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ABSTRACT

Brand identity is the way a company recognizes and identifies itself in a materialistic way. This research study examined the brand identity of the familiar biscuits brands Britannia, Sunfeast, other Brands (Parle, Horlicks, and Cadbury). The brand identity of these biscuits brands were analysed on the basis of six different dimensions namely such as Brand Personality, Brand Capabilities, Brand Value, Shared Value & Community, Brand Noble Purpose and Brand Image. The sample size considered for the study was 330.
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INTRODUCTION AND RELATED WORKS

Branding literally means distinguishing products from each other in order for the consumer to easily choose her favourite product. Nowadays a brand is a valuable as-set and branding means the creation of the asset. Any company willing to sell its product with a positive outcome has to make it look special and desirable; it has to be the number one choice a consumer seeks for. On the other hand, from the consumer’s point-of-view a brand is a product; it is an equation of a promise, expectations and beliefs, shaped by tangible and intangible factors. Some of the tangible factors are; the logo, design and the physical product. The intangible factors are the experiences the customer absorbs and the beliefs it creates. The intangible factors rely on the consumers own justification, but companies strive to feed the consumers’ imagination.
Together these factors create a bundle of promises and the actual image of a product. Branding has its roots deep in the history of man. Branding existed already in the Roman time. Through thousands of years people have promoted their products e.g. attaching a name and/or a picture on a business. These simple elements can still be found in today’s world, e.g. Apple uses a logo of an apple and Twitter a bird. (Hart and Murphy, 2008) Branding, as we know it today has its roots in The Industrial Revolution. During this time period it was understood that a brand comes with a greater value. Therefore, it is a quotidian procedure to patent ideas or products copyright an image or establish a trademark etc. This is simply done to protect the brand from imitations and competition. Motivated by the complexity of successful branding this research work created brand identity who gave the author an assignment to solve how well the biscuit brands values and identity are communicated to the public. Regarding academics, Vargo and Lusch (2004) argued in a recent paper that marketing is evolving toward a dynamic and evolutionary process—one that is based on a service-centered view. In keeping with this evolution, Vargo and Lusch (2004) suggest that (1) IMC should replace diverse, limited-focus promotional tools, and (2) brand management should be used for initiating and maintaining a continuing dialogue with the customers and for enhancing relationships. Kitchen et al. emphasize that "strategically oriented integrated communications can help businesses move forwarding the highly competitive world of the 21st century"(2004). For Schultz (1998), brands are central to this integrated marketing communication.

