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What Factors Influence Taste Perception?
Music Played and Taste

- White wine rated as more “subtle” and “refined” when Tchaikovsky was played

(North, et al., 2008)

http://drinkify.org/
*Extrinsic cues = marketing related*

*Intrinsic cues = ingredients*

(Olson and Jacoby 1972)
Theoretical Framework

1. Behavioural Choice
2. Consumption Experience
3. Memory of the Experience

- Price
- Music
- Order
- Name?
Does the “fluency”, or relative ease or difficulty of processing a name, influence perceived taste of the wine?
Basic Psychological Theory

Marketplace Phenomenon

Behavioural Study
Controlled experiments (counterbalancing, etc.)

Members of the Niagara community (ages 19 to 75)
Fluency

- Linguistic / Phonological
  - Easy-to-pronounce: Barnings Incorporated vs. difficult-to-pronounce: Aegeadux Incorporated
  - Ticker Symbols in NYSE
    - KAR vs. RDO

- Physical / Perceptual
  - Easy-to-read vs. difficult-to-read exercise instructions
  - Easy-to-read vs. difficult-to-read orange juice labels

(Alter and Oppenheimer 2009)
(Alter and Oppenheimer 2006)
(Song and Schwarz, 2008)
(Aysan and Mantonakakis 2010)
Linguistic Fluency of Names and Taste Perception?

- Easy vs. difficult winery name?
  - Storybrook vs. Spatzendreck
  - Ambrook vs. Ahnfeldt

- Easy vs. difficult grape varietals?
  - Riesling vs. Gewürztraminer
  - Grenache vs. Garnatxa
  - Merlot vs. Mtsvane
DIS-Fluency?

- Disfluent = Unfamiliar
- Unfamiliar = Usually Rare
  - Cheeses with disfluent *font labels* perceived to be more special
  
  (Pocheptsova et al, 2010)

- Rare = Higher Value

Disfluent ➔ Better Tasting
Hypothesis

Wines associated with difficult-to-pronounce names would be associated with higher ratings of taste perception than wines associated with easy-to-pronounce names

(Mantonakis and Galiffi)
Pre-test of Winery Names

- 4 winery name pairs – matched # syllables
  - E.g., Cotar vs. Cvetko
- Names rated on a 1 to 7 scale
  - Ease of pronunciation
  - Perceived similarity to English
  - Perceived prototypicality of the name
  - Perceived value ($)
  - Familiarity

(Mantonakis and Galiffi)
Pre-Test Results

- Titakis Winery (easy-to-pronounce)
- Tseleopou Winery (difficult-to-pronounce)

(Mantonakis and Galiffi)
Behavioural Experiment

- Consumer Perception and Cognition Laboratory
- Between subjects design:
  - “Easy-to-pronounce” group (n = 48)
  - “Difficult-to-pronounce” group (n = 45)
  - Control group (n = 41)
- Members of the Niagara community

(Mantonakis and Galiffi)
Behavioural Experiment

- $n = 144$ (81 men, 63 women)
- 19 – 62 years old (mean age = 24)

Participants tasted a chardonnay, rated
- Liking, on a 7-point scale
- Willingness to buy, on a 7-point scale
- Willingness to pay, in CAD$

(Mantonakis and Galiffi)
Expertise Moderator

Moderator: Wine knowledge questionnaire
  - e.g., “What is the traditional colour of Semillon?” (Hughson and Boakes 2001)

High Knowledge Group (n = 89)

Low Knowledge Group (n = 45) (Mantonakis and Galiffi)
MEANS FOR "OVERALL, HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THIS WINE?"
FOR LOW AND HIGH KNOWLEDGE PARTICIPANTS

Overall liking (LK)
Overall liking (HK)
MEANS FOR "OVERALL, HOW MUCH DO YOU LIKE THIS WINE?"
FOR LOW AND HIGH KNOWLEDGE PARTICIPANTS

Overall liking (LK)
Overall liking (HK)

Control
Easy-to-Pronounce
Difficult-to-Pronounce
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Means for "Overall, how likely is it that you would buy this wine?" for low and high knowledge participants.

- Control
- Easy-to-Pronounce
- Difficult-to-Pronounce

Willingness to buy (LK)
Willingness to buy (HK)
MEANS FOR "OVERALL, HOW MUCH WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO PAY FOR THIS WINE?" FOR LOW AND HIGH KNOWLEDGE PARTICIPANTS

Antonia Mantonakis, CCOVI Lecture Series, February 8, 2012.
Summary

- Advantage for the disfluent winery name

- Advantage especially for High Knowledge participants

(Mantonakis and Galiffi)
Managerial Implications

Behavioural Choice

Consumption Experience

Memory of the Experience

Price

Music

Order

Linguistic Fluency of Name
Limitations and Considerations

- Only linguistic fluency examined
- Canadian sample
- Laboratory context
- Only winery names examined
Current Research on Linguistic Fluency

- Grape varietals?
  - Semillon vs. Scheurebe
  - Alexandrouli vs. Alvarelhao

- Study examining Winery vs. Grape Varietal vs. Brand vs. Price $
Linguistic Fluency of a Name matters!

