CHAPTER – V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
5.1 Introduction

Template Digital is a community driven motion graphics marketplace which allows buying and selling of royalty free stock motion graphics for production, film, and television network professionals. The television templates are broadcast with a view to create new desire among the audience about the products and services and promote consumerism in modern society. The specialists in customization are actively involved in the production of templates for various communications media. The service providers make use of the television templates to furnish relevant information about text, slogans, images and/or videos relating to the new goods and services. The designers also furnish the technical details for the final video which includes resolution, file format and compression. The service providers also develop their own websites and provide the templates for customization. In this chapter, the demographic features of the respondents, communications media association of respondents, priorities of communication elements of television templates, uses of television template customization, gratifications of television template customization and effects of television template customization are analyzed.
## 5.2 Demographic Features of the Respondents

Table No. 5.2.1 Demographic Features of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 29.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 13.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduates</td>
<td>F 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 42.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 26.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 24.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Service</td>
<td>F 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 22.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 26.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 17.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 52.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 29.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengaluru</td>
<td>F 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 27.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysuru</td>
<td>F 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 24.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubli-Dharwad</td>
<td>F 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 26.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalburgi</td>
<td>F 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 21.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>F 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.2.1: Demographic Features of the Respondents
Table No.5.2.2 presents the data about the demographic features of the respondents. The data reveal that there are a majority of male respondents (70.29%) and a minority of female respondents (29.71%) among the study sample. A majority of the study sample are male respondents (70.29%).

There are about 44.0% of the respondents who have the graduation educational background, 42.29% of the respondents who have post-graduation educational background and 13.71% of the respondents who have pre-university educational background among the study sample. A majority of the respondents (57.71%) have graduation and post-graduation educational background.

There are about 26.86% of the respondents who represent the category of housewives/unemployed persons, 26.29% of the respondents who represent the category of agriculturists, 24.57% of the respondents who represent the category of business persons and 22.29% of the respondents who represent the category of public/private employees. A majority of respondents (53.15%) represent the category of agriculturists, housewives and unemployed persons in the study sample.

There are about 52.57% of the respondents who represent middle income group, 29.71% of the respondents who represent low income group and 17.71% of the respondents who represent high income group respectively. A majority of the respondents (82.28%) represent middle and low income groups.

There are about 27.43% of the respondents who represent Bengaluru city, 26.86% of the respondents who represent Hubli-Dharwad city, 24.57% of the respondents who represent Mysuru city and 21.14% of the respondents who represent Kalburgi city respectively. A majority of the respondents (54.29%) represent Bengaluru and Hubli-Dharwad cities.

A majority of the respondents belong to male category, (70.29%), graduates and post-graduates category (86.29%), agriculturists, housewives and unemployed persons category (53.15%), middle and low income groups (82.28%) and Bengaluru and Hubli-Dharwad cities (54.29%) respectively.

5.3 Communications Media Association of Respondents

Communication is the life blood of human beings. The media of communication are informal universities to the mankind. They provide information, education, entertainment, advertisement, publicity, propaganda, counseling, guidance, persuasion and other services which sustain the progress of mankind. The media are also known as the fourth estate of democracy. The media bridge the gap between the government and society. The media also function as the voice of the people. In modern society people are required to cultivate healthy media habits for their intellectual progress. The following tables furnish information about the communications media exposure among the respondents who are the users of television news channel templates.
Table 5.3.1 Exposure to Newspapers among respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.7845

Table No.5.3.1 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to newspapers. A majority of the male (75.20%) and female (78.85%) respondents have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to newspapers – local, regional and national. Overall, a majority of the respondents (76.29%) have stated that they had the benefit of exposure to newspapers. There is non-significant association (P=0.7845) between the gender status of respondents and exposure to newspapers in the study areas.

Table: 5.3.2. Exposure to Magazines among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.8398

Table No.5.3.2 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to magazines. A majority of the male (72.36%) and female (80.77%) respondents have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to magazines – local, regional and national. Overall, a majority of the respondents (74.86%) have stated that they had the benefit of exposure to magazines. There is non-significant association (P=0.8398) between the gender status of respondents and exposure to magazines in the study areas.

