Wine Advertising to the Millennial Generation

A Senior Project Presented to
The Faculty of the Communication Studies Department
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Arts

By

Jessica R. Luke

Dr. Richard Besel	_____	_____
Senior Project Advisor	Signature	Date
T.C. Winebrenner	_____	_____
Department Chair	Signature	Date

© 2010 Jessica R. Luke

Table of Contents

Table of Figures……..... 3

Table of Tables……..... 4

Introduction…….. 5

Literature Review…… 7

Method…… 14

Results……. 18

Discussion and Implications…… 23

Limitations……... 25

Future Research…… 26

Works Cited…….. 27

Table of Figures

Fig. 1. Seven – Point Semantic Differential Scales ……. 16

Fig. 2. Emotional Quotient Scale ..……..……. 17

Table of Tables

Table 1. Single Variable ANOVA Results……. 19

Table 2. Affective and Cognitive ANOVA Results…… 20

Table 3. Affective and Cognitive Post Hoc Test Results…… 20

Table 4. Favorable/Unfavorable ANOVA and Post Hoc Test Results …….. 21

Table 5. Purchase Intention ANOVA and Post Hoc Test Results…….. 22

Table 6. Gender Differences in Purchase Intentions ……. 23

Wine Advertising to the Millennial Generation

The United States has a multi-billion dollar wine industry with a tremendous amount of growth potential. With each passing year more and more people are becoming wine consumers. Wine is growing all over the United States, especially here in California. According to John Gillespie, president of the Wine Market Council, "in 2000 only 43 percent of the population drank wine… but in 2007, those numbers had reversed, with 57 percent now drinking wine. That's about 64 million people" ("Consumer Research Summary"). With this new boom of wine consumers comes a greater demand for wine advertising.

Currently, the majority of wine advertising is directed to the generation known as the Baby Boomers. In the past this was a smart choice because they are 80 million strong and drink the most wine, but now there is a new generation that marketers should be focusing on. They are known as the Millennials or the Y Generation, they are the children of the Baby Boomers. Millennials were born between 1980 and 2000 (beginning dates vary slightly depending on source) and they are "considered to be the largest consumer group in U.S. history" (Thach, "How").

The wine industry as a whole has started to pay attention to the lack of advertising to a huge population of potential wine consumers. There has been some research done about the Millennial generation and their attitude toward wine and how the wine industry can better advertise to them (Thach, Olsen, Tinney and Hay). What researchers have failed to do is test their findings. They have self-reported marketing techniques that the Millennial generation says

would be effective in making them consume more wine, but no one has actually tested to see if these advertising strategies work.

Another sector in wine advertising that has not gotten enough research attention is generic wine advertising. Generic advertising is a very effective way to increase consumption of a product. Generic advertising is designed to increase primary demand for a product, without affecting selective demand (Chakravarti 487). This is the type of advertising campaign that some in the wine industry feel could be very successful in increasing wine consumption. They look to the success of campaigns like the "Got Milk?" campaign and the pork campaign, "the other white meat." Before the launch of the "Got Milk" campaign, milk consumption was declining two to three percent each year. After the launch in 1994, milk consumption increased back to normal and the campaign achieved a 91% awareness rating (Bornstein). This type of advertising could be very effective in reaching the Millennial generation, but has lacked research to find out.

Based on the need to test findings from previous studies, a research study was designed to measure the effectiveness of generic wine advertisements to the Millennial generation. Four different print wine advertisements were shown to a hundred Millennials. The viewer's attitude toward the advertisements and their desire to purchase a bottle of wine after viewing each advertisement was measured on seven-point semantic differential scales. Also, their emotional response was measured on two-point Likert scales.

Results from this study found that the Millennial generation cannot simply be targeted by fun advertisements. This study shows that Millennials like to see wine advertisements that are

fun yet informative. This paper describes supporting literature, methodology, results, and implications of this study.

