

Leveraging Brand Assets By Understanding Brand Architecture- Imperatives For FMCG Sector For Competitive Edge In India

** Prof. Bhavin Pandya*

*** Mitesh M. Jayswal*

INTRODUCTION

Proper use of branding can make or break the launch of a new product or service, and similarly constrain or accelerate the growth of a mature product. Branding plays a pivotal role in a firm's growth. Strong brands help in establishing the firm's identity in the market place and develop a solid customer franchise. (Aaker, 1996; Kapferer, 1997; Keller, 1998). A strong brand name can also provide the basis for brand extensions, which further strengthen the firm's position in the marketplace as well as potentially enhance the brand's value (Aaker and Keller, 1990). Brands generally fail because: they become stale as customer needs or preferences change over time; they become clouded by haphazard product extensions; or their marketing fails to resonate with the targeted customer group. Correctly defining your brand essence and supporting it with clear brand architecture is critical to long-lasting success. While brand architecture must evolve and product lines should expand (or contract) over time as the market changes, brand essence must remain constant as the core value for which the particular product or service is sought out.

Branded products and services play an undeniable role in driving profitable growth for any organization, regardless of its size. Brands communicate the reasons why a customer should purchase a specific item. They make claims and set expectations their products have to fulfill. Brands can be a powerful source of competitive advantage. Harley-Davidson, Apple Computers, Nike, and Coca-Cola have built superior success with brands that enjoy loyal – at times fiercely loyal – customers. Many brands, however, fail to achieve or maximize/maintain brand loyalty and recognition. Marketing of such a brand may have failed to resonate with customers. Keeping current with market trends and staying competitive in the face of new market entrants may have proven challenging for the brand. Attempts at brand extension may have been unsuccessful due to the haphazard nature of the brand's approach to expansion. The brand's identity may be ill-defined, with a myriad of marketing messages, product introductions, and customer experiences having joined together over time to create perceptions of the brand and its key competitors. While there are a number of possible reasons for a brand's limited success, a common root cause lies at the heart of these brand issues – the failure of management to construct a brand hierarchy that will foster brand equity with customers. Management fails to thoughtfully establish the brand's essence and to support the brand's essence with brand and product line architecture and brand marketing. In order for managers to construct a brand hierarchy successfully, they must understand the needs of and purchasing decisions employed by their customers and segment their customers accordingly. Conducting a systematic, disciplined examination of the effectiveness of perceptions of the brand and its product structures is fundamental to achieving this understanding and segmentation. Three interrelated tasks are at the center of this process: understanding customer needs; reviewing the brand hierarchy; and, examining the current and future product line architecture. The following is a detailed discussion of these tasks and the competitive advantage that can be achieved with an effective brand hierarchy.

Stanley Moss has defined in the Global Brand Trends that-How an organization structures and names brands within its portfolio. There are three main types of brand architecture systems: monolithic, where the corporate name is used on all products and services offered by the company; endorsed, where all sub-brands are linked to the corporate brand by means of either a verbal or visual endorsement; and freestanding, where the corporate brand operates mainly as a holding company, and each product or service is individually branded for its target market.

BRAND ARCHITECTURE CONSTITUENTS

David Aaker, in his book Brand Leadership accentuated the aspect with – “Brand Architecture is an organizing structure of the brand portfolio that specifies the brand roles and the relationships among brands and different product market brand context. Brand architecture is defined by five dimensions- the brand portfolio, portfolio roles, product market context roles, the portfolio structures and portfolio graphics”.

Apart from brand portfolio, Aaker added that decentralized groups those have little feel or care about total brand portfolio may damage it by adding brands too promiscuously. The portfolio decisions are crucial and require contemplation on the part of brand champions or product managers. Both addition in the portfolio or pruning may determine the destiny of the company. Aaker also described the concern for portfolio roles viz. Strategic Brands, Linchpin brands, Silver Bullets and

* Asst. Prof. & Head of the Department, S.V. Institute of Management, Kadi-382715, Gujarat E-mail: profbhavin@gmail.com

** Sr. Lecturer, S.V. Institute of Management, Kadi-382715, Gujarat E-mail: mmjayswal@yahoo.co.in

Cash Cow Brands. Further, the Product-Market Context Roles have undeniable vitality in Brand architecture of the organization. Product market Context roles broadly involves the decisions pertaining to the Endorser and sub-brands roles, benefit brands, Co-Brands and Driver role of Brands.

Brand Architecture is a powerful tool that can help companies better organize various brands within their business portfolios and focus on strategic goals for individual brands. Doing so has enabled more effective and consistent brand management and helped put an increased focus on strategies to meet specific growth, sales, and profit goals for individual brands. Brand Portfolio structure is also an important constituent for Brand Architecture which involves the concerns for Brand Groupings, Brand Hierarchy Trees and Brand Range. Logos and Visual presentations have unique contribution in Brand architecture and eventually brand building. Companies are cautious about their portfolio graphics and choosy about colour schemes. Coca-Cola, Kodak, UPS, Fuji, Unilever, Wipro and Pepsi are few among the corporate, believe colour scheme is vital component in their brand building exercise and they benefited because of their logo and portfolio graphics. Effective and wise use of the five constituents of Brand architecture may result in powerful brands, help the company in optimal allocation of brand building resources. The poise brand architecture components also facilitate the company in synergy creating by good visibility, proper association building and efficiency. In addition, a proper brand architecture deliberate clarity of offerings from the company side and give little room to bewildering situations from the customer perspective. Proper Brand Architecture facilitates the leveraging brand assets and also provides the platform to the company for its future growth.

