



ISSN: 2249-894X
IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631 (UIF)
UGC APPROVED JOURNAL NO. 48514
VOLUME - 8 | ISSUE - 8 | MAY - 2019



FUNCTIONAL VALUE OF SMART PHONE USERS IN SRIRANGAM

M. Aishwarya¹ and Dr. V.P.T. Dhevika²

¹ Ph.D. Research Scholar in Commerce (Part-Time),
Srimad Andavan Arts & Science College (Autonomous),
Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu.

² Research Supervisor & Assistant Professor in
Commerce, Shrimati Indira Gandhi College,
Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu.

ABSTRACT:

This is a research paper on functional value of smart phone users in srirangam. The main objectives of the study are to find out the factors influencing functional value and to know the relationship between personal profile and functional value. Sample size consists of 50 respondents using simple

random sampling method. Results found that there is no significant difference between age and educational qualification with respect to functional value. It is concluded that the most important factor influencing the functional value of smart phone is 'storage capacity' followed by voice call.

KEYWORDS: Factors Functional Value, Smartphone Users.

FUNCTIONAL VALUE

Functional value is defined as the benefit consumers can derive from the perceived quality and expected performance of the product or service (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001). In the mobile telecommunications service context, functional value concerns those benefits customers can obtain from excellent mobile network performance, including sufficient geographical network coverage, clear and undisturbed call quality, minimum dropped calls, and instantaneous connection (Leelakulthanit & Hongcharu, 2011). Functional values are assessed based on

the reasons for purchasing and consuming a product based on physical attributes and utilitarian needs of the user (Seth et al., 1991). "Functional value is measured on a profile of choice attributes" (Seth et al., 1991, p.160). Functional values are based on economic utility theory and value derives by comparing costs and performance (Gimpel, 2011). Alternatively reliability, durability and price are considered functional attributes that derives functional values (Sheth et al., 1991).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

People would agree they couldn't survive one hour of their day without their Smartphone, but realistically, a

Smartphone isn't a basic essential for living like water, food and sunlight. Life can still be healthily and happily managed without a Smartphone; however, a mobile device can variably and significantly enhance life (and keep digitally relevant). Digital-dependent society relies on Smartphone to communicate and stay connected. Unlike a feature phone, a Smartphone keeps users connected through messaging services, email, video calls and social networking apps, in addition to standard text messaging and phone calls. A Smartphone functions as a handheld mobile computer for accessing and browsing the Web. Stay up-to-date on breaking news and shop online etc. Hence a study is made to know the functional value of Smartphone.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study the factors influencing functional value
- To know the relationship between personal profile and functional value.

HYPOTHESES

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

METHODOLOGY

Descriptive survey method was used for the present study. A convenient sample of 50 smart phone users was selected for this research from Srirangam, Tamil Nadu. Self-made tool was used for data collection. The collected data was analyzed by percentage analysis, ANOVA and t-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**Table 1: Opinion showing the Battery Life for Choosing the Smart Phone**

Particulars	N	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	11	22.0
Disagree	12	24.0
Neutral	7	14.0
Agree	9	18.0
Strongly agree	11	22.0
Total	50	100.0

Source: Primary data

Table-1 shows that 24% of the respondents disagree the statement 'I consider the battery life for choosing a smart phone' and 14% of the respondents are neutral to the above statement.

Table -2: Opinion showing the Size of Display Screen for Choosing a Smart Phone

Particulars	N	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	14	28.0
Disagree	11	22.0
Neutral	9	18.0
Agree	8	16.0
Strongly agree	8	16.0
Total	50	100.0

Source: Primary data

Table-2 depicts that 28% of the respondents strongly disagree the statement 'I consider the size of display screen for choosing a smart phone' and 16% of the respondents are agree and strongly agree to the above statement

Table 3: Opinion showing the Storage Capacity for Choosing a Smart Phone

Particulars	N	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	18	36.0
Disagree	10	20.0
Neutral	7	14.0
Agree	8	16.0
Strongly agree	7	14.0
Total	50	100.0

Source: Primary data

Table-3 reveals that 36% of the respondents strongly disagree the statement 'I consider the storage capacity for choosing a smart phone' and 14% of the respondents are agree and neutral to the above statement

