Perception of Business Owners about the Factors Influencing the Use of social media as a tool of marketing by the Business Community of Bhutan

Anusandhan-NDIM's Journal of Business and Management Research
Vol.4, Issue 2
August - 2022
https://qtanalytics.in/journals/index.php/ANUSANDHAN
https://doi.org/10.56411/anusandhan.2022.v4i2.1-11

Indra Prasad Tirwa¹; Shad Ahmad Khan²

¹Gedu College of Business Studies, Royal University of Bhutan, Bhutan ²College of Business, University of Buraimi, Oman

Abstract: Social media (SM) has gained popularity in today's business environment. consumers themselves are more engaged in this marketing media. This research aims to identify the perception of business owners about factors influencing the use of social media as a marketing tool by the business community of Phuentsholing- the commercial capital of Bhutan. This study used convenience sampling techniques to determine the sample size. A total of 140 responded data was taken to conduct the study and analyzed. The main purpose of this paper is to know the difference in perception of business owners while using social media as their marketing tool. The findings revealed several factors namely social media adoption, literacy, cultural, technological factor, consumer pressure, and cost by the business community. This study found that two factors influence the use of social media as a marketing tool namely technological factors and social media adoption. The primary level business owners have adopted to use social media as their marketing tool as they think that social media is the best way to promote their business whereas, degree level business owners were found to be more technological based as they have extensive technical knowledge as well as have the ability to quickly learn and apply new information technologies.

Keywords: Marketing tool, social media adoption, Literacy, Cultural, Technological factor, Consumer pressure, and Cost.

Introduction and Literature Review

Social media (SM) has made it possible to reach a wide range of consumers and engage them interactively (Nawi et al., 2019). We have chosen this research topic as we have identified some factors influencing the use of SM as a MT; some of the factors identified are SM adoption, literacy, cultural, network issue, technology, customer pressure and cost. The goal of our study was to investigate whether the identified factors are also influencing the use of SM as a MT by the business owners in Bhutan. Our study has investigated the perception of business owners about

factors that influence the usage of SM as a MT. Previous studies (Serben, 2014; Tripopsakul,2018; Vinerean, 2013) shows that the use of SM as a MT has a positive impact on the business performance both financial and non-financial. Our study has used a quantitative descriptive approach.

Problem Statement

The use of SM has grown in popularity among teenagers. As there is an increase in the usage of SM, businesses have been given an opportunity as well as challenges in terms of determining the ways to reach their customers.

While some organizations struggle to connect with their customers effectively (Edwin&Oyza,2015). With the growth of SM activity the individuals perceptions towards the news, products, reviews etc have been significantly affected. (Gibson, 2016). Also, the businesses who get involved in SM are expected to increase their profitability (Edosomwan etal., 2011). As the statistics given by the SM website show, there is a wide range of scope on SM like facebook, Youtube, twitter, etc. In our research thesis we have mainly focused on how the business owner is affected by the SM and what are the factors that influence the SM. Researchers have listed various factors influencing SM as a MT and we have identified a few factors such as SM adoption, literacy, culture, technology, cost and customer pressure. Therefore, this study has examined if the factors such as, literacy, technology, cost, customer pressure, and culture influences the business owners of Phuentsholing Throm in adopting SM as a MT. To give a direction to this study following objectives have been set:

- To determine the factors influencing the perception of business owners on usage of SM as a MT.
- To study the difference in perception of business owners while using SMas MTs based on demographic variables.

This study will help the government and its allied agencies in devising policies and mechanisms in relation to information technology, communication, and other SM related rules and utilization plans.

Research Methodology

The research is designed as a descriptive analysis, to understand the factors influencing SM as a MT by the Business community in Bhutan. The

main intention behind research design is to provide an appropriate framework for our research. We have adopted descriptive research in order to find out whether the factors that are already identified are really affecting the business to use SM as a MT. The descriptive method of research is used to describe a population or situation accurately (Voxco's Descriptive Research guide). Furthermore, the data was collected through a closeended questionnaire that was distributed among the business owners of Phuentsholing municipal area.