Keller (1993) points out that customer-based brand equity emanates from the consumer's familiarity and strong, favorable associations with the brand. For Keller, "marketing communications represent the voice of a brand and the means by which companies can establish a dialogue with consumers concerning their product offerings" (2001, p. 823). That is, marketing communication may provide the means for developing strong, customer-based brand equity (Keller 2003). Furthermore, marketing communications help the firm in eliciting favourable responses from customers (Duncan and Moriarty 1998). Although a number of factors influence customer-based brand equity, including product, price, and distribution, in this paper, we focus on the influence of IMC on brand equity. Recently, Kitchen et al. (2004) observed that IMC has evolved from being a mere "inside-out" device that brings promotional tools together to being a strategic process associated with brand management. Further, Naik and Ramannote that IMC emphasizes "the benefits of harnessing synergy across multiple media to build brand equity of products and services" (2003, p- 375). In this paper, however, by taking the works of several researchers (e.g., Duncan and Moriarty1998; Jap 1999; Reid 2003), we conceptualize interactivity, strategic consistency, and complementarity as synergy constructs. Therefore, noting the intricate relationship between IMC and brand management, this paper aims to explore IMC as an integral part of a firm's overall brand equity strategy. But what is a brand equity strategy? Hunt notes, the fundamental Thesis of brand equity strategy is that, to achieve competitive advantage and, thereby, superior financial performance, firms should acquire, develop, nurture, and leverage an effectiveness-enhancing portfolio of brands' (forthcoming). Analogously, we define brand equity strategy as a set of processes that include acquiring, developing, nurturing, and leveraging an effectiveness-enhancing, high-equity brand or portfolio of brands. By high equity, following Keller's (1993) definition of customer-based brand equity, we mean the strong and highly favorable brand associations of customers. Keller (1993) defines brand equity as the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand and suggests brand awareness and brand image as the constructs related to customer-based brand equity.
Keller (2003) notes that firm's marketing communication contribute to brand equity. That is, effective communication enables the formations of brand awareness and a positive brand image. These then form the brand knowledge structures, which, in turn, trigger the differentiated responses that constitute brand equity. Following Schultz (2004a), we define IMC strategy as a set of processes that include the planning, development, execution, and evaluation of coordinated, measurable, persuasive brand communications programs overtime with consumers, customers, prospects, employees, associates and other targeted, relevant external and internal audiences. Therefore, effective IMC is an integral part of an effective brand equity strategy. Furthermore, effective IMC potentially enhances the effectiveness of the firm's portfolio of brands, and hence, could positively influence brand equity. Recently, a shift was observed in the branding literature (de Chernatony 1999) from a singular focus on the importance of brand image, or consumers' perceptions of brand differentiation, to include a focus on brand identity (Aaker 1996; Kapferer 1997; Keller 2003; Upshaw 1995). Though multiple conceptualizations of brand identity exist, this paper uses Aaker’s (1996) conceptualization; that is, brand identity is seen as a unique set of brand associations that a brand strategist aspires to create or maintain. Further, we define brand identity strategy as a set of processes that include the coordinated efforts of the brand strategists in (1) developing, evaluating, and maintaining the brand Identity/identities, and (2) communicating the brand identity/identities to all individuals and groups (internal and external to the firms) responsible for the firm's marketing communications.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF BRAND IDENTITY

DEFINITION OF A BRAND

The American Marketing Association (AMA) defines a brand as a “name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competition” (Keller, 2008). From this definition, a brand is simply a unique identity given to goods and services to differentiate them from that of competitors.

BRAND IDENTITY

The visible elements of a brand (such as colors, design, logotype, name, symbol) that together identify and distinguish the brand in the consumers' mind. Brand identity is the way a company recognizes and identifies itself in a materialistic way. For example; the name, logo and brand packaging are vital parts of the brand identity. The finished product on display is the link of communication a company uses to reach its consumers. The company should therefore consider of; how it wants to be perceived and what is the message delivered? The ‘product’, May it be a tangible item or an intangible service it is the channel of communication that primarily links the company and the consumer.

Identity makes a brand unique for everybody who encounters it, it strives to be memorized and recognized. Brand identity specifies a brands uniqueness and value. It communicates an identical message from the entire product range and the company’s actions.

It needs to be kept in mind that the identity isn’t solid; it is an ever developing entity. More specifically explained; an identity is what one carries inside and it is backed up by externalities. A company changes through time. Its product range, workers and external looks change. In this case,
development is done on a long-term basis, not overnight. It is a challenge to keep customers on track of development and to ensure that the true identity won’t change. According to Kapferer, a true identity can be established when the company is able to complete these questions: What is the brands particular vision and aim?, What need is the brand fulfilling?, Its permanent nature?, Does it have a value or values?, In what field does the brand have competence?, What aspects of the brand should be worked on to make the brand recognizable? However, these questions only scratch the surface of brand identity. To gain a deeper understanding, divided a company’s identity into blocks, called the ‘Identity Prism’

BRAND IDENTITY MODEL

There are many different ideas about the best way to define a brand identity. After reviewing several, we concluded there is no one right way, but there are elements that are important to include. All brand identities have at least three components: rallying cry, capabilities, and personality. But some brands need more elaboration. Our Brand Identity Model is an adaptation of Jean-Noel Kapferer's “Brand Identity Prism.” It offers these three elements and four more, a reflection of the fact that the brands that are richest in meaning define themselves on more than just three dimensions.

