# User Perception Towards Smartphone Social Media Apps on Rural and Urban Area

## V. Rengarajan[1], V. Vijay Anand[2], Madhusoodhanan[3], N.V. Yogananth[4], A.K. Parthasarathy[5] and U. Sridevi[6]

[1,2]*Faculty Members, School of Management, SASTRA University, Thanjavur*
[3-6] *MBA Students, School of Management, SASTRA University, Thanjavur*

### ABSTRACT

Know-how that gives a person the power to connect at anytime, anywhere – has produced an entire market in cellular telecoms. Mobile phones have become a fundamental element of the development, success, and performance of any business/economy.

Customers are the central source of all company companies & coherently all company activities concern with customer and customer care. Product serves as a indication allowing the customer to quickly identify a product as they are familiar with or one they like. The powerful brand is which exists in the mind of the customer. This paper investigates how the non-urban and concrete communities consider the idea of "BRAND". The research is designed at evaluating the buying actions of non-urban & city customer & find out their main concerns while buying decision regarding cell mobile phones.

This research has been performed through literary works research as well as a set of questions applied a study of 120 participants of different age categories, income & profession and has been examined through the various systematic tools to adhere to the goals & also to attract results. The research reveals that the city customer is more brand and style 'conscious' compared to its non-urban version which prioritizes performance and Application Reliability/Stability more. It also reveals that a city inhabitant is based majorly on the internet as a source of information whereas non-urban inhabitants depend on T.V. ads& Cell phone suppliers. This document may recommend as an important guide for management to evaluation their promotional initiatives & change their Cellular Programs according to the need of the customer.

*Keywords:* Mobile users, Mobile apps, Perception, Smart and elegant phones, etc.,.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The government of India identifies and focuses that the supply of a world-class telecom facilities and knowledge is the key to fast economic and social growth and the growth of the nation. It is critical not only for the growth of the technology industry but also has extensive consequences on the entire economy of the nation.

The smart phone industry is drastically emerging with statistical soundness from 2012 to 2015 advert that 45% of china and 52% of USA adults, respectively, with agreed rapidly increasing. These inimitable gadgets are progressively complicated, computationally highly effective, sensor-rich, and incorporated with social media. With only this technical development there has been increasing interest from instructors and physicians in utilizing Smartphone as a means of providing behavior treatments for health.

Various numbers of elegant phones get them to good individuals for the acquiescence of activity therapies. First, as movable devices that are significantly considered by individuals, they usually be converted on and remain with the owner throughout the day. Therefore, they offer the chance to bring activities therapies into important actual circumstances where people create choices about their health and fitness insurance experience restrictions to activities change. Second, smart phone programs may provide less expensive, more practical, or less mistake therapies that are not available elsewhere. Third, the connectedness of mobile phones allows the talking about of connectedness of mobile phones allows the talking about of activities and health and fitness data with doctors or co-workers. Furthermore, the increasing ability of stylish phones to use inner receptors to infer viewpoint such a user location, activity, emotions, and social participation has brought up the chance of continuous and computerized tracking of health-related activities and appropriate, designed therapies for specific circumstances.

The individual and ecological aspects impact the Smartphone customers. Often, the customer in India buys the products or services, which they want, others to agree to. Actions are therefore identified by the individual's emotional blusher and the impact of other. Thus behavior is caused by the connections of the customer & personal impact and stress applied upon them by outside causes in the surroundings.

The current study desired to discover some of these under-researched areas. We performed a set of focus categories with fascinated teen Smartphone customers in order to explore: (1) their current encounters of using Smartphone applications, and (2) their opinions about a range of functions, technological innovation, and abilities that define currently available or future applications. We desired their opinions on functions that might support them in making changes to actions based on useful, aspects that play a role to interest in applications, desire to use the applications, and issues major to disinclination to using the applications.

Usage of Smartphone is not limited to city talk and knowledgeable youngsters. Mobile apps develop to keep up with modifying census, modifying spending habits, user's way of life, and various countries becoming more frequent. Native Indian Promoters on non-urban marketing have two understandings: (i) the city metropolis products and intelligent programs can be applied in non-urban markets with some or no change. (ii) The province required the individual skills and techniques from its city version.

