



Dark Fantasy, Cadbury Celebration, Kurkure(Etc.) Or Sweets: a Comparative Study

Reeta Kumari*

**Assistant Professor BBA Department ,GNIOT Institute of Professional Studies. G. Noida Affiliated to
CHAUDHARY CHARAN SING UNIVERSITY MEERUT Email : REETA INC@GMAIL.COM*

Article History

Received : 2025-12-01

Revised : 2026-01-04

Accepted : 2026-01-12

Published : 2026-01-20

Abstract

Marketing is convincing and convincing comes through positioning. How do you position your product will establish it in the market. A well positioned product is a guarantee of success of it. Taking the help of creativity one can set up a road for the customer advocacy and helps beating the competition.

Keywords: Positioning, Creativity, Competition

1. INTRODUCTION

Positioning is the backbone of marketing, or we can say Marketing is positioning. Marketers convert the need into reality. Marketers are many and needs are unlimited. In this dynamic environment positioning of the product works like a magic. It is the language of the product. It speaks to the customer through positioning. If positioned successfully the product sales easily and the customers become a lifetime customer for it. How much good the product be it clicks only if positioned correctly Remember the local market where a vendor sells easily only when he strundles. The hawkers practice different sounds/ slogans and unique tones .it catches the attention of the customers and arises the interest of her.the same is the job of positioning. It helps getting the product identified exclusively and reaches to the hands of the customer .in due course of time the product and the positioning strategy both should be revised .it should be repositioned if needed Loyalty and advocacy are also observed in the same way easily. Any activity demands the actor to be creative. In hindi we can say to work “thoda hatkar”. This approach needs to be addressed very well and everywhere. The creativity makes the journey of marketing /business very beautiful. It helps in reducing the risk of the dynamic marketing environment and you stand more firmly in the market. How beautifully you position the product lets you get the best return on your investments. Simultaneously it lets you stand apart from the crowd and this position is continued for long without any further modification in your product. Take the example of Lifebuoy. This product of HUL IS existing in the market for more than hundred years. The same Old Red Brick Color and Brick Designed Soap has been the king of the Indian soap industry. in villages and suburban places it as known as Laal Sabun (red soap).and even today it is the no. one soap of India when so many toilet and bathing bars have risen and many more we can expect in future. The saga of lifebuoy is very interesting and it is a matter of case study. I remember the oldest advertisement of lifebuoy as “Lifebuoy Hai Jahan Tandurusti Hai Wahan” and now a days it has positioned itself as a germicidal soap and has become a clear competitor of the Dettol soap. Similarly LUX also has created its market continuing with the same stratgy. There are a lot success stories of positioning cutting away the competition and many products washed away from the market because of their poor positioning strategy, for example- the pager from Motorola in the year 1999. This makes us conscious to think how a positioning strategy should be selected to make it successful or what the factors which make it successful are. The present research article revolves around the role of positioning .Through this we are trying to find out whether a particular positioning has done justice or not and to what extent.

Marketing is a communication and the objective of this is to make the communication effective i.e to make, retain a customer and ultimately convert her into an advocate. Every effort made in this regard is done through communication. The marketers are trying to communicate from the beginning in the form of Teaser ads which is we can say a pseudo communication built solely on arousing curiosity/ interest. The reader /viewer/listener becomes eager to see a glimpse of the product and wants to use it at least once. In every advertisement marketers are making so many promises and this makes a platform of converting a suspect into a prospect and ultimately into an advocate.\

Let us begin with the role of communication/positioning in marketing here. Can positioning of a product make considerable changes in the life of customer? The answer could be either yes or no. But why and how ? In fact marketing towards the end becomes equivalent to positioning, off course it is much more than that. For example Colgate. It is positioned as a solution to the protection of cavity. Lifebuoy is positioned as equivalent to Dettol and Dettol is being represented as an essential product to clean the hands before eating. It's good to mention the present advertisement contaning the slogan as “khaane se pahle jara haath dhona kabhi bhi na bhulenge ho, Dettol... Dettol ho”. Parallely so many examples can be placed here. TATA Nano was positioned as a car of Economy class. Likewise Tyres, Engine oils all are being advertised (positioned) as strong in their work so that a Car /Vehicle can be put to a longer or better use i.e it is not for commuting rather a means of togetherness and happiness. The smart phones have become a part and parcel of the life especially after the digitization move. Thus it can be said that positioning is much more important than all other functions of marketing. It is this only, which revolutionizes the life of the society.