Sample Size and Techniques

In order to determine the sample size, a convenience sampling technique is used to select the respondent. In the first stage from 20 Dzongkhag Chukha Dzongkhag was selected. In second stage, out of 11 Gewogs, Phuentsholing Throm was selected and in third stage, from the trading category we have selected retailer business as a respondent by using convenience sampling techniques.

Table 1: Sample Table Showing the Total Number of Population of Different Business Category in Phuentsholing Throm

Sl. No.	Trading Category	Population
1	MTRC	344
2	Retailer	1176
3	Wholesale	179
	Total	1699
	Population	1099

Sample size determination is the act of choosing the number of observations or replicates to include in a statistical sample (Qualtrics, 2022). Sample size for the study will be appropriate based on the factors including purpose of

study and population size. Sample calculation can be done in two ways that is when population is known and when population is unknown.

In our case, since the total population for retailers is 1176, we will determine sample size by using slovin formula.

$$n = \frac{N}{(1+Ne^2)} \frac{N}{(1+Ne^2)}$$
 $n = \text{sample size required}$
 $N = \text{population known (1176)}$
 $E = \text{margin of error (0.05)}$
 $n = \frac{1176}{(1+1176*0.05^2)}$

n=299 Therefore, the sample size required is 299.

Data Collection Methods

We have adopted descriptive research design to conduct the research. We have collected only a total of 140 sample sizes from the Phuentsholing municipal area. These respondents were the business owners irrespective of the size of the business they were running. Although the targeted sample size was 299, the number of business owners were either not available, or not approachable by the research team, thus, the sample size 140 was processed for further investigation.

Data Analysis Methods

From the various analysis methods, mean analysis, one way ANOVA and independent t-test was appropriate for this study to analyze the data since the primary objective of this study is to study the perception of business owner about factors that influence the use of SM as a MT by using the identified factors such as SM adoption, literacy, technology, cultural, cost and customer pressure.

Data Analysis and Results

Descriptive Mean:

• This section answers question number one: "What is the perception of business owners regarding the usage of SM as a MT?"

Table 2: Overall Ranking of the Variables

		DICO	
	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Customer Pressure	140	4.02	0.753
Social Media Adoption	140	3.76	0.617
Literacy	140	3.47	1.359
Technological	140	3.36	0.975
Cultural	140	3.25	0.972
Cost	140	3.04	1.123
Average mean		3.48	

From the above table (descriptive statistics) there are 140 respondents who use SM as a MT by the business owner. The mean value of customer pressure is 4.02 and business owners "agrees" that customer pressure influences the use of SM as a MT, as the mean value lies between 3.41-4.20

Table 2 shows that business owners are "not sure" whether technological factors influence the use of SM as a MT as the mean value for technological factor is 3.36 which lie between 2.61-3.40 (refer table 2). Also business owners are "not sure" whether culture influences the use of SM as a MT as the mean value for Culture is 3.25 which lie between 2.61-3.40 (refer table 2). Business owners are "not sure" whether cost influences the use of SM as a MT as the mean value for cost is 3.04 which lie between 2.61-3.40 (refer table 2). Therefore, the overall descriptive statistics shows that the business owners "agree" that factors such as the SM adoption, literacy, culture, technological factor, customer pressure and cost influences the use of SM as a MT as the average mean for overall descriptive statistics is 3.48 which lies between 3.41-4.20

Table 3: Respondents Ranking on SM Adoption Questionnaire

		Mean	Std.	
	n	Mean	Deviation	
SM Adoption 5	140	4.3071	0.73843	
Social Media	140	4.2	0.85831	
Adoption 1	140	4.2	0.03031	
Social Media	140	4.1286	0.82969	
Adoption 4	140	4.1200	0.82969	
Social Media	140	3.5357	1.20795	
Adoption 2	140	3.3337	1.20793	
Social Media	140	2.6429	1.2237	
Adoption 3	140	2.0429	1.2237	
Total		3.76		

