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Preface

I have had an interest in package design and visual branding since before I was aware that they were a part of a massive creative and business industry. As a child I was very aware of the impact that store brand products had on my low-income family. We often shopped for lower-priced versions of everything from grocery and household products to clothing, toys, and personal products, and for me this was often accompanied by embarrassment or emotional discomfort. I had somehow learned that store brand products were inferior to the popularity and perceived quality of national brand products, and that not having the ability to purchase these meant that I too was inferior. Luckily, with maturity came a new understanding of budgets, the consumer experience, and importantly, a better understanding of priorities and my perception of self.

As I approached the idea of this thesis, I looked to several of my areas of interest including art, crafts, and education. The idea that I could dig deeper into and contribute to the knowledge we as designers have with regard to private labels did not strike me at first, but rather, it presented itself slowly. I believe there has been an important shift in the way that we as consumers interpret value and quality, and in the way that we provide for our families. I am hopeful that through my research I can contribute to improved consumer relationships with private label brands, and help to empower the contemporary consumer - who is informed, discerning, and appreciative of functional, higher level design.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Changes In Private Labels

National brands and private label brands (also referred to as store brands) have never competed as much as they have in the last decade. (Birdwadker, 2011) With consumers looking to save money and spend more wisely, sales of store brand consumer packaged goods have skyrocketed since the most recent recession. This development has national brands rethinking their strategies and store brands taking advantage of tactics traditionally utilized by the same national brands with whom they compete. Numerous brands, both private label and national, have taken this opportunity to rebrand, repackage, and reformulate the products they offer. These efforts are not just to increase sales, but also to increase customer loyalty. (StoreBrandDecisions.com 2012)

With recent events like several Tylenol plant shutdowns and product recalls, this desired consumer loyalty is increasingly more discerning. Consumers of 2014 are looking for both national and private label brands to provide unique, satisfying, and effective experiences at lower prices, and because store brand products start further down the ladder in regard to said prices, they have seemingly had the upper hand. Conversely, the national brand advantage of broader customer bases, effective and ubiquitous marketing, and long-term loyalties keep the competition healthy and active. There are a growing number of viable options in nearly every product category for frugal consumers who expect quality at a great value. The glaring exception to this effect is the category of store brand personal care and personal
hygiene products.

What can be done to improve the audience perception of these products, and can consumer activity be positively influenced? Is this lack of interest (or trust, or perhaps quality perception) due to historically poor or bland product package and visual branding design? These questions serve as a springboard from which this research begins, set with the goal of finding answers that could possibly influence this sector of store brand products positively for the benefit of all consumers and for the benefit of brand competition nationwide.
Chapter 2

Research Methods Overview

Research Strategy

One of the most important aspects of tackling a research document of this scale is the implementation of a research strategy. The strategy for this investigation (Appendix A) includes an audit of previously published research about private label brands, national brands, consumer behavior, and package and information design, a comparative analysis of several comparable products both privately and nationally branded, an online questionnaire, brand and quality perception feedback from local university students gathered through on-site intercepts, the development of audience personas, package prototype testing based on acquired feedback, and a conclusive summary of all findings.

Assumptions

The research process began with a list of assumptions about consumer attitudes in regard to personal hygiene and personal care products purchased in brick-and-mortar retail environments. The researcher formed this list of assumptions based on personal experience and attitudes as well as previous research into the subject. This activity aids in the secondary research process by providing multiple origin points from which to seek information. Assumptions can be proven or disproven, or reevaluated based on previously published information adjacent to current research endeavors. The list of assumptions utilized includes the following statements:

- People buy generic products when they want to save money.
• Generic products are always cheaper than nationally branded ones.

• People think that generic products are not always as good as national ones. They think of them as less potent, less ideal versions of the “real thing.”

• People are less ashamed of purchasing generic brands today than they were 10 years ago.

• People will buy generic brands if they don’t “look” generic.

• Generic brands do not get as much design attention as national brands.

• Shoppers who are creative or artistic connect with beautiful packaging more than non-creative people do.

• Packaging matters little to the average person.

• College students trust national brands more than store brands.

• Students are frugal with most store purchases, but spend more on hygiene products.

• Students are drawn to aesthetically pleasing or unique packaging.

• Most people can tell which store a generic brand product comes from, based on the packaging.

In order to best address each of the assumptions made, they were placed into separate categories according to which of the various aspects of the consumer experience they addressed. The categories used for this list were: Value, Aesthetics, Environment, and Trust. From this point, a review of existing literature was conducted based on each of these (as well as additional categories that presented themselves during the process, such as information related to other store brand product areas.) Non-pertinent information was also catalogued for future reference.
Information for this period of investigation was primarily sourced from periodicals, magazines, and white papers, such as theses and dissertations. Additional sources of information include respective brand websites and corporate publications, as well as books and larger volumes of text. As the focus on visual branding for consumers has grown and continues to trend as an intelligent business tactic, many publications have included insightful and important discussions of the topic with greater depth and frequency. These publications often cite the opinions and observations of design, marketing, and retail industry experts. Other researchers around the globe have documented their findings in this area; most often this is in regard to food and grocery retail experiences and how unique visual branding (or the lack thereof) affects consumer impressions and participation. The contribution these researchers have made to this body of knowledge is significant, and in many ways very useful to the research being conducted for this thesis. Findings in previous research, though tangential to the topic discussed presently, allow the researcher to compare and contrast visual branding methods and techniques and consumer behavior as they each relate to multiple product areas within a retail environment.
Comparative Analysis of Brands

The next component of the secondary research conducted for this thesis is a comparative analysis of several brands. The brands chosen represent various levels of success and notoriety for national brands and store brands. Additionally they represent three different personal care and hygiene product areas. The national brands for analysis include Proctor and Gamble’s Crest, Johnson and Johnson’s Tylenol, and Unilever’s Suave brand. Crest is representative of the hygiene product area, Tylenol represents medicinal products, and Suave represents products used for personal care and beauty.

Three store brands will also be analyzed, with each brand representing a different product area as well. The brands included are Dollar General’s DG Health, Target’s up & up, and ALDI’s Lacura, which each represents hygiene, medicinal, and beauty care respectively. The comparative analysis will assist in the identification of typical national brand product development, marketing, and visual branding practices, and serve to highlight difference in said practices when national brands are compared to store brands.

Questionnaire and Interviews

The primary research component of this project includes a web-based questionnaire, interview sessions with local college students, and data gained through the synthesis of the responses given through the aforementioned methods. The questionnaire was distributed to an online audience, the majority of whom were college-aged (18- to 28-years-old) participants. The audience also included several adults of various ages. The audience was sourced by utilizing social media
networks like Facebook and Google+, and through the use of direct email. It consisted of eight questions, each related to the purchase of and individual consumer relationship with store brand products.

Interview sessions were conducted on the campus of Kent State University in Kent, Ohio over the course of several days. The sessions were held in a common campus space, and participants were intercepted as they traversed the area. The interviews generally consisted of five questions each, though several of the participants volunteered additional information and engaged in lengthier conversation about the subject matter. Interviews were recorded with permission from participants for further analysis and inclusion in this research.

Data gleaned from the questionnaire responses and from the in-person interviews was then categorized, quantified, and then implications of all findings were applied to this original research abstract. The details of these findings were then utilized in the development of audience personas and the comparative analysis. Research conclusions were extracted thereafter.
Chapter 3

History of and Current Trends in Private Labels

Defining Store Brands and Generic Products

The average shopper encounters both nationally branded and store branded products with each shopping experience. In the simplest language, a national brand product can be described as one that is distributed nationally under a brand name and is owned by a manufacturer. National brand product sales typically benefit from national advertisement and marketing, unique product qualities (fragrance, flavor, application, etc.), endorsements, and increased product research and development. (CBS News, 2010.)

Private label products (also known as generic, store brand, or local brand products) carry the brand of and are sold by specific retailers, and cost on average 23% less than their national brand counterparts. The retailers of private label brands manufacture, design packaging for, and develop marketing strategies for their products. Despite their ability to offer lower sales prices of most of these products (along with the claim in most cases that the store brand product is comparable to one branded nationally), many store brands must adhere to the same or similar quality levels mandated by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) that national brands do. These levels are most apparent in the category of over-the-counter and prescription medications. For example, to be certified a "generic" drug by the FDA, a pain relief product must have the same "active ingredient" as its brand name equivalent (e.g., the "active ingredient" in Advil is ibuprofen, thus a store brand of
ibuprofen medication has to have an efficacy rate similar to that of any name brand it claims comparability to - usually within a 20% range). (CBS News, 2010)

**Consumer Behavior**

There are myriad factors that play a role in determining the purchase habits and the non-habitual, individual purchase decisions of each consumer. Over time those factors have come to include product necessity, cost, availability, desirability, comparison to other products (whether they are very different or very similar), value (as well as perceived value), information, and the list continues. In a brick and mortar retail environment, some of these factors may play a more important role in the consumer’s purchase decision than other factors. It has been proven that sensory consideration in a retail environment is a powerful tool - used to drive customers to make positive associations with brands and products – which often leads to not only purchases, but importantly, also to relationships with said brands and products. (Milliman and Turley, 2000)

Historically, consumers have turned to generic and store brand products during times of financial distress. GfK Custom Research North America reveals that during the country’s most recent recession, American consumers turned to store brands as they tightened their budgets. In the 2009 GfK study, 75% of the shoppers surveyed indicated that the recession played a major role in their decision to purchase national brand or store brand products, with more than 30% stating that they are buying more store brand products than they did in 2008. (Private Label Manufacturers Association [PLMA], 2009) A Consumer Edge survey found that 93% of grocery shoppers changed their purchase habits because of the recession, often
opting for store brand versions of their typical national brand essentials. As the economy recovers, the growth of store brand consumers continues to increase (albeit at a slower pace.)

