1 Introduction

The interactive relationship between food and beverages has been a topic growing in interest and variety over the past decade. Food and wine pairing has a long history but much of defined match relationships are based on regional pairings, anecdotal evidence and expert opinions (Harrington et al., 2010; Pettigrew & Charters, 2006). These relationships provide an interesting and under-researched area for study whether this research considers the food and wine combinations or the relationship between education and hedonic or intensity ratings. In comparison to general food and wine research, research on the impact of food and wine education has been even more limited. Most studies to date have focused on wine education in general rather than the study of the impact on food and wine appreciation or hedonic perceptions (Taylor, Barber & Deale, 2012; Taylor, Dodd & Barber, 2008).

The purpose of the current study is to assess the differences in hedonic rating for and wine combinations using two wines and two food items. Further, it investigates the impact of food and wine education on perception of match (hedonic ratings) and intensity ratings of wine elements.

2 Background

While food and wine pairing “rules” and suggestions are abundant in popular literature, only a small amount of empirical studies have been published in peer-reviewed journals on the subject of food and wine pairing (Harrington et al., 2010; Harrington & Hammond, 2006; Nygren et al., 2001; Pettigrew & Charters, 2006). A slightly larger number of wine and cheese pairing studies have been conducted (Bastian et al., 2009, 2010; Harrington & Hammond, 2005; King & Clifford, 2005; Madrigal-Galan & Heymann, 2006; Nygren et al., 2002, 2003a, 2003b). Studies on the impact of food and wine education have been even more limited. Most research to date has focused on wine education in general rather than the study of the impact on food and wine appreciation or match perceptions (Taylor et al. 2008).

2.1 Wine evaluation

Many studies have been completed considering wine composition and wine sensory characteristics. To produce quality wines that are accepted by consumers, wine producers must consider wine color, flavor, beneficial attributes (such as antioxidants) and other desirable sensory qualities. While sensory evaluation in wine research has become more common, most
studies utilize trained panels due to the cost required for a larger sample size and a more objective measurement (Dooley, Threlfall, Meullenet, & Howard, 2012).

For consumer wine evaluation purposes and general wine ratings, evaluators consider a variety of aspects including appearance, aroma and bouquet, taste, texture, aftertaste and overall impression (American Wine Society, 2013). In other words, wine evaluation is done using a systematic approach assessing its appearance, smell, taste and overall characteristics to determine overall quality, estimated age, growing climate/location, complexity and acceptability to wine consumers (Gibson, 2010). From a sensory standpoint, research on identifiable wine characteristics thought to impact the relationship with food include the key elements of taste components, texture elements and flavors regardless of wine type (i.e. white, red, rose, sparkling, fortified or specialty). Wine taste components include four main elements (acidity, residual sugar content, bitterness and the presence and amount of effervescence); wine texture elements include three main elements (stringency, alcohol level, and overall mouthfeel); and flavor elements include retro-nasal smells (differentiated by type), intensity level and persistency of flavor (Harrington, 2008).

While much has been written and studied in regards to wine and its characteristics, little research has been done to assess the impact of wine characteristics when consumed with food and the role of training or education on these relationships.

2.2 Food and wine

Food and drink pairing has grown in popularity over the last decade in restaurants, books, magazines, blogs and television. The classic beverage to pair with food is wine with numerous books on the topic. These provide numerous rules-of-thumb for food and wine pairing suggestions (Dornenburg, Page & Sofronski, 2006; Goldstein, 2010). A longstanding rule-of-thumb is the old adage of 'red wine with meat, white wine with fish' but other relationships should be taken into consideration to address the numerous factors influencing a food and wine match such as type of cuisine, food characteristics and wine style (Harrington, 2008; Immer, 2002).

While food and wine pairing is a popular topic in the general press, a very limited amount of research on food and wine pairing has been published to determine relationships empirically as well as the cause and effect relationships between a particular food and wine. Hence, questions remain on a scientific basis regarding expert opinions for classic matches of food and wine. For example, is the classic match between Champagne and caviar driven by the effervescence and acidity levels in the wine? Or, just a psychological connection between the perceived luxury and these to items? Further, an empirical question remains on whether these match sensations are driven by socialization and training of individuals or if there is an innate sense that this example or other classic food and wine go together - regardless of training or background. Therefore, further empirical study is needed to assess whether a strong sensation of match exists in traditional food and wine matches for consumers, the cause and effect elements in wine driving this sensation, and if training or experience impacts perceptions of match.

