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Summary
The paper shows the results of a research on wine tourism in 2000 in the light of the activities of the Osservatorio sul Turismo (National Body on Wine Tourism), with the end in view of making a contribution to the analysis of the wine tourism phenomenon which has widely grown in the last decade. Taking into account the different levels of wine tourism development in the selected areas, the motivational research was conducted and aimed at meeting the various needs already known so as to make an initial assessment of the level of the services offered in the more progressive areas and to identify the elements of wine tourism that might appeal to prospective tourists.

A descriptive analysis of the results demonstrated salient characteristics in the profile of the tourists but the more significant information is in the application of the multiple correspondence analysis to the data in single questionnaires. The paper analyses these results, highlighting the potentialities and the limits of the instrument used in interpreting the qualitative questionnaire data.

From the graph of the first and second axes emerge the subdivision of the tourists interviewed from those "Not belonging to the sector" to those "belonging to the sector" (interpretation of the first axis) and from the "Enthusiastic" to those "Uninterested" (interpretation of the second axis). All in all, there are four types of wine tourists: 1) the professional, 2) the cultured, 3) the enthusiastic (who has already had some previous experience in wine tourism, 4) the wine tourist by chance.

1. The National Body on Wine Tourism

Wine tourism is a relatively recent phenomenon for Italy and in a state of continual growth and requires further study by means of instruments of direct research¹. In 2000, the National Body on Wine Tourism, organized in Italy by the Associazione Nazionale Città del Vino, in collaboration with the Department of Statistics of the University of Bologna undertook research that centred on the characteristics of wine tourists and wine tourism industries (Gatti, 2002). It distributed questionnaires right in the wine areas, involving 43 Italian wine-tourism locations and wine routes and the highly recognized Italian Denominazioni d’Origine Controllata (Protected Denomination of Origin) areas which had already been organized and defined in 2000. Only 25 of these areas took part in the survey, demonstrating a marked difference between the most organized and advanced areas and those where the wine tourism phenomenon is still a spontaneous activity. Of these, 6 are in the southern regions, 19 in the northern and central regions (tab. 1). Altogether 263 questionnaires relating to the characteristics, opinions and attitudes of the wine tourists that visit wine-producing regions, have been handed in.

The results of this survey are presented in this paper.

¹ Department of Statistics, University of Bologna
¹ A direct research on wine tourism in Italy has been made, in particular, by Antonioli Corigliano (1996). For an analysis of international experiences see Vandecandelaere (2003).
2. The survey on the characteristics, habits and opinions of wine tourists who visit wine-producing farms

The questionnaire for the wine tourists visiting the wine-producing farms was prepared in four languages (Italian, German, English and French) and divided into 4 distinct sections (see appendix 1). The first has social-demographic type of information on wine tourists; the second and the third sections deal with means of travel and the procedure of the visit to the winery; the fourth and last section concentrates on the expectations and evaluations of the visitors (ISTAT, 1989).

From the responses to the questionnaires, it can be deduced that 79.1% of those submitted in wine-producing farms were filled in and collected in the wine routes of Tuscany.

An analysis of the 263 collected questionnaires of the wine tourists in wine-making farms proved that 23 were not useful, since they gave generic answers.

The results of the research proved the need for greater in-depth work to reach a higher level of involvement throughout the areas within the research remit. The data collected cannot represent a synthesis on wine tourism in Italy, but nevertheless can be one of the first systematic efforts at gatherig information on the wine routes. The commentary on the results of the survey on the habits, opinions and characteristics of wine tourists must therefore be considered as an indication of the trend of a phenomenon that will be undergoing further investigation.

3. The results

One of the problems of an information-collection procedure that is not strictly structured is the possibility of receiving questionnaires from homogeneous groups of visitors (example, organized groups, visitors to cantine aperte/open cellar days2, etc.). In relation to the research on wine tourists in wine-producing farms, it can be said that, using certain questions such as the means of transport used to reach the wine cellar, the date of compilation of the questionnaire, in overall terms, was not concentrated on the open cellar days. As regards the composition of the groups, a balanced representation can be noted, for while all the areas gave out questionnaires to people who arrived in the cellars as part of an organized tour, these were all well-matched with other types of wine tourists.

