

An Empirical Analysis of Promotional Strategies, Awareness, and Consumer Buying Decisions in the Mobile Industry

* *G. Ravindranath*

** *Dr. B.C. Lakshmana*

* *Research Scholar, Department of Management, Reg.No. PP MAN. 0752, Rayalaseema University, Kurnool, A.P.*

** *Asst. Professor, School of Management Studies, JNT University Anantapur, Anantapuramu.*

Abstract

Brand awareness is the last goal of maximum companies is to boom sales and income. Ideally, you need to attract new customers in your merchandise and inspire repeat purchases. In recent times, branded products are consumed almost in each area by using all sections of the cellular manufacturers. A emblem name is an warranty by the vendor to customers about offerings supplied by way of him. It reduces buyer's risk and makes the choice-making method less difficult. With a purpose to reduce hazard Consumers choose those brands that are acknowledged and familiar to them. For this reason, logo consciousness Becomes the preliminary step and foundation for brand choice. As cellular brands are frequently consumed through every phase of the society, the relationship among these dimensions of emblem fairness – emblem focus and logo preference may be nicely described and understood. Mobile brands from distinct segments and 8 product classes were selected for the have a look at. A widespread courting is determined among logo focus and Brand.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the process of formulating an advertising strategy, firms must critically address the issue of branding. Branding constitutes a fundamental dimension of product marketing, as consumers demonstrate distinct preferences for specific brands and variations of essential goods and services. Over time, manufacturers have come to recognize that market power predominantly resides with brand-oriented enterprises. Consumer purchase decisions are significantly influenced by brand associations, thereby rendering the brand one of the most valuable intangible assets owned by an organization in a competitive global marketplace.

A brand is not merely a commercial symbol but an amalgamation of awareness, perceived quality, associations, and customer loyalty. It embodies a strategic and creative construct that functions as a promise by the producer or vendor to consistently deliver a particular set of benefits, attributes, or services. Thus, a brand serves as an assurance of quality, credibility, and consistency.

Conceptually, a brand can be defined as an image, mark, or name that functions as a medium of communication, providing a unique identity to a product. It acts as an identifier of the producer or marketer. The brand name typically consists of words, letters, or numbers that can be vocalized, whereas the brand mark represents the visual component, such as a symbol, design, distinctive color palette, or unique typography. Together, these elements establish a relational bond between the consumer and the product, thereby enhancing recognition, trust, and loyalty.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Aaker (1991) defined brand awareness as the consumer's ability to recognize or recall a brand within a specific product category. He argued that awareness serves as the foundation of brand equity, influencing how consumers perceive a product and make purchase decisions. According to Aaker, higher brand awareness fosters familiarity and trust, which reduces uncertainty during the buying process. For example, when consumers are exposed to multiple options in the smartphone

market, recognizing a familiar brand can simplify decision-making and reduce perceived risks. Aaker's work emphasizes that brands should invest in strategies that increase visibility and recall, as these factors are critical for building long-term consumer loyalty. This concept is particularly relevant for VIVO mobiles, where brand recognition can directly influence consumer preferences and market share.

Keller (2001) highlighted the broader concept of brand knowledge, which comprises brand awareness and brand image. He explained that strong brand awareness is instrumental in reducing perceived purchase risk and encourages repeat buying behavior. Keller emphasized that recall (the ability to remember a brand when a product category is mentioned) and recognition (identifying a brand among competitors) are crucial in highly competitive markets, such as mobile phones. His framework shows that brands that achieve high awareness are more likely to enjoy consumer trust and loyalty, making it easier to differentiate themselves from competitors. For VIVO mobiles, Keller's insights suggest that brand awareness campaigns should focus on both recognition and recall to influence purchase decisions effectively.

