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Executive summary

The term challenger brand shows up more and more in the marketing world. These are brands that are not the number one in their category and try to gain market share by acting on a certain challenge. This challenge is embodied by breaking the conventions of the category they are in. The lack of resources that challenger brands characterize makes that packaging is an important medium. For challenger brands, packaging design can be their only asset through which they can advertise.

Packaging consultancy CARTILS has been experiencing a new wave of brands that are not established in the market and need to find a way into the category. It is found that their current packaging design tools do not apply to the development of packaging for this type of brands. This thesis will therefore focuses on developing guidelines for the successful development of challenger brand packaging.

From literature research and the analysis of existing challenger brands, it is found that challenger brands need to evoke attention. Differentiating their packaging design can draw this attention. Many researches on differentiation and categorization conclude that moderate packaging deviations will give the best result in the trade off between drawing attention and avoiding negative evaluations (Schoormans & Robben, 1997; Blijlevens et al., 2012). However, from the analysis of existing challenger brands across several product categories, the packaging of the brands clearly show high levels of differentiation. This would mean that challenger brands are an exception to this ‘moderate deviation rule’.

Next to inducing attention it was found that the packaging design should invite the consumer to gain insights about the brand and find out whether they share values. Challenger brand packaging should be able to express their identity and tell their brand story, but also persuade their target group that their product is for them. This persuasion can only be done when a possible target customer is triggered to gain more insights and explore their shared values. Eventually the challenger brand should find a way to enter social conversation, and let their consumer perform word-of-mouth advertisement. It is through social conversation that challenger brands can reach their audience and find their way into the category.

Research is set up to examine the influence of differentiation and brand story elements on product evaluation when dealing with a challenger brand. Although prior research has found that higher levels of differentiation will lead to a negative product evaluation, it is proposed that high levels of differentiation in combination with brand story elements will lead to a positive evaluation. It is also proposed that high levels of differentiation in combination with brand story elements will lead to a want for more information and increase of word-of-mouth advertisement.

For two spirit categories, whisky and vodka, a challenger brand story was developed including all necessary challenger ingredients according to literature analysis. For both categories, six packaging designs were systematically designed: a low-, medium- and highly differentiated design, all three with- and without visual brand story elements. The visual brand story elements were developed to tell the challenger brand story as clear as possible.

An experimental context (n=147) was used to test how consumers respond to the different levels of differentiation for both packaging designs with- and without brand story elements. After a follow-up test, findings show that high levels of differentiation increase the attention induced by the packaging, and do not have a negative result on the product evaluation. Brand story elements were found to have a positive influence on the evaluation of the highly differentiated packaging designs. For highly differentiated designs it was also found that brand story elements increased the want for information by the respondent, as did it increase the likeliness of word-of-mouth advertisement.

The findings from the performed studies provide reasons for packaging designers to design a highly differentiated design and to explicitly tell the brand story through brand story elements. This will give challenger brands the opportunity to express their
identity; through their packaging but also because consumers will search for more information about the brand. Finally the brand will enter social conversation, since word-of-mouth advertising is more likely.

From the analysis of literature, of existing challenger brands and the conclusions from the studies performed during this project, the Challenger Diamond packaging guidelines are developed. The Challenger Diamond consists of three elements; ‘express your identity’, ‘be different’ and ‘be single-minded’.

· ‘Express your identity’ is the umbrella guideline. Their brand story should be expressed by brand story elements in order to express their identity; their values and their passion.

· ‘Be different’ provides systematic design steps in order to decide which category codes should be pursued and which category codes should be discarded in order to develop a highly differentiated packaging design.

· ‘Be single-minded’ emphasizes the importance of focusing on the specific target audience of the challenger brand.

These three elements together form the base for developing packaging design for challenger brands. When each of these aspects is taken into account properly, a strong base can be set for the development of the challenger brand packaging design.

This thesis is concluded with a short case study, in which the design guidelines were applied for the development of a packaging design for a fictitious challenger brand. Through a small qualitative research the packaging, and thereby the success of the Challenger Diamond is confirmed.
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1. The Project

This chapter introduces the assignee CARTILS, explains their line of work and the design tools they use for packaging design. The assignment is explained, as is the reason why CARTILS has set up this assignment.

1.1 The assignee
1.2 The assignment
1.1 The assignee

CARTILS was founded in 1960 by Dominique P.G. Claessens, under the name Claessens Product Consultants. They were one of the world’s first branding and packaging design consultants.

CARTILS is based in Hilversum, London, Miami and Hong Kong. They advise companies worldwide in the areas of 2D and 3D packaging design, new product development, brand strategy, limited editions and corporate identities in the Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) sector. Within the FMCG sector, CARTILS focuses on alcoholic drinks, non-alcoholic drinks and tobacco.

CARTILS employs over eighty people including specialists in branding, strategy, design, 3D design, an in-house artwork studio, printing facilities and model makers. The staff comes from a variety of backgrounds and has international experience.

Over the last 54 years they have been providing independent, expert advice with the focus on the development of brand packaging, corporate identities and brand personalities for brands such as Grolsch, Pellegrino, Ketel 1, La Paz and Pall Mall.

1.1.1 Design tools for packaging design

Over the years, CARTILS has developed several design tools to develop their packaging. They structure their work in three different sections:

- Redesigns
- Limited editions
- Line extensions and new brand developments

For all of these sections a different tool exists. These tools are all developed by CARTILS and built on their experience in packaging design. This chapter will explain each of the design tools.

**Redesigns: CARTILS|BrandStar**

The CARTILS BrandStar is a packaging evaluation method. This method is used for the redesign of existing packages. The current packaging is tested on five different aspects that serve two functions: be seen (is the brand visible?) and be understood (does the brand message come across?). From these five aspects a clear overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the design is provided. Based on this overview, a design strategy is formulated which is passed on to the designer who on its turn will create relevant design solutions. The visual representation of the BrandStar tool can be seen in Figure 1.

**Limited editions: CARTILS|Trinity**

The trinity design tool is developed for designing limited editions. These limited editions are introduced by brands to create attention and surprise consumers. In order to create a strong limited packaging design, CARTILS found three pillars that form the foundation: brand recognition, brand story and brand inspiration.

The conclusion of these three pillars creates a credible and reliable character for the limited edition, with a fit to the context of the brand. This all is connected to a theme that should appeal to the target audience and be able to generate greediness. The visual representation of the Trinity tool can be seen in Figure 2.

**Line extensions and new brand developments: CARTILS|Ignite**

The Ignite tool is an objective and structural tool for a new brand development or line extension. This method builds on the needs, wants and preferences of the target audience. It establishes a unique brand story and a visual brand language. This tool consists of three pillars: target audience, product promise and brand promise.

The conclusion of these three pillars results in a type of design language that appeals to the target audience and the level of similarity and differentiation that needs to be reflected in the design in terms of the parent brand and the category. Up until now no visual representation of the Ignite tool exists.
Figure 1 | The BrandStar analysis tool (source: CARTILS)

Figure 2 | The trinity tool (source: CARTILS)
1.2 The assignment

CARTILS has been experiencing a new wave of brands that are not established in the market and need to find a way into the category. These challenger brands ask for a different way of designing product packaging, since following the category codes and its unwritten rules will not differentiate them enough in order to draw attention and, eventually, gain market share. Evaluating the existing tools CARTILS uses, it is found that these do not apply to the development of packaging for challenger brands.

The BrandStar analysis, being an evaluation method for input on a redesign, does not provide insights in creating a packaging for a new brand or product. The Trinity tool is a tool for designing a limited edition based on an existing product packaging design. While this tool has a focus on creating an eye-catching design that is different than its competitors the Trinity tool is only focused on temporary sales. Second, this tool always relates back to the parent brand and existing products and is therefore not fitting for challenger brands.

The Ignite tool could be used when developing packaging for challenger brands. However the tool focuses on designing a new packaging that stands out in the corresponding category but still follows the unwritten rules within that category. Meaning this tool will not result in a packaging that has enough differentiation.

Concluding, the existing design tools do not fit the development of packaging for challenger brands. Based upon its extensive knowledge and experience, CARTILS creates brand presentations for this type of brands. This seems to be effective, but gaining knowledge on the essence of challenger brands’ dynamics would enable the agency to formulate a substantiated method to provide guidance through the design process.

This is why for this master thesis a design tool will be developed for creating packaging design for challenger brands. This tool will be developed as a set of guidelines or design aspects that need to be taken into account when designing packaging for a challenger brand product. This tool will fit next to the other tools used by CARTILS for different packaging design projects.

“Develop a tool that is applicable in the assistance of creating product packaging design for challenger brands.”
2. Challenger brand analysis

The analysis chapter starts off by defining the term ‘challenger brand’. Literature review on this subject, as well for packaging design itself is done. Followed by an analysis of existing challenger brands, the different brands are discussed on several aspects.

2.1 Defining challenger brands
2.2 Analysis challenger brands
2.1 Defining challenger brands

The term challenger brand shows up more and more in the marketing world. However, still limited research exists into challenger brands and their products. This chapter provides a literature study on the term ‘challenger brand’ and the different aspects of packaging design.

2.1.1 Challenger brands

“Challenger brands can be described as exciting, visionary, maverick, unconventional, boundary pushing and trend setting” (Chernatony & Cottam, 2009).

A challenger brand is a brand that is not the number one in its product category. By breaking with one or more conventions of the product category they differentiate themselves from the market leader, surprise the consumer and trigger their imagination. By doing this, they create a new criterion for choice within the product category and confidently communicate their strong identity. With this strategy they aim to gain market share and eventually become the “thought leader” of the category: the brand everyone talks about and gets the most attention (Morgan, 2009; Kokemuller, n.d.).

According to Morgan (2009) there are three characteristics that define challenger brands:

1. State of market: They are not the number one brands in their category.
2. State of mind: Challenger brands have “Ambitions that exceed their conventional marketing resources and a preparedness to accept the marketing implications of the gap between their ambition and their marketing resource” (Morgan, 2009, p.26).
3. Rate of success: Challenger brands have had/have an important growth through their marketing actions.

Being clear about the challenge as a challenger brand shapes their brand and gives them direction. According to Morgen (2009) challenger brands can take on the following challenges:

- **Challenging some fundamental dimension or driver of the category.**

Challenger brands originate in different ways. Some are new entrants, others choose to ‘change the rules of the game’ (Haxthausen, 2004). According to Haxthausen (2004), “building a challenger brand starts with having a different view on your category – ‘a new way of segmenting the market’”(p.36). This segmentation is often built on trends that are happening outside of the category or based on consumer needs that major brands do not address. The challenger brand can develop an offering that is “new, typically in terms of the product, the positioning, the price, or any combination of those elements to address an untapped need in the marketplace” (Haxthausen, 2004).

Morgan (2009) echoes the need of having a different view on your category. He states it is important for challenger brands to differentiate themselves, by selectively breaking with one or more conventions of the category. By doing this they will draw attention and at the same time they communicate their identity; what makes you stand out from the
This differentiated position of challenger brands has the potential to beat the competition on value rather than price (Chernatony & Cottam, 2009). Morgan (2009) calls this identity the ‘Lighthouse Identity’. He explains it as a very particular take on how challenger brands see the world; they show an intense projection of who they are in everything they do, they are highly intrusive and this identity is built on a product or brand truth that is inarguable. This identity comes with a strong relationship with their consumers. “This means that success for the challenger brand comes from considering very carefully what it is going to sacrifice in order to create this relationship” (Morgan, 2009, p.156).

The greatest danger for a challenger brand is not rejection, but indifference. They need to create a strong preference for their brand. When only a weak preference for the brand is achieved, all other attributes that the market leader will have on its side will convince the consumer to choose the market leader. This strong preference can only be achieved when challenger brands bind a specific group of people strongly to them and sacrifice other target groups.

The breaks in convention that lie at the base of a challenger brands’ lighthouse identity are rarely done through desire. Most of the time challenger brands are forced to break with conventions because of their limitations. These limitations are typically of advertising budget, distribution base or just the time frame. This forced change in behavior is the aspect that intrigues and seduces the consumer. The conventions that surround any category that can be broken in order to differentiate:

- **Conventions of representation**; how the brand portrays itself and its identity.
- This can be done in terms of advertising, packaging, logo and/or name.
- **Conventions of medium**; where consumers come across the brand.
- The way the brand is delivered, physically and emotionally. It can give the same kind of message as the market leader but through an entirely different kind of medium or context.
- **Conventions of product performance**; what the product really does.

What the product does besides what it is expected to do.

- **Conventions of (product and service) experience**; what the brand offers beyond talk or technical performance.
- The experience that surrounds the product or service. Not the actual performance of the product.
- **Conventions of neighborhood and network**; who the brand works with in order to create their unique offer.
- **Conventions of relationship**; moving through the invisible barrier between the brand and their consumers (Morgan, 2009).

According to Morgan (2009) challenger brands take an initial stance, and they evolve subsequently through different stances. They do this to refresh the way they present itself to the consumer, and to discover new and fresh sources of challenge and conflict. This way they keep the relationship with the category and the consumer fresh.

Morgan (2009) states that underpinning the stances and the transitions between them: “is perhaps the key requirement for a challenger, namely, to never be seen to win” (p.238). When a challenger reaches its goal, or overcomes one struggle, it evolves its narrative and ambition and moves on to the next. “Being a challenger is, after all, in essence about a state of mind, not a state of market” (p.238).

### 2.1.2 Packaging design

“In general terms, packaging is the container that is in direct contact with the product itself, which holds, protects, preserves and identifies the product as well as facilitating handling and commercialization” (Giovannetti 1995) as cited in, Ampuero & Vila, 2006, p.101).

Following Giovannetti (1995), three types of packaging exist. The primary packaging is the packaging that is in direct contact with the product content. The secondary packaging is the pack that contains the primary package; it serves to protect the primary package and to communicate the qualities of the product. Normally this package is discarded when the product is used or consumed. The tertiary packaging contains the secondary and primary package, this packaging
serves for distribution, holding the packages together and protecting them. In for example spirits, the primary packaging is the bottle itself containing the liquid. The box in which the bottle is sold is the secondary packaging, serving to protect the bottles. The tertiary packaging is the box in which several secondary packages fit to distribute the spirit bottles.

According to Underwood (2003) packaging is a product attribute. Keller (1993) sees packaging not as a product-related attribute but as part of the consumption and purchasing process. Zeithalm (1972) recognizes packaging as both an extrinsic and intrinsic attribute. For this research the packaging of the product is be seen as an intrinsic part of the product. As in beer and spirits the primary packaging is part of the product itself. Without packaging the liquid simply cannot be sold.

According to Underwood and Klein (2002) more and more in-store decision-making take place. Because of this the potential for packaging to influence choice and to communicate to the customer has increased (Underwood & Klein, 2002; Underwood & Ozanne, 1998). As Harckham (1998) states: packaging is “the shopper’s avenue to the product” because packaging often projects the initial impression someone forms about a brand, as its quality or value. This agrees with McNeal and Ji, who emphasize that packaging often accompanies the use or consumption of products and therefore increases the possibility of transmitting brand values and product characteristics (as cited in Ampuero & Vila, 2006).

Bloch (1995) provides a model that demonstrates that product form can evoke responses. In FMCG’s the exterior form or design is often the packaging. Meaning that product form can also relate to the packaging of a product. Bloch (1995) speaks of cognitive and affective responses. Cognitive responses are beliefs about the product and brand, and responses in categorization. Affective responses are positive or negative emotions.

Crilly et al (2004) agree on this and state that objective qualities of a package such as geometry, dimensions, textures, materials, colours, graphics and details can evoke these consumer responses and, in the end, cause behavior. Meaning that designers can purposely evoke these responses and therefore influence the buying behavior of their consumers.

Cagan (2009) found that better packaging has a positive impact on product evaluation. It was found that an appealing package positively influenced the attitude towards the product. “Emotions evoked by the appealing packaging were stronger and significantly more positive than those evoked by the ordinary” (Cagan, 2009, p. 255).

Reimann et al. (2010) found that when the aesthetic attributes of a product are promoted, consumers’ involvement with a product might further elevate. Reimann et al. go on and argue, “aesthetic product packaging design may work as effective product differentiator” (2010, p. 434). They found that when a product touches a consumer on an emotional aspect, it automatically elicits an effective response. Striking is that experiments have found that customers choose an aesthetic package design with an unknown brand over a standardized package with a well-known brand, even when the aesthetic package product has a higher price (Reimann et al., 2010).

In a highly competitive market, packaging can be the factor for product differentiation (Rundh, 2009). In the study of Schoormans and Robben (1997) on the effect of new packaging design, it was found that the more a package design deviates from the existing package the more attention will be induced. Also Garber (1995) emphasizes that product appearance, and thus packaging, has an effect on consumer attention and product categorization.

It can be concluded from literature that the packaging of a product is of high influence for consumer responses and consumer behavior. It adds value to the product and is a way to differentiate the product in the competitive market. It can attract attention to one’s brand and communicate desired brand impressions.
2.1.3 Categorization and differentiation through packaging design

It is found that a product can differentiate itself through packaging design, and by doing this gain attention. This section looks into differentiation and categorization in packaging design.

Schoormans and Robben (1997) found in their research that when packaging deviation becomes too high, the evaluation of the product will decrease and at one point even become unacceptable. This has to do with categorization.

It is well known that when coming across a new product consumers perform so called; categorization. Cohen and Basu (1987) state, “categorization, in essence, involves comparison between a target and categorical knowledge” (p.456). The more a product differentiates from the category expectations, or the category stereotype, the harder it is to categorize a product. When a product's stimuli are considered consistent with expectations, assimilation will take place and the product will be placed in the coherent category. Meyers-levy and Tybout (1989) explain that when incongruity takes place there are three possible solutions: assimilation (placing it in a known another category), sub typing (creating a subcategory within a known category) and activation of an alternate schema (finding a different category for the product). If a design shows a high level of discrepancy with the stereotype, it may be interpreted as exhibiting novelty. When a product has a high level of discrepancy a new category can be formed, or in the worst case the product is unacceptable to the consumer and will be discarded.

Both typicality and novelty have an influence on forming an impression of a product. Novelty arouses the consumer by presenting something new, and typicality helps the consumer to categorize the product and understanding it (Coates, 2003). In several studies it was found that consumers prefer those products that are most typical for a product category (Loken and Ward, 1990; Barnes and Ward, 1995; Schoormans and Robben, 1997). This is the case when consumers are not motivated to compare brands. Another explanation can be that a more typical product is better known (Loken and Ward, 1990).

Though some important exceptions exist. Ward and Loken (1987) found that when consumers regard prestige, exclusiveness or novelty as important goals for purchasing products in a category there is a negative relationship between typicality and preference.

In their research on premium packaging Mugge et al (2014) conclude that in order to create special and innovative packaging, designers need to uncover the typical design cues for the category of interest and purposefully break away from these codes. However, designers need to be careful and make sure they do not go over the top with their differentiating design. They found that consumers might get the impression that the product quality is less and that the packaging design is used to cover this up. Mugge et al (2014) uncovered four design cues that communicate premiumness in packaging. They are the first in presenting design guidelines for developing packaging specifically for premium brands.

In the research of Schoormans and Robben (1997) it was confirmed that perceptual differences affect product categorization. It was found that packaging designers should make a trade-off between the ability of differentiated packaging to draw attention and avoid negative evaluations. They conclude that moderate package deviations will give the best trade-off between drawing attention and creating favorable evaluations of the product (Schoormans and Robben, 1997). Schoormans and Robben (1997) used packaging deviations based on the “typical package design in the category of ground coffee. The packages contained the main distinguishing graphical elements such as the brand name and the logo of the original packaging” (p.280). The original package was, in this case, a well-known Dutch coffee brand.

The category coding of the coffee category was taken into account from one coffee brand and shape and colour were the only aspects of the packaging that were differentiated. Indicating that this research may not be stretched to other categories that may
use other typical visual aspects for packaging. The conclusion of Schoormans and Robben (1997) that a moderate deviation should be pursued for optimal results in redesigning existing packaging leaves some questions for designers. To what extent is it possible to implement ‘moderate’ deviations, does it apply to other product categories and does it also apply for challenger brands?

When it comes to challenger brands Morgan (2009) states that it is important to enter social conversation. Partly because the lack of marketing budget they need everyone who comes across them to tell their story. Next to the lack of budget this also might have much to do with the nature of their ambition. They might want to ‘inspire debate’ on a chosen issue. Mcquarter (2012) confirms this, he states that the traditional way of advertising plays a less important role in the building of a challenger brand. Many challenger brands place more importance on integrated community strategies and ‘packvertising’ (advertising through packaging).

Collins (2013) states that packaging should be at the heart of challenger brands. Achieving increased attention through their packaging design is a must, since most of these brands lack the marketing resources compared to their category rivals. In a highly competitive marketplace they need to maximize their impact through the assets they have; their packaging.

Yael Alaton (in Mcquarter, 2012) explains that challenger brands represent the living embodiment of change. Their packaging design needs to provoke, seduce and transform.

Concluding, challenger brands are brands who are not the number one in their category, who try and obtain market share by acting on a certain challenge. This challenge is embodied by the breaking of conventions. The different view they have on their category lets them differentiate themselves and communicate their identity.

Packaging is an important medium for challenger brands, because of their lack of resources packaging can act as their advertisement. By differentiating their packaging they can communicate their identity. In research it has been found that a moderate level of differentiation is optimal for packaging design in terms of product evaluation (Schoormans and Robben, 1997). However, the question remains whether, and to what extent, challenger brands have to stick to this moderate differentiation rule. The following chapter will look into existing challenger brands to see how they deal with their packaging and degree of differentiation.
2.2 Analysis Challenger brands

This chapter contains an overview of challenger brands from different FMCG categories. These specific brands are chosen because they are mentioned in literature on challenger brands.

2.2.1 Set-up

For all the chosen challenger brands the following aspects are described:

- **Brand description**
  This part describes the brand, what products they offer, who their target audience is and how they try to challenge their competitors within the category.
- **Life cycle**
  This part will try to describe the life cycle of the brands. If any redesign in the packaging took place this is mentioned as well.
- **Competitor and packaging analysis**
  The packaging of the challengers is analysed next to the market leaders, and also next to brands that pursue the same brand values.

The full analysis of all the challenger brands can be found in Appendix 1. The following pages will show a compact overview of the challenger brands that are referred to throughout this project and will just contain the brand description.

2.2.2 Hello Products

- **Who?** A dental care brand
  Launched in 2013, Hello Products tries to change the fear and loathing that exist around dental care.
- **What?** Fun and friendly dental care products.
  Their mission is to create safe, effective and delicious oral care products that are highly natural, vegan, never tested on animals, and made in the USA. They, for example, sell grapefruit flavoured fun looking toothpaste. (See Figure 3).
- **For whom?** Millennial women who are interested in design, natural living, fashion, and beauty. These women focus on choosing products that are safe and effective for them and their families.

How do they challenge? By breaking conventions of representation.
Hello products uses their packaging to be different in their category. Their friendly approach is visible through their soft and round packaging. By differentiating themselves in their representation they radiate their lighthouse identity; being natural and friendly (Hello Products, 2015).

2.2.3 Method

- **Who?** A Cleaning products brand.
  Founded in 2001, Method wanted to change the world of toxic, smelly and ugly cleaning products hidden under the sink.
- **What?** Eco-friendly, non-toxic stylish cleaning products.
  With their motto ‘Healthy happy homes’ Method produces products that are safe for the people, their pets and the planet. Their products do not contain toxins, their bottles are all from recycled material and all are designed to look nice in your home. (See Figure 4).
- **For whom?** A predominantly female group with a focus on natural living and an eye for design.
- **What do they challenge?** The category of home cleaning products itself.
- **How do they challenge?** By breaking conventions of medium, representation and product performance.
Method used a famous product designer to
develop their packaging, resulting in a stylish product line. This is new in the home cleaning category and therefore breaks conventions of representation. Method uses several (online) campaigns to advertise what they stand for and create a community. With this they break conventions of medium, since no other cleaning products brand does this. Next to this they also offer a better product. Method cleaning products are 99% natural, therefore they are better for one’s health, house and the planet, still they clean your house properly (Method, 2015).

They are being very explicit about the people behind their brand, their product and their ambitions. This involves the consumer and creates a personal emotional connection.

2.2.4 Innocent

- **Who?** A smoothies and juices brand
  Launched in 1999, Innocent wants to make it easy for people to do themselves some good and make it taste nice too.
- **What?** Smoothies, juices and food
  With their motto ‘To help people live well and die old’ innocent is all about health. Their juices, smoothies and food are 100% natural (Innocent, 2015). (See Figure 5).
- **For whom?** Younger people who want to be healthy in an easy way.
- **What do they challenge?** The category of healthy drinks.
- **How do they challenge?** By breaking conventions of relationship.
  Innocent has created a playful and chatty personality around their brand, they did this to introduce a new kind of relationship with a product that is ‘good for you’ (Morgan, 2009).

2.2.5 Propercorn

- **Who?** A popcorn brand.
  Propercorn was launched in 2011. In 2012 it was referred to as one of the most exciting and innovative challenger brands within the popcorn market (Talking retail, 2012). Now it is the fastest growing snack-brand in the UK.
- **What?** Healthy natural popcorn in innovative flavours.
  Their mission is to create ‘popcorn made properly’. Propercorn is made using natural ingredients, it is gluten free, high in fibers but low in calories but overall produced to be tasty. (See Figure 6).
- **For whom?** Opinion formers, young professionals between the age of twenty and thirty-five. They are; time-poor, urban, health conscious, culturally savvy and have an appreciation of the arts. Their product and packaging naturally appeal to women but we are not driven by this (Propercorn, 2015).
- **What do they challenge?** The role and nature of the snack category.
- **How do they challenge?** By breaking conventions of product performance and representation.
  Propercorn is the first to introduce a popcorn that is tasty and healthy. Also their presentation is different, they are very committed to the aesthetics of the brand, their packaging is designed by a Vogue illustrator and they have
created relationships with some of the leading brands within the fashion industry. They also have partnerships in charity that makes them stand out in their representation and help them gain popularity (Talking retail, 2012).

2.2.6 Hendrick’s Gin

- **Who?** A Gin brand
  Hendrick’s gin is a brand of gin produced by William Grant & Sons Ltd since 2001.
- **What?** Gin
  Instead of the normal gin recipe Hendrick’s gin uses an infusion with cucumber and rose petals. The drink needs to be drunk with a cucumber slide instead of a lemon slice, changing an experience that has been there for over one hundred years. Making it, according to them, an unusual gin that is not for everyone. Furthermore, the gin is handcrafted in small batches. (See Figure 7.)
- **For Whom?** Gin drinkers that do not like mainstream brands, who are attracted to the exotic, have a knowledge of culture and history, and have a high disposable income. Their vast majority of their consumers are young urbans in their twenties and thirties (Segran, 2014).
- **What to they challenge?** The gin category itself.
- **How do they challenge?** By breaking conventions of product experience and medium.
  Hendrick’s gin is the first in the gin category to introduce a gin and tonic with cucumber instead of lemon. Next to this change in product experience their advertising comprises itself to word-of-mouth and Hendrick’s unusual events. These events pop up at cultural events where they present themselves with several activities.