BRAND ARCHITECTURE- CONCERN FOR CORPORATES

Unfortunately, many companies today have trouble keeping their brand portfolios in order. Most brand architecture efforts focus on either the past—rectifying problems caused by a lack of defined brand roles and inconsistent brand-building and acquisition strategies—or the present—organizing brands to best meet short-term objectives. Further, brand architecture is primarily treated as an internal exercise aimed at defining brand “territories,” where brands are viewed as separate and distinct and are managed independently rather than collectively. The customer perspective is rarely included in the process. Finally, most brand architecture decisions still tend to be highly subjective and driven more by emotional sentiment and baggage than by rational, data-based judgment. Truly effective brand architecture focuses on managing brands collectively and unearthing inherent synergies to increase the collective value of the brand portfolio. When approached in this manner, brand architecture goes from being a simple yet valuable organization tool to becoming a forward-looking strategic weapon. This requires a few key elements:

- Viewing brand architectures not as hierarchical and static, but as dynamic and evolving.
- Identifying and understanding the customer-based inter-relationships of various brands within the portfolio.
- Fundamentally shifting the role and objectives of brand management away from individual brands and toward the collective value of the portfolio.

BRAND ARCHITECTURE- DYNAMICS FOR DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATION

In determination of Brand Architecture, brand equity has Strident voice. In fact, lot depends on equity parameters and areas of operations of the particular company. Majority of multinational firms who own a variety of national, regional and international brands, at different levels in the organization, spanning a broad range of diverse country markets face tremendous complexities in managing their brand architecture. Typically, these brands differ in their strength, associations, target market and the range of products covered, both within and across markets. Equally, the use of brands at different organizational levels may vary from company to company. Some firms such as Sony, IBM or Phillips emphasize branding at the corporate level. Others such as Beiersdorf mostly have brands at the product business level, such as Nivea and Juvena, while yet others such as P&G, have primarily product level brands.

In determining whether to emphasize branding at the corporate level as opposed to the product level or whether to adopt a hybrid structure, the firm needs to consider the role of corporate image as well as the diversity of its product businesses. Corporate brands provide strong identity for the firm’s products in the market place, but do not enable differentiation of specific product businesses or product lines. Equally, negative publicity relating to a specific product or the firm’s policies will affect all products and product businesses. Product-level brands facilitate differentiation from competing products, but may be less cost efficient and result in loss of potential synergies. The number of brands at each level of the organization and the range of product lines across which a brand is used, must also be considered. Parsimony in the number of brands helps to achieve cost efficiencies but may weaken brand strength if used across highly diverse product lines. Multiplicity of brands facilitates responsiveness to specific customer or segment needs and clear product differentiation, but may be cost inefficient and hamper building of a strong position in the marketplace.

Some firms, such as P&G and Coca-Cola, have expanded through leveraging their domestic “power” brands in international markets. Consequently, as they seek to expand further, they have to consider whether to develop brands geared to specific regional or national preferences. Others such as Nestle and Unilever have traditionally adopted country-centered strategies,

building or acquiring a mix of national and international brands. Such companies have to decide how far to move towards greater harmonization of brands and integration of their brand architecture across countries, and if so, how to do so. Nestle and Unilever face the problem in EU, because of their country centric approach.

IMPACT OF GLOBALISATION ON FIRM'S BRAND ARCHITECTURE

The firms operating in different sectors find new benchmarks for the same journey due to Globalisation. A firm's brand architecture is continually evolving (Susan Douglas and C. Samuel Craig, April 2002). As it enters in new countries or markets, acquired brands are integrated into the architecture, new brand extensions or product lines are added, and positioning may be modified or radically changed. Proliferation of media, increasing promotional cost due to fragmentations of markets and the trend towards globalization cause brand architecture subject to pressures at both the corporate and product level to become more cost effective and better integrated across country markets. As a result, increasingly complex brand structures are beginning to emerge, characterized by corporate endorsement of product brands in order to consolidate branding structure and by extension of strong brands across countries and product businesses so as to achieve cost economies.

BRAND ARCHITECTURE- CONCERN FOR CUSTOMER

The most important concern for the corporate in brand architecture is role of the customer. For understanding the same, let's cut the long story in to short; one fine day customer X was choosing the product from the shelves for his/her monthly grocery; the customer visualized a new variant of reputed food brand but didn't pick up the brand. At the same time, she found a new Sauce brand launched by the regional company and she picked the brand. The crux of the story is we cannot understand this behaviour of the customer and that is why it is very important to understand the customer. The reality is that customers—who are the ultimate arbiters of a brand's success or failure—don't experience brands in the neat, organized way they are typically portrayed on an organizational chart. Instead, they experience brands inter-dependently and differently over time. Effective brand architecture doesn't just take the customer brand experience into account; they are based upon it. For knowing the same thing in this paper, the researcher tried to understand the brand architecture constituents with some of the FMCG products in the Indian context.

OBJECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH

The main objective of the research is to understand the phenomenon call- leveraging brand assets by understanding the brand architecture in FMCG sector in India. Plethora of variants from different marketers is available in the market so far as the FMCG sector is concerned. Some of the companies face problem due to promiscuous brand portfolio and some others are perplexed because of umbrella or master brand. The only way to rid from the situation is proper understanding of the one's own brand architecture vis-à-vis competitor and painstaking exercise in context of, brand portfolio. Again, tremendous transformation has been witnessed by Indian economy in the last decade and the consumers-choices become contemporary. In the same line researchers tried to understand the brand preference for five categories viz. Tooth paste, Bath soap, Detergent powder, Shampoo and Chocolate (Confectioneries).