Those that filled in the questionnaire were mainly male (62.1%) and the majority were foreigners (59.2% altogether, with 63.7% females and 56.4% males), and predominantly young people. 7.1% of the respondents were below 25 years of age, the age modal class was between 26 and 35 years with 26.3%, and 25.8% between 36 and 45 years, 25% between 46 and 55 years and 13.3% over 56 years of age. Overall the women were younger than the men: 47.2% were below 35 years, in comparison with the figure of 24.9% of males. 84.6% of the men and 74.7% of the women were working, with 59.5% of the men and 64.7% of the women as employees. The men were mostly white collar workers (50.7%) or in the managerial staff (44%). Majority of the women were managers (45.5%) and white collar workers (43.2%). The men who were working on own were predominantly entrepreneurs (54.9%) and professionals (37.2%). Calculated on the respondings,

---

2 Cantine Aperte (Open Cellar Days) are organized annually in Italy by the "Movimento del Turismo" at the last weekend of May.
the women who were working on their own were chiefly professionals (69.6%) and entrepreneurs (30.4%). 18.8% of the men and 13.2% of the women's work was related to the wine industry. 95% of them declaring a direct connection to the wine, of which 54.2% undertake wine related commerce (enoteca, hotel and restaurant owners...). It can therefore be concluded that "professional" wine tourists make up 10.8% of the survey, concentrating on the whole on the wine routes of the Maremman hills.

Among the 3 main reasons given for visiting the region were “scenery”, “art”, “wine” and “gastronomy”. For the men, as well as for the women, the first reason for the visit was the scenery (39.1% for the men and 42.8% for the women). The second motivation for the trip in general was the typical local gastronomy (42.3% of the male and 40.2% of the female respondents). The third reason was the wine (55.8% of the male and 56.7% of the female respondents). Wine, in particular, attained the greatest figure on the sum of the three main motivations of the men (31.4%), while women prioritised, before wine (25.6%), the scenery (27.2%). The wine tourists who answered question 6 organized their trip independently (71.6% of the men and 73.9% of the women), the second most popular means was through tourist agencies and tour operators (19.6% of the men and 19.3% of the women) or with the help of friends (answer “others”), above all for the men (8.9%).

The wine tourists that responded travel on the whole in couples or in groups (35.6% of the men and 38.5% of the women travel in couples, 32.9% of the men and 31.9% of the women in groups).

Around half of them requested information on wine and gastronomic routes, with the men (33.3%) asking mainly in the enotecas and the women principally in the wine routes' welcome offices and tourist offices with the women (24.3% respectively). Of those that requested information, the 81.7% gave an evaluation of the grade of satisfaction; 66% gave marks from 8 to 10, with only 11.7% from 5 and under marks. The visits to the vineyards, generally is an excursion (49.8%) during a journey or a holiday. Overnight stays were mainly in a hotel (44.2% of the males and 33.8% of the women answering the question), or in agritourist place (19.2% of the males and 35.4% of the females) or in rented houses (11.7% and 16.2%). A third of them found promotional material on the wine and gastronomic routes at their accommodation (43.8% of the males and 49.3% of the females).

Specifically relating to the wine producing farm, the wine tourists received information mainly through specialized guides (38.5% of the first answer for the men and 35.1% for the women) or friends (24.8% of the first answers for the men and 18.7% of the women). Notably important also are the options not on the list and summarized in the answer “other” (23.9% of the men and 17.6% of the women). This answer reveal indications received from associations of sommeliers and from restaurant owners, with the discovery of the wine producing farm often by chance while travelling through the region. One third of the wine tourists had to book their visit directly through the wineries themselves. They reached their destination mainly by car (88.5% of the men and 78.1% of the women), while 8.8% of the men and 14.1% of the women used bus transport. Difficulties in reaching their destinations were not noted. 60.4% of the men and 54.7% of the women that responded to the question (89.2% of the total) found specific tourist indications relating to the wine routes. More than half of the wine tourists that responded to the questionnaire have had previous experience of wine tourism (63.2% of the male and 48.9% of the female respondents). On the whole, this experience has been in Italy and particularly in Tuscany (21.6%), in Piemonte (12.7%) and in the Veneto (9.9%). Abroad, the USA provided the highest experience with 12.7%, France with 8.4% and Germany 8.0%. This experience predominantly took place during a holiday period (52.7%) and for 30.8% of the cases, during work periods. Of a lesser significance (14.9%) came the experience during daily excursions.

