GOOGLE+: ARE WINERIES WILLING TO ADOPT?

Presented to the

Faculty of the Agribusiness Department

California Polytechnic State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Science

By

Michelle Witherwax

February 2012

APPROVAL PAGE

TITLE: GOOGLE+: ARE WINERIES WILLING TO ADOPT?

AUTHOR: Michelle Witherwax

DATE SUBMITTED: February 2012

Senior Project Advisor

Signature

ABSTRACT

This study was performed in order to assess wineries' willingness to adopt the social media platform Google+ as a way to market to consumers. More specifically, the study examined current social media use along with different types of brand personality to determine if these factors had an influence on a winery's willingness to adopt this platform.

A survey was given to 50 wineries located in San Luis Obispo County, and this survey data was taken and analyzed using statistical tests. Frequency tests were used in order to determine which responses were most frequently answered and to determine the percentage each response made up of each survey question. ANOVA and chi-squared tests were performed to determine if differences between the relationships between each variable and interest level in Google+ were statistically significant.

It was discovered that typical wineries expressing a higher level of interest in Google+ currently used Facebook and social media on a more frequent basis. These wineries were also most often categorized as the "excitement" dimension. Because these wineries are perceived this way and already have experience marketing using social media, it is recommended that the winery creates a Google+ page and uses other social media resources to promote this page. Another important step is to make promotions available only to customers who include the winery in their Google+ circle, giving an incentive to add the winery to their circles and visit the Google+ page.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 **6**

INTRODUCTION **7**

PROBLEM STATEMENT 8

HYPOTHESIS 8

OBJECTIVES 8

JUSTIFICATION 9

CHAPTER 2 **10**

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE **10**

WINE CONSUMPTION IN CALIFORNIA AND INTERNET USE TO DISCOVER/PURCHASE WINE 10

SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS, BRAND PERSONALITY, AND WINERIES' SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING 12

GOOGLE ADVERTISING AND GOOGLE+ USAGE 15

CONSUMER SURVEY 20

CHAPTER 3 **22**

THE METHODOLOGY **22**

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION 22

PROCEDURES FOR DATA ANALYSIS 25

ASSUMPTIONS 26

LIMITATIONS 26

CHAPTER 4 **27**

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY **27**

DATA COLLECTION PROBLEMS 27

ANALYSIS 28

CHAPTER 5 **44**

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS **44**

SUMMARY 44

CONCLUSION 44

RECOMMENDATIONS 45

WORKS CITED **47**

APPENDIX **52**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Frequency of Social Media Use by Wineries in Terms of Interest in Google+ 30

Table 2: Wineries Using/Not Using Facebook in Terms of Interest in Google+ 31

Table 3: Frequency of Facebook Use by Wineries Who Have an Account in Terms of Interest in Google+ 32

Table 4: Amount of Business Attributed to Social Media Use in Terms of Interest in Google+ 33

Table 5: Wineries Using Gmail/Google Accounts to Communicate with Consumers in Terms of Interest in Google+ 34

Table 6: Frequency of Gmail/Google Usage by Wineries Who Have an Account in Terms of Interest in Google+ 34

Table 7: Wineries' Level of Familiarity with Google+ in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 35

Table 8: Brand Personality Descriptors in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 36

Table 9: ANOVA Test with Means for Each Personality Dimension in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 37

Table 10: ANOVA Results of Brand Personality Dimensions in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 38

Table 11: Mean Comparisons Between Each Brand Personality Dimension in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 39

Table 12: Winery Size (cases/year) in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 39

Table 13: Length of Time Winery Has Been Open in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 40

Table 14: Vineyard Acres Owned by Winery in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 41

Table 15: Destination of Wine Purchased from Winery in Terms of Interest in Google+ 42

Table 16: City in Which Winery is Located in Terms of Interest Level in Google+ 42

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Social media has become an increasing focus and area of experimentation for companies of all industries. Consumers are also looking to the Internet more to shop; Internet sales have increased by 67% in 2006 alone (Thach 2009). More specifically, over three-quarters millennial generation specifically – the people who will soon be prominent in the workplace as they replace the retiring baby boomers – are using Facebook on a daily basis (Judd 2010). Two-thirds of Internet users use social networks or blogs, a fact that could be promising for wineries. Using this approach could reach a young market interested in trying new products – especially since wine is becoming a beverage purchased more often by this younger market (Carpenter, et. al. 2005). Specific uses of social networks need to be analyzed and researched in order to determine what wineries are currently using social media, and what specific factors influence wineries' interest in expanding (or beginning) their social media marketing.

Google+ is a recently developed social network that has been created by the well-known Google Company. Recently emerged from the beta stage, Google+ already has over 40 million users and continues to grow (Edwards 2011). Advertising on Google itself has been successful for many companies, so it will be relevant to many businesses to further explore marketing opportunities in addition to the social networks the business already uses. Not much research has been done regarding the Google+ network, so further analysis regarding how many wineries use social media in general and how this use could translate to willingness to expand to Google+. Google+ could provide another

low cost marketing opportunity for wineries and become a vital tool for wineries to directly communicate and receive feedback from consumers.

Problem Statement

Does using social media to connect with wine consumers appeal to wineries? Are wineries that perceive themselves in certain ways more willing to adopt marketing on a new social media platform? Are these wineries interested in promoting, advertising, and interacting with consumers on the social media platform Google+?

Hypothesis

Both wineries that currently use social media on a regular basis and those who perceive themselves in a more exciting way (e.g. daring and innovative) will be more willing to adopt the newly developed social media platform Google+.

Objectives

1. Determine the appeal to wineries of marketing via Facebook.
2. Discover if wineries have interest in using Google+ as an approach to interact with and advertise to consumers.
3. Determine if brand personality perception has an effect on the willingness of wineries to adopt marketing via a new social media platform.
4. Compare current Facebook marketing by wineries to their interest in using Google+ for marketing opportunities.

Justification

This study is significant because Google+ is a newer social media platform that could provide new marketing options to wineries. Many marketing opportunities have yet to be explored using Google+, and could provide wineries with a previously untapped way to reach specific markets. Social media has been a vastly growing marketing frontier with many opportunities, and Google+ is a network that has not yet been fully researched. This research will determine if marketing through this social media platform could be a viable option. The success of Google+ has yet to be determined, so research regarding opportunities and marketing effectiveness of the platform could be valuable information. In addition, brand personality greatly contributes to how a company markets and advertises, so it is useful to determine if how a winery views itself factors in to willingness to adopt new forms of marketing.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature will explore topics ranging from Internet use and wine consumption to Google AdWords and Google+ usage. An overview of wine consumption in California will be discussed along with the use of the Internet in California with regard to purchasing wine. Use of social media networks will be discussed with a main focus on Facebook, along with advertising successes and failures of Facebook. Current Google advertising and Google+ usage will be reviewed, and opportunities to advertise with Google+ will be identified. Studies will also be discussed regarding the use of surveys, which is the tool to be used in this study.

