

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

A Study on Customer Perception Towards Android Mobile

Kesavardhini R¹, S.V. Praveen²

¹MBA Student Jerusalem College of Engineering, Chennai, India.
²Assistant Professor of Department of Management Studies, Jerusalem College of Engineering, Chennai, India.
DOI: <u>https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.1024.3036</u>

ABSTRACT

Since consumer expectations have changed due to the advancement of mobile technology, customer perception is an important research topic in the smartphone sector. This study looks at usability, performance, features, and customer happiness in order to better understand how consumers see Android mobile devices. Given that Android is the most popular mobile operating system globally, it's critical to understand the factors affecting user experiences in contrast to rivals like iOS. The study collected qualitative and quantitative data from a varied population using structured surveys and interviews. Key findings show that while frequent upgrades and security concerns have a detrimental effect on user experiences, price, customisation, and ease of use are what drive contentment. ANOVA, regression, and Chi-square tests were among the statistical techniques that demonstrated that satisfaction is largely constant across demographic groups. In order to maintain competition in a crowded market and promote long-term brand loyalty, manufacturers can benefit from this research's insights into enhancing security, personalization, and communication tactics.

INTRODUCTION

The success of any product is largely dependent on how customers perceive it, especially in the cutthroat smartphone industry where user retention is fueled by brand loyalty and happiness. As the most popular mobile operating system, Android stands out from rivals like iOS due to its open-source nature, which permits a great deal of customisation. Price, performance, usability, customisation, and security are some of the elements that influence consumer perceptions that are examined in this study. The versatility and affordability of Android have increased its appeal across a range of groups as consumer preferences and technology change. Android, however, has difficulties, especially when it comes to security and delivering uniform updates from manufacturers. This study investigates these topics in order to ascertain how manufacturers may improve Android user loyalty and satisfaction by addressing the ecosystem's advantages and disadvantages.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research into Android customer perceptions highlights several factors that Price, customisation, security, and user experience are some of the elements that affect consumer happiness, according to research on Android customer perceptions.

Priya Kumar (2021)

The flexibility of Android's open-source design is examined in Priya Kumar's work, The Impact of Android Devices on User Perception (2021), which points out that although customization is appealing to many users, it also results in discrepancies.

Garg and Nath (2018)

In contrast to iOS's closed ecosystem, Android's open system raises security worries among users, according to Garg and Nath's (2018) study on Perceived Security of Android vs. iOS.

Wilson, Marshall, and Siegel (2018)

When Wilson et al. (2018) examined the user experiences of iOS and Android, they discovered that although iOS users value a unified ecosystem, Android users favor affordability and personalization. These studies highlight how crucial it is to strike a balance between usability, security, and personalization in order to increase Android customers' satisfaction and brand loyalty.

METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a descriptive approach to examine Android customer perceptions, using both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data. This study takes a descriptive approach to investigate how Android customers perceive the platform. Structured surveys were used to gather data from Android users across a range of demographics. By fusing the generalizability of quantitative data with the in-depth insights of qualitative data. To ensure informed opinions, respondents were chosen based on their use of Android for more than six months. Convenience sampling was one of the sampling techniques used, and snowball sampling was included to boost sample diversity. Statistical tools including ANOVA, regression, and Chi-square testing were used to process the data. The study uses these technologies to investigate the effects of demographics on satisfaction, offering a comprehensive picture of the variables affecting Android consumer perceptions across user categories.

PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS

Table 1: Gender

Introduction: This table presents the demographic breakdown of the sample population in terms of gender.

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Male	71	44.4%
Female	89	55.6%

Inference: The sample is slightly female dominated, with 55.6% of participants

Table 2: Occupation

Introduction: This table shows the occupational distribution of the participants.

Category	Frequency	Percentage	
Student	92	57.5%	
Professional	54	33.8%	
Business Owner	4	2.5%	
Homemaker	8	5%	
Retired	0	0%	
Employee	2	1.2%	

Inference: The majority of participants are students (57.5%), followed by professionals (33.8%).

Table 3: Smartphone Usage

Introduction: This table indicates the primary smartphone brands used by participants.

Category	Frequency	Percentage
iPhone	20	12.5%
Android	139	86.9%
Both iPhone and Android	1	0.6%

Inference: Android is the dominant smartphone platform, with 86.9% of participants using it.

Table 4: Smartphone Ownership Duration

Introduction: This table reveals how long participants have owned their current smartphones.

Category	Frequency	Percentage	
Less than 1 year	10	6.3%	
1-2 years	52	32.5%	
3-5 years	69	43.1%	
More than 5 years	29	18.1%	

Inference: Most participants have owned their smartphones for 3-5 years (43.1%), followed by 1-2 years (32.5%).

Table 5: Overall Satisfaction

Introduction: This table measures participants' overall satisfaction with their smartphones.

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Very dissatisfied	3	1.9%
Dissatisfied	4	2.5%
Neutral	32	20%
Satisfied	86	53.8%
Very satisfied	35	21.9%

Inference: The majority of participants are satisfied or very satisfied with their smartphones (75.7%)

TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS

1.ANOVA (ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE)

Null Hypothesis (H0): There are no significant differences in the satisfaction ratings of Android mobiles among different demographic groups (e.g., age, gender, occupation).

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There are significant differences in the satisfaction ratings of Android mobiles among different demographic groups.

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.417	3	1.472	2.201	.090
Within Groups	104.358	156	.669		
Total	108.775	159			

INFERENCE:

The ANOVA results (F = 2.201, p = 0.090) indicate that there are therefore no significant differences in Android mobile satisfaction among demographic groups. Demographic factors likely do not impact satisfaction levels.

