CONVENIENCE VALUE OF SMART PHONE USERS IN TIRUCHIRAPPALLI TOWN

M. AISHWARYA
Ph.D Part-Time Research Scholar in Commerce, Srimad Andavan Arts& Science College(Autonomous), Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu

Dr.V.P.T.DHEVIKA
Research Supervisor and Assistant Professor in Commerce, Shrimati Indira Gandhi College, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu

ABSTRACT

This is a research paper on customer perceived value of smart phone users in Tiruchirappalli town. The main objectives of the study are to study the factors influencing the convenience value of smart phone users and to know the relationship between convenience value and customer satisfaction. Sample size consists of 50 respondents using convenient sampling method. It is concluded that the most important factor influencing the convenience value of smart phone is 'to be secure in storing personal information' .Two hypothesis are framed and both are rejected. There is no significant difference between age, educational qualification and convenience value.

Key words: Factors Convenience Value, Smart phone Users

Introduction

Customer value is the basis for all marketing decisions. Analysis performed by Gummerus (2013) and Khalifa(2004) revealed that customer value is a complex, context specific phenomenon, which still requires attention from the researchers. Customer perceived value in marketing literature is being analysed twofold: as a ratio between customer's value received and cost experienced when purchasing and/or using service/product (e.g., Petrick, 2002; Wang et al., 2004; Smith & Colgate, 2007) or as a multidimensional construct incorporating various customer perceived value dimensions (e.g., Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Smith & Colgate, 2007; Park & Ha, 2015). The number of dimensions and their expression depend on the research context and on the purpose of the researcher. Zeithaml (1988) further observed that there appears to be diversity of meanings of value. Patterns of responses from the exploratory study can be grouped into four consumer definitions of value: value is low price, value is whatever I want in a product, value is the quality I get for the price I pay and value is what I get for what I give. These four consumer expressions of value can be captured in one overall definition: perceived value is the consumer's overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given. According to Liu (2006), it is the value that customers feel they receive, rather than their level of satisfaction, that keeps them returning. Customer value for a business service as an organizational buyer's assessment of the economic, technical and relational benefits received, in exchange for the price paid for a supplier's offer relative to competitive alternatives. Thus, customer value regulates behavioural intentions of loyalty toward the service provider as long as such relational exchanges provide superior value (Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002). Similarly, service quality and perceived value was examined as critical antecedents' to customer loyalty by Wieringa and Verhoef (2007).

Statement of the problem

A smartphone is a mobile phone that integrates a feature phone and a mobile computing platform, and the models today even combine functions such as digital cameras, media players, high-speed data access via Wi-Fi, GPS navigation, and other applications with option to download application through application market. A smart phone is a mobile phone with built-in, add-on applications and Internet (3G network) access. However, because of its capability to handle a great amount of applications and functions at the same time - the concept of a smartphone slowly transitioned into definitions of a handheld computer. The great differences between the available brands and models on the market today are the operating systems platform. The smartphone becomes more than a device for sending and receiving text messages and calls as it consists of various ways to interact with other users in a more personalized manner, compared to the traditional mobile phones. While an old-style feature phone includes some basic software such as an address book and games, a smartphone has the ability of further performance. Users are able to download and install application on their operating systems, such as time schedule, navigators, personal

finance managers and games. Generally, a smartphone is based on a certain operating system that allows phone users to install applications on it. Systems include Apple's iOS, Google's Android, Microsoft's Windows Phone etc. The core applications of smartphones consist of cellular voice, data, and PIM (personal information management) applications such as calendars, contact managers, 31 tasks, notes, e-mail. Hence a study is made to know the convenience value of the smart phone.

Scope of the study

This study aims at convenience value of smart phone users and in Tiruchirappalli Town.

Objectives of the study

- To study the factors influencing the convenience value perceived benefits of smart phone users .
- To know the relationship between convenience value and customer satisfaction.

Hypothesis of the study

- Age has an impact on Convenience Value.
- Educational qualification has an impact on Convenience Value.

Methodology

Data are collected through primary data and secondary data. Primary data is collected through questionnaire method. Secondary data are collected from journals, books and internet. The Questionnaire are constructed on likerts 5 point scale. Convenient sampling method is used based on the convenient of the respondents. Sampling size consist of 50 respondents. Percentage analysis, ANOVA and t-test are used for analysis purposes.

Results and discussion

Table -1: opinion showing the convenience value of the smart phone

opinion	SDA	DA	N	A	SA
I save time and money when I am using the smart phone	14(28%)	14(28%)	5(10%)	10(20%)	7(14%)
I use smart phone to manage my personal information like calendar and scheduling	16(32%)	9(18%)	6(12%)	9(18%)	10(20%)
I use smart phone would improve my job performance	15(30%)	9(18%)	8(16%)	8(16%)	10(20%)
I would be comfortable for using a smart phone for storing personal information	15(30%)	6(12%)	10(20%)	8(16%)	11(22%)
I would trust my data and information to be secure in a smart phone	17(34%)	9(18%)	12(24%)	8(16%)	4(8%)

Source: Primary data

Table–1 shows that 28 percent of the respondents each both strongly disagree and disagree the statement that –" I save time and money when I am using the smart phone", 32 percent of the respondents strongly disagree the statement that –"I use smart phone to manage my personal information like calendar and scheduling" 30 percent of the respondents stronglydisagree to the statement that – "I use smart phone would improve my job performance" ,30 percent of the respondents strongly disagree to the statement that – "I would be comfortable for using a smart phone for storing personal information" , and 34 percent of the respondents are strongly disagreed to the statement that – "I would trust my data and information to be secure in a smartphone".