# 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Adams, D. A., Nelson, R. R., & Todd, P. A. (1992),** have furnished their results of the studies demonstrate reliable and valid scales for measurement of perceived ease of use and usefulness. In addition, the paper

tests the relationships between ease of use, usefulness, and usage using structural equation modelling. The results of this model are consistent with previous research for Study 1, suggesting that usefulness is an important determinant of system use. For Study 2 the results are somewhat mixed, but indicate the importance of both ease of use and usefulness. Differences in conditions of usage are explored to explain these findings.

**Davis, F. D. (1989),** have described that a multi-national study evaluating the perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use of Ambient Intelligence (AMI) applications in office environments. In a first step, existing usage scenarios were analyzed to identify characteristic functionalities and application domains. The identified core functionalities were integrated into a representative and coherent evaluation scenario, which was presented to a target user population in a questionnaire-based study. The results of the study indicate that the participants regard the described Ambient Intelligence functionalities as rather useful and easy to use. Nevertheless, moderate overall ratings for both factors show, that the acceptance of AMI technologies is not as high as often argued.

**Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989),** has said that the Computer systems cannot improve organizational performance if they aren't used. Unfortunately, resistance to end-user systems by managers and professionals is a widespread problem. To better predict, explain, and increase user acceptance, we need to better understand why people accept or reject computers. This research addresses the ability to predict peoples' computer acceptance from a measure of their intentions, and the ability to explain their intentions in terms of their attitudes, subjective norms, perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and related variables. In a longitudinal study of 107 users, intentions to use a specific system, measured after a one-hour introduction to the system, were correlated 0.35 with system use 14 weeks later. The intention-usage correlation was 0.63 at the end of this time period. Perceived usefulness strongly influenced peoples' intentions, explaining more than half of the variance in intentions at the end of 14 weeks. Perceived ease of use had a small but significant effect on intentions as well, although this effect subsided over time.

**Ophus, J. D. & Abbitt, J. T.,** Attitudes only partially mediated the effects of these beliefs on intentions. Subjective norms had no effect on intentions. These results suggest the possibility of simple but powerful models of the determinants of user acceptance, with practical value for evaluating systems and guiding managerial interventions aimed at reducing the problem of underutilized computer technology.

**Fathema, N. (2013),** Universities have made a considerable investment in the use of Learning Management Systems (LMSs) to facilitate their teaching learning processes; however these systems are not used by the faculty members to their fullest capabilities. To address this issue, this study investigated factors that affect faculty members' LMSs usage behavior, focusing on user related variables and their pivotal role in determining faculty attitudes toward LMSs. This study offers an empirical evaluation of an extension of Davis's (1989)'s Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to investigate how faculty members' beliefs and attitudes influence their intention and actual use of LMSs under conditions of non-mandatory use of LMSs in higher education institutions. Data were obtained from 560 faculty members (from two universities) and analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling. The study results revealed that the three proposed external variables: system quality; perceived self-efficacy and facilitations

conditions were significant predictors of faculty attitude towards LMSs. Similar to prior research findings, the study results further confirmed the validity of the extended TAM in determining users' technology acceptance behavior. The study also addressed the implications of the findings for researchers and practitioners.

**Holden, H., & Rada, R. (2011)** focused of the current study was on faculty perspective of LMS usage. Two major purposes of the study were: (i) to identify the factors that influence faculty members LMS usage behavior and (ii)) to determine the underlying causal relationships among the factors. The core expectation was that understanding the factors that affect faculty members' LMS usage behavior can shed light on the development, selection, training, maintenance and investments on such systems. To this end, the current study utilized Davis's (1989) Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) as a baseline model to predict faculty intention and usage of LMS in higher education institutions. Also, this study proposed an extension of the original TAM by including three external variables: system quality, perceived self-efficacy and facilitating conditions in it and examined its validity in explaining faculty members' LMS usage behavior. By conducting an empirical study among university faculty members, this study presented important findings pertaining to faculty attitude under conditions of non-mandatory use of LMSs. Based on the findings; the significant determinants of LMS usage are discussed.

**Icek Ajzen and Martin Fishbein (1980),** TAM studies have focused on various user populations and technologies. Some studies observe the acceptance and use of one specific technology, whereas others focus on a type of technology (i.e., Web applications, educational technologies, etc.). Whereas some studies focus on validating the original TAM on different populations and technologies, others focus on extending the TAM to evaluate the impact of external variables on acceptance and usage.