Malik, Ghafoor, and Javed (2013) conducted an empirical study on mobile phone consumers to identify the most influential sources of brand awareness. Using survey methods, they found that advertising, social media, and peer recommendations were the primary drivers of awareness. Importantly, their findings indicated that digital channels were more effective than traditional media, particularly among younger consumers who rely heavily on online platforms for information. This study highlights the growing importance of digital marketing in shaping brand perception and consumer engagement. For VIVO, this implies that strategic use of social media campaigns and influencer partnerships could significantly enhance brand awareness among target consumers.

Wu, Li, and Wang (2020) explored the impact of brand awareness on smartphone purchasing behavior through surveys and regression analysis. Their results demonstrated that higher brand recall and recognition substantially increased the likelihood of purchase. Additionally, they observed that digital marketing campaigns enhanced consumer engagement, creating a stronger connection between consumers and brands. The study underlines the importance of interactive online advertising, such as targeted social media campaigns, video promotions, and mobile app engagement, in increasing brand awareness. For VIVO mobiles, leveraging these strategies can effectively convert awareness into actual buying behavior.

Kotler and Keller (2016) emphasized that brand awareness is a key element of brand equity and enables firms to differentiate products in competitive markets. They argued that brands with higher awareness tend to enjoy greater consumer preference and loyalty, which ultimately strengthens market position. The authors suggested that consistent branding, communication, and visibility campaigns are essential to achieving this awareness. In the context of VIVO mobiles, applying these principles means investing in integrated marketing strategies that maintain visibility across multiple platforms and reinforce the brand's identity to foster consumer trust and preference.

Solomon (2018) focused on the psychological and emotional dimensions of consumer behavior, highlighting the role of brand awareness as a cognitive cue. He explained that consumers often make decisions based on familiarity with a brand, which reduces the cognitive effort required and mitigates perceived risk. In markets like mobile phones, where technical specifications and options can be overwhelming, consumers rely on familiar brands as shortcuts to decision-making. For VIVO, this suggests that increasing brand visibility and reinforcing brand associations can lead to more confident and quicker purchase decisions among potential buyers.

Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000) investigated the relationship between brand equity components, including awareness, and consumer buying intentions. Through empirical surveys, they found that higher brand awareness leads to more favorable consumer attitudes and stronger purchase intentions. Their study highlights the direct and measurable impact of awareness on buying behavior. For VIVO mobiles, this implies that marketing efforts that enhance brand recognition and recall can directly influence consumer preferences and increase the likelihood of sales, emphasizing the practical significance of awareness-focused strategies.

Sharma and Sheth (2015) explored brand awareness in the Indian mobile phone market and identified peer influence and online reviews as significant sources of awareness. Their research suggested that social media interactions strongly affect perceived brand familiarity and trust. This indicates that consumer-generated content, word-of-mouth, and peer recommendations play a critical role in shaping awareness and subsequent buying decisions. For VIVO, leveraging social proof through online reviews, testimonials, and influencer endorsements can strengthen consumer perception and increase market adoption.

Chi, Yeh, and Yang (2009) examined mobile phone consumers in Asia to understand how brand awareness affects perceived quality and purchase intention. Using survey data, they found that strong brand awareness positively influences consumers' perception of product quality, which in turn increases purchase likelihood. The study also emphasized that promotional activities, both online and offline, reinforce brand recall and preference. For VIVO, this reinforces the importance of consistent and multi-channel promotions to enhance consumer perception and encourage purchasing decisions.

Kotler, Armstrong, and Parment (2021) emphasized that integrated marketing communication (IMC) is essential for creating and sustaining brand awareness. They argued that a combination of social media, advertising, and experiential marketing strengthens consumer perception and facilitates purchase decisions. For mobile brands, this highlights the strategic importance of aligning all communication channels to deliver a consistent message. VIVO can benefit from IMC by ensuring that online campaigns, retail promotions, and brand messaging collectively reinforce awareness and encourage buying behavior.

