IMPACT OF BRAND MANAGEMENT ON ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY IN A MUL TI-PRODUCT COMPANY

(CASE STUDY OF 7UP BOTTLING COMPANY ILORIN)

By

ABDULLAHI AMINAT

HND/23/BAM/FT/0815

SUBMITTED TO

THE DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

INSTITUTE OF FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES

KWARA STATE POLYTECHNIC, ILORIN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF H IGHER NATIONAL DIPLOMA (HND) IN

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

July, 2025

CERTIFICATION

This is to Certify that this project has been read and approved as meeting the requirement for the award of Higher National Diploma (HND) in the Department of Business Administration, Institute of Finance and Management Studies, Kwara State Polytechnic, Ilorin

________________	________________
MR. ABDUSSALAM A. F.	**DATE**
Project Supervisor	
______________	__________________
MR. UMAR B. A.	**DATE**
Project Coordinator	
________________	________________
MR. ALAKOSO I. K.	**DATE**
Head of Department	

________________ __________________

EXTERNAL EXAMINER **DATE**

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to Almighty God who has made it possible for me to complete my Higher National Diploma (HND) programmed. I also dedicate it my parent.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My acknowledgment first of all to ALMIGHTY ALLAH who made me what I am today because without him there would be nobody like me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

ABSTRACT

Brand management is an important aspect of marketing activities that det ermines how the branded products of a firm would be well placed in the mind of the customers in a competitive market. The objective of this study is to determi ne the impact of brand management on organizational efficiency in a multiprod uct company in Nigeria with a case study of 7up bottling company Ilorin. The st udy utilizes primary data sourced from respondents with 50 sample size that wa s conveniently selected. Copies of Questionnaire were administered and the res ults were analyzed using regression. Coefficient of determination of 0.944, with p-value of 0.000 reveals that product logo maintains 94.4% relationship with productivity. More so, correlation coefficient value of 0.919 which depicts that packaging maintains 91.9% relationship with customer service. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient value of 0.526 which depicts that customer service 52.6% relationship with organization efficiency in a multiproduct company. The study concludes that brand management factors have influence on organizational efficiency and as well places it in the mind of the consumers. The paper recommended that brand managers in the Multiproduct Oriented Company should ensure to see that brand management factors (such as Product logo, Packaging and customer service/usage) are scrutinized and fuelled to ensure that they turn out to a good image

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1Background to the Problem

In recent years, identity has become the footstone of one of the major research fields. This term is the root concept for such concepts as brand identity and or ganizational identity. The former, brand identity, represents specific values and its features, association with corporate brand, and indicator of an organization's offered products to the market (Buil, 2015).

Organizational identity is a strategic tool for accomplishment of goals and outlooks and an effective strategic tool and an important sustainable resource and competitive advantage with numerous advantages for the organization. Identity helps organizations find competent employees, attract new customers, and enhance loyalty of the existing. It can be applied as a critical factor and a factor of competitive efficiency, which can be important for fund raising from outside sources (Buil, 2015). In this process, employees have a major role in enhancing the organizational identity, and their job satisfaction and organizational commitment can be an important factor in improving the organization's image and identity. Organizational identity is related to many aspects of employee behavior and attitude, as well as contextual and work-related variables, and plays a pivotal role in regulating behavioral norms of organization's members. The concept organizational identity is partly formed by the employee attitudes which after 1980s have been moved to the front line of the organizational studies and enhanced managers' understanding of empl oyee and organizational behaviors (Anabila & Awunyo-Vitor, 2014).

Many a research conducted earlier on organizational identity indicated it as one of the productivity determinants. Expanding on the earlier studies by Anabila and Awunyo-Vitor (2014), De-Coninck, 2011, Ghabisheh (2010) and Buil (2015) gave evidence on the effect of brand management on commitment, satisfaction, and efficiency, this paper, proposing interrelation among brand identity with employee behavior and attitude, examines partial relationships between brand identity management, employee commitment, employee job satisfaction, and brand efficiency, as well as the mediating effect of brand identity management iEn the relationships of brand efficiency, employee commitment and job satisfaction.

To address these gaps, the present study therefore seeks to examine the relationship that exists between the brand management and organizational efficiency in a multiproduct company. As a matter of fact, a well-managed brand becomes an important instrument of differentiation and of competitive advantage (Hamel & Prahalad, 2014). Furthermore, the differentiation achieved through branding constitutes a barrier to entry, by making it difficult for competitors to emulate the company's offerings (De-Coninck, 2011). The main objective of this study is to examine the management of branding in a multiproduct company, and also to examine the relationship that exists between effective brand management and organizational efficiency.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Companies all over the world whether service or manufacturing firms, recognize the essential role branding plays in the course of business. In the present day marketing practice, branding has become an active weapon marketers use to strengthen their competitive advantage and thus improve the accomplishment of their prearranged objectives.

Over the past few years, a steady growth has been recorded in multi-product companies in Nigeria, whereby major companies are either into the production of their own commodities or supplementing their production with imports from international partners. This has resulted in increased competition and, in some cases, unfair competition because of the invasion of counterfeit commodities on the market. This often creates a bad image for genuine multi-product companies who have high level of rating for their company's brand. According to Anabila and Awunyo-Vi tor (2014), the multi-product companies has not been convincing in utilizing the force of their brands in respect to their partners in the consumer goods markets. This is fundamentally on the grounds that products have dependably contended with each other based on functional attributes.