**Karahanna, E., & Straub, D. W. (1999),** in general, they all suggest that perceived ease of use significantly influences perceived usefulness, and both perceived usefulness and ease of use significantly influence attitudes toward using or behavior intention to use. Additionally, they find that attitudes toward using or behavioral intention to use significantly influence actual technology usage or usage behavior. In some studies the attitudes toward using and/or the usage behavior are eliminated altogether. This study did not consider the behavioral intention to use element, as we focused on the usage behavior of currently used technologies.

## 3. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

This study's Mind-set towards using to examine the influence of Popular Application on two different segments of community, the city & the non-urban consumer base respectively. Basically the study intends to check out the subject through examining related articles & also by getting the views of experienced individuals regarding the subject through surveys. Moreover, these studies will focus on the following goals:

- To study the factor, if any, in the buying purpose, choices, flavor of the city & non-urban customer.

- To know about the attention stage of the customer regarding 'Brands'.

- To recognize and evaluate the main improvement in the factors which impinge on to the fulfillment stage of both types of customers.

- To make recommendations on the basis of results.

**Hypotheses**

- The level of attention of 'Branded 'a product among the clients is regular.

- Product picture & Marketing has an important connection with customer buying actions.

**Objectives of the Study**

- The research is designed at comparing the preference for cellular apps identification among city and non-urban cellular customers.

- The research is being designed to compare different age group people in the uses of smart phone among non-urban and city cellular customers.

- The research is planned to compare the cellular apps identification among different income groups among the respondents.

- The research is focused to compare preference of functionality, quality and Application Reliability/ Stability over brand identification among non-urban and city cellular customers.

- The research is designed at finding preferable cellular Programs among non-urban and city cellular customers.

**Statement of the Problem**

Currently, "Smart Phone" is growing out to be one of the most powerful marketing tools in all areas. Reducing down our view to cell phones, we can see that various programs play a significant role in customer decision-making process. But due to lack of technical improvements, 60% of the people in this country coping with non-urban areas still lacking this "Notion" as compared to their city alternatives. The existing study made an attempt to examine the impact of users understanding of cellular apps on both city and non-urban parts of the Native Indian community.

**Sampling**

This research has been conducted with the help of previous literary works available as well as a set of questions focused on a study of 120 participants of different age categories, income & profession and has been examined through the various systematic tools to adhere to the goals & also to attract results. The sample is selected on justification basis from the Urban as well as Rural places of Kancheepuram District of Tamil Nadu. The fewer villages like Enathur, Nazareth pettai and Dusi are for rural sample collection and Sevilimedu, Toll Gate and Putheri are the places in the boundary of Kancheepuram Town wherein the study is conducted.

**Significance of the Study**

This study helps the enterprises and industries to increase their market techniques knowing issues like:

- How the mindset of a city varies from non-urban customers i.e. how they think, feel, reason & choose among different solutions (e.g. program, purses etc.)

- How both customers are dependent his/her atmosphere (e.g. lifestyle, family, symptoms, press etc.)

- How restriction in customer knowledge & information handling capabilities impact uses.

## Data Analysis and Interpretation

From the above table it is clearly understood that Facebook scored 4.20, even though Facebook scored the highest score, there is not much deviation among top four in this category (Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook, and Hike) in terms of Usefulness. Less Popular scored the lowest.

**Table 1**
**(a) Classification of Respondents - Usefulness (Urban & Rural)**

|  | *N* | *Total Perception* | *Average Perception* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 120 | 452 | 3.77 |
| Twitter | 120 | 481 | 4.01 |
| Whatsapp | 120 | 500 | 4.17 |
| Facebook | 120 | 504 | 4.20 |
| Hike | 120 | 499 | 4.16 |
| Instagram | 120 | 357 | 2.98 |
| Youtube | 120 | 296 | 2.47 |

**Table 1**
**(b) Classification of Respondents - Usefulness (Urban Customers only)**

| *Product* | *N* | *Total Perception* | *Average Perception* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 49 | 174 | 3.55 |
| Twitter | 49 | 201 | 4.10 |
| Whatsapp | 49 | 207 | 4.22 |
| Facebook | 49 | 203 | 4.14 |
| Hike | 49 | 195 | 3.98 |
| Instagram | 49 | 153 | 3.12 |
| Youtube | 49 | 132 | 2.69 |

[a]Geo_area = Urban

From the above table, it is clearly evident that urban customers are given highest rank to Whats app but not much deviation among Twitter, Whatsapp, and Facebook.

