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ABSTRACT

This thesis looks at iconic branding in the context of fast moving consumer goods (FMCG) in New Zealand. Iconic branding has been studied in a broad overall context but has not yet been considered for individual brand types. Although iconic branding literature covers a variety of brand types, it does not go into specifics on if, and how, each iconic brand type differs. This thesis studies the development of iconic brands in the context of FMCG and presents the process as a strategy option for FMCG brands. Currently there is no iconic branding literature that discusses these types of brands in a private or national brand context. Likewise, in FMCG literature discussing private and national brands there is no mention of iconic brands as either a concept or a strategy. As there is no overlap between the two literature streams this thesis breaks ground by integrating the concepts. Specifically, this research looks at iconic FMCG brands to find out how they are formed, how they differ from non-iconic FMCG brands, how consumers perceive them, and how brand managers can develop them. Data has been gathered with focus groups where consumers discussed their perceptions of iconic and non-iconic private and national FMCG brands. The use of projective focus group techniques allowed the researcher to uncover perceptions that consumers may not have expressed through traditional question and answer methods. Thematic analysis was then used to analyse the data and interpret themes. The findings revealed that iconic FMCG brands differ to non-iconic FMCG brands in three key ways. Iconic FMCG brands were found to have attachments with consumers, while displaying aspects of New Zealand cultural heritage, and greater visibility. This study presents iconic FMCG brands as a new sub-topic of study in iconic branding literature for future studies to explore further. This thesis contributes to FMCG literature by proposing iconic branding as a new strategy for both private and national brands. In addition, the benefits of this strategy that
apply to private brands and how they can be used to combat any perceived gap between private and national brands is discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Iconic brands are instantly recognisable brands that have a strong influence on consumers. They are brands that engage with culture and often have their own place within the culture[s] that they interact with. The functional benefits of iconic brands are overshadowed by the value consumers place on the brands themselves and the myths and stories that are associated with them (For full description and references please see Section 2.7). Examples of iconic brands include Coca-Cola, Volkswagen, Apple, and Microsoft.

Private brands are brands that are owned and managed by the stores they are sold in. National brands are their counterpart, these are the brands sold in stores that are not owned or managed by the stores (For full description and references please see Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2). For the purpose of this research the stores referred to are supermarkets. Private brands have existed as long as stores have produced and stocked their own products, while national brands have existed as long as stores have sold products on behalf of producers. Globally private brands have 16.5% market share across the markets they operate in (Nielsen, 2014). Market share is considerably higher in Europe, and much lower throughout Asia. In New Zealand, private brands have 13.5% market share in the markets they are available in (Nielsen, 2014). New Zealand has three major private brands available – Pams, Signature Range, and Select. This research looks at private and national brands in the context of fast moving consumer goods (FMCG).

FMCG’s are packaged goods that have a quick sales process and retail for a low cost. Examples of FMCG goods include packaged foods, beverages, meats, vegetables, toiletries, pet foods, cosmetic products, and baked goods. The most common form of FMCG retailers are supermarkets. Other forms of FMCG retailers include petrol stations and convenience stores.

Currently in literature there is no overlap between iconic branding literature and private/national branding literature, and because of this there is no documentation of a private brand that has reached iconic brand status. From this, questions on the existence of iconic

\footnote{Foodstuffs used to have a private brand called Budget. But at the time of data collection Budget was discontinued. It was replaced by Value but at the time of data collection neither brand was available in stores.}
private brands begin to arise, along with questions on how an iconic private brand may differ to an iconic national brand. This thesis intends to fill this gap and answer these questions by conducting research that investigates the concept of iconic private brands and iconic brands in FMCG. This gap will be explained in greater detail in Chapter Two.

1.2 Problem Orientation

As discussed in the previous section, iconic brands are some of the most successful brands in their respective markets. The brands are immensely valuable in terms of past and future potential earnings, but also in sentimental value to their customers. Through the literature that will be reviewed in Chapter Two of this thesis it will be shown that iconic brands possess strong brand equity and emotional attachments with consumers (Holt, 2004). Because of this they experience improved performance benefits. Due to their increased brand equity, brands that become iconic experience increased perceived quality, name awareness, brand loyalty, and likelihood of consumers to believe advertisements related to the brand (Bakpayev, Borges, & Rossi, 2015; Chen, 2009; De Wulf, Goedertier, Odekerken-Schröder, & Van Ossel, 2005; Dick, Jain, & Richardson, 1995; Erdem & Swait, 1998). They also experience increases in consumers’ likelihood to repurchase, consumers’ intention to recommend, consumers’ likelihood to purchase, consumers’ resilience to negative information, brand loyalty, and consumers’ willingness to pay a price premium due to the emotional attachments consumers have with iconic brands (Ekinci, Japutra, & Simkin, 2014; MacInnis, Park, & Thomson, 2005; Oliver, 1999). The problems that arise from iconic branding literature is that there is no research focussing solely on iconic brands in FMCG, and there is no mention of private brands that have reached iconic brand status. So, from this it must be asked, do iconic FMCG brands differ from other iconic brands? And can private brands become iconic? And if so, do iconic private brands differ from iconic national brands?

In the past, a problem that has persistently hampered private brands is that consumers have perceived a gap in quality between private and national brands (Bao, Bao, & Sheng, 2011; Bellizzi, Hamilton, Krueckeborg, & Martin, 1981; Burt, 2000; Dekimpe, Geyskens, & Ter Braak, 2013; Dick, Jain, & Richardson, 1994). There are private brands that are of lower quality than national brands, but there are also private labels that are of equal or greater quality. Proof for this is shown in the Evolution of Private Brand Products (2.3.3) and Tiered Private Brand Strategy (2.4.2) sections in Chapter Two. The issue is that despite their quality,
brands are perceived as lower quality products due to being store owned private brands. Consumers have long believed in this gap in quality, and there are a number of influencing factors that will be explored in Chapter Two. Over time some private brands have focussed on improving on these factors to improve their commercial performance. This is a strategy that has worked for some private brands, but many others have continued to struggle with the perceived gap between private and national brands. This thesis intends to present iconic branding as a strategy for private brands looking to improve their commercial performance and bridge any perceived gap between themselves and national brands.

The New Zealand FMCG industry is home to both iconic and non-iconic brands, as well as private and national brands. Examples of iconic and non-iconic brands that can be found in New Zealand supermarkets are Whittaker’s Chocolate and Signature Range, respectively. In 2016, the estimated value of the New Zealand FMCG market was $22 billion (NZD) (Euromonitor International, 2016). As mentioned in the previous section private brands have a 13.5% market share in New Zealand markets (Nielsen, 2014). From this we can estimate that if they are able to maintain that level of market share in the FMCG market, then private brands in New Zealand’s grocery retailing market are worth $2,970,000,000 (NZD). Now consider if consumers perceived some private brands as iconic brands. These brands could potentially capture even more of this lucrative market.

This thesis intends to look at iconic branding in the context of FMCG brands and analyse how consumers perceive these brands. Currently there is no literature identifying any private iconic brands\(^2\), so this research will look to discover if one exists. From this research, it will be assessed whether iconic branding is a strategy that private FMCG brands could use to overcome the perceived gap between private and national brands. As well as providing information for brand managers, this thesis will also be valuable to academic studies in these two areas. As these two areas of marketing literature have not been looked at in conjunction before this thesis will lay the foundations for any future study into the relationship between FMCG brands and iconic branding.

\(^2\) As per literature searches using key words on databases such as Scopus and Google Scholar.
1.3 Research Objectives

Through researching the iconic branding and private/national branding literature streams it has become clear that currently there is no overlap between the two\(^3\). This thesis intends to look at them both and produce a piece of research that integrates them. The nature of this research and its corresponding research objectives is exploratory as it seeks to uncover basic information about iconic branding in an FMCG context. The research objectives/questions of this thesis are as follows:

1. What makes an FMCG brand iconic?

2. How do consumers perceive iconic FMCG brands in comparison to other FMCG brands?

3. Do consumers perceive iconic private FMCG brands differently to iconic national FMCG brands?

4. What are the strategic implications for retailers of FMCG private and national brands?

Using the methodology proposed in Chapter Three of this thesis, this research intends to gather data in the form of consumer thoughts, opinions, and beliefs towards certain FMCG brands. The analysis of this data will provide the necessary information required to answer the research questions detailed above.

1.4 Contributions of this Study

This study contributes to two areas of marketing literature. These are private/national branding, and iconic branding. It contributes to both areas by looking at each area of study in the context of the other, and vice versa. As there is no mention of iconic brands in private branding literature, the introduction of iconic brands contributes to widening this field of study. This is the same for iconic branding literature, where private brands have not been discussed or considered before. So, from this it can be said that this study contributes to two new areas of study, one in iconic branding, and one in private/national branding. This study also intends to develop insights for brand management strategies for developing iconic FMCG brands, both private and national. Through this, FMCG brand managers will be able to consider iconic branding as a new and achievable strategy option for their brands. The performance benefits of this strategy are outlined below.

\(^3\) Evidence of this will be shown in the Literature Review (Chapter Two).
This study contributes to private branding literature by proposing the performance benefits that a private brand would experience if it were to become an iconic brand. Some of these performance benefits include positive effects on perceived quality, name awareness, perceived risk, brand loyalty, and consumers’ likelihood to believe advertisements related to the brand (Bakpayev et al., 2015; Chen, 2009; De Wulf et al. 2005; Erdem & Swait, 1998). These performance benefits stem from a brand’s brand equity, and the increase in brand equity that would be experienced if a brand became an iconic brand. From this a private brand would experience an increase in positive consumer perceptions towards their brand. The brand would also experience increases in consumers’ likelihood to repurchase, consumers’ intention to recommend, consumers’ likelihood to purchase, consumers’ resilience to negative information, brand loyalty, and consumers’ willingness to pay a price premium due to the emotional attachments consumers form with iconic brands (Ekinci et al., 2014; MacInnis et al., 2005; Oliver, 1999). These relationships are explained in-depth in Chapter Two, Sections 2.5 and 2.6. They are then used to propose iconic branding as a strategy for brand managers.

In iconic branding literature, there is no mention of an iconic private brand. So already this thesis contributes to this area of study by proposing the existence of an iconic private brand. As well as this, iconic brands have not been studied specifically in an FMCG context before. Specifically, this thesis provides findings on how iconic FMCG brands are formed, and how consumers perceive them. The contributions of this thesis to iconic branding literature allow for comparison between FCMG iconic brands and other forms of iconic brands.

Brand managers should also find this thesis of interest as it provides information on using iconic branding as a strategy. Specifically, this thesis contains information on how to develop iconic FMCG brands and the positive effects iconic branding will have on consumer perceptions. Examples of changes in consumer perception include increased brand loyalty and reduced perceived risk.

From what is discussed above it can be seen clearly that this thesis offers contributions to iconic branding literature, private branding literature, and to brand managers’ strategies.
1.5 Thesis Overview

The structure of this thesis is as follows:

The second chapter consists of a review of the relevant literature relating to iconic, private, and national brands. Chapter Two begins with the necessary definitions of private and national brands followed by a brief history of the interplay between the two. It then delves into brand perceptions and how they are influenced. Following this, the review examines brand equity as an influence of brand perceptions, and the strategic benefits of brand attachment. Lastly iconic branding is reviewed and the research gap is presented, followed by the conclusion.

Chapter Three entails the research methodology of this thesis. It outlines the researcher’s beliefs on the theory of knowledge and how knowledge is communicated. Following this it outlines the methodological choices of the researcher, providing justification for each one. These include but are not limited to, the choice of qualitative research over quantitative, the choice to use focus groups, and the choice of exercises used in the focus groups. Lastly the research methodology outlines the participants of the research, the analysis that will take place during the research, and the trustworthiness of the research process that has been followed.

Chapter Four contains the findings of the research. It provides the context for the findings and discusses three key themes that emerged from the data analysis. The themes highlight certain factors that contribute to what makes an FMCG brand iconic. Each theme is broken down into sub-themes that are explained individually followed by a description of how they each contribute to a key theme. The themes and subthemes are demonstrated with supporting text units from the data.

Lastly, Chapter Five discusses the findings from Chapter Four linking them back to previous parts of the thesis. Specifically, it relates the findings back to the research questions, and the literature review. Each research question’s key findings are discussed along with a section summarising their collective importance. Following this Chapter Five presents this thesis’ academic contributions, managerial implications, limitations, and directions for future research followed by a final conclusion.
CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The following chapter will review literature on private and national brands, brand equity, brand attachment, and iconic brands. Please note that all literature reviewed on private and national brands is in the context of fast moving consumer goods (FMCG). What this means is that all the studies apply to grocery retailers such as supermarkets. To the best of the author’s knowledge this is the first time these four literature streams have been reviewed concurrently. This review intends to pose that, a brand’s iconicity, and its resulting brand equity, have effects on the perceptions of private and national brands. Brand attachment’s place in iconic branding literature, along with its strategic benefits, will also be reviewed. This link between the streams of iconic branding, brand equity, brand attachment, and private/national branding literature will provide justification for the research conducted in this thesis.

2.2 Definitions of Private and National Brands

2.2.1 Definition of a Private Brand

A private brand is best defined by Rousell and White (1970) as a brand that is sold under a retailer’s house brand name, and which is sold exclusively at that retailer’s outlets. Schutte (1969) first defined a private brand as a brand that is owned and operated by an organisation whose primary focus is distribution. He went on to question his own definition as he highlighted the complications of defining the primary focus of a business that engages in the manufacturing and distribution of products. In the early literature, there is a theme of a range of authors providing their own views on the correct name and definition of a private brand. In modern literature, the most commonly used definition is referenced as Morris (1979). But it is important to note that in his work Morris does not actually provide his own definition. Morris (1979) uses two definitions in his writing. The first used is provided by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) (1968), and the second is that of Rousell and White (1970). The main difference of note between the two definitions is that Rousell and White (1970) declare that private brands are sold exclusively in their distributors’ outlets. Morris (1979) goes on to say that his work is confined to the definition provided by Rousell and White (1970). Martell (1986) chose to use the same definition while also addressing the large variety of interpretations of private brands. He declared this an ineffective use of resources in private
branding research, and stated there is potential for miscommunications with no clear
definition or name. For the purposes of this research the definition provided by Rousell and
White (1970) will be used. This definition has been chosen as it is the most common amongst
the literature and focuses on ownership of the brand and does not concern itself with the
production of private brands, as private branding is not a matter of production but rather of
branding. An example of an FMCG private brand in New Zealand is Pams, which is owned
by Foodstuffs and stocked in its New World, PAK’nSAVE, and Four Square supermarket
chains.

2.2.2 Definition of a National Brand
Schutte (1969) defined a national brand as *a brand that is owned and managed by an
organisation whose primary focus is production*. Boyd and Frank (1965), on the other hand,
simply define them as brands owned by manufacturers. Schutte used the economic
commitment of a business as the basis for his definition of a national brand, just as he did for
his definition of a private brand. His definition for national brands is very similar to his
definition for private brands, a comparison between the two is provided in Section 2.2.4.
Boyd and Frank’s (1965) definition is only concerned with the ownership of the brand,
specifying that national brands are owned by manufacturers. Definition is an area in national
branding literature that pales in comparison to private brand literature. National branding
literature lacks a definition that is either commonly used or agreed upon by academics. For
the purpose of this research, Schutte’s (1969) definition will be used. An example of a
national brand is Coca-Cola, it is produced by The Coca-Cola Company while being sold on
their behalf by retailers all around the world. A New Zealand example of a national brand is
Barker’s of Geraldine, they are a company that specialises in juices and preserved fruit
products such as jams, chutneys, and syrups. Barker’s produces its products and then they are
sold on their behalf in supermarkets across New Zealand. This is a prime example of a
national brand, as distributors are responsible for selling the product while the brand owners
oversee production.

2.2.3 Alternative Terms for Private and National Brands
When defining private and national brands it is important to acknowledge the different terms
that can be used. The literature on the subjects interchanges between many different terms

---

4 Barker’s also allows for online orders and has a single physical store in its hometown of Geraldine.
despite all having the same meaning. This is not a new phenomenon, as Schutte (1969) was able to list 16 different names for private brands, which he referred to as ‘distributor-oriented brands’\(^5\). Even with this many names, it did not stop some members of this list being misclassified as national brands, which Schutte (1969) referred to as ‘manufacturer-orientated brands’. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 contain all the different monikers for private and national brands, respectively\(^6\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms for private brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unadvertised brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plated brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resellers’ brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributor brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghost brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleman’s brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Our own brand”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.1. Alternative terms for private brand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms for national brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-sold brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-known brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertised brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packer’s label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processor brand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.2. Alternative terms for national brand**

### 2.2.4 Similarities and Differences Between Private and National Brands

In order to compare private and national brands it is important to first understand the similarities and differences between the two. The differences between private and national

---

\(^5\) The terms private brand, private label, and store brand are used interchangeably throughout this thesis to refer to private brands.

\(^6\) The terms national brand, manufacturer brand, and manufacturer label are used interchangeably throughout this thesis to refer to national brands.
brands start with their ownership, with private brands being owned by distributors, and national brands being owned by manufacturers. A common example of this is a supermarket. Often a supermarket will have its own line of private brands that it stocks alongside national brand products. The brands differ in terms of which locations they are sold in, with private brands being sold almost exclusively in their owners’ outlets, whereas national brands are sold across a variety of outlets. But the main distinction between private and national brands lies in consumers’ perceptions of them. The literature on both types of brands addresses consumers’ perceived gap in quality between private and national brands (Geyskens, Steenkamp, & Van Heerde, 2010). Consumers believe that in regards to quality, and factors that contribute to quality, that national brands are superior (Geyskens et al., 2010). There are a variety of factors that contribute to this perceived gap and these will be addressed throughout the review. To recap, the main differences between private and national brands are their ownership, the locations in which they are sold, and consumers’ perceptions of them. Any other differences between the two will be as a result of the three main differences addressed here.

The similarities and differences between private and national brands are best summarised by the differences in the definitions provided by Schutte (1969). His definitions for private and national brands, which are provided in Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, respectively, differ by one word. His definition for a private brand is as follows, “[A brand] which is owned and controlled by an organisation whose primary economic commitment is distribution” (Schutte, 1969, p. 9). The definition provided by Schutte (1969) for a national brand is exactly the same apart from the word distribution is substituted for the word production. Essentially what this translates to is that supermarkets or supermarket chains own private brands, while national brands are brands owned by companies responsible for their production.

Private brands are similar to national brands in the way that they occupy the same FMCG product categories. There are suggestions that some consumers even perceive private brands as just regular brands (Richardson, 1997). It has been noted that some private brands are produced by national brand manufacturers’ and are essentially the same product with a different label (Ruekert, Shocker, & Srivastava, 1994). There are also some private brands that have attempted to mimic national brands packaging (Burt, 2000). To summarise, the similarities between private and national brands are the product categories in which they are available, the packaging of certain private brands, and the in some cases their manufacturers.
In terms of literature they are similar in that there is a vast amount of literature on both, and one cannot be discussed without mentioning the other. The following sections will address historical developments in early private brand research related to consumer perceptions. The findings highlighted in the next sections are fundamental in understanding how consumer perceptions of brands can influence their purchasing decisions.
### 2.3 Customer Perceptions

#### 2.3.1 Historical Developments in Early Research on Private Brand Perceptions

To understand how private brands can use iconic branding to increase brand equity, and in turn improve consumer perceptions and commercial performance, we must first understand how consumers perceive private brands. Figure 2.1 shows the major developments in early private branding literature regarding the perceptions of private brands in chronological order. These will be discussed in the following section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Dick et al.</td>
<td>Examined the effects of intrinsic and extrinsic cues on private brand performance. Found that <strong>extrinsic cues are more important for private brand success</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996a</td>
<td>Dick et al.</td>
<td>Found that familiarity, reliance on extrinsic cues (e.g. price and packaging), perceived quality variation, perceived risk, and perceived value for money are <strong>influencing factors of store brand proneness</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Batra &amp; Sinha</td>
<td>Explored <strong>which factors influence price consciousness</strong> (Category risk, price unfairness, price consciousness, and price-quality associations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Burt</td>
<td>Argues that certain grocery retailers have created and managed <strong>private brands which are now perceived as equal to, if not better than, some national brands</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Cunningham et al.</td>
<td>Reinforced the findings to Bellizzi et al. (1981) using different methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Banerji &amp; Hoch</td>
<td>Found that private brands <strong>perform better in high sale and profitability categories with high margins</strong>. Highlighted that product categories are a factor of private brand success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Laaksonen &amp; Reynolds</td>
<td>Proposed <strong>four tiers of private brands</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996b</td>
<td>Dick et al.</td>
<td>Found that <strong>store aesthetics influence consumer perceptions</strong> of private brand quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Baltas</td>
<td>Highlighted that <strong>private brand proneness is a matter of perceptions and behaviour, not demographic variables</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1. Timeline of early research on private brand perceptions**
2.3.2 Early Perceptions of Private Brands, and their Influences

In order to fully comprehend current perceptions of private brands, the early perceptions of private brands must first be understood. This will highlight why the perceived gap between private and national brands exists and how it has changed over time.

“The most important driver of private label share is its perceived quality” (Ailawadi & Keller, 2004, p. 336). Lots of early literature on consumer perceptions of private and national brands stems from Bellizzi, Hamilton, Krueckeburg, and Martin’s (1981) work. They developed a 33 item scale measured on five-point Likert scales to examine consumer perceptions of brands and applied it to national, private, and generic brands (Bellizzi et al., 1981). From this they found that in 32 of the 33 items measured, national brands were perceived more favourably, followed by private brands, and generic brands, respectively (Bellizzi et al., 1981). The only measured category where private brands were perceived more positively was value for money. The work of Bellizzi et al. (1981) was not the first to highlight that national brands are perceived to be superior to private brands, they note that Applebaum and Goldberg (1967) report a difference in perceptions before them. But the comprehensive set of scales used by Bellizzi et al. (1981), as well as their overwhelming results, has made it a seminal article in private and national branding literature. In literature in this area it is used as a cornerstone for the perceived gap in quality between national and private brands.

Cunningham, Hardy, and Imperia (1982) performed a similar study the following year, but only processed a result if the respondent showed loyalty to a specific brand type (The options were generic, private, and national brands). Bellizzi et al. (1981) focussed on a range of supermarket goods while Cunningham et al. (1982) focussed specifically on canned goods. Both studies provide valuable insight as it is noted that brand perceptions differ across product categories, so it is important to look at inter and intra category differences (Baltas & Doyle, 1998; Hoch 1996). Intra-category differences deal with the differences between private and national brands in the same product category. Cunningham et al. (1982) looked at intra-category differences between private and national brands by only looking at canned goods. Whereas Bellizzi et al. (1981) looked at three different product types and private and

---

7 A generic brand is a private brand designed to be sold at the lowest price and provide the basic functions associated with their product category, they often have little branding and very plain packaging, and are not designed to compete with national brands (Laaksonen & Reynolds, 1994).
national brand perception in each, so this provides information on inter-category differences. Both are important, as it is helpful to be able to look at private and national brand performance in a single category and then to be able to compare that to their performance across three different categories. This allows researchers to examine if there are categories where private brands perform better and if the perceived quality gap is consistent across all categories.

Heavily influenced by the studies examining consumers’ poor perceptions of private brands in the 1980’s (Bellizzi et al., 1981), many academics in the 1990’s sought to discover what factors influence these perceptions. This transition in research focus is shown in Figure 2.1. Through this stream of research, it was found that consumers rely extensively on extrinsic cues, such as price, packaging, and brand name, to form perceptions of product quality (Dick et al., 1994). Seeing as private brands tend to lack these extrinsic qualities, while national brands have them in abundance, store brands are often perceived as inferior products. It is worth noting that relying on extrinsic cues to form perceptions leads to increased perceived quality variation between the two brand types (Dick et al., 1994; 1996a). It was also found that the extrinsic variables that have the largest influence on consumers’ brand choice are brand name, price, packaging, and advertising (Dick et al., 1997). Another factor found to influence consumers’ perceptions of private brands is store aesthetics (Dick et al., 1996b). Consumers’ familiarity also comes in to play in their perceptions, this can be down to their familiarity with a brand, with store brands on the whole, or with a particular product category (Baltas, 1997; Baltas & Doyle, 1998; Dick et al., 1996a). As familiarity with store brands increases the perceived risks associated with them decrease (Baltas, 1997). In addition, it is noted that when consumers are unfamiliar with a product or product category they rely more on extrinsic cues (Dick et al., 1996a). The notion of perceived risks and its effects on private and national brands will be addressed in Section 2.3.4 of the review.

Private brand success differs across different product categories. Consumers’ are more likely to purchase private brands in product categories where they believe the complexity of production is low as they perceive a lower category risk (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Batra & Sinha, 1999). Private brands are also more successful in heavy usage categories as consumers tend to search for more economical alternatives to account for their high purchase amounts (Baltas & Doyle, 1998).
Throughout the early literature on private brands there are many attempts to segment consumers as either private or national brand prone. There are two methods associated with this. Academics attempt to segment consumers by either their demographics or their perceptions. The former has been a largely ineffective method of segmentation with most studies producing different demographic groupings that are claimed to typify the two purchasing groups (Baltas & Doyle, 1998; Boyd & Frank, 1965; Myers, 1967). While some studies found that private and national brands are used by households with identical socio-economic demographics (Boyd & Frank, 1965), others have found that private labels are used by a variety of socio-economic groups (Burger & Schott, 1972). A list of studies that have engaged in these segmentation techniques can be found in Table 2.3. A collection of academics came to the same conclusion that it is better to segment private and national brand consumers by their perceptions rather than their demographics and socio-economic status (Baltas & Doyle, 1998; Boyd & Frank, 1965; Burger & Schott, 1972; Busch, & Szymanski, 1987; Myers, 1967). Segmenting consumers via their perceptions has yielded far more definitive results such as relationships between store brand proneness and familiarity, perception of risks associated with store brands, value for money, the effects of brand names, a price-quality relationship, reliance on extrinsic cues, and price sensitivity (Baltas & Doyle, 1998; Dick et al., 1995; 1997; Omar 1996).

In summary, the research conducted during the 1990’s, highlighted the factors that have been found to influence the perceived gap between private and national brands (See Figure 2.1)\(^8\). This period of research on private and national brands produced many seminal works and findings on what influences the perceived gap. It also highlighted that perceptions are what differ between consumers who are more prone to purchasing one brand type over the other. The effects of these perceptions will be discussed in Section 2.3.5 of this review.

It is also important to note that these same studies made note of the increasing quality of private brand products in terms of product quality and position in the market. The evolution of these private brands will be addressed in the next section of this review.

---

\(^8\) Table 2.5 (Located in section 2.3.5) contains studies on influences on consumers’ perceptions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area studied</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Segmented national and private brand prone consumers based on socio-economic variables | • Segmented consumers on income  
• Segmented consumers on education  
• Segmented consumers on household size  
• Segmented consumers on ownership of accommodation                                                                                   | Ailawadi & Keller (2004); Baltas & Doyle (1998); Bettman, (1974); Boyd and Frank (1965, as cited by Dick et al., 1994); Coe (1971); Cole, & Sethuraman (1999); Dick et al. (1995); Gielens & Sethuraman (2014); Omar (1996) |
| Segmented national and private brand prone consumers based on perceptions   | • Store brand prone consumers:  
  - Are more price conscious  
  - Focus more on value for money  
  - Less reliant on price as an indicator of quality  
  - Rely less on extrinsic cues  
• National brand prone consumers:  
  - Less familiar with private brands  
  - Perceive private brands to be lower quality  
  - More likely to rely on brands to infer quality                                                                                     | Ailawadi & Keller (2004); Baltas (1997); Baltas & Doyle (1998); Dick et al. (1995; 1997); Omar (1996)                                      |
| Consumer perceptions of national and private brands differ across product classes | • Heavy usage categories result in consumers being more private brand prone  
• High involvement categories see more national brand purchases  
• Consumers who form favourable evaluations for a category tend to be more private brand prone in that category | Baltas (1997); Baltas & Doyle (1998); Hoch (1996); Gielens & Sethuraman (2000)                                                                 |

Table 2.3. Segmentation of private/national-brand prone consumers
2.3.3 Evolution of Private Brand Products

While the previous section focussed on consumers’ poor perceptions of private brands in comparison to national brands, this section will cover the evolution of some private brands into true rivals of manufacturer labels⁹. To examine how a private brand can become iconic it is important to first understand how these private brands have developed qualities that have assisted them in becoming strong brands that have the potential to become iconic.

From the mid-1980s onwards certain private brands began using non-price competition to market their products and reposition themselves by using their retailer’s trade names to communicate their quality (Burt, 2000; Burt & Davis, 1999). Non-price competition is competing on facets other than price. Rather than competing with national brands by dropping their prices and further emphasizing their low quality, private brand managers chose to compete with other aspects of their product such as quality and packaging. Along with that owners of private brands invested in product-range development, in-store improvements, and used their brands as a part of their overall image. The use of the private brand as a part of the overall store image is a crucial stage in their evolution, as retailers are able to offer a service while engaging in experiential retailing through offering a product and atmosphere alongside it (De Wulf et al., 2005). Private brands also had to improve features such as their visual cues from which consumers develop perceptions (Burt, 2000; Choi, & Coughlan, 2006). Many developed packaging very similar to that of national brands, while others went a step further and differentiated themselves entirely (Burt, 2000; Burt & Davis, 1999). The authors listed in Table 2.4 highlight how private brand producers’ focus on improving quality played a large part in distinguishing them from generic brands and their eventual repositioning as high-quality products that are viewed as alternatives to leading national brands.

Ambrosini, Semeijn, and van Riel (2004) looked at the progression of private brands, the extension of their brands, and their role in the evolution of supermarkets into one-stop stores that offer an ever-increasing amount of products and services. Consumers’ perceptions of private labels play a crucial part as they directly impact brand extensions and that can affect their ability to expand and offer more products and services. From here Ambrosini et al. (2004, p. 247) go on to touch on the transformation of private brands:

---

⁹ It is important to note that not all private brands have evolved into direct competitors of national brands.
“Store brands are evolving into full-fledged alternatives, capable of competing successfully with these manufacturer's brands on quality as well as on price (Quelch and Harding, 1996) and contributing substantially to profitability, store differentiation and store loyalty (Corstjens and Lal, 2000)”.

From there they go on to mention that private labels are becoming sizable brands that possess their own individual identities and qualities, while becoming increasingly profitable for their parent companies. This has led to an increase in the number of private brand products available and a small increase in the marketing of them as well (Ambrosini et al., 2004).

Ruekert, Shocker, and Srivastava (1994) look at the production of private brand products and how they have gone into direct competition with manufacturers. They observe that retailers are able to get competing manufacturers to produce their private labels, and then by offering their private brands at slightly lower prices they can compete with them using the exact same product (Ruekert et al., 1994). Manufacturers with low quality products coupled with prices that reflect their quality have been impacted the most, as private brands are easily able to compete with them. Many private brands have begun focusing on producing higher quality products that are positioned to offer better value for money than national brands. Table 2.4 below provides a list of authors who touch on this. Ruekert et al. (1994, p. 153) place these new higher quality private brands on a similar level to national brands and describe the situation competing brand managers find themselves in:

“Brand managers thus are being faced with new choices – to compete or join (i.e., produce the private label for the retailer). The national brand may be forced to concentrate only on flavours or varieties in which the private label does not choose to compete.”

The research presented here points to the fact that private brands have the capability of overtaking national brands in perceptions of quality through their improved quality, packaging, brand extensions, and use of store branding. A prime example of a private brand that has achieved this is multinational French retailer Carrefour. Their private brand’s quality often exceeds that of rivalling national brands, and as well as that they have managed to extend their brand to engage with customers through in-store information boards and public relation campaigns (Dick et al., 1994; 1995). It is important to note that Carrefour’s private labels are not always the cheapest alternative and are instead priced to reflect the quality of
the retailer’s brand (Dick et al., 1994; 1995). This is in direct contrast to the historical findings of the research presented in Section 2.3.2. In Section 2.3.2 it was shown that consumers perceive private brands as low quality, cheap alternatives to national brands. This section has shown that private brands have the capacity to evolve into equal or higher quality products with improved features that rival national brands. The following section of the review will address the risks consumers associate with purchasing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area studied</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private brand evolution</td>
<td>• Improved packaging</td>
<td>Argouslidis &amp; Baltas (2007); Burt (2000); Burt &amp; Davis (1999); Choi &amp; Coughlan (2006); De Wulf et al. (2005); Gielens &amp; Sethuraman (2014); Hyman, Kopf, &amp; Lee (2010); Ruekert, Shocker, &amp; Srivastava (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private brand extensions</td>
<td>• New product categories/lines</td>
<td>Ambrosini, Semeijn, &amp; van Riel (2004); Burt (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Services – e.g. insurance, personal finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4. Contributions to literature on the evolution of private brands

### 2.3.4 Risk

As mentioned throughout this thesis iconic brands’ brand equity results in improved consumer perceptions. Perceived risk is one of these perceptions. This section intends to outline one of the major influencing factors of brand perceptions that is perceived risk.

This perception of risk derives from performance risk, financial risk, and psychological risk. Performance risk is the uncertainty of whether a product will perform to the expected standards and provide the expected benefits (Gotlieb, Grewal, & Marmorstein, 1994). Financial risk is the risk of incurring a cost if the product fails (Ambrosini et al., 2004). Psychological risk is the risk that the consumer will receive negative status evaluations for consuming that product (Ambrosini et al., 2004). Psychological risk generally only extends to products that are consumed publicly.

Lack of familiarity with a product or brand has a strong impact on consumers’ perceived performance and financial risks, with less familiarity resulting in increased perceived risk (Baltas, 1997; Dick et al. 1995; 1996a). Dick et al. (1995, p. 19) defined familiarity by
saying, “Product familiarity denotes understanding of a product and its features and skill in judging the criteria needed to evaluate product quality”. Many consumers who are not familiar with private brands perceive them as having a higher performance and financial risk, this is common amongst non-private brand prone shoppers and often results in consumers not purchasing private brands (Dick et al. 1995).

Consumers can also perceive risk in product categories. Certain categories are considered to be more risky than others by consumers. This risk is based on consumers’ previous experiences with that category and the perceived complexity of production associated with that product category (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Batra & Sinha 1999; Dowling & Staelin, 1994). If consumers have experienced product failure in a category before, then in the future they will perceive that category as risky. Also, if consumers perceive products in a category as being complex to produce they tend to purchase national brands, as they believe they will have done a better job producing the product (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Batra & Sinha 1999). In looking at category risk it has been found that it decreases private brand purchase as consumers instead purchase national brands in an attempt to reduce risk (Baltas 1997; Batra & Sinha 1999). In categories considered risky, for example cold and flu medicine, consumers rely more on price to infer quality and in turn are less price-conscious and go for higher priced products in an attempt to minimise performance and financial risks (Baltas 1997; Batra & Sinha 1999).

When consumers do perceive risks they are more likely to rely on extrinsic cues to form perceptions (Gielens & Sethuraman, 2014; Schellinck, 1980). As shown earlier in Section 2.3.2, reliance on extrinsic cues does not favour private brand purchase. Extrinsic cues are features such as packaging, brand image, and price. Private brands tend to have less favourable extrinsic qualities in comparison to national brands. Therefore, consumers’ reliance on extrinsic cues to form perceptions of quality leads to less favourable evaluations of private brand quality and perceived quality variation between the two brand types (Dick et al., 1994; 1996a; 1997).

From the literature discussed in this section it can be seen that risk alone has vast effects on consumers’ perceptions. Consumers become more price conscious, more reliant on price as a quality indicator, and more reliant on extrinsic cues (Baltas 1997; Batra & Sinha 1999; Dick et al., 1994; Schellinck, 1980). These are all contributing factors to the significant difference
between store brand prone and non-prone consumers in terms of the perceived quality associated with the brands (Dick et al., 1995). It can be said that risk and familiarity are the main factors behind consumers’ perceptions of private and national brand products. Consumers look to purchase products that live up to their desired standards. When they are unfamiliar with a product or product category they consider what the likelihood of product failure is, and how much risk there is with purchasing something they are unfamiliar with. In an attempt to alleviate these risks, they rely on cues to help them distinguish the quality and reliability of a brand. In turn their perceptions of quality are shaped by these cues that don’t necessarily translate to functional quality.

### 2.3.5 Influences of Perception

This section of the review examines what factors influence consumer perceptions of brands. Understanding the key factors that influence consumers’ perceptions is important to give context to brand equity’s impacts on consumer perceptions.

Lennon and Livesey (1978) listed five possible reasons for differences in consumer perceptions of national and private brands. These are their degree of experience with store brands, responses to advertising, differences in needs, perceived risks, and differences in importance of product categories\(^\text{10}\). Table 2.5 contains a list of the major factors that have been found to influence consumer perceptions of private and national brands. Research on private brand perceptions has looked at store image, packaging, familiarity, advertising, brand image/equity, and price (See Table 2.5 for references).

Familiarity’s influence on consumers’ perceptions of risk in brands is discussed in Section 2.3.4. Store image and packaging have both been addressed briefly in Section 2.3.2 of this review, they will be addressed in more depth in this section.

A store’s image influences consumers’ perceptions of its corresponding private brand. Consumers transfer qualities of a store’s image to their perceptions of its private brands (Collins-Dodd & Lindley, 2003; Dick et al., 1996b). It has been found that private brands receive more favourable evaluations when the stores they preside in have higher aesthetic

---

\(^{10}\) This thesis will review the aspects of this list that are a part of private and national brand strategy, which are perceived risks, response to advertising, and degree of experience with store brands (This is referred to as familiarity).
qualities such as being tidy and well kept. Building on this it has also been revealed that layout, merchandise, and service all contribute directly to a store’s image (Ambrosini et al., 2004). The relationship between a store’s image and its private brand is considered two way. This means that a store’s brands also influence consumer perceptions of a store’s image (Collins-Dodd & Lindley, 2003). It is also important to note that risk is a mediating factor in store images’ influence on consumer perceptions. So, for private brands, if the stores they are sold in have a better store image, then they will be perceived as better products. Whereas national brands remain unaffected by a store’s image (Dick et al., 1996b).

It is well established that packaging influences consumer perceptions of products (Baker & McDaniel, 1977). In regards to private and national brands it is noted that private brands have a tendency to fall short when it comes to packaging (Burt, 2000; Dick et al., 1995; 1996a; 1997). Packaging is an important extrinsic cue as consumers associate it with quality (Dick et al., 1996a; 1997). It also is crucial when signalling the position of the brand to the consumer (Burt, 2000).

It has been found that advertising is an important extrinsic variable in regards to influencing consumer perceptions (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Dick et al., 1997). A high amount of advertising in a product category benefits national brands, while the opposite is true for private brands (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Dick et al., 1997). This is often because private brands do not have the advertising budgets to compete with national brands. Most importantly it has been found that advertising increases the perceived gap in quality between private and national brands, this is in part due to the fact that consumers use advertising intensity as an indicator of quality (Geyskens et al., 2010).

Brands and brand equity will be addressed in Section 2.5 of this review. For this section, it is important to note that brands, and the value consumers place on them, heavily influence consumer perceptions (Bakpayev, Borges, & Rossi, 2015).

The final influencing factor examined here is price. Pricing has a vast amount of effects on perceptions of brands, starting with whether consumers use price to infer quality. The effects of this are mitigated by factors such as whether the shopper is prone to purchasing store brands, whether they’re familiar with a product or category, and if they perceive it to be risky (Batra & Sinha, 1999; Dick et al. 1997). Private brands are often cheaper than national brands.
so when consumers assume that price reflects quality it has a negative impact on the perceived quality of private brands. Perceived price unfairness is another facet of price, and is a factor often associated with national brands that can contribute to a consumer’s price consciousness making them more likely to purchase cheaper options such as private brands (Batra & Sinha, 1999). In a study that presented individual extrinsic cues, without any others present, it was found that price was the strongest influencing extrinsic cue and is used to indicate quality. Although when brand names and store information were added the effects of price were reduced (Dodds, Grewal, & Monroe, 1991). Price has such a powerful relationship with perceived quality that Dick et al. (1994; 1997) recommended that private brand owners do not use a permanently low price strategy for their brands, as this would only reinforce consumers’ perceptions of poor quality. The influence of price on perceptions of brands is moderated by the perceived risk of a product or category, the relationship between these two variables is discussed in further depth in Section 2.3.4. Although price has an extremely impactful influence on perceptions of brands, it is important to note that quality and consistency of products and brands are actually more important to consumers (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Gielens & Sethuraman, 2014).

