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Abstract: Wine tourism can flourish in rural regions which often have low levels of economic development. To establish rural regions as attractive wine destinations, it is necessary to understand what affects wine tourists’ satisfaction and find ways to enhance the wine tourism product. Hence, the aim of the present study is to build a typology of wine tourists based on their satisfaction as well as to examine their preferences for complementary activities while visiting a wine destination in Northern Greece. According to the analysis, two dimensions characterised wine tourists’ visit; the first involved the wine region’s character and infrastructure and the second their satisfaction with the visit. Moreover, wine tourists expressed interest for carrying out complementary activities unrelated to wine while visiting the wine destination. It may be concluded that wine destinations can develop by applying strategies aiming at enhancing tourist satisfaction and by providing wine tourists with an integrated recreational experience that includes activities which fully correspond to their preferences.
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1 Introduction

Wine tourism can be roughly described as a special-interest tourism stemming from the desire to visit regions renowned for their wineries and their tradition in wine production. Despite being a relatively new type of tourism, wine tourism has been attracting acute interest due to its ability to generate tourism which may sustain local development.

More specifically, the development of wine tourism in rural areas would mark an increase in tourism in general. At the same time, it would instigate partnerships between local actors of wine industry and those of tourism industry. A remarkable advantage of the latter would be the revitalisation of traditional rural areas which suffer economic disadvantage due to the painful experience of deindustrialisation that left high unemployment and a plethora of social problems behind (Fytopoulou et al., 2021). In addition, globalisation brought radical changes and led to regional restructuring which, in turn, affected adversely traditional agriculture (Hall and Mitchell, 2000). Wine tourism can tackle the impacts of rural restructuring because it is able to sustain the financial and social bases of rural areas while encompassing environmental aspects. From this perspective, wine tourism may be an important factor in sustainable rural development due to its potential to create new jobs and increase the sales of products which are produced in rural areas (Hall and Mitchell, 2000; Mitchell et al., 2009). Moreover, local economies could benefit in the long run from attracting a steady flow of wine tourists. That is because it has been observed that special-interest tourists, such as wine tourists, spend higher amounts of money on travelling, plan trips more often and take part in a greater number of activities at the destination compared to different types of visitors (MacKay et al., 2002).

In Greece, the cultivation of the grape vine is traced back as far as the 5th millennium BC (Renfrew, 1996). Greek wine was traded across the Mediterranean and was particularly prestigious in Italy under the Roman Empire (Stavrinoudis et al., 2012). With such a long tradition in wine, it comes as no surprise that wine is produced in a wide geographical area and is met nearly in every tourist destination (Stavrinoudis et al., 2012). In specific, there are about 1,290 wineries throughout the country and many are owned by families which for generations have been dedicating their efforts to producing high quality artisanal wines (EDOAO, 2020). Greek wine tourism has been developed mainly due to local initiatives and has served as a medium to boost rural areas and establish certain areas as wine destinations (Alebaki and Iakovidou, 2010a). Although Greece is a major global tourist destination and has one of the world’s oldest traditions in viticulture, wine tourism has not been developed as much as in other countries and the huge potential of Greek wine tourism remains untapped.

The boom that wine tourism is experiencing has attracted considerable research interest (Hall et al., 2000). The main areas that have been examined involve wine tourists’ characteristics, motivations, preferences and factors affecting their travel decisions (Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002). Apart from understanding the type of wine tourist, another important research area is to explore satisfaction levels with wine tourism experience and also examine ways to improve the wine tourism product. For instance, the provision of complementary activities in wine destinations can create an integrated experience thereby increasing wine tourists’ satisfaction and enhancing their intention to visit again the destination in the future or recommend it to other potential visitors (Karasmanaki et al., 2020). Hence, the present study aims to build a typology of wine tourists on the basis of their satisfaction as well as to examine their willingness to carry
out complementary activities while visiting wineries in the Regional Unit of Drama which is located in Northern Greece. Findings of this study can guide local actors and stakeholders in wine destinations both in Greece and elsewhere to design strategies which can not only increase tourist satisfaction but also create a complete wine tourism product.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature in two subsections: Section 2.1 focuses on the definition, the advantages and challenges of wine tourism whereas Section 2.2 discusses wine tourists’ profile and the role of complementary activities in wine tourism. Then, the Section 3 describes in detail the methodology the researchers followed to carry out this study. The fourth section describes the study results in four subsections: Section 4.1 provides information on respondents’ socio-economic characteristics, Section 4.2 describes results concerning visitor types, Section 4.3 presents results regarding the correlation between visitors of wineries and their demographic characteristics and Section 4.4 presents results of respondents’ interest to carry out complementary activities while visiting wine regions. Afterwards, results are discussed in Section 5 and in Section 6, conclusions are drawn based on results and the discussion. Finally, there is a section providing all references which have been cited in this work.

