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Social Media as a Means to Access Millennial Wine Consumers

Abstract

Purpose
The purpose of this research is to gain insights of the use of social media (SM) in the wine industry. From the theoretical viewpoint to analyze wineries’ social media segmentation, targeting and positioning (STP) to help the wine industry to improve the effectiveness of SM communication.

Design/methodology/approach
An observational study of Spanish wineries’ SM presence and traffic was carried out during a three-month period in 2013 and repeated in 2016. During this period a questionnaire was distributed to 196 wineries. Logistic regression was used to model the dichotomous outcome variable of whether a winery “does” or “does not” utilise SM. Additionally, leader wineries were interviewed in April/May 2016 about SM segmentation, targeting and positioning (STP).

Findings
The results show that most wineries are starting in SM without a well-defined strategy. The presence of a webpage is significantly related to the use of SM. SM wineries do not segment and can take advantage of digital targeting strategies.

Practical implications
Segmentation and targeting SM can improve the effectiveness of the winery SM activities as well as the winery competitiveness in the wine industry.

Originality/value
This research is a first step in understanding the value of segmentation SM to reach millennial consumers and the importance of targeting to improve the effectiveness of winery on SM.

Keywords ICT, Spanish wineries, digital wine targeting and positioning strategy, wine SM segmentation.
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Introduction
Researchers and marketers emphasize the importance of SM as an easy, low cost communication option that provides an immediate connection with a large number of consumers (Dolan et al., 2016; Fiore et al., 2016; Forbes et al., 2015; Thach and Lease,
However, there is still a long way to go for the wine industry with regards to SM management before it becomes a truly efficient marketing tool for the wine industry (Laverie et al., 2011; Vinography, 2016).

It is generally accepted, even by wineries, that SM like Facebook and Twitter are a means to access millennial wine consumers. Nevertheless, the literature remarks that the younger generations are embracing SM (Leigon, 2011). Facebook and Twitter are more used by Generation X and baby boomers (Leigon, 2011; Reyneke et al., 2011). Little research has been undertaken to understand the segmentation and specific targeting of marketing practices using SM to improve the competitiveness of wineries. Even less is known about the effectiveness of SM communications in order to access target groups like millennial wine consumers.

1. Background

1.1 Wine and Social Media

The 2008 Global Financial Crisis did cause many consumers to move downmarket, which included purchasing wines that were less expensive, and from a greater variety of wine regions (Gokcekus and Finnegan, 2013). This coincided with a surge in the use of the internet and SM, which significantly expedited information sharing (Zickuhr, 2010; Wilson and Quinton, 2012). SM has become an important tool that connects one third of the world’s population (Nelson Field and Taylor, 2012), more than one billion people use Facebook and more than 280 million are active users on Twitter each month (Stieglitz et al., 2014). SM offers advertisers access to eighty per cent of global consumer expenditures, a US$29 trillion market (Nuttney, 2010) and more than 15 million brands are registered on Facebook (Koetsier, 2013). Wine and associated business received its fair share of increased exposure from this surge in SM-based interests, e.g. wine is the most frequently searched beverage on the web and is being talked about daily and hourly by an international and diverse tweeting population (Thach and Rosenberg, 2011; Storchmann, 2012; Wilson and Quinton, 2012). Many wine consumers pay attention to the views and thoughts of “similar others” to seek experts' opinions (Gokcekus and Finnegan, 2013; Cialdini and Goldstein, 2004); while the UK’s leading wine critic “tweets” regularly on Twitter who has more than 24,000 followers (Reyneke et al., 2011). A study carried out by Szolnoki et al. (2014) showed 75% of SM users admitted that wine-associated SM interactions can influence their purchases and increase spend on an individual wine purchase. Furthermore, their study
also revealed that fans are 41% more likely to recommend those wines. It is estimated
that 90% of wine drinkers use Facebook 6.2 hours per week, and Google Analytic-2012
shows that wineries are the third most popular subject on Pinterest. The number of wine
blogs is now estimated to be around 1,300 (Thach and Lease, 2014). While a keen
interest in wine-related SM exists.

