

TYPEFACE APPROPRIATENESS AND ITS IMPACT ON WINE PURCHASE INTENT AND
BRAND CREDIBILITY

A Thesis by

Luther Nelson Ottaway

Master of Business Administration, University of Minnesota, 1999

Bachelor of Science, Wichita State University, 1994

Submitted to the Department of Communication
and the faculty of the Graduate School of
Wichita State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

May 2020

© Copyright 2020 by Luther Nelson Ottaway

All Rights Reserved

TYPEFACE APPROPRIATENESS AND ITS IMPACT ON WINE PURCHASE INTENT AND
BRAND CREDIBILITY

The following faculty members have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content, and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts with a major in Communication.

Lisa Parcell, Committee Chair

Min Xiao, Committee Member

Alexandra Middlewood, Committee Member

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My decision to pursue a Master of Arts in communication was made quickly, but little did I know how impactful the decision would be. I've forged many cherished friendships during this degree's pursuit—something I hadn't envisioned when I applied for admission. The students, most significantly younger than I, were welcoming, friendly, and collaborative. I couldn't have imagined a more positive educational experience. So, to the graduate students of the Elliott School, thank you.

Gratitude is also owed to the Elliott School's faculty, who were professional, knowledgeable, supportive, thoughtful, and inspirational. My graduate curriculum was full of challenges, fun, and most of all, learning. Special thanks is due to my thesis committee chair, advisor, mentor, and friend, Dr. Lisa Parcell. Dr. Parcell was a positive influence over the course of my time at the Elliott School and pushed me to be a better student and researcher. I am grateful for her tireless encouragement and advocacy. Thanks also to thesis committee member, Dr. Min Xiao, who was so giving of his time and patience in working with me on statistical procedures and helping make my thesis better in many ways. I wish to also thank Dr. Alexandra Middlewood, who graciously participated on my thesis committee and provided valuable insights. A special thanks is also due to Katie Miller, whose graphic design work helped make my thesis survey instrument so much better than I could've prepared on my own.

I would also like to thank my parents, Harold and Lucretia Ottaway, who achieved advanced degrees and set a good example for me to do the same. This section would not be complete without noting the steadfast love and support I received from my daughter, Abby, and wife, Kelly. They both made significant sacrifices—of time, attention, and resources—for me to complete this thesis and degree. I am, therefore, forever indebted and grateful to them both.

“Typefaces are to the written word what different dialects are to different languages.”

— Steven Heller

ABSTRACT

Wine is big business in the United States—with over \$68 billion in 2018 retail sales (Wine Institute, 2019). The U.S. boasts over 10,000 wineries, which when combined with significant imports from across the globe, create a multitude of choices for consumers. Further complicating the purchase decision is the consumption occasion, the question of where and with whom wine is intended to be enjoyed. The purpose of this study is to improve the understanding of consumers' interaction with typeface on wine labels and how that interaction impacts: (1) purchase intent in wine consumption scenarios of varying perceived risk and (2) perceptions of brand credibility. Sixteen typefaces were pretested by 106 respondents recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (“MTurk”), who determined Monotype Corsiva typeface was the most appropriate typeface for use on a cabernet sauvignon wine label and Impact typeface was the least appropriate. Main experiment participants ($N = 154$)—again recruited through MTurk—were randomly presented with one of four wine consumption occasions (e.g., home, gift, family dinner, and business dinner) and asked to select a wine bottle for purchase—between two digitally presented wine bottles—each utilizing the typefaces selected in the pretest. Participants were also asked questions surrounding risk perceptions relative to the act of purchasing wine as well as brand credibility perceptions of the wine bottle selected in the choice experiment. Respondents selected the wine with the label utilizing the most appropriate typeface—regardless of wine use occasion. The study's results, however, failed to support a strong relationship between brand credibility and purchase intent. From a managerial perspective, this study's results suggest wine companies would benefit from: (1) testing label typefaces with consumers to assess appropriateness (an apparent proxy for likeability and purchase intent) and (2) utilizing typefaces ranking high from such tests on wine labels.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Brand Credibility	7
Typography in an Advertising/Branding Context	9
Typeface Appropriateness	12
Wine Labels' Impact on Consumers' Purchase Decisions	15
Consumption Occasions and the Wine Purchase Decision	18
Wine Purchasing Risk Reduction Strategies	20
Symbolic Interactionism	21
Summary	24
3. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	25
4. METHODOLOGY	26
Pretest	26
Main Experiment	29
5. RESULTS	37
Pretest	37
Main Experiment	38
6. DISCUSSION	41
Appropriate Typefaces for a Wine Label	41
Typeface Appropriateness and Purchase Intent	42
Typeface Appropriateness and Use Occasion	43
Brand Credibility and Purchase Intent	44
Perceived Risk and Typeface Appropriateness	46
Symbolic Interactionism	47
7. LIMITATIONS	49
8. FUTURE RESEARCH	51
REFERENCES	53

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter	Page
APPENDICES	79
A. Pretest Survey	80
B. Main Experiment Survey	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Descriptive Statistics for Pretest Typeface Appropriateness Scores	73
2.	Pearson Correlation Between Wine Use Occasion and Typeface Appropriateness	74
3.	Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Purchase Intent Based on Brand Credibility	75
4.	Logistic Regression Predicting Typeface Appropriateness Based on Perceived Risk and Wine Use Occasion	76

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Typefaces from Pretest	77
2.	Images from Main Experiment	78

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The United States is the world’s largest consumer of wine and the third largest producer—boasting 2017 consumption and production of 3.8 billion and 3.3 billion liters, respectively (Wine Institute, n.d.). Retail wine sales in the United States totaled \$68.1 billion in 2018—up from \$44.7 billion just 10 years earlier in 2008 (Wine Institute, 2019). The industry’s size and growth profile—particularly for a mature product like wine—attracts significant investment and competition. The barriers to enter the wine manufacturing business are not especially onerous and as a result, consumers benefit from a multitude of choices when they shop for wine. According to *Wines & Vines* (2019), the United States has 10,185 wineries and the number of distinct wine types emanating from these wineries results in exceedingly more choices for wine shops and other wine merchants to stock.

When consumers enter most stores where wines are sold, they are faced with hundreds and potentially thousands of bottles (Franson, 2006). As Schwartz (2016) theorized in the phenomenon known as the “paradox of choice,” having too many choices is not always a pleasant thing for humans and may translate into the inability to make a choice.

Wine is considered an “experience good”—a product whose quality cannot be ascertained until it is purchased and consumed (Ashton, 2014, p. 171; Nelson, 1974, pp. 730-731). Therefore, in addition to the plethora of choices, the uncertainty caused by wine being an experience good creates difficulty for the consumer—a phenomenon that has been documented by scholars and wine journalists alike (Barber, Almanza, and Donovan, 2006, p. 229; Dollar, 1997, p. 26; Kidd, 1993; Mitchell & Groatorex, 1989, p. 34; Spawton, 1991, pp. 37-38).

Further complicating the purchase decision is the consumption occasion, the question of where and with whom the wine is intended to be enjoyed. Is the wine to be consumed alone at home? Is the bottle intended as a gift for a good friend? Is the wine to be served at an important business dinner? Each of these occasions has levels of perceived risk in the purchase decision. Therefore, it is not surprising scholars have found consumers' purchase intent to be dependent upon the use occasion (Berni, Begalli, & Capitello, 2005, p. 142; Hall, Lockshin, & O'Mahony, 2001, p. 47; Olsen, Thompson, & Clarke, 2003, pp. 48-49; Quester & Smart, 1998, p. 232; Ritchie, 2007, p. 539; Sherman & Tuten, 2011, p. 232).

The wine industry's consumption and revenue statistics demonstrate that whatever uncertainties or anxieties consumers face, they are finding ways to simplify their purchase decision. Chrea, Melo, Evans, Forde, Delahunty, and Cox (2011) noted that when making purchases in experience products, consumers must rely on other available quality cues (p. 13). Similarly, Underwood and Klein (2002) reported "consumers use packaging, an extrinsic cue, to infer intrinsic product attributes" (p. 58). Researchers have created a robust record of scholarship addressing what drives the wine purchase decision. Goodman, Lockshin, and Cohen (2006) found "tasting the wine previously" and "someone recommending" were the most important factors in driving purchase decisions, followed by "grape variety" and "origin of the wine" (p. 62). Lockshin, Mueller, Louviere, Francis, and Osidacz (2009) found "brand" to be the most influential factor in consumers' wine choice, followed by "price" and "medals" (awards) won. Other research has focused on how specific extrinsic cues impact the purchase decision. One such example is Marin, Jorgensen, Kennedy, and Ferrier's (2007) study on wine bottle closures—finding when participants knew the bottle closure was a screwcap (instead of

the traditional natural cork), consumers' product liking and quality perceptions were significantly lower (p. 182).

A robust line of research into the drivers surrounding consumers' wine purchasing behavior includes aspects of packaging. Scholars have found wine consumers tend to "shop with their eyes" (Barber et al., 2006, p. 291; Mount, 2016, p. 28)—recognizing that a wine's packaging represents the first signal consumers perceive when making purchase selections (Rocchi & Stefani, 2005, p. 43). Orth and Malkewitz (2008) acknowledged the importance of packaging when they stated, "packaging design is an extremely influential medium because of its pervasive impact on purchasers, its presence at the crucial moment when the purchase decision is made, and consumers' high level of involvement when they actively scan packages in their decision making" (p. 64). Other scholars have affirmed how a product's visual appearance is a critical, if not the most important, determinant of consumer choice (Bloch, 1995, p. 16; Van Rompay & Pruyn, 2011, p. 600).

According to several scholars, one element of a wine's packaging, the bottle label, positively influences consumers' purchase intentions (Chaney, 2000, p. 17; Barber & Almanza, 2006, p. 95; Boudreaux & Palmer, 2007, p. 185; Wolf & Thomas, 2007, p. 181; Jarvis, Mueller, and Chiong, 2010, pp. 142-143). Britton (1992) noted, "in terms of wine marketing, label design is clearly the single most important ingredient" (p. 21). There are many aspects to a wine label—starting with whether one is referring to the front or back label. Both the front and back labels of a wine bottle contain valuable information to help inform the consumers' purchase decision, generally including: brand name, grape variety, vintage year, alcohol content, and origin.

A wine bottle's label—particularly the more prominent, front label—is an important component of a wine brand's visual identity, or the characteristics a company wishes to create and maintain in the eyes of its stakeholders (Alsem & Kosteljik, 2008, pp. 910-911). One of the elements wine companies use on labels to create a brand identity is typography. For products generally, scholars have found typography to impact consumers' brand perceptions (Childers & Jass, 2002, p. 100; Van Rompay & Pruyn, 2011, p. 599; Grohmann, Giese, & Parkman, 2013, p. 392; Celhay, Boysselle, & Cohen, 2015, p. 168). Researchers have also acknowledged how consumers recognize how certain typefaces are “appropriate” for certain products (Berliner, 1920; Poffenberger & Franken, 1923, p. 328; Schiller, 1935, pp. 661-663; Doyle & Bottomley, 2004, p. 877; Doyle & Bottomley, 2006, p. 121).

Literature considering typeface in the context of a wine label is scarce, however. Henley, Fowler, Yuan, Stout, and Goh (2011) conducted one of the few studies explicitly analyzing how typeface influenced consumers' wine purchase intentions. No scholarship was identified, however, which examined how a wine labels' typeface influenced purchase intent and brand credibility, which refers to perceptions of the believability of promises or claims made by a company (Swait & Erdem, 2007, p. 681). Given the magnitude of the wine market, firms operating in the space have great financial incentive to design labels to evoke the most favorable consumer purchase response across a wide variety of consumption occasions. This research study addresses several gaps in the literature while providing useful managerial guidance, including improving the understanding of: (a) how typeface impacts wine purchase intent, (b) how the consumption occasion impacts wine labels' typeface preferences, and (c) how typeface affects brand credibility.

The current study is examined through the lens of symbolic interactionism, a well-researched communication theory that emphasizes the importance of meaning and interpretation as essential human processes and the process by which individuals interpret their world (Solomon, 1983, p. 320). Symbolic interactionism offers interesting touch-points relative to the current study. The first such example surrounds the concept of typeface appropriateness, which is itself an abstraction derived from social engagement with others. Typefaces have meanings, which are generally shared; however, those meanings are the product of interactions with others, as we are not born knowing what is and what is not appropriate.

Wine consumption occasions also offer an interesting subject for which to apply symbolic interactionism. The wine consumption occasions utilized in this study were adapted from previous research and reflect varying levels of perceived risk (Barber et al., 2008; Olsen et al., 2003; Sherman & Tuten, 2011). The risks perceived by participants are, again, social constructs emanating from interpretative processes resulting from interfacing with other individuals. Understanding that selecting a wine for a business dinner may have greater risk than dinner alone at home is a learned perspective.

A third area of symbolic interactionism's applicability concerns the idea of brand credibility, which is comprised of two primary dimensions: trustworthiness and expertise (Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 192). In the context of the current study, participants were asked to make judgments of a fictitious brand, so no prior experiences of product use would be brought to bear in the assessment of brand credibility. Brand credibility was assessed through a measure utilized in prior research (Van Rompay & Pruyn, 2011). Wine label typeface was the only variable altered in the research stimuli; therefore, participants had to rely solely on their socially-learned

interpretations of which typefaces created higher or lower perceptions of brand credibility and whether those views influenced purchase intent.

The present study examined how typeface may be used as a risk reduction strategy—with more appropriate typefaces being perceived as a means to reduce risk in a purchase decision given four consumption occasions. Typeface appropriateness was also studied in the context of influencing brand credibility perceptions along with associated purchase intent.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following sections provide a review of the literature of importance to this study. Several topics will be discussed in this portion of the study, including: brand credibility, typography in an advertising/branding context, typeface appropriateness, wine labels' impact on consumers' purchase decisions, consumption occasions and the wine purchase decision, wine purchasing risk reduction strategies, and symbolic interactionism. This section concludes with a summary, which brings together the literature and frames it in preparation for the research hypotheses introduced in the section that follows.

Brand Credibility

A brand is defined as “a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, which is intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors” (Kotler, 1984, p. 482). Brands are important as they serve to provide information about a product and signal a product's position relative to others in a similar space (Wernerfelt, 1988, p. 458; Erdem & Swait, 1998, p. 136). Brand credibility is defined as the believability of the product information embodied or contained in a brand (Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 192; Swait & Erdem, 2007, p. 681; Wang & Yang, 2010, p. 179; Baek & King, 2011, pp. 261-262; Kemp & Bui, 2011, p. 429). Scholars generally agree brand credibility is comprised of two main components: trustworthiness and expertise (Erdem, Swait, & Louviere, 2002, p. 3; Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 192; Swait & Erdem, 2007, p. 681; Baek & King, 2011, p. 262). Trustworthiness, in the context of brand credibility, refers to the *willingness* of companies to deliver on consumers' perceptions of promises made by brands (Swait & Erdem, 2007, p. 681; Baek & King, 2011, p. 262). Expertise, on the other hand, refers to a company's

ability to deliver on consumers' perceptions of promises made by brands (Swait & Erdem, 2007, p. 681; Baek & King, 2011, p. 262). Other scholars have posited there is a third dimension of brand credibility—*attractiveness/likeableness*, which, as the name implies, refers to consumers' perceptions of a brand's likeability (Keller & Aaker, 1997, p. 358; Wang & Yang, 2010, p. 179).