2.Regression

Null Hypothesis (H0): The factors influencing the decision to choose an Android mobile have no significant effect on satisfaction ratings.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): The factors influencing the decision to choose an Android mobile have a significant effect on satisfaction ratings.

Anova						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	1.179	1	1.179	1.731	.190b
1	Residual	107.596	158	.681		
	Total	108.775	159			
a. Dependent Variable: on the scale 1 to 5 how satisfied are you with your android mobile (1= very dissatisfied5= very satisfied)						
b. Predictors: (Constant), What factors influenced your decision to choose an Android mobile? (Select all that apply)						

INFERENCE

The results (F = 1.731, p = 0.190) indicate no significant effect of factors influencing the choice of Android mobiles on satisfaction ratings. Therefore, these factors do not significantly impact on user satisfaction.

3.CROSS-TABULATION

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no association between the categorical variables in the population (i.e., the variables are independent).

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is an association between the categorical variables in the population (i.e., the variables are not independent).

Test	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.336	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	35.560	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.658	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	160		
Note: 13 cells (65.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.			

INTERPRETATION

The chi-square test results show a significant association between the categorical variables (Pearson Chi-Square = 39.336, p < .001). We reject the null hypothesis. However, 65% of the cells have expected counts less than 5, which may affect the validity of the results. Caution is advised in interpretation

FINDINGS

The findings show that Android consumers place a high importance on customisation, cost, and the wide range of apps available. Frequent upgrades and security, however, continue to be major issues that affect user pleasure. Age, gender, and employment do not appear to significantly affect pleasure, according to ANOVA analysis, suggesting that expectations are universal. Complex dynamics between customer choice and satisfaction are shown by regression analysis, which shows that decision considerations like price, brand, and features do not always transfer into satisfaction. Users frequently complain about battery life, security, and update frequency. These findings show that although Android's adaptability appeals to a wide range of users, security and stability improvements are required. Filling up these gaps could increase user happiness, particularly as consumers place a higher priority on data security, easier updates, and longer device lifespans.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Android's advantages are its flexibility, customisation, and affordability—features that appeal to a wide range of users. But because Android is open-source, it comes with drawbacks, chief among them being security and regular software updates, which are sometimes seen as more disruptive than helpful. The findings highlight the necessity for manufacturers to give priority to these areas in order to fulfill changing expectations and solve consumer concerns. Android's versatility across price points contributes to its market position, but in order to maintain growth, makers must enhance security protocols and provide more reliable software experiences. In conclusion, Android can strengthen its competitive position in the mobile market by boosting security and streamlining update procedures, which would increase user pleasure and encourage steadfast loyalty.

REFERENCES

- Kumar, P. (2021). *The Impact of Android Devices on User Perception*. Explores customization, price, and security in Android user perception, emphasizing customization's dual role as both a strength and a source of inconsistency.
- Garg, S., & Nath, R. (2018). *Perceived Security of Android vs. iOS: An Empirical Analysis.* Compares Android and iOS security, highlighting concerns due to Android's open-source model, which affects user trust.
- Wilson, J., Marshall, R., & Siegel, K. (2018). Smartphone Usage Patterns and User Experience: A Comparative Study of Android and iOS. Evaluates user preferences, noting Android's customization versus iOS's ecosystem integration.
- Tan, B., & Teo, L. (2019). Factors Influencing the Recommendation of Smartphones. Shows user satisfaction and perceived value as critical factors in recommendations, with Android favored for affordability and customization, contrasting iOS's security and integration appeal.
- Lee, S., & Kim, H. (2020). User Satisfaction and Brand Loyalty in Android and iOS Devices: A Comparative Analysis. Journal of Mobile Computing, 45(2), 120-132.
- This study examines how user satisfaction and loyalty vary between Android and iOS devices, emphasizing brand loyalty drivers in Android's affordability and customization, as well as iOS's cohesive ecosystem.
- Ahmed, R., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Android Performance in Multitasking and Resource Management: User Perceptions and Technical Evaluation. International Journal of Mobile Systems, 32(4), 301-314.
- Focuses on Android's strengths and challenges in multitasking and resource management, assessing how performance perception impacts the user experience and device preference.
- Singh, M., & Krishnan, V. (2021). The Role of User Interface and Experience Design in Android Device Adoption. Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 29(3), 194-207.
- This paper explores how Android's user interface design influences user perception, adoption, and loyalty, with attention to personalization and the learning curve associated with customization.
- Patel, T., & Lin, D. (2019). Trust and Privacy Concerns in Android: A Study of User Confidence in Data Security. Journal of Digital Privacy, 14(1), 88-101.
- Investigates privacy concerns among Android users, analyzing factors that shape trust in Android's security features, with a focus on the implications of Android's open-source nature on user trust and confidence.

RESULTS

According to the analysis, the main characteristics of Android that contribute to consumer happiness are its affordability, customization options, and intuitive UI. The expectations placed on Android devices for a wide range of functionalities are reflected in the main concerns, which include security, frequent software upgrades, and battery life. According to statistical testing, there are no appreciable variations in satisfaction ratings amongst demographic groups, indicating that Android users have similar expectations and experiences. Purchase decisions are influenced by affordability, but

customer views are greatly influenced by performance and brand reputation. Regression analysis reveals a discrepancy between expectations and experiences by demonstrating that user satisfaction does not always directly correlate with factors driving purchase. These observations highlight Android's cost and customisation appeal while pointing out areas for development, especially in security and update dependability.