Literature Review

Wine Consumption in the United States

Despite the current economic downturn in the United States, the wine industry continues to grow. According to the Wine Market Council's 2009 Consumer Tracking Study final report, "from 2007 to 2008, table wine consumption increased 1.2%, the smallest increase since 2001 but a positive one" ("Consumer Research Summary"). This means that about 53.4 million people in the United States drink wine. The Wine Market Council segments the US population into four categories based on their wine consumption levels: 1) core drinkers, 2) marginal drinkers, 3) non-adopters, and 4) non-drinkers.

Core drinkers are very important to the wine industry because they drink the most wine. They are defined by having at least one glass of wine a week, but most drink wine several times a week. The Wine Market Council reports that in 2009 core wine consumers made up 15.9% of the population ("Consumer Research Data"). This group drinks 88% of the wine sold in the United States (Olsen 4). Generic Advertising would not be very effective for this group seeing as they already consume a lot of wine.

Marginal drinkers are very important to the wine industry as well because they are the people that we want to get to drink more wine. They enjoy wine, but they tend to save it for special occasions. Marginal drinkers consume wine once or twice a month and make up 14.1%

of the American population ("Consumer Research Data"). These are the people who the wine industry is trying to get to consume wine with everyday meals, and a generic wine advertisement could be effective in doing so.

Non-adopters drink alcohol but they do not drink wine. This group makes up 27% of the population ("Consumer Research Data"). They drink beer and spirits and tend to be much younger on average. Consumers in this group report that they do not like the taste of wine or just prefer beer (Olsen 5). This group has potential to be persuaded by generic wine advertising.

The last group, non-drinkers, has no potential to be persuaded by any type of wine advertising. This is because, as their name says, they do not drink alcohol at all. This group makes up the largest portion of the American population with 43% (Olsen 5). There are many reasons that people do not drink alcohol and no matter how persuasive your advertisement might be it is not going to change their alcohol consumption.

Wine consumers can be categorized by their generation as well. There are four categories of generations: 1) Traditionalists, 2) Baby Boomers, 3) Generation Xers, and 4) Millennials. The Baby Boomers being the past focus of wine advertising are the largest group with 80 million people. But, the Wine Market Council reports that it is the Millennial generation that "offers the wine industry the kind of growth potential not seen in more than thirty years" ("Consumer Research Summary"). The Millennials, on average, add 5% more new adults to the US population each year compared to Generation X. There are also almost 20 million Millennials that have yet to reach the drinking age of 21 ("Consumer Research Summary"). These statistics further prove the need for wine advertising to this generation.

Millennial Generation

People born between 1980 and 2000 make up the Millennial Generation and there are roughly 76 million Americans that fall into this group (Thach and Olsen, "Market" 309). The Millennial generation is also known as Generation Y, Generation Next, and Net Generation. This generation represents the future market for most consumer brands because they are considered to be "the largest consumer group in the history of the United States in terms of their buying power" (310). This is why there have been studies to discover common characteristics of Millennials and the perceptions Millennials have about wine and wine advertising.

Researchers have found five traits and/or characteristics that describe Millennials. The characteristics are: 1) technology savvy, 2) optimistic, but practical, 3) embrace diversity, 4) belief in fun and responsibility, and 5) environmentally and socially conscious (Thach and Olsen, "Market" 310). It is important to keep these characteristics in mind when advertising to this generation. For example, it is important to show diversity in all advertisements and to use all different forms of media, especially the internet. It is also important to make advertisements fun and positive, not too serious, and to emphasize business practices that are socially and environmentally responsible.

In a study titled *Market Segment Analysis to Target Young Adult Wine Drinkers* done by Elizabeth Thach and Janeen Olsen in 2006 they researched the perceptions and attitudes of 108 Millennials. Their focus was to find out about their feelings toward wine and what the wine industry can do to better market to them. They found out the reasons they drink wine, if they think wine is cool, the events they associate with wine, and suggestions to get more Millennials to drink wine.