1.2 Millennial Generation and Wine Behaviour

Millennial consumers are defined as: persons born between 1977 and 2000, who are the
“children of the baby boomers” (Atkin and Thach, 2012). The most prominent
characteristic is their technology savviness and use of that technology in almost every
aspect of their lives (Pate and Adams, 2013). Five years ago, they spent on average of
33 hours per week on the internet (Kilian et al., 2012); with 83% being engaged with
online social networking sites (Zickuhr, 2010); and almost all millennials in developed
countries have a smart phone (Miller, 2014; Nicholls, 2012). The millennials’ interest in
technology might explain why many seek out wine groups on Facebook and other social
networking sites (Thach and Olsen, 2006).

While the millennials account for a 35% growth in wine consumption in US (Atkin
and Thach, 2012); in both France and Italy overall wine consumption among millennials
is decreasing (Charters et al., 2011; Espejel et al., 2011). Red wines appear to be the
preferred varietal among US millennials (Olsen et al., 2007; Teagle et al., 2010),
however they happily try previously unexplored wines from a range of different
countries. Millennials utilize ‘alcohol content’, ‘label imagery’ and ‘medals won’ as
points of interest; while older generations utilize ‘country of origin’, ‘vintage’ and
’region’ as cues to make purchasing decisions (Atkin and Thach, 2012). In this sense,
awards and medals, expert scores, and other on-package information all contribute to
increasing the probability of choice. In fact, consumers who spend more on wine
demand more information (Lockshin and Corsi, 2012).

When making purchasing decisions the millennials are especially susceptible to
opinions of others (Orth, 2005). They are readily influenced and are often concerned
about their own ability to choose the correct wine for the correct occasion (Barber et al.,
2006). In contrast, Teagle et al. (2010) pointed out that millennials were found to be
less risk averse than older wine consumers. Generally, the self-reported wine knowledge
by millennials is significantly lower compared to older people (Atkin and Thach, 2012).

Millennials rely more on advice from salespersons or waiters, and samples and in-house
Hussain et al. (2008) found that wine consumption was positively related to age and income.

1.3 Segmentation and targeting wine social media

In a strong competitive market a segment-based positioning strategy can be a competitive advantage and can provide solutions for the selection of an appropriate target group and the definition of a suitable offer (Natter et al., 2008). Viberti et al. (2014) emphasized the ability of SM to achieve a direct contact with a target market characterized by an interest in wine consumption and belonging to a wine community.

However, Thach (2010) highlights the lack of scientific studies about the type of consumer who reads and interacts with wine blogs. While Blasius and Brandt (2010) noticed a higher proportion of younger and more educated internet users, Bruwer and Wood (2005) remarked that wine-buying internet users’ are mostly men in their mid-thirties and in a high-income bracket. Apart from those, there is little evidence about who the users of wine SM are.

Likewise, little is known about wineries’ strategies for segmentation, targeting and positioning (STP) in SM. Capitello et al. (2014) remarked that larger wineries are targeting ‘fun’, “terroir” and ‘quality’ to attract potential consumers to their brands; while the rest of the wineries are conveying sophisticated corporate values associated to their brands, especially to young consumers. Capitello et al. (2014) classified wineries’ strategies as digital brand orientation and brand involvement, according to the development and positioning of the brand on SM. The wineries that use multiple SM channels, rather than only one or two are more probable to report increases in wine sales (Thach and Lease, 2014). Leigon (2011) defends the ability of SM to communicate directly with sales managers/representatives and distributors.

