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The wine industry has seen some major changes over the last decades that force French producers to react. In today’s competitive market, French wineries have to adapt their offer to the changing demand, especially younger drinkers that are taking the wine industry by storm.

Experts in the field especially point out the necessity to rethink wine packaging of the French offer. Currently out-dated, it is however one of the biggest factor influencing wine purchase in supermarket after the price.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to explore how wineries can marketed more efficiently their packaging to capture younger drinkers.

To answer this complex issue that have been controversial by previous researchers, the research methodology undertaken is underpinned by a mixed methods research design composed by a survey, observation and interview. It aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of younger consumers expectations regarding wine packaging, from its design to its information content.

Through the research, it has been found that younger drinkers are looking for moderated packaging, which ensures both aesthetic preference and quality. More, label information should be simplified to provide a clear description of the product and its consumption.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

France is the inheritor of a unique wine culture based on its long-rooted traditions and its « terroir » that contribute to its worldwide renown for centuries. With a turnover of 20 billions euros in 2014 and 558 000 persons employed, the wine industry is the third export sector and one of the most important industries in the French economy. (AgriFrance, 2015). Nevertheless, since the twenty-one century, the sector has been suffering from major changes at all levels, resulting from the globalization.

1.1.1 General consumption overview

According to FranceAgriMer (2014) France is the first wine consumers country in the world ahead of USA, with a consumption of 30 269 million hectolitres per year, whether 14% of the global production. Wine is also the most popular alcoholic drink consumed in France with 52.8 litres per person per year. Nevertheless the consumption has been divided by two over the last decades and should decrease by 2.91% by 2019 (OFDT study, 2014). Nonetheless, if wine consumption has never been so low, it is however more qualitative. Indeed, the consumption of bottle costing more than €10 increased by 20.96% between 2010 and 2015. In addition, with a domestic consumption reaching 70% in 2014, consumers tend privileged French wines.

1.1.2 The growing competition

The French wine industry is suffering from a fierce worldwide competition and has been lost 15% market shares since 2002 in favour of new wine producers countries (OFDT study, 2014). New producer countries gather Australia, Argentina, Chile, New Zealand, South Africa and China (F, Castellucci, 2009). With a volume growth of 48% and an export growth of 370% over the last ten years, they represent the biggest threat for French producers (Agrifrance, 2015.). According to experts, their biggest strength is their ability to adapt themselves to the globalization context. More precisely, the wine expert Robert Parker (2014) explained that their rapid success is firstly driving by their ability to offer good quality wines at affordable price and secondly, by the way they market their offer. Indeed, new producer countries (with Australia as a pioneer) were the first to use branding and packaging as major assets. They offer modern design as well as bring a huge simplification to the offer, which appeal and fit with the changing consumers.
1.1.3 The missed turn of the French offer

To face the growing competition and consumption decrease, the possible options for the French wine industry are limited. Indeed, innovations on the intrinsic characteristics of the product is limited and strictly regulated by law, as its communication (Evin law founded in 1991). More, with a constant increase of production costs and charges, a price decrease is unsustainable.

Thus, the main attribute that could allow producers to stand out from the competition is the packaging design. According to Rocchi and Stefani (2005), it is second element influencing buying decision after the price.

However, regarding the French offer, identical for decades, producers have neglected the importance and potential of the packaging, resulting to a lack of creativity and modernism. Indeed, more than 90% of consumers described the French offer as “not clear, complicated and out-dated” (Delmas, 2009), demonstrating their inability to adapt their offer to the changing demand. (Celhay & Passebois, 2011).

More, producers continue to consider the baby boomer generation as the only market target; however, Millennial is now taking the wine industry by storm. This segment will be the biggest market within 5 years representing 50% of the active population as well as the segment with the biggest buying power (Wolf & Thomas, 2007). Nevertheless, this segment does not adopt the same habits as their forefather requiring a specific attention.

1.1.4 The packaging issue

With the success of new wines, some French producers rethink their packaging, offering modern packaging. Results were fruitful for entry and mid ranges wines (Rosé, Beaujolais Nouveau etc.), however, the majority ended in failure for premium wines, which have some difficulties to output traditional codes (Celhay and Trinquecoste, 2008).

In order to understand this phenomenon, some authors conducted researches on the issue. If they unanimously agreed on the undisputable influence of packaging on consumers’ buying decision, authors disagreed on how packaging can positively influence consumers, especially younger ones. Indeed, two movements divide the literature. The first one argues that even if younger consumers are appealed by modern packaging, they remain attached to classical and authentic packaging, which are a guarantee of quality. According to this movement, when the perceived risk associated to the decision making process is high, consumers will systematically choose the most authentic option, without taking into account its aesthetic preferences (Hekkert et al, 2003; Celhay and Passebois, 2015).
According to the second movement, modern packaging that are graphically focused and brightly coloured labels are privileged by Millennial, justifying the success of new producer countries (Larson, 2012; Pelet, 2010).

1.2 Research question

So, facing disagreements between authors and without relevant solution allowing French producers to revive growth, the present dissertation asks the question:

“Traditional or modern, how premium white Burgundy wines packaging can capture 20-28 wine consumers without affecting the perceived quality of wine in supermarket?”

The purpose of this paper is to understand how producers can better market their offer to influence younger drinkers’ purchases and boost consumption in France. For that, the researcher decided firstly to focus on supermarket. Indeed, despite the fact that 9 out of 10 bottles are bought via this distribution channel, to date, no research is centred on it.

Then, the researcher focused on the 20-28 years old French consumers. Firstly, owing to the high potential of this segment and the lack of research conducted on Millennial, it was obvious for the researcher to focus on them. Secondly, some researchers found that millennial are a wide generation whose expectations regarding wines highly vary. Thus, an age bracket was set up.

In addition, it has been argued that premium wines have the biggest difficulties to output traditional codes in terms of packaging, thus, the researcher decided to focus on it.

Besides, in France, each wine area markets its offer differently allowing consumers to recognize wine origins, thus consumers’ expectations in terms of packaging vary depending on the wine provenance. Hence, the research focused on Burgundy wines, which is the second biggest wine area after Bordeaux. Burgundy premium wine is defined as “AOP and Grand Crus whose prices exceed 14 euros” (Union de sommelier de France, 2009).

Finally, white, red and rosé also used different visual codes, one packaging design cannot fit with all type of wines, so the researcher focused on white ones.
1.3 Research objectives

Through her research, the researcher aims to meet the six following objectives:

1. To analyse students’ relationship with wine, especially premium Burgundy ones.
2. To explore the purchasing process of Burgundy premium wines in supermarket and evaluate the role of packaging.
3. To compare the purchasing process and packaging preferences in high and low risk perceived situation.
4. To measure and compare the impact of typical, moderated typical and atypical packaging on purchase decisions as well as quality perceived.
5. To identify the key packaging attributes that influence positively students’ buying decision in order to marketed more efficiently premium Burgundy wines in supermarket.
6. To determine the information content expected by students

1.4 Justification

1.4.1 Market justification

Today, French wine industry is in crisis, suffering from visual uniformity and facing the increasing worldwide competition, which is gaining market shares.

Despite a state of emergency, French producers stand still and continue to market its offer similarly to the 50s. However, packaging may be the solution to the long-term viability of the business. Indeed, it helps to maintain and recruit new consumers and can also help producers to stand out from the crowded shelves in retail stores.

However, French producers do not have sufficient resources to conduct researches. Firstly, they do not have marketing skills, thus strategies implemented are often subject to failure. Secondly, the majority of producers are fragmented into small producers who do not have the financial resources to conduct marketing researches.

Hence, this paper aims to support advertisers and wineries to better understand why and how Millennial choose a specific product over others, in order to better attract and retain this growing consumer segment and regain its place as world’ greatest wine country.
In addition, the goal of this paper is also to raise producers’ awareness on how marketing can impact positively their business. Indeed, producers tend to think that marketing is only suitable for new products and is not for traditional product as wine. Thus, they do not consider it seriously and packaging is often neglected.

1.4.2 Academic Justification

From an academic view, the researcher noted diverging findings. It is explained by the different research models used, methods employed, context and the study population. Indeed, the issue is complex and findings vary according to each situation and cannot be generalizable. Hence, it is crucial to investigate the issue in a specific context and conditions.

However, no academic paper focuses on the influence of premium wine packaging in supermarket among the French millennial. French researches conducted so far investigated the packaging influence in a broadly and superficial way. In consequences, findings do not provide exploitable results for the industry.

1.4.3 Personal justification

From a family of winegrower and with five years of marketing school background, the researcher had the opportunity to develop skills in both fields for few years. More, the researcher also supplemented her learning in wine marketing field thanks to its participation to wine associations as “Comité de Saint Vincent” or “Les Winelovers Lyonnais”, as well as three professional experiences.

In addition, wishing to pursue her professional career in wine marketing area, the purpose of this study is also to help her to deepen knowledge to be better prepared for the working world.

1.5 Scope and Limitations to the Research

The research focuses on the packaging influence, through the definition given by Orth and Malkewitz (2006), defined as the most complete one. However, the research focuses on the communicative function of the packaging and not on the logistical and functional parts.

More, due to a lack of financial resources and time, this paper will only focus on French 20-28 Master degree students who are studying in ISEG Lyon (France).

Finally, to have specific results, only one distribution channel and one specific type of wine was investigated.
CHAPTER 2 LITTERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a critical and factual overview of what has been explored before. Through secondary data composed by academic journals, academic articles and previous studies in similar fields, the dissertation topic has been discussed, assessed and criticised. It aims to provide in-depth understanding of the selected subject and research’s context.

This literature review has been divided into four themes, starting by explaining general key concepts and ending with specific knowledge.

The first part aims to give an overview of the wine packaging concept, explaining firstly its importance, roles and influence on the quality perceived. Then, the researcher focuses on the wine label, which needs a specific attention due to the constraining regulation.

In a second part, the researcher explores the millennial consumers, which are very different from other generations. The purpose of this part is to better understand the younger wine consumers, starting with a general analysis and then, exploring in details their behaviours and expectations regarding wine.

Then, the different factors influencing wine purchases in supermarket are approached in a third part. Indeed, packaging influence depend on the purchase context, requiring a better understanding. Thus, the supermarket sales process and its specificities are analysed in a first subsection. Then, the researcher consciously decided to explore the three main factors that impact purchase in supermarket, which are the consumption situation, the consumers wine knowledge and the risk perceived.

The purpose of this section is to better understand the wine purchase process in a specific context to investigate how packaging can facilitate it.

Finally, after an overview of the key concepts of the research, which are, wine packaging, millennial generation and purchase process in supermarket, the last part of this literature review correlate them in order to explore how packaging can positively influence millennial when buying wine in supermarket. This section highlights the risks perceived by younger consumers and how packaging helps to reduce those risks.
2.2 Wine packaging

2.2.1 Definition

There is numerous definition of packaging, which varies from a simple protection function to a real marketing issue. The researcher retained the most complete definition from the latest researches, whereby “packaging is a wrapping material around a consumer item that serves to contain, identify, describe, protect, display, promote and otherwise make the product marketable” (Berthelot, 2013). Thus, packaging is a sales tool that enhances the product displays and facilitates its use.

By contrast with the intrinsic cues that are fundamental to the product itself as its tastes and aroma, the packaging gather extrinsic elements, which are part of the physical aspect of the wine (Lee & Lou, 1996; Teas & Agarwal, 2000).

As regards the packaging of wine, it is composed by various attributes, which vary according to authors. Indeed, many authors considered only five packaging components, which are, form, size, color, graphics and material (Kuvykaite, 2003; Tinlot, 2005; Pinto, 2006, Barat, 2012 to quote few). Hence, these researches only dealt with the visual aspect of the packaging.

However, other authors claimed the importance of information content as part of the packaging cues. Based on Kotler and Keller (2006) work, some authors demonstrated that more than a wrapping material; packaging is also a crucial source of information on which consumers rely (Barber et al, 2007; Lunardo, 2007; Mueller, 2008; Celhay and Passebois, 2015; Lakhan, 2014).

For this reason, the researcher retains the most exhaustive definition, which include both design and information content. Defined by Orth and Malkewitz (2010), wine packaging is composed by: "shape, size, colour, material, graphic application, brand, and label information".

Thereafter, looking at the different papers focusing on wine packaging, the researcher noticed that the majority of authors investigated distinct cues rather that packaging as a whole. It has the advantage to provide a deep analysis of each cue, however, when gathering and correlating the different findings, the researcher notes distorted results, explained by a lack of objectivity and point of comparison.
In addition, the majority of researches conducted so far only focus on the label design. However, in their researches, Szolnoki et al. (2010) argued that the format, bottle shape and cork are neglected cues whose influence may be “as important as the label”.

Thus, to provide an overall and objective analysis, the researcher decided to investigate the seven packaging cues. The table below provides a framework of what is explored in the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Format, design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Colours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Durability, recyclability, pleasantness, type of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic application</td>
<td>Image, drawing, pictures, style, secondary images, informative and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>graphic Images, Product representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Company name, product line, product name, name of variant, logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label information</td>
<td>Instructions and Suggested Uses, History/Product Description, components,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information required by law, functional text and informative one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Attributes composing packaging (adapted from De Luca and Penco (2006) p7).

2.2.2 Importance

The academic interest in packaging as a marketing and communication tools has become more pronounced over the past decade (Underwood & Klein, 2002). Defined as “the first consumers’ impression” (Maddox, 2012) packaging is a key tool to seduce and attracts consumers' attention. “Consumers shop with their eyes” (Olsen et al, 2003).

In addition, considered as a “silent salesman”, packaging communicates a message about the product, create the winery’s unique universe and give personality to the product (Sawyer, 2006).

More, packaging is also a tool of differentiation (Bloch, Brunel, & Arnold 2003). With hundreds of references available in retail stores, packaging helps wine to stands out from a wide range of similar products, and triggers the buying act (Abdullah, Kalam, and Akteruujaman, (2013), Aaker, (2003)). It is the “ultimate selling proposition” influencing consumer's purchase buying (Akin and Johnson, 2010).
Finally, Barat group (2012), leader on label design, found in their survey that packaging can increase purchase intention by 10%, which represents a potential gain of four million of consumers in France.

2.2.3 Packaging and quality perceived

Besides being one of the most valuable tools to impact consumers and boost sales, packaging also give off a feeling about the wine and directly impact the perception of the product (Celhay and Passebois, 2008; Rundh, 2005).

Other authors added that the majority of consumers consider the package as “a direct reflection of the quality of the product” (Jennings and Wood, 2004, Reidick, 2003). It is even more crucial when quality characteristics cannot be determined until after wine has been consumed. Thus, to evaluate the product quality, consumers mainly rely on packaging.

Hallberg and Woloshun (2007) even say, “Wine package makes the wine taste better”. According to these authors, a consumer who likes the packaging will have a better feeling and will be more likely to enjoy the wine.

To prove it, Folcher and Cohen (2012), ask 20 wine drinkers to mark 4 different wines before and after tasting them. However, it was actually the wine in the four bottles but presented in different packaging. Results show that premium packaging scored significant better marks than cheap packaging, before and after tasting the product. Thus, more than reflecting the quality, packaging also directly impacts the tastes of the wine. In addition, authors found that generally, lower scores were assigned to packaging with aggressive colours and plastic containing while package with gildings, rewards and castle images get the higher scores. It highlights that some attributes may be associated with good or bad quality.

However, despite the relevant findings, this research cannot be used as a framework due to the small sample of 20 participants and the lack of information regarding the sample composition. Indeed, the quality perceived through packaging cues vary from a person to another. It depends on personal tastes, values, culture, wine knowledge and other factors. For example, it has been demonstrated that for environmentalists, a recyclable or non-treated packaging has a positive influence on the quality perceived while it has negative influence for other. Thus, the experience should be conducted on a bigger and predefined sample.

In addition, researches shown that consumers expectations regarding packaging depend on the range level. Indeed, consumers are more demanding for premium wines. (Verdú Jover et al, 2004; Rocchi and Stefani, 2005). Thus, some packaging of middle price range can be
accepted as reflecting a good quality but will not be for a premium wine. This can explained the success of funny packaging launched for cheap wines while it ended in failure for more expensive wines.

However, despite the higher requirements expected for premium wines, no research explored the topic.

2.2.4 Roles of Packaging

In this section, the researcher only approaches the commercial function of the packaging.

