A Comparative Study on the Buying Behaviour of Rural and Urban Consumers towards Mobile Phone in Ganjam District, Odisha

Dr. Sathya Swaroop Debasish*

Reader, Department of Business Administration, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Mr. Sujit Kumar Prusty

Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Utkal University,Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Abstract

The present study aims to examine the comparative buying behaviour of rural and urban counterparts towards the purchase of mobile phone. To achieve these objectives an attempt is made to compare and analyze the factors (Price, Quality, Style, Functions and Brand) which act as motivators both for rural and urban people in purchase of mobile phone. A structured questionnaire was prepared using the 5-point Likert scale that was administered to 400 mobile users /respondents for obtaining primary data from both urban and rural consumer of Ganjam district of the state of Odisha, India. The present study indicates that there is no significant difference of price and style consciousness for purchase of mobile phone between rural and urban consumers but there is significant difference of quality, functions and brand consciousness for purchase of mobile phone between rural and urban consumers. Study indicates that rural consumers are less quality, functions and brand conscious as compared to their urban counterparts. The study indicates that rural consumer mostly use friends (45%), TV(17%) and mobile phone retailer(12%) as the source of information, the purchase decision is taken by self decision(52%) with the help of family (29%) and friends (18%) and most of rural consumers are satisfied (84%) in Ganjam District. Further, the research findings may guide various mobile manufacturing companies about modification required in present marketing strategies applied for tapping urban markets and to decide, if possible, and to what extent these strategies can be moulded and applied successfully to the rural markets.

Introduction

The Indian consumer market (rural and urban) represents a huge demand base, by offering a vast opportunity for the existing and emerging companies. The Indian market is still not exploited fully and is regarded as one of the fastest growing in global economy. This lures more number of domestic and foreign companies to venture into Indian market opportunity. An urban area as per the Census of India is defined as "all places with a municipality, corporation cantonment or a notified town area" and "All other places satisfying the following criteria: "Minimum population of 5000 ; At least 75 percent of male working population in non- agricultural pursuit; and Density of population is at least 400 persons per square kilometer." Therefore, an area that does not satisfy the criteria specified above can be considered as a rural area (as there is no official definition for an area which could be called as a Rural area). In this paper, we define rural marketing as any marketing activity in which one dominant participant is from a rural area.

For the purpose of defining the domain of rural marketing, "rural" and "urban" can be visualised on a continuum consisting of three broad groups, namely, rural, rurban (the overlap between rural and urban, with physical features closer to urban areas and proximity to large urban centres, but with deep rural sociological moorings) and urban. The domain of rural marketing, thus can be seen in a two dimensional space as a flow of goods, services, and ideas from one area to another, except in the case of urban to urban flow.

A complex set of factors influence rural consumer's behaviour. Social norms, traditions, caste, and social customs have greater influence on the consumer behaviour in rural areas than in urban areas. The seasonality of agricultural production influences the seasonality of rural consumer's demand. Given the fact that the landless labourers and daily wage earners get their income in instalments, their purchasing is restricted to small quantities of products at a time, mostly on a daily basis or once in two or three days. (Jha Mithileswar 2007) .A farmer in rural Punjab is more progressive than his counterpart in Odisha, a farmer in Karnataka is far more educated that one in Bihar, and so on and so forth. In an urban family, the husband, the wife and others even the children are involved in the buying and purchase decision making process. Urban individuals are free to take independent purchase decisions. However in a village, due to cultural/social/traditional practices men are the prime purchase decision makers. The urban population is more exposed towards the advertisements and technological developments as compared against their rural counterparts.

Domestic as well as MNCs and foreign marketers are focusing more on rural India, where there are areas, which are not exploited fully. The 740 million potential consumers and 6,30,000 villagers in rural Indian make up for 41 percent of India's middle – class and 58 percent of the country's total disposable income. Little

wonder then that almost all of corporate India is falling head over heels to reach out to rural India, which can add substantially to their bottom lines.