Despite the increase in consumer purchases of store brands, there are some product categories (as indicated in a 2009 IRI study) in which brand preference frequently trumps price; among the list of these products are shampoo and hair conditioner. The report noted a consumer behavior, coined “sophisticated splurging,” whereby shoppers who made an effort to save money during the recession found creative ways to purchase their favorite national brand products without budgetary consequence. For instance, shoppers found options to purchase said name brand products from lower-priced discount retailers as opposed to big box stores. (Leathers, 2009)

Though many store brand personal care and hygiene products may be comparable to their national brand counterparts (in composition, variety, and efficacy), they have been unable to draw the same consumer attraction that store brand household goods and grocery items have since the recession. The economic event forced retailers to rethink their store brand portfolio strategies in order to remain relevant in a world where, more than ever, consumers seek brands that not only offer value but speak in a unique, identifiable voice and deliver substance with purpose. (Birdwadker, 2011) This value has been added by changes in product packaging and branding conventions for several retailers in the past decade (including Target, Dollar General, and ALDI). Despite the fact that some of these efforts had a direct effect on packaging and branding of personal care and hygiene products, the consumer boost seen in other retailer product areas has not occurred,
with the exception of over-the-counter medications. (StoreBrandDecisions.com 2012) Time Magazine reports that 68% of shoppers say they actually prefer the generic store-brand versions of OTC drugs—presumably because they find that the ingredients are virtually identical to those of more expensive name brands options. (The Integer Group & M/A/R/C Research, 2012)

**Behavioral Composition**

The recent activity in the store brand sector has prompted a great deal of study into the behaviors of consumers. According to the Integer Group’s magazine The Checkout, women care more than men when it comes to products that go on their skin and in their hair. While 74% of women report a preference for name-brand health-and-beauty merchandise, just 56% of men say they prefer name brands. Laundry detergent products are a notable area with clear preferences. Of the eight product categories covered in the study (including batteries, ice cream, milk, cereal, and cookies and snacks), 69% of consumers think brand names are most important when it comes to laundry detergent. The study shows that Black Americans are more likely to report preferences for name-brand detergent (76%), cereal (72%), cookies (68%) and ice cream (62%), compared with White Americans (68%, 61%, 56% and 50%, respectively). However, White Americans tend to prefer name-brand batteries — 65%, compared with 57% for Black Americans.

Additionally, the study notes that in 2010, 57% of consumers agreed with the statement “Brand names are not better quality.” Recently, this figure increased to 64%. (Tuttle, 2012)
Chapter 4

Brands Comparative Review and Analysis

Comparative Brand Review

Six brands were chosen for review within this research. Three of the brands are nationally recognized, with high-selling product lines. The remaining three are store brands that together represent a general range of consumer options. The national brands included are Crest (Proctor & Gamble), Tylenol (Johnson & Johnson), and Suave (Unilever). Crest represents the personal hygiene sector, Tylenol represents the medicinal sector, and Suave is representative of personal care & beauty, each on a national level. Respectively, each sector or product area is also represented by a store brand of comparable use and purpose. The store brand counterparts for this research include DG Health (featuring personal hygiene products sold exclusively at Dollar General), Up & Up (a Target brand which includes among many other products, OTC drugs), and Lacura (a beauty and personal care brand produced and distributed by ALDI stores).

Each of the national brands researched has significant influence in their respective industries and exhibits a high percentage of sales and recognition nationwide. The brand comparison is beneficial to this research because it will assist in establishing the best practices of brands that are engrained in local consumer culture. Additionally, the comparison of national brand practices to the practices of respective store brands (in regard to packaging, marketing, and overall brand presence) will help identify design opportunities.
National Brands Analysis - Crest

Since its inception in 1955, the brand Crest, owned by Proctor and Gamble, has passionately pursued the improvement of oral care. Not only is the brand common to households, it is also one of the nation's most prominent and trusted in the dental health product category. This is in part due to the continued acceptance of many of Crest's products by the American Dental Association as well as the brand's compliance with the United States Food and Drug Administration.

In the early 1940s, dental disease was one of the most prevalent health problems in the United States, with an estimated 700 million cavities developing per year among the population. Proctor and Gamble began research with the goal of producing a toothpaste that could help reduce tooth decay. In 1950, this venture led them to Dr. Joseph Muhler at Indiana University, where studies on the effectiveness of fluoride were conducted. By 1955, Proctor and Gamble had launched Crest with fluoride into several test markets, followed by a national product expansion in 1956.

For over 50 years, Crest has led research and innovation in dental health. In 1976, it was even noted as of the 100 greatest discoveries of the previous 100 years by the American Chemical Society. Just under ten years later, Crest introduced the first tartar control toothpaste, which was also the first tartar control product to receive the seal of the American Dental Association. The brand was also the first to produce a whitening toothpaste that received the American Dental Association seal. (Crest, “Crest Heritage”)

Crest, like many other brands of similar prominence and history, conventionally utilize television marketing to reach its audience. Recently, however, the brand has opted for a different, more innovative route. Ernesto Levy, Proctor
and Gamble’s North America oral care marketing director, explains the recent decision to produce a series of video advertisements that were exclusively distributed through Facebook and Youtube. "Consumers are there [in social media] and we want to talk to them where they are." Levy adds that the brand wants to facilitate two-way communication with a visceral, provocative campaign that would prompt online sharing and discussions. (Wasserman, 2012)

**National Brands Analysis - Tylenol**

The brand Tylenol (nationally owned and distributed by Johnson & Johnson), which includes several product lines of its own, is one of the world’s leading over-the-counter pharmaceutical companies. The brand had humble beginnings. In 1879 Robert McNeil opened McNeil Pharmacy in Philadelphia, where he manufactured and sold medications to local hospitals and doctors. Over time, the pharmacy grew into a company that focused on the production of pharmaceuticals, and was eventually incorporated as McNeil Laboratories in 1933. Within two decades, McNeil introduced Tylenol Elixir for Children, the first aspirin-free pain reliever, which was available by prescription only. In 1959, Johnson & Johnson acquired McNeil Laboratories, and Tylenol was subsequently made available for purchase without a prescription. In the decades succeeding this acquisition, Tylenol products became the number one brand of OTC analgesic medications in the United States, the number one branded product in the Health and Beauty Aid consumer category, and a pioneer in safety-sealed, tamper-resistant packaging, a response to a criminal tampering incident in 1982. (McNeil Consumer Healthcare Company, “Tylenol.com”)
Within several days beginning Sept. 29, 1982, seven people in the Chicago area were found dead after taking cyanide-laced capsules of Extra-Strength Tylenol. At the time, the painkiller was the pharmaceutical company’s best-selling product. It was feared that the brand, which then accounted for 17% of Johnson & Johnson’s net income, would never recover from the crisis. However, the brand experienced only a temporary setback, nearly completely recovering its 37% share of the $1.2 billion analgesic market within two months. Tylenol set a precedent by immediately recalling 31 million bottles of its trademark medication, offering customers replacements products in a safer format, and by revolutionizing the product packaging as to prevent future similar scenarios. Though these moves were costly, the brands response to the crisis was seen as superior and illustrated a strength and a genuine concern for its consumers that the public continues to invest in. (Rehak, 2002)

The Tylenol brand is deeply rooted in the culture of the United States, and perceptions of the brand are overwhelmingly positive. According to a study conducted by the Relational Capital Group in 2010, consumers remain strongly interested in purchasing the Tylenol brand, with purchase intent and brand loyalty exceeding that for competitors, such as Advil. This loyalty persists despite Tylenol’s recall of millions of bottles and packages and plant closures earlier within that year. When surveyed about Tylenol, consumers noted that the popularly recommended brand was “honest and trustworthy,” and that the brand “acts with [one’s] best interests in mind.” This attitude is attributed in part to Tylenol’s long track record of reliability, and its humanistic traits of warmth and competence. (PR Newswire,
Since the brand’s most recent public relations scandal, Tylenol has spent approximately $30 million on a campaign and rebrand with the intention of holding on to its loyal consumers. Michael Sneed, VP-Global Corporate Affairs at Johnson and Johnson, states “I would say that it is a campaign that emphasizes our strategy for reconnecting with consumers when our business is really taking measurable strides to overcome the past challenges. We want to make sure people think of J&J as a long-term provider of health care, as a company that’s going to be there day in and day out. While we’re still considered among the best, there’s nothing wrong with being the best. And we want to make sure we get back to that.” (Miller, 2013)

**National Brands Analysis - Suave**

The Anglo-Dutch multinational consumer goods company Unilever produces Suave (in addition to many other brands, including Knorr, Lipton, Axe, TRESemmé, and Hellman’s). Along with Suave, Unilever represents a range of products that touch over two billion people daily. Suave is a brand that strives to offer exciting, luxurious personal care and hygiene experiences for households on a budget for 70 years. (Unilever, “Unileverusa.com”) Suave, one of the top shampoo brands in the United States, began as a hair care product brand owned by the company Helen Curtis (formerly the National Mineral Company), which was founded in Chicago in 1927. The company began as the manufacturer of the Peach Bloom Facial Mask, which was made of mineral clay from Arkansas. Company founders Gerald Gidwitz and Louis Stein eventually turned to manufacturing hair care products, which garnered them significant business success over the next several decades. After World War II the company shifted its focus back to personal care products, and was
renamed Helen Curtis. At this time, Suave products were reintroduced to department and drug stores nationally.