Brand credibility can be created through a myriad of ways. For example, brand credibility may be generated through a consumer's past use of, or experience with, the product or, potentially, another product under the same brand name (i.e., a brand extension). Additionally, brand credibility may be shaped through the result of investments made by companies in their brands. For example, marketing mix elements like packaging and advertising may influence consumers' brand perceptions (Erdem & Swait, 1998, p. 134). It stands to reason, therefore, that aspects of packaging—such as a product's label—could influence consumers' perceptions of brand credibility.

Scholars have demonstrated brand credibility is directly proportional to perceived, or expected quality (Wernerfelt, 1988, p. 458; Aaker, 1991, p. 99; Erdem & Swait, 1998, p. 139; Erdem et al., 2002, p. 4; Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 192; Spry, Pappu, & Cornwell, 2011, p. 886). As a result, if consumers perceive brand credibility to be high relative to alternatives, the company's corresponding product has a greater chance of being considered by the consumer for purchase as consumers evaluate those products more highly (Baek, Kim, & Yu, 2010, p. 674; Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 191; Swait & Erdem, 2007, p. 695). The literature also shows consumers are generally more likely to purchase products with higher brand credibility than products with lower brand credibility (Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 191). Indeed, from merely the trust dimension of the brand credibility definition, research has found trusted brands are purchased more frequently than brands which fail to evoke high perceptions of trust (Knox,

2004, p. 106; Sichtmann, 2007, p. 1008; Kemp & Bui, 2011, p. 430). Additionally, an important managerial insight relates to pricing, as consumers are willing to pay a premium price for products associated with credible brands (Netemeyer et al., 2004, p. 209; Kemp & Bui, 2011, p. 430).

Brand credibility plays an important role for consumers and, therefore, creates a source of competitive advantage for companies with products exhibiting high degrees of brand credibility. Brand credibility perceptions aid consumers in that they lower information costs, reduce perceived risk and, consequently, increase consumer utility (Erdem & Swait, 1998, p. 132; Erdem et al., 2002, p. 4; Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 192; Spry et al., 2011, p. 886). The role of brand credibility in this context is particularly important when consumers are considering experience goods, or products whose quality cannot be determined simply by visual inspection, as perceived risk is higher for such products (Kirmani & Rao, 2000, p. 67; Wernerfelt, 1988, p. 458).

Typography in an Advertising/Branding Context

Alsem and Kosteljik (2008) noted a brand's identity seeks to represent characteristics a company wishes to create and maintain in the eyes of its stakeholders. Through either active or passive product engagement, consumers are exposed to visual stimuli that comprise a brand's identity. Such stimuli include items and characteristics like logos, colors, shapes, characters, typefaces, styles, signage, and other elements, which combine to form a brand's identity (Henderson, Cote, Leong, & Schmitt, 2003, p. 297; Underwood, 2003, p. 62; Phillips, McQuarrie, & Griffin, 2014a, p. 225; Phillips et al., 2014b, p. 320). Many of these stimuli are part of a product's packaging. It is not surprising; therefore, that scholars have acknowledged packaging's ability to assist in the building of strong brands through the evocation of favorable

consumer impressions (Berkowitz, 1987, p. 559; Bloch, 1995, p. 20; Henderson et al., 2003, pp. 297-298; Orth & Malkewitz, 2008, p. 64).

Typography—being one aspect of a brand’s visual identity—is a packaging component, which, combined with other characteristics addressed above—companies use to communicate messages about their products and brands (Celhay, Boisselle, and Cohen, 2015, p. 167).

Consequently, companies may utilize typography to persuade consumers to purchase products through creating positive, shared meaning for their brands. Several scholars have studied this phenomenon. In one such study, McCarthy and Mothersbaugh (2002) developed a general model of typographic effects in advertising-based persuasion. The authors purported typography was a function of three dimensions: typeface characteristics, spacing, and layout (McCarthy & Mothersbaugh, 2002, p. 665). These dimensions, McCarthy and Mothersbaugh (2002) argued, created “typographic outcomes,” which they identified as semantic associations, legibility of ad copy, and ad appearance, which, in turn, impacted attitude perceptions of advertising audiences (pp. 665-667).

Childers and Jass (2002) developed a conceptual framework to explain how typographic cues impacted the message contained in an advertisement’s copy and thus, how such cues influenced consumer perceptions of brands. Through their framework, the authors confirmed typefaces convey meanings that influence consumers’ brand perceptions (Childers & Jass, 2002, p. 104). Grohmann, Giese, and Parkman (2013) confirmed Childers and Jass’s (2002) conclusions in finding typeface characteristics shape brand personality in unfamiliar brands (p. 392).

Extending the literature on establishing a brand personality with the help of typeface and typeface/product appropriateness, Celhay, Boisselle, and Cohen (2015) examined exotypes as a

means of communicating an exotic origin to consumers. Celhay et al. (2015) found the majority of the typefaces tested evoked the anticipated cultural association and the majority of participants successfully identified the typeface which was most congruent with a given product category. From a managerial perspective, this understanding provides further evidence that typeface helps direct consumer perceptions, particularly when guided by other contextual signifiers (e.g., product type) (Celhay et al., 2015, p. 173).

Van Rompay and Pruyn (2011) examined the impact of typography on consumer choice by leveraging research by Childers and Jass (2002), who identified typefaces that connoted luxury (Empire typeface) and casualness (Dom Casual typeface), respectively. Van Rompay and Pruyn (2011) utilized a choice experiment and found, when paired with a congruent packaging shape, brands with a congruent typeface generated higher credibility ratings with consumers and that consumers were willing to pay more for these brands (pp. 604-605).

Typeface's impact on consumer perceptions also extends to perceptions of taste. Velasco, Woods, Wan, Salgado-Montejo, Bernal-Torres, and Cheok (2018) found typefaces exhibiting round characteristics were more strongly associated with sweet tastes, while angular typefaces were more strongly associated with other tastes (p. 246)—a result confirming similar findings in the literature (see Velasco, Salgado-Montejo, Marmolejo-Ramos, and Spence, 2014, p. 92 and Velasco, Woods, Hyndman, and Spence, 2015, pp. 4-5).

The literature also shows typeface may be used to evoke brand gender perceptions in the mind of consumers. Grohmann (2016) found script typefaces were more associated with femininity, while display typefaces were more associated with masculinity (pp. 415-416).

Beyond the previously mentioned research by Van Rompay & Pruyn (2011), a search of the extant literature failed to yield any additional studies illustrating how typeface influences

brand credibility. Scholars have, however, noted the importance of a product's visual cues to brand credibility and the brand more broadly. For example, investments made in visual elements like advertising, product design, and packaging—according to the literature—are intended to improve brand perceptions and enhance brand credibility (Kirmani & Rao, 2000, p. 69; Loureiro, 2017, p. 1097).

Companies' typographical selections have significant impacts on consumers' perceptions. As the literature shows, this influence drives perceptions of brands generally, but may also influence perceptions of origin, credibility, taste, gender, and ultimately, the price consumers are willing to pay.

Typeface Appropriateness

Though no formal definition of typeface appropriateness exists, typefaces are generally designed for a specific purpose (Shaikh, 2007, p. 32). The typeface selected for a given brand name, for example, is not neutral, but can influence the message by altering consumers' perceptions of the name (Doyle & Bottomley, 2009, p. 396). Although typeface appropriateness is subject to personal opinion—with no one person's opinion being viewed as more correct than another's—scholars have demonstrated that large groups of people tend to agree on a typeface's relative appropriateness for a particular application or product, as discussed in the foregoing paragraphs. Since typeface is subject to opinion, there are no concrete right or wrong opinions on a typeface's appropriateness. Therefore, it makes sense to assess typeface appropriateness in relative terms. As will be shown in the remainder of this section, researchers have collected consumers' perspectives on typeface appropriateness for a range of uses and have generally concluded consumers know an appropriate typeface when they see it, with appropriateness being

defined as the quality of being suitable or proper given a certain set of circumstances (Macmillan Dictionary, n.d.).

The concept of typeface appropriateness first appeared in scholarship in 1920, when Berliner (1920) measured the relative suitability of 18 styles of hand-lettered type in the advertising of four products. Berliner (1920) concluded it was possible to classify commodities in accordance to the “character of their atmosphere” and a typeface’s appropriateness could be extended to other commodities within the same group (Poffenberger & Franken, 1923, p. 312; Schiller, 1935, p. 652). Poffenberger and Franken (1923) extended typeface appropriateness scholarship through their own study—varying their work from Berliner’s (1920) by utilizing 29 typefaces commonly used in advertising copy and measuring typeface appropriateness for abstract qualities (e.g., cheapness, dignity, economy, luxury, and strength) in addition to other products. Poffenberger and Franken (1923) concluded typefaces do vary in levels of appropriateness for differing commodities and respondents were able to “feel” the level of appropriateness or inappropriateness (p. 328). Schiller (1935) largely confirmed Poffenberger and Franken’s (1923) findings apart from two products (i.e., automobiles and coffee), whose perceptions had changed over the course of the 12 years between studies.

Poffenberger and Franken (1923) also concluded the effectiveness of a typeface could not be reliably predicted by one person—even a typographical expert. Instead, Poffenberger and Franken (1923) suggested the use of an adequate sampling of the intended target audience would generally provide superior results (p. 329).

Davis and Smith (1933) studied mechanical variations of typefaces (e.g., boldness, italics, and size) in terms of its impact on “feeling tone,” a concept similar to Berliner’s (1920)

“atmosphere.” Davis and Smith (1933) found typefaces, and mechanical variations thereof, differed in perceived appropriateness (p. 764).

Typeface research has extended beyond analysis in product contexts. For example, Ovink (1938) examined the appropriateness of different typefaces relative to types of books. Haskins (1958) studied typeface appropriateness for magazine article titles. Burt (1959) studied the legibility and aesthetic merits of typefaces in more frequent use—finding correlations between pleasantness and typeface readability as noted by Wendt (1968). Typeface appropriateness has also been researched in the context of professions. For example, Walker, Smith, and Livingston (1986) found certain typefaces were judged as more appropriate for certain professions than others (p. 41).

Scholars have also examined the “feelings” typefaces gave people in isolation. That is, without the context of a situation, product, or object. A popular rating scale used in the 1960s and later to assess typeface perceptions was the semantic differential developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). A semantic differential scale is comprised of intervals of word pairs bounded on either extreme by polar opposite adjectives (e.g., cool/warm, weak/strong, etc.). Several scholars (Brinton, 1961; Tannenbaum, Jacobson, and Norris, 1964; Bartram, 1982; Morrison, 1986) used Osgood et al.’s (1957) semantic differential scale to assess the appropriateness level laypeople and those with typographic experience/knowledge assigned to various typefaces. The lack of formal typographical training, as illustrated by Brinton (1961, p. 45), Tannenbaum et al. (1964, p. 68), Bartram (1982, p. 44), and Morrison (1986, p. 242), does not appear to inhibit one’s ability to derive typeface perceptions of feelings different than those of a professional typographer or one who has typographical knowledge.

Brumberger (2003a,b)—recognizing a gap in the literature—provided an update when he considered readers’ awareness of typeface appropriateness in various texts. Though roughly 20 years had passed since typeface appropriateness found its way into the literature, the conclusions were no different, as Brumberger (2003b) found participants were consistent in their perceptions of typeface appropriateness (p. 226).

Brumberger (2003a,b) was successful in reigniting scholarly attention to typeface appropriateness. Doyle and Bottomley (2004) extended the literature through the continued examination of typeface appropriateness relative to 10 different product categories—finding participants selected the product with the appropriate typeface (as determined from a pretest)—a result consistent with findings of some of the earlier studies on typeface appropriateness (e.g., Berliner, 1920; Poffenberger & Franken, 1923, p. 328; Schiller, 1935, pp. 661-663). Doyle and Bottomley (2006) extended their own research through the examination of 120 products with assistance from Osgood et al.’s (1957) three dimensions of connotative meaning framework—confirming that if a typeface connotes a meaning consistent with that of a product, the typeface’s appropriateness is considered higher than if the typeface’s meaning is incongruent with the product.

Wine Labels’ Impact on Consumers’ Purchase Decisions

Consumers may consult a variety of information sources prior to purchasing wine. Information sources may include retail sales associates, magazines, wine guides, sommeliers, reviews, tasting notes, third party recommendations, and winery websites. Additionally, wine labels (front and back) contain a significant amount of information, which consumers may leverage to inform their purchase decision. Some of the information included on wine labels collectively is: brand name, grape variety, vintage year, alcohol content, and origin (e.g., city,

state, region, country). Wine labels may also contain information regarding the intrinsic attributes of the wine (i.e., tastes or aromas). Thus, wine labels, in isolation, provide consumers with a large amount of data on which to base a purchase decision.

Wine labels and their impact on consumer choice have generated significant scholarly attention, particularly in the early 21st century. While some scholarship has been dedicated to wine labels exclusively, much of the wine literature examined the multitude of elements consumers may leverage in the purchase decision and sought to rank order those cues. The foregoing summary of the literature on the subject includes studies of each type.

The earliest wine label studies focused on the back label—not the more prominently displayed front label. One such study, which examined back wine labels and consumer decision-making was by Shaw, Keegan, and Hall (1999), who found product attribute information gleaned from wine labels had the largest impact on consumers' perception of a wine's quality and value (p. 87). Charters, Lockshin, and Unwin (1999) published another study on how consumers read and interpret back wine labels and found consumers view back labels as an important element of their purchasing decision-making process (p. 193). Other scholars (Tootelian & Ross, 2000, p. 30; Thomas & Pickering, 2003, p. 71; Barber, Ismail, & Taylor, 2007, p. 80; Kelley, Hyde, & Bruwer, 2015, p. 530; and Escandon-Barbosa & Rialp-Criado, 2019, p. 8) have confirmed this finding for wine labels in some form (either the front label in isolation, the back label in isolation, or both front and back labels collectively).

Chaney (2000)—in an examination of factors influencing UK wine consumers—found labels (no discernment between front and back labels) ranked second in terms of information source importance among participants—trailing only the “point-of-sale” information source (p. 12). Barber and Almanza (2006) found consumers would purchase wine based upon information

from the front label alone—primarily because the front label had strong cues from country of origin, vintage, and brand name (p. 95). Interestingly, however, Barber and Almanza (2006) found respondents considered the back labels significantly more important overall in their selection of a bottle of wine as compared to the front label (p. 92)—a finding confirmed by other research (Thomas & Pickering, 2003, p. 71 and Barber, Almanza, & Donovan, 2006, p. 223).

