A STUDY ON CUSTOMER PERCEPTION OF PAYTM APP - COMPARATIVE STUDY ON RURAL AND URBAN USERS IN THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT OF KERALA

Chandanraj.S.M
Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Karpagam Academy of Higher Education. Coimbatore - 21
Dr. K. Jothi
Professor, Department of Commerce, Karpagam Academy of Higher Education. Coimbatore - 21

ABSTRACT
The emergence of E-commerce has created new financial needs that in many cases cannot be effectively fulfilled by the traditional payments systems like cash and cheque. As payment is integral part of mercantile process, electronic payment is an integral part of E- commerce. So the study focused on the customer perception of PAYTM APP among rural and urban users in Thiruvananthapuram district. 300 samples were taken from 6 taluks of Thiruvananthapuram District of Kerala. and Simple Percentage and Garretts ranking method was applied for data analysis.
Keywords: Customer Perception, Digital, E Wallet

INTRODUCTION

Electronic payment is a financial exchange that takes place online between buyers and sellers. The content of this exchange is usually some form of digital financial instrument such as encrypted credit card numbers, digital cash or electronic cheques that is backed by a bank or intermediary like payment gateways. Digital or electronic wallet is the digital form of conventional wallet. It has a software component that allows a user to make payment with a financial instrument and an encrypted storage medium that can store user's payment information, a digital certificate to identify the user and shipping information to speed transactions. Users prefer a particular app depends upon its quality, multiple purposes and functions, security, speed, accuracy, convenience etc. So, the study focused on comparative study of rural and urban consumers regarding the perception of PAYTM APP in Thiruvananthapuram district of Kerala.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

PAYTM APP is one of the most important digital payment apps used by the common people. people use the PAYTM APP for various purposes like mobile recharge, bill payment, shopping etc. The 24 X 7 availability of the app helps the people for saving time and ensures safety and security. There is no need to wait for the opening bank or recharge counter whenever required for them. Customer's perception of PAYTM APP among urban and rural peoples may differ. Some users are fully aware about the uses, but some people have not awareness. These reasons made the researcher to take up the research study entitled "A Study on Customer Perception of PAYTM APP– Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Users in Thiruvananthapuram District".

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objectives of the present study are as follows.
- To analyze the Socio-Economic status of Rural and Urban respondents of Thiruvananthapuram District.
- To study the user's perception towards PAYTM app among rural and urban respondents.

METHODOLOGY

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. For the collection of primary data Questionnaire cum interview schedule method were used. Secondary data were collected from books, journals, articles, newspapers and websites.

SAMPLE DESIGN

The Thiruvananthapuram district consist of six taluks namely Thiruvananthapuram, Medumangadu, Chirayinkeezhu, Kattakada, Neyyattinkara and Varkala. From these six taluks total of 300 samples were taken. 150 respondents from rural areas and 150 respondents from urban areas. Convenient sampling is used to choose samples.

FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS

The collected data were processed with the help of appropriate statistical tools in order to fulfil the objectives of the study. For the present study simple percentage analysis and Garrett's Ranking Technique were adopted.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This part analyses the socio-economic profile, level of satisfaction, reasons for the selection of PAYTM digital payment among rural and urban users in Thiruvananthapuram District of Kerala in various aspects.

Gender

The following table shows the gender wise distribution of respondents.

Table 1
Gender

Gender	Rural		Urban		Total	
	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent
Male	80	53.33	85	56.67	165	55.00
Female	70	46.67	65	43.33	135	45.00
Total	**150**	**100**	**150**	**100**	**300**	**100**

Source: Primary data.

It is clear from the table that out of 150 rural users 80 (53.33%) are male and 70 (46.67%) users are female. Thus, majority of the PAYTM users are from male in rural area. Among the 150 urban users 85 (56.67%) users are male and 65 (43.33%) users are female. Thus, majority of the PAYTM users are male in urban area. Among the total 300 users 165 (55.00%) users are male and 135 (45.00%) users are female. Thus, majority of the PAYTM users are male.

Age

The following table shows the age wise distribution of respondents.

Table 2
Age

Age (in years)	Rural		Urban		Total	
	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent
Less than 20	20	13.33	30	20	50	16.67
21 – 40	78	52.00	89	59.33	167	55.67
41 – 60	35	23.33	19	12.67	54	18.00
61 and above	17	11.33	12	8.00	29	9.67
Total	**150**	**100**	**150**	**100**	**300**	**100**

Source: Primary data

It is clear from the table, among the rural users20 (13.33%) users age is less than 20, 78(52.00%) users age ranges between 21-40,35(23.33%) users age ranges between 41-60and the remaining 17(11.33%) users age is more than 61 and above. Thus, most of the rural PAYTM users age ranges between 21 – 40 years. The table also shows, among the urban users 30(20.00%) users age is less than 20,89(59.33%) users age ranges between 21-40,19(12.67%) users age ranges between 41-60 and the remaining 12(8.00%) users age is more than 61 and above. Thus, most of the urban PAYTM users' age ranges between 21 – 40 years.

