

# Wine consumer typologies based on level of involvement: a case of Turkey

Wine  
consumer  
typologies

Haluk Koksal

*Eastern Mediterranean University, Famagusta, Turkey, and*

Arian Seyedimany

*Department of Business Administration,  
Eastern Mediterranean University, Famagusta, Turkey*

Received 23 October 2022  
Revised 11 May 2023  
14 August 2023  
Accepted 24 August 2023

## Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this study is to segment Turkish wine customers based on their level of involvement. This study profiles them based on their wine drinking motivations, wine attributes, information sources, wine purchasing and consumption behaviour and socio-demographic characteristics.

**Design/methodology/approach** – For this study, a structured online questionnaire was used to collect data from the listed email addresses of institutes, universities and commercial websites. The sample size was 708 people. After splitting consumers into three groups based on their involvement levels in wine (high, moderate and low), the study profiles them by implementing ANOVA, principal component and chi-square analyses.

**Findings** – The study identifies the differences between groups with different involvement levels in wine regarding drinking motivations, wine attributes, information sources, consumption and purchasing behaviour as well as socio-demographic characteristics.

**Originality/value** – Although there are a few studies in the literature evaluating wine consumers from various nations, to the best of the authors' knowledge, this is the first study investigating wine consumers based on involvement levels in Turkey, where alcoholic beverages are excessively taxed, and advertising is banned and promoting them is limited.

**Keywords** Turkish wine consumers, Wine marketing, Consumer behaviour, Involvement levels, Wine drinking motivations, Market segmentation, Wine consumption and purchasing behaviour

**Paper type** Research paper

## Introduction

Western culture has a strong influence on several nations nowadays and the western way of living is gaining popularity all over the world. As a result, many countries with various social structures, cultures, religions and political systems respond to these changes in different ways. Wine is an alcoholic beverage associated with Western nations historically, spiritually and culturally. The world wine market has recently become increasingly complex due to a variety of factors such as: the globalization of the world wine industry, consolidation of international trade, being integrated with distribution channels, intricate competition, changes in consumption patterns and new product development initiatives.

Nowadays, there are different customers with a variety of preferences and tastes in the global wine market such as in Muslim and other culturally different societies. Consumption of alcoholic beverages in Islamic countries, such as Turkey, is one of the radical shifts that runs against Islamic religion and culture and the political structure. However, as a result of increased connections with the Western world, Turkish wine consumers have come to expect higher-quality wines.



---

In Islam and specifically in *Quran*, drinking wine is a major transgression that goes against Islamic culture and religion. The Turkish Government uses a wide range of public initiatives aimed at limiting alcohol consumption due to political and religious reasons. Policies such as excessive taxation on alcoholic beverages, outlawing promotion and advertisement of all types of alcoholic beverage (including sponsored activities, promotions, free giveaways and festivals) (Bloomberg, 2013). However, the enormous potential for alcoholic beverages in Islamic nations and other culturally different societies impacted by Western culture cannot be denied.

Turkey is the world's sixth largest producer of grapes. Despite its location in a particularly fertile geographical area and a favourable environment for grape growing, the country is not regarded as a big worldwide wine producer. In 2018, the total area under grape cultivation was 448,000 hectares, with 3.9 million tons of grapes produced (OIV, 2019). However, only around 3% of grapes are utilized to make wine. In 2017, over 2.9 million hectolitres of wine was exported with a value of 9.7 million dollars. In the same year, 2.0 million hectolitres of wine was imported (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Trade, 2021; OIV, 2019).

The study contributes to the existing literature from two perspectives. From the theoretical perspective, the majority of studies based on consumers' involvement with wine have been carried out in countries where wine consumption is commonplace (Calvo-Porrall *et al.*, 2019; Bruwer *et al.*, 2019; Bruwer *et al.*, 2017; Roe and Bruwer, 2017). This study adds to the existing wine literature by analysing the wine consumption behaviour of consumers in Turkey, which can exhibit very distinct behaviour due to a variety of political and religious constraints. Therefore, it enlarges a much-needed line of research to uncover an emerging phenomenon, such as the consumption of products like wine that can be considered taboo by a large part of the population. From a managerial perspective, the study also contributes to better understanding of wine consumer segments in Turkey and other Islamic countries, as little research has been conducted in the region. This helps marketers to design more accurate and better targeted marketing strategies.

This paper attempts to group Turkish wine consumers based on their involvement with wine. This has become a very valuable tool for marketers, as individuals with different levels of involvement are believed to have distinct attitudes, beliefs and values. This paper also explores the characteristics of the customers in each group, based on drinking motivations, wine attributes, wine consumption and purchase behaviours and socio-economic characteristics.

### **Involvement theory**

The historical root of involvement goes back to the psychology of ego involvement, in which Sherif and Cantril (1947) proposed that involvement exists when a social object is related by the individual to the domain of the ego. Over the past 20 years, the involvement theory has been a key topic in consumer behaviour due to its substantial impact on consumers information processing and decision-making (Laurent and Kaprerer, 1985; Dholakia, 2001). Rothschild (1984) has defined involvement as an unobservable state of motivation, arousal and interest. It is elicited by a particular stimulus or situation and has drive properties. Houston and Rothschild (1978) and Rothschild (1979) proposed that involvement has three types, namely, enduring, situational and response. They argued that enduring involvement points out the long term attachment of someone to a product class. Higie and Feick (1989) defined enduring involvement as "an individual difference variable representing the arousal potential of a product and service or activity that causes personal relevance". It represents an individual's interest in a product and service or activity on a permanent basis. Situational involvement, on the other hand, is a short term state of involvement with a situation,

---

generally a purchase decision (Mittal and Lee, 1989; Richins *et al.*, 1992; Aurifeille *et al.*, 2002). Response involvement draws attention to a behavioural view examining the extent to which a person is paying attention to a situation such as price or brand differences.

Generally, consumers with a high level of enduring involvement in a product class devote more time and effort to deciding on a purchase (Laurent and Kaprerer, 1985). When people are highly involved with something, they tend to develop stronger attitudes towards it (Cunha *et al.*, 2022). Enduring involvement is also directly related to product knowledge and product expertise. The consumers who are more involved with a product class are motivated to seek further information and by doing so they gain more expertise with a specific product category.

