



A STUDY ON CONSUMER ATTITUDE ON MOBILE PHONE MARKETING OF VARIOUS MOBILE BRANDS IN RURAL AND URBAN AREAS IN PUDUKKOTTAI DISTRICT

R. Muruganandam

Part-time Ph.D Scholar in Commerce,
H. H. The Rajah's College, Pudukkottai,
(Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli)
Tamilnadu, India

Dr. M. Veerappan

Research Advisor & Principal (Retd)
H. H. The Rajah's College, Pudukkottai,
(Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli)
Tamilnadu, India

ABSTRACT

The technology that gives a person the power to communicate anytime, anywhere has spawned an entire industry in mobile telecommunications. Mobile telephones have become an integral part of the growth, success, and efficiency of any business/economy. Consumers are the backbone of all business organizations & coherently all business activities are concerned with consumer and consumer satisfaction. Brand acts as a signal allowing the customer to quickly recognize a product they are familiar with or one they like. The powerful brand is which resides in the mind of the consumer. This paper examines how the rural and urban populations conceive the notion of "BRAND". The research aims at comparing the buying behaviour of rural & urban consumers & find out their priorities while making a purchase decision regarding mobile phones.

This study has been conducted through a literature study as well as a questionnaire administered a survey of 120 respondents of urban and rural areas of Pudukkottai district of different age groups people, incomes & occupations and has been analyzed through the various analytical tool to comply with the objectives & also to draw conclusions. This paper may suggest a valuable guideline for management to review their advertising campaigns & modify their mobiles according to the need of the customer.

Keywords: Network, Mobile Phones, Perception, Brand, etc

Cite this Article: R. Muruganandam and Dr. M. Veerappan, A Study on Consumer Attitude on Mobile Phone Marketing of Various Mobile Brands in Rural and Urban Areas in Pudukkottai District, International Journal of Management (IJM), 11(12), 2020, pp. 4473-4482.

<https://iaeme.com/Home/issue/IJM?Volume=11&Issue=12>

INTRODUCTION

The government of India recognizes that the provision of a world-class telecommunications infrastructure and information is the key to the rapid economic and social development of the country. It is critical not only for the development of the information technology industry but also has widespread ramifications on the entire economy of the country.

Although mobile phones have become a fundamental part of personal communication across the globe during the past ten years, consumer research has devoted little specific attention to motives and choices underlying the mobile phone buying decision process.

Individual and environmental factors influence consumer behaviour. Often, the consumer in India purchases the goods and services, which they want, others to accept. Behaviour is therefore determined by the individual's psychological makeup and the influence of others. This behaviour is the result of the interaction of the consumer & personal influence and pressure exerted upon them by outside forces in the environment. An understanding of buying behaviour is essential in marketing and planning programs. Comprehensive research of consumer behaviour gives the advertiser a deeper insight into his target section of the market, which in turn proves to be very significant in strategic advertising decisions, especially in defining the target markets and creating the advertising appeal and message. Modern Urban buyers along with the product feature also want to know how and why the product will benefit them. They look not only for what a product can do but also for what it means to them. Thus, buying behaviour involves a complicated series of stimuli and responses. The mobile phone itself has also become a totemic and fashion object, with users decorating, customizing, and accessorizing their mobile phones to reflect their personalities. In the rationale of modern marketing, the firm existence is dependent on the customer's satisfaction. Therefore, the knowledge of "what the customer thinks" and "what consequently would contribute to his satisfaction" is the requirement of the marketer.

The usage of cell phones is not restricted to urban talk and educated youth. Brands evolve to keep up with changing demographics, changing spending habits, consumer lifestyles, and various ethnicities becoming more prevalent. Indian Marketers on rural marketing have two understandings- (i) urban metro products and marketing products can be implemented in rural markets with some or no change. (ii) rural marketing required separate skills and techniques from its urban counterpart.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The fast pace of development within the mobile commerce industry has brought about a new field of academic exploration, in which studies have scrutinized the variety of factors persuading the acceptance of mobile phone marketing from both consumer and organization outlooks. Yet, the current literature remains largely inconsistent and fragmented. One main research stream focuses on consumer acceptance and adoption of mobile services in general, such as multimedia messaging services, online gaming and other wireless services (Foulds and Burton, 2006; Hung et al., 2003; Kleijnen et al., 2004). Another more precise field of research focuses on consumer perceptions and attitudes toward the use of the mobile phone for marketing and commercial application (Barnes and Scornavacca, 2004; Barwise and Strong, 2002; Bauer et al., 2005; Carroll et al., 2007; Leppäniemi and Karjaluoto, 2005)

The primary focus of this research is on three innovation attributes found by Tornatzky and Klein (1982) to exert significant influence over an individual's adoption decision: relative advantage, compatibility, and complexity. Relative advantage discusses the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being better than the innovation it replaces; compatibility refers to the degree that innovation is considered compatible with the existing values, past familiarities, and needs of the potential adopter; and complexity refers to the level of complexity associated with understanding and using the innovation (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971).

