



A charming little Cabernet

Effects of wine label design on purchase intent and brand personality

Claire A. Boudreaux and Stephen E. Palmer
University of California, Berkeley, California, USA

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of brand personality on purchase intent and the influence of three design elements of wine labels on brand personality.

Design/methodology/approach – Participants made brand personality judgments and rated their purchase intent for subsets of 90 experimental wine labels, which varied along the dimensions of color, illustration, and design layout.

Findings – Brand personality explained nearly half of the variance in purchase intent, with the facets successful, charming, spirited, and up-to-date being most strongly correlated with purchase intent. Of the three dimensions of visual design studied, the illustration used on the label had the greatest impact on both purchase intent and perceptions of brand personality.

Research limitations/implications – This study used a proxy to measure purchase intent and studied only a subset of brand personality facets, limiting the generality of findings.

Practical implications – This research offers brand managers a potential means of evaluating prospective designs in terms of their likely impact on purchase intent and consumer perceptions of brand personality, and suggests general guidelines for the design of product line extensions from a successful label design.

Originality/value – This research helps brand managers and packaging designers to leverage brand personality research and evaluate the effectiveness of new designs.

Keywords Wines, Labelling, Packaging, Brand image

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Brand personality, “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand” (Aaker, 1997, p. 347) has been shown to influence consumer preference and usage (Sirgy, 1982), build emotional ties to the brand (Biel, 1993), create trust and loyalty among consumers (Fournier, 1994), and determine how consumers interpret and respond to changes in product quality (Aaker *et al.*, 2004).

Although a number of antecedents of brand personality have been identified, little tactical guidance exists for marketers seeking to develop and manage the brand personalities of their products. The goal of this article is to provide some such guidelines for practitioners in the wine market. This empirical study examines the independent and interdependent effects of three elements of wine label design – imagery, layout, and color – on consumer perceptions of brand personality, and correlates specific brand personality attributes with intent to purchase. Although wine is the product studied, the implications of the findings may well apply to other situations where visual design is intended to create or support a given brand personality.



Review of literature

Branding serves many functions. Beyond identifying a product, branding can create perceptions of quality, reliability, and value in a product, as well as loyalty, confidence, and self-expression to the consumer (Aaker, 1996). It is particularly important for symbolic products, such as wine, and is used by consumers to imbue themselves with the brand's personality and create associations with the product's perceived user group (Belk, 1998; Malhotra, 1988).

A general framework of brand personality developed by Jennifer Aaker (1997) posits five primary dimensions – sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness – which subsume 42 individual traits clustered around 15 facets (see Table I). While there is partial overlap between the brand personality dimensions and the “Big Five” dimensions of human personality, the presence of two dimensions (sophistication and ruggedness) that exist only in the domain of brands suggests that consumers may prefer brands that do not necessarily match their own, but represent ideals with which they desire association (Aaker, 1997).

It is not yet known exactly how the various antecedents of brand personality interact, but perception of brand personality is likely to be a largely unconscious process roughly analogous to the perception of human personality, by which people draw conclusions based on minimal or incomplete evidence. Even in the face of conflicting evidence, people tend to feel quite confident about their perceptions (Kunda, 1999). As such, brand personality perception would be shaped by biases based on stereotypes that exist in the consumer's culture, and generally consistent within a given culture or market. In this case, a brand's ability to convey a few select attributes perceived as particularly relevant for a product or segment could be sufficient for a consumer to form an impression of and preference for a brand. This leads to our first hypothesis:

- H1.* A small subset of brand personality attributes will serve as a significant predictor of purchase intent.

Antecedents of brand personality include direct associations derived from traits displayed by human representatives of the brand (company employees, spokespersons,

Dimensions	Facets	Traits
Sincerity	Down-to-earth	Down-to-earth, family-oriented, small-town
	Honest	Honest, sincere, real
	Wholesome	Wholesome, original
Excitement	Cheerful	Cheerful, sentimental, friendly
	Daring	Daring, trendy, exciting
	Spirited	Spirited, cool, young
	Imaginative	Imaginative, unique
Competence	Up-to-date	Up-to-date, independent
	Reliable	Reliable, hard working, secure
	Intelligent	Intelligent, technical, corporate
Sophistication	Successful	Successful, leader, confident
	Upper class	Upper class, glamorous, good looking
	Charming	Charming, feminine, smooth
Ruggedness	Outdoorsy	Outdoorsy, masculine, Western
	Tough	Tough, rugged

Table I.
Aaker's brand
personality framework

and other customers) and indirect associations derived from nonhuman aspects (advertisements, pricing, distribution channels, brand name, and the characteristics of the products themselves, including packaging design).