### Conceptual framework and hypothesis

Wine, as a product, has pleasure value. It is perceived as a part of some consumer's lifestyle (Bruwer *et al.*, 2017; Brunner and Siegrist, 2011), and there is also a perceived risk in the purchasing process of a bottle of wine (Outreville and Desrochers, 2016). Some products (such as wine) absorb consumers, in relation to their involvement. This is made evident through their use of attributes of the product, which represent their source of involvement (Bruwer and Buller, 2012; Laurent and Kaprerer, 1985). Based on involvement level, there are some differences among wine consumers. From a marketing standpoint, involvement is a very valuable variable, as it is closely related to the purchasing and consumption behaviour of wine consumers (Lockshin *et al.*, 1997; Barber *et al.*, 2008; Lesschaeve and Bruwer, 2010). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that knowing about the product involvement level of wine consumers can provide valuable benefits for designing winery marketing strategies.

The motivation behind the consumption of wine is an important factor explaining consumers' involvement with wine. Zaichkowsky (1985) claimed that involvement is distinct from motivation. In fact, motivation may precede involvement and suggest that values, interests and needs are antecedents of motivations, which are precursors of personal involvement. Taylor *et al.* (2018) divided motivations for drinking wine into intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and noted that higher levels of each intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to purchase wine would lead to an increase in personal involvement with wine. Yuan *et al.* (2005) found that consumers exhibiting high involvement levels are motivated to buy wine for pleasure and enjoyment. Some studies also indicated that there is a relationship between drinking wine and enhancing self-esteem (Santos *et al.*, 2006; Olsen *et al.*, 2003). Nicholson (1990) discovered that knowledgeable wine consumers (i.e. highly involved ones) purchase wine for prestige and authority. Koksal (2021) profiled Lebanese wine consumers based on their level of involvement and stated that highly involved Lebanese consumers drink wine more for hedonic and coping motives in comparison to moderate and low involved consumers. On the other hand, low involved consumers are motivated to drink wine for weight control more than the other two groups. It can, therefore, be proposed as follows:

- H1.* There are some differences between the high, moderate and low wine involvement groups in terms of their motivations to drink wine.

In the literature, the relationship between the level of consumer's involvement and the wine attributes has been an important discussion in the consumer decision-making process. Consumer evaluations of wine can differ substantially based on varying levels of product involvement. Montgomery and Bruwer (2013) found that price is the most important cue in wine purchase decisions regardless of a consumer's level of involvement. Hirche and Bruwer (2014) and Quester and Smart (1996) found no significantly valid evidence for the declining importance of price with more highly involved consumers. It is claimed that highly involved

---

consumers are more likely to make use of grape variety whilst low involved consumers are more likely to use price as a strong purchasing clue (Zaichkowsky, 1988). Quester and Smart (1996) also revealed that highly involved consumers put greater importance on both wine region and wine style than consumers of low involvement. Tustin and Lockshin (2001), however, found that the region of origin was more important than price in purchase decisions made by consumers who were highly involved with wine. In their qualitative study, Charters and Pettigrew (2006) concluded that, in terms of extrinsic dimensions, low involved wine drinkers rarely made the link between grape quality and wine quality. Highly involved drinkers, by comparison, gave great importance to the notion of “terroir”. According to Rahman and Reynolds (2015), low involvement customers may place higher focus on taste, but as individuals become highly involved in wine, they tend to place greater attention to specific qualities of the wine, such as appearance and fragrance. Based on an Australian-based study by Tustin and Lockshin (2001), country of origin (COO) is important for both consumers with high and low levels of involvement. Hollebeek *et al.* (2007) specifically found that COO is less important for consumers with low wine involvement level. However, based on the study by Hirche and Bruwer (2014), grape variety is a much more crucial attribute for highly involved consumers. Another study (Quester and Smart, 1996) found that it is not important for highly involved consumers. Bruwer *et al.* (2014) observed that the label was identified by both high- and low-involvement consumers as highly important. Hence, it can be suggested as follows:

*H2.* There are some differences between the high, moderate and low wine involvement groups in terms of wine attributes.

Consumers with a high level of involvement depend mostly on their own knowledge and experience although they do benefit from other sources of wine information (Koksal, 2021). Barber *et al.* (2008) found that the information sources being used by consumers with high levels of involvement with wine is more complex than those with low levels of involvement. Bruwer *et al.* (2014) declared that customers with high levels of wine involvement have a stronger desire for a range of information sources as well as more information and they also added the importance of word-of-mouth (WOM) for both groups of consumers due to the nature of its reliability and trustworthiness. Dodd *et al.* (2005) asserted that consumers that have a lot of objective wine knowledge (highly involved consumers) tend to get their information from impersonal sources such as advertising, reviews and wine guides. Hence, it can be hypothesised as follows:

*H3.* There are some differences between the high, moderate and low wine involvement groups based on wine information sources.

Consumption quantity and frequency increases as a consumer gets more involved with wine. Bruwer and Buller (2013) studied this relationship and found that, when a consumer’s wine involvement level increases, the frequency and volume of wine consumption rises as well. Based on the study by Hirche and Bruwer (2014), highly involved consumer households consume significantly more per month, whereas low-involved households consume significantly more cask wine than high-involved households. A third of highly involved respondents drink wine every day which is significantly more often than low-involved respondents. Consumers with a low level of involvement were more inclined to buy wine for others and drink it mostly on special occasions (Lockshin *et al.*, 2001). Bruwer *et al.*, (2014) also found that highly involvement consumers spend significantly more money on wine than low involved consumers. Consumers with a high level of involvement in wine purchase and spend more on wine in comparison to low involved consumers (Barber *et al.*, 2008). Those

---

with a high level of involvement prefer old world wines, mainly from Italy and France (Bruwer and Buller, 2013). Koksals (2021) asserted that consumers with a low level of involvement like to drink local wines. Highly involved consumers drink much more red wine than lower involved customers (Hirche and Bruwer, 2014), and they purchase wine from special liquor shops (Koksals, 2021). Oyinseye *et al.*, (2022) stated that highly involved wine consumers choose to make purchases from supermarkets with large offerings of wines and from wineries. They also affirmed that expert wine consumers purchase wine from a plethora of sources, but dislike the purchase of wine from the supermarkets due to the generalisation of wine retail that is offered by supermarkets. It can, therefore, be proposed that:

- H4. There are some differences between high, moderate and low wine involved groups with regard to wine consumption and purchasing patterns.