2.2.7 BrewDog beer

- **Who?** A craftbeer brand
  Founded in 2007 BrewDog was the first company in the UK to produce craftbeers for the market.
- **What?** Craftbeer and beerpubs
  Their mission is to make other people just as passionate about craft beer as they are. (See Figure 8.)
- **For Whom?** Punks
  Brewdog presents their beer as ‘beer for punks’. They fight for equity for punks and organize all kinds of event for this target group.
- **What do they challenge?** The beer category with their industrialized beers
- **How do they challenge?** Breaking conventions of relationship and product performance.
  The anti-business model business model (as BrewDog calls it) invites their consumers to buy their stocks and invest in the brand. They also organize events in their bars to promote and present their beer (Brewdog, 2015).
3. Challenger packaging analysis

The CARTILS BrandStar tool is used to systematically analyse the packaging designs of the known challenger brands. From these separate analyses conclusions are drawn and findings are presented. Finally from these findings hypotheses are set up.

3.1 BrandStar analyses
3.2 Overview BrandStar analyses
3.3 Findings
3.1 BrandStar analyses

In order to structurally review the package designs of the previous mentioned challenger brands, the BrandStar analysis is performed. As mentioned before the BrandStar tool exists of five different aspects. These aspects look at the packaging of the brand in its competitive environment. For this analysis all brands are rated in consultation with two BrandStar experts of CARTILS on the following BrandStar aspects with reference to its competitive environment:

**Be seen**
In this analysis ‘be seen’ is focused on being visible as a brand in a competitive environment. This analysis focuses on visibility through design aspects. Design aspects that add to the visibility of a packaging according to CARTILS are: using strong recognizable main shapes, a high contrast and supporting colouring.

**Be real**
The ‘be real’ aspect of this analysis is focused on being authentic, genuine and having an ownable and unique brand story. According to CARTILS, on a design level this is usually expressed by uniquely executed elements such as a logo font, ownable shapes and distinguishing colours.

**Be confident**
The ‘be confident’ aspect of this analysis focuses on being trustworthy. According to CARTILS, brands should express leadership, pride and quality. In design aspects using powerful shapes, stable structures, high contrasts, capital logo writing and quality cues as coins and signatures can do this.

**Be relevant**
The ‘be relevant’ aspect of the analysis can be divided into three parts. The first is about category coding; does the brand fit into the category in which it belongs? This refers to the visual design language of the category, also called ‘the category code’. Secondly, it is about product expectation; does the product reflect what the consumer may expect from the product regarding taste and smell? According to CARTILS, design aspects that indicate this are shapes and illustrations. Thirdly, be relevant is about assortment navigation; does the packaging communicate the different tastes (if there is more than one flavour) but also realize a consistent family look and feel over the whole product range?

**Be aspirational**
The ‘be aspirational’ aspect refers to being a contemporary and modern brand. It is about connecting to the desired target audience and its environment. It is also about showing international premiumness; using a cosmopolitan, international perspective. According to CARTILS on a design level this can be reflected by prioritization of elements, use of advanced materials and printing techniques, modern colour schemes and layered designs.

All brand packaging is rated with help of the BrandStar tool. A score is given to all five aspects, the score ranges from one to ten and is made visible through the lines in the image of the BrandStar. The blue line represents a seven, which, according to CARTILS, is an acceptable score (see Figure 9).

Finally, the BrandStar analyses of the different challenger brands are compared. The scores on the different aspects are compared in order to see whether a pattern exists in the packaging design for challenger brands.

Note that this the following section provides a selection of challenger brands, these are picked to give a broad view of the kind of challengers that exist in the market.

![Figure 9 | BrandStar scoring tool](image-url)
3.1.1 Hello Products

**Be seen**
The use of high contrast between the white background and bright coloured letters makes the text clearly visible, though the logo itself could stand out more if one colour was chosen. The shape of the tube is clear and recognizable.

**Be real**
The logo has a specific font and look. The smiley face adds to the friendliness Hello wants to radiate. The text balloon shape with information also adds to this as well as the round shape of the tube. What diminishes the score is that there is no consistent colour for the brand logo; it uses different colours for the different flavours.

**Be confident**
The logo has a dominant position on the tube and makes clear use of a high contrast with the white background colour. Though the tube has a rounded shape, the broader top gives it a pride look. There are no quality cues on the packaging.

**Be relevant**
The packaging does not fit the current category code for dental products in terms of shape and the use of colours (see Figure 11). The product expectations might be not correct. The packaging gives it a childish look, and therefore the consumer might expect a really sweet taste. The variants do become clear through the packaging; each flavour variant has a different colour.

**Be aspirational**
The minimalistic design and use of colour makes it modern. Also the use of a soft touch exterior layer adds to the cosmopolitan perspective. The design speaks to the target audience, as it is a feminine, modern design with a focus on beauty.

All scores for the different aspects can be read from the BrandStar representation in Figure 10.
3.1.2 Method

**Be seen**
The logo is small and hardly visible especially for the products with a high transparency level. The logo also differs for the different products. There is not one clear bottle shape, but looking at just one product the shape is distinctive.

**Be real**
Method clearly shows authenticity next to the competitors in the category (see Figure 12). The specific bottle shapes are ownable for Method. For the different products there is no consistency; the bottles shapes and designs differ, and labels of Eco-friendliness change per bottle as well.

**Be confident**
The tall bottles give a confident look. Some bottles have an ecological stamp of approval.

**Be relevant**
The packaging design of Method does not fit the current category code for home cleaning products. The product expectations might be correct, the packaging is different from its competitors, and might give hints of Eco-friendliness. The spray head still tells consumers they are dealing with a cleaning product. The different variants do not become clear through their packaging. There is a small text explaining the product but it is not directly clear through the packaging.

**Be aspirational**
The packaging shows a minimalistic design with use of modern colours. The used material is advanced in terms of recyclability. With a focus on a predominant female target group with an eye for design the packaging is aspirational.

All scores for the different aspects can be read from the BrandStar representation in Figure 13.
3.1.3 Innocent

Be seen
The logo has a clear main shape and makes use of high contrasting. The colour of the packaging changes for the different flavours, but the logo remains the same.

Be real
The logo does not have a very specific colour or font. The angel drawing is ownable for the brand but is not consistent in colour. The drawing adds to their genuinity.

Be confident
The packaging of Innocent contains a label of quality; the juice contains two out of five fruit servings. The bottle shape or placing of the label does not express leadership but within the competitive environment the simplicity shows their confidence.

Be relevant
The fit with the current category code is good, but it seems as though the category codes have changed since Innocent became a popular brand. The dark score in the BrandStar image represents their relevance when introduced and the lighter score how their relevance is now (see Figure 15). The customer expectations are well set with this packaging, they show a no-nonsense (no additives) packaging, just as their product is. The different variants are clearly visible through the transparent bottles, also the flavour is mentioned clearly on the label. Special smoothies (in this example one with special fruits) are clearly marked as different through their label colour and star logo instead of smiley. See the most right bottle in figure 5 on page 24.

Be aspirational
The design is minimalistic and modern but does not show a cosmopolitan perspective. There is no show of advanced printing techniques, the bottle is made from recycled material. The packaging connects with the younger target audience.

All scores for the different aspects can be read from the BrandStar representation in Figure 15.
3.1.4 Propercorn

*Be seen*

The logo has a clear main shape and makes use of high contrasting. The colour of the packaging changes for the different flavours, but the logo remains the same.

*Be real*

The specially designed illustrations as well as the designed font for the logo on the bag add to the credibility of the brand. The colours that are used are distinguishable.

*Be confident*

The high placed logo in capital letters as well as the powerful shape of the logo gives the brand confidence. The clearly shown (low) amount of calories adds to their trustworthiness.

*Be relevant*

The bag shape fits well in the category, though the rest of the packaging does not fit the category codes (see Figure 16). The hand-drawn illustrations and fonts are not relevant for this category. The different variants are easily distinguished by the different colours and illustrations in combination with the text.

*Be aspirational*

The images used together with the modern colours makes the brand contemporary and modern. The packaging fit with their target audience; a more playful and design focus.

All scores for the different aspects can be read from the BrandStar representation in Figure 17.

---

**Figure 16 | Competitive environment Propercorn**

**Figure 17 | BrandStar Propercorn**
3.1.5 Hendrick’s gin

**Be seen**
The bottle has a clear shape but the colour makes it stand less out in a busy/dark background. The label also has a clear shape. The label colour is contrasting a lot with the bottle and therefore more visible. The logo is big and clearly visible.

**Be real**
The handwritten font and parchment rolls on the label add to the craftsmanship of the brand. The aspect of the unusual society that surrounds Hendrick’s gin is not visible through their packaging.

**Be confident**
The logo has capital writing and contains embossments. On the logo is written ‘small batch handcrafted’. These elements add to the level of confidence. The bottle itself is broad and contains embossing.

**Be relevant**
The product fits in the category codes (see Figure 18). Though when introduced it did not fit at all. The category code has grown around this gin. The packaging reflects the gin that it contains; it is different and handcrafted.

There are two scores presented in the BrandStar, the dark score presents the relevance when introduced, the lighter the current situation (see Figure 19).

**Be aspirational**
The packaging shows craftsmanship in a modern perspective. The use of the black bottle in combination with the label shows authenticity but also has a cosmopolitan perspective. They relate good to the target group, millennials living in urban areas with an appreciation of craftsmanship, design, art and culture.

All scores for the different aspects can be read from the BrandStar representation in Figure 19.
3.1.6 BrewDog beer (old)

Because BrewDog recently redesigned their packaging design both designs will be discussed, starting with the old design.

Be seen
The visibility of BrewDog amongst its competitors is not very high. In Figure 20 BrewDogs first packaging is placed next to its competitors during introduction. Their logo does not create a clear focus point. It does not have a central spot on the label. They have made use of high contrasting, but because all the text uses this contrasting it does not improve visibility. The stamp on the label does give a focus point, but it is not the brand name or logo.

Be real
BrewDog has a unique logo and font. The shape of the logo is ownable for the brand but is not clearly visible. The placing of the text and the font is unique and therefore adds to the credibility of the brand.

Be confident
Placed next to its competitors, the packaging shows boldness (see Figure 20). The big contrasting text combined with the chosen colours shows confidence. The label has no quality cues such as coins or symbols.

Be relevant
When BrewDog launched its craftbeer in Scotland they were the first brand to introduce craftbeer. The relevance within the ‘normal’ beer category is therefore very low. The category code of beer is not followed, except for the beer bottle. The packaging does reflect the product expectations. The label shows something different, as is the special beer. BrewDog does present a consistent look over their product family with clear communications of their different flavours.

Be aspirational
The packaging of their beer has a clear connection with their focus group: Punks. Their focus on craftsmanship is communicated in a modern way. The colours of the different labels are modern but no modern techniques or materials are used.
3.1.7 BrewDog beer (re-design)

Be seen
The logo does not create a focus point, it is placed off-center and not clearly visible. The name is placed vertically and not very visible since there is a lot of other text in the same colour and comparable font. The use of high contrasting is diminished by the fact that all text uses this contrast and the same colours.

Be real
The BrewDog logo is unique, as is the naming of the different beers. The specific print on the label adds to the credibility. The brand story is not that clearly visible in their packaging.

Be confident
The bottle that is used is a standard beer bottle. There is use of high contrasting and capital writing. There is no focus on the logo, which makes it less confident.

Be relevant
With the introduction of more and more craftbeers the BrewDog fits the category codes. The consumer expectations are well managed, they expect something different. The different variants are easily spotted by use of different colours and visible names (see Figure 22).

Be aspirational
The packaging design seems focused on a broader audience than just punks, it has become more mainstream and modern. Their focus on craftsmanship is communicated in a modern way.

The printing was done with an old printing press, therefore this is not a modern technique, but it does fit well with their target audience.

Comparing the new design with the old design it can be seen that the design has increased in terms of relevance. This is mainly due to the increase in craftbeers and their big variety in packaging design. The new packaging design has less connection with the target group, this is also visible in the be real aspect. It seems as though the focus is on a broader target group, letting go of their niche punk group a little bit and letting there brand story show less through their packaging. Also the level of visibility has diminished compared to the old packaging.
3.2 Overview BrandStar analyses

This section will discuss the findings of the BrandStar analysis performed for the six challenger brands. Differences and resemblances from regular brand packaging are pointed out and discussed per BrandStar aspect.

Be seen
In this analysis ‘be seen’ is focused on being visible as a brand in a competitive environment. As described in chapter 3.1 this analysis focuses on visibility through design aspects. The design aspects that CARTILS mentions that add to the visibility are: using strong recognizable main shapes, a high contrast and supporting colouring.

For Hello Products, Propercorn, Hendrick’s gin and Innocent a high score is found for be seen. Their logo is clearly visible in combination with recognizable main shapes and a high contrast makes their product stand out. Method and Brewdog score both low on the be seen aspect. Their logo is not clearly visible and they do not make use of recognizable main shapes and/or contrasts. When looking at a shelf full of competitors it would mean that they do not stand out.

It can be concluded that not all challenger brands follow the traditional ‘being seen’ design aspects as established by CARTILS. Being visible as a brand in the competitive environment is very important. As a challenger brand without the resources for other marketing, their packaging is their most important asset. So their need for being visible is even more important than for the established brands. From this analysis, it can be seen that for challenger brand packaging being seen comes from being different than the rest of the product category. That is how they are visible on the shelf. Though it should be kept in mind that it is important to have highly visible elements and shapes in your packaging, as stated in the BrandStar tool by CARTILS, so the brand stands out on the shelf.

Be real
The ‘be real’ aspect of this analysis, as explained in 3.1, is focused on being authentic, genuine and having an ownable and unique brand story. According to CARTILS on a design level this is usually expressed by uniquely executed elements such as a logo font, ownable shapes and distinguishing colours.

All of the analysed challenger brands have a unique logo, though not all of them are very consistent over their different products. All brands seem to have aspects that are ownable for their brand and that fit their brand story. As found in literature, challenger brands build their brands on their brand story, their so-called lighthouse identity (Morgan, 2009). Having their packaging express their lighthouse identity will get consumers involved and interested. This will cause them to tell their story to someone else and create mouth-to-mouth advertisement. Being real is therefore very important for challenger brands.

Be confident
As described in 3.1 the ‘be confident’ aspect of this analysis focuses on being trustworthy. According to CARTILS brands should express leadership, pride and quality. In design aspects using powerful
shapes, stable structures, high contrasts, capital logo writing and quality cues as coins and signatures can do this.

The challenger brands that are analysed show varying scores on confidence. This might have to do with the design aspects that CARTILS provide for expressing confidence. These aspects might fit in spirits and beer categories but less in other categories. These challenger brands have a bigger focus on their brand story, through which they can show their confidence and add to their trustworthiness. For some brands being humble will fit their brand story better. Though challenger brands must pursue being confident, as it expresses their boldness and mentality without purposely expressing leadership and pride.

Be relevant

The ‘be relevant’ aspect of the analysis can be divided into three parts. The first is about category coding; does the brand fit into the category in which it belongs? This refers to the visual design language of the category, also called ‘the category code’. Secondly it is about product expectation. Does the product reflect what the consumer may expect from the product regarding taste and smell?

According to CARTILS, design aspects that indicate this are shapes and sometimes illustrations. Thirdly, be relevant is about assortment navigation. Does the packaging communicate the different tastes (if there is more than one flavour) but also realize a consistent family look and feel over the whole product range?

The analysed challenger brands all score low on relevance. For the more established challenger brands (Innocent and Hendrick’s gin) the relevance was looked at during the introduction of their products. Nowadays the category code has grown around their product and the fit is better.

For all challenger brands it seems that they are not fitting the category code, they are trying to break with this code to stand out. Therefore being relevant as a scoring aspect wont fit the packaging of challenger brands. Though product expectations and assortment navigation are pursued.

Be aspirational

As described in 3.1 the be aspirational aspect refers to being a contemporary and modern brand. It is about connecting to the desired target audience and its environment. Also it is about showing international premiumness; using a cosmopolitan, international perspective. According to CARTILS on a design level this can be reflected by prioritization of elements, use of advanced materials and printing techniques, modern colour schemes and layered designs.

Challenger brands choose to focus on a more defined group of people in order to strengthen their identity and establish their place in the market. All the analysed challenger brands show a relatively high score on aspiration. All challenger brands have a specific target group with whom they are strongly connected. Not all packaging designs show a use of advanced materials and/or printing technique but all of them use a modern way of presenting their brand.
3.3 Findings

By performing the BrandStar analysis on the different challenger brands it is shown that challenger brands have a different approach on their packaging design. The following findings show interesting cues that should be researched further:

- Be relevant. Fitting the category code is the opposite of what challenger brands do. This is clearly indicated in the low scores found on be relevant for the different brands.
- Be real. Though not fitting the category code all challenger brands score relatively high on being real. Their brand story is what sets them apart and this is shown through their packaging.
- Be confident. The challenger brands score relatively low on confidence. This clearly has to do with the design aspects assigned to this part of the packaging. The brands are definitely confident, but not in a sense of leadership; they are confident by doing something different. It builds more on their mentality, which is again reflected in their sense of being real: showing their brand story.

The findings on ‘be relevant’ echo the findings in literature. As Morgan (2009) explains, challenger brands need to break conventions that surround their category. As mentioned beforehand these can be different conventions. Breaking conventions of representation is one of them; how the brand portrays itself and its identity. This can be in terms of advertising, packaging, logo and/or name. Though not only when breaking conventions of representation it is important to stand out in the category. This can be done through packaging. Since packaging has a great influence on consumer attention and responses there should be a focus on this aspect of the product. Because of their lack of marketing resources, packaging might be the only asset through which challenger brands can reach their consumers. As Morgan (2009) explains; it is very important for challenger brands to enter social conversation, as they need everyone to tell their story for them. Not only because this word-of-mouth advertising might be the only advertising they can afford but also because they might want to ‘inspire debate’ on a chosen issue.

Concluding, challenger brands need to evoke attention. No matter what convention they decide to break, in FMCG’s their packaging should evoke this attention. This can be done by differentiation, as mentioned before. Many researches on differentiation and categorization conclude that moderate packaging deviations will give the best result in the trade off between drawing attention and avoiding negative evaluations. This inverted u-shape was found in several experiments on product form or packaging differentiation (Schoormans & Robben, 1997; Blijlevens et al., 2012). When looking at the existing challenger brands across several product categories the packaging of the brands seems to deviate from this moderate differentiation. They clearly show high levels of differentiation. However, these brands still show successful sales of their products. (See Appendix 1 for life cycles of the different challenger brands.) This would mean that challenger brands are an exception to this ‘moderate deviation rule’. However, only by differentiating a challenger brand will not get the attention that they need. In order to enter social conversation they need to be able to tell their story through their packaging.

Brand stories or narratives are an effective marketing tool. People use stories to understand the world and what goes around them, but also to show who they are (Huang, 2010). Brand stories can be used to convey ideas and concepts to consumers. Brand stories can help consumers making sense of a brand (Escalas, 2004). Things as benefits, values, visions, birth and innovation can all be communicated through a brand story (Huang, 2010). By connecting physical products to the feelings and emotions of consumers, companies’ brand identities and their brand image will be enhanced. Besides utilitarian functions, products also have social meanings and help consumers communicate to the world who they are (Fontes and Fan, 2006). Creating a good brand story increases the audience’s belief and reinforces brand identity.

According to a study by Freeman, Spenner and Bird (2012) shared values are the strongest drivers for brand relationships. Of the consumers saying they have a brand relationship, 64% cited shared values as the primary reason. “A shared value is a belief that both the brand and consumer have about a brand’s higher purpose or broad philosophy.” (p.2)
Many brands have a higher purpose incorporated into their missions. “These feel authentic to consumers, and so provide a credible basis for shared values and relationship-building.” By clearly communicating your brand’s philosophy or higher purpose a brand relationship can be built (Freeman, Spiner and Bird, 2012).

Challenger brands are focused on communicating their brand philosophy. Morgan (2009) explains that challenger brands constantly do things that get people to talk about them. The stories of challenger brands make people curious. People want to know why they do what they do and want to find out more about the brand. It is then that consumers find their shared values.

Challenger brands present their stories in a way that consumers feel they are invited in participating in their stories, and to become a part of it. According to Morgan (2009) the narrative or brand story of a challenger brand should contain some key components:

1. Unexpectedness: By taking an unexpected course away from the educated codes and drivers established by the market leader the consumer is invited to think of the category in another way.
2. The inciting incident: Why is the brand a challenger brand? The moment that caused the people to start the brand or change the direction.
3. The objective: The desire that is created by the incident. It has to be visible to the spectators what specific goal the brand wants to achieve.
4. Conflict: The challenge they take on; the struggle to realize their desire. This struggle is the source of energy for their story (Morgan, 2009).

The packaging of a challenger brand is an important communicator of this brand story. The form of packaging and surface graphics as packaging shape can be used in many ways to construct a narrative for the target audience (Ambrose and Harris, 2011). These brand story elements are therefore very important for challenger brands to incorporate in their packaging. When these brand story elements trigger a target consumer, as aforementioned, the consumer will want to find more about the brand.

Much research exists on consumer information search (Stigler, 1961; Klein and Ford, 2002; Ozanne, Brucks and Grewal, 1992). Ozanne, Brucks and Grewal (1992) found that an inverted U-shape exists for the depth of information search and the discrepancy of a product with the coherent category. Their research found that at levels of moderate discrepancy, people spend more time and effort analysing a set of relevant attributes. For high levels of discrepancy the depth of information search decreased. Predicted was that higher levels of discrepancy will increase uncertainty, though found was at high levels of discrepancy uncertainty decreased. Linking this to categorization- and conflict-theory (Meyers-levy and Tybout,1989) rather than trying to resolve the discrepancy through information search, consumers appeared to have used other strategies such as sub typing or finding an alternative category from memory. This decreased their uncertainty.

However, from challenger brand literature it seems that high levels of discrepancy should lead to higher levels of information search. Instead of linking information search to uncertainty it is proposed that information search can be explained by an interest in the brand. It is proposed that when high levels of discrepancy, or differentiation, are combined with brand story elements the want for information will increase. It is proposed that this want for information does not arise from uncertainty, but from a positive interest in the brand.

Concluding, challenger brands need to differentiate themselves from the competitive market. By breaking conventions they differentiate themselves from the market leader in their category. Packaging is a medium to address the conventions they are breaking and to tell their brand story. However, they first need to be noticed in order to be able to tell their brand story. Combining their brand story with differentiated packaging will results in advertising through their packaging, this is also known as ‘packvertising’.

3.3.1 Hypotheses

From the analysis on existing challenger brands it was found that the level of typicality for product packaging exceeds previously established optimal
levels. All challenger brands show a higher deviation in packaging design. Combining this with the clear presence of their brand story in their packaging leads to the following hypotheses:

H1: A high level of differentiation will lead to a lower product evaluation compared to a low level of differentiation.

H2: A highly differentiated design with brand story elements leads to a higher evaluation compared to a high differentiated design without brand story elements.

H3: A high level of differentiation will lead to a higher level of induced attention.

Next to inducing attention it was found that packaging should invite the consumer to gain insights about the brand and see whether they share values. Their packaging should be able to tell their story, but also persuade their target group that this product is for them. This persuasion can only be done when a possible target customer is triggered to gain more insights and explore their shared values. With these gained insights customers should be willing to do word-of-mouth advertisement for the brand. From this the following hypotheses follow:

H4: A packaging design with brand story elements will lead to a want for more information compared to a packaging design without brand story elements.

H5: Packaging with brand story elements will lead to more likeliness of word-of-mouth than packaging without brand story elements.
4. Study one

The following chapter will research the hypotheses set in the previous chapter to come to a better understanding of the effects differentiation and brand story elements in packaging. The method of the study will be explained, then the results will be displayed. Finally the discussion and limitations will be mentioned.

4.1 Method
4.2 Results
4.3 Discussion
4.4 Limitations and further research
This research is conducted to test the effect of differentiation and visual brand story elements in packaging on product evaluation for a challenger brand. Two pre-tests, a main study and a follow-up test were performed. First, two challenger brand stories were developed for a fictional vodka and whisky brand. In pre-test 1 these stories were validated as being challenging, compared to an existing whisky and an existing vodka brand story. Then for both categories six designs were developed with help of a packaging designer from CARTILS. After the analysis of existing brands in both categories one low-, one medium- and one highly differentiated design were developed. Then for both categories brand story elements were added to all three levels of differentiated designs. The prototypicality and presence of brand story elements was tested for all twelve designs in pre-test 2. In the main study participants evaluated one stimulus product design for both categories on several variables, after first reading the corresponding challenger brand story. A follow up test was done for only the highly differentiated designs with and without brand story elements to further explore the findings from the main study.

4.1 Method

4.1.1 Stimuli

The stimuli section consists of the following parts:

- Challenger brand stories and pre-test 1
- Packaging designs and pre-test 2

Category choice

For this experiment product categories needed to be specified. With reference to Design consultancy CARTILS the focus is on spirits. For this experiment the spirits whisky and vodka were chosen. Between different whisky and vodka brands in a subcategory there are not a lot of functional differences. Therefore, consumers are forced to place high importance on abstract product attributes, such as packaging (Schoormans, den Berge, van de Laar, & van den Berg-Weitzel, 2010). This makes whisky and vodka suitable product categories for this experiment. Also, CARTILS has worked for whisky and vodka brands in the past, therefore the company has useful knowledge of these categories.

The whisky category

Whisky is a clear brown/reddish coloured spirit distilled from grain and aged in wooden barrels. There are several subcategories within whisky, which differ a lot. First of all, there are single malt and blended whiskies. A single malt whisky is the product of a single distillery. A blended whisky is a mixture of single malt whiskies from different distilleries and sometimes other spirits. The origin of the spirit categorizes the whisky in either Scotch; made in Scotland, Bourbon; made in the United States or Irish whisky; made in Ireland.

In order to narrow down this broad product category the subcategory Scotch blended whisky was chosen. Blended whisky was chosen because in the category there is a clearer product prototype. Single malt whiskies often are smaller breweries and show a broad variety in product packaging. Scotch was chosen due to the fact that CARTILS has worked with Scotch label whiskies before and has knowledge in this packaging field. A Scotch whisky needs to be aged at least three years and should be made in Scotland in order to call it a Scotch. Scotch typically uses malted grain, which causes the whisky to have a smoky flavour. This is due to the peat smoke that is used to treat the malt. When bottled, whisky contains an alcohol percentage of 40-65%. In general whisky has a rich, complex and smooth flavour.