2 Literature review

2.1 Wine tourism: definitions, advantages and challenges

Wine consumption is closely related to leisure, relaxed conversation with other people, learning new things and hospitality. These characteristics are valued by wine tourists who plan trips to wine areas and engage in wine tourism activities. Wine tourism has been experiencing an unprecedented growth and authors have exerted remarkable efforts to provide a definition of this new type of tourism in order to inform studies examining wine tourists.

An attempt to define wine tourism was made by Hall et al. (2000) who defined it as ‘visiting vineyards, wineries and wine festivals where wine tasting serves as a motivating factor for visitors’. Earlier in 2000, the Western Australian Wine Tourism Strategy defined wine tourism as travelling with the aim of gaining experiences in wineries and wine regions as well as their links to lifestyle. It also emphasised that wine tourism involves both service provision and destination marketing. Both of these early definitions were market-based and served to inform a substantial number of studies performed on wine tourists (Carlsen, 2004). Focusing more on wine tourism’s structural dimensions, Bruwer (2003) argued that wine tourism encompasses relationship-building, getting consumers to know the brand and creating brand awareness. In reviewing global wine tourism research, Carlsen (2004) observed that wine, food, tourism and arts are not only the fundamental traits of the wine tourism product but also the things that wine tourists pursue thereby confirming its market orientation. Moreover, Marzo-Navarro and Pedraja-Iglesias (2012) described wine tourism simply as visiting wineries in order to experience wine-making and wine production in situ with this visitation having become a tourism activity that inspires visitors to take part in the process. However, broader descriptions or definitions of wine tourism should perhaps include the effect of ‘rurality’. That is, wine tourism is strongly connected to the rural landscape and rural life with
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authors emphasising that ‘rurality’ lies at the heart of the wine tourism experience (Carmichael, 2005; Mitchell et al., 2012).

Wine tourism can yield many benefits for rural communities which are often plagued with declining population, scarce employment opportunities and limited public investment (Fytopoulou et al., 2021). Wine industry is perhaps one of the very few industries that is located away from urban centres and can thus boost local development, employment, business, corporate investment and of course tourism. Although wine is the core product of wine industry, wine production is linked to several activities such as winery visitation and wine region building (Bruwer, 2003). In this regard, wine tourism can be a strategy for wine regions to reposition or establish themselves as wine destinations, create awareness about the significance of quality issues and enhance their product portfolio (Szivas, 1999; Wargenau and Che, 2006).

2.2 Wine tourists’ profile and the role of complementary activities

In order to develop wine tourism, it is necessary to understand the fundamental elements that result in vacations in wine destinations. To that end, an increasing volume of research has already examined wine tourists’ profile and their interest in carrying out additional activities while visiting wine destinations.