The socio-demographic features of wine consumers are also linked to consumers' involvement level with wine. Women prefer wine over other spirits (Saad, 2005) and it has been perceived as a feminine spirit (Spawton, 1991). The study by Montgomery and Bruwer, (2013) found that female wine consumers can be as involved as their male counterparts. Bruwer *et al.*, (2011) also found no relationship between wine involvement level and gender. Montgomery and Bruwer (2013) found that females consume more white wine than men, whereas males consume more red wine than females. Women purchase more wine from wine shops and consume wine at pubs, bars and restaurants (Montgomery and Bruwer, 2013; Bruwer *et al.*, 2011). Although the back label includes much confusing information and can mislead females into make the wrong decision of buying wine, label image, logo and colour are considered significant attributes for women (Barber *et al.*, 2006). Regarding consumer age, older wine consumers were more likely to have higher involvement level (Bruwer *et al.*, 2011). Charters and Pettigrew (2006) suggest that this is due to the fact that older people have more financial resources and free time to devote to wine. Koksals (2021) also asserts that the highly involved consumer group is often older, well-educated and has a greater monthly income than the other two involvement categories. Bruwer and Buller (2013) identified that wine involvement increases by age, up to age 35–45 and then decreases slowly. To contrast, Montgomery and Bruwer, (2013) found no significant difference between level of involvement with wine and different age groups or different educational levels. It can, therefore, be proposed as follows:

- H5. There are some differences between the high, moderate and low wine involvement groups regarding socio-demographic characteristics.

## Research methodology

### *Data collection method and research sample*

This study is based on quantitative research gathered by using an online survey method to collect the data because of its convenience, turnaround speed and low cost. This method was preferred by previous studies on wine (Bruwer *et al.*, 2017; Brunner and Siegrist, 2011). Due to the unavailability of a proper list of wine drinkers in Turkey, some institutes, companies and universities were chosen for the sampling frame of this study. The questionnaire was tested on 28 masters students and faculty members prior to being used in a full-scale study to ensure that there were no problems with the questionnaire, such as confusing language that would lead to misinterpretation. Then, the mail questionnaire was developed on a Google Form, whereby respondents could access and complete it online after receiving a unique hyperlink through e-mail. Filter questions were used to choose the responders. The goal of this study was to collect data from a sample size of roughly 700 wine consumers. As a result, 3,000 individuals were

contacted, and 708 questionnaires were completely filled out. The general population and sample social demographic characteristics of the respondents are shown in Table 1.

*Research variables.* To collect the data needed for the study, a questionnaire was developed. It was available in Turkish and was divided into six sections. In the first section, six socio demographic characteristics of respondents such as gender, age, marital status, education level, occupation and income level were included. In the second section, the respondents were asked about their agreement level with their motivations to drink wine by reviewing the literature (Bruwer *et al.*, 2017; Palma *et al.*, 2014; Thach and Olsen, 2019) on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1: strongly disagree to 5: strongly agree. In the third section, the respondents assessed the wine attributes that influence them during their wine selection process such as price, quality, taste and others on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1: not important at all to 5: very important. In the fourth section, information sources that are used by respondents to purchase wine were evaluated on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1: none to 5: very often. In the fifth section, multidimensional constructs have been used to measure involvement.

This study adapted a short version of wine involvement with four questions based on other studies (Yoo and Donthu, 2001; Nella and Christou, 2014; Schaefer *et al.*, 2018; Calvo-Porrall *et al.*, 2019). The items in question were appended to measure the importance, interest and knowledge level of consumers regarding wine on a five-point Likert-type scale. The internal reliability of the involvement scale was 0.88. In the last part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked a wide variety of questions regarding their wine consumption and purchasing behaviours, such as frequency of in consumption, amount of wine consumption, the monthly budget for wine, preferred wine types and the type of outlet where they purchase wine.

|   | N   | %     | General population % |                            | N   | %     | General population % |
|---|-----|-------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----|-------|----------------------|
| <i>Gender</i>                             |     |       |                      | <i>Marital status</i>      |     |       |                      |
| <i>Female</i>                             | 363 | 51.3  | 50                   | <i>Single</i>              | 263 | 37.1  | 28.4                 |
| <i>Male</i>                               | 345 | 48.7  | 50                   | <i>Married</i>             | 445 | 62.9  | 61.6                 |
| <i>Total</i>                              | 708 | 100.0 | 100.0                | <i>Unknown</i>             | 0   | 0     | 9.9                  |
|   |     |       |                      | <i>Total</i>               | 708 | 100.0 | 100.0                |
| <i>Age</i>                                |     |       |                      | <i>Education</i>           |     |       |                      |
| <i>20–29</i>                              | 86  | 12.1  | 44.2                 | <i>Secondary/diploma</i>   | 13  | 1.8   |                      |
| <i>30–39</i>                              | 210 | 29.7  |                      | <i>University</i>          | 250 | 35.3  |                      |
| <i>40–49</i>                              | 177 | 25.0  | 36.7                 | <i>Master and PhD</i>      | 445 | 62.9  |                      |
| <i>50–59</i>                              | 117 | 16.5  |                      | <i>Total</i>               | 708 | 100.0 |                      |
| <i>60 and older</i>                       | 118 | 16.7  | 20.1                 | <i>Income (\$) monthly</i> |     |       |                      |
| <i>Total</i>                              | 708 | 100.0 | 100.0                | <i>Less than 400</i>       | 56  | 7.9   |                      |
| <i>Occupation</i>                         |     |       |                      | <i>400–600</i>             | 102 | 14.4  |                      |
| <i>Public and private sector employee</i> | 519 | 73.3  |                      | <i>More than 600</i>       | 550 | 77.7  |                      |
| <i>Self-employed</i>                      | 54  | 7.7   |                      | <i>Total</i>               | 708 | 100.0 |                      |
| <i>Retired</i>                            | 117 | 16.5  |                      |                            |     |       |                      |
| <i>Student, housewife, unemployed</i>     | 18  | 2.5   |                      |                            |     |       |                      |
| <i>Total</i>                              | 708 | 100.0 |                      |                            |     |       |                      |

**Table 1.**  
General population and sample characteristics

**Source:** Table by authors



## Findings

To achieve the study's goals, data analysis was performed by using SPSS 20 software. Firstly, the factor analysis with Varimax rotation was applied for motivations to drink wine. The correlation between items was sufficient to proceed with factor analysis according to Bartlett's test,  $\chi^2$  (136): 4376.203,  $p < 0.001$ . Items with factor loadings below 0.5 were dropped from the analysis for practical reasons (Hair *et al.*, 2010). Based on the factor analysis, five wine drinking motivations including coping, enjoyment, hedonic, socialising and health were grouped. A total of 66.7% of the total changes in variation were explained by the factor analysis. To measure the sampling adequacy, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin statistic (KMO) was applied to the data. The value of KMO for the data was 0.80, which came into the range of being great according to Kaiser (1974). To assess the internal reliability of dimensions, Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ), was measured and falls into the acceptable level (between 0.71 and 0.87) for forwarding the analysis. As composite reliabilities (CR)  $>$  ( $\alpha$ ) for each factor, the internal consistency is considered satisfactory for all the measurement scales. The convergent and discriminant validity of each of the measures were assessed to ensure construct validity. All of the extracted average variance (AVE) coefficients were more than 0.50 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Harman's one-factor test was applied to check whether the survey's data were free of common method bias (Harman, 1976). As one factor only explained 27.02% of the variance, which was less than 50%, there is no common method bias in the data (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). The factor analysis results based on wine drinking motives is shown in Table 2.