Traditionally, whisky consumption is focused on men in the age group 45-70. Though over the last years this has been shifting. A younger group from the age of 25-35 is targeted as well and also women are being included in target audiences for some whisky brands. Still whisky is mostly drunk by the older generation. Whisky can be drunk neat, with ice or a bit of water. Whisky can also be used as a mix drink with soda or as a spirit in cocktails. Still, in general, whisky is a traditional drink with a local (Scottish) image. This is clearly visible in whisky packaging. The more organic bottle shapes emphasize on the rich and smooth flavours of the whisky (Schoormans, den Berge, van de Laar, & van den Berg-Weitzel, 2010).
The vodka category
Vodka is a clear, colourless and almost odorless spirit. It is made by the distillation of fermented grain. The type of grain differs per vodka. Vodka does not have to age; it is bottled directly from the distillation tanks. The alcohol percentage lies between 35 and 70%. The first vodka was made presumably in Russia or Poland. From the 19th and 20th century next to pure vodkas, flavoured vodkas are being produced, like fruit flavours, cinnamon, honey and pepper. For this experiment only the normal vodkas (without added aromas) are taken into account.

Vodka brands target an audience of young millennials, aged between eighteen and thirty. There is a big focus on nightlife and clubbing. Vodka is often presented as a base for cocktails, since the flavour and taste are not dominant. But vodka is also presented to drink pure, as a more masculine drink. In general vodka is presented as a modern, pure, powerful drink. This is also visible in the packaging of vodka and tested in a previous study on the shapes of vodka bottles. Vodka bottles show stylized, angular and distinct shapes to express power and masculinity (Schoormans, den Berge, van de Laar, & van den Berg-Weitzel, 2010).

4.1.1.1 Challenger brand stories

For this research first two challenger brand stories needed to be developed, one for whisky and one for vodka. Existing brand stories were analysed for both categories. Then existing challenger brand stories were analysed from different categories. For both categories possible challenges were thought of. Eventually two challenger brand stories were developed.

Several existing challenger brand stories were analysed (see Appendix 2 for the challenger brand stories) from this analysis it was found that the following aspects always lie at the heart of their story:

- Unexpectedness
- The objective/desire

The four aspects that Morgan (2009) mentions are part of the story but are not always directly presented in their brand story. This does not mean they are not part of the story. On their website, for example, the history of the brand is often presented starting off with the inciting incident. Concluding, when developing a challenger brand story at least the two aspects ‘unexpectedness’ and ‘the objective’ should be present.

To come up with a challenger brand story for whisky and vodka first a brief analysis of the product itself, the target audience and the market leaders was done. The brand stories of the market leaders and their and packaging was analysed in order to see what elements of their brand story are visible in their packaging.

In order to come up with a possible challenge for a whisky brand the different type of challenges set by Morgan (2009) were reviewed. See Appendix 3 for the overview of this analysis. Because the challenge of this challenger brand should be easy to recognize, it was decided to go with a brand that challenges a fundamental driver or dimension of the category. These fundamental drivers and dimensions are most likely known by a lot of people, therefore making it a clear challenger brand to a broad public. In this case the following fundamental driver of the category was chosen to challenge: Whisky must sit in a barrel for many years to age and become a very tasty whisky. With this challenge the following brand story was developed for the fictional brand named ‘Pascal’s Law’.
Pascal’s Law

I have always had a passion for whisky. Not only for drinking it but also blending it. I would try and come up with the perfect blend of different whiskies, bottle those and give them as presents to friends and family. I’ve always had the dream of distilling and bottling my own whisky but I am not a man of great patience... so letting a whisky sit in a barrel for more than ten years without being able to taste it was just never my cup of tea.

So I did research on aging whisky and found that pressure speeds up the aging process. The pressure on the oak barrels makes that the liquid takes up more flavour and extracts of the wood, what normally takes years.

With no pressure machines available I thought of the sea and the pressure of water. So in the Scottish water it was that I lowered and secured the first batch of my homemade Scotch. People thought I was crazy, but I was willing to try!

After three ocean years I tried the first batch and discovered the flavour and colour of the Scotch was similar to a 12 year old scotch! I did it! A fast aged whisky, with help of the Scottish sea.

The brand story of ‘Pascal’s Law’ belongs to a challenger brand because:

- The story starts off with an inciting incident; aging whisky takes too long.
- The story contains conflict, wanting old whisky but not wanting to wait.
- The brand is unexpected, a complete new way of aging whisky.
- There is a clear objective: aging whisky faster.

For vodka was also chosen to challenge a fundamental dimension of the category; vodka is taste and odourless. The following brand story was developed for the fictional brand ‘Harvest Time’:

Harvest Time

Vodka has always been my drink, though after trying almost all vodka brands available I never found the perfect one. To me all vodka brands lacked flavour. Whenever I asked a salesperson to sell me vodka with flavour I got a list of options: from lemon to coconut to whipped cream. I tried to explain that I wanted the flavour of the ingredients, not artificial added aroma. It turned out: no such thing existed! All brands sell vodkas that are taste- and odorless; they call it purity, I call it boring. It was then that I decided to make it myself.

Years of research followed, I went to the farms of Poland to find out for what makes truly excellent vodka. Testing, every day, the effect of the soil, the climate and the harvesting processes. After much analysis I decided on three grains:

1. Spelt – “The Happy Grain” – Nutty, earthy, full-bodied
2. Rye – “The Dancing Grain” – Classic, peppery, jumps on the tongue
3. Wheat – “The Smiling Grain” – Sweetness and long finish

The trick, I discovered, was harvesting before the grains ripened. These softer, meatier grains retained their natural essence and created smooth flavours. Our crazy vodka professor perfected the distilling procedure over four years until the recipe was just right. This is a vodka to be sipped, like a single malt or sophisticated wine; the flavours to be appreciated. I want you to take the glass, to say hello to the vodka, to chew into the grains and get to know each other. I want you to laugh, to dance, and to smile like the very three grains that I chose to create this exquisite, incomparable vodka.

The brand story of ‘Harvest Time’ belongs to a challenger brand because:

- The story starts off with an inciting incident: the failure in finding vodka with flavour.
- The story contains conflict: the struggle of
finding the right ingredients took him years.
- The brand is unexpected: other vodka brands focus on the smoothness and purity of the vodka, not the flavour.
- There is a clear objective/desire: producing vodka in which you can taste the ingredients.

Part of this brand story was taken from challenger vodka brand Konik’s tail (Nichols, 2014). This brand has proven to be a successful challenger. This shows again that this story fits a challenger brand.

For the vodka the brand story of Absolut, the second most sold vodka globally, was chosen to compare to the designed story. For whisky the brand story of Ballantine’s, the second most sold whisky globally, was chosen (see Appendix 4). All brand stories were presented without brand names and were rewritten in the first person tense. Also the length of the stories was adapted to be equal for both categories. These four brand stories were used in pre-test 1.
Pre-test 1 Brand stories

In order to verify whether the brand stories were perceived as challenging a pre-test was done. The pre-test was conducted among sixty-one Industrial Design students. The challenger brands were tested between subjects, so the test was set up as four different online questionnaires, each representing one brand story: a challenger brand story for whisky (1) or vodka (2) and an existing brand story for whisky (3) and vodka (4). Resulting in 15 participants for three conditions and one with 16 participants. All participants rated the (challenger) brand story text on originality, and to what extent they perceived the story challenging (the questionnaire can be found in Appendix 6).

The originality of the brand story was measured with three items on a seven-point Likert scale (Common vs. original; ordinary vs. unique; routine vs. fresh; Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.86$). To measure to what amount the brand story is perceived as challenging, three seven-point Likert scale items were used (this brand story builds on the existing vodka/whisky product category vs. challenges the vodka/whisky product category; builds on existing vodka/whisky brands vs. challenges existing vodka/whisky brands; builds on traditional vodka/whisky brands vs. challenges traditional vodka/whisky brands; Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.84$).

Other aspects that are often present in challenger brand stories are their unexpectedness, their expressed desire, conflict and objective. Challenger brands are also often seen as more personal and more passionate (Morgan, 2009). All these aspects were included in the questionnaire for this pre-test. An independent samples t-test showed that for both whisky and vodka the challenger brand story was perceived as significantly more challenging than the corresponding existing brand story, see table 1 for whisky and table 2 for vodka.

Also for originality a significant difference was found, both challenger brands stories were perceived as more original than the existing brand story, see table 1 and 2. The whisky challenger brand story scores significantly higher on its unexpectedness, expressing a clear desire and conflict.

The vodka challenger brand story scores significantly higher on its unexpectedness, expression of a clear desire and conflict and passion (see Table 1 and 2.) These tests confirm the successful manipulation of the two challenger brand stories designed for this research. The most important aspects of a challenger brand; being challenging, original and expressing their objective and desire, are proven to be in the stories. This indicates that these challenger brand stories can be used in further research.
### WHISKY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal brand story</th>
<th>Challenger brand story</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>-5.54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>-6.74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear objective</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>-0.876</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear desire</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear conflict</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&gt;.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&gt;.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 | Results Pre-test 1 for whisky

### VODKA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal brand story</th>
<th>Challenger brand story</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>-3.80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear objective</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&gt;.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear desire</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear conflict</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&gt;.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 | Results Pre-test 1 for vodka
4.1.1.2 Packaging designs

For this research, packaging designs needed to be developed: one low-, one medium- and one highly differentiated design for the whisky and vodka category. First, for both categories the category codes were established by analysing the top ten selling brands in the category. With these codes a scoring system was set up in order to validate which elements should be present for the different levels of differentiation.

Analysis category codes

In order to identify the structural and graphical characteristics of the whisky category the packaging of the top ten global whisky brands was analysed (MillionairsClub, 2014), see Figure 24.

From the analysis of these packages and in consultation with experts from CARTILS design characteristics were established for the whisky category, see table 3. An overview of the prototypical design elements can be seen in Figure 26.

For vodka the structural and graphical characteristics of the product category were analysed for the packaging of the global top ten established by MillionairsClub (2014), see figure 25.

From the analysis of these packages and in consultation with experts from CARTILS design characteristics were established for the vodka category, see table 4. An overview of the prototypical design elements of vodka can be seen in Figure 27.
### Category prototype

- Organic slender bottles
- Onion neck OR long neck
- Big label
- Warm colours
- Traditional capital fonts
- Coat of arms present
- Signature of master distiller present
- Bottle embossing present

#### Table 3 | Whisky design characteristics

### Category prototype

- Long slender bottle
- Long neck
- High transparency
- Capital writing
- Blue and/or red colours (depending on region)
- Gold and silver details
- Bottle embossing present

#### Table 4 | Vodka design characteristics
Defining the design aspects for the differentiation levels

When looking at the different visual aspects present in vodka and whisky packaging some elements are more important for the category codes than others. In specifying the designs on the three levels of differentiation, values were given to the elements in terms of importance for the category. These values are established by looking at the current competitive environment and are agreed upon by experts on designing for this category of CARTILS. Packaging that is low differentiated contains almost all design aspects of the category. The packaging of the top 10 selling brands of the coherent category is used as a measure for the points. Looking into the high value points and diminishing the number of aspects from high to medium to low calculates which design aspects need to be present for the medium and high levels of differentiation.

Table 5 shows the values given to the different whisky design aspects. The most important design aspects in whisky packaging are the bottle shape and the shape of the neck. These aspects are given the value three. The coat of arms, label shape and colour scheme are then most important and given the value two. The signature of the master distiller and used font are scored one.

When looking at all the design aspects together the total amount adds up to 16 points. The top 10 most selling whisky brands score with their packaging on this scale between 12 and 14 points. This score will be the low differentiation packaging. For the medium differentiated packaging the score adds up to 7 points, containing one high value aspects. The highly differentiated packaging contains none of the high value aspects and has a score of 3 points. Note that the different aspects are chosen to come to the desired total score. There are several

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Design aspect</th>
<th>Category prototype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bottle shape</td>
<td>Organic slender bottles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bottle neck shape</td>
<td>Onion neck OR long neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Label shape</td>
<td>Big label with foot label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colour scheme</td>
<td>Warm colours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Font use</td>
<td>Traditional capital fonts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coat of arms</td>
<td>Coat of arms present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Signature of master distiller present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bottle embossing</td>
<td>Bottle embossing present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Design aspect</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bottle shape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bottle neck shape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Label shape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colour scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Font use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coat of arms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bottle embossing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 | Values for the whisky design aspects

Table 6 | Differentiation levels with whisky design aspects
possible combinations that lead to a medium and highly differentiated design (See table 6 for chosen aspects).

The values that are set for vodka can be read in table 7. The most important design aspect for vodka packaging is the high level of transparency and is given the value three. Next to that the shape of the bottle and neck are important aspects. Also the use of colours is very distinctive in the vodka category. These are all valued two. The font use, colour of details and bottle embossments are part of the vodka category but do not account for so much of the categorisation as the other aspects do. When seeing the values of the design aspects as a score system, the total amount adds up to twelve points. When looking at the current top 10 selling vodka brands the packaging of these bottles score between ten and twelve points. The difference in points comes from differences in the one-point category design aspects.

When establishing the design aspects that need to be present for the low, medium and high differentiation packaging this score system is used. The low differentiation level has a total of 10 points, including 5 of the 7 design aspects, of which 4 are the highest value aspects. This score relates to the current packaging in the top 10. The medium differentiation level has a total of 7 points and contains 4 of the 7 design aspects, of which two of the highest value aspects. The high differentiation level has a total of 2 points and contains only 2 of the 7 aspects, and just the low value aspects. Note that also here the design aspects are picked to come to a desired total score, there are more than one combinations to create a medium and highly differentiated design (see table 8 for the chosen design aspects).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Design aspect</th>
<th>Category prototype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bottle shape</td>
<td>Long slender bottle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neck shape</td>
<td>Long neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colours</td>
<td>Little colouring, blue/red accents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Font use</td>
<td>Capital writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Gold and silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bottle embossing</td>
<td>Bottle embossing present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 | Values for the vodka design aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Design aspect</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bottle shape</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neck shape</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colours</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Font use</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bottle embossing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Design aspect</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 | Differentiation levels with vodka design aspects
Designing the packaging

The decisions on the design elements for the three levels of differentiation for both categories were used as specific guidelines in the design brief for the packaging designers at CARTILS. As a base for the whisky packaging designs, the packaging design of whisky brand Scottish Leader was chosen. This brand is not sold in Europe and therefore will not be recognized by respondents in this research. This packaging meets all category prototype aspects, except for the coat of arms element. This element was added to the bottle to create a packaging design with all prototypical aspects (see Figure 28). Scottish Leader is a blended Scotch which has aged three years. (In Scotch the minimal aging period is three years, this is not named on the bottle.)

This packaging design was used as a base for the packaging designers in order to reduce the design time. This means that existing packaging elements were used to create the stimuli designs. For these designs all existing brand story elements, such as the image and textual brand information, were left out to make it a general whisky packaging design. The brand name was replaced by the brand name of the challenger brand: Pascal’s Law.

For every level of differentiation the table with design elements was consulted, exactly explaining which design elements should be adjusted and which design elements should remain as the prototypical elements. For the low differentiated design, as can be read from table 6 (page 52), the bottle shape, neck shape, label size, font use, colour scheme and coat of arms remained as the base design (see Figure 29). It can be seen that the imagery is taken out, to be replaced by a bigger brand name and the initials on the red band on the label. For the medium differentiated design, as can be read from table 7, the level of transparency, bottle shape, neck shape, colour use and font use were kept prototypical. The silver and/or gold details and bottle embossments were left out of the design (see Figure 28). For the high differentiated design, as can be read in table 8 (page 53), only the font and the silver details were kept as the base. The bottle shape was adjusted to a plump short bottle, the neck was adjusted to a short neck, the transparency was adjusted to an opaque bottle and the colours were adjusted to orange, as in the medium design (see Figure 30). Also for these designs all brand names and product information was kept as similar as possible.
Base design

- Organic slender bottle
- Onion neck
- Big label with foot label
- Warm colours
- Traditional capital fonts
- Coat of arms present
- Signature of master distiller present
- Bottle embossing present

Total score: 16

Low differentiated design

- Organic slender bottle
- Onion neck
- Big label with foot label
- Warm colours
- Traditional capital fonts
- Coat of arms present
- No signature of master distiller present
- No bottle embossing

Total score: 14
Medium differentiated design
- Organic slender bottle
- Short neck
- Small label, no foot label
- Warm colours
- Traditional capital fonts
- Coat of arms present
- No signature of master distiller present
- No bottle embossing

Total score: 7

Highly differentiated design
- Plump short bottle
- Short neck
- No label look
- Warm colours
- Traditional capital fonts
- No coat of arms
- No signature of master distiller present
- No bottle embossing

Total score: 4
Base design
- High transparency
- Long slender bottle
- Long neck
- Little colouring, blue accents
- Traditional capital fonts
- Silver details
- Bottle embossing present

Total score: 12

Low differentiated design
- High transparency
- Long slender bottle
- Long neck
- Little colouring, blue accents
- Traditional capital fonts
- Silver details
- No bottle embossing

Total score: 10
Medium differentiated design

- High transparency
- Long slender bottle
- Short neck
- More colouring, orange
- Traditional capital fonts
- Silver details
- No bottle embossing

Total score: 7

Highly differentiated design

- Not transparency
- Short plump bottle
- Short neck
- More colouring, orange
- Traditional capital fonts
- Silver details
- No bottle embossing

Total score: 2
Packaging with brand story elements
Next to the three whisky and three vodka designs also for each category three designs were needed with brand story elements. In order to give direction to the packaging designers for both categories an inspiration board was made (see Appendix 5). For the whisky inspiration board the focus is on the sea, since this is an important part of the coherent brand story. Packaging examples that incorporate the sea are included in the inspiration board, but also more abstract elements that have to do with the sea like anchors and sailors. The vodka inspiration board focuses on showing ingredients and craftsmanship, since this is an important aspect of the brand story. Examples of bottles with handcrafted spirits and labels are included. These inspiration boards were included in the design brief, together with both challenger brand stories. It was explained to the designers that the packaging design should explain the story as good as possible.

Eventually for the whisky design it was decided to include an image of the whisky barrels under the sea, a stamp of approval saying ‘Approved, Pressure aged, 3 ocean years’ and a text saying 3 ocean years (see Figure 36). These elements were chosen since they tell the story as good as possible. The image captures a big part of the story quickly. Combining this with the stamp of approval explains that the whisky is aged under pressure. The challenge of
a different aging method is what the challenger brand is all about and should come forward in the packaging design. The brand story elements needed to be implemented in all three whisky bottles without changing the prototypicality of the designs. Also, the brand story elements needed to be equally dominant on each bottle, so the size and placing of the brand story elements needed to be equal so that their influence would stay the same throughout the research with the different bottles. Meaning that the elements should be visible and clear, but not being so dominant that they would influence the prototypicality of the designs. For all three bottles the image is displayed in the same manner though due to label size restrictions for the medium size it is reduced a bit in size. The stamp of approval is the same for the three designs. For the low differentiated design the text ‘3 Ocean years’ is placed different compared to the medium and highly differentiated designs (see Figure 37). Because of the foot label present in the low differentiated design the designers were forced to place this text here to create a believable packaging design. For the medium and highly differentiated design the text is placed in a same manner (see Figure 37). It is presumed that this difference will not influence the research and is therefore neglected.

Figure 37 | Three whisky design with brand story elements, from left to right low, medium and highly differentiated.
For the vodka designs the focus is on the three grains presented in the challenger brand story. As this challenger brand is about the challenge to develop vodka with the flavour of vodka, this should be emphasized in the packaging design. First of all a drawing of the three different grains was developed, with the three grain names included. A paper label is included, this paper label includes a sentence from the challenger brand story about the three grains: “The happy grain, the smiling grain & the dancing grain”. Also a stamp is included saying ‘Taste the 3 grains’. On this label an autograph is placed from the founder of the brand (see Figure 38). This autograph emphasizes the craftsmanship and personal touch of the brand. The star in the general designs is replaced by a drawing of the three grains. All these elements have a clear focus on portraying the three grains and focusing on their taste.

Also for these three designs the elements needed to be of equal size and dominance without influencing the prototypicality of the designs. For the low and medium design the drawing of the grains is placed on the back of the bottle, by doing this the high level of transparency is kept. For the highly differentiated design the drawing of the grains is placed as a no label look on the bottle, this because the bottle is opaque. The paper labels are all added in the same way, as are the small three grain labels above the brand name (see Figure 39).

Figure 38 | Brand story elements for the vodka challenger brand story
Figure 39 | Three vodka design with brand story elements, from left to right, low, medium and highly differentiated.
To verify the manipulated differentiation levels and effectiveness of the added brand story elements a second pre-test was done. This test was conducted among twenty-five Industrial Design students. Each participant was asked to rate all twelve designs on its prototypicality and presence of brand story. Prototypicality was measured using three 7-point Likert scale items based on Campbell and Goodstein (2001): How novel do you consider this whisky/vodka packaging? (1=“not at all novel”, 7=“very novel” reverse-scored), How likely is it that whisky/vodka comes in this packaging? (1= "not at all likely", 7=“very likely”), How well does this whisky/vodka packaging match your expectations for whisky/vodka? (1=“not at all well”, 7=“very well”). A Cronbach’s alpha of .85 was found for this scale. The brand story elements were measured using three 7-point Likert scale items: This packaging expresses a clear brand story (1=“strongly disagree”, 7=“strongly agree”), This packaging informs me about the product and brand (1=“strongly disagree”, 7=“strongly agree”), The packaging elements clearly serve to tell a story (1=“strongly disagree”, 7=“strongly agree”). A Cronbach’s alpha of .92 was found for this scale. The questionnaire for this pre-test can be found in Appendix 7.

For the whisky and vodka packaging designs a 3 (differentiation level: low versus medium versus high) X 2 (brand story elements: with brand story elements versus without brand story elements) ANOVA showed a significant main effect of the level of differentiation on the prototypicality of the product, whisky (M_L =6.03, M_M = 4.75, M_H = 2.13) F(2,143) =247.18 p<.001, vodka (M_L =5.77, M_M = 4.39, M_H = 2.81) F(2,144) =128.13 p<.001. The Bonferroni post hoc test revealed that the lowly differentiated design scores significantly higher on brand story presence than the medium design, p<.01. This is something that should be kept in mind during further research. For vodka this effect is not significant, F(2,144) = .205, p<.81. No interaction effect was found of brand story elements and differentiation level on the perceived presence of a brand story for both categories, whisky F(2,143) =13.8, p>.25; vodka F(2,144) = .433, p<.64.

4.1.2 Main study design and participants

The main study used a 2 (brand story elements: elements present versus no elements present) X 3 (differentiation level: low versus medium versus high) x 2 (category: whisky versus vodka) mixed design. Brand story presence was measured as a between factor and differentiation level and product category as a within factor. One hundred seventy-four Industrial Design students (49% females, mean age = 22) participated in the main study. This study was conducted using an online questionnaire in a computer room so stimuli could be presented to the respondents in a constant size and quality.
4.1.3 Procedure and measures

All participants were first presented with a whisky design and then a vodka design. For both products the challenger brand story was presented before the picture of the packaging was shown. This was done to simulate as if the consumer already had read about the brand through, for example, social media. The participant was asked to first read the whisky brand story and then look at the corresponding picture. Then they were asked to answer the questions. This was then repeated for the vodka design. The complete questionnaire of this study can be found in Appendix 8.

First, the overall evaluation was measured using three 7-point Likert scale items adapted from the Marketing scales handbook (2005): “bad/good”, “dislike/like” and “undesirable/desirable” (whisky $\alpha = .87$, vodka $\alpha = .93$). To rate the quality of the product four 7-point Likert scale items adapted from Keller & Aaker (1992) were used: “poor quality/high quality”, “inferior/superior”, “mediocre product/exceptional product” and “poorly made/well made” (whisky $\alpha = .84$, vodka $\alpha = .92$). The want for more information was measured using two 7-point Likert scale items. These items ranged from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”: “I would like to know more about ‘brand name’” and “I would like more information about ‘brand name’” (whisky $\alpha = .81$, vodka $\alpha = .90$). Likelihood of word of mouth was measured by three 7-point Likert scale items (whisky $\alpha = .84$, vodka $\alpha = .92$) ranging from “very unlikely” to “very likely”: “I would suggest ‘brand name’ to friends or relatives”, “I would spread the word about ‘brand name’” and “I would tell people about ‘brand name’”. Visual appearance of the packaging design was measured using a two 7-point Likert scale items based on measures used by Lam and Mukherjee (2005): “unattractive/attractive” and “ugly/beautiful”. The induced attention by the packaging design was measured using two 7-point Likert scale items adapted from Schoormans and Robben (1997): “Inconspicuous/conspicuous” and “Does not draw attention/draws attention”. The participants were also asked to what extent the product is considered challenging, this was done using four 7-point Likert scale questions from pre-test one, based on literature on challenger brands (Morgan, 2009): “expected/unexpected”, “builds on the existing whisky/vodka category/challenges the existing whisky/vodka category”, “builds on existing vodka/whisky brands /challenges existing vodka/whisky brands” and “builds on traditional vodka/whisky brands/challenges traditional vodka/whisky brands” (whisky $\alpha = .77$, vodka $\alpha = .85$).

To confirm success of the design manipulations, measures on prototypicality and brand story elements were included, using the same scales used in pre-test 2 (see page 64). Finally, participants knowledge on whisky/vodka was measured using two 7-point Likert scale items adapted from The Marketing scales handbook (2005): “How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about whisky/vodka?” (“not at all knowledgeable/very knowledgeable”) and “Would you consider yourself familiar or unfamiliar with existing whisky/vodka brands?” (“very unfamiliar/very familiar”).
4.2 Results

4.2.1 Manipulation checks

To test whether the manipulation of the differentiation levels was successful, a 3X2 ANOVA was performed with prototypicality as dependent variable and differentiation level and brand story elements as the independent variables for both the whisky and the vodka category. For the category whisky, a significant main effect was found for the level of differentiation on the prototypicality of the design ($M_\text{L} = 5.34$, $M_\text{M} = 4.43$, $M_\text{H} = 2.53$), $F(2, 141) = 56.30$, $p < .001$. For the category vodka also a significant main effect was found for level of differentiation on the prototypicality of the design ($M_\text{L} = 5.76$, $M_\text{M} = 4.91$, $M_\text{H} = 2.97$), $F(2, 141) = 79.64$, $p < .001$. Bonferroni post hoc tests showed for both categories that the low differentiated design was rated significantly more prototypical than the medium and highly differentiated designs (both $p < .001$), and the medium design was rated significantly more prototypical than the highly differentiated design, $p < .001$. This confirms the success of the differentiation level manipulations. No significant effect was found for brand story elements on the prototypicality, whisky ($M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.97$, $M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.25$) $F(1, 141) = 1.48$, $p > .23$, vodka ($M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 4.51$, $M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.61$) $F(1, 141) = 1.59$, $p > .69$. Meaning that the adding of brand story elements did not influence the level of differentiation of the designs. For both categories no interaction effects were found, whisky: $F(2, 141) = .474$, $p > .62$, vodka: $F(2, 141) = .929$, $p > .39$. These results support that the manipulations were successful.

