

Cornell University School of Hotel Administration The Scholarly Commons

Articles and Chapters

School of Hotel Administration Collection

1998

Micro-Brewed Beer and the Patrons of Mid-Priced, Casual Restaurants

Carl P. Borchgrevink
Michigan State University

Alex M. Susskind
Cornell University School of Hotel Administration, ams76@cornell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles>

 Part of the [Food and Beverage Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Borchgrevink, C. P., & Susskind, A. M. (1998). *Micro-brewed beer and the patrons of mid-priced, casual restaurants* [Electronic version]. Retrieved [insert date], from Cornell University, SHA School site: <http://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles/1075>

This Article or Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Hotel Administration Collection at The Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles and Chapters by an authorized administrator of The Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact hlmdigital@cornell.edu.

Micro-Brewed Beer and the Patrons of Mid-Priced, Casual Restaurants

Abstract

Micro-breweries and micro-brewed beer have been growing in popularity ever since 1977. In recent years, the growth has been phenomenal; restaurants have started to take notice and advantage of the increased interest in micro-brewed beers. However, shakeout is expected. The research focused on mid-priced casual restaurants, a large segment with many chain restaurants, with respondents from three regions of the continental United States (i.e., the Southeast, the Pacific Northwest, and the Midwest). The research findings suggest that more than 70 percent of the participants in this study reported that they dine out at least once per week, indicating that they are accustomed to the dining process. These respondents indicated a higher than average socioeconomic index (Byrne, 1971), and a strong preference for micro-brewed product offerings. Additionally those respondents who indicated a preference for micro brewed products were less prone to desire a national brand of beer. Regional differences among the participants' responses are also discussed.

Keywords

beer, micro-breweries, casual restaurants, beer consumption, restaurant beverages

Disciplines

Food and Beverage Management | Hospitality Administration and Management

Comments

Required Publisher Statement

© Taylor & Francis. Final version published as: Borchgrevink, C. P., & Susskind, A. M. (1998). Micro-brewed beer and the patrons of mid-priced, casual restaurants. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 5(2-3), 115-129. Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.

Micro-Brewed Beer and the Patrons of Mid-Priced, Casual Restaurants

Carl P. Borchgrevink

Michigan State University

Alex M. Susskind

Cornell University

Author Note

Carl P. Borchgrevink, PhD, CFBE, is Assistant Professor, The School of Hospitality Business, 233 Eppley Center at Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824.

Alex M. Susskind, PhD, CFES, is Assistant Professor, Department of Hospitality Administration, 4111 University Center B at Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306.

ABSTRACT

Micro-breweries and micro-brewed beer have been growing in popularity ever since 1977. In recent years, the growth has been phenomenal; restaurants have started to take notice and advantage of the increased interest in micro-brewed beers. However, shakeout is expected. The research focused on mid-priced casual restaurants, a large segment with many chain restaurants, with respondents from three regions of the continental United States (i.e., the Southeast, the Pacific Northwest, and the Midwest). The research findings suggest that more than 70 percent of the participants in this study reported that they dine out at least once per week, indicating that they are accustomed to the dining process. These respondents indicated a higher than average socioeconomic index (Byrne, 1971), and a strong preference for micro-brewed product offerings. Additionally those respondents who indicated a preference for micro brewed products were less prone to desire a national brand of beer. Regional differences among the participants' responses are also discussed.

Micro-Brewed Beer and the Patrons of Mid-Priced, Casual Restaurants

There has been a significant decline in the number of consumers in the 21-25 age bracket, and beer sales from 1991 through 1995 have stayed below 1990 levels (Allan, 1997). These current demographic trends suggest that beer consumption and sales should suffer given that the age group that typically consumes beer has decreased in number. In 1996, despite the anticipated decline, the US beer market posted an increase over 1995 with 0.8 percent growth, and shipped 187.1 million barrels of beer in 1996 (Allan, 1997). Additionally, the imported beer segment has shown considerable growth between 1995 and 1996. The reported growth in the imported beer segment amounted to 10 percent, reaching 167.3 million cases in 1996 (Smith, 1997). When compared to general domestic and imported beers, micro-brewed beer has experienced tremendous growth, showing annual production increases from 1990-1995 in excess of 30 percent. The increase from 1994 to 1995 alone was 51 percent, reaching 4 million barrels (Gardner, 1997).