Experts in the field defined five main functions that will be discussed below. (Mitul, Deliya, Bhavesh, Parmar, 2012).

2.2.4.1 Facilitating products recognition

Firstly, packaging aims to help consumers to identify the product and its category. Zajonc (1968) was the first to work on this issue and found that each product category is defined by specific visual codes. Thus, most often used codes in a product category represent the “typical package”. For example, it is admitted that cereal are always presented in a rectangular cardboard box or that green is the colour used for organic products.

Typical package refers to something familiar and thus allows consumers to easily recognize the product (Mathieu, 2006; Heilbrunn, 2008). More, it reassures consumers by establishing a trusting relationship that encourages purchase (Mozota and Sabon, 2004).

However, nowadays, with the development of marketing and incremental innovations, each product category provides a large variety of different packaging, using visual codes that represent other product categories (Pantin, Sohier; 2015; Pesteil, 2006). It aims to facilitate product use, be visually different or even create confusion in consumers mind. Nevertheless, as a result, typical package tend to disappear. According to Pantin (2015), it is even more the case among younger consumers that grew up with the innovation context and are more pragmatic, privileging convenient package (Pantin, 2015).

Thus, the role of product recognition plays by the packaging is controversial. Nonetheless, the researcher noted that findings mainly concern FMCG products. Results may vary on other product categories as craft trade products or wine. Conclusions cannot be generalizable to every product categories.
2.2.4 Making the difference

The second role of the packaging is to differentiate a product from direct competitors. Indeed, in retail store, the wine offer is usually organized by type of wine, which mean that direct competitors offering similar prices are surrounded the product. So, even if consumers know what type of wine they want, packaging will help them to differentiate two products that are at first sight identical.

More, packaging can also be the only way to attract consumers’ eyes when the product is located in the lower or upper part of the shelves (Thomas & Pickering, 2003). Indeed, studies found that products placed in middle shelve have three times more chance to be selected than products located on the bottom or the top. (Cao, Hélinckx and Humbert, 2006)

In addition, exploring the literature, the researcher noticed that for the majority of authors, differentiate a product means “move out from traditional codes to be visually innovative and catch consumers’ attention” (Talke et al. 2009). So, by contrast to the typicality that assesses the first role of the packaging, we distinguish the « atypicality », which aims to create visual codes that break the traditional ones.

Hence, by analysing the two first roles of the packaging, the researcher highlighted contradicting functions that defended opposite designs, atypical and typical. Having both relevant advantages, the literature does not provide more information on which role is the most important for consumers.

Finally, the majority of authors limit the differentiator role of the packaging to innovative design, however, awards or any competitive advantage can also be considered as differentiator elements.

2.2.4.3 Reflecting the positioning

The third function of the packaging is to communicate its positioning. Indeed, the type of material, the imaginary, colours and all cues help consumers to position a product and identify company values. In addition, as explained above, the packaging also reflects the quality of the product.

2.2.4.4 Being a source of innovation

As explained previously, innovations regarding wine itself are limited; taste and aroma mainly depend on the grape variety and the “Terroir” that cannot be changed. Hence, packaging can be a key source of innovation (Divard et Urien, 2001; Heilbrunn, 2008). It also helps to better fit with consumers’ expectations, by being in line with their values or facilitating product use.
For example, consumers are more eco-conscious and might privileged packages that respect it. Thus, “the traditional wine bottle is becoming a relic of the old-world drinkers and must be adapted to new consumption trends” Saunders (2014).

Over the last decades, we noticed important innovations in the wine industry, especially drive by the “new world wine”\(^1\), which developed new containing, cork, innovative label design etc. However, French offer is suffering from visual uniformity. For some authors, it is explained by the fact that French producers trailed behind and under-estimated packaging potential. For other authors, consumers’ resistance to change explained the lack of innovation from French producers. Some researchers tried to investigate this issue and will be presented in detail in the fourth part of this literature review.

2.2.4.5 Inform consumers

The last role of the packaging is to inform consumers. Packaging communicates messages via its content and thus acts as an aid to the purchase decision (Draskovic, 2011, Thomas & Pickering, 2003). Often neglected by researchers, Barber and Almanza (2006) discovered that information provided on the label plays “an important role in consumers’ purchase decision and facilitate it”. Their study reveals that almost ninety per cents of wine consumers “heavily rely on the label information”.

Information included legal mentions that will be explained later, and other information that significantly vary from one label to another. It can be food pairings, grapes variety, producer history, production process, vintage, etc.

However, according to Chaney (2000), to make their decision, consumers only select little information. Labels with too much information loose consumers. For this reason, information content must be selected precisely in accordance with consumers’ expectations. However, researches conducted so far provided heterogeneous results regarding the type of information seeking by consumers and their relevance. Blanford et al (2010) argued that disparities between findings are explained by the heterogeneity of consumers. According to these authors, there is a correlation between information seeking and consumers’ wine knowledge. Lockshin (2010) confirmed this hypothesis founding that wine novices evaluated food pairing and taste as important information while wine experts privileged wine designation and vintage. However, researches did not explore all the possible information that a label can provided that can alter results.

\(^1\) New world wine countries: It designed countries that produce wine outside the traditional wine-growing areas of Europe. It gathers Australia, Argentina, Chile, New Zealand, South Africa and China. (Federico Castellucci, directeur général de l’OIV).
2.2.5 Labels cues

2.2.5.1 Importance
Label has been defined as the most important element influencing consumers after the price. (Sawyer, 2006; Curlew, 2011; Barber and Almanza, 2006). According to Barber and Almanza (2006), consumers' first sight is directly centred on label. It must be attractive enough to catch the attention of the consumer and in the same time, offered the right information to not distract the consumer from the actual wine.

2.2.5.2 French label regulation and AOP system
In their research, Barat Group (2012) found that for ninety per cents of consumers, “French labels are too complicated and not understood”. By contrast, for seventy-six per cents “label from new world wine are clearer and more understandable”.

The main difference is that French offer enhances the place of production (village’s name) and designation while new world wines usually do not used the designation system and enhance the grape variety and winemaking style. These specificities bring a huge simplification for consumers, reassuring them more about the taste than the origin.

However, the majority of authors agree on the fact that the complexity of the French label is mainly correlated with the constraining regulation that disadvantage French producers.

Reviewed in 2012, the French regulation imposed specific indications on the label that have to be simultaneously readable without having to turn the container. According to OFV (French Organisation for wine and vine, 2012), these indications are:

- The designation, which mean the word « Wine ».
- The volume in percentage
- The alcoholic strength by volume
- Name and address of the bottler
- Place of bottling
- The presence of sulphites
- The logo to inform that pregnant women should avoid drinking wine.
- Mentions concerning the classification of wine: AOP, IGP.

Hence, the grape variety is not an obligation; the regulation incites producers to promote the place of production with the AOP legal mention. However, in France, there is four hundred and seventy different AOP, gathering two-thirds of the total French vineyard.
AOP system aims to valorise the region and village of production as well as ensure the notion of “Terroir”. Thus, its valuable function is to guarantee the quality and the product authenticity (Atkin and Johnson, 2010).

However, Gamble and Taddei (2007) found that “95,7% of wine drinkers had little to poor knowledge of the AOP system and origin meanings”.

If AOP system aims to protect wine diversity in France, in fact, it tends to loose consumers, offering illegible labels that are not understood. No research explored the utility of these legal mentions, however it could be useful to adapt the regulation that is a barrier of modernization.
2.3 Millennial: the new wine consumers’ generation

2.3.1 Overview of Millennial

Sometimes referred as Generation Y, Millennial include person born between 1976 and 1994 (Thach, 2005). Children of the Baby Boomers, they are 15 million in France, representing 23% of the total population (INSEE, 2015).

Despite being at a young age, it is the most important generation since the baby-boomers. More, Millennial will be the biggest market segment within 2020, representing 50% of the active population as well as the segment with the biggest buying power (INSEE, 2015). Considered as the most promising target (Onivins, 2014), Millennial has been over the last years, the subject of increasing focus.

However, quite complex to understand, they developed specific traits and values that set them apart from previous generations. Knows for their technology savvy and their over-use of Internet, millennial is the first digital generation. They spend in average 38 hours per week on Internet, which shapes their buying decisions. (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007).

More, they are also well educated, knowledgeable and do not hesitate to express their point of views, especially through social media. Regarding their purchases behaviour, Millennial are looking for value quality products that are in line with their own values (Moriarty, 2004; KeyFindings, 2008). Other values defining them as innovative, fun, social and freedom to quote a few (Tapscott, 2008, (Borstin, 2011).

2.3.2 The forgotten generation by the wine field: a critical state

“Each generation is distinguished by certain generational values that drive consumption behaviour” (Walker, 2003). Regarding the wine consumption, it has been found that “Millennial are not adopting the traditional wine culture of their forefathers” (Macle, 2008).

For example, according to Charters (2011) millennial get use to drink wine outside mealtimes that is unthinkable for older generations. In the opposite, for millennial, drink wine everyday can be associated with addiction while it’s totally normal for baby boomers. More, if older generation perceived wine as a “daily food product”, Millennial tends to consider it as a “noble product that is drunk to affirm its social position » (Charters, 2011).

This different perception and relationship with wine has significant impacts on the wine consumption frequency, which are presented below.
As illustrated, younger are consumers and more occasional is the consumption. The researcher compared those figures with previous ones and noted that in 1980, 51% of 25-34 years old drank wine regularly and only 19% were non-drinker. By contrast, in 2015, only 5% of them are regular drinkers and 38% are non-drinkers. Another study conducted by Onivins (2014) confirmed this trend, showing that 67% of Millennial buy wine at least once a month in 2014, compared to 81% in 2000. In addition, only 27% buy wine more than once a week compared to 36% in 2000. Thus, we noticed a strong decrease of wine consumption, especially over the last fifteen years.

Facing this worrying decline that threatens the viability of the industry, some authors tried to understand the reason of this decrease, but explanations are controversial. For some authors, it is due to an old-fashioned offer that does not appeal and tally with millennial expectations as beers or cocktials do (Lendrevie and Lévy, 2012; Pelet, 2012; Closset, 2010, Faivre, 2011). Others authors play down the decrease of wine consumption, arguing that it is a matter of time, millennial should become regular drinkers by getting older (Bardin, 2015; Pastezeur, 2014; Delmas, 2010). Nevertheless this optimistic view was criticized by the study ‘wine consumption and generations’ conducted by Wine Intelligence (2010), which demonstrates that the consumption of a generation does not change. A 65 years old regular drinker was already a regular drinker at 20. Hence, “Young behaviour of today, prefigures adults behaviour of tomorrow” (Lorey, 2013).

So, wine producers should concentrate their efforts on younger drinkers to boost their consumption. Lunardo (2009) added that the viability of the business depends on it, “baby-boomers are not immortal and wine drinker generation is being renewed”.

Figure 1: Wine consumption frequency in 2015 per age (FranceAgrimer, wine consumption in France study, 2015).
More, it is also at this age that producers can educate consumers and start building loyalty, thus the objective is twofold (Seed, 2005).

However, despite evidence, wine producers keep focusing on baby-boomers. A study revealed that 48% of professionals think that Millennial are not an interesting target and 71% target only the baby-boomer (Onivins, 2015).

Nonetheless, if producers do not pay attention to younger drinkers, it may be the faulted of researchers, journalists and other experts, who mainly explored all wine drinkers as a whole or investigated baby boomers only. Only few French researches focus on Millennial.

2.3.3 Millennial and Wine relationship: complexity of the issue.

Regarding millennial and wine relationship, it has been found that younger drinkers are more oriented towards the quality value than the quantity value (Chrysochou and Krystallis, 2012). Indeed, 63% of millennial stated that they preferred spend more money in a good bottle rather than drink more medium-quality wines. (Wine Intelligence, 2010). The study also revealed that 82% plan to spend more money in a bottle of wine when they will see their purchasing power increased. So, the consumption decreases in volume but increases in value, which can reassure premium wine producers.

Then, statistics demonstrated that Millennial are enthusiastic about wine. 64% are interested in it and 76% buy it. More, 89% associate wine with great time, pleasure and conviviality (FranceAgriMer, 2012). However, 90% have poor wine knowledge and only 6% claim to be connoisseurs (Hekkert, 2003).

Regarding the place of wine purchase, even if Y Generation are using internet for everything, studies show that less than 1% often buy wine online and 96% never buy wine through internet (MBA MCI Part Time, 2011). However, 90% usually buy wine in supermarket, arguing that it is more practical. (Vinexpo, 2012).

Besides, millennial tend to be more influenced by packaging than other generation. “90% of Millennial choose a bottle of wine according to the packaging, whether 52% of baby-boomers” (Nowak and Newton, 2010). That can be explained by the fact that this generation grew up with advertising and communication and are generally more sensitive to it. The poor wine knowledge and distribution channel chosen can also explain it and will be analysed in the following part.

Thereafter, regarding millennial motivations, barriers and expectations, the literature provides poor explanations. Indeed, researches conducted so far are mainly quantitative, providing
more statistics. Few qualitative researches were conducted in France but do not provide unanimous information and cannot be exploitable. For example, the main consumption barrier found is the price. However, it is not in coherence with the fact that Millennial spend more money in a bottle of wine, nor the fact that they prefer drink expensive cocktails rather than wine.

Then, regarding millennial expectations, it divided authors. Some researchers argued that they are confident, self-reliant and eager for challenges (Lamb and Fountain; 2011). Greatly attracted by innovation, branding and packaging, they are attracted by original bottles and tend to try new wines rather than be loyal (Wolff and Thomas, 2007; Gillespie, 2010; Nielson, 2007). In opposition, others researches revealed that French millennial are conservative and attached to the tradition. Reluctant to the innovation, they prefer stick to what is familiar. For example, it is hard for them to imagine another containing than a glass bottle. (Celhay and Passebois, 2008; Celhay and Trinquecoste, 2014, Lunardo, 2007).

The heterogeneity of results and lack of congruence can be explained by the fact that this generation is too wide. Indeed, a 20 years old guy do not have the same consumption, knowledge and expectations regarding wine, than a 35 years old guy, which is more closed to X Generation. Those disparities inside the generation make researches non generalizable, and point out that another level of segmentation is required to understand younger drinkers. Researches need to be conducted on more specific groups gathering homogeneous participants. Nonetheless, to date, the few researches were conducted on the entire generation.

In addition, heterogeneous findings can also be explained by the fact that some researches relied on relevant researches that have been conducted abroad. For example, ‘Generation Y Students Perception of Packaging and Pricing of Arkansas Wines’ (Gillepsie and al, 2009) and ‘The wine consumption of students in UK’ (Ritchie, 2005), have been quoted by many French researches. However in an exploratory study investigating differences towards wine amongst young adults in UK and France (Valentin and Ritchie, 2011), findings show diverging behaviours between countries, explained by strong cultural differences. Authors found that French millennial has the heritage of their parents wine culture that English do not have because, wine consumption is still in an emerging stage. This impacts the wine perception and millenial’ behaviours that are different from French to English. English are described as more open minded and more likely to try different wines while French are defined as chauvinistic and narrow-minded. For this reason, using research conducted in other countries to understand the French millennial generation cannot be applied.
To conclude, younger drinkers in France have a different and new vision of wine that is poorly understood by the field. However, without a clear analysis of it, producers would not be able to adapt their offer to the evolving demand. Nonetheless, to reach it successfully, other factors that influence wine purchase also need to be taken into account and will be explored in the following part.

2.4 Factor influencing wine purchases in supermarket

2.4.1 Wine sales process in supermarket

According to Lockshin (2003) “If we can understand how consumers choose wine, then we have a much better framework to decide pricing, packaging, and merchandising strategies”.

Supermarket is the first wine distribution channel for wine, with two-thirds of the total sales in France (FranceAgriMer, 2014). More, supermarket also represents ninety per cents of millennial’ purchases (Vinexpo, 2012). Indeed, the main advantage of this channel is its convenience; consumers can find everything in one place.

To date, a supermarket sells about 750 different wines references, providing a very large choice to consumers (FranceAgriMer, 2014). Nevertheless, between different origins, types, labels, packaging and grape varietals, consumers face a complex buying decisions (Barber, et al., 2006). Indeed, for 72% of French drinkers, “wine purchase in supermarket is a difficult and uncomfortable activity” (Celhay and Trinquecoste, 2008). This has been explained by the fact that in supermarket, there is no assistance to help consumers in their decision process (Dubeau, 2012). Left in their own, consumers cannot rely on advice from expert or any other help.