It is against this background that branding is increasingly necessary due to the influx of fake commodities in the system, and that branding goes down to the very core of survival for companies and serve as a competitive advantage in the marketplace. In order to differentiate multi-product companies from each other it is expedient to create a corporate image or brand that would make the difference. Well established strategies in customer service are necessary in order to satisfy and create a competitive advantage. In recent times customers demand more than ever even to the extent that operators in the retail industry have to execute tasks in a timely manner and provide friendly service to customers (Tlapana, 2015).

In order to keep having an upper hand in the business, multi-product companies have had to distinguish winning marketing techniques that give upper hand on a management practice. This study therefore seeks to establish the relationship that exists between branding and organizational efficiency and also the impact bran ding has on organizational efficiency if customer service is introduced in order to create and maintain competitive advantage. There is therefore the need to investig ate the impact of brand management on organizational efficiency of 7up Bottling Company Ilorin.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to investigate the impact of brand man agement on organizational efficiency in a multi-product company. The specific obj ectives are to:

1. Assess the effect of product logo on productivity of 7up Bottling Company Ilorin.
2. Investigate the influence of packaging on customer service of 7up Bottling Company Ilorin.
3. Determine the mediating effect of customer service on branding and organi zational efficiency relationship.

1.4 Research Questions

In conducting this study, this research questions were formulated as;

RQ_1: What is the effect of product logo on productivity of 7up Bottling Company Il orin?

RQ_2: What is the influence of packaging on customer service of 7up Bottling Com pany Ilorin?

RQ_3: What impact does branding have on organizational efficiency with customer service playing a mediating role?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

In this research, the following research hypotheses were formulated as:

HO_1: There is no significant effect of product logo on the productivity of 7up Bottli ng Company Ilorin.

HO_2: Packaging has no significant influence on customer service of 7up Bottling C ompany Ilorin.

HO_3: There is no mediating effect of customer service on branding and organizational efficiency relationship.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study will be of importance to academicians as the study will provide a good basis for future research on branding strategies by multi-product companies and retailing companies at large. It will also add to the existing body of knowledge in the marketing field. The study will be of importance to companies as it would provide them with information to evaluate whether the branding strategies being adopted has an impact on organizational efficiency.

This study will also determine whether customer service plays a mediating role between branding and organizational efficiency for the multi-product companies. It will give an idea on improving their customer service strategies in order to improve its organizational goals.

1.7 Scope of the Study

This research focuses on the impact of brand management on organizational efficiency in a multi-product company. The survey study research will be adopted for this study. The population will comprise of members of staff in Accounting, Sales and Marketing Departments of 7up Bottling Company Ilorin because of their relevance to the study. It would consist of an estimate of fifty (50) staff members. The staff members will be selected using random sampling technique. Both primary and secondary data will be utilized where the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) will be utilized in analyzing the data collected. Pearson correlation will be used in analyzing the relationships between the variables whiles multiple linear regressions will be used in measuring the impact of branding on organizational efficiency, customer service on organizational efficiency, customer service and branding and customer service on organizational efficiency.

1.8 Definition of the Terms

The following concepts are defined as they are used in this study

1. **Brand:** Brand is defined as a name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of them, that intends to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of the competitors.
2. **Brand Management:** Brand management is the process of creating, coordinating and monitoring interactions that occur between an organization and its stakeholders such that there is consistency between an organization's vision and stakeholders' beliefs about a brand.
3. **Company:** this refers to a legal entity made up of an association of people carrying on a commercial or industrial duties e.g. 7up Bottling Company Ilorin.
4. **Efficiency:** this refers to very different inputs and outputs in different fields and industries.
5. **Organizational Efficiency:** this is the organization's ability to implement its plan using the smallest possible expenditure of resources.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter consists of review of relevant literatures that capture the variable on brand management and organization efficiency. It entails the conceptual review, empirical review and theoretical review. The conceptual review provides clarifications and discussions of concepts related to the subject matter such as productivity, customer service, profitability, product logo, and packaging price of a product and branding. The theoretical review provides insights on relevant theories that are related to the subject matter while the empirical review provided detailed information on previous researches on the subject matter.

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Productivity

Firms enjoy several benefits from branding which in turn helps to increase sales, profitability and return on investment. Some of these benefits are: Market control, Pricing interdependence, Promotional advantage, Expansion of product mix and New product introduction.

Branding can significantly help an organization in increasing its own share of the market for its product. A manufacturer who advertises his branded product is enhancing the industry in general but is not helping the product to increases its own share of the market. Also branding helps the brand owners to stimulate repeat sales and avoid product substitution and when sales are repeated, there is increase in profit and return investment. Consumers will often buy well established brands even when their prices are higher than those of less publicized competitors. And when there is awareness and trust about the particular brand of product, promotional campaigns can become effective and less expensive. If a firm has one or more lines of branded goods, it can add a new item to it product mix much more easily than a company selling unbranded merchandise. A new product is more favorable received by both the dealers and by consumers if it is linked to a respected brand name.

2.1.2 Customer Service

Customer service is defined as the retailer's efforts to improve what customers' experience when shopping. This is done by ensuring that the set of activities or programs offered is more rewarding in order that the value associated with any product or services purchased by customers tend will increase (Harris, 2010). In modern times, the idea that customer service is solely the ability of the retailer to meet customer specifications is not accurate. In order to define customer service adequately, basic element which include meeting customer's requirement effectively by supplying and delivering expert, necessary, superior services and helping on time, during the moment the customers' needs is served must be incorporated. Customer service is a game plan of activities proposed to enhance the level of purchaser loyalty, that is, the obtainment of service some time as of late, in the midst of and after so that the product or organization meet client wish, (Rhee & Bell, 2002). Customer service can be considered as acknowledging what customers need and seeing that they get it. Beyond the fact that some specific exercises that are done in the range of customer service is marketing in nature; yet genuine customer service is every one's obligation and not just the marketing office (Fry, Charles & Hattwich, 2008).