This proliferation and differentiation of beer products has been described as part of a broad societal consumer movement toward increasingly segmented product preferences (Khermouch, 1997a). Early predictions which suggested that micro-brewed beers would gain market share at the expense of imports has been proven false (Smith, 1997), with only the larger national brands and major breweries showing signs of decline in this newly differentiated marketplace (Khermouch, 1997b; Moen, 1997; Wolff, 1997). The microbreweries are now viewed as sources of education and intrigue among beer consumers. The micro-brew concept in the beer marketplace is effectively increasing consumer awareness, knowledge, and interest in discovering a wider variety of beer products and styles (Smith, 1997). Responding to the educated consumers' movement and the cycle of demand, restaurants are increasingly opting to carry a wider range of beers, micro-brewed beers, other specialty beers and craft beers, private-labeled beers, and hard ciders (Clay, 1997; Gardner, 1997; Khermouch, 1996; Olmsted, 1997).

Beer has consistently been a profitable product for restaurants and taverns to serve, and operators have found that customers are willing to pay more for micro-brews and other specialty beverages. People are drinking less, but wish to drink higher quality products (Moen, 1997), and premium products typically allow for greater contribution margins (Kotschevar & Tanke, 1991).

The product proliferation, however, is anticipated to lead to a shakeout (Nlan, 1997; Wolff, 1997), and the major brewers are responding by entering the micro-brewery market through acquisition (Khermouch, 1995), launching new brands (Khermouch, 1997), and by focusing their marketing efforts on their core brands (Allan, 1997; Wolff, 1997).

Given the current proliferation of beer offerings and the potential of a shakeout within the existing beer market, do restaurant patrons expect restaurants to carry micro-brewed beers? If so, do they expect to find the products of local micro-breweries on the menu? Would they purchase a micro-brew, or would they prefer a national brand? Is the consumer of micro-brews different than the consumer of national brands? Do demographic characteristics differentiate the purchaser of micro-brews from the patron who orders a national brand, or does the same patron order from both categories? Finally, are there regional differences among patron expectations for beer products? We believed these were reasonable questions to investigate, the answers to which may be helpful to restaurant operators and marketing professionals.

METHODS

Procedure

Given that the largest segment of beer consumers falls into the 21-25-age category, we attempted to accurately tap into that population. It appeared reasonable to use undergraduate and graduate college students as a sampling frame, due to their natural match with the general demographic profile of beer consumers (Student, 1995). This does, however, restrict the range of the sample using all respondents from the same general demographic category (i.e., all college educated or in the process thereof). Student

(1995) reports, however, that consumers of micro-brews are most likely to be college educated, providing a justification to limit the range of respondents. The participants were given the opportunity of participating for extra credit in hospitality business courses.' Any participants who were not of legal drinking age were asked to have their parents, or another person of legal drinking age close to them, complete the survey.

Participants at three universities, one in the Midwest ($n = 83$), one in the Pacific Northwest ($n = 50$), and one in the Southeastern United States ($n = 185$) were selected for this investigation. A total of 338 usable questionnaires were received from the (a) Midwest, $n = 83$, (b) the Pacific Northwest, $n = 50$, and (c) the Southeast, $n = 185$.

Participants were provided with a questionnaire which asked them basic demographic questions (i.e., age, gender, education level, and approximate dollar amount spent while dining out) and to indicate their level of agreement (on a five-point Likert-type scale) with statements addressing their preferences and expectations in regard to restaurant service in mid-priced, casual restaurants (i.e., "I usually order a recommended beverage" or "I expect a selection of local micro-brewed beer").

Forty-six percent of the respondents indicated they were male, while 52 percent noted they were female; 2 percent declined to indicate their sex. The average age of the participant was 30 years, ranging from 20 through 67 (mode = 21 and median = 23). The majority (82.5%) had completed a four year college education, while 22 percent indicated they had attended graduate school, 2.9 percent had only completed high school, and 14.7 percent had completed two years of college. Applying Byrne's (1971) approach to developing a socioeconomic index, we found the participants to be slightly above the US average, with a mean of 10.0 on a potential and obtained range of 3 through 15. The index compares respondent spending on important items to the amount the average American spends. The version used here considered respondent monthly spending on food and groceries, food in restaurants, and housing and housing related expenses.