These three innovation attributes form a significant part of Rogers's (1995) innovation attribute framework, which suggests that an individual's combined perception of the innovation's attributes will largely drive their adoption decision. Previously, researchers have used this, and other innovation diffusion theories to expound on the adoption of technology-driven innovations and for understanding consumer behaviour concerning new product development (Chen et al., 2002; de Ruyter et al., 2001; Hung et al., 2003).

Whereas Rogers's 1995 innovation attribute theory offers a valid context for examining consumer adoption of mobile phone marketing, (Thong, 1999) recommends researchers combine Rogers's, 1995 theory with other theories to provide a richer and potentially more explanatory model. For this motive, the suggested relationship between a consumer's level of involvement with their mobile phone or product involvement and their adoption of mobile phone marketing will also be examined in this study.

OBJECTIVES

This study is carried out with the following objectives:

1. The study aims at comparing the preference for brand recognition among urban and rural mobile users in Pudukkottai district.
2. The study aims to compare different age groups of people in the purchase of mobile phones among rural and urban mobile users in Pudukkottai district.
3. The study aims to compare the preference for brand recognition among different income groups among the respondents.
4. The study aims at finding the most preferable mobile brands among rural and urban mobile users.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In present times, "Brand name" is emerging to be one of the strongest marketing tools in all fields. Narrowing down our view to mobile phones, we can see that Brand Image plays a significant role in the customer decision-making process. But due to a lack of technological advancement, 60% of the total population residing in rural areas is still deprived of this "Notion" as compared to their urban counterparts. The present study has attempted to investigate the influence of Brand image and advertisement in both urban and rural sections of Indian society.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1 Classification of Respondents - Durability

	Overall			Urban			Rural		
Product	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception
Sony	120	452	3.77	49	174	3.55	71	278	3.92
Samsung	120	481	4.01	49	201	4.10	71	280	3.94
LG	120	500	4.17	49	207	4.22	71	293	4.13
Lenovo	120	504	4.20	49	203	4.14	71	301	4.24
Motorola	120	499	4.16	49	195	3.98	71	304	4.28
Micromax	120	357	2.98	49	153	3.12	71	204	2.87
Others	120	296	2.47	49	132	2.69	71	164	2.31

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is clearly understood that Lenovo scored 4.20, even though Lenovo scored the highest score, there is not much deviation among the top four in this category (Samsung, LG, Lenovo and Motorola) in terms of Durability. Non-Branded scored the lowest.

Urban customers have given the highest rank to LG, but not much deviation among Samsung, LG, and Lenovo whereas rural customers are unable to distinguish between LG, Lenovo, and Motorola.

Table 2 Classification of Respondents – Picture

	Overall			Urban			Rural		
Product	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception
Sony	120	468	3.90	49	178	3.63	71	290	4.08
Samsung	120	459	3.82	49	181	3.69	71	278	3.92
LG	120	513	4.27	49	212	4.33	71	301	4.24
Lenovo	120	517	4.31	49	212	4.33	71	305	4.30
Motorola	120	500	4.17	49	210	4.29	71	290	4.08
Micromax	120	355	2.96	49	132	2.69	71	223	3.14
Others	120	362	3.02	49	156	3.18	71	206	2.90

Interpretation:

Source: Primary data

It clearly shows there's Lenovo and LG scored the highest scored on Picture clarity. Others fall short on picture clarity. Micromax and Non-branded Scored the lowest and there is not much difference in perception among rural and urban customers on picture clarity.

Table 3 Classification of Respondents - Design

Product	Overall			Urban			Rural		
	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception
Sony	120	441	3.67	49	174	3.55	71	267	3.76
Samsung	120	493	4.11	49	203	4.14	71	290	4.08
LG	120	496	4.13	49	200	4.08	71	296	4.17
Lenovo	120	481	4.01	49	199	4.06	71	282	3.97
Motorola	120	498	4.15	49	203	4.14	71	295	4.15
Micromax	120	376	3.13	49	160	3.27	71	216	3.04
Others	120	426	3.55	49	174	3.55	71	252	3.55

Interpretation

Source: Primary data

From the above table, Samsung, LG, Lenovo and Motorola Brands scored equal scores regarding the Design of the product. Again the Rural difference in perception about the design of the product.