In the wine market, bottle labels are particularly relevant to the decision-making process, especially for infrequent wine drinkers, who have been shown to rely heavily on labeling information (Chaney, 2000). Because further research has shown that front labels are more important than back labels (Thomas and Pickering, 2003), we focused on design elements of front labels.

We chose to control for elements that are informational in nature and not generally under the marketer's control, such as region of origin, grape variety, and awards received, and examine only three visual design factors also generally identified as relevant: imagery, color, and layout. At the most general level, wine label designs tend to be described as either "traditional" or "modern/contemporary" (Batt and Dean, 2000), and we positioned design elements in reference to each of these styles based on general marketplace trends.

Each element of a label's visual identity, including color, imagery, typeface and label size, shape, and material, has an influence on the different aspects of a product's brand identity. These elements can support or undermine one another, and a product's position tends to be strongest when they are congruent (Doyle and Bottomley, 2004). Based on this, we predicted interactions between design elements in their effect on consumer perceptions of brand personality and purchase intent, and planned a robust experimental design that tested all possible combinations of our test elements. Our second hypothesis was:

- H2.* Image, color, and layout will have significant main and interaction effects on purchase intent and consumer perceptions of brand personality.

Experimental studies

The present research studies the effects of three elements of wine label design – imagery, layout, and color – on purchase intent and consumer perceptions of brand personality. It explores the use of Aaker's (1997) brand personality framework as a predictor of marketplace success, offers brand managers a potential means of evaluating prospective designs in terms of their likely impact on purchase intent and consumer perceptions of brand personality, and suggests general guidelines for the design of product line extensions from a successful label design.

Methods

Pilot study to select facets of brand personality. Because Aaker's 42-trait framework was designed to be widely applicable across brands and product categories, a pilot study was conducted to determine whether ratings based on only part of the framework – specifically, a subset of the 15 facets – could yield sufficient variance to be useful for our research purposes. A total of 13 casual wine drinkers rated 16 commercial wine labels on each of Aaker's 15 facets. To minimize confounding variables, all bottles were California Cabernets in a low-to-moderate price range (\$3-25) bottled between 2000 and 2002, with highly recognizable wineries (e.g., Gallo) excluded. A wide variety of label designs were selected, varying in color, layout, style, label shape and orientation, typography, and imagery.

Each participant rated each of the 15 brand personality facets in random orders on a five-point Likert scale. Instructions read, “For each of the words listed on your response card, please ask yourself, ‘If this winery were a person, how well would this word describe him or her?’ and then circle the appropriate number, from ‘not at all descriptive’ (1) to ‘extremely descriptive’ (5).” Presentation order was counterbalanced for facets and bottles.

As indicated in Table II, the dimensions of excitement, sophistication, and ruggedness produced high variance and were therefore fully represented by all their component facets in the main study. Variance was distinctly lower in the dimensions of sincerity and competence, suggesting that facets associated with these dimensions are either less relevant to wine purchases or more consistently expressed by commercial brands in the wine market. We therefore selected only one facet for each of these dimensions: cheerful (for sincerity), because it had high variance, and successful (for competence), because of its relevance to marketing of wine and other symbolic products in general. This yielded a working set of ten facets for the main study: successful, cheerful, daring, spirited, imaginative, up-to-date, upper class, charming, outdoorsy, and tough.

The experimental labels. A total of 90 fictitious labels were constructed using all possible combinations of three layouts, six colors, and five illustration subjects. To control for the effects of brand name, origin, and other informational elements, labels were all identified as Cabernet Sauvignons and had the same dummy producer name (Winery Cellars), origin (Napa Valley), year (2001), and alcohol content (13.5 percent).