From table 3 it shows that business owners "strongly agree" to the SM adoption for questionnaire 5, "I feel SM helps to inform about my business in a wide range." as the mean value for PSMA5 is between 4.21-5 (4.3) and has the highest mean value. Business owners are "not sure" regarding the questionnaire 3 of SM adoption, that is, "I feel using the SM platform is risky for advertising my product." as the mean value ranges between 2.61-3.40 (2.64) and has the least mean value

Table 4: Respondents Ranking on Literacy Questionnaire

	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Literacy 1	140	3.5214	1.44176
Literacy 2	140	3.4143	1.46904
Total	140	3.47	

From table 4 it shows that business owners "agree" to the literacy questionnaire one that is, "I feel education is necessary for my business to use SM as a MT." as the mean value

for literacy questionnaire one lies between 3.41-4.20 (3.52) and has the highest mean value. Business owners also "agree" regarding questionnaire 2 of literacy, that is, "I feel that educational level also determines how well one uses the SM platform." as the mean value ranges between 3.41-4.20 (3.41) and has the least mean value.

Table 5: Respondents Ranking on Culture Questionnaire

	n	n Mean	Std.
	11	Wicaii	Deviation
Cultural 4	140	3.4857	1.28906
Cultural 3	140	3.2643	1.31188
Cultural 1	140	3.2357	1.31188
Cultural 2	140	3.0143	1.37807
Total		3.25	

From table 5 it shows that business owners "agree" to the cultural questionnaire 4 that is, "I feel that the influence of social media to adopt is because of language diversity." as the mean value for cultural questionnaire 4 lies between 3.41-4.20 (3.48) and has the highest mean value. Business owners are "not sure" regarding the questionnaire 2 of cultural that is, "I feel cultural values are more important than using social media technologies." as the mean value ranges between 2.61-3.40 (3.01) and has the least mean value.

Table 6: Respondents Ranking on Technological Factor Questionnaire

	5	Maan	Std.
	n	Mean	Deviation
Technological	140	3.7286	1.07183
Factor 3	140	3.7200	1.07163
Technological	140	3.3714	1.28266
Factor 2	140	3.3714	1.26200
Technological	140	2.9786	1.34896
Factor 1	140	2.9760	1.34690
Total		3.36	

From table 6 it shows that business owners "agree" to the technological factor questionnaire 3 that is, "I feel the change in communication medium to contact customers made us adopt SM." as the mean value for technological factor questionnaire 3 lies between 3.41-4.20 (3.73) and has the highest mean value. Business owners are "not sure" regarding questionnaire 1 of the technological factor questionnaire, that is, "I have extensive technical knowledge about technologies similar to social media." as the mean value ranges between 2.61-3.40 (2.97) and has the least mean value.

Table 7: Respondents Ranking on Customer Pressure Ouestionnaire

	n	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Consumer Pressure 3	140	4.1929	0.86412		
Consumer Pressure 1	140	3.95	1.01304		
Consumer Pressure 2	140	3.9286	0.94939		
Total		4.02			

From table 7 it shows that business owners "agree" to the Consumer Pressure questionnaire 3 that is, "I feel social media marketing as an important part of business to outreach my customers." as the mean value for Consumer Pressure questionnaire 3 lies between 3.41-4.20 (4.19) and has the highest mean value. Business owners also "agree" regarding the questionnaire 2 of Consumer Pressure that is, "I know my customers are ready to do business transactions via social media application." as the mean value ranges between 3.41-4.20 (3.92) and has the least mean value.

Analysis of the data

Independent sample t-test:

This section answers question number two: "Which factors influence the usage of SM as a MT based on their demographic factors?"