Wineries can take advantage of the surge in SM engagement on Fridays (Dolan et al., 2016) and the increase in wine consumption on weekends. Wineries can also post images, mental associations, and lifestyles to target young wine consumers in developed countries (geo-targeting) (Fiore et al., 2016; Wilson and Quinton, 2012). The data provided by users through SM subscription, i.e. Facebook, can serve to segment and access millennial wine consumers and exploit demographic targeting (Bruwer and Li, 2007). Google allows business to perform searches on millennials, including millennials’ interests on the messages by keywords targeting (Bauer et al., 2011). Internet ‘cookies’ allows the webhost to send messages/banners of a category of wine
that the user has abandoned to purchase (re-targeting). Behavioral-targeting of a wine consumer and their online fingerprint might allow the user of a digital device to be prompted and send similar contents and advertisements (Barber, 2010). Businesses can also buy internet search hits/occurrences through keywords of wines of interest, or wineries, to receive all the information published about them, which is called semantic priming (Labroo et al., 2008). Despite this, Lockshin and Corsi, 2012, argued that we are still at a very early stage in understanding the best way to use SM in wine marketing.

2. Research Objectives, Hypotheses and Methods
The overall objective of the research is to gain insights of the use of SM in the wine industry and to test the wineries SM segmentation and targeting to improve the effectiveness of SM communication, but specifically to:

- Determine the SM strategy among Spanish wineries.
- Analyse the evolution of SM practices among the Spanish wineries.
- Measure the wineries awareness on segmentation and targeting SM.

To direct the research the following hypotheses were tested:

H₁: Most of the wineries are starting in SM without a well-defined strategy.
H₂: Wineries engaging in SM have a “digital” history.
H₃: Wineries engaging in SM do not segment SM on targeting wine consuming millennials.

2.1 Data collection
This study employed a randomized and stratified sample of 196 wineries in the Spanish wine region of ‘Castilla y León’ that counts twelve Origin Denomination labels. For a total of 588 wineries in the region at the time of this study, the sample size (196) yielded a 95% confidence interval with a 7.14% predicted margin of error.

Firstly, the wineries were selected from the Origin Denomination Board’s database. Then a survey was conducted to collect wineries data in the light of i) business and ii) SM management (Table 1). The survey was conducted by a mixed method. Some of the business data were collected using the annual directory of Spanish wineries and then completed by phone in 2013 and again in 2016; while some of the data were obtained by observing SM content and activities. For instance: SM activities of wineries on Facebook and Twitter were followed from January to March of 2013; and again for the
same period in 2016 during which Instagram was included (Instagram was not in use by any of the wineries in 2013). Categorical and quantitative data were obtained.

The study was completed with a qualitative study, consisting of deep interviews with leading Spanish wineries to collect data in the light of i) management, ii) millennial segmentation, and iii) success on SM.

2.2 Logistic regression model and significance analyses

SPSS 20.0 software package was used for statistical analyses. Absolute and relative frequencies and accumulated percentages were obtained. To obtain the significant variables to have SM a two-way dependence was calculated. The two-way dependence between the business variable to be explained and the explanatory dichotomous outcome variable, “use” or “do not use” social media by the winery was calculated by means of a chi-squared ($\chi^2$) test of significance between the items. To accept or reject the hypothesis $H_0$, which implies no relation between the variables, the value of the $\chi^2$ statistics and the respective $p$-values were considered and dependence was determined in the light of the frequencies expected and obtained and the corresponding residues. For the significant variables obtained, a logistic regression, logit, was used. In the logit model the log odds of the outcome was modelled as a linear combination of the predictor significant business variables. The dataset has a binary response (outcome, dependent) variable called SM, which is equal to 1 if the winery had social media, and 0 otherwise. Logistic regression was used to predict the odds of being a case based on the values of the independent/business variables (predictors). The odds are defined as the probability that a particular outcome is a case divided by the probability that it is a non-case.

$$\ln \frac{p_i}{1 - p_i} = x_β$$

Where $x_β$ is the linear probability model with linear combination of explanatory variables $X_i = [1, X_{1i}, X_{2i}, ..., X_{ki}]$ with k explanators and a vector of regression coefficients $β = [β_0, β_1, β_2, ..., β_k]$ as the parameters associated that will be all estimated. Finally, two (for 2013 and 2016) overall logit models were calculated and the
2.3 Profile of the sample