Often subject to criticism, some supermarkets worked on that issue, providing interactive terminal that offer information about different wines. Nonetheless, it concerns only few supermarkets and information provided remain superficial. More, a lot of consumers assert to not use it by fear to loose time and be disappointed with pointless information. Indeed, the majority of consumers who shop in supermarkets are in a hurry. According to Magali Dubeau (beverage executive at SymphonyIRI, 2012), consumers spend in average only one minute and twenty-six seconds to select a bottle, compared to nine minutes and fifty seconds in a specialized wine shop. Thus, consumers do not analyse deeply the offer.

Besides, compared to other wine distribution channels, consumers cannot try the product before buying it, so the quality-related characteristic as the taste cannot be evaluated before
purchasing it (Sawyer; 2006). Hence, consumers can only rely upon extrinsic cues to assess the quality of the product, which are firstly the price, following by the packaging. (Lockshin et al., 2006; Sherman and Tuten, 2011). Hence, packaging is a major asset in supermarket.

2.4.2 Reasons for purchase and consumption use

After a better understanding of the difficulties encounters by consumers when buying wine in supermarket, the researcher focus on factors that influence it. Firstly, It has been reported that the reason of purchase and the occasion of consumption significantly influence the wine purchase decision (Bettman, 1979; Engel et al., 2001; Williams, 2002,). According to these authors, the level of requirement and expectation would vary depending on the purpose of buying wine. For example, consumers would be more demanding for a gift giving than a home usage. In addition, Webster (2010) found that for a business dinner, consumers tend to buy a familiar label of wine while for a daily consumption, the willingness to try original package is higher.

Then, authors also highlight a diversification of the wine consumption that created new needs. For example, for long transport, a light bottle would be privileged; for outdoor consumption, screw cap would be preferred. It was confirmed in the UK market by Barber et al (2009), who proved that consumers rated packaging cues preferences depending on their purchase use. Thus, segmented the market according to wine used may be key of business future. Nevertheless, in France, statistics show a reluctance of consumers to buy convenient packages that vary from traditional ones, questioning the real influence of consumption use.

2.4.3 Consumers wine knowledge influences and purchase confidence

Consumer knowledge and purchase confidence are ‘considerable factors that impact consumer’s wine purchasing process (Lockshin and Hall, 2003). Purchase confidence is related to consumer’s product knowledge or any type of uncertainty with purchasing decisions (Veale and Quester, 2007).

Hall and Mitchell (2008) differentiated four different wine knowledge levels. Firstly, the wine novice, he is just starting to experiment and taste different wines and does not have any wine knowledge. Then, the wine interested, he drinks wine occasionally and just started to become more curious about the product and has very basic knowledge. The third one is the wine lover; he usually drinks a lot of wine and wants to learn more about the product. To finish, the wine connoisseur, who is the wine expert.

Barber, Ismail, and Dodd (2008) explored the wine knowledge level and its impact on the purchase process in retail store. They found that there is major difference between novices
and connoisseurs; they do not shop in the same way. Due to poor knowledge, novices tend to rely on the physical aspect of the bottle, especially label design and colours while it is not important for experts. More, as explained previously; information expected also varies.

To better understand who are novices and experts, Dodd et al (2007) correlated wine knowledge with age. Results were not relevant for older consumers, however, authors found that younger ones were unanimously less experienced and with poor wine knowledge. Indeed, 32% of the 18-28 consumers defined themselves as novice, 61% as interested, only 6% as lovers and less than 1% as connoisseurs. These findings could thus explain why 87% of Millennial express high level of intimidation and doubt their ability to choose a bottle.

2.4.4 Supermarket and risks perceived.
Finally, the last factor influencing wine purchase is the risk perceived. Wine is generally perceived as a complex product, which is hard to select. It is even more the case in supermarket because consumers cannot taste the product before buying it. One of the main consequences is that consumers express a high level of risks.

The concepts of risk perception related to wine purchases were firstly explored by Gluckman (1986). His research shown that the majority of consumers do not want to appear as ignorant, however, they do not have enough knowledge to make informed decision. Thus, wine purchase process is dominated by fear and anxiety (Gluckman, 1986).

More recently, the risk perception has been identified as “an important driver of wine purchase behaviour” (Lockshin et al., 2006).

Based on Kogan and Wallach (1974) work, Schiffman and Kanuk (2006) identified four main risks regarding wine purchase. Firstly, the functional risk. Related to the wine taste, it is the wine suitability for a particular occasion. Then, the financial risk, which is the value for money. The third risk is the physical one, related to health issue that is a growing interest. Finally, the social risk, it refers to consumers' discomfort. It is described as the consumers’ willingness to choose the right wine that will be appreciate by the others.

Therefore, to reduce those risks that can be more or less important depending on each consumer (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2006), consumers will set up a risk reduction strategy. Spawton (1991) identified six mechanisms that are:

- Selecting reliable and known brands
- Using recommendations of others
- Following the advice of sales associates
- Using their own knowledge gained through wine education
- Using price as an indicator of quality
- Packaging and labelling as an indicator of quality.

Researches conducted so far found that the risk reduction strategy implemented by consumers depends on the distribution channel used and wine knowledge. For example, in supermarket, the two main mechanisms identified are the price and the packaging (Atkin and Johnson, 2010). It confirms Chaney (2000) findings on purchase confidence, concluding that wine consumers mainly rely on extrinsic cues to reduce uncertainty.

After an exploration of the key concepts of the research that are wine packaging, Millennial and sales process in supermarket, the researcher focuses how packaging influence Millennial purchase in supermarket.

### 2.5 Packaging influence on Millennial wine purchase in supermarket

#### 2.5.1 Millennial and risk perceived when buying wine in supermarket

Millennial has been defined as the ‘segment displaying more risk seeking behaviour than the other’ (Johnson and Bruwer, 2004). “They are more intimidated and have a higher respondent concern about choosing wine” (Barber et al., 2006).

More, Orth (2005) found that Millennial expresses higher social risk than other generation and are more susceptible to the opinions of others. Indeed, as the consumption is more occasional and social for this segment, the pressure to select a good wine that will satisfy everybody without appearing as ignorant is higher.

Consequently, to reduce those risks and make the best purchase, Millennial mainly rely on the packaging (Atkin, 2012; Bruwer, 2013; Lacey, 2009). Researches show that, due to poor knowledge they do not rely on their own experience, neither on brand that are unknown for the majority. Then, price appears as directly correlated with quality level, however due to low buying power they do not buy expansive wine. More as they usually shop in supermarket, there is no help onsite to rely on. Finally, research show that surprisingly, Millennial do not use recommendations from others. Thus, the only risk reduction strategy adopted is the packaging.

However, by analysing the different researches and theories on the topic, the researcher found controversial findings on how packaging reduces the risk perceived. It is leaded by two main theories that will be investigated deeply in the next sub-section.
2.5.2 Packaging and risk reduction

2.5.2.1 Preference to the norm concept

In marketing, it is admitted that aesthetic preference is positively correlated with consumers’ purchasing intention (Creusen et Schoormans, 2005; Reimann et al., 2010; Radford et Bloch, 2011). “Consumers buy what they visually like”.

Aesthetic preference may be defined narrowly as the theory of beauty evaluated by one’s perception. Kant was one of the first theorists to work on the issue; he found that perception and preference are subjective and not suitable for standardisation. However, more recent researches argued that there is a linear and positive relationship between aesthetic appreciation and typicality perceived (Zajonc, 1968; Celhay, 2010). In accordance with the theory of preference for the prototype (Whitfield and Slatter, 1979), more familiar is the packaging, more it is appreciated and more the willingness to buy is high. More, when consumers perceive the product as not very sure and risky, the product appears as not authentic (Cova, 2002).

To better understand the phenomenon, Campbell and Goodstein (2001) investigated it. They found that in fact, consumers do not systematically appreciate typical packaging however, they will by it. By correlating the aesthetic preference with the risk perceived, they demonstrated that when the risk related to wine purchase is high; consumers tend to choose the most typical option that will reassure them without systematically take into account their aesthetic preferences. It is the “preference to the norm” theory.

More recently, Celhay and Trinquecoste (2008) demonstrated that when the situation is perceived as risky, the evaluation of the typicality is an heuristic choice and consumers would not take into account their aesthetic preference anymore.

So according to these authors, due to high risk perceived, it is not because consumers prefer a packaging in terms of aesthetic that they will necessarily choose it, they will prefer buy typical packaging that assess the quality.
2.5.2.2 Typicality perceived.

The notion of typicality perceived emerges from studies carried out by Rosch and Mervis (1975) in cognitive psychology. According to these authors, typicality perceived is defined as “the degree of representativeness of the product compared to a particular category”.

Thus, the visual codes mainly used within a category will serve as a marker due to repeated exposure. More the degree of similarity is high; more the product will be evaluated as typical. (Celhay et Passebois, 2008).

Regarding the wine product, experts agreed on the fact that typicality is based on the notion of « terroir » and the idealization of a region with its visual codes. (Bergadaa et Lorey, 2009 ; Guy, 2002 ). Typicality provides a high level of familiarity that will reassure consumers and guarantee the quality of the product.

If we take the example of Burgundy wine, experts noted the beige, yellow and green as the typical colours. Capital letters including serif are the most common letterpress, and drawing, engraving and castles images are privileged to picture or numeric image. (Bertrand Plessis, designer at BIVB, 2011). Burgundy wines also have a specific bottle shape and cork (Mathieu et Al, 2006). Thus, those elements define the typical packaging of Burgundy wines.

2.5.2.3 Typicality influence on younger wine consumers

Celhay and Passebois (2011) conducted an empirical study regarding typicality perceived on wine purchases. They found that more consumers are novices, more the risk perceived is high, and stronger is the typicality influence. Hekkert et al. (2003) also noted that several researches regarding art production shown that aesthetic preference from experts significantly differs from novices. Experts tend to support novelties and originality while novices have a preference for what is familiar. (Hekkert et Van Wieringen, 1996; Locher et al., 2001).
Besides, Lunardo (2007) worked on the young consumers’ perception of authenticity and pointed out that when the label is authentic, young consumers do not see any risk of buying wine. By contrast, when the label is modern, they perceive a risk and thus do not want to buy it.

Indeed, facing increasing corporate manipulation and guile, younger consumers are more suspects of marketing initiatives. Authenticity gives credibility to the product, it communicates trustable messages and is associated with something unchanged, undisputed origin and thus good quality. This reasoning from consumers goes along with their desire to escape excessive commercialisation and their search for experiences and what is “real” (Heine and Petersen, 2015).

Besides, authentic packaging can increased the perceived quality of wine by 15% (Celhay and Trinquecoste, 2008). It confirms Teague (2004) research, which demonstrates that modern labels are perceived as indicative of less serious and more frivolous quality.

So, even if younger consumers aesthetically preferred bright, fun, coloured and innovative packaging, they will choose the most typical and authentic one as a result of a risk reduction strategy. That can partially explained why premium wines have more difficulties to move out from traditional packaging than entry-level wine. Indeed, price of premium wine is high, thus, its consumption is more occasional and it is usually drink for specific occasions. By consequences, the risk perceived when buying premium one is higher.

2.5.2.4 Authenticity moderate effect theory

However, the role of authenticity on younger consumers purchase has been criticized. Firstly, according to VinoVitis (2014), consumers are more and more suspicious about authentic products, which is sometimes misused; thus, authenticity impact is questionable.

In addition, by contradiction to the theory of preference to the norm, Gardner et al (2009) developed the “authenticity moderate effect” theory, emerging from the previous work of Berlyne (1970) in experimental aesthetic research. This theory believes that the relationship between authenticity and aesthetic appreciation should follow “a reverse U curve”. This means that a moderate degree of authenticity should be strongly preferred over authenticity stimuli. According to this theory, the consumer’s tendency to privileged typical and authentic packaging is moderated by some variables. Indeed, as the success of new packaging from new wine producers illustrated, consumers are appealed by more innovative packaging. However, the variables that moderate the authenticity preference were not explored further and need to be determined precisely (Bornstein, 1989 ; Hekkert et al. 2003).
To conclude, there is a clear lack of evidence regarding the impact of typicality on younger drinkers' purchases. The framework used by authors may explain the contradiction between findings. Indeed, in the majority of authors defending the theory of preference to the norm tend to compare very typical and very modern packaging without take into account a possible moderate effect. More, the most advanced research on the issue, developed by Gardner et al (2009), do not provide sufficient findings and must be in-depth to measure the real impact of typicality, moderate typicality and atypicality.

In addition, authors did not test the level of risk tolerance. Even if younger consumers express the highest level of risk, they may have the higher risk tolerance that will impact the purchase process and may lower the influence of typicality.
2.6 Conclusion

To conclude, the literature review aims to gather the main researches that have been conducted so far on packaging influence on Millennial in supermarket and other related subjects.

Firstly, the packaging and its components were discussed to retain the most complete definition that provides the framework of the research. Then, the researcher points out its undisputable impact on consumers’ purchase and quality perceived, especially through its four main roles, which need to be review and prioritize. Besides, the constraining regulation was also approached, explaining the importance of designation and AOP system in the creation of a French label.

Then, the literature review highlights the necessity for the wine field to better market its offer to the emerging younger wine consumer segment, which is clearly misunderstood. More, motivations, barriers and expectations regarding wine consumption were not identified yet.

Besides, regarding the wine purchase process, it is influenced by several factors that have to be taking into account. Indeed according to the wine knowledge, the distribution channel chosen, the risk perceived and the purchase used, the packaging preference vary. Hence, to analyse its influence, a specific environment and context need to be set up.

Finally, regarding younger drinkers’ preferences in terms of packaging, despite the fact that it is one of the most important elements influencing purchase, researches conducted so far provide contradictory findings. The most advanced researches demonstrated a preference for typical packaging due to high risk perceived when purchasing wine. However, other authors found that a moderate effect of authenticity would be privileged. More in tune with new trends and the success of innovative packaging, this theory need to be tested and deepened to provide more explanation on how packaging cues can influence purchase.
3.1 Introduction

To answer the research problem “how premium white Burgundy wines packaging can capture 20-28 wine consumers without affecting the perceived quality of wine in supermarket?” and fill the gap highlighted in the literature review, the research aims to firstly explore students’ relationship with premium Burgundy wines (objective 1). Then, the research will investigates how packaging can influence it (objective 2). Furthermore, the influence of risks perceived on packaging preference will be tested (objective 3); as well as the impact of typicality and atypicality on the quality perceived and purchase intention (objective 4). To finish, the purpose is to concretely identify the information expected (objective 5), as well as the key packaging attributes to marketed more efficiently the offer (objective 6).

To reach these objectives, the ‘Onion’ model methodology developed by Saunders et al (2012) was used as reference framework for the research methods adopted.

