A comparison between tourists' profiles in two Italian wine routes

Una comparación entre los perfiles de los turistas de dos rutas del vino italiano

Luigi Galletto

Abstract

The study presents a comparative analysis of the wine tourism demand characteristics on two Italian wine routes. The research focuses on the more significant aspects that contradistinguish the wine tourists who frequent the Piave Wine Road and the Soave Wine Road, relying on 576 tourists' interviews. Through logistic regression, the identified variables may increase the relative propensity for a wine tourist to choose one or other itinerary. The results confirm a rather significant diversity between the two profiles (84% of cases are correctly classified). They show that the aspects that imply a greater propensity to travel along the Piave Wine Road rather than the Soave one correspond to an elderly foreign, university graduate tourist who have travelled for more than 3 days. This tourist pursues cultural activities, visits friends or acquaintances and tours with them. On the contrary, the latter one is more often preferred by someone aged less than thirty, who has learned of the route on a tourist board. He is less inclined to buy local wines and he spends less than 20 euro per meal. In this road is much more common the tendency to consider the wine tourism experience complete. Understanding the aspects that distinguish own wine tourists from other routes tourists allows Road Associations to position themselves better in an increasingly competitive market, in order to prepare appropriate territorial marketing strategies in relation to the wine tourism target that they intend to reach.

Keywords
wine route • wine tourist profile • logistic regression

Professor of Wine Economics. Centro Interdipartimentale Ricerche Viticole ed Enologiche (CIRVE). Universitá degli Studi di Padova. Agripolis. Viale dell'Università 16. 35020. Lengaro (PD) Italia. luigi.galletto@unipd.it

Resumen

El estudio presenta un análisis comparativo de las características de la demanda de turismo del vino en dos rutas del vino italiano. En particular, la investigación se centra en los aspectos más importantes que distinguen a los turistas del vino que frecuentan la Ruta del Vino del Piave y la Ruta del Vino Soave basándose en 576 entrevistas. A través de regresión logística, se pueden identificar las variables que más aumentan la propensión relativa para un turista del vino a elegir uno u otro itinerario. Los resultados confirman una diversidad bastante significativa entre los dos perfiles (84% de los casos son clasificados correctamente). Los resultados muestran que los aspectos que implican una mayor propensión a viajar a lo largo de la ruta del vino Piave en lugar de la ruta del Soave son: turistas ancianos, graduados, extranjeros, viajando por más de 3 días, que realicen actividades culturales, visitas a amigos o conocidos y viajar con ellos. Por el contrario, la preferencia por la segunda ruta se refleja mejor en los jóvenes menores de treinta años que han conocido el camino a través de organizaciones de turismo, están menos dispuestos a comprar vinos locales y gastan menos de 20 euros por comida. En esta ruta, es mucho más común la tendencia a considerar la experiencia del turismo del vino completa. El conocimiento de los aspectos que distinguen a los turistas del vino permite posicionarse adecuadamente en un mercado cada vez más competitivo y preparar estrategias de marketing apropiadas en relación con el target del turismo del vino que desean lograr.

Palabras clave
ruta del vino • perfil del turista del vino • regresión logística

Introduction

Wine or enological tourism is a type of tourism based on the promotion of a local product: wine. Wine tourism has been the subject of economics studies since the 1990s (33). These studies have regarded both the supply of and demand of economics experiences that, according to some authors (30), aren't much wider than simple services focused on the two characteristic organizations: wine festivals and wine routes.

The former are frequent mainly in the New World Countries, the latter have well-established roots in some Countries of the Old World (*e.g.* Rhein Weinstrasse), but they have found more and more favor with the public in some wine-growing areas of the New World.

Wine routes are organizations of wine growers and others take holders connected to the world of wine or the territory where one or more types of wine are produced.

They compete to provide a mix of products, services and experiences that can satisfy the expectations of the wine tourism demand, generating added value not only for their members, but also for other stakeholders in the area. And the closer these itineraries are each other the higher is the level of competition. If the incentive of price is undoubtedly important for the success of a wine route in many settings, its ability to attract one or more sectors of wine tourists in order to choose it instead of another one is

equally important. Therefore, complete information on the tourists who visit the wineries on a route is really important in order to identify an appropriate strategy of territorial marketing that benefits all the participants. This strategy must consider tourists' profiles visiting wineries in the nearby routes because they are competing each other. Therefore, the actions can differ whether the tourists travelling along two or more nearby routes constitute a fundamentally homogeneous group or present rather marked differentiating elements for each route.