Throughout the 60s, 70s, and 80s Helen Curtis and it’s Suave brand saw success after success, including international licensing, broadened product categories, inclusion in the Fortune 500 group of companies, and sales of over $1 billion. However, during the mid 1990s Helen Curtis recognized that the small company’s inability to compete with industry giants such as Proctor and Gamble and Unilever on an international scale was becoming a business disadvantage. In 1997, the company agreed to be acquired by Unilever for approximately $770 million. (Collins, 1996)

Suave has maintained its grasp on its share of the market with innovative marketing and attention to its audience. In 2005, the brand departed from its ordinary methods of television advertisement, opting for something more unique to its clientele. Allison Harmon, Unilever Home & Personal Care senior manager-marketing communications, states that "...there is so much competition in the category, and in order to truly stand out we felt the brand could make a greater impact and reach more consumers with a print, outdoor and Web campaign.” The campaign theme, “Can You Tell?” challenges women to try and recognize the difference between Suave and more expensive hair care brands. The campaign included direct brand comparison in salons, a web presence, and a guerilla marketing component. “To add further impact and awareness for the campaign, we decided to layer on experiential and guerrilla elements to the campaign in order to really penetrate with Suave's performance message,” states Harmon. This component included a temporary salon installation in New York City, along with 60
salon customers dressed in tee shirts printed with “Can You Tell?” walking around the city. (Todé, 2005)

Though it has long made use of its “Suave does what theirs does for a lot less” tagline, which was created in the 1970s by Bayer Bess Vanderwalker, Chicago, the brand has recently turned its focus to a stronger point of view and greater emphasis on the beauty brand that Suave is, and less on the price- and performance-comparison claims it has made in the past. Creative Director Donna Charlton-Perrin on Suave for Ogilvy and Mather Advertising, Chicago, states that she wanted “to create a new emotional space for Suave to own.” The firm created a campaign they have coined “Pretty Mom,” which features women with attractive hair in domestic situations, illustrating that they no longer have to sacrifice their own beauty for the care of their families. (Neff, 2006)

**National Brand Comparative Analysis**

As revealed in a previous chapter of this thesis, brands with products represented nationally typically benefit from dedicated marketing budgets, increased development, and broader or more complex objectives. Through the comparison of the Tylenol, Crest, and Suave brands and their respective histories, marketing practices, and product package design elements, a rubric was developed that illustrates how the inclusion of specific qualities in the presentation of leading personal care and hygiene products have positively influenced consumer attitudes and activity. The rubric includes the following components in regard to brand presentation: innovative marketing, clearly stated goals, unique product, and loyalty to consumer base. The rubric also indicates common inclusions with regard to
product packaging of these brands by including analysis of the following: package
information, branding, and color and imagery.

Businesses and brands are utilizing innovative marketing tactics, with wide
audiences taking note and participating with growing frequency. (Chaffey, 2013)
For instance, each of these national brands has made significant efforts to develop
non-traditional marketing campaigns in the past five years. Tylenol recently ended a
campaign called “Smile It Forward,” during which the brand asked mothers from all
walks of life to share joyful images and stories of their families. In turn, each
submission would result in a $1 donation (up to &100,000) from Tylenol to
Children’s Health Fund. Children’s Health Fund ensures that children in need can
visit doctors regardless of their ability to pay. The campaign was executed with the
use of a website, Facebook, and was shared through several blogs and personal
websites. (Johnsen, 2013) Suave and Crest have both recently utilized Facebook and
YouTube to deliver their brand messages to web-based audiences by using viral
videos, online sharing, and consumer initiated discussions.

Each of the three brands also communicates clearly stated goals or brand
objectives to its respective audience. For these three national brands, these goals
are a part of a humane or altruistic vision or mission. In recent decades consumer
culture has shown a growing interest in learning behaviors, values and attitudes of
companies towards social issues and socially responsible management. This trend
coincides with an increase in the incorporation of ethical criteria when assessing the
performance of companies, which is indicated in recent development of several
brand identities and values. (Fan, 2005) For instance, Suave claims to produce
products that “offer great quality beauty solutions for the entire family to help you
look good, smell good and feel good every day.” Though this goal is product-focused, additional goals of both Suave and Unilever indicate that the brand and its parent company also place great focus on the improvement of living conditions for people, the improvement of consumer self worth, and share a commitment to sustainable living. (Unilever, “Unileverusa.com”) Likewise, Crest began as a brand with the mission of improving the oral health care of this country, and has since worked toward that goal by conducting research, creating products that reflect the goal, and by pursuing a relationship with its consumer base and utilizing consumer feedback. (Crest, “Crest.com) These broader goals increase brand equity by introducing a brand component that, unlike package style or basic product characteristics, are more difficult to duplicate. (Araüna, Crescenzi, & Tortajada, 2013)

The prominence of each of these brands has improved over their respective timelines, and this in part due to the unique products that each of the brands has developed. Each of these national brands began its long history with a proprietary product that fit a unique consumer need. For example, Tylenol created the first children’s non-aspirin pain reliever, and has since pioneered several medicinal breakthroughs, as well as the use of tamper-evident sealing for over-the-counter medications. Tylenol also introduced what is considered the first official recall of a product from store shelves as it dealt with the package tampering scandal of 1982. Tylenol’s response to the incident is widely regarded as a bold, consumer-centric move that has since served as a model for a proactive brand response to product crises. This action exhibited for many that Tylenol maintains a strong loyalty to the public. (PR Newswire 2010) As brands like Tylenol, Suave and Crest continue to
propagate a concern for the consumer by engaging in philanthropic activity, product research, and communication innovation, this demonstration of loyalty will continue to positively influence consumer attitudes and activity.

Upon analysis of packaging for three of the selected national brand’s products, it was determined that there are three pertinent components for review and comparison: package information, branding, and color and imagery. The products reviewed include Crest 3D-White Whitening Toothpaste, Suave Clinical Protection Almond Verbena Antiperspirant, and Tylenol Extra-Strength Tablets. These products were chosen as basic representations of each of their respective brands, and represent a range of design sensibilities and package styles. Depictions of these packages are on Appendix B.

For this rubric, package information includes the basic or scientific product name, instructions for product use, and appropriate or required drug facts. Each of the nationally branded products features a basic or scientific product name. For example, Crest utilizes “fluoride anti-cavity toothpaste,” while Tylenol includes the medicinal name, “Acetaminophen”. Suave refers to its product as “anti-perspirant deodorant”. Each of these product packages also includes clear, simplified instructions for use.

Drug facts appear on any OTC medications or products containing an FDA approved drug, which includes the fluoride used in some toothpastes and aluminum zirconium tetrachlorohydrex GLY often used as an anti-perspirant. Products requiring drug facts follow specific requirements from the FDA for inclusion, which also indicate type styles, organization of information, and drug fact placement on packages. These label regulations, which were published in 1999 and affect over
100,000 OTC drug products, stem from consumer research conducted by the FDA. Notably, this research found that 30% of OTC medication users were older Americans. Aspects of the regulations, which are patterned after the Nutrition Facts food label, address previously hard-to-understand verbiage and inconsistency of information and placement. (Food and Drug Administration [FDA], 2009)

Adherence to these requirements is important not only for consumer use, but also for brand reliability and legitimacy.

The criteria for the branding component of the package design rubric include visual brand relationship to the product, unique product name or logo, and a major product or brand claim. Once again, each of the national brands utilized in this comparison effectively uses each of these criteria. Each of the packages has clear brand representation or acknowledgment, via the use of a prominent brand logo, brand color, or brand language. In the case of Tylenol, the brand name serves as the product name, with specifications of the style of product attached thereafter. In short, it is easy to determine the home brand of each of the products, because they respectively identify with said brands visually.

Both Suave and Crest have unique product titles in use – Crest 3D White Arctic Fresh Whitening Toothpaste, and Suave Clinical Protection Anti-Perspirant (Almond Verbena Scent), which sets them apart from comparable products with less imaginative or less descriptive monikers. In terms of nomenclature, store brand products have historically relied on generic naming conventions (dog food, deodorant, beauty cream), while national brands make use of descriptive, suggestive, arbitrary, or even fanciful or invented names (such as Coca-Cola, Nike, Fancy Feast). Suggestive names draw on the power of metaphor and analogy to help
the consumers create positive mental associations, while arbitrary and fanciful names have the added benefit of being easy to protect legally. In some cases, a descriptive brand or product name becomes synonymous with the product for a consumer, and thus, a memorable name with a positive consumer mental association can increase consumer activity and loyalty. Appendix C illustrates an example of how some store brands attempt to benefit from strong pre-existing product/name associations. (Friedman, 2013)

The use of unique color and strong, appropriate imagery are also present in each of the three packages. Likewise, they each include a depiction or illustration of the product (or its ingredients). Package color and imagery can be highly important to a consumer, and aside from the information gained through, for instance, the depiction of the contents inside a box, or a visual association to a specific scent, consumers often develop emotional responses based on package design. For instance, when Tropicana introduced a new design for the brand's iconic orange juice package in 2009, sales plummeted 20% between January 1 and February 22. On February 23, the company announced it would discard the new package version. The period during the newly designed package’s use marked an increase in sales for national and store brand competitors. (Zmuda, 2009) The strong consumer reaction to the missing “straw-in-orange” visuals usually incorporated into the packaging illustrates the strong emotional connection they share with their favored products.