Another valuable study to look at is titled *Wine for My Generation: Exploring How US Wine Consumers are Socialized to Wine* conducted in 2007 by Elizabeth Thach, Janeen Olsen and Linda Nowak. In this study they explored differences between the various generations drinking wine in their reasons they started drinking wine, the first kind of wines they drank, types of wine they drink now, situations wine is consumed, and image of wine.

When we look at the results from both of these studies we can take a lot of valuable information to market wine to Millennials. In the 2006 study they found that 48% preferred red wine, 18% preferred white, and 34% liked both. This corresponds with the results from the 2007 study, finding that majority of Millennials first started drinking red wine and that dry red wines are the top type of wine they are drinking now. An interesting finding from the 2007 study is that the Millennials are now starting to drink more sweet white wines, like Rieslings and Gewurztraminers. It is interesting because it is opposite of all the other generations, starting off with the sweeter wines and gravitating toward the dry reds and whites.

Besides what types of wines the Millennials are drinking it is also important to know why they drink wine. In the 2006 study they found that 31% reported drinking wine because they like the taste, 18% said it was because it goes well with food and 15% said they drink wine because it helps them relax. The 2007 study found similar results, but they also reported some other reasons for drinking wine. The Millennials reported drinking wine because their friends, family and co-workers drank wine, wine is more classy and sophisticated than beer, and that they enjoyed the feeling they got from drinking wine. In the 2006 study, 61% of the Millennials reported that they did not think drinking wine was “hip or cool” because “wine is too elite to be hip or cool.” This is a very key component that generation specific advertising can change.

Another aspect that marketers can attempt to change is the events that Millennials associate with drinking wine. In the 2006 study the results showed that Millennials associated drinking wine with nice dinners, weddings, and special events. However, the 2007 study found that the most popular situation for drinking wine reported by the Millennials was to consume wine with meals.

The most valuable findings for our study came from the 2006 study. They got suggestions for the wine marketers from Millennials to encourage more wine consumption (at reasonable levels). Some of the most popular marketing suggestions were to broaden market focus to diverse audiences, advertise more, reduce price, educate consumers on wine, and to provide more wine tasting opportunities. The three most popular advertising suggestions were to show people having fun and drinking wine, show young people drinking wine, and lastly to make commercials just like beer commercials, but with wine.

From both of these studies we got a lot of useful information for increasing wine consumption in the Millennial generation. The research shows that the Millennials do see wine as a good beverage to drink with food, to relax with, and to drink during social occasions with family and friends. We also found that a lot of Millennials view wine as elite and not focused enough to their generation.

Generic Advertising

The most popular generic advertising of our time is no doubt the “Got Milk?” campaign. Another popular generic advertising campaign was “pork: the other white meat.” Both of these campaigns saw increases in sales, which is the ultimate goal in advertising. According to

Amitav Chakravarti and Chris Janiszewski "the legislative goal of generic advertising is to increase primary demand of a product without influencing the market share of any one producer." Applying a generic campaign to any product comes with pros and cons; obviously there is no exception for the wine industry. Within the wine industry there are supporters of generic advertising and there are rejecters.

One generic wine campaign was the Wine Market Council's $1.2 million test ad campaign done in New York and Texas. It was developed by the same people who made the milk mustache campaign. They designed a generic wine campaign using the slogan "Wine: What are you saving it for?" to try to increase all wine purchases, not just for a specific brand (Cuneo 14). This campaign was trying to address the common notion that wine should be saved for special occasions and change it to an everyday drink. "Wine: What are you saving it for?" was not as successful as the wine industry had hoped. Rick Tigner, Kendall-Jackson Wine Estates, explained that this campaign was not effective because it was talking to people who already had a bottle of wine. He believes that the "upcoming campaign needs to reach those people who are marginal drinkers or who have yet… to adopt [wine] as even an occasional beverage of choice" (Hay).