Most of the wineries included in this study were established between 1996 and 2010 (57.7%) while only a few of them (3.6%) commenced operation before 1949 (Table 2). A third of the wineries were deemed to be small or medium sized wineries (32.1% produced less than 250 Hl per year); while 36.7% of the wineries produced between 250 and 2,990 Hl of wine. The remainder of the wineries (31.2%) achieved an annual production volume in excess of 3,000 Hl of wine per year. A very large proportion of wineries only produced a single type of wine (26% and 28.6% produced red and white wines only respectively); while nearly 44% produce mainly red and/or rosé wines (Table 2). Nearly one quarter of all wineries produced both red, white and rosé wines; which allows them to satisfy a broad range of consumer demands. Although the wineries were family-run business, most of them were ‘private limited companies’ (64.3%), or ‘public limited companies’ (16.3%). In 2013 two third of the wineries exported their wines; while in 2016 nearly all (98.9%) were exporting their wines. Most of the wineries operated an independent webpage, 81.03% in 2016 which was slightly up from 2013 (80.1%) (Table 2).

Research Limitations

One of the limitations of the research is the wineries heterogeneity that biases the sampling due to the geographical approach. The results could vary in another Spanish region or another country. It could be interesting to study other regions or countries. On the other hand, and due to the rapid-development of the technological environment of SM, the results could easily become obsolete although it is still of interest because it could be a first step in the use of technology for wine social media STP.

3. Research Results

3.1 Social Media Usage

Over the three years of this study (2013-2016), a large increase in the use of SM by the wineries was observed, an additional 35 wineries (up from 42.8% to 60.7%) started using SM. In 2013 the only SM sites used by wineries were Facebook and Twitter,
66.67% using only Facebook and the rest using both SM sites. By 2016 Facebook was used by 94.12% of the wineries; Twitter by 56.3%; and Instagram by 19.33% of the wineries. The prominence of Facebook at the dominating SM site used by the wineries makes sense although some authors recommend using variety and more specific wine SM (Thach and Lease, 2014; Wilson and Quinton, 2012). Facebook is the number one global SM site followed by YouTube, QQ, WhatsApp, Qzone, Twitter, SinaWeibo, WeChat, Google+ and Instagram (Web empresa, 2015; Dolan et al., 2016). Moreover, Facebook is the principal SM in America, Europe, Oceania, part of Asia and Africa; while Twitter is the principal SM in Japan (Web empresa, 2015).

In 2016, 44 wineries (36.97%) had attracted over 5,000 followers; while in 2013 the number of followers on SM of the same wineries varied from 31 to 4,939. For instance, one winery attracted 307,556 followers on Facebook. Yet another winery attracted 19,400 followers on Twitter and 5,048 followers on Instagram. Among the examples of positive uptake of SM among the wineries there were many wineries with a low number of followers despite the early accomplishment to initiate a SM presence (Table 3). These results confirm the engagement among the fans of wine SM (Dolan et al., 2016). Furthermore, apart from the number of followers that were linked to the SM sites of various wineries; the basic active interaction that followers have with the companies can be visualised through their indication of ‘like’ versus ‘dislike’. In 2013: 53,738 followers clicked “I like it” on Facebook for at least one of the wineries. In 2016: 85,291 followers clicked “I like it” for at least one of the wineries in Facebook per month; while well over 100,000 followers clicked ‘like’ on Twitter (Table 3). Of all the SM interactions; 30.1% and 25.9% (in 2013 and 2016 respectively) of the companies with an SM presence undertook no activity on their own SM sites with only a very small proportion of companies communicating in access of 50 interactions per month (Table 3). An inefficient use of wineries SM is confirmed at this point, wineries only send information to consumers, without a feedback loop and had not adopted the Wine 2.0 methods (Forbes et al., 2015; Reyneke et al., 2011; Thach and Olsen, 2006; OEMV, 2014). With this in mind a number of leader wineries were approached for their opinion and insight into the use of SM in their companies. The ‘Matarromera’ winery stressed the importance to communicate directly to consumers to avoid misunderstandings that could damage the company image. The ‘Martin Codax’ winery, reported that the company uses their SM daily and argues that it is important to send relevant information to receivers to maintain their interest. Both ‘Marques de Riscal’
and ‘Barahonda’ wineries highlighted the importance to utilize SM in order to create and build brand image to all the stakeholders, “the sales will arrive later from the image created” (Remaud and Couderc, 2006). ‘Barahonda’ and ‘La Purísima’ wineries remarked the importance of networks to communicate with remote consumers for exporter industries. A loss of opportunities to create relationships with consumers were found (Quinton and Harridge-March, 2008; Degen and Thach, 2015; Forbes et al., 2015).