The profile of wine tourists is affected by demographic trends while various characteristics have been reported in the relevant literature. On the one hand, there is research showing that wine tourists are older (in their 40s and 50s), knowledgeable about wine and more socially aware (Carlsen, 2004). On the other hand, other studies have reported that wine tourists are of younger age, mostly in their 30s (Taylor, 2004). Mitchell et al. (2012) and Mitchell and Hall (2004) examined wine tourists’ demographic as well as psychographic profile and found that wine tourists are often aged between 30 and 50 and are moderate to high incomers. In addition, they come from or reside in the wine area itself, consume wine regularly and the level of their knowledge about wine is intermediate to advanced. Similar results were reported by Alebaki and Iakovidou (2010b) who found that winery visitors in Northern Greece were mainly male, young, well educated, high incomers and resided in urban centres close to the wine region which they were visiting. Charters and Ali-Knight (2002) argued that there cannot be only one type of wine tourist and also observed that winery owners have the tendency to follow intuitive approaches in order to segment visitors. Gregorio and Licari (2006) classified wine tourists in Southern Italy into groups, and, according to their classification, wine tourists were generally men aged between 25 to 45 years and, in terms of their profession, were entrepreneurs or worked in the service sector. Moreover, they are well educated and prefer to plan vacations on their own. In a more thorough analysis, the same research team distinguished three groups of winery visitors: ‘talent scouts/opinion leaders’ who are characterised by their passion for wine and also write expert articles for wine magazines; ‘wine tourists’ who are willing to purchase high-priced wine bottles and seek to enhance their level of knowledge about wine through participating in tours and listening to expert explanations; and ‘occasional wine tourists’ who have a preference for restaurants and entertainment.

In addition to the above efforts to classify visitors and indicate their profile, Marzo-Navarro and Pedraja-Iglesias (2009) classified wine tourists into two groups, ‘curious tourists’ and ‘wine interested’. The first group was the least numerous and involved mostly women; members did not belong to wine clubs, consumed wine only
occasionally (mainly on weekends) and took part in wine tourism within a broader context, that is, they either visited family and friends or were on vacations or they were on the way to their destination. The second group was more numerous and included men aged between 50 to 64 years; most were wine club members, had a special interest in wine and enjoyed participating in wine-related activities such as wine tasting, reading wine magazines and so on. One more study that is worthwhile to discuss would be the study of Stergiou (2018) who examined the wine tourism experience among young adults in Greece. This researcher observed that higher education students participating in a field trip to a winery had quite different priorities when visiting wineries; these priorities involved mainly enjoying the natural landscape and food, socialising, as well as carrying out activities which are unrelated to wine. It can be seen that the profile of wine tourists can vary significantly. For this reason, wineries trying to attract different visitor segments need to design their strategies with great caution; one way would be by being accessible for groups only at certain periods or times of day and by providing different services (Nella and Christou, 2014).

Another interesting observation in the wine tourism literature is that a wide range of activities, which are not straightforwardly related to the central activity of visiting wine estates, exerts a positive influence on wine tourism experience and can instigate favourable assessments among wine tourists. These activities have been referred to as ‘winescape complementary product’ and underpin the main wine tourist experience (Quintal et al., 2015). Some of these activities can include visiting local attractions, shopping, entertainment, dining, as well as activities related to local culture like festivals and events (Mitchell and Hall, 2004; Thomas et al., 2010). In addition, the natural beauty of the wine destination has emerged as another important factor which is highly ranked by wine tourists (Mitchell and Hall, 2004; Getz and Brown, 2006). In examining the imagery of wine tourism, Williams (2001) observed that the emphasis of wine tourism is not any more on wine-related processes but on experiential as well as aesthetic values associated with recreational pursuits. Hence, the ideal value chain of wine tourism product can be created by combining the natural landscape and the culinary, cultural and historical context of wine regions with wine, which would remain the central subject of the visit (Carlsen, 2004; Carmichael, 2005). Moreover, the combination of these features can give wine regions a distinctive tourist appeal and bring forward its physical and cultural character (Hall and Mitchell, 2002).

Having presented the relevant research findings related to wine tourism’s effect on local development as well as wine tourists’ profile and attitude for additional activities, this paper seeks to understand wine tourists’ profile and their interest in carrying out complementary activities while visiting a typical Greek wine region. Such insights can guide policymakers, experts and stakeholders as to the steps they can take to utilise the underexploited yet significant potential of wine tourism.