In 2001 the Wine Market Council took another shot at generic wine marketing. This time they launched a website, *wineanswers.com*, hoping to "elevate and reshape the profile of wine in the minds of current and potential consumers" (Hay). The importance of a nationwide generic marketing campaign was supported by various leaders in the wine industry like Pete Seghasio from Seghesio Family Vinyards, Martin Johnson of Robert Mondavi Winery, Rick Tigner of Kendall-Jackson, and Rob Sinskey of Robert Sinskey Vineyards. This time the Wine Market

Council got a great response. Within a week of the launch of *wineanswers.com* the Wine Market Council booked an appearance on the ABC show *The View* with over 3 million viewers and they got 16 million mentions about the site in print (Hay). Sales in wine were also affected by the launch of the website. In 2000 wine sales were at $19.2 billion for that year, in 2001 sales increased to $20.3 billion and continued to increase to $21.8 billion in 2002 ("2009 California").

Although, we can see the success of generic wine advertising there are still people in the wine industry who do not think it is such a good idea. People point out the difference between the milk industry and the wine industry, noting that the wine industry is much more brand specific then the milk industry, while most consumers can not even name a brand of milk (Hay). Another issue at hand is that it costs a lot of money to do generic advertising and some of the smaller wineries do not have that kind of money to contribute, so the bigger wineries will have the greater responsibility to contribute. Smaller wineries have concerns about generic advertising because they are worried that the larger brands with more shelf space and more well-known names are going to be the only ones who benefit. Ruth Souroujan, Clos du Bois' marketing director, sums up the benefits that all of the wine industry would see from generic advertising by saying "even if consumers are swayed to buy wine more often, but end up buying the Mondavi or the Gallo… eventually they are in my brandset, and eventually they will buy our wine" (Tinnney). Shari Staglin, Staglin Family Vineyard, also notes that "any generic campaign should take the mystique out of wine and make it fun" (Hay).

Method

This study is designed to test what the research has found would be effective wine advertisements for the Millennial generation. This study will use four different print advertisements with two different messages about wine. The two different themes chosen follow what the research has found are among the top three reasons the Millennial generation drinks wine. The first is showing wine in a casual and relaxing setting. The second is showing wine with food in a social setting. Both will have people from the Millennial generation in them. The two different themes will be tested against each other to see which is more appealing to the viewers. Within each theme there will be a generic wine advertisement and a specific brand advertisement to also compare which one is more effective. The four print advertisements will be referred to as (1) food brand, (2) relax brand, (3) food generic, and (4) relax generic.

The brand specific advertisement and the generic advertisements will be showing the exact same pictures. In the generic wine advertisements no brand will be advertized, and in place a generic slogan will be printed on the advertisement. The brand that is going to be advertized is A to Z wines. This wine was chosen because it is from Oregon and it is not a super well known wine that Millennials on the central coast of California could easily recognize. The hope is that seeing the A to Z label will not evoke past experiences with that wine, and if it does hopefully it will be with only a small percentage of the sampling population. The relax generic brand will have the saying "wine a little… feel better" printed on it instead of the brand. The food generic brand will have the saying "wine… food's best friend."

The study is going to test which of these four advertisements are the most effective. This is going to be done by exposing each group to one of the four advertisements and then having

each participant fill out a survey post seeing the advertisement. The effectiveness of the advertisements is going to be measured by the viewer's attitude toward the ad and their purchase intentions. In general, it is believed that a positive attitude/feeling toward an advertisement is a good measure of its effectiveness (Baker & Churchill, Beerli & Santana, Okechuku & Wang). Another good measure of effectiveness is to see their purchase intentions after viewing the ad.

RQ 1 Will the brand specific or the generic wine advertisements be more effective at eliciting a favorable attitude from the Millennial generation?

RQ 2 Will the brand specific or the generic wine advertisements have higher reported purchase intentions after viewing the ad?

RQ 3 Which of the generic wine advertisements will be more effective at eliciting a favorable attitude from the Millennial generation?

RQ 4 Which of the generic wine advertisements will have higher reported purchase intention after viewing the ad?

Participants

There were 100 participants; each ad was viewed by 25 participants. The participants came from introductory soil science classes at California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo. The participants were male and female and they were all be born between 1980 and 2000. Participation in the study was completely voluntary.