To perform segmentation based on the consumers' level of involvement with wine, two stages of cluster analysis were applied. In the first stage, the number of clusters was determined with a hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward's method. The study used the

| Wine drinking motives  | Factor Loading | Variance explained % | $\alpha$ | CR    | AVE   |
|--|----------------|----------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| Enjoyment  |                | 27.019               | 0.783    | 0.857 | 0.601 |
| <i>I drink wine because it is delicious</i>                      | 0.827          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I love the taste of wine</i>                                  | 0.785          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>Wine enhances the taste of food</i>                           | 0.761          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine because I love its smell</i>                     | 0.723          |                      |          |       |       |
| Coping   |                | 14.686               | 0.774    | 0.820 | 0.534 |
| <i>I drink wine when I am depressed</i>                          | 0.801          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine because it improves my mood</i>                  | 0.738          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine because it reduces my tension during the day</i> | 0.727          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine when I feel lonely</i>                           | 0.650          |                      |          |       |       |
| Socializing  |                | 9.460                | 0.736    | 0.806 | 0.513 |
| <i>I drink wine to get closer to others</i>                      | 0.812          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine to adapt to the society</i>                      | 0.746          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine to show that I know more about it to others</i>  | 0.675          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine to be more romantic</i>                          | 0.616          |                      |          |       |       |
| Hedonic  |                | 8.646                | 0.717    | 0.782 | 0.547 |
| <i>I drink wine to celebrate something</i>                       | 0.784          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine to share something special with others</i>       | 0.778          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine to celebrate the thing that I accomplished</i>   | 0.649          |                      |          |       |       |
| Health   |                | 6.908                | 0.873    | 0.894 | 0.809 |
| <i>I drink wine because it balances my blood circulation</i>     | 0.904          |                      |          |       |       |
| <i>I drink wine for my health benefits</i>                       | 0.895          |                      |          |       |       |

Source: Table by authors

**Table 2.**  
Factor analysis  
results based on wine  
drinking motives

difference in fusion coefficients at different phases of the agglomeration schedule to determine the number of clusters in the data.

In the second stage, K-means cluster analysis was applied and the number of clusters specified as three in the first stage was used as the input. By using K-means cluster analysis, three main groups were identified based on the wine involvement construct. This method is used by previous studies in the literature (Koksal, 2021; Yuan *et al.*, 2005; Zaichkowsky, 1985). 30% of the sample ( $n = 212$ ) were labelled as highly involved wine customers. A total of 46% of the sample ( $n = 326$ ) were determined to be moderately involved wine consumers. A total of 24% of the sample ( $n = 170$ ) were classified as low involved wine consumers.

To test whether there was a relationship between customer groups with different wine involvement levels and wine-drinking motives, ANOVA analysis and post hoc analysis (Tukey test) were applied. High involvement groups consume wine for enjoyment, health reasons, coping and hedonic motives, more than the other two groups, other than the socialization motivation. The results presented on Table 3 indicate that there were some statistically significant differences among the involvement groups.

The study results regarding the wine attributes, show that there were statistically significant differences among involvement groups in terms of quality, taste, region, grape variety, international awards and medals won. Consumers in the high involvement group assigned more importance to those attributes than the other two groups. Nevertheless, price, cork, bottle, brand, alcohol level, package and label did not differentiate the three involvement groups. Table 4 shows the cluster profiles based on wine attributes.

**Table 3.**  
Cluster profiles based  
on wine drinking  
motivations

| Motivations          | High involvement<br>( $n:212$ ) | Moderate involvement<br>( $n:326$ ) | Low involvement<br>( $n:170$ ) | <i>F-value</i> |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Enjoyment</i>     | 4.38                            | 3.86                                | 3.08                           | 167.457***     |
| <i>Coping</i>        | 2.26                            | 2.10                                | 1.76                           | 14.543***      |
| <i>Socialization</i> | 1.80                            | 1.87                                | 1.89                           | 0.680          |
| <i>Hedonic</i>       | 2.57                            | 2.50                                | 2.35                           | 3.871*         |
| <i>Health</i>        | 2.78                            | 2.63                                | 2.02                           | 21.396***      |

**Notes:** \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ; 0.01; \* $p < 0.05$   
**Source:** Table by authors

**Table 4.**  
Cluster profiles based  
on wine attributes

| Wine attributes                        | High involvement | Moderate involvement | Low involvement | <i>F-value</i> |
|--|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <i>Quality</i>                         | 4.46             | 4.40                 | 4.10            | 30.355***      |
| <i>Price</i>                           | 4.07             | 3.93                 | 3.98            | 1.402          |
| <i>Cork and bottle</i>                 | 3.49             | 3.24                 | 3.08            | 5.925          |
| <i>Taste</i>                           | 4.90             | 4.76                 | 4.52            | 24.426***      |
| <i>Brand</i>                           | 3.43             | 3.60                 | 3.63            | 3.223          |
| <i>Alcohol degree</i>                  | 3.08             | 3.04                 | 2.99            | 0.265          |
| <i>Package and label</i>               | 2.93             | 2.93                 | 2.84            | 0.391          |
| <i>Region</i>                          | 4.15             | 3.64                 | 2.95            | 50.824***      |
| <i>Grape variety</i>                   | 4.43             | 3.88                 | 3.11            | 66.596***      |
| <i>International awards and medals</i> | 3.57             | 3.10                 | 2.48            | 34.573***      |

**Note:** \*\*\* $p < 0.001$   
**Source:** Table by authors



The results also showed statistically significant differences among involvement groups in terms of wine consumer's own knowledge and experience, family members, media and internet as their sources of information. The high involvement group relied on those information sources more than other two involvement groups except family members. Consumers who are moderately involved with wine preferred family members as their source of information more than the high and low involvement consumers. Table 5 shows the cluster profiles based on information sources.

A chi-square analysis was conducted to understand whether there were any statistically significant differences among the three wine involvement groups regarding wine purchasing, consumption behaviours and socio-demographic variables. The study found that consumers with high involvement levels consume wine once a day (83.6%) compared to consumers with moderate (13.4%) and low (3%) involvement levels. Moderately involved customers drink wine once a month (56.4%) compared to high (17.6%) and low involved customers (26.1%). The results also indicated that the same portion of consumers in moderate and low involvement groups (46.1%) drink wine on occasions compared to highly involved consumers (7.8%). Based on consumers' weekly wine consumption, the study found that low (32.1%) and moderate (50.6%) involved consumers consume less than a bottle per week while highly involved consumers consume more than four bottles per week (91.7%).