A comprehensive Brand Identity fully elaborates each element of the prism, describing what it means and just as importantly, what it does not mean. Elaborations can include images, relevant quotes, evidence from customer research, third party endorsements or product claims. The resulting Identity forms the basis of the brand expression guidelines, communications and internal brand activation programs, so it’s worth taking time to get it right.

BRAND PERSONALITY

Brand Personality describes how the brand has to do well to win with customers. Most brands in a category have similar capabilities, and differ in their ‘personality’, or the way they deliver. Jennifer Aaker identified five primary dimensions for describing brand personality: sincerity, ruggedness, sophistication, excitement, and competence. Each of these ‘Big Five’ has a number of
sub-dimensions. Some brands include additional traits, such as ‘humor,’ ‘social’ and ‘compassion’ in their personalities.

**BRAND CAPABILITIES**
Capabilities describe what the brand has to do well to win with customers. This usually means how it performs relative to what customers want and need from the category. Capabilities often include ideas like ‘quality’, ‘innovation’, ‘reliability’, ‘service’, and ‘selection’, and are what should come to mind first when stakeholders think of the brand.

**BRAND VALUES & CULTURE**
Company culture has always been important to iconic brands, such as Nike, Apple, Google and Harley-Davidson. Passionate, engaged employees also explain much of the success of legendary service brands such as Ritz Carlton, Southwest Airlines and Nordstrom’s. It is the key to understanding the difference between these brands and their competitors. Many company founders were also customers — that is, highly engaged users of their products or services with a clear and aligned set of values. As companies grow, it is imperative that they ensure employees and other stakeholders are inspired by the brand and want to live its values. This facet of the Brand Identity ensures that culture is genuinely nurtured by internal branding efforts as well as customer-facing activities.

**SHARED VALUES & COMMUNITY**
Our Brand Identity model takes into account the growing importance of shared values and experiences in brand building. Leading brands create, inspire, support and embrace ways to engage customers in immersive experiences. Harley Davidson’s HOGs emerged independently from the company and express the freedom of the open road. Patagonia adopted Dirt Bags as the embodiment of the Brand’s rugged, outdoors, minimalist values. Today, digital and social media are redefining community and providing brands with tools that make it easier than ever to help their users to find one another, compare notes and share their stories.

**NOBLE PURPOSE**
Noble Purpose answers the most important question addressed by the Brand Identity. Asked another way: ‘What would customers be missing if the brand didn’t exist?’ Anne Bahr Thompson calls this question the ‘CEO Test.’

Meaning what the CEO would say when asked, “So what is this brand/organisation really about?” For Kashi, the answer to the question is Seven Whole Grains on a Mission. For Virgin it’s Consumer Champion. For Pampers, it’s Happy Baby. For Innocent, it’s No Poisons. These are more than phrases, they are compelling forces that resonate with customers, inspire loyalty and motivate internal audiences.

**BRAND IMAGE**
A brand to succeed relies on the carefully selection of brand identity, its handling when developing brand image, as well as, the assurance that identity is being effectively transferred by brand image. Moreover, Kapferer, states that brand image’s purpose is to establish a constant dialogue with customers, communicating brand relevant aspects from identity. Marketing literature
provides several brand image definitions being one of them Kapferer definition. Image as a synthesis made by the public of all the various brand messages, e.g. brand name, visual symbols, products, advertising, sponsoring, an image results from decoding a message, extracting meaning, interpreting signs; he states that Brand image emanates from two possible sources: brand identity and extraneous factors that come from outside of the brand.