The majority of the wine tourists intended to visit the wine producing farm for wine-tasting (80.5% of the first answers of the men and 71.8% of the women) and partly also to buy them (9.3% of the
first answers of the men and 14.1% of the women, 60.9% of the second answers of the men and 45.9% of the women), with other aspects of little import that were not linked to wine. The wine tourists above all hoped to get to know the wine produce (78.2% of the men and 79.5% of the women that responded to the question put it as their primary expectation). They also expected to visit the wine cellars (12.6% and 7.9% of the men and women, respectively, that answered the question wrote it down as their primary expectation, 40.5% of the men and 52.7% of the women that gave the second choice put it down as their second motivation and 21.2% of the men and 23.6% of the women that gave the third choice as their third objective, they also hoped to get to meet the producer (35.5% and 25.7% of the men and women, respectively, who made the second choice) and visit the vineyards (25.2% of the men and 16.4% of the women that made the third choice and sample the wines for free (33.3% and 32.7% of the men and women, respectively, that made the third choice). All in all, 88.7% of those that answered the questionnaire responded to the question about the level of satisfaction with the various essential tourist items that are offered by the wine producing farms. This centred, most of all, on the quality of the wine, the kind of reception, technical explanations of the wine, tasting procedure and possible cost of tasting. The opinion polled is widely positive for those elements directly linked to wine and slightly less enthusiastic on complementary services: catering, sport and relaxation, camper-van facilities. Positive results prevailed on 87.4% and 86.1% of the men and women respectively that answered question 20, intending to buy typical local produce from the wine producing farm, but above all, wine (94.8% and 93% of the men and women respondents, respectively), but on a small quantity (71.6% of the men and 81.8% of the women respondents). Almost all the wine tourists that replied to the questionnaire planned to repeat the experience.

4. Data analysis

The descriptive analysis of the results of the direct research as a whole has shown various notable characteristics of the typology of the wine tourists.

A more articulate information on the results of the research in the wine-producing farms might be gleaned by an application of the multiple correspondence analysis that allow the identification of a synthetic profile of wine tourists that responded to the survey, by an elaborated formulation of the results of the filled in questionnaire.

5. Multiple correspondence analysis (MCA)

The multiple correspondence analysis can be defined as a multidimensional factorial analysis that supplies synthetic representations of great matrixes of data (Benzecri, 1973; 1980). For certain mathematical properties and as a result of the abundance of exercisable options, the multiple correspondence analysis is a tool for:

- synthetic and rational representations of data, inasmuch as the limited amount of the dimensions on which the observations are represented gives an immediate picture of the relationships among the variables;

- critical evaluation of data, by means of the identification of anomalous data, the enforcement of a value rather than not entering any data, the replacement of content by the loophole procedure ("Other", "I don't know", "Indifferent", etc.);

- the drawing up of synthetic indices;
- getting rid of irrelevant information.

Because the MCA allows the information gathered to be studied for both its quantitative as well as its qualitative characteristics, this technique is more prevalent in the analysis of questionnaires.

The MCA, however, faces certain problems:

- the results are strongly dependent on the samples analysed and on anomalous cases which, if not identified, affect the variables, as a result of the symmetry of the analysed whole;
- the elucidation of the same results through the interpretation of the graph must necessarily be completed by understanding the significance of the contributions;
- the analysis by inference is almost completely subordinated to descriptive analysis.