Table 8: Overall Ranking of Variables Based on Demographic Factors that is "Gender"

Group Statist	Group Statistics							
	Gender	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Social Media	Male	65	3.77	0.652	0.081			
Adoption	Female	75	3.76	0.588	0.068			
Litomom	Male	65	3.23	1.398	0.173			
Literacy	Female	75	3.67	1.298	0.15			
Cultural	Male	65	3.22	1.011	0.125			
Cultural	Female	75	3.28	0.943	0.109			
To also also si as l	Male	65	3.52	0.967	0.12			
Technological	Female	75	3.22	0.968	0.112			
Customer Pressure	Male	65	3.99	0.839	0.104			
	Female	75	4.05	0.675	0.078			
Cont	Male	65	3.01	1.164	0.144			
Cost	Female	75	3.07	1.093	0.126			

	Gender	Mean	Sig
Social Media	Male	3.77	0.496
Adoption	Female	Female 3.76	
Literacy	Male	3.23	0.293
	Female	3.67	
Cultural	Male	3.22	0.423
	Female	3.28	
Technologi	Male	3.52	0.721
cal	Female	3.22	
Customer	Male	3.99	0.272
Pressure	Female	4.05	
Cost	Male	3.01	0.511
	Female	3.07	

In the above table SM adoption shows the mean of SM adopted by the male and female business owners. The value as reflected shows that the mean of SM adopted by male is higher (3.77) than that of female business owners (3.76). However, the result is not statistically significant because P-value is higher than 0.05(0.496).

Therefore, the overall analysis accepts the null hypothesis that is "No significant difference in the mean of SM adopted by the male and female business owners".

In the above table customer pressure shows the mean of customer pressure influences the male and female business owners. The value as reflected shows that the mean of customer pressure influenced by females is higher (4.05) than that of male business owners (3.99). However, the result is not statistically significant because P-value is higher than 0.05(0.272).

Therefore, the overall analysis accepts the null hypothesis that is "No significant difference in the mean of customer pressure that influences the male and female business owners".

Therefore, the p value is more than the significant level (0.05) for all the variables, this research accepts the null hypothesis. The difference between two means (male and female) is statistically insignificant and it is concluded that the two population means (male and female) are equal.

One way ANOVA
Table 9: Overall analysis of the
variables based on their
qualification level

		n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
	primary	9	3.89	0.715	0.238
	secondary	29	3.72	0.631	0.117
Social Media	Higher	68	3.83	0.584	0.071
Adoption	Degree	28	3.86	0.38	0.072
	None	6	2.63	0.698	0.285
	Total	140	3.76	0.617	0.052