Table 4 Classification of Respondents - Sound

Product	Overall			Urban			Rural		
	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception
Sony	120	399	3.33	49	158	3.22	71	241	3.39
Samsung	120	483	4.02	49	194	3.96	71	289	4.07
LG	120	481	4.01	49	196	4.00	71	285	4.01
Lenovo	120	498	4.15	49	203	4.14	71	295	4.15
Motorola	120	504	4.20	49	204	4.16	71	300	4.23
Micromax	120	369	3.07	49	157	3.20	71	212	2.99
Others	120	368	3.07	49	157	3.20	71	211	2.97

Interpretation

Source: Primary data

It is evident that Branded mobiles (Samsung, LG, Lenovo, and Motorola) have scored almost equal scores, which shows that the customer perception of these brands does not differ much. On the Urban side, Motorola and Lenovo are and Non Branded mobiles lacking competitiveness in this aspect of the product. The top position in the rural customer space is similar to the urban customer. This shows that the Rural and Urban customers do not differ in terms of Sound Quality.

Table 5 Classification of Respondents – Price

Product	Overall			Urban			Rural		
	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception
Sony	120	452	3.77	49	174	3.55	71	278	3.92
Samsung	120	481	4.01	49	201	4.10	71	280	3.94
LG	120	500	4.17	49	207	4.22	71	293	4.13
Lenovo	120	504	4.20	49	203	4.14	71	301	4.24
Motorola	120	499	4.16	49	195	3.98	71	304	4.28
Micromax	120	357	2.98	49	153	3.12	71	204	2.87
Others	120	296	2.47	49	132	2.69	71	164	2.31

Source: Primary data

From the above table, it is evident, except for Micromax and Non-Branded Mobile, that every other mobile scored a similar score, showing dissimilarity among the customers. Urban customers gave much larger importance to Samsung, LG and Lenovo models, when comes to price. Least Importance to None Branded and Micromax Brand. Rural Customers gave nearly equal importance to all brands except, Micromax and Non-Branded mobiles. This is evident, that they don't differ on price terms in choosing the mobile phones.

Table 6 Classification of Respondents - Value for Money

Product	Overall			Urban			Rural		
	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception	N	Total Perception	Average Perception
Sony	120	368	3.07	49	144	2.94	71	224	3.15
Samsung	120	431	3.59	49	177	3.61	71	254	3.58
LG	120	429	3.57	49	175	3.57	71	254	3.58
Lenovo	120	442	3.68	49	185	3.78	71	257	3.62
Motorola	120	499	4.16	49	195	3.98	71	304	4.28
Micromax	120	472	3.93	49	196	4.00	71	276	3.89
Others	120	409	3.41	49	182	3.71	71	227	3.20

Source: Primary data

From the above table, it is evident that Motorola and Micromax have scored significantly higher scores when compared to others. Motorola, Micromax, Lenovo, and Non-Branded mobiles have scored nearly equal scores among urban customers, which implies that urban customers prefer Non-Branded mobiles because of the value for the money. Rural customers prefer Branded Mobiles like Motorola, Micromax, and Lenovo when comes to value.

Table 7 Fishbone Attitude Model Score

S.No	Company	Without Differentiation	Urban Customers	Rural Customers
1	Sony	35.53	33.78	36.68
2	Samsung	39.07	38.98	39.11
3	LG	40.32	40.47	40.24
4	Lenovo	40.795	40.94	40.695
5	Motorola	41.685	41.02	42.105
6	Micromax	32.065	32.485	31.775
7	Others	30.5	32.23	29.24

Interpretation

Source: Primary Source

From the above table, Motorola, Lenovo, and LG have secured maximum perception scores among the customers. The least being Non-Branded mobiles. Urban consumers prefer, LG, Lenovo and branded products whereas rural customers prefer more branded products when compared to urban customers.

Table 8 Descriptive Statistic

		F	%
Age	below 20	34	28.3
	21 to 30	39	32.5
	31 to 40	40	33.3
	40 and above	7	5.8
Gender	Male	84	70.0
	Female	36	30.0
Education qualification	SSLC	20	16.7
	HSC	53	44.2
	UG	39	32.5
	PG	6	5.0
	Illiterate	2	1.7
Geographical area	Urban	49	40.8
	Rural	71	59.2
Occupation	Private Employee	39	32.5
	Govt Employee	48	40.0
	Self Employed	33	27.5
Income	below 10000	12	10.0
	10001 to 20000	52	43.3
	20001 to 30000	25	20.8
	30001 to 40000	14	11.7
	above 40000	17	14.2

