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Wine tourism is a fast growing sector, with an estimated 30% growth in 2018 and has emerged as a strong and rising area of special interest tourism, representing an increasingly important element of regional and rural tourism development. In Greece wine has played an important role since ancient times, as it was an integral part of nutrition and religion, and by 800BC, Greeks had begun to perfect their techniques in winemaking. Wine tourism in our days, constitutes a factor for attracting visitors from all over the world. The present paper is an effort to explore and investigate the factors that affect the behavior of wine tourists in the island of Santorini, shaping their motives and intentions. More specifically, the aim of this paper is to explore the motivating factors that influence winery visitation, wine tourists’ level of satisfaction, interest and knowledge on wine, as well as their demographic characteristics. The methodological approach was based on quantitative research; more specifically a survey was conducted with the use of structured questionnaires. Results showed that the most popular activity for wine tourists visiting Santorini wineries was wine tasting and the main motives influencing the decision for winery visitation involved wine tasting and experiencing the atmosphere of the winery. This research also showed that the most important factors contributing to wine tourist’s satisfaction concerned the attitude, professionalism and knowledge of winery staff, as well as service quality.
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Introduction

A wine tourist is a person who in preference travels to visit wine-related destinations as well as territories of tourist attractiveness. Even though it is clear that the wine tourist demand is related to wine, as well as to a wine producing region, it is difficult to define a unique profile of the wine tourist (Asero & Patti, 2011, p.4). Wine tourists cannot be considered a uniform group because of the differences in their characteristics and motivations. Since wine tourism occurs in many different locations (Getz & Brown, 2006), wine tourist characteristics may vary depending on the destination where wine tourism takes place. Carlsen (2004) stressed...
that in order to be able to analyze wine tourism in depth, a thorough research is required in the wine tourism market, including tourists, since the wine producers and wine’s perceptions are not enough for the sustainable development of the industry. There has been an eminent lack of literature relating to wine tourist profiles, motivations, and characteristics (Hojman & Hunter-Jones, 2012; Marzo-Navarro & Pedraja-Iglesias, 2010; Kolyesnikova & Dodd, 2009; Wargenau & Che, 2006; Getz & Brown, 2006; Brown & Getz, 2005). On the contrary, most research has been outlined through the views and perceptions of wineries (Mitchell, Hall, & McIntosh, 2011).

Most recent publications concern the wine product (Alonso & Liu, 2011; Lopez-Guzman, Rodriguez-Garcia, Sanchez-Ganizares, & Lujan-Garcia, 2011), the profile, motives, intentions, and typology of the wine tourist (Marzo-Navaro & Pedraja-Iglesias, 2010; Alebaki & Iakovidou, 2010; Lopez-Guzman, Vieira-Rodriquez, & Rodriguez-Garcia, 2014; Byrd, Canziani, Hsieh, & Debbage, 2016). However, scientific research in Europe is less extensive compared to the New World (Australia, New Zealand, USA, Canada, etc.) (Bruwer, 2003; Alonso & O’Neil, 2009).

The existing limited academic research in Greek regions, particularly in an area that wine tourism is developing rapidly, namely the island of Santorini in the Aegean region, was the main reason for undertaking this specific research. The choice of this specific destination represents particular interest, as wine tourism in this region is a relatively new venture, however with great growth prospects. Existing infrastructures and organized activities combine wine with the local cuisine and alongside with the island’s traditions, such as the local architecture, musical and religious festivals, compose an attractive tourism product, capable of highlighting the wine experience in the area (Kokkosis & Balassa, 2012). According to a survey conducted by Marathronas (2017) for CNN Travel, the island of Santorini is on the list of top 15 wine tourism destinations internationally.

**Literature Review**

**Wine Tourism**

There are various definitions proposed for wine tourism. Wine tourism is a form of special interest tourism, and a significant component of both the wine and tourism industries (Hall, Johnson, Cambourne, Macionis, Mitchell, & Sharples, 2011). According to Hall and Macionis (1998) wine tourism involves the visitation of vineyards, wineries, wine festivals, and wine shows for which wine tasting and experiencing the attributes of a wine growing region, are the prime motivating factors. Additionally, Getz (2002) proposed that wine tourism concerns travel of wine lovers to wineries, wine growing regions, and wine themed attractions, though it is debatable whether only wine lovers should be considered part of wine tourism. It seems that visitors to wine regions vary in the extent to which wine and winery visits are principal to their decision to visit these regions (Charters & Ali-Knight, 2002; Gatti & Maroni, 2004).