The demographics of the participants were as follows: 58% of the participants were female and 42% male. When they were asked if they currently drink wine 31% reported being

core drinkers, having at least one glass of wine a week. 36% were marginal drinkers, having one or two glasses of wine a month and 33% did not drink wine at all. 61% of participants made less than $500 a month, 26% made between $500 and $1,000, 8% made between $1,000 and $1,500, and only 5% made above $1,500 a month.

Survey Design

The survey was given to participants after their exposure to one of the four advertisements. It was a one page survey using seven-point semantic differential scales (see Fig. 1) and two point Likert scales (see Fig. 2).

The scales used for testing effectiveness follow the survey designs of Baker and Churchill in 1977 and Okechuku and Wang in 1988. Another scale used is the Wells Emotional Quotient Scale from 1964 used by Beerli and Santana in 1999 in their *Design and Validation of an Instrument for Measuring Advertising Effectiveness in the Printed Media.* All of these scales were chosen because they were tested and used with print advertisements and they were used to compare the effectiveness of the print ads.

Fig. 1. Seven – Point Semantic Differential Scales

Interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dull
Unappealing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Appealing
Unbelievable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Believable
Impressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unimpressive
Attractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unattractive
Clear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Confusing
Not Eye Catching	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Eye Catching

Three components of an attitude (cognitive, affective, conative) were being tested by carefully chosen item statements. These items were chosen because they address all three components of an attitude and they "have been successfully used by companies in testing

advertising copy" (Baker and Churchill 540). The cognitive was measured by the items believable, informative, and clear. The affective (liking) was measured by the interesting, appealing, eye catching, impressive, and attractive items. Each item was measured on a seven-point semantic differential scale. Lastly, the conative was measured by their purchase intention, definitely not to certainly on a seven-point scale. This scale has a reliability rating of .91 for all ten items (541).

H1 The relax generic ad will be rated most favorably on the affective items.

H2 The relax generic ad will have the highest purchase intention reported.

H3 The food brand ad will be rated most favorably on the cognitive items.

The Wells Emotional Quotient Scale (EQ) is comprised of twelve statements to measure how the viewer feels about the advertisement. It was chosen because it is widely used, highly reliable, and ideal for use in the print advertisement medium (Beerli and Santana 20). The scale is scored by adding up the agreements with items 1,3,4,7,8 and 10 (the favorable items) and the disagreements with items 2,5,6,9,11 and 12 (the unfavorable items). After that that number is divided by twelve and multiplied by 100 to remove the decimal. Lastly, all the scores from each respondent are averaged to get score for each advertisement (Wells 46).

Fig. 2. Emotional Quotient Scale

This ad is very appealing to me.	Agree	Disagree
I would probably skip this ad if I saw it in a magazine.	Agree	Disagree
This is a heart-warming ad.	Agree	Disagree
I dislike this ad.	Agree	Disagree
This ad makes me feel good.	Agree	Disagree
This is a wonderful ad.	Agree	Disagree
This is the kind of ad you forget easily.	Agree	Disagree
This is a fascinating ad.	Agree	Disagree
I'm tired of this kind of advertising.	Agree	Disagree
This ad leaves me cold.	Agree	Disagree

In this survey only ten of the statements (see Fig. 2) were used because one of the favorable statements didn't work for this survey and taking one away on the favorable requires that one is taken away from the unfavorable side. The steps follow what was previously stated, except you divide by ten instead of twelve.

H4 The food generic ad will score highest on the EQ scale.

Results

Statistical analysis of the data was computed using the Windows versions of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). One-way ANOVA was used to test for significant differences in the mean for each group. Next, a series of Tukey's post hoc tests were performed to run multiple comparisons on the dependent variables; the mean difference being significant at the 0.05 level.

For analysis of the data each condition was labeled one through four: (1) food brand, (2) relax brand, (3) food generic, and (4) relax generic. For some of the scales on the survey the results had to be reversed so that all the positive items were on the number one side of scale and the negative items were on the seven side of the scale. The first tests were run with each of the variables being tested individually. Then the variables were grouped into cognitive or affective. The affective variables being measured were interesting/dull, appealing/unappealing, impressive/unimpressive, attractive/unattractive and eye catching/not eye catching. The cognitive variables being measured were believable/unbelievable, informative/uninformative and clear/confusing.