Regarding monthly budget allocation for wine, the study found differences among the three involvement groups. Most of the consumers with a low and moderate level of involvement allocate less than 13\$ for their monthly wine budget while highly involved consumers pay 13\$ and more for wine per month (47.1%).

Regarding place of consumption, the results indicate that most of the consumers with a high involvement level prefer to consume their wines at home (35.5%), whereas consumers with a low involvement level consume wine mostly in restaurants (32.6%). Moderately involved consumers prefer consuming wine in pubs, cafes and traditional Turkish bars (55.6%). Table 6 shows the cluster profiles based on wine consumption behaviours.

According to Chi-square analysis, there were no statistically significant differences among the three groups in terms of COO and the wine type. Regarding the type of outlet that the consumers purchase wine from, there were statistical differences among the three groups. Consumers with a high involvement level purchase wine mostly online (71.4%) in comparison to low (0.0%) and moderately involved consumers (28.6%). Wineries are also favourable for consumers with a high level of involvement (47.9%) in comparison with moderately (35.0%) and low involved consumer groups (17.1%). Grocery shops were found to be the most favourable place to buy wine for moderately involved consumers (51.0%) compared to high (22.6%) and low involved consumers (26.4%). Table 7 shows the cluster profiles based on wine purchasing behaviours.

| Wine information sources               | High involvement | Moderate involvement | Low involvement | F-value   |
|--|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| <i>My own knowledge and experience</i> | 4.41             | 4.02                 | 3.44            | 45.421*** |
| <i>Friends and colleagues</i>          | 3.34             | 3.44                 | 3.31            | 0.770     |
| <i>Family members</i>                  | 2.50             | 2.75                 | 2.34            | 5.455*    |
| <i>Label and package</i>               | 2.93             | 3.11                 | 2.88            | 2.189     |
| <i>Written and visual media</i>        | 2.69             | 2.64                 | 2.25            | 6.748***  |
| <i>Internet</i>                        | 2.91             | 2.71                 | 2.37            | 7.431***  |
| <i>Sales people</i>                    | 2.21             | 2.21                 | 2.22            | 0.999     |

**Table 5.**  
Cluster profiles based  
on information  
sources

**Notes:** \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ; \* $p < 0.05$

**Source:** Table by authors

| Wine consumption behaviour         | High involvement | Moderate involvement | Low involvement | $\chi^2$ value |
|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <i>Frequency of drinking</i>       |                  |                      |                 |                |
| Occasions                          | 17 (7.8)         | 100 (46.1)           | 100 (46.1)      | 220.175***     |
| Once a month                       | 29 (17.6)        | 93 (56.4)            | 43 (26.1)       |                |
| Once a week                        | 110 (42.5)       | 124 (47.9)           | 25 (9.7)        |                |
| Once a day                         | 56 (83.6)        | 9 (13.4)             | 2 (3.0)         |                |
| <i>Weekly wine consumption</i>     |                  |                      |                 |                |
| Less than a bottle                 | 86 (17.3)        | 252 (50.6)           | 160 (32.1)      | 155.478***     |
| 1–2 bottles                        | 102 (56.0)       | 71 (39.0)            | 9 (4.9)         |                |
| 3–4 bottles                        | 13 (81.2)        | 2 (12.5)             | 1 (6.2)         |                |
| More than 4 bottles                | 11 (91.7)        | 1 (8.3)              | 0 (0.0)         |                |
| <i>Monthly wine budget</i>         |                  |                      |                 |                |
| Less than \$5                      | 16 (11.5)        | 50 (36.0)            | 73 (52.5)       | 142.009***     |
| \$5–\$12                           | 49 (19.1)        | 138 (53.7)           | 70 (27.2)       |                |
| \$13 and more                      | 147 (47.1)       | 138 (44.2)           | 27 (8.7)        |                |
| <i>Consumption place</i>           |                  |                      |                 |                |
| Home                               | 182 (35.5)       | 244 (44.9)           | 117 (21.5)      | 15.719**       |
| Restaurants                        | 24 (17.8)        | 67 (49.6)            | 44 (32.6)       |                |
| Pub, Café, traditional Turkish bar | 4 (22.2)         | 10 (55.6)            | 4 (22.2)        |                |

**Table 6.**  
Cluster profile based  
on wine consumption  
behaviour

**Notes:** \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; data in the parentheses show relative size of the groups as percentage  
**Source:** Table by authors

| Wine purchasing behaviour  | High involvement | Moderate involvement | Low involvement | $\chi^2$ value |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <i>Type of wine</i>        |                  |                      |                 |                |
| Red                        | 171 (32.0)       | 238 (44.5)           | 126 (23.6)      | 10.287         |
| White                      | 22 (24.7)        | 49 (55.1)            | 18 (20.2)       |                |
| Rose                       | 1 (12.5)         | 6 (75.0)             | 1 (12.5)        |                |
| Champagne, brandy and port | 18 (23.7)        | 33 (43.4)            | 25 (32.9)       |                |
| <i>Country of origin</i>   |                  |                      |                 |                |
| Turkey                     | 154 (29.6)       | 230 (44.2)           | 136 (26.2)      | 9.062          |
| France                     | 18 (27.3)        | 34 (51.5)            | 14 (21.2)       |                |
| Italy                      | 23 (37.1)        | 27 (43.5)            | 12 (19.4)       |                |
| Spain                      | 4 (23.5)         | 10 (58.8)            | 3 (17.6)        |                |
| Others                     | 9 (26.5)         | 21 (61.8)            | 4 (11.8)        |                |
| <i>Type of outlets</i>     |                  |                      |                 |                |
| Grocery shops              | 101 (22.6)       | 228 (51.0)           | 118 (26.4)      | 63.175***      |
| Liquor store               | 30 (29.4)        | 44 (43.1)            | 28 (27.5)       |                |
| Wineries                   | 56 (47.9)        | 41 (35.0)            | 20 (17.1)       |                |
| Online                     | 5 (71.4)         | 2 (28.6)             | 0 (0.0)         |                |
| Others                     | 17 (81.0)        | 3 (14.3)             | 1 (4.8)         |                |

**Table 7.**  
Cluster profiles based  
on wine purchasing  
behaviour

**Notes:** \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ; data in the parentheses show relative size of the groups as percentage  
**Source:** Table by authors

Based on the Chi-square analysis results, gender, marital status and education level do not differentiate the customer groups. In terms of consumers' age ranges, the highly involved consumer group are between 40 and 49 years of age (28.3%). However, the moderately (30.1%) and low involved (35.9%) groups are consumers in their 30s. Regarding the income

level of wine consumers, the results showed significant differences among the three groups. In terms of occupation, highly involved consumers differ significantly with other two groups, including more self-employed consumers (57.4%) than low (11.1%) and moderately involved ones (31.5%). Table 8 shows the cluster profiles based on socio-demographic characteristics of consumers.