Wine Consumption in California and Internet Use to Discover/Purchase Wine

United States wine consumption has been steadily growing, and California has long been important to the country's wine industry. In general, U.S. wine consumption has been consistently increasing, "[surpassing] France as the world's largest wine consumer" (Wine Institute 2011). However, in 2008, research found that in "France and Italy… adults [drank] six to seven times as much wine" as Americans (Goodhue, et. al., 2008), and on a per capita basis these countries still surpass the United States. In addition, the U.S. has experienced 17 consecutive years of growth in wine consumption (Wine Institute 2011). Considering that California accounts for about 90% of the nation's wine production (Goodhue, et. al. 2008 ; Carpenter, et. al. 2005), consumers in California have

naturally been a focus for wineries. In 2011, 90% of wine exported from the United States was from California (Wine Institute 2011). California has a huge impact on the wine industry in the United States. An important fact to note is that a growing issue with the wine industry in the state is that "the top three wineries, [E&J Gallo, Constellation, and The Wine Group], now account for 60% of California wine shipments," and even though more new labels are appearing each year, the market continues to be dominated by these three (Goodhue, et.al. 2008). Small wineries are appearing everywhere in California, and the large amount of control exercised by these large labels makes it difficult for these smaller businesses to fully establish themselves in the wine market. San Luis Obispo County, in particular, has experienced a large increase of wineries in the past 10 years; one decade ago there were only 51 wineries in the county – a number that has more than quadrupled to 217 (Global Wine Partners 2007). The increase in wine consumption in both California and the United States provides plenty of opportunity for wineries to expand their marketing and advertising tactics.

The Internet has served as an important tool not only for consumers to communicate with wineries, but also to keep up with new events and promotions occurring at wineries they may have heard of or visited previously. The Internet has also made it easier for customers to purchase wine without having to physically go to the winery. In 2001, it was reported that "80% of [those surveyed in California] had a website e-commerce engine with online ordering and payment options" (Thach 2009). It was also discovered that "online wine sales increased by 67% [during] 2007" (Thach 2009). Consumers increasingly look to the Internet for a quick and simple purchase, and wineries clearly have been taking advantage of that. However, the Internet as a business

tool is not foolproof. Issues regarding privacy, misinformation, and copyright infringement have become prevalent as online transactions continue to increase. With regards to consumer concerns, the main issue is confidentiality. For businesses, viruses can easily enter an unprotected system in order to destroy and corrupt files vital to business transactions and activities (Bond 1996). The Internet is an excellent tool for expanding consumer reach and advertising, but it is important to remember possible risks and downfalls of online transactions.

Social Media Platforms, Brand Personality, and Wineries' Social Media Marketing

Social media has opened up a new arena in terms of advertising. Using the Internet to market, there is no need to follow "conventions of 30-second spots nor be subjected to censors" (O'Barr, et. al. 2009). Companies can now advertise and market to consumers anywhere from emails to social media brand pages and experience more creative freedom than previously. However, it is more difficult to capture the attention of the consumer due to the ability to easily close or ignore an ad without giving it much thought. Creative and attention grabbing advertisement and marketing techniques are necessary to spark enough interest in a product for a consumer's curiosity to be sparked enough to follow a link (O'Barr, et. al. 2009).

Another important variable to consider is the tendency of the consumer to associate brands with certain personality traits. Many consumers gravitate towards brands that they see themselves in (Aaker 1997), which is especially important for wineries that are trying to reach new target markets. Personality traits can become associated with brands from the actions of employees to the label to its endorsers (Aaker

1997). In addition, the way a company views itself also has a great deal to do with how the consumers view the company. The five dimensions of brand personality are sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness (Aaker 1997). A winery that associates itself more with the excitement dimension (seeing themselves as daring or imaginative) could possibly be more likely to try new techniques and venture away from the typical winery marketing and advertising activities.

Social media use continues to grow. In 2010, "over eighty-five percent of Internet users a month [engaged] in searches, while two-thirds [used] social networks or blogs." Among the latter group, time spent with "member communities has increased sixty-three percent" (Webster 2010). However, continued use of social media has caused what Webster (2010) terms "audience polarization, [which] describes the tendency of users to concentrate their patterns of consumption around a relatively homogeneous assortment of media products or outlets at the expense of exposure to more diverse offerings." Essentially, users of social media tend to remain using the platforms they have already experienced or ones similar to them. Also, users of these different platforms tend to be similar within their respective platforms in terms of demographics and consumption habits, so it would create obstacles for reaching markets other than those typical of a certain media outlet (Webster 2010). Facebook, being one of the most widely used social media platforms, is a network that needs to be further analyzed. Wineries have begun employing the use of Facebook "fanpages" in order to communicate with consumers more.

Facebook use in general has experienced huge growth in the last few years – especially in people in their early 20's to 30's. A large majority of students use Facebook

on a daily basis (Judd 2010). In terms of both social and professional use, communicating via Facebook has risen from 3% in 2005 to 38% in 2009. Facebook has been slowly replacing email in terms of communication – email use as a first priority tool to communicate has declined from 68% to 38%, dropping it down to equal use with Facebook (Judd 2010). In terms of advertising, Facebook is definitely taking advantage of its huge amount of users and worldwide reach. One option for companies to market to consumers is completely free. A company can create a group or fanpage, which allows them to directly communicate with consumers. One option that wineries have been using is offering special promotions solely to their "fans" on Facebook (those who have "liked" the page and thus subscribed to updates from the winery). Some popular examples are two-for-one tastings or special reserve tastings only available to winery Facebook fans (Loceff 2011).

In addition to fanpages, Facebook's targeted advertisements are appealing to companies, since this provides direct access to their target market that was previously much more difficult to reach. For example, if a user expresses interest in wine on their profile, a winery's advertisement could automatically be placed on their homepage. Facebook's information page, titled "Facebook Adverts," is a very simple, to-the-point site where it lists what the social network believes to be the most important benefits regarding companies' advertisements on the site. Companies also have the option to set a daily budget, so when their ad has been clicked a certain amount of times it is no longer available. This allows companies to keep to their advertising budget with much more ease. Facebook essentially takes a lot of risk out of Internet advertising and makes it much simpler for companies to reach their target market with minimal effort (Facebook

Adverts). However, potential risks have obviously been omitted from this information page, leaving companies in the dark regarding issues that have arisen from this style of advertising.

One downfall of Facebook's target market approach is distrust it could create (and previously has created) with consumers. In the past, Facebook implemented a program that informed users' friends of their recent purchases (i.e. a post in the News Feed stating "John Doe just purchased two tickets on Travelocity"). Users felt this was violating their privacy and made them uncomfortable, and created a stream of complaints. A petition was signed against the feature and it was removed, but this left many Facebook users wary of ads on Facebook (Stone, et. al. 2007). Faux pas such as this can (and have) lead to consumer distrust of social networks tracking online activity and sharing information with companies and other users.

Twitter has also been used to write "short, concise wine reviews by users" due to the 140-character limit (Thach 2009). Other examples of Internet use by wine consumers are two popular wine groups that consumers participate in using the Internet: "Open Wine Consortium" and "Dead Reds Wine Group." These are forums where consumers can discuss wine and wineries, and are excellent options for wineries to gauge consumer opinions regarding their wines. These free, interactive uses of social media are not the only marketing option available for businesses.