Table: 5.3.3. Exposure to Radio among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.8965
Table No.5.3.3 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to radio. A majority of the male (86.99%) and female (75.0%) respondents have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to radio – local, regional and national. Overall, a majority of the respondents (83.43%) have stated that they had the benefit of exposure to radio. There is non-significant association (P=0.8965) between the gender status of respondents and exposure to radio in the study areas.

Table: 5.3.4. Exposure to Television among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No.5.3.4 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to television. All the male (100%) and female (100%) respondents have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to television – local, regional and national. Overall, all the respondents (100%) have stated that they had the benefit of exposure to television. The researcher had selected the respondents who had the benefit of television exposure deliberately in order to understand the uses, gratifications and effects of television templates in Karnataka state. Hence, there was no need to test the statistical significance between the gender status of respondents and exposure to television in the study areas.
Table: 5.3.5. Exposure to VCR/VCP/VCD among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>78.05</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>78.86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=2.546

Table No.5.3.5 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to VCR/VCP/VCD. A majority of the male (78.05%) and female (80.77%) respondents have stated that they did not enjoy the benefit of exposure to VCR/VCP/VCD. Overall, a majority of the respondents (78.86%) have stated that they did not enjoy the benefit of exposure to VCR/VCP/VCD. It may be noted that in the age of advanced mobile communication tools and technologies the people normally do not depend on these communication channels in their day to day lives. There is non-significant association (P=2.546) between the gender status of respondents and exposure to VCR/VCP/VCD in the study areas.

Table: 5.3.6. Exposure to Computer among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.99</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.29</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.0367

Table No.5.3.6 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to computer. A majority of the male (86.99%) and female (84.62%) respondents have stated that they did not enjoy the benefit of exposure to computer. Overall, a majority of the respondents (86.29%) have stated that they did not enjoy the benefit of exposure to computer. It may be noted that in the age of communication revolution computer has become an important tool for the people to collect and disseminate information in all walks of life. There is non-significant association (P=0.0367) between the gender status of respondents and exposure to computer in the study areas.
Table: 5.3.7. Exposure to Computer with Internet among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.4881

Table No.5.3.7 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to computer with Internet. A majority of the male (65.85%) and female (61.54%) respondents have stated that they did not enjoy the benefit of exposure to computer with Internet. Overall, a majority of the respondents (64.57%) have stated that they did not enjoy the benefit of exposure to computer with Internet. It may be noted that in the age of communication revolution computer with Internet has become an added advantage for both service providers and service users in modern society. There is non-significant association (P=0.4881) between the gender status of respondents and exposure to computer with Internet in the study areas.

Table: 5.3.8. Exposure to Mobile among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No.5.3.8 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to mobile. All the male (100%) and female (100%) respondents have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to mobile. Overall, all the respondents (100%) have stated that they had the benefit of exposure to mobile. It may be noted that the people have become active users of mobile in the new millennium which has killed the distance from communication point of view. Hence, there was no need to test the statistical significance between the gender status of respondents and exposure to mobile in the study areas.
Table: 5.3.9. Exposure to Mobile with Internet among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>60.16</td>
<td>39.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.29</td>
<td>41.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No.5.3.9 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to mobile with Internet. A majority of the male (60.16%) and female (53.85%) respondents have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to mobile with Internet. Overall, a majority of the respondents (58.29%) have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to mobile with Internet. It may be noted that in the age of communication revolution mobile with Internet has become an added advantage for all sections of society in modern society. There is non-significant association (P=0.4650) between the gender status of respondents and exposure to mobile with Internet in the study areas.

Table: 5.3.10. Exposure to Cable/Satellite Connection to Television among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.68</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.85</td>
<td>21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No.5.3.10 provides the opinion of the respondents about the exposure to cable/satellite connection. A majority of the male (92.68%) and female (78.85%) respondents have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to cable/satellite connection. Overall, a majority of the respondents (88.57%) have stated that they enjoyed the benefit of exposure to cable/satellite connection. It may be noted that all the people in modern cities and townships are not in a position to make use of cable/satellite connection due to economic constraints. There is non-significant association (P=1.154) between the gender status of respondents and exposure to cable/satellite connection in the study areas.
Table 5.3.11. Exposure to Social Media among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.74</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.15</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing of Hypothesis

H1. The communications media association of the respondents is not adequate in the state of Karnataka.