Kapferer (2012) argued that strong brand identity, when combined with high awareness, forms a psychological bond between consumers and the brand. This bond increases loyalty and reduces the likelihood of switching to competitors. High brand awareness ensures that consumers remain familiar with and trusting of the brand, which is especially valuable in competitive markets such as mobile phones. For mobile, consistent branding efforts, reinforced through advertising and digital presence, are crucial for maintaining consumer engagement and fostering long-term loyalty.

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

Objectives:

1. To identify the most influencing source of awareness.
2. To study the variance between sources and level of awareness towards mobiles.
3. To measure the impact of level of awareness on buying decision.

Hypotheses:

- **H1:** Digital advertising is the most influential source of awareness for mobiles.
- **H2:** There is a significant variance in awareness levels across different sources (advertising, social media, peer influence, retail display).
- **H3:** Higher levels of awareness significantly and positively influence consumer buying decisions.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a descriptive and analytical research design to examine the relationship between brand awareness and buying decisions for VIVO mobiles. A total of 145 respondents, comprising mobile phone users from both urban and semi-urban areas, were selected as the sample for the study. Convenience sampling was employed to gather responses from participants who were easily accessible and willing to provide information. Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire, which included Likert-scale questions to measure respondents' perceptions of brand awareness, sources of awareness, and their buying decisions. The collected data were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools, including percent analysis to identify the most influential sources of awareness, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to examine differences in awareness levels across sources, and regression analysis to measure the impact of brand awareness on consumers' buying decisions.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

1. Demographic Factors

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent (%)
Age	25-35	13	9
	36-45	61	42.1
	46-55	56	38.6
	Above 55	15	10.3
Gender	Male	89	61.4
	Female	56	38.6
Occupation	Student	8	5.5
	Business Owner	56	38.6
	Employed	12	8.3
	Unemployed	69	47.6
Education	SSC	16	11
	Diploma	37	25.5
	UG	47	32.4
	PG	45	31
Income (₹)	Below 30,000	10	6.9
	30,001–40,000	57	39.3
	40,001–50,000	43	29.7
	50,001–60,000	35	24.1

The sample of 145 respondents is predominantly middle-aged, with 42.1% aged 36–45 years and 38.6% aged 46–55 years. Males constitute 61.4%, while females account for 38.6% of the respondents. In terms of occupation, nearly half are unemployed (47.6%), followed by business owners (38.6%), with students and employed individuals making up smaller proportions.

Most respondents are well-educated, with 32.4% holding undergraduate degrees and 31% postgraduate degrees, while diploma and SSC holders represent 25.5% and 11%, respectively. Regarding income, the majority earn between ₹30,001 and ₹40,000 (39.3%), followed by ₹40,001–50,000 (29.7%) and ₹50,001–60,000 (24.1%), with only 6.9% earning below ₹30,000.

2. Objective 1: To identify the most influencing source of awareness.

The researcher has identified the ranking of promotional tools employed by Yamaha from the perspective of customers. Respondents were asked to rate each promotional element on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 indicating the most preferred and 5 the least preferred, based on their individual preferences. To determine the order of preference for Yamaha's promotional tools, the study utilized the Henry Garrett Ranking Technique. The responses were converted into percentage scores using the formula provided in Henry Garrett's conversion table, allowing the researcher to calculate the overall rank and priority of each promotional tool.

Table2.2.1 – - iAssigning of values for the ranks

100(Rij-0.5)	Percent position
$100 \times (1-0.5) / 5$	10
$100 \times (2-0.5) / 5$	30
$100 \times (3-0.5) / 5$	50
$100 \times (4-0.5) / 5$	70
$100 \times (5-0.5) / 5$	90

For each rank, respondents are allowed to assign a value from 1 to 5. Once the ranks are allotted, the corresponding percentage score for each rank is calculated. These percentage scores are then converted into scale values using the Henry Garrett Scale Conversion Table. Specifically, ranks 1 through 5 correspond to scale values of 10, 30, 50, 70, and 90, respectively, which are used to determine the overall ranking of the promotional tools.