METHODOLOGY

Here under exploratory design, extensive literature review is performed by the authors and in the light of this study, objectives have been developed. The authors feel that for appropriate justification to the title, it is necessary to conduct primary survey of youngsters, Housewives and males performing buying activities. Cross section data has been collected by interviewing both the groups from Ahmedabad city and surrounding areas. Due to time constrain, the universe is limited to Ahmedabad city and by non probability- convenience sampling method. Total 256 respondents have been surveyed. The questionnaire was printed in English and it is an interviewer administered questionnaire. It included open ended as well as close ended questions. For the sake of ensuring validity and reliability cronbach- α has been calculated for the scale.

RATIONAL FOR SELECTING THE CATEGORIES AND COMPANIES IN THE RESEARCH

In India, there is fierce competition between the players who operate in Tooth paste, Bath soap, Detergent powder, Shampoo and Chocolate (Confectioneries) categories and at the same thing is true for their global operations also. Effective implementation of brand architecture becomes possible when companies understand and devise their strategies in line with competitors. In Indian scenario, HUL, P&G, Nestle, Cadbury, Colgate-Palmolive, Godrej, Dabur, Wipro, Cavin Kare, Nirma, Paras Pharmaceuticals are major payers who constantly fight for increasing their pie in terms of market share. All these players have multiple product-line and brands in their Indian operation. The researchers tried to understand the brand preference for five categories of FMCG products and retrieved the responses from the respondents in a manner; which throw light on the brand architecture of the particular companies.

BRANDS USED BY CUSTOMERS FOR TOOTH PASTE AND RELEVANT FACTS

When asked about the brand of tooth paste they are using and recalling other brands and the name of the companies which manufacture them, the outcome was eye-opening. The question was asked to the respondents with deliberation of knowing the usage, awareness and recall of the brands available in tooth paste category.

Brands used by Respondents

Sr.No.	Tooth-paste Brand	Used by Respondents in %
1	Colgate	44.53
2	Pepsodent	22.65
3	Close-up	11.71
4	Anchor	6.25
5	Meswak	1.56
6	Cibaca	0.78
7	Glistar	1.56
8	Dabur	3.90
9	Don't use Tooth Paste	7.06

(Table 1.1)

Table 1.1 divulges the fact about tooth-paste used by respondents and 1.2 reveals facts about brand recall and correct company name recall by the respondents. Colgate is used by 44.53%, Pepsodent is used by 22.65%, Close-up is used by 11.71% of respondents, Anchor is used by 6.25% and Dabur is used by 3.90% of respondents. Glistar of Amway is used by 1.56% of respondents, Cibaca is used by 0.78% of respondents and 7.06% of respondents donot use tooth-paste and did not respond. Again table 1.2 indicates the respondents who recalled the brands in tooth-paste category and the Companies which manufacture them; and the situation is astonishing. One brand was recall by 7.06% of the respondents, two by 16.40%, three by 27.34%, four by 25% and five brands were recall by 24.21% of respondents. The average recall in tooth paste category is 3.430 brands which indicate the mind space available from the respondent's side for the tooth-paste category. At the outset, the situation is worst in recalling the name of the company; one company name is correctly recalled by 19.53%, two companies' names are correctly recalled by 14.06% of respondents, thee companies' names are correctly recalled by only 5.47% of respondents, five companies' name are correctly recalled by 0.78% of respondents and none of the respondents recalled four companies' correct name. Apart from average company recall in tooth paste category, 0.68 companies divulge the fact about lack of awareness of respondents in context of Manufacturing and Marketing Companies. Again if we consider the companies then Colgate's atleast one brand is recalled in 93.75% of cases, HUL's at least one brand is recalled in 82.81% instances while Dabur's at least one brand is recalled in 45.31% of instances. Now these facts are evident Colgate's good brand architecture followed by HUL and to certain extent Dabur which has been supported by its acquisition of Balsara Group. But still there is lot of room for improvement in HUL and Dabur's brand architecture for its tooth-paste category. Colgate has its variants with Colgate-Gel and its rejuvenation of Cibaca and Colgate has done co-branding with highlight of Colgate-Cibaca. In upper price, Colgate perfectly suits while with lower-price of COLAGATE-CIBACA, it has perfect architecture(200gm Colgate- Rs.52, Colgate-Cibaca Rs.27). Pepsodent have the variants like Pepsodent Whitening, Pepsodent Complete, Pepsodent Fresh and Pepsodent Germi-check. In case of HUL, it does not have any low-price variant in Tooth-paste category. The company may suffer due to this in future because bottom of Pyramid may have definite space in India. Again, it becomes evident that respondent know little about the companies and they heavily rely on individual brands.

BRANDS USED BY CUSTOMERS FOR BATH SOAP AND RELEVANT FACTS

Respondents were asked about the brand of Bath soap which they use and recall the other soap brands and the name of the companies which manufacture and market them, following responses have been obtained:

It is evident from the table that HUL brands have considerable proliferation in bath soap market, while Godrej, Wipro and Anchor require some scrupulous work in bath soap categories. Nirma occupy second place so far as individual brand usage of bath soap is concerned, and this is reflection of respondents' selection from North and Central Gujarat where company has good recognition and recall. All HUL bath soap brand usage accounts for 48.51%, which indicate the strong position of HUL in this category. At the same time, it is indicative that Lux has commendable 29% of share in brand usage while other 8 HUL brands carry 19.51% market share only. So here, HUL requires meticulous work on power branding and eventually brand architecture. We can find that there are lot of brands which accounts for less than 1% in terms of brand usage. There is tremendous clutter in bath soap categories so marketers need to undertake painstaking exercise for sustainable growth. The following table reveals the fact about brand and company recall for bath soap category in India.