Google Advertising and Google+ Usage

Google is often a heavily used tool in any computer-owning household. Whether it is used as a search engine, email account, or news source, Google usually has

something for everyone. In August of 2009, Google was reported as the most visited website on the Internet (Lee 2011). Google alone received a quarter of funds that companies spent on online advertising (Lee 2011). The advertising program used by Google is AdWords, which uses the searches that users conduct to display relevant ads to the searchers. Google also partners with third party websites to display ads on these third party sites (such as the *New York Times*), and in turn the websites receive payment from Google (Lee 2011). Companies gain these ad placements by bidding for "keywords" – terms and phrases input by users into the Google search box. Users are searching for websites, not ads, so it is essentially a guessing game as to what users will search for that will be relevant to what a company is advertising. Relevancy of ads is of great importance to Google, so keywords purchased by a company are closely monitored to ensure that a company is not simply buying every keyword just to place their advertisement in as many searches as possible, making it easier for smaller businesses to hold their own against huge companies. Thus, a small winery has equal footing as a larger winery, so if "Cabernet Sauvignon" was searched, each would come up relatively high on the list of search results. Google also attempts to even the playing field for small businesses by placing a maximum bid on keywords of $100 (Lee 2011). Google is similar to Facebook in that they both offer unified sign-in services – meaning a user has a single sign-in username and password for multiple websites that allow a connection with either site (Raab 2011). The unified sign-in makes it simpler to access multiple sites without creating a whole new profile – something that could be useful for winery websites and could allow wineries to gain access to users without creating a hassle for visitors to their website. Since many wineries have begun employing Facebook for marketing purposes

(Loceff 2011), the unified sign-in feature will simplify registering for updated from the winery via other websites. This feature is also a simplification that Google expects to work in its advantage to attract users to Google+.

Google+ is the recently developed social media platform made by Google with the idea of combining the functions of Facebook and Twitter. The main concept is separating the people in a user's network into "Circles." Each circle contains different people, and for each post the user can select which circles see which post. Circles can be separated in terms of where people are located, allowing wineries to offer certain tasting deals to those who reside nearby and special shipping deals to customers who live farther away. This allows a user to separate who sees certain posts, giving a more simple way of exercising privacy than Twitter and Facebook, whose initial privacy settings do not work this way. Further adjustments of privacy settings allow for sharing with certain "lists" on Facebook, and on Twitter you can make your "tweets" private from those the user does not approve, but changing the sharing settings on both Facebook and Twitter is a more involved process than that of Google+ (Goldfarb 2011). Facebook fanpages also do not have the option to share certain posts with certain fans, rather allowing all fans to see each one.

Google+ has only recently opened membership to the public. Prior to the end of last year, the new social media platform was in beta stage – meaning that users needed to receive an invitation before being able to begin using the platform. Despite this recent opening to the public, they already have over 62 million users (Allen 2011). As expected, Facebook still trumps that with approximately 800 million users, but it is important to note that Google+ has only recently been fully released (Chapman 2011). However,

Facebook has a fairly firm grip as the most used social media network with the highest user count, and this could cause reluctance among users to begin a new social media profile. Facebook is relying on this. The network made a public statement saying they feel no threat from Google+, believing it is too well established and has too many users for Google+ to take any serious amount traffic away from the site (Chapman 2011). Wineries also are just beginning to feel comfortable using Facebook frequently, and many have yet to delve into Twitter (Loceff 2011). The prior slow uptake of social media platforms by wineries may not bode well for wine marketing on Google+. In terms of popularity and current usage, Facebook still has the upper hand, but in the near future the tides may begin to turn.

In terms of advertising, Google+ may already have an advantage over Facebook. Google and Apple have reached an agreement regarding advertising on mobile devices while continuing to prevent Facebook from this privilege. Facebook has yet to come to terms with Apple regarding advertisements on the Facebook mobile app, but the mobile Google+ app is allowed advertisements (Edwards 2011). This could generate interest in companies who want to delve in to the mobile advertising market – especially if Google+ continues to experience the growth it has thus far. Google also has high hopes that the integration of the social network with other Google features such as Gmail, Google Docs, and the highly used search engine will increase interest in the platform, making it easy for users to create a profile without needing to start from scratch (McCracken 2011). It is also important to note that Google still defines the network as a "project" and they are constantly looking for ways to improve user experience. The company hopes to respond to feedback from users until it believes it has improved enough to satisfy the general

public (McCracken 2011). Wineries who do not currently advertise using the Internet could benefit from this, using Google+ as a platform of social interaction online while providing feedback to developers in order to tailor the network to their needs (or at least attempt to). Businesses have already taken an interest in Google+ and possible advertising opportunities.

Literature has already been written advising businesses on how to use Google+ to their advantage. Sam Goldfarb has already written a book instructing businesses how to most effectively advertise using Google+. Entitled *The Google+ Book: How to Use Google+ For Yourself and Your Business*, the book first thoroughly describes how to use Google+ as just an individual, and then goes on to explain how to use it for your business. Following the creation of the page, the user may begin networking and advertising to these circles. The number of brand pages in general on Google+ has "risen sharply from fewer than 500,000 to more than 3.5 million" (Wasserman 2012). Many brand pages are posting three to four times in a week, and as of recently 13 brand pages have more than 100,000 "circlers" (Wasserman 2012). Similar to Facebook fans, circlers are those who have subscribed to updates by the page owner. Having a Google+ account will also increase chances of the brand's page showing up in related searches without having to bid for keywords (Goldfarb 2011). It is important to remember that although use of social media has been rapidly growing, research has revealed that current social media users are unlikely to branch out from the platforms they are already accustomed to (Webster 2010), and personalized advertising is not completely trusted by consumers (Stone, et. al. 2007). It is also essential for businesses to take into account the vulnerability that occurs with putting all vital information online, and to take the necessary precautions if online

advertising is the route the company wishes to take (Bond 1996). Instructional books such as these often will not include such precautions or warnings.

Consumer Survey

Surveys are a useful tool to research a select population by issuing questionnaires in order to make more accurate assumptions about an entire population. Mostly, surveys provide information about selected demographics in the population; questions can regard either demographic or category behavior. Surveys vary from "a written document that is completed by the person being surveyed, an online questionnaire, a face-to-face interview, or a telephone interview" (Barribeau 2005). According to Barribeau (2005), there are many different paths to consider when collecting information using surveys. A benefit of oral surveys is providing the opportunity to clarify when respondents experience trouble understanding the survey. However, oral surveys tend to be more costly and respondents can interpret that the surveyor desires one answer over another. Benefits of online questionnaires are their low cost, the ability to send questions to the populations quickly, and that "response rates on private networks are higher with electronic surveys than with paper surveys or interviews" (Barribeau 2005).