Consumers’ perceptions of brands are influenced through a variety of factors, as demonstrated in the literature above and in Table 2.5 below. Though all these factors contribute to perceptions of private and national brands, this review intends to focus on the influence of brands and brand equity on perceptions. The flow on effects from brand equity to brand perceptions, and risk, will be the prime focus of Section 2.5 of this review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area studied</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store image</td>
<td>• Store aesthetics can positively increase the evaluation of store brands</td>
<td>Ambrosini et al. (2004); Collins-Dodd &amp; Lindley (2003); Dick et al. (1996b); Liu &amp; Wang (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Store image is a predictor of consumers’ attitude towards store brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consumers transfer qualities of a store’s image on to their perceptions of a store’s brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Store image consists of aesthetics, layout, merchandise and service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Packaging is used to gauge quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>• Familiarity with a type of brand (private/national)</td>
<td>Baltas (1997);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Influences</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand image/equity</td>
<td>• Brands are used by customers to infer quality</td>
<td>Bakpayev, Borges, &amp; Rossi (2015); Bech, Engelund, Juhl, Kristensen &amp; Poulsen (1996); Cypert, Li, McClure, Montague, Montague, &amp; Tomlin (2004); d'Hauteville &amp; Fornerino (2010); Dick et al. (1997); De Wulf et al. (2005); Gielens &amp; Sethuraman (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consumers are more likely to believe advertisements when brand equity is high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brands have been found to influence taste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brands create positive perceptions for their products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>• Used to infer quality</td>
<td>Baltas (1997); Baltas &amp; Doyle (1988); Banerji &amp; Hoch (1993); Batra &amp; Sinha (1999); Bellizzi et al (1981); Dick et al. (1994; 1997) Dodds et al. (1991); Geyskens et al. (2010); Omar (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some consumers’ price consciousness leads them to purchase national brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consumers’ are less price conscious when they perceive risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some consumers perceive price unfairness among national brand products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Price has a negative effect on perceived value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Price is the most powerful extrinsic cue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>• Private brands perform better when their national brand competitors advertise less</td>
<td>Banerji &amp; Hoch (1993); Dick et al. 1997; Geyskens et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advertising increases the perceived gap between national and private brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advertising is used to judge intrinsic product quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>• Familiarity with a type of brand (private/national) influences quality</td>
<td>Baltas &amp; Doyle (1998); Dick et al. (1995; 1996a); Gielens &amp; Sethuraman (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5. Factors influencing perceptions of private and national brands
2.4 Competitive Strategies

2.4.1 Private Brand Competitive Strategy

To analyse iconic branding as a potential strategy for private brands we must first understand current private brand strategies and how these result in increased brand equity and brand attachments. Retailers want to develop private brands as they offer another revenue stream and they have the potential to increase store loyalty (Dick et al., 1996a). Retailers have the opportunity to provide their brands with premium shelf space to give their brands the best chance at success (Dick et al., 1996a). As well as this they tend to offer higher margins for retailers than they do for manufactures, as manufacturers margins are reduced by the payments they have to make to retailers to ensure their brand is stocked and shelved in a good location (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Bonfrer, Chintagunta, & Song 2002; Chen, 2009). National brand manufacturers are often forced to produce private brands on behalf of retailers at discount rates in order to maintain their relationships with distributors and thus ensure their national brand continues to be stocked (Chen, 2009; Nijssen, Sloot, & Verhoef, 2002; Ruekert et al., 1994).

Private brands are most successful when sold in large categories with high margins and few national brand competitors (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Batra & Sinha, 2000). Generally, the less national brand competitors are in a category, the lower the spending on advertising, which benefits private brands (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Batra & Sinha, 2000; Dick et al., 1997). To increase the success of private brands, retailers tend to focus on improving their quality, packaging, selling price, shelf space, and promotional activities (Chen, 2009). As they are the sole owners and operators of the brands, retailers can introduce value added services such as loyalty programs or guarantees at their outlets to increase the attractiveness of their private labels (Chen, 2009). When it comes to pricing their brands, retailers don’t always price the brands to maximise profits from them (Bonfrer et al., 2002). Instead they are priced to maximise the brand’s share of the market and to increase category profits through payments from national brands (Bonfrer et al., 2002).

2.4.2 Tiered Private Brand Strategy

Laaksonen and Reynolds (1994) were the first to propose the idea of tiered private brands. They proposed four different tiers (or generations as they refer to them), with each tier indicating a higher quality product than the last. They are listed in Table 2.6. Following this
Jary and Wileman (1997) proposed five tiers, and more recently Huang and Huddleston (2009) have proposed a three-tier model. All three works propose an evolutionary sequence of private brands improving in quality over time. While low quality store brands still exist, the trend for many private brands has been to try and move from low-price/quality to high-price/quality (Huang & Huddleston, 2009).

Laaksonen and Reynolds (1994) provide the most comprehensive explanation of tiered private labels so for the purpose of this review their work will be used as the definition for each tier. Their four tiers listed are generics, own labels, own brands, and value added own brands. Generics are designed to be sold at the lowest price and provide the basic functions associated with their product category. They often have little branding and very plain packaging, and are not designed to compete with national brands (Laaksonen & Reynolds, 1994). Following on from generics are own labels. They are usually positioned with a value for money approach and are medium quality. Own brands on the other hand are higher quality than own labels and are comparable to brand leaders. Lastly, value added own brands, are high quality private brands designed to compete with national brands by matching or surpassing them in terms of quality (Laaksonen & Reynolds, 1994). An example of a value added own brand would be Tesco’s own label in Europe, which is renowned for producing high quality products (Ailawadi & Keller, 2004). Table 2.6 showcases the different proposed tiers of private brands. Laaksonen and Reynolds (1994) provide the most comprehensive taxonomy, while Jary and Wileman’s (1997) may have the most tiers it could be argued that their ‘cheap’ category is unnecessary. Huang and Huddleston (2009) only provide three tiers but it can be argued there is a stage for private brands between being mimics of national brands and becoming equal to or greater than national brands. For these reasons, Laaksonen and Reynolds (1994) explanation will be used for addressing tiered private labels in this review.11

Private brand retailers who wish to offer a range of private brand products use tiered private brands as their strategy. Through this they are able to offer private brands that cost more and are of higher quality to compete with national brands, while still being able to provide cheaper alternatives to more price conscious consumers.

11 Throughout this thesis value added own brands will also be referred to as premium private brands.
### Tiers of private labels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generics, own labels, own brands, value added own brands.</td>
<td>Laaksonen &amp; Reynolds (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generics, mimic brands, own-brands</td>
<td>Huang &amp; Huddleston (2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.6. Tiers of private brands suggested by different authors.**

### Authors that address tiered private labels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area studied</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiered private labels</td>
<td>• Private labels of different quality levels as a retailer strategy</td>
<td>Bakpayev, Borges, &amp; Rossi (2015); Dekimpe, Geyskens, &amp; Ter Braak (2013); Fustinoni-Venturini, González-Benit, &amp; Martos-Partal (2015); Huang &amp; Huddleston (2009); Laaksonen &amp; Reynolds (1994); Nenycz-Thiel &amp; Romaniuk, (2016); Jary &amp; Wileman (1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.7. Authors that address tiered private labels**

### 2.4.3 National Brand Competitive Strategy

In order to develop iconic branding as a strategy for FMCG brands we must first understand current FMCG strategy. Effective use of competitive strategies for both private and national brands can result in increased brand equity and brand attachments. The effects of brand equity as a strategy are discussed in-depth in Section 2.5, while brand attachments’ strategic benefits are addressed in Section 2.6.

National brands consider private brands to be a threat to their profits, market, and brand shares. When faced with a private brand entering their market there are six strategies that national brand manufacturers tend to employ (Nijssen et al., 2002). These strategies are as follows:

1) Increase distance from private brands through differentiating your product.
2) Increase distance from private brands through increasing your value for money.
3) Reduce the price of your national brand.
4) Introduce another product that is lower priced and potentially lower quality to compete with private brands.
5) Wait and take no action.
6) Begin producing premium private labels on behalf of retailers.
Each strategy has its upsides and downsides but Nijssen et al. (2002) declared the strongest strategy was for national brands to differentiate themselves through the use of technology in their production process, while strengthening their brand value at the same time. This way they would be able to create the biggest perceived gap in quality between private and national brands (Nijssen et al., 2002). Subtle competition strategies are important for national brand manufacturers as they need to maintain their relationships with retailers to secure shelf space for their products (Nijssen et al., 2002). This means strategy options three and four are less likely to be used as they compete directly with private brands main offerings, value for money and cheaper prices.

Promotions and advertising are common techniques used by national brands to increase their brand share. As noted in an earlier section (2.3.5), advertising has vast effects on consumers’ perceptions. Promotions increase national brands’ brand share while lowering it for private brands (Cotterill & Putsis 2000). National brands experience a greater increase in brand share when they promote in comparison with private brands, hence why it is a much more common technique for national brands (Cotterill & Putsis 2000). Unsurprisingly national brands’ prices have a large impact on private brand sales, partially because private brands set their prices based on national brands’ prices (Chintagunta, & Song, 2002; Cotterill & Putsis 2000). Interestingly private brand prices do not impact national brand sales according to Cotterill and Putsis (2000). Consumers are also willing to pay higher prices for national brands in hedonistic product categories that provide a high amount of consumption pleasure (Cole & Sethuraman, 1999). Hedonistic products are those purchased for luxury purposes rather than practical or functional purposes. Examples of hedonistic products are ice cream, alcohol, and soft drinks. Therefore, when national brands advertise it is in their best interest to illustrate the hedonistic value of their brands/products through emotional advertising. Obviously, this only works in certain product categories such as ice cream or chocolate and would be less effective for selling a product such as toilet paper (Cole & Sethuraman, 1999).

2.4.4 Strategic Alliances as a Strategy

Private and national brands also have the ability to work together. One study highlighted that a private brand using national brand ingredients and advertising it on their packaging can benefit both brands (Aggarwal & Vaidyanathan, 2000). Perceptions of the private brand were
far more positive when a national brand ingredient was used and it was advertised on the packaging. As well as this it had no negative effects on consumer perceptions of the national brand. Value conscious consumers even perceived the national brand as being better value for money going forward (Aggarwal & Vaidyanathan, 2000). Obviously, relationships like these between brands can only last so long as a national brand cannot assist a private brand to the point that it is a direct competitor.

With correct use of the competitive strategies discussed above, private and national brands are able to develop brand equity and brand attachments. Brand equity, both as a concept and a strategy, will be discussed in the following section.

2.5 Brand Equity as a Strategy
This section will discuss the strategic benefits experienced by brands with strong brand equity. Due to these strategic benefits brand managers often seek to develop brand equity to improve the performance of their brands. As iconic brands possess a large amount of brand equity they also experience these performance benefits. Because of this, developing an iconic brand can be seen as a strategy for developing brand equity.

De Wulf et al. (2005, p. 224) defined brand equity as “The incremental utility or value added to a product by its brand name”. They then put this in terms relevant to private and national brands by posing the question of what perceived differences can be created by a store brand name compared to a manufacturer brand name (De Wulf et al., 2005). Brands are the main source of differentiation between products for consumers and allow them to assign identities to different manufacturers’ products, hence their importance to manufacturers and retailers alike (Fullerton & Low, 1994).

Through brand equity, brands are able to create value for their owners by evoking perceptions in consumers (Bakpayev et al. 2015). Used as a heuristic cue, they are often relied on by consumers to infer quality (Bakpayev et al. 2015). The strategic advantages of brand equity are its positive effects on perceived quality, name awareness, perceived risk, brand loyalty, and consumers’ likelihood to believe advertisements related to the brand (Bakpayev et al., 2015; Chen, 2009; De Wulf et al. 2005; Erdem & Swait, 1998). Brand equity even has the ability to increase perceived taste experience. There are a number of studies in which
consumers have blind-taste tested products, rated them, and then non-blind tested the same products and rated them differently solely because they have been exposed to branding (Bakpayev et al. 2015; Cypert et al. 2004; De Wulf et al. 2005; Dick et al. 1994; Luomala, Paasovaara, Pohjanheimo, & Sandell, 2012). Through developing brand equity businesses are able to ensure that the money they spend on marketing is a long-term investment in consumers’ perceptions of the brand, rather than a short-term expense to temporarily increase sales (Chen, 2009; De Wulf et al., 2005). The antecedents of brand equity are listed in Table 2.8 (De Wulf et al., 2005). Most of these are luxuries only national brand manufacturers can afford to offer their brands. So, it comes as no surprise to find that national brands exhibit higher brand equity than private brands. It is because of this that consumers associate national brands with being higher quality products and thus have a higher purchase intention towards them (Bakpayev et al. 2015).

De Wulf et al. (2005) proposed and proved the idea of brand equity for store brands, but they noted that they have considerably less of it, and that their store loyalty moderates it. Chen (2009) notes that a private brand strategy that encompasses brand equity construction will have the desired effects on consumers’ shopping preferences in regards to private brands.

Brand equity is positively related to positive quality perceptions (Dick et al. 1995; Erdem & Swait, 1998). This is due to brand equity’s reduction effect on perceived risk. With less perceived risk consumers also rely less on extrinsic cues to form their perceptions of brands\(^\text{12}\). This benefits private brands as they traditionally lack in these categories (Dick et al. 1994; 1996a; 1997). Reduced risk also results in price consciousness and a reduced perceived price-quality relationship (Baltas 1997; Batra & Sinha 1999; Dick et al., 1994; Schellinck, 1980). This means consumers are less likely to assume that a higher priced product is higher quality and they will be more open to purchasing lower priced products. As noted in Section 2.3.4 when there is perceived risk consumers rely on other cues that in turn influence their perceptions of brands and product quality. These cues that influence perceptions are discussed in Section 2.3.5 and are listed in Table 2.5. With consumers perceiving less risk they will rely less on the cues discussed in Section 2.3.5, store image, packaging, familiarity, advertising, brand image/equity and price. This benefits private brands, as apart from store

\(^{12}\)Extrinsic cues are price, packaging, advertising, and brand name (Dick et al. 1994).
image these are cues that usually result in a perceived gap in quality between private and national brands.

What brand equity does do is increase the perceived quality of a brand (Erdem & Swait, 1998). So from the ideas posited here as brand equity increases, risk decreases, reliance on extrinsic cues also decreases, and perceived quality increases. Brand name awareness, brand loyalty, and consumers’ likelihood to believe advertisements related to the brand are also increased by increases in brand equity. Increasing positive perceptions of brands and products, while reducing perceived risk, is crucial in the battle between private and national brands and a brands’ success will depend heavily on the management of these perceptions.

The strategic benefits of brand equity that have been discussed throughout this section result in brand equity’s positive affects on future profitability (Aaker, 1991; Wood, 2000). As brand equity is a long-term investment in the brand it also results in increased brand loyalty (Erdem & Swait, 1998). The benefits of brand equity discussed in this section highlight how brand equity can result in long-term profitability and brand loyalty. From this it can be seen that a brand possessing high levels of brand equity can be highly successful.

National and private brands should both be competing to develop brand equity to improve their profitability. A method for doing so could be developing an iconic brand. An iconic brand is a brand that reaches the identity value of a cultural icon, these will be discussed in depth in the next section (Holt, 2004). Iconic brands possess a large amount of brand equity and benefit from it immensely (Holt, 2004). However, there has been no research on how iconicity might be used as a strategy for FMCG brands. The next section intends to explore what the potential effects of a brand’s iconicity are on its brand equity and the follow on effects of this.
Antecedents of brand equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertising share</th>
<th>Brand-naming strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales force</td>
<td>Promotional effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing research expenditures</td>
<td>Country of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the brand</td>
<td>Company image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of entry</td>
<td>Warranties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product portfolio</td>
<td>Symbols and packages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of public relations</td>
<td>Slogans or jingles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8. Antecedents of brand equity (De Wulf et al., 2005)

2.6 Brand attachment

This section covers brand attachment as a concept, its place in iconic branding, and the strategic benefits associated with it. Attachment is a strong emotional bond between a person and an object that relies on an individual’s memories associated with an object (MacInnis, Park, & Thomson, 2005). These memories are formed over time through consumers’ experiences with an object. During these experiences and interactions people self-identify with the object they are interacting with and then begin to classify the object as a part of their self-concept (Belk, 1988; Aron, Aron, Nelson, & Tudor, 1991; Kernan, Kleine, & Kleine, 1993; MacInnis et al., 2005). Attachments can also be formed in childhood through nostalgic bonding, an example of this could be a place visited during an individuals’ childhood that still has nostalgic value for them during adulthood (Grisaffe & Nguyen 2011; Holbrook & Schindler, 2003; MacInnis et al., 2005). Behaviours such as proximity maintenance and separation distress can be by-products of attachments (MacInnis et al., 2005). Proximity maintenance is the individuals’ commitment to maintaining a relationship, while separation distress is the psychological distress that would be caused by the end of this relationship (MacInnis et al., 2005). An example of proximity maintenance could be an individual who chooses to reside in the same area as their parents so they can maintain proximity to them. Whereas separation distress is the discomfort they would feel if they were not able to maintain this proximity to their parents.
Brand attachment\textsuperscript{13} includes all the aforementioned facets of an attachment relationship to persona or object. MacInnis et al. (2005) define brand attachment as an emotion-laden bond between a person and a brand characterised by emotions of affection, connection, and passion. Consumers form attachments to a brand by matching their self-concept with a brand’s user image (Herrmann, Huber, Huber, Kressmann, Lee, & Sirgy, 2006). If the image of the typical user of the brand matches the perceived or desired image of one’s self then the consumer may form an emotional bond with the brand.

Grisaffe & Nguyen (2011) propose three sets of antecedents for brand attachment that differ in the amount of controllability they offer marketers. There are marketer-controllable antecedents such as superior marketing characteristics and traditional customer outcomes that offer a high amount of controllability. Superior marketing characteristics consist of place, price, promotion, product, and service, while traditional customer outcomes are value, satisfaction, and differentiation. Then there are user-derived benefits that offer mixed controllability, such as sensory pleasure, self-orientated goals, and social-orientated goals. These offer mixed controllability as the user derives some of the benefits while the product and the brand provide others. An example of this is a brand that helps individuals with identity development. The brand can only provide so much of the identity while the individuals must provide the rest themselves (e.g. with clothing). Through the interplay of aspects that offer control to marketers and those that don’t, we are presented with antecedents that offer mixed controllability. Lastly there are the less controllable antecedents, which are sentimentality/emotional memory and socialization. Sentimentality/emotional memory consists of people, places, and situations that link the brand with the person, while socialization is comprised of family and social group usage of the brand (Grisaffe & Nguyen, 2011). Examples of this include benefits that a customer derives from their family’s value of a brand. A consumer may choose to purchase a particular brand because it has great significance to their family. Whether or not the brand is valuable to a particular family is almost entirely out of the control of the marketer, thus this antecedent of brand attachment is less controllable.

Forming brand attachments can result in a number of strategic benefits for the brand. These include but are not limited to, increases in consumers’ likelihood to repurchase, consumers’

\textsuperscript{13} Brand attachments are referred to as emotional attachments and emotional brand attachments throughout this thesis. This is because brand attachments consist of emotional bonds.
intention to recommend, consumers’ likelihood to purchase, consumers’ resilience to negative information, brand loyalty, and consumers’ willingness to pay a price premium (Ekinci et al., 2014; MacInnis et al., 2005; Oliver, 1999).

Emotional attachments to a brand can be developed through Holt’s (2004) cultural branding process that brands use to become iconic. Holt (2004) addressed emotional attachments as a by-product of the cultural branding process (This will be addressed in greater detail in Section 2.7). Holt (2004) states that emotional connections with brands are not formed through emotional branding but rather through the brands producing identity myths that customers use to resolve their identity anxieties. This is consistent with the literature on brand attachments being formed through the self-concept and brand user image (Herrmann et al., 2006). But Holt (2004) does not pay enough attention to brand attachments, they are mentioned sparingly and the relationship with the cultural branding process is not explained in enough depth.

From what has been posited above it is clear that one of the strategic benefits from developing an iconic brand are the emotional brand attachments that are formed in the process and the corresponding strategic benefits of these attachments.

2.7 Iconic Brands

2.7.1 Iconic Brands

As noted in the previous sections brand equity and brand attachment have a range of effects on consumers’ perceptions of brands, which in turn affects how they are treated and how they perform. This section will cover what an iconic brand is and how its iconicity impacts its brand equity and brand attachments, along with the corresponding relationships discussed earlier. “Holt (2004) used the term iconic brands to capture the essence of highly successful, instantly recognisable brands that are embedded in culture and whose status transcends their functional benefits.” (Bulmer, 2011, p. 25). An iconic brand is defined as a brand that reaches the identity value of a cultural icon, while cultural branding is the set of strategies they use to achieve this (Holt, 2004). Icons are seen as symbols of cultural movements that are deserving of being revered (Holt, 2004). Through being a cultural icon, brands can then command cultural authority, which in turn means its followers look to the brand to provide a particular kind of myth or story (Holt, 2004).
Holt (2004) refers to brand equity as the economic value of the brand based on its potential future earnings. These future earnings are demonstrated by customers’ continued willingness to pay higher prices for a specific brand despite cheaper equivalents being readily available (Holt, 2004). Consumers place a high value on iconic brands as they address anxieties in their lives and they care about what this brand does for their identity. Brand equity stems from consumers’ historic consumption of a brand’s myth; if a brand’s stories have been of value to them in the past, then consumers will engage with the brand’s similar stories in the future. Brand equity affords brands the luxury of being able to establish a new image without losing its value to consumers. Iconic brands possess a high amount of brand equity, as they are extremely valuable brands with extremely loyal customers. From this we can see it is in the best interests of a brand to become iconic.

In the literature brand attachment is addressed as a by-product of forming iconic brands (Holt, 2004). It is noted that iconic brands have consumers that are emotionally attached to them. These emotional attachments occur due to the identity myths that the brand produces as a part of the cultural branding process. Cultural branding is Holt’s (2004) process of developing iconic brands and is discussed in-depth in the next section. According to Holt (2004) emotional brand attachments occur due to a brand’s myths’ ability to resolve consumers’ identity anxieties. This is consistent with brand attachment literature that states that consumers’ attachments to brands occur when they are able to match their self-concept to the brand user image (Herrmann et al., 2006).

2.7.2 Developing Iconic Brands – Cultural Branding

In order to develop a strategy for developing iconic FMCG brands, already existing strategies for developing iconic brands must be understood. This section will outline Holt’s (2004) cultural branding strategy for developing iconic brands.

Holt states iconic brands are brands that make use of already existing cultural myths to weave into their brand image and identity rather than developing their own tales and stories (Holt, 2006). To become an iconic brand, brands must undergo the process of cultural branding. Cultural branding consists of four main steps. The four steps are as follows 1) Iconic brands must address contradictions in society; 2) perform identity myths that subscribe to society’s
desires stimulated by these contradictions; 3) ensure that these identity myths are set in populist worlds; 4) and ensure the brand performs as a cultural activist.

Addressing contradictions in society involves the brand paying homage to the tensions in society created by the gap between a nation’s ideological lifestyle and consumers’ real lifestyles. Holt (2004) states that as well as addressing cultural contradictions, iconic brands must also perform identity myths that fulfil the desires and anxieties created by these cultural contradictions. Holt (2004) exemplifies this using Coca-Cola who, in a single advert, addressed the social tensions that arose during the late 1960’s and early 1970’s through civil rights movements, the anti-establishment youth culture, and the Vietnam War. These social tensions created anxieties such as fears people’s civil rights could be breached, fears that the youth would reject society, and fears that the United States was waging an unnecessary war. In their advert Coca-Cola brought together hundreds of youths of different ethnicities and cultures to sing a song about buying the world a Coke. The advertisement includes lines such as “I’d like to buy the world a home, and furnish it with love…” (Holt, 2004, p. 23) and “I’d like to buy the world a Coke, and keep it company” (Holt, 2004, p. 24). The advert addressed the social tensions at the time by performing a myth that communicated togetherness and peace amongst the world. This is a prime example of how an iconic brand can address contradictions in society (For a more in-depth description of the advertisement see Holt, 2004, p. 23-24).

The identity myths that iconic brands perform must be set in populist worlds (Holt, 2004). Populist worlds are worlds that are not a part of peoples’ everyday lives. They are worlds that are far removed, both figuratively and literally, from centres of commerce and institutions that influence peoples’ lives, such as employers and governments. Holt (2004) states that populist worlds exist on the edge of society. Populist worlds are realms of society where its members collectively create its ethos and participation in it is voluntary. The activities that members of these populist worlds carry out are valuable to them and they do not have commercial or political motivations behind them. The people who consume the myths set in populist worlds rarely inhabit them. The myth gives them an imaginary connection to that world. An example Holt (2004) provides is Harley Davidson drawing from outlaw biker culture. The consumers who engage with Harley Davidson’s advertising are very rarely outlaws but they see there are people who live as outlaws and they believe they can extract parts of the outlaw culture and bring them into their own lives through the brand.
Iconic brands must also act as cultural activists. Through the societal contradictions and anxieties they address, the brand must take on the role of an activist. Their myths must challenge the societal contradictions they highlight. The Coca-Cola advertisement discussed above is a great example of this, with the brand becoming an advocate for world peace and cultural tolerance. The advertisement is a prime example of an iconic brand performing the role of cultural activist.

Holt’s (2004) recommended strategy for forming iconic brands consists of three contradictions to popular brand management strategy. He says brands should refrain from using persuasion in their advertising and they should rather focus on myth making. By this Holt (2004) means that brands should stop trying to influence consumer perceptions of things such as product quality and benefits of the brand. Instead Holt (2004) says the brand should instead create myths and stories about the brand and consumers will instead buy the product to experience them.

Holt’s (2004) second contradiction is that rather than attempting to create associations between the brand and generic concepts, brands should instead focus on authoring myths that express the culture of the brand. Holt’s (2004) example of this is the Mexican beer brand Corona. Rather than associating themselves with the generic concepts of relaxation or refreshment, the brand instead communicated its culture by producing a series of adverts that took place on Mexican beaches. These ads were still able to communicate relaxation and refreshment along with many more concepts, such as escaping the busy lifestyle many Americans lived at the time. The ads communicated a more complex concept of a beach holiday to less developed country, rather than simple concepts like relaxation and the refreshment of a beer. Lastly Holt (2004) recommends that brands stray from consistently trying to provide one key message when necessary. He notes that while portraying a consistent image is important, brand managers should have the courage to abandon that image in favour of one that is more in touch with current social issues. Holt (2004) again uses Corona as an example, as originally their beer was perceived as a party implement, but they changed their message and marketing communications and became seen as a beer that resembled an escape from people’s busy working lives.
Holt (2004) used the beer brand Budweiser as an example to demonstrate the success of an iconic brand. The now iconic beer brand attached itself to the myth and icon of the stoic American working class man earning a living with his hands and enjoying a cold beer after a hard day’s labour. This myth couldn’t have been further from the truth at the time as it took place during a period of offshore outsourcing of production by American businesses (Holt, 2004). This made it a cultural contradiction. The myth addressed societies’ anxieties about the loss of value in jobs that consisted of manual labour. The public connected with it and Anheuser-Busch managed to increase sales dramatically (Holt, 2004). From these branding activities Budweiser were able to actively increase the perceived value of their brand (Holt, 2004).

Bulmer (2011) notes that most brands that currently claim to be iconic would not meet Holt’s (2004) definition of iconicity. But she then goes on to propose that individuals can have their own sets of iconic brands. This depends on what brands consumers have used throughout their lives, and what brands they have stories associated with as part of their family, cultural, or national heritage (Buchanan-Oliver, & Bulmer, 2011; Bulmer, 2011). Bulmer’s (2011) work goes on to recognise the role of brands as active cultural agents of national identity. It was also found that consumption heritage and the rituals involved in brand consumption contribute to consumers’ value of brands. Bulmer (2011, p. 26) states “Iconicity, potentially, encompasses those brands each of us grew up with and recount in stories, as part of our family, cultural and even national heritage (although there is little mention in the literature of such qualities)”. From this it can be posed that certain brands may be iconic to consumers depending on their consumption history and how they view their heritage. However, it is acknowledged that people have shared knowledge of the world and can develop shared views and meanings on what brands are iconic. The effects of this are discussed at the end of Section 2.7.

2.7.3 Iconic Brands in Retail

Iconic brands in retail must be discussed in order to provide context to our understanding of iconic brands in FMCG. The best example of an iconic retail brand from Holt’s (2004) work is, as he refers to it, the once-iconic retailer GAP. He discusses how GAP was already an iconic brand in the eyes of its customers but went on to attach itself to a fashion trend. GAP clothing became popular amongst the urban hip-hop movement and saw its status as a brand improve dramatically. GAP became an identity brand through the viral qualities of its
advertising. Due to the viral nature of its ascendance to the status of identity brand GAP relinquished control over its brand’s image and left it in the hands of trend developing customers. GAP attempted to maintain its new image in the urban hip-hop scene through advertisements, but the same trend developers that made the brand so popular in the first place moved on to new brands. This left the brand in a difficult situation as it had already alienated its once loyal consumer base, from before it was adopted by urban hip-hop culture, by trying to pursue a new image they did not relate to. Holt (2004) notes that identity brands are not in complete control of their image. Iconic brands on the other hand are, and they are more resilient and address social notions that have a longer life span than fashion trends (Holt, 2004).

Perhaps the most discussed retail brand in iconic branding literature is the American Girl doll and its corresponding brand stores. American Girl is famous for its themed brand stores that create a unique experiential retail environment and its dolls, each of which has its own backstory (Borghini, Diamond, Kozinets, McGrath, Muniz Jr, & Sherry, 2009a; Borghini, Diamond, Kozinets, McGrath, Muniz Jr, & Sherry, 2009b). These brand stores blur the lines between experiential retailing and entertainment. They contain a museum, a salon, a theatre, a library, a photo studio and a café. Each of which is themed to play a part in building the multi-storied American Girl brand. Borghini et al. (2009a, p. 132) state “A customer does not merely “buy,” “have,” or “use” an American girl doll; she is caught up in a mesh of interwoven experiences, some engineered by marketers and others improvised by stakeholders, at every touchpoint of the brand”. The American Girl brand has built iconicity upon values of traditional female values along with female heroism and then taken this a step further by providing a fully experiential shopping experience at their outlets. This allows consumers to engage with the iconic brand in ways that are not possible for many FMCG goods.

2.7.4 Iconic Brands in FMCG – Gap in the Literature

To develop a strategy for producing iconic FMCG brands (both private and national) it is crucial to first understand what is already known about iconic brands in FMCG. In his work, Holt (2003; 2004) makes mention of three FMCG brands that are iconic, Coca-Cola, Mountain Dew, and Snapple, all beverages. Holt (2003; 2004) makes no mention of whether they are private or national brands, as he is only concerned by their status as icons and not by
their ownership. But from the definitions of private and national brands (provided in Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, respectively) we can see they are all national brands. Holt (2003; 2004) discusses the stories behind the iconicity for each but does not discuss anything relevant to their status as national brands. Holt (2004) explains Snapple’s iconicity and how its amateur approach to marketing its products provided a contradiction to corporate big budget marketing. Snapple contradicted society’s willingness to let large conglomerates dictate what beverage marketing should be. They addressed society’s anxieties towards corporate America’s dominance. The myths that Snapple communicated were tales of amateurs taking on corporate American companies, in this case Coca-Cola and PepsiCo. The brand was an activist against mass consumerism and was a company with a personality that engaged with its customers. This provided a juxtaposition to the faceless companies of corporate America at the time. So technically speaking there is literature on iconic national brands, but it is not literature that addresses them as national brands. Meanwhile there is no literature on iconic private brands.

From what has been addressed in this Section (2.7) it can be posed that an FMCG brand can become iconic through being a cultural icon, through cultural branding, and through consumers’ consumption history and stories they associate with the brand (See Section 2.7.2). While the strategic merits of the brand equity and brand attachment associated with being an iconic brand have been discussed (see Sections 2.5 and 2.6, respectively), the idea of a private or national FMCG brand developing national icon status through consumers’ consumption habits and national heritage has not been proposed before. The effects of iconicity on a brand’s brand equity and brand attachments, and the impacts this would have on consumers’ perceived risks and perceptions of the brand have not been discussed in the context of private and national branding literature. This, along with the strategy to achieve it, remains to be researched. This highlights a clear gap between the literature streams of private/national brands and iconic brands.

This thesis intends to investigate this gap. There is no literature on iconic national brands that looks at iconic brands in an FMCG context, and none that compares private and national brands. As well as that, currently there is no literature on iconic private brands at all. But, considering that they can develop brand equity, brand attachments, and the iconicity of a brand can be developed through consumers’ lifetime consumption habits, it is entirely plausible that iconic private brands can exist (Bulmer, 2011; De Wulf et al., 2005). Lastly,
there is also no literature that looks at iconic branding as a strategy for private/national brands.

From the literature gap proposed above, the following research questions were developed and shall be addressed in this thesis:

1. What makes an FMCG brand iconic?

2. How do consumers perceive iconic FMCG brands in comparison to other FMCG brands?

3. How do consumers perceive iconic private FMCG brands differently to iconic national FMCG brands?

4. What are the strategic implications for retailers of FMCG private and national brands?

2.8 Conclusion

This review has highlighted the array of influences on the perceived gap in quality between national and private brands currently covered in literature. Specifically, it looks at risk and brand equity as influencers of consumer’s perceptions. Section 2.3.4 outlines the impacts of risk on consumer perceptions, and how increased risk leads to decreased likelihood to purchase and vice versa. Following that Section 2.3.5 covers the effects of consumer perceptions on private and national brands. Section 2.5 of the review clearly outlines the positive effects on perceptions of brands posited by brand equity, and puts forward the idea of relationship where, as brand equity increases, so does perceived quality. Section 2.5 also outlines the other strategic benefits associated with brand equity. Following this 2.6 explains the relationship between brand attachment and iconic brands while highlighting the array of strategic benefits it adds. Finally, in Section 2.7, the review then looks into iconic brands, specifically what makes them iconic, and then how their iconicity contributes to their brand equity.

This review has connected four different streams of literature and proposed the idea that through being an iconic brand, brands exhibit a higher amount of brand equity, which in turn increases consumers’ positive perceptions of the brand, while reducing its perceived risk. It also proposed that brand attachment is developed through the process of developing iconic
brands and this also adds a number of strategic benefits to iconic brands. This thesis intends to investigate these two phenomena along with the effects they have on the perceived quality gap between private and national brands.

This chapter contains a review of private and national branding literature that details the ‘perceived gap’ in quality between them and why it exists. The review also covers brand equity, brand attachment, and iconic branding literature and relates them back to the earlier sections on the influences on consumer perceptions of private and national brands. It has proposed the positive effects the national icon status of a brand could have on private or national brand performance through bringing together literature on iconic brands, brand attachment, brand equity, and FMCG brand perceptions. This has not been considered in brand equity, brand attachment, iconic branding, or private and national branding literature before and will be addressed by the research of this thesis.
CHAPTER THREE – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter contains an explanation of the approach, methodology, and methods of this research. It addresses why this research was undertaken in the first place and is followed by the researcher’s beliefs about knowledge and his theoretical approach. These two points heavily influence the research decisions that come after them. The following sections describe the methodology, method, participants, and data analyses used in the research. Lastly, the ethical approval of the research along with the measures taken to establish trustworthiness are outlined, followed by a conclusion.

3.2 Research Purpose
New Zealand’s grocery retail industry was valued at NZD $22 billion in 2016 (Euromonitor International, 2016). This grocery industry is home to both iconic and non-iconic brands, as well as private and national brands. In 2014 it was estimated that private brands have a 13.5% market share in New Zealand (Nielsen, 2014). From this we can clearly see that private brands are a lucrative brand type. They have the potential to be even more profitable if we can develop a better understanding of how brand managers can negate consumers’ perceived quality gap between private and national brands. This research will look into iconic brands in the New Zealand FMCG industry and analyse how consumers perceive these brands. Following this the research will look at private and national brands to see if consumers view any of them as iconic, and if so, how they are perceived. Better understanding of consumers’ perceptions of iconic and non-iconic FMCG brands would prove useful for both academics and practitioners looking to generate strategic implications. The research voids that will be filled by this research are addressed in Section 2.7.4 of the literature review. The research questions of this project are as follows:

1. What makes an FMCG brand iconic?

2. How do consumers perceive iconic FMCG brands in comparison to other FMCG brands?

3. How do consumers perceive iconic private FMCG brands differently to iconic national FMCG brands?
4. What are the strategic implications for retailers of FMCG private and national brands?

3.3 Research Approach

The following section will address the epistemological beliefs and the theoretical approach of the researcher (as per Crotty, 1998). The theory of knowledge that provides the foundation for this research will be explained in the epistemology. The theoretical approach is addressed next and will show how knowledge will be transmitted to the researcher from the participants of the study. The assumptions of each approach will also be addressed.

3.3.1 Epistemology

Epistemology is the theory of knowledge in the sense that it is the theory we use to explain what we know and understand in the world and how we have come to learn it (Crotty, 1998). Essentially epistemology deals with the existence of meaning. Does meaning, and in turn reality, exist on its own or do we assign meaning to things and thus construct their meaning ourselves? This research has taken the epistemological approach of constructionism, which means the researcher believes that knowledge and consensus is constructed through humans’ interaction with the world and is transmitted amongst them though social interactions (Crotty, 1998). Constructionism emphasizes that we do not create meaning, but instead construct it using the already existing world and objects around us. Through interaction with the world around us we are able to construct meaning. People may construct different meanings for the same object as their interpretations may differ. People’s interpretations differ according to their past experiences which shape their perceptions. The assumption of constructionism is that meaning and knowledge are formed based on how a person creates them using their own perceptions, consensus, and shared understandings. Constructionism believes we all view external reality differently due to differing previous experiences that have influenced our perceptions (Crotty, 1998).

Constructionism has a social element to it. This epistemology notes that social constructionism and culture are imperative in developing meaning. Though reality can be constructed alone, meaningful reality is socially constructed. Without culture and the social communication necessary to develop it, people would be unable to come to a consensus on reality. Culture passes on meaning so people are born into a world of meaning (Crotty, 1998). Symbols are a large part of social constructionism and culture. They carry meaning and have
the ability to outlive members of the culture. These notions of symbols in culture and the social construction of their meaning are relevant to the concepts of branding that are studied in this thesis.

This approach was chosen as the researcher subscribes to the beliefs of constructionism and the social construction of meaning. This consists of the belief that people assign their own meanings to brands according to their previous experiences with the brand. People also socially construct meanings for brands through stories and shared experiences. This is consistent with the literature reviewed where it is stated that brands can become iconic to individuals through experiences such as usage throughout their lives, stories related to the brand, their families’ usage of the brand, their culture’s usage of the brand, and how they view the brand as part of their national heritage (Bulmer, 2011). This is consistent with a constructionism approach as it states that people assign their own meanings to brands according to their own or shared beliefs and experiences.

3.3.2 Theoretical Perspective

Theoretical perspective is the philosophical standing that influences our choice of methodology (Crotty, 1998). For the purpose of this research the theoretical approach of hermeneutics has been used. Hermeneutics is the belief that language is the basis of our understanding and sharing of meaning. It is also concerned with the notion of pre-understanding of a research topic, the social aspect of creating meaning, and the interaction between researchers and their research (Arnold & Fischer, 1994; Crotty, 1998). Hermeneutics also subscribes to the belief that peoples’ realities may differ depending on their previous experiences and perceptions (Arnold & Fischer, 1994). Therefore hermeneutics is consistent with the epistemology discussed in 3.3.1.

Pre-understanding is the idea that the researcher will have at least some understanding of what they are researching before actually undertaking the task. This creates the potential for the researcher to interpret any data or findings according to their pre-existing understanding regarding the research. Though this is a downside of pre-understanding, it is also noted that without pre-understanding simple research concepts may in fact become incredibly complex. Arnold and Fischer (1994) give the example of shopping in modern stores, if one were to research this with no pre-understanding then aspects as simple as their layout or merchandise stocked would need to be fully understood before any further analysis could occur. In the
case of this research, without pre-understanding of cultural elements the researcher would not have been able to interpret how participants view brands as cultural icons. This research acknowledges that pre-understanding could have influenced analysis but accepts that it was necessary in order to understand the topic and to develop further insight into it.

As mentioned in the previous section (3.2.1), understanding is constructed, hermeneutics does not dispute that but is instead interested in how it is communicated and how greater understanding can be developed through doing so (Arnold & Fischer, 1994; Crotty, 1998). Hermeneutics assumes that understanding is linguistic and is shared via language, this research will assume the same.

When a research participant recounts an experience they first interpret the experience themselves when it takes place. They then interpret it a second time when they recount it to the researcher. The experience is then interpreted a third time by the researcher listening to the participant’s account of the event (Arnold & Fischer, 1994). So it is important to acknowledge that the researcher is just as much a part of the research as the participant due to their part in the interpretation. Their interpretation has as much influence on the outcomes of the research as the participant’s (Arnold & Fischer, 1994). This research acknowledges the researcher’s place as a participant in the research itself.

Hermeneutics also acknowledges the social aspects of knowledge and understanding, and that through social situations certain understandings are developed that would not have otherwise occurred (Arnold & Fischer, 1994). This means through communicating with one another people are able to further their knowledge and develop concepts that previously did not exist. This complements the researcher’s epistemology as constructionism also has social aspects to it. This aspect of hermeneutics was used while choosing the method for this research.

3.4 Methodology
A methodology consists of the research design that will be used to choose a set of methods (Crotty, 1998). This section will address the plan that was used for the research process and how this was used to meet the objectives of the research. This methodology is confined to the beliefs of the researcher discussed in Section 3.3.
3.4.1 Qualitative vs. Quantitative Approach

Quantitative research focuses on cause and effect relationships between two variables as a form of validity (Camara, Drummond, & Jackson, 2007). While qualitative research is research concerned with humanistic understanding and interpretation of humans’ experiences (Camara et al., 2007). It is best suited for providing in-depth and abstract analysis of consumers’ behaviours and often results in small sample sizes due to the complexity associated with collecting data (Calder, 1977). The methods differ epistemologically, methodologically, and in purpose. Quantitative research believes there is one true meaning, while qualitative research subscribes to the epistemological beliefs of the researcher, which in this case is constructionism. Methodologically quantitative research relies on experiments and surveys to generate its results in the form of statistical data (Camara et al., 2007). Whereas qualitative research relies on participants to provide in-depth answers to questions through data collection methods such as focus groups and interviews (Camara et al., 2007). The purpose of quantitative research is to provide a sample that is representative of the population in order to use it to make generalisations about the population (Marshall, 1996). It aims to test predetermined hypotheses. Qualitative research on the other hand seeks to answer ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions and is exploratory research with open-ended research questions that have no pre-determined answers (Hair, Bush, & Ortinau, 2006; Marshall, 1996).