Findings

To answer the research questions presented previously, several analytic techniques were employed. First, for the questions of interest, the percentage of response by scale category was calculated. Second, a product-moment correlation matrix was created to examine the relationships among the variables of interest. Third, tests of mean difference were applied to the categorical data using Chi-square analyses. Finally, independent groups t-tests were applied to assess the similarity of responses among the three subgroups in terms of demographic characteristics and their responses to the variables of interest described in the research questions above. Respondents were divided into subgroups based on their geographic location, viz., the Southeast (SE), Northwest (NW), and Midwest (MW). Each subgroup was compared to each other independently (i.e., subgroup 1 vs. subgroup 2, subgroup 1 vs. subgroup 3, and subgroup 2 vs. subgroup 3).

The participants were asked how frequently they visit mid-priced, casual theme restaurants for an evening meal such as dinner or supper. The data are summarized in Table 1. As can be seen from the data, more than 55 percent of the participants consume their evening meal at a mid-priced casual theme restaurant once per week or more, while 28 percent indicate that they frequent such eating establishments 2-3 times per week. The data are consistent with the National Restaurant Association (1996) study of meal consumption behavior.

In terms of beverage consumption, 53.5 percent indicate that they usually order beer when visiting a mid-priced casual theme restaurant, 21.4 percent suggest they usually order wine, while 28.1 percent order a distilled beverage. A total of 87 participants (27.3%) indicated that they typically do not order alcoholic beverages when visiting the target restaurants. The questions relative to beverage consumption were not mutually exclusive, due to the fact that in many cases a consumer may order several types of beverages during a restaurant visit. As such, the responses do not sum to 100 percent.

The participants were then asked about their expectations relative to micro-brewed beers. Do they expect that a mid-priced, casual theme restaurant would offer a selection of micro-brewed beers? Furthermore, do they expect such a restaurant to carry beers from local micro-breweries? The responses indicate 48.2 percent expect to find micro-brewed beers offered, while 25.3 percent do not expect them to be available. When asked about the expected availability of locally produced micro-brews, 40 percent of the participants indicated that this is expected, and 24.3 percent did not expect locally produced micro-brews to be available to them. Table 2 summarizes this data.

The next questions asked the participants if they would order a micro-brewed beer if such beers were available to them, or if they would prefer to order a national brand product when they order beer. Roughly a quarter of the participants (26.1%) indicated that they would not order a micro-brew if available, while 52.6 percent indicated that they would order a micro-brewed beverage if made available. These findings remained stable when filtering out those who usually do not order beverage alcohol, with 25.7 percent and 59.8 percent, respectively (see Table 3). An additional inquiry was made regarding their preference for a beer from a national brewery when ordering beer. This response was also stable across those who regularly order beverage alcohol and those who typically abstain. In either case, the majority of participants appeared to be neutral as 41.2 percent and 43.7 percent, respectively, noted that they had no preference for a national brand when ordering beer. Thirty percent of the entire sample, and 27 percent of those who tend not to consume beverage alcohol, indicated that they do not prefer a national brewer's beer, while 29 percent of the participants prefer a national brew, drinkers and non-drinkers alike.

Considering the increased contribution margin potential of micro-brewed beer over a national brand, operators may wish to try to persuade patrons to order micro-brews. As such, we asked the participants whether they tend to order a food or beverage that a server would recommend for them. Roughly a third indicated a neutral response, while 29.8 percent indicated they would order a recommended beverage. In terms of recommended food, 37.1 percent indicated they would order such an item (see Table 4).