There are many different methods of sampling to choose from. Barribeau (2005) explains that there are options including stratified sampling, simple random, cluster sampling, and systematic sampling. An important aspect to consider when choosing a sampling method is the population of the area. A fixed size "indicates that the target sample size has been specified by the user. Simple random sample indicates that we want uniform inclusion probabilities for each record" (Olken 1995). A benefit of simple

random sampling is being able to maintain a random selection of people while allowing each person to participate. More responses allow for the surveyor to gain a more complete picture about the population so it is important to strive for a high response rate, but it is also important to try and eliminate as much bias as possible in order to get the most accurate results.

When using a survey to collect information, the survey can either be created from scratch, or it can be re-used to survey a similar population to test for any possible changes. A survey question should never be open-ended; each one should be direct with options listed for evaluation. Barribeau (2005) states that the length of a good survey should be between 15 and 25 questions to ensure accuracy and prevent unnecessarily long answers. Questions should be simple and to the point. Once the survey is issued, the collected data can be analyzed using statistical tests (e.,g. two sample t-tests, paired sample t-test, chi-square tests, ANOVA tests) in order to analyze the collected data..

Chapter 3

THE METHODOLOGY

Procedures for Data Collection

The purpose of this study is to determine the willingness of wineries to adopt Google+ as a marketing tool, and what factors may influence this level of interest. The researcher surveyed a chosen sample of 50 wineries located throughout San Luis Obispo County. According to data provided by the Alcohol Tax and Trade Bureau, San Luis Obispo County has 349 wineries (National Revenue Service 2012). The sample size is about 15% of the wineries in the region. Different demographic questions on the survey were: winery size in terms of cases per year, the length of time the winery has been open, the number of vineyard acres the winery owns, the ultimate destination of wine sold at the winery, and the city the winery is located in. This information will be used to determine the social media use of wineries in San Luis Obispo County along with interest in adopting Google+.

In order to accurately determine wineries' level of interest in using Google+, a 17-question survey was administered to the selected wineries at the wineries' locations. This survey was conducted in the month of February in 2012 by personal interview. The locations for wineries located in San Luis Obispo, Arroyo Grande, Paso Robles, Templeton, and Atascadero. Respondents were asked to partake in the survey based on their willingness to participate and nothing more.

The survey's first question asked how often the winery used social media. The next question asks if the winery currently uses a Facebook account, then has a follow up

questions how often this account (if it exists) is used on a 5-point scale. These questions could possibly determine if there is a relationship between current social media use and the willingness to use Google+. The next question determined how much of their business each winery attributed to social media use. This question could determine a relationship between how successful a winery's current social media marketing is and their interest in Google+.

Question five asked respondents to indicate whether or not they currently use a Google account (Gmail, etc.) to communicate with customers. This question gave the researcher a clear idea of current Google use by wineries, thus allowing connections to be made between prior Google account use and interest in using Google+. The following question asked how often this account (if there was one) was used. This allowed the researcher to determine the frequency Google is already used and find out if this could lead to greater willingness to adopt Google+.

Question seven asked the respondent to provide their familiarity with the Google+ social media platform – thus the researcher had a clear idea of what wineries already knew about Google+. The survey then proceeded to ask if respondents have Google+ winery accounts. This gave the researcher data regarding any wineries that might already be using Google+. If the previous question was answered negatively, question nine inquired how interested respondents would be in using Google+ as a marketing tool. This data indicated the interested the wineries are in using Google+ to interact with consumers. The following question was open ended and asked participants to clarify why they answered the previous question with that particular level of interest. The researcher used this data to determine the certain reservations wineries may have that are holding

them back from using Google+ as well as reasons wineries may be eager to adopt this new platform. Question eleven asked participants who answered "yes" to question 8 to identify the effectiveness of their marketing via Google+. This gives the researcher a clear idea of the current success of marketing on Google+.

The survey then proceeds to ask the respondent to identify all the words that best described the winery. These words are related back to the five dimensions of brand personality (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness). This will let the researcher know how the wineries perceive themselves, and also will allow a connection to be made between interest in Google+ and brand personalities.

Question thirteen asks participants the size of the winery by cases per year. The five-point scale was determined by contacting Paso Wine and inquiring the average amount of cases per year for wineries in the area, which was about 7,000 (Todaro 2012). Question fourteen asks how many years the winery has been open, and fifteen inquires how many vineyard acres the winery owns. The scale for vineyard acres was also determined by determining the average amount of vineyard acres owned by each winery, which was about 150 (Todaro 2012). However, it was also explained that a few of the much larger vineyards could cause this average to be much higher than a typical winery in the region, and that the lower number of 100 acres would better to set the 5 point scale on (Todaro 2012). Question sixteen asks the destination of wine sold from the winery, and seventeen determines which city of the five visited the winery is located in. These different demographics can help determine if there is any link between them and interest in marketing via Google+.

Procedures for Data Analysis

After the surveys were administered, the data was analyzed in order to determine effectiveness of Google+ to advertise and promote wine. All surveys were input into Survey Builder, an online survey tool that graphically displays survey results. This tool allowed the researcher to view all of the answers and see the ones that were chosen most. Survey Builder organized the results into charts, tables, and graphs in order to give the researcher a clear picture of the results and for different answers to be compared. Comparing the results allowed the researcher to make connections regarding the percentages of each answer.

Following this, the results were entered into the program SPSS. Data was analyzed using chi-squared, ANOVA, and frequency tests. Running these tests allowed the researcher to determine relationships between social media use and wineries' interest in using Google+. Frequencies indicated the number of responses for each question in the survey, and if there was insufficient data it was not included. The analyzed data was further transformed into percentages. All characteristics had chi-squared tests run on them in order to determine statistical significance of each variable compared with interest in Google+. A significance level of .05 was used, and if the resulting p-values of the responses were less than .05, the hypothesis was rejected. If greater than .05, the hypothesis could not be rejected. The chi-squared test is used to determine the association between the statistically generated "expected responses" and responses given, then determining if there is a statistical difference when comparing the relationships between variables.

Assumptions

For the survey data to be accurate, it meant assuming that the winery employee interviewed was knowledgeable about the winery's social media use. It also assumed that the surveyor was able to alleviate concerns of respondents and clarify if any confusion arose. A sample always runs the risk of not being an accurate representation of the population and other wineries in the area could vary greatly from the wineries selected to be surveyed. The study also assumed that all wineries had at least some knowledge of social media.

Limitations

Limitations can include the lack of representation for the survey, given the fact of the sample size of 50 respondents. Also, the location of the surveys given in San Luis Obispo County may not give a large enough response to accurately represent the diversity of all California or U.S. wineries.

Chapter 4

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

Survey data collection was completed during the 3rd, 4th, and 9th of February. Each participant was asked to take part in the survey at their respective winery location based on the fact that they were wineries located in San Luis Obispo County. The researcher also attempted to survey as close to an equal number of wineries in each city as possible. The first day of collection yielded 25 surveys in Paso Robles, Templeton, and Atascadero. The second yielded 18 in San Luis Obispo and Arroyo Grande, and the third 7 in Paso Robles, Templeton, and San Luis Obispo.

Data Collection Problems

To collect the data, the researcher drove to wineries in the cities previously established. One issue was unwillingness of some respondents to take the survey at the time the researcher arrived. Some potential respondents professed they were too busy at the time, and others said they were no longer willing to participate at all. Another day (February 9th) had to be added to survey data collection in order to obtain the 50 surveys because 7 of the wineries selected asked the researcher to return on another day or simply stated they no longer wished to participate.