Categorizing key food and wine elements into components, textures, flavors can simplify the thought process of determining what drives a successful or unsuccessful food and wine match (Harrington, 2008). Experts disagree on which elements are most important in determining a match; Harrington (2008) suggests that taste components represent foundation elements that impact a match, while Rosengarten and Wesson (1989) indicate taste components matter most in food and wine pairing. Taste components correspond to the basic sense perceptions of sweet, salty, bitter and sour on the tongue. These sensations supply the initial impression for food and wine evaluation. But, little empirical research has been completed to substantiate the importance in the food and wine relationship.

Immer (2002) and Simon (1996) found that in their experiences that body style/weight is the most important element that determines the best food and wine marriages. This belief was supported in an empirical study by Harrington and Hammond (2006) indicating that full bodied foods were perceived as better matches with full bodied foods and light bodied wines were perceived as better matches with light bodied foods. Body style or weight has also been described as texture in both food and wine. This is primarily mouthfeel and can be perceived in every corner of the mouth (Harrington, 2008).

The third key element in food and wine pairing are flavors, which are experienced through an interaction of the nose and when on the palate via retro-nasal smells. Flavors give food and wine their distinct aromas and retro-nasal characteristics. A limited amount of research has been completed looking at the interaction between food and wine flavors. Nygren and colleagues (2001; 2002; 2003a; 2003b) completed several studies considering the interacting effects between food and wine flavor perceptions. Nygren et al. (2001) found the effect of hollandaise sauce on wine flavor was greater than the effect of wine on sauce flavor, although the
relationship of the sauce on the wine flavor was non-significant. Nygren et al. (2002) looked at the tasting sequence impact (white wine - blue cheese - white wine) on sensory perceptions of white wine; the findings indicated that wine sourness decreased but wine sweetness level remained the same. Using a cheese-wine-cheese sequence, Nygren et al. (2003a) found that wine flavors of butter and wooly and cheese tastes of saltiness and sourness declined. In a third study, the researchers used a mixed tasting approach (tasting the wine and cheese together); again, Nygren et al. (2003b) evaluated white wines and blue mold cheeses, finding that wine flavor and taste intensified but cheese flavor and taste elements decreased. The Nygren et al. (2003b) study indicated that using a mixed approach in wine and cheese research would be most appropriate as this technique resembles how people normally eat. Finally, Madrigal-Galan and Heymann (2006) evaluated the impact of red wine on flavor perceptions of certain cheeses. The overall finding indicated that tasting cheese prior to the evaluation of wine decreased the perception of several wine attributes (astringency, oak, berry flavor and aroma), but butter flavor in red wine did not decrease. This research aligned with Nygren et al. (2001) research indicating a mixture of effects on flavor perceptions with some attributes becoming suppressed and others enhanced.

Several classic matches between food and wine are apparent in the literature and industry nomenclature. These proposed marriages include pairing grilled fish and sauvignon blanc, lobster and a buttery chardonnay, Stilton and vintage Port, Chablis and oysters, or steak and cabernet sauvignon (Harrington, 2008). The scant empirical studies completed to date provide some support for the recommended pairings of industry experts. Bastian et al. (2009) studied consumers’ evaluations of ideal cheese and wine pairings recommended by experts. Using a mixed tasting sequence, the majority of pairs suggested by experts were also rated highly by the consumers. Harrington et al. (2010) evaluated the impact of the addition of specific food items or elements added to expert wine and cheese pairing suggestions. While the study found substantial differences in perceptions across participants, the expert wine and cheese pairings where highly rated with the additional food items increasing the overall sensation of the wine and cheese match.

A review of the small number of food and wine studies reveal that regardless of the tasting method (mixed, sequential or both) the combination of wine and food can bring about not only attribute suppression but also enhancement. Also, there appears to be a high level of variance for intensity perceptions in food elements, wine elements and perceived level of match among participants in all studies. This overall finding highlights the role of individual differences such as between subject taste preferences and food and wine expertise.