3.4.2 Qualitative Research Justification

For this piece of research, a qualitative approach was chosen. The majority of private and national branding research uses quantitative methods, but seeing as this study looked at an under researched area, a qualitative method was chosen for the exploratory benefits it offers (Calder, 1997). A qualitative method was also required as currently there are no quantitative measurement tools available in this area, and due to the time constraints of this research the development of measurement scales was ruled out as an option. The epistemological beliefs of the researcher also dictate a qualitative method be used as the researcher believes there is no one true reality of how consumers perceive a brand. As well as this, little research considers the psychological mechanisms that underpin how a private brand becomes an iconic brand in the minds of consumers. Qualitative research allows for the exploration of social and cultural contexts which are essential in studying branding as this is how many meanings associated with brands are created. A qualitative method provided an in-depth
understanding of consumer perceptions and opinions that quantitative research cannot (Calder, 1997). Qualitative research has also been used to study iconic brands in previous literature (Bulmer, 2011, Holt, 2004).

3.4.3 Semi-Structured Focus Groups

Data for this research was obtained using semi-structured focus groups. The usage of this technique allowed the researcher to gather a large amount and a wide range of data in an efficient manner (Morgan, 1997). This was an important consideration due to the time constraints of this research. Focus groups provide rich data and allow the researcher to observe interactions on a topic (Denzin & Lincoln, 2006; Morgan, 1997). Focus groups are managed by a moderator who is responsible for conducting the focus groups and making sure they run smoothly. The moderator has the opportunity to direct focus groups towards producing concentrated data that is directly relevant to the researcher’s interest (Morgan, 1997). But focus groups also allow the moderator to adopt a less controlling approach and let the focus group participants take control of the group. This gives the researcher the chance to observe where the group goes with their discussion and allows for the participants to freely interact and express themselves (Morgan, 1997). These strategies give focus groups the ability to produce concentrated data on the topic while also uncovering information relevant to the research that may not have arisen through traditional questioning.

With both of these strengths of focus groups in mind, it can be said that their success relies heavily on the focus of the researcher and the groups’ interactions (Morgan, 1997). Focus groups are useful for participants trying to recall or provide in-depth descriptions of events or experiences, in this case their shopping habits and experiences with certain brands (Denzin & Lincoln, 2006). As well as that, they can be useful for examining processes that are habit-driven or not entirely thought through, this makes them a valuable tool for looking at consumer purchasing habits (Morgan, 1997). The use of focus groups complimented the researcher’s epistemological beliefs, as he believes that meaning is socially constructed. Therefore having participants discussing the topic together, allowed the researcher to gain a consensus interpretation of the research context.

Other common methods include individual interviews and surveys. Individual interviews give the researcher more control of the interview and can provide access to more private
information that is less likely to be shared in a group setting (Morgan, 1997). Focus groups provide slightly less control in return for more rich data gathered in a more efficient manner (Fern, 1982). Focus groups also give the researcher the opportunity to see participants interact over the subject of the research. As well as that, the lack of control they provide for the moderator/interviewer can be seen as a strength, as leaving the group to lead their own discussion can provide rich data that otherwise wouldn’t be expressed while allowing the researcher to observe participants interact over the topic (Morgan, 1997).

Surveys provide access to a large amount of data in a very time efficient manner. The issue is the data they produce is limited by the questions they ask (Morgan, 1996). Surveys also require scales to provide measurement. As there are no existing scales available for the topic of this thesis and the time constraints placed on the researcher did not allow time for scale development, surveys were not considered a viable method for collecting data. As well as this the epistemological and theoretical beliefs of the researcher prohibit the use of surveys, as surveys work under the assumption there is one truth.

For this research focus groups were chosen as they provide in-depth data while allowing for a reasonable amount of data to be gathered. They provided enough control for the moderator/researcher to direct the discussion towards the purpose of the research, but also enough freedom for participants to address tangents that may be related to the research. Lastly, their efficiency in terms of both cost and time suited the budgetary and time constraints of this research.

### 3.4.3.1 Projective Techniques

Projective techniques were chosen as the focus group technique for this research due to their ability to uncover thoughts, feelings, opinions, and beliefs that participants would not normally express (Haire, 1950). This is important when studying brands and icons, as consumers may not have considered the thought process behind their perceptions of brands. These techniques involve presenting participants with a series of vague stimuli and asking them to make sense of them (Donoghue, 2000; Haire, 1950). Through the process of making sense of the stimuli the participant will project parts of themselves onto it (Haire, 1950). As the researcher knows what the original stimulus is, they can easily discern between what was already there and what the participant has added (Haire, 1950).
During focus groups people often withhold thoughts due to them being considered socially unacceptable to express or difficult to articulate. Many are unaware of the reasoning, motivations, and values that form their opinions (Donoghue, 2000; Haire, 1950). Through the use of projective techniques these thoughts, that would normally not be expressed, are instead conveyed onto the stimuli presented (Donoghue, 2000; Haire, 1950). To make sense of the stimuli the participant(s) construct a meaning from it and in the process they express themselves.

There are five types of projective techniques. These are association, completion, construction, expressive, and choice-ordering techniques (Donoghue, 2000; Gordon & Langmaid, 1988). In this research, association and completion techniques were used. These techniques were chosen for their ability to elicit participants’ emotional responses to brands, along with their image of brands, and to understand how they view the New Zealand FMCG brandscape. It is also noted that the chosen techniques are effective at combating participant exhaustion and boredom in focus groups (Donoghue, 2000).

Projective techniques were used in this research to uncover aspects of consumers’ relationships with brands that would not be discovered through direct questioning. This research endeavours to look past the face values of consumers’ opinions of brands to discover how and why these opinions are constructed.

3.4.3.2 Association Techniques - Pictures - Animals

An association exercise was used to get participants to project their perceptions of certain brands. Through this exercise the researcher was able to uncover more beliefs and opinions of brands than if participants were questioned about them. A participant’s choice of image, in this case an animal, communicates feelings that they would normally struggle to, or choose not to, express (Gordon & Langmaid, 1988). People often have varying feelings towards brands and this exercise allows them to express their individual beliefs associated with a selection of brands.

In this exercise participants were presented with images of seven different animals. Following this, participants were then presented with an image of a brand and asked to
individually decide which animal they believed best represented it. The moderator then asked each participant which animal they chose followed by questions that attempted to reveal the meaning behind these relationships. As there is no existing direct relationship between any of the stimuli (animals) and the brand(s), the participants were forced to create one (Duncombe & Hussey, 1999). Through doing so the participants projected their perceptions of the brand onto the animal. Brands with animals in their logo were not included, as this could have influenced participants’ choice of animal.

### 3.4.3.2.1 Choice of Images

Duncombe and Hussey (1999) provide the criteria for image selection for projective techniques. The photos used for projective techniques must all be distinctly different so consumers can differentiate between them, while also being as neutral as possible so participants provide emotional responses based on the content of the image. Lastly, the photos need to cover a range of extremes so that consumers can use them to show two different ends of a spectrum in their explanation. The criteria for selecting images for projective techniques are shown in Table 3.1 (Duncombe & Hussey, 1999). Animals were chosen as they are the most common image category used in forced relationship exercises, as a wide range of people have a basic understanding of the animal kingdom (Greenbaum, 1998). The animals used were chosen based on the research of Duncombe & Hussey (1999) who used the following images: cat, bear, chimp, lion, squirrel, elephant, panda, and a rabbit. In pretesting the focus groups it became clear that for this study there were too many animals to choose from, too many wild animals, and that the bear had too many similar associated qualities with the lion. As well as that, the squirrel was deemed un-relatable to New Zealanders. The bear and the squirrel were removed, and a photo of a dog was inserted in their place. The images used can be found in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The photos must be distinctly different from each other in at least one element.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The photos must be neutral so that they do not elicit an emotional response from participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The photos should cover a range of extremes, for example, they must range from: big to small, wild to domestic, and foreign to local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.1. Duncombe & Hussey's (1999) criteria for image selection for projective techniques.*
3.4.3.3 Completion Procedures - Brand Mapping

Brand mapping is a completion technique in which participants are presented with a range of brands, and asked to put them in groups according to their thoughts and feelings towards them (Gordon & Langmaid, 1988). This exercise allows the researcher to see how consumers view and segment markets according to brands. As well as that, it enables the research to compare participants’ views on brands as they interact.

The participants were asked to complete this exercise as a group. They were instructed not to group the brands based on their functional quality. For example, in a pre-test, a group was formed consisting of all the brands classified as breakfast foods. Instead, the participants were asked to group the brands based on their thoughts and feelings towards the brands. Following the completion of this, the group were asked to describe their reasoning behind each grouping of brands. Participants were also asked other questions such as if they all agreed with these groupings, and if they were to do the exercise again, what other groups they could come up with.

3.4.3.3.1 Choice of Brands

The brands that were presented for the brand mapping exercise are New Zealand’s most iconic FMCG brands along with the three major private brand labels available in New Zealand. The list of New Zealand’s most iconic brands was provided by Reader’s Digest who conduct the ‘New Zealand’s Most Trusted Brands’ survey every year. Reader’s Digest employ Roy Morgan Research to survey a representative sample of 1,400 New Zealand adults on their most trusted brands, they also include a category for the most iconic (Reader’s Digest, 2017). Reader’s Digest provided the top ten highest polling brands in the ‘New Zealand Iconic’ section and from this the FMCG brands were selected for the brand mapping exercise. The brands are as follows: Whittaker’s, Tip Top Ice Cream, Edmonds, Wattie’s, Anchor, Sanitarium, and L&P. Along with that the private brands available at New Zealand’s two major supermarket retailers, Pams, Signature Range, and Homebrand were presented to participants. These were chosen as they are the only private brand options in New Zealand’s supermarket duopoly14.

---

14 At the time of data collection.
3.5 Method

The following section addresses how the methodologies outlined in section 3.4 were used to collect data from subjects. It will first outline the guide that was used by the moderator of the focus groups, followed by the results of the pre-tests, and will conclude with how the data was collected.

3.5.1 Development of moderator guide

The moderator guide\textsuperscript{15} was constructed to meet the requirements stipulated by Morgan (1997). It contained an opening statement, that the moderator read aloud, that provided definitions and examples of an iconic and a non-iconic brand. The guide followed a simple structure. It listed each exercise in order of use, along with what should be read aloud to participants. Below each exercise was a series of questions to ask following their completion. Lastly, there was a set of prompts listed after each set of questions. The prompts were included to give the moderator a list of quick questions or statements to probe participants and to get them to elaborate on points they had made. The focus group moderator guide made certain that all the themes and ideas that the researcher wished to be included in the discussion were covered, along with all the questions he wanted to be asked.

3.5.2 Pre-Testing of Focus Groups

The focus groups were pre-tested twice with Masters of Business Management students. Both pre-tests used the same methods. Following the pre-test it was decided that the following changes needed to be made to the focus group techniques and the moderator guide:

- The animals used by Duncombe & Hussey (1999) for the picture association exercise were not entirely suitable for the research.
- The bear needed to be removed as the pre-test participants cited it had too many similar associated qualities with the lion.
- The squirrel had to be removed as the pre-test participants found it hard to relate to anything.
- Eight animals to choose from was too many.
- There needed to be a more balanced selection of wild and domestic animals in the picture association exercise.

\textsuperscript{15} A copy of the moderator guide can be found in section A of the appendices.
• The participants needed instructing to not group the brands based on their functional qualities before undertaking the brand mapping exercise.
• The moderator required a pre-prepared list of written prompts and questions for each exercise.

Following pre-testing, the following changes were made to the focus group techniques and the moderator guide:
• The bear and the squirrel were removed from the picture association exercise.
• A dog was added to the images used for the picture association exercise.
• A reminder not to group brands on their functional qualities, but to instead group them based on thoughts and feelings towards them, was added to the explanation for the brand mapping exercise.
• Questions and prompts relevant to each exercise were added below each exercise.

3.5.3 Data Collection
Six focus groups were conducted using students from the University of Canterbury and members of the general public. The focus groups consisted of five to seven participants (excluding the researcher). Though most literature on focus groups states that they should consist of eight to twelve participants there is a stream of literature that believes five to six participants is preferable due to being easier to manage and giving the moderator the opportunity to get more in-depth data from each participant (Barbour, 2007; Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999; Bloor, 2001). Focus groups were conducted until repeating themes emerged and a diverse sample of participants had been a part of the research. This was addressed after each focus group and after six it was decided the focus groups had reached the stage of repeating themes, and that they had consisted of an acceptable range of different participants.

Focus group participants were asked to arrive early so they could be briefed on what would take place and the ethical information associated with this (Edmunds & American Marketing Association, 1999). Pizza and beverages (non-alcoholic) were made available for participants as soon as they arrived. Following this they were given time to process and review the participant information sheets and consent forms. Tutorial and project rooms at the University of Canterbury were used for the focus groups. These rooms suit the requirements for focus groups as they are an appropriate size and remain undisturbed when booked.
(Greenbaum, 1998). Students of the university that partook in the focus groups were already familiar with these rooms. For those that were not students the researcher made sure to give them very clear instructions on how to locate the rooms. The moderator attempted to create a relaxed and informal atmosphere in the rooms to ensure that participants were comfortable. A quick introduction was done by the moderator to ensure everyone knew each other’s names. While setting up the moderator also made sure to engage with each participant to thank them for coming. The moderator endeavoured to create a conversational atmosphere during the focus groups, allowing focus group participants to speak freely and to do most of the talking whilst also making sure to return to an individual if they were interrupted by another member of the group (Edmunds & American Marketing Association, 1999). The moderator had a list of activities, questions, and prompts as part of the moderator guide but the questions and prompts were deemed flexible and to be used at the moderator’s discretion. This allowed the moderator to let the group flow but to use questions and prompts to combat fatigue among the participants. The researcher assumed the role of moderator for these focus groups as he has prior moderating experience and, when possible, the individual who moderates the focus group should be the person to analyse the data (Edmunds & American Marketing Association, 1999).

The focus groups began with an explanation of why the research was being conducted, followed by a definition and an example of an iconic brand (Edmunds & American Marketing Association, 1999). The same was then done for a non-iconic brand. The participants were then asked to name brands they believe to be iconic and non-iconic to New Zealand that they could find in New Zealand supermarkets. The moderator used an A3 paper pad to write down the brands being listed, listing the iconic brands on the left side and the non-iconic brands on the right in a table format. Following the listing of these brands, the participants were asked a series of questions about their classifications of the brands.\(^{16}\)

After the first exercise was completed, participants were given a short break while the moderator prepared the next exercise. The images of animals used for the picture association exercise were placed in the middle of the table and participants were encouraged to pass them around and to have a look at each of them. Following this, the participants were presented with a picture of one of the brands they listed in the first exercise and were asked to each

\(^{16}\) The questions are available as part of the moderator guide in section A of the appendices.
choose the animal they believe best represents it. The moderator then asked them each individually which animal they had chosen followed by questions about their selection. This process was repeated with four different brands. An iconic national brand, a non-iconic national brand, a non-iconic private brand, and an iconic private brand, that the participants had classified in the first exercise, were used in order to allow for comparison. If the participants did not classify any private brands as iconic, then the private brand Pams was used, as it was deemed by the researcher to be the private brand most likely to be viewed as iconic in New Zealand.

Following the second exercise, the participants were given another short break while the moderator set up the brand mapping exercise. The images of the brands17 (listed in section 3.4.3.3.1) were placed in the middle of the table and then the participants were asked to group the brands based on their thoughts and feelings towards the brands, not on their functional quality. They were also told they may group single brands on their own if they believed they did not fit in to any of the other groups. The brands used were New Zealand’s three private brands Pams, Select, and Homebrand, and the country’s most iconic FMCG brands identified by Readers Digest. These consisted of Whittaker’s, Tip Top Ice Cream, Edmonds, Wattie’s, Anchor, Sanitarium, and L&P. The participants were then given time to complete the exercise while the moderator observed and listened to their discussion. Once they told the moderator they had completed the exercise they were questioned on their groupings.

Once all the exercises were completed, the moderator opened the floor to the participants to discuss anything they may not have got a chance to mention earlier, or anything else they thought might be relevant to the topic. Once these discussions came to an end, the focus group was concluded.

All of the focus groups were audio taped with the permission of the participants. They were recorded using a cellular phone and a laptop and were transcribed verbatim by an outside transcriber. Following each focus group, the moderator listened to each recording to ensure the accuracy of all recordings. In accordance with the requirements of the Human Ethics Committee all names were redacted from the transcripts. They were replaced by (M) or (F) or (O) in the margin of the transcript denoting whether participants were male, female, or

17 The images of the brands used are available in Appendix C.
identified as another gender, respectively. (I) was used to denote the moderator. Each contribution to the discussion is noted in the transcript by a new line of text and the gender of the participant\(^\text{18}\).

After six focus groups had been completed it was decided by the author and his supervisor that repeating themes had emerged and no new themes were surface. By this stage 35 people had taken part in the focus groups.

### 3.6. Participants

Excluding the researcher/moderator, there were a total of 35 participants who took part in the study. This consisted of twenty females and fifteen males. Of the participants, the majority (25) were students. Students were sought for this research because they are heavy consumers of private brands. This was noted as a consistent theme throughout the focus groups involving students. To ensure this research was well rounded, a focus group of older non-student participants was used to see if their views on private brands, national brands, and iconic brands differed. As their views on these topics did not differ, it was declared that repeating themes had emerged across all six focus groups. An advertisement for the focus groups was posted online in a student noticeboard to ensure student participants were found quickly to combat the time constraints of the research. This lead to a skew in the age demographic with only five participants falling outside of the 18-24 age bracket. The selection criterion for participants was that they identified as New Zealanders and were over 18 years of age. This was to ensure they had interacted with the brands before through shopping experiences, and to make sure they understood certain brands’ places in New Zealand’s cultural and national heritage. A convenience sample was used due to the time and monetary constraints of the research. If possible, a more diverse sample would have been sought, but this was not possible. In the case of this research, the national brands being researched are available at every major supermarket in New Zealand so regardless of the age of the participants it is highly likely they had interacted with some, if not all, of the brands before. This is also the case for the private brands, with each being available at their respective retailers’ stores. Pams is available at all Foodstuffs supermarkets, while Select and Signature Range are available at Progressive Enterprise Ltd supermarkets.

\(^{18}\) The full transcripts of each focus group are available in Section D of the Appendices.
3.7 Data Analysis
The focus groups were all transcribed verbatim by an external transcriber. The researcher then reviewed the transcripts and checked their accuracy against both recordings of each focus group. This gave the researcher a chance to familiarise himself with the data and to begin to understand the participants’ comments (Ezzy, 2002). The researcher also kept a reflexive journal to keep track of his thought process behind the emerging themes he discerned from the focus groups.

Thematic analysis was conducted by identifying themes and concepts in the transcripts by the researcher manually coding them (Ezzy, 2002). Through this process, the data was categorised and the researcher was able to build a systematic bank of quotes relevant to each theme (Ezzy, 2002; Spiggle, 1994). This initial stage is known as categorisation, it is then followed by abstraction (Ezzy 2002; Spiggle, 1994). Abstraction is the process of grouping similar categories developed in the categorisation process to form higher-order conceptual constructs (Ezzy, 2002; Spiggle, 1994). This data analysis process is not to be confused with content analysis, which involves the use of predetermined themes (Ezzy, 2002).

3.8 Establishing Trustworthiness
The conventional terms of reliability and validity do not apply to this research as they deal with one true reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). Validity looks at how one variable causes another while reliability deals with the consistency of it (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). Both of these concepts believe in one truth, this is not consistent with the researcher’s epistemological beliefs that there are multiple truths depending on people’s own interpretation of reality. Instead, this research will deal with trustworthiness. Trustworthiness breaks down into four key aspects, credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Each of these will be addressed in this section.

3.8.1 Credibility
In qualitative research, credibility is the equivalent of internal validity. Internal validity is defined as the amount of variation in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variable (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). From this, we can see that internal validity deals with ‘one truth’ as it looks for a single and definitive explanation for a phenomenon. As the epistemological beliefs of this research deal with ‘multiple truths’ depending on differences between individuals’ realities, credibility is the appropriate way of establishing
the trustworthiness of this research (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). For the research to be considered credible, the researcher must show that ‘multiple truths’ have been interpreted accurately.

The credibility of this research was justified by the use of triangulation and peer debriefing. Triangulation of the data was performed by using recordings of each focus group, previous literature, and the reflexive journal notes from each transcript (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). This meant accuracy of interpretation was ensured, as there were multiple sources to consult. The use of the triangulation of data in this research proves its credibility. Peer debriefing was also performed by having the researcher’s supervisor examine the coding and the themes identified during analysis. The researcher’s supervisor acted as an expert judge and was able to confirm that the data reflected the themes found by the researcher. This expert judge also read over the transcriptions and thematic summaries of each focus group. This allowed for an expert outside source to judge if the researcher was interpreting the data in a logical manner and if his interpretations were detailed enough. These processes ensured the credibility of the research (Guba & Lincoln, 1985).

3.8.2 Transferability

Transferability is the equivalent of external validity, which is defined as how successfully the results of a piece of research could be generalised if different participants and measures were used (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). The concept of external validity cannot be applied to this research due to the epistemology underpinning this study (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). This is because the research cannot be recreated exactly with different participants. The researcher believes everyone experiences their own reality because of their previous individual experiences that shape their perceptions. However, a consensus of meaning is agreed upon through social interactions. But, this does not mean the same consensus of meaning could be developed using different focus groups. This means a different population may not generate the same results as their perceptions of reality may differ. Seeing as the researcher cannot determine the external validity they have provided a comprehensive description of the findings to allow anyone looking to transfer them, to come to their own decision on whether or not the findings are transferable. As the researcher could not foresee what populations or settings someone may want to transfer the findings on to, transferability is instead an issue belonging to the person attempting the transfer (Guba & Lincoln, 1985).
Seeing as transferability is achieved through thick description, the researcher has endeavoured to provide a rich and comprehensive description of the findings in order to achieve a high level of transferability. This includes an in-depth description of the participants (Section 3.6), an entire Chapter (4) detailing the findings (including participant quotes), and a discussion of how this is reflected in the literature (Chapter 5), along with transcripts of the focus groups (Appendices D). These sections should provide enough information for any researcher to determine whether or not the research is transferable to their population (Guba & Lincoln, 1985).

3.8.3 Dependability
Dependability is the qualitative equivalent of reliability. Golafshani (2003) defined reliability as how consistent the results would be if the research were to be repeated with similar methods. Reliability cannot be established by replication due to the epistemological beliefs of the researcher. Instead, dependability is established by ensuring the methodological and analytical processes used were logical (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). The researcher used two expert judges to determine this. The judges reviewed the researcher’s data, findings, thematic analysis, and reflexive journal that detailed all the methodological decisions made in the research. The expert judges agreed with 70% of the interpretations from the researcher’s first iteration. After the researcher’s second iteration of the thematic analysis, the judges agreed with all of his findings. Following this, the judges stated that the processes the researcher has followed are logical, therefore confirming dependability (Guba & Lincoln, 1985).

3.8.4 Confirmability
Confirmability is the qualitative equivalent of objectivity, which is where multiple researchers agree on the interpretations of the research’s findings. It is attained by having another researcher check over the data, findings, and interpretations to ensure that they are supported by the data and the researcher is not biased in any way (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). Triangulation of data along with the researcher’s reflexive journal were used to establish confirmability. This meant the judges were privy to the researcher’s notes from each focus group, assumptions made during the research, interpretations of the data, and recordings and transcriptions of the focus groups. From this, the judges were able to review anything that
may have influenced the interpretation. Through this, the judges were able to confirm that the findings were based on the data, interpreted accurately, and not biased in any way.

### 3.9 Ethical Considerations

Due to the nature of the topic of this research and the use of private focus groups, this thesis was deemed to have minimal ethical concerns. The few ethical concerns that arose from this research were mitigated by keeping all responses anonymous and not forcing participants to answer questions during the focus groups. See section 3.5.3 for the process of obtaining participant consent. The University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee granted ethical approval to this study on the fourteenth of August 2017. The reference for the ethical approval of this study is 2017/57/LR.

### 3.10 Conclusion

The contents of this chapter explain the thought processes and strategies that underpin this research. It has highlighted the research approach of the researcher, and made note of every major decision made throughout the research. This research applies the qualitative method of focus groups and is a piece of qualitative research subject to the researcher’s epistemological beliefs of constructionism and his use of hermeneutical techniques. This meant trustworthiness had to be established for the research to gain credibility. From what has been discussed prior to this conclusion in Section 3.8, it can be concluded that the methodology of this researcher is both trustworthy and credible.
CHAPTER FOUR – FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
The following chapter addresses the findings of the research. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the researcher has tried to provide as in-depth a description of the findings as possible. This research was gathered using six different focus groups that consisted of a total of 35 participants. These findings are demonstrated using supporting text units from the transcripts.

The analysis of the data gathered has discerned three major themes. These themes are each addressed by showcasing their subthemes, which combine to form each major theme. The subthemes are each explained using supporting text units from the focus groups. Following the subthemes there is a description of how they each contribute to one of the three overarching themes uncovered in the data.

The three themes relating to iconic brands that were found are a brand’s New Zealand cultural heritage, its brand attachments, and its visibility. A brand’s New Zealand cultural heritage is its ability to include aspects of New Zealand culture in its branding and communications. A brand’s brand attachment refers to the emotional bonds that consumers have formed with the brand. Brand visibility is a brand’s ability to be seen by consumers. A brand’s visibility extends to more than its physical visibility, it also includes emotional visibility, visibility amongst advertising, and visibility in consumers’ childhoods. The following section will give the context of this research, and following this, the three themes and their corresponding subthemes will be explained in depth.

4.2 Context
The context of this research refers to the setting in which consumers engage with these brands. For this research, the context extends to consumers in-store interactions with brands relating to their purchases. As these are FMCG brands, the majority of interactions relating to the purchasing of these brands would take place in supermarkets. Purchasing interactions may also take place at petrol stations and convenience stores. The context for this research does not extend to the consumers’ usage of the product. This research is confined to
consumers’ interactions with brands that influence their purchase decisions. What follows is a discussion of the themes uncovered in the research.

4.3 New Zealand Cultural Heritage

During the focus groups it was noted that according to participants, many brands that are iconic to New Zealand have a strong New Zealand cultural heritage. New Zealand’s cultural heritage is a mixture of indigenous Māori culture and inherited British culture. New Zealand used to consist of many rural communities, but due to modern urbanisation, this is no longer the case. But, despite this, rural aspects of New Zealand still remain strongly represented in New Zealand culture. Animals such as sheep, and professions such as farming, are still considered very ‘Kiwi’. As with all cultures there is a focus on food, many of New Zealand’s cultural foods of choice stem from British foods. Some of these include meat pies, fish and chips, barbecue foods, and marmite. Other New Zealand foods of note are kiwifruit, Pavlova – a meringue-based dessert and Hokey Pokey ice cream – a vanilla ice cream with frozen balls of caramel through it. Seafood such as Paua, and Crayfish are also iconic to the nation. Lastly Lemon & Paeroa, a lemonade style drink, is famous for being from the North Island town of Paeroa. It is instantly recognisable due to its distinct brown bottle, and the giant replica of it that exists in Paeroa.

Sports are also popular amongst New Zealanders with games such as rugby union, netball, and cricket all being considered part of the country’s heritage. Cricket in particular is played casually and socially during social summer gatherings. New Zealand’s cultural heritage places high importance on summer activities such as trips to the beach, going away for summer holidays, and the aforementioned social/casual games of cricket. Lastly, New Zealanders place a high importance on their natural environment. The national bird, the Kiwi, is of particular importance, along with the fern that is the emblem of many of New Zealand’s sporting teams. New Zealander’s take immense pride in their national environment and have put many conservation efforts in place to protect natural birds, marine life, and flora and fauna. Things that are strongly associated with New Zealand culture and history are described as being a part of ‘Kiwiana’ (Kee-wee-ahh-na). Discussed below are the subthemes that make up the concept of a brands’ New Zealand cultural heritage.
4.3.1 Agricultural Heritage

The supporting text units below show that the participants felt a strong connection between certain brands and the agricultural background of New Zealand. During the picture association exercise participants referenced certain brands’ strong connection to New Zealand cultural heritage through choosing animals that represented agriculture to them. New Zealand’s population is mostly urban based, but the rural population is strongly represented in New Zealand culture despite making up a small percentage of the population.

It is a common belief that agriculture props up the New Zealand economy and is responsible for most of the country’s economic success. Though this was true for a long time, it has evolved into more of a myth, as according to the Treasury’s most recent report, agriculture is only the 5th biggest contributor (6.2%) to New Zealand’s GDP (New Zealand Treasury, 2016). Despite this, many New Zealanders still consider agriculture to be the ‘backbone’ of their economy and even if they live in urban areas they understand that agriculture plays a large part in New Zealand’s history.

With the majority of early settlers being farmers, New Zealand is a nation founded upon agriculture and even though the nation’s dependency on it has decreased somewhat over time, farming is still considered to be a large part of New Zealand’s national and cultural heritage. From the supporting text units below we see that participants chose animals they believe belong on a farm to represent brands they believe to be iconic to New Zealand and have aspects of New Zealand cultural heritage. So, from this we see that brands that consumers can relate to agriculture are considered to have a New Zealand cultural heritage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’d probably say the dog for the same reason. Especially like the farm dog vibe. You picture a dog running across those big stations.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like, what’s that Tux? You know dog food… I would say that’s iconic. That’s New Zealand. Farmers, you know number eight-wire kind of stuff.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: I’d go the dog, herding sheep, Edmonds is really New Zealand.</td>
<td>Focus group #6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F: But it’s flour, not sheep.
M: Yeah, I know, but it’s still land… it’s farming.

Table 4.1. Support for the theme of agricultural heritage

4.3.2 Brands’ National Belonging Through Appearing to be Local

Across the focus groups it became clear that a brand’s ability to appear or be perceived as locally owned or made contributed to its New Zealand cultural heritage. Participants discussed brands that are iconic to New Zealand but then when questioned about if the brands were locally owned they either stated they did not know or that it does not matter and they only need to appear to be locally owned. A preference for purchasing brands that are perceived as being from New Zealand was noted, but the decision as to whether or not they actually came from New Zealand comes down to the consumers’ knowledge and perceptions. This notion of being perceived as a New Zealand owned brand is a contributing factor towards a brand’s New Zealand cultural heritage, and in turn its iconicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So to your point, I think it’s more the substance over the form. So the form might be legally an overseas entity, but substance, you know, what we… The appearance of it, is that we think they’re New Zealand owned.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally I think Chanui tea [is iconic] – honestly, because its New Zealand owned. Whereas the other ones, like Twinnings and Bell…</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah, I associate it [L&amp;P] with Paeroa, the town. But I don’t think of who owns it actually when I think of that.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the origin story, I think, it’s about. It’s less important who owns it. But more important where it came from. And if we feel like it’s the grassroots New Zealand movement towards the product, that’s something that counts.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Support for the theme of appearing to be local
4.3.3 Brands’ Belonging Through a New Zealand Backstory or Association to Kiwiana

From the supporting text units we can see participants find brands more iconic to New Zealand if they have some sort of narrative or association to New Zealand or Kiwiana. This ranges from sporting advertisements to the use of Māori words. Having some form of association to New Zealand gives the brand *New Zealand cultural heritage* and in turn, an iconic status. This differs to the previous theme as it was based on where the brand originated from, while this theme is about integrating aspects of New Zealand culture into the brand’s brandstory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The iconic ones either have like an affiliation with something you enjoy and find quite personal. Like as Kiwi’s or they just seem to have quite a history, a story behind them.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And because of the ads they put on TV are real Kiwi. Like L&amp;P and Wattie’s have real Kiwi ads. So it appeals to us.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think eventually if you plug it hard enough you sort of start to embrace it as well. I don’t know how much L&amp;P is genuine Kiwiana, just like they really thrash it. They let everyone know who they are.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think also the fact that it has got like a Māori word in it, definitely makes it feel more New Zealand.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3. Support for the theme of belonging through a New Zealand backstory or association with Kiwiana

4.3.4 A Brand’s Belonging Through its Place in a New Zealand Household

Many references to a brand’s availability ‘at home’ were made throughout the focus groups. In this case, the supporting text units show that the participants find certain brands to be iconic due to their place in their version of the ‘typical Kiwi’ household. This stems from the participants identifying as New Zealanders and having these brands available at their homes. They perceive themselves as Kiwis and their house as a ‘typical Kiwi’ household, thus the brands belonging in their household gives the brands *New Zealand cultural heritage*. As well as being available at home, many participants also stated that certain brands reminded them
of home. Through reminding them of, and being available in, their own homes as well as the homes of other ‘typical Kiwis’ these brands have become iconic to consumers. A brand’s perceived availability in New Zealand households contributes to its New Zealand cultural heritage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s just because every like New Zealand household has it. I just think about it like that, doesn’t matter [who owns it].</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog as well. Association with like the feeling of home. New Zealand brands, I associate them with being comfortable.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just feel like looking at that, that [iconic brands] would be like a typical shopping list like growing up at home. It just looks like mum is making a list.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. Support for the theme of a brand’s belonging through its place in a New Zealand household

The themes listed here highlight how a brand’s New Zealand cultural heritage is created. Through aspects of agricultural heritage, appearing to be local, belonging in New Zealand households, and having a story or association to New Zealand and/or Kiwiana, a brand’s New Zealand cultural heritage is built. It is from this cultural heritage that the brand can be perceived as iconic. It is important to note most of the brands that participants perceived as having a New Zealand cultural heritage were iconic national brands. There were cases where Pams (a private brand) was perceived to have a New Zealand cultural heritage.

### 4.4 Brand attachments

It was noted that participants had emotional connections with many of the brands they perceived as iconic. It was clear that these relationships had developed over time through participants’ use of the brands. The four subthemes that were identified that contribute to brand attachment are its association with an individual’s childhood, its ability to provide nostalgia to better times, its use for escapism, and its use for rewarding oneself. This notion of using brands to trigger memories is an aspect of brand attachment, and it is clear that from the brand attachment subthemes that these brands were being used for this purpose.
Attachments often develop in peoples’ childhoods, this is consistent with the subthemes of a brand’s association with an individual’s childhood and its ability to provide nostalgia (Grisaffe, & Nguyen, 2011; Holbrook & Schindler, 2003; MacInnis et al., 2005). Nostalgic bonding is a form of emotional bonding that results in brand attachment, this is consistent with the finding that a brand’s role in nostalgia to better times contributes to its ability to develop emotional attachments (Holbrook & Schindler, 2003). This research also presents two contributing factors to a brand’s ability to develop attachments that are new to the literature. These are a brand’s ability to provide escapism and its usage as a reward. It was discovered that a brand’s ability to provide each of the four subthemes listed above contributed to its ability to develop brand attachments. Each subtheme is discussed below along with their supporting text units.

### 4.4.1 A Brand’s Association with an Individual’s Childhood

Throughout the focus groups, many references were made to how certain iconic brands reminded participants of their childhood. Attachments can develop during childhood so it is plausible that participants had formed attachments to these brands during their respective childhoods (Esch, Geus, Langner, & Schmitt, 2006). The memories associated with participants’ childhoods were always positive, and reminded them of the carefree nature and freedom from responsibility that they enjoyed at that time. The presence of these brands in consumers’ childhoods allows them to develop attachments to them, thus a consumer’s ability to associate a brand with their childhood is a contributing factor to the brand’s ability to develop attachments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Weet-Bix they have that triathlon every year… I did that for a couple of years at school.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: Yeah, so have you got memories and stories associated with Anchor? What kind of feelings do you associate with these stories? M: Just being a kid, doing dumb things.</td>
<td>Focus group #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Just Juice and like Tip Top and raisins like remind me of my childhood, and like classic Kiwi lunchbox filler things.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of my earliest memories is having an ice cream at the wharf in Akaroa and I’m sure it was Tip Top.

Table 4.5. Support for the theme of a brand’s association with an individual’s childhood

4.4.2 A Brand’s Role in Nostalgia to Better Times

As well as citing a brand’s ability to remind them of their childhood, participants also alluded to brands being able to provide them with nostalgia to better times. Members of the focus groups stated that certain iconic brands remind them of summer holidays, trips to the beach, and gatherings such as barbeques. As per the brand attachment literature that was reviewed, attachments to brands are influenced by a brand’s ability to provide emotional memories such as nostalgia (Grisaffe, & Nguyen, 2011; Holbrook, & Schindler, 2003). Attachments that involve nostalgia are formed through nostalgic bonding (Holbrook, & Schindler, 2003). It was noted that when discussing a brand’s ability to provide nostalgia to better times, participants only referred to iconic brands’ ability to do so. From this, it can be seen that the memories associated with iconic brands are able to provide nostalgia to better times, while the memories associated with non-iconic brands are unable to provide this. Therefore, it can be said that a brand’s ability to provide nostalgia to better times influences its ability to develop emotional attachments which in turn is a factor in whether or not it is perceived as iconic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: What does it mean to you like the nostalgia of a brand?</td>
<td>Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: Childhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: Memories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Kinda like happy memories, and like those especially remind you of when it’s warm and being in the sun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aside from Whittaker’s, L&amp;P and Tip Top definitely bring up a lot of childhood [memories], like growing up, long summer holidays, camping as well I think of Tip Top dairies at campsites.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has good connotations of summer, which is like always good, always makes something more iconic.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of them [iconic brands] to me are like associated with a</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 Escapism via brands

It became clear that consumers use iconic brands for escapism by using them to help remember or reimagine positive memories that they associate with the brand. Through this, they are able to use these memories to escape from the everyday monotony of life. Escapism is also important as it allows people to hold on to an image of their former selves while also being able to see how they have developed since that point. During difficult times, escapism is often used to connect with one’s past self to restore the comfort and security of past times. Through this, consumers are able to use these brands to momentarily escape from the responsibilities of their adult lives, this highlights how people can engage in escapism via brands. As a contributing factor of brand attachment, escapism interacts with a brand’s association with a consumer’s childhood and its ability to provide nostalgia to better times. For escapism to occur these two factors must be present, and then through the brands use for escapism, consumers can develop an attachment to the brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kind of associate Anchor with like as a kid as well. I remember having Anchor milk, I don’t remember having Meadow Fresh. I still drink it now, so I hold on to that nostalgia a bit, do you know what I mean?</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just think ice-cream and then like BBQ’s, tomato sauce and they [Watties &amp; Tip Top] kind of come together.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip Top does make you think of ice-creams and summer.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[What memories do you associate with Tip Top Ice Cream?] The beach!</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Support for the theme of a brand’s role in nostalgia to better times

Table 4.7. Support for theme of escapism via brands
4.4.4 Reward Brands

Participants specified that they use certain brands as treats or rewards. These are brands they use to celebrate accomplishing something or overcoming an obstacle. By rewarding themselves with a certain brand, consumers are using it to escape the situation or obstacle they have just overcome. The acts of rewarding, treating, or celebrating with a brand all demonstrate brand attachment. All of the examples of reward brands provided by participants were brands they believed to be iconic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These three are sort of treat brands. If you are good as a kid, you’d get some ice cream, you get some L&amp;P for the barbecue and your mum makes you something with Edmonds.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I want to treat myself, to reward myself, maybe I’ll go iconic.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: But if you’re buying a chocolate bar, a bag of chips… M: Get some of these [iconic brands]</td>
<td>Focus group #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconic brands are more of a treat growing up, I reckon. You sort of get s***ty ice cream, and then you are on holiday and its like: “Oh, we’ll get Tip Top”.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8. Support for the theme of reward brands

The subthemes listed here highlight how consumers form attachments to brands. Activating childhood memories and nostalgia to better times, as well as being used as a reward and for escapism, all contribute to a brand’s ability to form attachments. If consumers have a collection of memories they relate to a specific brand then they can form an attachment to this brand and through this, it can become iconic to them. Consumers use these brands to escape using the memories they have developed through their attachments. With nostalgia to better times and childhood memories, these brands provide memories of situations that are more desirable than the consumer’s current situation. Strong attachments can develop during childhoods so it is not surprising that this contributes to brand attachment (Esch et al., 2006).
As well as that, nostalgia to better times is a prime example of nostalgic bonding, which is where emotional bonds with a brand are formed through nostalgic memories (Holbrook, & Schindler, 2003). Escapism via brands brings together consumers’ nostalgia and childhood memories of a brand. They use these to engage in escapism with the brand, which is where they use the brands to reimagine memories from more positive times that they associate with the brand. They use these memories to escape the monotony of everyday life. With reward brands consumers use the brand to celebrate their accomplishment by celebrating with a brand they have an emotional attachment to. Together these four sub-themes make up one of the major themes that emerged from the data, which is brand attachment. It was noted that the only brands that participants were emotionally attached to were iconic national brands.