Analysis

Once all 50 surveys were collected, they were thoroughly examined to ensure that the researcher had not missed certain questions and that all necessary data was present. All responses were then entered through Survey Builder, which took the results and exported them as a raw data file to Excel. After the results were coded, they were once more exported into SPSS, which was used to statistically analyze the results.

Frequency tests were run on each variable in order to determine the number of times respondents selected each answer. When compared to the average of vineyard acres, only fourteen percent of wineries surveyed answered with over 150 acres (the calculated average). Only two wineries (four percent) answered that they purchased grapes from an external source, and the most frequently chosen option was between one and fifty acres (thirty-four percent). The remaining forty-eight percent were split equally between the "51 to 100" and "100 to 150" options. This makes sense, since the interview informed the researcher that one hundred acres would be a good number to more evenly divide the wineries on a 5-point scale (Todaro 2012). 7,000 cases per year was the average determined via interview (Todaro 2012), and 36 percent of wineries fell into the 7,001 to 11,000 cases per year, while 20 percent answered in the 3,001 to 7,000 cases per year. This puts the majority of wineries surveyed within the range of 7,000 cases per year.

The researcher attempted to survey wineries in cities located in different parts of the county in order to attempt an equal distribution and equal representation of wineries in each city. The highest amount of respondents (30 percent) was located in the city of San Luis Obispo, and an equal amount of 26 percent in both Paso Robles and Templeton.

Seven respondents (14 percent) were wineries located in Arroyo Grande, and 4 percent of respondents were in Atascadero.

There was a large variation in the length of time wineries interviewed had been open. The largest amount of 16 respondents (32 percent) had been open for 11 years or more, followed by 26 percent only open for 3-5 years. The two categories of 6-8 years and 9-10 years had a combined percentage of 34, with 9 and 8 respondents respectively. Only 4 wineries (8 percent) surveyed had been open for less than 3 years.

Most of the wineries surveyed stated that the wine purchased at their wineries remained within San Luis Obispo and neighboring counties. No wineries responded that most of their wine left the country, and 36 percent stated that their wine remained within the state of California. Only 10 percent responded that most of their wine left the state, remaining within the United States.

Of all wineries surveyed, none had a Google+ page. When asked how interested they would be in using Google+ for their winery, 34 percent expressed at least somewhat interest. 22 percent was unsure, and 44 percent was somewhat or extremely uninterested.

Cross tabulations were run on each variable and divided into categories of interest in Google+: extremely uninterested, somewhat uninterested, unsure, somewhat interested, and extremely interested. This gave the researcher the frequency of each different respondent's interest in Google+ with respect to each variable the survey inquired about.

The total response percentage in Table 1 tell us that the majority of wineries in San Luis Obispo County currently use social media at least once a week. The data also tells us that wineries who use social media more frequently are more interested in using Google+ for marketing to and communicating with consumers. The chi-squared test

resulted in rejecting the null hypothesis – shown in the p-value located at the bottom of the table. Since the p-value is below 0.05, this indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in the relationships between current social media usage and interest in Google+.

Table 1: Frequency of Social Media Use by Wineries in Terms of Interest in Using Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Less than once a month	18%	9	67%	22%	11%	0%	0%
Once a month	16%	8	25%	25%	50%	0%	0%
Once a week	24%	12	17%	25%	17%	42%	0%
Multiple times per week	28%	14	7%	21%	29%	14%	29%
Multiple times daily	14%	7	14%	0%	0%	29%	57%
p=0.002							

A large majority of wineries currently have Facebook pages that are used to market to and communicate with customers (refer to Table 2). There is a statistically significant difference in the relationship between those who currently utilize Facebook and those who do not and their interest level in Google+, which is shown by the p-value located below the table. Respondents who do not currently use Facebook expressed mostly extreme uninterest in Google+, but the different interest levels of those who do currently have a Facebook are fairly evenly spread.

Table 2: Wineries Using/Not Using Facebook in Terms of Interest in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Yes	80%	40	15%	20%	23%	23%	20%
No	20%	10	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%
p=.026							

Wineries who currently use Facebook on a more frequent basis expressed a higher interest level in Google+ than those who use Facebook less frequently, shown in Table 3. There is a statistically significant difference between the relationships Facebook use frequency and interest level in Google+ by wineries, which is illustrated by the p-value below the table. The below data omits survey data where respondents did not answer the question because they do not currently use a Facebook.

Table 3: Frequency of Facebook Use by Wineries Who Have an Account in Terms of Interest in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Less than once a month	15%	6	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%
Once a month	20%	8	13%	38%	38%	13%	0%
Once a week	32%	13	23%	15%	23%	38%	0%
Multiple times per week	27%	11	0%	9%	18%	18%	55%
Multiple times daily	7%	3	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%
p=0.015							

The data in Table 4 illustrates that very few wineries attribute a high percentage of their business to social media use. Most respondents felt that social media use brought them a relatively low amount of business, and almost a third believed it to be less than 5%. There is a statistically significant difference between relationships of Google+ interest level and amount of business currently attributed to social media marketing. Those who responded high or moderately high tended to be much more interested in Google+ than those who answered otherwise.

Table 4: Amount of Business Attributed to Social Media Use in Terms of Interest in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Extremely high (21%+)	8%	4	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
Moderately high (16-20%)	22%	11	9%	9%	27%	9%	45%
Neither high nor low (11-15%)	22%	11	27%	27%	9%	27%	9%
Moderately low (6-10%)	18%	9	11%	33%	22%	33%	0%
Extremely low (0-5%)	30%	15	47%	20%	33%	0%	0%
p=0.012							

Table 5 shows that about three-fourths of wineries in San Luis Obispo County currently use a Gmail or other Google accounts to communicate with customers. There is, however, no statistical difference in the relationship of using a Gmail or Google account and having a certain interest level in Google+ (shown by a p-value greater than 0.05). It is interesting to note that Facebook usage seems to have more of an impact on Google+ interest than having a Google account.

Table 5: Wineries Using Gmail/Google Accounts to Communicate with Consumers in Terms of Interest in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Yes	72%	36	14%	22%	22%	19%	22%
No	28%	14	50%	14%	21%	14%	0%
p=0.06							

The majority of wineries who do currently use a Google account to communicate with customers responded that they use this account at least once per week (shown in Table 6). Those who used the account more frequently expressed more interest in Google+ than those who used the account less. The chi-squared test discovered that there is a statistically significant difference between the relationships of frequency of Google account use and interest level in Google+.

Table 6: Frequency of Gmail/Google Usage by Wineries Who Have an Account in Terms of Interest in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Less than once a month	5%	2	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
Once a month	5%	2	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Once a week	35%	13	8%	38%	38%	15%	0%
Multiple times per week	30%	11	18%	18%	9%	36%	18%
Multiple times daily	24%	9	11%	0%	11%	11%	67%
p=0.034							

The majority of wineries responded that they were fairly unfamiliar with Google+. The table below shows that those who were more familiar with Google+ expressed a higher level of interest in using it, but there is no statistically significant difference between the correlations of certain familiarity levels with interest levels in Google+.