METHODOLOGY AND INSTRUMENTATION

PILOT STUDY

A draft questionnaire was prepared to evaluate the Brand identity of biscuit brands which comprises of 6 different dimensions. They are Brand Personality(5), Brand Capabilities(5), Brand Value(4), Shared Value & Community(4), Brand Noble Purpose(3) and Brand image(3). 50 customers were randomly selected and the data collection was made. After the data collection is over, reliability of the 24 variables based on six dimensions were checked and the value of cronbach’s alpha for 24 conceptual items is 76.8% and it shows the items of brand identity achieved internal consistency and it is reliable. Finally, all the items were verified and the questionnaire was finalized to the final data collection.

SAMPLING FRAMEWORK

The research is a sample survey to evaluate the Brand Identity of Biscuit brands. For this purpose the researcher adopted the purposive sampling method which comes under the Non-probabilistic sampling technique and the sample customers were contacted in the supermarket located in different parts of namakkal district. The optimal sample size of customers was determined by using the following formulas.

DETERMINATION OF SAMPLE SIZE

In order to determine the sample size for this research the following formulas used.

\[ n = \left( \frac{z * s}{e} \right)^2 \]

Where \( n = \) the sample size, \( z = \) test is the standard variate value, \( s = \) standard deviation of the raw brand identity shows (1.768) is the allowing sample error is 5% level

Hence the optimal sample size of the research is 330 customers.

INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA COLLECTION

The finalised questionnaire after the pilot study is used for the final data collection without any change, the questionnaire comprises of six different dimensions. Part 1 consists of personal Demographic question (7), Part II consists of conceptual question (24), and all items were anchored at five likert scale (from 1 to 5). Finally, secondary information regarding the profile of the companies and related reviews were collected by the researcher through internet and journals.
DATA ANALYSIS

After the final data collection was completed, the researcher then conducted a computerised data analysis using statistical software namely SYSTAT V13.1. At first researcher checked the univariate test of normality and multivariate test of normality was also verified. At stage two, least median squares of regression analysis (LMS) were applied to find the effect of the dominating dimension of brand identity.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The research made an attempt to identify the Brand elements of Brand identity in biscuit brands.

LIMITATION

The study has the following constraints, the population of namakkal is very high, the study is conducted considering the prevailing condition which are subjected to change in future.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table-1: UNIVARIATE TEST OF NORMALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SW test</th>
<th>AD test*</th>
<th>AAD test*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand personality</td>
<td>Brand name</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>44.426</td>
<td>44.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Color</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>43.809</td>
<td>43.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Logo</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>65.570</td>
<td>65.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Information</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>58.342</td>
<td>58.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Tagline</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>54.122</td>
<td>54.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand capabilities</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>43.782</td>
<td>43.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refresh Energy</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>34.264</td>
<td>34.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>65.968</td>
<td>66.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>27.588</td>
<td>27.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>47.904</td>
<td>48.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand value</td>
<td>Reasonable Price</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>54.669</td>
<td>54.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>34.017</td>
<td>34.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Discrimination</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>52.347</td>
<td>52.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent Quality</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>57.616</td>
<td>57.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared value &amp; community</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>37.585</td>
<td>37.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>20.332</td>
<td>20.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Based</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>33.415</td>
<td>33.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unique Flavours</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>56.065</td>
<td>56.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand noble purpose</td>
<td>Brand Reputation</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>34.643</td>
<td>34.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pioneering Brand</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>36.717</td>
<td>36.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secured Brand</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>60.938</td>
<td>61.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand image</td>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>52.930</td>
<td>53.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent Taste</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>94.894</td>
<td>95.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>56.770</td>
<td>56.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SW=Shapiro- Wilk  AD=Anderson-Darling  AAD=Adjusted Anderson-Darling  
*P-Value<0.01

Table 2: MULTIVARIATE TEST OF NORMALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test name</th>
<th>Co-efficient</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mardia's Skewness</td>
<td>400.476</td>
<td>22,242.564</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardia's Kurtosis</td>
<td>745.215</td>
<td>31.166</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henze-Zirkler</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.765</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Impact of Brand Personality on Brand Identity