**Store Brands Analysis**

In contrast, both to their national brand counterparts and to each other, the store brands used in this comparative analysis have varied sales, influence, and
consumer responses. A great deal of this research began with the recognition that the Target brand, up & up, was one of the first, if not one of the most prominent, store brands to receive nation-wide promotion comparable to that of national brands, thus gaining the brand national attention. This promotion currently includes national television commercials and newspaper advertisements, prominent advertising online, and in non-traditional media (Target, “Target.com – Multimedia Library”). At the point of the store’s inception in 1962, Target was presented as a “new idea in discount stores” to its home of Roseville, Minneapolis. At the time, the goal of the store was to combine the fashion, quality, and service often found as individual shopping experience components at other stores, and to offer them at the low prices of a discounter. For 50 years Target stores have strived to remain innovative, honest, and focused on the Target “guest.” The store’s efforts have included free public holiday events, personal shopping assistants for seniors and the disabled, the company-wide implementation of UPC barcode packaging technology (the first of all mass merchandisers in the United States to do so, in 1988), offering credit to guests, producing exclusive lines of premium grocery products, and assisting local communities with upwards of four million dollars on a weekly basis since 2012. Since 1946 Dayton’s Dry Goods Company – now Target Corporation – has delivered 5% of its annual profit to communities in effort to combat hunger, aid disaster preparedness and relief efforts, to support and promote the arts, and to support education. [Target, “Target.com”]

**Store Brand Analysis – up & up**
Target has made an impressive impact in the realm of store products since the conception of its Archer Farms brand. For nearly 20 years the Archer Farms brand has committed to delivering a unique selection, packaging innovation, and brand experience consistency to the Target consumer. Archer Farms’ line of fine grocery products directly competes with comparable national brands in both taste and value. For instance, in 2011 Consumer Reports concluded that Archer Farms’ multigrain crisps were the most inexpensive among the competition, but tasted nearly as good as the category leader, Tostitos. Archer Farms’ Chocolate Ice Cream performed similarly a year earlier when compared to Håagen-Dazs.

Target brand essentials, such as household, healthcare, personal care, beauty, and baby products, have been a staple of the store since 1962. After a comprehensive audit of the store’s owned brands, it was determined that there was a wealth of untapped potential in the Target store brand, which features the aforementioned products. In 2009, the Target brand dropped the familiar red bullseye logo and the packaging and language reflection of comparable national brands, and the redeveloped brand “up & up” was released in 2009. The brand name “up & up” was chosen as a means to reinforce Target’s core values of optimism and enthusiasm. Annie Zipfel, director of owned brands for Target, expresses that Target recognized the brand revival as an opportunity to deliver on the “expect more, pay less” promise that the store makes to its guests by adding an element of design to the product packaging and creating and emotional connection with guests. Specific package design initiatives include the use of simplified, visually appealing graphics that do not become overly busy, and the inclusion of “compare to…” language, which was identified by guests as very important. (Orange Magazine)
Store Brand Analysis – DG Health

The nation's largest small-box discount retailer, Dollar General houses in over 11,000 stores both Dollar General branded and nationally branded products, including products produced by Proctor and Gamble, Johnson and Johnson, and Unilever. As of 2012, the chain had $16 billion in sales, with stores in forty states and twelve distribution centers.

The first Dollar General store was opened in Springfield, Kentucky in 1955, and operated with the goal that no merchandise would cost more than one dollar. Nearly 60 years later, the Dollar General Corporation has maintained a foothold in low-priced merchandise, by focusing on convenience, a humble work ethic, and friendly customer service. Additionally, Dollar General makes efforts to include charitable outreach as a component of its brand with a focus on improving literacy and promoting reading, and reaches out to the communities that house its stores. For instance, President Ronald Reagan honored the chain of stores for its literacy program in 1988. (Dollar General, “Dollargeneral.com”)

Dollar General recently reorganized its own products into several sub-brands. These sub-brands include DG Baby, DG Home, DG Body, and DG Health. These brands represent approximately 20% of the total dollar share for the chain of stores, making Dollar General one of the top ten U.S. store brand retailers in 2014. Dollar General joins a list that includes ALDI, Save-A-Lot, H-E-B, and Costco. (Hale, 2014) The chain has experienced a great deal of brand shifts in the last 5 years, with new executives, the company's acquisition by private equity investors in 2007, and subsequent re-filing for public offering in 2009. (de la Merced, 2009)
Dollar General heavily involved Valor Brands, manufacturer of private-label diapers for several brands, including DG Baby, in the new brand standards execution that was initiated. Kyle Tucci, Senior Vice President of Valor brands, recalled that upon meeting with Todd Vasos, Chief Merchandising Officer for Dollar General, it was communicated that Dollar General “wanted to build brands, not just sell the product.” The understood goal was to help the consumer connect in their mind the Dollar General name with a premium diaper that just happened to cost less than the national brands, with an emphasis in improving the quality of the product. Valor also worked closely with the design team on their packaging effort, ensuring brand cohesion across multiple products in the same area. Between August 2009 and October 2010, sales of the newly branded DG Baby Diapers increased by double digits. (Durham, 2010a) The product has been noted and favorably reviewed for its performance and design on several websites, including Viewpoints.com and Babycenter.com, as well as many personal blogs.

Using end cap headers, shelf tags, in-store circulars, and online promotion, Dollar General presented a “Switch and Save With Our Brands” campaign to the public in 2010, indicating its newly revitalized commitment to the stores brands. With the success of the previously discussed standout product, it is possible that the DG brand family will continue to impress consumers. Each of the Dollar General brands shares a similar package design profile, with simplified product category brand name, the bold use of color, and the consistent use of high-quality imagery. DG Brand packages now also feature a pale gray “DG” pattern, which is unique to the brand and assists in setting its products apart on the shelf. (Durham, 2010b)
**Store Brand Analysis – Lacura**

In 1976, the German ALDI retail organization opened its first ALDI store in Batavia, Illinois. Since then, ALDI Inc. has opened over 1,300 stores in 32 states. ALDI’s mission is to provide high-quality products at low prices. The chain of energy-saving stores carries a select assortment of about 1400 products, 90% of which are store brand. ALDI shoppers save approximately 50% on groceries when prices are compared to comparable products sold at leading grocery retailers, such as Walmart. Based on consumer survey’s conducted by Market Force International, Inc., ALDI has been recognized as “the nation’s low-price grocery leader” for three years running – 2011, 2012, and 2013. (ALDI, “Aldius.us”) "The ALDI approach to grocery retailing – delivering the highest-quality products and the lowest-possible prices in an easy-to-navigate shopping environment – has truly fueled our recent growth," Chuck Youngstrom, ALDI Inc.’s President, explains. ALDI’s President of Retail Consultancy Newmarketbuilders, shares that "ALDI has done a great job of presenting a compelling value proposition, which is something that its competitors in the U.S. and elsewhere are grappling with. People feel smart for shopping at ALDI, which only increases shopper loyalty." (StoreBrands Magazine, 2014)

Among ALDI’s many store brands is dermatologist-tested beauty and skin care brand Lacura. Lacura is a wide range of products, featuring cosmetic, face creams, cleansing masks, serums, and anti-aging products to name a few. Though Lacura branded products are present in U. S. ALDI stores, the brand is only presented on ALDI’s UK and Australian websites. Further research into the brand reveals that many consumers and beauty editors have reviewed items in the Lacura product line, and to the surprise of seemingly everyone, the products are as deluxe
as some standard luxury beauty brands, including brands with exceptionally expensive products. (Kirkova, 2014) In fact, some Lacura customers not within reach of an ALDI store have resorted to online auctions for the brand’s beauty creams and face cleansers. Outside of ALDI’s in store experience, occasional commercials, and printed and web-based circulars, there is no promotion of the Lacura brand in the U. S. market. The brand’s packaging is sleek, simple, and utilizes metallic silver accents in an elegant way. Recently, Private Label Store Brands Magazine selected ALDI as its 2014 Retailer of the Year. (Yeomans, 2013)

ALDI develops product packaging with a focus on quality, and partners with “leading design agencies to create eye-catching packaging that’s in line with what’s on the shelves today,” states Joan Kavanaugh, Vice President of Corporate Buying for ALDI. She emphasizes that ALDI aims to be consistent with other comparable products on the market. Youngstrom believes that ALDI’s marketing and advertising efforts (which include in-store signage and weekly inserts) will reflect the brand’s dedication to making healthy living simple and affordable, and attract new customers as

**Store Brand Comparative Analysis**

When the previously utilized rubric is used to determine the common qualities of store brand presentation and store brand product packaging, the results are slightly different in some areas. The qualities they do not share indicate opportunities for potential enhancement in regard to the consumer experience, which could in turn increase brand and product loyalty, as well as sales and prominence. Of the three store brands analyzed in this research – DG Health, up &
up, and Lacura – up & up utilizes the most aggressive marketing, in relativity to historic store brand marketing tactics. Not only does Target feature its store brands (including up & up) in national commercials and print ads, it also promotes the brand through social media, featuring brands in tweets, Facebook posts, and YouTube videos. Recently, Target began a television commercial campaign with utilizes a combination of fashion photography, edgy music, and beautiful models to sell its selection of both store brand and national brand grocery and household items. Target and advertising agency Mono in Minneapolis, created the tongue-in-cheek campaign that treats groceries and home products like fashion accessories in a photo shoot. (Anderson, 2013) Dollar General occasionally features its store brands on its Facebook page, with links to the store’s website or weekly digital sales ads. ALDI features Lacura on its international Facebook pages, but not on its United States page. According to a representative from ALDI, the store brand of cosmetics did not perform as well as expected in the United States, and thus most of its products are quietly being removed from stores across the country.

