autochthonous grape variety). Wine producers also offer wines from introduced grape varieties like Cabernet sauvignon (2/3 of producers), Chardonnay (1/2 of producers) and Merlot (1/2 of producers). A total of 20 producers was interested in the development of new wine products so they focused their production on different types of wine e.g. sparkling

wines, sweet wines. Besides wines, most of the wine producers were interested in expanding their production in other product lines that are based on grapes and wine (e.g. brandy, chocolate).

For the development of wine tourism, certain aspects related to tasting facilities are also important. Through this research, it was determined that 25 wine producers had the same type of tasting facility that was part of their wine cellar. Average capacity of tasting facilities was 33 seats but only few wine producers were able to accommodate groups larger than 40 people. Tasting facilities were usually rustically designed in order to evoke antique look of wineries. Number of visitors vary from 100 to a few 1,000 per year and is usually related to the location of individual wineries and the brand accompanying a particular winery.

Wine exhibition and winery visitors' characteristics

For the purpose of this paper, a total of 310 respondents were taken into account. There were slightly more wine exhibition visitors (157 respondents) compared to winery visitors (153 respondents). In general, both groups of visitors were mostly male (63%) with average age of 37 with a higher education level (60%) (Table 2). Visitors were mostly employees (36 %). The statistical significant differences between these two groups were determined in the case of age and profes-

Table 2 - Socio-demographic characteristics of winery and wine exhibition visitors with statistically significant differences (percentage).

Variable	Winery visitors	Wine exhibition visitors	Total	Differences
Gender				χ^2 (df)
Male	30.0	33.0	63.0	0,002 (1)
Female	17.7	19.3	37.0	
Age (M; SD)	40.4; 12.048	34.4; 14.107	37.3; 13.464	t-test
18-24	5.7	16.7	22.4	3.194**
25-34	8.3	16.7	25.0	
35-44	17.2	6.3	23.4	
45-54	9.9	5.7	15.6	
55+	7.3	6.3	13.5	
Education level				χ^2 (df)
High school and less	19.8	19.8	39.6	0.003 (2)
Higher education	30.0	30.4	60.4	
Profession				χ^2 (df)
Self-employed/freelance	15.2	9.3	24.5	14.341 (4) **
Manager	9.8	4.4	14.2	
Employee	15.7	20.6	36.3	
Student	4.9	11.3	16.2	
Other	3.4	5.4	8.8	

Table 3 - Wine type preferences of winery and wine exhibition visitors and the results of the chi square test (percentage).

Type of wine	Winery visitors		Wine exhibition visitors		Total		χ^2 (df)
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Dry	12.9	36.2	27.1	23.8	40.0	60.0	16.009 (1) ***
Semi-dry	36.2	12.8	32.9	18.1	69.1	30.9	2.124 (1)
Semi-sweet	43.8	5.2	44.8	6.2	88.6	11.4	0.112 (1)
Sweet	45.2	3.8	36.2	14.8	81.4	18.6	15.605 (1) ***
Sparkling	36.2	12.9	45.2	5.7	81.4	18.6	7.807 (1) **
Fortified	47.1	1.9	47.6	3.4	94.7	5.3	0.747 (1)

Note: *** α significant at 0.001, ** α significant at 0.01, * α significant at 0.05

Table 4 - Wine spending, place of consumption and interest in wine of winery and wine exhibition visitors and the results of the chi square test (percentage).

Variable	Winery visitors	Wine exhibition visitors	Total	χ^2 (df)
Monthly expenditure for wine				
Up to € 20	13.1	25.1	38.2	18.422 (3)***
€ 21 - € 35	12.1	13.1	25.2	
€ 36 - € 55	17.1	6.5	23.6	
€ 56 +	8.0	5.0	13.0	
The most common place of consumption				
Home	36.0	36.0	72.0	6.279 (2)*
Restaurant	11.2	9.6	20.8	
Other ¹	1.1	6.2	7.3	
Membership in wine club				
Not a member	44.7	44.7	89.4	0.163 (1)
A member	4.8	5.8	10.6	
Subscription to wine magazines				
Not subscribed	42.8	45.2	88.0	0.477 (1)
Subscribed	6.7	5.3	12.0	
Preferred packaging				
Bottles (0.75 l)	43.6	35.4	79.0	10.427 (2) **
Bottles (1 l)	3.1	8.2	11.3	
Others ²	2.6	7.1	9.7	

Note: *** α significant at 0.001, ** α significant at 0.01, * α significant at 0.05; 1 includes hotels, bars, wine bars etc.; 2 includes bag-in-box, wine on tap etc.

sion. Wine exhibition visitors were in general a bit younger (34 years) compared to winery visitors (40 years). In the case of profession, there were more winery visitors that were managers (10%) compared to wine exhibition visitors (4%) than it was expected. There were also more wine exhibition visitors that were students (11%) compared to winery visitors (5%).

In general, both types of visitors mostly preferred dry wines (60%) (Table 3). Semi-dry wines ranked second (31%), while

sweet (19%) and sparkling (19%) ranked third. Statistically significant differences between winery and wine exhibition visitors were determined regarding dry, sweet and sparkling wines. There were more winery visitors (36.2%) that did prefer dry wines compared to wine exhibition visitors (23.8%). Regarding sweet wines, there were more wine exhibition visitors who stated that they like sweet wines (15%) compared to winery visitors (4%) than it was expected. On the other hand, there were fewer wine exhibition visitors that preferred sparkling wines compared to winery visitors than it was expected. The respondents stated that they mostly spend up to € 20 per month (38%) (Table 4). Home (72%) is the place where most of them drink wine. 0.75 l bottles (79%) are the most preferred packaging.

In general, the respondents were usually not members of wine clubs (89%) and were not subscribed to wine magazines (88%). Statistically significant differences were determined in the case of monthly spending for wine, place of consumption and packaging. There were fewer winery visitors (13%) who spend up to € 20 compared to wine exhibition visitors (25%) than it was expected, while there were more winery visitors (17%) who spend between € 36 and € 55 compared to wine exhibition visitors (7%). Regarding the most common place of wine consumption, there were more wine exhibition visitors (6%) who selected some other consumption places which were not home or restaurant compared to winery visitors (1%) than it was expected. There were more winery visitors (44%) that said that they prefer to buy wine in 0.75 l bottles compared to wine exhibition visitors (35%).

On the other hand, there were more wine exhibition visitors (8% and 7%, respectively) who stated that they prefer to buy wine in 1 l bottles or other types of packaging compared to winery visitors (3% and 3%, respectively).

The respondents came to wine exhibition or winery mostly with friends or acquaintances (49%) while their partner (33%) as a travelling party was on the second place (Table 5). Children (11%) were not usual company for the visitors.

Table 5 - Travelling party of winery and wine exhibition visitors and the results of the chi square test.

Travelling party	Winery visitors		Wine exhibition visitors		Total		χ^2 (df)
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Partner	28.6	20.5	38.6	12.3	67.2	32.8	7.243 (1)**
Child/children	39.5	9.5	49.5	1.5	89.0	11.0	14.853 (1)***
Other family members	39.0	10.0	44.8	6.2	83.8	16.2	2.625 (1)
Friends/acquaintances	26.2	22.9	25.2	25.7	51.4	48.6	0.314 (1)
Colleagues	46.7	2.4	41.4	9.5	88.1	11.9	9.581 (1)**

Note: *** α significant at 0.001, ** α significant at 0.01, * α significant at 0.05

Table 6 - Results of logistic regression.

Variables	B	SE	Z values
Age	0.014	0.022	-0.658
Profession			
Self-employed/freelance	-0.593	1.124	-0.527
Manager	-1.735	1.238	-1.401
Employee	0.168	1.063	0.158
Student	1.129	1.261	-0.896
Monthly expenditure for wine			
Up to € 20	-0.543	0.714	0.761
€ 21 - € 35	0.968	0.692	1.398
€ 36 - € 55	0.207	0.764	-0.271
Type of wine			
Dry	-0.876	0.507	-1.728
Sweet	1.748*	0.740	2.362
Sparkling	-1.928*	0.754	-2.556
The most common place of consumption			
Home	1.327	0.980	-1.355
Restaurant	0.662	1.088	-0.609
Preferred packaging			
Bottles (0.75 l)	-1.725*	0.832	-2.073
Bottles (1 l)	1.527	1.150	-1.328
Travelling party			
Partner	-0.408	0.492	-0.829
Child/children	-2.233	1.171	-1.908
Colleagues	3.079**	0.910	3.383
Constant	3.837	1.978	

Note: Cox & Snell R Square = 0.350, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.468, *** α significant at 0.001, ** α significant at 0.01, * α significant at 0.05.

Reference values were: profession = other; monthly expenditure for wine = € 56 +; type of wine = preferred dry, preferred sweet, preferred sparkling; the most common place of consumption = others; preferred packaging = others; travelling party = children, partner, and colleagues.