The data which are presented in the above tables mainly 5.3.1 to 5.3.11 clearly reveal that the respondents have enjoyed the benefit of adequate media exposure in Karnataka state. Hence, the above hypothesis stands disproved according to the data analysis.

5.4 Priorities of Communication Elements of Television Templates

The template is designed to enable the beneficiaries or users to understand the essential details and description of the exact nature of the project. The television news channels adopt the new innovative customization of TV template evaluated by channels. The television templates facilitate better understanding and appreciation of the product and project requirements among the audience. The viewers also expect the presence of certain elements of television templates in modern times. The following tables furnish the views of the respondents about their priorities from television templates customization point of view.
Table No.5.4.1: Video is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91.06%</td>
<td>8.94%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>96.15%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.21%</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post- Graduates</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.24%</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.57%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.21%</td>
<td>12.79%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.59%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.68%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.10%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.48%</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.23%</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.57%</td>
<td>7.43%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.1 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement –‘Video is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (91.06%) and female (96.15%) respondents respectively have stated that video was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.107; P=0.3614) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about video as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (91.67%), graduation (92.21%) and post-graduation (93.24%) educational status have stated that video was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.168; P=0.2769) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about video as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (94.57%), business persons (87.21%), public/private employees (93.59%) and housewives/unemployed persons (94.68%) respectively have stated that video was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.099; P=0.4174) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about video as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (87.10%), middle income group (93.48%) and low income group (94.23%) respectively have stated that video was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.168; P=0.5303) between the income background and perception of the respondents about video as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (92.57%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that video was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.586) and perception of the respondents about video as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No.5.4.2: Audio is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.37</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>90.38</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>90.54</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.13</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.40</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.36</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.04</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.86</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.2 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Audio is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (85.37%) and female (90.38%) respondents respectively have stated that audio was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.068; P=0.6676) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about audio as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (79.17%), graduation (85.71%) and post-graduation (90.54%) educational status have stated that audio was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.152; P=0.3856) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about audio as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (89.13%), business persons (81.40%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that audio was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.114; P=0.3186) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about audio as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (87.10%), middle income group (88.04%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that audio was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.155; P=0.6363) between the income background and perception of the respondents about audio as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (86.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that audio was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.008) and perception of the respondents about audio as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No. 5.4.3: Text 3 line with scrolling news/ breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.3 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Text 3 line with scrolling news/ breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (86.99%) and female (84.62%) respondents respectively have stated that text 3 line with scrolling news/ breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.076; P=0.5988) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about text 3 line with scrolling news/ breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (87.50%), graduation (81.82%) and post-graduation (90.54%) educational status have stated that text 3 line with scrolling news/breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.165; P=0.2955) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about text 3 line with scrolling news/breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (86.96%), business persons (81.40%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that text 3 line with scrolling news/breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.171; P=0.0726) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about text 3 line with scrolling news/breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (88.04%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that text 3 line with scrolling news/breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.160; P=0.5996) between the income background and perception of the respondents about text 3 line with scrolling news/breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (86.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that text 3 line with scrolling news/breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.567) and perception of the respondents about text 3 line with scrolling news/breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No5.4.4: Picture-in-picture window is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>CC=0.021; P=0.9609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.18</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.083; P=0.8736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.42</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.49</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.009; P=0.9937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.07</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.36</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.180; P=0.4402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.4 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Picture-in-picture window is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. A majority of the male (86.18%) and female (84.62%) respondents respectively have stated that picture-in-picture window was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.021; P=0.9609) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about picture-in-picture window as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (87.50%), graduation (84.42%) and post-graduation (86.49%) educational status have stated that picture-in-picture window was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.083; P=0.8736) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about picture-in-picture window as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (86.96%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that picture-in-picture window was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.009; P=0.9937) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about picture-in-picture window as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (86.96%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that picture-in-picture window was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.180; P=0.4402) between the income background and perception of the respondents about picture-in-picture window as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (85.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that picture-in-picture window was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=3.268) and perception of the respondents about picture-in-picture window as a preferred element of television templates.
Figure 5.4.4: Picture-in-picture window is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization
Table No.5.4.5: Earn profit is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 184</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.80</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.00</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 112</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.73</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 110</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.32</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 69.77</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 138</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 262</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.86</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.5 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement –‘Earn profit is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (74.80%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that earn profit was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.049; P=0.8071) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about earn profit as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (72.73%) and post-graduation (74.32%) educational status have stated that earn profit was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.