The awareness that marketing is essential for the success of wine tourism has led to many studies on the subject of the segmentation of wine tourists. It has emerged that there are no wine tourist stereotypes; therefore, it is fundamental to identify the differences in order to reach the suitable target of the offer (8, 28).

Many approaches and applications have been applied in different geographical areas (3).

According to the standard socio-demographical characteristics (6, 13, 16, 31), the classification of wine tourists has been based on the interest in visiting wineries and on information on the offered wine (11), on the different perceptions of the visitors of the winery characteristics (12), on the level of involvement in the world of wine (4), on the type of sensations sought during the visit to wineries (15).

Barth and Salazar (2011) investigated the link between wine purchases at wineries and those made in day-to-day life, while Chang *et al.* (2002) combined wine purchases with the trip characteristics. However, the principal wine tourist reasons to make the excursion are of interest to the researchers in several geographical areas (1, 2).

The factors defining the choices and behaviors of wine tourists have been studied in North America: Brown (2005) and Getz (2006) analyzed the demand for wine tourism destinations in an important Canadian town (Calgary). Sparks (2007) applied the theory of planned behavior to identify the factors that determine the intentions of wine tourists; Geide *et al.* (2008) high lighted the role of preferences and motivations in the segmentation of wine tourists in Virginia.

Segmentation can be a complex operation, combining demographic, psychological and experiential variables with the purchasing behavior in a winery, the involvement of wine tourists and their information on wine (29). If Marzo-Navarro and Pedraja-Iglesias (2010) showed the existence of two segments in Spain in other researches on profiles, there are several and various categories of wine tourists. In general, a prominent variety prevails in terms of socio-demographical characteristics, attitudes and life styles.

Only a few studies considered the wine tourists' profiles linked to a specific wine route. Hashimoto and Telfer (2003) defined different profiles for the same route and Hojman and Hunter-Jones (2012) considered the heterogeneity of demand among the different routes in Chile. In Italy, the identification of a specific wine tourist out line associated with a wine route was the subject of the Galletto and Galletto's research (2010).

However, we do not know any paper comparing the wine tourist outlines in different routes, and this is the aim of research.

From this point of view, we have verified if two routes relatively close each other can be associated with two typical wine tourist profiles referring to variables commonly used in studies on wine tourists.

The both routes we have selected are sited in the Venetian region, in Italy, where wine tourism has presented a rapid growing in recent years.

Researches on wine tourism demand have used different techniques of multivariate analysis, such as confirmatory factorial analysis, principal components analysis, cluster analysis and logistic regression.

The last one seems to be the most qualified to achieve our aims. Its previous applications on wine tourism have considered various aspects: a) differentiating the level of involvement of wine consumers, *i.e.* between supporters and beginners (24, 35); b) discriminating between high and low spending potential wine tourists (22); c) specifying the factors of the approval deriving from wine tourism activities (23, 27); d) identifying the factors that make a trip along a wine route more probable (26); e) specifying the reasons that lead to the purchase of wine at festivals (9); f) delineating some consumers' features concerning both the participants in wine-tasting events at agritourists (18) and the visitors to wineries in the Northern Appalachian States (34).

In this study, we used logistic regression to identify the differences characterizing the two studied wine roads customers.

The hypothesis to be verified is that the two routes differ not only in terms of landscape and in terms of enological supply, but also because of the specific wine tourist profile, that distinguishes one another.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The routes we investigated are the Piave Wine Road (PWR) and Soave Wine Road (SWR), which are located at a distance of about 100 km. The Piave wines territory is between the provinces of Venice and Treviso, in eastern Veneto, on a vast plain delimited by the Adriatic Sea at the south and crossed by the Piave River. Piave DOC Wines include both white (Chardonnay, Pinot bianco, Pinot grigio, Verduzzo and Tai) and red wines (Cabernet Franc, Cabernet Sauvignon Merlot, Pinot nero and Raboso Piave).

The PWR is an itinerary of approximately 170 kilometers that starts and ends in Conegliano. It winds both on the right and left of the Piave River, therefore it is possible to visit places of cultural interest (Roman Time archeological sites, several Venetian Villas, as well as the sites of the Great War).

The PWR Association has about 80 members, mainly wineries. At the time of this research, it was reorganized, thanks to the most recent redefining of the route.

The Soave wine producing area is situated in western Venetian region, not far from Verona. It is a beautiful land where tourists can admire hills, volcanic soils, gentle slopes and green areas of vineyards. It is a popular tourist destination for Italians and foreigners, thanks to the easy motorway and railway links. Wines totally depend on the local variety named Garganega.