Academics started engaging in wine tourism research in the late 1990s (Charters & Ali-Knight, 2000). Carlsen (2004) stressed out the importance of a thorough research on the wine tourism market in order to be able to analyze the wine tourism industry, since the perceptions of wine producers alone are not enough in order to fully comprehend the development of this sector. However, scientific research was mostly concentrated on the supply side, rather than focusing on the demand side (Mitchell et al., 2011). Although the need to explore wine tourism development from the wine tourist point of view has been identified, existing research regarding the nature, motives, and behavior (Charters & Ali-Knight, 2002) is not considered sufficient and has
not yet provided clear answers regarding the wine tourist profile (Alant & Bruwer, 2010).

In addition, factors influencing tourist’s intentions to visit local wineries also require further investigation (Ye, Zhang, & Yuan, 2014). Consequently, despite the significant progress made over the last decade investigating the profile of actual and potential wine tourists, the variety of factors affecting consumer behavior needs further exploration (Molina, Gomez, Gonzalez-Diaz, & Esteban, 2015).

Academic studies that investigated the profile, motives, intentions, attitudes, behavior typology, and satisfaction of wine tourists mainly took place in the New World Countries (Galloway, Mitchell, Getz, Crouch, & Ong, 2008; Wade & Pun, 2009; Dawson, Holmes, Jacobs, & Wade, 2011; Charters & Menival, 2011; Kim & Bonn, 2015; Byrd et al., 2016) and less in European countries such as Spain, Italy, France (Marzo-Navaro & Pedraja-Iglesias, 2010; Asero & Patti, 2011; Charters & Menival, 2011; Lopez-Guzman et al., 2014).

Similarly in Greece, academics have mostly addressed the issue of wine tourism through the supply side, mainly concentrating on the perspective of winemakers, rather than wine tourists (Tzimitra-Kalogianni, Papadaki-Klavdianou, Alexaki, & Tsakiridou, 1999; Karaifolas, 2007; Stavrinoudis, Tsartas, & Chatzidakis, 2012; Vlachvei, Notta, & Tsakiriannidou, 2012). On the demand side, there is limited research, mainly exploring the profile and typology of wine tourists on the “wine roads” of Northern Greece (Alebaki & Iakovidou, 2009; 2010; 2011; Alebaki, Menexes, & Koutsouris, 2015).

Profile of Wine Tourists

Various studies outlined the demographic profile of wine tourists, which tend to concern tourists between 30-60 years old with moderately high levels of income, varying from 20,000-30,000$ per year (Dodd & Bigotte, 1997; Pratt, 2011; 2014). The demographics of the wine tourist, especially age, vary depending on the region (Charters & O’Neil, 2000), as well as employment, educational and economic background (Sparks, 2007).

In general, the wine tourist seems to have a high level of income (Lopez-Guzman et al., 2014) suggesting a high purchasing power (Alonso, Fraser, & Cohen, 2007a; Charters & Menival, 2011; Dawson et al., 2011) and a high level of education (university degree) (Carmichael, 2005). Getz (1999) using data from the South Australian Tourism Commission described wine tourists as being couples with no children, with higher education and incomes in professional occupations. Getz and Brown (2006) in their research in Canada, found that 51.6% of wine tourists were women, 62.8% were 40-59 years old, 70% were married, and nearly 50% of the respondents earned an annual income of more than $100,000. However, Marzo-Navaro and Pedraja-Iglesias (2010) in their study in Spain found that males had a stronger presence in wineries. Hall et al. (2011) suggest that as in the New World Countries the wine industry and the characteristics of their culture and landscape are different compared to Europe, similarly the typical profile of the wine tourist is also different. In addition, O’Neil and Charters (2000) note the existence of differences even among wine tourists visiting wineries within the same country. It is expected though, that visitors in a winery cannot easily constitute a homogenous group (Charters & Fountain, 2006).