Table 1. Single Variable ANOVA Results

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
InterestingDull	Between Groups	14.190	3	4.730	2.118	.103
	Within Groups	214.400	96	2.233		
	Total	228.590	99			
AppealingUnapp	Between Groups	30.960	3	10.320	5.012	.003
	Within Groups	197.680	96	2.059		
	Total	228.640	99			
BeliUnbel	Between Groups	7.760	3	2.587	1.332	.269
	Within Groups	186.480	96	1.943		
	Total	194.240	99			
ImpressiveUn	Between Groups	2.750	3	.917	.374	.772
	Within Groups	235.360	96	2.452		
	Total	238.110	99			
AttractiveUn	Between Groups	9.870	3	3.290	1.567	.202
	Within Groups	201.520	96	2.099		
	Total	211.390	99			
InformUn	Between Groups	22.320	3	7.440	3.653	.015
	Within Groups	195.520	96	2.037		
	Total	217.840	99			
ClearConfusing	Between Groups	2.830	3	.943	.343	.794
	Within Groups	264.080	96	2.751		
	Total	266.910	99			
EyeNot	Between Groups	42.120	3	14.040	5.013	.003
	Within Groups	268.880	96	2.801		
	Total	311.000	99			

When the variables were run individually there were only three variables that reported significant differences between the groups (see Table 1): appealing/unappealing, eye catching/not eye catching and informative/uninformative. The food generic ad was rated the least appealing, the least eye catching, and the least informative.

Table 2. Affective and Cognitive ANOVA Results

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
affective	Between Groups	347.310	3	115.770	3.214	.026
	Within Groups	3457.600	96	36.017		
	Total	3804.910	99			
cognitive	Between Groups	79.310	3	26.437	2.692	.050
	Within Groups	942.800	96	9.821		
	Total	1022.110	99			

After the variables were put into groups of affective items and cognitive items there was evidence of significant differences between the groups (see Table 2).

Table 3. Affective and Cognitive Post Hoc Test Results

cognitive

Tukey HSD[a]

Condition	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
1.00	25	9.6800	
4.00	25	10.5600	10.5600
2.00	25	10.9200	10.9200
3.00	25		12.1600
Sig.		.503	.277

affective

Tukey HSD[a]

Condition	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
2.00	25	17.0400	
1.00	25	17.5200	17.5200
4.00	25	17.8400	17.8400
3.00	25		21.7200
Sig.		.965	.070

Looking at Table 3, the food brand ad was ranked the most favorable for the cognitive items, with the food generic ad being ranked the least favorable for the cognitive items. On the other hand, the relax brand ad was ranked the most favorable for the affective items, but again the food generic was ranked the least favorable.

Participants were also asked their overall reaction to each advertisement and whether or not they would purchase a bottle of wine after viewing the ad. Using the same seven point scale their overall reaction was measured with unfavorable being a one and favorable being a seven. The same seven point scale was used when asking if they would actively seek out a bottle of wine to purchase in a store with definitely not being a one and certainly being a seven. Results found statistical differences for participants' overall reaction (see Table 4), but not for their purchase intentions. The relax brand ad was the least favorable overall and the food brand was the most favorable overall.

Table 4. Favorable/Unfavorable ANOVA and Post Hoc Test Results

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Unfavfav	Between Groups	26.360	3	8.787	4.069	.009
	Within Groups	207.280	96	2.159		
	Total	233.640	99			

Unfavfav

Tukey HSD[a]

Condition	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
2.00	25	3.2800	
3.00	25	3.6000	3.6000
4.00	25		4.4000
1.00	25		4.4800
Sig.		.868	.155

Although, there was no significant differences found for participants' willingness to purchase a bottle of wine after viewing one of the advertisements there was a direct correlation found between participants drinking habits and their likeliness to purchase a bottle of wine (see Table 5). As one would expect, core drinkers reported the most likely to actively seek out a bottle of wine to purchase and non-drinkers were the least likely.