2.1.4 Profitability

Profitability performance can be measure using ROA. The higher the ROA ratio, the better the organization profits (Rasiah, 2016). According to Landajo, Andre s, Lorca & Rasiah (2018) company performance is usually measured by profitability, may itself be proxies by using the return on asset ratio. Profitability is the ability of a business to earn a profit. It is the primary goal of all business ventures.

According to Haward and Upton (2016) profitability is the ability of a given instruments to earn a return from its use. Profitability is the ability to make profit from all business activities of an organization. Without profitability the business will not survive in the long run. Profitability can also be measured with income & expenses.

2.1.5 Product logo

Brands have the ability to help express or define individuals' actual or desired selves (Chaplin & Roedder John, 2005; Escalas & Bettman, 2005) and to differentiate customers' selves from those of others (Kleine, Kleine, & Allen, 2005). For instance, a brand may re- flect various parts of customers' identities, such as core beliefs/values (e.g., Rolex for uncompromising precision and attention to detail) or lifestyles (e.g., Quicksilver for a young-minded, individual, casual style) they adhere t o (Escalas & Bettman, 2005).

Brands also become relevant to customers by connecting the individual to others who share similar values and beliefs (Schau, Muñiz & Arnould, 2009). Since logos visually represent what the brand is and what it stands for, they have the potential to serve as a focal point of connection for customers by communicating and reinforcing a brand's core values. In other words, a brand's logo can be a critical tool for conveying associations between the brand and the self, which in turn helps people see the brand as part of themselves (Walsh, Winterich, & Mittal, 2010). Moreover, since logos provide brands with a face and may thus enhance a brand's authenticity and intimate appeal to customers, logos have the potential to not only express such brand-self associations, but also to reinforce and strengthen them, thus enhancing customers' willingness to exert effort and invest resources towards sustaining their relationship with the brand (Park, MacInnis, Priester, Eisingerich & Iacobucci, 2010; Thomson, MacInnis & Park, 2005).

The importance of establishing a symbolic association with a brand can be particularly critical in an environment in which customers resent or even attack corporations that are perceived as faceless or distant from customers' selves, but de velop a considerably stronger affinity towards brands that foster self-relevant relations with their customers (Escalas & Bettman, 2005).

2.1.6 Packaging

Packaging is a very important marketing strategy to glamorize product in order to attract the consumer's attention. Sometimes packaging is so important that it cost more than the product itself in order to lure the consumers to buy it. Packaging should definitely be included in the 4 major P's of marketing (product, place, promotion and price) (Soroka, 2002). Diana, (2005) believed that most consumers judge a product by its packaging before buying. So, it is logical to say attractive packaging is crucial in order to get the first-time buyers to buy your products. Without attractive packaging, who would buy it in order to try it? Your first step to enter the market is crushed if the packaging is ugly (Soroka, 2002). The basic function of packaging is to "preserve product integrity" by protecting the actual food product against potential damage from "climatic, bacteriological and transit hazards". However, the first to define packs as the "silent salesman" was Pilditch in 1957, who argued that the pack must come alive at the point of purchase, in order to represent the salesman (Vazquez, 2003).

Olayinka and Aminu (2006) see packaging as all activities of designing and producing the container or wrapper for a product. Kottler (2003) defines packagin g as all materials products used for the containment, protection, hard delivery and presentation of goods. Packaging is the protecting products for distribution, stora ge, sale and use, packaging also refers to the process of design evaluation and pr oduction of packages. Packaging can be described as a coordinated system of pr eparing goods for transport, warehousing information and sell. It is fully integrate d into government business, institutional, industry, and personal use (Diana, 2005).

Packaged goods are regularly seen in retail stores and may actually be seen by many more potential customers than the company's advertising. An effective p ackage sometimes gives a firm more promotional impact than it could possibly af ford with conventional advertising efforts. Promotionally-oriented packaging also may reduce total distribution costs. An attractive package may speed turnover so that total costs will decline as a percentage of sales. Rapid turnover is one of the i mportant ingredients in the success of self-service retailing. Without packages, se lf-service retailing would not be possible (Chaneta, 2012).Chaneta, (2012) agrees t hat costs may rise because of packaging and yet everyone may be satisfied becau se the packaging improves the total product, perhaps by offering much greater convenience or reducing waste.

2.1.7 Price of a Product

Pricing decision is a crucial decision every organization has to make, because this will eventually affect their corporate objectives, either directly or indirectly (Monroe 2003). For every business entity, irrespective of their line of business and objective, cost minimization and profit maximization is a general factor to be considered and for non-profit making organizations, there will always be the need to reduce cost at all means and to maximize output. A business whether small or big, simple or complex, private or public, is created to provide competitive prices (Ayozie 2008). According to Hilton (2005), setting the price for an organization's product or service is one of the most crucial decisions a manager faces, and one of the most difficult, due to the number of factors that must be considered. Some of the factors that influence pricing decision are demand, competitors, cost, political, environmental, legal and image-related issues.