Motivation for present Study

The present study aims to examine the comparative buying behaviour of rural and urban counterparts towards the purchase of mobile phone. A comparative study is needed to assess the similarities and differences between buying behaviour displayed by both urban and rural consumers with regards to mobile phone. Further, the research findings may guide various mobile manufacturing companies about modification required in present marketing strategies applied for tapping urban markets and to decide, if possible, and to what extent these strategies can be moulded and applied successfully to the rural markets. To achieve these objectives an attempt is made to compare and analyze the factors (Price, Quality, Style, Functions and Brand) which act as motivators both for rural and urban people in purchase of mobile phone.

Objectives of the Study

This paper is an attempt to explore the motivational factors for mobile purchase in view of the emergence of vast opportunities for rural markets. The present study aims to examine the comparative buying behaviour of rural and their urban counterparts towards the purchase of mobile phone. A comparative study is needed to assess the similarities and differences between buying behaviour displayed by both urban and rural consumers with regards to mobile phone.

The specific objectives of the study are:
1. To examine the Sources of Information considered.
2. To examine the role of Family Members in influencing brand choice.
3. To examine Consumer Satisfaction.

Hypothesis Development Based on Literature Survey

The study attempts to compare and analyze the motivational factors for purchase of mobile phone among rural and urban consumers. The motivational factors selected for purchase of mobile phone are: Price, Quality, Style, Functions and Brand.

Following Hypotheses are tested:
1. **H1:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban consumers regarding mobile phone on "Price Consciousness."
2. **H2:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban consumers regarding mobile phone on "Quality Consciousness."
3. **H3:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban consumers regarding mobile phone on "Style Consciousness."
4. **H4:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban consumers regarding mobile phone on "Functions Consciousness."
5. **H5:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban consumers regarding mobile phone on "Brand Consciousness."

Literature Review

Ananda & Hundal, B.S. (2007) examined the comparative buying behaviour of rural and their urban counterparts towards the purchase of refrigerator. The factors considered by them: item of necessity, symbol of social status, advertising influence, brand reputation and time saving device (Punjab) .Gupta (1987) examined the factors motivating consumers to buy durables, the factors considered by them in making brand choice: source of information considered, role of family members in influencing brand choice and to examine consumer satisfaction (Amritsar city) .Chirag V. Erda made a Comparative Study on the buying behaviour of rural and urban consumers on mobile phone (Ganjam District) . Shanthi, R. (2005) examined the Perceptual Dimensions of Brand Associations with reference to mobile Users (Chennai City) . Shashi Kumar Sharma, L & Chaubey, D.S. (2007) assessed the consumers' awareness and their attitude toward different mobile service providers operating in Lucknow.

Research Methodology

For the purpose of the study, both the rural and urban consumers are asked to rate the five mobile phone purchase motivators (price, quality, style, functions and brand) on 5-point Likert (importance) scale for, mobile phone: Extremely important (5), Somewhat important (4), Neither important nor Unimportant (3), Somewhat important (2) and Extremely unimportant (1), appendix-3). For the purpose of testing Hypothesis, the scores is averages and standard deviation is calculated, the Z - Test is used to test the Hypothesis, (appendix-2). Additionally, percentage analysis is used to analyze the sub-objectives: source of information, Role of family in

decision making and Consumer Satisfaction (appendix 1). The Z - Test is a parametric test to determine the statistical significance between a sample distribution mean and population parameter. The Z - Test is selected as parametric tests are more powerful because their data are derived from interval and ratio measurements. The Z - Test is used for two independent samples, large sample size and two tailed test. (Appendix - 2)

The Assumptions Made:

1. The random sampling distribution of a statistics is approximately normal.
2. Values given by the samples are sufficiently close to the population value and can be used in its place for calculating the standard error of the estimate.

The present study is mainly based on primary data. The mobile phone consumers belonging to both rural and urban areas of Ganjam District (Odisha) India are examined.