The psychographic characteristics of tourists involve aspects such as personality, values, activities, interests, views, and way of life (Strauss & Frost, 2001). Wine has many traits that could be combined with personality traits (Galloway et al., 2008) and a person’s involvement in wine tourism could provide an important structure, which could help understand wine consumption related behaviors (Christensen, Hall, & Mitchell, 2004). Furthermore, a person’s lifestyle with regard to wine reflects the level of interest in the product, consumer habits, even involvement in wine clubs (Alonso, Fraser, & Cohen, 2007b).
Similar characteristics identified from previous studies concern the interest shown by the individual for wine (Bruwer, 2003; Bruwer & Reily, 2006; Di-Gregorio & Licari, 2006; Houghton, 2008; Nella & Christou, 2014), his interest and knowledge regarding wine (Charters & Ali-Knight, 2002), his interest and motivation (Williams & Kelly, 2001; Gatti & Maroni, 2004; Diaz, 2008; Alebaki & Iakovidou, 2011; Bitsani & Kavoura, 2012), wine consumption (Taylor, Woodall, Wandschneider, & Foltz, 2004), including factors that are not directly related to wine, such as his preference regarding accommodation, the means of transportation, etc. (Tassiopoulos, Nuntsu, & Haydam, 2004).

A general framework regarding the behavior of the wine visitor proposes that he enjoys wine consumption being a regular consumer (Marzo-Navarro & Pedraja-Iglesias, 2010) and has specialized knowledge due to professional involvement in the wine industry (Getz & Brown, 2006). Moreover, when the purpose of the travel concerns wine tourism exclusively, the duration and activities are short and the main purpose is the search of pleasure, which derives from previous knowledge and experience (Alant & Bruwer, 2004).

**Motivating Factors That Influence Winery Visitations**

Determining tourists’ motivations has been significant in wine tourism literature (Carlsen, 2004; Mitchell & Hall, 2006). Education has repetitively been seen as a motivation in winery visitation (Charters & Ali-Knight, 2000; Getz & Carlsen, 2008; Fountain & Charters, 2010). Personal development was identified as a vital attribute desired by wine tourists (Sparks, 2007) and Galloway et al. (2008) found that sensation seekers rated learning as an even greater wine tourism stimulus.

The scenery and the vast open areas with vineyards are an important motive (Getz, 1999), as the characteristics of the wine region could stimulate winery visitation (Hall et al., 2011). Alongside, Hall and Mitchell (2002) highlight the term “tourist terroir”, which identifies the unique combination of natural and cultural resources that provide each region with a distinct tourism charm. In addition, the natural aspect of wine tourism involves internal and external services provided by the wineries (McDonnel & Hall, 2008), which have a positive impact on tourist behavior, as they encourage revisit (Mitchell & Hall, 2006).

Sparks (2007) identified three dimensions that could explain the behavior and motives of the wine tourists. Initially, the wine experience, which is associated with wine tasting, training, and friendly staff, constitutes one of the main targets of wine tourists (Getz & Brown, 2006). Additionally, developing an attractive wine route is considered critical in order to attract more visitors (Lee, Madanoglu, & Ko, 2016). Wine tourists tend to choose a wine destination taking under consideration its image, local cuisine, and weather conditions in the area (Sparks, 2007). The third and last dimension according to Sparks (2007) concerns their desire for personal development through learning during their wine tourism holidays. Wine tourists when visiting wineries have the desire to learn more about wine, meet new cultures, and enjoy the uniqueness of the wine region (Getz & Brown, 2006). Mitchell and Hall (2003) suggest that the level of knowledge regarding wine is an important indicator, as it has been linked with the money consumers spent for wine on a monthly basis, as well as, with the frequency of consumption (Mitchell & Hall, 2001; Beverland, 2003).

Experienced wine tourists would be motivated from the quality of wine, while novice wine tourists would be motivated from more basic factors such as the atmosphere and the winery facilities (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). Cohen and Be-Nun (2009) suggest that when a previous wine tourism experience exists, the individual is concentrated on more specialized features of wine. The individual experiences wine tourism in an
entirely different way when past experience exists, as his motives are affected (Alant & Bruwer, 2004), his attitude and perceptions (Hall et al., 2011) as well as his purchasing behavior in the winery (O’Mahony, Hall, Lockshin, Jago, & Brown, 2006).

Motives that include interest in wine and wine related activities are considered the main factors through which wine tourist’s behavior would be understood (Asero & Patti, 2011). This view is supported from Brown, Havitz, and Getz (2007) who argue that interest in wine has a very important role in creating the desire to visit a winery. The level of interest in wine is considered the best indicator to predict motivation (Charters & Ali-Knight, 2002). Additionally, Bruwer (2003) and Carmichael (2005) claimed that “winescape”, a term characterizing the wine region, wine production, and wineries (Tefler, 2000), constitutes a very important factor, acting as a motive for the wine tourist, which could explain the choice of winery to visit (Galloway et al., 2008), based though on the assumption that the sole purpose for visiting a particular destination is based on its winery’s reputation.