Table2.2.2 – - iHenry garret values for the ranks

Percent position	Garret value
10	75
30	60
50	50
70	40
90	25

The scale value for each promotional tool is calculated by multiplying the number of respondents (denoted by f) by the corresponding scale value (denoted by x) to obtain fx. All fx values are then summed to determine the total score for each factor. To establish the order of preference assigned by the respondents, the mean score for each promotional tool is calculated, and overall ranks are assigned accordingly.

Table2.2.3 – - iPreference factor of selection Air Coolers

Factors	iRank	I				III		Total	Total score	Mean rank	rank
		7	6	5	4	50	40				
Advertisement	F	51	41	21	31			145	8575	59.13	1
	F _x	3825	2460	1050	1240						
Personal selling	F	22	28	56	39			145	7690	53.03	4
	F _x	1650	1680	2800	1560						
Sales promotion	F	48	42	21	34			145	8530	58.8	2
	F _x	3600	2520	1050	1360						
Publicity / Public relation	F	23	34	47	41			145	7755	53.48	3
	f _x	1725	2040	2350	1640						

From the analysis, it is evident that respondents in the study area were most influenced by advertisement, followed closely by personal selling, publicity, and sales promotion, with respective mean scores of 59.13, 58.80, 53.48, and 53.03. This indicates that advertising emerged as the most effective promotional tool, while sales promotion ranked comparatively lower among the considered factors.

3. Objective 2: To study the variance between sources and level of awareness towards mobiles

3.1 To Study the Significant Difference Between Advertisement and Awareness

To examine whether a significant variance exists between advertisement and awareness, the researcher employed a One-Way ANOVA test. In this analysis, advertisement was treated as a categorical independent variable (fixed factor), while awareness was considered as the dependent continuous variable. This statistical approach was adopted to determine whether different modes of advertisement significantly influence the level of consumer awareness.

Table 2.3.1: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
price	Between Groups	3.022	3	1.007	1.421	.239
	Within Groups	99.944	141	.709		
	Total	102.966	144			
brand value	Between Groups	3.727	3	1.242	1.346	.262
	Within Groups	130.163	141	.923		
	Total	133.890	144			
features	Between Groups	8.425	3	2.808	2.089	.104
	Within Groups	189.575	141	1.345		
	Total	198.000	144			
style	Between Groups	1.554	3	.518	.598	.617
	Within Groups	122.197	141	.867		
	Total	123.752	144			

Table 2.3.1 indicates that there is no significant difference between advertisement and awareness. The observed significance value is greater than the threshold level of 0.05, suggesting that variations in advertisement do not result in statistically significant differences in the level of consumer awareness. Hence, it can be inferred that advertisement, as measured in this study, does not have a distinct impact on consumer awareness.

3.2 To Study the Significant Difference Between Personal Selling and Awareness

To assess whether a significant variance exists between personal selling and awareness, the researcher applied a One-Way ANOVA test. In this analysis, personal selling was treated as a categorical independent variable (fixed factor), while awareness was considered as the dependent continuous variable. This test was conducted to determine whether variations in personal selling efforts significantly influence the level of consumer awareness.

Table 2.3.2: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
price	Between Groups	2.770	3	.923	1.300	.277
	Within Groups	100.195	141	.711		
	Total	102.966	144			
brand value	Between Groups	3.157	3	1.052	1.135	.337
	Within Groups	130.732	141	.927		
	Total	133.890	144			
features	Between Groups	4.690	3	1.563	1.140	.335
	Within Groups	193.310	141	1.371		
	Total	198.000	144			
style	Between Groups	1.211	3	.404	.465	.707
	Within Groups	122.540	141	.869		
	Total	123.752	144			

Table 2.3.2 shows that there is no significant difference between personal selling and awareness. The significance value obtained is greater than the conventional threshold of 0.05, indicating that variations in personal selling do not lead to statistically significant differences in the level of consumer awareness. This suggests that, within the context of this study, personal selling does not independently influence consumer awareness.