Images. Five illustration subjects were chosen as representative of Cabernet labels. The most standard or traditional were images of chateaux or vineyards, grape motifs, and coats-of-arms. Animals such as deer were chosen as more neutral, and unusual animals (such as platypus or fish) were chosen to represent “modern” label trends (Figure 1). Because there is a tendency to prefer images one has seen before – the “mere exposure effect” (Zajonc, 1968) – six similar illustrations of each subject were acquired

Dimension	SD ²	Facet	SD ²
Excitement	1.41	<i>*Daring</i>	1.53
		<i>*Spirited</i>	1.06
		<i>*Imaginative</i>	1.71
		<i>*up-to-date</i>	1.35
		<i>*Outdoorsy</i>	1.48
Ruggedness	1.33	<i>*Tough</i>	1.19
		<i>*Upper class</i>	1.33
		<i>*Charming</i>	0.97
Sincerity	0.88	Down-to-earth	0.93
		Honest	0.56
		Wholesome	0.84
		<i>*Cheerful</i>	1.17
Competence	0.65	Reliable	0.67
		Intelligent	0.67
		<i>*Successful</i>	0.61

Note: * Facets in italic were included in the main study

Table II.
Variance among ratings
for each dimension and
facet

from a commercial clip art site, all of which were in the engraved style used in dictionary illustrations.

Colors. Six colors were selected, again ranging from traditional to non-traditional: burgundy, navy, bright red/orange, neutral (brown/black), wasabi green, and pink. Burgundy is the most commonly used color in wine packaging. Navy is also found on many traditional-style wine labels and was used as a “cool” counterpart to burgundy. Bright red and orange color schemes are moderately common, as are neutral palettes of brown, black, and grey. At the time of the experiment, wasabi green was a trendy color used by many modern brands, including at least one wine label. Pink was included as an inappropriate color for any situation, as it is almost never used for Cabernets. Because the experiment was run via the Internet, colors varied somewhat, depending on the monitors used by the participants. However, as the interest was in the difference between the color sets rather than the exact shades and because the color differences were fairly robust, this was deemed acceptable.

Layouts. With the assistance of two professional graphic designers, three basic layouts were designed for the study (Figure 2). Each layout was representative of a general design style found in marketplace wines: the traditional layout with an unprinted (white) background, a similar layout with a solid color background, and a modern design whose background was half unprinted, half solid color. There is much greater variation in the label designs of newer, “fun” brands, and no prototypical layout. The modern layout in the experiment uses a clean, modern visual typeface and style, but matches the traditional layouts in type-size and placement, to avoid effects due to these other factors.

Figure 1.
Examples of images used
in the study: one example
of each type is shown




Figure 2.
Sample graphic layout
designs: one example of
each layout type
(traditional – unprinted,
traditional – full color,
and modern), is shown
using with a traditional
animal image



Again, to provide sufficient variation in design to limit the influence of the mere exposure effect, the finished designs had minor variations. These were restricted to minimize the impact of these variations – for example, though individual type faces varied across a series, all type was of the same general style and size.

Participants. Participants were recruited through word-of-mouth, requests for participants in classes at UC Berkeley, and through postings on two popular online community sites: Craigslist.org and Tribe.net. Announcements asked participants to take a brief online survey. A total of 386 people began the survey and were assigned at random to rate one of 10 sets of nine experimental labels. Of these, 262 respondents (68 percent) completed the entire survey, of whom 20 to 30 evaluated each label. The mean age of participants was 37.77 (range: 18 to 76), and 63 percent of the participants were female. Nearly half of the participants reported consuming wine on a weekly basis, and nearly 70 percent consumed it at least every 2-3 weeks (see Table III). Participants were not compensated for their time.

Procedure and measurements. A web-based questionnaire was used. The introductory page presented the study as academic research, emphasized that knowledge of wine was not necessary, and explained that participants would answer questions about ten wine labels, themselves, and their shopping habits. Participants then previewed the ten labels to get a feel for the range and type of variations, so that they could use the ratings scale more fully and effectively.

The labels were then presented, one per page, and respondents were asked to indicate, using a seven-point Likert scale, whether they would purchase the wine, whether they liked the label, how much they thought the wine would cost (from a series of price ranges), and how well they thought each of the ten brand personality facets described the label. Participants had to answer all questions for each label before moving on.

Presentation order was counterbalanced, with randomization built in to the website's code. Participants were randomly assigned to view one of ten groups of nine experimental labels, although they did not know this. All participants viewed the same practice label first, after which the nine experimental labels were presented in random order. The ten brand personality facets were also presented in different, random order on each page.

Results and discussion

Brand personality as a predictor of purchase intent

To determine which brand personality facets best predicted purchase intent, each of the ten facets was linearly regressed onto purchase intent both individually and when

Consumption frequency	Male (%)	Female (%)	All (%)
Every week	46.4	44.9	45.4
Once every 2-3 weeks	24.7	24.2	24.4
Once a month	9.3	9.1	9.2
Less than once a month	15.5	15.8	15.7
Never	3.1	5.5	4.6
I don't know	1.0	0.6	0.8

Table III.
Wine consumption
frequency among
participants

grouped by dimension. Each facet was a significant predictor of purchase intent at the 0.01 level, and nearly half of the variance in purchase intent was explained by their joint influence (see Table IV).