1. Data Source: The present study is mainly based on primary data from Ganjam District.
2. Research Approach: Survey Research.
3. Research Instrument: Questionnaires both in English and Odia.
4. Sample Size:
   1. Sampling Unit: Data collected from users of mobile phone from Ganjam District
   2. A sample of around 400 mobile users. 200 each from rural and urban areas from Ganjam District Is selected.
   3. Sampling Procedure: In Ganjam District there are 22 blocks, Rural and Urban sample are selected on Judgment and Convenience basis.
   4. Data Analysis: For the purpose of study, both the rural and urban samples were asked to rate the five mobile phone purchase motivators (price, quality, style, functions and Brand) on 5 - point Likert (importance) scale for mobile phone. The Z- Test is used for analysis.

Data analysis and Discussion

Following is the summarized result from analysis of data.

Demographic Profile

The demographic data (Table I) indicates that,

- Most of the respondents of rural sample fall in the age category of 20 - 30 years (37%) and of urban sample fall in the age category of 20-30 years (47%)
- 84% of rural sample belong to male and 16% belong to female while in urban sample 52% belong male and 48% belong to female.
- Educational profile of the rural sample indicates that most of the respondents are under graduate (60%) in urban sample too most of the respondents are under – graduate (59%)
- Occupation profile of the rural sample indicates that most of the respondents are from service (36%) while in the urban sample most of the respondents are from students (other) (55%)
- Income profile of the rural sample indicates that most of the respondents are having monthly family income between Rs. 5,000/- to 10,000/- (48%), while in the urban sample most of the respondents are having monthly family income Rs.10, 000 and above (65%).

Mobile phone used

- Information pertaining to the mobile phone used (Table II) indicates that in rural sample most of the respondents are having Nokia Phone (71%) and in urban sample too most of the respondents are having Nokia Phone (68%)

Source of Information

- The received information pertaining to sources of information (Table III) indicates that most of the respondents use Friends (rural-45%, urban-34%) followed by T.V. (rural-17%, urban-22%), mobile phone retailer (rural-12%, urban- 19%) and News Paper (rural-11%, urban- 12%) as sources of information to purchase mobile phone.

Purchase Decision

- Information regarding Purchase Decision (Table IV) indicates that most of the respondents from rural sample take self decision only (52%) even more than urban sample (43%), followed by family help(rural-29%, urban-41%) and friends help (rural-18%, urban -13%) to make the purchase decision of mobile phone.

Customer Satisfaction

- Respondents are asked whether they recommend their mobile phone to a friend, it is assumed that positive answer (yes) will indicate satisfaction and negative answer (no) will indicate dissatisfaction (it is important to note that there are so many factors affect to the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.)
- The received information pertaining to consumer satisfaction (Table V) indicates that most of the respondents are satisfied (rural- 84%, urban- 91%), yet few are dissatisfied (rural-16%, urban- 9%) through the reasons are not known.

The Motivational Factors

The calculated value of Z- Test statistics at 5% level of significance indicates the following findings

- The difference between Price consciousness of rural and urban sample for purchase of mobile phone in Ganjam District is not significant.
- The difference between Quality consciousness of rural and urban sample for purchase of mobile phone in Ganjam District is not significant.
- The difference between style consciousness of rural and urban sample for purchase of mobile phone in Ganjam District is not significant.
- The difference between Function consciousness of rural and urban sample for purchase of mobile phone in Ganjam District is not significant.
- The difference between Brand consciousness of rural and urban sample for purchase of mobile phone in Ganjam District is not significant.

The present study indicates that there is no significant difference of price and style consciousness for purchase of mobile phone between rural and urban consumers but there is significant difference of quality, functions and brand consciousness for purchase of mobile phone between rural and urban consumers. Study indicates that rural consumers are less quality, functions and brand conscious as compared to their urban counterparts. The study indicates that rural consumer mostly use friends (45%), TV(17%) and mobile phone retailer(12%) as the source of information, the purchase decision is taken by self decision(52%) with the help of family (29%) and friends (18%) and most of rural consumers are satisfied (84%) in Ganjam District.