Table 7: Wineries' Level of Familiarity with Google+ in Terms of Interest Level in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Extremely familiar	8%	4	25%	25%	0%	0%	50%
Somewhat familiar	16%	8	0%	13%	25%	13%	50%
Limited knowledge (visited site once or twice)	30%	15	27%	13%	13%	33%	13%
Have heard the name, but nothing more	30%	15	27%	20%	33%	20%	0%
Never heard of it	16%	8	38%	38%	25%	0%	0%
p=0.101							

The following question (whether wineries currently used Google+) was answered "No" by each winery, so there were no relevant statistical tests to be run on the data.

In terms of brand personality, it is interesting to note that the majority of wineries who expressed interest in Google+ perceived themselves as "Daring," "Imaginative," and "Up-to-date" (refer to Table 8). These brand personality descriptors are also most likely how these wineries wish to be seen by their consumers, and most likely believe that

social media use and expanding that use will help them more attain these attributes. However, there is no statistically significant difference between the relationships of how wineries perceive themselves related to how interested they are in Google+.

Table 8: Brand Personality Descriptors in Terms of Interest Level in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely uninterested	Somewhat uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat interested	Extremely interested
DownToEarth	7%	16	31%	19%	19%	19%	13%
Daring	4%	10	10%	0%	20%	30%	40%
Reliable	7%	17	29%	18%	24%	24%	6%
UpperClass	3%	6	33%	50%	17%	0%	0%
Outdoorsy	7%	17	35%	29%	29%	0%	6%
Honest	9%	22	14%	23%	23%	27%	14%
Spirited	9%	21	19%	14%	19%	24%	24%
Intelligent	11%	26	12%	15%	23%	23%	27%
Charming	5%	11	27%	18%	27%	9%	18%
Tough	5%	11	36%	27%	18%	9%	9%
Wholesome	7%	16	31%	31%	31%	6%	0%
Imaginative	8%	19	5%	0%	26%	26%	42%
Successful	5%	12	17%	25%	17%	25%	17%
Cheerful	4%	10	10%	30%	20%	30%	10%
UpToDate	9%	20	15%	10%	15%	25%	35%
p=0.39							

In order to test the hypothesis further, the researcher grouped the wineries' answers into each dimension that the descriptive words belong in. This way, the wineries were categorized into the five dimensions of brand personality.

Table 9 shows that for each brand personality dimension, the descriptives output gives the number of wineries in each category along with the mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, standard error, and confidence interval each level of interest in

Google+. There were 21 people whose responses characterized them primarily in the "sincerity" category, and their mean interest level was 3.76. Eighteen wineries were in the "excitement" category, and their mean interest level in Google+ was 1.94. Of the wineries surveyed, 8 were categorized in the "competence" dimension of brand personality and 3 in the "ruggedness" dimension, with mean interest levels in Google+ of 3.75 and 5 respectively. The lower the number, the higher the interest level in Google+. No wineries were characterized as primarily "sophistication." The results were to be expected: those that identified themselves with descriptive words that fell mainly in the "excitement" category expressed a higher interest level in Google+. It is also interesting to note that the three wineries in the "ruggedness" category all expressed extreme uninterest in Google+.

Table 9: ANOVA Test with Means for Each Personality Dimension In Terms of Interest Level in Google+

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Sincerity	21	3.76	1.044	0.228	3.29	4.24	2	5
Excitement	18	1.94	1.110	0.262	1.39	2.50	1	5
Competence	8	3.75	1.035	0.366	2.88	4.62	2	5
Ruggedness	3	5	0.000	0	5.00	5.00	5	5
Total	50	3.18	1.410	0.199	2.78	3.58	1	5

Table 10 contains the results of the ANOVA test. The p value (shown in the column titled "Sig.") is less than 0.05, so we reject the null hypothesis. That is, there is sufficient evidence to state that there is a statistically significant difference between the relationships of different brand dimensions to interest level in Google+.

Table 10: ANOVA Results of Brand Personality Dimensions in Terms of Interest in Google+

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	47.126	3	15.709	14.379	0.000
Within Groups	50.254	46	1.092		
Total	97.380	49			

Table 11 compares the means of each dimension of brand personality. The table displays that the "sincerity" dimension is statistically significantly different from the "excitement" dimension, but not from "competence" or "ruggedness." The "excitement" category was significantly different from all the other dimensions. "Competence" was significantly different from "excitement" but no others, and "ruggedness" was the same. This tells us that "excitement" differs the most from all the other brand personality dimensions, which is important to note since they expressed the highest level of interest in Google+.

Table 11: Mean Comparisons Between Each Brand Personality Dimension

(I) Highest Coded	(J) Highest Coded	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Sincerity	Excitement	1.817*	0.336	0.000	0.92	2.71
	Competence	0.012	0.434	1.000	-1.15	1.17
	Ruggedness	-1.238	0.645	0.234	-2.96	0.48
Excitement1t	Sincerity	-1.817*	0.336	0.000	-2.71	-0.92
	Competence	-1.806*	0.444	0.001	-2.99	-0.62
	Ruggedness	-3.056*	0.652	0.000	-4.79	-1.32
Competenc1ce	Sincerity	-0.012	0.434	1.000	-1.17	1.15
	Excitement	1.806*	0.444	0.001	0.62	2.99
	Ruggedness	-1.250	0.708	0.302	-3.14	0.64
Ruggedness	Sincerity	1.238	0.645	0.234	-0.48	2.96
	Excitement	3.056*	0.652	0.000	1.32	4.79
	Competence	1.250	0.708	0.302	-0.64	3.14

Table 12 below shows that there is little relation between winery size and interest level in Google+. Of the wineries surveyed, the majority produce from 3,001 to 15,000 cases per year, which was expected from the information gathered from Paso Wine regarding the average case/year production of all wineries in the area.

Table 12: Winery Size (cases/year) in Terms of Interest Level in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Very large (15,001+ cases/year)	6%	3	67%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Large (11,001 to 15,000 cases/year)	28%	14	21%	21%	14%	21%	21%
Mid-sized (7,001 to 11,000 cases/year)	36%	18	28%	17%	28%	11%	17%
Small (3,001 to 7,000 cases/year)	20%	10	10%	20%	20%	40%	10%
Very small (3,000 cases/year or less)	10%	5	20%	40%	40%	0%	0%
p=0.629							

The number of years a winery has been open also has little to do with interest level in Google+. Most responses were evenly spread between all respondents, with the least amount of wineries being open less than three years.

Table 13: Length of Time Winery Has Been Open in Terms of Interest Level in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
0-2 years	8%	4	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%
3-5 years	26%	13	23%	23%	15%	23%	15%
6-8 years	18%	9	11%	11%	44%	33%	0%
9-10 years	16%	8	25%	13%	13%	13%	38%
11+ years	32%	16	38%	25%	19%	6%	13%
p=0.647							

There is also little relationship between the number of acres a winery owns and their interest in Google+. However, it is interesting to note that the largest wineries were mostly either extremely interested or extremely uninterested in marketing on Google+.