**Table 1**
**(c) Classification of Respondents - Usefulness (Rural Customers Only)**

|  | *N* | *Total Perception* | *Average Perception* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 71 | 278 | 3.92 |
| Twitter | 71 | 280 | 3.94 |
| Whatsapp | 71 | 293 | 4.13 |
| Facebook | 71 | 301 | 4.24 |
| Hike | 71 | 304 | 4.28 |
| Instagram | 71 | 204 | 2.87 |
| Youtube | 71 | 164 | 2.31 |

[a]Geo_area = Rural

From the above table, it is clearly understood, that rural customer unable to distinguish between Whatsapp, Facebook & Hike.

**Table 2**
**(a) Classification of Respondents - Ease of Use (Overall)**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 120 | 468 | 3.90 |
| Twitter | 120 | 459 | 3.82 |
| Whatsapp | 120 | 513 | 4.27 |
| Facebook | 120 | 517 | 4.31 |
| Hike | 120 | 500 | 4.17 |
| Instagram | 120 | 355 | 2.96 |
| Youtube | 120 | 362 | 3.02 |

From the above table, Facebook and Whatsapp scored highest scored on Ease of Use. YouTube fall short. Instagram and Others Scored the lowest scores on Ease of Use.

**Table 2**
**(b) Classification of Respondents - Ease of Use (Urban Customers Only)**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 49 | 178 | 3.63 |
| Twitter | 49 | 181 | 3.69 |
| Whatsapp | 49 | 212 | 4.33 |
| Facebook | 49 | 212 | 4.33 |
| Hike | 49 | 210 | 4.29 |
| Instagram | 49 | 132 | 2.69 |
| Youtube | 49 | 156 | 3.18 |

[a]Geo_area = Urban

From the above table, Facebook and Whatsapp scored highest scored on Ease of Use and there is not much difference between these Applications. Lowest being Instagram and Less Popular Applications.

**Table 2**
**(c) Classification of Respondents - Ease of Use (Rural Customers Only)**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 71 | 290 | 4.08 |
| Twitter | 71 | 278 | 3.92 |
| Whatsapp | 71 | 301 | 4.24 |
| Facebook | 71 | 305 | 4.30 |
| Hike | 71 | 290 | 4.08 |
| Instagram | 71 | 223 | 3.14 |
| Youtube | 71 | 206 | 2.90 |

[a]Geo_area = Rural

From the above table, Facebook and Whatsapp scored highest scored on Ease of Use and there is not much difference between these Applications. Lowest being the Instagram and other Applications, it clearly shows there's not much difference in perception among rural and urban customers on Ease of Use.

**Table 3**
**(a) Classification of Respondents - Attitude towards Using (Overall)**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---------|-----|------------------|--------------------|
| Google Hangout | 120 | 441 | 3.67 |
| Twitter | 120 | 493 | 4.11 |
| Whatsapp | 120 | 496 | 4.13 |
| Facebook | 120 | 481 | 4.01 |
| Hike | 120 | 498 | 4.15 |
| Instagram | 120 | 376 | 3.13 |
| Youtube | 120 | 426 | 3.55 |

From the above table, Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook and Hike Applications scored equal scores regarding Attitude towards Using of the product.

**Table 3**
**(b) Classification of Respondents - Attitude towards Using (Urban Customers)**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---------|-----|------------------|--------------------|
| Google Hangout | 49 | 174 | 3.55 |
| Twitter | 49 | 203 | 4.14 |
| Whatsapp | 49 | 200 | 4.08 |
| Facebook | 49 | 199 | 4.06 |
| Hike | 49 | 203 | 4.14 |
| Instagram | 49 | 160 | 3.27 |
| Youtube | 49 | 174 | 3.55 |

[a]Geo_area = Urban

From the above table, Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook and Hike Applications scored equal scores regarding Attitude towards Using of the product.