Literacy Secondary Secon		primorz	9	2.94	1.59	0.53
Higher 68 3.6 1.279 0.155 Degree 28 3.52 1.378 0.26 None 6 3 1.549 0.632 Total 140 3.47 1.359 0.115 primary 9 3.25 0.944 0.315 secondary 29 3.19 1.056 0.196 Higher 68 3.25 0.999 0.121 Degree 28 3.32 0.775 0.147 None 6 3.17 1.393 0.569 Total 140 3.25 0.972 0.082 primary 9 3.33 0.667 0.222 secondary 29 3.01 1.045 0.194 higher 68 3.5 0.871 0.106 gical degree 28 3.67 0.934 0.177 none 6 2.11 1.186 0.484 Total 140 3.36 0.975 0.082 primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 secondary 29 3.97 0.669 0.124 higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 Primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		primary	_			
Degree 28 3.52 1.378 0.26		J				
Degree 28 3.52 1.378 0.26	Literacy					
Total 140 3.47 1.359 0.115 Primary 9 3.25 0.944 0.315 secondary 29 3.19 1.056 0.196 Higher 68 3.25 0.999 0.121 Degree 28 3.32 0.775 0.147 None 6 3.17 1.393 0.569 Total 140 3.25 0.972 0.082 Primary 9 3.33 0.667 0.222 secondary 29 3.01 1.045 0.194 higher 68 3.5 0.871 0.106 degree 28 3.67 0.934 0.177 none 6 2.11 1.186 0.484 Total 140 3.36 0.975 0.082 primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 secondary 29 3.97 0.669 0.124 higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		Degree	28	3.52	1.378	0.26
Primary 9 3.25 0.944 0.315		None	6	3	1.549	0.632
Secondary 29 3.19 1.056 0.196		Total	140	3.47	1.359	0.115
Cultural Higher 68 3.25 0.999 0.121 Degree 28 3.32 0.775 0.147 None 6 3.17 1.393 0.569 Total 140 3.25 0.972 0.082 primary 9 3.33 0.667 0.222 secondary 29 3.01 1.045 0.194 higher 68 3.5 0.871 0.106 degree 28 3.67 0.934 0.177 none 6 2.11 1.186 0.484 Total 140 3.36 0.975 0.082 primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 secondary 29 3.97 0.669 0.124 higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		primary	9	3.25	0.944	0.315
Cultural Degree 28 3.32 0.775 0.147 None 6 3.17 1.393 0.569 Total 140 3.25 0.972 0.082 primary 9 3.33 0.667 0.222 secondary 29 3.01 1.045 0.194 higher 68 3.5 0.871 0.106 degree 28 3.67 0.934 0.177 none 6 2.11 1.186 0.484 Total 140 3.36 0.975 0.082 primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 secondary 29 3.97 0.669 0.124 Customer higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary <td></td> <td>secondary</td> <td>29</td> <td>3.19</td> <td>1.056</td> <td>0.196</td>		secondary	29	3.19	1.056	0.196
Degree 28 3.32 0.775 0.147	Cultural	Higher	68	3.25	0.999	0.121
Total 140 3.25 0.972 0.082 primary 9 3.33 0.667 0.222 secondary 29 3.01 1.045 0.194 higher 68 3.5 0.871 0.106 degree 28 3.67 0.934 0.177 none 6 2.11 1.186 0.484 Total 140 3.36 0.975 0.082 primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 secondary 29 3.97 0.669 0.124 higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247	Cuituiai	Degree	28	3.32	0.775	0.147
Primary 9 3.33 0.667 0.222		None	6	3.17	1.393	0.569
Secondary 29 3.01 1.045 0.194		Total	140	3.25	0.972	0.082
Technolo gical higher 68 3.5 0.871 0.106 degree 28 3.67 0.934 0.177 none 6 2.11 1.186 0.484 Total 140 3.36 0.975 0.082 primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 secondary 29 3.97 0.669 0.124 higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		primary	9	3.33	0.667	0.222
gical degree 28 3.67 0.934 0.177 none 6 2.11 1.186 0.484 Total 140 3.36 0.975 0.082 primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 secondary 29 3.97 0.669 0.124 higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		secondary	29	3.01	1.045	0.194
None 6 2.11 1.186 0.484	Technolo	higher	68	3.5	0.871	0.106
Total 140 3.36 0.975 0.082 primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 secondary 29 3.97 0.669 0.124 higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247	gical	degree	28	3.67	0.934	0.177
Pressure Pressure Pressure primary 9 3.96 0.696 0.232 0.669 0.124		none	6	2.11	1.186	0.484
Customer Pressure		Total	140	3.36	0.975	0.082
Customer Pressure higher 68 4.13 0.703 0.085 degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		primary	9	3.96	0.696	0.232
Pressure degree 28 4.01 0.844 0.159 none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		secondary	29	3.97	0.669	0.124
none 6 3.28 1.084 0.442 Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247	Customer	higher	68	4.13	0.703	0.085
Total 140 4.02 0.753 0.064 primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247	Pressure	degree	28	4.01	0.844	0.159
Primary 9 2.78 1.064 0.355 secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		none	6	3.28	1.084	0.442
cost secondary 29 3.03 1.093 0.203 higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		Total	140	4.02	0.753	0.064
Cost higher 68 3.01 1.181 0.143 degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		primary	9	2.78	1.064	0.355
Cost degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247		secondary	29	3.03	1.093	0.203
degree 28 3.36 1.07 0.202 none 6 2.33 0.606 0.247	04	higher	68	3.01	1.181	0.143
	Cost	degree	28	3.36	1.07	0.202
Total 140 3.04 1.123 0.095		none	6	2.33	0.606	0.247
		Total	140	3.04	1.123	0.095