Every multinational business entity is set up with the primary objective of m aking profits and several considerations underlying their profit motive come to bear in determining the pricing of their goods between associated parties. A business whether small or big, simple or complex, private or public is created to provide competitive prices. Most Nigerian small business owners lack the knowledge and skills of basic marketing ingredients, such as marketing research, market segmentation and market planning and control, which thereafter leads to poor quality products, unawareness of competition, poor distribution, and poor pricing methods. The poor pricing methods thereafter lead to poor product pricing, which will eventually affect sales (demand) and finally the profit of the business. In a developing country like Nigeria, with low income and high level of poverty, a company that wants to succeed should offer its product at the price the consumers can bear. But often, small manufacturers set prices of their products arbitrarily without regard to consumer characteristics in the environment (Ayozie 2008)

2.1.8 Branding

Brand is defined as a name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of them, that intends to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of the competitors Angus (2004). But Wo od (2000) criticized this definition for being too product-oriented, with emphasis on visual features as differentiating mechanisms. Waqas (2012) saw brand as a name, term, design, symbol or any other feature that identifies one seller's good or service as distinct from those of other sellers. Similarly, in the opinion of Gardner and Levy (2005), a brand name is more than the label employed to differentiate among the manufacturers of a product. It is a complex symbol that represents a variety of ideas and attributes. More recently, maintained that a brand is not the name of a product. It is the vision that drives the creation of products and services under that name. That vision, a key variable of the strategy and it is called brand identity in branding.

Brand identity is a unique set of brand links which communicates commitment or promise to customers and includes a core identity. The core identity is the central and timeless feeling of a brand that remains unchanged when the brand moves to new markets and products (Ghodeswar, 2008). For definition of the term "organizational identity," three fundamental aspects are necessarily considered. First, organizational identity is a set of outward forms and manifestations of an organization. That is to say, in addition to visual forms that a company makes for itself, vi sual identity is also expressed through verbal, behavioral, and structural means used by the company both in inter-organizational interactions and public relation with community.

Second, organizational identity should sufficiently comprise all the above forms of expressions, but this inclusion is not necessarily absolute. Polarity, in fact, is not necessarily always against an attractive and distinguished organizational identity.

Third, a successful or competitive organizational identity, in whatever form of expression it is, should return to one single core and renew the bonds with its roots. Put it differently, organizational identity should revolve round a coherent nucleus of values. Once its nucleus of values has been formed, three major steps for creation and support of a successful organizational identity could be as follows:

i. Visual identity of all the texts and visual materials and interactions should consist of a creative and strategic nucleus of values.
ii. Placing organizational identity deeper in the customer consciousness through a professional and sustained management.
iii. Regular evaluation and estimation for making sure of the plan consistency a

nd identification of weaknesses (Albert, Ashforth & Dutton, 2000).

Since marketing is an intricate phenomenon, impacted by society, business environment, customer conduct, an institutionalized worldwide way to deal with m arketing may not generally be relevant for a brand's local attractiveness. The respo nsibility of global marketing and maximizing items' business and helpful quality to build marketing and effectiveness are still restricted to multi-product organization s (Delagneau, 2004).

In many businesses, branding is an instrument that passes on item advanta ges to clients as names or images to which interesting and persuading affiliations are appended. Aside from the many sided quality of the items, the part of brandin g in Coca Cola is imperative and complex because of the official assignment in the item's profile, the naming, the avoidance of direct promoting of drink to customer s, and short item life cycles (Lim, Melewar & Sorensen, 2010).

2.1.9 Importance of Branding

From customer's point of view, a branded product makes choice easier. In th e absence of branding, customers would have to go through the tedious task of ha ving to assess different categories of products in times of shopping. They could n ot have been fully convinced of the desired products they are purchasing. A branded product ensures that there is accuracy when searching and selecting product and also helps in its evaluation. When companies have strong brand, they have the privilege of charging higher prices even when facing stiff competition. Noting the increasing understanding of branding as a means of creating competitive advantage by providing intangible and tangible benefits, more organizations are expected to embrace the benefits that branding brings, (Anabila & Awunyo-Vitor, 2014).

When a product is branded, it identifies the company that produced the products and thereby reducing the risk associated with after purchase dissatisfaction. Branding is very important as it aids in targeting new markets when brand extension strategies are used. When brands are extended several markets are reached. It also helps in the introduction of new product lines. Consumers are known to willingly adopt new products of popular brands. Branding also promotes the status and name of the company.

De Chernatony (2001) stated that brand management can help bridge the gap between a brand's image/identity and its reputation. Brand management is the process of creating, coordinating and monitoring interactions that occur between an organization and its stakeholders (Schultz &Barnes 2009), such that there is consistency between an organization's vision and stakeholders' beliefs about a brand. It is important that organizations initially focus their efforts on creating an appropriate brand image that has a niche in the market place.

Balmer and Greyser (2003) sees corporate image as publics' latest beliefs about a company or the total impression an entity makes with such publics. Corporate reputation, on the other hand, refers to value judgments about an organization's qualities, trustworthiness and reliability built up over time (Balmer & Greyser, 2003). This suggests that corporate reputation is more durable than image and cannot be developed or changed as quickly (Markwick and Fill 2014). Likewise, it requires nurturing over time (Weiwei 2007).

As the brand (and organization) grows, managerial emphasis should shift toward making a brand memorable, ensuring that positive brand associations can readily be recalled by consumers and reinforcing the link between a brand(image) and other products within a company's portfolio (Farquhar 2014; Park, Jaworski & MacInnis2013). This must be adequately communicated to the consumers to enable them to make a right choice and brand (Aremu & Saka, 2006).Regardless of whe ther an organization is comprised of a singular or multiple brands, it is necessary that marketing efforts be directed toward establishing and maintaining a positive brand image in the minds of key stakeholders. Ultimately, this can contribute to the development of a favorable corporate reputation (de Chernatony2001).

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that is guiding the study on impact of brand management on organizational efficiency in a multi-product company is based on Resource-based, View competence-based competition and Dynamic capabilities view.