Table 5. Purchase Intention ANOVA and Post Hoc Test Results

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SeekNoYes	Between Groups	79.438	2	39.719	12.000	.000
	Within Groups	321.072	97	3.310		
	Total	400.510	99			

SeekNoYes

Tukey HSD[a,,b]

Drinking	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
3.00	33	2.9394	
2.00	36		4.1667
1.00	31		5.1613
Sig.		1.000	.072

Gender also made a difference in reported purchase intentions of the participants. Millennial females were found to be more likely to actively seek out a bottle of wine for purchase. Table six shows these results. Gender labeled two is for females and the higher the number the more likely participants would actively seek out a bottle of wine for purchase.

Table 6. Gender Differences in Purchase Intentions

SeekNoYes

Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1	3.7381	42	1.75387
2	4.3103	58	2.16193
Total	4.0700	100	2.01136

Only one of the four hypotheses was supported. Hypothesis one that the relax generic ad will be rated most favorably on the affective items was not supported. This study showed that the relax brand was rated most favorably on the affective items with a significance of 0.026. The second hypothesis that the relax generic ad will have the highest purchase intention reported was also not supported. The food generic and the relax generic actually had the same purchase intention reported and they were the highest, but there was no significant difference. Hypothesis three that the food brand ad will be rated most favorably on the cognitive items was supported with a significance of 0.05. The fourth hypothesis that the food generic ad will score highest on the EQ scale was not supported, the food brand ad actually scored the highest out of the four ads. Once again, there was no significant difference to support it.

Discussion and Implications

With the largest consumer generation coming into adulthood and the legal drinking age, presenting the wine industry with effective ways to advertise to this generation may provide them with a great advantage. Previous research had found that the Millennial generation thought

that wine advertisements were not focused toward them and that they needed to be more fun. The purpose of this study was to design wine advertisements that were specifically made for the Millennial generation, based on the findings from previous research, and then test them to see which ones were the most effective.

Unfortunately, the results of the ANOVA testing did not reveal any significant purchase intention affects. However, there were other interesting and significant results found. The relax brand advertisement was ranked the highest on the items expressing liking of the advertisement. The food brand advertisement was ranked highest on the cognitive items like believable, clear, and informative. Lastly, the overall most favorable advertisement was the relax brand ad.

Overall, the generic wine advertisements did not do very well compared to the advertisements that showed a specific brand of wine. One reason that this study could have gotten these results is that the participants were used to seeing wine advertisements that advertise for a specific wine or winery. The participants could have found the generic wine advertisements to be unrealistic in that regards. Another reason could be that Millennials are not only concerned with seeing fun advertisements, they want information about their wine as well. Advertisers need to direct their wine advertisements to the Millennial generation by making it fun and interesting, but they also have to remember to give the Millennials the information that they want.

The purchase intentions of the participants were based upon whether they drank wine or not, how often they did and their gender. The participants that drank the most wine were the most likely to seek out a bottle of wine in a store for purchase, as one would expect. Females also had a higher reported purchase intention. This is not surprising, as in our society it is much

more likely that males will drink beer more than women and more than wine. The implication here is that wine advertisers need to direct their attention to the people that don't drink wine (but still drink alcohol) and those that only drink wine a few times a month or year. This might mean putting information in the advertisements about why they should drink wine over a beer/spirit or why they do not have to save wine for certain occasions.

Results from this study vary slightly from results from previous research. The generic advertising did not prove to be very effective in this study because it did not give any information about the wine. Previous research on the success of generic advertising was done on a much larger scale which makes it hard to compare the two. The previous research done on what the Millennial generation wants to see in wine advertisements focused a lot on fun, casual, and relaxing themes. This study found that Millennials did respond favorably to those themes, but that they still wanted to have information in the wine advertisements they saw.