## Discussion

This study segmented Turkish wine consumers based on their level of involvement. The study found differences between wine drinkers with different levels of involvement. In addition, it determined the characteristics of the wine drinkers with different involvement levels in a country where drinking alcohol is considered inappropriate by the government and also historically viewed as taboo by the majority of the population for religious reasons. However, this is beginning to change due to increased interactions with Western culture.

Highly involved consumers consume wine for enjoyment, coping and consider wine a healthy beverage, especially for preventing heart circulation diseases, dementia, obesity and digestion problems. These findings are consistent with earlier research (Yuan *et al.*, 2005; Koksall, 2021). However, there were no significant differences found among the involvement groups based on socialization as opposed to previous studies where there were (Nicholson, 1990). This shows that consumers in excessively taxed markets where advertising is banned

| Socio-demographic variables     | High involvement | Moderate involvement | Low involvement | $\chi^2$ value |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <i>Gender</i>                   |                  |                      |                 | 4.569          |
| Male                            | 116 (33.6)       | 148 (42.9)           | 81 (23.5)       |                |
| Female                          | 96 (26.4)        | 178 (49.0)           | 89 (24.5)       |                |
| <i>Age range</i>                |                  |                      |                 | 16.077*        |
| 20–29                           | 22 (10.4)        | 42 (12.9)            | 22 (12.9)       |                |
| 30–39                           | 51 (24.4)        | 98 (30.1)            | 61 (35.9)       |                |
| 40–49                           | 60 (28.3)        | 81 (24.8)            | 36 (21.2)       |                |
| 50–59                           | 47 (22.2)        | 52 (16.0)            | 18 (10.6)       |                |
| 60 and older                    | 32 (15.1)        | 53 (16.3)            | 33 (19.4)       |                |
| <i>Marital status</i>           |                  |                      |                 | 0.114          |
| Single                          | 78 (29.7)        | 120 (45.6)           | 65 (24.7)       |                |
| Married                         | 134 (30.1)       | 206 (46.3)           | 105 (23.6)      |                |
| <i>Education</i>                |                  |                      |                 | 1.766          |
| Secondary                       | 5 (38.5)         | 5 (38.5)             | 3 (23.1)        |                |
| University                      | 81 (32.4)        | 111 (44.4)           | 58 (23.2)       |                |
| Master and PhD                  | 126 (28.3)       | 210 (47.2)           | 109 (24.5)      |                |
| <i>Income level (\$)</i>        |                  |                      |                 | 9.767*         |
| Less than 400                   | 10 (17.9)        | 30 (53.6)            | 16 (28.6)       |                |
| 400–600                         | 22 (21.6)        | 55 (53.9)            | 25 (24.5)       |                |
| More than 600                   | 180 (32.7)       | 241 (43.8)           | 129 (23.5)      |                |
| <i>Occupation</i>               |                  |                      |                 | 24.117***      |
| Student, housewife, unemployed  | 8 (44.4)         | 6 (33.3)             | 4 (22.2)        |                |
| Retired                         | 31 (26.5)        | 57 (48.7)            | 29 (24.8)       |                |
| Private public sector employees | 142 (27.4)       | 246 (47.4)           | 131 (25.2)      |                |
| Self-employed                   | 31 (57.4)        | 17 (31.5)            | 6 (11.1)        |                |

Notes: \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ; data in the parentheses show relative size of the groups as percentage

Source: Table by authors

**Table 8.**  
Cluster profiles based  
on socio-  
demographic  
characteristics

---

and promotion is limited are enthusiastic about wine, despite there being no culture of drinking and socializing with wine. Building the socialization culture with wine, pairing food with wine and arranging wine events should be an issue to consider in such markets.

Regarding wine attribute preferences, this study found significant differences among involvement groups in terms of quality, region, taste, grape variety and international awards and medals which are in line with previous studies (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2007; Hirche and Bruwer, 2014). However, price, packaging and brand did not differentiate the involvement groups. These attributes can be considered as strong signals for wine consumers with a high level of involvement by wine marketers and producers, especially in Islamic countries.

Regarding wine information sources, this study found significant differences among involvement groups relying on impersonal sources such as the media and the internet. Besides using their own knowledge and experience, highly involved wine consumers tend to use the internet and media as their sources of information which is similar to the finding of the study conducted by Dodd *et al.* (2005). In addition, they mostly prefer to consume wine at home. This group is important for media channels and online marketers. Managers targeting this group should diversify their distribution channels by considering more in-house delivery strategies.

Consumers with a higher degree of involvement consume more and buy more wine than those with a lower level of involvement. This finding is in line with the results of the studies by Hirche and Bruwer (2014) and Barber *et al.* (2008).

Unlike previous studies (Lockshin *et al.*, 2006; Bruwer and Buller, 2013; Koksal, 2021), no statistical difference is found between consumers based on the wine involvement level regarding the type of the wine purchased and COO. Regarding the type of outlets, moderately involved consumers purchase the bulk of their wines at grocery shops confirming the findings of the study by Koksal (2021). Grocery shops should provide different types of wines from different regions with international awards and medals in such countries to these groups which are mostly in their 30s, as they are more open-minded about trying and consuming wine.

Finally, in line with previous studies (Montgomery and Bruwer, 2013; Hirche and Bruwer, 2014), there are no significant differences between the high, moderate and low wine involvement groups regarding their gender, marital status and education.

## Conclusions

This study divided Turkish wine drinkers based on their level of involvement with wine into three groups: low, moderate and high to identify differences between their motivations for drinking, wine attributes, sources of information, consumption and purchasing behaviour, as well as socio-demographic characteristics.