The collective of these store brands has a clearly stated mission or goal, as do each of their national brands counterparts. DG Health is promoted as a less-expensive option for “getting well and staying well,” additionally noting that the brand uses the same quality ingredients as national drug brands, and adheres to the same manufacturing standards as mandated by the FDA. (Dollar General, “Dollargeneral.com”) Target’s brand up & up is born from the Target ideal of “great quality, low price,” while Lacura (as advertised on ALDI’s international sites) promises that the dermatologically-tested brand features a “wide range of products for individuals who want affordable quality skin care.” (ALDI, “Aldi.com.au”)
Parent brands Dollar General and Target contribute to major causes or philanthropies, which meets this rubric’s requirement for consumer loyalty (i.e., a demonstration of concern for or growth for the benefit of the brand’s consumer base.) The Dollar General Literacy Program has assisted community members in learning to read, write, preparing for G.E.D. exams, and learning English for the past twenty years. The foundation has awarded of $86 million to nonprofit organizations and schools, assisting 4.9 million individuals advance their education. (Dollar General, "Dollargeneral.com/dgliteracy") Since Target’s inception, the brand of stores has been committed to supporting education, the environment, volunteerism, health and well being, and other areas. Each year, Target stores give 5% of profits earned to communities throughout the United States. This adds up to $4 million each week. ALDI also meets the rubric criteria for consumer loyalty. The parent brand of Lacura backs up its claim of quality products with a “double guarantee,” and tests each of its store brand products twice or more a year. On an operational level, the chain of stores exercises its commitment to decreasing product costs by avoiding credit card fees, utilizing recycled packaging, foregoing disposable shopping bags, and by building smaller, energy-saving store locations. (ALDI, Aldi.us”)

Utilizing the previously package rubric, no comparative gaps in store brand and beneficial product package criteria have been discovered. The three store brands compared in this analysis, DG Health, up & up, and Lacura, each share all qualities with their comparative national brands. Each of the brands displays appropriate, well-organized information on all packaging. This information includes directions for product use, product name and variety if applicable, drug facts when
required, and importantly, each of the packages contains “compare to” language. In the area of personal care and personal hygiene products, where innovation is seen less frequently, there is greater opportunity for consumers to replace national brands with similarly profiled store brands. The addition of direct brand comparison language can increase these chances. According to The Integer Group and M/A/R/C Research’s ongoing consumer study, 90% of women regularly compare store brands to national brands. (Bulldog Reporter, 2012)

According to the rubric, each of the store brands also utilizes an amount of branding that is comparable to national brands. They each include an appropriate visual reference to their respective brand names (through the prominent use of logos and visual brand elements). However, the products within the three store brands feature unique product names less frequently than their national brand counterparts, often referring to products by their basic name (e.g. cotton swabs, facial cleanser, etc.)

In regard to colors and imagery featured on store brand packaging, each of the brands uses similar or comparable strategies to those used by national brands. For instance, each brand (in many cases) features the depiction of a key ingredient, the product itself, or includes a visual representation of a scent, variety, or result. Based on criteria for successful design often utilized by both Kent State University and Northwestern State University of Natchitoches, Louisiana, each of the packages for the store brands includes the intelligent use of negative space, proper typographic hierarchy, and imaginative use of color as analyzed by several design professionals. Package design, specifically the use of color, imagery, and information printed onto packaging, is the driving force of this research. The three selected store
brands have each recently made strides toward improved packaging that both meets the needs of the consumer and is aesthetically pleasing, indicating the growing role that visual design is playing in the development of store brands in all product areas. As consumers continue to respond strongly to the visual design utilized for store brand products, those brands will continue to develop standards by which they can better reach their respective audiences.

For instance, Walmart's store grocery brand Great Value conducted a strategic brand overhaul in 2009 that caused a lot of discussion. The initiative involved extensive product and consumer testing, the introduction of new formulas and products, a staffed number for consumers' product inquiries, the ability to rate and review their products on the Walmart website, and new packaging. Michael Ellgass, Walmart's Director of Grocery Marketing, acknowledged that customers thought that the initial Great Value redesign went a bit too far into generic territory and as a result, since 2011 Walmart has begun to add touches of color back into Great Value's packaging. (SPieckerman, 2010)
Chapter 5
Research Methods and Findings

Web-Based Questionnaire

A web-based questionnaire was delivered to a wide audience online. Participants were solicited through email as well as social media networks, including Facebook, Twitter, and Linked In. Some participants were made aware of the questionnaire by word of mouth. Though no personal data was permanently recorded for each participant, the majority of the 97-participant response group was primarily selected because of their affiliations with area universities, and thus, the group was composed mostly of college students ages eighteen to twenty-four. Through responses to eight questions, participants were given the opportunity to indicate their purchasing habits with respect to common personal care and personal hygiene products, such as shampoo and conditioner, bandages, toothpaste, over-the-counter medications, and hand soap. Participants also answered questions about product loyalty, income and its influence in their purchasing decisions, and their use and trust of store brand products. Please refer to Appendix D for the complete questionnaire.

Acknowledging the active purchasing schedule of the audience assisted in establishing opportunities for influence. These opportunities include changes in brand presence, product packaging, point-of-sale presentation, and the general impression the product makes on the potential customer. In the questionnaire, participants were asked how often they purchase over-the-counter medications. Of the 97 participants, 26.8% responded that they purchase these products monthly or
more, 14.4% purchase them once every two to three months, while the remaining 58.8% purchase over-the-counter medications between two and three times annually, or rarely. In contrast to this fairly low number of purchase decision influence opportunities, when asked about hair care products, such as shampoo and conditioner, 49.5% of participants responded that they make these purchases once a month or more often. Similarly, 48.45% of these participants also purchase hand soap and/or body wash once or more often per month. This information indicates that there are numerous opportunities per month for influence of customer purchase decisions within a shopping environment. Additionally, it presents that though these opportunities are less frequent for over-the-counter medications, they remain present, and possibly more important if the goal of influence is to increase the frequency of purchase for these products.

Participants in the questionnaire were also asked about brand and/or product loyalty, and their inclination to purchase the same products regularly versus the trial of other brands of comparable products. The questionnaire indicates that of the 97 participants, 48.45% of them occasionally explore brands other than those they regularly purchase. Of the group surveyed, 35.5% of the participants generally stick to the same brands they regularly purchase, exhibiting a more rigid brand and product loyalty than the aforementioned group. The remaining 16.49% of the participants expressed that they try new products often, or that they never use the name brands or products regularly. This latter percentage may represent an opportunity to influence brand loyalty.

Store brand products have a history of providing consumers with less expensive alternatives to national brands. Thus, the questionnaire included two
inquiries about income and product costs. When asked whether or not the participant’s income affected his or her purchase of store brand products, 49.5% indicated that their income did affect their purchase decisions, while 47.4% stated that their respective incomes did not influence their choices. However, nearly half of the participants whose incomes did not affect purchase also indicated in their written statements that regardless of their funds, they shopped for options among store brand products as well as national brands, and in some cases, preferred store brands.

Intercepts

Despite the availability of existing statistical information about consumer audiences and their attitudes toward store-brand products, in-person interviews became one of the most valuable components of research for this project. The students chosen for participation in the interviews were all Kent State University students, but were intercepted and selected based upon no other criteria. This allowed for a diverse range of students (from multiple backgrounds, in varied programs of study, of many ethnic origins, etc.,) to be selected and represented in the response group. A total of six university students - four female, two male - were interviewed.

The interview process was fairly simple in structure. Each student was asked to participate in the research efforts regarding the purchasing habits of university students, and was subsequently given the appropriate documentation to sign before each session began. Sessions were conducted in the university Student Center, a common area for lounging, studying, and mealtime at Kent State University. Each
participant was asked five questions regarding pairs of similarly profiled store brand and national brand products, one labeled “A” and the other labeled “B”. While discussions with individual participants progressed, additional questions may have been asked. The nature of the discussions was very candid, allowing for participants to interject statements, opinions, ideas, and their own questions as they each saw fit.

The five standardized questions employed are featured on Appendix E.

The audio for each discussion was individually recorded, and later analyzed. Analysis tactics included labeling each participant with a number (in no particular order), tagging each concise statement delivered by said participants with a letter and the coordinating participant number, and then grouping statements by content category. Many of the statements applied to multiple categories. These content categories include: purchase history, national brand impressions, store brand impressions, brand presence and recognition, price, package and visual design, product information, product and brand trust, product usability and efficacy, and general consumer attitude. Categories were based on areas of discussion that presented themselves most often with the six participants. A conclusive statement was developed based on each of the content category’s collected responses.

In regard to purchase history, that is, the previous brand purchasing behavior of each individual, it was not surprisingly found that the students had an overall familiarity and sense of confidence with national brands. Though some participants did recognize individual store brands (and the retailers that produce them), there was a clear majority (five out of six) of students who did not regularly or did not ever purchase these products. The most regular store brand personal care
or over-the-counter drug purchases by participants were made at Walgreens, Target, and Walmart (Walgreens, up & up, and Equate brands, respectively).

In the content category of national brand impression, participants noted a visual difference in aesthetic and design quality when national brand product packages were compared to those of store brands. Participants generally commented that the national brand packages were more attractive and appeared more expensive than the comparable store brand packages. With respect to their store brand impressions, the student participants noted an apparent lack of quality and decreased design consideration for packaging and presentation. However, all of the participants generally viewed the design efforts of Target’s up & up favorably.