A significant main effect was found for brand story elements on the prototypicality, whisky ($M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 2.64$, $M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 3.98$) $F(1, 141) = 35.18$, $p < .001$, vodka ($M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 2.78$, $M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.08$) $F(1, 140) = 36.43$, $p < .001$. Differentiation level did not have a significant main effect on the presence of brand story elements, F(2, 141) = .062, $p > .92$, vodka F(2, 140) = 2.79, $p > .06$. For both categories no interaction effects were found, whisky $F(2, 141) = 1.25$, $p > .28$, vodka F(2, 140) = 1.45, $p > .23$. These results support that the manipulations were successful.

4.2.2 Test of hypotheses

This chapter describes the testing of the hypotheses that were set.

H1: There is an effect for level of differentiation on product evaluation, more specifically: a high level of differentiation will lead to a lower product evaluation compared to a low level of differentiation.

To test whether the level of differentiation had an influence on the overall product evaluation, ANCOVA analyses were done for both categories with level of differentiation as the independent variable and overall evaluation as the dependent variable. Knowledge in whisky/vodka and product attractiveness were included as covariates. For the whisky category results showed that product attractiveness was a significant covariate, $F(1, 68) = 44.27$, $p < .001$, as did it for vodka, $F(1, 68) = 19.11$, $p < .001$. To control for the influence of the visual appearance on the overall product evaluation this was used as a covariate, the other variables were left out of the analysis. For both categories no significant main effect was found for level of differentiation on overall evaluation, whisky ($M_\text{L} = 4.98$, $M_\text{M} = 4.81$, $M_\text{H} = 4.36$) $F(2, 68) = .395$, $p > .68$, vodka ($M_\text{L} = 4.95$, $M_\text{M} = 4.83$, $M_\text{H} = 4.73$) $F(2, 68) = .027$, $p > .97$, so no support was found for H1. See table 9 for an overview of the mean values.

Next to the overall evaluation, evaluation measures on the quality of the product were included in this research. ANCOVA analyses were done with the level of differentiation as independent variable and quality evaluation as dependent variables. Knowledge on whisky/vodka, gender, age and product attractiveness were included as covariates. For both categories product attractiveness was a significant covariate and therefore used as a covariate for the ANCOVA, whisky $F(1, 68) = 24.55$, $p < .001$; vodka $F(1, 68) = 12.82$, $p < .001$. For whisky no significant main effect was found for differentiation level on quality evaluation, ($M_\text{L} = 4.39$, $M_\text{M} = 4.29$, $M_\text{H} = 4.58$) $F(2, 68) = 2.38$, $p > .10$. When looking at the means of the quality
evaluation for whisky and comparing the low and highly differentiated design, an increase is visible. Meaning no support was found for H1.
For vodka also no significant effect was found for differentiation level on quality evaluation, (M_L = 5.02, M_M = 4.89, M_H = 5.51) F(2, 68) = 2.79, p>.06. When excluding the medium differentiated design from the analysis a significant effect is found, F(1,45) = 4.18, p<.05, the low differentiated design is significantly lower evaluated on quality than the highly differentiated design. See table 10 for an overview of the mean values.

H2: There is an interaction effect of differentiation level and brand story elements on the evaluation of the product, more specifically; a highly differentiated design with brand story elements leads to a higher evaluation compared to a high differentiated design without brand story elements.

To test H2 an ANCOVA analysis was performed with brand story elements and differentiation level as independent variables and overall evaluation as dependent variable. For both categories no significant effect was found for brand story elements on overall evaluation, whisky (M_No_BS_Elements = 4.72, M_BS_Elements = 5.04) F(1, 140) = .452, p>.50; vodka (M_No_BS_Elements = 4.83, M_BS_Elements = 4.93) F(1,139) = .085, p>.77. For both categories no effects were found for evaluation and the interaction between differentiation level and brand story elements, whisky (See table 9 for means): F(2, 140) = .967, p>.38, vodka (See table 9 for means): F(2, 139) = .865 p>.42, this shows no support for H2.
When performing a one-way ANOVA with 6 separate conditions and planned contrasts for the highly differentiated design without brand story elements compared to highly differentiated with brand story elements one-tailed significance was found, t(141) = -1.81, p < .04 (1-tailed), meaning that when looking at only the highly differentiated design, brand story elements have a significant main effect on the overall evaluation, supporting H2. For vodka this planned contrast did not show significant effects.
When performing the same ANCOVA with quality evaluation as dependent variable, for both categories no significant main effect was found for brand story elements on quality evaluation, Whisky (M_No_BS_Elements = 4.42, M_BS_Elements = 4.84) F(1, 140) = 2.91, p>.09, Vodka (M_No_BS_Elements = 5.14, M_BS_Elements = 5.03) F(1,139) = .739, p>.39. When looking into the means for both categories the quality evaluation is higher comparing the low differentiated design with the highly differentiated design, though this is not significant.
For both categories no significant interaction was found for differentiation level and brand story elements on quality evaluation, whisky (See table 10 for means), F(2, 140) = .094, p>.91, vodka (see table 10 for means) F(2, 139) = 1.22, p>.29.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whisky</th>
<th>Vodka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without brand story elements</td>
<td>With brand story elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 | Results main study: overall evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whisky</th>
<th>Vodka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without brand story elements</td>
<td>With brand story elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 | Results main study: quality evaluation
H3: There is a significant main effect of differentiation level on the induced attention by the product; a higher level of differentiation will lead to a higher level of induced attention.

To test H3 a 3 (differentiation level: low versus medium versus high) X 2 (brand story elements: with brand story elements versus without brand story elements) ANCOVA was performed for both categories, with differentiation level and brand story elements as independent variables and product attention as dependent variable. For both whisky and vodka product attractiveness was found as a significant covariate and included in the analysis, whisky F(1, 140) = 60.60, p<.001, vodka F(1, 139) = 72.14, p<.001.

For whisky there is a significant main effect of the level of differentiation on the attention induced by the product, (M_L = 3.52, M_M = 3.34, M_H = 4.68) F(2, 140) = 43.38, p<.001. Planned contrasts revealed that a low, p<.001, 95% CI[-1.89, -1.12], and medium, p<.001 95% CI[-2.03, -1.27], differentiated design induces significantly less attention compared to the highly differentiated design. These findings support H3 for the whisky category.

The effect of brand story elements on the attention induced by the product is not significant, (M_NO_BS_Elements = 3.77, M_BS_Elements = 3.90) F(1, 140)=.404, p>.52. There is a significant interaction between the differentiation level and the presence of brand story elements on the induced attention, F(2, 141) = 4.10, p<.05. Graph 1 shows this interaction. It is visible that a highly differentiated design with brand story elements leads to a lower level of attention than without brand story elements, though planned contrasts showed no significance but a trend t(141) = 1.61, p=.05 (1-tailed), also the difference in attention for a low differentiated design with and without brand story elements revealed to be not significant when compared with planned contrasts, t(141) = -1.53, p>.06 (1-tailed).

Graph 1 | Interaction effect of brand story elements and differentiation level on attention (whisky).
For the vodka category there is a significant main effect of the level of differentiation on the induced attention by the product, \( M_L = 3.38, M_M = 3.95, M_H = 4.08 \) \( F(2, 139) = 12.76 \ p < .001 \). Planned contrasts revealed that a low, \( p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI}[-1.51, -0.65] \), and medium, \( p < 0.05 95\% \text{ CI}[-0.86, -0.05] \), differentiated design induces significantly less attention compared to the highly differentiated design. This supports H3. There is no significant main effect of brand story elements on the induced attention by the product, \( M_{No\_BS\_Elements} = 3.77, M_{BS\_Elements} = 3.82 \) \( F(1, 140) = .037, p > .84 \). There is a significant interaction between the level of differentiation and the presence of brand story elements on the attention induced by the product, \( F(2, 139) = 4.13, p < .02 \). When looking at graph 2 it is visible that for the vodka category the low differentiated design without brand story elements induces less attention compared to the low differentiated design with brand story elements, this difference is significant \( t(140) = -2.23, p < .03 \) (2-tailed). The difference in attention for the medium differentiated designs, with- and without brand story elements, is not significant \( t(140) = .281, p > .37 \) (1-tailed). As for the difference between the highly differentiated designs, \( t(140) = 1.46, p > .053 \) (1-tailed), though this difference shows a trend.

Graph 2 | Interaction effect of brand story elements and differentiation level on attention (vodka).
H4: There is a main effect of brand story elements on the want for information, more specifically a packaging design with brand story elements will lead to a want for more information compared to a packaging design without brand story elements.

To test whether brand story elements in packaging will lead to wanting more information a 3 (differentiation level: low versus medium versus high) X 2 (brand story elements: with brand story elements versus without brand story elements) ANCOVA was performed, with differentiation level and brand story elements as independent variables and information search as dependent variable. Knowledge of whisky/vodka and product attractiveness were included as covariates. Results showed no significant covariate on information search for whisky, so these variables were excluded from this analysis. For the whisky category a significant main effect of brand story elements on information search was found, (M\text{No_BS_Elements} = 4.43, M\text{BS_Elements} = 5.00) F(1, 141) = 7.82, p<.01. For all levels of differentiation adding brand story elements increases the want for more information (see table 11 for means). These findings support H4 for the whisky category. No significant effect was found for differentiation level on wanting more information, (M\text{L} =3.82, M\text{M} = 4.42, M\text{H} = 4.17) F(2, 139) = 2.93, p>.05, or for the interaction of differentiation level and brand story elements on the want for information, (see table 12 for means) F(2, 139) = .734, p>.48.

H5: There is a main effect of brand story elements on likeliness of word-of-mouth, packaging with brand story elements will lead to more likeliness of word-of-mouth than packaging without brand story elements.

A 3x2 ANOVA was performed for both the whisky and vodka category, with differentiation level and brand story elements as independent variables and likeliness of word-of-mouth as a dependent variable. Knowledge of whisky/vodka, gender, age and product attractiveness were included as covariates. Results showed significance for product attractiveness as a covariate on information search for whisky, F(1, 141) = 5.63, p<.02, so this variable was included from this analysis. Whisky F(1, 141) = 5.63, p<.02. For vodka, knowledge was found as a covariate, F(1,139) = 5.07, p<.03. For the whisky and vodka category no significant main effect was found for brand story elements on word-of-mouth, whisky (M\text{No_BS_Elements} = 4.35, M\text{BS_Elements} = 4.60) F(1,140)=.490,p>.48; vodka(M\text{No_BS_Elements}=3.94,M\text{BS_Elements} = 3.80) F(1,139)=.009, p>.92. This rejects H5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Want for information</th>
<th>Whisky</th>
<th>Vodka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Without brand story elements</strong></td>
<td><strong>With brand story elements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Without brand story elements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 | Results main study: want for information
Also no significant effect was found for differentiation level on word-of-mouth, whisky ($M_L = 4.39, M_M = 4.45, M_H = 4.60$) $F(2, 140) = .99, p > .37$, vodka ($M_L = 3.61, M_M = 4.18, M_H = 3.83$) $F(2, 139) = 2.22, p > .11$. There is no interaction effect of brand story elements and differentiation level on word-of-mouth, whisky (see table 12 for means) $F(2, 140) = 1.63, p > .19$, vodka (see table 12 for means) $F(2, 139) = 1.10, p > .33$.

Finally, the main study included measures on how challenging the product and brand was perceived. A 3x2 ANOVA was performed for both the whisky and vodka category, with differentiation level and brand story elements as independent variables and challenging as a dependent variable. Knowledge of whisky/vodka, gender, age and product attractiveness were included as covariates. Results showed no significance for any of the covariates so these were excluded from the analysis. When measuring to what extent respondents considered the products challenging, for both categories level of differentiation was found as a significant main effect, whisky ($M_L = 4.47, M_M = 4.88, M_H = 5.20$) $F(2, 141) = 4.95, p < .01$; vodka ($M_L = 3.92, M_M = 4.51, M_H = 4.80$) $F(2, 140) = 6.32, p < .01$. Bonferroni post hoc tests revealed for whisky that the low differentiated design was seen as significantly less challenging than the highly differentiated design, $p < .01$, for vodka also the low differentiated design was seen as significantly less challenging than the highly differentiated design, $p < .01$.

The brand story elements do not have a significant effect on the challenging aspect, whisky ($M_{No_BS_Elements} = 4.80, M_{BS_Elements} = 4.90$) $F(1,14) = .266, p > .60$; vodka ($M_{No_BS_Elements} = 4.30, M_{BS_Elements} = 4.50$) $F(2, 140) = .922, p > .33$. There is no interaction effect of brand story elements and differentiation level on challenging, whisky (see table 13 for means) $F(2, 141) = .390, p > .67$, vodka (see table 13 for means) $F(2, 140) = 1.96, p > .14$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whisky</th>
<th>Vodka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No brand story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12 | Results main study: word-of-mouth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whisky</th>
<th>Vodka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No brand story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13 | Results main study: challenging**
This first study aimed to research the influence of brand story elements and levels of differentiation on the product evaluation. Findings from Schoormans and Robben (1997) showed that when packaging deviates a lot from its category prototype the evaluation by the consumer will decrease. In several studies was also found that consumers prefer those products that are most typical for a product category (Loken and Ward, 1990; Barnes and Ward, 1995; Schoormans and Robben, 1997). The level of attention induced by packaging will increase when it deviates more from the category prototype (Schoormans en Robben, 1997), so the optimal level of deviation, or prototypicality, would be around the middle, referred to as a ‘moderate level of incongruity’. Stated was that challenger brands need to break away from the category prototype and differentiate themselves in order to gain attention (Morgan, 2009; Mcquarter, 2012; Collins 2013). Though every challenger brand seems to cross the border of moderate deviation and comes to the market with a highly differentiated packaging. This research aimed to find out whether it are the brand story elements that bridge the gap from being too incongruent and discarded by the consumer, to being a highly conspicuous positive evaluated product.

Contrary to Schoormans and Robben (1997) overall seen this research showed no significant influence of differentiation level on the overall evaluation and quality evaluation. For both vodka as whisky all designs were rated relatively positive. On quality and overall evaluation scores are not below 4.29 on a 7-point Likert scale. Brand story elements did not have a significant influence on this, the evaluation for all three levels of differentiation, both with or without brand story elements were quite similar. Though when only looking into the highly differentiated designs for whisky, a significant effect was found for brand story elements on product evaluation, supporting H2. For vodka this effect was not found. A possible reason for the small difference in evaluation for the different design levels could be that the brand story was read first, and the measures for overall evaluation and quality evaluation were presented to the participant as the first questions, so the participant could have answered the evaluation questions solely on the brand story instead of the whole product.

In line with Schoormans and Robben (1997) it was found that the level of differentiation significantly influences the induced attention; a higher level of differentiation induces more attention, supporting H3. The presence of brand story elements had no further increase on the level of attention. Meaning that a highly differentiated packaging design, with or without brand story elements, induces more attention.

It was found that brand story elements significantly increase the want for information for the whisky category. This supports H4, which linked information search to an interest in the brand, when dealing with high differentiated packaging design. On the other hand this increase in want for information could be seen as remarkable since, compared to the designs without brand story elements, the information is complete; the participant has read the story and seen the brand story elements on the packaging. It could also be explained by the fact that the brand story elements were noticed but caused confusion and therefore the respondents wanted more information. The results for vodka did not support H4.

The main study did not find evidence to support H5, the hypothesis that brand story elements increase the likeliness of word-of-mouth advertisement. Likeliness of word-of-mouth is a difficult thing to measure when not dealing with the specific target group set for the product. The product might be evaluated high but when the participant and/or his friends and family do not drink vodka/whisky they will not tell them about this product. This might explain the mean values found for word-of-mouth.

Furthermore it is important to mention that the presence of brand story elements was tested in pre-test 2, though the perceived content of these elements has not been tested. The pre-test confirmed that the respondents noted the brand story elements and that the elements told them
something about the brand, compared to the packaging designs without brand story elements. Though it has not been tested what they thought it said about the brand, meaning that the brand story elements provided them information about the brand yet it is not clear if this information was in line with the actual brand story.
4.4 Limitations and further research

For this research several limitations can be noted which provide opportunities for further research. First of all, the respondents that participated in this research were all Industrial Design students. As these students often deal with innovation and really new products they can be considered to be more open to innovation, and therefore more open to the highly differentiated designs of this research. Preferably this research should be done with the targeted audience by the challenger brand. The challenger brands in this research did not have a very specific target audience, as a challenger brand should have. This was chosen deliberately in order to get enough participants for this research. This provides less evidence for the possible success of these challenger brands.

Furthermore the way in which the stimuli were presented (printed renders of the packaging design) to the respondents cannot be compared to the real situation, in which consumers would see the actual bottle in a store next to other brands. Also the way the brand story was presented to the respondents does not replicate the way a brand story would presumably be presented to a customer. In real life a challenger brand will probably display their brand story in an online environment. Consumers will therefore read the brand story prior to being at a store where they sell the product. Meaning that brand information might be already forgotten or read less accurately. Finally, this study is limited to two spirit categories. Although these categories were deliberately chosen because of the fact that consumers are forced to place high importance on packaging, it may be the case that different categories will lead to different results. Further research should be done to fully generalize these results in other spirit and beer categories.

In order to reduce the design time for the stimuli, an existing whisky and vodka brand was used, as their packaging was very prototypical. Meaning that some elements of these packaging designs were kept, according to the ‘category codes system’ set up for this research. Normally, there is no base design from which the designers develop the challenger brand packaging. This might have restricted the design freedom of the packaging designers. Also the implementation of the brand story elements was done very strictly for the sake of the research. All brand story elements had to be kept the same over the three differentiation levels, so the size and the type of elements could not differ. Also the brand story elements were not allowed to influence the prototypicality of the design. Normally these restrictions are not there, which might lead packaging designers to implement the brand story elements in a different way. For this research these restrictions were necessary in order to generalize and be able to draw conclusions. Further research should give designers the freedom to design the packaging from the start, so without existing brand elements, and also without restrictions for the size and type of brand story elements.

Finally, in order to gain further insights in the use of brand story elements, further research should try to proof the understanding of the brand story through the brand story elements. This could be done by presenting the participants the packaging design without first reading the brand story and in an interview asking them what they thought the brand story was for this design. Another option could be to for example ask the participant to answer the about the brand story: ‘Do you think the brand story of this brand starts off with an inciting incident?’ ("yes/no") if yes, please explain….. ‘Do you think the brand story of this brand contains conflict?’ ("yes/no") if yes, please explain….. ‘Do you consider the brand as unexpected?’ ("yes/no") please explain….. ‘Do you consider there to be a clear objective in the brand story of this product?’ ("yes/no") please explain…..This could be done in an interview or in the questionnaire. However, in a questionnaire an example challenger brand story might be needed in order to explain the questions. In an interview this could be done by the interviewer giving more information when necessary.

If in the end the consumer does not understand the brand story directly from the brand story elements, it is acceptable as long as they are triggered by these elements to search for more information about into the brand.
In order to gain more clarity on the exact influence of brand story elements it was chosen to perform a second study. In this study the textual brand story will be left out so only the influence of the visual brand story elements will be tested. After this second study final conclusions are drawn.
5. Study two

From the discussion and limitations found in study one a follow up study is conducted. This chapter describes this study and its findings. Starting with the method, following with the results, the discussion and the conclusion based on the two studies together.

5.1 Method
5.2 Results
5.3 Discussion
5.4 Conclusion
The findings in the main questionnaire raised some inconsistencies with the formulated hypotheses. As in earlier research was found that for a highly differentiated packaging design the evaluation of the product will be less high compared to a medium differentiated design, the findings of this study showed a nearly consistent rate for overall evaluation and quality evaluation for all three levels. When brand story elements were present there was a slight increase visible for the highly differentiated designs as hypothesized, but not a highly significant difference. Because this aspect is important for packaging designers, and thereby CARTILS, a follow-up test was done for only the high differentiated designs with and without brand story elements. This test is comparable to the main study, though this time the brand story itself is not presented to the customer, as though they would see the package in the store without having prior information. This test will show whether the presence of brand story elements actually makes a difference in the evaluation of the highly differentiated packaging designs.

5.1 Method

5.1.1 Study design and participants

The same questionnaire was used as in the main study (see Appendix 7). For vodka both highly differentiated designs were used as stimuli, one with- and one without brand story elements. For whisky also both highly differentiated designs were used. This resulted in a 2 (brand story elements or no brand story elements) x 2 (whisky or vodka) design. The category was used as a within factor and the brand story elements was a between groups factor. Since this is a follow up study again Industrial Design students participated. A total of forty-two participants of which half the participants received the stimuli with brand story elements, and the other half without brand story elements.

5.1.2 Measures

For whisky the following cronbach's alphas were found for the used scales: product evaluation overall ($\alpha = .90$), product quality ($\alpha = .62$), information search ($\alpha = .87$), word-of-mouth ($\alpha = .89$), challenging ($\alpha = .91$), product attractiveness ($\alpha = .91$), prototypicality (2-items) ($\alpha = .90$), presence of brand story ($\alpha = .91$), knowledge ($\alpha = .87$). For vodka the following cronbach's alphas were found for the used scales: product evaluation overall ($\alpha = .92$), product quality ($\alpha = .86$), information search ($\alpha = .92$), word-of-mouth ($\alpha = .89$), challenging ($\alpha = .91$), product attractiveness ($\alpha = .92$), induced attention ($\alpha = .74$), prototypicality (2-items) ($\alpha = .63$), presence of brand story ($\alpha = .91$), knowledge ($\alpha = .87$).
5.2 Results

5.2.1 Manipulation check

check for the main study the value for the highly differentiated designs was 2.53. For this follow-up test the presence of brand story elements had no significant main effect on the prototypicality, as it did not in the main study, \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 2.71, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 2.95\) F(1, 40) = .409, p>.52. A mean value of 3.71 was found for the prototypicality of the designs for the vodka stimuli. In the manipulation check for the main study, the value for the highly differentiated vodka designs was 2.97. For this follow-up test the presence of brand story elements had no significant main effect on the prototypicality, as it did not in the main study, \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.95, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 3.45\) F(1, 39) = 1.11, p>.29.

For whisky a significant main effect was found for brand story elements on the perceived presence of brand story elements, \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.19, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 3.97\) F(1, 40) = 5.05, p<.04. In the main study the means found for the highly differentiated design were: \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 2.50, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.24\). Also a significant main effect was found for brand story elements on the perceived presence of brand story elements.

For vodka a significant main effect was found for brand story elements on the perceived presence of brand story elements, \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.43, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.48\) F(1, 39) = 5.80, p<.03. The vodka designs in the main study had the following means: \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 2.78, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.08\), here the effect of brand story elements was also significant.

These results indicate that for this follow-up test the manipulation of the whisky stimuli is comparable with the stimuli in the main study.

5.2.2 Testing Hypotheses

The findings of this study are divided into each aspect researched in the main study and will refer back to the posed hypotheses of the main study.

Overall evaluation (H2)

There is a significant main effect of brand story elements on the overall evaluation of the product, \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.93, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.83\) F(1, 40) = 6.38, p<.02. The design without brand story elements is evaluated significantly lower compared to the design with brand story elements. Above supports H2 and is in line with earlier found significance for planned contrasts of the highly differentiated designs.

For vodka no significant main effect exists for brand story elements on the overall evaluation of the product, \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.43, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 3.71\) F(1, 38) = 2.02, p>.16. Product attractiveness was found as a covariate for this analysis, F(1, 38)= 43.20, p<.03. The vodka design without brand story elements is evaluated lower but no significant difference was found. Though rejecting H2, this is in line with the findings of the main study.

Quality evaluation (H2)

For whisky and vodka no significant main effect was found for brand story elements on the quality evaluation of the product, whisky \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 4.63, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.99\) F(1, 39) = .905, p>.33, vodka \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.62, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 3.80\) F(1, 38) = 1.04, p>.31. For both categories product attractiveness was found as a covariate, whisky F(1, 39)=5.11, p<.03, vodka F(1, 38) = 41.50, p<.001. This rejects H2.

Induced attention (H3)

For both categories no significant main effect was found for brand story elements on the induced attention, whisky \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 4.76, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 5.14\) F(1, 40) = .99 , p>.32, vodka \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 4.76, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 5.14\) F(1, 38) = .167 , p>.68. For this analysis no significant covariate was found for vodka product attractiveness was included as a covariate, F(1, 38) = 14.54, p<.001.

Want for more information (H4)

No significant covariate was found, so these variables were excluded from the analysis. A significant main effect was found for information search, \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.73, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 4.65\) F(1, 39) = 5.36, p<.03, the want for more information is significantly higher when brand story elements are present, this result supports H4 and is line with findings from the main study. For vodka product attractiveness was found as a covariate, F(1, 38) = 21.20, p<.001. No significant main effect was found \(M_{\text{No BS Elements}} = 3.06, M_{\text{BS Elements}} = 3.40\) F(1, 38) =
5.36, p>.23. This rejects H4 but is in line with the findings for vodka in the main study.

Word-of-mouth (H5)
For word-of-mouth for whisky no significant covariate was found. A significant main effect was found for brand story elements on word-of-mouth, $(M_{No_BS\_Elements} = 2.65, M_{BS\_Elements} = 3.73)$ $F(1, 39) = 5.01, p<.04$, when brand story elements are present word-of-mouth is significantly more likely compared to when no brand story elements are present. For vodka the variable product attractiveness was found as a significant covariate, $F(1, 38) = 10.56$, $p<.01$. A significant main effect was found for brand story elements on word-of-mouth, $(M_{No_BS\_Elements} = 2.38, M_{BS\_Elements} = 3.03)$ $F(1, 38) = 5.72, p<.03$, when brand story elements are present word-of-mouth is significantly more likely compared to when no brand story elements are present. This supports H3, contrary to the findings in the main study.