Among the total 300 users, 50 (16.67%) users age ranges less than 20, 167 (55.67%) users age ranges between 21-40, 54 (18.00%) users age ranges between 41-60and the remaining 29(9.67%) users age ranges more than 61 and above. Thus, most of the PAYTM users' age ranges between 21-40 years.

Occupation

The following table shows the occupation of respondents.

Table 3
Occupation

Occupation	Rural		Urban		Total	
	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Per cent
Government Employee	14	9.33	36	24.00	50	16.67
Private Employee	44	29.33	77	51.33	121	40.33
Businessmen	6	4.00	14	9.33	73	24.33
Farmer	59	39.33	7	4.67	13	4.33
Others	27	18.00	16	10.67	43	14.33
Total	**150**	**100**	**150**	**100**	**300**	**100**

Source: Primary data

It is clear from the table 3, among the rural users 14 (9.33%) users have Government job, 44 (29.33%) users have private job, 6 (4.00%) users are businessmen, 59 (39.33) are farmers and the remaining 27 (18.00%) users have other jobs. Thus, majority of the rural users are farmers. Regarding urban users, 36 (24.00%) respondents have Government job, 77 (51.33%) respondents have private job, 14 (9.33%) respondents have own business 7 (4.67%) respondents are farmers and the remaining 16 (10.67%) respondents have other jobs. Thus, majority of the urban users are private employees. Among the total 300 users, 50 (16.67) users have Government job, 121 (40.33) users have private job, 73 (24.33) users have own business, 13 (4.33%) users are farmers and the remaining 43 (14.33%) users have other jobs. Thus, most of the users are private employees.

Monthly Income
The following table depicts monthly income of respondents.

Table 4
Monthly Income

Monthly Income	Rural		Urban		Total	
	No. of Respondents	Per cent	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Per cent
Below 5000	13	8.67	6	4.00	19	6.33
5001 – 10000	60	40.00	48	32.00	118	39.33
10001 – 15000	38	25.33	40	26.67	78	26.00
15001 – 20000	25	16.67	38	25.33	63	21.00
Above Rs. 20000	14	9.33	18	12.00	32	10.67
Total	**150**	**100**	**150**	**100**	**300**	**100**

Source: Primary data

It is clear from table 4 that, among the rural PAYTM users 13(8.67%) users have monthly income less than Rs.5000, 60(40.00%) users' income ranges between Rs.5001 and Rs.10000, 38(25.33%) users have income ranges between Rs.10001 and Rs.15000, 25 (16.67%) users have income between Rs. 15001 and Rs. 20000 and the remaining 14 (9.33%) users have income more than Rs. 20000 per month.

Among the urban PAYTM users 6 (4.00%) users have monthly income less than Rs. 5000, 48 (32.00%) users' income ranges between Rs. 5001 and 10000, 40 (26.67%) users have income ranges between Rs.10001 and Rs. 15000, 38 (25.33%) users have income between Rs.15001 and Rs. 20000 and the remaining 18(12.00%) respondents have income more than Rs.20000 per month.

Among the total PAYTM users 19 (6.33%) users have monthly income less than Rs.5000, 118 (39.33%) users' income ranges between Rs. 5001 and Rs.10000, 78 (26.00%) users have income ranges between Rs.10001 and Rs. 15000, 63 (21.00%) users have income between Rs.15001 and Rs. 20000 and the remaining (10.67%) respondents have income more than Rs.20000 per month. Thus, most of the users earns between Rs. 5001 and Rs. 10000.

Purpose of Using Paytm

Table 5
Purpose of using PAYTM

PURPOSE	Rural		Urban		Total	
	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Per cent
Recharge	61	40.67	50	33.33	111	37.00
Bill Payment	40	26.67	35	23.33	75	25.00
Ticket Booking	30	20.00	25	16.67	55	18.33
Shopping	15	10.00	27	18.00	42	14.00
Others	4	2.67	13	8.67	17	5.67
Total	**150**	**100**	**150**	**100**	**300**	**100**

Source: Primary data

It is clear from the Table No. 5, among the rural users 61 (40.67%) users are choose PAYTM for recharge, 40(26.67%) users use for make bill payment ,30 (20.00%) users use for ticket booking, 15(10.00) users use for shopping and the remaining 4(2.67%) users use for other purposes. Thus, most of the rural respondents use PAYTM for recharge purpose. Among the urban users 50 (33.00%) users are choose PAYTM for recharge, 35 (23.33%) users use for make bill payment, 25 (16.67%) users use for ticket booking, 27 (18.00%) users use for shopping and the remaining 13(8.67%) users use for other purposes. Thus, majority of the urban respondents use PAYTM for recharge purpose.