Successful was the facet most strongly correlated with purchase intent, and charming was the second most strongly correlated. Together, successful and charming together captured 45 percent of the variance in purchase intent. Adding either spirited or up-to-date raised this to 46.5 percent, and using all four facets together accounted for 47 percent, nearly as high as the total yielded by the complete set of ten facets. Outdoorsy and tough were the least correlated with purchase intent. Although ruggedness may be strongly conveyed by some brands, this dimension appears not to be highly relevant to purchase intent in this study. This would likely change, however, in a context that activates the ruggedness dimension, such as wines chosen specifically for a barbecue.

Aaker's framework thus seems to be a valuable construct for predicting the likely success of product packaging options. Even within a single product category, products are perceived as having considerably different brand personality profiles, and these, in turn, seem to function as useful predictors of purchase intent. The high degree of variance captured by only four facets of the framework makes it an efficient tool for quickly evaluating a large number of potential designs and allows for faster cycles of design and evaluation during the product design process. Additional facets and even individual traits could easily be added to a questionnaire during final stages of development, if a more refined brand personality profile is needed.

Assuming that stated purchase intent matches actual purchase intent, these results support *H1*, and two to four facets of Aaker's framework are sufficient as a rough predictor of purchase intent. As this study used only a rough proxy to measure purchase intent, the generality of this finding is necessarily limited; further studies using products for which actual market data are known would clarify both the effectiveness of brand personality as a predictor of actual purchases and the rate of diminishing returns offered by increasing the number of facets or traits measured.

Effects of image, layout, and color on purchase intent and brand personality

To determine which design factors had significant effects on each personality facet and on purchase intent, preference, and perceived value, ANOVAs were run for each dependent variable, using image, layout, and color and all two- and three-way

Dimension	R^2	Facet	Coefficient	R^2
Excitement	0.3319	Successful	0.6053	0.3634
		Cheerful	0.4836	0.2273
		Daring	-0.1079	0.1224
		Spirited	0.2977	0.2652
		Imaginative	0.1669	0.2196
Sophistication	0.4048	Up-to-date	0.2771	0.2625
		Upper class	0.2283	0.2206
		Charming	0.4857	0.3607
Ruggedness	0.0824	Outdoorsy	0.1966	0.0703
		Tough	0.1238	0.0462
		All ten facets	-	0.4740

Table IV.
Correlation between purchase intent and brand personality

interactions as independent variables. Most main effects were significant at the 0.001 level, with small to medium effect sizes as measured by R^2 . There were fewer significant interaction effects, with most occurring between image and color (see Table V). The impact of each image, color, and layout was assessed by comparing mean purchase intent values for each relevant set of labels, as grouped by image, color, layout, and combinations thereof.

Image. Image had the strongest effects, both on market success factors and on brand personality. Its main effects on all dependent variables were significant at the 0.001 level, and effect sizes were generally greater than for color or layout. Image had the strongest main effect on purchase intent ($F(4, 2268) = 22.17, p < 0.0001, R^2 = 0.038$) (Table VI). Averaged across all experimental labels, image alone was responsible for an increase of 0.85 in purchase intent score (on the seven-point scale) from the least desirable images (the unusual animals) to the most-desirable images (grape motifs). This effect was markedly stronger in some series, such as the navy labels in the modern layout (see Figure 3), where the desirability of the label more than doubled due to the use of different images.

Image was the only design factor that produced a significant main effect on all brand personality facets. It had a greater effect on each facet than color or layout and had the only significant main effect on the important facet charming. Because images are so frequently used as iconographic representations, they function as strong clues to meaning, through direct representations, examples, symbolic imagery, and arbitrary images with culturally dependent meanings. Generally, grape motifs and images of chateaux or vineyards received the highest scores, and unusual animals the lowest. This varied by facet, however: unusual animals received the highest marks for imaginative, and coats-of-arms scored lowest on ruggedness facets but highest for upperclass and value.

Color. Color had significant main effects on most dependent variables, with the exceptions of the facets charming and imaginative. However, effect sizes were consistently smaller than those of image (mean effect size 0.020). Because of the great difference in the amount of color used in different layouts, a separate ANOVA was run for each layout individually, with the expected finding that the greater the amount of color in a design, the stronger its effect.