This study identified that consumers with a high level of involvement in wine scored highest on all wine drinking motivations except socialization. Grape variety, region, taste, quality, international awards and medals are the most important wine attributes in the choice of wine for this group. However, the price of wine is not a significantly important factor for them. The reason behind this could be that consumers with a high level of involvement are highly knowledgeable about wine. The information sources that this group mostly rely on includes their own knowledge and experience, written and visual media and the internet. In effect, this proves the previous conclusion, especially when considering the consumers reliance on their own knowledge. Their daily and weekly wine consumption as well as their budget allocation to wine are higher than consumers with a lower level of involvement. Wine consumers in this group more often tend to consume their wine at home

than low-involved consumers. The high involvement consumer group purchases wines online and from wineries more than moderate and low involved ones. This group is of crucial importance for wine producers and marketers since they drink more wine more frequently than other groups. Wine producers and marketers might communicate with this group by stressing grape variety, region, taste, quality and international awards and medals of the wines they produce and market. This group relies on their knowledge and experience when they choose wine and buy wine from wineries and online. In order to attract this group, wineries and wine companies might arrange wine tasting events and invite wine experts and writers to speak.

According to the findings of this study, consumers with moderate levels of involvement in wine scored second on all wine drinking motivations except socialization and wine attributes including grape variety, region, taste, quality, international awards and medals. This group depends on family members as an information source more than the high and low involved consumers. They consume and spend less on wine than the high involvement group but more than the low involvement one. This group prefers drinking wine mostly in restaurants, pubs, cafés and traditional Turkish wine bars. Wine companies targeting this group should be very careful about their word of mouth strategy, as consumers in this group rely on friends, colleagues and family members' advice and suggestions. Companies might help this group by providing some assistance to educate them about wines through salespeople and some books and booklets.

In addition, consumers with a low level of involvement in wine scored the lowest on each wine drinking motive. Consumers in this group attach more importance to price, taste and brand. This could be explained by the fact that this group is less knowledgeable about wine and tries to apply risk reduction strategies. They drink less wine and drink it mostly on occasions than the other two groups. They also spend less money on wine each month in comparison with the other two groups. They generally purchase wine from supermarkets and liquor stores. The low involvement wine consumer should not be disregarded because they seem to be the largest segment of the market. They focus on price and branding, as they use a risk reduction strategy.

#### *Theoretical contributions*

From an academic point of view, this study adds to the current wine literature by segmenting Turkish wine consumers in a market with a wide range of public initiatives aimed at limiting alcohol consumption due to political and religious reasons. As many countries are being more influenced by Western culture nowadays, more research is needed on consumption of products and foods in such countries that are facing this emerging phenomenon. As the majority of studies on wine drinkers' level of involvement have been done in areas where consuming alcoholic beverages is ordinary, this study enlarges the wine literature on markets that can exhibit very distinct behaviour due to a variety of constraints.

#### *Managerial implications*

From a managerial standpoint, this research can assist marketers to better identify wine customer segments. As little similar research has been done in Turkey, it gives valuable insights for marketers wanting to operate in the region. Managers may build more accurate and more focused marketing plans for each customer group by understanding the characteristics of each marketing segment. Despite the fact that the region's marketplaces are quite profitable, managers should consider that the culture, particularly religion, continues to play a vital role in the people's daily lives.

*Limitations and directions for future research*

As this study is confined to wine consumption in Turkey, its conclusions cannot be generalized. More studies in other nations, especially Muslim countries, will be required to establish more conclusive conclusions. The education and monthly income of the sample in this study are high. Future studies could gather more rigorous samples with participants from various income levels and educational backgrounds. Further research on the factors that influence satisfaction, commitment, loyalty and WOM behaviour in relation to Muslim wine drinking could be beneficial to provide more recommendations to wine marketers and producers.

**References**

- Aurifeille, J.M., Quester, P., Lockshin, L. and Spawton, T. (2002), "Global vs international involvement-based segmentation: a cross-national exploratory study", *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 369-386.
- Barber, N., Almanza, B. and Donovan, J. (2006), "Motivational factors of gender, income and age on selecting a bottle of wine", *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 218-232.
- Barber, N., Ismail, J. and Dodd, T. (2008), "Purchase attributes of wine consumers with low involvement", *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 69-86.
- Bloomberg (2013), "Diageo facing Raki trouble in Turkey after Booze-Ad ban", 12 June.
- Brunner, T.A. and Siegrist, M. (2011), "Lifestyle determinants of wine consumption and spending on wine", *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 210-220.
- Bruwer, J. and Buller, C. (2012), "Country-of-origin (COO) brand preferences and associated knowledge levels of Japanese wine consumers", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 307-316.
- Bruwer, J. and Buller, C. (2013), "Product involvement, brand loyalty, and country-of-origin brand preferences of Japanese wine consumers", *Journal of Wine Research*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 38-58.
- Bruwer, J., Chrysochou, P. and Lesschaeve, I. (2017), "Consumer involvement and knowledge influence on wine choice cue utilisation", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 4, pp. 830-844.
- Bruwer, J., Cohen, J. and Kelley, K. (2019), "Wine involvement interaction with dining group dynamics, group composition and consumption behavioural aspects in USA restaurants", *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 12-28.
- Bruwer, J., Saliba, A. and Miller, B. (2011), "Consumer behavior and sensory preference differences: implications for the wine product marketing", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 5-18.
- Bruwer, J., Burrows, N., Chaumont, S., Li, E. and Saliba, A. (2014), "Consumer involvement and associated behaviour in the UK high-end retail off-trade wine market", *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 145-165.
- Calvo-Porrà, C., Ruiz-Vega, A. and Lévy-Mangin, J. (2019), "The influence of consumer involvement in wine consumption-elicited emotions", *Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 128-149.
- Charters, S. and Pettigrew, S. (2006), "Produce involvement and the evaluation of wine quality", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 181-193.
- Cunha, D., Kastenholz, E. and Silva, C. (2022), "Analyzing diversity amongst visitors of Portuguese wine routes based on their wine involvement", *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 121-141.
- Dholakia, U.M. (2001), "A motivational process model of product involvement and consumer risk perception", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 Nos 11/12, pp. 1340-1362.