**Table 3**
**(c) Classification of Respondents - Attitude towards Using (Rural Customers Only)**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---------|-----|------------------|--------------------|
| Google Hangout | 71 | 267 | 3.76 |
| Twitter | 71 | 290 | 4.08 |
| Whatsapp | 71 | 296 | 4.17 |
| Facebook | 71 | 282 | 3.97 |
| Hike | 71 | 295 | 4.15 |
| Instagram | 71 | 216 | 3.04 |
| Youtube | 71 | 252 | 3.55 |

[a]Geo_area = Rural

From the above table, Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook and Hike Applications scored equal scores regarding Attitude towards Using of the product. Again the Rural and Urban Customers doesn't show much difference in perception about the Attitude towards Using of the product.

**Table 4**
**(a) Classification of Respondents - Intention to Use - Overall**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 120 | 399 | 3.33 |
| Twitter | 120 | 483 | 4.02 |
| Whatsapp | 120 | 481 | 4.01 |
| Facebook | 120 | 498 | 4.15 |
| Hike | 120 | 504 | 4.20 |
| Instagram | 120 | 369 | 3.07 |
| Youtube | 120 | 368 | 3.07 |

From the above table, it is clearly evident that Popular Mobile Applications(Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook, and Hike) have scored almost equal scores, which shows that the customer's perception about these Applications don't differ much.

**Table 4**
**(b) Classification of Respondents - Intention to Use – Urban Customers Only**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 49 | 158 | 3.22 |
| Twitter | 49 | 194 | 3.96 |
| Whatsapp | 49 | 196 | 4.00 |
| Facebook | 49 | 203 | 4.14 |
| Hike | 49 | 204 | 4.16 |
| Instagram | 49 | 157 | 3.20 |
| Youtube | 49 | 157 | 3.20 |

[a]Geo_area = Urban

From the above table, it is clearly understood that Hike, Whatsapp, and Facebook are competing in terms of Intention to Use. Google Hangout, Instagram lacking in Intention to Use of the product.

**Table 4**
**(c) Classification of Respondents - Intention to Use – Rural Customers Only**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 71 | 241 | 3.39 |
| Twitter | 71 | 289 | 4.07 |
| Whatsapp | 71 | 285 | 4.01 |
| Facebook | 71 | 295 | 4.15 |
| Hike | 71 | 300 | 4.23 |
| Instagram | 71 | 212 | 2.99 |
| Youtube | 71 | 211 | 2.97 |

[a]Geo_area = Rural

From the above table, it is understood that app, 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 Intention to Use.

**Table 5**
**(a) Classification of Respondents - Application Reliability/Stability - Overall**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 120 | 452 | 3.77 |
| Twitter | 120 | 481 | 4.01 |
| Whatsapp | 120 | 500 | 4.17 |
| Facebook | 120 | 504 | 4.20 |
| Hike | 120 | 499 | 4.16 |
| Instagram | 120 | 357 | 2.98 |
| Youtube | 120 | 296 | 2.47 |

From the above table, it is clearly evident that except Instagram and YouTube, every other Application scored similar score, showing dissimilarity among the customers.

**Table 5**
**(b) Classification of Respondents - Application Reliability/Stability –Urban Customers Only**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 49 | 174 | 3.55 |
| Twitter | 49 | 201 | 4.10 |
| Whatsapp | 49 | 207 | 4.22 |
| Facebook | 49 | 203 | 4.14 |
| Hike | 49 | 195 | 3.98 |
| Instagram | 49 | 153 | 3.12 |
| Youtube | 49 | 132 | 2.69 |

[a]Geo_area = Urban

From the above table, Urban customers gave much larger importance to Twitter, Whatsapp and Facebook, when comes to Application Reliability/Stability.

**Table 5**
**(c) Classification of Respondents - Application Reliability/Stability – Rural Customers**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 71 | 278 | 3.92 |
| Twitter | 71 | 280 | 3.94 |
| Whatsapp | 71 | 293 | 4.13 |
| Facebook | 71 | 301 | 4.24 |
| Hike | 71 | 304 | 4.28 |
| Instagram | 71 | 204 | 2.87 |
| Youtube | 71 | 164 | 2.31 |

[a]Geo_area = Rural

From the above table, Rural Customers gave nearly equal importance to all app except, Instagram and YouTube. This is clearly evident, that they don't differ on Application Reliability/Stability terms in choosing the Application phones.