The overall effect of color on purchase intent was ($F(5, 2268) = 8.75, p < 0.0001, R^2 = 0.019$), but when examined individually by layout, it was large for the traditional/full-color layout ($F(5, 756) = 8.15, p < 0.0001, R^2 = 0.051$), smaller for the half-colored modern layout ($F(5, 756) = 2.36, p < 0.0001, R^2 = 0.015$), and not significant for the traditional/unprinted layout ($F(5, 756) = 1.19, p = 0.33, R^2 = 0.008$), which contained only colored accents. Though the direction of the effect depended somewhat on the individual color, this finding suggests that desirable colors should be used boldly, whereas undesirable colors should be used only as accents, if at all. The difference in purchase intent between the lowest-rated color (pink) and the highest-rated color (which varied by layout) averaged 0.62 across all layouts, being 1.06 for the traditional/full-color layout, 0.54 for the modern layout, and 0.45 for the traditional/unprinted layout.

Conventional wisdom says that the labels of high-quality, expensive wines should use dark, rich colors, whereas brightly colored labels promise a fun but “frivolous” consumption experience (Teague, 2004). We therefore expected that burgundy, navy,

Table V.
Effect sizes (R^2) of design
factors on dependent
variables

	Image	Color	Layout	Image × color	Image × layout	Color × layout	Color × image × layout
Purchase intent	0.038***	0.019***	0.008***	0.020***	0.004	0.007	0.017
Preference	0.041***	0.025***	0.007***	0.018**	0.003	0.008	0.012
Perceived value	0.037***	0.026***	0.038***	0.010	0.009*	0.024***	0.018
Cheerful	0.036***	0.031***	0.001	0.013	0.002	0.008	0.023*
Daring	0.046***	0.005*	0.032***	0.017**	0.005	0.007	0.025*
Spirited	0.019***	0.006*	0.006***	0.009	0.002	0.005	0.020
Imaginative	0.053***	0.003	0.013	0.016*	0.004	0.005	0.019
Up to date	0.019***	0.009***	0.017***	0.020**	0.003	0.005	0.022
Upper class	0.101***	0.016***	0.028***	0.016**	0.004	0.020***	0.022
Charming	0.034***	0.004	0.002	0.014*	0.002	0.002	0.019
Outdoorsy	0.243***	0.020***	0.002	0.035***	0.006	0.008	0.028**
Tough	0.060***	0.046***	0.006***	0.013	0.004	0.014***	0.019
Successful	0.070***	0.019***	0.013	0.014	0.003	0.015***	0.024

Notes: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$

Success factors and brand personality facets	Effect		Chateau/vineyard	Grape motif	Mean rating Coat of arms	Traditional animal	Unusual animal
	<i>F</i> (4,2268)	<i>p</i>					
Purchase intent	22.17	<0.0001	3.8887	4.0362	3.5295	3.4852	3.1903
Preference	24.34	<0.0001	4.0899	4.3149	3.6498	3.6751	3.3700
Perceived value	21.87	<0.0001	3.3233	3.2915	3.4684	3.0295	2.9239
Successful	42.88	<0.0001	4.0707	4.1128	4.1203	3.5063	3.0930
Cheerful	21.08	<0.0001	3.4411	3.8766	2.9620	3.3376	3.4947
Daring	27.12	<0.0001	3.1328	3.1404	2.9135	3.5844	3.8393
Spirited	11.11	<0.0001	3.5289	3.6638	3.1709	3.7806	3.6596
Imaginative	31.55	<0.0001	3.2377	3.3872	2.8840	3.4599	4.0106
Up to date	11.14	<0.0001	3.5246	3.9128	3.2321	3.5042	3.6385
Upper class	63.87	<0.0001	4.0642	3.8979	4.3186	3.2785	2.9154
Charming	19.91	<0.0001	3.7495	3.9851	3.1667	3.3270	3.4715
Outdoorsy	182.11	<0.0001	3.4261	3.5234	2.2637	4.6561	4.3129
Tough	36.41	<0.0001	2.8266	2.5915	2.7173	3.6266	2.9260

Table VI.
Effect sizes and mean ratings: image

and the neutral palette would receive the highest marks for success factors (purchase intent, value, and successful); that the brightest colors (red-orange and wasabi green) would receive highest marks for excitement factors (daring, spirited, imaginative, and up-to-date), and that the inappropriate pink would receive the lowest marks throughout.