What this means to the wine industry is that focusing their advertisements to the Millennial generation is very important. The wine industry has to make sure not to insult the Millennials by assuming they do not need any information in their advertisements. Showing that wine is fun, casual and relaxing and giving information about the wine is key in successfully advertising wine to the Millennial generation.

Limitations

There are certain limitations that may impact the results of this study. One limitation is the small sample size. Another limitation is the sample's location in the central coast of

California. The central coast has over 200 wineries, making it the third largest wine region in California ("An Insiders Guide"). Both of these factors limit the generalizabilty of the results. Another limitation was the similarities in the advertisements and their message, making it difficult to get significant differences in responses from participants. Ideally, future research will have a larger population, employ random sampling techniques, and have very distinctively different advertisements.

Future Research

The limitations of this study open up many opportunities for future research. This study could be duplicated with a much larger sample and all over the United States. It would be interesting to see how Millennials not living in a wine region would react to these advertisements. It would also be interesting and helpful to researchers to add on to the survey a part where participants could write in what in particular they liked and did not like about the advertisement. Therefore, researchers could know more specifically what worked and what didn't.

Another opportunity for future research is to compare different themed advertisements. This study found that Millennials do want more information in their advertisements, so an advertisement with the health benefits of wine, or what goes into making a bottle of wine could be interesting to test. Redesigning the advertisements to show very different themes would hopefully allow for researchers to get significantly different results.

Works Cited

"2009 California Wine Sales." Wine Institute 2009. 3 May 2010 <www.wineinstitute.org>

"An Insiders Guide to California Wine Country." Wine Institute 23 Oct 2007. 3 May 2010 <www.wineinstitute.org>

Baker, Michael J. and Gilbert A. Churchill Jr. "The Impact of Physically Attractive Models on Advertising Evaluations." Journal of Marketing Research 14 (Nov 1977): 538-555

Beerli, Asuncion and Josefa D. Martin Santana. "Design and Validation of an Instrument for Measuring Advertising Effectiveness in the Printed Media." Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising 21 (Fall 1999): 11-31

Bornstein, Dan. "Milk: 'Got Milk' Article." U.C. Davis Innovator 1999. 5 May 2010 <http://www.milk.com/value/innovator-spring99.html>

Chakravarti, Amitav and Chris Janiszewski. "The Influence of Generic Advertising on Brand Preferences." Journal of Consumer Research 30.4 (March 2004): 487-502

"Consumer Research Data." Wine Market Council 2009. 20 April 2010 <www.winemarketcouncil.com>

"Consumer Research Summary." Wine Market Council 2009. 20 April 2010 <www.winemarketcouncil.com>

Cuneo, Alice Z. "Wine Group Huddles with Bozell Over Generic Push." Advertising Age 68.*37* (Sept 1997): 14

Hay, Jeremy. "Wine Market Council: 5-year Goal: Boosting Consumption to New Highs." Wine Business Monthly 15 Jan 2002. 15 April 2010 <www.winebusiness.com>

Okechuku, Chike and Gongrong Wang. "The Effectiveness of Chinese Print Advertisements in North America." Journal of Advertising Research 28 (Oct/Nov 1988): 25-34

Olsen, Janeen and Liz Thach and Linda Nowak. “Wine for My Generation: Exploring How US Wine Consumers are Socialized to Wine.” Journal of Wine Research 18.1 (2007): 1-18

Thach, Liz. “How to Market to Millennials.” Wine Business Monthly 15 Dec 2005. 15 April 2010 <www.winebusiness.com>

Thach, Liz and Janeen E. Olsen. “Market Segment Analysis to Target Young Adult Wine Drinkers.” Agribusiness 22.3 (2006):307-322

Tinney, Mary-Colleen. “Wine Advertising: Aims to Teach Consumers that Wine Can Be Enjoyed All the Time.” Wine Business Monthly 15 Jan 2002. 20 April 2010 <www.winebusiness.com>

Wells, William D. “EQ, Son of EQ, and the Reaction Profile.” Journal of Marketing 28 (Oct 1964): 45-52