The SWR, a much shorter itinerary, extends as far as 50 Km, with various ramifications among vineyards, churches, villas and castles and it covers the main *crus* for the production of Soave.

The SWR Association was founded in 1999. There are presently (2014) 130 members, including wineries (privates and cooperatives), agritourists, restaurants, hotels and companies offering typical local products. It is active in coordinating the members with the ambition of creating the Soave area as one of the principal circuits for the enological tourism.

The data utilized were obtained using interview based on a questionnaire. The analysis was conducted during the weekends in 2012 spring, a busy period for the wineries working along the two roads. Besides the usual socio-demographical questions, the questionaire included other information about the wine tourists in terms of a) motivations, b) type and duration of the trip, c) acquisition of information on the road, d) previous wine tourism experiences, e) accommodation preferences, f) willingness to pay for a meal, g) purchase of wines and h) the opportunity of repeating the same route.

Having considered the sample size in similar research on the consumer's profile (22, 26, 35), we planned 350 interviews in each wine road. Because of uncomplete or uncoherent answers led us to rely on 576 cases, a good number for performing statistical valid analyses. Interviewees were casually selected among people available to answer the questionnaire. In case of people travelling in group, we tried to individuate a sort of inside "guide" or "chief".

The logistic regression model verifies the differences between the two wine tourist profiles as well as provides the contribution of the significant variables for classifying a wine tourist as acustomer of one route rather than the other one. Therefore, it offers a prognosis (or propensity) relative to deciding on the former or the latter route.

Concisely, in the logistic regression model, the dependent variable belongs to one of the two roads, and it assumes a value 1 for the PWR and 0 for the SWR. Its probability is equal to $1/1(1+e^Y)$, with Y defined by the linear combination:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots \beta_n X_n, \qquad (1)$$

where:

β_0 = constant, *i.e.* = the value of Y when the value of all the independent variables are equal to 0

$\beta_1 - \beta_n$ = the estimates of the parameters

$X_1 - X_n$ = characteristics of the wine tourists

The model is estimated by logit transformation, which results as a linear function in the explanatory variables. More exactly, Logit is defined as the logarithmic transformation of the propensity (odds): Log $(p/(1-p)$, where p is the probability of favorable cases. Logit transfers the probability from the interval (0,1) to the whole axis. So logit values equal to zero are associated to the probabilities of success equal to ½, negative values are associated to the probabilities of success less than ½ and positive values are linked to the probabilities of success greater than ½.

In addition to the β_i coefficients, we have been estimated the marginal effects for those variables that are significant at a p level < 0.1. They indicate the variation on the probability that a wine tourist will belong to the PWR due to a given feature. After having specified that there is only binary explanatory variables, this change is given by: $p(X_{ij} = 1) - p(X_{ij} = 0)$.

Table 1 (page 162) lists the characteristics used for the logistic regression in terms of frequency distribution. Some important variables are not included in the table 1 (pág. 162). They are the level of income, the residence and the kind of profession. In fact, they were not considered because there were too many missing data (from around a third to two thirds of interviewees). For this reason, it was preferred to use only the variables surveyed for all the interviewees and to maintain a good sample size, thinking that these variables would be adequate to pursue the objectives of the research.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of the variables used in the logistic regression models.

Tabla 1. Distribución de frecuencias de las variables usadas en los modelos de regresión logística.

	%
Piave Wine Road	53.70
Soave Wine Road	46.30
Age: under 30 years	27.95
Age: between 30 and 60 years§	45.14
Age: over 60 years	26.91
Nationality: Italian §	64.58
Nationality: foreign	35.42
Male§	62.80
Female	37.20
Education: primary school	3.04
Education: secondary school	9.01
Education: high school§	52.95
Education: university	35.00
Motivation: visiting friends or acquaintances	20.42
Motivation: cultural trip	27.58
Motivation: holiday trip or other§	52.00
Day trip	31.30
Tripin 2 or 3 days§	37.50
Tripin more than 3 days	31.20
Trip with relatives or alone§	50.97
Trip with friends or acquaintances	32.81
Organized trip	16.32
The knowledge of the route: from friends or acquaintances	25.80
The knowledge of the route: from traditional advertising	10.33
The knowledge of the route: travel agents or tourist boards	25.87
The knowledge of the route: internet	10.10
The knowledge of the route: other§	27.90
Previous experience of wine routes§	50.17
The first experience of wine routes	49.83
Overnight staying in hotel or guest house§	58.33
Overnight staying in agritourist	15.10
Other kinds of overnight staying	13.54
Overnight staying with relatives or friends	13.03
The purchase of local wines: Yes§	66.68
The purchase of local wines: No	20.57
The purchase of local wines: Perhaps	12.75
The intention to repeat the route: Yes §	76.48
The intention to repeat the route: No	3.83
The intention to repeat the route: Perhaps	19.69
Willingness to payless than 20 € for a full meal	11.11
Willingness to payfrom 20 to 30 € for a full meal §	64.76
Willingness to paymore than 30 € for afull meal	24.13

