Branded Chicken – An Emerging Sector in India

*Dr. S. Franklin John , Principal ,
Nehru College of Management, Coimbatore
**R. Swapna Kumari, Assistant Professor,
Karunya University, Coimbatore
swapnakumari@karunya.edu

Abstract :

In the fast moving world, time spend on the intake of the nutritious food is very less. As there are various nutritious food available in the market chicken plays a vital role among those nutritious food. Now-a-days there are many private agencies functioning in many places to cater the needs of the public. Due to advance in technology, Branded chicken is available in all places .Branded chicken is preferred for its hygiene, quality, availability and so on. This Branded chicken is available to the consumers at any time whenever it is needed. The consumers prefer for good quality product that lead to the increased demand for branded chicken. This paper describes about the branded chicken which is an emerging sector in India.

Key Words: Branded Chicken, Hygiene, Quality, demand

Introduction:

The most essential basic needs of a common man are food, clothing and shelter. Among these needs, the need for food holds the primary position, where as clothing and shelter holds the secondary position. In the recent years the customers prefer branded food items due to hygiene factor, quality etc .

The Indian feed industry:

The Indian feed industry is about 35 years old. It is mainly restricted to dairy and poultry feed manufacturing; the beef and pork industry is almost non-existent. The quality standards of Indian feeds are high and up to international levels. Raw materials for feed are adequately available in India. The industry's production is about 3.0 million tones, which represents only 5 percent of the total potential, and feed exports are not very high. The feed industry has modern computerized plants and the latest equipment for analytical procedures and least-cost ration formulation, and it employs the latest manufacturing technology. In India, most research work on animal feeds is practical and focuses on the use of by-products, the upgrading of ingredients and the enhancing of productivity.

Poultry Industry:

Compared with the rest of the livestock sector, the poultry industry in India is more scientific, better organized and continuously progressing towards modernization. Breeding and feeding management has improved through education, training, competition, expansion and survival instincts. India is the world's fifth largest egg producer, with a total production of 40 billion eggs per year. The broiler industry is growing at the rate of 10 percent.

The poultry industry has witnessed several ups and downs in the last 25 years as a result of unplanned growth and a lack of government regulation. Currently, it is growing at the rate of 10 percent in broilers and 6 to 7 percent in layers and is going through a phase of integration in broilers which is likely to change the face of the industry. The poultry industry is very modern, with pure-line breeding, the latest vaccines and medicines, environmentally controlled poultry houses, up-to-date processing units, the latest management practices, chicken processing, exports of hatching eggs and excellent feed quality.

Objective of the study :

The present study is" Branded chicken – An emerging sector in India "mainly deals with the following objectives,

1. To develop and validate an instrument to measure the Influence of Branded chicken in Indian Poultry Industry.
2. To study the influence of gender of the respondents, on dimensions of Branded chicken.

Methodology:

The present study is both qualitative and analytical. This research is based on the material collected by both primary and secondary data.

Collection of primary data:

The primary data is collected from individual respondents where the respondents are the consumers of chicken.

Sample size:

Since the population of chicken consumers is quite large, convenient random sampling method is applied while collecting the primary data. Utmost care is taken to avoid indifferent consumers. Maximum care is taken to minimize the sampling error. The total numbers of respondents taken in to consideration are 336.

Tools of analysis:

The following are the tools used for analyzing the primary data,

1. Reliability
2. KMO - Kaiser –Meyer –Olkin(KMO) and Bartlett's Test
3. One way ANOVA

Scope of the study:

The study has been undertaken to analyze the factors influencing the customers to purchase the branded chickens. The primary data is collected to the consumers consuming chicken in the country wide. This study focus on the level of awareness of different branded chicken and the factors influencing to purchase the branded chicken.

Period of study :

The study has been undertaken during the period from May 2010 to December 2010. The primary data has been collected during the said period.

Limitations of the study:

1. Due to time limitation and to keep the model at a manageable size
2. The present study concentrates only on the influence of Branding
3. We have taken only into consideration   for brand building for branded chicken

Review of Literature:

Orla B. Kennedy, Barbara J. Stewart-Knox , Peter C. Mitchell and David I. Thurnham (2005) in   **Flesh color dominates consumer preference for chicken says that** Existing research investigating interactions between visual and oral sensory cues has tended to use model food systems. In contrast, this study compared product quality assessments of corn-fed and wheat-fed chicken products among persons recruited in Northern Ireland. Three approaches have been adopted to investigate the effect of color upon consumer choice of chicken: sensory assessment under normal lighting; focus group discussion; and sensory assessment under controlled lighting conditions. Initial consumer sensory assessment indicated that wheat-fed chicken was perceived to be tendered and to have a more intense flavor than that which was corn-fed. Qualitative enquiry discerned that this was because consumers perceived the yellow color of corn-fed chicken negatively. Yellow-colored corn-fed chicken was therefore again compared with wheat-fed chicken in terms of flavor, texture and overall liking with the flesh color disguised by means of controlled lighting. Quality ratings for corn-fed chicken were more positive when the yellow flesh color was disguised, with corn-fed chicken judged to be tendered than wheat-fed chicken and more flavorsome. This study illustrates the importance of using a combination of methods to gain insight into interactions between different sensory modalities in consumer quality judgments and adds to previous research on the importance of color up on consumer choice of real foods.