The correlations among the variables investigated were examined to describe their general patterns of relationships (see Table 5). Through the correlational analyses several interesting relationships were identified. First, those who responded positively to the inquiry "if offered, I would likely order a micro-brewed beer," usually order beer ($r = .60, p < .001$), expect a selection of micro-brewed beer ($r = .49, p < .001$), and expect a selection of locally micro-brewed beers as well ($r = .50, p < .001$). Participants who expected a micro-brewed beer to be available also expected to find a selection of local micro-brew offerings ($r = .80, p < .001$). Conversely, those participants who prefer a national brand of beer are less likely to be interested in micro-brewed products in terms of expecting a selection of micro-brewed beer or locally micro-brewed beers to be available ($r = -.26, p < .001$; $r = -.26, p < .001$, respectively), and are less likely to order a micro-brewed beer ($r = -.14, p < .05$). Lastly, those participants who normally follow server recommendations for food selections are more likely to follow recommendations for beverage selections and would order a micro-brewed beer if offered ($r = .48, p < .001$; and $r = .19, p < .05$, respectively).

To further explain these relationships, the participants' frequency of dining (by category) was examined using a Chi-square analysis in terms of their propensity to order beer products. Those respondents who dined out once per week or more showed a preference for micro-brewed beers and local micro-brewed beers ($\chi^2 [40] = 63.10, p = .011$ and $\chi^2 [40] = 62.17, p = .014$) and would order a micro-brewed beer if offered ($\chi^2 [40] = 59.59, p = .024$). Consequently, no statistically significant relationship was observed among the frequency of dining out and a preference for a national brand. Lastly, those respondents with a socioeconomic index of 10 or greater showed a higher propensity to order a micro-brewed beer ($\chi^2 [48] = 69.23, p = .024$) and women showed a higher preference for local micro-brewery offerings than men did ($\chi^2 [4] = 9.77, p = .045$).

Subgroup Differences

The final set of analyses examined subgroup differences among the participants. The means and standard deviations are reported in Table 6, and t-test results of the comparison items are reported in

Table 7. The Southeast (SE), Northwest (NW), and Midwest (MW) subgroups did not differ significantly in terms of their propensity to follow server recommendations for ordering both food and beverage products and their propensity to order a micro-brewed product. However, dining frequency was significantly different between the three subgroups. The SE respondents dined out most frequently, followed by the MW, and NW ($t [233] = -4.36, p = .001$; $t [265] = -2.07, p = .04$; and $t [130] = 2.01, p = .05$, for the SE vs. NW, SE vs. MW, and NW vs. MW comparisons, respectively). Only the NW and MW subgroups differed significantly in terms of their expectations of seeing both micro-brew and local micro-brew offerings ($t [129] = 2.94, p < .001$; and $t [129] = 2.42, p = .02$, respectively) with the NW showing the highest preference for both micro-brew and local micro-brew offerings ($M = 3.53$ and $M = 3.41$, respectively). In terms of preferring a national brand, the SE and NW, and the NW and MW subgroups differed significantly in their responses ($t [234] = 2.58, p = .01$; and $t [130] = -2.69, p = .01$, respectively). Those in the NW subgroup showed the lowest preference for national brands followed by the SE and MW subgroups ($M = 2.60, M = 3.01$, and $M = 3.06$, respectively). In terms of age, the MW subgroup was significantly older ($M = 44$) than both the SE and NW subgroups ($t [260] = -16.70, p < .001$; and $t [1321] = -10.81, p < .001$, for the SE and NW, and the NW and MW comparisons, respectively), while the SE and NW subgroups were not statistically different in age ($M = 25$, and $M = 26$, respectively). Lastly, the socioeconomic index differed significantly among those respondents in the SE and MW subgroups only ($t [12671] = -2.47, p = .01$), with those in the MW subgroup showing the highest reported socioeconomic index followed by the NW and SE subgroups ($M = 10.49, M = 10.42$, and $M = 9.73$, respectively).

DISCUSSION

This investigation examined restaurant patrons' preferences for micro-brewed beers in mid-priced, casual restaurants, and uncovered several interesting findings regarding restaurant patrons' desires, behavior, and preferences for micro-brewed beer. Over 70 percent of the participants in this study

reported that they dine out at least once per week, implying they are accustomed to the dining process. These respondents indicated a strong preference for micro-brewed product offerings. Additionally, those respondents who prefer to drink a micro-brew product are less prone to desire a national brand of beer.

While this sample tended to be higher than average in socioeconomic characteristics (i.e., disposable income and money spent on durable and household goods), those with a higher socioeconomic index score showed a greater preference for micro-brewed products than those with lower index scores. These findings are consistent with reports of consumers wishing to spend more money on fewer higher quality products, based on a higher available disposable income for recreation services (Moen, 1997).