The MCA is therefore a particularly useful tool in defining a primary overview of the situation on the fundamental relationships existing in a large body of information, being careful of avoiding generalizations. With this viewpoint the MCA has been applied to data collected from questionnaires distributed to wine tourists in wine-producing farms.

6. The application of the method

The first stage of the analysis has been to identify the active variables that directly determine the axes and the illustrative variables that are projected on the axes, once these have been determined and have a purely descriptive function.

Among the active variables, those relating to social-demographics were included, so with variables that were more directly linked to the motivations and the organisation of the visit and the level of satisfaction of the services offered by the wineries. The illustrative ones include all those variables relating to the second and third responses to questions that provided for an arrangement of the procedures in order of time or of preference.

Table 2 shows the first 20 eigenvalues in diminishing order, reassessed inertia according to the Benzecri formula and cumulated reassessed inertia. The first 5 factorial axes helped to explain around 62.7% of the system variables that are of generally satisfactory levels for an understanding of the characteristics of the studied phenomenon. The graphic analysis of the first and second factors is limited. (See graph 1).

7. Interpretation of the first factorial axis: Not belonging to the sector - Belonging to the sector

7.1 The "professional" tourist (Belonging to the sector)

The absolute contributions most relevant in determining the first axis have been the procedures relating to variables linked to working aspects of individuals:

- "profession relating to vineyard activities" (4.6% absolute contribution)
- "previous experience for work" (3.2%).
The first axis shows opposing behaviour between individuals whose work is somehow connected in some ways to vineyard activities and those who do not in any way belong to such sector.

On the positive semi-axis, in fact, are those who seem to have a privileged access to offered services, who have received information from vineyard associations and specialised magazines, besides from restaurants and broaden one's experience even with visits to other cellars. Besides, these people seem to be characterized as being self-employed and belong to the entrepreneur class. They have booked and organized the visit themselves.

- "self-employed" (2% absolute contribution)
- "role: entrepreneur" (2.6%)
- "wine/restaurant associations as sources of information" (2.4%)
- "visits to other cellars" (1.4%)
- "booking of the visit" (1.5%)

Those "belonging to the sector" group know in advance the wine quality and the formalities of wine tasting, purchase wine during the visit, assign high ratings (9 and 10) to their satisfaction of the type of reception and catering. They are not indifferent to the purchase of typical food products and are disappointed if such services are not offered:

- "to know the wine product as motivation to make the trip" (1.1% absolute contribution)
- "to purchase typical wine-food products as motivation to make the visit" (0.9%)
- "unmet expectations of typical products or sale" (1.1%)
- "10 point satisfaction rating to catering" (0.7%)
- "10 points satisfaction rating to manner of catering" (1.3%)
- "9 points satisfaction rating to reception" (1%)
- "9 points satisfaction rating to wine quality" (1.1%).

7.2 The tourist not belonging to the wine sector

On the first negative semi-axis are placed those whose visit is not related to the wine business.

It is not their first experience, but as has been in the past, they included the visit in their holiday activities. They make their visit by car and their interest in the arts is the main motivation that made them undertake such a trip. They are interested in purchasing wine, although in moderate quantity. They are characteristically employees, but with managerial functions.

The conditions that brought the greatest contributions in determining the first axis, with negative coordinates are in fact:

- "profession not related to vineyard activities" (0.8% absolute contribution)
- "employee workers" (1.1%)
- "travel by car" (1.8%)
- "art-motivated travel" (0.8%)
- "wine-purchase-motivated visit" (1.6%)
- "wine bought from 1 to 12 bottles" (2.2%).

The areas that principally contributed to the determination of the axes are:
- "the Maremman hills" (7.5% absolute contribution, positive semi-axis)
- "Montepulciano" (2.1%, negative semi-axis).

8. Interpretation of the second factorial axis: the enthusiastic - the uninterested

8.1 The enthusiastic tourist

Amongst the variables that weigh most heavily in the determination of the second axis, that which seems to have a major discriminant power, relates to the information on a past experience connected to wine tourism (independent from the fact that the tourist's profession is closely or not, relating to the wine-industry sector.