Firstly, the research design is presented through research philosophy, approach, strategy, choice and time horizon. Then, the process of data collection and analysis from both qualitative and quantitative is explained. Subsequently, the population and sample chosen for the researches are presented. The chapter ended by mentioning the research ethics that can come across, as well as the limitations of the methodology used.
### 3.2 Research Philosophy

According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2012, p. 140) there are three major ways of thinking concerning research philosophies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td>“It’s the science of reality or being” (Baikie, 1993). It gathers objectivism and subjectivism. This philosophy aims to understand “what is and what exist” from the researcher’s assessment. It also focuses on the most general properties of being. For this reason, this philosophy does not suit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiology</strong></td>
<td>It is the role of researcher’s values in the research process. This philosophy deals with values and ethics rather than truth (Mingers, 2003). However, the researcher believes that the research must be free of values to be valid. Therefore, it is necessary to approach the research in a neutral and objective way. For this reason, this philosophy was not selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>It focuses on what “is acceptable knowledge and what are the sources and limits of knowledge in the field of study”. This philosophy aims to understand what it means to know and how should reality be represented or described. In accordance with the objectives of the research, which considers opinions as acceptable knowledge, this philosophy was chosen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Research philosophies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positivism</strong></td>
<td>It can be defined as “research approach that collects data about an observable reality”. It searches for regularities and causal relationships in data “to create law-like generalisations like those produced by scientists” (Gill and Johnson, 2010, cited in Saunders et al, 2012, p 134). A research is positivist when there is evidences, quantifiable measures of variables and hypothesis to test (Orlikowski and Baroudi, 1991). However, as highlight previously, there is no predefined conceptual model. More, the research do not aim to provide generalisations, hence, this philosophy does not suit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realism</strong></td>
<td>It can be defined as “what we sense of reality”. Opposed to idealism, “objects have an existence independent of the human mind”. So according to this approach, only the mind and its contents exist. However, according to Saunders (2009), “if the researcher’ objective is to gather rich insights into subjective meanings and not to provide law-like generalizations, the researcher is more likely to reflect the philosophy of Interpretivism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretivism</strong></td>
<td>It relates to the study of social phenomena in their natural environment, focusing on human as social actors rather than objects. (Saunders et al, 2009, p.116). This philosophy considers that truth is subjective; reality is multiple and constructed by social actors’ interactions. (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988). Thus, interpretativism asserts that there is no definitive solution to a problem. To gain understanding of a social reality in a particular set of circumstances, researcher must understand it from the point of view of those social actors involved (Bryman, 2008). So, Interpretivism aims to capture meanings in human interaction (Black, 2006). As highlight in the literature review, wine packaging influence is complex and varies according to particular circumstances and individuals. Thus, the purpose of the research is to understand the reality of a specific population and in a specific situation. Hence, it adheres to the interpretivism philosophy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Research Approach

There are two research approaches. The deductive approach tests the validity of theories and hypotheses, whereas inductive aims to contribute to the emergence of new theories (Saunders, 2012, p. 108). "Inductive describes a picture of a phenomenon that is being studied" Lodico (2010).

In light of contradictions between authors on the topic, the researcher does not base the research on existing theories or hypotheses. The purpose is to observe a phenomenon, make sense of the data to finally end up by a theory. Hence, the inductive approach was selected.

3.4 Research Strategy

The research strategy is guided by the research question and how to answer it. More, it also depend on cost, time and skills of the researcher (Remenyi et al., 2005; p.45). Saunders et al (2009) enumerated seven strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>More used in social and natural sciences, it requires specific skills and an exclusive control of all variables. More, it usually implies study on a long-term period. So, for time and skills limits, experiment does not suit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Focus upon change; it implies the involvement of the practitioner. Thus, it does not suit with the objectives and philosophy of the researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded theory</td>
<td>Best example of inductive approach it is also the most popular strategy used in qualitative analysis, which mainly composed the present research. Mainly used when an explanation of the topic is needed, it implies the development of a theory from data generated by a series of observations and systematic comparisons. Tallying with the purpose of the research to provide explanatory framework, grounded theory was selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>Derived from anthropology, it is used to interpret the social world, cultural behaviour, events and contexts (Walliman, 2005). Nevertheless, according to Saunders et al, (2009), it is « a time consuming approach that is carried out over extended period of time ». So, for time and skills limits, ethnography does not suit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival research</td>
<td>It implies administrative records and documents as a principal source of data. Nevertheless, it is not appropriated due to the lack of literature on the topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, to summarize, the research strategy of the dissertation is composed by grounded theory, case study and survey.

### 3.5 Research Choice

Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2012, pp. 160-166) distinguish a mono-method, which is a single data collection technique and a multiple methods, which collects data from various techniques.

Multiple method includes multimethod and mixed method. The multimethod is restricted within either a qualitative or a quantitative design” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2010). Alternatively, the mixed method combines both quantitative and qualitative researches.

Mix method is the most appropriate strategy to answer the research question. Indeed, qualitative research is essential to analysis consumers' behaviour however; it restricts the
research to a small sample limiting results. In order to get a better representation of the population and statistics, quantitative survey is required too. Combining the strength of different methods, it provides richer data to better answer the question and build a theory.

More specifically, a sequential explanatory method was selected, which mean that qualitative results assist in explaining and interpreting quantitative findings.

Then, to facilitate the validation of data through cross verification, the researcher used triangulation. It ensures the reliability and coherence of the research through a single and holistic approach, allowing the researcher to capture all the details of the sample.

3.6 Time Horizon

Saunders et al (2012) differentiate cross-sectional studies and longitudinal studies. Cross-sectional studies are conducted only once and reveal a « snapshot of one point in time ». By contrast, longitudinal studies are « repeated over an extended period of time » (Blumberg, Cooper and Schindler, 2011, pp.490-495). Nevertheless, due to the limited time to complete the dissertation, a cross-sectional research was applied.

3.7 Data Collection

3.7.1 Secondary Data Collection

“Secondary researches are data collected by others, including both quantitative and qualitative data” (Maylor and Blackmon, 2003). It provides additional and different knowledge in a time and cost saving way.

Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2012, p. 307) classified secondary data in three main subgroups, which are documentary, survey-based and data compiled from multiple sources. Based on this classification, the researcher relied on four secondary data:

- Documentary: wine trade press, newspapers articles
- Continuous and regular surveys from organizations: Agrimer, Bourgogne, BIVB.
- Ad hoc surveys: academics'surveys, organizations'surveys: Vins et Société, Vigne et Vin
- Multiple sources:  
  - Snap shot: books, journals
  - Longitudinal: books, journals, government publications.
Multiple sources allow the researcher to explore and analyse deeply the subject as well as confront various sources to selected only reliable and relevant one. The majority of them come from Internet, hence, the researcher verified the reliability of each web sources used. To access to these data, the DBS Library, Google scholar and the book « *Strategie et marketing du vin* » (Yohan Castaing, ed Dunod, vol 1, 2013) served as the main sources.

### 3.7.2 Primary Quantitative Data Collection

The researcher used a self-completed and web-based questionnaire. Despite the low flexibility and low control on the data collection environment, it is cheap, allows quick answers and simplifies data analysis (Schutt, 2011, p. 176).

On the advices of Saunders et al (2012), the questionnaire was precisely defined and designed thanks to Monkey software.

Three types of data were collected:

- Attributes: respondents’ characteristics (part I of the questionnaire)
- Behavioural variables: participants and wine consumption, type of packaging bought (part II and III)
- Opinion variables: What participants feel and think about different packaging design (part IV)

After introducing the questionnaire and it purpose, filter questions were asked to ensure that respondents meet the research criteria. Then, four parts composed the questionnaire:

- Participants’ characteristics
- Wine purchases
- The packaging attributes
- The wine label aesthetic.

Questions were ordered to be logical and limited to avoid to loose participants. Each question was determined regarding data that needed to be collected to answer the research question. Hence, the researcher develops her own questions rather than adapted or adopted questions used in other questionnaires.

Different types of questions have been selected according to the purpose of each one. Closed questions were asked for simple and clear answers and rating questions for examining the importance of packaging cues. The majority of the questions were Likert scale. It aims to measure the intensity of consumers’ feelings and perception and thus, collect opinion data. Four points rating scale were suggested, preventing participants to be neutral.
Besides, before to be spread, the questionnaire was tested and readjusted until validation. For that, the researcher used the four stages of the constructing question model developed by Foddy (1994), presented below.

![Constructing question model diagram](image)

Figure 3: Constructing question model. Source: Foudy, 1994, cited in Saunders et al, 2009, p 372

Once approved, the questionnaire was sent by email the 14\textsuperscript{th} of October 2015, thanks to a list of students email addresses provided by the School. Then, it was sent again in October 28\textsuperscript{th}, through mail as well as Facebook. An example of the questionnaire translated in English is available appendix 4, p.112.

3.7.3 Primary Qualitative Data Collection

Primary qualitative data are “the non-numerical data or data that are not quantified” (Saunders et al, 2012). It aims to understand meanings, experiences, ideas, beliefs and values. (Wisker, 2001, p. 138)

Parts of the case studies strategy, the researcher conducted first primary observation in supermarket from October 20\textsuperscript{th} to October 23\textsuperscript{rd} on twelve students. It aims to analyse the wine purchase process of students in a natural environment to provide insights and information that people are unwilling or unable to give. (Kinnear and Taylor, 1996) It implies the observation, recording, analysis and interpretation of people’s behaviours.

Regarding the process, observation was non-intrusive, limiting the intervention of the researcher. It reduced the chance to skew participants and permits more spontaneity. More, observation was overt (for ethical reasons); participatory and direct. It explored the meanings that people attach to their actions in real-time.

Observation takes place in “Simply Supermarket” located one minute by walk from students school, facilitating the process.
To fulfil objectives and test the risk perceived influence on consumers’ choice, observation was split in two groups: six participants were in a low-risk perceived situation and six ones in a high-risk situation. Firstly, the researcher observed the wine buying process through a predefined observation grid (appendix 5, p.120). Then, to better understand participants’ choices, a short questionnaire of five questions was conducted (appendix 5, p.121).

Thereafter, the researcher conducted a face-to-face interview of four participants. It took place the 7th of November during one hour and a half at Iseg Lyon. It ensures in-depth investigation, intensive knowledge and insights (What, Why, How).

More specifically, the researcher conducted semi-structure interview, which combine predefined topics and free talks between interviewees. It aims to give a framework of what to talk about as well as approach subjects that are important to participants but which may be forgotten by the researcher.

During the first half hour, seven different packages from very design to very classical were presented to participants through a power point presentation. With predefined open questions that encourages interviewees to provide extensive and developmental answers (what, how, why), participants had to express their feeling and point of views regarding each packaging. It also allows an interaction and confrontation between students. For each packaging, the three following themes were approached:

1. Wine perceptions
2. Appreciation of corks and containing
3. Appreciation of labels design

The second part of the mini focus group was a workshop. It is an interactive collaboration of all participants to design the “ideal packaging”. It aims to put students into real life application and get insights by analysing students process and arguments. The purpose was to see if students tend to create a typical or atypical packaging, and investigate the information content selected.

To collect exhaustive data, the researcher take descriptive note and picture of what is happening and the experience was recorded through video camera. The researcher did not participate to avoid influence; she was only an external observatory.

Participants had forty minutes to design it and twenty minutes to explain their choice.

The process of the mini focus group is explained in detail in appendix 6, p.122
3.8 Data Analysis

This section aims to understand how qualitative and quantitative researches were analysed.

3.8.1 Quantitative data analysis

Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2012, p. 457) identified two types of quantitative data:

- Numerical data: Quantifiable, “whose values are measured numerically as quantities”.
- Categorical data: It included descriptive (nominal) data, grouped into sets without rank order; and ranked (ordinal) data, which have a definite order (McGivern, 2006, p. 457).

Regarding the purpose of the study, the researcher chooses ranked (ordinal) data, in accordance with Likert scale questions used. Descriptive data were also used to describe packaging perception (part III).

More, the researcher used Monkey software to treat and analyse data. Results are presented through tables to summarize answers; pie charts to show relative proportions and percentages of information as well as bar charts to compare data and point out differences. More, to compare data and examine interdependence between the variables, contingency table and cross-tabulation were used.

3.8.2 Qualitative data analysis

According to Saunders et al. (2009), there is no standardised procedure to analysing qualitative data, however, authors identified three main types of processes, which are:

- Summarising: condensation of meanings
- Categorisation: grouping of meanings
- Structuring: ordering of meanings using narrative

Through observation and interview, the researcher firstly produced a summary of the key points that emerge from the research thanks to audio-recorded and transcription. It provides briefer statements of what has been said and observed. To be the closer of what has been said, the researcher rephrased objectively using actual words.

Then, the researcher categorized data, developing categories and attaching meaningful data. It allows the researcher to develop and test proposition as well as draw conclusions.
3.9 Population and Sample

3.9.1 Quantitative research
The population is the students in Business Master degree, representing 77 205 students in 233 schools (element). More specifically, the researcher focuses on people ageing between 20 and 28 studying in Lyon (extent), in particular at ISEG School during 2015/2016 school year (sampling unit). A limit date has been fix to give time to the researcher to analyse data, October 14th to the November 8th (time).

The school provided an email list of all students that allows the researcher to identify the target population (sampling frame).

Regarding the sampling techniques, Saunders et al. (2012) distinguish two sampling techniques:
- Probability or representative sampling
- Non-probability or judgmental sampling

The researcher used probability sampling, more specifically, cluster sampling. Indeed, as it was unrealistic to send the questionnaire to the whole population, the researcher divided the population into discrete groups prior to sampling that were the different business schools (233 clusters). Then, she selected a school, ISEG Lyon.

In order to determine the sampling size, the researcher worked to a 5% margin of error and 95% confident level. Thus, with a population of 77 205, the required sample size is 383. Hence, the researcher selected 7 classes at ISEG Lyon, representing 402 students (sampling unit), proving 19 substitutes.

Despite reminder to boost students to participate, an overall number of 148 students participated to the survey. More, due to some incomplete questionnaires and lack of seriousness, only 120 were exploitable. Thus, the survey reaches a respond rate of 38,6%, however 120 questionnaires were acceptable to provide relevant quantitative data.
3.9.2 Qualitative research

For observation, the researcher selected 12 students from quantitative survey, based on volunteering. For interview, she selected 4 students from observation sample based on volunteering too.

Based on researcher judgement, limited time and volunteering, the researcher used a convenience sampling, part of a non-probabilistic technique.

3.10 Ethical Issues

According to Blumberg, Cooper and Schindler (2008, p. 92) ethical issues may occur in all the research process. Thus, a universalism stance on ethics was adopted.

Firstly, literature studied is referenced appropriately.

Then, the researcher demonstrated integrity and objectivity at all different research stages. Qualitative research was based on voluntary and participants can withdraw at any stage. To respect the privacy and confidentiality of participants, information was used responsibly and results are anonymous. Identity was not revealed and participants were aware that words can be quoted in the report.

The same instructions was read to all interviewees prior to commencement and legal mention regarding health and wine regulation was mentioned to not compel to consumption. Then, videos were strictly used for the research and interviewees signed a release giving their authorizations to be recorded.

More, due to little control over respondent’s ethical behaviour, an element of trust and assumption exists regarding answers.

Finally, ethical issues can come from the interpretation of data due to answers take out of context, non authenticity due to a non understanding and the translation in another language. For that a debrief after qualitative research was made with participants and data analysis was send to them upstream.
3.11 Limitations to the Research

Firstly, due to the bad perception of alcohol, participants could run out of honesty. So, research is presented as focus on packaging, without judging alcohol consumption.

Then, one of the main limits is the restricted financial budget to conduct researches. Nevertheless, thanks to Iseg Lyon, network and choices made, the cost was lower than expected (appendix 2, p.111).

More, due to limited time, it was not possible to conduct research on a long period of time and on a bigger sample as wanted. Indeed, sample is limited to one school in one city that can limit conclusion.

Besides, research needed to be translated with accuracy from French to English.

Concerning the research conducted, the researcher needed to deal with students schedule and her job located one hour to Lyon. Furthermore, the lack of experience regarding qualitative resources and psychology knowledge may impact data analysis.

In addition, to analyse the correlation between quality perceived and packaging, a testing experience was planned. Nevertheless, legal issue prevent to conduct this experience. However, as a replacement, a mini focus group was conducted.

To finish, due to restricted words count, some idea could not be deepened.
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Quantitative findings

4.1.1 Interviewee’s characteristics

Figure 4: Interviewees’ characteristics and wine interest
220 students at ISEG Lyon, ageing between 20 and 28, compose the sample. Regarding wine knowledge, 66% declared to be novice, 30% are interested but no one think to be an expert, confirming that younger consumers are not experienced and had poor wine knowledge. However, 94% are interested in wine, showing a good interest for it.

4.1.2 Students' wine purchases

49% of participants spend between €3 and €6 per bottle, 27% spend between €6 and €9; and 13% spend between €9 and €15. Taking into account their low buying power, expenses are quite high.

Regarding the consumption, 65% consume wine once or twice per month and only 15% consume wine more frequently, confirming the tendency for occasional consumption.
Correlating consumption frequency with expenses, the graphic below shows that more the consumption is occasional and more the average spending is high. Hence, there is a clear willingness to drink less but better.

![Figure 6: Wine consumption frequency](image)

Regarding the distribution used, 92% of students buy wine in supermarket, proving the importance to focus on this channel.

![Figure 7: Distribution channel used](image)
Finally, the risk perceived by students when buying wine in supermarket was analysed:

As the graphic below highlights, participants experienced high risks when buying wine in supermarket. 95% are not sure about the quality, 91% are afraid to be disappointed, 91% find it hard to select and 77% do not want to disappoint others. Thus, risks are mainly functional and social. Findings also confirm the difficulties encounters by students to select the appropriate wine in supermarket. Nevertheless, unlike other findings, health issue does not concern participants.