The situation is apparent again, respondents can comfortably recall brands but company recall was again emerging as a problematic area. Bath soap category is flooded with lot of regional and National brands, so 37.50% of respondents can recall five brands, while 28.12% can recall four brands, 17.18% can recall three brands and 13.28% can recall two brands.

Brand Recall Company Recall (Correct Name)

No. of brands Recalled by respondents	% of Respondents	No. of companies Recall by Respondents	% of Respondents
1	7.06	1	19.53
2	16.40	2	14.06
3	27.34	3	5.47
4	25	4	0.00
5	24.21	5	0.78
No Brand Recall	0.00	No company recall	60.16

(Table 1.2)

Sr.No.	Bath soap Brand	Used by Respondents in %
1	Lux	29
2	Lifebuoy	7.81
3	Santoor	3.12
4	Rexona	0.78
5	Pears	3.90
6	Dove	3.90
7	Dyna	2.34
8	Fairglow	2.34
9	No.1	0.78
10	Breeze	0.78
11	Hamam	1.56
12	Liril	1.56
13	Dettol	7.81
14	Cinthol	2.34
15	Person	0.78
16	Nirma	13.28
17	Jo	0.78
18	Aloevera	0.78
19	Chandan	0.78
20	Savlon	0.78
21	Margo	1.56
22	Mysore Sandal	1.56
23	Not responded	11.71

(Table 1.3)

Again, in bath-soap, respondents have substantial choices and according to seasons they use bath soap and do not mind experimentation. Average brand recall for bath-soap category is 3.976 (approx 4 Brands) which clearly show respondents awareness and preference. Again, it is quite possible that the new entrant can occupy mind space of the customer. Again for company recall the fact is daunting, only 0.859(approx 1 company name) can recall bath-soap company. So, further it becomes apparent that stand alone strong brand can make mark in the market and may enjoy substantial sales.

BRANDS USED BY CUSTOMERS FOR DETERGENT POWDER AND RELEVANT FACTS

Respondents were asked about the brand of Detergent Powder which they use and recall. The other Detergent Powder brands and the name of the companies which manufacture and market them are as follows:

Research reveals the fact that 32.83% of respondents use Nirma in detergent powder category followed by wheel with 18.75% usage, Surf with 14.06%, Tide with 7.81%, Ariel with 3.90%, Rin with 3.90% and Ghadi with 1.56% brand usage. Nirma has its factories and roots in Gujarat and with umbrella branding, it has strong brand image so apparently it rules the category. P&G aggressively focused on the category when they have launched Tide in India and in 2005, the detergent powder was at culmination. HUL suffer because of aggressive marketing by P&G supported by its good Brand Architecture. But if we see consolidated figure of HUL brands then, 36.71% of respondents are using Wheel, Surf and Rin brands. P&G brands are used by 11.71% respondents in detergent powder category which comprise Tide and Ariel brands. P&G is rapidly emerging with Tide Brands and it has beaten HUL's brand in several places and categories. Nirmas brand share will also suffer because of fierce competition between HUL and P&G. Ghadi from Kanpur Detergent is also emerging rapidly and becoming the National Brand with considerable market share. Hipolin detergent almost lost its image among customers and its market share.

It is apparent from the table that respondents can recall 3,4 and 5 brand and their percentage proportion almost resembles with 23.44% can recall 3 and 5 brands, while 25% can recall 4 brands. The average brand recall in detergent powder category is 3.328 brands which is quite near to other personal care items. Company name recall is again the concern due to the fact that only 0.609 companies recalled by the respondents. So it is apparent that the respondents even could not recall one company. The respondents who recalled the company comprises of the ones who recalled Nirma due to its plants and

Brand Recall		Company Recall (Correct Name)	
No. of brands Recalled by respondents	% of Respondents	No. of companies Recalled by Respondents	% of Respondents
1	1.56	1	25
2	13.28	2	14.06
3	17.18	3	3.13
4	28.12	4	3.91
5	37.50	5	2.56
6	1.56	6	0.00
0	0.78	No company recall	52.34

(Table 1.4)

Sr.No.	Detergent Powder Brand	Used by Respondents in %
1	Wheel	18.75
2	Surf(Variants)	14.06
3	Rin	3.90
4	Nirma	32.83
5	Tide	7.81
6	Ariel	3.90
7	Ghadi Detergent	1.56
8	S&A	0.78
9	Not Responded	16.41

(Table 1.5)

Brand Recall		Company Recall (Correct Name)	
No. of brands Recalled by respondents	% of Respondents	No. of companies Recalled by Respondented	% of Respondents
1	4.67	1	35.16
2	20.32	2	7.82
3	23.44	3	2.34
4	25.00	4	0.78
5	23.44	5	0.00
0	3.13	No company recall	53.90

(Table 1.6)

parent state Gujarat. In case of P&G, they have to promote their brands as product brand while HUL due to its name and logo change faces problem in corporate identity issues. One company is recalled by 35.16% of respondents, two by only 7.82%, three companies recalled by 2.34% and four by 0.78%, while 53.90 could not recall a single company. In detergent powder, promoting product brand makes sense for the marketer and if the company uses its power brand for the category, it can get extra edge in the market.

BRANDS USED BY CUSTOMERS FOR SHAMPOO (HAIR CARE CATEGORY) AND RELEVANT FACTS

Respondents were asked about the brand of Shampoo which they use and recall the other Shampoo brands and the name of the companies which manufacture and market them, the following responses have been obtained:

Sr.No.	Shampoo Brands	Used by Respondents in %
1	Clinic-Plus	15.62
2	Clinic All clear	4.69
3	Sunsilk	9.38
4	Chik	3.91
5	Rejoice	0.00
6	Head & Shoulders	7.03
7	Pantene	1.56
8	Clinic 2 in 1	0.78
9	Dove	0.78
10	Garnier	1.56
11	Nyle	0.78
12	Asharam's Ashram's brand	0.78
13	Not Mentioned	53.13

(Table 1.7)

Its really astonishing that half of the respondents did not respond to the question or were reluctant to say anything about the usage of their shampoo brands. The HUL brands rule the shampoo category; say for the sake Clinic Plus is used by 15.62% of respondents followed by Sunsilk used by 9.38%, Clinic all Clear is used by 4.69%. From the total responses obtained (46.87%), HUL brands of shampoo command 31.25% of market share. P&G brands have 8.59% of market share. Head & Shoulder became very popular and acceptable, while Pantene and Rejoice are gaining the ground. Cavin Kare's Brands have 4.69% of brand usage, among which Chik is heading the ground. L'oreal's Garnier brand is becoming popular in the upper segment. The following table divulges the facts about brand and company recall in shampoo category by the respondents.

Shampoo Brand Recall		Company Recall (Correct Name)	
No. of brands Recalled by respondents	% of Respondents	No. of companies Recalled by Respondents	% of Respondents
1	11.72	1	10.94
2	17.97	2	7.03
3	20.31	3	3.91
4	27.34	4	0.78
5	17.97	5	0.78
No Brand Recall	4.69	No company recall	76.56

(Table 1.8)

The situation is apparent in shampoo category. Respondents recalled the brands with average 3.125 brands recall in which one brand is recalled by 11.72% of respondents, two by 17.97%, three by 20.31%, four by 27.34 and five brands were

recalled by 17.97% of respondents. While in the same category, company recall is pathetic, on an average, respondents recalled 0.438 companies. So again, it is indicative in shampoo category that strong positioning of product brands may win the battle, exactly what is happening in the case of P&G with its three brands H&S, Pantene and Rejoice. HUL may suffer erosion in its market share due to its Hybrid Brand Architecture strategy.

BRANDS USED BY CUSTOMERS FOR CONFECTIONERY (CHOCOLATES AND MINTS) AND RELEVANT FACTS

Respondents were asked about the brand of confectionery (Chocolates and mints) which they use and recall the other confectionery brands and the name of the companies which manufacture and market them, the following responses have been obtained:

Sr.No.	Confectionery Brands(Chocolates and mints)	Used by Respondents in %
1	Dairy Milk	34.38
2	5 Star	2.34
3	Munch	3.13
4	Alpenlibe	1.56
5	Kit-kat	2.34
6	Éclairs	3.91
7	Kismi	0.78
8	Melody	3.13
9	Perk	4.69
10	Amul	0.78
11	Parle	2.34
12	Coffee-Bite	0.78
13	Cloro-mint	0.78
14	Coca	0.78
15	Not Responded	38.28

(Table 1.9)

It is apparent from the table that Cadbury brands have commanding market share due to its meaningful and innovative advertising and brand building exercises. Dairy milk is used and preferred by 34.38% of respondents while, 5 star is preferred by 2.34% of respondents and Eclairs by 3.91% respondents. But the astonishing fact is that 5 star is lagging behind the Cadbury Brand, because Cadbury Dairy Milk followed the co-branding strategy in India and made the brand for every occasion. Nestle's brand Munch and Kit-Kat also possess good command but not as substantial as Cadbury's brand. Perk of Cadbury, possesses 4.69% of brand usage share, which is second highest after Dairy Milk brand. In total, Cadbury's brand possess the market share of 45.32% , which is commendable. Parle's brands also have significant presence with Melody having 3.13% of share, Kismi with 0.78 and Parle with 2.34% of brand usage share. Perfetti- Van Melle's brands have noticeable presence with Alpenlibe and Chloromint brand. The fact about Brand and company recall in confectionery category is divulged by the following table:

Confectionery(Chocolate and mint) Brand Recall		Company Recall (Correct Name)	
No. of brands Recalled by respondents	% of Respondents	No. of companies Recalled by Respondents	% of Respondents
1	4.69	1	21.09
2	14.85	2	11.72
3	33.59	3	7.82
4	18.75	4	2.13
5	25	5	0.78
No Brand Recall	3.12	No company recall	56.26

(Table: 1.10)

Respondents recalled 3 to 4 brands in confectioneries (Chocolate and mint) while the recall value for the Companies which manufacture and market them became a cause of concern again. On an average, 3.352 brands are recalled by the respondents while they could recall only 0.813 companies, which is even less than one. So in this category also, product brands need support of the corporate identity like Cadbury Dairy Milk.

BRANDS USED BY CUSTOMERS FOR THE FAIRNESS CREAM AND RELEVANT FACTS

When respondents were asked about fairness cream, their answers baffled the researchers. The mind-set of Indian and specially Gujarati respondents was such that it became a cause of concern again. They divulge little about fairness creams.