4.5 Brand visibility

Participants stated that they rarely noticed certain brands. From the way participants described the brands it was as if they were invisible to them. The brands that consumers were failing to notice were brands that they did not consider to be iconic. Consumers spoke about these brands as if they were subconsciously ignoring the brands that were not iconic to them. There were four subthemes that contributed to brand visibility. These subthemes were a brand’s emotional visibility, physical visibility, visibility in advertising, and a brand’s visibility during consumer’s childhoods. Each of the subthemes that arose in the research, along with the supporting text units, are discussed below.

4.5.1 Brands’ Emotional Visibility

Participants described brands that were invisible to them because they failed to elicit any emotional responses from them. In all cases, these were brands that were not iconic to participants. While participants had emotional connections with iconic brands, this was not the case for non-iconic brands. Due to the lack of emotional value that these brands discerned from participants, they were considered invisible and in turn non-iconic brands. Throughout the focus groups, it was also evident that many of the private brands discussed were also emotionally invisible to the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M: Its [Signature Range] just a bit simple yeah.</td>
<td>Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: I think its just not being able to relate to it.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F: Exactly. When you have no association with the brand… I can’t even tell you what they sell.

Homebrand just gets no emotional values.  
Female - Focus group #1

It’s one of those things, is that if it’s un-iconic to you, it has very little impact on you, in which case you don’t think of it.  
Male – Focus group #5

Table 4.9. Support for the theme of brands’ emotional visibility

4.5.2 Brands’ Physical Visibility

Participants also spoke about brands they failed to physically notice. The way in which the participants discussed brands that were physically invisible to them highlighted that subconsciously, they do not look at these brands. They cited a variety of reasons such as poor shelf positioning, brands lacking eye-catching logos, and brands not being iconic. The supporting text units detail the reasons these brands were not visible to these consumers. Brands that are physically visible to consumers are a subtheme that makes up the theme of brand visibility. Of the brands discussed during the focus groups it became clear that the private brands in particular are often physically invisible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[You can] Just miss it. You know, a rabbit just hops past you and you just like don’t see it. It’s kind of like when you are walking past the supermarket brands and you just don’t look over at them [Signature Range and Homebrand] or Pams.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: I don’t notice it as much.</td>
<td>Focus group #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Maybe because of that black and white logo [Signature Range], you reckon? Like it’s just quite a simple logo. Other ones at least have a bit of colour and like a bit of a picture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They [iconic brands] are always in a better position on a shelf, always in the middle.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: How do you treat non-iconic brands in comparison to iconic brands?</td>
<td>Focus group #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: You don’t look at them first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Yeah they’re always the second option.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10. Support for the theme of brands’ physical visibility
4.5.3 Brands’ Visibility in the Advertising Spectrum

It was also noted throughout the focus groups that participants believed that iconic brands advertise more than brands that are not iconic, and because of this consumers considered them to be more visible. Through the supporting text units below we can see that consumers state that they see more television advertising for iconic brands. Consumers also note that there is less advertising for private brands and they are less visible because of this. It is not just television advertising that contributes to a brand’s ability to avoid invisibility though. It was also noted by participants that iconic brands advertise more overall. This subtheme raises the idea that there are brands that are invisible in consumers’ advertising spectrum and this contributes to the overall visibility of the brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I also wanted to touch upon the marketing, iconic brands have more of a presence outside of supermarkets: pop-up stores and advertising.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You see them [iconic brands] on TV a lot whereas other ones you wouldn’t.</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So if you think about those ones you just listed [Pams, Signature Range, and Homebrand], they don’t have any advertising, no advertising behind them whatsoever.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11. Support for the theme of brands’ visibility in the advertising spectrum

4.5.4 Brands’ Visibility in an Individual’s Family/Childhood

During the focus groups there were many instances where it was noted that brands are visible, or remain visible, to consumers due to the fact that they have been a part of their childhood and/or were used by their family. Participants indicated that they looked for certain brands due to them being readily available during their childhood. They also indicated that they were less inclined to purchase brands that were not available during their childhood. This aspect of a brand being visible throughout their childhood contributes to whether or not the brand is visible in their future.
Table 4.12. Support for the theme of brands’ visibility in an individual’s family/childhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Text Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F: I don’t think so because my family just never has it probably, so instead it’s a</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brand that I’m like “Eugh” too.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents bought them before you do, or before I do. So some of these things are what</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we had in our house when we were growing up. So we tend to stay with the same ones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But also, that [Cadbury] was the only thing we were exposed to. That’s all we knew.</td>
<td>Female – Focus group #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whereas now we get a lot of imported chocolate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadbury was on maximum [availability during my childhood], we always got Cadbury not</td>
<td>Male – Focus group #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittaker’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes listed above all contribute to the overarching theme of brand visibility. A brand’s emotional and physical visibility, along with its visibility in advertisements and its role in a consumer’s childhood/family life all contribute to its visibility. Throughout the subthemes that contribute to brand visibility it was clear that participants believed brands that were not visible to them were also not iconic to them. From this it can be said that an iconic brand cannot be an invisible brand because it must be visible to consumers. Consumers provided examples of visible brands that were not iconic, but there were no examples of invisible brands that were iconic. It is also worth noting that almost all the private brands discussed were considered by the participants to be invisible brands.

4.6 Chapter Summary

The findings addressed in this chapter highlighted the three major themes that emerged from the data. The three themes are brands’ New Zealand cultural heritage, visibility, and their ability to develop brand attachments. These three themes all have an influence on a brand’s iconicity.

A brand’s New Zealand cultural heritage is made of up four aspects. These are a brand’s agricultural heritage, its ability to appear local, its belonging in a New Zealand household, and its ability to integrate Kiwiana and New Zealand into its brand story. Together these four aspects combine to create a brand’s New Zealand cultural heritage, which in turn gives a
brand an iconic status in the minds of consumers. *Brand attachments* also consists of four subthemes, these are a brand’s association with a consumer’s childhood, a brand’s ability to provide nostalgia to better times, a brand’s use for escapism, and its use as a reward brand. Through the memories associated with these brands, consumers develop strong emotion-laden bonds with brands. Together these four subthemes make up iconic brands’ *brand attachments*. Lastly, is a brand’s *visibility*. This consists of a brand’s physical visibility, emotional visibility, visibility in advertising, and visibility throughout a consumer’s childhood. How well a brand performs in each of these four areas depends on whether or not it will be visible or invisible to consumers.

From the three themes and corresponding subthemes presented above, we see three aspects that are common amongst the iconic brands discussed during the focus groups. All of the brands consumers found to be iconic, had a *New Zealand cultural heritage*, an *attachment* with the consumer, and were *visible* to the consumer. Through these themes, it is noted that all three have an aspect that relates to the consumer’s childhood or family. From this it can be said that a brand’s presence in a consumer’s family life is essential in its iconicity. It was also noted that national brands were the examples most often used for each aspect of iconicity. This could be due to the lack of an iconic private brand in New Zealand, or due to the lack of a premium private brand. Exactly how the themes impact on a brand’s iconicity will be addressed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Introduction
The following section will discuss the findings of this thesis and how each research question was answered. This section will also address the academic contributions, managerial implications, and limitations of this research. This thesis will close with directions for future research followed by the conclusion.

5.2 Interpretation and Discussion of Findings
The literature review of this thesis gives an in-depth look at private and national branding, covering their history, perceptions, and competitive strategies. Brand equity, brand attachment, and iconic branding literature were then introduced along with their relations to private and national brands. The literature highlighted the potential effects of iconic brands, brand equity, and brand attachment on the private and national brand relationship. The exact effects were outlined along with their potential impacts on the commercial performance of the brands.

In the literature, it was established that nostalgic memories involving brands contribute to brand attachment, and that brand attachment can occur as a result of developing iconic brands (Grisaffe & Nguyen, 2011; Holbrook & Schindler, 2003; MacInnis et al., 2005). The strategic benefits of brand attachments were also highlighted. These are increases in consumers’ likelihood to repurchase, intention to recommend, likelihood to purchase, resilience to negative information, brand loyalty, and willingness to pay a price premium (Ekinci et al., 2014; MacInnis et al., 2005; Oliver, 1999). It was also established that iconic brands possess a high amount of brand equity (Holt, 2004). From the literature it can be said that with a high amount of brand equity, brands will experience increased perceived quality, name awareness, brand loyalty, likelihood of consumers believing advertisements, and reduced perceived risk (Bakpayev et al., 2015; Chen 2009; De Wulf et al., 2005; Dick et al., 1994; 1996a; 1997; Erdem & Swait, 1998). Brand equity can also positively impact future profitability (Aaker, 1991; Wood, 2000).

It was also highlighted in the review due to the reduced perceived risk associated with the brand, consumers would also rely less on extrinsic cues, such as price, to judge the quality of
the brand (Baltas, 1997; Batra & Sinha, 1999; Dick et al., 1994; Erdem & Swait, 1998; Gielens & Sethuraman, 2014; Schellinck, 1980). The review then highlighted the impact that this, along with the effects of brand attachment, could have on the perceived gap in quality between private and national brands. Iconic branding was then presented as a potential strategy that could be used by private brands to bridge the perceived gap in quality.

In the literature on iconic branding there is no mention of iconic brands in a private and national FMCG brand context. Though Holt (2004) addresses iconic brands that are technically national brands, such as Coca-Cola and Mountain Dew, he does not discuss them in an FMCG context as national brands. As they are not discussed in an FMCG context, there is no mention of a comparison between iconic private and national brands. In fact, there is no mention of any private brands in iconic branding literature whatsoever. As there is no discussion of private brands in iconic branding literature it can be said that the idea of an iconic private brand has not been proposed before. As the idea of an iconic private brand has not been proposed before, neither have the effects that the brand equity and brand attachment of an iconic brand would have on consumer perceptions of private brands. To understand more about how iconic brands could be used as a strategy for FMCG private brands the following research questions were posed:

1. What makes an FMCG brand iconic?

2. How do consumers perceive iconic FMCG brands in comparison to other FMCG brands?

3. How do consumers perceive iconic private FMCG brands differently to iconic national FMCG brands?

4. What are the strategic implications for retailers of FMCG private and national brands?

5.2.1 Research Question One

The following section will discuss how the findings answered research question one. The question will be answered by providing themes that emerged from the focus groups that contribute to knowledge on how iconic FMCG brands are formed. The three themes identified were a brand’s New Zealand cultural heritage, brand attachment, and brand visibility. The makeup of an iconic FMCG brand will also be compared to the makeup of the iconic brands discussed by Bulmer (2011) and Holt (2004).
5.2.2 Key Findings of Research Question One

Research question one asked what makes an FMCG brand iconic. One of the methods for developing iconic brands that is addressed in the literature is making use of already existing cultural myths for branding and engaging in cultural branding (Holt, 2004). A full explanation of cultural branding can be found in section 2.7.2. The review also addresses that a brand can become iconic to consumers through their consumption history and their cultural and national heritage (Bulmer, 2011).

When researching what makes FMCG brands iconic, three main contributing themes emerged from the focus groups. It was found that the brands that are perceived to be iconic had aspects of New Zealand cultural heritage, the ability to form emotional attachments, and were visible to consumers. These findings are consistent with the already established literature on forming iconic brands.

The findings related to New Zealand cultural heritage were consistent with the literature as it was found that iconic brands have aspects of cultural and national heritage. The subthemes that contribute to this are addressed in section 4.3 of the Findings. Consumers’ cultural heritage making brands iconic to them is addressed in the literature of Bulmer (2011). These previously established findings have been built upon by showing that brands themselves need a cultural heritage. Bulmer’s (2011) work stated that consumers view the brands as a part of their cultural heritage, whereas the study conducted here has found that in iconic FMCG branding, the brand itself must have its own aspects of cultural heritage. This finding differs entirely to Bulmer’s (2011) as it finds that in the case of FMCG brands the cultural heritage required for iconicity must be provided to the consumer by the brand. So, for FMCG brands, in a New Zealand context, the brand requires a New Zealand cultural heritage to be perceived as an iconic brand.

This research also found that consumers form attachments to iconic brands. It was found that consumers form emotional bonds with brands due to the brand’s ability to provide nostalgia to better times, its presence in their childhoods, its use for escapism, and its use as a self-reward (See Findings section 4.4). The findings of a brand’s ability to provide nostalgia, and its presence in consumers’ childhoods, leading to attachment, is consistent with the literature
on forming attachments to brands (Grisaffe & Nguyen, 2011; Holbrook & Schindler, 2003; MacInnis et al., 2005). The findings of a brand’s ability to provide escapism and its usage as a reward brand are new to brand attachment literature. These will be addressed in the Academic Contribution section (5.3).

The findings of this research demonstrate that consumers’ emotional bonds with brands stem from their memories associated with the brands. If consumers have a collection of memories they relate to a specific brand, then they can form an attachment to this brand and through this it can become iconic to them. Through the sharing of memories and stories related to specific brands, shared iconicity can be developed with other consumers. From this it can be seen that what allows consumers to form these emotional bonds with brands is the specific collection of memories a consumer associates with them. These memories must be able to provide nostalgia to better times and a connection to consumers’ childhoods, all while being usable for escapism and self-rewards. Examples of this include consumers associating the brand with memories of times they hold dear to themselves, such as family holidays. A memory such as this could be used to provide nostalgia to better times or to engage in escapism to reimagine an experience and to provide an escape from the everyday monotony of life. Similarly, the memory could be specific to the consumer’s childhood and result in the associated brand being held in high regard by the consumer. Alternatively, the memory could be used as a reward that the consumer rewards themself with by purchasing the brand. These are four examples of how consumers’ memories associated with a brand contribute to their attachment to a brand, and in turn its status as an iconic brand. From these findings it is clear that one of the factors that makes FMCG brands iconic are the emotional bonds that consumers form with them based on their memories associated with the brands.

The third contributing finding to what makes FMCG brands iconic is their visibility. It was noted that certain brands were visible to consumers in a variety of ways. Factors that impacted their visibility to consumers were the brand’s emotional visibility, physical visibility, visibility in advertising, and visibility during their childhoods (See Findings section 4.5). It was found that brands were emotionally visible to consumers if they managed to register an emotional connection with them. Physically visible brands were those which consumers found themselves noticing due to factors such as shelf positioning and packaging. Consumers described a subconscious decision to ignore brands that did not attract their vision. Brands were visible in consumers’ advertising spectrum if they stood out from the
vast number of advertisements they are exposed to. If consumers were not reminded of the brands’ existence by their advertising they then became invisible to them. Visibility of brands in consumers’ childhoods refers to brands that were on offer during their time as children. It was noted that brands that were visible in consumers’ childhoods and family life were not invisible to them in later life. From that we see that often, invisible brands are those brands that consumers did not engage with during their childhood.

With regards to the findings of the brand visibility theme, it was found that only non-iconic brands registered as invisible to consumers. From this, it can be said that in order for an FMCG brand to become iconic, it must be highly visible. Iconic FMCG brands must be brands that have managed to avoid invisibility, and are in turn visible due to their ability to be visible in the four aspects addressed above. This is the first study to uncover invisible brands in purchasing. Invisible brands have been discovered once before in consumer research. Specifically invisible brands within a consumer’s household have been looked at, but these are brands that consumers purchase and then they become invisible once inside the consumers’ households through their lack of use (Coupland, 2005). So not only is this only the second study to uncover invisible brands, it is also the first study to uncover invisible brands in purchasing. In this case purchasing extends to the purchase of FMCG brands in locations such as supermarkets, petrol stations, and convenience stores.

Research question one set out to address what makes an FMCG brand iconic. This was to see if iconic FMCG brands differed to the more ‘general’ iconic brands discussed in the literature. This research question was necessary, as Bulmer (2011) and Holt (2004) do not go in to specifics on different types of brands and whether their iconicity differs. From this research question, it was confirmed that like the iconic brands referenced by Holt (2004) and Bulmer (2011), consumer perceptions of cultural and national heritage of the brand contributed to iconicity.

It was also found that in the case of iconic FMCG brands, the brands must be able to form attachments with consumers. For consumers to be able to develop attachments to the brand, they must have specific memories and stories associated with the brand. This confirms Bulmer’s (2011) work on forming iconic brands as she states that iconic brands can be developed through a consumer’s memories and stories associated with the brand. However, an addition to current literature and a contribution of this research is that in the case of iconic
FMCG brands, they must be able to provide consumers with brand attachments. This does not mean that all brands that consumers are attached to are iconic, but rather that all brands that are iconic must be brands which consumers are attached to. These findings related to brand attachment differ to iconic branding literature on the subject. In the literature brand attachments occur as a part of the cultural branding process used to develop iconic branding, whereas, the findings here present brand attachments as a part of the process of, and a contributing factor in, developing iconic brands (Holt, 2004). This will be addressed in Academic Contributions (5.3) section of this chapter. Lastly, it was found that for an FMCG brand to be iconic it must be a brand that is visible to consumers. This is because it was found that all the iconic brands discussed in the focus groups were visible brands, while all the non-iconic brands tended to be invisible. Therefore, if a brand were to be invisible to consumers then it would be a non-iconic brand. So from the findings addressed in research question one it can be seen that makeup of an iconic FMCG brand differs to the makeup of the iconic brands discussed by Holt (2004) and Bulmer (2011).

5.2.3 Research Question Two
Research question two sought to address if and how consumers perceive iconic FMCG brands differently to non-iconic FMCG brands. Two of the major themes addressed in the findings emerged as differences in consumers’ actions towards the different classes of brands. The two themes that emerged were consumers’ attachments to iconic brands and the visibility of iconic brands.

5.2.4 Key Findings of Research Question Two
Two major themes from the findings were evident in the differences in how consumers perceive non-iconic and iconic FMCG brands. These were the visibility of iconic brands and consumers’ emotional bonds with these that led to them forming attachments. Currently no literature exists that looks at iconic brands in an FMCG context, therefore the answer to this research question will address new discoveries in this field of research.

In the findings it was noted that consumers are attached to iconic FMCG brands (See Findings section 4.4). This was not the case for non-iconic brands, these brands had less memories and stories associated with them. Thus, there was less mention of them as brands that consumers have emotional bonds with, as consumers had less memories to draw upon.
From this it can be seen that one of the ways in which consumers perceive iconic FMCG brands differently to non-iconic FMCG brands is through their emotion-laden attachments to brands.

Non-iconic FMCG brands appeared to be far less visible to consumers than iconic FMCG brands. It was noted that many non-iconic brands were invisible to consumers, and they failed to notice or look at them. In this lies one of the differences in consumer perceptions of non-iconic and iconic FMCG brands. Consumers noticed themselves failing to look at or notice the non-iconic brands. This could be due to failings in one of the four contributing subthemes of brand visibility. The four subthemes that contribute to brand visibility are physical visibility, emotional visibility, visibility in advertising, and visibility in a consumer’s childhood. A brand’s physical visibility is dependent on its packaging, logo, and shelf positioning. While emotional visibility is determined by the brand’s ability to foster an emotional connection with consumers. If the brand fails to establish an emotional connection then it will be emotionally invisible. Visibility in advertising is contingent on how much the brand advertises and if it advertises on television. Visibility in a consumers’ childhood is controlled by the brand’s presence in consumers’ childhoods and family life. Iconic brands manage to avoid invisibility by being visible to consumers in all the aforementioned aspects. This exemplifies how iconic brands are perceived differently. Consumers connect with them emotionally and engage with their advertising. They also notice the brands in stores and find their packaging and logos eye-catching. Lastly they have a consumption history with the brand, the brands have been a part of their childhoods or family lives and are perceived differently because of that.

Research question two looks to explore the effects of iconicity among FMCG brands. It was designed to do so by looking at the ways that consumers perceive iconic and non-iconic FMCG brands differently. As there is no literature on iconic FMCG brands (see Section 2.7.4), the findings of this research question were always going to be the first of their kind. From what has been posited above, it is clear that there are two key differences in consumers’ perceptions of iconic and non-iconic FMCG brands. These differences are consumers’ attachments to iconic FMCG brands and the visibility of iconic brands to consumers in comparison to non-iconic brands. This finding can provide insight into the performance capabilities of iconic FMCG brands as it provides insight into how consumers use and perceive the brands. This will be discussed further in the managerial implications.
5.2.5 Research Question Three
The third research question addressed by this thesis asked if and how consumers’ perceive iconic private FMCG brands differently to iconic national FMCG brands. This question attempted to uncover how an iconic private brand would perform in comparison to an iconic national brand.

5.2.6 Key Findings of Research Question Three
Research question three failed to yield any substantial results. This is in part due to the fact there were not many instances in the focus groups where a private brand was perceived as iconic. This may be due to the fact that New Zealand only has three private brands, none of which are considered to be premium private brands.

This is an undesirable result as it would have been preferable to have an iconic private brand to compare to an iconic national brand. This would have provided insights to both researchers and managers of FMCG brands. There were cases made by participants for the private brand Pams to be an iconic brand, but these were not frequent enough for a theme to develop in the data. Despite no iconic private brands emerging from this study, it is important to note that through the literature it can be posited that private brands achieving an iconic status is possible. Private brands do have the ability to develop brand equity (De Wulf et al., 2005). It has also been mentioned throughout this thesis, that iconic brands can be developed through consumers’ consumption history and cultural/national heritage (Bulmer, 2011). From that it can be said that if a private brand developed enough brand equity, and a consumer had enough specific memories and stories associated with the brand, then it could become iconic. Following the findings of research question one, if an iconic private FMCG brand were to be developed it would need to have all the attributes of an iconic FMCG brand that were found.

Improvements that could be made to the research to uncover an iconic private brand to study will be addressed in the limitations and the directions for future research sections.

5.2.7 Research Question Four
Research question four outlines the strategic implications from the findings addressed in research questions one to three. This research question will look to relate the answers of the
previous three questions to the strategic implications of iconic branding discussed in the literature review (See Chapter 2).

5.2.8 Key Findings of Research Question Four

From research questions one and two we can see what it is that makes an FMCG brand iconic and how these brands are perceived in comparison to non-iconic brands. Question four will take these findings and present the strategic implications that can be derived from them.

In the literature review, it was highlighted that iconic brands possess high levels of brand equity (Holt, 2004). So, if a brand reaches the status of an iconic brand it will experience increased brand equity. Then through this they will also experience increased perceived quality, name awareness, brand loyalty, and likelihood of consumers believing advertisements, all while also experiencing reduced perceived risk (Bakpayev et al., 2015; Chen 2009; De Wulf et al., 2005; Dick et al., 1994; 1996a; 1997; Erdem & Swait, 1998). There are also follow on effects from the reduction in perceived risk, such as less reliance on extrinsic cues and less price consciousness due to the decreased perceived risk (Baltas 1997; Batra & Sinha 1999; Dick et al., 1994; Gielens & Sethuraman, 2014; Schellinck, 1980).

The findings of this research highlight that brand attachments play a role in forming iconic brands. There are also a number of strategic benefits associated with brand attachments. These are increases in consumers’ likelihood to repurchase, intention to recommend, likelihood to purchase, resilience to negative information, brand loyalty, and willingness to pay a price premium (Ekinci et al., 2014; MacInnis et al., 2005; Oliver, 1999). From the ideas posited here, we can see that developing an iconic brand has a number of strategic benefits for both private and national brands. The necessity for strategic benefits for private brands is amplified by their need to bridge any perceived quality gap between them and national brands. Normally private brands would also receive added benefits from the decreased reliance on extrinsic cues, as reliance on extrinsic cues benefits national brands (Dick et al., 1994; 1996a; 1997). However, seeing as they have become iconic brands, the private brands would have improved extrinsic cues, such as packaging, branding, and advertising, and consumer’s perceptions of the private brands would not be hindered by their use of extrinsic cues to judge quality. Therefore, the decreased reliance on extrinsic cues to judge products is redundant, as private brands that have become iconic brands would have done so through
improving their extrinsic cues. So, the next step in taking advantage of these proposed strategic benefits is developing an iconic brand.

As addressed in research question one, an iconic FMCG brand (in a New Zealand context), requires aspects of New Zealand cultural heritage, stories and memories that allow consumers to form attachments to them, as well as visibility. Therefore, in regards to the strategic implications of what has been discussed above, it would be in the best interests of brand managers to develop aspects of New Zealand cultural heritage for their brands. To do so they would have to attach their brands to already existing cultural myths and relate their brand to consumers’ cultural and national heritage. As mentioned in research question one these are methods for developing iconic brands (Bulmer, 2011; Holt, 2004). The managerial implications of this strategy will be discussed in Section 5.4.

The second aspect of an iconic FMCG brand found was consumers’ attachments to them. To achieve the strategic advantages associated with being an iconic brand, brand managers must attempt to create an emotional bond between consumers and their brand. This can be done through emphasizing the emotional value of the brand and developing stories and memories that consumers can later use. This would have to be done through marketing communications. Literature on the subject states that in order to influence brand attachments it is recommended that brand managers try to understand and stimulate consumers’ sentimental memories involving brands (Grisaffe & Nguyen, 2011). Grisaffe and Nguyen (2011) provide the example of reinforcing intergenerational themes in marketing communications by having an advertisement for Campbell’s Soup that shows mothers serving the product to their children. They also suggest helping consumers to create memories through experiential marketing by designing brand events. The specifics of this strategy will be discussed in the managerial implications.

Visibility is the final aspect of iconic FMCG brands that was found. It would be obvious to state that an iconic brand must avoid becoming an invisible brand. However, this finding uncovered different forms of visibility that consumers use to engage with brands. These are physical visibility, emotional visibility, visibility during childhood, and visibility in advertising. Brand managers need to try to maximise as many of these forms of visibility as possible.
The strategic implications from this finding also come in the form of marketing communications. Brand managers looking to develop an iconic brand need to ensure that in their communications, their advertising stands out enough so that consumers notice it. They also need to ensure that their communications allow consumers to engage with the brand emotionally and emphasize its emotional uses. The packaging of their brands’ products must also do enough to ensure it is physically visible to consumers. In the findings it was noted that consumers found certain brands and packaging to be too plain and stated that it failed to catch their eye. This is also the case with the brand’s logo itself, for example participants stated that the logo of private brand Homebrand is too plain and that they did not engage with it. In regards to physical visibility, the shelf positioning of products played a strong role in whether or not consumers managed to notice a brand. This is a strategic advantage for private brands as retailer chains control the shelving positioning in their stores. This presents two strategic options for retailers as they can choose to place their store brands in preferable shelf positions and give them more shelf facings to make them more visible, or they can choose to charge national brands higher prices to ensure their positioning and number of shelf facings (Banerji & Hoch, 1993; Bonfrer et al., 2002; Chen, 2009). Another option would be to improve their packaging to make it more eye-catching and unique.

To ensure visibility in consumers’ childhoods, brand managers may need to target younger audiences with their advertising, or sponsor childhood activities such as children’s sporting events. These may seem like long-term investments to some brand managers, but it is important to note that although this is an investment into developing an iconic brand, it is also an investment into brand equity. Any investment into brand equity is a long-term investment into consumers’ perceptions of the value of the brand (Chen, 2009; De Wulf et al., 2005). Another potential option is to market the brand’s products as products that should be used or consumed with children or the entire family. To encourage this, brand managers could sell family sized packs of their products. The strategies associated with ensuring visibility in consumers’ childhoods also double as strategies for developing emotional brand attachments with consumers. These strategic implications will be built upon in the managerial implications.

19 It is important to consider the ethical dilemmas associated with targeting children in advertising.
The findings addressed by research question four have outlined the strategic implications from the previous three research questions. From this we can see a variety of strategies that brand managers can use to attempt to develop an iconic brand. These will be expanded on in the managerial implications where more specific recommendations will be given on how to execute these strategies.

5.2.9 Importance of Findings

The findings of this thesis are important as they present newly researched areas for both iconic brands and private brands. For the first time iconic brands have been researched specifically in an FMCG context. The findings from this provide a host of new strategies for practitioners, along with new areas of research for academics in this area. The idea of iconic branding has now also been applied and researched in a private branding context. Again, this presents findings of interest for both practitioners and academics in these fields. Lastly, brand attachment has been studied in the context of iconic brands and its part in the process of developing iconic brands has been reviewed. These new areas of research open the door for further research into each field that could prove useful for both brand managers looking to improve their brands’ performances, and researchers’ looking to further understand branding.

FMCG brands looking to improve their performance should find these findings of relative importance. They present a collection of strategic implications that outline how brand managers can approach attempting to develop an iconic FMCG brand. The numerous benefits of being an iconic brand mentioned in this section, and the literature review, highlight why every brand manager should at least consider iconic branding as a strategy. Managers of private brands should be attempting every possible method of bridging the perceived gap between their brands and national brands. Seeing as this gap continues to exist despite the improvement in quality of private brands, brand managers should at least consider iconic branding as a method of improving perceptions of their brands (Burt, 2000; De Wulf et al., 2005).

To summarise, these findings are of importance to FMCG brand managers, especially private brand managers, due to the positive effects their implementation could have on their brands’ performance and in turn, the impacts this could have on their sales and profits.
5.3 Academic Contribution

The research conducted for this thesis presents academic contributions to two areas of literature: iconic branding, and private branding. The literature review has highlighted the gaps in the literature for each subject area. This section will show how this thesis has endeavoured to fill, or contribute to filling, these gaps.

This thesis has contributed to academia in private branding by proposing iconic branding as a strategy and outlining its potential effects. Private branding has not looked at the idea of iconic brands before, thus this is the first academic contribution of this research – introducing the notion of iconic brands to private branding literature. The idea of an iconic private brand has not been proposed before. The proposed relationship between private brands and iconic brands exists through brand equity and ties together the three literature streams. Through the increased brand equity gained from being an iconic brand, private brands would experience a number of benefits for their performance. This would occur through increased positive consumer perceptions of the brand (See Section 2.5 of the literature review). Though this research was unable to uncover an iconic private brand, it is still the first to present the notion of ones existence.

The first way that this thesis contributes to iconic branding literature is by providing a study on iconic brands in an FMCG context. Specifically, it has contributed by looking at forming iconic FMCG brands and how consumers interact with these brands. Bulmer (2011) and Holt’s (2004) works provide all that is known about developing iconic brands. Their work looks at brands in a more general sense, and does not focus specifically on a brand category. Therefore, the research conducted here can be considered to have contributed to the academic area of iconic branding, as it has looked specifically at iconic brands in an FMCG context, a focus that has not been addressed in the literature before. The second way that this research has added to knowledge on iconic branding is through its brand attachment findings. In the literature on the subject, brand attachment is a by-product of the cultural branding process that is used to develop iconic brands (Holt, 2004). While this research agrees that brand attachment occurs during the process of developing iconic brands, it does not believe it is a by-product of the process. Instead, this thesis has found that brand attachment is a part of the development process for iconic brands. Instead of considering brand attachments as a by-
product of the process, this thesis considers them a factor in the process. This is an academic contribution to iconic branding as it challenges current theories in the area.

Holt (2004), and Bulmer (2011) also outline their respective methods for forming iconic brands, this thesis has then built upon those works by looking at how iconic FMCG brands are formed. Holt’s (2004) methods for forming iconic brands consist of attaching the brand to already existing cultural myths using his cultural branding strategy (outlined in 2.7.2) to elevate the brand to the status of a cultural icon. According to Holt (2004) cultural branding also results in brand attachments being formed. Bulmer (2011) states iconic brands can be developed through consumers’ consumption history, such as brands they have used throughout their lives, brands they have stories associated with, brands they relate to their family, and brands that reflect their cultural or national heritage. This research has added to this area of iconic branding knowledge as it has provided more information on forming iconic brands. Specifically, this research has looked at what it takes to form iconic FMCG brands.

On top of this previous literature, the current study has found that consumers believe iconic brands must have aspects of New Zealand cultural heritage, brand attachments, and must be visible brands. This confirms the works of Holt (2004), and Bulmer (2011), and then adds to them. The finding that iconic FMCG brands must have aspects of New Zealand cultural heritage is consistent with Holt (2004), and Bulmer’s (2011), methods for forming iconic brands. It also builds on their work as it confirms that this is also the case for FMCG brands.

The brand attachment finding confirms that brands can become iconic to consumers if they have stories and memories associated with the brand. This supports Bulmer’s (2011) theory on forming iconic brands. It then builds on it by finding that for iconic FMCG brands the memories and stories associated with them must be able to provide escapism, nostalgia, a reference to childhood, and a use for self-rewards for consumers. This is a contribution to the research area of iconic branding. This thesis has uncovered that through these four usages, consumers can develop attachments towards brands. The literature on attachments states that they are often formed during childhood, this supports the finding of a brand’s association to an individual’s childhood as a contributing sub-theme of brand attachment (Esch et al., 2006; Grisaffe & Nguyen 2011; MacInnis et al., 2005). This is also the case for the finding of a brand’s ability to provide nostalgia to better times, contributing to its ability to form emotional brand attachments. This finding is supported by literature that states that brands
formed with nostalgic memories are formed using nostalgic bonding (Grisaffe & Nguyen 2011; Holbrook & Schindler, 2003).

While the findings related to brand attachment support Bulmer’s (2011) work, they do not entirely support Holt’s (2004). As stated throughout this thesis, Holt (2004) declares brand attachment to be a by-product of the cultural branding process. While these findings do not dispute that brand attachment occurs during the process of developing an iconic brand, they do dispute that brand attachment is a by-product of producing iconic brands. Instead, these findings propose that brand attachment is a contributing factor in the development of iconic brands. This is an area that Holt (2004) overlooked in his cultural branding model for forming iconic brands. In his model, brand attachment occurs due to the identity value of the brand’s myths, but there is no mention of brand attachments contributing to a brand’s status as iconic. The findings presented in this thesis clearly show brand attachment as a factor that contributes to a brand’s status as iconic. Presenting iconic branding and brand attachment as interacting concepts is one of the key academic contributions of this thesis. Additionally, this contributes to the broader operationalization of iconic branding by providing further understanding on the makeup of iconic brands.

Lastly, the findings related to visible and invisible brands are an entirely new contribution to the area of iconic branding. Invisible brands have been discussed once before. Coupland (2005) found that certain household brands purchased by consumers become invisible to their owners in their homes. It was found that brands became invisible through their roles in habitual processes and their physical invisibility. The invisible brand finding of this thesis differs as it applies to purchasing, not to consumption like Coupland’s (2005) work. Unsurprisingly, iconic brands must be visible to consumers, but the ways in which visibility is attained are of particular interest. Apart from being physically visible to consumers, they must also be emotionally visible, visible in advertising, and visible in consumers’ childhood memories.

When looking at how consumers perceive iconic FMCG brands compared to non-iconic FMCG brands, we see that consumers form attachments to iconic FMCG brands. It was also discovered that consumers perceive many non-iconic brands as invisible, while all iconic brands are perceived as visible. These findings contribute to the area of iconic branding, as iconic brands have not been studied in an FMCG context before.
From what has been discussed in this section it is clear that there are academic contributions from this research. In regard to private branding literature, contributions regard the introduction of iconic brands to private branding literature along with the proposed effects. For iconic branding, contributions address how iconic FMCG brands are formed, the introduction of brand attachment as a contributing factor, and how consumers perceive iconic brands.

5.4 Managerial Implications

The managerial implications for this thesis stem from the proposed relationship between a brand’s iconicity and its brand equity. As highlighted several times throughout this thesis, if a brand becomes iconic it will possess a large amount of brand equity. Through this it will experience benefits such as increased quality perception, brand loyalty, name awareness, and likelihood of consumers to believe advertisements, whilst also experiencing reduced perceived risk (Bakpayev et al., 2015; Chen 2009; De Wulf et al., 2005; Dick et al., 1994; 1996a; 1997; Erdem & Swait, 1998). Due to this reduced perception of risk, consumers will also have less reliance on extrinsic cues to judge the quality of the brand (Baltas, 1997; Batra & Sinha, 1999; Dick et al., 1994; Erdem & Swait, 1998; Gielens & Sethuraman, 2014; Schellinck, 1980). From these extensive performance benefits associated with iconic brands the most basic of all the managerial implications is to develop an iconic brand. In the research questions, iconic FMCG brands have three main aspects; these are brand attachments, visibility, and aspects of New Zealand cultural heritage. The rest of this section will outline the managerial implications associated with developing each aspect of an iconic FMCG brand.

To give their brands a New Zealand cultural heritage brand managers need to convince consumers that their brand is in some way related to New Zealand. To do so they need to craft or emphasize the brand values in a way that creates an emotional connection between the brand and the consumer. If they can convince consumers the brand is from, owned, or produced in New Zealand then that may be enough to develop New Zealand cultural heritage. The brand requires some form of a New Zealand backstory. This can be developed through marketing communications such as advertising and packaging. This is an area where brand storytelling through communication strategies are of utmost importance. In advertising, the
brand should do its best to relate New Zealand culture to the product. The advertisement could also attempt to include aspects of Kiwiana to further provide authenticity for its claims that it is from New Zealand. With its packaging, the brand can tell the backstory behind the brand, and how it related to New Zealand. This can be done using text to tell the story of the brand or by using images and symbols that relate to New Zealand. A prime example of this is Edmonds, which has the words “Part of New Zealand’s Heritage” printed across the back of its packaging on products. Another example is the packaging used by Whittaker’s in their artisan range. On the front of the packaging the words “New Zealand Artisan Collection” are printed at the top. On the reverse side, there is a paragraph detailing the story and history of the Whittaker’s brand and their use of New Zealand ingredients.

Developing attachments towards a brand requires consumers to have positive memories associated with using the brand. This works better with some product categories than others, for example it would be easier to develop positive memories with an ice cream brand than a toilet paper brand. The most effective way to communicate that the brand is associated with positive memories would be through advertising. If a brand can show its products being used in situations that consumers enjoy while also emphasizing its emotional values then consumers may associate the brand with these times. For example, if a brand can show its products being used during events such as family gatherings and summer holidays, consumers may be more likely to associate the brand with these positive times and develop emotional connections with them. Another option would be to sponsor family events or run promotions at beaches (or other popular family destinations) to try to achieve this same association. Brand attachment’s importance is highlighted in research question two where it was found the attachment to the brand was one of the differences consumers perceived between iconic and non-iconic brands.

To ensure their brand does not become an invisible brand, managers must make sure their brands achieve physical visibility, emotional visibility, visibility in advertising, and visibility during consumers’ childhoods. To ensure physical visibility brand managers need to make sure their products are equipped with packaging and a logo that are vibrant and differentiated enough to stand out to consumers. Brand managers should avoid strategies that involve the imitation of other brand’s packaging. Instead, they should look to develop unique packaging that differentiates their products from competitors’. Shelf positioning is also important to
ensure physical visibility of a brand, as it was noted in the research that poor shelf positioning led to consumers failing to notice certain brands.

For brand managers to make sure their brands achieve emotional visibility, they must create an emotional connection between the brand and the consumers. Through their marketing communications, such as advertising, they can produce content that shows consumers using their brand to meet emotional needs. Through this they can stress the emotional values of their brand to encourage consumers to engage with them in that manner. The recommendations for developing emotional visibility are similar to that of brand attachment. Though the two serve different purposes, they can be achieved through similar strategies.

To attain visibility in advertising, a brand manager must be willing to spend on advertising. Advertising on television would be recommended, as this was the method of advertising that was mentioned the most during the focus groups. Advertisements need to stand out enough so that they are visible to consumers and do not get lost amongst the noise of other advertisements.

Developing visibility in consumers’ childhoods is a long-term strategy. To execute this, brand managers must be willing to target younger audiences or families with their advertising. It is recommended that brands sponsor children’s events to ensure the brand is present during their childhood. For example if a brand sponsors a children’s sports tournament and their branding is present throughout the tournament then the children may associate memories of childhood sports with the brand. An excellent example of this is the Weet-Bix TRYathlons that take place around New Zealand. Children aged 7-15 years old compete in the events. The TRYathlon places an emphasis on participation, and upon completion every child is presented with a Weet-Bix branded medal and t-shirt along with a complementary Weet-Bix breakfast. Other brands looking to develop visibility in consumers’ childhoods should look to imitate Weet-Bix/Sanitarium’s efforts. Grisaffè and Nguyen’s (2011) work proposes a similar managerial implication for developing brand attachment. They recommend that brand managers try to better understand customer experiences with the brand and advertise accordingly.

---

20 It is important to consider the ethical dilemmas associated with targeting children in advertising and sponsorship.
To target families, brands can stress in their marketing communications that their products are to be consumed as a family, or by a parent and a child together. This could lead to parents purchasing brands to share them with their family and the brand being visible in children’s childhoods. To further encourage this, brand managers could sell family sized packs of their product.

Research question two notes that if consumers perceive a brand as invisible it will not be iconic to them. This demonstrates the importance of visibility to iconic FMCG brands. It is important to note there are ethical concerns with targeting children, especially with products that are deemed unhealthy. Whether or not a product can ethically target children with their advertising would have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

To summarise this section the managerial implications for developing iconic FMCG brands are presented below:

- Develop a New Zealand cultural heritage for the brand:
  - Create a New Zealand backstory related to the brand.
  - Communicate this story through advertising and packaging.
  - Legitimise this story through use of Kiwiana.
- Help the consumer develop an attachment to the brand:
  - Through marketing communications associate the brand with positive times in people’s lives so they can use their memories of the brand to escape the everyday monotony of their lives.
  - Emphasize the brand’s usage for meeting emotional needs through marketing communications.
- Develop brand visibility:
  - Make sure packaging and branding do enough to attract consumers.
  - Through advertising emphasize the use of the brand to meet emotional needs.
  - Advertise heavily, and on television when possible, but also differentiate advertising to ensure it stands out.
  - Target younger audiences or families to develop a place for the brand in their childhood.
  - Sponsor children’s events to increase chances of them associating parts of their childhood with the brand.
Reinforce intergenerational themes in advertising.