Hypothesis:

H₀₁ is no difference in perception of Sony brand among rural and urban

Customers H₀₂ : There is no difference in perception of Samsung brand among rural and urban customers

H₀₃: There is no difference in perception of LG brand among rural and urban customers

H₀₄ : There is no difference in perception of the Lenovo brand among rural and urban customers

H₀₅ : There is no difference in perception of Motorola brand among rural and urban customers

H₀₆ : There is no difference in perception of the Micromax brand among rural and urban customers

H₀₇ : There is no difference in perception of Another brand among rural and urban customers

Table 9 Product-wise ANOVA

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Sony Perception Score	Between Groups	244.033	1	244.033	9.545	.003
	Groups	3016.699	118	25.565		
	Total	3260.731	119			
Samsung Perception Score	Between Groups	.368	1	.368	.015	.904
	Within Groups	2963.599	118	25.115		
	Total	2963.967	119			
LG Perception Score	Between Groups	1.772	1	1.772	.116	.734
	Within Groups	1801.895	118	15.270		
	Total	1803.667	119			
Lenovo Perception Score	Between Groups	1.692	1	1.692	.115	.736
	Within Groups	1743.556	118	14.776		
	Total	1745.248	119			
Motorola Perception Score	Between Groups	35.036	1	35.036	1.968	.163
	Within Groups	2100.212	118	17.798		
	Total	2135.248	119			
Micromax Perception Score	Between Groups	15.254	1	15.254	.314	.576
	Within Groups	5726.894	118	48.533		
	Total	5742.148	119			
Others Perception Score	Between Groups	265.444	1	265.444	8.057	.005
	Within Groups	3887.481	118	32.945		
	Total	4152.925	119			

Source: Primary Source

Interpretation

- Perception of Sony brand: Since the significance value of Sony brand is less than 0.05 (5% LOS), We reject the null hypothesis
- Perception on Samsung brand: Since the significance value of the Samsung brand is greater than 0.05 (5% LOS), We accept the null hypothesis
- Perception on LG brand: Since the significance value of LG brand is greater than 0.05 (5% LOS), We accept the null hypothesis
- Perception on Lenovo brand: Since the significance value of the Lenovo brand is greater than 0.05 (5% LOS), We accept the null hypothesis
- Perception on Motorola brand: Since the significance value of the Motorola brand is greater than 0.05 (5% LOS), We accept the null hypothesis
- Perception on Micromax brand: Since the significance value of the Micromax brand is greater than 0.05 (5% LOS), We accept the null hypothesis
- Perception on Another brand: Since the significance value of other brands is less than 0.05 (5% LOS), We reject the null hypothesis

FINDINGS

- From the table, it is clearly understood that Lenovo scored 4.20, even though Lenovo scored the highest score, there is not much deviation among top four in this category (Samsung, LG, Lenovo and Motorola) in terms of Durability. Non-Branded scored the lowest.
- From the table, it is evident that Urban customers have given the highest rank to LG, But not much deviation among Samsung, LG, and Lenovo.
- From the table, it is clearly understood, that rural customers are unable to distinguish the brand between LG, Lenovo, and Motorola.
- From the table, Lenovo Brand and LG Brand scored the highest scored on Picture clarity. Others fall short. Micromax and Non-branded Scored the lowest score on picture clarity.
- From the table, Lenovo Brand and LG Brand scored highest scored on Picture clarity and there is not much difference between these brands. The lowest being Micromax and Non Branded mobile phones
- From the table, Lenovo Brand and LG Brand scored highest scored on Picture clarity and there is not much difference between these brands. The lowest being Micromax and Non Branded mobile phones. It clearly shows there's not much difference in perception among rural and urban customers on picture clarity.
- From the table, Samsung, LG, Lenovo and Motorola Brands scored equal scores regarding the Design of the product.
- From the table, Samsung, LG, Lenovo and Motorola Brands scored equal scores regarding the Design of the product.
- From the table, it is evident that Branded mobiles(Samsung, LG, Lenovo, and Motorola) have scored almost equal scores, which shows that the customer's perceptions of these brands do not differ much
- From the table, it is clearly understood that Motorola and Lenovo are competing in terms of Sound. Sony, Micromax, and Non-Branded mobiles lacking in the sound of the product
- From the table, it is understood that the brand, which occupied the top position in the urban customers' space is similar to rural customers. This shows that the Rural and Urban customers don't differ in terms of Sound Quality.
- From the table, it is evident that the urban consumers prefer, LG, Lenovo and Motorola products to other branded and Non branded products
- From the table, Motorola, Lenovo, and LG have secured maximum perception scores among the customers. The least being Non-Branded mobiles.
- From the table, it is evident that Rural customers prefer more branded products when compared to urban customers.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to study the influence of brand names on the consumer decision-making process and to investigate the effect of external factors on consumer behaviour by comparing the choices of two different consumer bases- rural and urban. Consumer behaviour is a conditioned response to external events; therefore the region and surrounding environment also have some impact on the choice of the consumer. To conduct the research, a questionnaire administered survey has been conducted among 120 respondents from urban and rural regions and the data revealed that brand name has a strong influence on the purchase decision. In rural areas, pricing is given more consideration than brand name, while in urban areas, brand name overtakes the pricing factor.