More, it also confirms the correlation found previously between poor wine knowledge and high risk perceived.
Regarding the risk perceived according to the wine knowledge, the graphic below illustrates that all remain highly concerned by the quality. However, results show that novices are more concerned regarding the value for money while lover are more concerned to disappoint others. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that wine interested and lovers were under-represented due to their small numbers, so it could be interesting to verify this finding through bigger and equal samples for each knowledge category.

Furthermore, results demonstrate that the risk perceived tend to decrease when purchase frequency increased, especially when the purchase frequency is higher than three times per month, except for the fear to disappoint other.
So, the high-risk perceived is associated with a lack of experience and the poor knowledge. Indeed, people who buy wine frequently or have some knowledge are more familiar with the purchase context and with products. So the risk should decrease with experience.

### 4.1.3 The packaging influences

To determine what influences students, the researcher used the tenth attributes identified as the most important by Celhay (2012).

With Likert scale, participants rated each attributes per degree of importance:

![Figure 11: Packaging cues importance](image)

Thanks to results, the researcher set up a ranking that order the elements per importance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Important for 99%, (very important for 93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>Important for 95%, (very important for 87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Awards &amp; distinctions</td>
<td>Important for 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Food pairings</td>
<td>Important for 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grape variety</td>
<td>Important for 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vintage</td>
<td>Important for 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Important for 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Producers information</td>
<td>Important for 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brand Name</td>
<td>Important for 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The 10th most important cues per degree of importance
Findings confirm that price and packaging are the most influencing cues (Sawyer 2006; Curlewis, 2011; Barber and Almanza, 2006). More, it also highlights the undisputable importance of awards and food pairing, currently under-utilised by wineries. However, brand name and producers’ information appeared to be of little significance.

Then, the researcher analysed containing and cork preference, often forgotten by authors. Results were almost unanimous with 91% preferring glass bottle and 96% preferring cork, showing a clear preference for typical cues.

![Figure 12: Containing and cork preferences](image)
4.1.4 The label design preferences

To investigate label preferences and test the theory of preference to the norm, three different labels were presented to participants, one typical, one moderate and one atypical.

4.1.4.1 Typical moderate label

The first label was the typical moderate one. More considered as classic (for 65%) than modern (19%), 84.7% aesthetically like the label and 88.7% would be willing to buy it.

Figure 13: Aesthetic preference and willingness to buy correlation
Regarding the quality, 89.5% associated this label with good quality. Thus, there is a correlation between aesthetic preference, quality perceived and willingness to buy.

![Figure 14: Quality perceived associated with typical moderate label](image)

**4.1.4.2 Classical label**

Considered as classical by 100% of respondents, only 24% aesthetically like the label. However, 54.5% would be willing to buy it. So, by contrast to the first label, there is no correlation between aesthetic preference and willingness to buy. Hence, findings do not confirm the linear and positive relationship between aesthetic appreciation and typicality perceived defended by Celhay (2010).
Regarding the quality, 85% associated this label with good quality. So as the label is little appreciated aesthetically, the quality perceived is driven the willingness to buy. Indeed, results show that some participants would buy this label even if they do not like the design.
4.1.4.3 Modern label

Considered as modern by 98.6%, only 26% likes the label, 16% would be willing to buy it and 26.37% perceived a good quality. The low attractiveness of the label from a young population is surprising. Indeed, the label design was inspired from a chocolate box that was successful and aesthetically appreciated by young people, however, as a wine packaging, it is not appreciated.

Figure 17: Aesthetic preference and willingness to buy correlation
To conclude, modern label presented the most disappointing results in every way, contradicting authors arguing that students prefer modern labels. However it confirms that the willingness to buy is also driven by the quality perceived.

Thereafter, to better understand and compare the influence of typicality, atypicality and moderate ones, the researcher correlated the authenticity perceived, willingness to buy, quality perceived and aesthetic preference of the three labels:

The graphic below points out that in fact, the willingness to buy depends on both quality perceived and aesthetic preference, explaining the preference for the moderate label.
Then, quality is only associated with more classical label, however compared to previous findings; higher quality is not necessarily associated with the most classical label.

Regarding the aesthetic preference, the survey shows that both classical and modern labels were not appreciated. Students would be more attracted by moderate label that are aesthetically preferred and associated with good quality by almost all consumers. Thus, it confirms the research conducted by Gardner et al (2009) on the “authenticity moderate preference”.

Finally, if we take into account the high risk perceived by students and their preference for the moderate classical label, findings disprove the preference to the norm theory developed by Campbell and Goodstein (2001), whereby in high-risk situation, consumers select the most classical packaging.

Then, to better understand the influence of each design, the researcher correlated the willingness to buy them with the average price spend.

As the graphic demonstrates, higher is the price and more the willingness to buy typical label increase, even if there is a constant preference for moderate label. By contrast, the willingness to buy atypical packaging remains low for any price range, except for wines costing less than €3.00.

Thus, the tendency to privilege more classical packaging when the price become higher can be explained by a lower level of risk tolerance for expansive wines than cheapest ones.
Indeed, for cheap wines, students are more willing to try modern package, showing a greater tolerance.

Nonetheless, based on only three labels design and with poor explanations due to questionnaire format, conclusion cannot be draw at this stage, qualitative research will deepen the phenomenon.

4.1.4.6 Burgundy wines packaging expectations and quality perceived

Regarding Burgundy wines, 65% would like a modernization of current packaging, confirming that it does not tally with students’ expectations. However, paradoxically, 55% would not dare to buy atypical packaging, lest the wine is bad, confirming the preference for moderate typical packaging.
4.2 Qualitative findings

4.2.1 Findings of observation

4.2.1.1 Low risk perceived situation

4.2.1.1.1 Purchasing process

Five novices and one interested composed the sample. They spent in average 3.38 minutes to choose the bottle, and €6.3 per bottle.

Regarding the selection process, participants read in average five front labels, two students look at the back label and participants usually hesitated between two bottles took in their hands. For a low risk situation, the research noted that the risk perceived remains high due to the long time spent in the aisle and the strong hesitation, confirming quantitative findings. So, the researcher point out that the risk perceived is mainly associated with the poor wine knowledge rather than the purchase used.

4.2.2.1.2 Packaging selected

Regarding the packaging, all selected glass bottle and traditional cork, confirming quantitative findings. Wine label chosen are presented below.

Table 7: Label selected in low risk situation
Labels are very different however all tend to be moderate classical. Neither very classic nor very modern label was selected.

Excepting student 2 who tend to be more classical, all other chose very simple design. Colours are soft with a dominance of grey and brown shades, expect for student four who stand out from typical colours. More, expect student 2, labels do not used illustration. Regarding information content, labels tend to be simple and clear. The brand name is ensured on all label, as well as the grape variety, only one label (student 5) privileged the designation. Finally, four bottle chosen get awards.

### 4.2.2.1.3 Packaging influences to selecte a bottle.

After the observation process, few questions were asked to participants to better understand their choice. Four participants had difficulties to selected a bottle arguing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments given</th>
<th>Number of time quoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I did not know which want to choose</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>There is too much choice</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I do not know which one is good</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I do not use to buy this type wine</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: difficulties encountered

It confirms the high risk perceived and the lack of experience.

Then, participants had to explain why they chose this bottle. It was found that the price mainly drives the purchase, following by the quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments given</th>
<th>Number of time quoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The price was good</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The wine looks good</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>It gets reward</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I like the label</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>It inspires trust</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Reasons for choosing the bottle
If the packaging was not directly quoted unanimously, when asking, all participants declared that packaging influenced them. The table below summarizes the three most important cues ranked by importance by participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of times cited as the most important</th>
<th>The second most important cues</th>
<th>The third most important cues</th>
<th>Total times cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design of the packaging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape variety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images/pictures/drawings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine tastes/ description</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: “looks organic”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Cues per importance

Three main cues stand out from other. The design of the packaging appears as the most important cues, following by grape variety and awards. However, designation, brand name, Cuvee and origins are not quoted despite the fact that they are enhanced on the label chosen.

Besides, the fact that a product “looks organic” is also an interested proposition that should be deepened.

Thereafter, regarding the image convey by the packaging, all students perceived the bottle chosen as a good product and typical from Burgundy. Student 2 and 5 did not like the design chosen. However we can associate these designs with the most typical ones, confirming quantitative findings. More, student 6 perceived the bottle as cheap one, which may be associated with the poor information provided or the funny name used that can undermine the bottle.
All responses are sum up in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is a good product</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is an expensive one</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a cheap one</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is at your style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are afraid to be disappointed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are sure that it will taste good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unique</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is original</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is traditional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It typical from Burgundy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is reassuring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the design of the label</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Consumers’ perception of the bottle selected

4.2.2.2 High risk perceived situation

4.2.2.2.1 Purchasing process

Regarding wine knowledge, four are novices, one is interested and one is lover.

Participants spent in average 4.45 minutes to select a bottle, whose 1.17 minutes more than in low risk situation. They spent in average €13.5 whose more than the double spent in previous observation.

Regarding the selection process, participants were even more hesitating, they picked up in average three different bottles before choosing one, all students look at the back label and read in average three ones. They also hesitated eight times before to make their choice.

So, even if there is a high-risk perceived in low situation, it is clearly stronger in high-risk one, students are less confident and more demanding. So, the purchased used also have an impact on the risk perceived, increasing it.

Then, during the process, some unexpected behaviours took place. One participant called his father to ask him advices and another one went on Internet to find information. It ensures the lack of information available on site and the high pressure on students that do not want to make bad choice. More, it also highlights that students tend to use other risk reduction strategies (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2006) that they do not in low risk situation, especially price and recommendations from others.
4.2.2.2 Packaging selected

Regarding the packaging selected, once again, all bottles were glass one and corks were traditional one. Labels are presented below.

![Student 1](image1).  POMMARD 1er Cru.  Le Clos des Boscherettes.  Monopole  
![Student 2](image2).  POUILLY-FUISSE.  1er Cru.  Domaine Coste-Cauvin.  Monopole.  
![Student 3](image3).  Chablis.  Domaine Vacheron.  Monopole.  

![Student 4](image4).  L'ORIGINE.  Franciacorta.  DOCG.  Nino Cera di Nisa.  Le Monofilo.  Madia.  
![Student 5](image5).  POUILLY-FUISSE.  1er Cru.  Chateau de Verpiol.  
![Student 6](image6).  CHABLIS 1er Cru.  Domaine Vacheron.  

Table 12: Label selected in high-risk situation

The majority of the design chosen is rather classical than modern, expect student 4. Comparing choices made with the offer available, the research noted that no very classical label was selected despite that it represents the majority of the offer, confirming quantitative findings. All labels tend to be refined and more associated with moderate classical design (expect students 3 and 6, who are a bit more classical).

Then, comparing with low risk situation, labels are more homogeneous in term of appearance and slightly more classical. Serif letterpress is privileged as well as gold gildings, white and brown shades and light background (expect student 4). Imaginary of labels one and two refers to tradition and labels three and six refer to premium product (crown and shield). Then, compared to previous observation, brand name and grape variety are not enhanced in favour of designation.
4.2.2.2.3 Packaging influences to selected a bottle

All participants have difficulties to select the bottle despite their different levels of knowledge, arguing:

![Table 13: difficulties encountered](image)

It points out a higher social risk illustrated by the fear to disappoint others.

Then, when participants had to explain their choices, arguments given vary from previous observation:

![Table 14: Reasons for choosing the bottle](image)

The researcher noticed that information content is more important than in low risk situation. Compared to previous observation, quality price ratio is not impacting students who selected only expansive wines; the purchase is mainly driven by the quality search. More, half participants quoted designation while it was not in previous observation.
Regarding packaging influence, the three most important cues for each participant are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of time cited as the most important cue</th>
<th>As the second most important cues</th>
<th>As the third most important cue</th>
<th>Total times cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design of the packaging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation/ Appellation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letterpress</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label format</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: Label format</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Cues per importance

Two main cues appear as mainly influencing consumers: packaging design and designation. Thus, in high-risk perceived situation, consumers do not rely on grape variety but on designation. However, it can be explained by the fact that students choose renowned one that guarantee the quality.

More, gilding and letterpress, associated with classical packaging, were quoted while it was not previously.

In order to see if results vary in real situation regarding packaging cues importance, the researcher correlates findings from quantitative research with observation. Results are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance ranked in quantitative research</th>
<th>Importance ranked in qualitative research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>High-risk perceived</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd after the price</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance for 95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grape variety</strong></td>
<td>Not quoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for 76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designation</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Packaging cues importance in survey and observation correlation
From a global perspective, the most important cues highlighted in quantitative research were confirmed by observation. However, questionnaire revealed a high importance of suggested food pairings and vintage (4th and 6th position) while it was not mentioned during observation. Food pairing divergence can be explained by the fact that the majority of the French offer does not provide food pairings information, and thus was not available during observation. However vintage issue will be deepen during interview.

Then, the importance of designation is controversial.

To finish, regarding the perception of the product selected in high-risk situation, all participants associated it with a good product and typical from Burgundy as previous observation. It highlights the importance to buy a product that reflects wine origins. More, five of them associated the packaging chosen with a traditional one and four participants approved that it is reassuring. Finally, compared to previous observation price reflection is important, showing that in high-risk situation, the product has to reflect an expansive wine. All results are summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is a good product</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is an expensive one</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a cheap one</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is at your style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are afraid to be disappointed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are sure that it will taste good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is original</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is traditional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It typical from Burgundy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is reassuring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the design of the label</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Consumers’ perception of the bottle selected
To conclude, the better understand the main differences in high and low risk situation, the table below compared and summarized findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Low risk situation</th>
<th>High risk situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average time spent</td>
<td>3,38</td>
<td>4,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average money spent</td>
<td>€6,3</td>
<td>€13,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottles picked up</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels read</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back labels read</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottles picked up again</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going back</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Conclusion**
  - Quite long process
  - Entry-level wines
  - Long process
  - Premium wines
  - Very low self-confidence
  - Very demanding
  - More analytic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cork and bottle</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Classical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Moderate classical</td>
<td>Moderate classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more classical than low-risk situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Good price</th>
<th>Renowned designation</th>
<th>Quality perceived of the bottle “1er cru”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Packaging</th>
<th>Most important cues</th>
<th>Packaging Design</th>
<th>Packaging Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grape variety Award</td>
<td>Designation Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Differences when buying wine in supermarket in high and low risk situation
4.2.3 Interview findings

Firstly, the four participants had to express their feelings and point of views regarding seven visuals through three themes:

- Wine packaging and perceptions
- Appreciation of cork and bottle
- Label design

For each theme, the researcher gathered the relevant information and insights approached.

4.2.3.1 Part I: Packaging discussion

4.2.3.1.1 Perceptions through packaging visuals

To begin, for each visual, participants spontaneously say first: “I like” or “It looks good”, which mean that first impression are directly associated with aesthetic preference and quality perceived, confirming the importance of both influencers. However students would be more willing to buy a bottle “that looks good” rather than “a packaging they like”, showing the necessity for a bottle to firstly reflect a good quality. It also explains why the willingness to buy is not systematically correlated with the aesthetic preference.

Besides, according to participants, packaging should also reflects “the product and its know how”. When going in-depth, wine is perceived as the passage into adulthood, and refers to “a sophisticated product” that “symbolises pleasure and conviviality”. It is also directly associated with “French culture, tradition and gastronomy”. Thus, it can explain the low willingness to buy modern packaging find previously.

4.2.3.1.2 Appreciation of cork and bottle

All participants preferred unanimously glass bottle and classical cork. Other “are not adapted and reflect a bad quality”. “I cannot drink wine in another containing that glass bottle, I would feel like drink a “Coke”.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
More, participants explained that open a bottle “traditionally” is part of the experience of drinking wine. “Even if it is difficult, I like it”.

Then, the capsule was discussed. It can be a good communication support but students tend to not pay attention to it.

4.2.3.1.2 Label design

4.2.3.1.2.1 Modern label (2 - 3 - 6 pictures)

Very design labels were described as “attractive, eyes catching, fun and original”. Nevertheless, despite first enthusiasm, students explained “it is not adapted for wine and fits more with daily products or industrial ones”.