Table 4: Opinion showing the fast connection of internet for choosing a smart phone

Particulars	N	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	4	8.0
Disagree	5	10.0
Neutral	9	18.0
Agree	15	30.0
Strongly agree	17	34.0
Total	50	100.0

Source: Primary data

Table-4 indicates that 34% of the respondents strongly agree the statement 'Consider the fast connection of internet for choosing a smart phone' and 8% of the respondents are strongly disagree to the above statement

Table 5: Opinion showing the Clarity of Voice Calls for Choosing a Smart Phone

Particulars	N	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	15	30.0
Disagree	6	12.0
Neutral	9	18.0
Agree	9	18.0
Strongly agree	11	22.0
Total	50	100.0

Source: Primary data

Table-5 shows that 30% of the respondents strongly disagree the statement 'Consider the clarity of voice calls for choosing a smart phone' and 12% of the respondents are disagree to the above statement.

Table 6: Chi-square test showing the Significant Association between Age and Functional Value

Functional 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%	8	16%	4	8%	4	8%	18	36%	X ² =0.746 Df=3 0.862>0.05 Not Significant
High	2	4%	14	28%	10	20%	6	12%	32	64%	

Table-6 depicts that there is no significant association between age and functional value because $p=0.862$ which is more than 0.05. Functional value is low for the respondents who are in the age group of below 30 years and high for the respondents who are in the age group of between 30 to 35 years.

Table-7: F-test showing the significant difference between educational qualification and functional value

Table 7.1 Test showing the significant difference between educational qualification and functional value										
Educational Qualification		N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max	Statistical inference
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Functional Value	Upto SSLC	9	14.22	3.598	1.199	11.46	16.99	6	18	F=2.240 .057>0.05 Not Significant
	HSC	5	12.60	3.912	1.749	7.74	17.46	6	16	
	Diploma	6	13.33	3.724	1.520	9.43	17.24	6	16	
	Bachelor Degree	4	16.50	4.041	2.021	10.07	22.93	13	22	
	Master Degree	15	14.07	2.712	.700	12.57	15.57	6	19	
	M.Phil.	9	17.22	1.986	.662	15.70	18.75	15	20	
	PhD	2	18.00	2.828	2.000	-7.41	43.41	16	20	
	Total	50	14.78	3.376	.477	13.82	15.74	6	22	

Table-7 reveals that there is no significant difference between educational qualification and functional value as $p=0.057$ which is less than 0.05. It also shows that functional value is high for M.Phil. holders and low for HSC holders.

FINDINGS

- 24% of the respondents disagree the statement- 'I consider the battery life for choosing a smart phone'.
- 28% of the respondents strongly disagree the statement- 'I consider the size of display screen for choosing a smart phone'.
- 36% of the respondents strongly disagree the statement- 'I consider the storage capacity for choosing a smart phone'.
- 34% of the respondents strongly agree the statement- 'Consider the fast connection of internet for choosing a smart phone'.
- 30% of the respondents strongly disagree the statement- 'Consider the clarity of voice calls for choosing a smart phone'.
- Functional value is low for the respondents who are in the age group of below 30 years.
- Functional value is high for M.Phil. degree holders.
- There is no significant association between age and functional value.
- There is no significant difference between educational qualification and functional value.

SUGGESTIONS

- Storage capacity of Smartphone can be increased by the manufacturers.
- Display Screen can be increased.

CONCLUSION

The most important factor influencing the functional value of smart phone is 'storage capacity'. Functional value is low for the respondents who are in the age group of below 30 years and high for M.Phil. degree holders. There is no significant association between age and functional value. There is no significant difference between educational qualification and functional value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Eggert, A., & Ulaga, W. (2002). Customer-perceived value: a substitute for satisfaction in business markets? *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 17(2/3), 107-125.
2. Petrick, J. (2002). Development of multi-dimensional scale for perceived value of service. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(2), 119-134.

3. Sanchez, J., Callarisa, L., Rodriguez, R., & Moliner, M. (2006). Perceived value of a purchase of a tourism product. *Tourism Management*, 27(3), 394-409.
4. Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer Perceptions of Price, Value, and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52, 2-22.