**Dependent Variable: Brand identity(Y)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Britannia*(n=176)</th>
<th>Sunfeast*(n=63)</th>
<th>Others*(n=91)</th>
<th>Pooled*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Efficient</td>
<td>Contribution (%)</td>
<td>R ank</td>
<td>Co-Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Name(x₁)</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Color(x₂)</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Logo(x₃)</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Information(x₄)</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Tagline(x₅)</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust R-Square=0.984a
Estimation Method: Quick Search

Robust R-Square=0.889b

Robust R-Square=0.990c

Robust R-Square=0.910d

\[Y^a = 2.188 + 0.250X_1 + 0.083X_2 + 0.208X_3 - 0.083X_4 + 0.042X_5 \]
\[Y^b = 2.319 + 0.042X_1 + 0.028X_2 + 0.208X_3 + 0.014X_4 + 0.194X_5 \]
\[Y^c = 2.222 - 0.042X_1 + 0.097X_2 + 0.313X_3 + 0.090X_4 + 0.035X_5 \]
\[Y^d = 2.063 + 0.250X_1 + 0.042X_2 + 0.292X_3 - 0.083X_4 + 0.042X_5 \]

Table 4: IMPACT OF BRAND CAPABILITIES ON BRAND IDENTITY

**Dependent Variable: Brand identity(Y)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Britannia*(n=176)</th>
<th>Sunfeast*(n=63)</th>
<th>Others*(n=91)</th>
<th>Pooled*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Efficient</td>
<td>Contribution (%)</td>
<td>R ank</td>
<td>Co-Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.394</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (x₁)</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresh Energy(x₂)</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety(x₃)</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
<td>-451.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition(x₄)</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>351.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive(x₅)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust R-Square=0.984a
Estimation Method: Quick Search

Robust R-Square=0.938b

Robust R-Square=0.990c

Robust R-Square=0.910d

\[ Y^a = 4.394 + 0.083X_1 + 0.083X_2 - 0.375X_3 + 0.292X_4 + 0.000X_5 \]  
\[ Y^b = 2.215 + 0.458X_1 + 0.125X_2 + 0.042X_3 \]  
\[ Y^c = 1.458 + 0.219X_1 - 0.125X_2 + 0.031X_3 + 0.188X_4 \]  
\[ Y^d = 1.187 + 0.000X_1 + 0.042X_2 + 0.375X_3 + 0.250X_4 + 0.042X_5 \]

**Table 5: IMPACT OF BRAND VALUE ON BRAND IDENTITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Brand identity(Y)</th>
<th>Britannia(^a) (n=176)</th>
<th>Sunfeast(^b) (n=63)</th>
<th>Others(^c) (n=91)</th>
<th>Pooled Table (^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.394</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>1.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Price(X(_1))</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness (X(_2))</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Discrimination (X(_3))</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Quality (X(_4))</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust R-Square=0.938\(^a\)  Estimation Method: Quick Search  
Robust R-Square=0.938\(^b\)  
Robust R-Square=0.990\(^c\)  
Robust R-Square=0.840\(^d\)

\[ Y^a = 4.250 + 0.125X_1 + 0.208X_2 - 0.167X_3 - 0.083X_4 \]  
\[ Y^b = 2.959 - 0.292X_1 + 0.292X_2 + 0.167X_3 + 0.067X_4 \]  
\[ Y^c = 0.250 + 0.438X_1 + 0.104X_2 + 0.167X_3 + 0.229X_4 \]  
\[ Y^d = 2.792 - 0.125X_1 + 0.417X_2 - 0.083X_3 + 0.167X_4 \]