Overall, the sociodemographic information provided a few notable distinctions among the participant groupings in terms of their responses to the survey items. Those who reported a greater frequency of dining out expressed a greater interest in micro-brewed products, local micro-brewed products and would be most likely to order a micro-brewed product. This suggests that as patrons become more exposed to the dining process, they are more likely to "experiment" with a variety of beverage offerings. Moreover, the preference for national brands appears to be less important to the respondents in this sample. This preference (or lack thereof) may be a function of the stability and long-standing availability of national brands. Among these respondents, the interest or intrigue associated with micro-brewed products appears to be the strongest, as there was a negative relationship between a preference for a national brand and a preference for a micro-brewed product, suggesting that those who prefer a national brand are less likely to prefer a micro-brewed product (or vice versa). Additionally, the female respondents indicated a stronger preference for a selection of local micro-brewed beers than their male counterparts. This suggests that women may be more comfortable selecting a local micro-brewed product when its origin is easily recognized and supporting product information is readily available. Finally, the correlational data indicated that participants who reported they are likely to order a micro-brewed product are also prone to follow server recommendations when ordering. This suggests that servers can exert a certain level of influence over their patrons in regard to their product selection while dining.

This study sampled individuals from three geographic locations. While the general demographic character and surroundings of the participants were similar (i.e., mostly college educated and contacted through a university setting), each subgroup displayed some similarities and differences with each other. All three subgroups were equally likely to order a micro-brew and tend to follow recommendations for food and beverage from their servers in a similar fashion. However, the subgroups displayed differences in their responses in terms of: (a) dining frequency, (b) expectations for product offerings, (c) socioeconomic index, and (d) age. The specific similarities and differences among the subgroups are presented below.

Respondents from the Northwestern subgroup appeared to be the most interested in micro-brewed products and the least interested in national brands when compared to the other two subgroups. These findings suggest that among this sample, the popularity of micro-brewed products is strongest in the Northwestern United States. It is likely that these findings are a result of a stronger market presence of micro-breweries in that region. An upward trend is likely to persist in other regions, as micro-breweries continue to increase in presence and gain additional market support.

While the subgroup from the Midwest was significantly older than the other two subgroups, their preference for micro-brewed products was similar. Remarkably, the more senior Midwestern subgroup shared many similarities with both subgroups, as evidenced by the non-significant t-test results. In addition to server recommendations and a propensity to order micro-brewed products, the Midwestern and Southeastern subgroups' responses did not differ significantly in terms of their expectations for micro-brew and local micro-brew offerings, and national brand preference, but showed significant differences in their dining frequency and socioeconomic index scores. It is interesting to note that the older subgroup indicated the highest socioeconomic index score, which is consistent with the contention that older college-educated individuals have higher incomes. Although the index score was higher for the Midwestern subgroup overall, the difference for the Midwestern and Northwestern was not statistically significant. Consequently, the Midwestern and Northwestern samples were significantly different in terms

of dining frequency, product expectations, and national brand preference; Finally, the Southeastern and Northwestern subgroups shared the most similarities, indicating significant differences only in their dining frequency and national brand preference responses.

CONCLUSIONS

In sum, micro-brewed beers are gaining in popularity among restaurant patrons in the mid-priced casual dining segment. Operators of restaurants should attend to these needs by beginning to expand upon their micro-brew offerings. Although this study found that consumers of micro-brewed products are less interested in national brands of beer, careful attention should be paid to the beer products offered in this segment to ensure that each target group of consumers' preferences are being accurately and effectively represented. In fact, these findings suggest that consumers in this specific sociodemographic grouping have a stronger preference for microbrew products. These respondents represent only a portion of this dining segment, and future investigations should expand their inquiries to sample additional target groups in this market.

This investigation identified regional differences among the responses of the participants in this investigation. These differences are important and indicate that each market in which mid-price casual restaurants operate, should examine their specific customers' needs and preferences to best meet their consumers' ever-developing needs. With future research, it would be useful to further examine the characteristics and preferences of restaurant patrons who are interested in consuming micro-brewed products to provide a better understanding of consumer demand at the restaurant level. With a more complete understanding of consumer preferences, restaurant operators can more appropriately prepare to meet their customers' needs and expectations for product and service offerings. As micro-brewed products continue to gain popularity among the mid-priced casual dining segment, restaurant operators should prepare to carefully add new micro-brewed products to their beverage lists.