All the wineries that engaged in SM provided a link to the webpage of the winery; however, only 3.36% linked to an email to contact someone at the winery. This number is down from 4.6% in 2013.

Seventy-two percent of the wineries used their SM interactions as a simple publicity tool. All showed awards and medals won and the label imagery, all associated with the brand, as millennials appreciate; however, none of them revealed the alcohol content of their wines (i.e. nothing about the product) (Fiore et al., 2016). The latter could be a concern, since information regarding alcohol content is something millennials look for when making purchasing decisions (Atkin and Thach, 2012). Furthermore, other details such as pricing or environmental practices were also missing from SM sources; while again these were previously identified as important for millennials when choosing a wine (Atkin and Thach, 2012).

More than half of the wineries (52.17%) presented quite technical information that was not immediately of use for the general public, let alone understandable. Lockshin et al. (2006) and Capitello et al. (2014) have previously remarked that wine professionals need to recognise that consumers may find it difficult to comprehend technical information, and that the wine professionals perhaps need to spend more time listening to the language of the typical low-involvement wine drinkers, especially millennials. Wine professionals may need to rethink the way in which they communicate with their customers about wine in the light of the inaccuracies of what is said; the idiosyncratic interpretation of commonly-used terms; and the scepticism some consumers have about the jargon used to describe wine (Charters and Pettigrew, 2006; Marks, 2015; Zurbita, 2012).

In the 2013 part of this study 77.1% of the wineries indicated that their SM is managed by a dedicated person, a role dedicated to a single person within the company that increased in prevalence to 86.2% in 2016. It has to be clarified that regardless of being a dedicated role, it is not the sole role of that person within the winery business – the
same person has several functions to fulfil. This multiskilling requirement does not mean that SM management skills are not considered as an important skill of communication. On the contrary, the increase in dedicated persons acting as the SM manager revealed that wineries are treating this function more and more as a professional one. When interviewing the representatives of the key wineries, they unanimously declared that having a dedicated communications manager to manage their SM and other communication was vitally important. Furthermore, they all recognized the need for a clear communication plan. Some of the representatives of the wineries interviewed for this study recognized that many of their contemporary companies commenced their SM activities with no clear objective of communication; while others remarked the importance to create an overarching image for all the wineries in the region and general society (Bouquet, 2012; Forbes et al., 2015). Wineries might frequently check and update the content and interactions of their SM, and adjust them accordingly to fit their general consumers’ profile (Lockshin and Corsi, 2012). Table 3 has confirmed the first of the hypotheses that the research study sought to test:

\[ H_1: \text{Most of the wineries are starting in SM without a well-defined strategy.} \]

### 3.2 Significant business variables to have SM

In light of the Chi-square analysis for significant variables, relationships \( (\chi^2 < 0.95) \) between size of the winery (S), exportation (E), webpage (W), origin (O), type of wine (T) and “have SM” were found in 2013. In 2016, only to have a webpage (W), the origin (O) and the type of wines (T) produced were significant to have a SM (Table 4).