3 Methodology

The findings reported here were part of a broader research work which investigated residents’ and visitors’ views on regional development and tourism to propose communication strategies in the Regional Unit of Drama, in Northern Greece. The area of study is known for its unique natural beauty, long-standing tradition in wine making as well as exquisite culinary products. As with most Greek rural areas, the study area has
been hit by deindustrialisation and unemployment. However, there are many wine estates in the area and a wine event called ‘Draminognosia’ takes place every year and lasts for a week. During this week, nearly all local wineries open their cellar doors to visitors and some even hold cultural events. At that time, the study area becomes the centre of wine tourism.

The study employed a quantitative research approach to build wine tourist typology based on their satisfaction with visiting the destination, and to examine their interest in taking part in activities (unrelated to wine) while visiting the destination. To examine these areas, a structured questionnaire was designed based on former wine tourism research. A pilot questionnaire was pretested on a limited scale. Then, to make sure that participants would fully comprehend the items, all questionnaires were filled in through personal interviews with respondents. In aggregate, 500 visitors filled in the questionnaire and questionnaires were collected from November 2016 to September 2017. Finally, to analyse the data, descriptive statistics, categorical principal components analysis as well as categorical regression were performed using the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS), version 23.

4 Results

4.1 Socio-economic characteristics

In the sample, male participants (59.4%) outnumbered their female counterparts (40.6%). Participants represented a diversity of age groups but most respondents were aged between 31 to 40 (30.4%) and 41 to 50 years (23.4%). In addition, many were university graduates (34.6%) and married (54.3%). Concerning the number of children, the responses ‘no children’, ‘one child’ and ‘two children’ presented similar shares, that is, 27.8%, 27.2% and 24.6%, respectively. Most visitors were public employees (18.4%), freelancers (14.2%), private employees (13.8%) and workers (12%). Conversely, only 3.8% of respondents were pensioners.

4.2 Visitor types

In order to indicate the types of visitors who share similar characteristics, visitors’ views were analysed using categorical principal components analysis (CATPCA). Table 1 shows the variables included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimension 1</th>
<th>Dimension 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D27 Drama: value for money destination</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28 Destination of special cultural interest</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25 Overall meeting the expectations of visitors</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>0.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31 Overall evaluation of tourist services</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30 Drama’s proposal to third parties</td>
<td>-0.537</td>
<td>-0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29 The importance of maintaining the cultural character</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33 Intention to purchase agricultural and livestock products</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>0.594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The solution of two dimensions revealed that the values of characteristic root were \( \lambda_1 = 1.73 \) and \( \lambda_2 = 1.626 \). In addition, cronbach’s reliability coefficient alpha gave a score of 0.764. Regarding the first dimension, variables ‘the importance of maintaining the cultural character (D29)’ and ‘overall evaluation of tourist services (D31)’ showed the highest positive loadings. Conversely, variable ‘drama’s proposal to third parties (D30)’ showed the highest negative loading. In terms of the second dimension, variables ‘Intention to purchase agricultural and livestock products’ (D33), ‘overall meeting the expectations of visitors’ (D25) and ‘destination of special cultural interest’ (D28) showed the highest positive loadings. Meanwhile, variables ‘drama: value for money destination’ (D27) and ‘drama’s proposal to third parties’ (D30) showed the greatest negative loadings. The scattering of the variables in the two dimensions plane is presented in Figure 1.

**Figure 1** Scattering of the variable categories (see online version for colours)

The high loadings which occurred for the dimensions enable us to identify and interpret the two dimensions. Hence, the first dimension can be characterised ‘The region’s character and infrastructure’ while the second dimension may be characterised as ‘satisfaction with the visit’. Therefore, the scores of the CATPCA could be used as general indicators of visitor characteristics and provide for visitor type recognition.

### 4.3 Correlation between visitors of wineries and their demographic characteristics

Categorical regression was performed in order to examine the concurrent combined correlation between visitors’ types (CATPCA scores) and demographic characteristics.
Hence, a correlation emerged between the first dimension and specific demographic characteristics:

a. gender
b. age
c. educational level
d. number of children
e. main occupation.

However, no noteworthy statistical difference occurred between visitor types and marital status. Based on Pratt’s index of relative importance, the variables main occupation, educational level, age, gender and number of children showed the greatest weight in the sub-sample (see Table 2).