§ Reference variable in the logistic regression (=0).

§ Variable de la referencia en la regresión logística (=0).

RESULTS

Sample features

The distribution of interviewees between the two routes seems adequate. Regarding socio-demographical aspects, both the young and the elder people seem well represented, the number of graduates at university is reliable, moreover the foreigners are more than a third and the percentage of women appears to be in line with many investigations on wine tourists and, in general, on wine drinkers both in Italy and in Europe. People visit the wineries mainly for a short holiday for cultural interests or for study.

The prevailing period of the trip is about 2-3 days; a day trip and longer ones are also well represented. About 50% of these are family or unaccompanied trips, followed by trips among friends or acquaintances, while it is limited the percentage of the travelers in trips organized by travel agents with provided transport. It is nearly equal the division between those who experience a wine route for the first time and who has already experienced them at least once.

How they get to know the routes is quite different. Travel agents and tourist boards are used by more than a quarter of the interviewees, while to get to know about the trip from friends and acquaintances is the most used way of deciding a wine route. Only a tenth of the samples obtained the information by internet and another tenth by traditional forms of advertising (television, radio, the printed press).

The prevalent type of night accommodation is a hotel or a guest house, followed by an agritourist. A quarter of the sample does not buy wines at the wineries, but they only taste them during their visits. A few of them do not want to repeat the itinerary not for dissatisfaction but because the want to experience new wine routes: it could be the consequence of the presence of "route hunter" tourists.

Finally, the willingness to pay for a meal is at an intermediate level for almost two thirds of the samples.

Logistic regression models

Variables in table 1 (page 162) can be divided into three groups: a) socio-demographic (they cover from age to levels of education), b) related to the characteristics of the trip as a wine tourist (they cover from the trip duration to the wine route experience), and c) related to choices of a wine tourist. These groups were firstly introduced separately in the logistic regression model and then all together.

If we consider the indicators on the validity of the logistic regressions and on the level of adaptability to the observed data (table 2, page 164), the first three models, where the three groups of variables were considered separately, show an absolutely higher contribution of the aspects related to the trip and the socio-demographic and choice aspects follow in the list. These models are partial even if they demonstrate a great ability in classification chiefly in the second model. Moreover, the full model appears to be equally suitable according to the explained variability.

The analysis of the odds ratio (e^B) shows extremely high values for two characteristics: The former is the organized trips and the latter is the learning about the route via internet.

The odds ratio in favor of the PWR compared to the SWR is less than 86% for those who obtained information via internet in comparison with other methods and it is 72% for those who belong to an organized group, comparing them to those who travel alone or with relatives.

Table 2. Results of logistic regression models. Main statistical indicators.

Tabla 2. Resultados de los modelos de regresión logística. Principales indicadores estadísticos.

Model	Log likelihood -2	Cox and Snell R²	Nagelkerke R²	Hosmer-Lemeshow χ² (8 g.l.)	Correctly classified cases (%)
1 – Socio-demographic variables	613.081	0.271	0.362	13.110	72.7
2 – Trip variables	468.864	0.433	0.578	8.362	82.6
3 – Choice variables	673.140	0.186	0.249	3.630	68.4
4 – All variables	314.398	0.565	0.755	10.832	89.7
5 – All variables*	400.658	0.494	0.660	5.925	83.8
6 – Step selection*	417.897	0.479	0.640	9.102	83.8

* Excluding the variables: organized trip and learning about the route via internet.

* Excluyendo las variables: viaje organizado y aprendizaje sobre la ruta vía internet.