**Table 6**
**(a) Classification of Respondents - Actual Use-overall**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 120 | 368 | 3.07 |
| Twitter | 120 | 431 | 3.59 |
| Whatsapp | 120 | 429 | 3.57 |
| Facebook | 120 | 442 | 3.68 |
| Hike | 120 | 499 | 4.16 |
| Instagram | 120 | 472 | 3.93 |
| Youtube | 120 | 409 | 3.41 |

From the above table, it is clearly evident that Hike and Instagram has scored significantly higher score when compared to YouTube.

**Table 6**
**(b) Classification of Respondents - Actual Use-Urban Customers Only**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 49 | 144 | 2.94 |
| Twitter | 49 | 177 | 3.61 |
| Whatsapp | 49 | 175 | 3.57 |
| Facebook | 49 | 185 | 3.78 |
| Hike | 49 | 195 | 3.98 |
| Instagram | 49 | 196 | 4.00 |
| Youtube | 49 | 182 | 3.71 |

[a]Geo_area = Urban

From the above table, it is clearly understood, that Hike, Instagram, Facebook and YouTube have scored nearly equal scores, which implies that the urban customers too prefer Hike and facebook for messenger services.

**Table 6**
**(c) Classification of Respondents - Actual Use-Rural Customers Only**

| Product | N | Total Perception | Average Perception |
|---|---|---|---|
| Google Hangout | 71 | 224 | 3.15 |
| Twitter | 71 | 254 | 3.58 |
| Whatsapp | 71 | 254 | 3.58 |
| Facebook | 71 | 257 | 3.62 |
| Hike | 71 | 304 | 4.28 |
| Instagram | 71 | 276 | 3.89 |
| Youtube | 71 | 227 | 3.20 |

[a]Geo_area = Rural

From the above table, Rural customers prefer Popular Mobile Applications like Hike, Instagram, Facebook when comes to value.

**Table 7**
**(a) Combined Result – Overall**

| S.No | Company | Total Perception |
|------|---------|------------------|
| 1 | Google Hangout | 35.53 |
| 2 | Twitter | 39.07 |
| 3 | WHATSAPP | 40.32 |
| 4 | Facebook | 40.795 |
| 5 | Hike | 41.685 |
| 6 | Instagram | 32.065 |
| 7 | Youtube | 30.5 |

From the above table, Hike, Facebook, and Whatsapp have secured maximum perception score among the customers.

**Table 7**
**(b) Combined Result -Urban**

| S.No | Company | Total Perception |
|------|---------|------------------|
| 1 | Google Hangout | 33.78 |
| 2 | Twitter | 38.98 |
| 3 | WHATSAPP | 40.47 |
| 4 | Facebook | 40.94 |
| 5 | Hike | 41.02 |
| 6 | Instagram | 32.485 |
| 7 | Youtube | 32.23 |

From the above table, it is clearly evident that the urban consumers prefer, Whatsapp, Facebook, and Hike Applications.

**Table 7**
**(c) Combined Result -Rural**

| S.No | Company | Total Perception |
|------|---------|------------------|
| 1 | Google Hangout | 36.68 |
| 2 | Twitter | 39.11 |
| 3 | WHATSAPP | 40.24 |
| 4 | Facebook | 40.695 |
| 5 | Hike | 42.105 |
| 6 | Instagram | 31.775 |
| 7 | Youtube | 29.24 |

From the above table, it is clearly evident that rural customers prefer more Popular Applications when compared to urban customers.

## 4. RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

- From the table it is clearly understood that Facebook scored 4.20, even though Facebook scored the highest score, there is not much deviation among top four in this category (Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook, and Hike) in terms of Usefulness

- From the table, it is clearly evident that Urban customers have given highest rank to Whatsapp, But not much deviation among Twitter, Whatsapp, and Facebook.

- From the table, it is clearly understood, that rural customer unable to distinguish the app between Whatsapp, Facebook & Hike.

- From the table, Facebook App and Whatsapp App scored highest scored on Ease of Use. YouTube fall short. Instagram and Others Scored the lowest scored on Ease of Use.