Bright colours (packaging 6) were criticized and associated with bad quality. When going in depth, colours have meaning and impact wine perception. For example, green is associated with organic products and flash green is associated with bitter flavours. By contrast gold and silver are directly associated with high quality.

More, images that differ from traditional ones as castle, cellar, oak wood, are not understood (picture 2 and 6). “Images used should reflect wine process or wine tastes”. “A lemon picture can be accepted, but I do not understand the purpose of using a fox”.

Regarding aesthetic preference, it was a controversial subject due to personal tastes. So, it is not because a packaging is modern that it will be systematically appreciated.

Then, previous research argued that humour attracts young consumers. However, according to participants “it makes the wine less serious” and negatively affects the quality (label 4).

Finally, modern packaging was more associated with new world wines and cheap bottle. “If I want to buy a premium wine, I will choose a French one and I would buy a packaging that reflect it, which will not be modern”.

4.2.3.1.2.2 The classical label (picture 3)

Classical label was qualified as “the most representative of French wineries”. Black serif letterpress, escutcheon and colours used are elements associated with a high quality according to participants, reflecting “know-how” and “tradition”. Previous researches found that it refers to “the nobility” and “history” explaining why it is associated with high quality. This design is also “the most common”, which reassures consumers.

However, students argued that label is overloaded “I do not know what to look at first”.
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Participants also described it as “stuffy”, “ordinary”, “old fashion”, “pretentious” and “bland”. Only one student likes it and all claimed that it must be modernized.

Thus, it is interesting to see that visual aspect can convey positive associations as tradition and quality and in the same time negative associations as old fashioned. It also confirms quantitative findings.

However comparing with modern label, they would be more willing to buy the classical packaging for a premium wine because “the quality looks high”.

4.2.3.1.2.3 Moderate label. (Picture 1 and 7)

They were described as “not very eye catching”, “ordinary” and “simple”. However the simplicity of the design has the advantage to provide “clear”, “efficient” and “trustable” labels that were highly appreciated by participants. More, the researcher noted that simple label were the less criticized in term of design and aesthetic. Simpler is the label and more numerous are participants who aesthetically like it.

Participants also explained that “it respect wine codes” and reflect “good quality”.

These labels are the most attractive for students; however, “design can be improved to be more attractive”. Thus, it confirms previous findings and arguments defended by the “moderate typicality effect theory.

4.2.3.2 Part II: Workshop to create the perfect label

In the second part, students had to create their own “perfect label of premium Burgundy wine” among several choices, available in appendix 6, p.123. See below the results.
4.2.3.2.1 Choice of cork and containing

The bottle chosen was a classic 0.75L glass bottle with dark coloured and “Bourguignone” shape.

Glass containing was obvious for a premium wine and students added that Bourguignone shape “allows them to immediately recognize product origin”. Then the dark colour “reflects a higher quality as heavy bottle”.

Regarding the capacity, students mentioned that a smaller container as 10cl or 20cl would be privileged. The format is sometimes a barrier of consumption due to limited shelf life and restricted quantity when driving. Thus, participants suggested developing 10 cl bottle, sold individually or by “six-pack”.

The cork chosen was the traditional one and the capsule was the grey one but it was more a choice by elimination than conviction.

4.2.3.2.2 Label design

Label created was reproduced on computer, translated in English and then validated by all participants to ensure the conformity with their work.

4.2.3.2.2.1 Design of the front label

A white and qualitative paper was selected. The typography used is a mix between serif and sans serif and colours were gold, brown and black.

Serif letterpress is associated with “traditional and luxury product” while sans serif is more “modern and readable”. Colours chosen were “noble ones” and “fit with wine codes”. However, no image was selected due to lack of time and disagreement between participants.
The information is centred in the middle of the label and structure very clearly, ensuring grape variety.

The design created is a moderate classical one, which aims to be simple, in accordance with wine codes and reflecting a good quality.

### 4.2.3.2.2 Information content of the front label

Among the different choice, students selected the following information:

- Brand Name
- Reward
- Grape variety
- Designation

Their justifications are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Argument given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Name</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Placed in top centre, in big. “Everybody who is proud of its product signs it”. It gives trustworthiness and reliability to the product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is also useful in case consumers want to find it again or recommend the product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Guarantee of quality, it is reassuring on the quality. “It is one of the most important cues”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>However, participants would more rely on professional awards or medals than the “supermarket selection”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape variety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Placed in the centre of the label, in big, serif and gold letterpress. There is only few grape varieties compared to hundreds of designation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>thus it is easier to understand. It also allows consumers to familiarise themselves with the different grape variety and learn to distinguish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what they like or dislike. “It is part of the learning process”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Under the designation, smaller character than grape variety, sans serif type and brown letterpress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Even if they usually do not pay attention to it because they do not have enough experience to dissociated two designations of one grape variety;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it could be a selling argument when the designation is renowned or for experts. Very common, it is also more specific and aims to recognize the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuvee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>It is only interesting when it provides an added value or a description regarding the wine as “Premium”, “old vines”. By contrast, imaginary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuvee’s name is pointless.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Packaging cues on the front label and justification
Research confirms observation findings but highlights the importance of brand name, which was not ensures by neither quantitative research nor observation.

4.2.3.2.3 Back label information

Due to limited time, students do not work on the design focusing on information content. They selected:

- Grape variety
- Vintage
- Brand Name
- Food pairing
- Wine tastes
- Advises to serve
- Shelf life
- Contact of producer
The researcher noted that information aims to be very simple and descriptive of the wine and its consumption. Students are not looking for technical information, evaluated as too complex.

Finally, students explained that the label design is too simple and can be improved. However, the information content has been discussed deeply and the overall of the bottle meet their expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cue</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Argument given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grape variety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Used again, It aims to gather all key information in a single look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food pairings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>More associated with new world wines and poorly used by French producer, it is useful information that can influence buying purchase. It help consumers to find the best wine that tally with the occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine tastes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very helpful, it reassures consumers on the intrinsic quality of the product, allowing them to select a bottle according to own tastes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It is not a key information for students, it become important only when it is an old vintage. However, “it can be useful for experts or people who want to keep it”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: shelf life and advices to serve</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not suggested by the researcher, participants explained that it is interesting and allows them to improve wine knowledge and optimize the wine tasting experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producers’ contact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“In case consumers want to directly ordered wine”. Email rather than postal address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer information</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Even if it was identified as important by previous researches, participants argued, “they never read it and it more or less the same on every bottle”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Packaging cues on the back label and justification
5.1 To analyse students’ relationship with wine especially premium Burgundy wine.

The majority of 20-28 students are novices and had poor wine experiences, confirming previous research (Atkin, 2012).

They consume wine occasionally with a frequency of once or twice per month in average. However, 49% spend between €3 and €6 per bottle, and 40% spend more. Comparing with baby-boomers, they spent as much money as them despite their low buying purchase.

Then, more occasional is the consumption and more students spend money per bottle, which also varies according to wine used.

Students also show a growing interested for wine with 94% of interviewees that are interested in and eager to learn more about. Thus, it confirms previous findings and point out millennial potential and willingness to drink less but better quality (Onivins, 2015).

Besides, they perceive wine as “a sophisticated product” that allow drinkers to affirm a social status. More, it is also associated with pleasure and conviviality, explaining the more occasional consumption. By contrast to older generation, wine is not perceived as a daily drink.

Regarding Burgundy wines, it is associated with “good quality and renowned products”. However, they also perceived this offer as very traditional and old fashion, with 65% who would like a modernization. The researcher also noted a clear lack of knowledge especially regarding the different designations. However, Burgundy wines are directly associated with Chardonnay and the majority heard about the most renowned designations when asking (aided awareness but not spontaneous).
5.2 To analyse the purchasing process of Burgundy premium wines in supermarket and evaluate the role of packaging.

5.2.1 Students purchase process in supermarket

Firstly, students easily found Burgundy wines in the aisle. However, facing the offer, select a bottle start to become complex for 10 out of 12 participants. Indeed, they spend in average four minutes to choose a bottle, which is almost three times more than previous findings conducted on all consumers (SymphonyIRI, 2012). It is explained by the abundance of references that is complicated to differentiate for novices as well as the lack of information and help on site. The organization of the Burgundy offer is not clear and products are perceived as very similar to each other.

Nonetheless, despite the uncomfortable situation they are facing, 92% of students buy wine in supermarket. It is explained by the fact that students never anticipate wine purchases; they buy wine in small quantity for a specific occasion and immediate consumption so they go to the most convenient place, which is supermarket. One of the consequences is that they more or less know what they want and have a budget for. The purchase is planned and cannot be compulsive as in other distribution channel. However, they are also in a hurry and do not take enough time to analyse the entire offer.

5.2.2 The influence of packaging

In accordance with Bloch, Brunel and Arnold (2003) findings, packaging is the only way to differentiate two products with similar price for novices. Indeed, all participants without exception used packaging to make their decision. So as Olsen et al (2003) stated, “consumers shop with their eyes”.

Packaging is a direct reflection of the wine and its quality, and thus influences the intrinsic cues of the wine.

More, regarding the roles of the packaging presented in the literature review, the research particularly highlights how packaging facilitates purchases through product recognition and information provided. By contrast to previous findings (Pantin, 2015) consumers perceived typical codes and use it to facilitate products recognition, especially wine origins. It was even identified as the major role of the packaging. So, contrary to previous researches, packaging purpose is not firstly to make the difference.
Then, the research confirms the crucial role to inform consumers. In accordance with Draskovic (2011), label information is described as the only source of information available and acts as an aid to the purchase decision.

According to findings, the research set up a hierarchy of the role of the packaging according to students’ importance.

![Figure 23: Packaging roles](image)

5.3 To compare the purchasing process and packaging preferences in high and low risk perceived situation.

5.3.1 The buying process in high and low risk situation
Firstly, the researcher noted that whatever the situation, there is indisputably a high-risk perceived by students when buying wine, especially functional (taste and quality). It is explained by the lack of experience. Indeed, research shows that more consumers used to buy wine and more the risk perceived decreased.

Regarding students behaviours, they were more hesitating, anxious and less confident in high-risk situation, spending 1.08 minutes more. Indeed, students observed with greater care the offer in high-risk situation. For example, all students systematically look at the back labels while they do not in low one; they also hesitate between more products and read more labels, showing that they are more demanding when the risk is high. Then, research points out that in high-risk situation, the fear to disappoint others appears as very important, and it is even more the case for the most experienced consumers.
Thereafter, the most striking finding is the difference of prices. Participants spend in average €13,50 in high-risk situation and only €6,3 in low one. Thus, the research highlights that higher is the risk and more students will select premium wines. So, among the six risk reduction strategies presented by Spawton (1991), to cope with high ones, students firstly rely on price to assess the quality.

Furthermore, in high-risk situation, some participants used external sources of information as recommendations from more experienced peer or through Internet reviews, confirming Schiffman and Kanuk (2006) findings. So to cope with higher risks, students tend to set up several risk reduction strategies rather than one.

5.3.2 The packaging preference in high and low risk perceived situation

In both situations, packaging is used to lower the risk and reassure students on the quality.

In high and low risk situations, classical cork and bottle were chosen. Regarding the label, despite the risk perceived, refined and sober designs were preferred; neither very classical nor modern packaging was selected. So, by contrast to previous researches (Campbell et Goodstein, 2001; Leder et Carbon, 2005; Celhay and Trinquecoste, 2008), in high-risk situation, buy classical label is not an heuristic choice.

However, the researcher noted that more homogeneous packaging were selected in high-risk situation. In addition, colours, letterpress and imaginary of label chosen tend to be more typical from Burgundy wines than in low-risk situation. So, there is a tendency to slightly buy more classical packaging for a business dinner than for a daily drink with a friend, confirming Webster theory (2010). Higher is the risk and lower is the opportunity for a modern packaging to be chosen. Nevertheless, this theory should be softened due to the tendency to selected moderate packaging in both situations.

In order to explain why more classical labels were selected in high-risk situation, the researcher correlated it with aesthetic preference. It has been found that in high-risk situation, only one participant likes the design chosen, against four in low one. Hence, it confirms previous findings showing that higher is the risk and less aesthetic preferences have an impact (Campbell and Goodstein, 2001). So, the researcher concludes that in high-risk situation, the level of risk tolerance is lower and the purchase intention is more driven by the quality search.

Nonetheless, the hypothesis whereby very classical packaging is systematically chosen in high-risk situations (preference to the norm theory) is questionable. The theory should take into account the moderated role of the design.
Then, the researcher found that information expected is similar in both situations. However, in high-risk situation, designation appears as important while it is the grape variety in low one. Looking in details, the researcher noted that designation is influencing students only if it is renowned ones. If not, students tend to rely on grape variety. So, compared to previous findings, the risk perceived to do not have an impact on information expected.

To conclude, the researcher noted that the risk perceived do not really impact packaging preference. By contrast to previous findings, they do not select the most classical packaging when the risk is high. Packaging preferences slightly vary but expectations remains the same in both situations. However, to cope with high-risk, consumers set up several risk reduction strategies. Students firstly select expansive wine and also may ask for recommendations.

5.4 To measure and compare the impact of typical, moderated typical and atypical packaging on purchase decisions as well as quality perceived.

5.4.1 Atypical packaging

Firstly, unlike other countries, packaging does not have to be modern to attract younger consumers. Even if modern packages are described as “attractive, eyes catching, fun and original”, students argued that it is “not adapted for wine”. According to them, wine packaging should reflect the tradition and the French know-how, which are reassuring codes, especially for novices. Indeed, students have some difficulties to trust and rely on modern packaging. More atypical is the packaging and lower is the quality perceived, confirming research conducted by Celhay (2008, 2012). Indeed, 73.63% of respondents associated modern labels with bad quality and more than 95% only buy traditional bottle and cork. In addition, only 16% would be willing to be modern label.

Paradoxically, modern labels are desirable for 69% of respondents. So, it is not because a packaging is appreciated that it will be chosen. There is a purchasing reluctance to buy modern packages that are explained by the low quality image reflected as well as values that do not fit with wine product.

To finish, students also connect modern packaging with new world wines that are associated with a lower quality then French ones. Even if their reasoning is not true, the research shows that when students buy French wines they are also looking for a packaging that reflects it and cannot be confused with foreign wines.
Nonetheless, findings demonstrate that lower is the price and higher is the willingness to try modern packaging. It is explained by a higher tolerance and lower requirement regarding the quality of cheap bottle. However, it does not fit with premium wines.

5.4.2 Typical packaging

Typical packaging was defined as the most representative of the French offer. In effect, the majority of French wineries, especially premium wines tend to use very classical package, resulting in a visual uniformity.

More, 89.5% of respondents associated typical label with high quality. Indeed, among the cues identified by students as reflecting high quality, all described a typical packaging except awards. The cues are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Meanings and associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gliding</td>
<td>Gold, hot foil</td>
<td>Luxury and handmade product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Castle, vine, cellar, hand</td>
<td>Traditional, old wineries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letterpress</td>
<td>Serif, italic, calligraphy</td>
<td>Fine writing is associated with delicate tastes and refined products. Bigger writing express product strong character. Handwriting style refers to meticulous work and thus artisanal product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Supermarket selection,</td>
<td>Quality guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional competition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Used since the dawn of time, only wine products used glass containing which allow direct recognition. Part of custom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>Traditional cork</td>
<td>As bottle containing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Packaging cues associated with high

However, the research found that accumulated several cues that reflect high quality can have an opposite effect. Indeed, qualitative research demonstrated that when more than three of these cues are on the label, the attractiveness decreased and label is qualified as “pretentious” which undermine the wine. This also explained why the most classical labels were not associated with the higher quality perceived in quantitative research.

In addition, despite the good quality associated with classical packages, the research highlights that it is the less attractive packaging, with only 24% who aesthetically like the label. It was also defined as “stuffy”, “ordinary”, “old fashion”, “bland”, “undesired”. Thus, the linear and positive relationship between typicality perceived and aesthetic preference as previous researchers defended is not verified.
More, only 54.4% of students would be willing to buy the classic label. Thus, the hypothesis whereby the most typical packaging is an heuristic choice and will be systematically choose is counterbalanced too.

Classical labels do not meet students’ expectations in terms of design. So even if it reflects a high quality image they will not be selected due to its lack of attractiveness. However, facing the visual uniformity of the French offer that tends to be very classical and complicate to understand, students tend to privileged refined design.