These expectations were generally supported with two notable exceptions: the fairly bright red-orange palette scored nearly as high as or higher than burgundy on most success factors, whereas navy received much lower scores than expected in these areas. Several possible confounding factors must be considered. First, because the labels were viewed on the participants' own computer monitors, the colors may not have been "true" and the red-orange and burgundy labels may have looked more similar than intended. Second, six different illustrations of each image subject were used (six different drawings of grapes, six different chateaux, etc.), but these versions were not counterbalanced across color, meaning that the apparent effect of color may have been partially an effect of its interaction with the particular illustration paired with that color.

Overall, the warm palettes (burgundy, red-orange, and neutrals) were seen as successful, desirable, and expensive; the bright palettes (wasabi green and red-orange) were seen as exciting and imaginative, and pink was seen as a poor choice of color for Cabernets, with low scores for nearly every trait except cheerful. Because the connotations of different colors vary according to culture, context, and current fashion, the effects of particular colors will not necessarily generalize to other cultures or product domains. Premium chocolates, coffees, olive oils, and vinegars are often marketed and discussed in the same terms as wines and may benefit from similar packaging guidelines, but we leave this generalization for future research (see Table VII).

Layout. Layout had significant main effects on all facets except cheerful, charming, and outdoorsy, and on the success factors of preference, cost, and purchase intent. The effect sizes were quite small (<0.03 in most cases), possibly due to the similarity between the two traditional labels. However, the labels with the traditional, full-color layout received significantly higher ratings on most dependent variables than the other two designs.

Each of the three layouts used has its own associations in the wine market. The traditional/unprinted layout is the oldest and most traditional design, and this is the type of design most typical of high-end and French wineries, though it can be found on wines of all origins and qualities. The full-color version of this label is somewhat more recent and common among American wines. The third layout, used to provide contrast

Figure 3. Mean purchase intent ratings for a sample of labels using different images: this set of images changed average purchase intent by more than a factor of two from least to most preferred



Success factors and brand personality facets	Effect			Mean rating					
	$F(5,2268)$	p	R^2	Burgundy	Navy	Neutral	Orange	Wasabi	Pink
Purchase intent	8.75	<0.0001	0.0189	3.7425	3.6865	3.7642	3.7725	3.6225	3.1503
Preference	11.87	<0.0001	0.0255	3.9825	3.9430	3.9689	3.9575	3.8200	3.2280
Perceived value	12.03	<0.0001	0.0258	3.3300	3.2306	3.4352	3.2475	3.0675	2.9301
Successful	8.69	<0.0001	0.0188	3.9250	3.9793	3.9611	3.7800	3.6350	3.3964
Cheerful	14.46	<0.0001	0.0309	3.2775	3.2824	2.9560	3.5875	3.7400	3.6736
Daring	2.46	= 0.0313	0.0054	3.3050	3.3549	3.4249	3.4125	3.3350	3.1010
Spirited	2.90	= 0.0130	0.0063	3.5750	3.4845	3.5181	3.7275	3.6700	3.3782
Imaginative	1.48	= 0.1917	0.0033	3.4600	3.3497	3.3627	3.4250	3.5100	3.2617
Up to date	4.19	= 0.0009	0.0091	3.5725	3.7021	3.5674	3.6250	3.6625	3.2358
Upper class	7.16	<0.0001	0.0155	3.8475	3.7720	4.0052	3.5950	3.4975	3.4508
Charming	1.72	= 0.1277	0.0038	3.5475	3.5570	3.3834	3.6000	3.6775	3.4585
Outdoorsy	9.39	<0.0001	0.0203	3.7850	3.6088	3.6969	3.7400	3.7975	3.1788
Tough	21.63	<0.0001	0.0455	3.1375	3.0285	3.4430	2.9575	2.5800	2.4896

A charming little Cabernet

Table VII.
Effect sizes and mean ratings: color

with the traditional styles, is only one example of a more modern label, and results for other modern label designs are likely to vary considerably.

Both traditional label layouts had an advantage over the modern one in terms of consumer preference, perceived value, purchase intent, and perceived success. For most other facets, however, the traditional/full-color layout received the highest scores, the modern layout the second highest, and the traditional/unprinted layout the lowest scores, suggesting that bold use of color is more effective in establishing a strong brand personality, though the choice of color must, of course, be taken into consideration. The notable exception to this trend is the facet *upperclass*, for which the unprinted/unprinted layout was the most effective, likely reflecting the predominance of this design in high-end wine labels (see Table VIII).