2.2.1 Resource-based View

The first researcher to propose a resource-based view was Edith Penrose (1959), even though her analysis of the resources was aimed at understanding the output of the firm rather than the definition of its behaviour. Only recently has interest in this approach arisen, mostly in a critical key and as an alternative to the industrial organization model, so within the ambit of strategic studies. The seminal study on the theme was that of Wernerfelt (1984), though in some ways it still remain s linked to the Porterian model. In fact, for Wernerfelt, “resources and products are two sides of the same coin”, where the resources are understood as “the assets, tangible or not, which are semi-permanently linked to the firm”. In practice, industrial organization would take care of maximizing profits, consigning the resources; resource-based view would, instead, concentrate on minimizing the cost of resources, given a certain level of profit. Wernerfelt then applied Porter’s five competitive forces model to the resources, in particular he points out the existence of “resource position barriers”, with a role similar to that of the entry barriers in an industry. Successive works decisively move away from the Porterian theory and make determinant contributions to the definition of resource-based view. Grant (1991) first of all distinguishes between resources and competencies: The resources are the input of the productive process, the basic unit of the analysis, which need accumulation and co-ordination. According to Grant, six categories of resources exist: financial; physical (plant capacity, availability of raw materials, etc.); human; technological (number and importance of patents, etc.); the reputation (recognition of the brand, customer fidelity, etc); and organizational (values, management styles, etc).

The competencies are placed at a higher level of the aggregation, and identi fy the capacity of a group of resources, if properly managed, to carry out an activity or reach a target. The competencies explain how two firms, though with similar objectives and exactly the same resources, can achieve different performances, or vice versa, how two firms can obtain similar performances even if with different resources. The conceptual distinction between resources and competencies is a typical connotation of resource-based view. Amit and Schoemaker (1993) refer to the resources as a group of possessed or controlled factors available to the firm, that can be transferred or acquired from outside, while the competencies represent the capacity to spread resources by means of organizational processes so as to obtain the desired results (they are the fruit, in contrast to the resources, of information developed, exchanged and spread among the personnel of the firm). Aaker (1989) distinguishes between "assets" and "skills": the former are linked to the possession, the latter to the doing. Dierickx and Cool (1989), in contrast, distinguish between "stock" and "flow": the stock accumulates over time thanks to the flow, which is easily modified unlike the former. Grant (1991) thus asserts that firm's resources and competencies, on one hand provide the basic direction for a firm's strategy, and on the other are the primary source of profit for the firm. Consequently, the strateg ic planning should be divided into the following phases: (1) identify and classify the firm's resources, appraise strengths and weaknesses relative to competitors, identify opportunities for better utilization of resources; (2) identify the firm's competencies, and the resources inputs of each competence; (3) appraise the rent-generating potential of resources and competencies; (4) select a strategy which best exploits the firm's resources and competencies relative to external opportunities; and (5) identify resource gaps which need to be filled (invest in replenishing, augmenting and upgrading the firm's resources).

One of the subjects best treated by resource-based view regards the "sustainability of the competitive advantage", understood by Hall (1993) as "the "capability differential" maintained for a significantly long period". Barney (1991), in a work that has become fundamental, individuates in the "heterogeneity" and in the "imperfect mobility" of the resources the conditions necessary for a sustainable competitive advantage, consequently the resources must: be valuable, increasing efficiency and effectiveness;· be rare, in other words utilized by only one or few firms;· be imperfectly imitable (due to one or more of the following factors: unique historical· conditions; causal ambiguity[3], when the link between controlled resources and c ompetitive advantage is not understood or only partially or in a vague manner; complexity of internal relations and those with the customers and suppliers); and be imperfectly substitutable, that is, equivalent resources from a strategic point of view do not exist. In short, it can be stated that the definite conquest of resource-based view is due to the link established between the firm's internal resources and a sustainable competitive advantage.

The role of the firm's external environment is re-evaluated (together with its five forces) when determining its competitive advantage and profitability. At the same time the hypotheses regarding perfect homogeneity of the distribution of resources between firms operating in the same industry and of their perfect mobility fail: to determine an advantage, the resources must confer on the firm that posses ses them traces of uniqueness and non-imitability, neither can they be easily transferred or substituted. If all the firms were equal in regard to the endowment of resources, there would be no profitability differences among them and all would earn the same amount. The amount earned may not be proportional to the quantity of resources possessed, quantities measured in monetary terms: there are "resources" – or more exactly "competencies" – that are the ability to manage the resources, a nd thus difficult to evaluate, but can make the difference.

Besides, the differences between firms exist because there is not transparency and certain mechanisms between possessed resources and performances obtained are not well known, indeed the links are multiple and difficult to form. That is, at least for a certain period of time, the advantages of some firms, in respect to others, are protected and the efforts made to rise above the average are repaid. One of the most strategically important firm's resources is knowledge: the knowledge-based view of the firm (the firm is conceptualized as an institution for integrating knowledge) is an outgrowth of resource-based view (Grant, 1996). Since the origin of all tangible resources lies outside the firm, it follows that competitive advantage is more likely to arise from the intangible firm-specific knowledge which enables it to add value to the incoming factors of production in a relatively unique manner (Spender, 1996). Knowledge management perspective, which privileges the consideration of intellectual resources, could enrich the debate on resource-based view, linking together the concepts of competence, governance, and entrepreneurship (Foss and Mahnke, 2000), treated in the paragraph on comparative analysis of competence theory and industrial organization. At the same, a completion of analysi s could derive from studies not only on but also in organizations, testing cultural b asis and ethnographic variables (Rouse and Daellenbach, 1999).