Sell family sized packs of products and through marketing communications, place importance on consuming products as a family to increase chances of a brand’s visibility in consumers’ childhoods.

Improvements to advertising and packaging are two of the recurring themes from the managerial implications section of this thesis. Referring back to the literature review, it can be seen that advertising and packaging are discussed in the Evolution of Private Brand Products (2.3.3), Influences of Perception (2.3.5), and National Brand Competitive Strategy (2.4.3) sections. From the literature review (Section 2.3.3) we can already see that private brands that have evolved from lower tiered private brands into value added own brands have done so through the use of improved packaging (Argouslidis & Baltas, 2007; Burt, 2000; Burt & Davis, 1999; Choi & Coughlan, 2006; Dick et al., 1994; 1995; 1996a; 1996b; De Wulf et al., 2005; Gielens & Sethuraman, 2014; Huang & Huddleston, 2009; Hyman et al., 2010; Laaksonen & Reynolds, 1994; Ruekert et al., 1994). Packaging improvements have been recommended for private brands since the 1990’s (Dick et al., 1994) so the packaging recommendations of this thesis are not the first of their kind.

In regard to the advertising recommendations, it has been noted for a long time that national brands can afford to advertise far more frequently than private brands. This has long been a contributing factor to consumers’ perceived gap in quality between private and national brands (Ailawadi & Keller, 2004; Baltas & Doyle, 1998; Batra & Sinha, 1999; Bellizzi et al., 1981; Richardson, 1997). Much like packaging improvements, increases in advertising have been recommended to private brand managers since the 1990’s (e.g. Dick et al. 1995; 1996a).

Although in this thesis the managerial implications related to advertising and packaging are related to forming iconic brands and need to be done in conjunction with other managerial implications, it is interesting to note that private brands have been recommended to improve both advertising and packaging in the past. Perhaps if the private brands available in New Zealand had followed this advice then there may be an iconic, or at least premium, private brand available in New Zealand today.
5.5 Limitations

The research conducted for this thesis has its limitations. This is the case with all research. Specifically, there were methodological limitations, sampling limitations, and limitations that pertained to the grocery retailing market in New Zealand. These three limitations and how they were mitigated will be discussed below.

New Zealand’s grocery retailing economy is a duopoly, with two companies owning all the major grocery retailing chains in the country. Foodstuffs Ltd are a New Zealand based company who own the New World, PAK’nSAVE, and Four Square supermarket chains. Foodstuffs’ main competitor is Progressive Enterprises Ltd who own the Countdown, Fresh Choice, and Super Value supermarket chains. Progressive Enterprises Ltd is an Australian based company. Each of these companies has their own line of private brands, with Foodstuffs owning Pams\(^{21}\), and Progressive owning Signature Range and Select. This placed a limitation on the research as none of these three brands are seen as premium private brands.

The research may have been able to provide more information on iconic private brands if there had been a premium private brand to present to the focus group participants. As there is not one available in New Zealand it meant the research was limited to trying to find an iconic private brand amongst private brands that are not perceived to be high quality and are not heavily advertised. However, this study does present strategies that New Zealand private brands could use to improve their status. Though a brand does not necessarily have to be high quality to be iconic, it would have been advantageous to have an opportunity to research a premium private brand to see if its higher quality made a difference to its perceived iconicity. The fact that there are only three private labels in New Zealand did provide an advantage to the research, as all focus groups participants were familiar with them and had engaged with them at some time.

The methodological limitations of this research pertain to the researcher’s decision to use focus groups. It is important to note that all data collection methods present their own set of limitations. Focus groups were selected as despite their limitations they are still the most appropriate data collection method for this research. The limitations of focus groups are that

\(^{21}\) Foodstuffs used to have a private brand called “Budget”. But at the time of data collection “Budget” was discontinued. It is now replaced by the “Value” brand but at the time of data collection neither brand was available in stores.
participants are less likely to share in-depth personal information with a group, the potential for people dominating the focus groups, and the possibility of the moderator leading the focus group. These limitations were mitigated by the moderator’s level of experience and the friendly, relaxed, and conversational atmosphere the moderator created for participants.

Focus groups may produce less in-depth and personal information than individual interviews. Due to the social aspect of focus groups, participants are not as willing to share highly personal information in a group environment. The epistemological beliefs of the researcher are that meaning is created socially, so focus groups are actually the most appropriate data collection method for this despite the potential for less personal information being shared. As the nature of this research does not touch on extremely personal information, it was deemed that this limitation of focus groups would not hinder the research. Therefore, this limitation was mitigated by the context of the research.

As with all focus group research there is the potential for participants to dominate the focus group and dictate the discussion. The moderator made sure to limit this by encouraging all group members to share, and asking each member of the group for their opinion before moving on to a new discussion topic. The moderator also attempted to create a warm and conversational environment for each focus group to encourage contribution. Through these methods, the focus group moderator was able to mitigate the potential limitations of participants dominating focus groups. Upon review of the transcripts and recordings of the focus groups, it was deemed that no participants had dominated the focus groups.

To limit the chances of the moderator leading the focus groups the moderator made sure to allow the participants to discuss the topics among themselves and to allow for interaction among them. The moderator’s prior moderating experiences, along with his practice attempts during the pretesting, and his focus on allowing interactions between participants, was enough to mitigate the potential limitation of him leading the focus group. Upon review of the transcripts and recordings of the focus groups, it was deemed that the moderator did not lead them to a degree that would affect the findings of the research.
Sampling limitations arose as this research consisted mostly of a student sample, and because of this a skewed age demographic for the research. Due to the time constraints of this research this sample was deemed appropriate, as all participants had interacted with the brands discussed. One focus group consisting of an older age demographic was able to be carried out. It returned similar results to those involving younger demographics and so it was felt that findings would not differ between age groups. If it were possible a more diverse sample of participants would have been sought, but the time constraints did not allow for this.

From the information presented in this section, it can be seen that although there are limitations to this research, the researcher has made every attempt to mitigate them.

5.6 Directions for Future Research

As mentioned throughout this thesis there is no mention of iconic brands in private branding literature, nor is there any iconic branding literature that focuses on FMCG brands. Because of this, there are many different directions for future research in each area.

Following this study, further research that could be conducted in the area of private branding could carry out similar analyses in countries with more private brands, and higher quality private brands. Future research could look to further examine if there is a private brand that is perceived by consumers as iconic. As well as that, a longitudinal study could be conducted on a private brand attempting to develop iconicity to see if it is possible and what steps would have to be taken to do so. Lastly, if an iconic private brand was found then a study to test the proposed relationship between a brand’s iconicity and consumer perceptions of private brands could also be conducted. If this could be tested and proved then this would provide further support for the use of iconic branding as a possible strategy for iconic brands to bridge the perceived gap between them and national brands.

Future research in the area of iconic brands could look to study different consumer groups and further address the findings from this research. A study similar to this one on iconic brands could be conducted with consumers from lower socio-economic backgrounds to see if they find a different set of brands iconic. As well as this, studies in different countries could see if different nationalities also use cultural and national heritage to form iconic brands, and

---

22 A full description of the studies’ participants can be found in Section 3.6 of the Research Methodology.
if so what aspects of it they use. Further studies could be conducted on the interplay between iconic brands and brand attachment to look at how consumers develop these attachments and if this extends to types of brands other than FMCG brands. The visibility of brands could also be looked into, particularly the emotional visibility, and how it relates to brand attachment. Finally, a set of scales could be developed to measure aspects of brands’ iconicity. That way survey research could be conducted to collect more data on the subject. This would provide a method for gathering data on consumer perceptions of iconic brands in a far faster manner.

An area of future research that presented itself in the findings is that of visible and invisible brands. To the knowledge of the researcher there is only one other study that uncovered invisible brands. Coupland (2005) looked at brand’s invisibility in consumers’ households and how this occurs. Interestingly there were aspects of physical visibility that contributed to this. From this we can see physical visibility and invisibility is a topic of future research in this area. Research could look at if a brand’s physical visibility in-store has any relationship with its visibility in the household. As only two studies have uncovered invisible brands it can be said that this area of research has a wealth of directions for future research.

5.7 Conclusions

Iconic branding is a strategy that marketers should further understand and develop. This study has shown what meanings consumers believe make up iconic FMCG brands. This information is important to FMCG brand managers as it allows them to know what areas of their brand they should be looking to develop to increase their chances of developing an iconic brand. Through the literature reviewed in this study, it has been proposed that there is a relationship between an iconic brand’s brand equity, brand attachment, and certain aspects of consumer perception. This proposed relationship results in increased positive perceptions of a brand if it becomes iconic. The affects these perceptions could have on brands’ sales and the profit that would be incurred as a result of this, should be of great importance to brand managers. Further understanding of iconic brands should be of interest to both practitioners and academics, as it will provide more information on a profitable strategy for practitioners while also allowing academics to further understand some of the most powerful brands.
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Appendix A: Moderator Guide

Focus group questions/plan
The research I’m conducting here is on iconic brands found in supermarkets and how consumers think and feel about these brands. Iconic brands are brands which hold a high level of value to us, you may view different brands as icons depending on what brands you grew up, what brands you’ve used throughout your life, and how you view your national heritage. Examples of these in the United States are Harley Davidson, Budweiser, and Coke. So I’d like you to think of what brands you’d buy in a supermarket and to name ones you view as iconic in a New Zealand context and ones you do not view as iconic. Non-iconic doesn’t necessarily mean you don’t like them, but it just means you don’t think highly of the brand and it doesn’t mean a lot to you personally. For example I use the Sunfield Canola Oil, I don’t think it’s a bad brand or product, but I definitely don’t think it’s iconic. Just remember there are no wrong answers here, any brand can be iconic or non-iconic to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICONIC</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Can you list any supermarket brands you see as iconic, and ones that you don’t see as iconic? Suggest Pams and Signature Range if they have not already been iconic?

Questions:
- What makes brand X iconic but brand Y not?
- How do you treat these brands differently?
- Do you have any memories of using any of these brands?
- Do you have any stories about any of these brands?

Prompts:
- Can you explain that a bit more to me about that?
- How come?
- What makes you feel that way about that brand?
- Can you explain to me about why that brand makes you feel that way?
- Can you elaborate on that point?
- Is there any particular reason that you feel/act that way?

Do you views on brands and their national icon status change across product categories? For example what brands are nationally iconic in the chocolate category (Whittaker’s & Cadbury)? And what about the soft drink category, can you think of any nationally iconic brands there (L&P)?
- Why is brand X in this category iconic, but brand Y in this category not?
- What makes brands iconic in different categories?

Picture association
For this next exercise I’m going to present you with photos of seven different animals and a photo of one the brands written on the board. I want you as individuals to choose an animal to represent the brand and then to explain why you’ve chosen it. There is no right answer with this exercise. Be as imaginative or as creative as you like. You’re more than welcome to use the same animal to represent more than one brand.
Questions/prompts:
- Can you explain why you’ve chosen this animal to represent this brand?
  o Is there any particular behind that choice?
- What is the thought process behind this animal and brand choice?
- What characteristics of this animal relate it to this brand?
- What is it about brand X that makes it this animal here?
- This animal has been used to represent brand X and brand Y, is there a quality those two brands share that led to this animal being used for both?
- I noticed not everyone agreed on this one, could those who didn’t disagree explain why they don’t think this animal represents this brand?

Brand mapping
For the final exercise I’m going to present with a series of the brands we’ve discussed today and as a team I’d like you to group them based on your thoughts, feelings, and opinions of the brands. I just ask that you don’t group the brands based on the types of foods and products they produce, for example don’t form a group based on the fact that all of the brands make breakfast foods. I want you to form groups based on your thoughts and feelings about the brands. Also, you may group brands on their own if you like.

Questions/prompts:
- What are the differences between these groupings of brands?
- What made you exclude brand X from this group?
- I noticed not everyone was in agreement on brand X being in this group, can you explain both sides of that to me?
- If you had to do this exercise again, how could you do it differently?

Prompts:
- Can you explain that a bit more to me about that?
- What makes you feel that way about that brand?
- Can you explain to me about why that brand makes you feel that way?
- Is there any particular reason that you feel/act that way?
- Would you mind elaborating on point X for me?
- I noticed you that you brought X up, could you explain why you choose to describe Y in that particular way?
Appendix B: Animal Images for Picture Association
### Appendix C: Brand Mapping Images

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whittaker's</th>
<th>Sanitarium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Tip Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattie's</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Focus group transcripts

Focus group one
18/09/2017

I: So, I just basically want you guys as a group to name brands that you think are iconic and not iconic that you can find in the supermarket. Oh, one more thing, we can't do alcohol.

M: Whittaker's chocolate.
F: Lindt chocolate.
I: So you think that's iconic? Do you?
F: Yep.
M: Anchor milk.
M: Charlie's.
F: Tip Top.
F: Lewis Road Creamery.
M: Cadbury.
M: What's that – Heartland chips?
M: Yep.
F: Bluebird.
M: They've got that penguin.
F: Kettle Chips.
M: Arnott's.
M: Griffins.
M: Cookie Time.
I: Alright, that's a whole lot of icons. And then, what about ones that are not iconic? Just any brand you can think of...
M: Budget.
F: Homebrand.
F: Pams.
M: Maybe like Meadow Fresh in comparison with Anchor.
M: Meadow Fresh flavoured milk in comparison to Lewis Road Creamery.
M: Signature range.
F: Very not iconic.
M: Telley frozen vegetables as opposed to McCain's. Yeah they do like minted peas and s*** they have a whole bunch of s***.
I: What about Deep South? Is it iconic or not Iconic?
M: Deep South tastes like s***.
F: Not Iconic.
I: So you don't think it's iconic, but you do. Why do you think it's iconic?
M: Well, I'm kind of biased because I've done a presentation on Deep South ice cream. Because it's kind of premium brand from New Zealand, the pictures and the packaging is like places around New Zealand, and it sells at quite a high price point.
I: So do you think that connection to New Zealand makes it iconic?
M: I think it helps, it supports it. I don't think it necessarily makes it iconic.
I: And what about you? You don't think it's iconic?
F: No, it's in black boxes, so it seems it's not going to have nice ice cream out of it. I think, it's like the product doesn't hold. It's not iconic like Kohu Road, they have really good ice cream.
I: So for you iconic brands depend on the quality of the product as well?
F: I think so and the image of the product... while the image of the product does have like New Zealand on it, it does associate genuinely with an iconic brand, it doesn't have have like, I don't know, really super nice branding. Like it's a bit basic.
M: Can I switch back to iconic? Just thinking about like budget, but icons probably in New Zealand, something like Mi Goreng noodles, like that’s something that potentially that you’d say is almost iconic, especially among students but isn’t necessarily like high quality either.
I: Yes, definitely. It doesn't necessarily have to be high quality to be iconic. So looking at Meadow Fresh and Anchor, what makes Anchor iconic and Meadow Fresh not to you guys?
M: I don't know. I suppose Anchor is a little bit more expensive. That helps, makes it look like it is better. The packaging. Meadow Fresh tends to have less like kind of fancy looking packaging as well. I guess those two things really.
I: So packaging and price?
F: I also reckon Anchor has like really good ads compared to Meadow Fresh, especially with their association with Fonterra as well.
M: Does Meadow Fresh have ads?
F: Do they have a presence on TV?
F: Yeah I feel Anchor definitely does, but I can't even think of a Meadow Fresh ad.
F: And like the bottle design...it's like special whereas Meadow Fresh is just like run of the mill.
M: I don't know where the milk comes from but I feel I'm buying more of a New Zealand product when I buy Anchor and I feel that probably contributes to why I think it will be more iconic than Meadow Fresh.
I: So, like, you’ve mentioned earlier the aspects of like... if the brand is associated with New Zealand, your own country, it’s more likely to believe it’s iconic?
M: Kind of associate Anchor with like as a kid as well. I remember having Anchor milk, I don’t remember having Meadow Fresh. I still drink it now, so I hold on to that nostalgia a bit, do you know what I mean?
I: Yeah, so have you got memories and stories associated with Anchor? What kind of feelings do you associate with these stories?

M: Just being a kid, doing dumb things.

I: So would they be positive or negative?

M: They would be positive.

M: I think with my growing up Anchor has always been a premium brand because we just used to get Meadow Fresh because it was cheaper. So when we saw Anchor we saw it as premium and high quality because it cost more.

F: And they do the Anchor cream and the other associated products. That’s always like Anchor cream is like fancy...

I: And how do you feel about Pams as not an icon?

M: It’s just kind of like the equivalent of Budget and Signature range, I suppose. Like, its cheap, well its the cheapest variation of the product you can get. And so like, I kind of associate it with being a student and like just buying it because it is the cheapest thing. I feel like I’m trying to save [money]

M: I feel more like it is functional, you know you just buy it because you need it. Like, you buy Pams because you need that as a product, as opposed to you by Pams because you want to buy Pams. If that makes sense?

M: I feel like iconic brands have story behind them. Whereas not iconic brands just don’t.

I: So there are like stories that you associate with brand?

M: Yeah. I’m pretty sure with like Whittaker’s chocolate there’s like a picture on the back and it talks about where it comes from and stuff, but with those other...

M: Yeah Pams doesn't really have so much of a legacy on the back of their products.

I: Has been in New Zealand for a long time though.

F: I’d still say like Edmonds though. Like Edmonds flour vs. like Pams flour. Is that a thing? Like I’d say Edmonds, even though it’s probably been around in New Zealand for as long as Pams, I’d say Edmonds is more iconic because of its associated products like the recipe book and like as a brand I think its stronger and there’s like a bit more about it.

I: So with that brand they have multiple quality offerings. Like different product categories, does that contribute to the value put on the brand then? Like Edmonds with a cookbook and the flour?

F: Potentially, yeah. And the cookbook has enabled it to get into different markets kind of, so its sort of more iconic because of that.

I: So if you compare two non-iconic brands. Say, if we compare Pamm’s to a Homebrand, which do you prefer?

M: Pretty indifferent between the two.

M: Yeah usually when you buying them you’re just buying them in bulk and cheap. It is associated with being a student, trying to cut down on money.

M: I think it goes back to that point like I’m buying it not because I like this product, I’m buying it because it is like a core component of like how I live. Like toilet paper, or like pasta. It’s just like there, kind of you need it.

F: Where all these products are really similar in that anyway. Like white rice. There is not going to be a huge difference between like expensive white rice and Pams white rice.

I: Well, this leads on nicely to my next question which is about product categories...

M: It’s also what your friends use and your family is use, and what you’re brought up.

I: Yeah, like your reference group for what’s good and what’s not.

F: Totally

I: So, yeah, looking at different categories, I noticed here you’ve named two iconic brands in chocolate category with Whittaker’s and Cadbury. So do you feel both of those brands are iconic here in New Zealand?

M: Yes, but for different reasons, I think. With Whittaker’s, I guess, it’s iconic because it’s got this association of like being made in New Zealand with all grass roots home grown products. Whereas Cadbury’s kind of got more of an international kind of vibe to it and… yeah I suppose that’s the main thing. That and Cadbury has that mean ad.

M: Where does Cadbury originate from?

I: From the UK, but obviously we have a factory here in New Zealand.

F: I feel as well with the recent news with Cadbury, it probably went down in my books in terms of how iconic it is.

F: Like they’re shutting the factory down in Dunedin

I: And they had a palm oil scandal before that.

F: Yeah so that sort of switched me to Whittaker’s

M: Palm oil scandal?

M: So would you say Cadbury stopped being iconic to you following that sort of bad press?

F: Yeah I’d say somewhat.

I: Or like iconic in the infamous way?

F: Yeah potentially, and its just like not so high rated.

M: As a kid I like didn’t even know about Whittaker’s until I was [older]...

M: Yes, same with me.

M: We just always had ‘ throughout. I prefer Whittaker’s now but in terms of like iconic brands if you’d asked me five or six years ago, I would have said Cadbury was the only iconic chocolate brand in New Zealand. For me anyway.

M: Its’ because its got more of a global presence.

I: And then what about say, if we were talking about soft drinks, are there any soft drinks that you think are iconic? Like worldwide and in the New Zealand?

F: L&P surely iconic, and Coke would be like internationally iconic.

M: L&P would be the only one I can think of.

I: How do you feel about L&P as an icon knowing that it is owned and produced by Coke?
I: For this exercise I’m going to give you a brand and you each have to associate it with one of these animals I’ve got printed out here. This is an individual exercise. I just want you to say why that particular animal represents that brand to you. And I will probably ask you about why. You can use the same animal to represent more than one brand, you can use it once or twice and provide reasoning for. I guess we will just start it off with Budget. If you could choose an animal to represent it amongst brands available in New Zealand, what would you choose? You can take some time to think about it if you like.

M: My thing with L&P is I have always felt like its been shoehorned to fit the mould of an iconic [Kiwi brand]… Because I never really drank L&P that much, it always felt to me that L&P was forced on me as being an icon.

M: Yeah! So when you say: “What is the most iconic soft drink?” people will still say L&P, but I’m not sure that’s because people [think so] or they are almost obliged to say it is.

M: I mean what other drinks do we have? There is nothing else that sort of fits in to that mould.

I: Obviously there are drinks in the wider drinks category, say Charlie’s, but in the soft drink category it would probably be that. You could even make an argument that as a kid that large, like Budget 1.5 L drinks were iconic.

F: One of those ones you kind of got in school disco, the kind of little plastic ones.

M: Yeah they come in like the 24-pack.

F: Yeah they have like raspberry, orange, lime…

F: Yeah yeah yeah.

I: So do you think like, because obviously that’s Budget a brand which isn’t iconic to you. But do you think that a brand can be iconic in certain categories but not in others?

F: Yes, iconic products within the brand but not necessarily an iconic brand.

M: I think with that one though it’s iconic only in certain contexts. Like if you’re making like spiders or if you are giving them out after the sports game when you are a kid, like real iconic moments to have those. But for example, if you were to put one of those on a table I’d be like, “Yuck!”

I: So yeah, I guess, its like you said, like situational, in contextual to that. Do you say like that’s another example of branding iconic because you associate memories with it?

M: Yeah.

F: Some historical moments.

M: Coming back to the story components of the brand as well, that’s in there.

F: Yeah.

I: Yes, so having like positive memories with the brand.

F: So yeah I definitely wouldn’t associate it [Budget] with being an icon right nowm but it was definitely was so like a part of my childhood.

I: Would say its plain or normal?

M: Yeah, not particularly interesting.

M: I’d go the cat for the same reason.

F: I was thinking the cat because I feel its something they’d use on… I don’t know if they do like pet food… Its just very generic.

M: Yeah I’m pretty sure there is like Pams cat litter or something.

F: I feel like it has a cat that looks like that, its tabby, its run of the mill stuff. Its nothing out of the box.

M: I would probably go with a rabbit for the same reason others have chosen the cat. It's run-of-the-mill, stock standard, and there's like a billion of them in New Zealand. Its nothing special.

I: For the exercise I was probably going to say the lion. Just thinking about the movie Lion King, and the Lion being the king of jungle. You know Whittaker’s is one of the most recognised brands in New Zealand so its probably up there towards the top.

F: I would have said the dog because I associate Whittaker’s with… like the advertising is all really positive, that’s actually probably about it… Also I love the dogs and I love Whittaker’s, so that's why.

M: I was going to say the dog because Whittaker’s comes off to me like kind of a homely brand. Dog is obviously a domesticated animal, but not as sneaky as the cat, more loyal.

F: More loving.

F: You could say the Panda though, because of the palm oil scandal, I’m pretty sure they have a tiny panda on the side [of the packaging].

F: Yeah its like a conservation-y thing.

F: Or is that on Cadbury?

F: It might be, which goes against the earlier point.

M: I’m going to say the panda because there’s not many pandas, and there’s not many strong New Zealand brands, and if we don’t buy Whittaker’s it’ll just disappear, as opposed to Cadbury which is still going to be there if nobody buys it because its got enough worldwide popularity.

I: Yeah, so the scarcity of it.

M: Yeah.

M: Dog as well. Association with like the feeling of home. New Zealand brands, I associate them with being comfortable.

I: Yep. All very good and then, if we move to Pams, what animals would you associate with that?

M: Maybe the monkey. I’m kind of thinking that monkeys are quite friendly and approachable, and Pams is always there and always will be there. That's where it is kind of coming from.

I: Yep, so sort of reliable...

M: Sort of reliable, relatable, easy-to-use, just always there.

M: For the same reason I would say the cat. For similar kinds of reasons, just like, there are lots of them. They're just kind of there, they’re versatile. At the same time it's kind like its just a cat.

F: It's kind of standard.

I: Would say its plain or normal?

M: Yeah.
I: What if we went with... We need another non-iconic brand that everyone knows well. What about say Master Foods? They do all spices and all peppers, and stuff like that. Would you consider them iconic?

M: No

I: What animal would you associate with them, if you had to?

F: I would say the dog because I think like a cat it's like a family kind of animal so its pretty like standard and there are a lot of them kind of thing. And with Master Foods if go down the isle, there's like literally 50 different herbs or spices that you can buy so it is kind of similar in that respect.

M: I'd go with the lion because whenever I go down the isle where Master Foods stuff would be kept its usually like that spice isle, its usually next to all the Pams stuff as well, which comes in like little resalable bags of just like mixed herbs and s***. So normally Master Foods has like more variety and doesn't just taste all like mixed herbs, so I guess, it's kinda like the better product and as a result I guess I associate it with the lion.

I: So I guess, would you call it like the relation that you put through Master Foods and the lion is sort of the king of its category?

M: Yep, yep, yeah is sort of the nicest version of that product you can get at most supermarkets, being like PAK'NSAVE, New World, and stuff. I'm sure, you can get better spices from elsewhere, but in terms of dried stuff that tends to be the nicest stuff.

M: Lion for similar reasons for me. I think, like also because when I cook with spices I feel like I am extravagant – I feel like I'm a Master Chef, even if it's like s***y spices, you know that's the kind of thing with Master Foods whenever you buy... I mean Master Foods is probably generally any spices...

M: They have like heaps of variety as well

F: They also don't just do spices, they do heaps of stuff. They like do sauces and... Yeah

I: So, a dog was used to represent Whittaker's and you've used it to represent Master Foods as well. Are there any similarities between them, with that choice?

F: Maybe they're both reliable brands,

M: Wholesome

F: They are both like kind of family brands. Its not like you're whipping out something super fancy, but it's like still good, its still quite consumable.

M: I kind of associate it with being home and stuff – the dog and chocolate thing. It's like, you go home and mum has got all the herbs and stuff.

I: That notion of family does that coming into branding and iconic brands to you guys, and the value you put on brand?

M: For sure

M: I think especially if its like what you were bought up on. That's what brand your family bought then you have sort of a home bias towards it.

I: And the last one for this, if we'd went with Signature range? What animal?

M: Probably the rabbit, its just everywhere, it's a pest.
F: But it’s like Weet-Bix, like fruity. We always had them at the bach.

F: I’d almost put Edmonds with Wattie’s and Tip Top. I think they’re all sort of like really classic New Zealand brands.

M: Yeah.

M: Home baking.

F: Those are real homely, and those are slightly more special like you wouldn’t have those all the time, but you probably would have those all the time.

F: Where does L&P sit though?

M: Do you guys reckon they fall into either of those three categories? I definitely don’t think it goes into Whittaker’s and Anchor.

F: Yeah not the same quality as that.

M: I feel like L&P is better than these guys, not as good as those guys, and completely different to them.

F: Maybe it sits on their own? Can they do that?

I: They can sit on their own, yeah.

F: Sanitarium then?

M: Yeah how do you feel about that? Not great anymore.

M: What about these two can we group them? Because that’s just a soft drink and that’s breakfast cereal. Like even though its Weet-Bix.

F: Do they do other products? I don’t even know.

M: I feel like if Sanitarium comes close to anything it’d be that group over there.

F: When you associate it with Weet-Bix I’d put it over there definitely, but I don’t even know what else they do. They probably do heaps of other stuff.

M: They probably do other cereals and stuff.

F: If it was just Weet-Bix I’d put it over there, but I don’t know about the whole Sanitarium range.

M: I think yeah if its just Weet-Bix it’d belong here, but as Sanitarium it doesn’t belong in those two.

F: And when you think Sanitarium I don’t think Weet-Bix. I think about Weet-Bix on its own.

M: Is Pams just the same as the other two? Or slightly better? I feel like Signature range is at the bottom with like Homebrand and Pams is a slightly better.

F: Is Pams the same as Sanitarium then?

M: I’ve always actually thought Signature Range was better than the other two.

F: I think they’re getting rid of Signature Range.

M: If I had to rank those I’d have to Signature Range, Pams, then Homebrand because Homebrand just like looks the cheapest.

F: Pams just did its new re-brand though, and it’s like low-key bourgeois products. Pams like has done like some sort of really fancy sauces…

F: I feel like Signature range has just done a really similar thing.

I: Pams has released a super foods range.

F: Yeah that’s my jam.

I: If you all had to rank those three where would you put them?

M: Homebrand at the bottom.

F: I’d say in that order, Pams at the top.

M: Yeah.

F: Correct me if I’m wrong, but Pams is available in all supermarkets, and Signature range is like specific to Countdown or Woolworths kind of thing. And so Homebrand maybe? So maybe I prefer Pams because it is more readily available, like you might associate it with more products because you can get it wherever you go but I’m not actually sure if that’s right.

F: Yeah, you can’t like get Homebrand in New World.

F: Yeah.

M: I’ve always been intrigued by who Pam is?

F: I’ve always wanted to think like Auntie Pam?

M: Yeah I think Auntie Pam as well.

M: Yeah it sounds like a bit of an auntie.

I: So do you reckon there are family values associated with Pams?

M: Yeah.

M: Definitely

M: More so than with other two

F: Definitely more than with Homebrand

F: Homebrand just gets no emotional values.

M: It’s got the name brand within its brand.

M: They don’t think outside the box at all.

I: But you compare Pams and Signature range, does Pams still has more family values than Signature range?

F: Yeah.

F: I think they’re more readily available, like I don’t think you can get them at New World. Like I just don’t see it a lot. Whereas Pams I do, and they do a lot of different things.

F: Definitely slightly nicer than the other ones.

I: So are we happy with these group as our final?

M: I can’t think of anything else to put Sanitarium under.
M: No, didn’t get them as much as those ones for sure.

F: These guys do all products though. Whereas these brands are way more specific.

M: I’d almost be inclined to put like L&P over there just with the other classic New Zealand brands. But because they are owned by Coke and I know that it’s kind of like: “Nah you sold out”.

I: It’s interesting you say that because Wattie’s is owned by Heinz.

M: Ahh f***.

F: But I reckon it’s different though because L&P it’s just the drink right. You can buy it in that [1.5L bottle range] and you can buy small ones. Whereas Wattie’s you’ve got tomato sauce, baked beans, peas.

M: That’s the thing with Sanitarium , I feel like Sanitarium is like with a bunch of s*** that we just don’t realise is Sanitarium maybe. Or maybe not? I know they do Weet-Bix but…

M: They seem kind of secretive.

M: Real slippery aye.. Slippery Sanitarium.

I: And if you had to associate Sanitarium with one of those animals that we’ve looked at earlier what would you [say]?

F: Snake!

M: What’s the most sneaky animal?

F: Giraffe

F: I reckon that monkey could be pretty cheeky.

F: Yeah like a cheeky small monkey.

M: Some tax-evading monkey.

M: What about having Tip Top and Whittaker’s and Anchor?

I: But is that grouping them as products because they’re all dairy based?

M: I feel like Whittaker’s and Anchor are on this plain that Tip Top cannot touch.

M: A bit premier.

M: Tip Top is just like you just go to your local dairy and get it.

M: I don’t really buy... Us, as a family, like Tip Top was always slightly above, we have never really bought it. We bought whatever ice cream was on special, but we didn’t often buy, actually buy Tip Top. Like it was always that little notch above.

F: I associate Tip Top with getting a scoop ice cram more than getting a punnet of it.

M: They do bread as well and I never buy their bread.

I: With these brands like Tip Top and Wattie’s you have a lot say, familiar memories as a child because they were readily available, say, Wattie’s at the BBQ, tomato sauce, or baked beans for breakfast and Tip Top for your ice cream at home or like at the dairy. Were Anchor and Whittaker’s as readily available in your childhood? Did you think?

M: No, didn’t get them as much as those ones for sure. Cadbury was on maximum [availability during my childhood], we always got Cadbury not Whittaker’s.

F: Can’t you get Tip Top milk? Or is that not a thing?

I: When it comes to the quality of them, does the fact that they were readily available in your childhood sort of lower the quality in comparison to those brands that were not readily available? You guys talk about these two as being premium brands. But does the price point come in to? Do you think?

F: I think they all would have been really available but it was far more common to get those, they were your cheaper option. These were more of a treat and there might be a price point thing.

M: I think in terms of groupings I think the way we’ve done it: this is what my family would get, this is what I would get currently, this is what I would like to get, and these is just kind of like... I don’t really like Weet-Bix or L&P that much. L&P is all good but like I wouldn’t get it at the dairy if there were other options available like Coke and stuff.

M: I agree.

I: If you had to do this again differently, what other groupings could you see from these brands?

M: You could do brands that feel New Zealand and brands that don’t. Because like for example, Sanitarium, Weet-Bix and L&P probably say feels New Zealand-y, and that probably adds to their the iconic nature. Whereas like these ones...

M: Pams is quite New Zealand-y.

M: Yeah.

I: So brands that you associate with like aspects of Kiwiana, national heritage, versus brands that you don’t.

F: I think as well you could possibly like… these are like… that’s like a flour and this is like Weet-Bix – pretty generic. Then you could probably put Tip Top with those guys. Then Anchor is kind of like awkward. Then Signature range and Homebrand that’s like very basic. Pams is somewhere in the middle, almost could sit with these guys, I reckon because it is like quite generic products that they create like its flour, its Weet-Bix, its basies.

M: I think I would invariably put these three together. That just like a solid group. I don't think I would ever put like for example, Pams’s next to Whittaker’s.

F: Especially Signature Range and Homebrand, they’re like tight.

I: That ends all questioning. If you guys have any thoughts or queries about the brands, we have looked today, their iconic side of them that you want to share, then go ahead. If not, then we all finished.

F: What are you looking into, Johnny?

I: I will tell you once the focus groups are over.

M: I think for me personally, I looked at an iconic brands based?

I: Maybe how much of the story they have. Like I don’t think that L&P has that much of a story because it's kind of just like one product. Whereas potentially Whittaker’s has more of a...
M: I feel like it might be a new generation - old generation thing. Like with L&P I feel like the generation before us might see L&P as more of a [icon]... you know, because Whittaker’s and Anchor we’ve only sort of taken more notice of recently so maybe in the next generations time Whittaker’s and Anchor is going to be in that group. So maybe it’s a generational thing as to what we see as iconic now because we’ve been used to it.

M: Maybe its how the old generation were educated. Maybe they were educated about the history and heritage of L&P and now we're just going in and get a soft drink and don’t know much about it.

M: I don't think a product has to be around for ages and ages for it to have a sense of heritage or like a story behind it. And I think that the story definitely contributes towards making the product iconic. But like that tea brand Madame Flavour has like a long story at the back about how it was made.

M: Did you read that?

M: Yeah, yeah. It's like I remember having cups of tea with my Uncle Bernard and *** like that. I know that they were like a new product because I’ve never seen them as a kid.

F: What brand is it?

M: It’s called Madame Flavour. But when you compare it to a product like Lipton or Bell or whatever, same thing. The fact that they’ve got to this effort of writing this story, it might be a crock of s***, but like you know they’ve made up this legacy behind it, or this history behind it, about how they’ve cared for the product and they’ve literally hand delivered it to you and that’s pretty mean.

M: But that comes with like that premium sort of value that they want to give off though, so people associate it with... So people know that they’re not buying a real stock of the mill tea.

M: That and they put their tea in like tea bag pyramids! It’s f***ing mean.

F: The other thing that might play into it without you even realising is advertising. You might associate something with being iconic because its got iconic advertising. Like with Cadbury, Cadbury has had awesome ads. And even like L&P, they put effort into their ads. Same with like Whittaker’s, they have celebrity endorsements and stuff, Tip Top has always had ads and they’re all over dairies and stuff, and you may subconsciously taking it in and that make them iconic for you. I feel like there’s definitely not a Signature range ad, and there’s definitely not a Homeb brand ad, that might make them less iconic.

M: I also wanted to touch upon the marketing, iconic brands have more of a presence outside of supermarkets: pop-up stores and advertising.

F: And like product presentation. Anchor has a funky bottle. And L&P doesn’t it?

I: L&P has that brown bottle to look like the brown can.

F: And Anchor has the fancy bottle and I always see it, and if you buy the square bottle its the cheaper stuff.

F: And like Whittaker’s with the gold on it.

I: One more thing I wanted to ask. You guys mentioned earlier you feel about L&P that you were sort of told it’s iconic but you don't really know why. Do you feel like you’ve been forced to engage with the content and stories behind it?

M: Yeah, they used to have this classic ad that was always playing like in between like... during like sport games, and the ad basically had different shots of classic New Zealand places... Like the massive fish thing... it was talking about, you know, they had their tagline, “World famous in New Zealand since ages ago” and its kind of like: “Oh, man. It’s been around for that long”.

I: Do you feel like asking what is ages?

M Yeah. But it is funny the way they say it. It’s like a joke lets not try to explain the joke.

F: Maybe again it's like a generational thing, maybe as a kid, like your dad was drinking it.

M: I think also the fact that it has got like a Miiori word in it, definitely makes it feel more New Zealand.

I: I think it's a place name.

M: Yeah, it is a place name.

I: It’s definitely not colonial.

F: But I reckon when you asked what about soft drinks we all sort of said nothing because we were all like ahhh the only one that is ever going to come up is L&P, even if we didn’t necessarily think of it ourselves... They’ve branded it as iconic which makes us think that it is iconic, not that is necessarily is for us.

---

**Focus group two**

**18/09/17**

I: And then it comes to brands that aren't iconic to you, it doesn't necessarily means brands that you don't like. Like for example, when it comes to brands that are not iconic to you, they’re just brands that are not of high value to you. So for example, I use Sunfield canola oil to cook and I think the product is fine and it does the job but obviously the brand is not iconic to me in any way whatsoever. There is nothing wrong with it, just I don't place a high value on the brand. So just for the first exercise I just want you guys, to name the brands you can find in New Zealand supermarkets that are iconic and then ones that are not iconic to you.

F: Wattie’s.

F: Yes, definitely.

F: Maggi.

M: Weet-Bix, like Sanitarium.

F: Indomie.

F: It’s your childhood.

F: Tip Top.

F: Meadow Fresh.

I: Oh sorry, I forgot to say it can't be beer brands or alcohol brands.

F: Molenberg bread.

F: Vogels, definitely.
M: Bluebird.
F: Edmonds.
M: Hellers.
F: Chelsea.
F: Pic’s peanut butter.
I: Ok, so plenty of iconic. What about non iconic?
M: Sunfield oil.
F: Just basic brands.
F: Budget.
I: Pam’s was iconic or not Iconic?
F: I would say non iconic.
I: What do you guys think like about the likes of Signature Range?
F: No.
F: Yeah.
M: Any like supermarket brands are like pretty not iconic.
M: I definitely buy Homebrand stuff because I can't afford anything else, but it's definitely s***. I know its s***.
F: What’s the opposite of Wattie’s tomato sauce?
F: Heinz.
F: No, not Heinz. I'm not thinking of Heinz, I'm thinking of...
M: Gregg’s.
F: Eugh, yeah.
F: I don’t mind it, I prefer it to Wattie’s.
F: Eugh nah.
I: What about, obviously you said Tip Top, what about like other ice cream brands?
F: Oh yeah, oh that's like Signature Range as well.
F: Yeah like the black tubs?
F: Maggi, two-minute noodles.
I: Black tubs can also be Deep South.
F: Deep South’s the blue one isn't it?
I: No it’s the black one. Well, there is two black ones. If it is not iconic and you don’t think its iconic, it doesn't necessarily mean it is bad.
F: Can we go back to iconic and say like Lewis Road?
I: Yeah sure thing.
F: Oh, what about Whittaker’s.
M: Cadbury.
M: Any form of chocolate.
F: Can we say non iconic Pascalls? See I would say non iconic for that. I wouldn't buy Pascalls.
F: Smarties.
I: Ok so, Smarties are non iconic?
F: Non iconic?
I: So that’s plenty of brands for now. So just in general, what's the difference between non iconic and iconic brands to you guys? Like, what features do these brands have [that the other brands don’t].
F: Trusted brands.
F: Quality.
I: So you trust iconic – quality? Quality is a factor?
M. You see them [iconic brands] on TV a lot whereas other ones you wouldn’t.
I: Cost. Do you think these ones are more expensive?
M: Yeah, definitely
F: They've been around for a while.
I: So like what would you say like heritage?
F: Yeah yeah.
M: I wouldn’t say that they are any better. Like the other brands all taste fine. Like bread would be the only one that tastes better when it’s expensive.
F: Did anyone say advertising?
I: Yeah. And do you have… Someone said something about, I don't remember which brand, but they mentioned being a kid and growing up…
F: Like being brought up...
F: Yeah, like Tip Top.
I: So do you have more memories with iconic brands than you do with non-iconic brands?
F: Yeah, definitely.
I: What kind of memories are those? Positive or negative memories mostly?
F: Positive memories.
F: Like family.
F: Childhood.
F: I’d say if there were negative they would have been on non iconic [side].
I: Do you have aspects of nostalgia with some of the iconic brands?
M: With Weet-Bix they have that triathlon every year… I did that for a couple of years at school.
I: Yes so you have childhood memories with the ones you’ve grew up with.
M: Mi Goreng because its cheap and nice.