Among the total 300 users 111 (37.00%) users are choose PAYTM for recharge, 75(25.00%) users use for make bill payment, 55 (18.33%) users use for ticket booking, 42 (14.00%) users use for shopping and the remaining 17(5.67%) users use for other purposes. Thus, majority of the users use PAYTM for recharge, bill payment and shopping purpose.

Reasons for choosing PAYTM among Rural users

Table 7

Reasons for choosing PAYTM among Rural Users.

Sl. No.	Reasons	Garrett's Mean score	Rank
1	Fast service	51.00	III
2	Convenience	59.84	II
3	Simple to use	65.00	I
4	Secured	42.21	V
5	Multiple purpose	47.00	IV
6	Promotional offers	35.25	VI
7	Any time available	31.28	VII

Source: Primary data

It is clear from the table number 6, that majority of the rural respondents prefer PAYTM because of simple to use with mean score 65.00 (ranked first), followed by convenience with mean score 59.84 (ranked 2nd), fast service with mean score 51.00 (ranked 3rd), multiple purpose with mean score 47.00 (ranked 4th), secured transaction with mean score 42.21(ranked 5th), promotional offers with mean score 35.258 (ranked 6th) and any time availability with mean score of 31.28 (ranked 7th). Thus, majority of the rural users prefer PAYTM APP because of its simple to use feature.

Reasons for choosing PAYTM among Urban users

Table 7

Reasons for choosing PAYTM among Urban users

Sl. No.	Reasons	Garrett's Mean score	Rank
1	Fast service	65.67	I
2	convenience	53.25	III
3	Simple to use	48.35	V
4	secured	52.18	IV
5	Multiple purpose	58.45	II
6	Promotional offers	34.80	VII
7	Any time available	38.84	VI

Source: Primary data

It is clear from Table No. 7 most of the urban respondents prefer PAYTM because of fast service with a mean score of 65.67 (rank 1st) followed by Multiple purpose 58.45(ranked 2nd), convenience with a mean score 53.25 (ranked 3rd), Secured with mean score 52.18 (ranked 4th), Simple to use with a mean score 48.35 (ranked 5th) any time available with a mean score 38.84 (ranked 6th) and Promotional offers with a mean score 34.80 (ranked 7th). Thus, majority of the urban consumers choose PAYTM because of its Fast service, Multiple purposes, Convenience.

FINDINGS

Following are the results of the study.
1. Majority of the consumers are male.
2. Most of the respondents age ranges between 21 – 40 years.
3. Most of the respondents are private employees.
4. Most of the respondents earns between 5001 – 10,000.
5. Majority of the rural respondents use PAYTM for recharge and bill payment purposes.
6. Majority of the urban respondents use PAYTM for recharge purpose.
7. Majority of the rural respondents prefer PAYTM because of simple to use, convenience and fast service.
8. Majority of the urban consumers choose PAYTM because of its Fast service, Multiple purposes, Convenience.

SUGGESTIONS

Following are the suggestions.
❖ The digital payment companies should create awareness among their users regarding the multiple uses of apps through various sales promotion techniques and advertisements.

❖ Provide more facilities and add more features will enhance the utilization of PAYTM app among more peoples.

CONCLUSION

PAYTM APP makes their users to transfer their payments with the help of mobile phone. The study reveals that majority of the people uses the PAYTM app for mobile phone recharge, DTH recharge, making payment to Electricity bill, hotel bill, water bill and shopping. Majority of the respondents prefer PAYTM because of simple to use, secured, convenient and its fast service.

REFERENCES

- Shwetu Kumar, Vijay Yadav, Atiqu-Ur-Rahman, Aditi Bansal (2014), "A Study on Paytm", Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi.
- Balan, R., Ramasubbu, N., Tayi, G (2006), "Digital Wallet: Requirements and Challenges", http://apollo.smu.edu.sg/papers/digitalwallet_case.pdf
- Bessant, J., Lamming, R., Noke, H., and Philips, W. (2005), "Managing Innovation Beyond the Steady State", Technovation, Vol. 25, No.2, pp.1366-76.
- Lin, H., Wang, Y (2006), "An Examination of the Determinants of Customer Loyalty in Mobile Commerce Contexts", Information and Management, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 271-282.