**Satisfaction**

Determining tourists’ motivations has been important in the wine tourism literature (Carlsen, 2004; Mitchell & Hall, 2006) with research assessing tourists’ evaluations focusing on the winery experience (Carmichael, 2005; Mitchell, 2006; Fountain & Charters, 2010). Tourists’ evaluations which follow the winery visitation include travel experience and quality based on the value and satisfaction received, as perceived by the tourist, while future intentions involve re-visititation and willingness to suggest to others to live the experience (Chen & Tsai, 2007; Tung & Richie, 2011). Consequently, the overall satisfaction from the visit, the quality of travel, the impression created by the image of the destination, all constitute reference points for predicting future intentions (Cole, Crompton, & Willson, 2002; Petrick, 2004).

The wine tourist enjoys wine consumption as it creates positive emotions and gives him pleasure (Quadri-Felitti & Fiore, 2013). Moreover, since wine tourism is considered an interactive and not a passive form of tourism (Quadri-Felitti & Fiore, 2013), experiencing it in all its dimensions leads to the creation of strong memories (Gilmore & Pine, 2002). The wine visitor is able to capture these memories, not only through the visit to the winery, but also through the purchase of wine (Charters & Pettigrew, 2005), souvenirs and books (Wilkins, 2011) during his visit. In addition, recreational and educational activities during the tour can satisfy his inherent needs for his search for escape (Getz & Carlsen, 2008).

Mitchell and Hall (2003) also indicate that customer satisfaction can be influenced by the quality of the interaction between frontline employees and winery visitors. Furthermore, Mitchell (1999) notes a strong association between visitors’ satisfaction with wine and with their experience at the winery. Wineries need to ensure that visitors’ demands and expectations are being fulfilled, and to achieve this, they should consider evaluating and monitoring the performance of their service quality (Getz, 2002).

**Methodology**

Quantitative research presents many advantages to the social sciences. According to Brunt (1997), in the tourism industry there is a focus on statistical analysis and numerical presentations, which mean that industry managers can use this information to make decisions in a knowledgeable framework. For example, quantitative research is predominantly useful in the areas of forecasting and predicting demand in the hospitality sector and in the study of tourists’ behavior (Dunn, 1994), which is the case in this study. According to Wickens (2002),
the social survey is one of the main methods of data collection which embodies the features of quantitative research. The survey’s capacity to generate quantifiable data on large numbers of people has been viewed by many researchers as a means of capturing many of the ingredients of a natural science.

The methodological approach of this paper was based on quantitative research methods. Taking into consideration the objectives and nature of this specific research, it was decided that quantitative research methods were appropriate for this particular study, as the aim was to reach and investigate opinions, beliefs, motivation, and behavior of international tourists visiting wineries in the island of Santorini. More specifically, a survey was conducted with the use of structured questionnaires, which were given to winery visitors shortly after the end of their tour and visit. Questions were developed working deductively from general to specific. It should be noted that the review of the literature played a significant role in research planning, questionnaire development, and design stages, as it became an input to the planning, design, and analysis of the questionnaires. The questionnaires employed for the purpose of this research contained closed questions. They were easier and quicker to complete, the quantification and coding was easier, and there was the possibility to ask more questions in relation to the time and money available (Brunt, 1997).

The participants in the research process were selected with the use of convenience and purposive sampling. A total of 280 questionnaires were distributed during a period of three weeks in August 2017, of which 161 were returned completed. However, 150 questionnaires were processed for statistical analysis, as there were 11 respondents who were Greek and could not be included in the results, as this investigation concerned international tourists.

Limitations

The main limitation of this research would be the collection period of primary data, as research was conducted during August, and according to the wineries’ managers, it does not reflect the seasonality of the product. June and September are considered the peak season for wine tourism in the island of Santorini, according to the wineries. Moreover, this sample would not be completely objective, as the number of participants is small compared to the total market (Charters & Ali-Knight, 2002). Although the sample concerns international tourists, the research is limited by its exploratory nature and in particular because it took place in a specific part of Greece. Finally, another major constraint of this research was that a large number of tourists refused to participate due to time constraints, as most of them visited the wineries in organized excursions and were on a very tight time schedule.