Boudreaux and Palmer (2007) examined how a wine label's imagery, layout, and color affected consumers' purchase intent and perceptions of brand personality. The authors found the image on a wine's front label impacted brand personality perceptions and images of grape motifs and chateaux/vineyards received the highest liking scores (Boudreaux & Palmer, 2007, p. 177). Wolf and Thomas (2007) echoed the importance of a wine label's attractiveness—noting a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intent (p. 181). Jarvis et al. (2010) tested four label attributes (i.e., grape varietal, label image, label headline, and wine region) and concluded label image was the most important choice driver (p. 141). Chrea et al. (2011) also studied how label liking affected consumer choice—finding graphic content had the strongest positive influence on consumer purchase intent with architectural images and images of animals on the wine label having the most significant influence on liking (p. 18).

In one of the few studies to even tangentially address wine labels' typeface, Henley, Fowler, Yuan, Stout, and Goh (2011) examined millennials' perceptions of wine packaging characteristics with regard to purchase intent. The researchers found “font style” had a significant impact on millennials' wine purchase intent in one of the four bottle types tested (Arial typeface—a sans serif typeface—on a Riesling bottle) (Henley et al., 2011, p. 15). Additionally, Henley et al. (2011) found typeface—for two of the four bottles tested (one riesling with script typeface and one pinot noir with Times New Roman typeface, a serif typeface)—

significantly impacted quality perceptions amongst the millennials in the data set (pp.14-15). In the only other scholarly article considering typeface, Koenig and Lick (2014) performed a semiotic analysis on Austrian red wine labels. In their study, Koenig and Lick (2014) performed a simple frequency analysis on “font types” used in their sample—noting 52% of the typefaces used were “sans serif,” 39% were “with serif,” 6% were “italic,” and 3% were “other/combined” (p. 327). Notably, Ampuero and Vila (2006), in a non-wine product packaging study, found “Roman” typographical letters were associated with elegant products (p. 105). Koenig and Lick (2014) noted the incongruence with Henley et al.’s (2011) findings and posited Austrian wine producers would improve consumers’ perceived quality of Austrian red wines by transitioning to a sans serif typeface (p. 327).

Not all scholarship on the influence of wine labels in affecting purchase decisions has yielded positive results. For example, Goodman, Lockshin, and Cohen (2006) found a wine label’s attractiveness to be one of the least influential factors in consumers’ wine purchase decision. Instead, “tasting the wine previously” and “someone recommending” were the most important factors, followed by “grape variety” and “origin of the wine” (Goodman et al., 2006, p. 62). Additionally, Lockshin et al. (2009) determined brand, price, and medals (awards) were key consumer choice drivers, while label style and label color were two of the three least important attributes studied.

Consumption Occasions and the Wine Purchase Decision

Sandell (1968) was the first to examine how consumption occasions impact consumer choice. He assessed consumer choice in the context of ten different drinks (one of which was wine) for seven different situations and concluded consumers’ purchase intent was highly dependent upon the use occasion (Sandell, 1968, p. 407). Green and Rao (1972) and Belk (1974)

performed similar studies and confirmed Sandell's (1968) finding that situation drives consumer preference.

Dubow (1992) was the first researcher to make wine the subject of his occasion-based analysis and extended the literature through leveraging data from a company, The Wine Spectrum, who had gathered consumer data to assist it with positioning a new label. The novelty of Dubow's (1992) study included a comparison of user-based benefit segmentation and occasion-based segmentation. Dubow (1992) found occasion-based segmentation was more predictive of consumer choice than user-based segmentation (p. 15).

Quester and Smart (1998) examined product involvement and the consumption situation for red wine—analyzing product attributes in the context of three purchase occasions. Similar to early research on the topic in a broader, non-wine product context, the authors found consumer purchase intent for red wine was influenced by the consumption situation (Quester & Smart, 1998, p. 232). Hall, Lockshin, and O'Mahony (2001) confirmed the importance of occasion on wine selection through the review of five wine use situations (p. 49).

Hall, O'Mahony, and Lockshin (2001) conducted semi-structured qualitative interviews to assess respondents' perceptions on the importance of various attributes relative to wine purchases in relation to eight different wine consumption occasions. The authors concluded wine selection is filtered through the anticipated consumption scenario and those who might participate (Hall et al., 2001, p. 114).

Olsen, Thompson, and Clarke (2003) considered wine purchase preferences in three consumption scenarios—finding the selection choice varied with the perceived riskiness of the use occasion—with more conservative choices manifesting themselves in higher risk situations (i.e., a business dinner) versus lower risk occasions (i.e., personal consumption at home) (p. 48).

Sherman and Tuten (2011) examined how two aspects of wine labeling—design genre and brand naming—affected consumers’ perceptions of wine and purchase intent across four wine use occasions. The researchers found a traditional label design (not contemporary or novelty labels) was significantly more likely to positively influence consumers’ purchase intent and a wine label’s appeal varied considerably in terms of its importance to the consumers’ decision by occasion (Sherman & Tuten, 2011, p. 229).

Wine Purchasing Risk Reduction Strategies

Since wine is an experience good, it is impossible for a consumer to know how a wine tastes—save for a wine tasting—prior to purchase and even then, a specific bottle may be spoiled due to a faulty cork or having been stored at an improper temperature. This inherent uncertainty makes selecting a wine for purchase a risky and anxiety-ridden exercise for many consumers—a perspective first documented by Gluckman (1986, p. 29) but subsequently acknowledged by several scholars (Barber et al., 2006, p. 229; Batt & Dean, 2000, p. 34; Bruwer et al., 2013, p. 372; Hall & Winchester, 2000, p. 93; Mitchell & Grotorex, 1989, p. 34; Olsen et al., 2003, p. 40; Outreville & Desrochers, 2016, p. 556; Spawton, 1991, pp. 37-38).

Mitchell and Grotorex (1989) sought to determine which risk reduction strategies were employed by UK wine consumers and how those strategies differed depending upon the perceived risk. The authors found consumers engaged in information-seeking risk reduction strategies in the form of recommendations from family and friends and based on taste cues provided on wine labels (Mitchell & Grotorex, 1989, p. 40). Bruwer, Fong, and Saliba (2013) confirmed the importance of information seeking as a risk reduction strategy—noting it as the most important risk reduction strategy in their study (p. 385). Relative to wine labels specifically, Mitchell and Grotorex (1989) found wine labels were influential to consumers

when purchasing a previously untried bottle of wine and labels were particularly helpful when they contained information surrounding food pairing (p. 41).

Lacey, Bruwer, and Li (2009) considered risk reduction strategies and factors influencing perceived risk in the context of wine purchases at a restaurant. The researchers concluded the most important risk reduction strategies were “familiar grape type,” followed by “favorite brand” and “familiar region” (Lacey et al, 2009, p. 108). Celhay and Passebois (2011) examined how the typicality of a wine label impacted consumers’ purchase intent—utilizing various Bordeaux wines based on their congruence with the region’s “visual codes.” The authors found a positive relationship between perceived typicality and aesthetic appreciation, along with a positive correlation between aesthetic appreciation of the wine label and purchase intent (Celhay & Passebois, 2011, pp. 327-329). Lastly, the researchers demonstrated when perceived risk was higher, the proportion of respondents choosing the most typical wine increased (Celhay & Passebois, 2011, p. 330)—a finding consistent with research by Sherman and Tuten (2011). This finding is of particular significance to the subject study as appropriateness of typeface presumably impacts consumers’ perceptions of wine label typicality.

Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism has been described as one of the most important theoretical perspectives in the history of the field of communication (Crabbe, 2009, p. 945). Symbolic interactionism asks the question, “What common set of symbols and understandings have emerged to give meaning to people’s interactions” (Patton, 1990, p. 75; Solomon, 1983, p. 320)? Symbolic interactionism’s roots are traditionally traced to George Herbert Mead (Crabbe, 2009, p. 945). Mead taught at the University of Chicago from 1893 to 1931 but did not publish on the topic of symbolic interactionism (Kuhn, 1964, p. 61-62). Mead had, however, published a

significant number of articles, but they were primarily devoted to philosophy and ethics in journals not likely to be consumed by sociologists or social psychologists (Kuhn, 1964, p. 62).

The term “symbolic interactionism” was introduced by one of Mead’s students, Herbert Blumer, who coined the term—off-handedly—in an article written in *Man and Society* (Blumer, 1937, p. 153). According to Walker (2010), however, the term “symbolic interactionism” did not become associated with Mead’s work until Blumer, in 1969, assimilated Mead’s lecture notes and published selections of Mead’s work in his book, *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method* (p. 224).

Symbolic interactionism asserts three major premises: humans interact with things based on the meanings humans attribute to them, humans develop a meaning for such things through the social interaction with other humans, and the meanings are addressed and modified in an interpretative process when one encounters things (Blumer, 1969, p. 2).

Symbolic interactionism has had a tremendous influence on sociology and related disciplines. Evidence of this point may be found in its broad application across wide-ranging topics. For example, scholars have used symbolic interactionism and its principles as a lens to study: advertising (Armstrong, 1999), complex organizations (Dalton, 1959), cults (Klapp, 1969), cultural studies (Becker, 1982), deviance (Becker, 1953 & 1963; Scheff, 1966), feminism (Deegan & Hill, 1987), gift card giving (Austin & Huang, 2011), nursing (Burbank & Martins, 2009), politics (Lang & Lang, 1968; Hall, 1972), race (Hughes & Hughes, 1952; Shibutani & Kwan, 1965), research on the family (Stryker, 1967), rumor (Shibutani, 1966), social problems (Best, 2003), social types (Klapp, 1972), theories on identity and social roles (Burke & Stets, 2009; Heise, 2002; MacKinnon, 1994; Stryker & Serpe, 1982), work (Hughes, 1958), and even coffee breaks (Stroeback, 2013).

Symbolic interactionism holds relevance—and may be applied—to a wine label’s typeface—or any “thing” for that matter—as the meanings consumers associate with certain typefaces are derived from consumers’ interactions with one another. These meanings are not static in nature, but subject to an interpretive process, which may be modified with continued exposure and interaction (Blumer, 1969, p. 2). Indeed, as has been demonstrated by Doyle and Bottomley (2006), Van Rompay and Pruyn (2011), Celhay et al. (2015), and Velasco et al. (2018), the concept of a typeface’s perceived appropriateness with the rest of its packaging or the product itself, is a critical design element and is a contributing factor to the purchase decision. Perceptions of typeface/product appropriateness are not innate and are, thus, learned in a manner consistent with the teachings of symbolic interactionism. It stands to reason; therefore, these socially-derived meanings and interpretations of typeface influence purchase decisions. Furthermore, such purchase decisions are thought to be influenced by the consumption occasion—as the purchaser understands they will be judged socially for their wine selection. The first impression of such judgment will be based on the visual characteristics, or extrinsic cues, of the bottle, of which the front label—and by default, the label’s typeface—is a key focal area.

Symbolic interactionism is a theory that emphasizes the importance of meaning and interpretation as essential human processes. Consumers create shared meanings through their interactions, and those meanings become their reality. It is through this lens that consumer preferences for cabernet sauvignon red wine are examined as they relate to the impact of typeface and use occasion scenarios.

Summary

The fact that wine is an experience good, which, coupled with a specific wine use occasion combine to create risk for consumers when they make wine purchase decisions (Gluckman, 1986, p. 29; Olsen et al., 2003, p. 40; Palmer, 2001, p. 22. Spawton, 1991, pp. 37-38). The perceived risks associated with the purchase decision emanate from a socially derived orthodoxy. Scholars note that in the face of a risky purchase decision, it is not uncommon for consumers to engage in information seeking as a risk reduction strategy (Erdem & Swait, 1998, p. 139; Smith & Bristor, 1994, p. 589; Shiu, Walsh, Hassan, & Shaw, 2011, p. 602). In the context of wine, researchers have affirmed the importance of information seeking strategies as a means for risk reduction (Mitchell & Greated, 1989, pp. 38-41; Bruwer et al., 2013, p. 385). Further, the literature shows that brand's having brand credibility—as perceived by the consumer—lowers information costs and reduces perceived risk (Erdem & Swait, 1998, p. 139; Erdem et al., 2002, p. 4; Spry et al., 2011, p. 886). Additionally, extrinsic cues—including a wine bottle's front label—positively influence consumers' purchase intentions (Chaney, 2000, pp. 12-13; Barber & Almanza, 2006, p. 92; Boudreaux & Palmer, 2007, pp. 182-185). One element of the front label, typeface, is the subject of the current study. The research examined socially constructed views of typeface appropriateness as a means of reducing risk—another construct developed through social interaction—in the wine purchase decision under four distinct consumption occasions.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The aim of this research is to improve the understanding of consumers' interaction with typeface on wine labels and how that interaction impacts purchase intent in wine consumption scenarios of varying perceived risk. The literature examining wine labels' effect on consumers' liking and purchase intent is robust. So too is the literature on typeface appropriateness in numerous contexts—including the role typeface plays in consumer packaging and advertising more broadly. Research considering typeface in the context of a wine label; however, has received very limited scholarly attention. Henley et al. (2011) conducted one of the few studies, which explicitly included typeface as a variable that may influence consumers' wine purchase intentions. The research hypotheses below are designed to begin to fill the void in wine-related typeface appropriateness scholarship, while simultaneously exploring the role typeface plays in wine brand credibility and as a risk reduction strategy in the wine purchase decision.

H1: There is a high, positive correlation between typeface appropriateness perceptions and consumers' purchase intent.

H2: Consumers will prefer appropriate typefaces when selecting wines for occasions with greater perceived risk.

H3: There is a high, positive correlation between brand credibility perceptions and consumers' purchase intent.

H4: Consumers who view wine purchases as inherently risky will more frequently select a wine with higher perceived typeface appropriateness—regardless of use occasion.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Data for this study was gathered through two, self-administered online surveys, the first of which was a pretest. The pretest was conducted to determine participants' perceptions of typeface appropriateness relative to the cabernet sauvignon red wine category. The main experiment addressed the research hypotheses specifically.