Limitation of the Study

The present study is confined to Ganjam District only and the findings may not be applicable to the other states of the country because of socio-cultural, consumer preference, spendable income and other differences. Again consumer behaviour, preference, and technology being dynamic in nature, there is every possibility that over time and space findings of today may become invalid tomorrow.

Conclusion

In order to utilise the immense potential of rural market in India, companies need to develop specific marketing strategies and action plans taking into account the complex set of factors that influence consumer's behaviour. Rural marketing cannot succeed if the marketing strategy and action plans are only extrapolation or minor modification of the urban marketing strategy and plans. Innovative companies who adopted an integrated of the urban marketing strategy and plans. Innovative companies who adopted an integrated approach have succeeded in utilizing market opportunities that rural areas offer.

REFERENCES

Anand & Hundal, B. S.(2007). Motivators for purchase of durables for rural and urban consumers of Punjab: A case study. *The ICFAI Journal of management research*, 7

Balaji Sathya Narayanan(2007) Rural marketing the road for sustainable growth. *Marketing Mastermind* 8(5), 22 -24

Cooper Donald, R & Schindler Pamela, S.(2006). *Marketing research concepts and cases*. New Delhi, India: Tata McGraw Hill publishing company limited.

Ganguly Parthasarathy & Kapse Sampada (2006, February). Rural communication: An integrated approach. *The ICFAI Journal of Marketing Management*, 5(1), 18-26.

Gupta, S.P. (2000)Statistical interference- Test of hypothesis. In Gupta S.P., *Statistical Methods* (pp. A-3.1-3.71) New Delhi, India: Sultan Chand & Sons.

Jha Mithileshwar (2007). Rural marketing in India. In Kotler Philip, Keller Kevin Lane, Koshy Abraham & Jha Mithileshwar, *Marketing Management* (12th ed.)(pp. A1 – A6). Delhi India: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.

Karynakaran, K.(2007). Rural marketing. In Dr. Karunakaran K., *Marketing Management* (1st ed) (pp.277-292).

Mumbai, India: Himalaya publishing house.

Khairoowala Ziauddin & Siddiqui Saif(2001). Buying behaviour of rural consumer in haat markets – A case study of some selected villages of western Uttar Pradesh, *Indian Journal of Marketing*, 31(11-12), 14-24.

Kashyap Pradeep. (2005)Selling to the hinterland. In Tony Joseph, *The Marketing Whitebook* (p.89- 104). New Delhi: ABP Pvt. Ltd.

Malik Aman(2007 May 20).Consumer India 2025. *Business Today*, 16(10), 100 -104. More proof that India's going all mobile(2007, Aug 3 -16) 4Ps.

Saxena Ranjan (2007) Consumer behaviour. Understanding the buyer. In Saxsena Ranjan, *Marketing Management* (3rd ed.)(pp.148-177) New Delhi, India: Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Limited.

Shanthi R. (2005, September). Perceptual dimensions of brand: A study with reference to mobile users. *The ICFAI Journal of Brand Management*, 2(3), 55-62.

Sharma Shashilumar, L & Chaubey, D.S. (2007. February). Consumer behaviour towards mobile service providers: An empirical study. *The ICFAIjournal of Marketing Management*, 6(1),41-4.

APPENDIX- I

Table I Demographic Characteristics:

Variables	Characteristics	Respondents					
		Rural		Urban		Total	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Age	1. Below 20 years	61	31%	94	47%	155	39%
	2. 20 to 30 years	74	37%	64	32%	138	35%
	3.30 to 40years	29	15%	17	9%	46	12%
	4.40 to 50years	22	11%	20	10%	42	11%
	5.over 50 Years	14	7%	5	3%	19	5%
		200	101%	200	101%	400	102%
Sex	1. Male	168	84%	105	53%	273	68%
	2. Female	32	16%	95	48%	127	32%
		200	100%	200	101%	400	100%
Educational Qualification	1.Under Graduate	120	60%	118	59%	238	60%
	2. Graduate	46	23%	43	22%	89	22%
	3.Post Graduate	20	10%	34	17%	54	14%
	4.Others	14	7%	5	3%	19	5%
		200	100%	200	101%	400	101%
Occupation	1.Service	72	36%	61	30%	133	33%
	2. Business	45	23%	21	11%	66	17%
	3.Profession	7	4%	7	4%	14	4%
	4.Agriculture	22	11%	1	1%	23	6%
	5. Others	54	27%	110	55%	164	41%
		200	101%	200	101%	400	101%
Family Income (Per Month)	1. up to Rs.5000	65	33%	19	10%	84	21%
	2. Rs.5000 to Rs.10000	94	47%	51	26%	145	36%
	3. Rs.10000 and above	41	21%	130	65%	171	43%
		200	101%	200	101%	400	100%

Table II Mobile Phone Used:

Sl.No	Mobile Phone	Respondents					
		Rural		Urban		Total	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	Nokia	142	71%	135	68%	277	69%
2	Motorola	9	5%	22	11%	31	8%
3	L.G	2	1%	3	2%	5	1%
4	Reliance	14	7%	19	10%	33	8%
5	Sony	17	9%	12	6%	29	7%
6	Samsung	5	3%	4	2%	9	2%
7	TATA	9	5%	4	2%	13	3%
8	Other	2	1%	1	1%	3	1%
	Total	200	102%	200	102%	400	99%

Table III Sources of Information Used:

Sl.No	Sources of Information	Respondents					
		Rural		Urban		Total	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	News Paper	21	11%	23	12%	44	11%
2	TV	34	17%	44	22%	78	20%
3	Internet	7	4%	7	4%	14	4%
4	Mobile Phone Retailer	23	12%	38	19%	61	15%
5	Magazine	2	1%	7	4%	9	2%
6	Radio	4	2%	1	1%	5	1%
7	Friends	90	45%	67	34%	157	39%
8	Other	19	10%	13	7%	32	8%
	Total	200	102%	200	103%	400	100%

Table IV Purchase Decision:

Sl.No	Purchase Decision	Respondents					
		Rural		Urban		Total	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	Self Decision only	104	52%	85	43%	189	47%
2	Friends	36	18%	25	13%	61	15%
3	Family	57	29%	81	41%	138	35%
4	Mobile Phone Retailer	2	1%	4	2%	6	2%
5	Other	1	1%	5	3%	6	2%
	Total	200	101%	200	102%	400	101%

Table V Consumer Satisfaction:

Sl.No	Consumer Satisfaction	Respondents					
		Rural		Urban		Total	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	Satisfied	168	84%	181	91%	349	87%
2	Dissatisfied	32	16%	19	10%	51	13%
	Total	200	100%	200	101%	400	100%

Table VI THE Z- TEST (Two Tailed Test, Significance Level – 0- 05)

Motivational Factors	Rural Sample		Urban Sample		Calculated value (Z)	Critical Value	S/NS
	Mean	Stand. Deviation	Mean	Stand. Deviation			
Price	4.03	1.23	4.05	0.96	0.18	1.96	NS
Quality	4.57	0.72	4.74	0.69	2.43	1.96	S
Style	3.98	1.16	4.15	0.96	1.55	1.96	NS
Function	4.32	1.02	4.53	0.78	2.33	1.96	S
Brand	4.09	1.25	4.5	0.89	3.73	1.96	S
Note: NS- Not Significant, S- Significant							

APPENDIX- 2

<div align="center">

THE TEST OF HYPOTHESIS (Z TEST):

RURAL CONSUMER: 1   **URBAN CONSUMER: 2**
</div>

1. **PRICE (A)**
   1. Null Hypothesis:

      H0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of price of rural and urban consumer\ $(X_{A1}= X_{A2})$

      H1: There is significant difference in the mean score of price of rural and urban consumer\ $(X_{A1}= X_{A2})$.

   2. Statistical Test:

      The Z- Test is chosen because the data are interval and two samples are large and independent.

