

A STUDY ON CUSTOMER ATTITUDE ON MOBILE PHONE MARKETING IN VARIOUS BRANDED MOBILE ON RURAL AND URBAN AREA

Sanjeev Kumar

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Government Girls Degree College, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India

Received: 25 Feb 2019

Accepted: 25 Feb 2019

Published: 28 Feb 2019

ABSTRACT

The technology that gives a person the power to converse anytime, anywhere – has produced an entire industry in the mobile telecommunications. Mobile telephones have become a primary part of any business/economy of the growth, success, and efficiency. Consumers were the support of all the business organizations & reasonably all the business actions concern with the consumer, consumer satisfaction.. The dominant brand is which exist in in the mind of the consumer. “Brand acts as a signal allowing the customer to quickly identify a product as they are aware with or one they like this paper checks how the rural and urban populations conceive the concept of BRAND”. The research aims at relating the buying behavior of rural & urban consumer and to find out their importance while making a purchase decision concerning mobile phones.

To study this, literature study as well as a questionnaire administered a survey of 120 defendants of urban and rural changed age groups people, income & occupation and have been analysed through the many analytical tool to observe with the objectives & also to draw conclusions. This paper may suggest as a valued instruction for managing to analyse their promoting the campaigns & modify their mobiles according to the want of the customer.

KEYWORDS: *Network, Mobile Phones, Perception, Brand, Etc*

INTRODUCTION

The government of India identifies that the facility of the outstanding telecommunications structure, data is the key to rapid the economic and social development of the country. It is dangerous not only for the growth of the data technology industry but also has extensive difficulties on the entire economy of the country.

Though mobile phones must become an important part of personal communication across the world during the past ten years, consumer research has dedicated little exact attention to motives and optimal underlying the mobile phone purchasing choice process.

The individual and environmental factor effects the consumer behavior. Frequently, the consumer in India purchases the goods, services and which they want others to receive. “Behavior is therefore resolute by the individual’s spiritual makeup and the influence of other. This behavior is the end of the communication of the consumer & personal influence and pressure used upon them through the outside forces in environment. An accepting of buying behavior is essential in marketing and planning programs”. Comprehensive research of consumer behavior gives the advertiser a thoughtful vision of his target section of the market, which in turn proves to be very major in planned advertising

decisions, especially in defining the target markets and creating the advertising appeal and message. Modern and Urban buyers along with the product feature also want to know about the product will benefit them. The look is not only for what a product can do for them but also what it means to them. Thus, the buying behavior includes a problematic sequence of motivation and response. The mobile phone itself has also become a symbolic and fashion object, with users decorating, accessorizing and customizing, their mobile phones to reproduce their personality. In the basis 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 donate to his satisfaction is at the necessity of the marketer.

Procedure of cell phones is not limited to the urban talk and educated youth. Brands grow to keep up with "changing demographics, consumer lifestyles, changing spending habits and various ethnicities becoming more prevalent". Indian Marketers on rural marketing have two understandings-(i. The marketing products, urban metro products can be realized in rural markets with some or no change, ii. The rural marketing compulsory the single skills and procedures from its urban complement).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The fast step of develop the mobile commerce industry has brought about a new field of academic search, in which studies have analysed the variation of issues conversion the getting of mobile phone marketing from in cooperation with the consumer and also the organization views. Hence, the current literature remains the largely unpredictable and uneven. One main research stream focuses on the consumer taking and acceptance of mobile services in general, such as "multimedia messaging service, online gaming and other wireless services Foulds and Burton, 2006; Hung et al., 2003; Kleijnen et al., 2004". Another one more precise field of research focuses on consumer views and approaches towards 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 features found by Tornatzky and Klein (1982) to exert important influence over the individual's adoption decision: (complexity, compatibility, advantage, and relative). Relation advantage discusses the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being better than the innovation it replaces; compatibility refers to the degree that an revolution is considered well-matched with the (past experiences, current values, and requirements of the possible adopter and difficulty denotes to the level for difficulty associated with accepting and using the invention Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971).

These three innovation features form the important 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 invention distribution theories to expand the approval of technology-driven innovations and for understanding consumer behavior in relation to new product development (Chen et al., 2002; de Ruyter et al., 2001; Hung et al., 2003).

Whereas Rogers's 1995 development 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 with a more explanatory model. For this motive, the optional 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 by this study research.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This learning was carried out with the following objectives:

- The study aims at comparing the preference for brand respect among urban and rural Area.
- The study aims to match changed age group people in the purchase of mobile phone among rural and urban Area.
- The study aims to compare the preference of brand recognition among different income groups among the respondents.
- The study aims at finding the most choice mobile brands among rural and urban mobile users.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

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

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1: Classification of Respondents - Durability

Product	Overall			Urban			Rura		
	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 assumed that Lenovo scored 4.20, even though Lenovo scored the highest score, there is not much deviation among top four in this classification (Samsung, LG, Lenovo and Motorola) in terms of Durability. Non-Branded scored the lowest.