- From the table, Facebook App and Whatsapp App scored highest scored on Ease of Use and there is not much difference between these Applications. Lowest being Instagram and Less Popular Applications

- From the table, Facebook Application and Whatsapp Application scored highest scored on Ease of Use and there is not much difference between these Applications. Lowest being Instagram and Less Popular Applications. It clearly shows there's not much difference in perception among rural and urban customers on Ease of Use.

- From the table, Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook and Hike Applications scored equal scores regarding Attitude towards using the app.

- From the table, Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook and Hike Applications scored equal scores regarding Attitude towards Using the app.

- From the table, it is clearly evident that Popular Mobile Applications(Twitter, Whatsapp, Facebook, and Hike) have scored almost equal scores, which shows that the customer's perception about these Applications don't differ much.

- From the table, it is clearly understood that Hike and Facebook are competing in terms of Intention to Use. Google Hangout, Instagram and Other Mobile Applications lacking in Intention to Use.

- From the table, it is understood that app, 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 Intention to Use.

- From the table, it is clearly evident that the urban consumers prefer, Whatsapp, Facebook, and Hike Applications than other Popular Applications

- From the table, Hike, Facebook, and Whatsapp have secured maximum perception score among the customers.

- From the table, it is clearly evident that rural customers prefer more Popular Applications when compared to urban customers.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to learn the collision of reputation of program on the making process and to check out the effect of exterior factors on customer understanding by evaluating the choices of two different customer bases- non-urban and city. Consumer actions is a programmed reaction to exterior events; therefore the area and around environment also have some effect on the choice of the customer. To perform the research, a set of questions applied study has been performed among 120 participants of city and non-urban areas and the data said well-known program has a strong affect utilization decision. In non-urban places, price is given more consideration than cellular program, while in towns, program overtakes costs factor. From the research, it is also clear that well known cellular Programs are similarly used by the people of both areas and the customers believe in the applying. The company which offers a wide variety of options to choose from is more likely to efficiently recognition well in city as well as non-urban places. The research features the key elements which impact the customer actions and can establish to be useful to Application companies as well as market experts.

## *References*

Adams, D. A., Nelson, R. R., & Todd, P. A. (1992). Perceived usefulness, ease of use, and usage of information technology: A replication. MIS Quarterly, 16, 227–247.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13, 318–339.

Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. Management Science, 35(8), 982–1003.

Fathema, N. (2013). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) of an extended Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to report web technology adoption behavior in higher education institutions (Ph.D. thesis). Auburn University, Auburn, al., United States.

Fathema, N., Sutton, K. (2013). Factors influencing faculty members' Learning Management Systems adoption behavior: An analysis using the Technology Acceptance Model. International Journal of Trends in Economics Management & Technology, Vol. II(vi), pg20-28.

Holden, H., & Rada, R. (2011). Understanding the Influence of Perceived Usability and Technology Self-Efficacy on Teachers' Technology Acceptance. Journal Of Research On Technology In Education (International Society For Technology In Education), 43(4), 343-367.

Icek Ajzen and Martin Fishbein, 1980. Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice–Hall.

Karahanna, E., & Straub, D. W. (1999). The psychological origins of perceived usefulness and ease-of-use. Information & Management, 35(4), 237-250.

O. Kwon and Y. Wen, "An empirical study of the factors affecting social network service use," Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 26, pp. 254-263, 2010.

Lee, Y., Kozar, K. A., & Larsen, K. (2003). The technology acceptance model: Past, present, and future. Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 12(50), 752–780.

K. -Y. Lin and H. -P. Lu, "Why people use social networking sites: An empirical study integrating network externalities and motivation theory," Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 27, pp. 1152-1161, 2011.

Liaw, S. (2008). Investigating students' perceived satisfaction, behavioral intention, and effectiveness of e-learning: A case study of the Blackboard system. Computers & Education, 51(2), 864-873. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2007.09.005

Ophus, J. D. & Abbitt, J. T. 2009, Exploring the Potential Perceptions of Social Networking Systems in University Courses MERLOT, Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, Vol. 5, No. 4.

Venkatesh V. & Davis F.D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: four longitudinal field studies. Management Science, 46, 186–204.

V. Venkatesh and M. G. Morris, "Why don't men ever stop to ask for directions? Gender, social influence and their role in technology acceptance and usage behavior," MIS Quarterly, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 115-139, March 2000.