Time has changed . the need of the customer has changed and what best we expect from it is convenience. the articles which were ordinary product based on common need are taking place of the product of special occasion. positioning just changes the mindset of the customer. But even though some products are quite valueable. They remain relevant forever. Here we are trying to examine the relevancy of sweet with other gift items.

Let us not wait more and raise the curtain. We are talking of Cadbury Chocolate kuch meetha ho jaye}. The chocolate has been presented as a sweetening agent on every occasion starting from Cadbury Shots (man me

laddoo foota) to Cadbury celebrations as a valuable gift for Raksha Bandhan and again Cadbury Chocolate as a sweet when Pappu cleared the examination(Pappu pass ho gaya).recently Maggi Noodles also is being served as an award to speaking truth(sach bolne ke to pure ank milenge na.) A further tag in this sequence is of the gift pack of Kurkure, Haldiram Bhujia etc. Similarly another name in this category is of Priyagold biscuits and the latest entry is of the big size pack containing a number of the small packs(priced for Rs. 30 each) of ITC'S Dark Fantasy biscuits. These items (made special) have caught the fancy of public. Nowadays you don't expect a pack of sweets from the guest coming to your house, but do wait for a pack or two of these lightweight, beautifully packed, storable sweets. Even Big Bazaar provides an offer of 'buy one get one' to catch the pulse of customers on the occasion of Diwali and other festivals. The present article tries to explore the success of this beautiful endeavour. Whether it is successful only in paush towns /places or everywhere. How much capable it is to sweeten the occasion and what factors are responsible for making it popular. Whether it comes to terms with the satisfaction or not and if yes/no how much? The answer to this question will make a base for other products in this category as prima facie it appears user friendly. This is a research article based on primary research with limitations of doing the survey in few colonies of Greater Noida. Off course the effort will be made to collect data from people of different classes so that the result can be generalized making the applicability of this report

useful for the firms and creating awareness of gifting these items. It may prove to be useful for companies making other products that can make them compatible to be gifted and making the occasion sweet.

2. OBJECTIVES:

3. Can Sweets replace other gift items?

If not how does it create an opportunity for marketers?

Methodology: the research is based on primary data collected from the residents of Greater Noida urban region only because of the limitation of the time. Had this been done at the nearby villages also the findings would have added a new colour to the research. The research design is exploratory/ descriptive. Moreover the study is related to the two hundred no. of respondents.

Sweets vs. Gift Items (Eatables SKUs)

Questions:

1.Do you know about new gift packs (Eatables): Yes/No?

	Yes	No	Total
Female	100	00	100
Male	100	00	100
Total	200	00	200

Null hypothesis: both the gift items are known equally **Alternative hypothesis:** the gift items are not known equally.

Q	F _O	F _E	fo-fe	(F _O -F _E) ²	(F _O -F _E) ² /F _E	
NO						

1	100	100	0	0	0	
---	-----	-----	---	---	---	--

DF= (R-1)X(C-1)=(2-1)X(2-1)=1X1=1. P=.05 CHI SQUARE=3.841> 0

Hence we accept null hypothesis.i.e both the items are known equally.

2.For how many years you know these New Eatables?

a. Recently b. last two years c. three years d. last many years

	One	Two	Three	Many	Total
Female	00	60	35	5	100
Male	00	80	17	3	100
Total	00	140	52	8	200

NULL HYPOTHESIS: new eatables is equally known by Male and female.

Alternative hypothesis: new eatables is equally known by Male and female.

100	100	0	0	0
-----	-----	---	---	---

$$DF = (R-1)X(C-1)=(2-1)X(2-1)=1X1=1. P=.05 \text{ CHI SQUARE}=3.841 > 0$$

Hence we accept null hypothesis.i.e both the male and female know equally about these.

3.Which one of the following Eatable gift items you know?