The statistically significant differences from the aspect of travelling party were determined in the case of being accompanied by partner, children and colleagues. There were fewer wine exhibition visitors (12% and 2%, respectively) who were accompanied by their partner and or children compared to winery visitors (21% and 10%) than it was expected. However, there were more wine exhibition visitors (12%) who came with colleagues compared to winery visitors (2%).

Four predictors were significant in predicting the odds of belonging to a wine exhibition visitors' group (Table 6). The model explained between 35 and 47% of variance. Predictors that were significant in predicting wine exhibition visitors' group were: type of wine (sweet and sparkling), bottles of 0.75 l capacity as a preferred packaging and colleagues as travelling party. Sweet types of wine and colleagues increased the odds of being in a wine exhibition visitor group, while preferences regarding drinking sparkling wines and bottles of 0.75 l capacity decreased the odds of being in a wine exhibition group.

Men were generally more interested in visiting wineries and wine exhibition. The same applies to those of higher education level. However, those visitors attending wine exhibition were a bit younger compared to those visitors who frequent wineries. This is linked to the visitors' profession suggesting that wineries are commonly visited in order to do business compared to wine exhibition.

Wine tourists in general preferred dry wines, while semi-dry wines were preferred by about 1/3 of them. About 20% preferred sweet and sparkling wines suggesting a potential new niche market within wine tourism. However, sweet wines should be more directed towards wine exhibition visitors, while sparkling wines are more of interest to winery visitors. Winery visitors showed fewer preferences toward dry wines compared to wine exhibition visitors which sug-

gests that wine tourists are interested in different wine types.

Winery visitors spend more on wine monthly, spend more on bottled wines (0,75 L) and spend more on wine in restaurants compared to wine exhibition visitors which are more likely to chose other types of packaging.

In most cultures wine is usually not considered good for children and this is supported by the results. However, winery visitors are more likely to bring children with them when frequenting a winery compared to wine exhibition visitors. They are also likely to be accompanied by their partner. This finding suggests that wineries should try to offer different services and entertainment to their visitors especially for those coming with children (and for the future these children are expected to become wine consumers after their parents' behaviour towards wine).

On multivariate level, sweet and sparkling types of wines, bottles of 0.75 l capacity and colleagues as companions were important in differentiating between wine exhibition and winery visitors. Preference for sweet wines and travelling with colleagues were the main decisions of wine exhibition visitors, while preference for sparkling wines and bottles of 0.75 l capacity were the main decisions of winery visitors. These results suggest that sweet and sparkling types of wines, bottles of 0.75 l capacity and colleagues were important in differentiating between wine exhibition and winery visitors and that this effect holds even after other variables significant on bivariate level were taken into account. Travelling with colleagues had the strongest effect in logistic regression suggesting more private reasons in visiting wineries and more business motivated reasons to visiting wine exhibitions.

Discussion

The survey of Istria winery visitors showed some similarities to the survey of Australia (Yuan *et al.* 2005; O'Mahony, Lockshin, 2008) in terms of socio-demographic profiles of visitors. Our research samples showed that most winery visitors were in their thirties. In general terms education was the most consistent characteristic similar in our and all literature findings (see table 1); winery and wine exhibition visitors were mostly highly educated persons. The majority of winery visitors were not a member of wine club or winery mailing list (above 90%) in examined countries what implies a need for other, more appropriate types of advertising.

The value for money or in our sample the wine attribute price per bottle showed most frequent consumption and purchase of wines within the lowest price range beyond 20 Euros (it was similar to findings of other authors, range of 20 Euros, Chrea *et al.*, 2011; 15 Australian dollars in Melo *et al.*, 2010).

Wine as a product was accompanied with social life whereas wine was used to complement food (in a set of environments such as dinners with family, friends, special occasions) similar to findings of Melo *et al.* (2010) who found impacts on the occasions of wine consumption from social life - dinners, outdoor eating, parties, celebrations up to health benefits. Our findings pointed out socializing effects of wine consumption through visits to wineries with partner or/and children, other family members and friends.

Conclusion

In general terms, wine tourism is a part of tourism development of Istria County clearly stated in the County development strategies and plans. Rural spaces are seen as a natural resource for tourism development and a place of gastronomy promoting autochthonous products and local producers. The most important steps toward wine tourism were first the infrastructure establishment during the 90s of the 20th century (wine roads with about two hundred wineries in the distance within 80 kilometres, from north to south Istria; currently seven wine roads are established and four virtual wine roads). In this way small producers can sell directly their product and create cellar door experience for wine tourists.