While corresponding to the actual sample, these latter pieces of evidence appear to be rather incidental, *i.e.* linked to the fact that at the time of the survey, unlike the SWR, the PWR had a scarcely functioning internet site and the organization of the trips in collaboration with other tourism stakeholders was still at an embryonic stage. Therefore, it was decided to re-estimate the models omitting these two variables in model 5 (table 3, page 165), which the following analysis refers to. In this model, it is immediately obvious that some characteristics have little implication in explaining the probability of belonging to the route. These are 10 variables out of 25: three of them are socio-demographic, three of them are linked to the trip and four variables are connected to the choices.

However, this does not imply that these variables have no influence in defining the profile of the wine tourist on each route. They are associated to a consistent level of collinearity with the other independent variables and, in such a way, they provide redundant information for determining the propensity to the trip along one or another route. Only the gender is not significant in all the models. A subsequent estimation with the stepwise method selects the 15 variables that are fully significant.

According to table 2, this regression (Model 6) shows a level of adaptation only slightly lower than that of the previous model and it has an equal classification capacity. In addition, the values of the coefficients are not very different from those in Model 5.

Main discriminating variables

Age and nationality discriminate more than the level of education. Infact, a young person is the 50% less expected to drive the PWR than a wine tourist of intermediate age (from 30 to 60 years), while the 29% of people over 60 years of age decided to do so. Likewise, the probability for a foreigner is the 28% higher than for an Italian tourist for the same route. As the level of education rises there is an increasing odds ratio, even if only the coefficient related to the graduate wine tourist is significant.

Table 3. Logistic regression. Independent variables used in Model 5.
Tabla 3. Regresión logística. Variables independientes usadas en el Modelo 5.

Variable	B	St. Err.	Wald	Sign.	Exp(B)	Marginal effect
Age: under 30 years	-2.308	0.36	41.166	0.000	0.099	-0.5009
Age: over 60 years	1.289	0.348	13.72	0.000	3.629	0.2871
Female	-0.185	0.271	0.464	0.496	0.831	
Nationality: foreign	1.236	0.322	14.699	0.000	3.442	0.2835
Education: primary school	-1.664	0.946	3.092	0.079	0.189	-0.3698
Education: secondary school	-0.215	0.51	0.177	0.674	0.807	
Education: university	0.666	0.291	5.235	0.022	1.946	0.1622
Motivation: visiting friends or acquaintances	1.105	0.354	9.750	0.002	3.020	0.2717
Motivation: cultural trip	1.284	0.339	14.317	0.000	3.609	0.2999
Day trip	0.294	0.378	0.604	0.437	1.342	
Trip in more than 3 days	1.020	0.36	8.044	0.005	2.773	0.2127
Trip with friends or acquaintances	0.899	0.309	8.460	0.004	2.457	0.2204
The knowledge of the route: from friends or acquaintances	0.678	0.352	3.712	0.054	1.970	0.1532
The knowledge of the route: from traditional advertising	0.049	0.468	0.011	0.917	1.050	
The knowledge of the route: travel agents or tourist boards	-0.839	0.358	5.509	0.019	0.432	-0.2249
The first experience of wine routes	2.023	0.29	48.664	0.000	7.560	0.4653
Overnight staying in agritourist	1.209	0.47	6.628	0.010	3.350	0.2475
Overnight staying with relatives or friends	1.200	0.458	6.857	0.009	3.319	0.2407
Other kinds of overnight staying	0.386	0.423	0.832	0.362	1.471	
The purchase of local wines: No	-1.191	0.353	11.357	0.001	0.304	-0.2800
The purchase of local wines: Perhaps	0.745	0.435	2.935	0.087	2.107	0.1604
The intention to repeat the route: No	-1.477	0.863	2.933	0.087	0.228	-0.3510
The intention to repeat the route: Perhaps	0.720	0.348	4.295	0.038	2.055	0.1813
Willingness to pay for a full meal < 20 €	-2.126	0.458	21.563	0.000	0.119	-0.4405
Willingness to pay for a full meal > 30 €	-0.372	0.308	1.462	0.227	0.689	
Constant	-2.235	0.534	17.518	0.000	0.107	

Being the first experience of a wine route is the variable that most differentiate the profiles of the tourists on the two routes. The "beginner wine tourists" marginal effect shows that they are 47% more expected to prefer the PWR in comparison with expert wine tourists.

A person with cultural objectives is more disposed to follow the PWR rather than the SWR. Moreover, the wine tourist, who travels for visiting friends or relatives, usually prefers the PWR in comparison with someone who travels mainly for a holiday, and it corresponds well to the choice of this route performed by those who travel with friends or acquaintances.