**Table 6: IMPACT OF SHARED VALUE & COMMUNITY ON BRAND IDENTITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Brand identity(Y)</th>
<th>Britannia(^a) (n=176)</th>
<th>Sunfeast(^b) (n=63)</th>
<th>Others(^c) (n=91)</th>
<th>Pooled Table (^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.785</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation (X(_1))</td>
<td>-0.889</td>
<td>7.7490</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>3.8376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment (X(_2))</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>7.7490</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Based (X(_3))</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>48.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust R-Square=0.915\(^a\)  Estimation Method: Quick Search  
Robust R-Square=0.859\(^b\)  
Robust R-Square=0.960\(^c\)  
Robust R-Square=0.840\(^d\)

Y_a = 1.785 - 0.889X_1 + 0.139X_2 + 0.694X_3 + 0.861X_4 ---------------- (1)
Y_b = 2.229 + 0.042X_1 + 0.042X_2 + 0.250X_3 + 0.208X_4 ---------------- (2)
Y_c = 2.958 + 0.333X_1 - 0.167X_2 + 0.292X_3 - 0.208X_4 --------- (3)
Y_d = 2.111 + 0.028X_1 + 0.028X_2 + 0.236X_3 + 0.278X_4 --------- (4)

Table -7: IMPACT OF BRAND NOBLE PURPOSE ON BRAND IDENTITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Britannia^a(n=176)</th>
<th>Sunfeast^b(n=63)</th>
<th>Others^c(n=91)</th>
<th>Pooled^d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Efficient</td>
<td>Contribution (%)</td>
<td>R ank</td>
<td>Co-Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation (x_1)</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>166.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneering Brand (x_2)</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-33.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Brand (x_3)</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-33.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust R-Square=0.937^a
Estimation Method: Quick Search
Robust R-Square=0.859^b
Robust R-Square=0.910^c
Robust R-Square=0.910^d

Y_a = 3.500 + 0.417X_1 - 0.083X_2 - 0.083X_3 ------------ (1)
Y_b = 2.938 + 0.375X_1 + 0.000X_2 + 0.000X_3 ----------- (2)
Y_c = 2.021 + 0.333X_1 + 0.125X_2 + 0.083X_3 --------- (3)
Y_d = 3.479 + 0.375X_1 + 0.021X_2 - 0.104X_3 -------- (4)

Table-8: IMPACT OF BRAND IMAGE ON BRAND IDENTITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Britannia^a(n=176)</th>
<th>Sunfeast^b(n=63)</th>
<th>Others^c(n=91)</th>
<th>Pooled^d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Efficient</td>
<td>Contribution (%)</td>
<td>R ank</td>
<td>Co-Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity (x_1)</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Taste (x_2)</td>
<td>-0.524</td>
<td>-195.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill (x_3)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>248.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust R-Square=0.609^a
Estimation Method: Quick Search
Robust R-Square=0.859^b
Robust R-Square=0.910^c
Robust R-Square=0.750^d
Y^a = 3.438 + 0.125X_1 - 0.524X_2 + 0.667X_3 \quad \cdots (1)
Y^b = 1.979 + 0.083X_1 - 0.292X_2 + 0.125X_3 \quad \cdots (2)
Y^c = 2.125 + 0.104X_1 + 0.042X_2 - 0.375X_3 \quad \cdots (3)
Y^d = 1.562 + 0.292X_1 + 0.042X_2 + 0.292X_3 \quad \cdots (4)

DISCUSSION

Tables-1, visualize the result of univariate test of normality. In order to test the univariate normality of 24 items of Brand Identity based on six Dimension shapiro-wilk test, Anderson darling test and Adjusted Anderson darling test where used. The result of the test revealed that the items of the Brand Identity where departed from the univariate normality at 1% level of significance. Hence this shows that the items were followed non-normal distribution and the application of parametric estimation and testing was impossible to conduct further statistical analysis. Table-2 describes the multivariate test of normality and test was conducted for the 24 items of brand Identity. In order to check multivariate normality Mardia’s Skewness, Mardia’s Kurtosis and Henze Zirkler test were using. The result of the test clearly exhibits that all the variables and all the items of variables at 1% level of significant. Hence the items of Brand Identity followed the multivariate Non-Normality distribution and the use of parametric techniques in multivariate analysis was impossible to perform further statistical analysis. Table-3 visualises the impact of Brand Personality on Brand Identity based on three Biscuits brands namely Britannia, Sunfeast, others.