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Pratt index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (male/female)</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main occupation</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = 0.580$, beta: regression coefficient, SE: standard error.

As for the second dimension, it was correlated with:

a. gender
b. marital status
c. main occupation (Table 3).

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Pratt index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>–0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>–0.156</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main occupation</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = 0.506$, beta: regression analysis, SE: standard error.

As Pratt’s index of relative importance shows, the variables:

a. main occupation
b gender
c family status showed the highest weights in the sub-sample (in descending order).

Then, cluster analysis was performed in order to derive the visitor types (see Table 4). To that end, the factor scores that emerged from CATPCA served as dependent variables. Cluster analysis gave three types of visitors (winery visitor type 1, winery visitor type 2 and winery visitor type 3 – Figure 2).

Table 4 Results relating to cluster centres for each type of winery visitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of visitors of wineries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1</td>
<td>–1.59</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2</td>
<td>–0.39</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>–0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of subjects</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Results of cluster analysis identifying the types of winery visitors in the two-dimensional space (see online version for colours)

There is significant differentiation among the three visitor types. Winery visitor type 3 expressed a moderate satisfaction with the character and the infrastructure in the region. A similar satisfaction was expressed by winery visitor type 2, while winery visitor type 1 evaluated them negatively. The highest satisfaction level was recorded for Winery visitor type 2 as opposed to the other two types, which expressed a slightly negative satisfaction.

4.4 Respondents’ interest in carrying out complementary activities

Principal component analysis was used to investigate winery visitors’ interest in participating in activities unrelated to wine during their visit to the wineries. The variables used in this analysis are shown in Table 5.
Three factors were loaded by the application of principal component analysis which accounted for 63.8% of the total variance of the data with this percentage being considered satisfactory (Table 5). The first factor (mean = 1.26) can be named ‘educational activities and guided tours’ as it refers to activities which are of interest both to young and old people (guided tours with a mean of 1.80). The second factor is formed only by the variable ‘mountaineering’ (mean = 1.92) while the third factor can be named ‘high-profile activities’ since it is formed by the variables ‘Horse-riding’ (mean = 1.33) and ‘gastronomy seminars’ (mean = 1.16).

Table 5   Principal component analysis and category reliability analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>CFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D26.6 Educational activities</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26.4 Guided tours</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26.9 Other sport activities</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26.3 Mountaineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26.1 Horse-riding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26.5 Gastronomy seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Explained variance         | 32.4%| 20.6%| 17.4%|
| Total explained variance   | 70.4%|      |      |
| Cronbach’s alpha           | 0.757|      | 0.722|
| Total scale reliability    | 0.725|      |      |
| Mean factorial degree      | 1.41 | 1.92 | 1.25 |
| Standard deviation         | 0.52 | 0.82 | 0.35 |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test | 0.505|      |      |
| Bartlett’s test of sphericity | Chi-square = 428.877, df = 15, p < 0.0001

5 Discussion

Interestingly, two dimensions characterise the visit to wine destinations with the first being the region’s character and infrastructure and the second being satisfaction with the visit. Regarding the character of the region, authors who have dedicated efforts to understanding the dynamics of wine tourism have already observed that wine tourism is strongly linked to the rural landscape which can be described as a central component of the wine tourism experience (Mitchell and Hall, 2004; Carmichael, 2005; Getz and Brown, 2006; Mitchell et al., 2012). Our findings confirm the important role of the rural character of wine regions but also point to the role of infrastructure in wine tourists’ satisfaction. That is, wine tourists seem to pay considerable attention to the infrastructure of the wine region which is possibly associated with their satisfaction with the destination. Building on this, it is only reasonable to expect that improvements in infrastructure can increase the satisfaction levels of wine tourists and enhance their revisiting intentions. As wine regions are often located away from urban centres and major road networks, it is possible that the existing roads may require improvements in
order to render wine destinations more accessible. In addition, local actors involved in tourism should consider providing tourist-friendly infrastructures including hotel rooms per capita, car rental services, ATMs per capita, convenient transportation and so forth. This study developed a typology of wine tourists based on their satisfaction levels. Previous studies had categorised wine tourists based on demographic trends such as age, gender, income, occupation and education level (Taylor, 2004; Carlsen, 2004) as well as on the basis of their psychographic characteristics like frequency of wine consumption, wine knowledge and membership to wine clubs (Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002; Brown et al., 2007; Gregorio and Licari, 2006). A contribution of the present study is therefore that it proposes a typology that focuses on visitor satisfaction thereby highlighting the exact areas which, if improved, will increase satisfaction and perhaps attract more wine tourists. For this reason, wine destinations are recommended to analyse visitor satisfaction and develop satisfaction-based typologies in order to understand what determines satisfaction and take steps to improve what seems to have a negative effect on the wine tourism experience.