NOTE

1. Those students not of legal drinking age who still desired the extra credit for participation were encouraged by the researchers to have a friend or family member over the age of 21 complete the survey. This procedure lead to a slightly inflated mean age, as respondents clearly older than average college age completed the survey. This also provided for a light expansion of the respondent population.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T.F. (1997). Beer market shows increase in 1996, fighting adverse demographic trends. *Impact*, 27 (1 & 2), 1-7.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The Attraction Paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Clay, M. (1997). Tap dance. *Market Watch*, 16 (5), 39-42.
- Gardner, K. (1997). A toast to tradition. *Restaurants USA*, 17 (2), 31-33.
- Khermouch, G. (1996). Body? Bouquet? Its only beer! *Brandweek*, 37(27), 25.
- Khermouch, G. (1997a). Tapped-in outsider. *Brandweek*, 38(6), 52-54.
- Khermouch, G. (1997b). Major brewers still struggling to gain handle on fickle new market. *Brandweek*, 38(1), 10.
- Kotschevar, L.H. & Tanke, M.L. (1991) *Managing Bar and Beverage Operations*. East Lansing, MI: The Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Motel Association.
- Moen, M. (1997). Premium pilsners. *Market Watch*, 16 (5), 29-33.
- National Restaurant Association (1996). *Meal Consumption Behavior*: Washington, DC: National Restaurant Association Research Department.
- Olmsted, L. (1997). The brewing interest in private-label beers. *Restaurants USA*, 17 (2), 28-30.
- Smith, A.T. (1997), Imported beer volume rises sharply, fueled by consumer trading-up trends, *Impact*, 27 (S), 1-5.
- Student, 1. (1995). True brew. *American Demographics*, 17 (5), 32.
- Wolff, M. (1997). Premium pilsners. *Market Watch*, 16 (S), 22-27.

Table 1. Evening Meal Frequency

	<u>n</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Twice a day or more	2	0.6
Once a day	4	1.3
4-6 times per week	14	4.4
2-3 times per week	88	27.8
Once per week	69	21.8
2-3 times per month	86	27.1
Once per month	26	8.2
6-11 times per year	14	4.4
3-5 times per year	9	2.8
Twice a year	3	0.9
Once a year or less	2	0.6

Table 2. Micro-Brew Availability

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I expect mid-priced, casual theme restaurants to offer a selection of beers from micro- breweries	4.7%	20.6%	28.5%	38.9%	7.3%
I expect mid-priced, casual theme restaurants to offer a selection of beers from local micro-breweries	3.8%	20.5%	35.6%	35.0%	5.0%

N = 316

Table 3. "Would Likely Order a Micro-Brew if Offered"

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Entire sample	10.1%	42.5%	21.4%	19.2%	6.9%
Excluding those who normally do not order beverage alcohol	12.1%	47.6%	19.0%	16.9%	4.3%

N = 316

Table 4. Response to Server Recommendations

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
“I usually order a recommended beverage”	1.6%	28.2%	38.9%	27.3%	4.1%
“I usually order a recommended food”	2.5%	34.6%	34.3%	25.8%	2.8%