The result of the least median square of regression analysis and from the following equations clearly explains the effect of Brand Personality as for as Britannia brand was concern Brand Name 50%, Brand Logo 41.6%, Brand color 16.6% and Brand Tagline contributes 8.4% respectively moreover the Brand Name, Brand color, Brand logo, Brand Information, Brand Tagline 98.4% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly the Sunfeast is concern Brand Logo contributes 42.7%, Brand Tagline consuming 39.9%,Brand Name consuming 8.6%,Brand color consuming 5.7% and Brand Information consuming 2.8% respectively moreover the Brand Name, Brand color, Brand logo, Brand Information, Brand Tagline 88.9% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly Other Brands is concern Brand logo contributes 63.4%,Brand color consuming 19.6%, Brand Information 18.2% and Brand Tagline consuming 7.1 respectively moreover the Brand Name, Brand color, Brand logo, Brand Information, Brand Tagline 99% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly pooled is concern Brand logo contributes 53.7%, Brand Name contributes 46%, Brand color contributes and Brand Tagline contributes 7.7% respectively.

Similarly Robust R-square 0.910 shows the dimension of Brand Personality define in the Brand Identity. Table-4 visualises the impact of Brand Capabilities on Brand Identity based on three Biscuits brands namely Britannia, Sunfeast, others. The result of the least median square of regression analysis and from the following equations clearly explains the effect of Brand Capabilities as for as Britannia brand was concern Nutrition 351.8%, Satisfaction and Refresh Energy 100%, respectively moreover the Satisfaction, Refresh Energy, Variety, Nutrition and Proactive 98.4% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly the Sunfeast is concern Refresh Energy contributes 84.5%, Variety consuming 23%, and Proactive consuming 7.7% respectively moreover the Satisfaction, Refresh Energy, Variety, Nutrition and Proactive 93.8% of variance in the Brand Identity.
Similarly Other Brands is concern Refresh Energy contributes 38.6%, Proactive consuming 33.2%, Variety 22%, Satisfaction 16.5% and Nutrition consuming 5.5% respectively moreover the Satisfaction, Refresh Energy, Variety, Nutrition and Proactive 99% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly pooled is concern Variety contributes 52.8%, Nutrition contributes 35.3%, Proactive and Refresh Energy contributes 5.9% respectively. Similarly Robust R-square 0.910 shows the dimension of Brand Capabilities define in the Brand Identity. Table-5 visualises the impact of Brand Value on Brand Identity based on three Biscuits brands namely Britannia, Sunfeast, others. The result of the least median square of regression analysis and from the following equations clearly explains the effect of Brand Value as for as Britannia brand was concern Trustworthiness 250.6%, and Reasonable Price 150.6%, respectively moreover the Reasonable Price, Trustworthiness, Brand Discrimination and Consistent Quality 93.8% of variance in the Brand Identity.

Similarly the Sunfeast is concern Trustworthiness contributes 87.4%, Brand Discrimination and Consistent Quality consuming 50% respectively moreover the Reasonable Price, Trustworthiness, Brand Discrimination and Consistent Quality 93.8% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly Other Brands is concern Reasonable Price contributes 46.6%, Consistent Quality consuming 24.4%, Brand Discrimination 17.8%, and Trustworthiness consuming 11% respectively moreover the Reasonable Price, Trustworthiness, Brand Discrimination and Consistent Quality 99% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly pooled is concern Trustworthiness contributes 110.9%, and Consistent Quality contributes 44.4% respectively. Similarly Robust Rsquare 0.840 shows the dimension of Brand Value define in the Brand Identity. Table-6 visualises the impact of Shared Value & Community on Brand Identity based on three Biscuits brands namely Britannia, Sunfeast, others. The result of the least median square of regression analysis and from the following equations clearly explains the effect of Shared Value & Community as for as Britannia brand was concern Unique Flavours 163.4%, and Customer Based 131.6%, respectively moreover the Recommendation, Entertainment, Customer Based and Unique Flavours 91.5% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly the Sunfeast is concern Customer Based contributes 46.1%, Unique Flavours consuming 38.4% Recommendation and Entertainment consuming 7.7% respectively moreover the Recommendation,