Interaction effects. The interaction between color and layout has already been discussed. For nearly every dependent variable, color had the greatest effect for the traditional/full-color layout, less effect on the modern layout, which was only half colored, and almost no effect (often not significant) for the traditional/unprinted layout, where color was used only as an accent. These effects were not large but consistently in this direction.

There was also a relatively strong interaction between image and color ($F(29, 2328) = 6.09$, $p < 0.0001$, $R^2 = 0.071$). Grape motifs and coats-of-arms generally received higher scores for success factors when presented in neutral colors (browns and blacks) than in brighter palettes, whereas chateaux and traditional animals received the highest marks in burgundy and red/orange palettes. This may be because certain color schemes were considered better matches for the different images. Other interactions were minimal.

Our results provided partial support for *H2*: the test factors had enough significant main and interaction effects on both purchase intent and perceptions of brand personality to warrant their evaluation in all combinations. The present finding of significant interactions suggests that when a basic design is adapted to a new label, changes should be tested for their effects on relevant facets or traits; one cannot assume independence.

This is particularly important when the different products are to be presented as appropriate for different occasions or consumers or to evoke different brand personality types. While wine marketers often attempt to achieve these purposes with back labels filled with lavishly-written copy describing the type of person or situation for whom or which the wine is ideal, subjects in Thomas and Pickering's (2003) study gave these notes little credence, ranking them the least important of all information elements found on wine bottles.

Rather, the use of appropriate images on the front label increases the likelihood that a winery's positioning efforts will be effective. Thus, a wine being marketed as best for casual gatherings might benefit from an image ranked high on ruggedness and excitement dimensions but neutral on sophistication (such as a bull), while a higher-priced wine would do better to emphasize sophistication and excitement, with less ruggedness (such as a cluster of grapes) (see Table IX).

Conclusion

To realize the full benefit of brand personality research, one must make it both useful and accessible not only to brand managers, but to those implementing the tangible

Success factors and brand personality facets	Effect		Mean rating			
	$F(2,2268)$	p	R^2	Traditional unprinted	Traditional full color	Modern
Purchase intent	9.14	< 0.0001	0.0080	3.6870	3.7430	3.4440
Preference	8.27	= 0.0003	0.0072	3.8282	3.9720	3.6552
Perceived value	44.82	< 0.0001	0.0380	3.3308	3.3639	2.9262
Successful	14.42	< 0.0001	0.0126	3.9097	3.8868	3.5420
Cheerful	1.31	= 0.2706	0.0012	3.3626	3.4008	3.5013
Daring	37.33	< 0.0001	0.0319	2.9784	3.6794	3.3104
Spirited	6.99	= 0.0009	0.0061	3.4262	3.7112	3.5445
Imaginative	14.37	< 0.0001	0.0125	3.2150	3.6361	3.3372
Up to date	19.28	< 0.0001	0.0167	3.2735	3.7176	3.6947
Upper class	33.12	< 0.0001	0.0284	3.9644	3.7863	3.3308
Charming	1.88	= 0.1521	0.0017	3.6107	3.5420	3.4631
Outdoorsy	2.48	= 0.0840	0.0022	3.7087	3.6005	3.6018
Tough	7.16	= 0.0008	0.0063	2.8181	3.1120	2.8855

A charming little
Cabernet

Table VIII.
Effect sizes and mean ratings: layout

Table IX.
Effect sizes and mean ratings: image x color

Success factors and brand personality facets	Effect		Mean rating: purchase intent						
	<i>F</i> (20,2268)	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Color	Chateau/vineyard	Grape motif	Coat of arms	Traditional animal	Unusual animal
Purchase intent	2.29	= 0.0010	0.0198	Burgundy	4.0988	3.8846	3.5570	3.6506	3.5190
Preference	2.09	= 0.0031	0.0181	Navy	3.8649	4.3671	3.5443	3.7468	2.8800
Perceived value	1.19	= 0.2554	0.0104	Orange	3.8000	4.5190	4.0886	3.2703	3.1139
Successful	1.57	= 0.0514	0.0136	Neutral	4.4810	3.8608	3.6024	3.5679	3.3590
Cheerful	1.53	= 0.0623	0.0133	Wasabi	3.7595	4.2099	3.4304	3.4359	3.2771
Daring	1.91	= 0.0087	0.0166	Pink	3.3165	3.3243	2.9200	3.2152	2.9747
Spirited	1.00	= 0.4594	0.0087						
Imaginative	1.83	= 0.0137	0.0159						
Up to date	2.26	= 0.0012	0.0195						
Upper class	1.89	= 0.0098	0.0164						
Charming	1.66	= 0.0331	0.0144						
Outdoorsy	4.09	< 0.0001	0.0348						
Tough	1.47	= 0.0810	0.0128						