### 2.3 Wine education

Consumer education has long been suggested as a method to improve marketplace efficiency and improve consumer skills for using information to make purchase decisions (Sproles, Geistfeld & Badenhop, 1978). Researchers studying wine education for both consumers and industry professionals suggest that education and socialization is needed for the wine market as a whole to develop and prosper in the 21st century (Taylor, 2009). Prior research in marketing indicates that many times individuals can be overconfident in their knowledge which impacts their decision-making. The research stream also suggests the concept of knowledge can be divided into three main types: objective knowledge, subjective knowledge (Taylor, Dodd & Barber, 2008) and prior experience (Dodd, Laverie, Wilcox & Duhan, 2005).

Taylor, Dodd and Barber (2008) completed an exploratory study on the impact of wine education on developing wine knowledge and preferences. The study evaluated the impact of an introductory wine appreciation course on objective knowledge, subjective knowledge and wine preferences. The study found that, while objective knowledge increased, subjective knowledge levels ("what participants believe they know") did not change (p. 193). Further, while an anticipated change in participants’ preferences for particular wine styles did not change significantly (i.e. preferences for white, red or blush wines), the participants’ rankings of the wine changed significantly; specifically, the participants’ perception of wine samples’ overall quality decreased with a more educated wine palate.

In a study of 256 consumers completing a wine course, Taylor et al. (2012) used a pre- and post-test methodology to assess changes in wine purchasing decisions, wine knowledge confidence and sources used when making wine selections. Findings indicated that consumer education led to increased concerns for wine quality and style, changes in wine producing region preferences, as well as greater concern for wine flavor, aroma, how it pairs with food and the country of origin. Further, participants were less likely to base purchases on price alone and less reliant on critics or the Internet as key sources of decision-making information.

Prior experience and knowledge has also been a topic for consideration in wine evaluation or evaluators for research purposes (Gawel, 1997; Lawless, 1984). Research has highlighted some performance differences between experts and novices in sensory study environments. The
literature reveals that the main difference between wine experts and novice consumers has been the quality of the vocabulary used to describe food and wine elements (Chollet & Valentin, 2001; Gwel, 1997; Lawless, 1984; Solomon, 1990).

The majority of recent food and wine studies conducted have used expert or trained sensory panels (Harrington & Hammond, 2005, 2006; Harrington et al., 2010; King & Cliff, 2005; Madrigal-Galan & Heymann, 2006; Nygren et al., 2001; Nygren et al., 2002, 2003a, 2003b) and few studies used novices to study preferences for food and wine combinations (Bastian et al., 2009, 2010). This dearth of research based on knowledge, experience and training level leaves the question of the impact of education on food and wine preferences an unresolved area of inquiry.

While substantial research has been completed considering wine characteristics and sensory attributes, little more than anecdotal evidence has been provided to support cause-and-effect relationships of perceived food and wine matches for traditional food and wine combinations proposed as superior marriages. Empirical study is needed to determine drivers of food and wine matches that exist to assist in guiding food and wine industry professionals to make better recommendations as well as to enhance consumer knowledge and decision-making. Further, research exploring the relationship between education and training on match perceptions and wine or food evaluation is lacking in the literature. This area is important for the development of the wine industry marketplace and to ensure efficient and effective education processes resulting in the largest impact to both industry professionals and consumers.

The research questions of the current study are as follows. First, when classic food and wine marriages are compared to non-marriages, is the hedonic relationship higher across a diverse group of individuals (based on differing levels of experience and education)? Second, does education on food and wine impact hedonic ratings of food and wine match? And, does completion of a 16 week food and wine education program impact intensity ratings for key wine elements such as tannin, sweetness level and acidity level?

3 Methodology

To test the research questions of this study, the researchers used purposeful selection to create two comparable groups. Both groups were junior and senior-level students at a large midwestern U.S. university. Class Group consisted of students enrolled in a 16-week food and wine university course. Non-class Group consisted of student volunteers that were not enrolled and had not taken the 16-week food and wine university course. Thirty-two (23 females and 9 males) students with an age range between 21 and 33 years (mean age ± standard deviation = 23 ± 3 years) participated in this experiment.