   3. Significance Level $\propto$ = 0.05 (Two- Tailed Test)

   4. Calculated Value: $Z = \dfrac{\bar{X}_{A1} - \bar{X}_{A2}}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{A1}{}^2 + S_{A2}{}^2}{n_1 \quad n_2}}}$

      Where:

      $\bar{X}_{A1} = 4.03$. $S_{A1} = 1.23$ $n_1 = 200$

      $\bar{X}_{A2} = 4.05$ $S_{A2} = 0.96$ $n_2 = 200$

      $Z = \dfrac{|4.03 - 4.05|}{\sqrt{\frac{(1.23)^2}{200} + \frac{(0.96)^2}{200}}}$, $Z = 0.18$

   5. Critical Test Value : For 5% significance level and tow tailed test the critical value is 1.96

   6. Interpretation \: Since the calculated value is less than the critical value (0.18 < 1.96), we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

      There is no significant difference in the mean score of price of rural and urban consumer.

2. **QUALITY (B)**
   1. Null Hypothesis:

      H0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of quality of rural and urban consumer $(X_{B1} = X_{B2})$

      H1: There is significant difference in the mean score of quality of rural and urban consumer\ $(X_{B1}= X_{B2})$.

   2. Statistical Test:

      The Z- Test is chosen because the data are interval and two samples are large and independent.

   3. Significance Level: $\propto$ = 0.05(Two – Tailed test).

   4. Calculated Value:

      $Z = \dfrac{\bar{X}_{B1} - \bar{X}_{B2}}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{B1}{}^2 + S_{B2}{}^2}{n_1 \quad n_2}}}$

      Where:

      $\bar{X}_{B1} = 4.57$. $S_{B1} = 0.72$ $n_1 = 200$

      $\bar{X}_{B2} = 4.74$ $S_{B2} = 0.69$ $n_2 = 200$

      $Z = \dfrac{|4.57 - 4.74|}{\sqrt{\frac{(0.72)^2}{200} + \frac{(0.69)^2}{200}}}$,

      $Z = 2.43$

   5. Critical Test Value: For 5% significance level and two tailed test the critical value is 1.96

   6. Interpretation: Since the calculated value is larger than the critical value (2.43 > 1.96), we reject the null hypothesis.

      There is significant different in the mean score of quality of rural and urban consumer.

3. **STYLE (C)**
   1. Null Hypothesis:

      H0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of Style of rural and urban consumer $(X_{c1}= X_{c2})$.

      H1: There is significant difference in the mean score of style of rural and urban consumer\ $(X_{C1}= X_{C2})$.

2. Statistical Test:

The Z- Test is chosen because the data are interval and two samples are large and independent.

3. Significance Level: $\propto$ = 0.05(Two – Tailed test).

4. Calculated Value:

$$Z = \frac{\bar{X}_{C_1} - \bar{X}_{C_2}}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{C_1}^2 + S_{C_2}^2}{n_1 \quad n_2}}}$$

Where:

$\bar{X}_{C1} = 3.98$.	$S_{C1} = 1.16$	$n_1 = 200$
$\bar{X}_{C2} = 4.15$	$S_{C2} = 0.96$	$n_2 = 200$

$$Z = \frac{|3.98 - 4.15|}{\sqrt{\frac{(1.16)^2}{200} + \frac{(0.96)^2}{200}}}$$

$Z = 1.55$

5. Critical Test Value: For 5% significance level and two tailed test the critical value is 1.96

6. Interpretation: Since the calculated value is less than the critical value (1.55 < 1.96), we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

There is no significant different in the mean score of Style of rural and urban consumer.

4. **FUNCTIONS (D)**

1. Null Hypothesis:

H0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of functions of rural and urban consumer\ (X_{D1}= X_{D2})

H1: There is significant difference in the mean score of functions of rural and urban consumer\X_{D1} = X_{A2}).

2. Statistical Test:

The Z- Test is chosen because the data are interval and two samples are large and independent.