F: Like everyone’s eaten that after a night out, like you come back and you all have your Mi Goreng together, you know... And I’d eat it after school.

I: Does anyone have any stories like about these brands at all? Fine, if you don’t.

F: One time I ate a whole thing of Pic’s peanut butter in one sitting. That was the only one.

I: What did that make you feel?

F: Not bad, I’ve felt worse eating things.

F: I just feel like looking at that, that [iconic brands] would be like a typical shopping list like growing up at home. It just looks like mum is making a list.

I: And what about in relation to say like New Zealand as a country? Do you think iconic brands reflect New Zealand more than non-iconic brands?

F: Yes.

F: Well there are quite a lot of Kiwi brands in there.

I: What about like certain product categories? Like for example, chocolate, you've got Whittaker’s and Cadbury. You view both of them as iconic? But for like the same reasons or for different reasons?

F: Both good like taste wise... Well some chocolate brands aren’t that good, whereas like both of them are nice.

I: Do they both sort of have that relation to New Zealand?

F: Yeah

M: Whittaker’s definitely does but Cadbury everyone just buys it because its cheaper and still tastes just as good.

I: And then what about say like in the soft drink category? Are there any iconic brands there?

M: Coca-Cola obviously.

F: Mmm, yeah.

M: It’s all over TV and s***, like everyone knows about it.

I: And any related to New Zealand? Because Coke is obviously quite international.

F: L&P

F: Yeah.

I: How do you feel about L&P as a New Zealand brand?

M: Isn’t it owned by Coke?

I: Yes, it is. So how do you feel about that? That it is an iconic New Zealand brand and there’s a lot of advertising around it and it's been Kiwi for ages ago, yet it's owned by Coke. How do you feel about the brand after knowing that?

M: Still pretty Kiwi, I guess.

M: It’s more Kiwi than Coke.

M: Yeah, definitely.

M: I don't think that they L&P much overseas. If I was going to choose a Kiwi soft drink it would have to be L&P. Even though it's owned by coke.

I: I think you can get it in parts of Australia but yeah I think that is about it.

Ok so in regards to some brands that have products in multiple categories, do you think they are iconic in some categories but not in all? Like, for example, Cadbury is probably iconic in chocolate but they make like hot chocolate, like drinking stuff as well. Are they iconic in that category as well?

M: Yeah, like Wattie’s, for me, would be iconic for me in sauce and that’s about it, maybe in baked beans?

F: I’d say tins like cans, I’d definitely buy Wattie’s.

F: Fruit, baked beans, chickpeas.

I: How do you treat non-iconic brands in comparison to iconic brands?

F: You don’t look at them first.

F: Yeah they’re always the second option.

F: You look at the price of the iconic.

I: So the price is quite a big factor whether you purchase one or the other. Do you like look at them and think because they're higher price they're better products?

Everyone: Yeah.

I: For the next exercise, we’re going to do picture associations. So we’re going to look at some of those brands from there, and you've got to pick an animal to represent it.

F: Out of the ones you give us?

I: Yep. So, what we're going to do, we're probably go through 4 or 5 different brands and each of you, just on your own pick an animal to represent one and I will ask a few questions about why. You can choose any animal and you can be as creative and imaginative as you like. Even it is quite an odd reason if you can kind of explain why, that's fine. And you can use the same animal more than once, if you like. So yeah, if we just start off with Whittaker’s. What animal would you guys choose to represent Whittaker’s?

M: Soft puppy.

F: I would say a dog.

F: Yeah same.

F: I reckon I would say lion, quite like big and strong.

M: It just makes me think of Country Calendar so I’d say dog.

F: That’s what I’m thinking as well.

I: So Jess you think lion because its a big strong brand. Are there any other aspects of a lion that relate to it?

F: Kind of matches the gold label.

I: And then why do some of the others think that a dog represents Whittaker’s well?

M: Chocolate is like nice, you have it when you want to feel happy.
I: Alright and then what if we moved to say, Pams?
F: Maybe like a cat.

F: Negative associations.
F: Its just kind of in and out of your life.
F: Its just there.
F: Its like the lesser thing of a dog.
F: Its just like always hanging around.
F: You never want to pick it up and take it home.
I: So what you think its just quite plain, boring?
F: Yeah
F: Its nothing that you get super excited about.
I: Yeah, I guess, do you feel like this, there are lots of them? Pams obviously covers quite a wide range of products.
F: Yeah.
I: Alright, and then if we did say Pascall, the lollies that were mentioned. What animal do you think would represent them?
M: Maybe a rabbit, I don't know.
I: Why do you reckon a rabbit?
M: Lollies are little and rabbits are little.
F: I reckon – elephant, but only because it is a big name and it’s just been around for ages.
F: I don’t reckon Pascall looks nice, and elephants aren’t that appealing to look at.
F: Like its just kind of a gentle giant.
M: I just never probably buy Pascalls.
F: Unless you’re buying Pineapple Lumps.
I: So, elephant then. And what about say Homebrand?
F: Panda, because it's just black and white, just quite basic, simple.
I: Any other? Just on the colour in that one?
F: What’s a dumb animal? Like a sloth.
F: Yeah if there was something like that, something like really [dumb]. Do we have to use these animals?
F: I guess Pandas, they’re kind of silly. I think that about Homebrand

M: It’s the same as a cat pretty much. Just the same as whatever the other one was.
I: Pams?
M: Yeah, its just there.
I: Do you have a preference for them?
M: Probably Pams, but like just whatever is cheapest I go with.
F: And what we said before with the cat, it covers a variety of things.
I: Yeah, I suppose, there are different types of cats, lots of them.

I: So that one was more of an individual exercise and this one is more of a team one. So what I want you guys to do as a group is to put these brands into groups. You can put them into as many or as few groups as you like and then I’ll just ask you some questions about the grouping you’ve made. The only thing I ask is that you don’t group them all on their product categories, group them more on how you feel towards the brand. For example don’t just put Tip Top and Anchor off on there own because they’re dairy related brands.
F: I definitely would have done that.
I: Like I did this with someone for practice and they grouped all the breakfast brands in one corner. But I would like to know more about how you feel towards the brands rather than just what types of products they are.

{the group is working}
M: I feel like these ones can just all go over there.
F: Do you reckon we can put Anchor and Sanitarium together because its Weet-Bix and milk?
F: I feel nothing towards Anchor. I would never [buy it]… I just feel like it can go with the others.
M: Way too overpriced.
F: But then I don’t even think its good milk. Its not what comes to mind when I’m like yeah I’ll go buy milk.
F: What would you buy?
F: Well I don’t buy milk but… I think I buy Sanitarium, do they do milk? I’m pretty sure they do.
F: I buy Meadow Fresh.
F: So Good, I buy So Good.
F: That’s Sanitarium.
F: Yeah so I think I like Sanitarium, and don’t they do Weet-Bix? And I love Weet-Bix, so I feel very positively towards them.
F: I would put those three together because like say I had a friend coming over from the [United] States or something I’d go and buy [those three product]. I’d be like you’ve got to try L&P, you’ve got to try like Jelly Tip and you got to try Whittaker’s. They’re real Kiwi.
F: They’re all quite summery as well.
F: Yeah, looking at them visually their logos look summery.
F: They’re summer foods as well.

F: Yeah.

M: I’d just put Anchor by itself to be honest.

F: I’d like to put Anchor next to Edmonds because I’d just never feel anything towards Edmonds.

I: Someone suggested that Edmonds was iconic before...

F: I think its an iconic name but I wouldn’t buy something based of it.

F: You see I think Edmonds and Wattie’s together because they’re like staple pantry brands.

F: Yeah like you’d be guaranteed to find one or the other in a pantry.

F: Yeah, but Anchor is kind of not really them. Its kind of by itself.

I: You can put things on their own.

F: These are just like trusty.

F: Like they’re not amazing, but they’re all good. They’re well known but they’re not the highest level...

F: They’re just like always... you find them in almost everyone’s [house].

I: So, those four groups there? And so you’ve grouped like... Obviously there are few sort of brands like Kiwi classics. So how do you feel about, obviously I asked about L&P earlier being owned by Coke, what about like how do you feel about Wattie’s being owned by Heinz that American company. Is it still kiwi?

M: Still Kiwi.

F: I think it’s just because every like New Zealand household has it. I just think about it like that, doesn’t matter [who owns it].

M: And because of the ads they put on TV are real Kiwi. Like L&P and Wattie’s have real Kiwi ads. So it appeals to us.

I: You guys talked about it a little bit, but what put Anchor out on its own?

M: Because its just s*** and expensive.

I: You feel like its overpriced for what it is?

F: Yeah I’d never ever look at Anchor.

I: So negative associations towards it because of the price?

M: It’s probably a good product, but...

I: I just was going to ask. Do you feel other milk is just the same to you?

M: I’ve never had Anchor, but I just think its ridiculously overpriced.

I: Anyone else has thoughts on Anchor?

M: It’s kind of weird. I’ve never seen anyone buy it.

F: Yeah you never see it in any household really.

F: For the product that it is you just can't justify spending the extra like... Like milk is milk, you can't justify spending more on the same product. That’s what I reckon anyway.

I: Yeah obviously because we are all operating on student budget, but say you were at home would you consider purchasing it?

F: I don't think so because my family just never has it probably, so instead it's a brand that I’m like “Eugh” too.

I: And then what about these three brands here: Signature range, Pams and Homebrand?

M: I’d almost just want to put Pams in its own group as well, its just slightly above Signature Range and Homebrand.

F: Yeah, I reckon it’s a little bit better. If I was going to pick one out of them I’d probably pick Pams. Is that because Pams is it stocked in New World? Is it stocked at New World?

M: I think is Pams like an actual brand whereas other two are done by the supermarkets?

F: I think Pams is owned by a supermarket, isn’t it?

M: I thought it's just like actual brand, whereas these two are done by Countdown.

I: I thought they were like a biscuit brand to the honest... Competitors to Griffin’s.

I: Are you thinking of Arnott’s?

F: Yeah

M: Maybe yeah.

I: So if you guys could do this exercise again, like if you had to do it again, I'm not going make you do it all over again, but what are different other groups do you think you could form out of these brands?

F: Like you said the categories - like Tip Top and Anchor.

M: By colours.

M: I’d probably split Wattie’s and Sanitarium as like their own group, and put Edmonds by itself. Because like Wattie’s and Sanitarium are like huge New Zealand things that like everyone know. But Edmonds is like half way there probably, everyone will own it but if someone asks you which flour you have you’d go, “Eugh, I don’t know”.

I: So do you feel those brands you use and see everyday like Wattie’s and Sanitarium mean more to you than Edmonds?

M: Yeah.

I: Would you say it's because, say you used tomato sauce and it tasted a bit funny, you’d probably noticed whereas if your flour wasn't as good of a grade....

M: I would probably think I was a s*** cook.

I: You mean baker?

M: Oh whatever.

I: And then what about those three brands there in the middle: Tiptop, Whittaker, L&P?

F: I put Tip Top with Wattie’s and Sanitarium, I don’t know why. I think because they’re things you have when you’re younger and then when you grow up you get more things like
Whittaker’s and I feel like its slightly better quality than those slightly cheaper brands.

I: Would you say there’s better ice cream brands out there than Tip Top?

F: Yeah definitely.

I: More or less iconic, you reckon?

F: I don’t know if I’d call them iconic because they’re actually like those little alternative little ice creams things that are coming out.

I: Like Oob or Kapati?

F: Yeah yeah. They’re real expensive but I’d say they’re way better. But maybe less iconic because most people don’t really know them.

I: Is there anything you guys want to say about any of the brands, what they mean to you or like whether or not you find them iconic? I’m just opening the floor for discussion.

M: I would generally disagree with a lot of people at this table. Just stuff, I guess like it’s not a bad thing.

I: Yeah, do you have any examples of that?

M: I consider like Edmonds for example just as up there as Wattie’s and Sanitarium for sure. I didn’t put Wattie’s down the list or anything. Like Tip Top doesn’t mean as much to me maybe, I don’t know.

I: Obviously different people have like different versions of what’s iconic to them and what is not. Is there anything that you think can make a brand iconic to you but not to someone else?

M: Childhood I’d, some people have grown up with different things to other people I’d say.

F: What your parents buy.

I: So would you say in terms of what you think is iconic, what your parents use has an effect on you?

M: Yeah, definitely. When you’re younger you can’t tell your parents what to buy and what not to buy.

F: There’s not like a really good example in this one, but in Gizzy (Gisborne) there’s not a New World. So if there was a New World specific brand it wouldn’t mean anything to me. When I think of going to the supermarket I never think of going to New World kind of thing. So yeah kind of where you grow up.

**Focus group three**

**19/09/2017**

I: Yeah, just anything you can find in the supermarket.

M: Wattie’s.

M: Vegemite.

M: Kellogg’s.

F: Just Juice.

F: Whittaker’s.

M: Cadbury.

F: Tip Top.

F: Vogels.

M: Hellers.

M: Rexona

I: What do you think makes Rexona iconic?

M: The fact that they sponsor the All Blacks. Aspirational brand.

F: Sanitarium.

F: I’d probably say in relation to Rexona, Adidas.

I: Adidas is not sold in supermarkets, not yet.

M: What are those raisins call again?

M: Sunmaid.

M: Nostalgic value.

F: Bluebird.

M: Uncle Toby’s.

M: Uncle Ben’s.

I: Ok, what about some brands you guys think aren’t iconic that you find in supermarkets?

F: Budget.

M: S***ty ass Homebrand.

F: Signature range.

M: Pams.

M: Eta, terrible chips.

M: Deep South.

M: It’s good though.

M: It’s F***ing good.

M: Sunfield.

F: Under iconic, Anchor?

M: Bic, under iconic.

M: Non-iconic Keri, the orange juice.

M: What are some Australian brands?

I: We’ve got plenty.

F: Lewis Road creamery.

I: As iconic?

F: Yeah

F: Oh RJ’s, the liquorice.

I: Iconic?

F: Yep.
I: What makes this list of brands iconic and this list of brands non iconic to you guys? Are there any particular features or qualities of the brands on the right versus brands on the left?

M: Quality’s definitely there but it shouldn't be necessarily there because being crappy doesn’t make it non-iconic.

I: Well its up to you if quality is what makes a brand iconic.

M: The iconic ones are one you’d sort of use first choice if you’re getting these products.

F: The iconic ones you’re probably choosing no matter what the price.

I: So would you say these have better value for money?

F: Yeah they’re non-iconic and… cheap yeah.

M: Yeah like you pay more for the brand.

F: The iconic ones either have like an affiliation with something you enjoy and find quite personal. Like as Kiwi’s or they just seem to have quite a history, a story behind them.

I: Do you have any examples of ones that you have memory with?

F: The Just Juice and like Tip Top and raisins like remind me of my childhood, and like classic Kiwi lunchbox filler things. And then you get to like Rexona and like Sanitarium, and Anchor and things which are all very much like… they do stuff to do with like to All Blacks or Kiwi specific ads with Kiwi landscapes and Kiwi actors and stuff. And then like the Vogels ones, even though that’s a bit more recent, they’re really built like a bit of a story behind it and their own little history. With some of their ads those like pop-up cards they do.

I: So like with iconic brands, say those stories and memories play quite a big bit in what makes iconic to you?

F: Its like nostalgia.

F: And with like the advertising for when I think about things like Tip Top and Sanitarium, and Anchor and things which are all very much like… they do stuff to do with like to All Blacks or Kiwi specific ads with Kiwi landscapes and Kiwi actors and stuff. And then like the Vogels ones, even though that’s a bit more recent, they’re really built like a bit of a story behind it and their own little history. With some of their ads those like pop-up cards they do.

I: Do you find that any of the non-iconic brands relate to New Zealand at all?

F: Yeah I kind of feeling, I don't know, does anyone else feel like Budget is an iconic brand?

F: I’m kind of feeling like that about Pams.

M: Maybe not but for good reasons.

M: As a student, reminds me of being a student – the non-iconic brands.

I: Like would you say the Budget drinks?

M: Yeah the 89 cent ones.

F: Yeah, I use to buy them as a kid when I’d get a dollar.

M: I don’t know if it’s New Zealand like though, its just sort of one of those things you have as a kid that’s cheap as f***.

I: So do you think of brand like Budget in some categories, say in terms of say like… Some of its products, like canned fruit isn’t iconic, but if you look at it in terms of its soft drinks, it would be iconic to you?

F: Yeah.

F: Yeah, it’s more about the meaning behind it and like what memories you associate with it.

I: So like some brands can be iconic in some categories but not in all?

M: Yeah.

F: Yeah.

F: It’s quite interesting looking between these two lists as well, the non-iconic ones are quite broad like Budget Homebrand Signature Range and Pams. They all do a huge range of practically everything, whereas the iconic [brands] ones are quite specific – like just one type of food or like one product, yeah.

I: Do you feel like not iconic brands trying to do too much?

F: Yeah, I reckon.

F: So if you think about those ones you just listed [Pams, Signature Range, and Homebrand], they don’t have any advertising, no advertising behind them whatsoever.

F: They have market share because they have the best price.

M: They have market share because they have the best price.

F: Yeah, definitely.

I: And how do you treat these brands differently in terms of your shopping habits and relationships to the brand?

M: Pretty budget orientated. If I was at home, go iconic, but flatting – non-iconic.

F: Yeah if I had mums card I’d go iconic.

F: If I want to treat myself, to reward myself, maybe I’ll go iconic.

M: There’s some things I wouldn’t go to a sh*** brand for though, like I wouldn’t go budget toilet paper or like budget chocolate or anything.

M: Very true. If it’s like relatively cheap anyway, like Cadbury is only $3 why not just get iconic.

I: So when you guys mentioned Cadbury and Whittaker’s, and you’ve listed them both as iconic. Do you think they are iconic for similar reasons?

F: No

I: What makes Cadbury iconic versus say Whittaker’s then?

F: I feel like Whittaker’s goes with more like classier Kiwi homegrown story and then Cadbury is like more of… I just remember that, “Wouldn’t it be nice”, and that’s like crackup as for probably more like a younger audience…

M: It was the factory as well.

F: Yeah.

M: Yeah.

M: You could like go to that.

F: Like if you're going to share a whole lot of chocolate and give it to kids whatever, you do Cadbury. But if you’re like an adult who’s more focussed about quality who just wants to have a couple of squares while watching TV or whatever, you definitely do Whittaker’s.
I: But do you still associate Cadbury with New Zealand because of the factory?

Everyone: Yeah

I: Even it’s not from New Zealand?

F: Is it not?

I: No, its from England.

M: Really?

F: I probably associated Whittaker’s more with New Zealand.

I: And then what about say in like soft drink category. Are there any iconic or not iconic brands in that category? Like soft drinks, like fizzy drinks.

F: Sprite.

M: L&P.

M: Most are part of the Coca Cola company which is sort of worldwide so it’s not really special to us.

I: But do you think L&P is iconic?

M: Yeah.

F: Yeah.

I: What is it about L&P that makes it iconic to you guys?

M: Based on a place in New Zealand

M: The name, yeah.

F: And it’s got a cute little message at the back. Oh that’s another one Charlie’s.

M: And that ad L&P used to do about it was, “World Famous in New Zealand since ages ago”.

M: L&P isn’t popular anywhere else, is it?

F: It’s not anywhere else which I think makes it iconic to New Zealand.

I: You can buy it in Australia.

M: Yeah, but beyond that it’s probably quite unique to New Zealand so we all get behind it.

F: I guess the branding behind it, like you said, being famous in New Zealand, that makes it special to us.

I: How do you feel about say L&P being famous in New Zealand, yet it’s owned by Coke? Does that change what you think about it?

F: Yeah that’s why I didn’t bring it up because it was the first thing that came to mind but I was like “Oh nah its Coke, so that’s not iconic to New Zealand”.

F: Did they buy it out though? Did it start off as separate?

F: I don’t know.

F: I don’t know why but I feel like that’s the way it was.

M: It’s kind of similar to like people from overseas coming over and bottling our water and you know selling it, like New Zealand water overseas, stealing our kind of brand.

M: Yes definitely. If it was Kiwi it would probably be more iconic, no doubt.

M: The fact that it is only in New Zealand sort of makes it a little bit better.

F: Yeah.

F: It has good connotations of summer, which is like always good, always makes something more iconic.

I: Yeah, so we’re just like say positive connotations to you.

F: Yep

F: Yeah.

So yeah, would you say, like, most of the iconic brands or any of them like... What sort of connotations do you have towards them as whole in terms of memories and what they mean to you?

M: Good feelings, home.

F: Nostalgia.

M: Childhood.

M: A lot of them [iconic brands] to me are like associated with a classic summers day. Hellers is on the BBQ, L&P, Tip Top ice cream, sort of thing.

F: And like stuff that you share, like big bags of Hellers, ice cream, big drinks and that sort of stuff.

I: Oh, do you think that’s like an aspect of iconic brands in terms of how you consume, like share with others, helps you to develop more memories?

F: I reckon if you’d like shared lunch at school, or potluck for dinner, you’d probably rather bring an iconic brand rather than a non-iconic. Whereas if it was just for yourself, like in your flat you’d probably just go non-iconic.

M: If you go to BBQ or something, you’d expect there to be certain brands to be there like Bluebird.

I: Yeah. Now we move onto the second exercise which is picture associations. So I will just put these in the middle. So what I am going to do is to give you one of the brands from this list to look at, and I just want you on your own to come up with an animal from this group that best represents it. And you can be as imaginative and creative as you like, and we’re going to do a few brands, and you are more than welcome to use the same animal for more than one brand. They could be different for different reasons or similar reasons. So, we’ll just go with Wattie’s can you think of which animal best represents Wattie’s brand?

M: Probably the dog.

M: Yeah that’s my gut feeling.

F: Mouse, cat.

F: Mine is the uh chimp.

I: We’ll start with the dog. Why the dog?

M: It’s like a dog’s name – Watty.
I just picture farm dogs and like, “Watties! What else?!”. Real like farmer voice in like the ads and s***. I don’t know.

A bit of tomato sauce and your dog

Yeah yeah and its like your staples, like your baked beans and your veges and s***.

So would you say like the must-haves in any New Zealand kitchen or pantry?

I: Yeah

F: And what’s the thought process behind the cat?

I: I felt like it reminded me of my cats at home and I just feel like Wattie’s is that brand that’s always in your cupboard. You might not go out specifically just to get Wattie’s but it’s always there. Just like my cat, it never leaves the house.

F: And what about a chimp?

I: Curtains.

F: I just didn’t look at any others than the chimp. I just thought it's really messy... I just think of squirting the Wattie’s on fish and chips and the chimp just seemed like messy and playful. And like we said before its like a sharing kind of food. For some reason gives me that impression.

M: Chimp probably likes tomatoes.

I: If we did say Pams, what animal would you associate with that?

F: What [products are] Pams?

M: Are they like a cheap brand?

F: Pams is everything.

M: A cat.

I: Yeah, why is that?

F: Because it's like, no offence, but cats are like f***ing boring. They're really you know, slightly human, I suppose, and really prowling... Pams like, especially their baking goods are quite like “Mama come do some baking”; really old fashioned and I just feel that it suits the persona of a cat... Really mundane, nothing to write home about it.

I: So you find it a little bit old fashioned?

F: Yeah yeah.

I: How the brand goes about their products...

F: Yeah, yeah, and the packaging and everything. And the name Pam like you know that’s a cat lady.

I: What else do we have?

F: That was my reason for a rabbit. It's just a bit average, just like hops away from you, you want to play with it.

M: It’s got a real small logo and its just nice and small.

I: Any other characteristics of the rabbit that relate to it.

F: [You can] Just miss it. You know, a rabbit just hops past you and you just like don’t see it. It’s kind of like when you are walking past the supermarket brands and you just don’t look over at them or Pams.

M: It’ll always be there because it just hops back and forth and its got products everywhere.

I: And if we went with say, Signature Range? What would you associate with that?

M: Such a terrible brand, it doesn’t catch the eye.

F: Is it similar to Pams?

M: The same thing, just a homely feel, domesticated cat. Wattie’s is always there... Like if you rocked up to a family BBQ and someone didn’t have Wattie’s there it’d be like: “What?” It's almost an insult to kiwis.

F: Yeah you might as well go home.

I: Any other characteristics of the rabbit that relate to it.

F: [You can] Just miss it. You know, a rabbit just hops past you and you just like don’t see it. It’s kind of like when you are walking past the supermarket brands and you just don’t look over at them or Pams.

M: It’ll always be there because it just hops back and forth and its got products everywhere.

I: And if we went with say, Signature Range? What would you associate with that?

M: Such a terrible brand, it doesn’t catch the eye.

F: Is it similar to Pams?

F: Like the Countdown version.

M: I’d buy Pams over Signature Range probably.

M: Same.

I: I’m leaning towards the Panda here.

M: Same, the colours are the same.

F: Probably cat again.

I: The cat for you? What reasons for the cat?

F: This ones way harder. If I had to pick one probably... well out of these none, but if I had to pick one then I’d have to pick the cat for similar reasons, just real meh.

F: I like the Panda or the Lion because I feel like I have no relationship with Signature Range. Its not something we used growing up and I’m just, yeah I don’t know... Other animals I quite like.

M: Because Signature Range is only at Countdown and I never shop at Countdown so I can never see a Panda.

F: Yeah its my least favourite supermarket.

I: So does the supermarket reflect the brand?

F: Yeah.

M: Yeah.

I: Any different animals?

Everyone: Nah.

I: So what is it about the Panda that made you relate it to Signature range?

M: That foreign aspect.

F: A bit gumby.

M: Its [Signature Range] just a bit simple yeah.

F: I think its just not being able to relate to it.

F: Exactly. When you have no association with the brand, I can’t even tell you what they sell...
M: Bread.
M: They definitely sell bread.
F: Ah!
M: And drinks. But I think the big one with this is the unrelatable aspect.
I: And last but not least, what about Deep South ice cream?
M: Never even heard of it.
F: Me neither.
F: Yeah, neither.
I: You've never heard of Deep South ice cream?
F: Is that on our list?
I: Yeah.
F: Who said it?
M: Me.
F: Ahh... Are they in black boxes?
M: Yeah, and they do like peaches and cream flavour.
F: Oh yeah they're the one that look quite classy and then have the pictures of the landscapes.
M: Yeah real picturesque.
F: I think Lion, kind of regal looking over everything.
M: A bit wild.
F: Except they're always in hot climates and this is ice cream.
M: I was thinking the elephant.
M: The panda kind of looks like a polar bear.
I: What is about an elephant you reckon?
M: They're always in real picturesque places and this is just a really picturesque brand.
I: Yeah with their packaging?
M: Yeah, packaging.
F: I'd probably say the dog for the same reason. Especially like the farm dog vibe. You picture a dog running across those big stations.
I: So it is for advertising and packaging for Deep South... Z** any thoughts?
M: For me Deep South just suggests a wild element, so probably just a lion to go with that. Just in the name.
F: Very premium as well, suits the lion.

I: So this is the last one I'm going to get you guys to work as a team to group all these brands. You can put them in as many or as few groups as you like. They can go on their own or with other brands. And then I will ask you a few questions about why certain brands are in certain groups. Only thing I ask though: don't group on products. Like, don't group Anchor and Tip Top on their own just because they are dairy products. Group them based on what you think of the brand, just not what the nature of the product is. But you can group them on what you think the quality of those products are in your mind, but it's not what they made out of or what they relate to.
M: So we'll start with the easy ones... let's put all the s*** things to one side.
M: Nice
M: We didn't even think of Edmonds.
F: Is Pams a level up above those?
M: Nah.
F: Yeah I kind of agree. Like those two together then Pams by itself.
I: [group is working]
M: I reckon Whittaker's aside because it's more a premium.
M: Premium brand, yeah.
M: I'd say Tip Top, but it's not premium.
M: What do you reckon? Is that good?
M: I almost want to put Sanitarium with Whittaker's?
M: Should we lock it in?
M: Yeah but if we're going on iconicness...
M: What about Sanitarium with Anchor, because that's all like... they all sort of advertise around like aspiring to be a...
M: Like New Zealand sport yeah.
F: Yeah then the three left are like...
M: Your classic Kiwi brands.
F: Yeah nostalgic.
F: Yeah they are they're real nostalgic.
M: Sanitarium is pretty nostalgic too.
F: Yeah if this group is nostalgic I'd almost put Sanitarium in there, because these two are kind of iconic New Zealand brands that you always expect to be there, whereas those two you kind of...
M: You sort of do expect Sanitarium, if you go into a family home they've got Weet-Bix.
I: Can I get you to start to explain the differences between this group here: Anchor, Wattie's and Sanitarium and the Edmonds, L&P, Tip Top group?
M: They're kind of like your staples. You're always going to have your Weet-Bix, your sauce, and your milk in the fridge.
M: These three are sort of treat brands. If you were good as a kid, you'd get some ice cream, you get some L&P for the barbecue and your mum would make something with Edmonds.
F: You kind of get warm fuzzies with these ones.
I: Have you got more positive associations with Sanitarium, Edmonds and Tip Top?
M: I wouldn’t say positive associations.

M: You expect that to.

Both groups are positive, but that one is more of a treat.

I: So like more a reward?

M: Yeah.

I: Then you feel that Wattie’s, Anchor and Sanitarium are…?

M: Should be staples.

I: Iconic Staples to you?

M: Yeah.

I: What does it mean to you like the nostalgia of a brand?

M: Childhood.

M: Memories.

F: Kinda like happy memories, and like those especially remind you of when it’s warm and being in the sun.

M: Yep.

M: An L&P with boys.

I: And then, what's with this grouping out on its own here? Whittaker’s

M: Maybe a bit of hierarchy: staples here, treats here and then here you’ve got super treats.

I: So what's the best brand out of this list?

M: What do you mean by the best?

I: You’re right terrible question, which one do you think is most iconic to you?

F: I would say Edmonds.

F: I would say Tip Top.

M: I’d say Sanitarium.

M: I’d say Tip Top or Wattie’s… or Sanitarium, I don’t know.

F: I’d probably say… Tip Top.

M: Tip Top or Wattie’s.

M: I don’t know aye. Yeah Tip Top or Wattie’s.

I: Why is Whittaker out on its own? What is it doing out there?

M: It’s a premium product. Being a high price point.

I: Do you think it’s a high value product?

M: And I feel like even though it's been around for ages, and it's a classic Kiwi brand, I feel like only recently it's got the hype it deserves.

F: And these ones are like really old.

F: Yeah I don’t feel that same sort of nostalgia towards Whittaker’s but do feel it to be iconic.

M: Still pretty old, 1896.

M: But it wasn’t really advertised.

M: Did they make that chocolate milk recently?

I: That’s the Lewis Road Creamery.

F: But wasn’t it Whittaker's chocolate?

M: Yeah.

M: I feel like that really sparked brand a bit.

I: Yeah, Whittaker’s is really interesting. Can you remember when about in your life you started acknowledge Whittaker’s as a brand?

M: When Cadbury stuffed up.

F: When the palm oil scandal came out with Cadbury.

F: Yeah the palm oil.

I: Does anyone know what year that would have been?

F: I would have been about 15?

M: It was about 2011.

M: Cadbury really staffed their brand up there.

M: And when they downsized their blocks, they’re like the same price but 20 grams less.

M: When I was at school we used to sell Cadbury boxes of chocolate [for fundraisers] and now we sell Whittaker’s.

M: Ohhh, sign of the times.

I: Do you reckon New Zealanders prefer Whittaker’s now?

F: Yeah I think they do.

M: Yeah.

M: I feel we’re getting older and starting to appreciate it as well.

F: Yeah it does taste better.

I: And what do you think about the difference in the price between two?

M: It's pretty marginal, it's like a dollar.

F: Whittaker’s is bigger.

M: Unless one of them is on sale… at PAK’nSAVE.

ML You can get that for $3.70.

F: I feel like I used to prefer Cadbury on price but now I prefer Whittaker’s so much more so I just get Whittaker’s.

F: And the palm oil thing I’m still just like f*** you I’ll choose Whittaker’s.

F: I wouldn’t be able to tell you if there was still palm oil in Cadbury but that’s definitely a factor.

I: So you know how you guys said Cadbury was iconic before, to those that still have negative feelings because of the palm oil scandal, do you think that Cadbury is iconic in a negative way, in an infamous way.

F: No, I think like childhood memories still outweigh the negative.
M: Definitely.
M: When the close the factory that’ll blow things up, because that whole new generation isn’t going to get that same nostalgia.
M: Not many companies when you think of them a song comes to mind straight away, but with Cadbury that song straight away.
F: And the gorilla ad and the eyebrows ad!
F: Yeah.
M: Whittaker’s needs to do ads like that.
I: Nigella Lawson ads don’t appeal to you?
F: Oh yeah. That ad makes me not think of New Zealand.
I: Have you seen their most recent one? Nigella Lawson is still in it but it's got even more British celebrities.
M: That's foolish.
M: Yeah… why are they…? That’s bad branding almost.
F: I suppose that’s more like tradition and a bit more posh and stuff.
I: Do you feel the older generation will relate better to that ad?
M: Yeah.
F: Yeah.
I: Do you feel like they have more better connection with colonialism and Britain than your generation?
F: Yeah.
M: Definitely.
I: And then going down to these last three? Signature range and Homebrand versus Pams. How come Pams has escaped?
M: Pams is best of the worst essentially.
F: And its got like a bit more nostalgia.
F: Yeah I feel like they've made themselves quite Kiwi.
M: They’ve definitely put more effort into packaging.
M: Yeah they look a lot nicer.
F: What supermarket is Pams?
M: Foodstuffs, New World, PAK’nSAVE.
F: Just better supermarkets then.
M: Yeah and I guess Progressive Enterprises is Australian as well and that's got Signature Range and Woolworths. So that kind of has connotations of being an overseas thing.
M: True
M: Why does everyone hate Countdown so much?
F: Ahh its just s***.
M: Yeah its s***.
M: Which ones Countdown? Homebrand?
F: Signature Range.
M: Yeah it is pretty bundy actually.
F: Like if you’re going to go bundy you to PAK’nSAVE because you’re going to save heaps of money but like if you like to feel good then… Countdown is neither one nor the other and their fresh produce is always s***.
M: Their butchery is s*** too.
F: And then this scandal a few years ago when they wouldn’t sell Kiwi stuff in Australia they would sell Australian stuff here and that barred me up.
I: So would you say you project your feelings towards the supermarket onto the brand?
F: Yeah and big chain vibe whereas Pams still has a Kiwi vibe to it.
I: So say big chain vibe, you associate it with Countdown but say, you were purchasing Pams in New World you don't get the same feeling or you do?
F: Nah still more Kiwi.
I: What about if you are purchasing Pams at PAK’nSAVE?
F: Yeah, still Kiwi.
M: Both of those are Kiwi. Countdown is a part of that progressive Australian thing.
I: So the overall ownership of the supermarket means something to you? What would you say it means to you?
M: Prefer to be patriotic
M: Do it for your country.
F: Yeah going to New World is like a real experience.
M: See your mates, have a yarn.
F: Yeah you see all your mates.
I: That about wraps it up for all my exercises. I was just wondering if you guys have anything you want to say about any of the brands or what's iconic and not iconic to you? Is there anything we have spoken about today... Or if you feel that the group agreed on something and you didn't get to say your part because it is different. If anyone wants to say anything we talked about today?
F: I think it's interesting like health hasn't come in to it at all.
I: Is there any brand among these ones that you associate with healthy well-being?
M: Anchor.
M: Yeah.
M: Santitarium.
F: I’d say Sanitarium and Wattie’s.
F: And Pams does quite of a lot of the packaged veges.
M: Tomato sauce has so much sugar in it.
M: What do you think the most iconic Johnny?
I: I'm not allowed to say.
F: I didn’t actually feel that strongly towards Signature Range and now I’ve got a strong hate for it.
I: Do you find opinions of other people affect you?
F: Yeah there were a lot of points about foreign ownership that got me...
M: Triggered?
F: Yeah!
M: Its definitely what your mates think make you buy it. Even just being in a focus group like this has slightly swayed my views. Potential for error in my judgement.
M: If the boys were all buying Cadbury I would as well.
F: Yeah I feel that just talking about these brands has made me more patriotic towards some of them.
F: I feel like particularly with Tip Top you do notice the quality of their ice cream compared to Pams or Signature range. But some of the other products, like fizzy drinks really doesn’t matter for me, taste the same. Like with milk, it’s all the same. Whereas Tip Top ice cream really does taste better.
M: Yeah if mum had Signature Range ice cream at home I’d probably bin it.
I: What do you feel about say Anchor milk vs. Meadow Fresh?
M: I’ve seen a [production] plant where it all literally just comes out of the same tap into the bottle
F: Is Meadow Fresh Fonterra?
I: I don’t know.
M: It’s like Golden and Pams pikelets and crumpets, they’re made in the same building, it’s exactly the same.
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I: So what I’m doing is looking at iconic brands in a supermarket context. I just want to know how you think and feel about those. Iconic brands are brands that you hold and place quite a high value on and you think quite highly. And like different people have different versions of what is an iconic brand, so that's fine. I want like your individual opinions, not just opinions as a group. So you might have different brands that you think are iconic: what you’ve used throughout your life, what your family have used, like how you view national heritage, what brands mean a lot to you. So like some of the obvious examples of iconic brands in States are Coke, Budweiser – the beer. One of them like Harley Davidson – the motorcycles. Yeah, so I just want... to start with, I just want you guys to think of, like in a supermarket, what brands are there that you think are iconic, but also brands you think are not iconic. And so by non-iconic brands I mean brands that are just like... when you look at them they don't mean much to you. So for example, I use like Sunfield canola oil for my cooking, and it's fine, it does the job. I have no like negative feelings towards it, but I also... when I look at it, I just don't think it's iconic. But yes, so what I'm saying is not iconic brands don't necessarily have to be brands you don't like, but just the brands you don't think of that highly because of whatever reasons it is to you. And yeah, so basically to start I want you guys to think, if you are in a supermarket, and what brands you would find there that you think are iconic? I'll just write them down.

I: What's that one? CalciYum.
F: Meadow Fresh.
F: Meadow Fresh is good, yeah
F: I feel like Coke as well
F: Yeah
F: Vegemite
F: Really? Marmite!
M: Marmite is New Zealand. Vegemite is Australian.
I: I always grew up with Vegemite.
F: Same.
M: Should we put Marmite?
I: Yeah, I will put Marmite and Vegemite
F: Tip Top.
F: Iconic.
F: Tegel.
F: Cadbury... and Whittaker’s.
F: Weet-Bix.
F: What about Lewis Road? You know how like it went off, like chocolate milk? Or is it too modern?
I: No, no, that's fine.
F: Also like what do you like... is it our interpretation of iconic?
I: Yeah, your interpretation.
F: Ok.
F: Pie’s.
M: Tegel.
I: Yeah, I’ve got Tegel.
F: Colgate.
I: Oh yeah, that’s a good one. Alright, plenty of iconic. Now what about non-iconic?

M: Pams.

F: Peckish.

F: Budget.

F: Select – it’s like Countdown brand.

F: Homebrand.

I: Yes, they kind of changed the Select range.

F: What's the brand, they doing those frozen pizzas? because...

F: Is it Leaning Tower?

F: I tried to say them as iconic but I actually can't remember their name.

M: The oil you talked about.

I: Sunfield, yeah.

F: What's that margarine that comes in a circle container and it’s got a sunflower on it?

F: Is it called Sunflower?

M: San something?

F: Sunrise!

M: Oh yeah, that's the one.

I: Is that the one quite cheap? Like a dollar.

F: Yeah, and it's in the circle container. Yeah, Sunrise.

F: Oh, do you know what is so un-iconic to me? You know, I used to buy lancheon in a role. I can't remember the name of it, the brand of it. Do you know what I mean?

F: Do you know in the supermarket Verkerks? Salami.

I: Yeah, we know what that is.

F: Was Milo said?

I: No.

F: For iconic.

F: Oh, that’s the very iconic.

F: Yep.

F: Non-iconic? It’s hard because you can’t think of it…

F: I would say non-iconic – the sauce brand Al Pastor. Yeah, the sauce I mean, I just don’t find it very iconic.

I: Dolmio?

F: Yeah, sort of Dolmio.

I: What about Signature Range?

F: Oh, yeah.

I: Very good so far. That's probably all we need. Now... so basically, I just want to know what makes these brands different to these ones, in your opinion?

F: Most of the iconic ones are more professional, like looking.

I: Yeah, what do you mean by more professional? Like packaging?

F: Yeah, packaging, advertising.

F: They’re more established.

F: They’ve just been around for longer as well.

F: They are always in a better position on a shelf, always in the middle.

F: Kind of like New Zealand orientated, most of them. You know like, the advertising.

I: Yeah, they've got more relation to New Zealand.

F: Yep.

M: They cost more, which makes you think they are better.

I: So do you use price to gauge quality?

F: Probably like reputation as well. Like, lots of them have long standing good reputations. Particularly Colgate.

I: So yeah... so do you think these brands been around for longer, they advertised better, they are positioned better on shelves, they have better packaging, they relate better to New Zealand?

Everyone: Yeah.

I: Anything else on top of that?

F: Sponsorship maybe, they like sponsor things.

F: Yeah, Milo like...

I: Or like Weet-Bix, they try...

F: All Blacks...

I: I guess, you guys can add Whittaker’s to that as well. And how do you treat these brands differently in terms of your usage and purchase?