A person, who has obtained information by friends or acquaintances or who stays over night with friends or relatives, presents a higher propensity for the PWR. Therefore, it could really be known as the "wine road of friendship or company", as human relations play an important role.

Those who follow the SWR more often obtain information from travel agents and tourist boards in comparison with the wine tourists on the PWR, and there is a greater participation in organized trips. Indeed, a tourist who obtained information from these sources has a 22.5% lower probability in favor of the PWR than a person who used other methods. A long trip is the 21% more probable along the PWR than a trip of average duration. Similarly, a greater propensity for this route is shown by those who spend the night either staying with friends or in an agritourist (odds ratio higher than three for both variables).

If a propensity for cheap accommodation distinguishes the wine tourist of the PWR, travelers of the SWR want a less expensive meal and they are less incline to buy wine. Indeed, the probability to pay no more than 20 euro for a meal is 44% less for people who follow the former route in comparison with someone willing to pay an intermediate sum. Moreover, a tourist, who does not intend to purchase wine in comparison with one who is instead certain of doing so, is 28% less probable in this route. Finally, people, who have frequented the PWR, show a greater hesitancy about repeating the itinerary in the future.

Discussion

Previous results shows that it is neither possible to identify a wine tourist stereotype nor give a unilateral definition of his behavior. They confirm what Charters and Ali-Knight (2002) stated, *i.e.* it is difficult to define wine tourists within a single homogeneous group and it is more realistic to describe the different traits in relation to the investigated areas. In addition to the above-mentioned studies on the wine tourist's demand, they have demonstrated the key role of wine roads in defining the wine tourist local market. In fact, each of the two routes is distinguished by a specific wine tourist profile that is highly differentiated and defined by a set of variables commonly used in segmentation processes. Some comments seem useful for a better understanding of the reasons underlying the main differences between the two profiles.

The particularly higher age of the wine tourist on the PWR can be related to the presence of many elderly residents in the area of the route who return periodically to stock up with their preferred wines (14).

The higher number of foreign wine tourists on the PWR may be due both to the vicinity of this itinerary to the cities of Venice and Treviso and the capacity of the stakeholders to arouse the interest

of the many foreigners who are in the Adriatic beach resorts, while the nearest competitor is the short Lison Pramaggiore Wine Road. This choice happens much less on the SWR, because the foreign tourists are on holiday near Lake Garda or they want to visit Verona and therefore they have many opportunities of wine tourism itineraries (*e.g.* Valpolicella, Custoza and Bardolino Wine Roads). Graduate people prefer the PWR because few young people have reached that level of education and a cultural motivation.

In order to understand the high marginal effect of the first experience in favor of the PWR, it should be considered that the visit to the wineries may be a stopgap, *i.e.* a spontaneous resolution when weather is bad for many beach vacationers or an unplanned digression for a large section of tourists who did not know the wine tourism before. Because of the great resources of wine routes in the province of Verona, a lot of people who just experienced wine routes spend time at the SWR and therefore they are more acquainted with wine tourism excursions.

About trip motivations, the possibility of combining the itinerary with a visit to Venice also undoubtedly increases the cultural reasons for the PWR tourists. Moreover, the high rate of visitors of the SWR, who knew the route by travel agents and tourist boards, clearly depends on the SWR Association's strategy of closely involving these entities.

The length of the itinerary, the greater foreign participation, more varied motivations encourage longer trips for the PWR wine tourists, compared to the SWR ones, because it has a much shorter itinerary with wineries very close each other, and if a tourist is in a hurry he can taste wine or organize other activities.

The PWR tourists can choice cheaper accommodations than the usual hotels and guest houses for their overnight stayings.

A high frequency of young and limited income travelers on the SWR may contribute to the willingness of to pay less for a meal for those touring this road. That is why these tourists purchase less local wine along the itinerary; therefore, there is a larger proportion of "pure tasters" in comparison with those on the PWR.

The doubt on repeating the experience is higher among those who travelled the PWR because the involved area is very large, the production of wine is rather various and there are several historical sites and monuments. Tourists need to consider all these elements when they decide to plan another trip in the same area.

Even though there is a marked differentiation between the wine tourists on the two examined wine routes, its generalization is not possible on other wine tourism contexts because it must be confirmed by further investigations. Some peculiarities of this research appear to be relevant and they may have significantly widened the gap between the wine tourists' profiles on the two routes such as: a) even if both routes can be reached by car in an hour, they are not adjacent; b) the SWR is mainly located in a hilly area, while the PWR is an itinerary entirely on the plain; c) the surrounding areas have characteristics that can strongly influence the profile of the wine tourist who approaches these routes; d) there is a significant gap between the organizational level of the two routes, especially in terms of creativity of the two Associations. Indeed, if these peculiarities diminish or disappear, the differences between the wine tourist profiles of two routes might become less marked even if no less interesting.