3. Significance Level $\propto$ = 0.05 (Two- Tailed Test)

4. Calculated Value: $Z = \frac{\bar{X}_{D_1} - \bar{X}_{D_2}}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{D_1}^2 + S_{D_2}^2}{n_1 \quad n_2}}}$

Where:

$\bar{X}_{D1} = 4.32$.	$S_{D1} = 1.02$	$n_1 = 200$
$\bar{X}_{D2} = 4.53$	$S_{D2} = 0.78$	$n_2 = 200$

$$Z = \frac{|4.32 - 4.53|}{\sqrt{\frac{(1.02)^2}{200} + \frac{(0.78)^2}{200}}}$$

$Z = 2.33$

5. Critical Test Value : For 5% significance level and two tailed test the critical value is 1.96

6. Interpretation: Since the calculated value is larger than the critical value (2.33 > 1.96), we reject the null hypothesis.

There is significant difference in the mean score of functions of rural and urban consumer.

5. **BRAND (E)**

1. Null Hypothesis:

H0: There is no significant difference in the mean score of Brand of rural and urban consumer\ (X_{E1}= X_{E2})

H1: There is significant difference in the mean score of Brand of rural and urban consumer\(X_{E1} = X_{E2}).

2. Statistical Test:

The Z- Test is chosen because the data are interval and two samples are large and independent.

3. Significance Level $\propto$ = 0.05 (Two- Tailed Test).

4. Calculated Value: $Z = \frac{\bar{X}_{E_1} - \bar{X}_{E_2}}{\sqrt{\frac{S_{E_1}^2 + S_{E_2}^2}{n_1 \quad n_2}}}$

Where:

$\bar{X}_{E1} = 4.09$	$S_{E1} = 1.25$	$n_1 = 200$

Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research
www.iiste.org
ISSN 2422-8451 An International Peer-reviewed Journal
Vol.23, 2016

$$\bar{X}_{E2} = 4.50 \qquad S_{E2} = 0.78 \qquad n_2 = 200$$

$$Z = \frac{|4.09 - 4.50|}{\sqrt{\frac{(1.25)^2}{200} + \frac{(0.89)^2}{200}}}$$

$$Z = 3.73$$

5. Critical Test Value : For 5% significance level and two tailed test the critical value is 1.96
6. Interpretation: Since the calculated value is larger than the critical value (3.73 > 1.96), we reject the null hypothesis.
   There is significant difference in the mean score of brand of rural and urban consumer.

QUESTIONNAIRE
Consumer buying behaviour towards Mobile phone

1. Name of the customer/consumer:_____

2. Town/Village:_____

3. Age group in years:

   Less then20 ☐   20-30 ☐   30-40 ☐   40-50 ☐   Above 50 ☐

4. Gender: Male ☐   Female ☐

5. Educational qualification:

   Under Graduate ☐   Graduate ☐   Post Graduate ☐   Others ☐

6. Occupation:

   Service ☐   Business ☐   Profession ☐   Agriculture ☐   Others ☐

7. Family income @ month:

   5-10K ☐   10-20K ☐   20-30K ☐   30-40K ☐   above40K ☐

8. Do you have mobile phone?   Yes ☐   No ☐

9. Which mobile phone do you have?

   Sony ☐   Samsung ☐   Micromax ☐   Nokia ☐   Others ☐

10. Which information source(s) you used for purchasing the mobile phone?

   News Paper ☐   T.V ☐   Internet ☐   Mobile Phone Retailer ☐

   Friends ☐   Others ☐

11. Who helped you in making the purchasing decision?

   Self Friends ☐   Family members ☐   Mobile phone retailer ☐   Others ☐

12.   Indicate which important characteristics helped you in purchasing the mobile phone?

	Extremely important	Some what important	Neither important Nor unimportant	Some what Unimportant	Extremely Unimportant
	5	4	3	2	1
Price	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quality	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Style	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Functions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Brand	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

13.   Would you recommend your mobile phone to your friend?   Yes ☐   No ☐

14.   Complete the sentence: "My Mobile phone is.."

Thank you for your cooperation and time spent in information sharing.