In second line, the initiative of the tourist board, local government and producers that created the wine producers association Vinistra. The creation of wine fair Vinistra was an attempt to attract a large number of wine consumers and to help producers to present themselves and their products. Several other sports and cultural events (like tennis, running, jazz, film festivals) also include wine and include the promotion of local wine producers.

In the meanwhile the producers' activities were focused on product quality and promotion achieving the top level in terms of quality and offer which was offered and promoted via wine roads and wine fairs.

Finally the promotion of the tourist destination Istria through county and local tourist boards presentation on tourism fairs, promotional tours with foreign journalists, online promotion (through social media) brought positive image so Istria became one of top ten wine destinations (according to the Wine Enthusiast review in 2014).

From our survey it is evident that possibilities for future wine tourism development are within wine production and sales in wineries.

The county and cities tourist boards should continue to promote Istria as a tourism destination which connects coastal and rural offer, pointing out the possibility of short stays for wine tourists. In general for all incoming tourists they should provide information about tourist packages which are available through commercial tourist agencies, and create appropriate offer (accommodation connected to wine thematic ex. rooms decorated with wine pictures, with wine room service), easy accessible to motorized tourists.

The wine fair Vinistra should continue its educational aspect in workshops, food and wine pairing and education about wine. Also the wine fair schedule could be connected with new tourism itineraries (short one/two day/week courses about wine, wine tasting, pairing food and wine, how to store and age wine). The promotional aspects for wine producers should be continued during the wine fair because of direct contact of the producers and consumers. Also it should be more promoted via social media (since few visitors were on the mailing list or wine club members).

Considering the current state of wine roads and its importance for rural areas where the wine roads are located tourist can spend some time and money on these roads and benefit the local population and local economy. Using our survey results,

we can propose some adjustments for further development of wine tourism (achieving larger volume of tourist expenditure and number of arrivals) such as: promotion of local autochthonous varieties of grapes and wines keeping the existing high quality and enhancing within the segment of sparkling wines; creating additional activities for socialization). These new activities imply new places for employments in rural areas and for rural population.

In the rural areas, the gastronomic offer of native and autochthonous products including wine should be improved (creating thematic restaurants, shops, stands that pair wine and food, creation and sales of wine accessories (items connected to wine, glasses, ceramics, textile, food offer, sweets, cookies, candies, chocolate with wine, jam, juice).

Finally it should be remarked that although our survey had some limitations, it had a unique approach of comparative analysis of two types of wine tourists i.e. winery and wine exhibition visitors. Since there were no statistical or official data about the number of wine tourists we have used a sufficient sample for statistic procedures. Since in Istria there is only one nationally and internationally important exhibition it was difficult to obtain a larger survey sample.