- "identical experience already had in the past (1.2% absolute contribution)
- "a similar experience never had in the past" (0.8%).

The enthusiastic tourists who come from abroad and repeatedly visit the wine producing areas, whether for work or for pleasure, are placed on the negative part of this axis. They are very keen on demonstrating such an interest in the wine quality and remain enthusiastic about it. They book their sojourn right in the agro-tourist place or in similar accommodation near wine cellars. They ask information during their trip and, satisfied with requests granted, they would want even more informative materials at the place of the overnight stay to consult with.

The factors that primarily contribute in determining the negative semi-axis are:
- "coming from the USA" (0.7% absolute contribution)
- "emanating from Germany" (0.3%)
- "work-related experience in the past" (0.9%)
- "holiday experience in the past" (1.2%)
- "previous experience in France" (0.9%)
- "sojourn in agro-tourist place" 0.9%)
- "distance ranging from 21 to 50 kms. between accommodation and wine cellar" (1.5%)
- 10 points satisfaction rating with the quality of wine (0.7%)
- "requested information during the trip" (1.2%)
- "10 points satisfaction rating for information received" (0.7%).

8.2 The indifferent tourist

Conversely, on the positive semi-axis are the tourists who seem uninterested in visiting wine cellars. It shows this, among others, the high contributions of the modality “not answer” to the questions which had asked them to assign points to assess the quality of the services offered by the wine producing farm (these modalities have very high positives co-ordinates). Moreover, for these tourists, such an experience is first ever. There is a lack of involvement on their part, mentioning other more important reasons for their excursion than visiting a wine producing farm. These mainly are Italian (students and pensioners), who go through long distances of even over 100 kilometres to get to a wine cellar and at times are met with some difficulties and yet are not inclined to ask information about directions.

The features with the highest contributions on the positive semi-axis are:
- "reason for the visit: other" (0.7% absolute contribution)
- "coming from Italy" (1.5%)
- "professional student" (1%)
- "occupation pensioner" (0.7%)
- "age bracket below 20 years" (1.1%)
- "101 to 200 kilometre distance between residence and winery" (1.8%)
- "difficulty in reaching winery" (0.9%)
- "request for information not made" (0.7%).

In this case, the one and only Verdicchio wine route has an absolute contribution (1.1%) relevant in determining the factor and is placed on the positive semi-axis.

9. It takes all kinds of tourists

The application of technical statistics in the analysis of data derived from results of motivation research on wine tourism, without claiming total representation, showed evidences of variations of behavioural attitudes among wine tourists.

To summarize, there are the enthusiastic tourists belonging to the wine sector, very much keen on wine tourism and all that comes with it; those not pertaining to the sector, but anyhow involved, and on a good professional level, interested in the purchase of wine and in the arts. Lastly, there is the tourist by chance, young Italian and pensioners alike, who have had no previous experience in wine tourism and whose reason for the visit was not closely linked to the wine or the wine territory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wine Tourism Areas</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donnas</td>
<td>Valle d’Aosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langhe</td>
<td>Piemonte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oltrepò Pavese</td>
<td>Lombardia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciacorta</td>
<td>Lombardia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garda (Lom.)</td>
<td>Lombardia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallagarina</td>
<td>Trentino Alto Adige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collio</td>
<td>Friuli Venezia Giulia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colli Berici</td>
<td>Veneto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colli Bolognesi</td>
<td>Emilia-Romagna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montepulciano</td>
<td>Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colline Lucchesi</td>
<td>Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gimignano</td>
<td>Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colline Pisane</td>
<td>Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candia e Lunigiana</td>
<td>Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colli Maremma</td>
<td>Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montespertoli</td>
<td>Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Etruschi</td>
<td>Toscana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdicchio</td>
<td>Marche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biferno</td>
<td>Molise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castelli Romani</td>
<td>Lazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurasi</td>
<td>Campania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aglianico</td>
<td>Basilicata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salento</td>
<td>Puglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsala</td>
<td>Sicilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcamo</td>
<td>Sicilia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - MCA: eigenvalues, reassessed inertia and accumulated reassessed inertia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Reassessed Inertia</th>
<th>Accumulated reassessed inertia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1726</td>
<td>0.279358</td>
<td>0.279358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1259</td>
<td>0.132790</td>
<td>0.412148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1050</td>
<td>0.084649</td>
<td>0.496797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1019</td>
<td>0.078428</td>
<td>0.575225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0874</td>
<td>0.052480</td>
<td>0.627705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0849</td>
<td>0.048531</td>
<td>0.676236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0796</td>
<td>0.040671</td>
<td>0.716907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0725</td>
<td>0.031228</td>
<td>0.748135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0684</td>
<td>0.026343</td>
<td>0.774478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0651</td>
<td>0.022712</td>
<td>0.797190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0625</td>
<td>0.020041</td>
<td><strong>0.817231</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>0.019156</td>
<td>0.836387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.017818</td>
<td>0.854205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0580</td>
<td>0.015813</td>
<td>0.870018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0564</td>
<td>0.014431</td>
<td>0.884449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0535</td>
<td>0.012086</td>
<td>0.896535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0509</td>
<td>0.010160</td>
<td>0.906695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.009601</td>
<td><strong>0.916296</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0487</td>
<td>0.008661</td>
<td>0.924957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0472</td>
<td>0.007707</td>
<td>0.932664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graf.1- MCA. Representation of the first two axes
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Appendix 1. Questionnaire