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social	Between Groups	8.382	4	2.096	6.36	0
Media Adoption	Within Groups	44.465	135	0.329		
	Total	52.847	139			
	Between Groups	5.186	4	1.296	0.7	0.6
Literacy	Within Groups	251.42	135	1.862		
	Total	256.605	139			
	Between Groups	0.291	4	0.073	0.08	0.99
Cultural	Within Groups	131.084	135	0.971		
	Total	131.375	139			
m 1 1	Between Groups	16.761	4	4.19	4.9	0
Technolo gical	Within Groups	115.476	135	0.855		
	Total	132.237	139			
G	Between Groups	4.206	4	1.051	1.9	0.11
Customer Pressure	Within Groups	74.604	135	0.553		
	Total	78.81	139			
	Between Groups	6.475	4	1.619	1.3	0.28
Cost	Within Groups	168.768	135	1.25		
	Total	175.243	139			

The overall analysis accepts the alternative hypothesis H1 that is there is a significant difference in the perception of business owners on the SM adoption as a MT.

One way ANOVA on Hours Spent

Table 10: Overall Analysis of Variables Based on their Hours Spent

		n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	
Social Media Adoption	less than 1 hour	3	3.87	0.611	0.353	
	1 hour	2	3.8	0.566	0.4	
	2-3 hours	31	3.45	0.683	0.123	
	3-5 hours	56	3.8	0.585	0.078	
	more than 5 hours	48	3.91	0.558	0.081	
	Total	140	3.76	0.617	0.052	
	less than 1 hour	3	3.83	1.607	0.928	
	1 hour	2	5	0	0	
	2-3 hours	31	3.29	1.51	0.271	
Literacy	3-5 hours	56	3.52	1.268	0.169	
	more than 5 hours	48	3.44	1.371	0.198	
	Total	140	3.47	1.359	0.115	
Cultural	less than 1 hour	3	3.33	1.465	0.846	
	1 hour	2	3.75	0.354	0.25	
	2-3 hours	31	3.48	0.92	0.165	
	3-5 hours	56	3.15	1.032	0.138	
	more than 5 hours	48	3.2	0.924	0.133	
	Total	140	3.25	0.972	0.082	
Technolo gical	less than 1 hour	3	3.89	1.018	0.588	
	1 hour	2	3.33	1.414	1	
	2-3 hours	31	3.25	0.919	0.165	
	3-5 hours	56	3.36	1.021	0.136	
	more than 5 hours	48	3.4	0.97	0.14	
	Total	140	3.36	0.975	0.082	
Customer Pressure	less than 1 hour	3	3.89	1.171	0.676	
	1 hour	2	3.67	0.471	0.333	
	2-3 hours	31	3.65	0.839	0.151	
	3-5 hours	56	4.14	0.675	0.09	
	more than 5 hours	48	4.16	0.705	0.102	
	Total	140	4.02	0.753	0.064	

Cost	less than 1 hour	3	3.67	1.528	0.882
	1 hour	2	3	0	0
	2-3 hours	31	3	1.155	0.207
	3-5 hours	56	2.93	1.051	0.14
	more than 5 hours	48	3.17	1.195	0.173
	Total	140	3.04	1.123	0.095

ANOVA

		Sum of df	Mean	F	Sig.	
		Squares	uı	Square	r	org.
Social Media Adoption	Between	4.332	4	1.083	3.01	0.02
	Groups					
	Within	48.515	135	0.359		
	Groups					
	Total	52.847	139			
	Between	6.257	4	1.564	0.84	0.5
	Groups				0.84	0.5
Literacy	Within	250.348	135	1.854		
	Groups					
	Total	256.605	139			
	Between	2.822	4	0.706	0.74	0.57
1	Groups				0.74	0.57
Cultural	Within	128.553	135	0.952		
	Groups					
	Total	131.375	139			
	Between	1.323	4	0.331	0.34	0.85
Technologi	Groups				0.54	0.83
cal	Within	130.915	135	0.97		
car	Groups					
	Total	132.237	139			
	Between	6.357	4	1.589	2.96	0.02
Customer	Groups				2.90	0.02
Pressure	Within	72.452	135	0.537		
riessuie	Groups	12.432				
	Total	78.81	139			
	Between	2.695	4	0.674	0.53	0.72
Cost	Groups				0.55	0.72
	Within	172.548	135	1.278		
	Groups	172.346		1.270		
	Total	175.243	139			

The overall analysis accepts the null hypothesis H_0 , that is there is no significant difference in the perception of business owners based on cost.

Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Findings

Findings revealed that there is a significant difference in SM adoption and technological factor based on the qualification level by the business owners. In terms of SM adoption, primary level has a higher influence in the use of SM as a MT. In terms of technological factor, degree level has a higher influence in the use of SM as a

MT. So, the primary level business owners will adopt the use of SM as a MT as they think that SM is the best way to promote their business whereas, degree level business owners will be more technological based as they have extensive technical knowledge as well as have the ability to quickly learn and apply new information technologies. It also revealed that there is no significant difference in terms of literacy, culture, customer pressure and cost based on the qualification level which was perceived by business owners.

Findings from an independent sample t-test revealed that there is no significant difference in influencing the use of SM as a MT. So therefore, overall analysis of the variables accepts the null hypothesis that is "There is no significant difference in the factors influencing the use of SM as the MT based on the gender".

Conclusions

With the growing technology ways of operating business is also changing, with the research" Perception of Business Owners about Factors Influencing the use of SM as a MT by Business Community Phuentsholing" our study wanted to investigate whether the identified factors like SM adoption, literacy, cultural, technological, consumer pressure and cost are influencing the use of SM as a MT by the business owner of Phuentsholing Throm. Our study's main objective is to study the perception of business owners about the factors that influence the usage of SM as a MT and the difference in perception of business owners about the factors influencing the usage of SM as a MT based on their demographic factors. Our research has adopted a quantitative approach, where we collected our data using the data collection method of questionnaire.

Our research's sample size was determined using the Slovin formula and it came to 299 but we could only collect a total of 140 data from business owners of Phuentsholing Throm as we couldn't get more response from the business owners. The data analysis method that our study used was mean analysis, one way ANOVA and independent t-test.

Finally the findings revealed that there was significant difference in SM adoption and technological factors based on the qualification level by business owners. And the findings also revealed that there is no significant difference in terms of literacy, culture, customer pressure and cost based on literacy, culture, customer pressure and cost based on the qualification level which was perceived by business The findings from an independent sample t-test revealed that there is no significant difference in factors influencing the use of SM as the MT based on gender. From the findings of one way ANOVA the two factors that are SM adoption and technologies shows that there is significant difference in the perception of business owners about the use of SM as the MT based on the qualification or education level. On the other hand the two factors such as SM adoption and customer pressure shows that there is a significant difference in the perception of business owners about the use of SM as the MT based on the hours spent by them.

Recommendations

The responses to the study and the interpretation of the data collection have led to several recommendations and suggestions. With the assistance of this study, the following recommendations and suggestions can be made:

• The study covers only

Phuentsholing area as its result cannot be generalized. Therefore, we recommend that future researchers conduct similar research covering all the business in Bhutan. As a result, future researchers could use a bigger sample size to obtain more reliable and representative results.

• The study has taken only six variables such as SM adoption, literacy, culture, technology, customer pressure and cost. Therefore, we recommend future researchers to conduct research on similar topics taking other factors influencing SM as Mts.

References

- AlSharji, A., Ahmad, S. Z., & Bakar, A. R. (2018, September 27). Understanding social media adoption in SMEs: Empirical evidence from the United Arab Emirates. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies.
- Atika Hermanda, U. S. (2019). The Effect of Social Media Influencer on Brand Image, Self-Concept, and Purchase Intention. Journal of Consumer Sciences.
- Beevi, F. A. (2014). Power of Advertisements on Buying Habit of Women. Abhinav International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology.
- Binwani, K. a.-Y. (2019). Effects of Social Media on Cosmetic Brands. Journal of Marketing Advances and Practices.
- Durkin, M., & McGowan, P. (2013).
 Exploring social media adoption in small to medium sized enterprises in Ireland. Journal of Small Business