All participants confirmed that they had no clinical history of major disease and no impairment in smell and taste perceptions. Participants were also asked to provide information on 1) whether or not they drink wine, 2) wine consumption frequency, and 3) liking levels for red, white and rosé wines. To assess whether the two groups were comparable on wine knowledge and interest, independent t-tests were run to test for significant differences between groups. Statistical tests between groups (class vs. non-class participants) found no significant differences for wine consumption frequency, age, gender ratio, or wine liking levels (P > 0.05). The responses to these questions also demonstrated the diversity of wine and food background, wine consumption patterns, interest in wine, and wine type preferences within each group. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for participant characteristics.

For the tasting sessions, the researchers selected two wines and two food items that are likely to create two good matches and two mismatches. The two wines included Ruby Port (RP) and Sauvignon Blanc (SB); the two food items included dark chocolate and goat cheese. Table 2 provides details on the wines and foods used for this study.

Ruby Port combined with dark chocolate and Sauvignon Blanc combined with goat cheese are thought to be classic marriages in food and wine. Conversely, the Ruby Port with goat cheese and Sauvignon Blanc with dark chocolate should be perceived as significant mismatches based on conflicting taste elements of sweetness level and acidity level as well as texture conflicts when consumed together (Harrington, 2008).

The survey utilized a Likert-type 9-point scale (e.g., 1 = extremely weak, 5 = neither weak nor strong, 9 = extremely strong) to assess perceived intensities of wine flavor, sweetness, dryness, sourness, and tannin level, as well as hedonic responses of the wine, food, and food and wine combinations (e.g., 1 = dislike extremely, 5 = neither like nor dislike, 9 = like extremely).

Data analysis was performed using SPSS 20.0 for Windows™ (IBM SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, U.S.A.). To investigate the effects of “wine item”, “food item”, and “test session (1st and 2nd)” on the ratings of sensory intensity and hedonic response, 3-way repeated measures analyses of variance (RM-ANOVAs) were used. If a significant difference of means was determined by RM-ANOVAs, post hoc comparisons between independent variables were performed using
4 Results
4.1 Sensory attribute and hedonic response for wine and food items

4.11 Class group

There was no significant difference in the intensity ratings of sensory attributes, except for tannin level, between the first and second tests ($P > 0.05$). Tannin level of wine items was rated significantly higher in the first session than in the second session ($F(1, 12) = 4.95, P = 0.046$).

Intensity ratings of wine flavor [$F(1, 12) = 20.28, P = 0.001$], sweetness [$F(1, 12) = 11.20, P = 0.006$], and tannin level [$F(1, 12) = 7.82, P = 0.02$] were significantly different between two wine items. For example, participants rated Ruby Port wine significantly more intense in terms of wine flavor, sweetness, and tannin level than Sauvignon Blanc wine. No significant differences between wine items were observed in dryness, sourness, and wine liking ($P > 0.05$).

There was no significant difference in the hedonic responses between two wine items ($P > 0.05$), as well as between two food items ($P > 0.05$).

For the tannin level, significant interactions were obtained between “test session” (i.e. between before and after education) and “wine item” [$F(1, 12) = 14.46, P = 0.003$]. As shown in Fig. 1, participants were more able to differentiate the tannin level between Ruby Port and Sauvignon Blanc wines in the second session (after education) more clearly than in the first session (before education) ($P < 0.001$). For the other ratings of sensory intensity and hedonic response of wine or food items, there were no significant interactions between “test session” and “wine item” ($P > 0.05$), between “test session” and “food item” ($P > 0.05$), and between “wine item” and “food item” ($P > 0.05$).

4.12 Non-class group

There was no significant difference in the intensity ratings of sensory attributes between the first and second test sessions ($P > 0.05$).

Intensity ratings of wine flavor [$F(1, 18) = 24.17, P < 0.001$], sweetness [$F(1, 18) = 32.99, P < 0.001$], and dryness [$F(1, 18) = 6.94, P = 0.02$] were significantly different between two wine items. For example, participants evaluated Ruby Port wine, in comparison to Sauvignon Blanc wine, significantly more intense in terms of wine flavor and sweetness. However, dryness was rated significantly more intense in Sauvignon Blanc wine than in Ruby Port wine.