3.3 To Study the Significant Difference Between Sales Promotion and Awareness

To investigate whether a significant variance exists between sales promotion and awareness, the researcher employed a One-Way ANOVA test. In this analysis, sales promotion was treated as a categorical independent variable (fixed factor), while awareness was considered as the dependent continuous variable. The test was carried out to determine whether different levels of sales promotion activities significantly influence consumer awareness.

Table 2.3.3 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
price	Between Groups	1.574	3	.525	.730	.536
	Within Groups	101.391	141	.719		
	Total	102.966	144			
brand value	Between Groups	3.059	3	1.020	1.099	.352
	Within Groups	130.831	141	.928		
	Total	133.890	144			
features	Between Groups	3.329	3	1.110	.804	.494
	Within Groups	194.671	141	1.381		
	Total	198.000	144			
style	Between Groups	1.815	3	.605	.699	.554
	Within Groups	121.937	141	.865		
	Total	123.752	144			

Table 2.3.3 reveals that there is no significant difference between sales promotion and awareness. The significance value is greater than the accepted threshold of 0.05, which indicates that variations in sales promotion activities do not produce statistically significant differences in the level of consumer awareness. Thus, within the scope of this study, sales promotion does not appear to have a direct influence on consumer awareness.

3.4 To Study the Significant Difference Between Publicity and Awareness

To examine whether a significant variance exists between publicity and awareness, the researcher employed a One-Way ANOVA test. In this analysis, publicity was treated as a categorical independent variable (fixed factor), while awareness was considered as the dependent continuous variable. This approach was used to determine whether different forms of publicity significantly influence the level of consumer awareness.

Table 2.3.4: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
price	Between Groups	2.063	3	.688	.961	.413
	Within Groups	100.903	141	.716		
	Total	102.966	144			
brand value	Between Groups	5.647	3	1.882	2.070	.107
	Within Groups	128.243	141	.910		
	Total	133.890	144			
features	Between Groups	5.548	3	1.849	1.355	.259
	Within Groups	192.452	141	1.365		
	Total	198.000	144			
style	Between Groups	3.535	3	1.178	1.382	.251
	Within Groups	120.216	141	.853		
	Total	123.752	144			

Table 2.3.4 indicates that there is no significant difference between publicity and awareness. The significance value is greater than the conventional threshold of 0.05, suggesting that variations in publicity do not lead to statistically significant differences in the level of consumer awareness. Hence, within the context of this study, publicity does not exert a distinct influence on consumer awareness.

4. Objective 3: To measure the impact of level of awareness on buying decision.

1. Table 2.4.1: List of factors of awareness

S.No	Description of items	Denoted by
1	Advertisement	X1
2	Sales Promotion	X2
3	Personal Selling	X3
4	Publicity	X4

To examine the impact of independent variables on the dependent variable, multiple linear regression analysis was employed. In this study, the elements of awareness were treated as independent variables, while the buying decision was considered the dependent variable. This statistical approach provides deeper insights into how different dimensions of awareness influence consumer buying behavior. The results of the regression analysis highlight the extent to which each

independent variable contributes to variations in the dependent variable, thereby offering a clearer understanding of their relative impact.

Table 2.4.2. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.722 ^a	.521	.507	2.02650

a. Predictors: (Constant), style, features, price, brand value

The table indicates that the combination of awareness elements explains 72.2% of the variance in buying behavior, the dependent variable. The R² value (0.521) demonstrates a strong effect of the independent variables (X1 to X4) on the dependent variable. Moreover, the adjusted R² value, exceeding 50%, confirms a substantial contribution of the predictors to the response variable. The F-value (37.75), significant at the 1% level, further validates the overall model fit, suggesting that the regression model is statistically significant and reliable.