Only Kurkure Cadbury Celebration Priyagold Biscuits Dark Fantasy

Only kurkure b. kurkure and Cadbury C. all the three. D. all the four

	a	b	c	d	Total
Female	00	70	30	0	100
Male	00	60	20	20	100
Total	00	130	50	20	200

Null hypothesis: all new eatables are known equally

Alternative hypothesis: all new eatables are not known equally

S no.	fo	fe	Fo-fe	{Fo-fe} ²	{Fo-fe} ² /fe
1	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0
3	70	65	5	25	25/65=.384
4	60	65	5	25	.384
5	30	25	5	25	1
6	20	25	5	25	1
7	0	10	10	100	10
8	20	10	10	100	10
				Total	22.7

$$Df=1, P=.05, \text{ CHI SQUARE}=3.841 \text{ CHI SQUARE}=22.7$$

Null hypothesis rejected

4.Have you got any of these as gift? Yes/no

	Yes	No	Total
Female	100	00	100
Male	100	00	100
Total	200	00	200

Null hypothesis: these gifts are received

S no.	fo	fe	Fo-fe	{Fo-fe} ²	{Fo-fe} ² /fe
1	100	100	0	0	0
2	100	100	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5				Total	0

$$Df=1, p=.05,$$

Null hypothesis accepted.

Have you given any of these as gift? Yes/no

	Yes	No	Total
Female	100	00	100
Male	100	00	100
Total	200	00	200

Null hypothesis: new eatables and old traditional gifts are equally in use

S no.	F _o	F _e	F _o -f _e	{f _o -f _e } ²	{f _o -f _e } ² /f _e
1	100	100	0	0	0
2	100	100	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5				Total	0

Df=1

Null hypothesis accepted

6.If yes, how many times? Once or twice/many times

	Once	Many times	Total
Female	90	10	100
Male	90	10	100
Total	180	20	200

7.Your response towards The Modern Eatable gift items: like/dislike

	Like	Dislike	Total
Female	95	5	100
Male	70	30	100
Total	165	35	200

Null Hypothesis: Both types of gift items are liked equally

Alternative Hypothesis: These are not liked equally

S NO.	F _o	F _e	F _o -F _e	{F _o -F _e } ²	{F _o -F _e } ² /F _e
1	95	82.5	12.5	156.3	1.89
	70	82.5	12.5	156.3	1.89
	5	17.5	12.5	156.3	8.92
	30	17.5	12.5	156.3	9.65
				TOTAL	22.35

Df=1 Null Hypothesis Rejected

8.If you have to gift someone what would you purchase: Sweets/Modern gift items

	Sweets	Packs	Total
Female	50	50	100
Male	70	30	100
Total	120	80	200

S NO.	F _o	F _e	F _o -F _e	{F _o -F _e } ²	{F _o -F _e } ² /F _e
	50	60	10	100	1.66
	50	40	10	100	2.5
	70	60	10	100	1.66
	30	40	10	100	2.5
				TOTAL	8.32

Df=1 Null Hypothesis Is Rejected.

9.Do you plan for gifts in advance?: yes/no

	Yes	No	Total
Female	40	60	100
Male	10	90	100
Total	50	150	200

S NO.	F _o	F _e	F _o -F _e	{F _o -F _e } ²	{F _o -F _e } ² /F _e
-------	----------------	----------------	--------------------------------	--	--

	40	25	15	225	9
	60	75	15	225	3
	10	25	15	225	9
	90	75	15	225	3
				TOTAL	24

Df=1 Null Hypothesis Is Rejected.

10.While purchasing them you look for : more shelf life/money/ease of availability

	Shelf life	Price	Ease of availability	Total
Female	30	40	30	100
Male	40	30	30	100
Total	70	70	60	200

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
	30	35	5	25	.714
	40	35	5	25	.714
	30	35	5	25	.714
	40	35	5	25	.714
	30	35	5	25	.714
	30	35	5	25	.714
				TOTAL	2.856

DF=2,Null Hypothesis- All Varieties Are Equally Important

Null Hypothesis Accepted, Chi Th==5.991

11.Modern Eatables gift items are preferred because these are branded: yes/no

	Yes	No	Total
Female	50	50	100
Male	40	60	100
Total	90	110	200

Null hypothesis: Brand value is important **Alternative hypothesis:** brand is of no value

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
1	50	45	5	25	.556
2	40	45	5	25	.556
3	50	55	5	25	.454
4	60	55	5	25	.454
				TOTAL	2.020

DF=1 NULL HYPOTHESIS IS ACCEPTED, I.E. BRAND VALUE IS IMPORTANT

12.Which one is easily available? Sweets/Modern Eatables /both

Available: **Sweets/Modern Eatables/Both**

	Sweets	Gift items (eatables)	Both	Total	
Female	30	40	30	100	
Male	40	30	30	100	
Total	70	70	60	200	
S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
	30	35	5	25	.71
	40	35	5	25	.71
	40	35	5	25	.71
	30	35	5	25	.71
	30	30	0	0	0
	30	30	0	0	0