As marketing plays a significant role in the difference between store brand and national brand products, participants were asked which brands they recognized, where they could be purchased. According to statements in the brand recognition category, it was noted that the audience generally has some familiarity with (or the ability to recognize) store brands and their respective retailers. Nearly all participants mentioned Walmart as a source for the national brand product presented. One participant even noted his admiration of Walmart’s brand strength (specifically that of Great Value, Walmart’s store brand of grocery products and consumer packaged goods). Participants did not indicate a loyalty to any retailer, however. A majority of the participants indicated, similarly to the results of the questionnaire, that price had an affect their purchase decision. Participants expressed in the product price category that store brand products are usually less expensive, but not always as effective (particularly OTC drugs and beauty products).
One participant stated, “[Package design] isn’t why I buy things. It still depends on the price. I don’t buy things just because they are pretty.”

Participants consistently expressed parallel thoughts with regard to the package and visual design category. All participants indicated the brightness or vibrancy of color as aesthetically pleasing (and noted its presence on most of the national brand packages.) The participants viewed clean, contemporary designs favorably overall, and some communicated a preference for image over text. One participant stated, “DG Health has too many words. Pictures talk to [me] more.” The participants also overwhelmingly conveyed that they each had greater amounts of trust for the national brand products with regard to clarity and accuracy of product depictions. In reference to the available information on each of the products, some participants noted that they were not aware of or were not concerned with the information that needed to be present on packaged products. Most participant responses however indicated the benefit of major product claims, uses, and descriptive information being present on the packaging. It was noted by multiple participants that the national brand packaging included this kind information, and the comparable store brand products often did not. In only one instance did a respondent note that he felt the store brand package featured more information that the national brand counterpart (specifically the DG Radiant White Whitening toothpaste).

Responses in the product and brand trust as well as the product usability and effectiveness categories indicated that all participants trusted national brands more than store brands. Several respondents noted that they had tried several store brand products (hair color, OTC drugs, etc.) and experienced decreased efficacy or
undesirable results. Most participants additionally noted that the appearance of the national product packages prompted them to believe that these products would be more trustworthy. Though some participants believe that store brand and national brand products are generally comparable or identical, they insisted that they still would not try them.

Lastly, the category of general attitude outlined the overall feelings that participants had with regard to store brand products, and their respective consumer behaviors. Notably one participate stated, “When it comes to my hygiene, I want the best. That isn’t necessarily always the national brand, but most likely, it is.” The collection of statements gathered indicate that the student participants acknowledge that store brands may offer potentially comparable or identical quality products, but that familiarity with and popularity of national brand personal care and hygiene products is, in most cases, more important. Curiously, several participants noted that this was not the case with regard to the purchase of store brand grocery or household items.
Chapter 6
Implications of Research

Consumer Behavior

The results of the aforementioned online questionnaire and audience intercepts indicate a distinct pair of consumer behaviors, which were developed into two personas. The behaviors were gleaned from both purchasing habits and apparent attitudes toward store brand personal care and personal hygiene products as the collective of participants expressed them. For the purposes of this research, one presented behavioral persona has been termed Price-Conscious Explorer (Samantha), and the other persona and its accompanying behavior has been coined Established Brand Allegiant (Adam). The personas are presented on Appendix H.

The behavior of the Price Conscious Explorer (PCE) persona was exhibited by several participants, and is comprised of several attitudes and actions, including (but not limited to): a willingness to test the quality of store brand goods (in all categories), regular price comparison, the exploration of opportunities for increased value with regard to frequent purchases, and a generally positive view of store brand goods. These behaviors are not dependent on the PCE’s income status, and are exhibited during times of greater wealth as well as the converse. The PCE strives for frugality in all consumer experiences, and greatly regards the comparison of product value, product cost, and the overall bargain available. Thus, this behavior is accompanied with an increase in consideration (and purchase) of store brand products in categories, which include household products, consumer packaged goods, and personal care and hygiene products.
The behavior of the Established Brand Allegiant (EBA) persona is nearly opposite of the former. The EBA behavioral composition includes: loyalty to a single brand in each product area, generally negative or indifferent attitude towards store brand products (especially those in the personal care and personal hygiene product category), greater comfort and security with nationally branded or mass-marketed products, and a general concern for frugality that is often second to brand preference. The EBA consumer has little or no interest in store brand options, regardless of packaging efforts, but has a clear idea of what he or she finds attractive and enticing. Participants who fit in the EBA category commonly expressed no willingness to explore a comparable store brand of their preferred products in the personal care and hygiene category, citing either regretful previous experience, lack of perceived quality, or both as explanations.

**Identifiable Areas for Design Intervention**

A number of potential areas for design intervention have been identified based on the consumer behavior information gained through this research. Composing and investigating the specific behavioral personas, PCE and EBA, has assisted in the identification of these areas, specifically, the opportunities as they pertain to each persona. For example, the PCE views store brand personal care and personal hygiene products more favorably than the EBA, but an opportunity to increase loyalty still exists. Ensuring that product packaging, information, and desirability exhibit an equal quality to that of the national brands to which retailers so often encourage consumers to compare store products to can increase consumer loyalty and trust, and perhaps, influence the rate of repeat purchases. Many store
brand retailers have already inaugurated changes like this, implementing new package schemas that include contemporary use of color and space, greater informational hierarchy, and increased visual consistency. Increasingly, retailers are recognizing that strong product branding and packaging does not have to be disregarded in lieu of lower prices, but rather, that the strength of these brands must be increased because of them.

The EBA behavioral persona reveals an additional set of design intervention opportunities. The EBA relies on a strong public presentation as the basis of his or her consumer opinion, and this not only includes strong packaging and branding, but also an effective marketing strategy. Most retailers do not include an aggressive or especially innovative marketing component when presenting their own brands to the public, and with the exception of residential mailers and in-store sales flyers, many have no additional marketing efforts whatsoever, as this allows said retailers to offer their brands at reduced costs.

The addition and integration of low-cost marketing efforts, such as social media representation, ambient media, or an online blog, can have a big impact on brand perception for consumers exhibiting EBA behavior. There are many low- or no-cost marketing solutions for retailers that utilize redirected effort and creativity in a sustainable way, but that also have potential to make incredible impacts on consumer attitudes. Retailers like Target and Kroger have begun making use of these methods, and have improved sales as a result. (Moore, 2014; Store Brands Decisions, 2014) The lack of marketing efforts for store brands has discouraged EBA consumers from trusting these products, and in many cases, it has discouraged them from even considering them as an option. As indicated in this research, the
marketing experience they receive from national brands assists in the creation of relationships with the brands, which in many cases is more influential than price or product value.
Chapter 7

Conclusive Statements

Both store brand retailer and consumer behaviors have evolved dramatically in the past decade, and this behavioral shift can be greatly attributed to the recent recession. The rise of store brand sales numbers, increased interest in alternatives to more expensive national brand products, and a renewed frugality in the consumer approach to shopping for basics have culminated in focused, thoughtfully reorganized efforts for packaging and promoting store brand products. Brands like Walmart’s Great Value, the retail giant’s store brand of grocery products, have already taken on multiple iterations of new package and branding approaches in this time. Every store brand product category has experienced an increase in sales, with the exception of store brand personal care and personal hygiene products.

The immunity this product category seems to have with regard to the newfound consumer appreciation of private labels has not yet been explained. This thesis began with the postulate that the consumer audience, specifically one composed of university students, has not increased purchase activity with regard to personal care and personal hygiene store brand products because packaging for these products is visually unappealing, lacks desired information, and indicates a lack of quality when compared to that of national brands. Through the use of many research efforts, including an online questionnaire, in-person interviews, a comparative analysis, persona development, and information analysis, a rubric of consumer desired package design and visual branding design components was developed.
The rubric revealed that, with retailers’ recent emphasis on developing store brands holistically, package design and branding design were not disagreeable to the university student consumer audience. Despite the general audience agreement that packages featuring bright colors, vivid imagery, and contemporary, simplistic design were most aesthetically pleasing, most participants did not note packaging as a repellent for purchase. However, a majority of participants cited that familiarity with national brands, specifically nationally branded personal care and hygiene products, increased their trust, improved their perceptions of, and ultimately attracted them, resulting in purchase.

National brands have larger budgets, and dedicate portions of these budgets to marketing and promotion. Store brands historically have been able to offer products at prices lower than their national brand counterparts because they forego these marketing efforts. As consumer behavior becomes more dependent on and prompted by innovative marketing channels like social media, online media sharing, blogging, and viral campaigns, it is imperative that retailers take advantage of these low-expense channels to promote their own brands as well. With only slight increases in marketing expenditure and creative promotion, retailers can enjoy continued sales increases, healthy brand competition, and improved brand and product perceptions.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Research Strategy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Comparative Analysis</th>
<th>Electronic Questionnaire</th>
<th>Student Intercepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiarize self with content in this area, and to help formulate questions and hypotheses about what the problem is and how the problem can be affected.</td>
<td>To understand the packaging design and marketing practices of three national brands and compare and contrast them to those of three private label brands as they specifically affect personal hygiene products.</td>
<td>Ask a wide audience specific questions based on literature review and comparative analysis regarding their use, purchasing habits, and impressions of both national and private brand hygiene products.</td>
<td>To acquire consumer impressions of national brands and private label branded products, and to further inquire about their product expectations and decision making in a retail environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Read and catalogue journals, abstracts, articles, and interviews. Look for gaps in the design process, user experience, etc.</td>
<td>Read journals and articles. Seek information from brand websites and/or make contact with brand representatives.</td>
<td>Generate questions, set up online questionnaire and system for responses.</td>
<td>Set up a portable station for displaying products both nationally and privately branded; Ask a short series of questions about which item(s) each volunteer would purchase and why, and proceed with brief survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Define a specific, actionable problem to approach, and formulate a rubric for comparative analysis.</td>
<td>Use rubric to synthesize comparative information about the six brands.</td>
<td>Glean information about responders' consumergship, attitudes, and knowledge of personal hygiene brands. Compile a list of general consumer expectations.</td>
<td>Information gathered will aid in the production of guidelines for personal hygiene product branding and/or packaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Principal Investigator, brand contacts</td>
<td>Principal Investigator, questionnaire volunteers</td>
<td>Principal Investigator, KSU student volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required IRB Documents</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Recruitment Script, Consent for Data Collection</td>
<td>Recruitment Script, Consent for Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Persona Development</td>
<td>Identification of Implications</td>
<td>Research Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To identify and navigate behaviors of the consumer audience and applicable subsets</td>
<td>To recognize potential avenues for consumer attitude and/or activity influence with regard to store brand personal care products</td>
<td>Summarize all findings, implications, and suggested solutions cohesively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Categorize all audience data from Questionnaire and Interviews, outline attitudes and actions</td>
<td>Identify gaps in experience by analyzing persona behavior</td>
<td>Audit all information gathered through the course of the project and determine what information is pertinent to the conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Develop guidelines for reaching each audience persona based on exhibited typical consumer behavior</td>
<td>Create a list of recommendations for retailer action with regard to store brand personal care products</td>
<td>Generate a research document which will add to the body of consumer goods packaging, branding, and marketing knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required IRB Documents</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