2.2.2 Competence-Based Competition

The first to mention “distinctive competence” was Selznick (1957) – though understood more in the sense of a bond than a variable on which to act – and the concept was treated those same years by the “Austrian economic school”. Howev er, the strategic approach based on the competencies competence-based compet ition is much more recent (Snow and Hrebiniak, 1980) and has been outlined with strategic valences by Prahalad and Hamel (1990) in a well-known article in the Har vard Business Review. They think of the “core competencies” of a firm as the facto rs that determine its success (Lenz (1980) calls them “strategic capabilities”). Co mpetence-based competition enters the field of studies on resource-based view, t o such an extent that some authors do not distinguish between them (e.g. Porter, 1991); however it assumes a connotation precisely because of the emphasis plac ed on the “behavioural” aspect of strategic planning, that is, on its deliberativenes s, proactive stance and amplitude of vision (Hamel and Prahalad, 1994).

In particular, while resource-based view individuates practically ex post the r esources that determine a competitive advantage, competence-based competition tries to understand a priori which are these resources/competencies. In addition – as Montgomery (1995) observes competence-based competition follows a process orientation that resource-based view does not consider. According to competence-based competition, a solid competitive advantage is based on the capacity to create, strengthen, and broaden the firm's core competencies to make new products that will be a success on the market. Prahalad and Hamel (1990) define "core competence" as "the collective learning in the organization, especially how to co-ordinate diverse production skills and integrate multiple streams of technology": they quote for example – among others – Sony's capacity to miniaturize, Canon's optical technology, and Honda's engine design.

A "core product" is the "physical representation" of a core competence, as that which makes a core competence visible is not the final product but a product (or part or subset) that is at a level intermediate between the competencies and the finished products (also called "product platform" (Meyer and Utterback, 1993)). In Prahalad and Hamel's (1990) view, the diversified firm resembles a tree, where the core competencies are the roots which supply food,support and stability. Core competencies to be such must: permit potential access to a high number of markets;· be seen by the end customer as the principal source of value added to the product; and· be difficult to imitate by the competitors.· Competencies, in contrast to material goods, increase the more they are used and shared. The non-material resources in fact are characterized by: ability to settle through people("organizational memory"),uniqueness, difficulty to acquire, difficulty to copy, multiplicity of uses, perishability if not used, and being incremental. Competence-based competition could be compared to the capabilities-based competition of Stalk et al.(1992), which accentuates the aspects of closeness to the customer and extension of the capabilities/competencies along the entire value chain of the firm. The need to abandon functional management and proceed in a transversal manner is common to both ("the building blocks of corporate strategy are not products and markets but business processes").

Also, the importance given to the human factor (the capacities, in virtue of their transversal and collective nature, for the most part do not exist in a small number of people, but a large number of people each playing a small part), and the flexible dynamic character are recognized as the strategy to adequately face market i nstability (we have passed from a “war of position” to a “war of movement”, and need to have “acuity” to foresee the future development of the markets). So firms need, according to the analogy made by Stalk et al. (1992), to be “capabilities predators”, that is move rapidly from one business to another, copying capacities, developing them so as to assume the role of leader, and this is possible only thanks to flexible human resources and transversal management of the firm. This is aligned with the thesis of Cockburn et al. (2000), for whom the origins of competitive advantage lies in the ability to identify and respond to environmental cues well in advance of observing performance-oriented pay-offs.

2.2.3 Dynamic Capabilities View

Also following the dynamic aspect just faced by Stalk et al. (1992), much more consideration for the evolution of firm capabilities has appeared in recent works (including a special issue of Strategic Management Journal (Helfat, 2000)). One of the major themes deals with the question of how it is that, over time, some firm s manage to become successful using their capabilities, while other firms do not. Furthermore, how does the nature of technology and markets affect the ability of firms to alter their capabilities over time in order to prosper? And under what conditions do successful firms in an industry end up with relatively different vs. somewhat similar capabilities?

The framework for dynamic capabilities is own to Teece et al. (1997), who theorize that competitive advantage of firms rests on distinctive processes (ways of coordinating and combining), shaped by the firm's (specific) asset positions, and the evolution path(s) it has adopted or inherited. They distinguish: models of strategy emphasizing the exploitation of market power (like the competitive forces of industrial organization or the game theory for studying the nature of competitive interaction between rival firms); models of strategy emphasizing efficiency (like resource-based view, which is based, according to Teece et al. (1997), on scarce firm-specific resources); and a dynamic capabilities approach. In this latter case, the term "dynamic" refers to the capacity to renew competencies so as to achieve congruence with the changing business environment, given path dependencies and actual market positions. The term "capabilities" emphasizes the key role of strat egic management in appropriately adapting, integrating, and reconfiguring internal and external organizational skills, resources, and competencies to match the requirements of a changing environment. As a consequence, competitive advantage of firms seems to lie with their managerial and organizational processes (the way things are done in the firm, or its routines, or patterns of current practice and learning), shaped by their (specific) assets, market position, and paths done.

Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) recognize that dynamic capabilities are a set of specific and identifiable "processes" (such as product development, strategic decision making, alliancing, etc.), which have commonalities across firms in terms of key features (popularly termed "best practice"), in so violating the resource-based view assumption of heterogeneity across firms. So where does the potential for long-term competitive advantage lie? It lies, according to Eisenhardt and Martin (2000), in using dynamic capabilities sooner, more astutely, or more fortuitously than the competitors; therefore, long-term competitive advantage lies in the resource configurations that managers build using dynamic capabilities, not in the capabilities themselves.