Pretest

Participants

Participants for the pretest were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (“MTurk”). MTurk, which started in 2005, is a crowdsourcing web platform that enables individuals—known as “requesters”—to distribute small online tasks (“human intelligence tasks,” or “HITs”) to an anonymous workforce—known as “workers”—in exchange for a fixed, nominal amount of compensation upon task completion (Bartneck, Duenser, Moltchanova, & Zawieska, 2015, p. 3; Behrend, Sharek, Meade, & Wiebe, 2011, p. 802; Shank, 2016, p. 47). MTurk is the most well-known crowdsourcing platform and boasts the largest number of workers and requesters of all such platforms (Zhao & Zhu, 2014, p. 430; Follmer, Sperling, & Suen, 2017, p. 330). Furthermore, of particular relevance to the current study, MTurk participants are generally older, represent each of the United States, and are more racially diverse than standard Internet samples and typical American university samples (Behrend et al., 2011, p. 800; Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011, p. 4; Follmer et al., 2017, p. 331; Paolucci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010, p. 414). Not surprisingly, MTurk continues to be used as a means to collect data in several research disciplines including communication (e.g., Appelman & Schmierbach, 2018; Chien & Seate, 2017; Dixon, 2016; Kim & Hancock, 2017).

One hundred and twenty United States' residents, 21 years or older (the minimum legal age to consume alcohol in the United States), completed the online survey. Participation was completely voluntary, and each respondent received \$1.25 for their time upon completion.

Among all respondents, 14 were excluded from the final data pool for failing to follow the survey's instructions, leaving a survey population of $N = 106$. There were more men ($n = 63$) than women ($n = 42$) and other ($n = 1$) in the sample. Respondents identified in five of the age categories provided. The age category with the most respondents was 30-39 year-olds ($n = 41$), followed by 21-29 year-olds ($n = 35$), 40-49 year-olds ($n = 17$), 50-59 year-olds ($n = 10$), and 60-69 year-olds ($n = 3$). Most respondents were Caucasian (non-Hispanic) ($n = 83$), though others identified as Latino or Hispanic ($n = 11$), Asian/Pacific Islander ($n = 8$), African-American (non-Hispanic) ($n = 3$), and Native American ($n = 1$). The pool of respondents reported to reside in 33 states. States which had the largest number of respondents included: California (18, or 17.0%), New York (10, or 9.4%), and Texas (9, or 8.5%).

Pretest Design and Procedures

A pretest—via a self-administered Qualtrics online survey (see Appendix A for the pretest survey)—was conducted to assess perceptions of typeface appropriateness in the context of the cabernet sauvignon red wine product category. The literature demonstrates people perceive certain typefaces should be associated with certain products, but not others (Davis & Smith, 1933; Doyle & Bottomley, 2006; Poffenberger & Franken, 1923; Schiller, 1935). Participants were instructed to provide their perceptions regarding the appropriateness of 16 typefaces in the context of a cabernet sauvignon red wine label. The 16 typefaces selected were consistent with those used by Shaikh, Chaparro, & Fox (2006), except four typefaces were excluded from the original 20 typefaces. These four were not available to the researcher via the

standard typefaces included in Microsoft® Word for Mac 2011, Version 14.7.7, the word processing program used by the researcher. The typefaces selected included a sampling of a variety of typefaces, including: serif, sans serif, scripted/fun, monospaced, and display/modern typefaces (see Figure 1 for typefaces used in the pretest). For each of the typefaces, as adapted from Celhay et al. (2015), participants were digitally presented with the word, “Typography” along with the Latin alphabet typeset (upper and lowercase), numbers, and common symbols—all in 14-point, which was consistent with Shaikh et al.’s (2006) presentation (see Questions #1-#16 in Appendix A). At the top of each page (one for each typeface) of the online survey, the following instruction was provided—adapted from Celhay et al. (2015) and Doyle and Bottomley (2004)—“Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine’s front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).” In addition to assessing participants’ perceptions of typeface appropriateness, the online survey solicited select demographic information, including: age, gender, ethnicity, and U.S. state of residency (see Questions #17-#20 in Appendix A).

Pretest Measure

The median appropriateness score was calculated for each of the 16 typefaces tested and was placed in ascending order—from 1 (the typeface with the lowest calculated median, the typeface assessed as least appropriate) to 16 (the typeface with the highest calculated median, the typeface assessed as most appropriate). The typefaces to be used in the main experiment were those comprising places 1 and 16 in the ordered list of typeface median calculations. All other typefaces (i.e., those with median typeface appropriateness scores ordered 2-15) were discarded

and not used in the main experiment. The use of median (instead of mean) was selected as the appropriate measure of central tendency to mitigate against the influence of outliers.

Main Experiment

Participants

Participants were, once again, recruited through MTurk. The researcher solicited 210 responses from people living in the United States who were at least 21 years of age (the legal drinking age). Participation was completely voluntary, and each respondent was compensated \$1.00 for their time upon completion.

Two hundred and ten survey responses were obtained. A question was included in the survey to ensure respondents read and internalized the experimental treatment (see Question #7 in Appendix B). This type of question is known as an Instructional Manipulation Check, or IMC, but is also known as an attention check, a screener, or a trap question (Hauser, Ellsworth, and Gonzalez, 2018, p. 2). Oppenheimer, Meyvis, and Davidenko (2009) recommend utilizing IMCs “...to eliminate inattentive participants from the analysis and...increase the statistical power of the data” (Hauser et al., 2018, p. 2). The manipulation check utilized in the current research asked respondents to verify the wine consumption occasion presented in a choice experiment question earlier in the survey. Of the 210 responses, 55, or 26.2%, answered the manipulation check question incorrectly—signifying inattentiveness to at least a portion of the survey from these 55 respondents. As a result, to increase the statistical power of the data, those 55 data points were excluded from the final data set as was one other respondent for providing spurious responses—leaving a final survey population of $N = 154$.

Interestingly, the 26.2% of respondents who failed the manipulation check questions was in the range (14% to 46%) of respondents who failed such a question in Oppenheimer et al.’s

(2009) studies (p. 871). The large number of respondents excluded from the analysis does not, therefore, appear, to be radically inconsistent with previous scholarship.

There were more men ($n = 96$) than women ($n = 58$) in the sample. Respondents identified in each of the six age range categories provided. The age category with the most respondents was 30-39 year-olds ($n = 61$), followed by 21-29 year-olds ($n = 40$), 40-49 year-olds ($n = 28$), 50-59 year-olds ($n = 17$), 60-69 year-olds ($n = 5$), and 70 years-old and older ($n = 3$). Most respondents were Caucasian (non-Hispanic) ($n = 109$), though others identified as African-American (non-Hispanic) ($n = 16$), Latino or Hispanic ($n = 15$), Asian/Pacific Islander ($n = 8$), Native American ($n = 3$), and other ($n = 3$). Geographic diversity was more pronounced than ethnic diversity, as the pool of respondents represented 38 U.S. states. States which had the largest representation included: California ($n = 24$), New York ($n = 14$), and Florida ($n = 10$). The sample represented a variety of annual household income categories, with \$20,000 - \$34,999 being the most common ($n = 45$), followed by \$50,000 - \$74,999 ($n = 37$), \$35,000 - \$49,999 ($n = 24$), \$75,000 - \$99,999 ($n = 20$), less than \$20,000 ($n = 14$), \$100,000 - \$125,000 ($n = 8$), and more than \$125,000 ($n = 6$). From an educational perspective, the most frequently reported highest level of education completed was bachelor's degree ($n = 69$), followed by some college/no degree ($n = 27$), high school diploma or equivalent ($n = 22$), associate degree ($n = 22$), master's degree ($n = 12$), less than a high school diploma ($n = 1$), and doctorate ($n = 1$).

Study Design & Procedures

A self-administered online, Qualtrics survey was used to collect the study's data (see Appendix B for the survey). The online survey format provided convenience for the participants as they were able to access and complete the survey when and where they desired. An online survey also provided anonymity to the respondents, provided a cost-effective way for the

researcher to collect the data, and importantly, provided targeted responses to address the study's aims and objectives.

The survey was comprised of four separate sections. The first section was developed to determine participants' risk perceptions relative to the act of purchasing wine. The second section was comprised of a choice experiment, whereby participants were randomly presented with one of four wine consumption scenarios and asked which of the two bottles they preferred. The third section's intent was to assess participants' perceptions of the credibility of the wine brand they selected. Lastly, a general section was created to assess socio-demographic and wine consumption characteristics.

Section one attempted to understand participants' perceptions related to the riskiness of a wine purchasing decision generally (see Questions #1-#4 in Appendix B). Questions for this section were adapted from Celhay and Passebois's (2011) study on wine labels and consumers' risk perceptions, who in turn leveraged it from the original creators, Laurent and Kapferer (1986) who, according to Celhay and Passebois (2011), "...tested and validated..." the multi-item scale (p. 326).

Section two (see Question #5 in Appendix B) sought to ascertain participants' wine selection preferences given four consumption scenarios—adapted from Barber et al. (2008), Celhay and Passebois (2011), and Olsen et al. (2003)—and detailed later in this section. An image of two, digitally-created wine bottles—side by side—was shown to participants (see Figure 2 and/or the visual depiction preceding Question #5 in Appendix B). The two bottles (i.e., the experimental stimuli) were identical except the bottles utilized the different typefaces identified from the pretest, where one bottle displayed the most appropriate typeface and the second bottle displayed the least appropriate typeface. Thus, all variables were controlled—

except for the typeface variable—which included four consumption occasion conditions (home, gift, family dinner, and business dinner) and two typeface conditions (least appropriate versus most appropriate). The position in which the bottles were presented (left or right) was randomized.

The brand selected for the wine bottles was Warren Williams, a name, which was intended to have a neutral connotation and to not evoke any peripheral emotions or perceptions. The name, Warren Williams, was used as part of Sherman and Tuten's (2011) study, who intended it to represent a "traditional" name, as wines are commonly named after the wine maker or proprietor (p. 226). The use of surnames as brand names has been a common method for scholars to study other variables relative to typeface (Doyle & Bottomley, 2004, 2006, 2009). Although the brand name for the experiment was not varied between the two stimuli, to reduce the risk of unintended influence due to familiarity, a review of a well-known wine directory, Wines Vines Analytics, was conducted to verify the brand name was indeed fictitious and not representative of an actual wine company. Additionally, an Internet search yielded no matches for an actual Warren Williams wine.

The label's color was a neutral off-white tone with black typeface. The neutral color was selected to not distract the participants and to present a cabernet sauvignon bottle in a manner which one could easily visualize in a retail liquor store or wine shop setting. Boudreaux and Palmer (2007) found warm palettes—which include neutral colors—"...were seen as successful, desirable, and expensive..." (p. 180). Thus, presenting the label in the best possible context for selection appears to be consistent with the use of a neutral label color.

In addition to winery name, grape variety, and vintage, it is not uncommon for wine labels to contain an image. To make for a more interesting label, a Chateau/vineyard image was

included in the present study. Boudreaux and Palmer (2007) examined the effect of image on wine labels and found that with a neutral colored label, a label with a Chateau/vineyard image had the highest mean rating for purchase intent (p. 184). Therefore, consistent with the color selection, the use of a Chateau/vineyard image was selected for the present study to provide participants with label choices that could reasonably be expected to be observed in an actual retail setting.

The label's layout was presented in a manner consistent with the "traditional-unprinted" format utilized by Boudreaux and Palmer (2007). The label included a horizontal line at the top and bottom of the label, a 2016 vintage year below the label's graphic image (the vintage one would expect to see for new cabernet sauvignon wines being introduced by wineries in Fall 2019/Spring 2020), with Warren Williams printed on two lines at the top of the label. The Chateau/vineyard image was shown below the winery name—centered above the grape variety, cabernet sauvignon. In smaller font, at the label's base, on two separate lines, the following was printed, "Produced and bottled by Warren Williams, Napa, California, USA, Alcohol 13.5% by Volume." Boudreaux and Palmer (2007) leveraged the assistance of two professional graphic designers in the creation of the three layouts used in their study and noted, "each layout was representative of a general design style found in marketplace wines" (p. 174). Therefore, the general design and layout—adapted to reflect the typeface characteristics—is believed to be a realistic visualization of what a participant might find in a retail store.

Above the bottle images, participants were presented with one question, which addressed purchasing preference given one of four wine consumption occasions. Participants were randomly presented with one of the following scenarios—adapted from Barber et al. (2008) and Sherman and Tuten (2011)—and asked which of the two wines they would purchase for the

occasion presented: (1) purchasing wine for personal home consumption alone (“home”), (2) purchasing wine as a gift (“gift”), (3) purchasing wine for a dinner party away from home with friends/family (“family dinner”), and (4) purchasing wine for a dinner party away from home with a business associate/boss (“business dinner”).

The third survey section sought to understand the participants’ perception of the preferred wine’s brand credibility (see Questions #8-#10 in Appendix B). Participants were asked three brand credibility questions, which are described in the following section.

The fourth and final section requested socio-demographic information from the participants, along with consumer behavior activities, and psychographic information—following the research of Lee, Zhao, and Ko (2005), which has been replicated by other researchers, including: Barber et al. (2006) and Barber et al. (2007) (see Questions #11-#23 in Appendix B). Responses to wine consumers’ preferences and usage habits were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale. For economy and to more closely align with the study’s aims and objectives, questions derived from Lee et al.’s (2005) research were reduced from 35 questions to 12 questions (see Appendix A).

Measures

This section discusses and defines the four measures examined as part of the study: perceived risk, purchase intent, typeface appropriateness, and brand credibility.

Perceived Risk. Participants were asked about their risk perceptions relative to purchasing wine. Consistent with the measure developed by Celhay and Passebois (2011), participants were asked to express their agreement with the following statements: “When you purchase a wine, it’s not a big deal if you make a mistake;” “It’s really annoying to purchase a wine that is not suitable;” “When I purchase a wine, I’m never sure of my choice;” and “When I

face a shelf of wine in a store, I always feel a bit at a loss to make my choice” (see Questions #1-#4 in Appendix B). The level of agreement was quantified via a seven-point Likert-type scale with 1 = *I completely disagree* to 7 = *I completely agree*. Calculating the arithmetic mean of the four items formed the initial perceived risk composite measure. Celhay and Passebois (2011) did not indicate the internal consistency of their perceived risk measure. Of note, however, an initial test of the four statements yielded a measure with an “unacceptable” level of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha of 0.197), based upon the interpretation rules of thumb outlined in Cronbach’s Alpha (2014). After removing statements #1 and #2 from the original list from Celhay and Passebois (2011), the two item measure yielded an “excellent” level of internal consistency, as determined by a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.901, based upon the interpretation rules of thumb outlined in Cronbach’s Alpha (2014). Therefore, the perceived risk composite measure utilized in this study comprised the arithmetic average of responses to the third and fourth statements from Celhay and Passebois’s (2011) aforementioned perceived risk measure. For purposes of interpretation, lower mean scores were associated with lower perceptions of perceived risk, while higher mean scores were interpreted as higher perceived risk perceptions.

Purchase Intent. Purchase intent was determined based on the percentage of participants selecting the bottle containing typeface A (Monotype Corsiva) or typeface B (Impact), with the relevant typefaces determined based upon the pretest results.

Typeface Appropriateness. Typeface appropriateness was determined based on the percentage of participants selecting the bottle containing typeface A (Monotype Corsiva—most appropriate) or typeface B (Impact—least appropriate), with the relevant typefaces determined based upon the pretest results.