F: I don't buy Select.

F: Yeah, I just buy the icons more and it’s what my family would’ve used, so it’s better even if I haven’t tried the other ones.

I: So do you think that the notion of iconic brands depends on what your family used to?

F: Yeah.

F: Yeah.

F: Definitely starts there anyway.

F: I wouldn't say I buy them. I'm buying some of the cheap stuff because it is what, you know, I'm looking for.

F: It depends on the product.

F: Yeah, it does depend on what it is.

I: Like which products, in which product categories you would be more inclined to look for iconic brands than non-iconic?
F: Probably chocolate.
M: I reckon things in small quantities. If you're like buying in bulk, you're just getting the cheapest.
I: So say, if you're buying salt?
M: Just buy the cheapest.
F: Yeah.
I: But if you buying a chocolate bar, a bag of chips...
M: Get some of these [iconic brands].
F: Yep.
I: So you guys have memories associated with the iconic brands? Positive memories?
Everyone: Yeah.
M: I collected those Weet-Bix rugby cards.
F: I always had Colgate, like always. I don't know if I have any memories, a little bit with Nestlé on the non-iconic side. Nah for can drives we always used to give away Pams and Signature range cans, that's about all.
F: I can't really think of anything positive, like outstanding.
I: Say positive memories contribute to what makes them iconic in your eyes?
Everyone: Yeah.
F: Definitely, I would say that.
I: And then, how would you feel about say... you’ve listed Whittaker’s and Cadbury as iconic. Do you think they are iconic for similar reasons being both chocolate brands?
F: I feel like Cadbury has been iconic for longer. Whereas Whittaker’s is sort of newly iconic.
F: I can like remember Cadbury ads, but can't remember Whittaker’s ones.
F: The gorilla on the drums.
F: And then Cadbury factory, like the big chocolate fountain.
F: But then I feel like Whittaker’s is more iconic, as they do like different chocolate. Whereas like Cadbury is stock standard.
F: And they’re [Whittaker’s] fair trade.
I: Yeah, I remember that. How do you feel about L&P as an iconic New Zealand brand being that it is actually owned by Coke?
F: Shut up!
F: Did you not know that?
F: No, I had no idea.
F: I didn’t know but I'm not surprised.
F: No way.
F: Isn’t that the same as Powerade as well?
M: I still think it [L&P] is New Zealand iconic brand just because it's only available in New Zealand, it's a speciality in New Zealand.
F: Yeah it's almost like the exclusivity.
I: Being exclusive makes more iconic? Like the exclusivity of it makes it more iconic?
F: Oh, could we add Pascalls to the list?
I: On iconic or not?
F: On iconic.
I: How do you feel about, say, these brands, some of them being iconic in certain categories but not in others? So for example, if we are looking at Budget to those Budget 24 packs of little drinks, would you guys say that's iconic to you?
Everyone: Yes.
F: Yes, for me it's like Primary School fairs and parties.
F: Yeah.
I: But then if I say, Budget canned baked beans, would you say that’s iconic?
Everyone: No
I: So yes, do you guys think that brands can be iconic in certain categories but not in others?
Everyone: Yes.
F: Brands like that do a lot of things.
I: So say, how do you think about the iconicity of Pams? What makes it non-iconic to you?
F: It’s just a name that I know but like, I can’t off the top of my head name the products they do.
F: They are boring.
F: I think it's almost because they do so much that nothing stands out to me from them. It's like: “Oh, Pams...”:
I: Yes, see, there are few brands on this side that do quite a few things. Do you think to be iconic a brand has to like specialise in a product?
F: Almost yes to say it’s iconic. I'd like to associate iconic with ice creams. And it's like Tip Top. Do you know what I mean?
F: But then, you know, what do you mean by iconic? You can say like Signature Range, everyone knows what it is. Like, Homebrand stuff.
F: Yeah, it’s up to your in interpretation of what iconic actually is.
I: And how would you feel about like Bluebird as an iconic brand?
F: I just love chips.
F: Yeah.
I: But there are other chip brands out there?
F: Heartland.
I: Eta.
F: I had Bluebird as a kid the little ones in school lunches, and like the adverts with the penguin.
F: Yeah, the penguin is great.
I: So the advertising comes into the equation?
F: Yeah it's long-standing.
F: It's kinda like the Cadbury of chips, I guess.
F: I wouldn't go for Bluebird like over other chips, but it's still the most iconic to me.
I: Yeah, iconic does not necessarily mean it is the one that would be your first choice but it means more to you.
F: The brand means a lot, yeah.
I: Do you say like... Everyone was sort of mentioning like memories of their childhood and stuff. Do you think there are aspects of like nostalgia when you see these brands and use them?
Everyone: Yeah.
F: Like she said for Colgate you have the Disney toothbrushes and stuff.
I: So do you have nostalgic memories of using these brands as a kid and throughout your life?
Everyone: Yeah yeah
F: And like, I will still go for some of them for that reason today just because they've been so long-standing, quality products.
F: And if they were bad they wouldn’t be as big as they are today.
Everyone: Yeah.
I: And what about say, how much you trust a brand? Are you more trusting of iconic brands?
Everyone: Yeah.
F: Yeah way more trusting.
F: Yeah except Shapes who betrayed our trust. They changed their formula, but they fixed it so it’s ok.
I: Year, the consumer feedback is important. So what makes you more trusting of their iconic brands?
F: Sort of it's all the same as we have always had. So you go with what you know.
M: They just have got a good reputation.
F: Yeah, a good reputation, I think.
I: And do you find what your friends and family used would influence what you think is iconic and non-iconic?
Everyone: Yeah.
F: Definitely.
F: Family definitely does.
F: Like I’ve tried stuff just because my friends have tried it I wouldn’t call iconic just because I know if through my friends, but maybe if I’d grown up with it.
F: I wonder for people who grew up in really poor families, if their iconics would be different?
F: They may have grown up with Signature Range?
I: Yeah, I think it's definitely that notion of it. Alright, that's first I suppose done.
I: Next one is picture associations. So we will look at animals. I'm going to give you a brand and I want you individually to come up with which animal you think best represents it. So I want you individually to pick an animal that pictured here. Not the bird [laughter]. It's fine, animal safety comes first. Yeah, you can be as creative and imaginative as you like, you know. It can be for any like strange or odd reason. I want to pick based on what you think of a brand in terms of its qualities and personality and image of it, and which animal has qualities that relate to that. But they can be quite abstract, if you'd like.

F: So we are choosing the qualities of the animals?

I: Yeah. So if we went with Meadow Fresh, what animal would you pick to associate with that? Take your time, there is no rush.

I: So what is it about the dog that you relate to Meadow Fresh?

F: Ok, so this is my train of thought, I think like the farm, milk and stuff and then I have the dog. That was literally it.

I: No, that is fine. So you think that's agricultural relation. So when you think of Meadow Fresh, you think of like cows and where it's come from?

F: Yep.

I: Anyone else?

F: Rabbit. I thought rabbit is when you drive to the places that are rural places, you will see real rabbits hopping around. And I've just thought of like same again: like grass and stuff.

I: So the rural connotations with the animals and the brand, the product itself.

M: I thought of a rabbit because Meadow Fresh is much more cows who eat grass and rabbits eat grass. It's all linked.

F: I thought the cats.

I: Why was that?

F: Because cats drink milk.

I: Anyone else has anything different? Or different reasons?

F: Not really, no. Definitely the farming.

I: What if we went with Whittaker's?

M: My immediate thoughts were panda.

F: Same! But I have no idea why.

I: Because it's dark, like...

F: Yeah, I thought that, but then I like no – lion.

I: Lion, why a lion?

F: Because it's like wise and like Whittaker's is adulty kind of chocolate. Lions are adulty, not adulty, but kind of.

I: What if we went with Whittaker's?

F: That's what I thought about the elephant, but it's old.

I: Lion, why a lion?

F: Never forgets.

I: Next one is picture associations. So we will look at animals. I'm going to give you a brand and I want you individually to come up with which animal you think best represents it. So I want you individually to pick an animal that pictured here. Not the bird [laughter]. It's fine, animal safety comes first. Yeah, you can be as creative and imaginative as you like, you know. It can be for any like strange or odd reason. I want to pick based on what you think of a brand in terms of its qualities and personality and image of it, and which animal has qualities that relate to that. But they can be quite abstract, if you'd like.

F: Yes, because like they're classy.

F: And what was that you've said, Laura?

F: Yeah, I thought old. Really established.

I: So when you see Whittaker's, you think of how long it's been around? So if you look at the logo, it's got the date.

F: Yeah, the 1896 thing.

I: Very good. And what about [Homebrand]?

F: Rabbit.

M: Yes, I was thinking rabbit.

F: I was thinking the cat.

I: And why is that?

F: There's lots of rabbits.

F: I think lots of cats, they're everywhere, and they're at home.

F: Just because of that it's where you grew up.

F: Lots of rabbits.

F: I don't like them that much.

F: Yeah I'm the same, I don't really like rabbits.

I: So when you say at home, do you mean like?

F: I just associate because it's HOME-brand, and then it's like a domestic cat.

F: I just kind of thought like sheep. But that's not here, so in my mind I was like rabbit, it's like, you know, the most worthless animal here.

F: There is so many of them and there is so much Homebrand stuff.

I: So worthless, you reckon? What would be the most worthless animal there, what do you think? Homebrand one of the most worthless brands?

F: No, not worthless, but I think you just put it in that category.

I: But say it's the one we've listed.

F: Oh, of what we've listed, then yeah, along with Signature Range.

I: Anyone has any different reasons or different animals?

F: I thought elephant but I like don't know why. I just pinned the logo onto the picture of the elephant. But like for the reasons, I don't know.

F: Big brand – big elephant.
F: Yeah maybe, I don’t know.

F: It’s funny how your mind makes the connections.

I: And what about say Pams?

F: Panda.

F: The dog.

F: Yeah, I thought the dog.

F: Yeah, I thought the dog as well.

I: Why the dog? What characteristics?

F: They [Pams] have a nice red love heart and I just love dogs.

I: It’s how you feel towards Pams?

F: No, not how I feel towards Pams. It’s just the love heart.

F: It’s kind of like a dog tag as well.

F: Oh, I think it looks like a dog brand. I think a dog brand has that font, maybe.

F: Yeah, a dog food brand.

I: Does Pam’s do dog food? I don’t know.

F: I don’t know.

F: The dogs are like companions, you know. They’re just there. Pams is always just there. At the same time, I think that Pam’s like it’s not bad quality, you know. Or I don’t associate it with bad quality.

F: And so, if I need to go, I always go with... It’s sort of a loyal [brand]. And a dog is just like that.

I: So do you think it’s quite reliable?

F: Yeah, reliable is a good word. It’s quite good.

I: Anyone else has any different animals or reasons?

F: I did said the cat but because of the love heart and how like Whiskers... Does Whiskers have the love heart? I don’t know, maybe. It’s like a cat brand. So the cat.

F: I just thought panda because it’s almost starts sounding like it.

I: And what about Peckish?

F: I don’t know, like a dog because it’s like a snack. You think a dog snacks, but it’s not a dog’s snack.

F: Human snack.

F: I kinda think the panda.

F: Panda, yeah.

F: The panda or the chimp.

I: What about the chimp or the panda?

F: Panda is like snacking away, yeah.

F: Probably the same with chimpanzee, you know.

I: Yes, so the snack food qualities of it?

F: Yeah, reminds me of those two.

I: Can you recall what brands we’ve associated with the panda so far?

F: Pams.

F: Peckish.

F: I did Whittaker’s.

I: Are there any similarities between those brands that allow all of them to be panda?

F: The Ps.

F: They’re not kid’s brands or they wouldn’t be like: “I really want some Peckish things”.

F: I might have to get Pams now.

I: So you think they’re the brands you associate with an adult purchase choice?

F: Yes.

I: Alright so the next exercise we call brand mapping. We’ve got a selection of brands here and I want your guys as a team to put them into groups. But you can put them in as many or as few groups as you like. And I want you to group them in terms of what you think and feel about the brands. Not say, like on the type of product.

F: Should we start grouping?

F: I would always put these two together.

F: Classics, they’ve never changed ae.

F: Whittaker’s and L&P – I would put together.

F: Yeah, Wattie’s is staple.

F: I was going to put Tip Top and Anchor with these ones.

F: I’ll probably put it Anchor here. Because I just feel like it’s a staple.

F: I kind of want to put all the reds together. And then like leave those two in this.

F: You are OCD.

F: Yeah, I know, but that’s what I’d do.

M: Red is quite a prominent colour among these brands.

F: And then, you guys reckon Tip Top here? I almost put two those in between. I don’t know why.

M: Tip Top and Wattie’s together? But they are not similar.

F: These brands are associated with like reputation, like time.

M: They’re both very reliable.

F: Reliable and they have like a small range of different products, you know, but not too much.
F: Like classic doesn't change, but good at what they do. So I'd put Wattie's here.

F: I feel like we only have Whittaker's and L&P together, because you associate it with the chocolate, and I don't think that the brands are par at all.

F: I don't think Anchor is a staple. I don't recognise it that much.

F: But are you guys milk drinkers?

F: I grew up as a milk drinker.

F: I've never been a milk drinker. And I know what you are saying, you'd like... I've just always had it.

F: So maybe that's because you've guys grew up drinking a different kind of milk? I wouldn't have said staple but I wouldn't say it's like down with like Signature Range.

F: I: You can put them in groups just on their own, if you like.

F: Yeah that's by itself compared to the other ones.

F: I: Is that five groups instead? How do we feel about that one?

F: I'm happy with that.

F: That's fine.

I: So yeah, tell me about this group then. What were thoughts behind that?

F: It's sweet stuff.

F: Yeah, I was gonna say.

M: Snacks.

F: They are like treats.

F: Yeah.

I: So pretty safe thing to say – you would enjoy them in moderation?

F: Yeah.

F: Definitely.

I: Would you reward yourself with those group of brands?

F: Yep.

F: Yep.

F: Yeah.

I: What sort of memories does that group bring up to you guys?

F: Like kids parties.

F: Aside from Whittaker's, L&P and Tip Top definitely bring up a lot of childhood, like growing up, long summer holidays, camping. As well I think of Tip Top dairies at campsites.

F: But I wouldn't group Whittaker's with that.

F: No, me neither. See, we can even put Whittaker's to the side.

F: Yeah, for me Whittaker's would be like out of all these the top brand in terms of like how it's grown in creativity and stuff. And I don't think that matches the rest of them.

I: Do you feel that Tip Top and L&P have been around for a long time as well?

F: Yeah.

I: But do you think they have changed over time? Or they are the same?

F: They are staple.

F: Yeah.

I: And how do you feel about Whittaker's over time? Has it changed?

F: I think it’s gotten better.

F: I don't reckon it’s changed, I just still think of it like just that lady talking about chocolate.

F: I would put it on its own because I just think that it is the higher-end than L&P and Tip Top.

F: It is a classier brand whereas the other ones are just like...

F: I just think it’s those small blocks and collaborations...

F: That's why I wouldn't put it with L&P and Tip Top because for me L&P and Tip Top haven't had much movement within the brand.

F: But they've all kind of collaborated together and co-exist almost.

I: What about in terms of logos in that group?

F: Whittaker's is definitely older.

F: And classier, yeah.

I: What is it about the logo that makes it a lot classier?

F: The gold sort of colouring as well.

F: L&P and Tip Top both have sort of ‘old school never changes’.

F: Even the font.

F: It's so eye-catching.

I: Do you think the complexity of the logo comes into it?

F: Oh, yeah.

I: Like, do you feel that you can draw L&P or Tip Top logos?

F: I could draw L&P and Tip Top probably without looking, but not Whittaker's.

M: You reckon?

F: You don't draw it amazingly you know but you just draw it naturally. But Whittaker’s since.

I: Alright, and then tell me about Anchor on its own?

F: I mean it's like a brand everyone knows, but not really uses.

F: Yeah one of us are attached to it.

I: Is Anchor iconic to you?
F: Not iconic like personally, but like I definitely do recognise it.

I: So would you say like famous but not iconic? Or recognisable?

F: Yes, it's recognisable.

M: It's just makes me think of milk, which is a big part of my childhood.

F: Yeah, makes me think of like soccer games and stuff, I don't know. I feel they sponsored heaps when I was younger. So that's why I associate the brand with them.

F: It just doesn't fit in anywhere else.

F: I don't think it's down on that level I wouldn't put it with Pams, but then it's so iconic.

I: And then, what about the group to the right: Pams, Signature range and Homebrand?

F: Just the staples.

F: Ones that do heaps of different things.

M: They all are like on par quality wise.

I: Can you recall seeing an ad for any of those brands?

F: No.

F: Homebrand they do a Countdown cooking ad, the Master Chef ones.

M: That would be more of a Countdown ad though?

F: Yes, but they use the Homebrand stuff for their meals, the cheap meals. You know how they do $20 family meals? They use all their Homebrand products. But that would be the only thing.

F: But they only ever kind of feature in adverts.

I: If you had to rank those three brands, what would you rank them as?

F: Like first, second, and third?

I: Yeah, in terms of which brands you prefer out of these three?

F: I think I'd keep them as is.

Really?

F: Yeah.

M: Personally, I'm the other way round.

F: Are you starting with number one Homebrand?

M: Yeah

F: No, Homebrand would be last for me.

F: Same, and I'd have Pams at the top.

F: Same.

F: And I would have Pams on the top.

I: So what is about Pams that makes it less desirable to you?

M: I just don't like it. If I see something Pams, it's kind of just makes me think of bad quality when I'm shopping. And I will go for something else that is a similar price.

I: And to those of you that wanted Pams on the top? What would you think of the brand?

F: That they've got good alternatives and my flatmate really likes Pams peanut butter.

F: Just like, I guess if you can't afford something staple, you just go Pams because it's always reliable. For me it'd be like the go to brand. What supermarket is Pams with? Because I'm trying to associate with it. Because Homebrand would only be in Countdown so maybe that's why I associate with it less.

F: Yeah, I don't really shop in Countdown.

M: I only shop at Countdown

F: And I don't where you buy Signature Range from.

F: I don't know, I just never get Pams that's why I'm kind of... I don't hate it or anything, but I just don't get it. I feel like I don't really see it round as much.

M: They do a lot of your frozen veggies and stuff and chips.

F: I don't notice it as much.

F: Maybe because of that black and white logo [Signature Range], you reckon? Like it's just quite a simple logo. Other ones at least have a bit of colour and like a bit of a picture.

I: Yes, it's quite plain, doesn't catch your eye.

F: Definitely not

F: It's almost trying to be fancy, but it's obviously not.

F: It's trying to be like a Signature, you know.

I: And then what about these three brands?

F: You find these things in every cupboard, standard.

F: New Zealand classics.

F: You go home and they'll be in the pantry.

M: Edmonds baking soda, that's what comes to mind when I see it.

F: And this... I just think of the Edmonds cookbook. Such a classic growing up. And it's just like such an iconic brand. That's definitely kept me buying Edmonds. Honestly it's a really good brand. Their scone mix is very good.

F: Yeah it is actually.

M: And their pre-made muffin mix, add three eggs, half a cup of olive oil, a cup of water and off you go.

F: It's pretty good.

F: They have like pre-mixed cakes as well and they are quite nice and easy to make. Great for when you're babysitting.

F: Yeah I've used them for when I'm babysitting as well.

I: How do you feel about that grouping of brands? What do you think about Wattie's being owned by an American company Heinz? And Sanitarium is Australian? You would still group them like that?
F: Yeah, definitely, it doesn't really affect me.

F: I'll still see them as New Zealand.

F: I feel like they’re iconic to New Zealand families.

I: Yes, I suppose with Sanitarium they do a lot of advertising and sponsorships, like you guys mentioned earlier – All Blacks and triathlon. Does Wattie’s sponsor anything?

F: They probably do.

F: I was trying to think, but it was always just growing up with that sauce.

F: And just like cans of food and stuff.

F: And frozen veggies.

M: I just think tomato sauce.

I: With that grouping Edmonds probably stands out in terms of it's advertising, sponsorships. Would you say?

F: Yeah, and Sanitarium maybe out of everything else.

M: Wattie’s, I’m pretty sure the brands always looked exactly like that. They’ve kept it the same so everyone always knows exactly what they are looking for.

I: So if you guys had to do this exercise again, I'm not gonna make you do it again, but with these groups of brands what other groups do you think you can see yourself forming here? If you had to do it again and group them a little bit different?

F: I may group Whittaker’s just apart from L&P and Tip Top.

F: I would keep that the same.

F: I just think Whittaker’s is more high-end.

F: Personally, I wouldn't be against putting Anchor with Tip Top.

F: Yeah.

F: Actually, me too.

M: I agree.

I: With staples?

F: Yeah just Anchor.

I: Yes, what are those brands to you? What do they mean as a group?

F: Like, staples.

I: Would you expect to find them in most Kiwi kitchens?

F: Maybe not Anchor.

F: Is Anchor... Aren’t they sour cream as well?

I: Yeah, and butter.

F: Yeah, you would probably find all those in someone’s fridge.

F: Like cream cheese and stuff.

F: I reckon, Anchor is one of those things, you can eat them or... You grow with one of those CalciYum or Meadow Fresh.

M: Yeah, I think I just like associating Anchor with dairy, milk.

F: If I were to do it, I would probably put Wattie’s here and the rest of them all together. Just like because those ones like do heaps of things and they're really broad and the others kind of are almost specialise.

F: Like canned foods.

I: Wattie’s down with Signature range, Pams and Homebrand?

F: Yeah, and then I would just put the rest of them together, maybe. Or probably like, have these two by themselves. Then that one over there.

I: And why Wattie’s is down there? Because it does canned food?

F: And just like does heaps, it’s like a range.

I: Yeah, no that makes sense. So that’s wraps up that exercise. It’s the last one I have planned. I just want to see if you guys have anything you want to say or anything you’ve think about what we’ve discussed today? The brands we were talking about and the concept of icons...

F: Did you research the brands to find out that...

I: Just kind of already knew.

F: Did any of you guys know that they were not associated with New Zealand at all?

M: I guess I’ve just never looked at food in this way, it has always been food, never looked at the background. And what it may actually mean.

F: Yeah, it’s weird that we associate food with memories.

I: Certain tastes or smells can trigger certain memories.

F: Is your study is looking at the association?

I: I’ll tell you once we finish. Cool, seems finished to me.
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I: It’s up to you. If you think it's iconic.

M: As long as you can justify why.

I: You don't even need to justify.

F: New Zealand is tricky because I am maybe more English.

I: Iconic brands contribute to your national heritage.

F: The only New Zealand brand I can think of right now is Homebrand.

I: So you think it's an iconic brand?

F: Yeah, I don't know.

M: Vogels.

F: Yeah, Vogels

F: Whittaker’s
M: Definitely Indomie.
F: L&P.
M: Cadbury is pretty un-iconic right now.
F: Tim Tam.
I: Well that’s comes under the Arnott’s brand.
M: Sanitarium.
M: Marmite.
M: Meadow Fresh.
M: Lewis Road.
F: Shapes.
I: That Arnott’s as well.
M: Anchor milk, Anchor butter.
F: Tip Top Ice Cream.
M: Wattie’s.
M: Mainland. Is it a brand name?
M: Anchor milk, Anchor butter.
I: Yeah, Mainland is owned by Fonterra, cheese
M: I quite like Kiwi Blue Water.
M: Can we say alcohol we use? You didn't say no alcohol.
I: No sorry, no alcohol.
M: Coca-Cola – is that iconic? I suppose.
M: Not for me.
M: Well, it's Coca-Cola Amatil in New Zealand.
M: Yeah, it’s iconic.
I: Well, that’s the company name.
M: My diet is quite high in fat so I just think of Hellers.
F: Pineapple lumps.
M: Cadbury.
M: Pascalls.
I: So plenty of iconic and what about non iconic brands?
M: Pams.
F: Why Pams?
I: So we've got Homebrand as iconic and Pams as not Iconic?
M: I guess Pams could be an iconic.
M: Actually, Durex would be pretty iconic
I: But more like brands that are iconic in a New Zealand context, iconic to New Zealand.
M: Well, like the only condom brand.
I: It's an iconic brand in a lot of places.
I: You said Cadbury before. I feel like that's iconic not to New Zealand. Do you think?
M: No I said it’s not iconic in New Zealand at the moment.
M: You've got Whittaker’s.
M: No, I don't think Cadbury is iconic to New Zealand, I think it’s non-iconic.
M: Do you really?
M: Do you mean iconic is an icon in New Zealand culture? Right?
M: Cadbury is our chocolate company. No, was, was…
M: No Cadbury is English.
M: But there is a Cadbury factory, so it could be iconic.
F: Like Sprite, Coca-Cola.
F: Although we had Coca-Cola in the iconic ones.
M: But it’s subjective to everyone’s views.
F: Is it iconic to how you perceive yourself as a kiwi?
F: Yeah.
M: Is this all about Kiwiana.
I: There are some aspects of it involved.
M: I think I’m struggling with the definition of what iconic is.
I: Like I said, an iconic brand is a brand that you all hold high value to yourself. Iconic brands contribute to our cultural heritage. Iconic brands are brands that attain a status of cultural icons.
M: So we are talking about brands that are iconic to us or to New Zealand?
I: To you, but indirectly they relate to New Zealand.
M: I really like Bundaberg Peachy, it’s iconic to me. It’s quite a refreshing beverage, my favourite soft drink.
I: So where do we go with Pams, sorry?
M: Pams – no, not iconic.
I: No? But we have Homebrand as yes.
M: I would argue against Homebrand.
I: Well, can I get like a vote on that?
M: It’s a no from me.
Everyone: Yeah, no.
F: But is it New Zealand brand? Or is it American?
M: Yes.
M: There are probably iterations of Homebrand.
M: It’s a non-brand, like supermarket brand. Like Pams, Budget, made up by supermarkets.
F: So I think it is iconic to New Zealand then. Because you’ve got like Woolworth, which is Australian and New Zealand. So
you could say that their Budget stuff is not iconic to New Zealand.

F: Are you saying Homebrand then is?

I: But like, do you view it as Australian when you look at it?

F: Woolworths is Australian.

I: Yeah.

M: I view Bundaberg as being distinctly Australian. It’s not iconic to me, but I think it’s very Australian.

M: Personally I think Chai tea – honestly, because its New Zealand owned. Whereas the other ones, like Twinings and Bell...

Twinings is not un-iconic.

M: I feel like your Dilmah is Sri Lankan.

F: Weet-Bix, is that New Zealand?

I: We’ve got Sanitarium.


I: The coffee.

M: Yeah, that’s not really iconic.

F: Moccona and Nescafe.

M: Absolutely.

I: Not iconic.

M: Oh, Tip Top, that’s gotta be iconic.

M: I’m just trying to think of a non-iconic brand.

M: It’s kinda hard because the non-iconic ones don’t... I can’t remember what they are.

F: What about like salami and stuff?

M: Verkerks.

M: Verkerks is New Zealand, I think it is.

M: It’s not a New Zealand sounding name.

I: It does not matter if the brand is not from New Zealand, if you think it’s iconic in New Zealand.

M: Ok.

M: No, probably not. Hellers would be probably iconic, Verkerks probably isn’t.

M: I think Kinder Surprise is not iconic in New Zealand. It’s one of those things, if someone...

M: It’s one of those things, is that if it’s un-iconic to you, it has very little impact on you, in which case you don’t think of it.

F: Mars bars and Snickers is Nestle as well, ae?

M: Mars bars are by Mars.

M: What about like Tegel chicken? Do you reckon?

M: Tegel is quite iconic.

M: It’s kind of iconic, yeah.

F: Wait, wait, what’s that ad that goes with something chicken. Inghams, Inghams that’s New Zealand.

I: You are focusing too much on the New Zealand context. Don’t say just New Zealand, think what are iconic brands in the supermarket down the road?

F: McCain.

M: That’s pretty iconic.

I: Iconic? Or?

M: I would say Purina cat food not iconic.

M: Have we said Wattie’s?

M: Whiskeys is much more iconic than Purina

M: Like, what’s that Tux? You know dog food... I would say that’s iconic. That’s New Zealand. Farmers, you know number eight-wire kind of stuff.

M: What about Schmackos? It’s the dog gum.

F: What about Juicy Fruits?

M: What about other brands of gums?

M: Wrigley’s is pretty iconic.

M: Hubba Bubba, you know the roll up ones.

I: What about Signature range? Where is that going?

M: That’s definitely not iconic.

F: I just like to say that it is iconic for me because that is what mum bought when I was growing up.

I: So you find Signature Range iconic because it is what you used in your childhood. Do you find nostalgic to a point?

F: I do, yeah.

M: Is Budget iconic?

M: No, I would suggest no, based on my personal opinion.

M: Their dish washing liquid...

M: Pams and Signature range are above budget.

I: Plenty of brands. Basically to start off, what makes these brands iconic and these non-iconic to you?

F: They [Iconic brands] bring you back to a memory, I reckon.

M: I think it is what you’ve just said, you get value for money in those brands, and so you can go back and get it again.

F: I thought yeah, most of these brands, I think of my childhood. Hubba Bubba – I think my childhood.

I: So do you have memories and stories associated with these brands?

M: I’d say they elicit a strong emotional response for me.

M: I think the marketing associates with these brands strongly in New Zealand.
M: They portray a classic kiwi brand. A lot of the non-iconic ones, they’re brands that are very broad: Pams and Signature range. They don’t actually target and make an image for themselves in one particular area. They just become a brand that is associated with low cost in no particular food.

F: I guess, because we aren’t New Zealanders, things like Cadbury and stuff is like global giants and sort of thing... And you are like: “Oh, they don’t do anything actually directly from New Zealand”.

I: They have a factory here.

F: That shut down, but...

I: It’s still going at the moment, but yeah...

M: Yeah, they were very kiwi, very kiwi, that’s what’s iconic to me

I: But you know how you’ve listed Cadbury is not iconic, because is like not really New Zealand, doesn’t do really anything for New Zealand. How do you feel then about L&P, which is owned by Coke?

M: I think, it’s not so much is that... They do so for New Zealander, they market themselves to be a normal part of kiwi life.

F: Like the L&P sign...

M: In Paeroa.

F: If someone come to New Zealand, do you get then to drink L&P, have like pineapple lumps, have pies, have a Pavlova...

M: Fonterra can be owned by Chinese, but it is a New Zealand brand to me.

M: So to your point, I think it’s more the substance over the form. So the form might be legally an overseas entity, but substance, you know, what we... The appearance of it, is that we think they’re New Zealand owned.

M: It’s style over substance.

I: And what do you think it makes them New Zealand or appear to you as a New Zealand brand?

M: The way they market it, and advertising.

M: It’s totally the marketing.

M: All the origin story, I think, is about. It’s less important who owns it. But more important where it came from. And if we feel like it’s the grassroots, New Zealand movement towards the product, that’s something that counts.

F: It’s like the Pineapple lumps ad, you know, how’s that... We are New Zealand...

M: Oh, god, I hate that ad so much.

F: Yeah, I think actually kiwi advertising. I think Tip Top ad – like on a kiwi beach...

M: New Zealand culture.

F: Pohutukawa trees are always in these ad, Ice cream ads: like iconic kiwi things in the ad as well.

I: So yeah, you guys are saying like kiwi advertising that makes... I like aspects of Kiwiana in advertising makes them iconic. Can you think of any non-iconic brands that have used Kiwiana in their advertising, like unsuccessfully?

F: I guess, you could say that Coke sort of uses that. They stood things on beaches and stuff, but it’s not like kiwi beaches, it’s like American beaches.

M: I think KFC does a really bad job with trying to integrate itself with Kiwiana, I know it’s a bit off topic. But I always think, you see those ads, I always find it amusing how bad they are. Kids are like out camping and get in the boot of their car – and there’s like a family bucket waiting for them. It’s like KFC is a big part of family life and an outdoorsy holiday. And I’m like, there is no KFC at any camping grounds and even if there were... It’s such a ridiculous ad...

M: They show rugby players and stuff. But it’s like your average Super Rugby team doesn’t sit around and eat buckets of KFC after a game. But they make it seem like that’s what they do it after a game.

I: What if I show you guys this one? Sorry, could I just show you this ad and you guys...

F: Pams one?

I: No, that’s not.

[watching video]

M: They’re just trying to be cliche and annoying.

F: I just thought it was all too much, and then they just say it, so it kind of justifies it.

I: Would you say they are an iconic New Zealand brand?

Everyone: No.

M: It just seems too forced and unauthentic.

I: Do you think there is an aspect of authenticity to use of Kiwiana?

F: You sort of expect sort of ad be like a tourist match, not like a food ad.

I: Would that be a good tourism ad though? I don’t know if tourists would understand most of the references.

M: No.

M: The juxtaposition of so many iconic New Zealand things to Tasti, which is not. It only serves to illustrate how it is non-iconic. Like it can be showing a whole list of things that are iconic then you put Tasti bars with them and its definitely going to be the odd one out. Makes me... Even more obvious that it’s really not iconic.

I: Do you think they need to sort of attach from the start. Do you think it is kind of similar to what you said about products. Like, how certain brands try to do something in every category and do not refocus on one in being iconic. Do you think it’s kind of similar to the advertising? They should attach themselves to one kiwi sort of stigma or like story or like cliché and focus on that one? Like Speight’s, they’ve attached themselves to one and go with like working man, Southern bloke. Do you think it’s kinda like that? Like, L&P focuses on kiwi summer.

M: Yeah, could also be... Tasty is probably more of newer... Whereas the iconic ones, a lot of things that actually have been iconic probably feel like decades. Hellers might be like one of the newer brands on the iconic list. Could be that Tasty like needs another 10-20 years of marketing till like drill it in.

F: I feel like muesli bars don’t really invoke
M: Not very inspiring.

I: But there are brands like Edmonds flour, which is considered iconic by many Kiwi, and that’s not really a product that envoke, you know, like attachment.

M: That makes me think of mum cooking.

I: Because you have memories with it. But then you could have them like... For example, with these brands, do you have any memories to these brands that we’ve listed as iconic, say like in your lunch box when you are on your way at school and stuff?

F: Some, but I feel like...

I: Tasty could definitely take you back to school. Like a lot of people have said Sun-Maid raisins were iconic to them.

M: Oh yeah, they are

F: Oh, yeah!

I: And it’s like Tasti could do that, they could be considered iconic because of it. Obviously like...

M: May be it’s a different generation

M: May be it is a time thing

F: I feel that iconic brand tend to be more brands that are like treats as such. I don’t know I just think about L&P and stuff like growing up and we have always had these treats.

I: You’ve got Sanitarium, Anchor, Meadow Fresh, McCain. There are a lot of very like plain standard iconic brands as well.

M: Yeah I think it’s a timing thing, you just probably need to attach to one aspect.

M: We forgot Weet-Bix, surely it’s...

I: No, that’s Sanitarium. Do you think may be if Tasty like stuck with this marketing for like four or five years, they might have better results?

M: I think this just seems too forced, consumers can tell the difference between something that comes across with what they do and trying to push that onto you.

M: I think eventually if you plug it hard enough you’ve sort of start to embrace as well. I don’t know how much L&P is genuine Kiwiana, how much it is, just like they really thrash it. They let everyone knows who they are.

M: There is a big L&P in Paeroa, the actual place, the actual place it came from

F: If it comes from New Zealand, it doesn’t mean it’s...

M: I think like, perhaps, we’ve kind of already accepted a little bit and they just turned it and whacked it up a thousand. If you said what’s a Kiwiana product, L&P would one of the first ones mentioned.

F: I guess with Weet-Bix, if you think about it, they’ve been advertising for ages. And I think they’ve always gone with Weet-Bix and helping to raise like Kiwi kids and rugby.

M: The difference is Tasti is trying to say: “We are the Kiwiana”, when they are not. All other ones, they are slowly try to attach themselves to one part and actually made themselves Kiwiana. None of them try to say: “We are Kiwiana”. The only one will be L&P when they actually do kind of admit they are part of Kiwiana, but you don’t see Sanitarium going: “We’re part of Kiwiana”. It’s more like: “We help kiwi kids”. “How many Weet-Bix do you eat?”

M: They thrash the whole All Blacks thing.

M: But they don’t say: “We are Kiwiana”. Because it’s what Tasty said. Explicitly: “We’re part of the Kiwiana”.

M: Other brands try, just subtly insert themselves.

M: L&P has said they are part of Kiwiana, but they can probably get away with that because they are Kiwiana. Whereas a new brand kind of comes and tries to force itself into the Kiwiana. It need like do it over a couple of decades. Then it can like Speight’s... You can probably say it’s part of Kiwiana now because it attached itself to this Southern man.

I: That’s all really good, really in depth. Now probably a bit more basic. How do you treat the iconic brands and non-iconic brands differently?

M: I would choose to buy an iconic brand over a non-iconic brand.

M: It depends.

F: You sort of trust the iconic ones. You know its gonna be good.

M: If they are all the same price, I would buy an iconic one.

F: Or sometimes if you are feeling rich, you like kind of buying Homebrand and then you see Edmonds and then you might just like: “I’ll splash out”.

I: And like do you think product category comes into it in terms weather you want to purchase an iconic brand or not? Like if you are buying salt, would you be trying find an iconic brand?

F: I think as student you almost got what’s cheaper. When thinking that you want these items in your household, you kind of want the iconic brands. You will have guests and stuff seeing them. You don’t want them seeing you have Homebrand.

I: So do you think status and stuff, judging you on the brands you use, that’s important?

F: Yeah.

F: It’s not part of iconic just that the fact that these are the ones that you always buy. Does not that make them iconic to you?

M: I feel for me, it’s a status thing. People will go: “Oh, I can’t believe you don’t have Wattie’s”. If I didn’t have Wattie’s, if I had Budget or something instead.

F: Oak.

F: I like Oak baked beans because they’re the only gluten free ones.

M: Yeah, yeah. Oak instead of Wattie’s. But common, they kind of the same baked beans.

M: I’ve kind of been [thinking about] trust again. It’s like Vogels, Vogels is an example it’s like nice toast bread. I’d probably have Vogels, because of its iconicness and trustworthiness. You kind of know what you are getting. And even though there could be a new product on a market same price as Vogels, I kind of will be: “Oh, I don’t know what that is”. So I will still buy Vogels.

M: And that’s same with milk as well. Meadow Fresh over some budget one. Even though they probably come from the same cow...
M: Do you buy Meadow Fresh?

M: If I was going to buy in middle range price range, I was going for this price range, I was probably be picking Meadow Fresh nine out of ten time because...

F: I think that’s just depends... It’s like realistically, it’s the exact same milk you are getting.

F: Lewis Road, my mum has started buying that one.

M: It’s the value of the iconic brand.

F: It’s the whole milk thing, and people are not doing homogenised stuff anymore. Back in the old days in New Zealand, you used to get milk from the cow, so the fat was separated out. And now brands are going back into that and all like our parents’ generation is frothing it because like ‘Ah’!

M: You’ve got nice creamy milk at the top.

F: Yeah.

F: And so like, I know my parents would splash out more just because it’s like their childhood and stuff like that. And now it sort of that like...

I: Does anyone have any memories or stories associated with brands on either side?

M: Tip Top does make you think of ice-creams and summer.

I: So do you say it’s positive or negative memory?

M: One of my earliest memory is having an ice-cream at the wharf in Akaroa, and I’m sure it was Tip Top.

I: Anyone else?

M: I’m kind of back to younger years, I guess, on both side of pantry.

F: Sanitarium, Weet-Bix like mornings and stuff. Not necessarily positive…

I: Do you think brands can be iconic in certain categories but not like, on the whole? Or iconic because they are iconic in a category? For example like, if you look at those Budget little drinks, those ones in 24 pack.

M: It’s quite iconic.

M: At school.

M: Kids birthday parties.

M: It can be iconic in certain settings.

M: The product can be iconic, even if the brand itself isn’t.

I: What’s the difference between a product being iconic and a brand?

M: For me, if you’ve got like a particular memory associated with like an individual product. This one is stupid, but for me – Budget dishwashing liquid is iconic but just because it’s been a course between my flatmates. Yeah, my flatmates from few years ago stayed last year, I would always get Budget dishwashing liquid, just because it is iconic for me. Even it’s like a weird thing. I wouldn’t call Budget an iconic brand. I’d call Budget dishwashing liquid iconic just because I’ve got that memory associated with that.

M: It can be something like roll-ups, you know. Kids lunch box, I haven’t the brand itself. They probably do the whole lot of other products.

I: So obviously you’ve got memories associated with brands, you said, on both sides. What is the difference between the memories with the iconic brands or the memories that make the brands iconic? and memories of just say generally non-iconic brands?

F Iconic brands are more of a treat growing up, I reckon. You sort of get s***ty ice cream, and then you are on holiday and its like: “Oh, we’ll get Tip Top”.

M: I honestly think it comes down to society and what people... Like what society as a whole deems as a status item vs. what it does it not, because... They are the same, but for whatever reason your peers hold one brand in a higher seeding than another and that’s becomes iconic.

M: Yeah I agree with that.

I: Alright, we’ve sort of covered everything, that’s good.

I: Next exercise we will do picture associations with animals. [explaining the task] So if we just went with Pams? What animal do you think best represents it to you?

F: I’d probably go with a cat out of those images just because I think it is sort of the most basic domestic animal among those. And these options which is how I see Pams, sort of. A cat is affordable, just like Pams.

M: I would think the panda bear.

I: So what other qualities of Pams are related to the cat? Apart from affordability.