In 2013, a strong relationship (typified and corrected residues t.c.r. = 2.5) between the non-use of SM and being a small winery (<250 Hl) was found. These results reinforced the fact that larger the wineries, higher is the adoption of Web 2.0 (Rehm et al., 2013; Kolb and Thach, 2016; Mariani et al., 2012).

In 2013, wineries exporting to international markets were more probable (t.c.r. = 2.5; \( p\text{-value} = 0.001 \)) to have a presence on SM. Further significance analysis revealed that is also highly probable that exporting wineries maintain a webpage. These exporting wineries are highly probable to use SM to provide general ready-to-use information with regards to their wines, the brand, and the company to potential customers in their
own country or abroad. A strong relationship ($p\text{-value}=0.000$) for both periods (t.c.r.$_{2013}=5.2$ and t.c.r.$_{2016}=7.4$) was found in operation both SM and a webpage.

In 2013, it was very probable that wineries producing only red wine (t.c.r.=2.3) had SM. Three years later (in 2016) the uptake of SM by wineries had broadened to also include a high probability that white wine producing wineries (t.c.r.=2.2) were utilizing SM. In 2013, there was a significant interaction (t.c.r.=2.8) between wineries that operated in the largest red wine producing areas and the use of SM (Wilson and Quinton, 2012). Whereas wineries from small viticulture areas producing both red and rosé wines were less likely (t.c.r.=-3.0) to use SM. By 2016, the interaction between wineries that operated in the largest red wine producing areas and the use of SM increased to t.c.r.=3.5; while wineries in the largest white wine producing areas had also become very likely to utilize SM (t.c.r.=2.2).

Note to typesetter: Insert Table 4 here

The significance analysis concludes a shifting pattern in the use of SM by the wineries over this three year period.

The principle aim of the logistic regression analysis was to run an overall model with the significant variables obtained in 2013 and 2016, and to describe the determinant variables associated with operating SM. The original dataset in the logit model included the following variables in 2013: viticulture origin area ($O$); type of wine/s produced ($T$); exports ($E$); size of the winery ($S$) and the existence of a winery webpage ($W$). For 2016, the dataset in the logit model included the variables: viticulture origin area ($O$); type of wine/s produced ($T$) and the existence of a winery webpage ($W$).

The analysis was developed in two steps. The first model in the output is a null model, that is, a model with no predictors, a univariate logistic regression analysis. The second model output the determinant variables to have SM ($p\text{-value}<0.05$). The odds ratio in 2013 revealed that being a winery in a small viticulture area producing red and rosé wines versus a winery in a large and specialized red wine region decreases the log odds of having SM by 0.029. Being a winery with webpage versus not webpage winery increases the log odds of SM by 18.979 (Table 5). The overall test for the 2013 model includes these predictors. The chi-square value of 43.847 with a $p\text{-value}$ of 0.000, less than 0.005 tells that the model as a whole fits significantly better than an empty model (a model with no predictors). The deviance of the overall model $G=223.853$ in
comparisons of nested models is significant. The presence of a webpage (W) and the origin (O) provides significant variables in the overall model equation to have SM in 2013 (p-value=0.000; p-value=0.005). The outcome overall logit model for 2013 is:

$$\ln \frac{p_i}{1-p_i} = -0.384 + 2.943W - 3.549O$$

The odds ratio in 2016 revealed that being a winery with a webpage versus a none webpage winery increases the log odds of SM by 28.693 (Table 5).

The overall test for the 2016 model includes this predictor. The chi-square value of 71.873 with a p-value of 0.000, less than 0.005 tells that the model as a whole fits significantly better than an empty model (a model with no predictors). The deviance of the overall model $G=187.001$ in comparisons of nested models is significant. The presence of a webpage (W) provides significant variable in the overall model equation to have SM in 2016 (p-value=0.000). The outcome overall logit model for 2016 is:

$$\ln \frac{p_i}{1-p_i} = -3.42 + 3.357W$$

The results indicate that to have a webpage is the single most determinant factor linked to operating a SM site (Velikova et al., 2011). Although 81.0% of wineries have a webpage, these observations revealed that not all of them use this tool to its best potential (Bruwer and Wood, 2005).