Table 14: Vineyard Acres Owned by Winery in Terms of Interest Level in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
None (grapes purchased from external source)	4%	2	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%
1-50 acres	34%	17	24%	24%	24%	18%	12%
51-100 acres	24%	12	17%	17%	33%	33%	0%
101-150 acres	24%	12	17%	33%	17%	8%	25%
151+ acres	14%	7	43%	0%	14%	0%	43%
p=0.356							

The majority of wineries responded that the wine purchased at their winery remained within neighboring counties (including San Luis Obispo County). The relationship between the destination of wine purchased from the winery and interest level in Google+ has no statistically significant difference, but an interesting observation is that 40% of wineries whose wines leave the state more often replied that they would be very interested in Google+, although only 10% of wineries surveyed responded with "within the country."

Table 15: Destination of Wine Purchased from Winery in Terms of Interest in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
Stays within San Luis Obispo County	12%	6	33%	33%	17%	0%	17%
Within neighboring counties	42%	21	19%	19%	29%	29%	5%
Within the state	36%	18	22%	22%	17%	17%	22%
Within the country	10%	5	40%	0%	20%	0%	40%
Out of the United States	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
p=0.572							

The researcher purposefully attempted to gather as equal an amount of surveys from each city containing a large number of wineries in San Luis Obispo County. There is very little relationship between interest level in Google+ and the location of the winery, and there is no statistically significant difference in the relationships.

Table 16: City Winery in Which Winery is Located in Terms of Interest Level in Google+

	Response Percent	Response Count	Extremely Uninterested	Somewhat Uninterested	Unsure	Somewhat Interested	Extremely Interested
San Luis Obispo	30%	15	7%	20%	27%	27%	20%
Arroyo Grande	14%	7	29%	14%	29%	29%	0%
Paso Robles	26%	13	31%	15%	23%	8%	23%
Templeton	26%	13	38%	31%	15%	0%	15%
Atascadero	4%	2	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
p=0.228							

Question 10 of the survey asked respondents to elaborate on the reason for their level of interest in Google+. Most wineries that expressed interest in Google+ stated that they had experienced success with Facebook and were looking to expand their use of social media. Wineries that were not interested in using Google+ often shared the same view that they were doing well enough with either no use or infrequent use of social media, and did not think that using social media would increase their business. Those wineries that were unsure mostly were confused as to what Google+ was or were previously unaware of its existence.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The analysis of the data collected proved the hypotheses to be correct. Wineries who currently use Facebook and other social media on a more frequent basis responded with a higher interest level in Google+. Likewise, those wineries that expressed a high interest level in Google+ perceived themselves as daring, imaginative, and up-to-date – falling in the "excitement" dimension of brand personality. Also, an interesting finding to note is that those wineries that use their existing Google account more often also were more interested in using Google+. These findings show that wineries that are familiar and comfortable with Google or social media are more interested in adopting a new social media platform.

Conclusion

The results of this study determined that current use of Facebook and social media does create a significant difference in interest level in using Google+. Wineries who currently use social media more frequently express higher interest in Google+. The same can be said for those who use Gmail on a more frequent basis. Only 34% of wineries surveyed expressed any interest in using Google+, with 22% unsure and 44% expressing some level of uninterest. Wineries that did express interest in Google+ also

went on to explain that they had previous good experiences with social media and were eager to expand. Some of these wineries also stated that their familiarity with using Google made them more willing to adopt Google+. One such winery stated that they liked Google and Gmail, and they believed "Google+ might be easy for [them] to figure out" due to this familiarity.

Brand personality also plays a large factor in interest in Google+. Wineries that perceive themselves as primarily in the "excitement" category express a significantly different interest level in Google+. This finding indicates that perceptions wineries have of themselves have an influence on how they go about marketing to their consumers. Dimensions of brand personality play a factor in willingness to try new ways of marketing and communicating with customers. This also implies that these brand personality dimensions speak to the type of customers they wish to attract, and using different social media platforms such as Google+ may be their attempt at reaching new customers.

Recommendations

For wineries that expressed interest in Google+, it would be a good idea to start off with simply making a Google+ page at first, then toying around with different settings and making adjustments to familiarize themselves with the format of Google+ and make everything to their liking. This approach will especially resonate with those wineries that perceive themselves as daring, since no wineries responded stating that they currently use a Google+ page. Then, as the winery becomes accustomed to using the new platform, they can begin offering certain promotion available only to their circlers via

Google+. Wineries that currently use Facebook could suggest to their fans to go to the winery's Google+ brand page, thus utilizing their current social media while promoting a new one. This will promote their page and allow the winery to gain a larger following while increasing their marketing reach. Also, if the winery has a website, it would be useful to promote the Google+ page on the winery website, and possibly allow the user to sign in to the website using a Google account log in. This will make it easier for customers to log in to their website with an account that previously exists and will also alert the consumer to the presence of a Google+ page. It will also encourage the user to add Google+ to his/her circles so he/she will be able to take advantage of certain deals and promotions only offered to circlers.

There is also a vast amount of room for further research on wineries using Google+. A different approach to be taken would be to survey wine consumers to determine their use of social media relating to wine, and determine relationships between that and interest in Google+. Another topic for further study could be to broaden the scope of wineries interviewed and expand those included beyond San Luis Obispo County. Differences could then be determined between wineries located in different areas regarding social media use and interest in Google+. This will also create a more accurate representation of wineries in California (and possibly the United States). It would be very interesting to determine differences in brand personalities of wineries from different states compared to those in California and also determine if this creates differences in wineries' willingness to adopt new social media platforms.

Works Cited

Aaker, Jennifer L. 1997. "Dimensions of Brand Personality." *Journal of Marketing Research* 34, no. 3:347-356. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3151897 (accessed February 1, 2012).

Allen, Paul. 2011. "Google+ Growth Accelerating. Passes 62 million users. Adding 625,000 new users per day. Prediction: 400 million users by end of 2012." https://plus.google.com/117388252776312694644/posts/ZcPA5ztMZaj (accessed January 24, 2011).

Barribeau, P. 2005. "Survey Research." Colorado State University Department of English. http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/researchsurvey (accessed October 9, 2011).

Bond, Robert. 1996. "Successful business strategies on the Internet: Are There Black Holes in Cyberspace?" *International Review Of Law, Computers & Technology* 10, no. 2: 301. Academic Search Elite, EBSCOhost (accessed November 30, 2011).

Carpenter, Scott, Eivis Qenani-Petrela, and Marrianne McGarry Wolf. 2005. "A Comparison of X, Y, and Boomer Generation Wine Consumers in Califoria." *Journal of Food Distribution Research* 36:186-191. http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/26724/1/36010186.pdf (accessed October 10, 2011).

Chapman, Glenn. “Facebook and eBay Downplay Google Threat.” October 18, 2011. http://www.physorg.com/news/2011-10-facebook-ebay-downplay-google-threat.html (accessed October 28, 2011).