The hedonic ratings were significantly different between two food items [$F(1, 18) = 5.88, P = 0.03$], but not between wine items ($P > 0.05$). That is, participants liked chocolate more than goat cheese.

For the ratings of sensory intensity and hedonic response of wine or food items, there were no significant interactions between “test session” and “wine item” ($P > 0.05$), between “test session” and “food item” ($P > 0.05$), and between “wine item” and “food item” ($P > 0.05$).

4.2 Matching pair of wine and food items

4.21 Class group

There was a significant interaction between wine and food items for matching pair of wine and food items [$F(1, 12) = 5.37, P = 0.039$]. Fig. 2 shows that participants matched Ruby Port wine with chocolate more strongly than with goat cheese, whereas they paired Sauvignon Blanc wine with goat cheese more strongly. This result was consistently obtained between the first and second test sessions.

4.22 Non-class group

There was a significant interaction between wine and food items for matching pair of wine and food items [$F(1, 18) = 6.99, P = 0.02$]. As like in Class group, participants matched Ruby Port wine with chocolate more strongly than with goat cheese, whereas they paired Sauvignon Blanc wine with goat cheese more (Fig. 2). This result was consistently observed between the first and second test sessions.

5 Discussion and Conclusions

The study demonstrated strong match differences among wine and food pairings. Specifically, these hedonic differences were consistent with earlier articulated expectations based on traditional rules and anecdotal evidence. More importantly is that this finding was consistent across groups and test repetition; this demonstrates the strength of these relationships for both novice and more expert consumers. There were two significant differences apparent for education effects. First, the study demonstrated wine element intensity rating effects with participants in the education treatment able to more accurately assess presence and levels of tannin in the wines in this study when compared to the non-education treatment group and to the education treatment pre-test. Second, the class group also rated the sauvignon blanc and goat cheese match higher in the post-education period. This finding indicates some learning effects of food and wine matching; it remains a question on whether this learned relationship is primarily
based on greater familiarity with these food/wine items and the combination or a socialization effect.

5.1 Implications and future research

The first implication from this study relates to wine evaluation and intensity ratings. Regardless of treatment group (class or non-class), the participants were able to consistently identify the key wine components of sweetness, dryness and sourness in the table wine and fortified wine used in this study. Therefore, regardless of training or education, it appears consumers should be able to identify intensity of these basic wine characteristics. But, this does not appear to be the case for the wine characteristics of tannin and astringency. Education and training appears to be an important mechanism for consumers to be able to identify tannin and astringency in wine or at least to be able to articulate this feeling and its intensity. This finding supports the value of systematic wine training for increasing appreciation of wine and, ultimately, wine purchasing decisions.

The study also supported the notion that many food and wine combinations have characteristics that create a sensation of match and mismatch for consumers regardless of training or education. In general, the two match examples used in this study were very straightforward and low complexity. But, as shown in the study, the hedonic relationship between sauvignon blanc and goat cheese increased with familiarity and knowledge. Sauvignon blanc is a dry white wine with tart and herbaceous characteristics; goat cheese is frequently perceived as tangy and pungent (Immer, 2002). These characteristics are likely to require more familiarity and experience to appreciate the flavor profiles of each independently and with consumed together. Therefore, this finding supports the importance of food and wine experience as a contributor to appreciation of lesser known styles of wine or food items (e.g., Taylor et al., 2008). An implication for restaurants wanting to add value for consumers by creating food and wine marriages is that consumer prior experience is an important consideration, and the education process is something that can happen in real-time for the consumer. To facilitate the appropriateness of this process based on individual differences in experience and knowledge, wine staff trained to identify interest and experience levels in consumers can be an effective tool for co-creating a food and wine pairing experience.