Table 2.4.3 ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	620.169	4	155.042	37.754	.000 ^a
	Residual	570.831	139	4.107		
	Total	1191.000	143			

a. Predictors: (Constant), style, features, price, brand value

b. Dependent Variable: Buying

Table 2.4.4 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	8.087	.417		19.386	.000
	Price (x1)	-3.109	.536	-.912	-5.802	.000
	brand value(x2)	5.807	.489	1.940	11.872	.000
	Features(x3)	-.775	.320	-.315	-2.422	.017
	Style(x4)	-2.563	.453	-.826	-5.662	.000

From Table 2.4.4, it is observed that only three independent variables significantly influence the dependent variable, i.e., buyer decision. The standardized β values highlight the relative strength of each predictor. Among the significant variables (X1, X2, and X3), all show significance at the 1% level. Based on the β coefficients, X2 exerts the strongest impact, indicating its dominant role in shaping buyer decisions compared to the other predictors.

6. FINDINGS

1. Among the promotional tools analyzed, respondents in the study area expressed greater attraction towards Advertisement (Mean = 59.13), followed by Personal Selling (Mean = 58.80), Publicity (Mean = 53.48), and Sales Promotion (Mean = 53.03).
2. The One-way ANOVA results revealed that there is no significant difference between each promotional tool (Advertisement, Personal Selling, Sales Promotion, and Publicity) and awareness, as the significance values were greater than 0.05. This indicates that the level of awareness does not vary significantly across different promotional strategies.

3. The Multiple Linear Regression analysis demonstrated that the combined effect of awareness elements accounted for 72.2% of the variation in buying behavior, with an R^2 value of 0.521 and Adjusted R^2 exceeding 0.50, confirming strong explanatory power of the model.
4. The regression model was significant at the 1% level ($F = 37.75$), highlighting the overall validity of the relationship between awareness elements and buyer decision.
5. Out of the four independent variables (X_1 to X_4), only X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 showed a significant impact on buyer decision at the 1% level of significance.
6. The standardized β values confirmed that X_2 has the highest impact on buyer decision, followed by X_1 and X_3 , while X_4 was found to be insignificant.

7. CONCLUSION

The study reveals that although all promotional strategies (advertising, personal selling, publicity, and sales promotion) are recognized by respondents, none of them individually contributes to significant differences in awareness levels. However, when combined as elements of awareness, they exert a strong influence on buying decisions, with more than 70% explanatory power.

Among the predictors, X_2 emerged as the most influential factor, demonstrating that consumer buying behavior is shaped more strongly by certain dimensions of awareness compared to others. This finding underscores the importance of focusing marketing efforts on the most impactful awareness-building activities rather than distributing resources equally across all strategies.

In conclusion, businesses—particularly mobile brands like Vivo—should strategically prioritize those awareness elements that strongly shape buyer decisions (especially X_2), while complementing them with supportive promotional tools. This targeted approach can maximize consumer awareness and positively drive purchasing behavior.

References

- Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name*. Free Press.
- Chi, H., Yeh, H., & Yang, Y. (2009). The impact of brand awareness on perceived quality and purchase intention in the mobile phone market. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 18(3), 188–198.
- Kapferer, J.-N. (2012). *The new strategic brand management: Advanced insights and strategic thinking* (5th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Keller, K. L. (2001). *Building customer-based brand equity: A blueprint for creating strong brands*. Marketing Science Institute.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Kotler, P., Armstrong, G., & Parment, A. (2021). *Principles of marketing* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- Malik, M., Ghafoor, M. M., & Javed, T. (2013). Influence of advertising and social media on mobile phone brand awareness. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 5(4), 45–53.
- Sharma, A., & Sheth, J. (2015). Peer influence and online reviews as sources of brand awareness in India's mobile phone market. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 24, 58–67.
- Solomon, M. R. (2018). *Consumer behavior: Buying, having, and being* (12th ed.). Pearson.
- Wu, L., Li, C., & Wang, T. (2020). Brand awareness and consumer engagement in smartphone purchasing decisions. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 37(5), 519–530.
- Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lee, S. (2000). An examination of selected marketing mix elements and brand equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2), 195–211.