Results

The questionnaire provided to wine tourists included 24 questions and was divided in four key themes: travel-visit characteristics and motives for winery visitation, level of knowledge, interest in wine and consumption, level of satisfaction, and demographics.

Travel and Visit Characteristics

There were 150 respondents who took part in this research from four wineries in Santorini. More than half of the respondents, 53%, were visiting Santo Wines Winery, followed by 28% in Venetsanos Winery, 11% in Xatzidakis Winery, and 8% in Sigalas Winery.

A total 78.4% of the respondents visited Santorini for the first time and 21.6% were repeat visitors.

Regarding the length of stay, 54% of the tourists were visiting Santorini for more than two nights, 25% for
Respondents were asked “Which one was the main purpose for visiting the island of Santorini”. As shown in Table 1, the highest percentage of the respondents, 30%, visited Santorini for holidays, followed by 25% who stated that their purpose was relaxation, leisure, and recreation. Attractive scenery and sunset was the reason why 13% of the respondents visited Santorini, 9% to experience the local culture, 9% for sightseeing and to visit attractions in the region. Although Santorini is on the 15 top wine tourism destinations internationally (Marathonas, 2017), only 4% stated that their purpose was wine tourism and visiting wineries.

**Table 1**

**Purpose of Visit**

| Purpose                              | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Wine tourism—visiting wineries       | 4%         |
| Experience local culture             | 9%         |
| Holiday                              | 30%        |
| Relaxation—leisure—recreation        | 25%        |
| Cruise                               | 3%         |
| Attractive scenery—sunset            | 13%        |
| Meet with friends and relatives      | 3%         |
| Business                             | 1%         |
| Sightseeing—visiting attractions in the region | 9%   |
| Wedding anniversary                  | 2%         |
| Honeymoon                            | 1%         |

The highest percentage of the sample, 48%, stated that they were accompanied by their partner, followed by 21% who visited the winery with their friends. Additionally, 17% of the respondents were with their wives/husbands, another 7% were accompanied by relatives, 4% with their family with children, and finally 3% were accompanied by colleagues.

With the motives for visitation change depending whether tourists are experienced wine tourists or novice (Alant & Bruwer, 2004; O’Mahony, Hall, Lockshin, Jago, & Brown, 2006; Cohen & Be-Nun, 2009), it was important to investigate their past experience. More than half of the respondents, 65% stated that they were repeat winery visitors and 35% were visiting a winery for the first time. In order to determine the future intention of the participants, they were asked whether they were going to visit another winery during their staying in the island of Santorini. Results showed that 72% of the respondents had no intention to visit another winery in Santorini during their stay and only 28% answered positively.

The most popular activity, presented in Table 2, which respondents were engaged during their visit to the winery was wine tasting (33%). Guided winery vineyard tours seem to be more popular (14%) compared to self-guided (4%). Results also showed that 13% of the respondents purchased wine, 12% tasted local products on display at the winery, 9% dined at the winery restaurant, and 8% attended staff educational presentation. There was low interest in purchasing winery souvenirs (3%) and local products on display (2%) as well as meeting and discussing with the winemaker (2%).
Table 2

| Wine Tourism Activities During Winery Visit       | 21  | 14% |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Guided winery—vineyard tour                      | 6   | 4%  |
| Self-guided winery—vineyard tour                 | 18  | 12% |
| Tasted local products on display in the winery   | 14  | 9%  |
| Dined at winery restaurant                       | 12  | 8%  |
| Purchased local products on display at the winery| 4   | 3%  |
| Purchased winery souvenirs                       | 19  | 13% |
| Wine tasting                                     | 50  | 33% |
| Met and discussed with the winemaker             | 3   | 2%  |
| Attended staff educational presentations         | 12  | 8%  |

In order to interpret the behavior of the wine tourist, it was very important to investigate the motives that led to the winery visitation. Initially, participants were asked to evaluate on a scale from 1-5 (where 1 = not important and 5 = very important) the significance of several sources of information that influenced the decision of the respondents to visit the winery. Winery’s reputation was considered a very important source of information by 85% of the respondents, followed by word of mouth as 80% believed it was equally important. Evidence showed that 68% of the respondents did not believe that visitor information centers were important and 65% believed that previous visits were not important as well. As far as wine region’s guides were concerned, opinions differed as 40% considered them not important and 48% answered that they were important.