Challenging
No significant main effect was found for brand story elements on to what extent the design was seen as challenging for both categories, whisky $(M_{No_BS\_Elements} = 4.52, M_{BS\_Elements} = 4.80)$ $F(1,40) = 1.06, p>.31$, vodka $(M_{No_BS\_Elements} = 3.65, M_{BS\_Elements} = 3.78)$ $F(1,38) = .178, p>.67$. For the whisky category in the analysis no significant covariate was found. For the vodka designs the variable product attractiveness was a significant covariate, $F(1, 38) = 5.60, p<.03$. 

5.3 Discussion study two

This study aimed to further research the influence of brand story elements on the evaluation of highly differentiated products. This time without letting participants first read the brand story of each brand, the packaging designs were evaluated.

A significant effect was found for brand story elements on the evaluation of the highly differentiated whisky designs, meaning that without having read the brand story prior to evaluating the product, brand story elements positively increased the evaluation of the product, supporting H2. Again, this effect is only found for the whisky design, as it was in study one. Also for the whisky category a significant effect was found for brand story elements on information search, supporting H4. This is in line with the findings from study one where this was also found for only the whisky category. This can be explained by the fact that the respondent is enthused and curious about the brand and wants more information. In the discussion of study one it was mentioned that the want for information might have been caused by the fact that the respondent is confused by the brand story element and therefore wants more information, this can be also be applicable to this study.

When comparing the means from highly differentiated design of the first study with the means of this study it can be seen that without the textual brand story present, the want for information is lower. Meaning that the brand story elements increase the want of more information, but the presence of the textual brand story present, the want for information is lower. Meaning that the brand story elements increase the want of more information, but the presence of the textual brand story present, the want for information is lower. When these are combined (as in study one) the want for more information is highest. This can be explained by the fact that the respondent knows the whole story and is curious about the brand.

A significant main effect was found for brand story elements on word-of-mouth advertisement. When brand story elements are present, word-of-mouth advertisement is significantly more likely compared to when no brand story elements are present. Meaning that the brand story elements make the product more worth to talk about. This supports H5. Looking into the means, with or without brand story elements the likeliness of word-of-mouth is below 3.8. So it can be said that although the brand story elements make them significantly more likely to perform word-of-mouth advertising it is still not likely that they actually perform this.

Comparing these findings to the findings in study one, the mean for the highly differentiated design with brand story elements is higher than for this study. This difference can be explained by the fact that in study one the respondents had all possible information, meaning the brand story and the brand story elements on the packaging. The details of the brand story might have triggered them more to talk about this brand. Though in study one no significant effect was found for the brand story elements on the likeliness of word-of-mouth.

In both study one and study two the results for the vodka designs differ a lot compared to the whisky designs. In study one, except for H3, no evidence was found to support the hypotheses, compared to partly support for H2, and support for H3 and H4 for the whisky category. In study two, for vodka, support was found for H5, whereas for whisky support was found for H2, H4 and H5. These results indicate a difference between the stimuli of both categories. Because both pre-tests and the manipulation tests showed success of the designed stimuli in terms of prototypicality, presence of brand story elements and to what extent the brand story was perceived as challenging, a packaging designer was asked to evaluate the vodka designs once more.

P. van den Aardweg, an experienced packaging designer at CARTILS who was not involved in the designing of the stimuli took a look at the designs. He noticed that to him the highly differentiated packaging design for whisky was still a credible design, he could imagine that whisky would come in this bottle. For vodka he thought the bottle was not credible as a vodka bottle anymore. He also mentioned that for vodka the use of colour is very important, it gives the bottle authority, as is important in the vodka category. For the medium and highly differentiated packaging the use of colour was differentiated from the prototypical blue and red. For the whisky designs the use of colour stayed the same over the three levels of differentiation. Though in the pre-test both highly differentiated designs were rated equally differentiated, the
whisky design could have been more credible and thereby evaluated different than the vodka design.

When looking at the brand story elements for whisky, the used illustration of barrels have a close link to whisky. It is likely to say that most consumers will know that whisky is aged in barrels. The vodka brand story elements might have been less recognizable as being linked to vodka; the ingredients of vodka differ per brand and consumers might not be aware that vodka can be made from grains. This might have influenced the credibility of the brand story elements and thereby the findings in this study.

The found means for knowledge on the category did not show great differences (Mvodka = 3.54 Mwhisky = 3.26) so it can be concluded that this was not the cause for the difference in findings between the two categories.

Another cause for the difference in findings could be the fact that the whisky designs were always presented first, and that when participants reached the second stimuli they were less attentive.

In order to draw conclusions the findings for the vodka category are left out in the overall conclusions of this research.
5.4 Overall conclusion

It is important for packaging designers to consider the different aspects of differentiation and brand story telling when designing packaging for challenger brands. Summarizing the findings of the first study shows that challenger brands can cross the moderate incongruity ‘rule’ set by earlier research. Not only will a highly differentiated design increase the attention induced by the packaging, it will not have a negative result for the evaluation of their product. This increased attention might enter the brand into the consumer’s attention set, and the positive evaluation might enter the brand into their consideration set (Schoormans & Robben, 1997). For the evaluation of the product the differentiation level did not show a significant effect, contrary to what was found in literature and therefore expected. Also the influence of brand story elements did not give consistent results. The possible influence of the textual brand story was the incentive to perform the second study to investigate the influence of brand story elements further.

In study one it was found that brand story elements increase the want for information. This is a powerful effect for challenger brands. This research might not be able to proof whether the brand story elements told the participants the actual brand story, or that the participants understood the brand story elements. Though when more information is sought the actual brand story will get to the consumer (by for example reading the back of the product or searching for it online) and the target group will find their shared values with this challenger brand. When the consumer has read the story beforehand the brand story elements can act as recognition for this brand or as a reminder of the brand story.

Summarizing the findings of study two it can be concluded that brand story elements increase the evaluation of highly differentiated designs. This is an important finding for challenger brands. As found in study one, the brand story elements increase want for information. The brand story elements also increase likeliness of word-of-mouth for highly differentiated designs. This is a powerful effect that packaging designers should make use of. This word-of-mouth advertising is the marketing for every starting challenger brand.

Concluding, the findings from study one and study two provide reasons for packaging designers to design a highly differentiated design and to explicitly tell the brand story through brand story elements. This will give challenger brands the opportunity to express their identity; through their packaging but also because consumers will search for more information about the brand. Finally the brand will enter social conversation, since word-of-mouth advertising is more likely.
6. Design Guidelines

In this chapter all the findings from the literature study and the two quantitative studies are combined into design guidelines for packaging design for challenger brands. The chapter starts off with an explanation of the eventual tool. Then the difference between a real challenger brand and a brand who strives to be a challenger is explored. Finally the implementation of the Challenger Diamond is explained and the tool is compared with existing design tools of CARTILS.

6.1 Challenger Diamond
6.2 Challenger brand or challenger approach?
6.3 Implementing the Challenger Diamond
This chapter will combine the findings and conclusions from the previous chapters into design guidelines for packaging designers. The guidelines will be thoroughly explained and compared to the existing packaging tools CARTILS is using.

From the analysis of literature, of existing challenger brands and the conclusions from the studies performed during this project, the following guidelines are developed for designing packaging for challenger brands:

- **Express your identity**

As found in literature and the analysis of existing challenger brands; challenger brands are brands that have a very clear lighthouse identity. This lighthouse identity is an intense projection of who they are, what they stand for and how they see the world (Morgan, 2009). Their brand values and their passion are the base of this identity.

When designing packaging for challenger brands, it is important that this identity becomes clear through their packaging. Their brand story should be clearly implemented by adding brand story elements to the packaging design and also the design language of the packaging arises from this identity. The packaging design should exude the confidence and passion the brand has in taking on this challenge.

- **Be different**

As found in literature and analysis of existing challenger brands, and confirmed by the studies performed in this project, it is clear that challenger brands should differentiate in order to gain attention and stand out against their competitors. The conclusions from the study show that challenger brands should let go of most of their category codes.

- **Be single minded**

Challenger brands have a very clear and specific target audience. They need to be single-minded, and sacrifice what might seem to be important markets (Morgan, 2009). They want to strongly bind a certain group of people to them in order to be able to enter the market.

This single-mindedness also needs to be exercised in the packaging design for the brand. The packaging needs to clearly focus on this target audience and connect with them and their environment.

These three guidelines together form the ‘Challenger Diamond’, see Figure 40. The different aspects of the model are shaped like light beams, that together form a diamond shape. The light beams represent the expression of the challenger brand’s identity, referring to the lighthouse metaphor used by Morgan (2009). The beams all originate from the same point, the core of the challenger brand: its identity. When the expression of this identity is combined with the two elements ‘Be different’ and ‘Be single-minded’ a diamond shape becomes visible. This shape is purposely used because the metaphor ‘diamond in the rough’ refers back to challenger brands; without a fitting packaging design that expresses their identity a challenger brand can remain a diamond on the rough; an undiscovered brand with much potential. When using these three aspects correctly for a challenger brand packaging its true identity can be revealed and make it a successful challenger brand; it is turned into a polished diamond.

The Challenger Diamond forms the base for developing packaging design for challenger brands. When each of these aspects is taken into account properly, a strong base can be set for the development of the challenger brand packaging design.
EXPRESS YOUR IDENTITY

Figure 40 | The Challenger Diamond
During the past years CARTILS has experienced that established brands are asking for a challenger approach in their packaging design. These are mostly brands that are in their maturity state. These brands notice the challenger brands around them gaining market share through their different approach and disruptiveness. It is at this point that they want to change their appearance and present themselves as a challenger brand in order to increase their market share. This can be by tapping a different market, presenting a different product or just rebranding their existing products and brand image.

A distinction should be made between actual challenger brands and brands who strive to be a challenger brand. It is up to CARTILS to make this distinction. In order to guide this distinction a challenger brand check model is set up (see Figure 41). This model can be used as a checklist in order to make sure whether the client brand is an actual challenger brand. The elements form this checklist are derived from the performed literature research and research of existing challenger brands.

The first step to evaluate the brand is a question. In this step the following questions need to be asked whether to proof the brand is a challenger brand:

1. Not the number one of the category: A challenger brand can be number two, number ten or number twenty, as long as it is not the number one brand in the category.
2. Ambitions exceed resources: Challenger brands’ ambitions are bigger than its resources and they are willing to accept this gap.
3. Rapid growth: A challenger brand has experienced a fast growth through their marketing actions. Note that when dealing with a start-up challenger brand this growth has yet to take place.

From this first step it is decided whether the client brand has the attributes of a challenger brand. The second and third steps establish the other necessary ingredients of a challenger brand: the challenge and the broken conventions.

**What do they challenge?**

There needs to be a clear challenge for the brand. As mentioned before in chapter 2.1.1 on page 18 possible challenges for a brand are:

- Challenging some fundamental dimension or driver of the category
- Challenging some aspect of the way the consumer shops for, experiences, or consumes the product.
- Challenging the culture surrounding the category.
- Challenging some broader aspect of a contemporary culture.
- Challenging some dimension or quality of the competition/Market leader (Morgan, 2009).

**What conventions are broken?**

The challenge on which the brand is built comes with conventions that are broken. What are these conventions? As mentioned in chapter 2.1.1 on page 18 the conventions that can be broken are:

- Conventions of representation
- Conventions of medium
- Conventions of product performance
- Conventions of (product and service) experience
- Conventions of neighborhood and network
- Conventions of relationship (Morgan, 2009).
All these challenger attributes should be summarized in the lighthouse identity of the brand. Their brand story translates this lighthouse identity into a narrative. As a final check, for a challenger brand it is important that this brand story is unexpected and contains a clear desire and conflict.

When the client brand matches the attributes of a challenger brand the Challenger Diamond tool can be used for designing packaging design. When the client brand does not match the attributes of a challenger brand it should be concluded that his brand is a regular brand. Meaning that for a line extension or a new brand development the existing Ignite tool (see chapter 1.1.1 on page 12) should be used.

Since these brands specifically ask for a challenger brand approach, it means that they want to differentiate themselves. In order to answer to this request at the pillar product promise the category analysis should include existing challenger brands in that category. These challenger brands can be used as an inspiration for the new packaging design. Since their brand story does not contain the elements of a challenger brand story, it cannot convey their identity as well as needed in order to differentiate themselves from their competitors. This means that they will have to follow relatively more category codes in order to be credible. If there are any small elements present in their brand story that seem challenging these need to be emphasized and expressed as well as possible in order to create some room for differentiation. What level of differentiation is acceptable for these type of brands, or more specific; how many prototypical design elements need to be present, should be researched.

For the pillar target audience is it important that the brand focuses on a smaller and more specified target audience. By doing this, they will automatically end up with a more specific packaging design, and therefore more differentiated than their competitors who focus on a very broad target audience. This approach of the target audience pillar of the Ignite tool can be compared with the Be single-minded guideline from the Challenger Diamond.

If a brand really wants to convert itself into a challenger brand this is not something that packaging or branding alone can do for them. They will have to reorganize who they are and what they stand for. They need to (re)find their challenge and adjust their behaviour and strategy accordingly.
6.3 Implementing the Challenger Diamond

6.3.1 Who will use these guidelines?

The guidelines will be used by the strategy department of CARTILS. The design process of CARTILS consists of five phases: acquisition, concept creation, implementation, research preparation, finalisation and production (Dekker, 2013). During the acquisition phase the client is brought in and the scope of the project is defined. During this phase the client provides information about the brand. In this phase CARTILS can use the challenger brand check model in order to verify whether this brand is a challenger brand. If it is a challenger brand the following phase, concept creation, consists of setting up the design brief. This design brief follows from using the guidelines set in the Challenger Diamond. This design brief is presented to Creation (the packaging design department), where the first concepts are designed. This is combined in a presentation for the client. This presentation communicates the analysis and the chosen strategic design direction. During the implementation concepts are selected and elaborated. This is also an important check moment to see whether the designs fit the demands and set restrictions of the design brief set by the strategy department. Concept choice can be done in different ways; the client can decide on a concept, but there is a possibility that the client wants to do customer research in order to pick a concept. During the research preparation phase the packaging designers create all concepts needed for research purposes. During the finalisation phase a final concept is chosen and fine-tuned. Then the concept is taken in production (Dekker, 2013).

6.3.2 Using the guidelines

Express your identity

The CARTILS strategy team should make a thorough analysis of the challenger brand. The following elements should be clear in order to get a broad overview of the brand:

- The inciting incident: The moment that caused the people involved to start the brand or change its direction. This makes the story of what the brand is trying to achieve uniquely theirs.
- Unexpectedness: When analysing the category and its products find out where the challenger brand takes the different direction. This unexpected direction is where the challenger brand differentiates itself from others in the category.
- Objective: The objective comes directly from the inciting incident. The brand wants to achieve something and make it visible to their public.
- Conflict: Challengers are driven by conflict. The way they deal with this conflict or struggle is their way to reveal their true character. This challenge, that they publicly take on, is their reason for being in a market (Morgan, 2009).

The conclusion from this analysis should come in a description of possible brand story elements that should be implemented in the design. Visual translations of these descriptions can be made with the use of mood boards. Product packaging examples can also be used as inspiration for these brand story elements.

It should be kept in mind that the targeted audience must understand the brand story and must be triggered to look into the brand. Next to mood boards it is important that all involved designers understand the brand story of the challenger brand, in order to be fully aware of their identity.

Be single minded

An analysis of the specific target audience of the challenger brand needs to be done. Their demographics and characteristics need to be established. This is combined into a mood board, which forms a realistic image of the target. A visual overview of preferred products for this target audience is realized. This gives a direction of the design language that appeals to this audience. It should be kept in mind that this target audience is a very specific audience and therefore the design language and characteristics will be more distinct than when dealing with broader target audiences.

Be different

In order to systematically find out what codes should and what codes should not be present in the
packaging design the following steps are advised to be undertaken:

1. Analysing the category and establishing the category prototype.
   The category prototype needs to be established for the different design aspects present in the category. These aspects are structural and graphical, meaning these aspects are about the bottle design but also the graphical design. Examples of design aspects are: bottle shape, neck shape, label shape, colour use, font use and bottle details.
   An approach is to look into the packaging design of the ten biggest brands in the category, and to identify all structural and graphical design aspects. When a clear prototype is visible, list that for the specific design elements. For example in the vodka category (as can be read in chapter 4.1.1.2) the bottle shape for almost all top 10 vodka brands are long and slender, this is therefore identified as the category prototype. For all the different design aspects present in the packaging design in the category the prototype needs to be listed, even if the found elements are only present in a few packaging designs.

2. Defining values for the design elements.
   The values given to the category design aspects are defined by looking at the frequency the prototypical elements are used for competitive brands, and the dominance of the prototypical aspects. When most (eight out of ten) competitive brands include a prototypical aspect this aspect and/or is a dominant design aspect, it will be rated as value 3. These are most likely aspects such as the bottle and neck shape. The value 2 will be given to items that are present in half of the competitive brands and to items that are often present but less dominant in packaging, these will be aspects like use of colour and label shape. For design aspects that are present in only a few (two out of ten) competitors or items that are present in competitors but not highly visible the value 1 will be given, these are aspects like for example bottle embossments.

3. Decide on design elements.
   The values are now added to create a total score. When one would design a very prototypical packaging this will include all prototypical design elements and therefore score the highest possible score. In this case a highly differentiated design is wanted, meaning that it will not contain many prototypical design aspects.
   A rule of thumb that can be used to specify which elements should be included is not to include value 3 items for highly differentiated designs. The design should contain only value 1 items or a combination of 1 and 2 value items. This is to make sure that the design will be really highly differentiated. So major dominant design aspects as a bottle shape and neck shape should be different than the prototype.
   Note that it can be decided to discard all prototypical design elements, though research has not validated this approach and therefore it is not clear what will happen with the product evaluation.
   What the design elements should be for the challenger brand packaging design is open to packaging designers. The established design language at the ‘be specific’ aspect will be of influence and guidance. This tool helps to establish what prototypical aspects should be discarded.

6.3.3 Comparing the Challenger Diamond to existing tools

As mentioned before CARTILS now employs three different tools in the development of their packaging design. The Trinity design tool; a tool for developing limited editions, the Ignite tool; a tool for line extensions and new brands and the Brandstar tool; a tool for evaluating packaging. In retrospect not all of these are actual tools. A tool is a thing that helps you perform a job (Cambridge online dictionary, 2015). For the Brandstar tool this is the case, it helps CARTILS to evaluate packaging designs. The Trinity and the Ignite tool are not tools per se, they are the content a packaging design must have in order to meet the requirements set
by CARTILS for a limited edition and a new brand development or line extension.
As for the Challenger Diamond these are, as the Trinity and Ignite, guidelines for developing packaging design.
Looking into the Ignite tool there are some resemblances with the challenger guidelines, after all they are both set up for new brand packaging development. Though dynamically they are substantially different. A packaging design coming from the guidelines set by the Ignite tool is specified to the needs and wants of the target audience, this is the base of their brand. Then it is about their product promise, about seducing their target audience and performing in the category they are in. This means that they will follow the necessary category codes of the category they are in. The third guideline is about the brand promise, the brand story and brand values the new product contains.

The challenger brand guidelines are first of all based on developing packaging directly from the brand identity. What the brand stands for and what it challenges is what drives the brand and this is what they want to exude through their packaging. The target audience is connected to this, this specified group comes from the challenger brand identity; it is the group of people that share the same values as the challenger brand does. Brands for which the Ignite tool is used fit their product to their target audience; a challenger brand’s target audience follows from what they stand for. Where the product promise is an important part of the packaging design in the Ignite tool, this promise is intrinsic to the brand identity and therefore not a separate guideline. The product promise in the Ignite tool also deals with fitting the category the product it is in and the category codes it should communicate. The challenger brand guidelines focus on the exact opposite; what codes should be let go in order to succeed?

Concluding, the Challenger Diamond guidelines are an addition to the tools and guidelines currently used by CARTILS.
7. Case study: Bisquit Cognac

This chapter describes the case study which is performed. This case study is set up in order to test the Challenger Diamond. First the brand is examined, then a challenger brand is developed from this brand. With the guidelines of the Challenger Diamond a design brief is set up. The design resulting from this design brief is tested in qualitative research. From this research the Challenger Diamond is evaluated.

7.1 Introduction
7.2 Bisquit Cognac
7.3 Setting up the design brief
7.4 The packaging design
7.5 Qualitative research
7.6 Conclusion
7.1 Introduction

Distell, a South African wine spirits and flavoured alcoholic beverages producer and marketer, approached CARTILS with the question to develop a challenger brand packaging for their Cognac brand, called Bisquit. This chapter will first look into the Cognac category. Then the brand Bisquit Cognac itself, and its brand story is researched. The challenger brand check model will be used in order to conclude whether this brand is a challenger brand. If it is concluded that Bisquit Cognac is a challenger brand their existing brand and brand story will be used for the creation of their new packaging. If it is not, a challenger brand story will be developed for a line extension of the main brand. The challenger guidelines will be used in order to come to a design brief for the packaging designers at CARTILS. Then the designed packaging will be tested in a qualitative manner in order to see whether the design was successful.

For this case study it is chosen to focus on the most general and most sold Cognac of the product portfolio of Bisquit; the V.S. Cognac (Distell, n.d.).

7.1.1 What is Cognac?

Cognac is a brown/reddish coloured spirit named after the region of Cognac in the southwest of France. Cognac is a variety of brandy. Brandy is a distilled and aged wine made from white grapes. For a brandy to bear the name Cognac, the production methods must meet several legal requirements. It must be made from the Ugni Blanc, Colombard, or Folle Blanche grape varieties. Also, Cognac must be distilled following a specific, traditional, two-stage method. This distillation must be done in a traditional copper Charentais still. Following the harvest, this distillation must be completed by March 31st, now the obtained spirit is called eau-de-vie. The eau-de-vie must be aged for at least two years in French barrels from Limousin-oak or Troncais-oak. After these eau-de-vies are blended they are now referred to as Cognac. All cognacs are blended, this is what gives them their complex flavour. As with whisky, the longer the Cognac ages in a barrel the more extracts and flavours of the barrels wood are taken up. Therefore Cognac is often aged longer than the legally set two years.

The minimum alcohol content to be sold must be 40% by volume. There are different types of Cognac, this has to do with the aging:

- Very Special (or V.S.): a Cognac whose youngest eau-de-vie is at least two years old.
- Very Superior Old Pale (V.S.O.P.): a Cognac whose youngest eau-de-vie is at least four years old.
- Napoléon, Hors d’âge or Extra Old (X.O.): a Cognac whose youngest eau-de-vie is at least six years old (Bureau National Interprofessionnel du Cognac, 2013).

Cognac typically features flavours of caramel, nuts and vanilla but it differs per brand. Also the age of the Cognac is of big influence on the taste. A younger Cognac is typically fruity. Fruits one can recognize are raisins, apricots, oranges, lemons, apples and/or peaches. For medium old Cognacs present a certain nuance of flowers. The older Cognacs usually contain flavours of spices (Cognac-Expert.com, 2014). Traditionally Cognac is drunk neat, or on ice. The traditional target audience of Cognac is a mainly male, middle-aged and affluent. Though in the last decade this has been changing. As this target group grew older, the sales staggered. Cognac brands want to reinvigorate their brand by speaking to a broader target audience. Cognac makers are emphasizing mixability in order to make Cognac more approachable to new-to-the-category consumers (Lafave Grace, 2011). For example Hennessy, the number one most sold Cognac in the world, started in 2010 with targeting a younger audience. Their new Cognac Hennessy Black is a smoother Cognac that is promoted to be ideal for cocktails. Hennessy hopes their campaign and product will show younger affluent consumers that it is a different product than what their fathers drank. “They are motivated by a desire to stand out, be unique and be seen as connoisseurs of quality, and that is where Hennessy has stepped in with Hennessy Black.” (Wong, 2010). ABK6 also tries to target a younger audience with the introduction of their ICE Cognac; a Cognac specially made to drink from the freezer, but also with marketing campaigns for cocktails with Cognac (ABK Cognac, 2014).
7.2 Bisquit Cognac

7.2.1 Bisquit cognac brand story

The House of Bisquit Cognacs was founded in the heart of France in 1819, from the spirit of one man: Alexandre Bisquit. Confident in the superior quality of his Cognacs and a passionate entrepreneur, he took Bisquit Cognacs to all corners of the globe, making them a reference from Asia to Africa and through America to Europe.

While travelling again and again, he understood how important it is, beyond one’s business, to take more time to savour life and to cultivate privileged moments as time is what you make it. A life philosophy that Alexandre Bisquit decided to implement for the elaboration of his Cognacs through a unique and authentic savoir-faire passed down from one generation of master distiller to another – a longer distillation time.

Aging in handmade oak casks in our dark cellars will magnify the specificity of our longer distillation, creating the distinctive signature of the House. Nearly two centuries later, our Master distiller still masters time with an inspired skill to bring you an exceptional tasting experience. Thanks to a longer distillation time, mastered to the nearest second, and magnified through a long ageing in oak barrels, Bisquit Cognacs express a more abundant bouquet of aromas and a smoother, supplier taste. Bisquit Cognac, ‘Time is what you make it’ (Distell, n.d.). Bisquit Cognac is a global brand but mostly sold in South Africa. Bisquit Cognac has four different Cognacs in their product portfolio, a V.S. Cognac, a V.S.O.P. Cognac, Prestige Cognac and a X.O. Cognac (see Figure 42 for an overview of their Cognacs). In recent years their market share has staggered. By converting themselves into a challenger brand they hope to reinvigorate their brand and increase their market share.

7.2.2 Target audience

Bisquit Cognac targets an elite society who appreciates quality and luxury and the time it takes to achieve both (Bisquit Cognac, n.d.). There is not mentioned whether they target males or females but their advertising through their Facebook shows solely men and seems to target a middle class consumer group. There is no clear age group targeted, though their advertising in South Africa shows a focus on a younger audience (see Figure 44 on page 99).

Figure 42 | Product portfolio Bisquit Cognac, from left to right: V.S., V.S.O.P., Prestige, X.O.
7.2.3 Challenger brand check

From general knowledge of the brand Bisquit it can be said that it is not a typical challenger brand. With help of the challenger brand checklist this can be further explored and concluded (see 6.2).

- Not number 1: Bisquit Cognac is not the number one in its category. Which number it is cannot be said clearly but it is not included in the top 4 of Cognacs sold in the world.
- Ambitions exceed resources. Bisquit Cognac is not a brand that is limited by their resources in terms of marketing. They make use of several marketing channels such as TV commercials, magazine advertisement and events.
- Rapid growth: No exact numbers for the growth of Bisquit Cognac are available, though it can be said that since the brand is set-up no rapid growth has taken place.

What do they challenge?
Bisquit Cognac has no clear challenge. In its brand story it is explicitly said that they, compared to all other Cognac brands, use a 15% longer distillation time. It could be said that with this they challenge the existing distillation time.