- 
- Dodd, T., Laverie, D., Wilcox, J. and Duhan, D. (2005), "Differential effects of experience, subjective knowledge, and objective knowledge on sources of information used in consumer wine purchasing", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 3-19.
- Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), "Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 39-50.
- Harman, H. (1976), *Modern Factor Analysis*, University of Chicago press, Chicago, IL.
- Hair, J., Black, B., Babin, B. and Anderson, R. (2010), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Pearson Education, London.
- Higie, R.A. and Feick, L.F. (1989), "Enduring involvement: conceptual and measurement issues", in Thomas, K.S. (Ed.), *ACR North American Advances*, Association for Consumer Research, Provo, UT, Vol. 16, pp. 690-696
- Hirche, M. and Bruwer, J. (2014), "Buying a product for an anticipated consumption situation: observation of high-and low-involved wine buyers in a retail store", *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 295-318.
- Hollebeek, L., Jaeger, S., Brodie, R. and Balemi, A. (2007), "The influence of involvement on purchase intention for new world wine", *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 18 No. 8, pp. 1033-1049.
- Houston, M.J. and Rothschild, M.L. (1978), "Conceptual and methodological perspectives on involvement", *Proceedings of Educators of American Marketing Association*, pp. 184-187.
- International Organisation of Vine and Wine Intergovernmental Organisation (OIV) (2019), available at: [www.oiv.int/public/medias/6782/oiv-2019-statistical-report-on-world-vitiviniculture.pdf](http://www.oiv.int/public/medias/6782/oiv-2019-statistical-report-on-world-vitiviniculture.pdf) (accessed 1 August 2021).
- Kaiser, H.F. (1974), "An index of factor simplicity", *Psychometrika*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 31-36.
- Koksal, M.H. (2021), "Segmentation of wine consumers based on level of involvement: a case of Lebanon", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 123 No. 3, pp. 926-942.
- Laurent, G. and Kaprerer, J.N. (1985), "Measuring consumers' involvement profiles", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 41-53.
- Lesschaeve, I. and Bruwer, J. (2010), "The importance of consumer involvement and implications for new product development", in Jaeger, S.R. and MacFie, H. (Eds), *Consumer-Driven Innovation in Food and Personal Care Products*, 1st ed., Woodhead Food Series No. 195, Woodhead Publishing, Cambridge, pp. 386-423.
- Lockshin, L., Quester, P. and Spawton, T. (2001), "Segmentation by involvement or nationality for global retailing: a cross-national comparative study of wine shopping behaviours", *Journal of Wine Research*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 223-236.
- Lockshin, L.S., Spawton, A.L. and MacIntosh, G. (1997), "Using product, brand and purchasing involvement for retail segmentation", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 171-183.
- Lockshin, L., Jarvis, W., d'Hauterville, F. and Perrouy, J. (2006), "Using simulations from discrete choice experiments to measure consumer sensitivity to brand, region, price, and awards in wine choice", *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 17 Nos 3/4, pp. 166-178.
- Mittal, B. and Lee, M. (1989), "A causal model of consumer involvement", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 363-389.
- Montgomery, I. and Bruwer, J. (2013), "Domain-specific consumer involvement in the US wine market", *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 5, pp. 439-462.
- Nella, A. and Christou, E. (2014), "Segmenting wine tourists on the basis of involvement with wine", *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 7, pp. 783-798.
- Nicholson, P. (1990), "Gender, power and wine selection: a pilot study", *Journal of Wine Research*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 235-242.
- Olsen, J.E., Thompson, K.J. and Clarke, T.K. (2003), "Consumer self-confidence in wine purchases", *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 40-51.

- 
- Outreville, J.F. and Desrochers, J. (2016), "Perceived risk: an experimental investigation of consumer behavior when buying wine", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 15 No. 6, pp. 549-559.
- Oyinseye, P., Suárez, A., Saldaña, E., Fernández-Zurbano, P., Valentin, D. and Sáenz-Navajas, M.P. (2022), "Multidimensional representation of wine drinking experience: effects of the level of consumers' expertise and involvement", *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 98, p. 104536.
- Palma, D., Cornejo, C., Ortúzar, J.D., Rizzi, L.I. and Casaubon, G. (2014), "Tell me why you like to drink wine: drinking motivations as a basis for market segmentation", *8th AWBR International Conference*, June 18-30, Geisenheim, Germany.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.Y. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003), "Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, p. 879.
- Quester, P. and Smart, J. (1996), "Product involvement in consumer wine purchases: its demographic determinants and influence on choice attributes", *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 37-56.
- Rahman, I. and Reynolds, D. (2015), "Wine: intrinsic attributes and consumers' drinking frequency, experience, and involvement", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 44, pp. 1-11.
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Trade (2021), available at: [www.trade.gov.tr/data/5b8fd55613b8761f041fee87/Wine.pdf](http://www.trade.gov.tr/data/5b8fd55613b8761f041fee87/Wine.pdf) (accessed 6 August 2021).
- Richins, M.L., Bloch, P.H. and McQuarrie, E.F. (1992), "How enduring and situational involvement combine to create involvement responses", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 143-153.
- Roe, D. and Bruwer, J. (2017), "Self-concept, product involvement and consumption occasions: exploring fine wine consumer behaviour", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 6, pp. 1362-1377.
- Rothschild, M.L. (1979), "Advertising strategies for high and low involvement inventory in marketing", in Mahoney, J. and Silverman, B. (Eds), *Attitude Research Plays for High Stakes*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, IL, pp. 74-93.
- Rothschild, M.L. (1984), "Perspectives on involvement: current problems and future directions", *Advances Consumer Research*, Vol. 1, pp. 216-217.
- Saad, L. (2005), "Wine gains momentum as Americans' favorite adult beverage", *The Gallup Poll Survey*, Vol. 18, pp. 1-8.
- Santos, C.R., Blanco, M.C. and Fernández, A.G. (2006), "Segmenting wine consumers according to their involvement with appellations of origin", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 13 Nos 4/5, pp. 300-312.
- Schaefer, R., Olsen, J. and Thach, L. (2018), "Exploratory wine consumer behavior in a transitional market: the case of Poland", *Wine Economics and Policy*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 54-64.
- Sherif, M. and Cantril, H. (1947), *The Psychology of Ego-Involvements: social Attitudes and Identifications*, John Wiley and Sons, Washington, DC.
- Spawton, T. (1991), "Of wine and live asses: an introduction to the wine economy and state of wine marketing", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 19-31.
- Taylor, J.J., Bing, M., Reynolds, D., Davison, K. and Ruetzler, T. (2018), "Motivation and personal involvement leading to wine consumption", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 702-719.
- Thach, L. and Olsen, J. (2019), "Luxury wine: analyzing motivations of luxury wine buyers in the US market", *Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, Vol. 13 Nos 3/4, pp. 51-58.
- Tustin, M. and Lockshin, L. (2001), "Region of origin: does it really count", *Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 5, p. 139.

- Yoo, B. and Donthu, N. (2001), "Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 1-14.
- Yuan, J.J., So, S.I. and Chakravarty, S. (2005), "To wine or not to wine: profiling a wine enthusiast for a successful list", *Journal of Nutrition in Recipe and Menu Development*, Vol. 3 Nos 3/4, pp. 62-79.
- Zaichkowsky, J. (1985), "Measuring consumer involvement in products", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 341-352.
- Zaichkowsky, J.L. (1988), "Involvement and the price cue", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 323-327.

**Corresponding author**

Arian Seyedimany can be contacted at: [arian.imani@gmail.com](mailto:arian.imani@gmail.com)

---

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

[www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)

Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)