



International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications (IJEBA)

www.iasir.net

Effectiveness of Mobile Handset Advertisements: A Comparative Analysis in North India

Dr. Rajesh Kumar

Assistant Professor,

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences,

NIT, Hamirpur, Himachal Pradesh, INDIA

Abstract: India is one of the fastest growing telecom markets in the world. The telecom companies are investing huge expenditure on advertising and are using various extensive research techniques to know the effectiveness of their advertisements. This research paper investigates the effectiveness of mobile handset advertisements in the select states/UT of Northern region of India. Five major mobile handset manufacturing companies namely; Nokia, Samsung, Micromax, Blackberry and Karbonn have been considered for the purpose of study. The study concludes that Samsung's advertisements are most effective as it was the most recalled brand by the consumers and Samsung also scored highest on the basis of other parameters of effectiveness i.e. likability, rationality, believability and persuasiveness. Samsung's brand ambassador i.e. Aamir Khan was most preferred by the respondents. Study has the implications for the advertisers as some recommendations are provided to improve the advertising effectiveness to the companies with poor advertising performance.

Keywords: Advertising effectiveness; mobile handset advertisements; Nokia, Samsung; Micromax; Blackberry; Karbonn.

I. Introduction

Nearly everyone in this modern world is influenced to some degree by advertising and other forms of promotion. Organizations in both the public and private sectors have learned that the ability to communicate effectively and efficiently with their target audiences is critical to their success. We are experiencing perhaps the most dynamic and revolutionary changes of any era in the history of advertising and promotion. These changes are being driven by advances in technology and developments that have led to the rapid growth of communications through interactive media, particularly the internet. The increasing growth in advertising and media expenditures provides evidence of their rising significance. (Belch and Belch, 2012).

India is one of the fastest growing telecom markets in the world. India's telecom sector has shown massive upsurge in recent years in all respects of industrial growth. From the status of state monopoly with very limited growth, it has grown to the level of an industry. The stupendous growth of the telecommunication companies in India over the last fifteen years can be attributed to the liberal government of India's economic policy. The telecommunication companies in India went through a huge make-over during the implementation of the open-market policy of India. Since the telecom companies are investing huge expenditure on advertising, they are obviously interested in knowing the impact of advertising. That's why companies are using various extensive research techniques to know the effectiveness of their advertisements.

II. Riview of Literature

Schoham and Aviv (1996) conducted research on the effectiveness of standardized and adapted TV advertising. Findings of the study showed varied levels of standardization, recognition, recall, believability and purchase levels in the outcome measures. **Simon Broadbent (2000)** advocated in the study that the effects of advertisements must be seen in behavior before discussing how individuals are affected. **Brett et al (2002)** examined the effectiveness of infomercials and their influence on advertisement design elements. The results of the survey revealed that infomercials with expert comments, testimonials, product demonstrations, the use of elements such as market models, celebrity endorsers, product comparisons and bonus offers is more effective in infomercials. **Claire et al (2003)** focused on the influence of selective exposure of context effects on advertising effectiveness in their study. The study concluded that the attitude of the respondents to advertisements positively correlated with recall and recognition of advertisements. **Brian and Daniel (2005)** assessed the importance of creativity in advertisements. The results of the study suggested that creative advertisements generate significantly greater brand execution recall on unaided basis. **Demetrios and Zhengeng (2005)** examined the long term effectiveness of multimedia advertising in a competitive setting and its implications for budget allocation decisions using multivariate persistence methodology. **Tim Broadbent (2008)** studied the historical evidence and recent case histories of successful marketing campaigns form UK's IPA effectiveness awards. **Peter et al (2009)** consolidated past findings on clutter with analysis of four new data sets, documented the

empirical patterns for how advertising works in TV and Radio with different levels of clutter. **Yognick et al (2011)** studied how brand recall and recognition are affected by non-editorial clutter in mega events broadcasting. The results revealed that increase in the number and length of other ads and on-air promos negatively affect brand recall and recognition. **Purva & Himanshu (2011)** advocated that absurdity in advertisements increases notice ability and brand recall of the consumers. A strong correlation was found between brand recall of absurd advertisements and entertainment scale of the likeability dimension. **Yashmin (2011)** opined that the agencies in India have no formal way of evaluating their advertising campaigns. The study concluded that the most common and popular factor for evaluating the effectiveness of advertising agencies' campaign is client's feedback. **Dalip & Kritika (2012)** studied the effectiveness of advertising in terms of impact of general advertising, whether it may be through media on the awareness, knowledge, liking, preference, trial, purchase decision and post purchase decision of the consumer and analyzing variation in consumer responses.

III. Objectives of the Study

Keeping in mind the rationale behind the study, the following research objectives have been framed:

- To know the most recalled mobile handset brand by the consumers
- To evaluate the effectiveness of mobile handset advertisements on the basis of (a) Creativity (b) Likability (c) Rationality (d) Believability (e) Persuasiveness
- To find the most preferred celebrity endorser by consumers in mobile handset advertisements

IV. Research Methodology

Research Design: The study is descriptive in nature and is focused on the comparative analysis of effectiveness of mobile handset advertisements in north India.

Sampling: The study attempts to investigate the effectiveness of mobile handset advertisements in the select states/UT of Northern region of India. At the first stage; 3 states; namely Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and one UT; namely Chandigarh were selected on the basis of simple random sampling. Then, a sample of 500 respondents was selected from different cities of these states on the basis of convenience sampling. The sample was comprised of 330 male respondents and 170 female respondents.

Scope of the Study: Five major mobile handset manufacturing companies namely; Nokia, Samsung, Micromax, Blackberry and Karbonn have been chosen on the basis of their market share in India for the purpose of study. Further, in order to evaluate the advertising effectiveness of these five major mobile handset manufacturing companies, two advertisements from each company were selected randomly. So, total ten advertisements were shown to the respondents and their opinion about them was drawn and evaluated.

Data Collection: The study is based on primary data. A well structural schedule of questions containing different aspects of the study was developed and circulated among the respondents. Certain information has been collected through personal observations.

Statistical tools: The Pearson Chi-square test was used to compare the results for brand-recall. The mean and standard deviation were used to compare the results of effectiveness of mobile handset advertisements. Further, ANOVA was used to check the significant difference among effectiveness of different mobile handset vendors on the basis of creativity, likability, rationality, believability and persuasiveness. The mode was used to find the most preferred celebrity by the respondents on the basis of ranks assigned to different celebrities.

V. Analysis and Findings

(1) Comparative analysis of Brand-Recall

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Gender

Gender	Nokia	Samsung	Micromax	Blackberry	Karbonn	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	p-value
Male	110	163	21	17	19	330	6.341	.175ns
	33.3%	49.4%	6.4%	5.2%	5.8%	100.0%		
Female	46	84	20	12	8	170		
	27.1%	49.4%	11.8%	7.1%	4.7%	100.0%		

ns = not significant

It is evident from table 1 that majority of male and female respondents recalled Samsung with equal proportion i.e. 49.4%. In order to verify the statistical significance of gender and brand recall, Pearson Chi-Square test was applied and following hypothesis was framed:

H₀: There is no significant difference among male and females towards brand recall

H_A: There is significant difference among male and females towards brand recall

The computed Pearson Chi-Square value is 6.341 which is not significant i.e. 0.175 at 95% confidence level i.e. null hypothesis is accepted and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the male and female respondents towards brand recall.

Table 1.1: Descriptive Statistics for Age

Age (In years)	Nokia	Samsung	Micromax	Blackberry	Karbons	Total	Pearson Chi-Square	p-value
<= 20	29	57	16	10	12	124	32.223	.001**
	23.4%	46.0%	12.9%	8.1%	9.7%	100.0%		
21 - 30	51	78	11	10	5	155		
	32.9%	50.3%	7.1%	6.5%	3.2%	100.0%		
31 - 40	32	77	9	3	6	127		
	25.2%	60.6%	7.1%	2.4%	4.7%	100.0%		
Above 40	44	35	5	6	4	94		
	46.8%	37.2%	5.3%	6.4%	4.3%	100.0%		

Table 1.1 signifies that in age the groups <=20 years, 21-30 years and 31-40 years, the most recalled brand was Samsung. Whereas the respondents of the age group of above 40 years had mostly recalled Nokia with 46.8%. In order to verify the statistical significance of age and brand recall, Pearson Chi-Square test was applied and following hypothesis was framed:

H₀: There is no significant difference among respondents from different age groups towards brand recall

H_A: There is significant difference among respondents from different age groups towards brand recall

The computed Pearson Chi-Square value is 32.223 which is significant i.e. 0.001 at 95% confidence level. This shows that null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is significant difference among respondents from different age groups towards brand recall.

(2) Comparative Analysis of Advertising Effectiveness on the basis of different parameters

(a) Comparative Analysis on the basis of Creativity

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Creativity

Company	Number of Respondents	Mean	Std. Deviation
Nokia	500	3.5540	1.06271
Samsung	500	3.6040	1.15492
Micromax	500	3.6940	1.01904
BlackBerry	500	3.5040	1.23654
Karbons	500	3.0020	.97360
Total	2500	3.4716	1.11933

Table 2 clearly shows that mean value with respect to creativity is higher for Micromax i.e. 3.6940 as compared to other companies. It reveals that respondents had found Micromax advertisements most creative followed by Samsung, Nokia and Blackberry. Karbons advertisements were found to be least creative of all.

Table 2.1: ANOVA for Creativity

Creativity	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	147.678	4	36.919	30.876	.000**
Within Groups	2983.306	2495	1.196		
Total	3130.984	2499			

Austerly to verify the statistical significance of creativity in the advertisements of different mobile handset companies, ANOVA test was applied and following hypothesis was framed:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the creativity of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

H_A: There is significant difference in the creativity of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

The computed value of F is 30.876 which is highly significant i.e. 0.000 at 95% confidence level. This shows that null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded there is significant difference in the creativity of advertisements of different mobile handset companies.

(b) Comparative Analysis on the basis of Likability

Table 2.2: Descriptive Statistics for Likability

Company	Number of Respondents	Mean	Std. Deviation
Nokia	500	3.4420	1.15121
Samsung	500	3.5100	1.16129
MicroMax	500	3.5020	1.15441
BlackBerry	500	3.0340	1.16772
Karbons	500	3.2780	1.07844
Total	2500	3.3532	1.15628

Table 2.2 reveals that mean value for Samsung is higher i.e. 3.5100 with respect to likability as compared to other companies. It shows that respondents had found more likeability in Samsung advertisements followed by Micromax, Nokia and Karbons. Respondents have given least preference to Blackberry regarding likability.

Table 2.3: ANOVA for Likability

Likability	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	81.078	4	20.270	15.513	.000**
Within Groups	3260.046	2495	1.307		
Total	3341.124	2499			

Austerly to verify the statistical significance of likability of the advertisements of different mobile handset companies, ANOVA test was applied and following hypothesis was framed:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the likability of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

H_A: There is significant difference in the likability of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

The computed value of F is 15.513 which is highly significant i.e. 0.000 at 95% confidence level. This shows that null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded there is significant difference in the likability of advertisements of different mobile handset companies.

(c) Comparative Analysis on the basis of Rationality

Table 2.4: Descriptive Statistics for Rationality

Company	Number of Respondents	Mean	Std. Deviation
Nokia	500	3.4960	1.10473
Samsung	500	3.5620	1.17512
MicroMax	500	3.5100	1.12803
BlackBerry	500	3.2160	1.21173
Karbons	500	3.4740	1.19674
Total	2500	3.4516	1.16936

Table 2.4 signifies that mean value for Samsung is higher i.e. 3.5620 with respect to rationality as compared to other companies. This shows that respondents had found Samsung advertisements more rational followed by Micromax, Nokia and Karbons. BlackBerry advertisements were found to be least rational by respondents.

Table 2.5: ANOVA for Rationality

Rationality	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	36.790	4	9.197	6.788	.000**
Within Groups	3380.354	2495	1.355		
Total	3417.144	2499			

Austerly to verify the statistical significance of rationality of the advertisements of different mobile handset companies, ANOVA test was applied and following hypothesis was framed:

H₀: There is no significant difference in rationality of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

H_A: There is significant difference in rationality of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

The computed value of F is 6.788 which is highly significant i.e. 0.000 at 95% confidence level. This shows that null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded there is significant difference in the rationality of advertisements of different mobile handset companies.

(d) Comparative Analysis on the basis of Believability

Table 2.6: Descriptive Statistics for Believability

Company	Number of Respondents	Mean	Std. Deviation
Nokia	500	3.5020	1.10655
Samsung	499	3.5511	1.16977
MicroMax	500	3.4760	1.11171
BlackBerry	500	3.2220	1.20483
Karbons	500	3.2000	1.06878
Total	2499	3.3902	1.14214

Table 2.6 signifies that mean value for Samsung is higher i.e. 3.5511 with respect to believability as compared to other companies. This shows that respondents had believed most in Samsung advertisements followed by Nokia, Micromax and BlackBerry. Karbons advertisements were found to be least believable by the respondents.

Table 2.7: ANOVA for Believability

Believability	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	55.083	4	13.771	10.721	.000**
Within Groups	3203.515	2494	1.284		
Total	3258.598	2498			

Austerly to verify the statistical significance of believability of the advertisements of different mobile handset companies, ANOVA test was applied and following hypothesis was framed:

H₀: There is no significant difference in believability of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

H_A: There is significant difference in believability of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

The computed value of F is 10.721 which is highly significant i.e. 0.000 at 95% confidence level. This shows that null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded there is significant difference in the believability of advertisements of different mobile handset companies.

(e) **Comparative Analysis on the basis of Persuasiveness**

Table 2.8: Descriptive Statistics for Persuasiveness

Company	Number of Respondents	Mean	Std. Deviation
Nokia	500	3.4980	1.14219
Samsung	500	3.6000	1.10564
MicroMax	500	3.4100	1.15263
BlackBerry	500	3.2700	1.18317
Karbons	500	3.4100	1.12980
Total	2500	3.4376	1.14727

Table 2.8 signifies that mean value for Samsung is higher i.e. 3.6000 with respect to persuasiveness as compared to other companies. This shows that respondents had found Samsung advertisements more persuasive followed by Nokia, Micromax and Karbons. Blackberry advertisements were found to be least persuasive by respondents.

Table 2.9: ANOVA for Persuasiveness

Persuasive	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	29.818	4	7.454	5.706	.000**
Within Groups	3259.448	2495	1.306		
Total	3289.266	2499			

Austerly to verify the statistical significance of persuasiveness of the advertisements of different mobile handset companies, ANOVA test was applied and following hypothesis was framed:

H_0 : There is no significant difference in persuasiveness of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

H_A : There is significant difference in persuasiveness of advertisements of different mobile handset companies

The computed value of F is 5.706 which is highly significant i.e. 0.000 at 95% confidence level. This shows that null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded there is significant difference in the persuasiveness of advertisements of different mobile handset companies.

(3) Ratings of Brand Ambassadors of Mobile Handset Companies

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Most preferred Celebrity

Company	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Rank 5	Total	Mode
Nokia (Priyanka Chopra)	112 22.4%	125 25.0%	150 30.0%	70 14.0%	43 8.6%	500 100.0%	3
Samsung (Aamir Khan)	271 54.2%	137 27.4%	44 8.8%	34 6.8%	14 2.8%	500 100.0%	1
Micromax (Akshay Kumar)	38 7.6%	125 25.0%	191 38.2%	124 24.8%	22 4.4%	500 100.0%	3
BlackBerry (Ranbeer Kapoor)	49 9.8%	89 17.8%	72 14.4%	154 30.8%	136 27.2%	500 100.0%	4
Karbons (Virendra Sehwa)	32 6.4%	24 4.8%	47 9.4%	114 22.8%	283 56.6%	500 100.0%	5

Respondents were asked to rank different celebrities on the basis of their liking and preference and it is evident from the table 3 that Samsung's brand ambassador i.e. Amir Khan was most liked by the respondents followed by Priyanka Chopra in Nokia and Akshay Kumar in Micromax, Ranbeer Kapoor in Blackberry. Karbons's brand ambassador i.e. Virendra Sehwa was least liked by the respondents.

VI. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study concludes that Samsung advertisements are more effective and were able to leave a considerable impact on the consumers. Samsung was the most recalled brand by the respondents of different gender and different age groups. Micromax advertisements were found to be most creative of all. Consumers had found Samsung advertisements most likable, rational, believable and persuasive as compared to other brands. Further, brand ambassador of Samsung i.e. Aamir Khan was most preferred by the respondents among all the celebrities. On the basis of results of the study, certain recommendations could be provided to the companies like Blackberry and Karbons. Since both these companies scored low in almost all the parameters of advertising effectiveness, therefore they need to make their advertisements more creative and interesting in order to improve their advertising performance.

VII. References

- [1] Belch George E, Belch Michael A, and Purani Keyoor (2012), "Advertising and Promotion", 7th Edition, Tata Mcgraw Hill Education Private Limited, New Delhi, pp. 8.
- [2] Broadbent Simon (2000), "What do Advertisements really do for Brands?", International Journal of Advertising", Vol. 19 (2), pp. 147.
- [3] Broadbent Tim (2008), "Does Advertising grow Markets? More evidence from UK, International Journal of Advertising", Vol. 27(5), pp. 745-770.

- [4] Demetrios and Zhengeng (2005), "A look at the long run effectiveness of Multimedia Advertising and its Implications for Budget Allocation Decisions", Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 45 (2), pp. 241-254.
- [5] Hammer Peter, Riebo Erica and Kennedy Rachel (2009), "How Clutter affects Advertising Effectiveness", Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 49 (2), pp. 159-163.
- [6] Raina Dalip and Khajuria Kritika (2012), "Effectiveness of Advertisements in India: An Empirical study", India Journal of Marketing, Vol. 42(5), pp. 30-38.
- [7] Scoham and Aviv (1996), "Effectiveness of Standardized and Adapted TV Advertising: An International Field Study Approach", Journal of International Consumer Marketing, Vol. 9(1), pp. 5-23.
- [8] Sofat Yashmin (2011), "Strategy of Advertising Agencies in India for evaluating Advertising Effectiveness", Indian Journal of Marketing, Vol. 41(9), pp. 62-72.
- [9] Kansal Purva and Sharma Himanshu R. (2011), "Effect of Absurdity in Advertising on Brand Recall", Indian Journal of Marketing, Vol. 41(7), pp. 3-8.
- [10] Martin Brett A S, Bhimy Andrew C and Agee Tom (2002), "Infomercials and Advertising Effectiveness: An empirical Study", Journal of Consumer Marketing, Vol. 19(6), pp. 468- 480.
- [11] Jeong Yongick, Kim Yeuseung and Zhao Xinshu (2011), "Competing for Consumer Memory in TV Advertising: An empirical examination of the impacts of non-editorial clutter on Brand Memory in Mega-event Broadcasting", International Journal of Advertising, Vol. 30 (4), pp. 617-640.
- [12] Norris Claire E, Colman Andrew M and Aleixo Paulo A (2003), "Selective Exposure to Television Programmes and Advertising Effectiveness", Journal of Applied Cognitive Psychology, Vol.17, pp. 593-606.
- [13] Till Brian D and Baack Daniel W (2005), "*Recall and Persuasion- Does Creative Advertising Matter?*" Journal of Advertising, Vol. 34(3), pp. 47-57.