It can be concluded that operating a webpage, would be a requirement in order for wineries to utilise SM. Hence, the digital environment influences the winery to have SM. 37.8% of the wineries with webpage in 2013, and the 20.8% in 2016, do not have SM.

Additionally, the increase in wineries that utilise SM in 2016 compared to 2013 has reduced the number of determinant variables to have a SM. The marked increase (from 67% in 2013 to nearly 100% (98.9%) in 2016) of wineries that export their wines made exportation an unsuitable determinant factor. However, not all of the wineries make similar use of SM.

Table 4 and 5 have confirmed the second of the hypotheses that the research study sought to test: H2: Wineries engaging in SM have a “digital” history.
3.3 Targeting wine millennial consumers

The wineries unanimously thought that SM is the best media to access to younger
customers. Nevertheless, wine culture has not achieved its position amongst younger
audiences who however, are the principal users of SM, especially the generations
known as millennials (Matellanes, 2014). Wineries must focus their strategies on
millennials; be positioned through all sales channels, especially in e-commerce (Portelli,
2016). The representatives of the wineries interviewed for this study expressed their
concern that wine consumption among Spanish youth is lower than in countries like the
UK or the USA. Only 5.5% of the Spanish youth drink wine on a regular basis (OEMV,
2014). The wineries’ representatives indicated that they sponsor events, promote brand
images and design wines to encourage young consumers. To this effect, wine festivals
are organized each year, like the Madrid based “enofestival”, which is organised by
wine large producers not only to increase the wine consumption among millennials but
also to impart some of the traditional Spanish wine culture to the nation’s youth. Other
wineries include this approach onto the product design by the use of vibrant colours,
branding, bottle design, etc. to be attractive to millennial consumers. Such as the “San
Millán of Codorniu” brand. “Fancy gulps” like “Iglup” have been designed by the
“Grandes Vinos” brand that meant to be a low graduation “slurp of fresh grapes”
oriented to millennial consumers. These innovative products emerge with an offer for
millennials that includes an attractive image and creative communication with the
quality of traditional Spanish wineries.

None of the winery representatives interviewed, recognized the need to undertake any
SM practices that specifically appeal to millennial wine consumers. The wineries
acknowledged that SM is itself a young people’s media although they do not consider
targeting strategies or segmentation of SM users to ensure and enrich communications
with millennials. To start with, in order to reach millennials, wineries could post on SM
over the weekends and between eight and ten in the mornings, because millennials are
proven to check their SM when they wake up (Wilson and Quinton, 2012). They should
also select the proper SM outlets (Leigon, 2011) and adapt to SM language and create a
dialogue with younger users (Laverie et al., 2011). It is relevant to enhance a
personalised communication with and to their SM community users (Dolan et al., 2016;
Degen and Thach, 2015).
Interviews confirmed the third hypothesis that the research study sought to test: \( H_3 \): Wineries engaging in SM do not segment SM on targeting wine consuming millennials.

4 Conclusions, Applications and Future Research areas

Conclusions

A digital environment like a webpage was found to be a strong determinant to have SM used by the wineries. An explosion in the use of SM over the three years between 2013 and 2016 was found. The gap between digital and non-digital wineries in the sample has been reduced over the same period, which was evident by the greater interest in the use of SM. The profile of a digital winery in 2016 includes the utilisation of a webpage, SM, on-line services and e-commerce. The need and the opportunity were the main factors, in 2013 to use SM by the wineries. A need to look for new markets and millennial consumers forced the wineries to implement different tools. The opportunity of resources drove the wineries to use SM. The larger wineries, with more resources and opportunities, were more likely to have started using SM in 2013. Three years later, the large and daily increase of the use of SM and follower’s interest originated an explosion in the use of SM by wineries. Moreover, wineries use SM so as not to lose the opportunities of this communication tool but most of the wineries are starting in SM without a well-defined strategy. The wineries do not segment and target their SM. Targeting would allow wineries to focus on task groups increasing the efficiency of each action. In the era of communication with plenty of information available to focus on the target group SM communication strategy could be optimized. SITE must be encouraged by the wineries for competitiveness and an efficient communication.