A SURVEY OF CHARACTERISTICS, HABITS AND OPINIONS OF WINE TOURISTS

QUESTIONNAIRE to be proposed to WINE TOURISTS visiting a winery

Area code _ _ _
Winery code _ _ _
Date _ _ _ _ _ _

Part 1 - The wine tourist's personal data

1. Sex M [ ] F [ ]
2. Age _ _ _
3. Origin city _ _ country _ _ _

4. Professional status:
   working [ ]
   in search of work [ ]
   housewife [ ]
   student [ ]
   retired [ ]
   other (please specify: ………………….) [ ]

4.1 If you are working please specify your professional condition:
   employee [ ]
   working on your own [ ]

4.1.2 If you are an employee please specify your function:
   manager/director [ ]
   clerk [ ]
   worker [ ]
   apprentice [ ]
4.1.3 If you are working on your own account please specify your role:
entrepreneur
professional
craftsman
assistant

4.2 Is your work related to wine-production?
YES ☐  NO ☐

4.2.1 If so, how?
........................................................................................................

Part 2 - The particular features of your trip or excursion

5. Please choose 3 points in order of importance from the list below to explain the main reasons for your visiting this area:
   art ☐
   landscape ☐
   local gastronomy ☐
   wine ☐
   craftsmanship ☐
   local cultural events ☐ (please specify: ………………)
   others (please specify: ……………..) ☐

6. How did you plan your trip?
   by yourself ☐
   travel agency ☐
   through the wine-route reception ☐
   other (please specify:…………………..) ☐

7. With whom are you travelling?
   alone ☐
   couple ☐
   family (or parts of the family) ☐
   group ☐ please specify number of persons ☐☐☐

8. Did you ask for information on wine and gastronomy? YES ☐  NO ☐

8.1. If so, where did you ask?
   wine-route reception ☐
   tourist-office ☐
   restaurants, hotels ☐
   museums ☐
   wine-cellars ☐
   others (please specify: ……………………..) ☐

www.vdqs.net
8.2 If you asked for information please indicate your satisfaction regarding the answers you were given using a number between 1 and 10.

9. Your stay in this winery is part of:
   - a day-trip  
   - a holiday  
   - a trip during which you will visit other wine-cellars  
   - other (please specify: ………………….)

9.1 If you are on a day-trip please specify when it started:
   - in the morning  
   - in the afternoon

9.2 If you are on a day-trip please indicate how far away you live from this winery:  km.

9.3 If you are spending the night out, please specify the final destination of your trip:
   - the area surrounding this house  
   - a different area  
   - home

9.4 Where you are spending the night?
   - in this house  
   - hotel  
   - agritourism  
   - bed & breakfast  
   - house of your own/friend's house  
   - rented flat  
   - camping  
   - other (please specify:……………….)