Furthermore, Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) distinguish between moderately dynamic markets, in which dynamic capabilities are more homogeneous, fungible, equifinal, and substitutable than is usually assumed, and high-velocity markets, where these processes are highly experiential and fragile, with more unpredictable outcomes, and emphasis on selection (new knowledge created for new situations) rather than variation (embedded in cumulative existing knowledge). So, in both cases, orthodox resource-based view misses the reality. Makadok (2001), rather distinguishing between moderately dynamic markets and high velocity ones, evidences two different causal mechanisms about how firms create economic rents: a “resource-picking” mechanism (being more effective than rivals at selecting resources) and a “capability-building” mechanism (being more effective than rivals at deploying resources). These two rent-creation mechanism are complementary in some circumstances but substitutes in others.

2.3 Empirical Review

Although previous studies emphasized the importance of the brand management system (BMS), the definitions of the BMS are diverse. Whereas some authors broadly define the BMS as anything related to brand identity system, or brand management (Alsop &Alsop, 2004), others narrowly view the BMS as the brand man ager system adopted by Procter & Gamble in the1930s (Roberts, 2004). Unfortunately, the roles of the BMS in brand efficiency are not so clearly defined. Vanauken (2002) suggested some brand management tools and a checklist to execute brand management efficiently and to build power brands effectively. Aaker and Joachimsthaler (2000) and Davis and Dunn (2002) emphasized the importance of building the brand management system and acknowledged the value of implementing the evaluation system for brand efficiency. However, the relationship between BMS and brand efficiency is rarely investigated, especially in the studies on market orientation–efficiency relationship. A study of Noble, Sinha, and Kumar (2002) is an important exception.

Whan, Andreas, Gratiana and Jason (2013) conducted a study on the role of brand logos in firm performance. The research demonstrates that the positive effects of brand logos on customer brand commitment and firm performance derive not from enabling brand identification, as is currently understood, but primarily from facilitating customer self-identity/expressiveness, representing a brand's functional benefits, and offering aesthetic appeal. This study examines whether brand names or visual symbols as logos are more effective at creating these benefits and whether or not the impact of the three aforementioned brand logo benefits on customer brand commitment and firm performance is contingent on the extent to which a firm leverages its brand (i.e., employs brand extensions to different product categories).

Pham and Dinh carried out a research on the influence of branding management on business performance: empirical evidence from Vietnamese food and beverage industry. This study examined the relationship between branding and firm's financial performance within Vietnamese small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in food and beverage industry. Analyzing data from 135 Vietnamese SMEs, the study provided an evidence for the positive relationship between branding management and business performance. The study also provided a deep insight on how Vietnamese entrepreneurs think and develop their brands; therefore, made some recommendations for businessmen, policy makers and branding service providers in Vietnam.

Narver and Slater's (2000) adopted a dimension of brand focus and added it to market orientation framework. However, Narver and Slater's (2000) include only a national brand or a private label focus but do not incorporate other aspects of a brand focus such as brand education, and the CEO's interest in brand building. Wet, develop a conceptual model including the BMS in a framework of market orientation–efficiency relationship. The BMS is broadly defined as a set of any systems, organizational structure, or culture of affirm supporting brand building activities. This broad definition allows us to investigate various aspects of the BMS. However, the BMS is different from brand building activities or from more general concepts such as innovation and organizational culture. The BMS consist of infrastructure building activities but not direct brand building activities. In addition, the BMS is closely related to innovation or organizational culture but does not include a more general type of innovation or organizational culture not related to brand management.

Leiser (2004) explained that there exist many factors that attribute to the brand being successful when extended into new markets or products categories; the prominent one among them being brand credibility. The imagery and stature of the brand is sold alongside with the service delivered to the customers who buy the brand, (O'Loughlin&Szmigin, 2005). The marketing procedure and brand give people in general, prepared learning of what the item is about and makes a state of di stinguishing the brand amongst numerous other comparable items in the market (Blackett, 2005). To add to this, the whole branding process has esteem for an org anization as it helps the business concentrate on, improve and be predictable with its message. Also, it permits an organization to constantly test the message and c heck whether it is being understood in the correct way (Malone, 2004) Making bra nds will empower the organizations to separate their products from those of com petition utilizing both intangible and intangible advantages. Branding can maintain brand against non-specific items after the lapse of the patent. A solid brand will pr ofit by high purchaser loyalty, permitting solid deals even after the patent has laps ed. In addition, brands will affect the conduct and state of mind of patient and spe cialists (Schuiling & Moss, 2004)

De Chernatony (2001) opined that brand management is the process of cre ating, coordinating and monitoring interactions that occur between an organizatio n and its stakeholders such that there is consistency between an organization's vis ion and stakeholders' beliefs about a brand. It is important that organizations initia lly focus their efforts on creating an appropriate brand image that has a niche in th e market place.De Chernatony (2001) stated that brand management can help bri dge the gap between a brand's image/identity and its reputation.

Balmer (2003) sees corporate image as publics' latest beliefs about a company or the total impression an entity makes with such publics. Corporate reputation, on the other hand, refers to value judgments about an organization's qualities, trustworthiness and reliability built up over time (Balmer, 2003).

Leiser (2004) explained that there exist many factors that attribute to the brand being successful when extended into new markets or products categories; the prominent one among them being brand credibility.

From the reviewed literature, it helps to explain the predicting impact of brand management as an important indicator of organizational efficiency

2.4 Gaps in Literature

Base on the review of the previous researches, the following were deducted:

De Chernatony (2001) stated that brand management can help bridge the gap between a brand's image/identity and its reputation. Balmer (2003) sees corporate image as publics' latest beliefs about a company or the total impression an entity makes with such publics.Leiser (2004) explained that there exist many factor s that attribute to the brand being successful when extended into new markets or products categories; the prominent one among them being brand credibility.