Barnack, Renee. National Petroleum News, Dec97, Vol. 89 Issue 13, in branded chicken in C-Stores says   the feasibility of brand-name chicken in   convenience stores   are increasing . Ease to market the products as meal-replacements. Chicken restaurants reporting increased business at convenience stores. This article also tells about the factors influencing to purchase the branded chicken rather than the branded chicken . There's the granddaddy of **chicken** chains--KFC--with over 10,000 restaurants worldwide. KFC contends that the company invented the home meal replacement concept by selling complete family meals with side dishes nearly 40 years ago.

 Grohmann, Bianca. Journal of Marketing Research (JMR), Feb2009, Vol. 46 Issue 1, p105-119, 15p in Gender dimension of brand personality says that although masculinity and femininity are personality traits relevant to brands, their measurement and contribution to branding theory and practice have not been examined. This article describes the development and validation of a two-dimensional scale measuring masculine and feminine brand personality that is discriminate with regard to existing brand personality dimensions and scales measuring masculinity and femininity as human personality traits. This scale is applied to show that (1) spokespeople in advertising shape masculine and feminine brand personality perceptions; (2) brand personality–self-concept congruence in terms of masculine and

feminine brand personality and consumers' sex role identity positively influences affective, attitudinal, and behavioral brand-related consumer responses; and (3) masculine and feminine brand personality lends itself to the creation of brand fit in a brand extension context, which in turn leads to more positive brand extension evaluations and increased purchase intentions with regard to the extension.

Analysis and Interpretation :

Reliability:

Cronbach's alpha is a coefficient (a number between 0 to 1)   that is used to rate the items in a test. If the Cronbach's alpha   is >.7   then it is highly reliable . The data collected from was subjected to reliability test using Cronbach Alpha .Traditionally the Cronbach alpha co- efficient has been to evaluate reliability. The reliability analysis of the branded chicken was computed by using alpha technique. The analysis was done for the five dimensions of the branded chicken to establish the level of reliability in the overall study. In the same way the reliability analysis was carried out to the factors determining the influence the Branded chicken.

Interpretation:

In this study the reliability analysis shows that all the factors have shown alpha value greater than 0.7 indicating the evidence of reliability of the instrument is 0.969.   The factors and dimensions included for analysis carry a good degree of reliability to support the objectives formulated. Hence it is concluded that the data collected in this study is highly reliable.   (Table 1)

Kaiser –Meyer –Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy:

The KMO measures the sampling adequacy which should be greater than 0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis to proceed. Kaiser –Meyer –Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is indexes for comparing the magnitudes to the partial correlation coefficients .Large values of KMO measure indicate that a factor analysis variable is a good idea. (Table: 2)

The sample is worth enough to measure variables. The value of the Kaiser –Meyer –Olkin (KMO) should be greater than 0.7 .Hence the above test shows the unique and homogenous .The extraction of all the 29 variables are >.6. It clearly shows that each variable contributes 60% of the variance. The cumulative variance is 77.66%, which means 77.66% of the measured variables are contributing towards the study. But still there is an error that 22.34% of the sample variance is not measured.

Gender of the Respondent:

In India, the gender plays a vital role in any decision of an individual . It could be observed from the table   that the number of male respondent is 184 and female is 152 .The male respondents are more when compared to the female respondents .The total number of respondents were 336. (Table: 3)

Analysis to find the significant difference in various dimensions of Branding by the Gender of Respondents:

The below statistics table provides statistics including the mean, standard deviation and standard error for the dependent variables when two groups -male and female , and the
combined –Total

In order to find out the presence of significance among the influence of Branding by the Gender of the respondents and the variable of the dimensions the total mean scores for each dimension of brand rating were obtained by combining the actual scores obtained for each respondents for each statement   in that attribute and averaging it. From the above table it is clearly interpreted that salience, performance, Quality, Superiority have significant effects with the gender of the respondents.(Table :4)

Significant difference in Salience of Branding by the Gender of Respondents:

It is clearly interpreted that salience- I can easily identify the logo of branded chicken, When I think of chicken, branded chicken comes into my mind , I can easily recognize branded chicken among other brand have significant effects with the gender of the respondents (Table : 4.1)

significant difference in the performance   of Branding by the Gender of Respondents:

It is clearly interpreted that Performance- Branded chicken are more tasty , Branded chicken have good weight have significant effects with the gender of the respondents(Table :4.2)

significant difference in the Imagery of Branding by the Gender of Respondents:

In this analysis it is clearly interpreted that Imagery- I can buy branded chicken anywhere, I can buy branded chicken anytime, I admire and respect people who use branded chicken, I feel better to be attached with branded have no significant effects with the gender of the respondents. (Table :4.3)

Significant difference in the Quality of Branding by the Gender of Respondents

In this analysis it is clearly interpreted that Quality- My branded chicken offer good value, Branded chicken satisfies our product needs, My branded chicken smells better than unbranded have significant effects with the gender of the respondents.(Table : 4.4)

Significant difference in the Superiority of Branding by the Gender of Respondents

The analysis table it is clearly interpreted that Superiority - My branded chicken is unique, my branded chicken has a differentiated image have significant effects with the gender of the respondents. (Table: 4.5)

Significant difference in the Loyalty of Branding by the Gender of Respondents

From the above analysis table it is clearly interpreted that Loyalty- I am satisfied and will continue to use branded chicken have significant effects with the gender of the respondents. Whereas, I would not switch to any other brand of chicken, I would recommend branded chicken to others have no significant effects with the gender of the respondents. (Table: 4.6)

Significant difference in the Attachment of Branding by the Gender of Respondents

From the above analysis table it is clearly interpreted that Attachment: I really like branded chicken have significant effects with the gender of the respondents. whereas, My family members like to eat branded chicken , My branded chicken is a well known brand one have no significant effects with the gender of the respondents (Table : 4.7)

Future directions of the study:

Further research can be carried out by taking in to consideration to known the different branded chicken in different states and the contribution , reasons for selecting particular brand by consumers and also be taken into consideration the other stakeholders namely retailers , managers.

Conclusion:

Branding has become increasingly significant in the present era of Poultry industry and this study proves that Branding has influenced significantly on Indian Poultry industry . From the study we can prove that the branded chicken is dominating Indian Poultry industry .The   customers expectation have increased and prefer hygiene food . Their expectation can be satisfied when they concentrate on the branded chicken items if they need to sustain in the Indian Poultry industry.

References:

1. Dr. S.L.Gupta (2005), Brand Management (An Indian Perceptive),Himalaya Publishing House .
2. Kevin Lane Keller (2008), Strategic Brand Management Building, Measuring and Managing, Brand Equity Prentice –Hall of India, private limited.
3. Retail Industry In India (2010), A Report on Indian Retail Industry ,Corporate Catalyst.
4. Sathyanarayanan (2010), Building and sustaining a brand lesson from TITAN, Advertising Express, IUP.
5. Steps in Building a Brand Name Product or Service , Management Study.
6. A review on the Indian feed industry.
7. Suguna Poultry   Industry , Company profile
8. Fourier Susan (1998),"Consumers and Their Brands : Developing relationship theory in consumer research ", Journal of Consumer Research ,24 march ,343-373.
9. D.J. Troy and J.P. Kerry (2010) **,"** Consumer perception and the role of science in the meat and broiler industry", Food Packaging Research Group, School of Food & Nutritional Science, University College Cork, Ireland , Available online 11 May 2010.
10. Sanderson-Walker . M (2003)," Time-temperature monitoring and quality inspection for quick-frozen food manufacturers — design factors" , Birds Eye Foods Ltd, United Kingdom,   Available online 14 February 2003.
11. Eva Martínez, Teresa Montaner and José M. Pina (2008)," Brand extension feedback: The role of advertising", Available online 13 February 2008.

Tables :

Table 1
Reliability co-efficient (α value)

S.No	Dimensions	Reliability co- efficient (α value)
1.	Salience	0.902
2.	Performance	0.926
3.	Imagery	0.843
4.	Quality	0.917
5.	Superiority	0.827
6.	Loyalty	0.773
7.	Attachment	0.863
8.	Engagement	0.907
Over all Reliability		0.969

Table : 2

Kaiser –Meyer –Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.869
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	12020.459
	Df	406
	Sig.	.000

Table :3
Gender of the respondent

Gender	No of Respondents	Percent
Male	184	54.8%
Female	152	45.2%
Total	336	100.0%

Table :4 **significant difference in various dimensions of Branding by the Gender of Respondents:**

Dimensions	N	Mean		Standard Deviation		F-Value	Sig
		Male	**Female**	**Male**	**Female**		
Salience	336	3.45	2.88	1.00	1.02	26.250	.000
Performance	336	3.28	2.99	1.13	0.84	6.899	.009
Imagery	336	3.05	3.06	0.88	0.99	.017	.896
Quality	336	3.34	2.98	1.06	0.89	11.047	.001
Superiority	336	3.33	2.98	0.94	1.03	10.551	.001
Loyalty	336	3.05	2.98	0.91	0.84	.606	.437
Attachment	336	3.13	2.91	1.15	0.91	3.551	.060
Engagement	336	2.86	2.73	1.18	1.16	1.058	.304

.