9.5 What is the distance from this winery to where you are staying overnight?  km.

9.6 Did you find any informative material (posters, booklets, etc.) about wine and gastronomy in the place you stay in?
    YES ☐ NO ☐
Part 3 - The particular features of your stay in this house

10. How did you know about this house?
   - specialized guides
   - tv/press
   - wine route informative materials
   - tourist-information offices
   - travel-agencies
   - friends
   - wine-route reception
   - web-sites (please name: ……………….)
   - others (please specify: ……………….)

11. Did you need to book your stay?  YES □ NO □
11.1 If so, where?
   - directly in this house
   - through wine-route reception
   - others (please indicate: …………………….)

12. What means of transport did you use to reach this place?
   - car  □
   - motorcycle  □
   - camper  □
   - train  □
   - bus  □
   - bicycle  □
   - other (please specify: ………………….)

13. Did you find it difficult to reach this house?  YES □ NO □
13.1 If so, where?
   - public transport unsatisfactory or not available
   - roads insufficient or not available
   - street signs insufficient or not available
   - others (please specify: …………………….)

14. Did you find specific wine-tourism street-signs on the road?  YES □ NO □
14.1 If so, did you find them helpful to reach the winery (1 to 10)?  □□
15. Do you have any previous experience in wine-tourism?  YES [ ] N0 [ ]

15.1 If so, where did you have the experience?
1. zone………………………….. country [ ] [ ] [ ]
2. zone………………………….. country [ ] [ ] [ ]
3. zone………………………….. country [ ] [ ] [ ]

15.2 On which occasion? experiences
- work 1. [ ] 2. [ ] 3. [ ]
- holiday 1. [ ] 2. [ ] 3. [ ]
- excursion 1. [ ] 2. [ ] 3. [ ]
- else (please specify: ……………….) 1. [ ] 2. [ ] 3. [ ]

Part 4 - Expectations and evaluation of your stay in this house

16. Please choose in order of importance 3 points from the list below to explain the main reasons for your stay in this house:
- wine tasting [ ]
- buying wine [ ]
- artistic aspects [ ]
- food [ ]
- seminars, meetings, conventions (please specify subjects: …………………..) [ ]
- possibility to buy typical local products other than wine [ ]
- sports- and leisure-facilities [ ]
- camper-services [ ]
- other (please specify: ……………………………..) [ ]

17. What did you expect this house would offer, as far as wine is concerned? (3 answers possible)
- get to know the wines produced [ ]
- get to know the producer [ ]
- visit the cellars [ ]
- visit the vineyards [ ]
- visit wine-museums and/or wine-exhibitions [ ]
- consult an expert on the technical aspects of wine-making [ ]
- paid-for wine tasting [ ]
- free wine tasting [ ]
- others (please specify:………………………………………….) [ ]
18. To what degree (1 to 10) are you satisfied with the following features offered by the house you visited?

- wine quality
- hospitality
- technical explanation of wine-making
- wine tasting
- eventual price of wine tasting
- food quality
- quality of sports- and leisure-facilities
- quality of camper services

19. What else would you have liked to be offered during your stay in this house? (Please specify a maximum of 3 wishes in order of importance)

1. ………………………………………………………
2. ………………………………………………………
3. ………………………………………………………

20. Do you intend to buy wine or other local gastronomic products in this house?

YES ☐  NO ☐

20.1 If so, what?

- wine ☐
- typical food products (please specify: …………………) ☐
- typical gastronomic specialties (please specify: ………………………) ☐
- others (please specify: ……………………) ☐

20.1.1 If you wish to buy wine in this house please quantity:

- 1 – 12 bottles ☐
- more than 12 bottles ☐
- 1 demijohn ☐
- more than 1 demijohn ☐
- other (please specify: ……………) ☐

21. Do you think you might repeat this kind of trip connected to wine culture?  YES ☐  NO ☐