The scholars above did not take into consideration the issue of organization al efficiency. Therefore, this study will tend to find out the impact of brand manage ment on organizational efficiency using adequate sample size through the use of g ood sampling method, already validated research instruments for the variables an d good statistical procedures will be followed in order for it to be reliable.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will cover the methodology and method that will be used for re search work which are; research design, population of the study, sample and samp ling technique, research instrument, validity and reliability of the instrument and m ethod of data analysis.

3.2 Research Methods

The research method concerns with the tactic and plans of action that give direction to research effort and enable systematic conduct of the research. Theref ore, in this study, survey method will be adopted because it gives an depth and a b etter understanding of the unit under study, while survey method is adopted becau se if it involvement on extensive study of a particular phenomenon and it enable da ta to be collected through the administration of questionnaire which is a major so urce of primary data for this study (Otokiti, 2018).

The research method include experiment, survey, ipso-factor, action researc h, grounded theory, ethnography, archival method, observation. This is a common a nd popular strategy in business management research, the study strategically use d survey research method.

3.3 Research Design

This study is a Descriptive survey research. The descriptive survey design e nabled collection of data without manipulating the research variables. It is chosen because of its direct contact to the population of the sample that is relevant to the research. The study is aimed at collecting information from members of staffs of a multi-product company to determine the independent variable on the dependent variable.

3.4 Population of the Study

The target populations of this study are the customers of 7up bottling com pany product in Ilorin, Kwara State. The population will comprise of members of st aff in Accounting, Sales and Marketing Departments of 7up bottling company bec ause of their relevance to the study. It would consist of an estimate of fifty (50) st aff members.

3.5 Sample Size Determination

Stutely (2003) is of the opinion that when the sample size is less than 30, we are to study all For the purpose of the study. The stutely opinion was adapted. Therefore, since the total population of the employees of the multi-product company are less than so, the entire population constitute the sample.

3.6 Sampling Techniques

For the purpose of this study, purposive sampling will be used for the selection of the participants. Hence, simple random sampling will be used to administer the questionnaire.

3.7 Source of Data Collection

Primary data is the use of oral or personal interview, observation (personal) and questionnaire. While secondary data include: company document, journals, textbooks and internal file.

For the purpose of this study, ‘Structured Questionnaire’ will be developed based on literature review. The questionnaire will be divided into two parts. The first part will have based on respondent's personal data. These include sex, age, education, marital status, religion and academic qualification, while the second part contains items relating to the subject matter to measure respondents on the subject matter; brand management and organizational efficiency. The Likert five point's scale will be used in scoring the respondents on their personal views as regard the subject matter. The respondents reacted to the statements by ticking strongly agreed (SA), agreed (A), undecided (U), disagreed (D), or strongly disagreed (SD). For the purpose of this research, questionnaire will be administered to staff and customers to gather first and information.

3.8 Research Instruments

The type of data that will be used for this study will be purely primary data which involves data collected directly from the field by the researcher. The primary source of data for this research work will be questionnaire which will be a closed ended questionnaire that required the respondent to merely check the boxes provided to provide answers to questions. This will done to ensure that required questions asked were in accordance to the stated objectives and also to avoid ambiguitie s in the questions and to validate the instrument to be used.

3.9 Validity and Reliability of the Data

Before the commencement of data analysis, the reliability and validity tests would be carried out to establish that the instrument and its constructs had intern al consistency and had actually measured what they will designed to measure. For ascertaining the reliability, the research would employ the Cronbach's Alpha Test o f reliability. The reliability test would be carried out to determine the consistency o f all the responses given by respondents to all items in the questionnaire instrume nt used to get respondents perception on the subject matter. It also examines the interconnectedness of responses using the Cronbach's Alpha (α) with a coefficient value ranging from 0 to 1 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

3.10 Method of Data Analysis

The descriptive statistics; Multiple Linear Regression, correlation will be use d to test the hypotheses. These statistical tools will be selected as a result of the nature of the study and hypotheses formulated. The study will causal design, stud ying the effect of one variable on another i.e. studying the effects of an independe nt variable (brand management) will have on a dependent variable (organizational efficiency).

Multiple Linear Regression will be used to test hypothesis and to achieve ob jective. This was to examine the effects on variable i.e. independent (brand manag ement) has on dependent variable (organizational efficiency) and the choice of mu ltiple linear regression and not simple linear regression for this was because the p redictor which was dependent variable is more than one. Therefore, it can be said t hat with the help of these methods, the researcher will analyse the data in order to answer the research questions and test the acceptability of the hypotheses.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of data obtained throu gh the use of questionnaire administered to 7up Bottling Company Ilorin. In doing this, the chapter is divided into three sections: Introduction, presentation, interpret ation and hypotheses testing.

4.1 Data Presentation and Analysis

A total of fifty (50) copies of questionnaire were administered in both enter prises which were duly filled and returned. This connotes that the responses recei ved were factual in accordance to the sampled population.

Table 4.1.1: Demographic Variables

Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	37	74.0	74.0	74.0
	Female	13	26.0	26.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

SOURCE: FIELD SURVEY 2025

The table above shows the sex analysis of the respondents. The table revealed that 74% of the respondents were male while 26% were female. From this, most of the respondents were male. This implies that male staffs have a great effect on brand management.

Marital status

	Frequen	Percen	Valid Perc	Cumulative