Finally, 44 from the total 150 respondents’ added information in “other” motivating factors, with 55% indicating TripAdvisor, 27% own research, 14% friend recommendation, and 14% oenological interests.

In order to investigate the motives that drove the participants of this research to the wine tourism experience and activities, a list of different motives was provided and they were asked to indicate their main motive for visitation. Table 3 shows the main motives for winery visitation according to the participants of this research. The main motive for the international tourists to visit the winery, 39%, was to have a wine tasting experience, 13% wanted to experience the atmosphere, and 11% to drink wine. Motives following with lower percentages were to have a relaxing day out (6%), to find interesting and unique wines (5%), to increase their knowledge (4%), positive recommendation by others (4%), the high reputation of the winery (3%), to learn more about the wine making process (3%), to go on a winery tour (3%). More motivations that were stated concerned to be entertained, for the rural setting and to buy wine with 2% accordingly and finally positive past experience, to socialize, and to eat at the winery’s restaurant were motives chosen by 1% of the sample accordingly. There were three motives that were not chosen by the respondents (to purchase souvenirs, to meet the winemaker, the rest of the group influence me).
Table 3

Main Motive for Winery Visitation

| Motive                                             | Yes | No |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| To have a wine tasting experience                  | 58  | 30%|
| To experience the atmosphere                        | 19  | 13%|
| To drink wine                                       | 16  | 11%|
| To have a relaxing day out                          | 9   | 6% |
| To find interesting and unique wines                | 7   | 5% |
| To increase my knowledge                            | 6   | 4% |
| Positive recommendation by others                   | 6   | 4% |
| The high reputation of the winery                   | 5   | 3% |
| To learn more about the wine making process         | 5   | 3% |
| To go on a winery tour                              | 4   | 3% |
| To be entertained                                   | 3   | 2% |
| For the rural setting                               | 3   | 2% |
| To buy wine                                         | 3   | 2% |
| Positive past experience                            | 2   | 1% |
| To socialize                                        | 2   | 1% |
| To eat at the winery’s restaurant                   | 2   | 1% |

Level of Knowledge, Interest in Wine, and Consumption

The next part of the research concerned the sample’s level of interest, knowledge, and wine consumption. Respondents were asked to answer with a “yes” or “no” to some specific statements. As presented in Table 4, 75% of the respondents do not have extensive knowledge on wine and 85% are not wine specialists. Most of the respondents (77%) do not read frequently articles that specialize in wine and 86% are not members in wine clubs. However, 95% are interested in wine and wine related activities and 67% stated that wine related activities are a sufficient element for taking the trip to the winery.

Table 4

Interest and Knowledge in Wine

| Statements                                                   | Yes  | No   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|
| I have extensive knowledge on wine.                          | 25%  | 75%  |
| I am a wine specialist.                                      | 15%  | 85%  |
| I am interested in wine and wine related activities.         | 95%  | 5%   |
| The wine related activities are a sufficient element for taking the trip. | 67%  | 33%  |
| I frequently go for wine tasting.                            | 44%  | 56%  |
| I frequently read articles that specialize in wine.          | 23%  | 77%  |
| I am a member of a wine club.                                | 14%  | 86%  |

Regarding the level of interest in wine in general, the highest percentage of respondents, 62%, had an average interest on wine, 30% were highly interested, 7% demonstrated a low interest, and 1% did not answer the question.

As far as the consumption of wine was concerned, nearly half of the respondents, 49%, drank a lot of wine, 29% drank enough, 17% drank a little, and a 5% visiting the winery did not drink at all.

Although for only 2% of the respondents this was a motive for visitation as stated earlier, more than half, 55% of the respondents, bought wine during their visit to the winery, and another 45% answered negatively.
Those 55% of the respondents (82 out of 150) were asked to determine the most important factor that led them to their wine purchasing decision. As presented in Table 5, results showed that the most important factors were taste (34%), followed by wine quality (23%), aroma (13%), and value for money (11%). Other factors chosen by the respondents follow with lower percentages, such as staff presentations (9%), service quality of the winery (4%), information acquired regarding wine production (3%), creation of a favorable image for the winery (2%), and brand label (1%).

Table 5
Factors That Contributed to the Wine Purchasing Decision

| Factor                                      | Count | Percentage |
|---------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Taste                                       | 28    | 34%        |
| Wine quality                                | 19    | 23%        |
| Aroma                                       | 11    | 13%        |
| Value for money                             | 9     | 11%        |
| Staff presentations                          | 7     | 9%         |
| Service quality of the winery               | 3     | 4%         |
| Information acquired regarding wine production | 2   | 3%         |
| Create a favorable image for the winery     | 2     | 2%         |
| Brand label                                 | 1     | 1%         |

Level of Satisfaction

Additionally, it was important to investigate the level of satisfaction acquired from the winery visitation, as well as, the experiences and feelings derived from this wine tourism experience. Table 6 shows that the most important outcome was the opportunity to relax (27%), followed by the ability to have new experiences (18%). The main feelings that derived from the winery visitation involved sensation seeking (14%), stimulation (11%), and indulgence (10%). Possibility of adventure was an outcome for 7% of the respondents and share similar values with other people for 5%. Opportunity for introspection (3%), possibility of romance (3%), feeling of achievement (1%), and spiritual experiences (1%) follow with lower percentages among the choices of the respondents.

Table 6
Wine Tourists' Feelings and Experiences

| Feeling                                      | Count | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Opportunity to relax                         | 41    | 27%        |
| Novel—new experiences                        | 27    | 18%        |
| Sensation seeking                            | 21    | 14%        |
| Stimulation                                  | 17    | 11%        |
| Indulgence                                   | 15    | 10%        |
| Possibility of adventure                     | 11    | 7%         |
| Share similar values with other people       | 7     | 5%         |
| Opportunity for introspection                | 4     | 3%         |
| Possibility of romance                       | 4     | 3%         |
| Feeling of achievement                       | 2     | 1%         |
| Spiritual experiences                        | 1     | 1%         |

Respondents also evaluated the most important factors that contributed to the overall satisfaction of the winery visitation. The most important factor for 23% of the sample was the politeness and friendliness of the
staff, 19% stated the professionalism and knowledge of the staff, 18% the staff attitude, 11% service quality, and 7% the individual attention from staff. Factors such as variety of wines (6%), attractiveness of the scenery (6%), winery tasting room (5%), rural landscape (3%), recreational and educational activities (1%), and wine and souvenir purchase (1%) follow with lower percentages. Results show that for the highest percentage of the respondents (78%) in Santorini wineries, factors concerning staff and service quality were considered most important for their overall satisfaction.

Table 7

| Factors                              | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Polite and friendly staff            | 34        | 23%        |
| Professional and knowledgeable staff| 29        | 19%        |
| Staff attitude                       | 27        | 18%        |
| Service quality                      | 16        | 11%        |
| Individual attention from staff      | 11        | 7%         |
| Variety of wines                     | 9         | 6%         |
| Attractiveness of the scenery        | 9         | 6%         |
| Winery tasting room                  | 8         | 5%         |
| Rural landscape                      | 5         | 3%         |
| Recreational and educational activities | 1       | 1%         |
| Wine and souvenir purchase           | 1         | 1%         |

The last question concerns the sample’s overall satisfaction from their visit to the winery. Results show that more than half of the sample (59%) were extremely satisfied, 37% stated that they are satisfied and 4% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. There were no respondents stating that they were dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied. The overall satisfaction is considered a forecasting indicator for re-visitation and future intention (Chen & Tsai, 2007; Tung & Richie, 2011); nonetheless, in this case, 96% of the sample stated that they are satisfied and 72% stated that they do not intend to visit another winery.

Demographics

The majority of the respondents, 62%, were female and 38% were male. Visiting wineries is evidently more popular between the ages 18-29 as this band represented 73% of the respondents, followed by 24% in the age band between 30-39. Only 3% were between 40-59 years old and no one over 60 years old.

Since this was a research for international tourists, the nationality of wine tourists was an important factor to investigate. Respondents generated from 18 different countries. Results agree partly with the nationality of tourists visiting Greece in general, as 22% of the respondents were from Germany, 14% from UK, 10% from Italy, 9% from USA, 7% from France, 6% from Turkey, 5% from China, Poland, and Russia accordingly. Countries of origin following with lower percentages include Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Sweden with 3% accordingly. Finally, Belgium, Hungary, Malaysia, Singapore, and Bulgaria follow with 1% accordingly.

The highest percentage of the respondents, 48%, stated that they are couples, 31% were single, and 21% were married. There was no respondent in the category divorced or widowed.