Finally, respondents’ pronounced interest in carrying out complementary activities while visiting the study area resonates with previous studies which have proposed that participating in activities unrelated to wine affects positively the wine tourism experience and can induce favourable assessments among wine tourists (Quintal et al., 2015). This is also in line with Williams (2001) who noted that the focus of wine tourism has moved away from procedures associated strictly with wine towards the inclusion of recreational experiences. In the relevant literature, these activities have been referred to as ‘winescape complementary product’ and can take many forms (Quintal et al., 2015). In our study, the most preferred activities involved educational activities, guided tours, mountaineering, horse-riding and gastronomy seminars. Hence, the study area could gain a distinctive tourist appeal by combining the primary experience of wine with activities that are carried out in the natural landscape as well as activities that bring forward the local cultural context.

6 Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to develop a typology of wine tourists in a renowned Greek wine destination and to examine their interest in carrying out complementary activities which are not related to wine procedures. The findings presented in this paper allow us to draw certain conclusions.

Most importantly, since the dimensions characterising the visit to wineries are affected, inter alia, by participants’ family status and number of children, it is necessary to improve the services provided to families, especially families with more than one child. Such improvements could induce more positive evaluations and encourage families to revisit the study area. Wine tourists were classified into three types based on their satisfaction levels. Of these groups, winery visitor type 3 was moderately satisfied with the character of the area and local infrastructure while winery type 2 expressed the highest satisfaction levels. Since most respondents fell into these two groups, efforts to improve local infrastructure in terms of roads, accommodation and transport would possibly improve wine tourists’ experience and attract more wine tourists to the area.

Finally, visitors were found to be interested in participating in activities which could be combined with their visit to the wineries but would not be related to wine.
Educational activities and guided tours, mountaineering and high-profile activities (such as horse-riding and gastronomy seminars) were the three types of activities which appealed mostly to wine tourists. Hence, the relevant stakeholders and those responsible for promoting the study area as wine destination should consider providing these types of activities as a strategy to increase wine tourists’ satisfaction levels and to enhance the provided wine tourism experience.

Wineries are able to act as a remarkable lever for the development of the wider region of Drama. Our results suggest that providing an integrated wine tourist product would be met with positive acceptance by winery visitors in this area as they were found to be not solely attracted to wine but also to the local natural beauty and gastronomy.

However, certain study limitations need to be acknowledged. Although the Regional Unit of Drama has many similarities with other Greek wine regions, the results of this study are not generalisable beyond the study area. In specific, the study area is located very close to the city of Thessaloniki, a large urban centre, and this close proximity may be what enabled many residents of Thessaloniki to visit the study area. Since other Greek wine destinations are not as close to cities, it is possible that wine tourists in other regions have different motivations and characteristics.

A few directions for future research can be recommended. It is advisable to conduct similar studies in neighbouring countries and examine foreign wine tourists’ profile, expectations and interests. Based on the results of such studies, actors involved in Greek wine tourism, could create attractive holiday packages for wine tourists but also design strategies aimed at attracting more foreign wine tourists and increasing their satisfaction levels. Finally, as tourism in general has been severely hit by the COVID-19 pandemic and the restrictions posed to travelling, it would be meaningful to carry out research on the effects of this crisis on wine tourism. Such insights could help relevant stakeholders come up with effective strategies and measures that will help wine tourism recover quickly.
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