### 5.4.3 Moderate typical design

So far, it has been found that neither classical nor modern packaging attract younger consumers. Nevertheless, the researcher also tests the moderate typical packaging effect, often neglected by authors.

Based on Gardner et al (2009) hypothesis, “a moderate degree of authenticity should be strongly preferred over authenticity stimuli”.

Mixing classical and modern cues, moderate classical labels are defined as “simple, refined, trustable and efficient”. More, simpler is the label and more numerous are participants who aesthetically like it. The main advantage of this design is that it allows refined and clear label that respect wines codes and do not affect the quality.

Thus, it scored the most satisfactory results and appeared as the design that tallies the most with students’ expectations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality perceived</th>
<th>Aesthetic preference</th>
<th>Willingness to buy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score: 89.5%</td>
<td>Score: 64.7%</td>
<td>Score: 88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4.4 points than typical</td>
<td>+67.7 points than typical</td>
<td>+34.2 points than typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+63.16 points than modern</td>
<td>+15.7 points than modern</td>
<td>+72.8 points than modern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Moderate typical packaging scores compared to typical and modern ones

Hence, the researcher concludes that the willingness to buy is driven by both quality perceived and aesthetic preference. It explains disagreement between authors who either focus on aesthetic preference or quality perceived. Authors focusing on aesthetic tend to defend the importance of modern packaging while authors who focus on quality search defended classical packaging. However, the purchase intention depends on both quality perceived and attractive design. Indeed, students are just starting to learn about wine and so far, wine was always presented in the same way. Thus, traditional cues act as a reference
point, allowing younger drinkers to recognize the product and assess the quality. However, they must be moderate to be aesthetically appreciated.

After exploring the different designs, the researcher will present in details the key packaging attributes that influence positively students. Indeed moderate typical packaging is a wide and vague concept. To evaluate the degree of typicality and atypicality accepted by students, each cue has been explored in details.

5.5 To identify the key packaging attributes that influence positively students’ buying decision in order to marketed more efficiently premium Burgundy wines in supermarket.

For that, the researcher used the packaging definition of Collesei and Ravà (2004), described as the most complete one.

5.5.1 Containing

5.6.1.1 Shape


Never explored before, the researcher tested the bottle shape influence and found that it allows students to easily recognize the wine origins. “Burgundy wine should be systematically presented with its bottle shape, if not it will create confusion”. Thus, the traditional shape reassures consumers regarding the wine origins and must be respected.
5.5.1.2 Size

Around 80% of the offer in supermarket is presented in 0,75cl format. The rest concerned 3L and 5L BIB as well as few 0,50 cl, representing less than ten references. Nevertheless, research show that current format is not very adapted to young consumers. Indeed, the wine conservation is limited to few days only and its consumption is limited to 10cl when driving. Hence, to avoid waste, other drinks as beer whose format is more adapted can be privileged to wine. Thus, participants suggested developing 10cl or 20cl containing, sold individually or by “six-pack”. It respects the authorised dose of alcohol when driving and allows consumers to avoid waste, encouraging more the wine consumption. However, the researcher noted that the concept of wine in cans recently launched in France failed due to its bad quality image. Thus the containing should respect glass bottle even for small quantity.

5.5.1.3 Colour

During interview, it has been found that the colour of the glass bottle also has an influence on consumers. Indeed, associated to plastic, transparent bottle reflect a bad quality. By contrast dark colour was associated with the highest quality and must be privileged by producers.

5.5.1.4 Material

Students preferred unanimously glass bottle in any context. More practical or ecological solutions as plastic, aluminium were rejected, despite their convenience. In addition, heavier is the bottle, higher is the quality perceived.

5.5.2 Cork

5.5.2.1 Material

Traditional cork is privileged to any other one. Despite its practicality, the new trend of screw cap do not seduced younger consumers as some authors claimed (Heilbrunn, 2008; Puig, 2012). It is associated with “bad quality” and “soft drink” so “not adapted for wine”. More, students argued that open a bottle with a corkscrew is sought and appreciated by consumers. “It is part of the experience of drinking wine”.

5.5.2.2 Design

As part of the packaging, the capsule was often forgotten by previous researches. When discussed during qualitative researches, students explained that they usually do not pay attention to it. Personalised capsule with producer’s information on it was not noticed. More, no one thinks about keep the capsule to have producer contact, arguing, “it is easier to
take a picture". Thus, the capsule does not have an influence on consumers. To be impacting all information should be gathered on the label only.

So, regarding bottle and cork, research found that there is an attachment to traditional cues that allows participants to facilitate product recognition and reassure them.

5.5.3 Label

5.5.3.1 Shape (format and design)
Through the research, rectangular and square formats were privileged, however no shape appears as very impacting students.

Regarding the format, as students expect a lot of information and refined label in the same time, front and back format is recommended.

Then, information must be structure and centred to be clear and readable.

5.5.3.2 Colour
Previous research found that colours have a big impact on younger consumers' purchases. Some authors argued that bright and flashy colours are relevant to catch consumers’ attention. However, it has been found that students highly prefer label using only one or two colours that are natural rather than bright.

Beige and brown shades were mainly selected during qualitative research. It was associated with “authenticity, nature, ground”, which tally with wine. Generally, warm colours are appreciated, as well as gold or silver, which refer to luxury product and high quality. By contrast, participants argued that aggressive colours and multi colours labels are not adapted for wine. They associated it with bad quality wines.

Colours are key to attract consumers, however producers should inquire about the different meaning of colours. For example, red and purple are associated with red wine only, blue and silver referred to the cold and thus sparkling wine and pink is for Rosé. Shade of colour also have meaning and should be analysed before to be used. For example, bright green or yellow are associated with bitter taste.

5.5.3.3 Graphic Application
Regarding the graphic application that gathers images, drawings and pictures it has to be used with moderation in order to maintain a refined design. Pictures, houses and black and white drawing of castles, mainly use by French wineries are associated with “old fashion” and
should be avoid. More, qualitative research found that imaginary is not necessary; it is useful only if it reflects a characteristic of the wine.

5.5.3.4 Letterpress

Research shows that letterpress reflects the type of wine. Indeed, strong wine should privileged big letterpress while delicate wine should privileged fine letterpress. More, for clear information, sans serif letterpress should be privileged.

5.6 To determine the information content expected by students

Students described current French labels as “overloaded and not clear”, confirming Chaney findings (2000). Too much information do not influence students but tend loose them. More, due to limited time when buying wine in supermarket, they do not analyse deeply all the information provided, thus very clear and key information have to be presented.

For that, it is essential to have front and back labels, which is not common especially for premium wines. Front label should provide the most important information, arranged in order of importance. Thus, key information has to be centred, in big and readable letterpress. The front label also has to arouse the curiosity of the consumers to encourage them to look at the back label, which is not systematic for consumers. The back label aims to provide and gather all information expected, which must be descriptive of the product characteristics and style as well as help consumers to be more familiar with the product. Thus, wine tastes and food pairings are very important information but rarely used in France. Conversely, technical information is not understood and thus not relevant.

Then, research show that even if students are not able to differentiate two designations, renowned ones are a quality guarantee that influence positively students. However, when the designation is not renowned, students will rely on the grape variety, often neglected by French producers. Fewer, it is easier for novices to differentiate and also allows them to be more familiar with the different type of wines.

More, among the large variety of distinctions, it has been found that students more rely on professional competitions than supermarket selections.

Finally, findings also highlight that legislation must review the legal mention system, which tend to overload the label with pointless information for consumers, especially bottling contact and address.
To conclude, the most important information and its location have been classified and are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Rank by importance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grape variety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Front label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Name</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Front and back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Front label for renowned one and back for non-renowned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For renowned one especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards/Medals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Front label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine tastes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Back label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food pairing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Back label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advices to serve the wine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Back label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Back label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Back label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuvee's name</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Front label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only if descriptive of the wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Back label</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Label information content
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 Conclusion

Facing heterogeneous findings from different authors and the necessity for wine producers to review the way they market their offer, the purpose of the dissertation was to explore “how premium white Burgundy wines packaging can capture 20-28 wine consumers without affecting the perceived quality of wine in supermarket?”

Firstly, the present research aimed to better understand the relationship between younger drinkers and premium Burgundy wines (objective one). Findings ensured the high potential of students for premium wines that can reassure producers for the long-term sustainability of the business. Indeed, even if the consumption is more occasional than older generations, wine expanses are high and students present a growing interest for this drink. Indeed, the majority of students want to become connoisseur.

In addition, compared to other alcoholic drinks, it is not the drink of parties, it is a sophisticated product that is drank with moderation and appreciated for its tastes. However, regarding Burgundy wines, there is a clear lack of knowledge especially regarding designations and their differences. It is explained by the abundance of Burgundy designations, which are more than one hundred with the special feature of being made from one vintage of 100% Chardonnay. Thus, despite the heterogeneity provide by climatse, grounds and “terroir”, it is hard to differentiate them for novices and required some experience. It also points out the lack of communication, especially from specialized organizations that only promote a designation without any explanation and do not target younger consumers.

More, despite the good quality associated, students point out the complexity as well as the lack of attractiveness of the offer, which is “visually uniform and old fashion”. Thus, students perceived the offer as not adapted for them and may privileged other wines.

Facing the complexity to attract younger consumers in France, the researcher analysed then the context of purchasing wines (objective two). Findings demonstrated that in supermarket, students are facing an uncomfortable and intimidating situation, confirming previous findings. Due to poor wine knowledge, they are totally lost facing the overabundant wine aisle, composed in average by thirty Burgundy references. Thus, they mainly rely on packaging,
which is the only communication vector in supermarket. Packaging is a strong selling argument and the first impression of the product; “containing is the image of the content”.

Previous researches determined four roles of the packaging but the majority of authors mainly highlight the importance to use packaging to make the difference in an ever more competitive world. Nevertheless, the research particularly underlines how packaging facilitates purchases through product recognition and information provided. Indeed, before to be visually innovative, packaging have to reassure consumers on the content, its origins and its quality.

In addition, previous researches argued that the packaging influence varies regarding the risk perceived by consumers, thus wine purchase in low and high-risk situation was tested (objective three). It has been found that the packaging preference slightly varies; however, there is a clear tendency to select moderate classical packaging in both situations. Nonetheless, to cope with high-risk, the research shows that novices implement various risk reduction strategies, especially the price one. Indeed, in high-risk situation, participants only chose premium bottles. So select the most classical packaging to reduce the risk (F. Cehlay, 2012, Lundardo, 2007) was not verified.

Besides, to better explore the theory of preference to the norm, which was a controversial issue, the researcher analysed the influence of typicality, moderate typicality and atypicality on purchase intention (objective four). The most advanced researches conducted so far (Celhay and Passebois, 2009, Lunardo, 2007 to quote few), found that due to poor wine knowledge and risk perceived, most classical is the packaging and more students would be willing to buy it. According to authors, classical packaging is associated with the highest quality, which reassures consumers and directly influences their choice.

The present research confirms that a need for reinsurance appears when students buy wine in supermarket. More, findings show that classical packaging increases consumers’ confidence and assesses the product quality, confirming the correlation found by previous authors between classical packaging and quality perceived. However, by contrast, the research demonstrates that the willingness to buy classical labels is very low. Perceived as “old fashion” and “overloaded”, it is the less attractive packaging, affecting the purchase intention. So, if the search for quality is a crucial factor influencing consumers when buying wine, the research founds that aesthetic preferences also drive the purchase intention. Looking in details, the researcher noted that previous researches mainly focused on quality search as the main driver of the purchase process, without considering the possible influence plays by aesthetic preferences. Hence, it explained the heterogeneity of findings.
Then, the researcher explored the impact of modern packaging, defined as “a successful strategy implemented by new producers wines countries”. Findings demonstrate that these packages are perceived as attractive and visually innovative. Nevertheless, students’ purchase intention for modern packaging is the lower. This design is too far from what students used to experience or what they learnt about wines, thus they do not recognize the product, which negatively affect the quality and the willingness to buy. Hence, it confirms the importance of both influencers.

In fact, compared to other countries, wine is a product embedded in the French culture for centuries. Perceived as a typical drink, the radical modernization of the product is a desacralization for consumers. More, students are just starting to learn more about wine, thus traditional packaging is a reference point, explaining their attachment to the authenticity markers. A strong modernization destabilizes novices and is not understood, especially for premium wines, whose the quality search is dominant.

So facing unsatisfactory results for the two main types of design, the researcher also tests the influence of moderate classical packaging. In accordance with Gardner et al (2009) findings, moderate packaging scored the highest willingness to buy. It appears as a transitional stage, which ensures both aesthetic preference and quality perceived. It aims to retain traditional codes and provide in a same time a desaturated label.

Thereafter, to better understand how producers can provide desaturated label without affecting the information required, the researcher explored information content expected by students (objective five). Research underlines that current labels are overloaded and complex to understand for novices. Information must be simplified and fully organised, focusing on an explanation of the intrinsic characteristics of the wine and its consumption. Indeed, information must be descriptive, using simple words that can be understood by everybody. More the research highlights the importance of grape variety rather than designation, which allows product recognition. However renowned designations are preferred to grape variety and directly associated with higher quality.

The table 21 “label information content” p.92 presents in detail the information expected by students.

Then, to understand how producers should balance between originality and tradition to positively influence students buying decision, the key packaging attributes of premium Burgundy wines were explored in details (objective six). Findings show that each packaging cue is important and not only the label. Even if the label is the most important cue on which
consumers rely, packaging must be considered as a whole, each cue conveys a message to consumers and must be taking into account by producers to provide a coherent and balanced packaging.

The table below summarize findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Containing</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Burgundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>10-20cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colours</td>
<td>Dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capsule</td>
<td>Simple, one colour, no information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Moderated classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Rectangular or squeeze but no specific shape determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Front and back label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colours</td>
<td>Natural and warm rather than bright One or two only Must reflect the wine type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic application</td>
<td>Not necessary Must respect wine codes and reflect wine tastes or style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letterpress</td>
<td>Sans serif for clear information Big letterpress for strong wines and fine for delicate wines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Packaging cues preference sum up

To conclude, the present research allows the researcher to conceptualize a theory. The purchase intention of French younger consumers is driven by both quality search and aesthetic preference. Thus, a moderate degree of authenticity is strongly preferred over authenticity stimuli. It maintains the high quality perceived and better fit with aesthetic expectations by providing simpler label.
6.2 Recommendations

6.2.1 Recommendations for producers

Until now, producers tend to marginalize the packaging impact. However, they must be aware of the importance of the packaging, which can increase sales by 10% (Lunardo, 2009). More they have to understand that packaging cannot be based on their own preferences; it has to be adapted to consumers.

More, producers should take into account the high potential of Millennial, which required a specific attention on the long term, especially for premium wines.

To attract them as effectively as possible, the research finds that French producers do not have to imitate marketing strategies set up by new world wine producers regarding the packaging. Due to strong wine culture from centuries, French market is very specific and a radical modernisation is risky. However, the present research provides recommendations to improve existing packaging, as highlighted in the previous chapter. Producers must facilitate the purchase process in supermarket by developing a simple packaging, appealing and reassuring in the same time. The innovation must be incremental, respecting some traditional visual codes from the region and improve label readability.

For that, it is essential to have front and back label, which is not common for premium wines. The objective is to keep only the few most important information on the front label and deleted misunderstood ones. Then, secondary information should be gathered on the back label, to provide explicative and educational information.

Besides, often neglected, producers should promote their name as a brand. Attractive and reassuring in the same time, it can bring a touch of originality without affecting the quality perceived or the readability of the label.

In addition, after an investigation, the researcher noted that four bottles out of ten, selected in supermarket aisle get rewards that are not promoted on the bottle. However, it is a guarantee of quality that reassures consumers and should be enhance on the bottle.

Thereafter, it is also recommended to test label before to validate a final design. Indeed, aesthetic preference is subjective and different points of views are required.

Finally, wine producers should continue to further understand motivations and expectations of the heterogeneous wine consumers to adapt they offer.
6.2.2 Recommendations for further researches

The research provides relevant findings and new insights, however it also indicates future research possibilities to deepen current results. Firstly, the study is focused on a restricted geographical sample, from one school in one city and with similar educational level. Hence, the research should be replicated on students from various horizons to compared results and found similarities to better attract students as a whole. More, observation should be conducted in a long-term period to better analyse students’ purchases.