Table :4.1

Significant difference in Salience of Branding by the Gender of Respondents.

Dimensions	Mean (Standard Deviation)		F-Value	Sig
	Male	Female		
Salience: I can easily identify the logo of branded chicken	3.60 (1.102)	2.99 (1.131)	24.913	.001
Salience: When I think of chicken, branded chicken comes into my mind	3.53 (1.101)	2.89 (1.024)	29.249	.001
Salience: I can easily recognize branded chicken among other brand	3.39 (1.075)	2.63 (1.183)	37.397	.000
Salience: Branded chicken name is unique	3.30 (1.419)	3.03 (1.151)	3.634	.057

Table :4.2

significant difference in the performance   of Branding by the Gender of Respondents.

Dimensions	Mean (Standard Deviation)		F-Value	Sig
	Male	Female		
Performance: Branded chicken are more tasty	3.57 (1.094)	3.02 (.966)	22.969	.000
Performance: Branded chicken have good weight	3.37 (1.352)	3.06 (.855)	6.739	.010
Performance: Branded chicken have more flesh	3.23 (1.312)	3.07 (.896)	1.796	.181
Performance: Prices are so reasonable	2.98 (1.361)	2.84 (1.013)	1.236	.267

Table :4.3

significant difference in the Imagery of Branding by the Gender of Respondents.

Dimensions	Mean (Standard Deviation)		F-Value	Sig
	Male	Female		
Imagery: I can buy branded chicken anywhere	3.05 (1.100)	3.13 (1.166)	.389	.534
Imagery: I can buy branded chicken anytime	3.08 (1.121)	3.10 (1.041)	.021	.885
Imagery: I admire and respect people who use branded chicken	3.10 (1.160)	3.07 (1.102)	.066	.797
Imagery: I feel better to be attached with branded	2.99 (1.201)	2.98 (1.159)	.005	.945

www.iiste.org

Table: 4.4

Significant difference in the Quality of Branding by the Gender of Respondents

Dimensions	Mean (Standard Deviation)		F-Value	Sig
	Male	Female		
Quality: My branded chicken offer good value	**3.57 (.878)**	**3.14 (1.006)**	**16.717**	**.000**
Quality: Branded chicken satisfy our product needs	**3.57 (1.099)**	**2.79 (1.200)**	**38.155**	**.000**
Quality: Satisfactions to usage experience is good	**3.13 (1.265)**	**3.11 (.855)**	**.044**	**.835**
Quality: My branded chicken shows quality	**3.22 (1.354)**	**3.05 (.948)**	**1.603**	**.206**
Quality: My branded chicken smells better than unbranded	**3.26 (1.362)**	**2.84 (1.229)**	**8.588**	**.004**

Table : 4.5

Significant difference in the Superiority of Branding by the Gender of Respondents

Dimensions	Mean (Standard Deviation)		F-Value	Sig
	Male	Female		
Superiority: My branded chicken is unique	**3.52 (.829)**	**3.05 (1.150)**	**18.796**	**.000**
Superiority: My branded chicken has a differentiated image	**3.35 (1.130)**	**2.89 (1.169)**	**12.970**	**.000**
Superiority: I consider my branded chicken is superior than other	**3.13 (1.332)**	**3.00 (1.218)**	**.862**	**.354**

Table: 4.6

Significant difference in the Loyalty of Branding by the Gender of Respondents

Dimensions	Mean (Standard Deviation)		F-Value	Sig
	Male	Female		
Loyalty: I am satisfied and will continue to use branded chicken	3.43 (.827)	3.21 (.953)	5.327	.022
Loyalty: I would not switch to any other brand of chicken	2.83 (1.170)	3.00 (.861)	2.320	.129
Loyalty: I would recommend branded chicken to others	2.91 (1.352)	2.74 (1.072)	1.699	.193

Table : 4.7

Significant difference in the Attachment of Branding by the Gender of Respondents

Dimensions	Mean (Standard Deviation)		F-Value	Sig
	Male	Female		
Attachment: I really like branded chicken	**3.17 (1.132)**	**2.79 (1.243)**	**8.785**	**.003**
Attachment: My family members like to eat branded chicken	**3.09 (1.352)**	**3.00 (.977)**	**.439**	**.508**
Attachment: My branded chicken is a well known brand one	**3.13 (1.332)**	**2.95 (1.002)**	**1.956**	**.163**

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** http://www.iiste.org/Journals/

The IISTE editorial team promises to the review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar