China’s BBK Giving Jitters to Other Android Brands through Impactful Marketing Strategies: A Study of the Indian Market

Dr. Shikha Singh  
Assistant Professor  
Symbiosis Centre for Management Studies, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Noida, Uttar Pradesh. India. Email: shikha.singh@scmsnoida.ac.in, shikhabirsingh@gmail.com

Prof. (Dr.) Tarun Kumar Singhal  
Professor  
Symbiosis Centre for Management Studies, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Noida, Uttar Pradesh. India. Email: tarun.singhal@scmsnoida.ac.in

Rupashi Sehgal  
BBA Student  
Symbiosis Centre for Management Studies, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Noida, Uttar Pradesh. India. Email: sehgal.rupashi@gmail.com

Tuhina Shukla  
BBA Student  
Symbiosis Centre for Management Studies, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Noida, Uttar Pradesh. India. Email: tuhinashukla98@gmail.com

Abstract- Technology has flourished enormously over the last few decades, which has bought a revolution to the IT and Telecom sector. Cellphones which were primarily developed to make phone calls, have now turned out to be a necessity and are just not limited to calling. They have taken over many gadgets that are useful in day to day lives. Everyday people encounter a significant number of better and improved features being embedded into them. The end-users face a dilemma in selecting smartphones because of the cut-throat prices and a wide range of features being offered. Seeking the business opportunity, BBK Electronics Corporation (a Chinese company) tapped the Indian market with a different approach to capture the Indian market. BBK Electronics launched three different smartphone companies - VIVO, OPPO, ONE PLUS with different owners, USPs, marketing tactics as well as different features. These three companies are now competing with different smartphone players in different segments. ONE PLUS is now competing with big brands like SAMSUNG and APPLE whereas Vivo and Oppo are competing with Mi, Redmi, Honor, etc. This research paper has examined these impactful marketing strategies adopted by BBK Electronics in the Indian market.
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I. INTRODUCTION

From being a luxury product to reaching the pockets of all the income segments of the country, cell phones now fuel an industry touching all corners of the globe. The phone industry is one of the fastest growing sectors in the communication industry. It is engaged in manufacturing mobile phones, including mobile handsets. The industry is known for continuous technology up-gradation and innovation building a path for the smartphones and other phone features and segments made in recent years. Indian market is very competitively poised between price conscious and features conscious customers. However, the big size of the Indian market inundated with the presence of the customers in almost all the price segments is attracting organizations from across the world. The market strategists have been fascinated with the diversity of the Indian market. They are always on the lookout for the strategies that will help them in getting a grip on the dynamics of the Indian market. Marketing strategies always play a significant role in attracting customers and making a brand reputation in any market. With the era of smartphones and android technology, the Indian market was dominated by already existing mobile companies like Nokia, Samsung, etc. With technological advancements, the mobile companies were charging huge amounts on smartphones making a hole in the pocket of the Indian customers. While initially only the rich class and upper middle class were entitled to the pleasure of this new technology, the customer segment of the lower middle class, constituting a major part of the Indian population was still waiting for reasonable and good quality of smartphones. Seeking this as a business opportunity new android companies came into the market with less expensive phones providing an almost similar feature and in no time tapped the huge Indian market. In the modern digital world, smartphones are a ‘centre of discussion’ amongst the consumers. Now having a mobile phone doesn’t only mean using it for cellular conversations for long distances but having the best camera features, smart apps, video calling feature, ram, speed of the processor, etc. are also the parameters of choosing the smartphones.

BBK is a Chinese multinational corporation. BBK Electronics has been operating in various sections of China’s electronics industry since the 1990s. Duan Yongping, a reclusive billionaire, spearheaded the company. After successfully generating more than 1 billion Yuan from the “Subor” gaming console, a competitor to the Nintendo Entertainment System, Duan left his position running a Chinese factory in 1995. He then started the company Bubugao, which would eventually become BBK. The company now owns factories spread over 10 hectares of land and more than 17,000 employees. Triggs (2020) BBK Electronics began by manufacturing a range of CD, MP3, and DVD players, along with other household appliances. These appeared under a range of global brands. In 2004 Duan founded Oppo with CEO Tony Chen. Oppo built on Duan’s experience in the video market by selling DVD and Blu-ray players, before moving into the smartphone market.

The research paper focuses on understanding the intention behind choosing three different company names, three different marketing strategies highlighting three different unique selling price (USPs) yet targeting the same target market and also understanding the impact on the consumers of these methodologies used by the marketer. The progress the Indian market has made in terms of smartphone selling and other gadgets, how the technology has evolved in the past few years and how the consumer market and its demand keeps on changing with the change in their taste and preferences and their urge to own the newest and the best. These reports and reasons have guided us through the process of writing this research paper. The goal of the research is to transform the general statement into a targeted well-defined statement that can be looked upon using research and surveys.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

With increasing globalization and international trade, many international brands are entering into India which is one of the fastest growing and highly competitive markets in the world. Though most of the global firms failed to understand the needs of Indian consumers as well as the market characteristics there are a few of them who have been successful in positioning their brands into the Indian market because they attempt to understand well the needs of target group before introducing a brand into the market. Even some of the most successful brands in today’s time had committed several blunders or mistakes while initially entering into the Indian market. Oburai & Baker (2005) in their paper discuss the prominent organizational strategies of many leading Indian firms and multinationals located in India. This is a significant indicator of the growing competitiveness of firms, industries, and the nation. This paper examines the sources of competitive advantage in a few selected sectors and firms and explores the internationalization possibilities and potential. International marketing strategies are complex and tend to vary widely across nations, industries, and firms. The elements that form the ingredients of international strategies are numerous and their importance is tightly interwoven to contexts. Intending to enrich the existing body of international marketing theory, the authors investigate the international marketing strategies adopted in 12 different
business sectors in India in an attempt to explore and explain the similarities and differences found in this varied set of industries. Murphy (2018) in his paper states that BBK Electronics is the world’s third-largest smartphone company. It is a consumer electronics company that owns a range of smartphone brands that are popular in regions around the world. BBK owns Oppo, which is popular across Southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent and sponsors FC Barcelona; Vivo, which mainly sells in Russia, India, and China which markets phones in China, but seems to have gone quiet recently. Oppo, in turn, owns One Plus, a smartphone maker that sells directly to consumers online, including in the US. Hackley & kitchen (1998) describe in their research paper the models of consumer behavior, these models explain how consumer searches and get the information and goes on to decide on how consumer searches and gets the information and goes on to decide for himself, for his family or the organization. Kwak Lee& Do Bum (2012) talks about how China has become a significant player in the international standardization regime of telecommunications. It is currently attempting international standardization of its indigenous technologies. This paper examines how China’s approach for standardization has evolved in the cases of locally developed 3G and 4G mobile standards: TD-SCDMA and TD-LTE. The authors collected network data through a sociometric technique. In this approach, defining the alliance boundary under study is important, and they limited the boundary to the mobile service industry. This approach offers an advantage in that it provides information on all kinds of formal (transaction-based) interactions within the alliance. It shows that China’s approach has shifted from techno-nationalism to techno globalism. It means that in China’s strategy for international standardization, relatively more weight is placed on the links with foreign firms than on those with local firms, and China is increasingly open to foreign firms with regards to international standardization in specific instances, and national technological innovation systems in general. Breitinger, Tully-Doyle, & Hassenfeld (2020) in their research paper describes that smartphones contain a significant amount of personal data. Additionally, they are always in the user’s possession, which allows them to be abused for tracking (e.g., GPS, Bluetooth or Wi-Fi tracking). To not reveal private information, smartphone users should secure their devices by setting lock screen protection, using third party security applications, and choosing appropriate security settings (often, default settings are inadequate).

In this paper, they mount a survey to explore user choices, awareness and education concerning cybersecurity. Survey findings suggest that most users have appropriate lock screen settings to protect their phones from physical access; however, they disregard other security best practices, e.g., not using a VPN when connecting to a public WiFi or turning off unused features (regardless of the level of expertise). Compared to desktop computers, smartphones are less secured and fewer third-party security products are installed. The study’s idea goes behind the dynamism of the marketing strategies that are nowadays being used by marketers to tap the Indian market. A recent survey shows that approximately 30 percent of the consumers are influenced by the marketing tactics of the researchers when they plan to buy a product from the market Nicholas(2019). The research also focuses on the dimension used to measure user heterogeneity which plays a key role in customer segmentation. For most traditional products, customer requirements (CRs) for products are often related to their basic characteristics and psychological characteristics. Therefore, in the traditional market segmentation theory, the dimensions used to distinguish customer differences include demographic attributes such as gender, age, income, etc., or the customer psychology. Customer behavior, especially purchasing behavior, is also used as an important dimension for market segmentation Yan (2019). Therefore, this study focuses on the impact of launching three separate brands in three different ways of targeting the same customer segment, their different marketing strategies and their impact on the customers. The research constitutes of primary data which will entertain qualitatively (analyzing the customer perception) and secondary data by analyzing the already available data regarding the marketing techniques of the company. This paper is of value to each MNC or company that is seeking to enter the Indian market with prospective marketing strategies and to optimize their business using these strategies and gain a competitive advantage in his/her industry.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research paper has used both secondary and primary data for the analysis. The secondary data consists of using the authentic sources stating BBK company’s strategy of working. This included analyzing the marketing schemes and strategies, understanding the Indian presence of all the three brands and further interpreting the reasons behind it. Primary data is collected through the questionnaire method and statistical testing is done to identify the impacts of these strategies on the consumers. A sample size of 148 respondents has been taken and their responses are interpreted and analyzed with the help of graphical representations. The research has been conducted in DELHI-NCR(National capital Region) with the help of a questionnaire using convenience sampling. The period of the study was from January 2019 to February 2019. The data has been collected by doing fieldwork and going to showrooms of
Oppo and Vivo where customers were buying the brand phones. The questionnaire has also been filled by the employees of the One Plus organization since they don’t have many retail stores in the area. The survey was also distributed on social media sites such as Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn along with different mailing lists.

The tool that was used to analyze our research study is the Chi-square test. The Chi-square test is commonly used to test the relationship between categorical variables. The software used is SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for the analysis and interpretation of data. The null hypothesis of the Chi-square test shows that no relationship exists between the categorical variables in the populations.

The research paper tries to answer the following question:

1. Does the selection of the phone by consumers depend upon the brand?
2. Does the ownership of the brand affect the consumers buying decision?
3. Is the buying decision affected by the age of the customer?
4. Is there any association between the marketing strategies of the company and the buying preferences of the consumer?

Hypothesis– Since the data is in qualitative form, hypothesis testing is conducted using chi-square testing. 4 hypotheses have been formed in the following research paper.

Hypothesis 1
H0- there is no association between the selection of the company and the basis of the selection of the smartphone.
H1- there is an association between the selection of the company and the basis of the selection of the smartphone.

Hypothesis 2
H0 - there is no association between the preference of the company (consumer buying) and awareness about their ownership (same parent company)
H1 – there is an association between the preference of the company (consumer buying) and awareness about their ownership (same parent company)

Hypothesis 3
H0- There is no association between the age group of the respondents and the preference of the company.
H1- there is an association between the age group of the respondents and the preference of the company.

Hypothesis 4
H0 - there is no association between the marketing strategies of the companies and the buying preference of the consumers.
H1- there is an association between the marketing strategies of the companies and the buying preference of the consumer.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Demographics–
A sample size of 148 was selected based on the number of questions asked in the questionnaire. Since there were 15 questions asked in the survey, 10 times the number of respondents was selected. The sample consisted of almost half women and half men population, between the age group of 14-50 years. The results of the survey indicate that there are 50.7 percent of males and 48 percent of respondents are females. There was 1.3 percent of the respondent population that kept their gender anonymous. The intention to take the gender factor was to check whether different genders have a different or similar perception about the different brands or not. The age group of the respondents falls between 15- 50 years of the population that hugely gets affected by any changes in the price, features or model of the smartphone that comes in the market. The results further indicate that 45.3 percent of the respondents belong to the age group of 20-25 years followed by the age group of 15-20 with a 32.4 percent point. 13.5 percent of the respondents belong to the category of 25-30 and the least number of respondents belonged to the category of 30 and above with 8.8 percent point.
The income chart of the respondents is shown in this analysis ranging from 0 Rs per month to 1 lac Rs per month. The intention to keep 0 the starting limit was because the age group targeted had respondents between 15-20 years of the age group who usually don’t indulge in any income-generating activities. While 30 percent of the respondents belong to the income range of 0-20,000 followed by 22 percent respondents between 20,000-40,000 range. 40,000-60,000 and 60,000-80,000 range has an almost close number of respondents with a weightage of 16 percent and 12 percent respectively. The highest range of income chart i.e. 80,000-1,00,000 consists of 20 percent of the respondent sample size.

The intention to take different income brackets is because the three companies in the research paper are known for targeting the three income segments of the market (lower, middle and upper). This made it easier to understand which income group gets attracted to which model or pricing of the phone and which brand does he/she prefers in the Indian consumer market.

4.2 Descriptive Analysis

The results of the survey in figure 1 indicate that the target market’s spending capacity is very vast that can sometimes make it difficult for the brands to cater to this. The main reason behind asking this question was to check the vastness of the respondent’s buying capacity. According to the responses, 35 percent of the sample size belongs to the category that is ready to spend between Rs 10,000-20000 on a smartphone whereas 25 percent are willing to spend Rs 20,000-30000 per smartphone. There is around 40 percent of the respondents falling in the bracket of luxury buyers with 20 percent in Rs 30,000-40000, 15 percent in Rs 40000-50000 and finally, the highest range constitutes 5 percent respondents who are willing to spend Rs 50,000-60000 to own a smartphone.

The results in figure 2 indicate that 40 percent of the respondents rely on online shopping when it comes to buying their smartphones. This shows that the market trend has experienced a shift from retailer buying in the last few years since before that online buying was considered less reliable. 23 percent of the respondents still prefer going to malls where they get several options under the same roof to choose from and 27 percent of the respondents still prefer
going to the retail shops of their preferred brands to buy their smartphones. 10 percent of the respondents also buy their smartphones directly from the factories since they believe they get those smartphones before they enter the market and even at a lesser cost than the market price. It seems that brand loyalty has somewhat decreased in the past few years since the availability of the number of brands has increased, the mode of buying has taken a shift due to which customers get more options to choose and compare from under a single roof.

The results in Figure 3 indicate the smartphone brand distribution. This question focuses on understanding the market share of the different smartphone companies within the respondent’s sample size. While 25.2 percent are consumers of Apple phones, 22 percent own Redmi/MI phones. This percentage shows a variety of respondents. While Apple comes in the upper level/premium-level brands, Redmi/MI are sellers to middle and low-income groups. Samsung has a market of 15.6 percent in the respondents’ sample set. The three brands that are to be surveyed are owned by 23.8 percent (One Plus) while 13 percent are owners of Oppo and Vivo. This has turned out to be a limitation of the survey that only around 33.8 percent of the respondents are owners of the phones produced by three companies. This also shows that according to the sample survey, 33.8 percent of the market is acquired by Vivo, Oppo, and One Plus.

In continuation of the previous question, the respondents were asked to choose the criteria based on which they buy their preferred smartphone. The results are indicated in Figure 4 showing that 25.7 percent believe that brand name is the most essential aspect of buying a smartphone which is followed by 25 percent of respondents who believe that processor and RAM are the most important aspects. 23.6 percent believe that the pocket-friendly pricing of a smartphone makes them buy that specific brand. 12.8 percent of the respondents are attracted by the speed and the camera feature of smartphones. While Vivo is famous for its pocket-friendly price, Oppo is famous for the camera features and One Plus is popular its speed and processor, it shows that probably the respondents are inclined towards buying these three brands.
The results in figure 5 indicate that the respondents believe that the best time to buy a smartphone is when the brand has launched it. According to them to maintain the status symbol buying the latest model of phone is essential. There are usually luxury bracket consumers who don’t consider price as a parameter of buying smartphones. These are impulsive buyers. 30 percent of the respondents believe that the best time to buy a smartphone is when a discounted price or an exchange offer deal is offered by the company. These are usually rational buyers of the product. 20 percent of the respondents believe that festive season is the best time to buy a smartphone since according to them the brands offer the best products at the best price during the festive seasons. Lastly, 10 percent of the respondents believe that buying a smartphone during the end of the year is the most suitable time to put money in smartphones.

The results in figure 6 indicate that the main question that caters to the objective statements of the research. Not many people in India have information about the fact that Oppo, Vivo and One Plus belong to the same parent company. BBK Electronics, a Chinese multinational company. This statement can be proven by looking at the responses according to which 44 percent of respondents consider this as first-time information and 16 percent fall in the maybe category. According to the personal interaction, the candidates who have opted for maybe weren’t able to believe that the information was genuine. Only 40 percent of people in the sample size knew the fact which shows that even though a large set of the sample believes that these three brands are competitors in the smartphone market some even know that they belong to the same parent company even when they are competing in the market.
The results in figure 7 indicate that 54.1 percent of the respondents say they have no information about the above-mentioned question while 11.5 percent are still doubtful about the trueness of the information. Only 34.5 percent of the sample claims to have the correct information about the relation between the Oppo and One Plus companies of smartphones. While Oppo and One Plus both entered the Indian market in 2014, Oppo gained popularity in the same year whereas One Plus became famous in 2016 after the launch of One Plus 1 and T series. Even after 4 -5 years of existence there are very fewer people who know that Oppo is a subsidiary of BBK electronics and a parent company to the One Plus range of phones.

Since all three companies have been competing in the market since the time of their birth in the Indian market, to understand the effectiveness of the strategy that BBK electronics used and check which brand was most preferred by the respondents the above-mentioned question was asked.

According to the responses indicated in figure 8, 73.6 (nearly 74) percent of respondents will buy a One Plus phone over Oppo which is 11.5 percent and Vivo which is 14.9 (nearly 15) percent. Existing studies have shown that One Plus has increased its revenue by about 115 percent in the last one year after the launch of One Plus 5T and One Plus 6. If the statistics are to be believed One Plus 6 launches resulted in a sale of 1 billion dollars within the first 10 minutes of its launch. While Oppo and Vivo use direct retailing to sell their smartphones, One Plus only uses the online medium to promote its product yet it is more accepted by the Indian market as compared to the other two.
In context with the above question, the respondents were asked to select the parameter of choosing One Plus/Vivo or Oppo as a buying option in smartphones. The results in figure 9 indicate that 52 percent of respondents believe that features of any smartphone make it more appealing for the consumer to buy while 18.2 percent fall for the brand name and 13.5 percent are attracted to the pricing. This shows that the dynamics of the market have changed; instead of running towards getting a price-friendly smartphone the consumers have become more aware to buy the good featured phone with value for money. In accordance with the above question since One Plus was considered the most bought smartphone. It is assumed that One Plus has been capable of providing good featured phones at reasonable prices to its customers.

The respondents were shown a picture of the brand ambassadors and were asked about their preference regarding the marketing campaigns of the three companies. While Vivo used Amir Khan (the Indian Bollywood actor) as brand ambassadorship in the Indian premier league, OPPO used actors like Hritik Roshan (the Indian Bollywood actor), Sonam Kapoor (the Indian Bollywood actor), etc. and became the official partner of the Indian cricket team. The results in figure 10 indicate that even then 41.5 percent of respondents believe that One Plus has the most effective branding strategy as compared to Oppo and Vivo which received 36.1 percent and 22.4 percent.

The results in figure 11 indicate that for 27.7 percent of the respondents, Vivo phones are famous for its camera feature whereas 22.3 percent believe that its association with the IPL and usage of the mascot has increased the sales of the company. 16.2 percent believe that the pocket-friendly price of the company makes it attractive while 14.2 percent and 10.1 percent vote for the fingerprint scanner and huge attractive screens respectively are the reasons for sales for Vivo. The company claims that its USP is providing the best features and pocket-friendly prices which has somewhat justified by the responses of the respondents in the study. The survey hence shows that Vivo has been able to convey itself properly amongst the Indian market consumers. The respondents believe that the speed of the processor is one of the least attractive features of Vivo phones.
As the results in figure 12, 44.6 percent of the respondents have voted for the camera feature of the phone for being the most attractive attribute while 23.6 percent support the concept of the speed of the processor. 13.5 percent think that they are attracted to the brand due to its association with the Indian cricket team. Only 10.6 percent believe that Oppo’s huge attractive screens excite them which is almost contradictory to the marketing campaigns of the company that claims to have the best huge sizes screen that is provided at that particular cost but at the same time Oppo has been famous for its camera features which have been appreciated by the respondents of the survey as well.

The final question in the survey asked the respondents about their perception of their opinion about how much they think this strategy of launching three different brands with three different unique selling points (USPs) to target the same target market would have been effective. The results in Figure 13 indicate that almost 49.3 percent of them believe that it was an effective way of tapping the market. They believe this makes it easier for the marketer to tap the entire market and reduce competition and probably try to earn a monopoly over its competitors. 28.4 percent lie in between the decision of yes or no and have chosen maybe and say that the concept is effective in only some cases the moment they are the only competitors that remain in the market it will be difficult for them to increase sales and generate revenue. Finally, 22.3 percent of respondents believe that the idea is ineffective as by becoming a combined force the companies could have earned more in the market and could have easily competed with high premium and luxury smartphone brands since their financial power would have increased. According to them, a monopoly could be created within the market by joining the forces.

4.3 Hypothesis Analysis—

Condition: Error percentage: 0.05

Basis of analysis: If the value of p is less than 0.05 then accept h1 and reject h0.

If the value of p is more than 0.05 then reject h1 and accept h0.
TABLE 1. CHI SQUARE RESULTS HYPOTHESIS 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW VALUE</th>
<th>BRAND NAME</th>
<th>CAMERA</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>PROCESSOR &amp; RAM</th>
<th>SPEED</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Plus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmi / Mi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of P: 0.000469344

EXPECTED | BRAND NAME | CAMERA | PRICE | PROCESSOR & RAM | SPEED | GRAND TOTAL |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppo</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Plus</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmi / Mi</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivo</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H0: there is no association between the selection of the company and the basis of the selection of the smartphone
H1: there is an association between the selection of the company and the basis of the selection of the smartphone.
Condition: if the value of P is less than 0.05 accept H1 else accept H0.

After analyzing the actual and expected value the solution for P came out to be 0.000469344. Since the value of P is less than 0.05 this means we accept H1 and reject H0. Hence, the hypothesis proves that there is a direct association between the selection of the company and the basis of the selection of smartphones. This means that any company is selected based on the features that it offers camera quality, processor and ram, speed of the android, etc. This also shows that the brand is selected by any respondent on the reputation or the image the brand carries or the price it has to offer in the market.

TABLE 2. CHI SQUARE RESULTS HYPOTHESIS 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW VALUE</th>
<th>MAYBE</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Plus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of P: 0.03118

EXPECTED | MAYBE | NO | YES | GRAND TOTAL |
|----------|-------|----|-----|-------------|

Volume XII, Issue III, 2020
There is no association between the preference of the company (consumer buying) and awareness about their ownership (same parent company).

Condition: if the value of P is less than 0.05 accept H1 else accept H0. After analyzing the actual and the expected value the solution for P came out to be 0.03118.

Since the value of P is less than 0.05 this means we accept H1 and reject H0. Hence, the hypothesis proves that there is a direct association between the preference of the company and the awareness about their ownership. This means that the respondents who had awareness about the three companies being interrelated have been persuaded to buy the smartphones offered by these three companies.

**TABLE 3.CHI SQUARE RESULTS HYPOTHESIS 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW VALUE</th>
<th>ONE PLUS</th>
<th>OPPO</th>
<th>VIVO</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and Above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of P: 0.55801

**EXPECTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW VALUE</th>
<th>ONE PLUS</th>
<th>OPPO</th>
<th>VIVO</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>47.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>49.34</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>66.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and Above</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>12.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>108.98</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>147.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4.CHI SQUARE RESULTS HYPOTHESIS 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW VALUE</th>
<th>MAYBE</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no association between the age group of the respondents and the preference of the company.

Condition: if the value of P is less than 0.05 accept H1 else accept H0.

After analyzing the actual and the expected value the solution for P came out to be 0.55801. Since the value of P is greater than 0.05 this means H1 is rejected and H0 is accepted which infers that there is no association between the age group and the choice of the company. This means that the age factor doesn’t contribute to the consumer’s decision making of the brand selection between Oppo, Vivo and One Plus.

**TABLE 4.CHI SQUARE RESULTS HYPOTHESIS 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW VALUE</th>
<th>MAYBE</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After analyzing the actual and the expected value the solution for P came out to be 0.205623. Since the value of P is less than 0.05 this means that there is an association between the effectiveness of the marketing strategies of the companies and the choice of smartphone brands of the respondents. The marketing campaigns and promotions these companies run to tap a target market and the hypothesis says that the consumer’s preference towards a brand or a product is affected by the marketing campaigns these brands run to increase sales. This hypothesis proves the main objective of the study that the marketing tactics designed to persuade buyers to genuinely impact their buying decisions

V. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

The research paper had faced a few limitations. Firstly, many respondents were not willing to fill the questionnaire so there is a possibility of inaccuracy in data due to the unwillingness of the respondents. Secondly, all the respondents weren’t the owners of the brand researched upon, so the data is a little perception based. Due to the limited availability of time, the survey could be conducted only in a few segments of the Delhi-NCR market. Thirdly, many respondents were reluctant to give out personal information especially their monthly income.

VI. CONCLUSION

The entire focus of the study was to analyze the fact that whether the consumers of the smartphone have information regarding the relationship between the ownership of Oppo, Vivo and One Plus. The study has shown that almost 50 percent of the respondents had no information about BBK electronics being the parent company of the three smartphone companies. While some said they had heard about the information, other respondents didn't believe the information and choose maybe in the questionnaire. This shows that all these three companies have been effective enough in their markets and don’t advertise their relation in the market and are successful in tapping their markets separately. This statement can be proven by the following question that was asked by the respondents regarding their choices between the three brands stated and more than 70 percent of the respondents preferred One Plus against the other two brands out of which 52 percent respondents choose speed and processor feature as their basis of the decision. In the past 2-3 years, One Plus has always promoted speed and ram processor features as their USP the research thus proves that they can communicate their motto to their prospective customers.

According to the respondent’s opinion, Vivo phones are popular for its camera features and its association with the India premier league at the same time Oppo is also considered popular for its camera features but unlike Vivo, respondents feel that the speed of the processor makes Oppo popular. Similarly, One Plus is also considered to be famous for the speed of its. This proves that even though all these three companies use different brand names, different marketing tricks, different USPs and even different technology their product’s likeability factors amongst the consumers are nearly the same. The survey shows that respondents of age groups between 15-20 and 20-25 are
the biggest target market for smartphone companies as this is the segment that gets attracted to the features, camera quality, and all the high-tech innovation that the brand has to offer. This shows that their perceptions and opinions impact the brand value and image directly. Lastly, the consumers believe that BBK electronics have applied impactful marketing strategies to launch three separate brands to tap the various income segments of the Indian market ranging from low segment to middle and high-income consumers segment. The research is beneficial for the consumer segment of the smartphones which according to the study are consumers between the age group 18-50 having a monthly income between Rs 0-1,00,000. It has helped in understanding the significance of marketing strategies and knowing the reasons behind the buying pattern of the consumers leading to the success stories of such multinational companies (here BBK ELECTRONICS). The innovative marketing techniques and promotional activities adopted by BBK like multinational companies also give the businesses the required government incentive for building their competitive advantage. For example, Oppo and Vivo have invested in the MAKE IN INDIA program run by the government of India and have built manufacturing and production factories in Noida and Greater Noida regions and have estimated to produce 1,00,000 models in every six months. Oppo has invested 2200 crore Rupees, aiming to make the country a global export hub for smart devices, it will focus on “Make in India” to double its production capacity in India to 100 million units by end-2020 (Sahu, 2020).

This research paper has revealed an interesting mix of different outcomes associated with these three brands. These three brands coming from a single parent brand have been able to create diversified product offerings for different categories of Indian customers. The market affinity can be very lucidly viewed from budget, feature and premium offerings, which the Indian consumers have happily embraced. Interestingly, the Indian consumers treating these three brands differently place different premiums on the product offerings not exactly knowing that they all represent the same parent brand. This complex marketing mix has been able to ensure that whichever brand the Indian consumer goes for, eventually ends up in profiting BBK electronics. This strategy has emerged as a trendsetter not only in India but elsewhere as well due to different market dynamics. This paper can be concluded by saying BBK electronics has been successful in tapping (Narwal, 2013) marketing strategies have strongly impacted the customer base they have created in just 5 years of existence in the Indian market. The analysis shows that the marketing strategies of the Oppo, Vivo and One Plus are diverse and innovative which helps them tap the market share from three sides and this has turned out to be successful for them.
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