What about other types of names associated with the wine?
Other Types of Names

How good of a “fit”? 

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Conceptual Fluency

- Ketchup after burger vs. Corn Flakes (Lee and Labroo 2004)
Congruity: the degree of match between an object’s attribute and its related schema

(Collins and Loftus 1975; Mandler 1982)
Complete match

Moderately incongruent

Partial match

Highly incongruent

Complete mismatch

Congruent

Carbonated

Preservatives

Carbonated

Healthy

All natural

No preservatives

Carbonated

Soft Drink

Sweet

Cola

Preservatives

Sweet

Fruit juice

(Mandler 1982; Meyers-Levy and Tybout 1989)
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Hypothesis

Consumers will give the highest evaluations to the moderately incongruent product pairing

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Pre-test of Athletes

- Participants rated athletes (e.g., Derek Jeter, Kobe Bryant, Brett Farve, etc.)
  - “Fit” with wine
  - Liking
  - Familiarity

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Vijay Singh  
Jeremy Wotherspoon  
Dwayne "The Rock" Johnson

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Behavioural Experiment

- n = 115 (52 men, 63 women)
- 19 – 64 years old (mean age = 23)
- Participants tasted a pinot noir

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Behavioural Experiment

• Independent variable
  – 3 levels of congruity

• Dependent variables
  - Liking, on a 7-point scale
  - Willingness to buy, on a 7-point scale
  - Willingness to pay, in CAD$

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Expertise Moderator

- Moderator: Wine knowledge questionnaire
  - e.g., “What is the traditional colour of Semillon?” (Hughson and Boakes 2001)

- High Knowledge Group (n = 37)

- Low Knowledge Group (n = 64)
  (Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Overall Liking, by Knowledge Level

Low Knowledge

High Knowledge

Congruent

Moderately Incongruent

Highly Incongruent

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Overall Liking, by Knowledge Level

- Low Knowledge:
  - Congruent: 3.70
  - Moderately Incongruent: 3.55
  - Highly Incongruent: 3.59

- High Knowledge:
  - Congruent: 3.46
  - Moderately Incongruent: 4.05
  - Highly Incongruent: 3.41

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Willingness to Buy, by Knowledge Level

- Low Knowledge
  - Congruent: 3.28
  - Moderately Incongruent: 3.02
  - Highly Incongruent: 3.08

- High Knowledge
  - Congruent: 2.86
  - Moderately Incongruent: 3.51
  - Highly Incongruent: 2.84

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Willingness to Pay, by Knowledge Level

Low Knowledge
- Congruent: 16.62
- Moderately Incongruent: 14.09
- Highly Incongruent: 16.05

High Knowledge
- Congruent: 12.62
- Moderately Incongruent: 14.94
- Highly Incongruent: 12.62

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Take Away

Golfer & Wine vs. Hockey Player & Wine

Consumers will prefer the athlete-wine pairing that is perceived as being only a partial match

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Managerial Implications

- Behavioural Choice
- Consumption Experience
- Memory of the Experience

Price
Music
Order
Linguistic Fluency of Name
Partial Match of Name to wine
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Limitations of the Athlete Experiment

• All male athletes
• Only 1 grape varietal examined

(Clemente, Dolansky, Mantonakis and White)
Linguistic Fluency of a Name matters

Degree of “fit” matters

What about other types of cues?
Current Research on Conceptual Fluency

The Barringer Crater is on the Northern Hemisphere of the moon

(Newman, Garry, Bernstein and Lindsay 2010)
Photo

- Disfluent = Unfamiliar
- Unfamiliar = Usually untrue

- Photo = Adds familiarity…
Do photos on labels influence judgments about the quality of wine?
Hypothesis

Consumers will give the highest evaluations to the wines associated with a photo in the label (vs. no photo)

Cardwell, Newman and Garry
Behavioural Experiment

- Garry Cognition & Memory Lab, Wellington, NZ
  - Participants were members of the Victoria University of Wellington student community
- Participants saw wine labels
  - With photo
  - Without photo
- Participants assigned to groups:
  - Rated whether wines were High quality
  - Rated whether wines were Low quality

Cardwell, Newman and Garry
Two Quills

Wine of California

2007
White Mast

Wine of California

2007
White Mast

Wine of California

2007
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“This wine was rated as high quality”
“This wine was rated as **high** quality”
“This wine was rated as **high** quality”

“This wine was rated as **low** quality”

Cardwell, Newman and Garry
Tasting Experiment

- Consumer Perception and Cognition Lab

- Participants will view wine labels
  - With photo
  - Without photo

- Participants will be assigned to:
  - Rate whether wines are High quality
  - Rate whether wines are Low quality
Managerial Implications

Behavioural Choice

Consumption Experience

Memory of the Experience

Price
Music
Order
Linguistic Fluency of Name
Partial Match of Name to wine
Photo?
Take Aways of Today’s Lecture

- Linguistic Fluency
  - Wines with difficult-to-pronounce names preferred

- Conceptual Fluency
  - Wines with partial match of athletes preferred
  - Adding a photo to wine labels increases perceived quality of the wine
Thank you
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