Edwards, Jim. October 17, 2011. “How Google and Apple May Have Plotted the Death of Facebook.” http://www.bnet.com/blog/advertising-business/how-google-and-apple-may-have-plotted-the-death-of-facebook/10708 (accessed October 20, 2011).

“Facebook Adverts.” Facebook, Inc. http://www.facebook.com/advertising/

Global Wine Partners US and Frank, Rimerman & CO. 2007. "Economic Impact of Wine and Winegrapes in the Paso Robles AVA and Greater San Luis Obispo County 2007." *MFK Research*. http://www.sloevc.org/files/SLO%20Impact%20Wine%20Study_Executive%20Summary.pdf (accessed January 28, 2012).

Goldfarb, Sam. *Google+ Book: How to Use Google+ For Yourself & Your Business.*

Goodhue, Rachael, Richard Green, Dale Heien, and Philip Martin. 2008. “California Wine Industry Evolving to Compete in 21st Century.” *California Agriculture* 62:12-18. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/99j0q0gx. (accessed October 10, 2011).

Judd, Terry. 2010. "Facebook Versus Email." *British Journal of Educational Technology* 41, no. 5: E101-E103. ftp://124.42.15.59/ck/2011-

04/165/095/671/086/Facebook%20versus%20email.pdf (accessed November 23, 2011).

Lee, Micky. "Google Ads and the Blindspot Debate." *Media, Culture, and Society* 33, no. 3 (2011): 433-447. http://www.sagepub.com.ezproxy.lib.calpoly.edu/home.nav (accessed November 17, 2011).

Loceff, Jenna V. 2011. "Wineries increase use of smartphone, social media technology." *North Bay Business Journal*. http://www.northbaybusinessjournal.com/29654/wineries-increase-use-of-smartphone-social-media-technology (accessed February 1, 2012)

McCracken, Harry. 2011. "Google+ Reverses Social-Network Curse." *Time Business*. http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,2081795,00.html (accessed November 21, 2011).

National Revenue Center. 2012. "Wine Producers and Blenders-California." Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau. http://www.ttb.treas.gov/foia/xls/frl-wine-producers-and-blenders-ca-nevada-to-sanmateo.htm (accessed February 22, 2012)

O'Barr, William M., Rishad Tobaccowala, John Partilla and Irwin Gotlieb. 2009. "Media and Advertising." *Advertising & Society Review* 10, no. 2 http://muse.jhu.edu/ (accessed May 19, 2011)

Olken, F. and Rotem, D. 1995. “Random Sampling from Databases - A Survey." *Statistics & Computing* 5:25-42.

Raab, David M. 2011. New Metrics for Social Media: Sophisticated marketers are already looking at applications beyond message delivery, but they will face challenges. *Information Management* 21, no. 6: 24. http://www.proquest.com/ (accessed November 21, 2011).

Simon, S. 2002. The Research Sample, Part I: *Sampling. Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics* 7 no. 3:105-112. http://journals.lww.com/jpojournal/Abstract/1995/00730/The_Research_Sample,_Part_I__Sampling.8.aspx (accessed October 24, 2011).

Stone, Brad and Louise Story. November 30, 2007. "Facebook Retreats on Online Tracking." *New York Times.* http://www.isy.vcu.edu/~jsutherl/Info658/FBOOKADS7.doc (accessed October 20, 2011).

Todaro, Paula. Interview by author. Phone conversation. San Luis Obispo, CA., January 30, 2012.

Wasserman, Todd. 2012. "H&M Has the Most-Followed Brand Page on Google+." *Mashable Business.* http://mashable.com/2012/02/09/hm-google-plus-brand-pages (accessed February 9, 2012).

Webster, James G. 2010. "User Information Regimes: How Social Media Shape Patterns of Consumption." *Northwestern University Law Review* 104, no. 2:593-612.

http://www.scribd.com/doc/57369895/Social-Media-and-Consumer-Behavior (accessed November 19, 2011).

Wine Institute. 2011. "2010 California/U.S. Wine Sales." Last modified March 17, 2011. http://www.wineinstitute.org/resources/statistics/article584. (accessed October 9, 2011).

APPENDIX

1. How often do you (as a winery) use social media (Facebook, Twitter, Linked-In, MySpace, etc.)?
   a. Less than once a month
   b. Once a month
   c. Once a week
   d. Multiple times per week
   e. Multiple times daily

2. Does your winery currently have a Facebook account (fanpage, etc.)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. If yes, how often is this Facebook account used to communicate with customers?
   a. Less than once a month
   b. Once a month
   c. Once a week
   d. Multiple times per week
   e. Multiple times daily

4. How much of your business would you attribute to use of social media?
   a. Extremely high (21%+)
   b. Moderately high (16-20%)
   c. Neither high nor low (11-15%)
   d. Moderately low (6-10%)
   e. Extremely low (0-5%)

5. Does your winery currently have a Gmail (or any other Google) account that is used to communicate with customers?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. If yes, how often do you use this Gmail/Google account?
   a. Less than once a month
   b. Once a month
   c. Once a week
   d. Multiple times per week
   e. Multiple times daily

7. How familiar are you with the social media platform Google+?
   a. Extremely familiar
   b. Somewhat familiar
   c. Limited knowledge (visited site once or twice)
   d. Have heard the name, but nothing more
   e. Never heard of it

8. Does your winery currently use a Google+ account to market/communicate with customers?
   a. Yes
   b. No

9. If no to #8, how interested would your winery be in using Google+ as a platform to interact with customers (inform them of sales, special online promotions, etc.)?
   a. Extremely interested
   b. Somewhat interested
   c. Unsure
   d. Somewhat uninterested
   e. Extremely uninterested

10. Why is this your interest level in Google+?

11. If yes to #8, how effective would you consider your marketing via Google+?
   a. Extremely effective
   b. Somewhat effective
   c. Unsure of effectiveness
   d. Somewhat ineffective
   e. Extremely ineffective

12. Of the following words, which best describe your winery? Circle all that apply.
   a. Down-to earth
   b. Daring
   c. Reliable
   d. Upper-class
   e. Outdoorsy
   f. Honest
   g. Spirited
   h. Intelligent
   i. Charming
   j. Tough
   k. Wholesome
   l. Imaginative
   m. Successful
   n. Cheerful
   o. Up-to-date

13. What is the size of your winery?
    a. Very large (15,001+ cases/year)
    b. Large (11,001 to 15,000 cases/year)
    c. Mid-sized (7,001 to 11,000 cases/year)
    d. Small (3,001 to 7,000)
    e. Very small (3,000 cases/year or less)

14. How many years has your winery been open?
    a. 0-2
    b. 3-5
    c. 6-8
    d. 9-10
    e. 11+

15. How many vineyard acres does your winery own?
    a. None (grapes purchased from external source)
    b. 1-50
    c. 51-100
    d. 101-150
    e. 151+

16. Where does most of the wine purchased from your winery go?
    a. Stays within San Luis Obispo county
    b. Within neighboring counties
    c. Within the state
    d. Within the country
    e. Out of the United States

17. In what city is your winery located?
    a. San Luis Obispo
    b. Arroyo Grande
    c. Paso Robles
    d. Templeton
    e. Atascadero