National Brand Package Images
Crest 3D White Whitening Toothpaste (*Crest*)

Clinical Protection Prescription Strength Almond Verbena Deodorant/Anti-perspirant (*Suave*)

Tylenol (Acetaminophen) Extra Strength Caplets (*Tylenol*)
APPENDIX C

Store Brand Package Styles
DG Health Antiseptic Blue Mint Mouth Rinse *(Dollar General)*

Lacura Face Care Q10 Renew Night Cream *(ALDI)*

up & up Acetaminophen Extra Strength 500mg Caplets *(Target)*
Illustration: 72 store brand soda cans. Each of these products and their respective packages are modeled on nationally branded Dr. Pepper. Mr. Pibb and its varieties are actually owned and were developed by Coca-Cola, and closely resembled Dr. Pepper’s original formula at its inception. The brands featured here include Sam’s Choice, Eckerd Drugs, and Brookshire Brothers.
APPENDIX D

Questionnaire
Online Questionnaire

Primary Investigator: Larrie King

Please answer the following questions.

1. How often do you purchase the following items?
   • Shampoo, conditioner and other hair care products
   • Over-the-counter medications
   • Hand soap and body wash

2. Do you often purchase one brand of these items, or do you try new brands on a regular basis?
   • I usually stick to the same brands.
   • I explore other brands occasionally.
   • I like to try new brands often.
   • I never use the same brand regularly.

3. Would you continue to purchase your current brand of bath soap or body wash if the price increased by $1.00?
   • Yes, the price change would affect me.
   • No, the price change would not affect my choice.
   • Other (Please specify)

4. Which of the following store brand/generic products, if any, have you purchased in the past 6 months?
   • Equate
   • up & up
   • Dollar General Brand
   • Bing Well
   • Top Care
   • Walgreens Brand

5. How likely are you to try a comparable store brand version of each of the products listed below? (1=very unlikely, 5=very likely)
   • Shampoo/Conditioner
   • Headache Medication
   • Lotion/Moisturizer
   • Cosmetics/Shaving/Products
   • Bath Tissue

6. Would you trust the following store brand products to work as well as national brand versions?
   • Migraine Medication
   • Razor Blades
• Hair Gel/Hair Spray
• Bandages
• Heartburn Medication

7. Does your income affect whether or not you purchase store brand products instead of national brand products? (please respond yes or no, and why.)

8. Which of the following features of a product make you want to purchase it (Select all that apply.)
   • Design of Package
   • Popularity of Brand
   • Usability of Products
   • Information on Package
APPENDIX E

Selected Questionnaire Responses
**Question:** Which of the following features of a product make you want to purchase it? Select all that apply.

- Usability of Product: 85.57% (83)*
- Package Information: 69.07% (67)
- Design of Package: 54.64% (53)
- Popularity of Brand: 30.93% (30)

*Actual number of respondents

**Question:** Would you trust the following store brand products to work as well as national brand versions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Avg. Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migraine medication</td>
<td>59.79% (58)</td>
<td>21.65% (21)</td>
<td>18.56% (18)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razor blades</td>
<td>54.64% (53)</td>
<td>39.18% (38)</td>
<td>6.19% (6)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair gel/spray</td>
<td>48.45% (47)</td>
<td>36.08% (35)</td>
<td>15.46% (15)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandages</td>
<td>86.60% (84)</td>
<td>13.40% (13)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartburn medication</td>
<td>59.79% (58)</td>
<td>21.65% (21)</td>
<td>21.65% (21)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** How likely are you to try a comparable store brand version of the following products below? (1 = very unlikely; 5 = very likely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Probably not likely</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Possibly likely</th>
<th>Very much likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headache medication</td>
<td>4.12% (4)</td>
<td>8.25% (8)</td>
<td>3.09% (3)</td>
<td>26.80% (26)</td>
<td>57.73% (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotion/Moisturizer</td>
<td>20.62% (20)</td>
<td>11.34% (11)</td>
<td>10.31% (10)</td>
<td>31.96% (31)</td>
<td>25.77% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath Tissue</td>
<td>27.84% (27)</td>
<td>12.37% (12)</td>
<td>6.19% (6)</td>
<td>21.65% (21)</td>
<td>31.96% (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics/Shaving</td>
<td>21.65% (21)</td>
<td>25.77% (25)</td>
<td>16.49% (16)</td>
<td>16.49% (16)</td>
<td>19.59% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shampoo/Conditioner</td>
<td>26.80% (26)</td>
<td>24.74% (24)</td>
<td>6.9% (6)</td>
<td>22.68% (22)</td>
<td>19.59% (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Interview Questions

Primary Investigator: Larrie King

1. Which of these two products is store brand? In which store would you find either of these products?

2. Of the products shown here, which do you trust more? Why?

3. Would you purchase the other product if the price was much lower than your original choice?

4. What would you change about the packaging of the product you didn’t choose?

5. Do you ever purchase store brand or generic products of any kind?
APPENDIX G

Categorized Interview Responses
Categorized Statements

1. Purchase History
   - 1a) Has purchased Crest, not DG Health.
   - 1k) Has purchased certain store brand things, but will not buy non-name brand hygiene products.
   - 1m) If he has tried it before and liked it, he sticks to it.
   - 2a) Has never purchased Bayer or Walgreens brand products presented.
   - 2b) Prefers to buy Advil or Excedrin
   - 3a) Prefers to use Excedrin.
   - 3m) Has used cheaper (two or three dollar) hair color, and feels it is good for a quick fix, but that for something longer lasting she would prefer a more expensive brand.
   - 3n) Has used cheap brands before, with bad results.
   - 4a) Has colored hair before.
   - 4b) Has purchase Clairol Nice ’n Easy before.
   - 4j) Has never purchased hygiene products from the Dollar Tree.
   - 5a) Has not colored hair before.
   - 5i) Sometimes purchases store brand hygiene products (such as Walgreens, Target, Equate brand) but never from Dollar Tree or Aldi.
   - 6a) Has purchased Crest before, at Walgreens. Has seen it at Wal-Mart, everywhere.
   - 6f) I normally just get the basic Crest.
   - 6x) Never buys store brand hygiene products.

2. National Brand Impressions
   - 1c) Crest looks flashy.
   - 1e) Crest looks nicer because it is flashy.
   - 1o) Believe that Crest makes the generic product as a cheaper alternative.
   - 2f) “I think I would trust Bayer more because I’ve heard of it, and it is advertised more.”
   - 2i) “[The up & up package] is more modern.”
   - 3d) Bayer is more expensive (by two or three dollars) because it is name brand.
   - 4c) The national brand has more appealing visuals than the store brand.
   - 4d) The national brand has clearer imagery; the store brand looks blurry.
   - 4e) Would trust the national brand more.4f
   - 4i) Thinks the national brand is more expensive.
   - 5b) National brand has more vivid color, and the girl on the store brand box (photograph) looks sad.
   - 5c) Would trust the national brand more than the store brand.
   - 6c) Prefers Crest because it has been around for a long time. He is more comfortable with it.
• 6e) The Crest and DG Health products seem to be the same price.
• 6g) Prefers the “well marketed” national brand package and the included details.
• 6j) The national brand puts money into the product as well as the package.
• 6y) “When it comes to my hygiene, I want the best.” That isn’t necessarily always the national brand, but most likely it is.

3. Store Brand Impressions
• 1d) DG Health “looks like it came straight form the doctor’s office. It looks professional.”
• 1o) Believe that Crest makes the generic product as a cheaper alternative.
• 2g) (Of the up & up package) “It looks like the new Walgreens branding.”
• 2h) “[The up & up package] is a little cleaner, the other two are a little cluttered.”
• 3n) Has used cheap brands before, with bad results.
• 4d) The national brand has clearer imagery; the store brand looks blurry.
• 4n) The DG Health brand needs a better logo.
• 5b) National brand has more vivid color, and the girl on the store brand box (photograph) looks sad.
• 5d) Does not believe the store brand would work as well as the national brand.
• 6e) The Crest and DG Health products seem to be the same price.
• 6h) The store brand doesn’t catch my eye as much
• 6i) The store brand package doesn’t seem well thought out. “Let’s just get a product out there.”
• 6j) The store brand package looks faded.
• 6cc) (On generic food) I don’t think people judge you if you buy generic food, like cereal, because nobody sees that. But hygiene stuff, you don’t want to look out of the norm.
• 6dd) If the store brand package looked more like the national brand, people would buy it and trust it.
• 6jj) The store brand product would sell better if the time was taken to market (design) it well.