What conventions are broken?
There are no conventions broken, all existing conventions around the Cognac category are followed.

Concluding it can be said that Bisquit Cognac is not a challenger brand. A visual representation of the challenger brand check model can be seen in Figure 43.

Are you a challenger brand?
1. Not the number one: YES
2. Ambitions exceed resources: NO
3. Rapid growth: NO

What do you challenge?
Usual distillation time.

What conventions are broken?
None.

NO LIGHTHOUSE IDENTITY
BRAND STORY

Figure 43 | Challenger brand check model for Bisquit Cognac
Figure 44 | Bisquit Cognac online advertisement (source: Bisquit Facebook)
7.3 Setting up the Design brief

For this project it is chosen to develop a challenger brand story for Bisquit Cognac. By doing this, the brand can be used as a basis to use and test the developed guidelines of the Challenger Diamond.

To come up with a challenger brand story, first, the possible challenges for the Cognac category were explored. From these challenges, several stories were developed (see Appendix 9). In consultation with CARTILS, the following challenger brand story was chosen:

7.2.1 Challenger brand story - Armelle

Being the daughter of a master distiller comes with drinking a hell of a lot of Cognacs. I love the sweet taste and all the different flavours you can find in each different Cognac. Crazy enough my female friends just don’t believe me.

All of us are creative, love cooking and trying out new things. After our home cooked dinners we drink liqueur with our coffees. Once I brought a bottle of our families Cognac but they didn’t even want to drink it. They thought it is something for men to drink neat, not for our girls-dinner-night. When I once poured their glasses in the kitchen and told them it was a new liqueur I found they all loved it! So a few years ago I decided to follow my father’s footsteps. With his help, I created cognac for women like my friends and me, with sweet and fruity flavours and without the masculine image it surrounds. As it aged for two years it is called a V.S., but I decided to focus on the flavours it contains and label it accordingly. So: red fruit, rose petals and lime, making it even more special than Very Special! Under my own name I introduced this brand as the daughter brand of the famous Bisquit Cognac. This Cognac is especially distilled for women. It is delicious when drunk neat, but don’t worry, unlike my dad I won’t mind if you add ice or water!

Love, Armelle

7.2.2 Applying the Challenger Diamond.

Express your identity

In order to express the identity of the brand first, the brand needs to be analysed. Normally, the client brand will provide information about their brand, in this case, the information comes from the developed challenger brand.

The four elements explained in the Challenger Diamond guidelines give a broad overview of the brand’s nature and identity:

- The inciting incident: The female friends of Armelle not wanting to drink Cognac at their dinner parties because they think it is for men and old-fashioned.
- Unexpectedness: Producing cognac specifically for women, not as a base for cocktails but as a spirit to drink neat.
- Objective: Change the image that drinking Cognac is old-fashioned and for men.
- Conflict: The struggle of dealing with the culture around Cognac.

From the brand story and exploration of the brand, one inspiration board and one moodboard are created. The moodboard (see Figure 45) shows several aspects that are important for this brand: femininity, creativity, and modernity. The upper left image shows a conversion from old material into something new and feminine, which corresponds to what Armelle is doing to the Cognac category. The lower image shows old-fashioned objects framed in a contemporary and feminine way. The flower vases embody the creativity and feminine side once more. The watercolour fruits focus on the flavours of the cognac and the creativity of the target audience.

The inspiration board (see Figure 46) gives an overview of brand packaging examples that could fit this brand or show elements fit this brand. This inspiration board shows different types of feminine packaging: modern feminine packaging with bright colours, packaging with illustrations of fruits and feminine soft coloured packaging.

Be single-minded

The target audience of Armelle are creative women; they have creative jobs and love to organize all kinds of events with friends. They enjoy cooking and travelling and are always looking for unique experiences. These women are feminine, self-assured, open-minded, and sociable. The moodboard in Figure 47 gives a visual overview of this target audience.
Figure 46 | Packaging inspiration for Armelle
Target audience for Armelle

- Creators
- Looking for unique experiences
- Creative
- Sociable & open minded
- Feminine & self-assured
- Active & positive

Figure 47 | Target audience for Armelle
Be different
In order to be different than the existing Cognac brands in the category, the three steps of being different are performed as presented in the Challenger Diamond guidelines.

1. Analysing the category and establishing the category prototype
The top 4 global most sold volume Cognac brands were analysed, see Figure 48 (Millionairsclub, 2014). (Cognac has a top 4 because other brands do not sell large enough volumes to be included in the Millionairs club list.) The packaging of the four brands was analysed, in consultation with experts from CARTILS, the prototypical design elements were identified for the Cognac category are presented in Table 14 and a visual presentation can be seen in Figure 49.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category prototype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long bottle with volume at the bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long thin neck with wrap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm colours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold and silver details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand symbol plate in bottle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serif font</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle embossing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 | Cognac category prototype design elements

Figure 48 | Top 4 Cognacs (from left to right): Hennessy, Martell, Remy Martin and Courvoisier (Millionairsclub, 2014).
2. Defining values for the design elements
Looking at the frequency of which aspects are present in the packaging designs of the top four brands, it can be seen that except for the bottle embossing all elements are present in each packaging design. The bottle embossing is present for two out of four designs. So all the other elements are equally prototypical. When looking at the importance or dominance of the design aspects in consultancy with experts from CARTILS, it is decided that the bottle and neck shape are the two most important design aspects, these are given the value 3. Then the use of colours and the gold and silver details are most important and given the value 2, the brand symbol plate, font use and bottle embossing are given the value 1. These aspects are the least conspicuous and dominant in packaging design (see Table 15).

3. Decide on design elements
To decide which elements should, and which elements should not be present in the new packaging design, first the total score of the design elements together is looked at. This adds up to 13 points (see Table 15). First of all, no 3 value items should be included in the design. One fifth of the score means a total score of 2 to three points should be strived for. It was chosen to include two 1 point items in order to make the design as differentiated as possible while using this method. The design brief will include all three 1 point items: metal look plate with brand symbol embossed in bottle, Serif font, Text embossing on bottle, the packaging designers may choose which two items to include in the packaging design.

All moodboards and conclusions from the three guidelines of the Challenger Diamond are combined into a design brief for the packaging designers at CARTILS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Design aspect</th>
<th>Category prototype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bottle shape</td>
<td>Long bottle with volume at the bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neck shape</td>
<td>Long thin neck with wrap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colour use</td>
<td>Warm colours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Gold and silver details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extra elements</td>
<td>Brand symbol plate in bottle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Font use</td>
<td>Serif font</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bottle embossing</td>
<td>Bottle embossing present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 | Values for Cognac design aspects
7.4 The packaging design

From the Challenger Diamond design guidelines a design brief was set up and presented to the creative department of CARTILS. From this design brief the following design was developed for Armelle Cognac (see Figure 50). As set in the design brief, all elements except for the brand stamp and serif font were changed with reference to the prototypical design elements that were established for the Cognac category. The brand story elements that are present in this packaging design are the colour of the packaging and the feminine bottle shape; referring to the younger female target audience, the text saying: ‘Especially distilled for women’, and the text mentioning the fruit flavours that can be found in this Cognac; referring to the sweeter taste of this Cognac.
In order to determine whether the Challenger Diamond design guidelines were successful in the creation of a challenger brand packaging design for Armelle, qualitative research was done. The following sub questions were set:

- Is the brand seen as challenging for its category?
- Does the design appeal to the target audience?
- Do the brand story elements tell the brand story?
- Does the target audience want more information about the brand?
- Will the target audience perform word-of-mouth advertisement?

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with people that belong to the target audience of Armelle Cognac. An interview guide was drafted in order to structure the interview, this guide can be found in Appendix 10. The interview guide was constructed of several parts, each part was linked to a sub question. After the introduction questions the packaging design was showed to the participants. If the interviewee could not make a visual representation of a regular Cognac brand the packaging of the top four Cognac brands were shown.

In total five interviews were conducted. These were transcribed and line-by-line coding was used to analyse the transcripts of the interviews (Charmaz, 2006). The insights that resulted from this analysis will be discussed in this chapter and will be used to answer the previous set sub questions. With the answers to the sub questions the main question will be answered.

Be different

As stated in the Challenger Diamond guidelines, a challenger brand packaging should be different from its competitors to stand out and gain attention. The packaging design of Armelle Cognac lets go of most of its category codes. The following section describes the insights from the interviews that can conclude whether this guideline was successfully implemented in the packaging design and whether the benefits of this guideline were visible in the reactions of the target audience.

When first seeing the packaging design of Armelle Cognac, none of the interviewees directly thought it was a Cognac bottle. Some interviewees mentioned that, because the content of the bottle is clearly visible, it was obvious that it was a colored spirit, but all interviewees had to read the label Cognac in order to conclude what kind of product Armelle is.

‘I directly thought of a spirit, I think because of the cap of the bottle, but I did not know what type of spirit... I did think it was something sweet.’ – Interviewee J.

All of the interviewees had a very clear image of the culture around the Cognac category and could link this very clearly to the packaging designs of existing Cognac brands. All five female interviewees mentioned that the existing packaging designs were old fashioned, classy and for men, and that the packaging design of Armelle is very different from this.

“To me Cognac is for old men, with a Cognac glass in one hand and a cigar in the other. This packaging design does not match that image at all...Normal Cognac bottles are very classical, with gold and old fashioned elements, this is modern and hip and stands out!” – Interviewee L.

“These bottles are very fancy (pointing to the existing Cognac brands), I would drink that with my grandpa for example. If I would be with my friends I think I would choose Armelle.” – Interviewee R.

“It is surprising and confusing at the same time... it is presented as something that I could drink, but I have never thought of drinking Cognac, I think Cognac is for old fashioned people.” – Interviewee R2.

By being unexpected the consumer is invited to look at the category in a different way (Morgan, 2009). When asking whether the product and brand was seen as unexpected all interviewees indicated that to them the appearance of the packaging was
unexpected. Everyone mentioned the colour of the packaging as an unexpected feature of Cognac. Next to the appearance, the flavours mentioned on the label were indicated as not being expected for the Cognac category.

“To me the colour is unexpected. They make it seem like a completely different product.” – Interviewee R.

“The flavours of fruit are new to me, I did not know you could taste this in Cognac!” – Interviewee R2.

It is important that the goal of the brand is visible by the spectators (Morgan, 2009). When asking the interviewees whether they thought this brand had a clear objective, all interviewees indicated that the objective should have something to do with targeting a different audience. Rejuvenating the target audience and changing the dull image of Cognac were mentioned as possible objectives.

“To inspire young people to look differently at Cognac, and show them that it might be something for them, instead of being an old fashioned drink, which to me it is.” – Interviewee R.

“I think they want to rejuvenate, it is an old men’s drink, a little bit like a forgotten vegetable.” – Interviewee L.

From this it can be concluded that the presented design was highly differentiated in the Cognac category. Because of the name Cognac on the bottle the interviewees were helped in placing the differentiated design in the coherent category. When comparing the design of Armelle Cognac to existing brands in the Cognac category all interviewees mentioned something about the culture surrounding Cognac. They all found that this packaging did not match this culture and had some unexpected features. From this is can be concluded that the target audience understand the challenge that Armelle is taking on; breaking with the culture that surrounds Cognac.

Be single-minded

As stated in the Challenger Diamond guidelines, a challenger brand packaging should focus on its specific target audience. The packaging should have a clear connecting with the target audience and its environment. The following section describes the insights from the interviews that can conclude whether this guideline was successfully implemented in the packaging design.

All interviewees thought the product was for a younger target audience, around their own age. One interviewee indicated that the product was more targeted for a more lowbrow audience and could not identify herself with this product. The rest of the interviewees found that this product was something for them.

“It is clearly for younger women, maybe around my age. I think my friends and I could drink this.” – Interviewee J.

“I think it is for women between 20 and 30 years old. But a bit more lowbrow... you know what I mean? People that like sweet cocktails..” – Interviewee R2.

Three of the interviewees said that they would like to buy this product, even if they did indicated normally not to like Cognac.

“I do not know anything about Cognac so I would think it is exciting and fun to try this one. It is something new, it appeals to me.” – Interviewee L.

“I love the pink bottle, I would want to try this.” – Interviewee E.

After reading the brand story all interviewees indicated that they can relate to the brand story and that they feel addressed by this brand. All interviewees were enthusiastic about the brand after reading the story, all five interviewees now indicated that they would like to buy this product.

“I can really relate to Armelle in this brand story. It is a really personal story and I feel like i
fit her target audience.” – Interviewee E.

“Because it is so personal, and now I know that someone really put his heart into this brand I think I would like to try it more.” – Interviewee L.

This can conclude that the target audience was addressed by the packaging. However, reading the textual brand story improved this. After reading the brand story the interviewees were able to relate themselves more to the brand.

Express your identity
When asking the interviewees if they could tell something about the brand story behind this product packaging they had trouble explaining this

“I can tell that it is something different, they try to do it different than others… more conspicuous and a different target audience. But I cannot tell the story behind it why they do this.” – Interviewee L.

Though they were not able to explicitly tell a story, the different brand story elements were all noticed and understood by the interviewees:
· The colour of the bottle was clearly identified as being for young women and indicating a sweeter taste
· The feminine bottle shape was noticed
· The text on the bottle was identified and understood

Together these different elements succeeded in providing information on the objective of the brand; changing the image that drinking Cognac is old-fashioned and for men. Meaning that the packaging design was able to express its identity to their target audience. However the passion and personal touch of the brand only became apparent after reading the brand story.

Information Search
When developing a successful challenger brand packaging, the packaging should elicit a want for information, when consumers look further into the brand they will find their shared values.

After seeing the packaging design of Armelle four interviewees indicated a want for more information. To them the bottle design makes such a statement that they want to know what is behind this. The interviewees indicated they wanted more information on the motive behind the brand, and on why the brand is so different than the rest of the category.

“Because it is so striking you think ‘Huh, what is this?’ it is then that I want some more information about the product and the brand.” – Interviewee R.

“Now I am kind of curious why this packaging is so different..” – Interviewee R.

Word-of-mouth advertisement
The packaging of a challenger brand should elicit word-of-mouth advertising, “they need to enter social conversation” (Morgan, 2009). None of the interviewees indicated that they would perform mouth-to-mouth advertisement without having tasted the product. Unless if they would be in a store with somebody and noticed the bottle. When, after tasting the Cognac, the interviewees would like the product they would perform mouth-to-mouth advertisement.

“I would like to tell my friends about this product if I liked it.” – Interviewee J.

“If I would see it in a store I would say ‘What a distinct bottle!’... I think that if you are not in a store and saw the bottle you would have to know more about the brand to be able to talk about it.” - Interviewee L.

After reading the brand story four interviewees indicated to be more likely to talk about the brand than before having read the story.

“I think I will talk about it sooner now… just because it makes me so enthusiastic. I do think you have to know this story before buying it.” – Interviewee L.

“If I like the drink, I would refer to the story and convince my friends that they really have to taste it.” – Interviewee J.
In terms of being different it can be said that the Challenger Diamond was successful in the development of a differentiated packaging design. All interviewees saw the packaging design as differentiated within the existing category. All interviewees also mentioned the packaging to be conspicuous within the existing category. Meaning the packaging design stands out in the category and elicits the desired attention.

For being single-minded it can be concluded that the Challenger Diamond was successful in connecting to its target audience. Four out of five interviewees thought this product was something for them.

Being different and being single-minded are strongly bound with expressing the identity of the brand. From the qualitative research it can be concluded that the packaging design was able to express the identity of the brand. All interviewees were able to identify what is at the heart of this challenger brand and what they are challenging. Though the passion and values behind the brand only became apparent after reading the brand story.

A successful challenger brand packaging design should enthuse their consumers and elicit a want for more information about the brand. Four interviewees indicated that they wanted more information about the brand, this want for information was caused by the curiosity elicited by the unexpectedness of the packaging design.

Next to eliciting a want for information, a challenger brand packaging design should be able to enter social conversation (Morgan, 2009). From the packaging design alone none of the interviewees indicated that they would perform word-of-mouth advertisement or talk about the brand at all. After reading the brand story of Armelle the interviewees indicated to be more likely to perform word-of-mouth advertisement but still first wanted to taste the product. If Armelle Cognac was brought to the market it can be concluded from this qualitative research that they should find a way to do tastings of their product at, for example, events.

From this qualitative research the importance of the textual brand story came forward. After reading the brand story, all interviewees were more enthusiastic about the brand and thought the product was something for them. Also, after reading the brand story, the interviewees indicated to be more likely to talk about the brand. From this should be concluded that challenger brands should be focused on getting their consumers to read their brand story. This brand story should be included on the packaging design, for example on the back of the packaging. Next to including their brand story in their packaging they should use online and social media to spread their brand story as good as possible.

From this qualitative research can be concluded that for this case study the Challenger Diamond guidelines were successful in the creation of a challenger brand packaging. Since this qualitative research was only performed with a small group of participants these findings can only be concluding for this case study.
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8.1 Recommendations

The research performed in this thesis has increased the knowledge on challenger brands and their packaging design, but has also raised new questions. The following recommendations provide direction for further research on this topic.

Challenger brand approach
It was found that new to the market challenger brands lack resources to employ CARTILS for the creation of their packaging design. For established brands that strive to be a challenger brand now is advised to use their existing Ignite tool. However, these brands want to take a risk and differentiate themselves from the competition. From the Ignite tool a packaging design will follow that will fit within the category codes. This type of brands asks for a certain level of differentiation and CARTILS should be able to offer that. It should be researched what level of differentiation is acceptable for this type of brands and to what extent they can let go of their previous branding.

Letting go of all category codes
In this research the level of differentiation was varied from low differentiated to high differentiated. The highly differentiated designs always contained one or two of the design elements that were established as category codes for that category. It should be researched what happens with product evaluation when all category codes are discarded. This might lead to a positive reaction, attention levels, might increase and word-of-mouth advertising as well. On the other hand it might cause levels of incongruity to rise to a point that the product is unacceptable to the consumer. This is something that should be researched in order to fine-tune the ‘be different’ aspect of the Challenger Diamond.

Information search
From this research was shown that at high levels of differentiation the respondents wanted more information about the brand. It should be further researched whether this want for information was caused by enthusiasm about the brand or by confusion. In the case study it was found that want for information was caused by enthusiasm and interest, but in order to draw conclusions this should be further researched.

Also, from the case study it was concluded that it is important for challenger brands to spread their brand story to their target audience. An interesting topic to address could be through which means this information is best spread and what information should be included in the packaging design.

Testing the guidelines
To further proof the success of the developed Challenger Diamond guidelines, more testing needs to be done. In the case study the guidelines were used for just one case, and one designer developed the packaging design. No feedback was provided by the packaging designer on the presented design brief. In order to further develop these guidelines the packaging designers should be included in testing the guidelines and evaluating them.
8.2 Personal reflection

Seven months ago I had never heard of the term challenger brands. When CARTILS brought up this subject as a possible graduation project I started looking into these brands. Their (success) stories enthused me to start this project. Now, seven months later, I have submerged myself in what challenger brands are, how they work and how their packaging should be.

Where to start?
When starting this project I enjoyed having no boundaries and all the opportunities that came with that. Though soon I experienced that having no clear boundaries can make a project quite difficult. This was something I had not experienced before. With courses in the master programme there are clear project deliverables and the end of the project is clearly marked. With this project I had trouble finding where to start and where to end. I found it difficult that I needed a lot of time to first thoroughly analyse challenger brands in order to see where the project would go. I felt I had to move forward faster and that all the analysing did not bring me anywhere.

In the end I am happy I took the time for this. Without this thorough analysis I would not have had a clear base for this project. With this strong base I was able to set a direction for the project and from there I could move forward.

Decision making
Since CARTILS had only stated rough outlines for the project, a lot of big decisions on the direction of the project had to be made by me. I am used to working in a team and to consult with my team members about big decisions. Now I had to make these decisions on my own. Throughout the whole process I needed guidance for big decisions, since I found it hard to trust on my own knowledge and insights.

Constructive criticism
The constructive criticism that I received during this project on one hand always pushed me in the right direction, on the other hand it also made me doubt my previous work. I always felt the need to get confirmation for my earlier work, in order to move on to the next phase of my project. Towards the end of the project I grew more confident and found it easier to go further without confirmation. Looking back I can see that this is also part of the graduation project: being able to make decisions and being confident enough to stand by these decisions.

Performing
During this project in my head I was always busy with performing. Since the graduation project is the last project to show everything that I learnt over the years I really wanted to show my capabilities. This pressure I put on myself actually resulted in an insecurity of my capabilities and knowledge. During meetings this insecurity caused me to be less confident and passionate about the project.

The focus on customer research in this project made this sense of insecurity bigger. From previous courses in my master I had some experience with experiments and statistical analysis, though for this project I felt I lacked knowledge and experience. This resulted in the need of help of my chair and mentor. Even though they were always happy to help, to me this felt as a shortcoming from my side. However, I have found it very interesting to perform customer research from a to z; from setting my hypotheses, to developing the stimuli, to merging the conclusions together in packaging guidelines.

Looking back I realize that there is no standard SPD graduation project, meaning that it is impossible to show everything you learnt in the past years in one project. I also realize that being able to ask for the right help from the right people is something that is part of being a strategic product designer. Also, by doing this extensive customer research I think I have learnt more than I would have done if my project solely consisted of applying my existing SPD knowledge.

Working within a company
When starting this project I was really looking forward to working at the office of CARTILS, so I could experience how they work and see their projects. It turned out that I was much more isolated than expected and did not experience much of what was going on in the company.

When designing the stimuli for my research I did work together with the design department of CARTILS. I
noticed that I found it hard to be demanding and strict, since I was just the student. This resulted in the fact that the deadlines I set were not realized. I have learnt from this that, even though I am ‘just’ a student, I should be stricter and try to emphasize the importance of deadlines. Although I have experienced less of the company than I was hoping, I really enjoyed my time there and learned a lot about their company and what they do.

Despite the ups and downs, delays and insecurities, I really enjoyed diving into this new subject and making it my own. In doing so, my enthusiasm for challenger brands has only grown. The passion that goes out from these brands and the reaction of their target audience to me is typical for what challenger brands do; They put a smile on your face and give you goose bumps! I am pleased and proud of the project and its results. I have learnt a lot about challenger brands, packaging design and customer research but also about myself.
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1. Challenger brand analysis

**Hello Products**

- **Who?** A dental care brand. Launched in 2013 Hello Products try to change the fear and loathing that exist around dental care.
- **What?** Fun and friendly dental care products. Their mission is to create safe, effective and delicious oral care products that are highly natural, vegan, never tested on animals, and made in the USA. They, for example, sell grapefruit flavored fun looking toothpaste. (See Figure 51).
- **For whom?** Millennial women who are interested in design, natural living, fashion, and beauty. These are women who focus on choosing products that are safe and effective for them and their families.
- **What do they challenge?** Challenging fear and loathing in dental care (Hello Products, 2015).
- **How do they challenge?** By breaking conventions of representation. Hello products uses their packaging to be different in their category. Their friendly approach is visible through their packaging. By differentiating themselves in their representation they radiate their lighthouse identity; being natural and friendly.

**Life cycle:**

Hello products were only recently launched in 2013. That year they received a Good Design award. By 2014 their products were already being sold in 20,000 stores in the USA and Canada, and they are still rapidly growing. In 2014 they also received the Leaping bunny certificate, for never testing on animals, and won the Red Dot award for their packaging design and business.

As being just introduced, Hello Products is clearly still in their growth phase and still working on their initial challenge: challenging the role and nature of the dental care category. Their packaging has not changed since the introduction. They are still breaking conventions of representation.

**Competitor and packaging analysis:**

The packaging of Hello products is very clearly differentiated from the leading brands in the dental care category. In Figure 52 a toothpaste and mouthwash are showed of, on the left, Hello products and next to those the packaging of the four brands with the biggest brand share in the world and western-Europe: Signal, Oral-B, Crest and Colgate (Euromonitor, 2013).

The leading brands show a very masculine and aggressive packaging. The packaging is angular and labels contain a lot of text. Three out of 4 brands use a see through bottle for the mouthwash to show the content.

The Hello products use a more friendly and feminine way of packaging. All the product shapes are organic without sharp edges. The use of clear plastic and labeling show the content of the mouthwash. The toothpaste bottle comes without a secondary package and maintains its shape after squeezing it, unlike other toothpaste tubes.

The use of bright colors gives a fun and friendly look to the products. By using just two colors and a minimal amount of text on each package the product has a calm and clear look.

Hello products stand for naturally friendly and fun dental care (Hello Products, 2015). This is clearly visible through their packaging.

For hello products several competitors exist that share their values. In Figure 53 left from Hello Products a range of products is showed that are all natural, vegan and non-toxic. These are all small private label brands. Their packaging design is formal and makes use of natural colors. On the right side, products are showed that provide dental care with ‘unusual’ flavors. None of these brands combine both values as Hello Products does. Also here is a clear difference in packaging between Hello Products and their competitors. The newly launched toothpaste of Crest, it’s Be adventurous (Farnham, 2014), does show a more contemporary packaging design. Marvis toothpaste sells their flavored toothpastes since 2002 (Tien, 2002). Their packaging shows a more authentic approach.
Method

  Founded in 2001 Method wanted to change the world of toxic, smelly and ugly cleaning products you hide under the sink.
  With their motto ‘Healthy Happy homes’ Method produces products that are safe for the people, their pets and the planet. Their products do not contain any toxics, their bottles are all from recycled material and all are designed to look nice in your home. (See Figure 54).
- For whom? A predominantly female group with a focus on natural living and an eye for design.
- What do they challenge? The category of home cleaning products itself.
  Method used a designer to develop their packaging, resulting in a stylish product line. This is new in the home cleaning category and therefore breaks conventions of representation. Method uses several (online) campaigns to advertise what they stand for and create a community. With this they break conventions of medium, since no other cleaning products brand does this. Next to this they also offer a better product. Method cleaning products are 99% natural, therefore they are better for you health, your house and the planet. Though they still clean your house properly. (Method, 2015)

Life cycle:
Method launched its first products in 2001. In the end of 2002 Method is sold in Target stores nationwide. In 2005 method is launched in the UK and Canada. In 2006 Method is ranked number 7 in the 500 fastest growing private companies. In 2007 Method becomes a founding B Corporation formally making social and environmental change a company objective. In 2008 they start making their bottles from 100% post-consumer plastic. In 2009 they become one of the first Cradle to Cradle companies, in the mean time they sell their products in Australia, Japan and France. In 2012 Method joins the world’s largest green cleaning company Ecover. In 2013 they are reincorporated as a public benefit corporation, meaning that they are meeting the highest social and environmental ethics (Method, 2015).