Research reveals the fact that 44.53% of respondents use the fairness cream. Out of the respondents who mention the brands they are using, Fair & Lovely occupies first place with 64.28% brand mention in terms of usage, followed by Nivea, Ponds, Faiveer, Vicco etc. Respondents, even find it difficult to recall the brand and company name in case of fairness-cream. Average brand recall in fairness cream category is 1.949 and company recall is 0.444 brands.

OVERVIEW OF BRAND AND CORPORATE IDENTITY OF SOME FOOD BRANDS IN INDIA

The researchers tried to unveil the facts about some of the popular food brands operating at national level and they encompass Nestle's Maggi which is also recognized as mother brand for the company, HUL's Quality Walls ice-cream (Quality is popular endorser for HUL), Kurkure and Lays from Fritolay division of Pepsico India Holdings Pvt. Ltd. and Sun-feast Pasta from ITC. The responses again divulge the fact that the product brands rule the market and respondents know little about the companies which own the brands. Out of the respondents who replied, 88.70% are aware about Maggi brand while 11.30% are unaware about the brand, surprisingly only 6.36% are aware about Nestle, the parent company of Maggi brand. Again the fact is that Nestle's brand tree consists of 10 world wide brands, such as Nestle, Carnation and Buitoni, 45 worldwide strategic product brands such as Kitkat, Polo and After Eight (these are always endorsed by a corporate level brand); 25 regional corporate brands; 100 regional product brands, such as Contadina and Stouffer; 700 local strategic brands, and approximately 7,000 local brands (Parsons 1996). The awareness of Quality walls ice-cream is 51.81% which is low compared to other regional ice-cream brands in Gujarat. The astonishing fact is that only 2.72% respondents are aware about the fact that Quality Walls ice-cream is the brand of HUL. Kurkure, the packaged snack brand is known by 87.80% of the respondents which is considerable but only 0.80% respondents know the fact that it is the brand of Pepsico India Holdings Pvt. Ltd. Again Lays, the package snack brand enjoy 68.64% of awareness. That Pepsico India Holdings Pvt. Ltd is the parent brand of Lays is known by 1.69% of respondents. It is apparent from the research that Kurkure enjoys good brand status and loose parent brand association while Lays enjoys moderate brand awareness but relatively good parent company association. In fact, Pepsico with its Fritolay division achieved remarkable success in packaged snacks business. ITC's Sunfeast Pasta is known to 56% of respondents, in spite of Pasta being relatively little known food product and limited to premium segment in India at this juncture. Sun-feast is a strong brand of ITC and apart from biscuits, ITC stretched it to some other food categories like Pasta. ITC is successful compared to other FMCG brands in context of parent company relation, 6% of respondents know Sun-feast pasta is brand of ITC which is considerable. Succinctly, product brands carry strong awareness in India and parent company is overlooked or ignored by the people in many of the instances. But only those companies are successful in India which have good brand status across the world and are smartly managing their product brands. It is very difficult for the FMCG players to manage the portfolio at National level because of diversity in income, culture and reference groups.

BRAND PERSONALITY SCALE: MEASUREMENT ON TOOTH PASTE CATEGORY

Researchers measured the Brand Personality scale with 40 parameters on different FMCG companies like HUL, Colgate, Wipro, Reckitt-Benckiser, Cadbury, Anchor and Nestle's leading brands. For qualifying the parameters as perfect association to the brand, parameters need to score more than 33% of responses in favour of that parameter. In tooth paste category, the companies like Colgate, HUL and Anchor's brands have been taken with their strong brands like Colgate, Pepsodent and Anchor. Colgate has its association with the brand personality character, like Original, Honest, Genuine, Friendly, Unique, Reliable, Secure, Efficient, Trustworthy, Careful, Leader, Confident, Smooth and Gentle. The best three associations as per the score are, original (67.50%), honest (65%) and Genuine (52.5%). When it comes to Pepsodent, then again honest, original, secure and trustworthy are the parameters which people associated with it. Anchor did not qualify in the single parameter of the test and respondents did not associate any brand personality characteristics to the brand Anchor. It's very apparent from the research that Colgate occupies substantial space in the mind-set of people of India and stands for originality over the years. Anchor needs to position itself with specific identity except low cost brand in tooth paste category. (Cronbach α for Colgate's parameter Honest, Original Genuine and Reliable = 0.71, Cronbach α for Pepsodent tooth-paste for parameters: Honest, Original, Reliable, Secure and Trustworthy = 0.78, Cronbach α for Anchors's parameter Honest, Original and Reliable = 0.74).

BRAND PERSONALITY SCALE: MEASUREMENT ON BATH SOAP CATEGORY

In bath-soap category, we measured the scale with Lux (HUL), Dettol (Reckitt-Benckiser) and Santoor (Wipro) brands which are actively involved in the brand building exercise and known for their good advertisement campaign. Again, these three brands possess different characteristics so far as their categories are concerned, one is positioned as beauty soap (Lux), other is possessing medicinal properties (Dettol) and third one is nearer to Ayurvedic properties (Santoor). Lux has association with Honest, Original, Genuine, Cheerful, Friendly and Reliable brand characteristics. Top three associations are original (45%), Reliable (42.50%) and Honest (41.67%) for Lux beauty soap. Dettol is associated with Honest, Original, Genuine, Reliable, Secure, Trustworthy and Careful brand characteristics. Here, the top three associations for Dettol are Honest (57.5%), Original (55%), Secure (43.33%) and Genuine (43.33%). Its astonishing that Dettol as a brand carries more

reliability and trustworthiness than Lux brand soap, but though people prefer Lux brand as their bath soap. Santoor needs scrupulous working for associating personality characteristics and eventually strong brand preference. (Cronbach α for Lux parameter Honest, Original, Genuine, Sentimental and Warm = 0.85, Cronbach α for Dettol soap parameters: Honest, Original, Genuine, Reliable, Secure, Careful and Trustworthy = 0.82, Cronbach α for Santoor's parameter Honest and Original = 0.72)