Conclusions

The logistic models adequately confirm the hypothesis on the existence of different wine tourist profiles between two wine routes located in the same region. Most of the employed variables act as a distinction between the wine tourists of the two routes even if variable sub-groups determine a good classification of the sampled cases. Especially features related to trips differentiate the two profiles. In fact, the first experience as a wine tourist plays the main role and his motivation is the second important consideration. Among the socio-demographic variables, the most relevant ones are age, foreign participation and education.

The choice variables have a less defining influence, although willingness to pay for food and buying wine at the wineries are quite significant.

The obtained results interest the stakeholders belonging to the wine routes. For this purpose, if wine producers need to differentiate themselves from the competitors on the other routes by emphasizing the characteristics that make them exclusive (*e.g.* the grape type, the soils and climate that contribute to differentiate wine qualities, the cultural tradition, etc.), they must also concentrate their competitive offers towards one or more segments of wine tourists. In fact, positioning and targeting are both part of an overall strategy of territorial marketing that the wine routes must put into practice to compete in an increasingly globalized arena.

If this competition concerns even distant wine tourist destinations, it is mostly true for wine routes in competition in the same geographical area, both in providing services that satisfy the demands of their main tourists, and identifying new factors to attract tourists with different characteristics. It is a case of modelling the supply on the basis of the real requirements of the tourists, promoting every resource of the local territorial system and making an efficient use of the public funding that is often available for wine tourism activities.

For example, it emerged from the analysis that either SWR stakeholders could try to attract more wine tourists through the organization of events and a better promotion of the territorial cultural aspects or they could study initiatives as a passport for the road in order to encourage people to come back. Instead, the PWR stakeholders could attract younger tourists improving their marketing by internet, travel agents and tourist boards, in such a way they can reduce the portion of people who have not yet decided their coming back.

References

1. Alant, K.; Bruwer, J. 2004. Wine tourism behavior in the context of a motivational framework for wine regions and cellar doors. Journal of Wine Research. 15(1): 27-38.
2. Alebaki, M.; Iakovidou, O. 2010. Segmenting the Greek wine tourism market using a motivational approach. New Medit. 9(4): 31-40.
3. Alebaki, M.; Iakovidou, O. 2011. Market Segmentation in Wine Tourism: A Comparison of Approaches. Tourismos. An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism. 6(1): 123-140.