Brand Credibility. Participants were asked about their perceptions regarding brand credibility through the completion of three questions within the survey instrument (see Questions #8-#10 in Appendix B). Consistent with the measure developed by Van Rompay and Pruyn (2011), participants were asked to express their level of agreement with the following statements: “This brand makes a sincere impression,” “This brand makes a credible impression,” and “This brand makes a trustworthy impression.” The level of agreement was quantified via a seven-point Likert-type scale (with 1 = *definitely disagree* and 7 = *definitely agree*). Calculating the arithmetic mean of the three items formed the brand credibility composite measure. Van Rompay and Pruyn (2011) found their measure to generate a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.85 (p. 603). The three-item brand credibility measure used in the present study yielded a “good” (and nearly “excellent”) level of internal consistency, as determined by a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.898 and based upon the interpretation rules of thumb outlined in Cronbach’s Alpha (2014). Higher brand credibility measure results were associated with higher perceptions of brand credibility, while lower relative brand credibility measure results were associated with lower brand credibility perceptions.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

The research results are presented in two sections—(1) pretest and (2) main experiment. Pretest results were used to identify the typefaces for the main experiment. Within the main experiment section, H1-H4 are addressed. The statistical results presented herein were performed in SPSS Version 26.

Pretest

Participants—via an online Qualtrics survey—were asked to rate the appropriateness of 16 distinct typefaces in the context of selecting a typeface for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine. The ratings were based on a scale of 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate). Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the 16 typefaces (see Table 1). The median for each typeface was used for sorting purposes—identifying the least appropriate and most appropriate typefaces. The use of median (instead of mean) was selected as the appropriate measure of central tendency to mitigate against the influence of outliers. Survey results showed respondents found the Impact typeface as least appropriate ($Mdn = 20.00$, $M = 30.06$, $SD = 28.63$, $n = 106$) and the Monotype Corsiva typeface as the most appropriate ($Mdn = 75.00$, $M = 67.17$, $SD = 27.72$, $n = 106$). As can be observed in Table 1, the use of mean (instead of median) would've yielded the same “most appropriate” and “least appropriate” typefaces.

Although the discrepancy between the scores of Impact and Monotype Corsiva appeared significant on their face, a one-sample *t*-test was run to determine whether the Impact appropriateness score was statistically different to Monotype Corsiva, as defined by Impact's appropriateness score of 30.06. Mean appropriateness scores were normally distributed for both Impact and Monotype Corsiva, as assessed by visual inspection of Normal Q-Q Plots. The mean

appropriateness score for Impact ($M = 30.06$, $SD = 28.63$) was lower than Monotype Corsiva's mean appropriateness score of 67.17, a statistically significant mean difference of 37.11, 95% CI [31.77,42.45], $t(105) = 13.784$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.34$. According to Cohen's (1988) rules of thumb regarding effect size, the calculated figure of 1.34 falls into the "large" effect size category, which is reserved for the absolute value of effect sizes greater than 0.50.

Main Experiment

H1 predicted the data would show a high, positive correlation between typeface appropriateness perceptions and consumers' purchase intent. Respondents were asked to choose between two wine bottles for one of four consumption occasions (e.g., home, gift, family dinner, or business dinner). The selection would represent each respondent's purchase intent. The two bottles were identical except the bottles utilized two different typefaces, where one bottle displayed a label with the most appropriate typeface identified in the pretest (Monotype Corsiva typeface) and the second bottle displayed the least appropriate typeface (Impact typeface). Of the 154 responses, 141 respondents (91.6%) selected the bottle with the appropriate typeface, while only 13 respondents (8.4%) selected the wine bottle with the least appropriate typeface displayed on its label. Based on the large difference between the two proportions, H1 was supported.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to address H2, which predicted consumers would prefer appropriate typefaces when selecting wines with occasions of greater perceived risk. The analysis showed there was a small, statistically significant, negative correlation between typeface appropriateness and wine use occasion ($r = -0.171$, $n = 154$, $p < .05$). The results of the Pearson product-moment correlation output are presented in Table 2.

Since the correlation between typeface appropriateness and wine use occasion was not high and positive, H2 was not supported.

H3 predicted there would be a high, positive correlation between brand credibility perceptions and consumers' purchase intent. A binomial logistic regression was performed to ascertain the effects of brand credibility on the likelihood respondents would select the bottle of wine with the appropriate typeface. Purchase intent was the dependent variable and brand credibility was the independent variable. The logistic regression model was statistically significant, $X^2(1) = 5.59, p < .05$, as shown in Table 3. The model explained 8.1% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in purchase intent and correctly classified 91.6% of the trials. Sensitivity was 100.0% and specificity was 0.0%. The predictor variable, brand credibility, was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Although the regression model was significant, the brand credibility coefficient was negative; therefore, H3 was not supported.

H4 predicted consumers who view wine purchases as inherently risky would more frequently select a wine with higher perceived typeface appropriateness—regardless of use occasion. A binomial logistic regression was performed to determine the effects of perceived risk and wine use occasion on the likelihood respondents would select the bottle of wine with the appropriate typeface. The dependent variable was purchase intent, while the independent variables were perceived risk and wine use occasion. The logistic regression model was statistically significant, $X^2(2) = 6.25, p < .05$. The model explained 9.0% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in purchase intent and correctly classified 91.6% of the trials. Sensitivity was 100.0% and specificity was 0.0%. Of the two predictor variables, only wine use occasion was statistically significant ($p < .05$, as shown in Table 4). Therefore, perceived risk was neither a predictor nor a moderator of purchase intent. Although the regression model was significant,

purchase intent was driven only by wine use occasion—not perceived risk—thus, H4 was not supported.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to improve the understanding of consumers' interaction with typeface on wine labels and how that interaction impacted: (1) purchase intent in wine consumption scenarios of varying perceived risk and (2) perceptions of brand credibility.

Appropriate Typefaces for a Wine Label

Sixteen distinct typefaces were evaluated in the pretest—utilizing a range of typeface classes, including: serif, sans serif, script, and display typefaces. Respondents found Monotype Corsiva typeface to be most appropriate and Impact typeface to be least appropriate for use on a cabernet sauvignon red wine label. As noted earlier, prior scholarship on wine labels' typeface is scarce. In one of the few studies to address the subject, Henley et al. (2011) found “font style” had a significant impact on millennials' wine purchase intent in only one of the four bottle types tested (Arial typeface—a sans serif typeface—on a riesling bottle) (p. 15). Additionally, Henley et al. (2011) found typeface—for two of the four bottles tested (one riesling with a script typeface and one pinot noir with Times New Roman typeface, a serif typeface)—significantly impacted quality perceptions amongst the millennials in the data set (pp. 14-15). Looking at other scholarship, in their frequency analysis of “font types” on Austrian red wine labels, Koenig and Lick (2014) found “sans serif” typefaces were most prominent (52%), followed by “with serif” (39%), “italic” (6%), and “other/combined” (3%) (p. 327).

According to Shaikh (2007), the Monotype Corsiva typeface is considered to be a “script and handwriting” typeface, while Impact is categorized as a “display” typeface (p. 49). The fact respondents selected a script typeface as most appropriate does not allow for much in the way of corroboration with prior research save for the observation that a script typeface was one of two

typefaces to have been found to significantly influence quality perceptions—but not the purchase intent—of millennials (Henley et al., 2011, pp. 14-15). Notably, however, a script typeface was not offered by Koenig and Lick (2014) as one of the more prominent typefaces in their Austrian red wine label study. Instead, “italic” typefaces—which could be one categorization of Monotype Corsiva—comprised only 6% of all analyzed labels (Koenig & Lick, 2014, p. 327). Therefore, the selection of Monotype Corsiva as the most appropriate of the 16 typefaces evaluated is somewhat surprising. This evaluation is tempered to some degree by its use in formal settings and logo design, “...because its cursive quality fulfills the need for fancier lettering without rendering the result completely indecipherable” (Monotype Corsiva, n.d.).

Since a display typeface, such as Impact, was not used in Henley et al.’s (2011) study, no comparison with that particular study is able to be made. However, it is relevant to note that in Koenig and Lick’s (2014) frequency analysis of “font types,” display typefaces were not prevalent and if they appeared at all, would have been included in the “other/combined” category, which comprised only 3% of the observations (p. 327). Therefore, based on this result, it is not surprising that the Impact typeface was viewed as least appropriate among the choices provided.

Typeface Appropriateness and Purchase Intent

H1 examined the relationship between typeface appropriateness and purchase intent. As referenced earlier, only one prior study has attempted to address typeface appropriateness and its impact on purchase intent in the context of wine. Henley et al. (2011) found for one of the four wine bottle labels tested, typeface had a statistically significant effect on millennials’ wine purchase intent. Although wine scholarship on the subject is not robust, other researchers have argued a label’s typography influences consumers’ brand perceptions (McCarthy &

Mothersbaugh, 2002, pp. 665-667; Childers & Jass, 2002, p. 104; Van Rompay & Pruyn, 2011, pp. 604-605). Of more relevance to the present study—though not specific to wine labels—scholars have also previously concluded typeface impacts brand choice (Doyle & Bottomley, 2004, 2006; Van Rompay & Pruyn, 2011). The current study supports these prior findings. Additionally, the subject study—having isolated all packaging-related variables save typeface—contributes to existing literature by establishing a significant relationship between typeface appropriateness and purchase intent for wine. Moreover, unlike Henley et al.'s (2011) study, the current research examined a broader demographic—extending beyond that of the millennial generation, while utilizing a 58% larger sample ($N = 154$ vs. 97).

Typeface Appropriateness and Use Occasion

H2 explored the role typeface played as a risk reduction strategy. The concept of risk in the present study was manifested through one of four use, or consumption, occasions. Scholars have previously found wine selection is influenced by the use occasion (Hall et al, 2001, p. 49; Olsen et al., 2003, p. 48; Quester & Smart, 1998, p. 232). The use occasions presented to study participants were adapted from Barber et al. (2008) and Sherman and Tuten (2011). The consumption scenarios presented were intended to reflect various levels of situational risk. For example, selecting the right bottle of wine for personal home consumption alone would generally be considered less risky than purchasing wine for a business dinner or a gift—a conclusion supported by the literature (Barber et al., 2008, p. 135; Sherman & Tuten, 2011, p. 230). The present study marked the first time typeface appropriateness for a wine label was evaluated as a potential risk reduction strategy for various consumption occasions. A high correlation between typeface appropriateness and use occasion was not found, however.

Supplementary analysis was conducted to assess whether respondents selected the wine with the appropriate typeface at greater proportions for certain use occasions. A series of independent *t*-tests were run—evaluating the mean typeface appropriateness score for each pair of occasions (e.g., home vs. business dinner, gift vs. family dinner, family dinner vs. business dinner, etc.). The analysis showed there were no statistically significant differences between the mean appropriateness scores for any of the use occasion pairs. Given the high proportion of respondents selecting the wine with the most appropriate typeface, the implication is respondents selected the wine with the most appropriate typeface regardless of wine use occasion.

Brand Credibility and Purchase Intent

H3 explored the relationship between brand credibility and purchase intent. The literature shows brand credibility positively influences purchase intent (Baek, Kim, & Yu, 2010, p. 674; Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 191; Wang & Yang, 2010, p. 183). The study's results, however, failed to support a high, positive relationship between brand credibility and purchase intent in the context of wine. The reason for this conclusion is not entirely clear; however, brand credibility's lack of influence on purchase intent in the present study may be due—at least in part—to the construct itself.

Scholars generally agree brand credibility is comprised of two main components: trustworthiness and expertise (Erdem, Swait, & Louviere, 2002, p. 3; Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 192; Swait & Erdem, 2007, p. 681; Baek & King, 2011, p. 262). Some scholars have also suggested a third component, attractiveness/likeableness (Keller & Aaker, 1997, p. 358; Wang & Yang, 2010, p. 179). The literature also suggests brand credibility reflects "...the cumulative impacts of...past and present marketing strategies and activities" (Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 192). A consumer's perception of brand credibility may be, therefore, developed over time, over

multiple interactions with the product, its packaging, its advertising or a combination of multiple engagement elements. Thus, the fact participants in the current study were asked questions to gain insights into their perceptions of brand credibility relative to fictitious and heretofore unseen or unexperienced brands, may have been unfair as the participants had not had the opportunity to build a relationship with the product—particularly as it relates to brand credibility’s trustworthiness component. With the benefit of this understanding of the brand credibility construct, it is not wholly surprising respondents’ views of the wine labels failed to generate results consistent with the literature surrounding the linkage between brand credibility and purchase intent.

A literature search yielded no results for studies demonstrating a failed link between brand credibility and purchase intent. However, a related construct known as *corporate credibility*, is of relevance to the present discussion. Corporate credibility is defined as “...the extent to which consumers and other stakeholders believe in the company’s trustworthiness, expertise, and likeableness, which contributes to a corporation’s whole image” (Fombrun, 1996). Corporate credibility’s definition shares the precise characteristics of brand credibility, but instead of referring to the brand, it refers to the brand’s owner, the corporation. Nevertheless, consistent with research surrounding brand credibility, scholars have generally found the higher the credibility of a corporation, the higher the purchase intent towards the corporation’s brands (Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999, p. 114; Goldsmith, Lafferty, & Newell, 2000, pp. 313-314; Lafferty, Goldsmith, & Newell, 2002, p. 7; Li, Wang, & Yang, 2011, p. 63). Interestingly, however, in their study of the telecommunications sector of Karachi, Pakistan, Yaseen and Mazahir (2019) concluded corporate credibility was not a statistically significant predictor of

purchase intention (p. 96). Therefore, the notion that a credibility-based construct (and one very similar to brand credibility) failed to drive purchase intent is not without scholarly precedent.

Perceived Risk and Typeface Appropriateness

A binomial logistic regression model showed perceived risk was neither a predictor nor a moderator of purchase intent relative to the likelihood respondents would select the wine bottle with the appropriate typeface. Furthermore, results showed purchase intent was driven only by wine use occasion—not perceived risk.