				TOTAL	.284	
--	--	--	--	-------	------	--

Null Hypothesis: Both Are Available Easily Null Hypothesis Is Accepted

13.Which one is easy to carry? Sweets/Modern Eatables/both

	Sweets	Gift items (eatables)	Both	Total
Female	30	40	30	100
Male	40	30	30	100
Total	70	70	60	200

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
	30	35	5	25	.71
	40	35	5	25	.71
	40	35	5	25	.71
	30	35	5	25	.71
	30	30	0	0	0
	30	30	0	0	0
				TOTAL	.284

NULL HYPOTHESIS IS ACCEPTED BOTH ARE EASY TO CARRY

14.Which one is costlier? Sweets/Modern Eatables / Equal in cost

	Sweets	Modern (eatables)	Equal in cost	Total
Female	80	20	00	100
Male	40	30	30	100
Total	120	50	30	200

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
	80	60	20	400	6.33
	40	60	20	400	6.33
	20	25	5	25	1
	30	25	5	25	1
	00	15	15	225	15
	30	15	15	225	15
				TOTAL	42.66

Df=2, 5.991

Null Hypothesis – both the eatables gift are equal in cost.

Null Hypothesis is rejected. i.e the cost is not equal.

15.Does perishability of sweets affect its purchase as gift? Yes/no

	Yes	No	Total
Female	60	40	100
Male	30	70	100
Total	90	110	200

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
	60	45	15	225	5
	30	45	15	225	5
	40	55	15	225	4.4
	70	55	15	225	4.4
				TOTAL	18.8

Null Hypothesis: Perishability Does Not Matter To Gift Null Hypothesis Is Rejected
Hence Perishability Is An Important Factor To Gift.

16. Which one tastes better? Sweets/Modern Eatables /both

	Sweets	Modern Eatables	Total
Female	30	70	100
Male	80	20	100
Total	110	90	200

Null hypothesis - both are equally good in taste. Null hypothesis is rejected.

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
	30	55	25	625	11.36
	80	55	25	625	11.36
	70	45	25	625	13.88
	20	45	25	625	13.88
			Total		48.48

Null hypothesis is rejected: Both are not equally good in taste.

17. Which one is more nutritious? Sweets/Modern Eatables /both

	Sweets	Modern Eatables	Equal in nutrition	Total
Female	30	45	25	100
Male	80	20	00	100
Total	110	65	25	200

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
1	30	55	25	625	11.36
2	80	55	25	625	11.36
3	45	32.5	.5	.25	.007
4	20	32.5	12.5	156.25	4.8
5	25	12.5	12.5	156.25	12.5
6	00	12.5	12.5	156.25	12.5
			Total		52.527

Null hypothesis: both have equal nutrition value. Null hypothesis is rejected.

18. Are they suitable for all occasions? Yes/no

	Yes	No	Total
Female	60	40	100
Male	30	70	100
Total	90	110	200

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
1	60	45	15	225	5
2	30	45	15	225	5
3	40	55	15	225	4.091
4	70	55	15	225	4.091
			TOTAL		18

NULL HYPOTHESIS: THEY ARE SUITABLE FOR ALL OCCASIONS
ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS: THEY ARE NOT SUITABLE FOR ALL OCCASIONS DF=1
NULL HYPOTHESIS IS REJECTED.

19. Which one is suitable for all occasions? Sweets/Modern Eatables /both/none

	sweets	Modern eatables	Both	None	Total
Female	20	20	00	60	100
Male	70	20	10	00	100
Total	90	40	10	60	200

NULL HYPOTHESIS: NONE OF THEM IS SUITABLE

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
1	20	45	25	625	13.88
2	70	45	25	625	13.88
3	20	20	00	00	00
4	20	20	00	00	00
5	00	5	5	25	5
6	10	5	5	25	5
7	60	30	30	900	30
8	00	30	30	900	30
				TOTAL	98

DF=3, CHI SQUARE TH=7.82

NULL HYPOTHESIS IS REJECTED

20. Can these gift packs replace the value of sweets? Yes/no

	Yes	No	Total
Female	60	40	100
Male	30	70	100
Total	90	110	200

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
1	60	45	15	225	5
2	30	45	15	225	5
3	40	55	15	225	4.091
4	70	55	15	225	4.091
				TOTAL	18

DF=1, CHI SQUARE TH=3.84 NULL HYPOTHEIS IS REJECTED

21. You are(occupation): working/non working Any

other

Null hypothesis: the choice of gift is independent of their status of earning.