- and Enterprise Development, 20 (4), 716-734.
- Edosomwan, S. o., Prakasan, S. K., Kouame, D., & Watson, J. (2011). The history of social media and its impact on business. The Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship, 16.
- Fransiska Murwaningtyas, M. H. (2020). Effect of Celebrity Endorser Through Social Media on Organic Cosmetic Purchasing Intention Mediated with Attitude. The 6th International Conference on Entrepreneurship.
- Gazal, K., Montague, I., Poudel, R., & Wiedenbeck, J. (2016). Forest Products Industry in a Digital Age: Factors Affecting social Media Adoption. Forest Products Journal, 66.
- Omar, J. (2014). Factors Influencing Social Media Marketing In Different Culture Context. School of Business and Law.
- Gibson, N. (2016, December). An Analysis of the Impact of Social Media Marketing on Individuals' Attitudes and Perceptions at NOVA Community College. Occupational and Technical Studies.
- Henninger, C. a. (2016). Effects of Beauty Vloggers' Ewom and Sponsored Advertising – The Case of Sina Weibo. Global Marketing Conference. Global Alliance of Marketing & Management Associations.
- Holly, P. (2013). Social Media as a Marketing Tool: A Literature Review.
- Ismail, A. (2018). International Marketing Strategies in the Celebrity Cosmetics Industry: A Dual Case

- Study: Huda Beauty and Fenty Beauty.
- Khare, P. a. (2016). Impact of Electronic Media on Purchasing Decision among Youths with Special Reference to Fairness Cream. Journal of Globalization and Business Management.
- Lekhanya, L. M. (2013). Cultural Influence On The Diffusion And Adoption of Social Media Technologies By Entrepreneurs In Rural South Africa. International Business & Economics Research Journal, 12 (12).
- M.I, D., Mizal, K., Langgat, J., & Fabeli, N. F. (2014, August). Factors influencing SMEs Adoption of Social Media Marketing.
- Manickam, S. a. (2015). Influence of Social Network Websites over Women Consumers from Islamic Religion: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach. Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce.
- Narula, S. &. (2019). Impact Of Festive Season On Female Online Shopping Of Beauty Products.
- Nawi, N. C., Mamun, A. A., Nasir, N. A., & Muniady, R. (2019). Factors Affecting the Adoption of Social Media as a Business Platform: A study among Student Entrepreneurs in Malaysia. 1 (23), pp. 1-2.
- Omar, J. (2014). Factors Influencing Social Media Marketing In Different Culture Context.
- Oyza, I., & Edwin, A. (2015). Effectiveness of Social Media Networks as a Strategic Tool For Organizational Marketing Management. The Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce (2),

- 1-9.
- Pendyala, V. (2020). A Study on Factors Influencing the Consumer Buying Behavior. 3rd International Conference on Accounting, Management and Economics 2018.
- Prasad, A. a. (2019). A Study of Digital Shopping Behavior of Women with Respect to Beauty and Personal Care Products. SSRN Electronic Journal.
- Prenaj, B. (2016). Social media as a marketing tool for SMEs: opportunities and challenges. Academic Journal of Business, Administration, Law and Social Sciences, 2.
- qualtrics. (2022). Determining sample size: how to make sure you get the correct sample size. Retrieved from https://www.qualtrics.com
- Rahman, R. U., Shah, S. A., Gohary, H. E., Abbas, M., Khalil, S. H., Altheeb, S. A., et al. (2020, December 18). Social Media Adoption and Financial Sustainability:Learned Lessons from Developing Countries.
- Serben, D. F. (2014, February). The examination of factors influencing social media usage by African American small business owners using the UTAUT model.
- Trawnih, A., Yaseen, H., Alsound, A. R., Jaber, O. A., & Al-Adwan, A. S. (2021). Factors Influencing Social Media Adoption Among SMEs During Covid-19 Crisis. Journal of Management Information and Decision Science, 24 (6).
- Tripopsakul, S. (2018, November 08). Social Media Adoption as a Business Platform: An integrated Tam-Toe Framework. Polish Journal

of Management Studies, 1-13.

- Vinerean, S. a. (2013). The Effects of Social Media Marketing on Online Consumer Behavior. International Journal of Business and Management.
- Voxco's Descriptive Research guide .
 (n.d.). Voxco. Retrieved from https://www.voxco.com