Supplementary analysis was conducted to further explore the relationship between perceived risk and purchase intent. As noted earlier, the perceived risk measure was adapted from the work of Celhay and Passebois's (2011) study—with a composite measure being developed from responses to two Likert-type questions (1-7 scale). Respondents reported a mean perceived risk score of 4.14 ($SD = 1.80, n = 154$). A one-sample t -test was run to determine whether the perceived risk score of respondents was different to a score of indifference, defined as “neither agree nor disagree” and a perceived risk score of 4.0 (the mid-point of the 7-point Likert-type scale). Perceived risk scores were normally distributed, as assessed by visual inspection of Normal Q-Q Plots and there were no outliers, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. The mean perceived risk score ($M = 4.14, SD = 1.80, n = 154$) was higher than the indifference score of 4.0; however, the difference of 0.14 was not statistically significant, 95% CI [-.14,.43], $t(153) = .983, p = .327, d = .08$. Therefore, this analysis supports the findings from the binomial logistic regression model and does not suggest the respondents—overall—viewed purchasing wine as a risky endeavor. This perspective is in conflict with the literature, which has historically indicated selecting wine is generally thought of as a risky exercise due to the variety of factors previously discussed (Gluckman, 1986, p. 29;

Olsen et al., 2003, p. 40; Palmer, 2001, p. 22. Spawton, 1991, pp. 37-38). H4's result, which noted perceived risk was neither a predictor nor a moderator of purchase intent, however, is consistent with the average view of respondents in the current study that purchasing wine—at least in the abstract and not for a specific, identified occasion—is not a particularly risky behavior. It is unclear; however, what forces drove respondents to view wine selection in this way. It is possible—though more study would be required to confirm—society is becoming less risk averse in certain situations—with wine selection being one such situation.

Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism emphasizes the importance of meaning and interpretation as essential human processes. Consumers create shared meanings through their interactions, and those meanings become their reality. Symbolic interactionism provides a useful framework in which to interpret this study's results.

Consumers' views of a typeface's appropriateness are a learned perspective—something developed over time through interactions with others—consistent with symbolic interactionism's teachings. As noted earlier, while there is no textbook definition of typeface appropriateness for a given product, people know it when they see it. This phenomenon was undoubtedly present in the study's results as evidenced by the fact that 91.6% of participants selected the wine bottle containing the typeface deemed most appropriate by pretest respondents. Through repeated interactions with others and with wine bottles over time, the interpretative process noted by Blumer (1969) as central to symbolic interactionism, have combined to create visions within consumers of what typefaces *are* and *are not* appropriate for wine labels.

Moreover, according to the study's data, the shared meanings created through repeated interactions were significant enough to overcome potential differences in the risks perceived in

various consumption occasions. While it is generally regarded—though not specifically tested in this study—the perceived risk of selecting a wine for personal use alone at home is less than that associated with selecting a wine for a business dinner, the socially-derived interpretation of typeface appropriateness resulted in respondents selecting the wine with the appropriate typeface at a frequency such that differences between the four, tested use occasions could not be differentiated at a significance level of $\alpha = .05$.

A key takeaway, then, from this study is that the shared meanings created through interactions—with people and products—generate powerful mental constructs for how products are perceived and selected. From a managerial perspective, this study's results suggest wine companies would benefit from: (1) testing labels and typefaces with consumers to assess appropriateness (an apparent proxy for likeability and purchase intent) and (2) utilizing labels and typefaces ranking high from such tests. The perspective from the study demonstrating that consumers gravitate toward an appropriate typeface regardless of use occasion greatly simplifies a wine company's typeface selection decision—an appropriate typeface will be expected to generate greater purchase intent.

CHAPTER 7

LIMITATIONS

Several limitations were present in this study. First, the sample may not be representative of the United States' population and thus, may not be generalizable to that same population. The samples gathered—for both the pretest and main experiment—were limited in *size* due to the researcher's budget and *breadth* due to the fact that while MTurk is a useful tool for sourcing study participants, such participants are regulated by the need for access to a computer connected to the Internet and a desire to engage in such studies, which may not intersect with a sample that is representative of the U.S. population.

A second limitation relates to the experiment's construction. For economy, only 16 typefaces were selected for inclusion in the pretest. While the typefaces included were consistent with those used in prior research (Shaikh et al., 2006) and the number of typeface alternatives tested was in-line with many studies (Berliner, 1920; Davis & Smith, 1933; Schiller, 1935; Shaikh et al., 2006; Velasco et al., 2015), 16 typefaces were considerably fewer than some other typeface appropriateness scholarship. For example, Doyle & Bottomley (2006, 2009) tested a considerably higher number of typefaces (132). On a related note, the categories of typefaces utilized in the subject study were largely comprised of serif and sans serif typefaces—with comparably less representation from display and script typefaces. Ultimately, therefore, the selection of typefaces for the study may have impacted results as it is impossible to know how participants may have reacted to different/more typefaces.

Another limitation relates to the selection of use occasions tested. Four consumption occasions were utilized in the study and while they were adapted from existing scholarship (Barber et al., 2008; Sherman & Tuten, 2011) and intended to reflect a range of perceived risk,

the occasions selected were, by no means, exhaustive. For example, Celhay and Passebois (2011) examined two different scenarios not in the current study: “bring wine to novice wine drinkers” and “bring wine to expert wine drinkers” (p. 327). Additionally, Quester and Smart (1998) included added specificity into some of the consumption occasions they used (e.g., “wine as a gift for the 50th birthday of an employer or highly-respected friend”) (p. 228). It is possible that different conclusions could have been reached if more or different use occasions were presented to participants.

From a related perspective, for economy, participants were not asked to rate the perceived riskiness of the consumption occasions utilized in the subject study. Therefore, it was not possible to understand respondents’ precise risk perceptions relative to each occasion. Although existing scholarship provides some hints as to the occasions’ relative risk, it would’ve been helpful to know the respondents’ perceptions, which would’ve allowed more specific analysis on an occasion-by-occasion basis and provided more transparency surrounding perceived risk, which would’ve allowed comparison with the perceived risk composite measure utilized in the study.

A final limitation worth mentioning relates to the study’s use of brand credibility. As noted in the Discussion section, brand credibility reflects “...the cumulative impacts of...past and present marketing strategies and activities” (Erdem & Swait, 2004, p. 192). This definition implies the brand credibility construct is intended to measure a consumer’s relationship with a brand *over time*. Given the use of fictitious brands in the current study, only an immediate-term relationship with the brand was possible. This use of the brand credibility construct, therefore, may not have been wholly-consistent with its intended usage—particularly as it relates to one of its main components, trustworthiness.

CHAPTER 8

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should endeavor to address the limitations previously discussed. A larger and more diverse sample should be sought in future studies. Greater numbers overall, including an increased representation of females and African-American (non-Hispanic) people would allow for greater alignment with the U.S. population. Further, the pretest and main experiment participants represented 33 and 38 states, respectively. Therefore, representation from all United States would be preferred.

A larger number of typefaces would also improve the quality of the findings as well as the importance to wine brands. Along these lines, future research could benefit from presenting the various pretest typefaces on the bottle (like in the main experiment) instead of in isolation. Seeing the various typefaces on a simulated wine label may evoke a different perception of the appropriateness and should, therefore, be examined.

Additional research on the topic may benefit from the use of more consumption occasions and greater specificity in the occasions presented. For example, instead of using compound occasions (e.g., purchasing wine for a dinner party away from home with friends/family or purchasing wine for a dinner party away from home with a business associate/boss), the occasions could be made specific to “friends,” “family”, “business associate”, or “boss.” Doing so may allow participants to improve the accuracy of their risk perceptions and provide more accurate responses to the questions. For example, it is conceivable one’s risk tolerance (and behavior) is different with friends than family. Going a step further, the level of friendship, or closeness of the family member, may also influence wine selection behavior.

Future research on typeface appropriateness and wine use occasions should collect data relative to the participants' perceived risk of the occasions presented. Not only would such information be beneficial in comparing it to prior scholarship, but it would be useful in quantifying differences in behavior (e.g., wine label typeface appropriateness selection).

Lastly, should future typeface appropriateness scholarship seek to include an analysis of the impact on brand credibility, known brands should be utilized so as to ensure consumers had sufficient opportunity to develop a relationship with the product—from which they would be positioned to accurately assess components of brand credibility, like trustworthiness. This pursuit, however, may be challenging and would require use of a relatively highly educated sample related to wine, where a sufficiently large and diverse sample had familiarity with many brands that utilized different typefaces in their labeling. Complications are anticipated with such an approach; however, as other variables may confound isolating perceptions of typeface appropriateness. For example, knowledge of a wine's taste or cost may—unknowingly— influence participants' typeface appropriateness perceptions. Further, issues like label color, type of wine, appellation region, and the use of multiple typefaces on a single wine label could also combine to complicate data analysis.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D.A. (1991). *Managing brand equity*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Alsem, K.J. & Kosteljik, E. (2008). Identity based marketing: A new balanced marketing paradigm. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(9/10), 907-914.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090560810891064>
- Ampuero, O. and Vila, N. (2006). Consumer perceptions of product packaging. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 23(2), 102-114. doi: 10.1108/07363760610655032
- Appelman, A. & Schmierbach, M. (2018). Make no mistake? Exploring cognitive and perceptual effects of grammatical errors in news articles. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 95(4), 930-947. doi: 10.1177/1077699017736040
- Armstrong, K. L. (1999). Nike's communication with black audiences: A sociological analysis of advertising effectiveness via symbolic interactionism. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 23(3), 266-286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699017736040>
- Ashton, R.H. (2014). Wine as an experience good: Price versus enjoyment in blind tastings of expensive and inexpensive wines. *Journal of Wine Economics*, 9(2), 171-182. doi: 10.1017/jwe.2014.7
- Austin, C. G. & Huang, L. (2011). Proceedings from Academy of Marketing Science (AMS) Annual Conference: *Gift or gift card? Symbolic interactionism in gift exchange* [Abstract]. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10873-5_13
- Baek, T.H., Kim, J., & Yu, J.H. (2010). The differential roles of brand credibility and brand prestige in consumer brand choice. *Psychology & Marketing*, 27(7), 662-678. doi: 10.1002/mar.20350

- Baek, T.H. & King, K.W. (2011). Exploring the consequences of brand credibility in services. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25(4), 260-272. doi: 10.1108/08876041111143096
- Barber, N. & Almanza, B.A. (2006). Influence of wine packaging on consumers' decision to purchase. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 9(4), 83-98. doi: 10.1300/J369v09n04_06
- Barber, N., Almanza, B.A., & Donovan, J.R. (2006). Motivational factors of gender, income and age on selecting a bottle of wine. *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, 18(3), 218-232. doi: 10.1108/09547540610704774
- Barber, N., Dodd, T., & Ghiselli, R. (2008). Capturing the younger wine consumer. *Journal of Wine Research*, 19(2), 123-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571260802622225>
- Barber, N., Ismail, J., & Taylor, D.C. (2007). Label fluency and consumer self-confidence. *Journal of Wine Research*, 18(2), 73-85. doi: 10.1080/09571260701660847
- Bartram, D. (1982). The perception of semantic quality in type: Differences between designers and non-designers. *Information Design Journal*, 3(1), 38-50. <https://doi.org/10.1075/idj.3.1.04bar>
- Bartneck, C., Duenser, A., Moltchanova, E., & Zawieska, K. (2015). Comparing the similarity of responses received from studies in Amazon's Mechanical Turk to studies conducted online with direct recruitment. *PLoS ONE*, 10(4), 1-23. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0121595
- Batt, P.J. & Dean, A. (2000). Factors influencing the consumer's decision. *The Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal*, 15, 34-41.
- Becker, H. S. (1953). Becoming a marihuana [sic] user. *American Journal of Sociology*, 59(3), 235-242. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2771989>

- _____ (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York, NY: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- _____ (1982). *Art worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Behrend, T.S., Sharek, D.J., Meade, A.W., & Wiebe, E.N. (2011). The viability of crowdsourcing for survey research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 43, 800-813. doi: 10.3758/s13428-011-0081-0
- Belk, R.W. (1974). An exploratory assessment of situational effects in buyer behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(2), 156-163. doi: 10.2307/3150553
- Berkowitz, M. (1987). The influence of shape on product preferences. In M. Wallendorf and P.F. Anderson (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research*, Vol. 14, (p. 559). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Berliner, Anna (1920). Atmosphärenwert von Drucktypen. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Psychologie*, 17, 165-172.
- Berni, P., Begalli, D., & Capitello, R. (2005). An occasion-based segmentation approach to the wine market in Denmark. *Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing*, 17, 117-145. doi: 10.1300/J047v17n01_07
- Best, J. (2003). Social problems. In L.T. Reynolds & N.J. Herman-Kinney (Eds.), *Handbook of symbolic interactionism* (pp. 981-996). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Bloch, P.H. (1995). Seeking the ideal form: Product design and consumer response. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(July), 16-29. doi: 10.2307/1252116
- Blumer, H. (1937). Social Psychology. In E. P. Schmidt (Ed.), *Man and society*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.

- ____ (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Boudreaux, C.A. & Palmer, S.E. (2007). A charming little cabernet. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 19(3), 170-186. doi: 10.1108/17511060710817212
- Brinton, J.E. (1961, October). The “feeling” of type faces. *CA Magazine*, 3, 43-45.
- Britton, P. (1992, August). Packaging: Graphic examples of consumer seduction. *Beverage Industry*, 21(8).
- Brumberger, E.R. (2003a). The rhetoric of typography: The persona of typeface and text. *Technical Communication*, 50(2), 206-223. <http://rid.olfo.org/doc/rhetoftypography.pdf>
- ____ (2003b). The rhetoric of typography: The awareness and impact of typeface appropriateness. *Technical Communication*, 50(2), 224-231. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/85fb/e1e4d7d1ff34b44ea38ba51771d83ba9647b.pdf>
- Bruwer, J., Fong, M., & Saliba, A. (2013). Perceived risk, risk-reduction strategies (RRS) and consumption occasions: Roles in the wine consumer’s purchase decision. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 25(3), 369-390. doi: 10.1108/APJML-06-2012-0048
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S.D. (2011). Amazon’s Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3-5. doi: 10.1177/1745691610393980
- Burbank, P. M. & Martins, D. C. (2009). Symbolic interactionism and critical perspective: Divergent or synergistic? *Nursing Philosophy*, 11(1), 25-41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-769X.2009.00421.x>
- Burke, P. J. & Stets, J. E. (2009). *Identity theory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Burt, C. (1959). *A psychological study of typography*. London: Cambridge University Press.