There is non-significant association (CC=0.113; P=0.6878) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about earn profit as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (69.77%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that earn profit was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.075; P=0.6067) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about earn profit as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (75.0%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that earn profit was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.137; P=0.7610) between the income background and perception of the respondents about earn profit as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (74.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that earn profit was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.863) and perception of the respondents about earn profit as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No5.4.6: Increase of TRP is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>CC=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 180</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73.17</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 76</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73.08</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 106</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 68.83</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 116</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.38</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 69.57</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.09</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>F 58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>% 74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 76.60</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 138</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 69.23</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 256</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73.14</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.6 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Increase of TRP is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (73.17%) and female (73.08%) respondents respectively have stated that increase of TRP was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.044; P=0.8455) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about increase of TRP as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (68.83%) and post-graduation (78.38%) educational status have stated that increase of TRP was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.167; P=0.2880) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about increase of TRP as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (69.57%), business persons (72.09%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (76.60%) respectively have stated that increase of TRP was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.073; P=0.6294) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about increase of TRP as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (75.0%) and low income group (69.23%) respectively have stated that increase of TRP was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.153; P=0.6483) between the income background and perception of the respondents about increase of TRP as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (73.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that increase of TRP was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.411) and perception of the respondents about increase of TRP as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No. 5.4.7: Social news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 218</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 88.62</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 86.54</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 40</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 140</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 90.91</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 128</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 86.49</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 77.17</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 87.21</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 73</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 93.59</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 89</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 94.68</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 54</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 87.10</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 156</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 84.78</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 98</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 94.23</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 308</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 88.00</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. No. 5.4.7. provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Social news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (88.62%) and female (86.54%) respondents respectively have stated that social news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.059; P=0.7387) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about social news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (90.91%) and post-graduation (86.49%) educational status have stated that social news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.
There is non-significant association (CC=0.089; P=0.8454) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about social news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (77.17%), business persons (87.21%), public/private employees (93.59%) and housewives/unemployed persons (94.68%) respectively have stated that social news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.105; P=0.3783) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about social news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (87.10%), middle income group (84.78%) and low income group (94.23%) respectively have stated that social news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.214; P=0.2090) between the income background and perception of the respondents about social news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (88.0%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that social news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.171) and perception of the respondents about social news as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No.5.4.8: Crime news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.8 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Crime news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (77.24%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that crime news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.068; P=0.6663) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about crime news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (58.33%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (79.73%) educational status have stated that crime news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.219; P=0.0661) between the educational...
background and perception of the respondents about crime news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (76.74%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that crime news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.075; P=0.6081) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about crime news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (78.26%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that crime news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.193; P=0.3396) between the income background and perception of the respondents about crime news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (76.57%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that crime news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.680) and perception of the respondents about crime news as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No.5.4.9: Breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.99</td>
<td>13.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.38</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.54</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.17</td>
<td>22.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.21</td>
<td>12.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.59</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>15.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.9 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (86.99%) and female (90.38%) respondents respectively have stated that breaking news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.050; P=0.8009) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (87.50%), graduation
(85.71%) and post-graduation (90.54%) educational status have stated that breaking news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.088; P=0.8515) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (77.17%), business persons (87.21%), public/private employees (93.59%) and housewives/unemployed persons (94.68%) respectively have stated that breaking news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.068; P=0.6634) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (87.10%), middle income group (84.78%) and low income group (94.23%) respectively have stated that breaking news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.145; P=0.7080) between the income background and perception of the respondents about breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (88.0%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that breaking news was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=3.024) and perception of the respondents about breaking news as a preferred element of television templates.