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

Table 2: Classification of Respondents – Picture

Product	Overall			Urban			Rural		
	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

Source: Primary data

Interpretation

Lenovo and LG scored highest scored on Picture clarity. Others fall short on picture clarity. Micromax and Non-branded Scored the lowest scored on picture clarity. It clearly shows there's 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

Source: Primary data

Interpretation

From the above table shows that the Samsung, LG, Lenovo and Motorola Brands scored equal scores regarding Design of the product. Again the Rural and Urban Customers doesn't show much 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

Source: Primary data

Interpretation

It is clearly evident that Branded mobiles (Samsung, LG, Lenovo, and Motorola) have scored almost equal scores, which shows that the customer perception about these brands doesn't differ much. On the Urban side, Motorola and Lenovo are competing in terms of Sound. Sony, Micromax, and Non Branded mobiles lacking competitiveness in this aspect of the product. The top position in rural customer space is similar to urban customer. This shows that the Rural and Urban customer don't 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 clearly evident, except for Micromax and Non-Branded Mobile, every other mobile scored a similar score, showing dissimilarity among the customers. Urban customers gave much larger importance to Samsung, LG and Lenovo model, when comes to price. Least Importance to None Branded and Micromax Brand. Rural Customers gave nearly equal importance to the all brand except, Micromax and Non-Branded mobiles. This is clearly 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 clearly evident that Motorola and Micromax have scored significantly higher score when compared to others. Motorola, Micromax, Lenovo, and Non Branded mobiles has scored nearly equal scores among urban customers, which implies that the urban customers to prefer Non Branded mobiles because of the value for the money.

Rural customers prefer Branded Mobiles like Motorola, Micromax, 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

Source: Primary Source

Interpretation

From the above table, Motorola, Lenovo, and LG have secure maximum perception score among the customers. Least being Non-Branded mobiles.

Urban consumers prefer, LG, Lenovo and Motorola products than other branded and non branded products whereas rural customers prefer more branded products when compared to urban customers.

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics

		Frequency	Percent
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

Source: Primary Source

Hypothesis

- H₀₁: There 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 on Sony brand: Since the significance value of Sony brand is lower than 0.05 (5% LOS), We scrap the null proposition
- 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 brand is less than 0.05 (5% LOS), We reject the null hypothesis

Findings

- From the tables, it is clearly assumed 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 clearly evident that urban customers have given highest rank to LG, but not much deviation among Samsung, LG, and Lenovo.
- From the table, it is clearly understood, that rural customer unable to distinguish the brand between LG, Lenovo, Motorola.
- From the table, Lenovo Brand and LG Brand scored highest scored on Picture clarity. Others fall short. Micromax and Non-branded Scored the lowest scored 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. 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. 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 Design of the product.
- From the table, Samsung, LG, Lenovo and Motorola Brands scored equal scores regarding Design of the product.
- From the table, it is clearly evident that Branded mobiles(Samsung, LG, Lenovo, and Motorola) have scored almost equal scores, which shows that the customer's perception of these brands don't 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 brand, which occupied the top position in 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 clearly evident that the urban consumers prefer, LG, Lenovo and Motorola products than other branded and Non branded products
- From the table, Motorola, Lenovo, and LG have secure maximum perception score among the customers. Least being Non-Branded mobiles.

- From the table, it is clearly evident that Rural customers prefer more branded products when compared to urban customers.

CONCLUSIONS

The resolution of this paper was to study the impact of brand name on the consumer decision-making procedure and to examine the effect of the external factors on consumer behavior by equating the choices of two changed consumer bases- (rural and urban). Consumer behavior is a trained response to external events and therefore the region and immediate environment also have some impact on the choice of the consumer. To bearing the research, a questionnaire administered survey has been conducted among 120 respondents from urban and rural regions and the data exposed that the brand name has a strong influence on the purchase decision. In rural areas, pricing is given higher consideration than brand name, while in urban areas; brand name reaches the pricing factor. From this study, it is also clear that well known mobile phone brands are similarly popular among the people of both regions and the consumers trust the brand name. The company which offers a inclusive range of choices to choose from is more likely to effectively gain popularity and capture market share equally well in urban as well as rural areas. The study highpoints the key elements which inspire the consumer behavior and can prove to be respected to mobile phone companies as well as market experts.

REFERENCES

1. Dr. PratyushTripathi & 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. Karjaluo, 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. Gokulanathan, J. 2006 *Essentials of Marketing Communications*. 3rd Edition Pearson Education Limited. Essex
11. Stayman, D.M. and Deshpande, R. (1989), "Situational Ethnicity and Consumer Behavior", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, December, pp. 361-371.
12. Nithila Vincent, *A Study on Brand Consciousness Among Children and its Effect on Family Buying Behavior in Bangalore City*, *Indian Journal of Marketing*, Volume XXXVI • Number 1 • January 2006
13. Schmitt, B. H. & Pan, Y. (1994). *Managing corporate and brand identities in the Asia-Pacific region*. *California Management Review*, 36 (4), 32-48.
14. Nedungadi, P. (1990). *Recall and consumer consideration set: Influencing choice without altering brand evaluations*. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(3), 263-276.