BRAND PERSONALITY SCALE: MEASUREMENT ON CONFECTIONERY (CHOCOLATE) CATEGORY

In Chocolate category, leading brand of Cadbury, Dairy Milk and Nestle's KitKat were taken for brand personality measurement. Dairy Milk is associated with the brand personality characteristics like Honest, Original, Genuine, Ageless, Cheerful, Friendly, Happy, Young, Fun and Smooth. Its apparent from these personality association that Dairy Milk is very popular, young and associated with fun. Top three association for Dairy Milk are Happy(56%), Original(54%) and Honest(47.5%). Nestle's Kit-Kat brand does not qualify for even single brand personality characteristic. That is why Nestle's is lagging behind in chocolate category than Cadbury. Cadbury has very strong brand value in India and its corporate endorsement has given edge to all its brands. Its leading brands are Dairy Milk, Eclairs, Perk and 5 star. (Cronbach α for Dairy Milk parameter Honest, Original, Genuine, Ageless, Cheerful, Friendly, Daring, Cool, Young, Fun and Reliable = 0.81, Cronbach α for Kit Kat chocolate parameters: Honest, Original, Genuine, Secure, Cheerful, Friendly and Happy = 0.78).

PICTURE (LOGO) IDENTIFICATION BY THE RESPONDENTS

The research unveiled the facts about the logos of Hindustan Unilever Ltd, Nestle, Cadbury, Procter & Gamble and Wipro by and large. The new name and logo of HUL had been approved in 74th AGM on May 18, 2007. In fact, this transformation is systematic movement of Unilever towards enforcing the corporate identity of the company in India to its various products. The new logo is symbolic of the company's mission 'Adding Vitality to Life'. All the 25 different icons representing the organization, its brands and the idea of vitality are represented in the logo. Basically, the new logo has borrowed the 'U' symbol (loaded with 25 different vitality icons) from the Unilever basket and gelled it with the 'Hindustan Unilever Ltd' brand identity. Each of those apparently represented the company's new mission: adding vitality to life. 25 different icons which stands for- 'Our brands, our peoples, our values'. These icons are Bowl, Spice and Flavors, Fish, Sparkle, Bird, Recycling, Lips, Ice-cream, Tea, Particles, Frozen, Wave, Liquid, Container, Clothes, Heart, Sun, DNA, Bee, Hand, Flower, Hair, Palm tree, Sauces or spreads and spoon. The logo is blue and 'U' shape but this transformation is tough and Indian consumer found it difficult to digest. The logo seems to be the creation of intellectual minds, and difficult to digest by layman. Research divulges the fact that 29.68% respondents recognized the picture as the logo of HUL. HUL needs to show the transformation of logo through television commercial, print medium and hoardings. In fact, in television commercials, they should play some jingle when they expose the logo behind every product advertisements, so they can attract the attention of viewers. In fact in India, HUL needs some concrete actions in terms of establishing the corporate identity. And the change in name and logo added difficulties to HUL, because the green HLL logo was popular from last several decades. Tough time for HUL can be visualized in context of corporate identity and brand portfolio management. Some of the respondents identified the logo as "Swaminarayan Sampraday" logo.

Cadbury's logo was identified by 32.81% of respondents, which is again a daunting fact for such popular and strong brand. Some of the respondents perceive the picture as the logo of Amul because it shows two milk glasses.

Nestle's logo was identified by 61.67% of the respondents, which is highest among the all five company logos. The simplicity of the picture and years of operation in India and across world's operation make this true for company. Nestle's hybrid branding strategy and simple communication "Good food. Good life" given the company's remarkable success in majority of their product lines.

Procter & Gamble's earlier logo was recognized as satanic logo and lot of controversy happened in the U.S.A. for that. Today, P&G is the logo for Procter & Gamble. Research reveals the fact that 32% respondents correctly identified the picture as logo of Procter & Gamble. Some of the respondents perceived the logo as logo of Parle-G.

Wipro's logo has been correctly identified by only 21% of respondents. In fact, the company designed the logo and punch line "Applying Thoughts" with some specific deliberation. Logo contains rainbow flower which stands for Youthful & Energetic, Multifaceted, Innovative, Large-diversified and Vibrant. The punch line "Applying Thoughts" stands for Powerful, Intellectual, Futuristic-visionary, Maturity and Commitment to Innovation. Because of Wipro's diversification and limited range in FMCG products, it carries lower visibility. The Company requires some meticulous work for brand management and corporate identity creation.

In the entire exercise, Nestle emerged as a clear winner in Brand portfolio management and identity creation, followed by Cadbury, P&G, HUL and Wipro.