As far as respondent’s profession is concerned, 46% stated that they work in the private sector, 22% were civil servants, 13% stated that they are self-employed, 9% were retirees, 6% were students, 1% stated unemployed, and finally 3% stated “other” without though specifying this choice.
Results also show that more than half of the respondents, 53%, have a bachelor degree, 31% have a master’s degree, and 7% stated having a Ph.D. degree. Another 9% stated secondary education. There were no respondents with primary education or no formal education.

Finally, as far as income was concerned, 27% of the respondents stated a monthly income above 4,501 €, 21% stated 1,501-2,500 €, 18% had an income of 2,501-3,500 €, 16% stated 3,501-4,500 €, 13% earned 751-1,500 €, and finally 5% stated that earned less than 750 € at a monthly basis.

**Conclusion**

This paper contributes to the expanding of our understanding and knowledge of the context of wine tourism, examined from the demand side, which is shaped by a variety of factors and variables. It can be observed that conclusions deriving from both primary and secondary research vary. First of all, some elements regarding the profile of wine tourists in Santorini wineries differs, compared to wineries in Europe and the New World. While findings agree with the literature as far as high level of education and income are concerned, differences can be spotted in age and gender. The largest group of wine visitors in Santorini were women, 18-29 years old. However, as mentioned in the literature, it is not expected for wine visitors to constitute a homogenous group.

Nevertheless, the most important aspect of this research involved the overall experience gained from wine tourists. Wine tourism generally seems to be a part or an improvement of tourists’ holidays, as it is not considered the main motivation when choosing Santorini as a destination. This is illustrated by the sample population of this specific research. The most important sources of information to visit specific wineries seem to be the winery’s reputation and word of mouth. The most popular activity for the wine tourists that constituted our sample, was wine tasting and guided winery vineyard tours. The main motives influencing the decision for winery visitation involved having a wine tasting experience, drinking wine, experiencing the atmosphere of the winery, and having a relaxing day out. However, although the images and memories that wine tourists have formed through this experience and strong and happy, the majority are not interested and have no intention of repeating the visit to the same or a different winery.

Wine tourism extends beyond simple wine consumption. This research shows that although wine tourists are interested in wine and wine related activities, they do not have extensive knowledge on wine and they do not consider themselves wine specialists. Wine tourists seek opportunities to relax, to gain new experiences, sensation, stimulation, indulgence, and possibilities of adventure. From the moment the wine tourists decide to live this experience, their satisfaction depends on whether the winery will meet their expectations and complete this visit in a satisfactory way. Results show that for the wine tourist the most important factors contribute to his satisfaction concern polite, friendly, professional, and knowledgeable staff, attitude (of the staff), and service quality in general, as well as individual attention from the staff. These views, combined with the efforts of many wineries to create and present a pleasant environment, indicate the importance of service and atmosphere regarding the quality of visitors’ experiences.

**Recommendations**

The design of quality wine services would highlight its social aspect and could help approach both international and domestic wine tourists. Proper selection and training of staff, with high professionalism and knowledge, is of outmost importance for wineries, in order to fully satisfy even the most demanding customers.
Searching for ways to increase the level of consumer participation in wine tourism activities will reinforce tourism and local society. As this research showed, the initial desire of a tourist to visit a winery starts with stimuli he receives from a narrow or wide external environment (e.g., word of mouth). Therefore, broader synergies and partnerships are needed in order to promote the image of the offered wine tourism product.

It is important to identify the factors that stimulate wine tourist’s motivations, preferences, and satisfaction factors, as this would assist the wine tourism industry to improve the provided services and wine tourism product through the development of appropriate strategies, in order to meet even the most sophisticated needs and requirements of their targeted market. Moreover, there are more aspects of wine tourism that need investigation, such as: the effect of age, emphasizing on younger visitors, on the intention of visiting a winery, in which way activities that wine tourists are involved within the winery could boost sales, the role of wine clubs, social media, and the internet in the promotion of the wine tourism products.

Finally, it is suggested to repeat this research with similar objectives in wineries in different parts of Greece as well as in a different time during the year in Santorini, preferable May or September, to investigate similarities or differences in the data acquired. Concluding, as the literature supports, more consumer based research into wine tourism is needed, as it is very important to understand the image of wine tourism and wine tourists in order to ensure the future growth of the wine tourism industry.
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