Figure 5.4.9: Breaking news is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization
Table No. 5.4.10: Animation is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 204</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 82.93</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.85</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 122</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.22</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 124</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.78</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 71.74</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.07</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 87.18</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 89.36</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.87</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 146</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 286</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 81.71</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.10 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Animation is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (82.93%) and female (78.85%) respondents respectively have stated that animation was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.143; P=0.1594) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about animation as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (83.78%) educational status have stated that animation was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.
There is non-significant association (CC=0.126; P=0.5894) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about animation as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (71.74%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that animation was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.117; P=0.2964) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about animation as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (79.35%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that animation was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.132; P=0.7942) between the income background and perception of the respondents about animation as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (81.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that animation was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.839) and perception of the respondents about animation as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No. 5.4.11: Branding is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>90.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post –  Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.11 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Branding is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (89.43%) and female (90.38%) respondents respectively have stated that branding was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.023; P=0.9564) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about branding as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (88.31%) and post-graduation (93.24%) educational status have stated that branding was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.164; P=0.2994) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about branding as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (83.70%), business persons (87.21%), public/private employees (93.59%) and housewives/unemployed persons (94.68%) respectively have stated that branding was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.110; P=0.3448) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about branding as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (87.10%), middle income group (88.04%) and low income group (94.23%) respectively have stated that branding was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.206; P=0.2562) between the income background and perception of the respondents about branding as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (89.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that branding was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.857) and perception of the respondents about branding as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No. 5.4.12: Color is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.55</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.141; P=0.1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.78</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.208; P=0.0940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.07</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.36</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.161; P=0.5877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>292</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.43</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.412 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Color is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (84.55%) and female (80.77%) respondents respectively have stated that color was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.141; P=0.1697) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about color as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (87.50%), graduation (81.82%) and post-graduation (83.78%) educational status have stated that color was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.208; P=0.0940) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about color as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (78.26%), business persons (79.07%), public private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that color was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.106; P=0.3720) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about color as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (82.61%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that color was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.161; P=0.5877) between the income background and perception of the respondents about color as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (83.43%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that color was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.223) and perception of the respondents about color as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No.5.4.13: Textures is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.13 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Textures is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (83.74%) and female (78.85%) respondents respectively have stated that textures was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.085; P=0.5313) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about textures as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (87.50%), graduation (76.62%) and post-graduation (81.08%) educational status have stated that textures was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.169; P=0.2740) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about textures as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (73.91%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that textures was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.128; P=0.2322) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about textures as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (80.43%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that textures was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.246; P=0.0814) between the income background and perception of the respondents about textures as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (82.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that textures was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.119) and perception of the respondents about textures as a preferred element of television templates.
Table No.5.4.14: Trailer of Particular Programme is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.67</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.92</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.14</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.79</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.26</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.58</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.14</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.4.14 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘Trailer of Particular Programme is preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization’. A majority of the male (79.67%) and female (84.62%) respondents respectively have stated that trailer of particular programme was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.138; P=0.1811) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about trailer of particular programme as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (79.17%), graduation (77.92%) and post-graduation (85.14%) educational status have stated that trailer of particular programme was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.056; P=0.8541) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about trailer of particular programme as a preferred element of television templates.
A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (84.78%), business persons (82.56%), public/private employees (76.92%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that trailer of particular programme was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.086; P=0.5226) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about trailer of particular programme as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (82.26%), middle income group (78.26%) and low income group (85.58%) respectively have stated that trailer of particular programme was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association (CC=0.191; P=0.2939) between the income background and perception of the respondents about trailer of particular programme as a preferred element of television templates.