In a few years Method has grown rapidly into a big company, and now by working together with Ecover they keep on growing. Though they are now part of a big company they keep on being a challenger. Where method was first breaking conventions of medium, hiring a designer to develop a packaging design that was completely different than any other cleaning product on the market. Now they are breaking conventions of product performance, with a focus on environmental subjects. They are, for example, the first ever to create a bottle made of plastic from the ocean.

Competitor and packaging analysis:
The packaging of Method is differentiated from the products in the home cleaning product category. In Figure 55 a surface cleaner of method is showed on the left, and on the right the brands with the biggest brand share in the world and in West-Europe are showed. Note that information on brand shares in the juice category does not exist for earlier than 2008 (Euromonitor, 2008).

Most of the brands use clear plastic to show the (colorful) content of the bottles, just as method does. Though the leading brands do not use a clear label. Their labels are big, colorful and contain a lot of information. The bottles itself are angular and embody the cleaning power of the product. The Mr. Clean and Mr. Muscle flasks have a ‘broad shouldered’ look.

The method bottle is see-through, as is the label. The shape is very basic and together with minimal information on the label it gives the product a calm look. Method makes use of 100% recycled plastic bottles for their packaging. They are the first in the world that use a blend of recovered ocean plastic and post-consumer recycled plastic. All of their bottles are recyclable and they design their packaging so that a minimal of material is used (Method, 2015).

The values of method; Eco-friendly and non-toxic are visible through their packaging when consumers take a closer look. Their aim of changing the
aesthetics of cleaning products and not needing to ‘hide’ them under your sink can be seen in the design of the bottles, which was done by famous Designer Karim Rashid. Though when looking at the bottle it is not immediately clear that the products are eco-friendly and non-toxic. Competitors method encounters on their values of eco friendliness and the use of non-toxic ingredients are showed in Figure 56. Clorox, a big cleaning products company, launched its Green Works line in 2008. A line with 98% natural cleaning products. Though the packaging of these products are more transparent then the normal Clorox products it still resembles the existing cleaning products a lot. Ecover, an eco-friendly cleaning products brand launched in 1980 took over method in 2012. Several smaller brands such as Mrs. Meyer’s and Lilly’s exist in the eco friendly non-toxic cleaning products. Overall seen the competitors in the eco friendly cleaning products have a bigger focus on the eco friendliness in their packaging, mainly by placing it clearly on the label or in the product name.
Innocent

- **Who?** A smoothies and juices brand
  Launched in 1999 Innocent wants to make it easy for people to do themselves some good and make it taste nice too.

- **What?** Smoothies, juices and food
  With their motto ‘To help people live well and die old’ innocent is all about health. Their juices, smoothies and food are 100% natural (Innocent, 2015). (See Figure 57).

- **For whom?** Younger people who want to be healthy in an easy way.

- **What do they challenge?** The category of healthy drinks.

- **How do they challenge?** By breaking conventions of relationship.
  Innocent has created a playful and chatty personality around their brand, they did this to introduce a new kind of relationship with a product that is ‘good for you’ (Morgan, 2009). They are being very explicit about the people behind their brand, their product and their ambitions. This involves the consumer and creates a personal emotional connection.

Life cycle:
Launched in 1999 Innocent experienced a steady growth. In 2004 they expanded to Paris and Amsterdam. In 2009 18% of the business is sold to Coca-Cola. In 2011 Innocent is the official juice and smoothie of the Olympic and Paralympic games. In 2013 Coca-cola increases its stake and now owns 90% of the company. Now Innocent owns 60% of the smoothie market share.

When Innocent launched its products, it was the only all-natural juice on the market. They challenged the existing juice category by breaking conventions of relationship. They developed a playful and chatty personality around their brand. Through their packaging they create a tone of voice that embodies their brand. In the last few years Innocent grew into the number one smoothie in Europe, meaning that they grew rapidly and going into the maturity phase of the life cycle. Through this life cycle their narrative and main packaging stayed relatively constant. Some minor changes in packaging have happened but their stance has not changed a lot. According to Mcquarter (2012) Innocent still remains it’s challenger values in terms of their positioning. Though being copied by many brands, Innocent keeps coming up with new ways of expressing their brand values through their packaging, activities and relationship with the consumer. And also they maintain this personal relationship, even now they are a big company and a part of Coca-Cola. You can still call them and talk to them personally. Innocent has reached a market leader position but still breaks conventions on relationship and therefore still is a challenger brand.

Competitor and packaging analysis:
When innocent launched it products (1999) the main competitors in healthy juices were dull and boring (Morgan, 2009). In Figure 59 on the left a bottle of innocent juice is showed, on the right the brands with the biggest brand shares in the world and western-Europe are showed. (Note that information on brand shares in the juice category does not exist for earlier than 2008) (Euromonitor, 2008). All these brands use very colorful opaque packaging, and display a picture or drawing of the fruit the juice contains. Innocent uses clear plastic bottles and a very minimalistic label. The bottom of the bottle has an embossing in text saying: ‘Stop looking at my bottom.’ Where other brands place ingredients and other ‘necessary’ text Innocent places a small story or fun facts on their labels. For example, next to all the actual ingredients it says ‘a sprinkling of ground up cats’. They have up to eight versions of each piece of body copy and they change them every three months. (See Figure 58) The minimalistic packaging together with the use of fun quirky informal texts provides a tone of voice and personality that projects what Innocent stands for. The engaging and charming writing makes you believe in them.

Nowadays quite a few competitors exist that produce all natural juices. Figure 60 shows some examples. These brands are relatively small, compared to Innocent, or own-label products from grocery stores. As can be seen in Figure 60 the packaging of these smoothies is comparable to Innocents packaging. The minimalistic look is used, but some brands also use the quirky texts. All these brands were launched after Innocent so it can be said that their packaging design has been copied.
Figure 57 | Innocent juices

Figure 58 | Bottom of innocent juice bottle (left), label with quirky texts (right)

Figure 59 | Juice packaging

Figure 60 | All natural fruit juices
Propercorn

- Who? A popcorn brand.
  Propercorn was launched in 2011. In 2012 it was referred to as one of the most exciting and innovative challenger brands within the popcorn market (Talking retail, 2012). Now it is the fastest growing snack-brand in the UK.
- What? Healthy natural popcorn in innovative flavors.
  Their mission is to create ‘popcorn made properly’. Propercorn is made using natural ingredients, it is gluten free, high in fibers but low in calories but overall produced to be tasty. (See Figure 61).
- For whom? Opinion formers, young professionals, 20-35 year olds. They are; time-poor, urban, health conscious, culturally savvy and have an appreciation of the arts. Our product and packaging naturally appeal to women but we aren’t driven by this (Propercorn, 2015).
- What do they challenge? The role and nature of the snack category.
  Propercorn is the first to introduce a popcorn that is tasty and healthy. Also their presentation is different, they are very committed to the aesthetics of the brand, their packaging is designed by a Vogue illustrator and they have created relationships with some of the leading brands within the fashion industry. They also have partnerships in charity that makes them stand out in their representation and help them gain popularity (Talking retail, 2012).

Life cycle:
Launched in 2011 Propercorn had a really successful first year, selling 1 million packs of popcorn. In 2012 Propercorn became the official popcorn’ at London Fashion Week for two seasons (Briggs, 2012). Propercorn is still in its’ growing phase.
During the last years Propercorn changed their packaging once, keeping their main design but increasing the font size for the logo and decrease the popcorn images on the pack. As Propercorn is still growing it is still a challenger, as they challenge the category of popcorn. They have a mission: ‘Be the best tasting healthy popcorn on this planet’.
Though when they complete this mission/challenge a new stance needs to be found in order to stay a challenger.

Competitor and packaging analysis:
When Propercorn launched it’s products in 2011, left in Figure 62, these were the brand with the biggest brand share in the world and in West-Europe in the category of sweet and savory snacks, right in Figure 14 (Euromonitor, 2011). As can be seen these were, and still are, potato chips brands.
The packaging of the potato chips brands make use of very loud colours and texts. They all use large images to show the content of the bag. The brand logo is large and clearly visible on all the products. From the five brands showed, Pringles is the only brand that uses a different approach to packaging it’s chips. The can is inseparable from the brand.
Propercorn uses hand drawn illustrations from designer Zoe More O’Ferrall for their packaging. They developed their own font and use distinctive colours. For all the different flavors a different fitting drawing and colour exist. Also it clearly states the (low) amount of calories on the packaging.
According to Cassandra Stavrou, Propercorn’s co-founder, their goal was to “create expressive packaging that is as at home on the front row of London Fashion Week as it is on a supermarket shelf” (Lin, 2015). Also the secondary packaging is illustrated by Zoe More O’Ferrall. Where normally these are utilitarian corrugated board boxes, Propercorn made them into actual cases, with a colour print on it. This secondary packaging is not something the consumer sees, but the actors in the retail environment do. See figure 61 (right).

In the healthy snack category quite a few competitors exist. Shown right from Propercorn in Figure 63 Lesser Evil snacks (USA, 2004) also produces low calorie organic snacks from popcorn to chips. In their packaging they use illustrations just as Propercorn and really distinguish themselves from the unhealthy competitors. Next to that is Boom Chica pop (USA, 2011). They produce low
calorie organic popcorn. Their packaging shows a minimalistic design with focus on text and colour. Skinny pop (USA, 2010) sells low calorie ‘guilt free’ popcorn. Their packaging is minimalistic but lacks the artwork that the other brands have. Tyrell’s (UK, 2011) produces proper popcorn, low calorie popcorn with different flavors. Their packaging is colourful and uses antique black and white photos that differ per bag. On the back of the pack a fun anecdote is given on the photograph. Ten acre popcorn (most right) (UK, 2014) produces healthy vegan popcorn. Their packaging is colourful and uses illustrations. Just as all the other brands they clearly show the amount of calories on the bag.
Hendrick’s Gin

• Who? A Gin brand
Hendrick’s gin is a brand of gin produced by William Grant & Sons Ltd since 2001.

• What? Gin
Instead of the normal gin recipe Hendrick’s gin uses an infusion with cucumber and rose petals. The drink needs to be drunk with a cucumber slide instead of a lemon slice, changing an experience that has been there for over 100 years. Making it, according to them, an unusual gin that is not for everyone. Furthermore the gin is handcrafted in small batches. (See Figure 64).

• For Whom? Gin drinkers that do not like mainstream brands, who are attracted to the exotic, have a knowledge of culture and history and have a high disposable income. Their vast majority of their consumers are young urbans in their twenties and thirties (Segran, 2014).

• What to they challenge? The gin category itself.
• How do they challenge? By breaking conventions of product experience and medium.

Hendrick’s gin is the first in the gin category to introduce a gin and tonic with cucumber instead of lemon. Next to this change in product experience their advertising comprises itself to word-of-mouth and Hendrick’s unusual events. These events pop up at cultural events where they present themselves with several activities.

Life cycle:
Hendrick’s gin was launched in 1999 as part of William Grant & Sons in Scotland. In 2000 they presented their gin in New York. In 2003 the brand is launched in the UK and a year later also in Spain. It is only in 2008 that the sales really get off the ground. It is also in 2008 when the so called ‘gin revival’ takes place. In 2009 they redesign their website (Elliot, 2010). By 2012 Hendrick’s gin is sold globally in over 70 markets and very popular, they win a double gold medal at the San Fransisco International Spirits Competition, they are voted ‘Gin of the year’(PR Newswire, 2012). In 2013, as a response to their upcoming competitors, Hendrick’s launches its own quinine cordial: Quinetum. An ingredient to make cocktails with gin, it functions as a substitute to tonic (Bruce-Gardyne, 2014).

Although Hendrick’s already existed for almost 10 years, in 2008 the rapid, challenger like, growth started. Hendrick’s gin challenges the gin category by breaking conventions with the product experience (serving gin tonics with cucumber, instead of lemon). In 2009 they decided to change their website, since the previous web page did not do justice to the brand. The old website “served a purpose” whereas the new website brings the life of Hendrick’s gin alive. The intent for the website is to become part of the customer relationship, and to provide brand fans an experience (Elliot, 2010).

Their packaging has stayed the same since the product launch. Hendrick’s gin is still in the growth phase and is still a challenger brand. By breaking conventions of product experience but also breaking conventions of medium. Hendrick’s does not use regular advertising methods, but uses unusual events to speak to and obtain their customers.

Competitor and packaging analysis:
Figure 65 shows Hendrick’s gin on the left, and on the right the three biggest global Gin brands in 2007. Note that information on gin brands does not exist for earlier than 2007 (Millionaires club, 2011). These brands all have clear bottles, two white clear glass and one clear green glass. The labels use the color red and display the royal coat of arms and any prizes they won. Tanqueray uses a red seal as a sign of quality.

Hendrick’s gin uses a complete different look than the established brands. The black medicine bottle and use of a handwritten font on the label emphasizes the craftsmanship of the gin and makes it stand out between the other gins.

In the recent years gin has become trendy and a lot of new gin brands emerged. In Figure 66 next to Hendrick’s gin four of these brands are displayed that have the same brand values as Hendricks gin. Monkey (launched 2006) and Sipsmith (launched 2009) are both in the top 10 trending gin brands of 2015 as respectively number 2 and 4, next to Hendrick’s as number one (Drinksint, 2015). All of these brands are gin that is handcrafted in small batches. The packaging of Monkey 47, Goodmans
gin (2014) and Withley Neill (2005) all use a type of medicine look bottle, and all have a cork. Sipsmith and Monkey 47 both use illustrations on their bottle, Sipsmith shows the copper distiller that they use for crafting this gin. The bottle of Whitley Neill uses a black medicine bottle, just as Hendrick’s gin.
BrewDog beer

- Who? A craftbeer brand
  Founded in 2007 BrewDog was the first company in the UK to produce craft beers for the market.
- What? Craftbeer and beerpubs
  Their mission is to make other people just as passionate about craft beer as they are. (See Figure 67).
- For Whom? Punks
  Brewdog presents their beer as ‘beer for punks’. They fight for equity for punks and organize all kinds of event for this target group.
- What do they challenge? The beer category
  With their industrialized beers
  The anti-business model business model (as BrewDog calls it) invites their consumers to buy their stocks and invest in the brand. They also organize events in their bars to promote and present their beer (Brewdog, 2015).

Life cycle

Launched in 2007, BrewDog started off with just two employees and produced small batches of beer. In only the end of 2008 BrewDog became the largest independent brewery of Schotland. By 2009 their Punk IPA had become the UK’s fastest growing alternative beer brand and the top selling IPA in Scandinavia. By offering their brand shares online their anti business model business model was launched and they were able to grow more. In 2010 they launched their first bar. In 2011 then opened three more bars and grew the business again over 200%. In 2012 the business grew another 95% and six more bars were opened. In 2013 the first international bar was opened and in 2014 twelve other international bars followed. This year the packaging of the beer was redesigned. BrewDogs mission was and is to make other people as passionate about great craft beer as we are. BrewDog grew enormously in just a few years from a small company to a big internationally known brewery. And they are still growing. In 2014 they decided to redesign their packaging because their old packaging was “no longer quite reflective of where we are as a brewery” (Brewdog, 2015). The new packaging has, according to BrewDog, a focus on the two most important things: quality and craft. These labels also have a three-word tag-line on each beer and extra information for to “help craft beer newcomers find their feet” (Brewdog, 2015). This is an interesting move, since before the focus was more on the craft beer drinking punks, now they show a more general focus to make people passionate about their beer.

While their packaging might be a bit less extraordinary than the first packaging, they keep challenging the beer category in developing new and different beers, so they break conventions of product performance. Also the culture and community they build around their brand keeps breaking conventions relationship. Therefore they are still a challenger brand, but they might be broadening their target audience.

Competitor and packaging analysis:

In figure 68 Brewdog beer is placed on the left, next to the brands with the biggest brand share in 2008 in the UK (left) and the world (right)(Euromonitor, 2008). Brewdog was launched in 2007 but no data on brand shares exist before 2008. The packaging design of the brand with the biggest brand share differs quite a lot. Beer bottles are either green clear glass or brown clear glass and also the bottle shapes differ. For Carling (the biggest brand share in the UK) a can is displayed since they do not offer the beer in glass. All labels show a wide variety of color use. Red is used in all the bottles and also blue and gold are visible. The brand name is displayed relatively big on all the beers. Carling, Carlsberg and Budweiser use a royal coat of arms. These labels are quite classic and well known within the beer category. But also the design of Bud light and Skol fit well in the beer category.

Brewdog also uses a brown glass bottle. Their label uses a bright color as background with the image and text printed in white. The used font and scuffed look emphasizes on the craftsmanship. Also the seemingly random places fonts and imagery gives a more rebel feel to it.

The last few years craftbeer has become really popular and more and more microbreweries are set up. In Figure 69 some of the more popular craft
beers (Naylor, 2014) (Smith, 2015) are showed next to Brewdogs packaging design of 2014. Beer by numbers (left) uses a very minimalistic paper look label, this emphasizes on the craftsmanship of the brand. Evil twin beer (second from the left) uses imagery and ‘fun’ names for their beers which make them stand out from the rest of the beers. Sierra Nevada (third from the left) uses a bright green color and a lot of detailed illustrations on their beer. Meantime beer and Innis & Gunn (two most right) has a more general beer label but express their craftsmanship in extra details.

Overall the packaging for craft beer differs a lot for the different brands. This probably has to do with the different audiences the beer is targeted upon: Brewdog focuses on Punks, Evil Twin beer on Hipsters.
For the existing challenger brands the brand story was looked at. Then the packaging was analysed in order to find out how the brand story is told through the packaging. The brand story elements that were found in the packaging are listed. Some of these brand story elements are based on product information. Other elements are purely added for the brand story.

**Hello Products**

*We had this wild idea: let’s make oral care that’s safe, effective, delicious and beautiful. And while we’re at it, let’s make it as natural as we can, and free from things like triclosan, dyes, and artificial sweeteners.*

We think it’s time to think differently about what goes into (and out of) your mouth. We’re just getting started, so say hello to Hello, and choose friendly.

Elements present in brand story:
- Unexpectedness
- Objective

The packaging of Hello product clearly shows elements of their brand story and shows the values Hello products has:
- Natural.
  - There is an emblem stating 99% natural on every product.
  - Use of white and see-through packaging.
- Friendly.
  - Round shapes
  - Smile in logo
- Fun.
  - Fun coloring

**Hendrick’s gin**

*In our opinion, there are far too many experiences that are so-called “normal.” Which is why Hendrick’s follows it own peculiar path. Crafted in the tiny seaside village of Girvan, Scotland, Hendrick’s resides in a most unlikely place for a gin to exist. A wondrous orchestra of 11 botanicals sets the stage for our pièce de résistance; two rather unusual, yet marvelous infusions. An absurdly small batch gin. Typically, “small batch” is just that. Small. For us, small would be cruelly large. Instead, Hendrick’s is made in minuscule batches by hand. It takes considerably longer, but it tastes considerably more wondrous. Oh my, we must mention the stills themselves. Very unusual indeed. The rare Carter-head. It bathes the botanicals in the vapors of its anachronistic flavor basket. Lusciously subtle. The copper pot Bennet: A meticulous and vigorous still that yield a spirit of rare and robust character. Hendrick’s is the divine marriage of these two different spirits from our two different stills. The closely guarded proportions of which are known only by our master stillman. Then added is rose petal. The second is even more sublime and less anticipated. A curious, yet marvelous infusion of cucumber. It can be said with some scientific certainty that Hendricks’s owes its distinctive flavor to the all-important cucumber. Thus, little explanation is needed to understand why proper etiquette dictates a cucumber garnish is to be served with a Hendrick’s cocktail rather than the humdrum lime.*

Elements present in brand story:
- The objective
- Unexpectedness

The packaging of Hendrick’s Gin clearly shows elements of their brand story and shows the values Hendrick’s Gin has:
- Unusual.
  - Black medicine bottle
- Handcrafted.
  - Paper label,
  - Handwritten
  - In text: ‘small batch handcrafted’

**BrewDog beer**

*Martin and I (James) were bored of the industrially brewed lagers and stuffy ales that dominated the UK beer market. We decided the best way to fix this undesirable predicament was to brew our own. Consequently in April 2007 BrewDog was born. Both only 24 at the time, we leased a building in Fraserburgh, got some scary bank loans, spent all our money on stainless steel and started making some hardcore craft beers. We brewed tiny batches, filled bottles by hand and sold our beers at local markets and out of the back of our beat up old van. Our biggest mission when we set up BrewDog was*
to make other people as passionate about great craft beer as we are. And that is still our biggest mission today.

In 2009: We also launched Equity for Punks. In a ground-breaking first, we offered people the opportunity to buy shares in our company online. Over 1,300 invested and our anti-business business model was born.

Elements present in brand story:
· Unexpectedness
· Objective

The packaging of BrewDog clearly shows elements of their brand story and shows the values of BrewDog:
· Punks.
  o Equity for punks stamp
· Craftsmanship.
  o Scuffed look.

Innocent
Hello, we’re innocent and we’re here to make it easy for people to do themselves some good (whilst making it taste nice too).

We started innocent in 1999 after selling our smoothies at a music festival. We put up a big sign asking people if they thought we should give up our jobs to make smoothies, and put a bin saying ‘Yes’ and a bin saying ‘No” in front of the stall. Then we got people to vote with their empties. At the end of the weekend, the ‘Yes’ bin was full, so we resigned from our jobs the next day and got cracking.

Since then we’ve started making veg pots, juices and kids’ drinks, in our quest to make natural, delicious, healthy foods that help people live well and die old.

Elements present in brand story:
· Inciting incident
· Unexpectedness
· Objective

The packaging of Innocent clearly shows elements of their brand story and shows the values of Innocent:
· Natural.
  o Name Innocent
  o Angel logo
· Fun.
  o Humor on pack. ‘Stop looking at my bottom’

The Kraken
The kraken like many Cephalopods uses ink to startle its pray and obfuscate its notorious bad behaviors. One of the few documented Kraken ink attacks occurred in Caribbean water during history. A ship carrying cargo-spiced rum from its island origin to Norway was attacked by a monster Kraken. The brave crew tried to obliterate the eight-armed menace by deploying a giant depth charge of dynamite. The bomb, while powerful enough to startle its target, did not deter the squid from its task need fact only served to further augment his rancor. The beast thrust upon the ship, plunging the ship into darkness. A struggle ensued only with the destruction of every living man on board the vessel and all but one of the barrels of rum, which was badly stained by the squids black ink. Following the attack the barrel of rum was delivered to the queen of Norway along with apologies for the missing cargo. On tasting the rum the queen proclaimed: “Though I am quite fearful of this rums’ ominous complexion, I am helplessly attracted to its rich oakness and its exotic hints of ginger cinnamon and clove.” In honor of those who perished in the attack it was colored black and dubbed The Kraken rum.

Named for a sea beast of myth and legend The Kraken rum is strong, rich, black and smooth.

Elements present in brand story:
· Inciting incident
· Unexpectedness

The packaging pf The Kraken clearly shows elements of its brand story:
· History.
  o Old rum bottle shape.
· Kraken.
  o Picture on label
Meet Adam Lowry and Eric Ryan, proud brainparents of method® and the very first people against dirty®. Despite founding one of the fastest-growing private companies in America, and single-handedly turning the consumer-packaged-goods industry on its head, these two former roommates are quick to tell you that they’re no heroes. And that’s true. They’re super-heroes. And like every great superhero, they gained their powers after being exposed to toxic ingredients. Cleaning supplies, to be precise. But rather than turning them green or granting them the ability to talk to fish, Eric and Adam’s toxic exposure gave them something even better. An idea.

Eric knew people wanted cleaning products they didn’t have to hide under their sinks. And Adam knew how to make them without any dirty ingredients. Their powers combined, they set out to save the world and create an entire line of home care products that were more powerful than a bottle of sodium hypochlorite. Gentler than a thousand puppy licks. Able to detox tall homes in a single afternoon.

Elements present in brand story:
- Unexpectedness
- The objective

Brand story elements in packaging:
- Natural.
  - Basic look
  - See-through packaging.
- Beautiful.
  - Different colorful designs.
Vodka
When looking into the brand stories of the globally most sold vodkas, the following ingredients are always present:

- **Origin**
  Where does the vodka come from? All vodka brands are very nationalistic and show pride of their country. Elements of the origin of the vodka are always present in their packaging. Either in text: ‘Product of Poland’ in the form of design elements; the tsarist elements on the label, or in the name itself: ‘Finlandia’.

- **Ingredients/product itself**
  Two major ingredients of vodka are grain and water. Most brands focus on their used ingredients in their brand story. It is what makes their vodka special. Absolut, for example, uses water from the deep well in Åhus, making it very pure. Finlandia uses spring water from Finnish glaciers. Zubrowka uses bison grass to flavor their vodka. Some brands have a big focus on these elements and show them in their packaging. Finlandia’s bottle shape represents the melting glacier, Zubrowka adds a grass blade to their bottle and shows a bison on their label.

- **Production process**
  How the vodka is produced is another major thing that brands present in their brand story. The distillation process, the filtration process or the equipment that is used all influence the end product. Smirnoff writes it on their label: ‘Triple distilled’. Absolut is distilled an infinite number of times but they do not show it on their packaging. Khortytsa uses very modern high precision technology to measure their ingredient. They state on their label: ‘Ultimate perfection’.

Possible challenges for a vodka brand
- Challenging some fundamental dimension or driver of the category:
  - Ingredients
  - Origin
  - Production
  - Vodka is modern
  - Vodka is clear
- Pure Vodka does not have a taste or smell
- Challenging some aspect of the way the consumer shops for, experiences, or consumes the product
  - Vodka for cooking instead of drinking
  - Another way to show flavors. Coding system or something
- Challenging the culture surrounding the category
  - Why young clubbers as mix drink. Focus on the flavor of the vodka?
- Challenging some broader aspect of a contemporary culture
  - Drink vodka because it does not contain calories and does make you drunk.
  - Binge drinking vodka with less alcohol
- Challenging some dimension or quality of the competition/Market leader
  - Price
  - Ingredients
  - Origin
  - Production

Vodka challenger brand ideas
Vodka challenger brand story1 ‘Vodka with taste’

Challenging a fundamental driver of dimension of the category – Vodka is flavor- and odorless

*Vodka has always been my drink, though after trying almost all vodka brands available I still did not find that outstanding one. To me all vodka brands lacked flavor. Whenever I asked a salesperson to sell me a bottle of vodka with flavor I got a list of options: from lemon to coconut to whipped cream. I tried to explain the salesperson that I wanted the flavor of vodka, not some artificial added aroma. It turned out: no such thing existed! Or at least, my liquor store did not sell it.*

*So I went looking for vodka with the actual flavors of the ingredients: winter wheat, potato and so on. But I simply could not find it. It was then that I decided to make it myself.*
Years of research followed, I went to the farms of Poland to find out for what makes truly excellent vodka. I slept beside the grains – waking to test, every day, the effect of the soil, the climate and the harvesting processes. After much analysis I decided on three grains for my vodka:

1) Spelt – “The Happy Grain” – Nutty, earthy, full-bodied
2) Rye – “The Dancing Grain” – Classic, peppery, jumps on the tongue
3) Wheat – “The Smiling Grain” – A sliced sweetness and long finish

The trick, I discovered, was to harvest before the grains ripened – otherwise they were too dry. These softer, meatier grains retained their natural essence and worked together to create layers of smooth flavors. The next step was honing the distilling procedure where our crazy vodka professor perfected the process in a tiny kitchen over four years until the recipe was just right. This is a vodka to be sipped, like a single malt or sophisticated wine; the flavors to be appreciated. I want you to take the glass, to say hello to the vodka, to cleanse our palates and chew into the grains, getting to know each other. I want you to laugh, to dance and to smile like the very three grains that I chose to create this exquisite, incomparable vodka (Lawson, 2014).