Table-2: Chi– Square test showing the significant association between age and convenience value

Convenience value	Age in years										Statistical inference
	Below 30yrs		30 to 35yrs		36 to 40yrs		41yrs & above		Total		
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	
Low	2	4%	14	16%	5	8%	10	8%	31	%	X^2=10.504
High	2	4%	8	28%	9	20%	-	-	19	-	Df=3 0.015<0.05 Significant

Source: Compiled from Primary Data

Table-2 shows that there is significant association between age and Convenience Value because p=0.015 which is less than 0.05. Convenience value is high for the respondents who are in the age group of between 30 to 35 years.

Table-3: F-test showing the significant difference between educational qualification and convenience value

Educational Qualification		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Statistical inference
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
CONVENIENCE VALUE	Upto SSLC	9	15.00	4.000	1.333	11.93	18.07	9	21	F=1.038 0.414>0.05 Not Significant
	HSC	5	11.00	2.550	1.140	7.83	14.17	9	15	
	Diploma	6	12.50	2.881	1.176	9.48	15.52	9	16	
	Bachelor Degree	4	12.50	3.317	1.658	7.22	17.78	9	17	
	Master Degree	15	13.20	4.313	1.114	10.81	15.59	7	19	
	M.Phil	9	14.67	2.739	.913	12.56	16.77	12	19	
	PhD	2	15.50	4.950	3.500	-28.97	59.97	12	19	
	Total	9	15.00	4.000	1.333	11.93	18.07	9	21	

Source: Compiled from primary data

Table-3 reveals that there is no significant difference between educational qualification and convenience value as p=0.414 which is less than 0.05. It also shows that convenience value is high for M.Phil degree holders.

FINDINGS

- 28 percent of the respondents strongly disagree the statement that –" I save time and money when I am using the smart phone"
- 32 percent of the respondents strongly disagree the statement that –"I use smart phone to manage my personal information like calendar and scheduling"
- 30 percent of the respondents strongly disagree to the statement that – "I use smart phone would improve my job performance"
- 30 percent of the respondents strongly disagree to the statement that – "I would be comfortable for using a smart phone for storing personal information"
- 34 percent of the respondents strongly disagree to the statement that – "I would trust my data and information to be secure in a smart phone"
- Convenience value is low for the respondents who are in the age group of below 30 years
- Convenience value is high for M.Phil degree holders.
- There is no significant association between age and convenience value .
- There is no significant difference between educational qualification and convenience value.

SUGGESTIONS

- Security of data can be enhanced.
- Personal information can still be protected by producers of smart phone..

CONCLUSION

The most important factor influencing the convenience value of smart phone is 'secure to be storing personal information'. Convenience value is low for the respondents who are in the age group of below 30 years and high for M.Phil degree holders. Two hypotheses are framed and both are rejected. There is no significant difference between age, educational qualification and convenience value.

BIBILIOGRAPHY

- Alpert, F. "Innovator Buying Behavior Over Time", Journal of Product & Brand
- Benbasat, I., and Barki, H. "Quo Vadis, TAM?", Journal of the Association for InformationSystems, (8) :212-218, 2007.
- DeLone, W.H., and McLean, E.R. "The DeLone and McLean Model of Information Systems Success: A Ten-Year Update", Journal of Management Information Systems (19): 9-30,2003.
- Fishbein, M., and Ajzen, I. "Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An introduction to Theory and Research", Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., Reading, Mass., 1975.
- Holbrook, M.B., and Hirschman. E.C. "The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun," Journal of Consumer Research (9):132-140, 1982.
- *International Journal of World Research, Vol: I Issue XXIV, December 2015, Print ISSN: 2347-937X* www.apjor.com Page 49
- Lee, Y., Kozar, K.A., and Larsen, K.R.T. "The Technology Acceptance Model: Past, Present, and Future", Communications of AIS, 752-780, 2003.
- Management, (3): 50-62, 1994.
- Maslow. A.H. "A Theory of Human Motivation. Twentieth Century Psychology: Recent Developments", Psychology 22, 1946.
- Sheth, J.N., Newman, B.I., and Gross, B.L. "Why We Buy What We Buy: A Theory of Consumption Values". Journal of Business Research (22): 159-170, 1991b.
- Veblen, T. "The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions", BW Huebsch, 1912.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988, July). Consumer Perceptions of Price, Value, and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52, 2-22.