4. Alonso, A. D. 2008. An investigation of wine involvement among travelers in New Zealand. e-Review of Tourism Research. 6(1): 1-9.
5. Barth, S.; Salazar, J. 2011. Wine tourism and consumer behaviors related to wine purchases. Journal of Tourism Insights. 1(1): 1-6.
6. Boatto, V.; Barisan, L.; Montedoro, M. 2006. Domanda enoturistica: l'esempio del Trevigiano. VQ. 1(6): 16-20.
7. Brown, G.; Getz, D. 2005. Linking wine preferences to the choice of wine tourism destinations. Journal of Travel Research. 43(3): 266-276.
8. Brunori, G.; Rossi, A. 2000. Synergy and coherence through collective action: some insights from wine routes in Tuscany. Sociologia Ruralis. 40(4): 409-423.
9. Bruwer, J. 2002. South African wine routes: some perspectives on the wine tourism industry's structural dimensions and wine tourism product. Tourism Management. 24(4): 423-435.
10. Chang, T. C.; Kim, M. K.; Kim, S. H. 2002. Profile of winery visitors of Michigan wineries based on behavioral segmentation. In Proceedings of the 2002 Northwestern Recreation Research Symposium. Bolton Landing, New York. 133-139.
11. Charters, S.; Ali-Knight, J. 2002. Who is the wine tourist? Tourism Management. 23(3): 311-319.
12. Dodd, T.; Bigotte, V. 1997. Perceptual differences among visitor groups to wineries. Journal of Travel research. 35(3): 46-51.
13. Evans, M. R.; Carol, P.; Grant, H. 2008. Discover North Carolina wines: A wine tourism visitor profile study. John A. Walker College of Business, Appalachian State University.
14. Galletto, G.; Galletto, L. 2010. A profile of the wine tourist of the Vini del Piave Route. Progrès Agricole et Viticole. 127(19): 408-413.
15. Galloway, G.; Mitchell, R.; Getz, D.; Crouch, G.; Ong, B. 2008. Sensation seeking and the prediction of attitudes and behaviours of wine tourists. Tourism Management. 29(5): 950-966.
16. Gatti S.; Maroni, F. 2004. A profile of wine tourists in some Italian region vineyards: an application of the multiple correspondence analysis. Vineyard Data Quantification Society (vdqs) Colloque, Oenometrics XI, Dijon, France.
17. Geide, C.; Harmon, L.; Baker, R. 2008. Northern Virginia Wineries: understanding visitor motivations for market segmentation. In Proceedings of the 2008 Northwestern Recreation Research Symposium. Bolton Landing, New York. 350-356.
18. Gennari, A. J.; Winter, P.; Martin, D.; Eiseclhlas, P.; Ciardullo, V.; Smud, H. 2011. Analisi dell'enoturismo in Argentina, 149-210. In Boatto, V.; Gennari, A. (eds). *La roadmap del turismo enologico*. Franco Angeli, Milano, Italy.
19. Getz, D.; Brown, G. 2006. Critical success factors for wine tourism regions: a demand analysis. Tourism Management. 27(1): 146-158.
20. Hashimoto, A.; Telfer, D. J. 2003. Positioning an emerging wine route in the Niagara Region: Understanding the wine tourism market and its implications for marketing. Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing. 14(3-4): 61-76.
21. Hojman, D. E.; Hunter-Jones, P. 2012. Wine tourism: Chilean wine regions and routes. Journal of Business Research. 65(1): 13-21.
22. Lankford, S.; Oksana Grybovych, O.; Lankford, J. K. 2006. Development of a Regional Wine Culture in Iowa. Final Report Prepared for the Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture. University of Northern Iowa STEP. 1-35.
23. Lopez-Guzman, T. J.; Millán, G.; Caridad y Ocerin, J. M. 2008. Análisis econométrico del enoturismo en España: un estudio de caso. Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo. 17(2): 98-114.
24. Magalhães Serra, E.; Carvalho Vieira, M.; Spawton, T. 2010. Determinants of Portuguese wine & enotourism consumer behavior. COGITUR: Journal of Tourism Studies. 10(3): 9-20.
25. Marzo-Navarro, M.; Pedraja-Iglesias, M. 2010. Are there different profiles of wine tourists? An initial approach. International Journal of Wine Business Research. 22(4): 349-361.
26. Mauracher, C.; Procidano, I.; Sacchi, G. 2014. Customer satisfaction per l'innovazione dell'enoturismo in Veneto. Effetti delle nuove forme di integrazione turistica. Economia Agro-Alimentare. 16(1): 157-178.

27. Millàn, G.; Melìàn Navarro, A. 2010. Turismo enológico y desarrollo rural: una applicacion empirica. Revista Lider. 17: 159-175.
28. Mitchell, R.; Hall, C. M. 2001. Life style behaviours of New Zealand winery visitors: wine club activities, wine cellars and place of purchase. International Journal of Wine Marketing. 13(3): 82-93.
29. O' Mahony, B.; Hall, J.; Lockshin, L.; Jago, L.; Brown, G. 2008. Wine tourism and subsequent wine purchase behaviour. CRC for Sustainable Tourism. Gold Coast, Australia.
30. Quadri-Felitti, D.; Fiore, A. 2012. Experience economy constructs as a framework for understanding wine tourism. Journal of Vacation Marketing. 18(1): 3-15.
31. Romano, M. F.; Natilli. M. 2009. Wine tourism in Italy: New profiles, styles of consumption, ways of touring. Tourism. 52(4): 463-475.
32. Sparks, B. 2007. Planning a wine tourism vacation? Factors that help to predict tourist behavioral intentions. Tourist Management. 28(5): 1180-1192.
33. Varchiano Pol, M.; Ramon Cardona, J. 2013. Turismo y vino en la literatura academica: Breve revision bibliográfica. REDMARKA UIMA. 2(6): 55-82.
34. Woods, T. A.; Nogueira, L.; Yang, S. 2013. Linking wine consumers to the consumptions of local wines and winery visit in the northern Appalachian States. International Food and Agribusiness Review. 16(4): 181-205.
35. Yuan, J. J.; So, S.; Chakravarty, S. 2005. To wine or not to wine: profiling a wine enthusiast for a successful list. Journal of Nutrition in Recipe & Menu Development. 3(3-4): 63-79.