aspects of the brand. Demonstrating the importance of having a brand personality is only the first step: the next step requires providing practical tools for developing and communicating a successful one. At the design level, this means creating efficient metrics for assessing a design's effect on brand personality and developing guidelines for evoking specific personality types through design.

The results of the present study confirm that there are tangible benefits to designing packaging in order to develop a brand personality, and offers guidelines for doing so. Without undervaluing the importance of a design's overall effect, or gestalt, the results show the importance of evaluating the constituent elements, individually and in interaction, as they are perceived by the design's intended audience. This is particularly important when a basic design will be varied along one or more dimensions to differentiate elements of a product line, or when a design is meant to evoke a specific desired response, such as the perception of a particular brand personality. Knowing which interactions are significant ensures that all volatile combinations are evaluated, eliminating unpleasant surprises that may occur when elements that are benign in separate contexts produce undesired consequences in combination. Finally, a complete evaluation based on the iteration of basic elements, as performed here, is useful for future projects and cross-market comparisons, providing a set of guidelines for the evocation of different brand personality profiles.

References

- Aaker, D.A. (1996), *Building Strong Brands*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Aaker, J.L. (1997), "Dimensions of brand personality", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 34, August, pp. 347-56.
- Aaker, J.L., Fournier, S. and Brasel, S.A. (2004), "When good brands do bad", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 1-16.
- Batt, P.J. and Dean, A. (2000), "Factors influencing the consumers decision to purchase wine from a retail liquor store in Perth", *Western Australia, Australian and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 34-41.
- Belk, R.W. (1998), "Possessions and the extended self", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 2, September, pp. 139-68.
- Biel, A. (1993), "Converting image into equity", in Aaker, D.A. and Biel, A. (Eds), *Brand Equity and Advertising*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Chaney, I.M. (2000), "External search effort for wine", *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 5-21.
- Doyle, J.R. and Bottomley, P.A. (2004), "Font appropriateness and brand choice", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 57, pp. 873-80.
- Fournier, S. (1994), "A consumer-brand relationship framework for strategy brand management", unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Kunda, Z. (1999), *Social Cognition: Making Sense of People*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Malhotra, N.K. (1988), "Self concept and product choice: an integrated perspective", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 9, pp. 1-28.
- Sirgy, J. (1982), "Self-concept in consumer behavior: a critical review", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9, pp. 287-300.
- Teague, L. (2004), "Why labels matter", *Food & Wine*, February, pp. 75-8.

Thomas, A. and Pickering, G. (2003), "The importance of wine label information", *International Journal of Wine Marketing*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 58-74.

Zajonc, R.B. (1968), "Attitudinal effects of mere exposure", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monographs*, Vol. 9, pp. 1-27).

Further reading

Gosling, S.D., Rentfrow, P.J. and Swann, W.B. Jr. (2003), "A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains", *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 37, pp. 504-28.

About the authors

Claire A. Boudreaux is a marketing practitioner whose work focuses on applications of cognitive and social science research to marketing design and communication challenges. She attended Berkeley City College and the University of California, Berkeley, where received her BA with highest honors in 2005. Her research in Cognitive Design in the Marketplace was awarded the Robert J. Glushko Prize. She is currently marketing manager of PopularMedia, Inc., a strategic viral marketing firm in San Francisco, CA. She is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: claire.boudreaux@gmail.com

Stephen E. Palmer is a perceptual psychologist whose current research concerns perceptual organization and aesthetic response in vision. He received his BA in Psychology from Princeton University in 1970 and his Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of California, San Diego, in 1975, where he worked with Donald A. Norman and David E. Rumelhart. He is currently a Professor in Psychology and Cognitive Science at the University of California, Berkeley, where he has also been Director of the Institute for Cognitive Studies and Director of the Undergraduate Major in Cognitive Science. He is a member of the Society of Experimental Psychologists, a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, and a Fellow of the American Psychological Society.