This brand story is a belongs to a challenger brand because:

- The story starts off with an inciting incident: the failure in finding vodka with flavor.
- The story contains conflict: the struggle of finding the right ingredients took him years.
- The brand is unexpected: other vodka brands focus on the smoothness and purity of the vodka, not the flavor.
- There is a clear objective/desire: producing vodka in which you can taste the ingredients.
- Part of this brand story was taken from challenger vodka brand Konik’s tail. This brand has proven to be a successful challenger. This proofs again that this story fits a challenger brand.

Vodka challenger brand story 2 ‘ Vodka from tap water’

Challenging some dimension or quality of the competition/Market leader – The ingredients used by the competition

We wanted to produce vodka that is different than all the others. Not in flavor or odor because, if we are honest, premium vodka is odorless and flavorless and so almost all big vodka brands taste and smell the same, but by the most important ingredient: water. Other vodka brands talk about their exotic water sources like glaciers and icebergs. We don’t believe in that. Our vodka is made with 100% tap water, and we are proud of it. Why melt icebergs if we have the luxury of running water in our homes?

As with any water used for making vodka it is filtered first through activated carbon to absorb unwanted organic and inorganic materials. Then it is passed through deionization columns, which remove other impurities.

Our tap water vodka is as premium as any other vodka, with the same pure and smooth taste. Only we are proud to say that the water comes from our own tap. This makes our vodka just as good, but way better priced than the brands who feel the need to melt glaciers to present themselves.

This brand story belongs to a challenger brand because:

- The brand is unexpected: The market leaders show off with their water sources and build their brand around it.
- There is a clear objective/desire: showing that exotic water sources are overrated for making vodka.
Whisky
When looking into the brand stories of whisky the following things are always present:

- Founder of the brand
  All whisky brands start their brand story by telling the history of the brand, and that starts with the person who decided to make whisky. There is no inciting incident in any of the stories. Most brand stories just state that they decided to blend whisky.

- Family history
  Most Scotch whisky brands elaborate the history more and how the blending went from father to son. The master distiller's signature is found on all analysed whisky bottles.

- Location
  The location of the distillery is an important part of the brand story. For a whisky to be a Scotch it should be produced in Scotland, hence the importance linked to location in the brand story. As mentioned before, all of the analysed whisky bottles place the royal coat of arms of Scotland on their packaging. Also the name Scotch is mentioned, but this is necessary as product information.

Possible challenges to take on

- Challenging some fundamental dimension or driver of the category
  - Ingredients
  - Aging
  - Aging in barrels of oak (set in Scotch regulations)
  - Whisky should be clear
  - Whisky should be expensive to be good

- Challenging some aspect of the way the consumer shops for, experiences, or consumes the product
  - Whisky for cooking instead of drinking
  - Looking at age for quality
  - Whisky from a whisky glass

- Challenging the culture surrounding the category
  - Whisky is for men
  - Whisky is for experts
  - You need to learn how to drink whisky
  - Whisky is for old people

- Challenging some broader aspect of a contemporary culture
  - Men only groups, barbershops whisky

- Challenging some dimension or quality of the competition/Market leader
  - Price
  - Ingredients
  - Origin
  - Production

Challenger brand ideas for whisky

Whisky_challenger_brand_story1 ‘ Welcome to whisky’

My dad, as a true Scot, was a whisky drinker. He always wanted me to drink with him, but I just hated the flavor. Every damn time he told me to try, because “You need to learn how to drink whisky!”.

I never understood why people would want invest time in overcoming a dislike for something if they can just drink something else? So I never learnt and I stuck to my beer.

A few years ago my dad past away, and I was left with a liquor cabinet filled with Scotch. It was then that I felt I owed it to my dad to start trying to drink whisky. But where to start?! There were so many bottles and ages and every whisky just tasted the same to me: smoked fuel in a glass.. But then I came up with an idea:

I asked my friend, who once did some at home distilling, to help me distill a new whisky, a Scotch of course, but a simple Scotch. An easy to drink Scotch for beginners, who want to drink whisky with their dads but not be blown away by the complex flavors of a 12 year old liquid.

That was the birth of 'Welcome to whisky’, a 3 year aged true Scotch, with some sweet notes to just make it a hell of a lot more pleasant to drink!
This brand story is a challenger brand because:
· The story starts off with an inciting incident, the death of his father.
· The story contains conflict, wanting to drink whisky but not liking the flavor.
· The brand is unexpected, other whiskies focus on their complex and rich flavors, this whisky focuses on the simple easy to drink whisky.
· There is a clear objective: teaching people how to drink whisky in an easy way.

When this brand story is presented to whisky experts a negative product evaluation might follow because of their preference for strong and complex flavors. These respondents could be filtered out by a question in the questionnaire.

**Whisky challenger brand story 2 – ‘No Age’**

My friend Pete and I always love to try new whiskies. One day we set a challenge to try all the Scotch whiskies available. So, we printed a list with all the Scotches available and each bought bottles alternately tried them together and rated them, so in the end of our great tasting challenge we could pick our favorite. But, as our challenge went on, the distillers did not sit still, and our list was out of date! So we updated it from time to time, but the list just got longer, our wallets lighter and our whisky taste buds more and more confused.

We always thought ‘know the age, know the whisky’ that is what the experts say, as does the price tag. After spending $200 dollars on a 32 year old whisky and ending up hating it we started to doubt the importance of the age of whisky. Doesn’t it all depend on the flavor? Some people prefer vanilla tones, other the smoky flavor. We came up with a labeling system to group the whiskies and to remember the flavor.

Friends started calling us for whisky help with questions as: I am looking for a whisky with a hint of honey. All we had to do was open our labeling system and find out which whiskies measured up to their needs.

When a few years ago I lost my job I decided it was time to do something with this. Pete and I decided to blend our own whiskies and bottle them not on their age, but on their flavor. It was in 2012 that No Age whisky was founded.

This brand story is a challenger brand because:
· The story starts off with an inciting incident: their system became helpful to other people.
· The story contains conflict: rating whiskies left them confused.
· The brand is unexpected: market leader whiskies focus on the age of the whisky, No Age whisky does the opposite.
· There is a clear objective: helping people find the whisky that they like.

**Whisky challenger brand story 3 – Whisky for young people**

I grew up drinking whisky. My parents both love it, their parents drunk it and so on. Whenever I am in a bar and I order a neat whisky my friends look at me like I am crazy. According to them whisky is something you drink when you are old in your leather chair by the fire. I've hosted several whisky tastings at my place and all my friends like the flavor. Though I could not get them to drink it when we went partying. Such a shame because drinking whisky alone is just less fun!

So I decided to blend a whisky more suitable for young people like my friends and me. It is still a Scotch, my dad would kill me if it wasn’t, but without the grey traditional image. Whisky for a night out. To drink neat, on the rocks or as shots.

This brand story belongs to a challenger brand because:
· The story starts off with an inciting incident, drinking whisky alone in a bar
· The story contains conflict, people like the taste of whisky but link it to old people.
· The brand is unexpected, other whiskies focus on a totally different target audience
· There is a clear objective: getting people from a younger age to enjoy whisky.
Whisky challenger brand story 4 – fast aged whisky

I’ve always loved whisky and love trying new brands and whiskies. Once a year I would let myself buy a really old whisky, I could not do it more than once a year because those prices, wow… But the flavors of a really good old scotch are well worth it. I once did some at home distilling and planned to let it age 30 years, but I am still waiting for that batch. So I did research on aging whisky and found out that pressure will speed up the aging process. The pressure on the oak barrels makes that the liquid takes up more flavor and extracts of the wood, what normally takes years.

With no pressure machines available I thought of the sea. So in the Scottish water it was that I lowered and secured the first batch of Scotch. People thought I was crazy, but I was willing to try! After three ocean years I tried the first batch and discovered the flavor and color of the Scotch was similar to a 12 year old scotch! I did it! I have now sold my whisky to more than 100 bars, and still smile when buyers don’t believe the age of my whisky.

This brand story belongs to a challenger brand because:
  · The story starts off with an inciting incident, aging whisky takes too long.
  · The story contains conflict, wanting old whisky but not wanting to wait.
  · The brand is unexpected, a complete new way of aging whisky.
  · There is a clear objective: aging whisky faster.
The following two existing brand stories were used in pre-test one. For vodka the story of Absolut was used and for whisky the brand story of Ballantines was used. Both brand stories were adjusted so no brand names were included in the story and so that the length of the story was comparable to the length of the developed challenger brand stories.

Brand story Absolut vodka

In 1836 Åhus, Sweden, a boy was born into poverty. Dreaming of a life greater than he’d known he was determined to make something of himself. It did not take him long. By the age of 26 he distributed 3 quarters of all vodka sold in Sweden. However, he still dreamt bigger. He transformed his vodka distilling it hundreds of times until all impurities were removed. The result was a product of unrivaled quality. His empire growing internationally he returned to southern Sweden and built a new distillery to meet the growing demand. Over a century later there it remains. It is where Swedish vodka craftsmanship has been perfected over generations and from where I can proudly tell this story.

All our vodka starts in the same way: with farmers that ferry their winter wheat directly to the distillery. The partnerships with local farms are unique, transforming how international vodka is typically made. Every bottle is both from Åhus and from the people of Åhus. This is not just vodka; this is a community working the land their fathers and grandfathers did to create something they are proud of.

It’s why every drop of water and every blade of wheat comes from one well, one village and one community. I call it ‘one source’. It is the reason why everywhere in the world it will have the same high quality. And since the way it is made won’t change, neither will the true taste of vodka. This vodka is rich, full-bodied and complex, yet smooth and mellow with a distinct character of grain, followed by a hint of dried fruit.

Brand story Ballantines whisky

At just 18 years old, my great-grandpa George founded his first grocery business in Edinburgh, stocking a range of whiskies and hand-selected malts.
5. Inspiration boards for brand story elements

Figure 70 | Inspiration board whisky brand story elements
Figure 71 | Inspiration board vodka brand story elements
6. Pre-test 1 questionnaire

The images below show the online questionnaire of pre-test one. In this case the normal brand story of whisky is presented in the questionnaire.

Hi!

For my graduation project of Industrial Design at the Delft University of Technology I am doing research on branding. The following questionnaire focuses on brand stories. A whisky brand story will be presented to you. Afterwards several questions will be asked about this brand story. Please fill out all the questions to complete this survey, there are no right or wrong answers!

It just takes a few minutes, thank you so much for helping me! :)

Lisanne

Whisky brand story

At just 18 years old, my great-grandpa George founded his first grocery business in Edinburgh, stocking a range of whiskies and hand-selected malts. An ambitious man, with the vision and drive to innovate, he soon made a name for himself as a blender, creating the perfect balance of smoothness and sophistication. Instead of using the whiskies available to him, he scoured the four corners of Scotland for the very best whiskies to blend.

George entrusted his legacy on to his sons. And then they passed it on to their sons and then 15 years ago it was up to me. I could have let the family standards slip, but I didn’t. I stayed true to their grandfather’s passion by still creating the whiskey he is today most remembered for. He left his impression on the world with an authentic Scottish Whisky with a touch of flair. Today, the unique blends live on in a range of whiskies that share his name. Stay true and excellence will always be by your side.

Stay True’. Inspired by the founder, I believe in celebrating the men and women that stay true and leave an impression on everything they do and everyone they meet.

1. This whisky brand story can be described as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uninteresting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unexpected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passionate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrealistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whisky brand story

At just 18 years old, my great-grandpa George founded his first grocery business in Edinburgh, stocking a range of whiskies and hand-selected malts. An ambitious man, with the vision and drive to innovate, he soon made a name for himself as a blender, creating the perfect balance of smoothness and sophistication. Instead of using the whiskies available to him, he scoured the four corners of Scotland for the very best whiskies to blend.

George entrusted his legacy on to his sons. And then they passed it on to their sons and then 15 years ago it was up to me. I could have let the family standards slip, but I didn't. I stayed true to their grandfather's passion by still creating the whiskey he is today most remembered for. He left his impression on the world with an authentic Scottish Whisky with a touch of flair. Today, the unique blends live on in a range of whiskies that share his name. Stay true and excellence will always be by your side.

Stay True’. Inspired by the founder, I believe in celebrating the men and women that stay true and leave an impression on everything they do and everyone they meet.

4. This whisky brand story presents a clear objective

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very much

5. This whisky brand story expresses a clear desire

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very much

6. This whisky brand story expresses an outspoken conflict

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very much

7. This whisky brand story...

builds on the existing whisky product category ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ challenges the whisky product category
builds on existing whisky brands ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ challenges existing whisky brands
builds on traditional whisky brands ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ challenges traditional whisky brands

8. How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about whisky?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very knowledgeable

9. How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about whisky brand stories?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very knowledgeable

10. I am a
☐ Male
☐ Female

11. My age
☐ 18-24 years old
☐ 25-34 years old
☐ 35-44 years old
☐ 45-54 years old
☐ 55-64 years old
☐ 65-74 years old
☐ 75 years or older

Thank you for your time!

Your answers to this questionnaire will be used to evaluate different brand stories in order to find out which of these can be used for my follow-up research. All your answers will be kept anonymous.
7. Pre-test 2 questionnaire

Below the questionnaire of pre-test two is shown. This questionnaire was done offline, this page of the questionnaire was presented to the respondent 12 times, for all twelve designs. These designs were provided to the participants in a printed appendix.

**Questionnaire**

Hi!
For my graduation project of Industrial Design at the Delft University of technology I am doing research on branding and packaging.
The following questionnaire focuses on vodka and whisky packaging.
The appendix given to you shows 3 vodka and 3 whisky designs. For each design several questions are asked about the novelty of the packaging and presence of a brand story. Please pay attention to the design number that is presented on the top of the list of questions.

Please fill out all the questions to complete this survey, there are no right or wrong answers! It just takes a few minutes, thank you so much for helping me! :) Lisanne

---

**Please answer the following questions for design A1**

How novel do you consider this whisky packaging?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all novel</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very novel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How likely is it that whisky comes in this packaging?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How well does this whisky packaging match your expectations for whisky in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all well</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:**

This packaging expresses a clear brand story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This packaging informs me about the product and brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The packaging elements clearly serve to tell a story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Hi!
For my graduation project of Industrial Design at the Delft University of technology I am doing research on branding and packaging.
The following questionnaire focuses on whisky and vodka packaging.
The appendix given to you shows 1 whisky and 1 vodka design. For each design several questions are asked.
Please fill out all the questions to complete this survey, there are no right or wrong answers!
It just takes a few minutes, thank you so much for helping me! :) 
Lisanne

Please first read the brand story of Pascal's law whisky below:

Brand story for Pascal's law

I have always had a passion for whisky. Not only for drinking it but also blending it. I would try and come up with the perfect blend of different whiskies, bottle those and give them as presents to friends and family. I have always had the dream of distilling and bottling my own whisky but I am not a man of great patience... so letting a whisky sit in a barrel for more than ten years without being able to taste it was just never my cup of tea.

So I did research on aging whisky and found that pressure speeds up the aging process. The pressure on the oak barrels makes that the liquid takes up more flavor and extracts of the wood, what normally takes years.
With no pressure machines available I thought of the sea and the pressure of water. So in the Scottish water it was that I lowered and secured the first batch of my homemade Scotch. People thought I was crazy, but I was willing to try!
After three ocean years I tried the first batch and discovered the flavor and color of the Scotch was similar to a 12 year old Scotch! I did it! A fast aged whisky, with help of the Scottish sea.

Now take a close look at the whisky packaging design. This is the first image in the appendix presented to you.
The following questions will be about the product in this image.

Good luck!
Please take a close look at the packaging design of Pascal’s Law. This is the first image in the appendix presented to you. The following questions will be about this product.

1. Please indicate on the following scales your overall opinion of Pascal’s Law:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Bad | | | | | | | |
   Dislike | | | | | | | |
   Negative | | | | | | | |
   Undesirable | | | | | | | |
   Good | | | | | | | |
   Like | | | | | | | |
   Positive | | | | | | | |
   Desirable | | | | | | | |

2. Please indicate on the following scales your opinion on the quality of Pascal’s Law:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Poor quality | | | | | | | |
   Mediocre product | | | | | | | |
   Inferior | | | | | | | |
   Poorly made | | | | | | | |
   High quality | | | | | | | |
   Exceptional product | | | | | | | |
   Superior | | | | | | | |
   Well made | | | | | | | |

Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

3. I would like to know more about Pascal’s Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | | |
   Strongly agree | | | | | | | |

4. This packaging makes me curious about Pascal’s Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | | |
   Strongly agree | | | | | | | |

5. I would like more information about Pascal’s Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   Strongly disagree | | | | | | | |
   Strongly agree | | | | | | | |
Please indicate how likely it will be that you would do the following things:

6. **I would suggest Pascal's Law to friends or relatives**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. **I would spread the word about Pascal's law**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. **I would tell people about Pascal's law**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. **Pascal's Law whisky (is):**

   **Expected**
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   |----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builds on the existing whisky category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
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<td>----------------------------------------</td>
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<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
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<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
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</table>
12. **How novel do you consider the packaging of Pascal’s Law whisky?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novelty Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all novel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **How likely is it that whisky comes in this packaging?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **How well does the Pascal’s law whisky packaging match your expectations for whisky in general?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:*

15. **This packaging expresses a clear brand story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **This packaging informs me about Pascal’s Law**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. **The packaging elements clearly serve to tell a story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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18. **How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about whisky?**

Not at all knowledgeable ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very knowledgeable

19. **Would you consider yourself familiar or unfamiliar with existing whisky brands?**

Very unfamiliar ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very familiar

This was the end of the questionnaire about Pascal's law whisky. You will now proceed to part 2.

Please first read the brand story of Harvest Time vodka below:

**Brand story for Harvest Time**

Vodka has always been my drink, though after trying almost all vodka brands available I never found the perfect one. To me all vodka brands lacked flavor. Whenever I asked a salesperson to sell me vodka with flavor I got a list of options: from lemon to coconut to whipped cream. I tried to explain that I wanted the flavor of the ingredients, not artificial added aroma. It turned out: no such thing existed! All brands sell vodkas that are taste- and odorless; they call it purity, I call it boring. It was then that I decided to make it myself.

Years of research followed, I went to the farms of Poland to find out for what makes truly excellent vodka. Testing, every day, the effect of the soil, the climate and the harvesting processes. After much analysis I decided on three grains:

1) Spelt – “The Happy Grain” – Nutty, earthy, full-bodied
2) Rye – “The Dancing Grain” – Classic, peppery, jumps on the tongue
3) Wheat – “The Smiling Grain” – Sweetness and long finish

The trick, I discovered, was harvesting before the grains ripened. These softer, meatier grains retained their natural essence and created smooth flavors. Our crazy vodka professor perfected the distilling procedure over four years until the recipe was just right. This is a vodka to be sipped, like a single malt or sophisticated wine; the flavors to be appreciated. I want you to take the glass, to say hello to the vodka, to chew into the grains and get to know each other. I want you to laugh, to dance, and to smile like the very three grains that I chose to create this exquisite, incomparable vodka.

Now take a close look at the vodka packaging design, this is the second image in the appendix presented to you. The following questions will be about the product in this image.
Now take a close look at the packaging design of Harvest Time, this is the second image in the appendix presented to you. The following questions will be about this product.

1. **Please indicate on the following scales your overall opinion of Harvest Time:**

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Good
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Bad
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Dislike
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Negative
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Undesirable

2. **Please indicate on the following scales your opinion on the quality of Harvest Time:**

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | High quality
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Poor quality
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Inferior
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Mediocre product
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Poorly made
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Well made

*Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:*

3. **I would like to know more about Harvest Time**

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongly agree
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Strongly disagree

4. **This packaging makes me curious about Harvest Time**

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongly agree
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Strongly disagree

5. **I would like more information about Harvest Time**

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongly agree
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Strongly disagree
Please indicate how likely it will be that you do the following things:

6. **I would suggest Harvest Time to friends or relatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **I would spread the word about Harvest Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **I would tell people about Harvest Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Harvest Time vodka (is):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds on the existing vodka category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds on existing vodka brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds on traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges the existing vodka category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges existing vodka brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions are specifically about the packaging design.

10. Please indicate on the following scales your opinion on the visual appearance of the packaging design of Harvest Time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **The packaging of Harvest Time is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconspicuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not draw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspicous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draws attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. **How novel do you consider the packaging of Harvest Time vodka?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all novel</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **How likely is it that vodka comes in this packaging?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **How well does the Harvest Time vodka packaging match your expectations for vodka in general?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all well</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:*

15. **This packaging expresses a clear brand story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **This packaging informs me about Harvest Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. **The packaging elements clearly serve to tell a story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. **How knowledgeable do you consider yourself about vodka?**

| Not at all knowledgeable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Very knowledgeable |

19. **Would you consider yourself familiar or unfamiliar with existing vodka brands?**

| Very unfamiliar | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Very familiar |

20. **My age:**  


21. **I am a**

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female

**You have completed the questionnaire!**

Thank you so much for your cooperation!
Your answers in this questionnaire will be used in my research on packaging design.
All your answers will be kept anonymous.
9. Defining the challenge for Bisquit Cognac

- Challenging some fundamental dimension or driver of the category
  Cognac is made of grapes (set in Cognac regulations)
  Cognac should be aged (set in Cognac regulations)
  Aging in barrels of oak (set in Cognac regulations)
  Cognac is a clear spirit
  Cognac is expensive

- Challenging some aspect of the way the consumer shops for, experiences, or consumes the product
  Cognac for cooking instead of drinking
  Looking at age for quality

- Challenging the culture surrounding the category
  Cognac is for men
  Cognac is for experts
  You need to learn how to drink Cognac
  Cognac is for old people

- Challenging some broader aspect of a contemporary culture
  Men only groups, barbershops with Cognac
  Cognac for cocktails in clubs

- Challenging some dimension or quality of the competition/Market leader
  Price
  Ingredients (Set by Cognac restrictions)
  Origin (Set by Cognac restrictions)
  Production (Set by Cognac restrictions)

Challenger brand story 1 - Armelle

Being the daughter of a master distiller comes with drinking a hell of a lot of Cognacs. I love the sweet taste and all the different flavours you can find in each different Cognac. Crazy enough my female friends just don’t believe me.

All of us are creative, love cooking and trying out new things. After our home cooked dinners we drink liqueur with our coffees. Once I brought a bottle of our families Cognac but they didn’t even want to drink it. They thought it is something for men to drink it neat, not for our girls-dinner-night.

When I once poured their glasses in the kitchen and told them it was a new liqueur I found they all loved it! So a few years ago I decided to follow my fathers footsteps. With his help I created cognac for women like my friends and me, with sweet and fruity flavours and without the masculine image it surround. As it aged for two years it is called a V.S.

but I decided to focus on the flavours it contains and label it accordingly. So: red fruit, rose petals and lime, making it even more special than Very Special!

Under my own name I introduced this brand as the daughter brand of the famous Bisquit Cognac.

This Cognac is especially distilled for women. It is delicious when drunk neat, but don’t worry, unlike my dad I won’t mind if you add ice or water!

Love, Armelle

Challenger brand 2 – l’Intensité

My husband is a master distiller of Cognac, very very good Cognac. You would think as being a master distiller you would know your customers. Strange enough he only knows half of them. The men!

It is not that he thinks women do not drink Cognac but he thinks it is ‘too strong’ for women and keeps serving me Cognac cocktails… What he doesn’t know is that when my friends and me come together we drink Cognac. Neat, not in cocktails! Together we decided it was time to change the ‘Cognac is for men’ culture. We distilled a V.S.O.P . Cognac with very powerful but subtle flavours. For women with life experience who are tired of those cocktails for the twenty-year-olds and not afraid of a bit of taste!

Challenger brand 3 – No Name

Being the son of a master distiller comes with one big perk: Cognac! With every family dinner, holiday or birthday we would drink the most exclusive and rare Cognacs, and experiencing all these different flavours from pepper to truffle to almonds and fruits.

I was always surprised, sometimes in a good way and sometimes in a bad way. Like eating chocolates, you never know what is inside until you bite it. When I go to my liquor store I am always reluctant to pay a lot of money for an older Cognac, because I might
love it but I also might end up hating it! It was then that I decided to join my father to create my own Cognac. With his help we came up with a Cognac that is not labelled V.S. or X.O. but labelled with its flavour: vanilla, prune and oakwood. For people that love Cognac but prefer knowing the taste.
10. Interview guide

General
1. Would you like to introduce yourself (age, gender, job, hobbies)
2. Can you tell me something about what spirits you drink and when you drink these?

(The interviewee is asked to take a close look at the packaging design)

Category check
3. What do you think of this packaging design?
4. From your first impression of this packaging design, in which category would you place this product?

(If it was not clear, explain that this is a Cognac.)

Challenger check
5. What do you think of this Cognac packaging?

(Provide a print of top 4 Cognac packaging designs)

6. What do you think of this Cognac packaging compared to other Cognac packaging?

Be single minded check
7. Who do you think this brand wants to target?
8. Is this a product that you would buy and why?

Brand story elements check
9. Can you tell me something about this brand and its brand story from the packaging?
10. Why do you think this brand was started?
11. Is there something about this brand that is unexpected to you?
12. If this brand has an objective or desire, what do you think this would be?

Word-of-mouth check
13. Would you talk to people about this brand, and why?

Information search check
14. Would you like more information about this brand and why?
15. What is something you would like to know about this brand/product?

(The interviewee is asked to read the brand story of Armelle)

16. What do you think of this brand story?
17. Now that you know the story, would you talk about this brand?
18. What is your opinion of the product, now that you know this story?