4. Brand Presence/Recognition
• 1b) Knows Wal-Mart carries name brand products.2c)
• 2d) Suggests Giant Eagle, Walgreens, or CVS for purchasing the national brand product.
• 2g) (Of the up & up package) “It looks like the new Walgreens branding.”
• 3e) Does not immediately recognize the Target brand.
• 4m) Bases perception of product on popularity and expense.
• 4n) The DG Health brand needs a better logo.
• 5j) Recognizes the DG Health brand.
• 6a) Has purchased Crest before, at Walgreens. Has seen it at Wal-Mart, everywhere.
• 6b) Recognized DG Health brand.
• 6c) Prefers Crest because it has been around for a long time. He is more comfortable with it.
• 6y) “When it comes to my hygiene, I want the best.” That isn’t necessarily always the national brand, but most likely it is.
• 6ee) Admires the brand strength and details of Wal-Mart’s Great Value.
• 6ff) Store brand hygiene products don’t normally have any appeal.
• 6jj) The store brand product would sell better if the time was taken to market (design) it well.

5. Price
• 1j) Assumes DG Health is cheaper than national brand.
• 2j) Purchase decision is based on price.
• 3c) [On trust] “I go based on price, except with Excedrin. I’ve used generic before, and it doesn’t work as effectively. Out of these two, I’d go based on price.”
• 3d) Bayer is more expensive (by two or three dollars) because it is name brand.
• 3g) “I’d look at the package but that isn’t why I buy things. It still depends on the price. I don’t buy things just because they are pretty.”
• 3h) Would buy the cheaper product even if the package were unappealing.
• 3m) Has used cheaper (two or three dollar) hair color, and feels it is good for a quick fix, but that for something longer lasting she would prefer a more expensive brand.
• 4i) Thinks the national brand is more expensive.
• 4m) Bases perception of product on popularity and expense.
• 6d) “The more expensive it is, the better it is.”6x)
• 6u) Price would influence my choice slightly, but I’d still choose the national brand.

6. Package and Visual Design
• 1e) Crest looks nicer because it is flashy.
• 2k) “I’d make the packages pop more, and update them.”
• 2h) “[The up & up package] is a little cleaner, the other two are a little cluttered.”
• 2g) (Of the up & up package) “It looks like the new Walgreens branding.”
• 2i) “[The up & up package] is more modern.”
• 2l) The [Dollar Tree Hair Color] package looks dated
• 3b) “Neither package pops out at me.”
• 3f) up & up is easier to read.
• 3g) “I’d look at the package but that isn’t why I buy things. It still depends on the price. I don’t buy things just because they are pretty.”
• 3h) Would buy the cheaper product even if the package were unappealing.
• 3i) I like a pop of color, but dislike the blandness of the [Bayer] package.
• 3o) Recognizes that depictions of hair color on the store brand box are inconsistent.
• 4c) The national brand has more appealing visuals than the store brand.
• 4d) The national brand has clearer imagery; the store brand looks blurry.
• 4g) The national brand package has more information. It describes the technology and results of use of the product on the box.
• 4h) The national brand shows the details of the results on the box.
• 4n) The DG Health brand needs a better logo.
• 5e) Trusts the color and clarity in the national brand photography more.
• 5f) Would change the store brand packaging by changing the brightness, colors, and lighting of the photography.
• 5g) Would show more of the model’s hair on the [hair color product] package.
• 5h) Suggests making the package stand out with brighter colors
• 5k) Thinks package similarities (between national brand products and comparable store brand products) are intentional.
• 5l) Thinks Crest looks nicer than DG Health; DG Health has too many words. “Pictures talk to you more.”
• 6g) Prefers the “well marketed” national brand package and the included details.
• 6h) The store brand doesn’t catch my eye as much.
• 6i) The store brand package doesn’t seem well thought out. “Let’s just get a product out there.”
• 6j) The national brand puts money into the product as well as the package.
• 6k) I think that the store brand is trying to imitate the national brand.
• 6l) I would add more detail to the store brand package – more color, bigger words.
• 6q) The store brand package looks faded.
• 6s) The photography and information on the store brand box is really plain.
• 6t) The store brand package doesn’t seem well thought out.
• 6w) (Of the national brand package) I like the photography and the bold words.
• 6dd) If the store brand package looked more like the national brand, people would buy it and trust it.
• 6ii) Most people see colors and it draws in their attention.
• 6ff) Store brand hygiene products don't normally have any appeal.
• 6jj) The store brand product would sell better if the time was taken to market (design) it well.

7. Product Information
• 1f) I'm not looking for information, honestly.
• 1g) Notices the major facts, like how much Crest whitens teeth.
• 3f) Up & up is easier to read.
• 3j) Hopefully no information is missing. If it is, that is scary.
• 3k) Does not know what information should be present on package.
• 3l) “I don’t like being lied to. I’d rather be warned.”
• 3o) Recognizes that depictions of hair color on the store brand box are inconsistent
• 4g) The national brand package has more information. It describes the technology and results of use of the product on the box.
• 4h) The national brand shows the details of the results on the box.
• 4l) Noted that the two products have similar ingredients, but does not normally compare when shopping.
• 6m) Believe the store brand package has more detailed information that the national brand.

8. Product and Brand Trust
• 1h) Trusts Crest because he has used it before.
• 1i) No change to the DG Health package would increase trust. He'd have to use it.
• 3a) Prefers to use Excedrin.
• 3c) [On trust] “I go based on price, except with Excedrin. I’ve used generic before, and it doesn't work as effectively. Out of these two, I’d go based on price.”
• 3l) “I don’t like being lied to. I’d rather be warned.”
• 4e) Would trust the national brand more.
• 4f) Would trust the national brand results/effectiveness more than the store brand.
• 4h) The national brand shows the details of the results on the box.
• 4m) Bases perception of product on popularity and expense.
• 5c) Would trust the national brand more than the store brand.
• 5d) Does not believe the store brand would work as well as the national brand.
• 5e) Trusts the color and clarity in the national brand photography more.
• 6c) Prefers Crest because it has been around for a long time. He is more comfortable with it.
• 6p) Would trust Clairol more than Dollar Tree brand.
• 6v) The national brand product looks like it will work.
• 6dd) If the store brand package looked more like the national brand, people would buy it and trust it.

9. Product Usability and Effectiveness
• 1n) Thinks store brand products probably work as well as national brands products, but likely would not try them.
• 3c) [On trust] “I go based on price, except with Excedrin. I’ve used generic before, and it doesn’t work as effectively. Out of these two, I’d go based on price.”
• 3m) Has used cheaper (two or three dollar) hair color, and feels it is good for a quick fix, but that for something longer lasting she would prefer a more expensive brand.
• 3n) Has used cheap brands before, with bad results.
• 4f) Would trust the national brand results/effectiveness more than the store brand.
• 4g) The national brand package has more information. It describes the technology and results of use of the product on the box.
• 4h) The national brand shows the details of the results on the box.
• 4k) Thinks the national brand (Crest) and store brand (DG Health) products work equally well.
• 5d) Does not believe the store brand would work as well as the national brand.
• 6n) I could see the store brand being better than the national brand. Similar companies might make them; the store brand just doesn’t spend as much money on the package.
• 6o) The store brand may be more focused on working on the product.
• 6r) Does not trust the result of the store brand product.
• 6v) The national brand product looks like it will work.
• 6y) ”When it comes to my hygiene, I want the best.” That isn’t necessarily always the national brand, but most likely it is.
• 6bb) “With something like deodorant, it doesn’t matter so much, as long as I don’t smell bad.”

10. General Attitude
• 1f) I’m not looking for information, honestly.
• 1l) Has a “real high feeling” about his hygiene.
• 1m) If he has tried it before and liked it, he sticks to it.
• 1n) Thinks store brand products probably work as well as national brands products, but likely would not try them.
• 1o) Believe that Crest makes the generic product as a cheaper alternative.
• 2f) “I think I would trust Bayer more because I’ve heard of it, and it is advertised more.”
• 3g) “I’d look at the package but that isn’t why I buy things. It still depends on the price. I don’t buy things just because they are pretty.”
• 3l) “I don't like being lied to. I'd rather be warned.”
• 6c) Prefers Crest because it has been around for a long time. He is more comfortable with it.
• 6d) “The more expensive it is, the better it is.”
• 6x)
• 6y) “When it comes to my hygiene, I want the best.” That isn’t necessarily always the national brand, but most likely it is.
• 6z) “I’m very picky about toothpaste and mouthwash.”
• 6aa) “I’m not just picking up anything.”
• 6cc) (On generic food) I don't think people judge you if you buy generic food, like cereal, because nobody sees that. But hygiene stuff, you don’t want to look out of the norm.
APPENDIX H

Consumer Personas
Persona 1: “Samantha”  
*Price Conscious Explorer*

Common Behaviors and Traits:  
- Frugal shopper  
- Actively explores both national and store brand options  
- Open to testing the quality of store brand goods  
- Regularly compares prices  
- Has a generally positive view of store brand goods.

Persona 2: “Adam”  
*Established Brand Allegiant*

Common Behaviors and Traits:  
- Consistent brand loyalty in each product category  
- Has generally negative or indifferent attitude towards store brand products (especially those in the personal care and personal hygiene product category)  
- Has greater comfort and security with nationally branded or mass-marketed products  
- Has a general concern for frugality that is often second to brand preference.
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