Besides, the research focuses on French students that limit findings to the domestic market. For producers who aimed to developed exportations; as the literature review highlights, results will varies, especially if the country is in a wine consumption emerging stage. It is also a relevant topic that needs to be deepened. Indeed, some researches show that a modern packaging is recommended for new consumers countries, because they do not have the wine heritage and are more sensitive to innovation, ease of use etc. By contrast, when the researcher meet professionals of the field the majority explained that export markets ask for very traditional packaging that symbolized French products. So further researches on key exportation markets would be relevant.

Then, it could be also relevant to analyse other population segments, with similar and different wine knowledge and then, correlated results to see if expectations vary according to age or wine knowledge.

In addition, it can be interested to focus on other type of wines, from different regions, colours or other price ranges, it could be interesting especially for producers who usually provide different type of wines and price.

To finish, the research focuses on supermarket distribution channel, however some producer may privilege other channels. Thus, further researches should be conducted on other distribution channel as specialised shop or wine fair.
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Appendix 1: Self Reflection on own learning and performance

A. 6.1 Introduction

This section presents the learning process of the researcher during the Master Degree pursued and the writing of the dissertation. Firstly, the researcher explains the learning style adopted, then, she highlights the added value and skills improved and finally she presents the usefulness of this learning for her future career.

A. 6.2 Learning style theories

Experiential learning is defined as: “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. 38).

Kolb (1984) presented the leaning process in four stages, illustrated below

![Kolb's experimental learning cycle](image)

Figure 24: Kolb’s experimental learning cycle. Source: simplified version (Moon, 1999, p. 25)

This cycle refers to the process whereby a learner experience, reflects, thinks and acts during the learning.
The first stage is the concrete experience, referring to learner active involvement « doing and not only watch » (Activist stage). It refers to the new learning process adopted by the researcher, mainly based on a self-learning rather than passive one. Indeed, courses needed to be prepared and deepen by own researches. The researcher also become aware that learning is a continuous process and knowledge acquired can be quickly out-of-date. Thus, she started reading academic articles, books, and specialized press. It aims to enrich knowledge, be more critics, objective and up-to-date with marketing and communication realities, which are rapidly evolving. From « interested in a subject », the researcher is focused now on « being an expert of the subject ».

It also refers to the implementation of the dissertation. Conducted by her own, it required extensive and new knowledge on wine marketing as well as an assessment of the situation and practices used. Thus, the researcher searched academic articles, read books but she also met professionals from the wine field, producers, graphic designers, organisms specialized as BIVB. Even if it was not necessarily connected with the dissertation purpose, it allows her to better understand the context and issues, as well as acquire new knowledge. It also helps her to define the research question based on a real and specific problem. More, it was also a unique opportunity for professional development by expanding her networks.

Besides, achieve a dissertation was a new challenge that required a specific process and new tasks that the researcher had to acquire.

The second stage is the reflective observation. It means stepping back to review what has been done and experienced (reflector stage). During this year, with all questions the researcher raised by to achieve successfully the dissertation, assessments and optimize her employability, the research learnt to be analytic, critics and demanding regarding herself.

The researcher crossed this stage especially thanks to « Personal and professional development classes ». Indeed, by creating her portfolio she became aware of what she wants and what she need to improve. Thus, she realized that she wants to pursue her career in a wine marketing area despite her lack of knowledge. Thus, it was at this moment that she decided to focus the purpose of the dissertation on a wine marketing topic.

Besides, since she has been set up her portfolio, she updates the file regularly and step back both professionally and personally, allowing her to progress.

In addition, the researcher became aware that it is essential to review what have been done and experienced successfully or not in marketing field. Indeed, it gives an overview of the evolution of consumers' behaviours, of the different strategies implemented by companies as well as their cultures and heritages, allowing to optimized future strategies.
Regarding the dissertation, the researcher need to refined many times the topic, objectives and content, forcing her to be specific and to get to the bottom of the matter. She also needed to step back in order to correlate data or theories which allow her to be critics as well as better analyse and understand findings.

The third stage is the abstract conceptualisation, the learner makes sense of what have been search, conceptualising a theory or models (theorist stage). The researcher learnt to interpret and find meaning of what she saw, read and found. To take a concrete example, previous researches do not allow the researcher to assess a theory or hypothesis, thus she developed it through the various data collected.

The final stage of the learning cycle is the active experimentation. At this stage, the learner takes what she concluded and put it into practice, making decision and solving problems (pragmatist stage). The researcher learnt to turn knowledge into skills by using theoretical in concrete situation. She started practicing it through assessments, especially in marketing classes, but also in working situation. Indeed, during the dissertation writing, the research was working for a winery. One of her mission was to set up a marketing strategy and reviewed wine packaging. Thanks to courses provided and research conducted for the dissertation, the researcher was able to apply what have been found and learnt.

A.6.3 Skills improved
The Msc Marketing program and the dissertation writing allow the researcher to acquire and develop various skills that are presented below.

A.6.3.1 Adaptation skills
Firstly, the researcher had to adapt herself to a new educational system, whose expectations and requirements were totally different from the French ones. Based on a new way of working, the researcher learnt to be more pro-active and involved. She had to deepen knowledge and subjects approached in class or regarding the dissertation by own researches. Thanks to recommended readings and some researches, the researcher had a relevant database to improve knowledge for the future and continue to deepen her knowledge by herself. It is very important, especially in marketing area, which is quickly changing.

The researcher also had to adapt herself to another culture to fully experienced its adventure, which was personally rewarding.
Then, from everyday English to specific vocabulary required for the dissertation, the researcher developed written and oral competences in English, which is essential for her professional career, intended to be international.

**A.6.3.2 Interpersonal skills**

During the Master Degree at DBS, the research developed interpersonal skills.

Interactive classes, assessments and group projects were benefits. She learnt to manage work groups composed by international students with very different culture and background. Thus, she had to adapt herself and developed listening and leadership skills. More, she had to manage the discussion, collaborate with others and accept the contribution of each team members, which was a clear weakness before.

In addition, being surrounded by international people, the researcher became more curious and acquired open-mindedness. More, work groups were also a great source of knowledge, thanks to the variety of contribution of each ones, she also learns more than she did individually.

Then, with the dissertation, the researcher also increased her self-confidence and perseverance, making decisions and taking risks, especially regarding data collection and research process.

Besides, to deal with different assessments and dissertation deadlines, she had to manage deadlines, which was a weakness before. Thus, she splits tasks and sets goals that needed to be achieved in a specific time frame. Thus, she developed organizational competences, prioritising tasks and managing time. It also allows her to admit her weaknesses and lack of productivity for specific tasks as summarize content or extract qualitative findings. Hence, she had to make sense to compromise and manage work under pressure, common in working life.

**A.6.3.3 Research skills**

Writing this dissertation was one of the biggest challenge but also one of the biggest opportunities to develop skill.

First of all, regarding the literature review, the researcher learnt to found information, where and how. Indeed, due to large amount of information and disparities between authors, the researcher had to be careful regarding information used and a specific process was implemented. Firstly, specific and reliable sources were selected, then some criteria was set up (websites sources, authors, years, sample used, location etc.) to selected the most
appropriate ones. More the researcher realized that it is also essential to trace the source of information, even if it is not directly linked with the subject. For example, aesthetic preference theory regarding art was used. So additional readings were also useful.

Thus the researcher developed analytical, interpretation and critical skills.

More, by analysing and confronting articles, the researcher highlights disparities that allow her to set up the purpose of the dissertation and how to conducted research.

Besides, conducted qualitative research was totally new for the researcher who had to learn about data collection and analysis to provide relevant conclusions and recommendations. She learnt how to interpret data without judgment, how to find meaning and correlate them with quantitative data.

To conclude, many difficulties come up at different stage of the dissertation and also during work groups. The researcher learnt to manage to her owns, dealt with unpredictable and resolved problems or barriers than came up, which is beneficial both personally and professionally.

**A.6.3.4 Marketing and communication skills**

Finally, the MSC Degree allows the research to perfect her skills and knowledge in marketing and communication area as well as related subjects. She also learnt about new concepts, theories and strategies, especially regarding social media, consumers’ behaviour and integrated marketing and communication.

**6.4 Future application of learning**

Msc Marketing program and dissertation were indisputably valuable foundation for the researcher to start her professional career. The researcher acquired a new way of thinking and working that will be useful during the lifetime. More, it also provides new knowledge and skills in marketing and wine marketing field, which are crucial for the future professional career of the researcher. She feels more aware, confident, skilled and prepared for employability. Then, the researcher will continue to improve her learning cycle and process.

Finally, the dissertation also comforts the researcher in her choice to orient her career toward wine marketing.
Appendix 2: Completion plan

Table 25: GANTT chart

The researcher followed the schedule presented below in order to perform the dissertation on time. The work dispatch was set up regarding researcher’s schedule. She worked in part time until the end of October and started working full time in November.
## Appendix 3: Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT equipment : camera, computer, video projector</th>
<th>Allocated budget</th>
<th>Real cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place to conducted research</td>
<td>€0</td>
<td>€0 thanks to own materiel and equipment loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material to conduct collaborative workshop</td>
<td>€150</td>
<td>€30. Bottle, cork, capsule were loan by Vitivini Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€30 gathered extra material (paper, colour choices, etc) and printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
<td>€0</td>
<td>€0 thanks to the free software used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel cost to conducted research</td>
<td>€45</td>
<td>€40,80 including toll and gazol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print and send to Dublin</td>
<td>€100</td>
<td>€85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>€295</strong></td>
<td><strong>€155.8. The budget was respected</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Costs management
Appendix 4: Questionnaire

The questionnaire was translated in English as part of the dissertation submission.

Part I. Interviewee’s characteristics

As part of my Master Degree of Dublin Business School, I am doing a packaging regarding wine packaging. There is no bad answer and answers will be kept confidentially. It will only take two minutes, thank you.

*Obligatoire

Are you a student at ISEG Lyon? *
If not, do not proceed
☐ Yes
☐ No

How old are you? *
If you don’t have between 20 and 27, please do not proceed.
☐ 20-22
☐ 23-25
☐ 26-27

Are you: *
☐ Female
☐ Male

Concerning wine, your are *
☐ Wine novice : no or little knowledge. « I know nothing »
☐ Wine interested : few knowledge, « I have the very basic knowledge »
☐ Wine lover : knowledgeable, « I have good knowledge »
☐ Wine connoisseur : « I’m an expert »
☐ No

Are you interested in wine? *
☐ Yes
☐ No
Part II Wine purchases

How often do you buy wine? *

☐ I never buy wine
☐ Few times per year
☐ Once per month
☐ Twice per month
☐ Once a week
☐ Twice a week
☐ More than twice a week

Where do you usually buy wine? *

☐ Supermarket
☐ Cellar/Specialized shop as Nicolas
☐ Trade show
☐ Directly to the winegrower
☐ Internet
☐ Autre: ______________________________________

When you buy wine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s hard to select one</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never know which one choose</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m never sure of the quality</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m afraid to be disappointed</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m afraid that it is not value for money</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want to disappointed others</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concern for my health</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III The packaging attributes

When you buy wine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Rather important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not important at al</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellation/Designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award, prize, distinction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested food pairings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine producer information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the following cork, which one do you used to buy? *
Choose the number of cork selected

![Cork options](image1)

Among the following format, which one do you used to buy?
Choose the number of the format selected

![Format options](image2)
Part IV. Label

Label 1

![Image of Domaine Girard label]

**This label is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aesthetically I like the label**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I would be willing to buy this bottle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**According to you, this label is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High quality</th>
<th>Rather high quality</th>
<th>Rather bad quality</th>
<th>Bad quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Label 2

This label is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classic</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aesthetically I like the label:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would be willing to buy this bottle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to you, this label is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High quality</th>
<th>Rather high quality</th>
<th>Rather bad quality</th>
<th>Bad quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Label 3

![Image of a wine label](image-url)

#### This label is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classic</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aesthetically I like the label:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I would be willing to buy this bottle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### According to you, this label is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High quality</th>
<th>Rather high quality</th>
<th>Rather bad quality</th>
<th>Bad quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part V Authentic and Burgundy wine quality perceived

**Concerning Burgundy wines, you would like a modernization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. **Concerning Burgundy wine, you would not dare buy a design/atypical label, lest the wine is bad.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I tend to agree</th>
<th>I tend to disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Observation process

Context

Observations have been conducted on 12 students in 4th years of Master Degree in Business, conducted during three days, following the schedule below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>20/10/15</td>
<td>12.00 - 12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>20/10/15</td>
<td>12.15 - 12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>20/10/15</td>
<td>12.30 - 12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>21/10/15</td>
<td>12.00 - 12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>21/10/15</td>
<td>12.15 - 12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>21/10/15</td>
<td>12.30 - 12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>22/10/15</td>
<td>12.00 - 12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>22/10/15</td>
<td>12.15 - 12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>22/10/15</td>
<td>12.30 - 12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>23/10/15</td>
<td>12.00 - 12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>23/10/15</td>
<td>12.15 - 12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>23/10/15</td>
<td>12.30 - 12.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Observation planning

Place: With an authorization from the management, observation takes place in *Simply Supermarket*, located two minutes by walk from students’ school.

Wine offer: Thirty-four white Burgundy references.

Observation Progress

To test the influence of risk perceived, participants have been split into two equal groups and the process and purpose of the observation was explained to them before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk perceived</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>“Every Thursday evening, after his/her music class, your friend visits you at your place. It is a friendly occasion to drink a glass of Burgundy wine that you are going to buy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time limit or constraint</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Observation progress
Observation was structured in two parts. Firstly, the researcher observed students' behaviours when buying wine in a supermarket. According to findings expected, the researcher created the observation grid presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
<th>Wine knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bottles picked up</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labels read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back labels read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottles picked up again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others observations</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in the wine aisle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of the bottle selected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of the design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture's number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Observation grid used

Then, the second part of the observation was a short questionnaire, which aims to better understand participants' choices. Due to limited time, the number of questions was restricted:

**Was it hard to select your bottle?**
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**If yes, why?**

**Why did you choose this bottle?**

**Does the packaging help you to choose?**
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
Among the attributes below, select the three most important one that help you in your decision
Rankeled them (1 is the most important and 3 the less important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shape of the bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested food pairings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellation/Designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of the packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gliding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When you are re looking at the packaging of the bottle choose, you can say about the wine that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is a good product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is an expensive one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a cheap one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is at your style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are afraid to be disappointed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are sure that it will taste good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It typical from Burgundy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is reassuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the design of the label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Interview process

Context
Three girls ageing 22,22,24 and one 25 years old guy composed the sample.

Progress
Part 1: Firstly, during the first half-hour, seven different packaging from very design to very classic were presented to participants through a power point presentation:

For each packaging, the three following themes were approached:

1. Wine perceptions
2. Appreciation of cork and bottle
3. Label design
The interviews aims to be free talk, however some questions were prepared to meet researcher expectations in terms of findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions prepared to deepen the argumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Prepared question for interviews

Part 2: The second part was a collaborative workshop between all participants. The instruction was the following: “Through the different elements that are at your disposal, you have to design together the “perfect wine packaging for a Premium Burgundy wine”. Each decision must be take by the majority in the limited time of forty minutes”. See below a table summarizing students’ choices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>Number of choices</th>
<th>Possibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Containing</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bourguignone - Bordelaise - Alsacienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50cl - 75cl - 1L - 5L. Smaller containing were not available due to difficulties to find them however, it was discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plastic - Glass - Tetrapack - BIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass bottle colour</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transparent - light - dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cork - Screw cap - Glass cork - Synthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capsule colour</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beige - black - gold - orange - grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Front and back - front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gms: low - medium - high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label design</td>
<td>Letterpress</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Serif - Sans serif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary/picture</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Related to the wine (castle, vine, house, etc.) to non related to the wine and abstract imaginary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colours</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>From white to black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural colours: beige - brown etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bright colours: blue - pink etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Square - rectangio - oval - divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label content</td>
<td>Other information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Designation, vintage, grapes variety, food pairing, brand name, producers information, wine tastes, name of Cuveé, others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>than compulsory indication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Guide Hachette selection, Paris International Agricultural competition, supermarket selection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Workshop process