For less experienced consumers, the wine staff may start them out with less complex pairing such as the ones used in this study (such as sauvignon blanc and goat cheese as an amuse bouche or Port and chocolate to enhance sales and interest in dessert wines). For more experienced consumers, more complex experiences can be co-created. The concept of co-creation is based on the notion of service-dominant logic rather than a more traditional product-dominant logic. A core element of co-creation is that it integrates a continuous dialogue with the customer (before, during and after the service) as well as the primary value to the customer being driven by the experience or process of the service delivery rather than the product itself (Chatworth, et al. 2013). Thus, this concept of service and the resulting value to the consumer seems very appropriate for wine service in restaurants and wine shops as well as food and wine pairing interactions.

The lack of statistical significance for many of the relationships may be a function of the lack of power in the tests and small sample size. Future research should extent this research using a larger sample and additional wine and food combinations. Specifically, future research should assess more complex relationships such as complex food dishes and elements in food and wine that are likely drivers of a match or mismatch (i.e. the impact of aroma, fattiness in food and the relationship with tannin, etc.). This research stream would also benefit from a greater understanding of participant characteristics on perceptions of match or mismatch. For example, if the food and wine combination is perceived as a match or mismatch, is this driven primarily by the participant liking level of the individual food or wine? Or, are there other key drivers of match perception for consumers? Further studies should also consider the impact of training or education on the ability to 1) predict match or mismatch levels for food and wine combinations, 2) articulate the impact of various food and wine elements on match perceptions, and 3) predict food matches based on key element with a variety of beverages (beer, tea, coffee, soda, etc.).
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Table 1. Wine interest and knowledge of between groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Class group</th>
<th>Non-class group</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you a wine drinker? (no/yes)</td>
<td>19%/81%</td>
<td>13%/87%</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you consume red wine? (never to daily)</td>
<td>2.76 (2.19)</td>
<td>2.30 (1.66)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you like or dislike red wine? 1= dislike extremely, 9= like extremely</td>
<td>6.24 (2.39)</td>
<td>6.61 (1.80)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you consume white wine? (never to daily)</td>
<td>3.05 (2.01)</td>
<td>2.30 (1.36)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you like or dislike white wine? 1= dislike extremely, 9= like extremely</td>
<td>7.19 (1.29)</td>
<td>7.30 (1.11)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you consume rosé wine? (never to daily)</td>
<td>1.33 (1.56)</td>
<td>.87 (1.01)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you like or dislike rosé wine? 1= dislike extremely, 9= like extremely</td>
<td>6.19 (1.37)</td>
<td>5.87 (1.22)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How strong is your interest in wine? 1= extremely low, 9= extremely high</td>
<td>7.29 (1.35)</td>
<td>6.91 (1.35)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much background knowledge or experience do you have with wine? 1= extremely low, 9= extremely high</td>
<td>4.43 (1.91)</td>
<td>4.52 (1.53)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine and desert pairing knowledge? 1= extremely low, 9= extremely high</td>
<td>3.67 (1.93)</td>
<td>3.48 (1.86)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of dessert served with wine? 1= extremely unimportant, 9= extremely important</td>
<td>6.67 (1.62)</td>
<td>5.83 (1.40)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you drink wine with dessert? 1= not at all, 5= every time</td>
<td>2.14 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.26 (.86)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (male/female)</td>
<td>38%/62%</td>
<td>26%/74%</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23.24 (2.51)</td>
<td>22.91 (3.01)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Description of wines and food items used in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Brand/Producer</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Retail Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sauvignon Blanc</td>
<td>4 Bears/Sean Minor</td>
<td>Sonoma County, CA</td>
<td>Alcohol: 13.5% pH: 3.22 Ta: .67/100 ml Aromas of ruby grapefruit, citrus and tropical fruit. Crisp with flavors of fresh melon and lime.</td>
<td>$14.00 US for 750 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Port</td>
<td>Cockburn</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Alcohol: 20% Fortified wine with sweet raisiny, prune and blackberry notes.</td>
<td>$15.00 US for 750 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>Laura Chenel Select goat’s milk cheese</td>
<td>Sonoma County, CA, Purchased at Sam’s Club</td>
<td>Creamy and tangy with smooth texture</td>
<td>$6.97 US for 16oz log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Ghirardelli</td>
<td>Intense dark bars with 72% cacao</td>
<td>Unsweetened chocolate, sugar, cocoa butter, vanilla, soy lecithin</td>
<td>$4.35 US for 100 grams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>