References

- Alebaki M. and Iakovidou O., 2010. Segmenting the Greek wine tourism market using a motivational approach. *New Medit*, 9(4): 31-40.
- Ampuro O. and Villa N., 2006. Consumers perception of product packaging. *Journal of consumers market*, 23: 100-112.
- Bruwer J. and Alant K. 2009. The hedonic nature of wine tourism consumption: an experiential view. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 21(3): 235-257.
- Charters S. and Ali-Knight J., 2002. Who is the wine tourist? *Tourism Management*, 23:311-319.
- Cardebat J.M., Fiquet J.M., 2013. Expert opinions and Bordeaux wine prices: an attempt to correct the bias of subjective judgments. *AAWE Working Paper*, 129.
- Chrea C., de L., Evans G., Forde C., Delahunty C. and Cox D.N., 2011. An investigation using three approaches to understand the influences of extrinsic product cues on consumer behaviour: An example of Australian wines. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, 23: 13-24.
- Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2014. *Tourism 2013*. Available at: www.dzs.hr
- Čorak S. et al., 2008. *Tomas Summer 2007*.
- Dolnicar S., 2008. Market segmentation in tourism. In: Woodside A.G. and Martin D. (eds). *Tourism management: analysis, behaviour and strategy*. Cambridge: CAB International, 129-150.
- Faugère C., Bouzdine-Chameeva T., Durrieu F. and Pesme J.O., 2013. The impact of tourism strategies and regional factors on wine tourism performance: Bordeaux vs. Mendoza, Mainz, Florence, Porto and Cape Town. In: *Proceedings of the 7th International Academy of Wine Business Research conference, Canada*, 1-13.
- Field A., 2005. *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publication.
- Galloway G., Mitchell R., Getz D., Crouch G. and Ong, B. 2008. Sensation seeking and the prediction of attitudes and behaviours of wine tourists, *Tourism Management*, 29(5): 950-966.
- Getz D. and Brown G., 2006. Critical success factors for wine tourism regions: a demand analysis. *Tourism Management*, 27: 146-158.
- Gill J.M. and Sanchez M., 1997. Consumer preferences for wine attributes: A conjoint approach. *British Food Journal*, 99: 3-11.
- Goodman S., Lockshin L., Cohen E., 2007. Influences of consumers choice – comparing international markets. *AAWE Working Paper*; 86.
- Gomez M., Mollivia A. and Esteban A., 2013. What are the main factors attracting visitors to wineries? A PLS multi group comparison. *Quality and Quantity*, 47: 2637-2657.
- Gujarati D.N., 1988. *Basic econometrics*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hall C.M. and Macionis N., 1998. Wine tourism in Australia and New Zealand. In: Butler R., Hall C.M. and Jenkins J. (eds). *Tourism and recreation in rural areas*. Chichester: Wiley & Sons, 197-224.
- Hertzberg H. and Malorgio G., 2008. Wine demand in Italy: an analysis of consumer preferences. *New Medit*, 7(4): 40-46.
- Ilak Peršurić A.S. and Červar A., 2012. Visitors opinions about the wine fair “Vinistra”. In: Pospisil, M. (ed.). *Proceedings 47th Croatian and 7th International Symposium on Agriculture, Opatija, Croatia, 13-17 February 2012*, 175-178.
- Ilak Peršurić A.S., Sinožić R., 2012. Consumer opinions about wine cellars and wine routes *Proceedings 47th Croatian and 7th International Symposium of Agriculture, Opatija, Croatia, 13-17 February 2012*, 183-188.
- Ilak Peršurić A.S. and Težak A., 2011. Wine production on Istria family farms. *Acta agriculturae Slovenica*, 97(1): 25-31.
- Istria Tourist Board, 2013, 2014. Statistics, <http://www.istra.hr/hr/pr/statistika>
- Krešić D. and Miličević K., 2010. Information as competitive advantage in tourism. *Tourism BiH*, 2(2): 98-117.
- Koch J., Martin A. and Nash R., 2013. Overview of perceptions of German wine tourism from the winery perspective. *International Journal of wine Business Research*, 25(1): 50-74.
- Kolyesnikova N., Dodd T.H. and Laverie D.A., 2007. Gratuity purchasing at wineries: An investigation of the determining factors. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 19(4): 239–256.
- Lockshin L., Cohen E. and Goodman S., 2009. Overcoming measurement errors: Segmenting wine consumers across 11 countries. *Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal*, 24: 46-51.
- Master Plan of tourism, 2003. Available at: <http://www.istra-istra.hr/masterplan>
- Melo L., Colin J., Delahunty C., Forde C. and Cox D.N., 2010. Lifetime wine drinking, changing attitudes and associations with current wine consumption: A pilot study indicating how experience may drive current behaviour. *Food quality and Preference*, 21: 784-790.
- Mueller Loose S. and Lockshin L., 2008. *How important is wine packaging for consumers? On reliability of measuring attribute importance with direct verbal versus indirect visual methods*. Available at: <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/267421053>
- O'Mahoney B. and Lockshin L., 2008. *Wine tourism and subsequent behaviour*. CRC Sustainable Tourism. Available at <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/241521630>
- Outreville F. J., 2011. Does the bottle size matter? An investigation into differences between posted and market price. *AAWE Working Paper*, 86.
- Pikkemaat B., Peters M., Boksberger P. and Secco M., 2009. The staging of experiences in wine tourism. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18(2-3): 237-253.
- Rössel J. and Beckert J., 2012. Quality classification in competition: Price formation in the German Wine market. *AAWE Working Paper*, 114.
- Sparks B., 2007. Planning a wine tourism vacation? Factors that help to predict tourist behavioural intentions. *Tourism management*, 28: 1180-1192.
- Veal A. J., 2006. *Research methods for leisure and tourism. A Practical Guide*. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Veale R. and Quester P., 2008. Consumer sensory evaluations of wine quality: The respective influence of price and country origin. *Journal of Wine Economics*, 9(1):10-29.
- Yuan J., Liping C.A., Morrison M.A., Linton S., 2005. Segmenting wine festival attendees: A factor – cluster approach. *Tourism Review International*, 8: 297-309.