Suggestion:

	Working	Non Working	Total
Female	15	85	100
Male	70	30	100
Total	85	115	200

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
1	15	42.5	27.5	756.25	17.79
2	70	42.5	27.5	756.25	17.79
3	85	57.5	27.5	756.25	13.51
4	30	57.5	27.5	756.25	13.51
				TOTAL	62.60

Null hypothesis is rejected. Questions to sellers:

1. Do you sell Modern gift items: yes/no

	Yes	No	Total
General Retailers	10	10	20
Sweet Retailers	5	25	30
	15	35	50

NULL HYPOTHESIS: new gift eatables are equally available at every type of retailer

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
1	10	6	4	16	2.66
2	5	6	1	1	.16
3	10	14	4	16	1.1
4	25	14	11	121	8.64
				TOTAL	14

DF=1

NULL HYPOTHESIS IS REJECTED.

2.How do you sell these: frequently/rarely

	Frequently	Rarely	Total
General Retailers	10	10	20
Sweet Retailers	5	25	30
	15	35	50

NULL HYPOTHESIS: these are sold rarely.

S NO.	F _O	F _E	F _O -F _E	{F _O -F _E } ²	{F _O -F _E } ² /F _E
1	10	6	4	16	2.66
2	5	6	1	1	.16
3	10	14	4	16	1.1
4	25	14	11	36	8.64
				TOTAL	14

NULL HYPOTHESIS IS REJECTED.

3.The degree of frequency is:

	Once in a week	Once in a month	Once in a fortnight	Total
General Retailers	01	07	02	10
Sweet Retailers	00	05	00	05
Total	01	12	02	15

4.Any other

5.Suggestion:

Questions to sweet shop owners:

1.Do you sell Modern gift items along with Sweets: yes/no

2.How do you sell these: frequently/rarely

3.The degree of frequency is:

4.Any other

5.Suggestion:

Findings:

Both the items are known equally.

These gifts are received i.e are very well in use.

These are not liked equally i.e Sweet is preferred over other. Brand value is important.

Both are equally available.Both are easy to carry. Both are not equally good in taste.

Both do not have equal nutrition value. These are not suitable for all occasions. They can not replace Sweets.

Conclusion and suggestion :

Sweets have got more weightage in this present research . modern gift items are not equivalent to it. But nobody has seen future. The relation can change also. Positioning will play a bigger role .

Choice of gift depends on earning condition, Tastes etc.. This conclusion heads towards a further research i.e

people of which profession purchase / like which type of gift, the traditional one or the modern one. Most importantly in this survey majority of the persons were not working but they are fully aware of the modern gift items. Simultaneously they were female enriching the scope of further research. Positioning of the modern gift items is done well but there is always some scope of creativity.

REFERENCES:

1. Collier, D. A., & Meyer, S. M. (1998). A service positioning matrix. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 18(12), 1223-1244.
2. Deppermann, A. (2015). Positioning. *The handbook of narrative analysis*, 369-387.
3. Fayvishenko, D. (2018). Formation of brand positioning strategy. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, 4(2), 245-248.
4. Fayvishenko, D. (2018). Formation of brand positioning strategy. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, 4(2), 245-248.
5. Harré, R., & Van Langenhove, L. (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*.
6. Saqib, N. (2021). Positioning—a literature review. *PSU Research Review*, 5(2), 141-169.
7. Sheinin, D. A. (1998). Positioning brand extensions: implications for beliefs and attitudes. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 7(2), 137-149.
8. Sujan, M., & Bettman, J. R. (1989). The effects of brand positioning strategies on consumers' brand and category perceptions: Some insights from schema research. *Journal of marketing research*, 26(4), 454-467.
9. Thompson, A. B. (2003). Brand positioning and brand creation. *Brands and branding*, 1, 79-95.
10. Urban, G. L. (1975). PERCEPTOR: A model for product positioning. *Management Science*, 21(8), 858-871.
11. Yamakawa, Y., Forman, E., & Ansell, E. (2009). Role of positioning. *Investigating Classroom Interaction*; Brill: Leiden, The Netherlands, 179-202.
12. Yamakawa, Y., Forman, E., & Ansell, E. (2009). Role of positioning. *Investigating Classroom Interaction*; Brill: Leiden, The Netherlands, 179-202.