OUTLOOK

Succinctly, HUL is in transformation phase of identity to enforce the corporate identity as its hybrid branding strategy across the world. But in the entire exercise of promoting 30 National and 10 regional brands, they give substantial room to regional brands and other National brands. At the same time, the power brands of HUL, Lux and Fair & Lovely could not

achieve stretching successfully. Now they again co-branded Surf-Rin but its success is again the big question. Bath soap, Fairness cream, cosmetics, detergent Cake are the categories where HUL rules but at the same time, in Shampoo category, P&G gives it a tough fight. At present, the research indicates that in shampoo category also, HUL brands are ruling. In tooth paste category, Colgate rules with the strong brand image and preference, while Pepsodent and Close-up of HUL follow Colgate. Pepsodent has baffled the customers by so many variants. In detergent powder category, Nirma rules the market as per the research, followed by Wheel and Surf (the strong National brands of HUL in category), Tide of P&G which got commendable success in short period of time. In fairness cream category, Fair & Lovely, the power brand of HUL rules the market. Other HUL brands have also considerable share in the category. HUL should stretch Fair & Lovely by up-scaling, and again it should reduce the variants of Fair& Lovely. In confectionery category, Cadbury rules the market for chocolate as it follows Corporate endorse branding. Cadbury Dairymilk is the undisputable leader in chocolate category, while other brands - Eclairs, Perk, and 5 star have also considerable market share. Nestle is still struggling with its strong brand Kit-Kat and Munch in chocolate category. Parle's Melody and Kismi have stagnant position in the category. It is vital to note where there is no recall in more than 60% of cases.

SUGGESTED LEVERAGE FOR SOME EMINENT COMPANIES IN INDIA

	<i>Existing strategy</i>	<i>Suggested for India</i>
HUL		
Nestle	Hybrid Branding	Need to move towards endorse branding in some of the categories. Can use power branding in some products.
P&G	Product Branding	Successful in India (e.g. Shampoo Brands). Needs to promote bath-soap and detergent category and toothpaste to much extent.
Cadbury	Endorse Branding	Successful in India. Can extend the successful brands to some other product categories.
Nirma	Umbrella Branding	Having Brand Trap in India. Needs to transform identity to launch other FMCG products.

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH: BRAND RELATIONSHIP MAPPING

Brand relationship mapping goes far beyond the traditional approach of simply inventorying, classifying, and grouping the existing brands within a given portfolio. Instead, it defines the relevance and credibility of brands, from the customer perspective, across various need states and product/service sets; perceived limitations and extendibility of brands; areas of inter-relationship and overlap between the brands; and gaps within the portfolio. All these issues are vital to explore some meaningful information in context of Brand Architecture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

AAker David A., Building Strong Brands, The Free Press
 AAker David A and Joachimsthaler Erich., Brand Leadership, Published by The Free Press, p.p-134-136
 Chernatony Leslie de, From Brand Vision to Brand Evaluation, Published by Butterworth Heinemann

Journals:

Aaker, David and Erich Joachimsthaler. 1999. The Lure of Global Branding. *Harvard Business Review*, 77 (November/December): 137-144.
 Aaker, David and Kevin Keller. 1990. Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1): 27-33.
 Bartlett, Christopher A. and Sumantra Ghoshal. 1989. *Managing Across Borders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
 Barwise, Patrick and Thomas Robertson. 1992. Brand Portfolios. *European Management Journal*, 10(3): 277-285.
 Court, David C., Anthony Freeling, Mark C. Lerter and Andrew J. Parsons. 1997. If Nike Can 'Just Do It' Why Can't We? *McKinsey Quarterly*, 3: 25-34.
 DeMooij, Marieke. 1997. *Global Marketing and Advertising, Understanding Cultural Paradoxes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
 Douglas, Susan P. and C. Samuel Craig. 1996. Global Portfolio Planning and Market Interconnectedness. *Journal of International Marketing*, 4(1): 93-110.
 Douglas, Susan P., C. Samuel Craig and Edwin J. Nijssen. 2001. Executive Insights: Integrating Branding Strategy Across Markets: Building International Brand Architecture. *Journal of International Marketing*, 9(2): 97-114.
 Echikson, William and Dean Foust. 2000. For Coke, Local Is It. *BusinessWeek*, (July 3): 122.
 Kapferer, Jean-Noel. 1997. *Strategic Brand Management*. 2nd edition. London: Kogan Page.
 Keller, Kevin. 1998. *Strategic Brand Management*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
 Khermouch, Gerry, Stanley Holmes and Moon Ihlwan. 2001. The Best Global Brands. *BusinessWeek*, (August 6): 50-57.
 Laforêt, Sylvie and John Saunders. 1994. Managing Brand Portfolios: How the Leaders Do It. *Journal of Advertising Research*, (September/October): 64-76.
 Melewar, T.C. and John Saunders. 1999. International Corporate Visual Identity: Standardization and Localization. *Journal of International Business Studies*.
 Olins, W. 1989. *Corporate Identity*. London: Thames and Hudson.
 Parsons, Andrew. 1996. Nestlé: The Visions of Local Managers. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 2: 5-29.
 Quelch, John. 1999. Global Brands: Taking Stock. *Business Strategy Review*, 10(1): 1-14.
 Roth, Marvin S. 1995. Effects of Global Market Conditions on Brand Image Customization and Brand Performance. *Journal of Advertising*, 24(4): 55-72.
 Roth, Marvin S. 1995. The Effects of Culture and Socioeconomics on the Performance of Global Brand Image Strategies. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32 (May): 163-175
 Schmitt, Bernd H. and Alex Simonson. 1997. *Marketing Aesthetics: The Strategic Management of Brands, Identity and Image*. New York: The Free Press.