\( \text{S-egmentation}\) of the target niche of consumers.

\( \text{I-dentification}\) of the proper social media where the niche of consumers are.

\( \text{T-ools}\) of communication implementation for the niche of consumers and SM.

\( \text{E-valuation}\) of the engagement and response of consumers.

Practical implications for wineries:

- Well-defined and continuous SM actions will allow wineries to locate the winery’s public image into SM.

- Digital technologies can be considered an important driver that affects and impacts firm decisions related to improving a winery’s marketing management.
Accomplish the winery’s own education in SM management and possibilities as a marketing tool that can improve the efficiency on SM.

The target group for SM output must be millennials, but also other consumers and distributors that use SM.

Segmentation and targeting on SM can improve the effectiveness of the winery SM activities, but also the competitiveness of the brand in the wine industry.

Wineries might use big-data analysis for SM segmentation, targeting and positioning.

**Future Research Areas:**

There is a need to classify wine SM due to customer segmentation and to identify the best SM to focus the winery SM activities regarding its wine sales. Moreover the characterization of SM millennial users by interests, motivation to use SM and purchases would be interesting. Researchers might hold focus groups with users of the various SM sites in order to gather in-depth feedback on their involvement in these media.

It would be useful to analyse the number of followers that become consumers of the brand and measure the level of conversion of awareness to action. Evidences of the consumers’ responses for different type of SM interactions are needed and develop skills to measure the marketing impact of SM. Moreover, not only economic criteria but social and environmental benefits need to be evaluated of the use of SM.

It would also be important to explore new functionalities of SM and applications to reach task customers and develop marketing tools applied to SM.
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Table 1. Business and social media management variables, classified by categorical and quantitative for the 196 wineries sampled in Old World region of Castilla and Leon in 2013/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Business (obtained through survey)</th>
<th>Social media management (obtained through online observation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical</strong></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year of foundation</td>
<td>Map and directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company format</td>
<td>Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webpage</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-commerce</td>
<td>Link to webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Link to email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organic production</td>
<td>Target public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wine tourism</td>
<td>Institutional or product publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct sales</td>
<td>Professional site management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of wines</td>
<td>Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative</strong></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shareholders</td>
<td>Actualizations in 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Number click “I like it”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Profile of wineries in the Spanish wine producing region of Castilla and Leon, percentage (%) and distribution (n=196)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wineries variables</th>
<th>Percentage 2013-2016</th>
<th>Wineries variables</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1949</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Company format</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1965</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Natural person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1980</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Public Limited company</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1995</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>Private Limited company</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2010</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>Community property</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 2010</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual production</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shareholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 250</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>Only owner</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-990</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,990</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-10,000</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More 10,000</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of wine/s</td>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red only</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White only</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>Web page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red and rosé</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red and white</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red, white and rosé</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Distribution and percentage of social media variables measured in a sample of 196 wineries in a Spanish wine region of Castilla and Leon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social media items</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Social media items</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 4. Chi-square analysis for significant variables relationships ($\chi^2 < 0.95$) between business variables and “have” or “not have” social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business variables</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the winery (S)</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (O)</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of wine/s (T)</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpage (W)</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports (E)</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p$-value<0.05, **$p$-value<0.01

Table 5. Significance analyses of the logistic model in two steps: Wald Forward. Logistic regression analyses for 2013 and 2016 significant business variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business variables</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin (O)</td>
<td>-3.542</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpage (W)</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>18.979</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>28.693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p$-value<0.05, **$p$-value<0.01