Entertainment, Customer Based and Unique Flavours 85.9% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly Other Brands is concern Recommendation contributes 133.2%, and Customer Based consuming 116.8% respectively moreover the Recommendation, Entertainment, Customer Based and Unique Flavours 96% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly pooled is concern Unique Flavours contributes 48.7%, Customer Based 41.4% Recommendation and Entertainment contributes 4.9% respectively. Similarly Robust R-square 0.840 shows the dimension of Shared Value & Community define in the Brand Identity. Table-7 visualises the impact of Brand Noble Purpose on Brand Identity based on three Biscuits brands namely Britannia, Sunfeast, others. The result of the least median square of regression analysis and from the following equations clearly explains the effect of Brand Noble Purpose as for as Britannia brand was concern Brand Reputation 166.1% respectively moreover the Brand Reputation, Pioneering Brand and Secured Brand 93.7% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly the Sunfeast is concern Brand Reputation contributes 100% respectively moreover the Brand Reputation, Pioneering Brand and Secured Brand 85.9% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly Other Brands is concern Brand Reputation contributes 61.5%, Pioneering Brand 23.1% and Secured Brand consuming 15.4% respectively moreover the Brand Reputation, Pioneering Brand and Secured Brand 91% of variance in the Brand Identity.
Similarly pooled is concern Brand Reputation contributes 150% respectively. Similarly Robust R-square 0.910 shows the dimension of Brand Noble Purpose define in the Brand Identity

Table-8visualises the impact of Brand Image on Brand Identity based on three Biscuits brands namely Britannia, Sunfeast, others. The result of the least median square of regression analysis and from the following equations clearly explains the effect of Brand Image as for as Britannia brand was concern Goodwill 248.9% and Popularity 46.6% respectively moreover the popularity, Consistent Taste and Goodwill 60.9% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly the Sunfeast is concern Consistent Taste contributes 58.4%, Goodwill consuming 25% and Popularity consuming 16.6% respectively moreover the popularity, Consistent Taste and Goodwill 85.9% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly Other Brands is concern Goodwill contributes 71.9%, Popularity consuming 19.9% and Consistent Taste consuming 8.2% respectively moreover the popularity, Consistent Taste and Goodwill 91% of variance in the Brand Identity. Similarly pooled is concern Popularity and Goodwill contributes 46.6% and Consistent Taste consuming 6.8% respectively. Similarly Robust R-square 0.750 shows the dimension of Brand Image define in the Brand Identity

CONCLUSION

This research study examined the brand identity of the familiar biscuits brands Britannia, Sunfeast, other Brands (Parle, Horlicks, and Cadbury). The brand identity of this biscuits brands were analysis on the basis of six different dimensions namely such as Brand Personality, Brand Capabilities, Brand Value, Shared Value & Community, Brand Noble Purpose and Brand Image. Based on the research conducted the overall brands concern customer identify brand logo is best identification mark, brand name, brand color and brand information all so concern. Moreover the brands produce some new verities of biscuits with high nutrition. Similarly customer thing the biscuits brand having consistent quality and it is trustworthy of compare to other brands. This brand is having unique flavours and exclusively made for customers in the same manner. The biscuits brands have high status and reputation in the mind of customer. Moreover the brand popular in over all country and all so get goodwill it is maintain taste is very well. The above point’s importance for identifying biscuits brands.
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