From the study, it is also clear that well-known mobile phone brands are equally popular among the people of both regions and the consumers trust the brand name. A company which offers a wide range of options to choose from is more likely to successfully gain popularity and capture market share equally well in urban as well as rural areas. The study highlights the key elements which influence consumer behaviour and can prove to be valuable to mobile phone companies as well as market analysts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dr. Pratyush Tripathi & Prof. Satish Kr. Singh, An Empirical Study of Consumer Behavior towards The Preference and Usage of Mobile Phone Services in Bhopal, Current Trends in Technology and Sciences Volume: 1, Issue: 2, Sept. 2012
- [2] Jegan, A. And Dr. S. Sudalaiyandi, Consumer Behavior Towards Mobile Phone Services In Kovilpatti, Thoothukud District (India) - A Case Study by, International Journal of Current Research, Vol. 4, Issue, 04, pp.261-265, April 2012
- [3] Karjaluoto, H., J. Karvonen, et al. (2005). Factors affecting consumer choice of mobile phones: two studies from Finland. Journal of Euro marketing 14(3): 59-82.
- [4] Bettman, J.R. and Zins, M.A. (1977), "Constructive Processes in Consume Choice", Journal of Consumer Research, 4, September, pp. 75-85.
- [5] Sun, T. and G. Wu (2004). Consumption patterns of Chinese urban and rural consumers. Journal of Consumer Marketing 21(4):245-253.
- [6] Keller, K. L., (2008) Strategic Brand Management, Second Edition, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- [7] Gosh, Aparisim, „The New Rules of Rural Marketing“, Business World, April 1994
- [8] Alba, J.W., and Hutchinson, J.W. (1988), "Dimensions of Consumer Expertise", Journal of Consumer Research, 13, March, pp. 411- 454.
- [9] Rogers M.J 1988. "Expenditures of rural and urban consumers", Monthly Labour Review, Vo.41
- [10] Blythe, J. 2006 Essentials of Marketing Communications. 3rd Edition Pearson Education Limited. Essex (UK).
- [11] Jeya, J., & Gopinath, R. (2020). Customer Service Techniques and National Insurance Company Efficiency, International Journal of Management, 11(12), 3776-3784.
- [12] Karthick, S., Saminathan, R., & Gopinath, R. (2020a). A Study on the Problems faced by Farmers in Paddy Marketing of Cauvery Delta Region, Tamilnadu, International Journal of Management, 11(10), 2155-2164.
- [13] Karthick, S., Saminathan, R., & Gopinath, R. (2020b). Agricultural Marketing – An Overview, Tamilnadu, International Journal of Management, 11(11), 3007-3013.
- [14] Kavitha, H., & Gopinath, R. (2020a). Effect of Service Quality on Satisfaction and Word-Of-Mouth: Small Scale Industries and their Commercial Banks in Tamil Nadu, International Journal of Management, 11(11), 3034-3043. (Scopus Indexed)
- [15] Kavitha, J., & Gopinath, R. (2020b). A Study on Perception of Internet Banking users Service Quality-A Structural Equation Modeling Perspective, International Journal of Management, 11(8), 2204–2217.
- [16] Putter (2017), "Impact of social media on consumer buying intention", journal of international business research & marketing, volume 3, issue 1
- [17] Unnamalai, T., & Gopinath, R. (2020). Brand preferences and level of satisfaction in consuming noodles among working women in Tiruchirappalli district. International Journal of Management, 11(11), 2909-2917.
- [18] Usharani, M., & Gopinath, R. (2020a). A Study on Consumer Behaviour on Green Marketing with SSreference to Organic Food Products in Tiruchirappalli District, International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Technology, 11(9), 1235-1244.
- [19] Usharani, M., & Gopinath, R. (2020b). A Study on Customer Perception on Organized Retail Stores in Tiruchirappalli Town, Bangalore, International Journal of Management, 11(10), 2128-2138