- Celhay, F., Boysselle, J., & Cohen, J. (2015). Food packages and communication through typeface design: The exoticism of exotypes. *Food Quality and Preference*, 39, 167-175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2014.07.009>
- Celhay, F. & Passebois, J. (2011). Wine labeling: Is it time to break with tradition? A study of the moderating role of perceived risk. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 23(4), 318-337. doi: 10.1108/17511061111186497
- Chaney, I.M. (2000). External search effort for wine. *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, 12(2), 5-21. doi: 10.1108/eb008706
- Charters, S., Lockshin, L., & Unwin, T. (1999). Consumer responses to wine bottle back labels. *Journal of Wine Research*, 10(3), 183-195. doi: 10.1080/09571269908718177
- Childers, T.L. & Jass, J. (2002). All dressed up with something to say: Effects of typeface semantic associations on brand perceptions and consumer memory. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12(2), 93-106. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1202_03
- Chien, H.-Y. & Seate, A.A. (2017). When talking differences makes us closer: Communicative dynamics of group salience in intergroup contact. *Communication Studies*, 68(4), 455-475. doi: 10.1080/10510974.2017.1361458
- Chrea, C., Melo, L., Evans, G., Forde, C., Delahunty, C., & Cox, D.N. (2011). An investigation using three approaches to understand the influence of extrinsic product cues on consumer behavior: An example of Australian wines. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, 26(1), 13-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-459X.2010.00316.x
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Crable, B. (2009). Symbolic interactionism. In S. W. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (pp. 945-948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cronbach's Alpha: Simple Definition, Use and Interpretation. (December 8, 2014).
<https://www.statisticshowto.datasciencecentral.com/cronbachs-alpha-spss/>
- Dalton, M. (1959). *Men who manage: Fusions of feeling and theory in administration*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Davis, R.C. & Smith, H.J. (1933). Determinants of feeling tone in type faces. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 17(6), 742-764.
- Deegan, M. J. & Hill, M. R. (1987). *Women and symbolic interaction*. Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin Inc.
- Dixon, G. (2016). Applying the gateway belief model to genetically modified food perceptions: New insights and additional questions. *Journal of Communication*, 66(6), 888-908. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12260
- Dollar, T. (1997, November/December). Romancing the consumer with packaging. *Vineyard & Winery Management*, 26-30, 89.
- Doyle, J.R. & Bottomley, P.A. (2004). Font appropriateness and brand choice. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(8), 873-880. doi: 10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00487-3
- ____ (2006). Dressed for the occasion: Font-product congruity in the perception of logotype. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16(2), 112-123.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1602_2

- _____ (2009). The message in the medium: Transfer of connotative meaning from typeface to names and products. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 23(3), 396-409. doi: 10.1002/acp.1468
- Dubow, J.S. (1992). Occasion-based vs. user-based benefit segmentation: A case study. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 32(Mar/Apr), 11-18.
- Erdem, T. & Swait, J. (1998). Brand equity as a signaling phenomenon. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7(2), 131-157. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0702_02
- _____ (2004). Brand credibility, brand consideration, and choice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 191-198. doi: 10.1086/383434
- Erdem, T., Swait, J., & Louviere, J. (2002). The impact of brand credibility on consumer price sensitivity. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 19(1), 1-19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8116\(01\)00048-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8116(01)00048-9)
- Escandon-Barbosa, D. & Rialp-Criado, J. (2019). The impact of the content of the label on the buying intention of a wine consumer. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02761
- Follmer, D.J., Sperling, R.A., & Suen, H.K. (2017). The role of MTurk in education research: Advantages, issues, and future directions. *Educational Researcher*, 46(6), 329-334. doi: 10.3102/0013189X17725519
- Fombrun, C.J. (1996). *Reputation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Franson, P. (2006, March). Labels gone wild. *Wine Enthusiast*. <https://www.winemag.com/2006/03/01/labels-gone-wild/#>
- Gluckman, R.L. (1986). A consumer approach to branded wines. *European Journal of Marketing*, 20(6), 21-35. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000004649>

- Goldsmith, R.E., Lafferty, B.A., & Newell, S.J. (2000). The influence of corporate credibility on consumer attitudes and purchase intent. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 3(4), 304-318.
doi: 10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540122
- Goodman, S., Lockshin, L., & Cohen, E. (2006). What influences consumer selection in the retail store? *Wine Marketing*, 515, December, 61-63.
- Green, P.E. & Rao, V.R. (1972). Configuration synthesis in multidimensional scaling. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9(1), 65-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F002224377200900113>
- Grohmann, B., Giese, J.L., & Parkman, I.D. (2013). Using type font characteristics to communicate brand personality of new brands. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(5), 389-403. doi: 10.1057/bm.2012.23
- Grohmann, B. (2016). Communicating brand gender through type fonts. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 22(4), 403-418. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2014.918050>
- Hall, J., Lockshin, L., & O'Mahony, G.B. (2001). Exploring the links between wine choice and dining occasions: Factors of influence. *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, 13(1), 36-53. doi: 10.1108/eb043369
- Hall, J., O'Mahony, B., & Lockshin, L. (2001). Wine attributes and consumption occasions: An investigation of consumer perceptions. *The Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal*, 16, 109-114.
- Hall, J. & Winchester, M. (2000). Focus on your customer through segmentation. *The Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal*, 15(2), 93-96.
- Hall, P. M. (1972). A symbolic interactionist analysis of politics. *Sociological Inquiry*, 42(3-4), 35-75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1972.tb00229.x>

- Haskins, J.B. (1958). Testing suitability of typefaces for editorial subject-matter. *Journalism Quarterly*, 35(2), 186-194. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F107769905803500205>
- Hauser, D.J., Ellsworth, P.C., & Gonzalez, R. (2018). Are manipulation checks necessary? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(998), 1-10. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00998
- Heise, D. R. (2002). Understanding social interaction with affect control theory. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch Jr. (Eds.), *New directions in contemporary sociological theory* (pp. 17-40). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Henderson, P.W., Cote, J.A., Leong, S.M., & Schmitt, B. (2003). Building strong brands in Asia: Selecting the visual components of image to maximize brand strength. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 20(4), 297-313. doi: 10.1016/j.ijresmar.2003.03.001
- Henley, C.D., Fowler, D.C., Yuan, J., Stout, B.L., & Goh, B.K. (2011). Label design: Impact on millennials' perceptions of wine. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 23(1), 7-20. doi: 10.1108/17511061111121371
- Hughes, E. C. (1958). *Men and their work*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Hughes, E. C. & Hughes, H. M. (1952). *Where people meet: Racial and ethnic frontiers*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Jarvis, W., Mueller, S., & Chiong, K. (2010). A latent analysis of images and words in wine choice. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 18(3), 138-144. doi: 10.1016/j.ausmj.2010.05.001
- Keller, K.L. & Aaker, D.A. (1997). Corporate-level marketing: The impact of credibility on a company's brand extensions. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(4), 356-378. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540057>

- Kelley, K., Hyde, J., & Bruwer, J. (2015). U.S. wine consumer preferences for bottle characteristics, back label extrinsic cues and wine composition. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 27(4), 516-534. doi: 10.1108/APJML-09-2014-0140
- Kemp, E. & Bui, M. (2011). Healthy brands: Establishing brand credibility, commitment and connection among consumers. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 28(6), 429-437. doi: 10.1108/07363761111165949
- Kidd, I. (1993). The art of dressing the product. *Wine & Viticulture Journal*, 3, 201-204.
- Kim, S.J. & Hancock, J.T. (2017). How advertorials deactivate advertising schema: MTurk-based experiments to examine persuasion tactics and outcomes in health advertisements. *Communication Research*, 44(7), 1019-1045. doi: 10.1177/0093650216644017
- Kirmani, A. & Rao, A.R. (2000). No pain, no gain: A critical review of the literature on signaling unobservable product quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 64(2), 66-79.
<https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.64.2.66.18000>
- Klapp, O. E. (1969). *Collective search for identity*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- _____ (1972). *Heroes, villains, and fools: Reflections of the American character*. San Diego, CA: Aegis Publishing Company.
- Knox, S. (2004). Positioning and branding your organization. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 13(2), 105-115. doi: 10.1108/10610420410529735
- Koenig, B. & Lick, E. (2014). Wine labels in Austrian food retail stores: A semiotic analysis of multimodal red wine labels. *Semiotica*, 200, 313-334. doi: 10.1515/sem-2014-0014
- Kotler, P. (1984). *Marketing management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Kuhn, M. H. (1964). Major trends in symbolic interaction theory in the past twenty-five years. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 5(1), 61-84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1964.tb02256.x>
- Lacey, S., Bruwer, J., & Li, E. (2009). The role of perceived risk in wine purchase decisions in restaurants. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 21(2), 99-117. doi: 10.1108/17511060910967962
- Lafferty, B.A. & Goldsmith, R.E. (1999). Corporate credibility's role in consumers' attitudes and purchase intentions when a high versus a low credibility endorser is used in an ad. *Journal of Business Research*, 44(2), 109-116. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(98\)00002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(98)00002-2)
- Lafferty, B.A., Goldsmith, R.E., & Newell, S.J. (2002). The dual credibility model: The influence of corporate and endorser credibility on attitudes and purchase intentions. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 10(3), 1-12. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41304270>
- Lang, K. & Lang, G. E. (1968). *Politics and television*. Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books, Inc.
- Laurent, G. & Kapferer, J.N. (1986). Les profils d'implication. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, 1, 41-58. doi: 10.1177/076737018600100103
- Lee, K., Zhao, J., & Ko, J.-Y. (2005). Exploring the Korean wine market. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 29(1), 20-41. doi: 10.1177/1096348004268195
- Li, Y., Wang, X., & Yang, Z. (2011). The effects of corporate-brand credibility, perceived corporate-brand origin, and self-image congruence on purchase intention: Evidence from China's auto industry. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 24(1), 58-68. doi: 10.1080/08911762.2011.545720

Lockshin, L., Mueller, S., Louviere, J., Francis, L. & Osidacz, P. (2009). Development of a new method to measure how consumers choose wine. *The Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal*, 24(2), 37-42.

Loureiro, S.M.C. (2017). Exploring the attractiveness of manufacturer brands and retailer own-brands in supermarket context. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 45(10), 1095-1113. doi: 10.1108/IJRDM-10-2016-0196

MacKinnon, N. J. (1994). *Symbolic interactionism as affect control*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Macmillan Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/appropriateness>

Marin, A.B., Jorgensen, E.M., Kennedy, J.A., & Ferrier, J. (2007). Effects of bottle closure type on consumer perceptions of wine quality. *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture*, 58(2), 182-191.

McCarthy, M.S. & Mothersbaugh, D.L. (2002). Effects of typographic factors in advertising-based persuasion: A general model and initial empirical tests. *Psychology & Marketing*, 19(7-8), 663-691. doi: 10.1002/mar.10030

Mitchell, V. & Grotorex, M. (1989). Risk reducing strategies used in the purchase of wine in the UK. *European Journal of Marketing*, 23(9), 31-46. doi: 10.1108/EUM00000000000589

Monotype Corsiva (n.d.). *Fonts.com*. <https://www.fonts.com/font/monotype/monotype-corsiva/story>

Morrison, G.R. (1986). Communicability of the emotional connotation of type. *Educational Communication and Technology*, 34(4), 235-244. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30218198>

Mount, A. (2016, April). Eye candy. *Harpers*, 28-29.

- Nelson, P. (1974). Advertising as information. *Journal of Political Economy*, 82(4), 729-754.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1837143>
- Netemeyer, R.G., Krishnan, B., Pullig, C., Wang, G., Yagci, M., Dean, D., ... Wirth, F. (2004). Developing and validating measures of facets of customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(2), 209-224. doi: 10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00303-4
- Olsen, J.E., Thompson, K.J., & Clarke, T.K. (2003). Consumer self-confidence in wine purchases. *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, 15(3), 40-51. doi: 10.1108/eb008762
- Oppenheimer, D.M., Meyvis, T., & Davidenko, N. (2009). Instructional manipulation checks: Detecting satisficing to increase statistical power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 867-872. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.009
- Orth, U.R. & Malkewitz, K. (2008). Holistic package design and consumer brand impressions. *Journal of Marketing*, 72(3), 64-81. <https://doi.org/10.1509%2FJMKG.72.3.064>
- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Outreville, J.F. & Desrochers, J. (2016). Perceived risk: An experimental investigation of consumer behavior when buying wine. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 15(6), 549-559.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1593>
- Ovink, G.W. (1938). *Legibility, atmosphere-value and forms of printing types*. Leiden, Holland: A.W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij N.V.
- Palmer, J. (2001, August). Bacchus' revenge. *Barron's*, 81, 21-24.
- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P.G. (2010). Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 5(5), 411-419.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46525612_Running_Experiments_Using_Amazon_Mechanical_Turk

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Phillips, B.J., McQuarrie, E.F., & Griffin, W.G. (2014a). How visual brand identity shapes consumer response. *Psychology and Marketing*, 31(3), 225-236. doi: 10.1002/mar.20689

_____. (2014b). The face of the brand: How art directors understand visual brand identity. *Journal of Advertising*, 43(4), 318-332. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2013.867824

Poffenberger, A.T. & Franken, R.B. (1923). A study of the appropriateness of type faces. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7(4), 312-329.

<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0071591>

Quester, P.G. & Smart, J. (1998). The influence of consumption situation and product involvement over consumers' use of product attribute. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 15(3), 220-238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769810219107>

Ritchie, C. (2007). Beyond drinking: The role of wine in the life of the UK consumer. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(5), 534-540. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2007.00610.x>

Rocchi, B. & Stefani, G. (2005). Consumers' perception of wine packaging: A case study. *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, 18(1), 33-44. doi: 10.1108/09547540610657669

Sandell, R.G. (1968). Effects of attitudinal and situational factors on reported choice behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 5(4), 405-408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224376800500407>

- Scheff, T. J. (1966). *Being mentally ill: A sociological theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Schiller, G. (1935). An experimental study of the appropriateness of color and type in advertising. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 19(6), 652-664.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0056090>
- Schwartz, B. (2016). *The paradox of choice*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Shaikh, A.D. (2007). *Psychology of onscreen type: Investigations regarding typeface personality, appropriateness, and impact on document perception* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas.
- Shaikh, A.D., Chaparro, B.S., & Fox, D. (2006). Perception of fonts: Perceived personality traits and uses. *Usability News*, 8.
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9769/026987797773c2633c61c202560ffbb24819.pdf>
- Shank, D.B. (2016). Using crowdsourcing websites for sociological research: The case of Amazon Mechanical Turk. *The American Sociologist*, 47(1), 47-55. doi: 10.1007/s12108-015-9266-9
- Shaw, M., Keeghan, P., & Hall, J. (1999). Consumers judge wine by its label, study shows. *Wine Industry Journal*, 14(1), 84-87.
- Sherman, S. & Tuten, T. (2011). Message on a bottle: The wine label's influence. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 23(3), 221-234. doi: 10.1108/17511061111163050
- Shibutani, T. (1966). *Improvised news: A sociological study of rumor*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Shibutani, T. & Kwan, K. M. (1965). *Ethnic stratification: A comparative approach*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