N = 316

Table 5. Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
1. Usually order a recommended food	1.00																		
2. Usually order a recommended beverage	0.48 **	1.00																	
3. Usually order a distilled beverage	0.11	0.08	1.00																
4. Usually order wine	0.20 **	0.17	0.00	1.00															
5. Usually order wine by the glass	0.19 **	0.14 **	-0.02	0.84 **	1.00														
6. Usually order beer	0.08	0.08	0.36 **	-0.29	-0.08	1.00													
7. Usually do not drink alcoholic beverages	-0.03	0.00	-0.21 *	-0.24 **	-0.22 **	-0.43 **	1.00												
8. Expect a selection of local micro-brewed beer	0.09	-0.00	0.12	-0.19	-0.03	0.30 **	-0.14 *	1.00											
9. Expect a selection of micro-brewed beer	0.08	0.03	0.11	0.04	-0.01	0.30 **	-0.09	0.80 **	1.00										
10. If offered I would likely order a micro-brewed beer	0.19 **	0.03	0.22 **	0.08	0.04	0.60 **	-0.30 **	0.49 **	0.50 **	1.00									
11. When drinking beer, I prefer a beer from a national brewery	0.05	0.12 *	0.05	-0.14	-0.06	0.12 *	-0.08	-0.26 **	-0.26 **	-0.14 *	1.00								
12. Evening meals per week at mid-priced, casual theme restaurants	-0.05	0.06	-0.15 **	-0.09	-0.08	-0.18 **	0.22 **	0.00	-0.08	-0.06	-0.08	1.00							
13. Average lunch bill	0.05	0.01	0.08	0.11	0.06	0.12 *	-0.07	0.13 *	0.10	0.17 **	0.08	0.07	1.00						
14. Average dinner or supper bill	0.04	0.00	0.09	0.17 **	0.13 *	0.11	-0.07	0.08	0.06	0.11 *	0.03	0.14 *	0.80 **	1.00					
15. Level of education	-0.00	0.1	-0.12 *	0.05	-0.10	-0.06	0.04	-0.01	0.00	-0.05	-0.06	0.10	-0.03	0.01	1.00				
16. Gender	-0.02	-0.08	-0.08	0.08	0.07	-0.26 **	0.13 *	-0.00	0.00	-0.20 **	-0.11	0.03	-0.17 **	-0.18 **	-0.10	1.00			
17. Age	-0.02	-0.02	-0.23 **	0.08	0.07	-0.25 **	0.00	-0.18 **	-0.16 **	-0.14 *	0.03	0.10	-0.04	0.06	0.19 **	-0.11 *	1.00		
18. Socioeconomic Index	-0.00	0.02	0.14	0.05	0.06	0.07	-0.13 *	0.00	0.03	-0.07	-0.03	-0.24 **	0.22 **	0.24 **	0.16 **	-0.25 **	0.28 **	1.00	

** $p = .001$, * $p = .05$, $N = 315$

Table 6. Subgroup Analysis.

<u>Group:</u>	<u>Southeast</u>			<u>Northwest</u>			<u>Midwest</u>		
<u>Variable</u>	<i>n</i> 186	M	SD	<i>n</i> 50	M	SD	<i>n</i> 83	M	SD
Dining Frequency		5.07	1.38		5.48	1.67		6.10	1.82
Expect Local Microbrew		3.17	0.97		3.02	0.86		3.41	0.91
Expect Microbrew		3.24	1.07		3.05	0.91		3.53	0.89
Order National Brand		3.01	1.01		3.06	1.00		2.60	0.88
Order Microbrew		3.40	1.08		3.12	1.15		3.20	1.07
Follows food suggestions		3.14	0.88		3.05	0.89		2.92	1.00
Follows beverage suggestions		3.00	0.87		2.95	0.91		2.82	0.89
Age		24.71	7.35		43.87	10.90		25.69	6.32
Sociodemographic Index		9.73	2.38		10.49	2.31		10.42	2.51

N = 317

Table 7. Subgroup Comparisons

	Southeast vs. Northwest			Southwest vs. Midwest			Northwest vs. Southeast		
	<i>t</i> value	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i> value	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i> value	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Dining Frequency	-4.36	233	0.00	-2.07	265	0.04	2.01	1.30	0.05
Expected Local Microbrew	-1.53	233	0.13	1.19	266	0.24	2.42	129	0.02
Expect Microbrew	-1.76	232	0.08	1.39	265	0.17	2.94	129	0.00
Order National Brand	2.58	234	0.01	-0.42	266	0.68	-2.69	130	0.01
Order Microbrew	1.15	234	0.25	1.88	266	0.06	0.39	130	0.70
Follows food suggestions	1.52	234	0.13	0.78	265	0.43	-0.77	131	0.45
Follows beverage suggestions	1.28	235	0.20	0.42	266	0.68	-0.79	131	0.43
Age	-0.86	228	0.39	-16.70	260	0.00	-10.81	132	0.00
Sociodemographic Index	-1.81	234	0.07	-2.47	267	0.01	-0.17	131	0.86

N = 317