F: I guess, affordability in relation to those animals I see the cat is the most basic, the most common animal, and Pams is a pretty common supermarket brand. That’s just of the top of my head for the reasons.

I: And the panda?


I: Alright, moving on.

M: I picked rabbit, because I value the life of a rabbit the least. And I also value Pams not that highly.

F: I reckon rabbit, but just because it’s like seeing as an alternative pet, and I feel Pams tries to be like... They are not Budget, but they are trying to be better than they are. Because Pams is still budget brand, but...

M: For me it’s the dog or the cat. Because those two are probably the most vanilla animals. And I see Pams as very vanilla, like underwhelming. you know, brand. If someone had a pet elephant, you’d be like: “Yo!” But with a pet dog, you’d like: “Whatever”. It’s like Pams, which is very meh brand.

M: Yeah, I agree.

I: What about Whittaker’s?

M: Definitely the elephant. It’s like very old iconic, powerful brand. Elephants just like old, and iconic animals.

F: For me, it’s the lion, I think the gold is getting me. But I think also its kind of proud brand. I see a lion as being that.
F: I think it’s the elephant. Because a while ago they did an advertising campaign, back in a day. And I’m pretty sure there were elephants involved.

M: I think of a dog because... I see Whittaker’s as sort of New Zealand kind of loyal brand that I sort of associate similar qualities to a dog a bit abstractly.

M: I was just going to say that as well. Thing about loyalty and a dog, it’s the commonality, I think.

I: What about you? What do you think?

M: I’m gonna say something stupid again. I don’t have any sort of rational basis between putting those two together. I just picked on basics sort of s***. Like Grace... like gold lion. With gold killers Whittaker’s, literally its our symbol.

M: I just can’t think of it at all. Verkerks is European. Maybe European dog or something

I: That’s plenty, cheers for that. That’s all I need for brand picture associations.

I: This is our next exercise – brand mapping [explaining the task].

M: How do you want to group them? Do you want to group them as iconic and non-iconic?

I: You can group them anyway you like, the only thing I ask: you don’t group them based on a product category. Group them on your thoughts and feelings towards the brand.

F: Basic things...

M: Maybe Pams? Because you guys reckon it’s a basic brand?

F: I though Sanitarium and Edmonds.

F: I feel like Sanitarium is slightly higher, oh yeah yeah

M: Are we putting these here? Or? Oh, god!

M: I feel like these three...

M: These are the cookie cutter brands.

M: S***ty brands.

F: Then kind of like slightly more higher up, but still a basic brands.

M: Staples and then you’ve got treat ones, I don’t know, that’s how you could group them.

F: Yeah.

M: Can there be a spectrum, or do they have to be separate?
F: No, I like these groupings.

I: I just gonna ask, is everyone happy with that?

M: Yeah, I think so.

M: Not me. You’ve done it by like other than the povo brands. You’ve done it by like ‘these are treats’, ‘these are that’.

I: Would you be able to hold on to those thoughts? Yeah, I will have a question about it more towards the end.

F: I would have done them more as like staples. Like half-staples, half-treats and treats.

I: So how do you feel about this group vs. that group in terms of your relationship with the brand?

M: Same for me.

F: That’s the sort of the treat me pile.

I: Are these products more rewarding to you? It is consumed less often.

F: Yeah. Like if I’m having a movie night and I’m having Tip Top, but that’s quite rare. Whereas with flour and that sort of thing...

M: They are old school, they’re OG.

M: And these two, I reckon... But they not, they like are a different kind. Edmonds is like flour and...

I: I just wanna ask, is everyone happy with that?

Everyone: Yeah.

F: Sanitarium is not really iconic as such. I’d say, Weet-Bix is iconic, but Sanitarium is not. If you ask people, who does Weet-Bix, they’d say Weet-Bix.

I: Yeah, I see what you mean. Would that be fair to say, if you are gonna have a conversation about iconic brands with someone, you would be more likely to talk about these four: Whittaker’s, L&P, Tip Top and Wattie’s.

M: Yeah yeah.

I: So you guys believe there is different, or may be Tom thinks...

M: If you don’t bake... Edmonds is old school.

F: It’s only when they got Eliza McCartney and people like that on board and all those ads, was like ‘my game’, ‘my bla-bla-bla’. So it’s now becoming iconic. But these are like god tier iconic and this is like... still pretty iconic, but I don’t associate these as iconic as these. And these have just become iconic.

I: How about these three down here then: Pams, Signature range and Homebrand?

M: Not necessarily.

F: Whittaker’s is not a treat, it’s just baked beans and tomato sauce.

I: I think it’s just for me...

M: They are old school, they’re OG.

F: But do you call those ones as iconic because they are more like treat food, as such.

M: Not necessarily.

F: No, I like these groupings.

I: I just gonna ask, is everyone happy with that?

M: Yeah, I think so.

M: Not me. You’ve done it by like other than the povo brands. You’ve done it by like ‘these are treats’, ‘these are that’.

I: I’d probably keep these two together.

M: They can be grouped individually.

M: See, may be even have Wattie’s in here. May be Anchor sort of separate. And then, I’d probably keep these two together.
F: You sort of associate them with uni too.

F: Because you always on the lookout for Homebrand, Pams, that sort of thing. Because you know it should be cheaper. And so it is almost a goal not have to buy like Signature range or Homebrand because it does not needed to you anymore.

M: There is huge range of products as well, and the ones over there, you can really hone in on what their product is, what it is like, what their product is providing. Whereas these ones down here provide such a huge range. You can almost look at it as a line across there. Whittaker’s your chocolate, and L&P the drink. Down here could be peanut butter, could be all like Weet-Bix, and down here could be a dozen different things. You can graph that iconicness towards how many products they actually have. Yeah, how focused their market is. More focused it is, perhaps it makes it easier to become more iconic in some senses. Because if you offer a huge range of products for that company, to become iconic is gonna take a huge amount of time.

M: I feel as well the commonality between these two brands is that they market themselves as being cheap, so the price plays the factor towards that they are not iconic. And like you said, when you think iconic, you probably think more positively, which is associated with a higher price because you are aspired to have that good.

I: Do you associate price with quality then?

Everyone: Yes.

M: And iconicness. I cannot think of any like cheap product in the category that I’d call iconic. Can you think of any?

I: You’ve said earlier Indomie, like Mi Goreng noodles.

M: What brand?

I: Indomie, Mi Goreng noodles.

M: Is that iconic? Not to me.

I: Yeah.

M: Ok.

M: That’s true, I didn’t actually think about that.

M: Is that the cheapest brand of noodles?

F: You’ve still got like Budget.

I: I think there are cheaper noodles, but people...

M: I guess, my comment was, it does not need to be the most expensive product in its range, but generally the brand to be iconic... generally doesn’t mean it cannot charge at a higher price for its products.

F: It is not gonna be the cheapest.

F: Indomie is different though because you’ve got three different types of flavour. Like, you have choices of how you make them. Whereas with everything else you just get a packet of seasoning and a packet of dehydrated veggies or whatever. So it’s like, they sort of being more exclusive. But I guess, also with the brands like Signature range and Pams they rebranded quite a few times. They kept their name, but they’ve changed their logos and the packaging. So I guess, that makes us more likely to be... less iconic to us. Rather than Wattie’s, which has looked the same for ages.

F: Yeah, actually they do change it around a bit.

I: As you can see L&P changed its logo, that’s a new one, but... Would you say that they are rather similar?

M: Yeah, I guess for L&P it’s the colours and then just the “L” and “P”. It’s so simple.

I: If you guys have to rank those three brands down here, how would you rank them?

F: Homebrand is the worst.

M: Yeah move that down to the bottom.

M: I’d have Pams perhaps above Signature range.

M: So would I.

M: Yeah I’m probably the same.

I: And if you had to do this exercise again and try to group these brands, could you figure any other groupings that you could come up with?

F: I would almost like put Anchor with Tip Top because they are dairy based food.

M: You can group them by their functionality, but he is not interested in. Or like colours, or something like that, or how effective their logos are, maybe.

I: What are the most effective logos?

F: I think Tip Top, you just... I don’t know, I guess, probably the first brand when I came to New Zealand, we drove past that Tip Top factory in Auckland, and I just... And I love ice cream, so I guess, this brand has just always resonated with me.

M: I like those ones that have like a little logo – Tip Top logo, the Anchor logo.

F: And just really simple, basic.

F: I think those prime colours are important.

F: Tip Top is good because you’ve got the swirl, which is like ice-cream. It’s also like a beach ball, that’s how they advertise their stuff.

M: If you drive past any dairy in New Zealand, no matter in what city you are in, or rural, you see they sell Tip Top. You immediately recognize it.

I: Do you think there is a relationship at all between the amount of advertising and whether the brand is iconic?

Everyone: Yeah.

F: I think so.

F: And the simplicity of advertising, and the logos used in that, so it’s not too busy.

I: Do you find the advertisements that are easy to understand and engage with are more effective?

M: Yeah, it is just simple sort of. If you go back to the Tasti one before, it was just absolutely cluttered with so much stuff going on, throwing all these other things at you. Whereas the more simple adverts just resonates with you. The key simple points with the product associated with it, and you just remember it more.

F: Also subconsciously, we’ve had Tip Top advertising to us for years. Whereas, if there was a Movenpick store, I wouldn’t be that keen to go into it. Just because they are from overseas and I
don’t associate them with the quality of Tip Top – you always know it’s gonna be good. You never going to be disappointed.

M: Whittaker’s has Nigella Lawson in their advertising. One, like attractive female chef, but two like, you associate her with quality. Because she is such a well-known and respected person in the culinary world.

F: I associate her with England.

I: What you think about such a strong kiwi iconic brand using British celebrities? And especially if you watch their most recent ad, it’s not just Nigella, it’s like a collection of British celebrities. It’s like Stephen Fry.

M: I find it quite jarring.

M: It’s bizarre.

F: I clicked when someone said before that Whittaker’s is a New Zealand brand. I forgot...

F: You kind of forget, especially from watching advertising, so while you are watching it, you kind of assume that it comes from somewhere else.

M: Because it fits into their chocolate. That’s bougie chocolate, I think. But because it’s British culture, they’ve got kind of snobby accents that add sophistication to the product, which makes me think that’s not just standard dairy milk, that is the boutique, up-market chocolate.

M: It probably does draw away from the New Zealand Kiwiana. It’s like a double end sword, it might be good marketing, on that hand. But like in terms of trying to get New Zealand Kiwiana, New Zealand iconicness it does draw like...

M: Are they trying to do that though with the ad?

I: Do you think they put the iconicity at risk with how they advertise?

M: Yeah, definitely.

F: It has been said, I never buy Whittaker’s chocolate, I always buy Cadbury. Regardless...

M: You’ve said you buy Whittaker’s before

F: You said for a friend.

F: Yeah, for me Whittaker’s is like... If you are going to someone’s place and you wanna bring food for them...

F: Because it’s more expensive.

F: You buy those like, I don’t know, limited edition chocolate things. Whereas like me personally, I always buy Cadbury, just because that what I’ve grown up on.

M: I don’t think being New Zealand and being iconic are necessarily mutually exclusive though. Like I think...

I: Oh yeah, like Sanitarium is Australian.

M: I didn’t even know that, but yeah... So that’s kind of defeats the point. Like, I think of say Coke. I feel it’s an iconic brand. But they don’t do it in New Zealand. But I think the New Zealand element certainly helps.

I: I think with Coke...

M: It’s iconic to Western culture.

I: Yeah, Western culture in general, worldwide really. I suppose when you guys were talking about levels of iconicity before, you guys said that these were the top: Tip Top, L&P and Whittaker’s. Would you put Coke even above that? Or below? Or like on level?

M: Definitely above

M: Above, yeah.

F: You can go anywhere in the world, but Coke... yeah

M: The most recognisable brand of all time.

I: Yeah, I don’t have any more questions. I was gonna say, if you guys have any thoughts that have come up during this process at all?

M: I don’t know, it is incredibly difficult to actually rationalise how I think these things. Sometimes I feel that is just so subconsciously. You do this because... but when you try think about why, you think about something in the way you do, it is really hard to actually pinpoint it.

F: Even like often say, you always buy like, I don’t know, a certain type of something and then you go to someone’s house and you try the different brand of it, you like: “Oh, actually, this is better”. Often you still go back to buying the other brand just because that’s your habit now and that’s what you always buy.

M: It can be habitual. Can be quite sheep culture as well. You know, everyone has got Tip Top. Everyone has that. It’s kind of like... You might feel inclined to buy it as well.

M: Just how well it’s been normalised.

M: Status probably has a huge part in things.

I: Yeah, like your reference group. Your friends and family, what they think you should be having.

F: Like even if you preferred Pams ice-cream, if you are going to meet a group of friends, you’d bring Tip Top, it would be almost rude to turn up with Pams? You get judged for that.

F: Another thing – Wattie’s vs. Heinz sauce. Yeah, it’s kind of what you’ve said earlier. It is a judgy sort of thing.

F: I’ve always preferred Heinz and I think that’s because I grew up with Heinz, not Wattie’s.

F: Wattie’s has heaps of sugar added, and Heinz doesn’t.

I: I’m pretty sure Heinz owns Wattie’s now.

F: Does it?

M: Oh!

M: Heinz is massive.

F: I think it depends because my boss is American, and she hates Wattie’s. She prefers Heinz. So I think Wattie’s has like...

M: Yes, in New Zealand we have [Wattie’s], but worldwide...

I: I don’t think you can get Wattie’s outside New Zealand.

F: Maybe it’s part of New Zealand, but the simpler logos tend to be more kiwi, almost more iconic.

I: Can anyone recall Wattie’s ad?
M: Just the food in a minute ones. It’s kind of an advertisement, but not really. How they cook a meal and then have one token Wattie’s product.

F: Because it was always on before the news.

M: I can think of one was around the BBQ and there was flipping a thing? I can’t remember. Sauce out of there and then like flip the bottles, and the bottles left upside down. Something like that. Something to do with BBQs and summer.

I: They changed their bottle shape.

M: The food in a minute made it feel like such a staple like it’s so versatile. Wattie’s stuff you can cook so many different dishes. You are silly if you don’t have it.

M: It’s not iconic, but it’s probably marketed as iconic because everyone has it.

M: But that was the marketing approach they took though.

I: Suppose, can anyone recall an Edmonds ad?

M: No, but I feel everyone has got their cookbook.

F: Don’t you have Jo Seagar with Edmonds?

M: I just think sure to rise. If I hear Edmonds the first thing I think is: “Edmonds sure to rise”. Just that motto.

M: Yeah, my mum had the Edmonds cookbook as well.

F: I’ve been thinking of Edmonds corn flour for some reason.

F: I think corn flour doesn’t have Budget equivalent to it. So you can only get Edmonds.


F: Corn flour?

I: I don’t know. They make at least four different types of flour.

F: The only corn flour that can literally fit into my head right now is in the yellow Edmonds box.

M: It does not have to market. It is such a Kiwiana brand, people know about it. And I have no idea, but probably it has like a monopoly. Back in 1800’s... It’s owned the market for 200 years and they just don’t need to do anything.

I: When you ranking them in terms of iconicity, where does that one fit? See, it does not even need to advertise to maintain its iconicity, the iconic status.

M: Well, that what I thought when Edmonds picture appeared before. Just because of how like famous it is in New Zealand.

F: I feel it’s almost like a subconscious level though. I think with Edmonds, I think it’s almost sound stupid, but with Edmonds – you just get Edmonds. Whereas like Whittaker’s and L&P feel like it’s more of a choice thing.

M: It’s just something about Whittaker’s and L&P, it’s seems little bit more like iconic.

M: Perhaps, it’s what we buy. We probably don’t get a lot of Edmonds, we probably get one flour, whatever every now then.

M: How many flour brands are there? There might be only like...

F: They’ve got all the Budget ones.

I: It’s like at least three or four.

M: But in terms of soft drinks, I can get probably...

F: A tonne.

M: A dozen or more, easily. Also, I don’t know, in terms how much there is on the market.

I: Any final thoughts?

F: I’ve just go a funny story. My teacher got Pams stuff ones, and she opened up the milk and there were maggots in it. She told us that story. So I’ve never bought Pams... And then she said they sent her a whole heap of stuff, which was Pams branded. Like, after that to say sorry. She just: “I just don’t use Pams any more”. So if you like... With cheaper brands, it’s a lot easier for them to lose your trust. Whittaker’s, if you’ve got a bad batch, you will be: “Oh, that’s just that one time, it’s ok”. Whereas for the cheaper ones, there is like ‘no’, you are out now.

M: Yeah, I just associate more quality with Whittaker’s. That is probably comes down to price.

M: Yeah, it might be the way they actually package it. Anchor and Meadow Fresh, I’m sure the milk is actually the same.

F: From the exact same factory, it’s just when it goes to people and in the bottles, it splits off.

M: It’s a marketing thing. Clearly.

F: It’s like the whole Anchor bottle thing. How it’s like not see-through. It seems stupid because your fridge doesn’t have a light in it, so it’s in a dark anyway, unless you leave it out on your bench top. Your milk is always going to be in the dark when it is in the fridge. But then lots of people like: “Oh, that’s a good idea”.

M: Particular integrity of the milk.

I: If there is anything wrong with your milk, you couldn’t see it.

F: Yeah, true.

F: You can’t see how much you’ve got.

I: It’s quite impractical, isn’t it.

---
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I: So, I’m just gonna write them down as you go, so... Could anyone just name the brand you think it’s iconic to kick us off in the New Zealand context?

F: Wattie’s.

F: Raro.

M: Tip Top.

F: Tellys.

M: Marmite.

F: Fielders.

F: Heinz.
F: Whittaker's.
F: Cadbury.
F: Arnott's.
F: Pineapple lumps.
F: That's Pascalls?
F: Wrigleys.
F: Tip Top.
F: Anchor.
F: Meadow Fresh.
F: Yoplait.
F: We're going around supermarket now naming them.
F: Vogels.
F: What are some of the bread things?
I: Goodman Fielder does Vogels.
F: Who's across the road from us? He's the burn the breadcrumbs [company].
F: Oh, Couplands isn't it?
I: No, you can't, no, you right.
M: Couplands?
F: You can't, can you?
M: No.
F: What's the bread across the road? I just can't believe that...
F: What's that Eco? Eco Fresh?
F: Molenberg.
F: New Zealand. You know cleaning products?
F: Sunlight, is it a brand?
F: Yeah, but it's not New Zealand.
F: Knights Castille.
F: Mumm.
F: Nivea.
F: Dove, yeah.
F: Colgate.
F: Macleans.
M: Sealord.
F: Yeah, we haven't got fish.
F: Any fruit?
I: Fruit does not have much branding on it, does it?
M: Oh, yes, it does – Dole.
F: Oh, yeah yeah.
F: From Australia though.
I: Yeah.
Does it matter?
I: No, it's just iconic in New Zealand.
M: It's only bananas. What's the other brand?
M: Bonita.
F: Palm Olive, have we mentioned that?
F: The mag one?
F: You know: “You're soaking in it”.
F: Maggi?
M: What's the Kiwifruit one – Zespri.
F: Oh, Zespri, yeah!
I: Alright, plenty of iconic there. That's the most I've had. And then what about brands that to you are not iconic?
F: Just on the shelf?
I: Yeah.
F: Who does the peanut butter?
M: Is it Pics?
F: Yeah, Pics.
F: I reckon that's verging on iconic.
F: Budget brands?
I: The Budget ones?
F: Yeah.
M: Pams.
F: Kellogg's is another one that should have been...
I: Homebrand?
M: Yeah.
M: Anathoth, Barkers
F: Are these ones iconic?
F: Iconic.
F: Yeah, chuck them... And Kellogg's.
F: Yeah, Kellogg's!
F: We've mentioned Sanitarium, haven't we?
I: No.
F: Weet-Bix
F: Quality Bakers, that's the one across the road. Uh, I will be able to sleep tonight!
F: Dilmah.
I: What about Signature range?
F: Choya Tea.
F: Yeah, Choya is iconic.
F: Twinings.
I: What about Deep South ice-cream?
F: Yeah, iconic.
F: It depends where you are ae, you see up North you never ever heard of Deep South.
F: No no.
M: Do you like it?
F: Yeah it’s nice.
I: What about say Hellers? The sausages.
F: That’d be very iconic, wouldn’t it?
I: It’s up to you. You all have different opinions on it.
M: Hellers is iconic.
F: There are Hellers substitutes.
F: What do you call these disgusting ones with cheese in them?
F: Sizzler.
F: They are not iconic.
F: What about, you know, fish fingers?
F: Sealord.
F: We’ve mentioned that.
M: A non-iconic one would be Silver Fern.
I: Silver Fern Farms?
M: Yeah, a lot of their meat is exported so people don’t know about it.
F: Yeah.
F: SPC, canned fruits, that’s not an iconic one to me.
I: What about Oak baked beans?
M: Yeah.
I don’t like them.
F: No.
F: Awful.
I: What about Master Foods?
F: Spices and things like that.
I: Iconic or non-iconic?
M: Iconic to me.
F: Parents bought them before you do, before I do. So some of these things are what we had in our house when we were growing up. So we tend to stay with the same ones.

M: Hell yes

I: What are some of those brands?

F: Definitely Cadbury, Edmonds.

F: Marmite vs. Vegemite

F: Yeah yeah.

I: The great debate.

M: Wattie’s

F: Wattie’s vs. Oak.

M: vs. Heinz.

F: What are the stocks?

F: Maggi.

F: Tip Top.

Yeah!

The ice-cream, yeah!

I: What kind of memories do you guys have with that?

M: The beach!

Yeah, exactly.

F: A Sunday drive to get an ice-cream.

F: The dairy always had the cones.

F: They had those cool ads as well.

I: So nostalgic memories?

F: Yeah.

M: Sealord – although it’s iconic, lots of bad memories with those. Because everyone grew up on those fish fingers, bloody awful weren’t they.

I: So do you think a brand can be sort of infamously iconic to you?

M: Yeah, but terrible, horribly terrible stuff.

F: Now they are better standard, at that time we thought it was...

F: And tomato sauce was always with those or your fish and chips, the canned tomato sauce or little red tomato, which is coming back [in to fashion].

F: Yeah, it was a good one.

I: What about just in general, how do you treat the brands differently, the iconic and non-iconic brands? If you can think yourself heading through a supermarket, how would you treat the brands here differently to these ones?

F: I wouldn’t look at them.

F: I wouldn’t buy them.

M: Even some of those iconic ones I wouldn’t buy.

F: No, I wouldn’t either.

F: No, I don’t buy Cadbury any more.

F: No, I don’t either.

I: So do you think there are different levels of the iconic brands?

Everyone: Yeah.

F: Iconic to everybody in they way they perceive it. But then, to us personally, some of them aren’t what we wouldn’t buy.

M: I wouldn’t say levels, I would say categories. So yeah, these are one that are iconic, but I’m not gonna use them. And these are ones that I would use.

I: And what about say do you think the brand can be iconic in sort of one category or one product rather than the whole brand itself being iconic? Like for example, would you guys say Pineapple Lumps is iconic? Would you say Pascall is an iconic brand? Or just Pineapple Lumps?

F: The product.

M: Pineapple lumps.

F: Well, they have other products.

F: Minties.

F: Yeah, there is probably a range within that.

F: There is even like Wattie’s with baked beans and spaghetti.

M: But what do we talk about, overseas – Pineapple Lumps.

I: Minties iconic?

F: Minties, yes.

F: And there was Jaffas.

F: Oddfellows.

F: Yeah yeah

F: I always have them in the car.

I: Is there anything you noticed about all the brands on this side compared to some of the ones on this side? Or some of the brands on this side in comparison to these?

F: Not New Zealand… owned, or started here.

M: A large proportion of them started here.

I: So they relate to New Zealand more? Do you think they use aspects of Kiwiana in their advertising?

F: I think they do.

F: Some do yeah.

F: Probably a lot actually, yeah.

M: How much they do now, but certainly 20-30 years ago were fully New Zealand branding. You know relating back to something New Zealand as to how you were going to use that product.

F: It had something to do to with New Zealand, how you gonna use this product.
F: And marketing wise, I think there’s been a huge push to support New Zealand products.

I: Buy local?

F: Yeah, I do that.

I: And what do you think about say some of the brands on this side, say Pams and Homebrand and Signature range? Do you think they have a really wide range of products? Whereas the brands on this side have quite a focused product area there? Do you think that makes a difference in terms of being iconic?

F: Yeah.

F: I do too.

F: I’m in two minds about that one.

I: I guess, you think of Wattie’s that have products in every category and quite a few?

F: But Pams does a bit of everything, every single product it copies.

M: I think it’s a generalisation. If you look at Budget, Pams, I associate it with a whole range of products, rather than...

F: From toilet paper to a spice mix.

F: Yeah.

M: Exactly.

I: What if we looked say... You said Coke is iconic and Pepsi. What about say L&P? Iconic?

M: Yeah, sure, forgot about that one.

F: Yeah, yeah.

I: But how do you feel about L&P as an iconic brand to New Zealand when it’s owned by Coke?

F: Yeah, I associate it with Paeroa, the town. But I don’t think of who owns it actually when I think of that.

F: Because it was originally.

F: It’s Coke, is it now?

F: I wouldn’t have a clue.

M: I reckon it’s a historical thing now. I don’t drink L&P. But I grew up seeing it all because we used to drive though there and see it often.

F: Me neither.

I: What is we went back to the chocolate category, say Whittaker’s and Cadbury? Do you look at Whittaker’s and Cadbury differently as iconic brands? Or similarly?

F: I look differently because it was what was going into Cadbury when they had that palm oil thing. There was a lot of negative. I know, you know... I know what goes into Whittaker’s so I like... I do it because I know them as well. But I just don’t like the whole Cadbury’s. What was happening there? Because they just got too big, I think. But that’s more of a new story. I don’t know.

M: Cadbury has been around a lot longer, in our minds than Whittaker’s. They were huge, but they imploded.

F: But also, that was the only thing we were ever exposed to. That’s all we knew. Whereas now we get a lot of imported chocolate.

M: Yeah, that’s right.

F: Belgium chocolate, amazing.

F: Yeah, the flavours.

F: And suddenly you realise: “S*** this Cadbury doesn’t taste very good”.

F: That’s right.

F: It’s way too sugary.

F: Yeah.

F: And not enough actual chocolate in it.

F: Cocoa.

M: And then, they used the palm oil. And it was sold off overseas to a US company ten years ago. Whatever it was. That’s what I’ve got. They’re buggered.

I: And so, this new range of chocolate you were exposed to, would it be stack up to those, do you think?

F: Oh, yeah, that artisan range is amazing.

F: Yeah.

I: What do you think of Whittaker’s, their advertising at the moment on TV with lots of British celebrities like Nigella Lawson to start with? And now, have you seen their most recent ad? It’s similar but now they have another 20 British celebrities coming into the door? What do you guys think about that?

F: Yeah, that is different. I was quite surprised when they did that trick actually. But they are trying to get more of a global market. They are trying to get more international as well by exposing to other people. Especially they said on the Internet they’ve got a different way of doing that. But I’m not as fussed on that part of it... But that’s just me.

F: I’m not sure if that sort of advertising affects me now. I see those ads and they’re clever but I hate to think what is costs them to get the people to do it, because they had Roger Federer and they had...

M: No.

F: Well, no.

F: They probably get free chocolate.

F: Yeah, they probably do.

F: Probably should be getting. Where is Lindt from? Is it Swiss, or is it Belgium?

F: Lindt is Swiss, it’s made in Zurich

I: Alright, that’s that done. Now, we will move on to the next exercise. Actually, one more question. These days the news often say aspects of Kiwiana in their advertising. Is there any particular way they have done that well? In comparison to the brands that used it and... Can you think of any brands that used Kiwiana in the advertising and it hasn’t paid off?

I: It’s fine, if no one has got any.

F: I’m trying to think of some.
I: Sorry, I said the question badly. Can you just think of brands that have sort of... When they advertised, they try to sort of latch themselves onto New Zealand, and it hasn’t paid off for them, they are not what you’d call iconic.

I: I can show you an example. I was going to show you guys this video here. [watching the ad]

M: Is this an ad?

F: I’ve never seen it.

M: That was a bad advert.

I: So obviously, they have used a lot of Kiwiana aspects, Kiwiana in the advertising. But do you think Tasty bars are iconic?

Everyone: No.

I: So what do you think makes their New Zealand related advertising poor in comparison to some of the brands we’ve got here: Whittaker’s or Tip Top or Weet-Bix?

F: They are just trying too hard.

F: We don’t even know the message by the end of it

F: When they said: “Oh, Tasti”, it was like: “What??”. 

I: Do you feel they are like trying to force kiwi, aspects of the Kiwiana in the advertising too much?

F: Yeah.

F: They had every aspect of Kiwiana you can think of: pāua and every...

I: Alright, very good.

I: So the next exercise is a picture association. It’s gonna be a little bit more abstract. [explaining the task].

I’m an accountant, I can’t think wishiwashi.

I: So I would just start it off. Think it yourself and we will go around the table. We will start it off with Signature range. Is there any animal you can come up to represent it if you had to choose one?

F: Me probably – the rabbit

M: Yeah, rabbit. Yeah, I’m rabbit

I: Why the rabbit?

M: It’s a rodent.

I: What about that reminds you of Signature range?

M: It’s something that you get because you have to.

F: Cheap and cheerful.

F: Pesty.

F: I was a bit like that with the elephant. Just, I don’t know, like it. It covers quite a wide range. It’s just like there and plonky.

I: Yeah, I get fully what you are saying. Like a slow moving brand.

F: I can’t think of anything.

I: What about Edmonds?

F: Oh, gosh.

F: Well, I reckon the lion.

I: If you think of the brands we’ve talked about, say iconic and non-iconic, and think of what you think of... How powerful the brand is or how much it means to you? Does that help at all?

F: Yeah, that’s fine. A powerful lion, the brand

M: I’d go the dog, herding sheep, Edmonds is really New Zealand.

F: But it’s flour, not sheep.

M: Yeah, I know. But it’s still land... its farming.

I: It’s agriculture, the country.

M: Agriculture, yep.

F: I reckon the elephant.

I: Why is that?

F: It’s solid, dependable, old.

F: Old.

F: Do you use the same ones like all the time?

I: Yeah.

F: God!

M: Panda.

F: It’s funny I was thinking of that because it starts with “P”.

F: I was thinking the rabbit.

F: Is Pams Chinese?

M: No, the panda is Chinese. It’s cheap. Pams brand is cheap.

F: I’m thinking Pams – the rabbit. Fluffy and not sort of flash.

F: Cheap and cheerful.

I: Any other thoughts on Pams, anyone? Last one. [showing the brand – Diamond pasta]

F: Oh dear, pasta.

F: I’d go for the dog.

I: Any reasoning behind that?

F: Easy, little jumpy, and bright and breezy. Diamond’s quite sparkly.

M: None of these animals...

F: I’ve got one, yes. Can I have more than one?

I: Yeah, go on.

F: Ok, so, the rabbit, the chimpanzee or the elephant.

I: For different reasons?
F: No, for the same reasons. All the rest are meat eaters, and that is pasta.

[laughter]

F: I didn’t really think of that.

I: No, that’s fine.

F: Not many people get Diamond though, do they? No, it’s pretty hard to associate with it.

M: Was that the right answer?

I: No, there is no right answer.

I: Next exercise is a lot easier, I would say.

F: Did you make up these questions by the way?

I: Yeah. Although there are techniques. Let me give you a bunch of brands, as a team I want you to group them into different groups. [explaining the task].

M: How do you know what we are gonna say?

F: Anchor, Wattie’s, Edmonds and Sanitarium together. Because they kind of like old and dependable. Been around a long time.

F: Ok, those ones you know.

F: Yes.

F: What about Tip Top? What is underneath Pams?

F: Signature range, Pams and Homebrand – I would group those because they are cheaper.

M: Whittaker’s newer.

F: Maybe Tip Top should go with... I don’t know

M: With?

F: With the group of four.

F: They’ve been around as long as Sanitarium.

F: I grew up with all those. I suppose we all did.

M: L&P. How recent is L&P?

F: Yeah, I would put these two together. We are done!

F: Oh, no.

M: So do we agree with that one?

F: I would group them sort of by quality. That what I was thinking. I was thinking... Hard to know if that goes in there. I don’t know. This is not quality.

M: Wattie’s?

F: Anchor would probably go in there, wouldn’t it? I don’t know, that’s just another sort of...

F: So where do you put Wattie’s and Tip Top? So what you are doing is adding Whittaker’s to those five.

F: I’m definitely saying I would probably group those because they are definitely higher quality.

I: So it’s Whittaker’s, Anchor, Edmonds and Sanitarium?

M: Yeah.

F: I’m not sure about Whittaker’s though.

M: These are mid.

I: So Tip Top, Wattie’s and L&P?

F: Depends on what the parameters are.

F: Yeah. I would’ve probably done it another way.

I: You can have more than go at grouping them. So if we look at the original one...

F: Let’s try the first way with the iconic ones.

F: I think Whittaker’s with L&P

F: That goes there, with L&P. That groups like that. That’s perfect.

F: So that’s age.

F: Do you need to take a photo of that?

I: I was gonna ask you some questions about it. If you can explain to me that group on the right: Tip Top, Wattie’s, Sanitarium, Anchor, Edmonds? What does that group mean to you guys?

F: Memories.

F: Classic.

F: Been around a long time.

F: Good memories.

M: Dependable.

F: A decent range of products.

I: What about Whittaker’s? They’ve been around a long time – 1896.

F: Yeah, they actually have been around...

F: But not as well known.

F: Cadbury was the biggy, now they’ve surpassed it.

F: These guys [Whittaker’s] always played second fiddle.

F: And they were in North Island.

F: And they only did peanuts slabs.

F: Yeah, they did.

F: They were one product wonders in the day, weren’t they? Whereas these had more.

I: So Whittaker’s just used to be peanuts slabs?

F: Yeah early on they did.

F: But pretty good.

F: Oh, and Whittaker bars.

F: The santé bars.
F: The skinny chocolate ones with santé bars, they made those as well.
I: So these are brands you’ve got lots of memories with, childhood memories.
F: They covered more products.
F: But they were one off, they really made one product. Whereas these, they’ve got a range within there.
I: What’s Edmonds range, flour and...?
F: Self-raising.
F: Baking powder.
F: Corn flower.
F: They use to have an amazing recipe book. That’s what you grew up with, everyone baked in a day. Recipe book, gave you the recipes and then...
F: I guess in our day there weren’t a huge variety of brands.
M: No.
F: No.
F: You know, so we lived on a farm, we go to town and come back with those.
I: And then the middle group here?
F: It’s more luxury items for me.
F: They are luxury, but they are one item in each range, really, in a day.
F: Does L&P do others? Or just the drink?
M: It’s just like Fanta or Coke, it’s just one item really.
I: They did the chocolate with Whittaker’s for a while. L&P chocolate.
F: Yeah, they did too.
F: Yeah, it was fizzy.
M: Yeah, it was terrible. I didn’t like it.
I: But I think L&P, they did L&P sour for a while. They still do it. And now they are trying to do L&P chilly and lime drink. And then what about the ones down there? They’ve been referred to as cheap and cheerful: Signature range, Homebrand, and Pams.
F: Flatting.
F: That’s dead right, flatting, yeah.
F: That’s what you buy the kids for their flats.
F: Yeah.
I: If you had to rank those three brands, what would you rank them?
F: They are different supermarket chains, from the different supermarkets.
F: I’d go Pams
F: Pams, then Homebrand
F: Who does Pams?
F: Well, New World has it, but I don’t know about the others, because it’s the only one I go to really. Because I don’t have time.
I: So Pams, Homebrand, Signature range?
M: Yeah.
F: Who does Homebrand?
M: They’re Countdown? They might be.
F: Yeah, I think they might be actually.
F: I don’t go to Countdown.
F: Possibly these too. Pams and Signature Range, but not Homebrand.
F: Yeah.
I: Homebrand has changed now. It’s no longer has the Homebrand, it just has a little logo there.
F: Oh, has it?
F: Like an apple.
F: Looks like Woolworth to me.
F: So where should we put Homebrand, at the bottom then?
F: Maybe Homebrand is Countdown, because it’s the old Woolworth logo.
I: So which one of those brands have been the longest that you can remember?
F: Pams probably for me.
M: I don’t know.
F: Who does Signature range?
M: I think Signature had been around before Pams.
F: Where do you get Signature range?
F: I think that’s at Super Value.
F: I don’t know.
F: I don’t know either.
M: They’re there or thereabouts. Which one did come first, do you know?
I: I don’t know.
M: I think they are pretty much the same.
F: Homebrand could be Fresh Choice
M: I’d say Pams is bigger than Signature range, but Signature range started out first.
F: You’re just guessing.
M: I remember it was more dominant in the supermarkets than Pams, and then vice versa.
F: Think of X he’s always bought Pams.
F: It depends what supermarket you go to, and what you see really.

I: Alright, and if we... Oh, one of the questions is if you could group these again how would you group them. But I’ve seen that. I was gonna ask about those groups, you had them before. Was it like that and was it Sanitarium in the middle? That was it?

F: I was thinking of quality.

F: You didn’t rate Tip Top as good quality?

M: I don’t think its high quality stuff

F: It’s probably what you go, if you want these fancy schmancy ice-creams: Puhoi, Kapati.

F: That’s just a standard stock. 2L for your kids isn’t it?

M: It’s good. It’s really good, same as Wattie’s. But it’s not the top end stuff.

F: But then all these, that’s just baking powder really. I mean, in a way...

F: Well if you ask Jo Seagar, she would say...

F: It’s quality.

F: That always... Don’t buy Pams sugar because it will make you pavo runny.

F: Really, has it got that many other additives in it?

F: You know how pays can get runny.

F: So what about Sanitarium, do you think it is a quality brand?

F: Not necessarily. Do they do Weet-Bix?

F: Yeah, they do.

F: That’s probably the only decent, the rest is sugar

M: I’d say it’s baorderline...

F: Anchor, what’s Anchor?

F: Cheese.

F: Milk, cheeses.

M: Butter.

F: I quite like that one, I’m quite happy with that.

I: Tip Top, Wattie’s, L&P and Sanitarium in the middle. Whittaker, Edmonds and Anchor are high quality. What do you make of the stories that at the Fonterra factory all the milk is the same at one end and it just literally splits, and it goes into the Meadow Fresh bottle and in the Anchor bottle.

F: Yeah, that’s fine, not too sure about that.

F: It’s just a brand.

F: Are you telling us? Is that what happens?

I: It’s the rumour, I haven’t been there.

F: And there is stuff that goes in to make it, trim stuff.

F: I’d quite like to talk about how much high CEO’s salary at the moment.

F: Yeah, I know.

F: Jesus!

F: Eight and half million a year.

F: Winston will sort that out.

F: Sounds like it.

M: When you pick Anchor, like milk... I don’t buy the cheap milk because I reckon it goes off quicker.

F: Because it has got less preservatives in it, which is probably a good thing.

F: So are you saying, you wouldn’t probably put Anchor in that category?

F: I would put it in the middle, but that’s just me.

F: That’s alright, you allowed to have your own opinion.

I: So I’ve sort of asked all my questions. I just want to know if anyone had any thoughts about the brands or the ideas that we have talked about. You wanted to get off your chest.

F: Do you have samples?

I: What if I brought a couple of Weet-Bix samples...

F: Oh, not Weet-Bix, Whittaker’s would be better

F: Whittaker’s would be nice.

F: I just think that our demographic group, we don’t look at marketing the same as everyone else. We are not convinced with marketing any more. It’s like, we go there, we know all our products.

F: Yeah, you right.

M: I agree.

I: And why is that? You’ve seen these all before? Or you’ve just already set in your ways?

M: We’re saturated. It’s like TV, I turn off all the ads now. You’ve got the ad blockers when you’re going through the internet. If I want to find out about something, if I want to find out what’s Edmonds up to, I will go and have a look what are they doing.

F: Yeah, I agree actually.

M: And then you see a little bit of new stuff coming in, and so you go away... I go away and research it rather than...

F: You are not getting turned by watching the ads.

M: Superstar endorses L&P or something like that? Forget it.

F: Doesn’t make any difference here.

I: What about some of the things you can’t miss. What about Anchor changing their bottles from transparent to opaque?

F: It makes no difference to me.

F: I don’t really care.

F: I don’t either.
F: I didn’t see that advertised on TV to be honest, I just saw them appearing in the supermarket.

M: I heard the explanation. Yeah, I listened to it.

F: Yeah, they tried to get the light affecting...

M: It’s not that we are getting no advertising. But it’s filtered. There is only so much coming in rather than...

I: Would you say, they process certain amount?

M: A small amount.

I: I suppose, you’ve seen too much throughout the years.

F: Maybe we’re happy with our selection currently. I’m a bit time poor when I’m shopping, I don’t have a lot of time to investigate new stuff. Otherwise it’s by word of mouth. You pop in, you get what you know is right, what you always get.

F: The other thing that I find, I’m doing now too, I’m buying organic stuff.

F: Yeah, me too.

F: We all support the local markets.

F: That’s what I’m doing with the milk.

M: I’m a cynic of that.

F: What about the eggs? What about the Sarah’s brand? I always buy that.

M: Eggs whether they caged or not, I don’t care about that.

F: The difference if you buy them fresh.

F: I don’t buy organic meat at the moment.

F: No, but...

F: Too expensive.

M: Yeah waste of time.

F: We don’t really buy processed food now. I just cook from scratch really. I think we are a bit more aware of all the dramas that go on with everything like that at the moment.

I: No. We pretty much finished now…