- Shiu, E.M.K., Walsh, G., Hassan, L.M., & Shaw, D. (2011). Consumer uncertainty, revisited. *Psychology & Marketing, 28*(6), 584-607. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20402>
- Sichtmann, C. (2007). An analysis of antecedents and consequences of trust in a corporate brand. *European Journal of Marketing, 41*(9/10), 999-1015. doi: 10.1108/03090560710773318
- Smith, J.B. & Bristor, J.M. (1994). Uncertainty orientation: Explaining differences in purchase involvement and external search. *Psychology & Marketing, 11*(6), 587-607. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.4220110606>
- Solomon, M. R. (1983). The role of products as social stimuli: A symbolic interactionism perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research, 10*(3), 319-329. doi: 10.1086/208971
- Spawton, A.L. (1991). Grapes and wine seminar-prospering in the 1990s: Changing your view of the consumer. *International Journal of Wine Marketing, 3*, 32-41. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM00000000001542>
- Spry, A., Pappu, R., & Cornwell, T.B. (2011). Celebrity endorsement, brand credibility and brand equity. *European Journal of Marketing, 45*(6), 882-909. doi: 10.1108/03090561111119958
- Stroeback, P. S. (2013). Let's have a cup of coffee! Coffee and coping communities at work. *Symbolic Interaction, 36*(4), 381-397. <https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.76>
- Stryker, S. (1967). Symbolic interaction as an approach to family research. In J. G. Manis & B. N. Meltzer (Eds.), *Symbolic interaction: A reader in social psychology* (pp. 371-383). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Stryker, S. & Serpe, R. T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience, and role behavior: Theory and research example. In W. Ickes & E. S. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, roles, and social behavior* (pp. 199-218). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

- Swait, J. & Erdem, T. (2007). Brand effects on choice and choice set formation under uncertainty. *Marketing Science*, 26(5), 679-697. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1060.0260>
- Tannenbaum, P.H., Jacobson, H.K., & Norris, E.L. (1964). An experimental investigation of typeface connotations. *Journalism Quarterly*, 41(1), 65-73.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F107769906404100108>
- Thomas, A. & Pickering, G. (2003). The importance of wine label information. *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, 15(2), 58-74. doi: 10.1108/eb008757
- Tootelian, D.H. & Ross, K. (2000). Product labels: What information do consumers want, and will they believe it? *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 6(1), 25-38. doi: 10.1300/J038v06n01_02
- Underwood, R.L. (2003). The communicative power of product packaging: Creating brand identity via lived and mediated experience. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 9(Winter), 62-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2003.11501933>
- Underwood, R.L. & Klein, N.M. (2002). Packaging as brand communication: Effects of product pictures on consumer responses to the package and brand. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 10(4), 58-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2002.11501926>
- Van Rompay, T.J.L. & Pruyn, A.T.H. (2011). When visual product features speak the same language: Effects of shape-typeface congruence on brand perception and price expectations. *Journal of Production and Innovation Management*, 28(4), 599-610. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5885.2011.00828.x
- Velasco, C., Salgado-Montejo, A., Marmolejo-Ramos, F., & Spence, C. (2014). Predictive packaging design: Tasting shapes, typefaces, names, and sounds. *Food Quality and Preference*, 34(1), 88-95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2013.12.005>

- Velasco, C., Woods, A.T., Hyndman, S., & Spence, C. (2015). The taste of typeface. *i-Perception*, 6(4), 1-10. doi: 10.1177/2041669515593040
- Velasco, C., Woods, A.T., Wan, X., Salgado-Montejo, A., Bernal-Torres, C., & Cheok, A.D. (2018). The taste of typefaces in different countries and languages. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 12(2), 236-248.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/aca0000120>
- Walker, C. M. (2010). George Herbert Mead: An overview and understanding of symbolic interactionism. *The Proceedings of the Laurel Highlands Communications Conference*, 221+.
- Walker, P., Smith, S., & Livingston, A. (1986). Predicting the appropriateness of a typeface on the basis of its multi-modal features. *Information Design Journal*, 5(1), 29-42.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/idj.5.1.02wal>
- Wang, X. & Yang, Z. (2010). The effect of brand credibility on consumers' brand purchase intention in emerging economies: The moderating role of brand awareness and brand image. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 23(3), 177-188. doi: 10.1080/08911762.2010.487419
- Wendt, D. (1968). Semantic differentials of typefaces as a method of congeniality research. *Journal of Typographic Research*, 2(1), 3-25. https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/visiblelanguage/pdf/V2N1_1968_E.pdf
- Wernerfelt, B. (1988). Umbrella branding as a signal of new product quality: An example of signaling by posting a bond. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 19(3), 458-466. doi: 10.2307/2555667

Wine Institute (n.d.). Word wine consumption.

https://www.wineinstitute.org/files/World_Consumption_by_Country_2017.pdf

____ (n.d.). World wine production by country.

https://www.wineinstitute.org/files/World_Production_by_Country_2017.pdf

____ (2019). California wine sales in U.S. market hit \$40 billion in 2018.

<https://www.wineinstitute.org/resources/pressroom/06242019>

Wines & Vines. (July 1, 2019). U.S. wineries – by state July 2019.

<https://winesvinesanalytics.com/statistics/winery/>

Wolf, M.M. & Thomas, S.M. (2007). How millennial, Generation X, and baby boomer wine consumers evaluate wine labels. *Journal of Food Distribution Research*, 38(1), 170-181.

<https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/162281?ln=en>

Yaseen, S. & Mazahir, I. (2019). Impact of corporate credibility, brand awareness, brand image and brand loyalty on purchase intention in the telecommunication sector of Karachi.

Global Management Journal for Academic & Corporate Studies, 9(1), 86-99.

<https://gmjacs.bahria.edu.pk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Paper-8.pdf>

Zhao, Y. & Zhu, Q. (2014). Evaluation on crowdsourcing research: Current status and future direction. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 16(1), 417-434. doi: 10.1007/s10796-012-9350-

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics for Pretest Typeface Appropriateness Scores*

	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Kurtosis	Skewness
Monotype Corsiva	67.17	75.00	27.72	106	-0.59	-0.67
Georgia	62.84	65.00	26.37	106	-0.37	-0.56
Cambria	54.39	60.00	28.05	106	-1.00	-0.19
Constantia	59.23	60.00	26.29	106	-0.53	-0.48
Candara	55.94	60.00	25.81	106	-0.73	-0.21
Arial	53.47	60.00	28.22	106	-0.91	-0.25
Century Gothic	59.48	60.00	28.29	106	-0.72	-0.32
Times New Roman	59.22	57.50	25.39	106	-0.50	-0.26
Calibri	54.25	56.50	29.25	106	-1.02	-0.28
Verdana	53.75	56.00	29.34	106	-1.11	-0.13
Consolas	55.07	55.50	27.61	106	-0.67	-0.22
Corbel	54.15	55.00	28.02	106	-0.85	-0.28
Rockwell	56.82	54.50	25.69	106	-0.76	-0.11
Courier New	48.15	50.00	29.40	106	-1.24	-0.09
Comic Sans MS	34.10	30.00	30.16	106	-0.75	0.60
Impact	30.06	20.00	28.63	106	-0.45	0.86

Table 2

Pearson Correlation Between Wine Use Occasion and Typeface Appropriateness

		Occasion	Appropriateness
Occasion	Pearson Correlation	1	-.171*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.034
	<i>N</i>	154	154

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3*Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Purchase Intent Based on Brand Credibility*

	<i>B</i>	SE	Wald	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
							Lower	Upper
Brand Credibility	-.72	0.31	5.53	1	0.019	0.49	0.27	0.89
Constant	1.48	1.59	0.86	1	0.354	4.38		

Table 4

Logistic Regression Predicting Typeface Appropriateness Based on Perceived Risk and Wine Use Occasion

	<i>B</i>	SE	Wald	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
							Lower	Upper
Perceived Risk	0.21	0.17	1.52	1	0.217	1.24	0.88	1.74
Occasion	-0.61	0.30	4.17	1	0.041	0.54	0.30	0.98
Constant	-1.99	1.02	3.86	1	0.050	0.14		

Figure 1

The typefaces below were utilized in the pretest. The type class for each typeface is noted in parentheses.

Arial (Sans Serif)

Calibri (Sans Serif)

Cambria (Serif)

Candara (Sans Serif)

Century Gothic (Sans Serif)

Comic Sans MS (Sans Serif)

Consolas (Sans Serif)

Constantia (Serif)

Corbel (Sans Serif)

Courier New (Serif)

Georgia (Serif)

Impact (Display)

Monotype Corsiva (Script & Handwriting)

Rockwell Extra Bold (Display)

Times New Roman (Serif)

Verdana (Sans Serif)

Figure 2

The images below were presented as part of the choice component of the main experiment.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

[Note: After providing consent, confirming they were: (i) at least 21 years of age and (ii) a resident of the United States, participants were presented with the following.]

We would like to understand your perceptions of 16 different typefaces that may be used on cabernet sauvignon red wine labels. A different typeface will be presented to you on each of the following screens and you will be provided with the following instruction:

“Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine’s front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).”

After your typeface appropriateness perceptions are captured, you will be asked about your age, gender, ethnicity, and state of residence.

Please read the questions that follow and answer honestly. Please remember that all responses will be kept confidential and that completing the survey is voluntary and you may exit the survey at any time.

[Note: Questions #1 - #16 were presented in random order.]

APPENDIX A (continued)

1. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

2. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

3. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

4. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

5. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

6. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

7. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

8. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

9. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

10. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

11. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

12. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

13. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ

abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

1234567890.,;(!?"')@* \$%

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

14. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

15. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

16. Imagine you are responsible for a brand of cabernet sauvignon red wine and you need to choose a typeface for your logo, which will appear on the wine's front label. Rate the appropriateness of the typeface below for your cabernet sauvignon wine logo on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate).

Typography

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

*1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 . : , ; (# ! ? ") @ * \$ %*

Appropriateness: _____

APPENDIX A (continued)

17. Which category below includes your age?

- (a) 20 years old or younger
- (b) 21-29 years old
- (c) 30-39 years old
- (d) 40-49 years old
- (e) 50-59 years old
- (f) 60-69 years old
- (g) 70 years old or older

[Page break inserted here.]

18. What is your gender?

- (a) Female
- (b) Male
- (c) Other

[Page break inserted here.]

19. Which one of the selections below best describes your ethnicity?

- (a) African-American (non-Hispanic)
- (b) Asian/Pacific Islander
- (c) Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
- (d) Latino or Hispanic
- (e) Native American
- (f) Other

[Page break inserted here.]

20. In which U.S. state do you currently reside? [Participants were provided with a drop-down list from which they could select the appropriate response.]

APPENDIX B

[Note: After providing consent, confirming they were: (i) at least 21 years of age and (ii) a resident of the United States, participants were presented with the following.]

We are interested in how you perceive the riskiness of selecting wine for purchase, how different typefaces used on wine bottle labels impact your purchase intent, and how those perceptions influence your views on brand credibility. Additionally, you will be asked questions intended to understand your wine consumption practices. Lastly, you will be asked general demographic questions.

Please read the questions that follow and answer honestly. Please remember that all responses will be kept confidential and that completing the survey is voluntary and you may exit the survey at any time.

APPENDIX B (continued)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = “I completely disagree” and 7 = “I completely agree.”

1. When you purchase a wine, it's not a big deal if you make a mistake.
2. It's really annoying to purchase a wine that is not suitable.
3. When I purchase a wine, I'm never sure of my choice.
4. When I face a shelf of wine in a store, I always feel a bit at a loss to make my choice.

APPENDIX B (continued)

In this section, you will be presented with an occasion for which you must select a fictitious bottle of wine for purchase. Please read the instruction and make your wine bottle selection based on if you were actually confronted with the situation stated. [Note: the typefaces used were derived from the pretest and the placement of the bottles (left or right) was randomized.]

[Participants were randomly provided with one of the following four scenarios.]

[Scenario #1: Which of the two bottles shown above would you purchase if you were purchasing wine for personal home consumption alone?]

[Scenario #2: Which of the two bottles shown above would you purchase if you were purchasing wine as a gift?]

[Scenario #3: Which of the two bottles shown above would you purchase if you were purchasing wine for a dinner party away from home with friends/family?]

[Scenario #4: Which of the two bottles shown above would you purchase if you were purchasing wine for a dinner party away from home with a business associate/boss?]

APPENDIX B (continued)



5. [A selection button was placed underneath each bottle to allow the participants to select either the wine on the left or the wine on the right.]

APPENDIX B (continued)

6. For the wine bottle you selected in the prior question, rate the appropriateness of the label's typeface on a scale from 0 (entirely inappropriate) to 100 (entirely appropriate). [A slide bar was inserted for the participant to record their score.]

7. Select—from the list below—the wine purchase occasion you were presented with earlier in this survey when you were asked to choose between two wine bottles.
 - a. Purchasing wine for personal home consumption alone
 - b. Purchasing wine as a gift
 - c. Purchasing wine for a dinner party away from home with family/friends
 - d. Purchasing wine for a dinner party away from home with a business associate/boss

For the wine bottle you selected previously, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = “I completely disagree” and 7 = “I completely agree.”

8. This brand makes a sincere impression.
9. This brand makes a credible impression.
10. This brand makes a trustworthy impression.

APPENDIX B (continued)

The section that follows will collect some information on your wine purchasing and consumption habits as well as some demographic information.

For each of the wine varieties listed below, please indicate your preference based on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 = least preferred and 7 = most preferred.

11. Red

12. White

13. Sparkling

14. Rose

[Page break inserted.]

15. Indicate the price you typically pay for a bottle of wine you purchase.

- (a) Under \$8.00
- (b) \$8.00 - \$24.99
- (c) \$25.00 - \$41.99
- (d) \$42.0 - \$58.99
- (e) \$59.00 - \$75.99
- (f) \$76.00 or more

[Page break inserted.]

16. When was the last time you purchased or consumed wine?

- (a) Within the last week
- (b) Within the last month
- (c) Within the last three months
- (d) Within the last six months
- (e) Within the last year
- (f) More than one year ago
- (g) I do not purchase or consume wine

APPENDIX B (continued)

17. How many years have you been drinking wine?

- (a) Less than 1 year
- (b) 1-4 years
- (c) 5-9 years
- (d) 10-14 years
- (e) 15 or more years

[Page break inserted.]

18. Which category below includes your age?

- (a) 20 years old or younger
- (b) 21-29 years old
- (c) 30-39 years old
- (d) 40-49 years old
- (e) 50-59 years old
- (f) 60-69 years old
- (g) 70 years old or older

[Page break inserted.]

19. What is your gender?

- (a) Female
- (b) Male
- (c) Other

[Page break inserted.]

20. Which one of the selections below best describes your ethnicity?

- (a) African-American (non-Hispanic)
- (b) Asian/Pacific Islander
- (c) Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
- (d) Latino or Hispanic
- (e) Native American
- (f) Other

APPENDIX B (continued)

21. Which category below includes your annual household income?

- (a) Less than \$20,000
- (b) \$20,000 - \$34,999
- (c) \$35,000 - \$49,999
- (d) \$50,000 - \$74,999
- (e) \$75,000 - \$99,999
- (f) \$100,000 - \$125,000
- (g) More than \$125,000

[Page break inserted.]

22. Which category below represents the highest level of education you have completed?

- (a) Less than a high school diploma
- (b) High school diploma or equivalent
- (c) Some college, no degree
- (d) Associate degree
- (e) Bachelor's degree
- (f) Master's degree
- (g) Doctorate

[Page break inserted.]

23. In which U.S. state do you currently reside? [Choices were provided via a drop-down menu.]