A majority of the respondents (81.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that trailer of particular programme was preferable as a communication element of television templates for customization. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.852) and perception of the respondents about trailer of particular programme as a preferred element of television templates.

**Testing of Hypothesis**

**H2.** The priorities of communication elements of television templates are not appropriate.

The data which are presented in the above tables mainly 5.4.1 to 5.4.14 clearly reveal that the respondents have identified the appropriate priorities with reference to television templates. Hence, the above hypothesis stands disproved according to the data analysis.
5.5 Uses of Television Template Customization

The television templates are designed and broadcast to enable the beneficiaries or users to understand the essential details and description of the exact nature of the project. The television news channels adopt the new innovative customization of TV template evaluated by channels. The television templates facilitate better understanding and appreciation of the product and project requirements among the audience. The television templates basically include website templates, flash templates, e-commerce templates,
Facebook templates, responsive templates and other templates which include amazing features. The television templates have certain advantages from the point of view of commercial broadcasting in modern times. The following tables amplify the views of the respondents on the uses of television templates from customization point of view.

Table No. 5.5.1 The television templates design is an inexpensive way to get the business online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.42</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.15</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.03</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.77</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.86</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.1 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates design is an inexpensive way to get the business online’. A majority of the male (76.42%) and female (71.15%) respondents respectively have stated that television templates design was an inexpensive way to get the business online. There is non-significant association (CC=0.094; P=0.4609) between the gender group and
perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (74.03%) and post-graduation (72.97%) educational status have stated that television templates design was an inexpensive way to get the business online. There is non-significant association (CC=0.211; P=0.0857) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (69.77%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that television templates design was an inexpensive way to get the business online. There is non-significant association (CC=0.090; P=0.4922) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (75.0%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that television templates design was an inexpensive way to get the business online. There is non-significant association (CC=0.139; P=0.7501) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (74.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that television templates design was an inexpensive way to get the business online. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.789) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.5.1: The television templates design is an inexpensive way to get the business online
Table No. 5.5.2 The television templates enable the consumers to look for innovative advertising appeals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>CC=0.114;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P=0.3140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 208</td>
<td>38 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 84.55</td>
<td>15.45 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>26 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.00</td>
<td>25.0 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.279;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P=0.0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 28</td>
<td>20 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 58.33</td>
<td>41.67 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 122</td>
<td>32 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.22</td>
<td>20.78 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 136</td>
<td>12 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 91.89</td>
<td>8.11 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.128;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P=0.2311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 66</td>
<td>26 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 71.74</td>
<td>28.26 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>18 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.07</td>
<td>20.93 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>10 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 87.18</td>
<td>12.82 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 84</td>
<td>10 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 89.36</td>
<td>10.64 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.230;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P=0.1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 52</td>
<td>10 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.87</td>
<td>16.13 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 146</td>
<td>38 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.35</td>
<td>20.65 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>16 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 84.62</td>
<td>15.38 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P=0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 286</td>
<td>64 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 81.71</td>
<td>18.29 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No.5.5.2 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates enable the consumers to look for innovative advertising appeals’. A majority of the male (84.55%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the consumers to look for innovative advertising appeals. There is non-significant association (CC=0.114; P=0.3140) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (58.33%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (91.89%) educational status have stated that the television templates enabled the consumers to look for innovative advertising appeals. There is non-significant association (CC=0.279; P=0.0053) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (71.74%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the consumers to look for innovative advertising appeals. There is non-significant association (CC=0.128; P=0.2311) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (79.35%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the consumers to look for innovative advertising appeals. There is non-significant association (CC=0.230; P=0.1352) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (81.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates enabled the consumers to look for innovative advertising appeals. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.686) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.3 The television templates are most widely used marketing strategy by modern companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>P=0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 168</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 68.29</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 69.23</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 54.17</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 112</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.73</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 68.92</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 61.96</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.51</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 119</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 64.67</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>F 240</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 68.57</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.3 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates are most widely used marketing strategy by modern companies’. A majority of the male (68.29%) and female (69.23%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates were most widely used marketing strategy by modern companies. There is non-significant association (CC=0.135; P=0.1991) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (54.17%), graduation (72.73%) and post-graduation (68.92%) educational status have stated that the television templates were most widely used marketing strategy by modern companies. There is non-significant association (CC=0.175; P=0.2373) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (61.96%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (70.51%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates were most widely used marketing strategy by modern companies. There is non-significant association (CC=0.145; P=0.1519) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (64.67%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates were most widely used marketing strategy by modern companies. There is non-significant association (CC=0.267; P=0.0366) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (68.57%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates were most widely used marketing strategy by modern companies. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.625) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.4 The television templates reduce the time and effort of the users/customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.80</td>
<td>25.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>68.92</td>
<td>31.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.65</td>
<td>29.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>33.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.51</td>
<td>29.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>30.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.86</td>
<td>29.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.4 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates reduce the time and effort of the users/customers’. A majority of the male (74.80%) and female (61.54%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the time and effort of the users/customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.201; P=0.0256) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (72.73%) and post-graduation (68.92%) educational status have stated that the television templates reduced the time and effort of the users/customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.289; P=0.0031) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (70.51%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the time and effort of the users/customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.058; P=0.7463) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (69.02%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the time and effort of the users/customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.224; P=0.1624) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (70.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates reduced the time and effort of the users/customers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.937) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.5 The television templates are effective tools of providing the real time messages to the customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.49</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.46</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.03</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.28</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.09</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.43</td>
<td>24.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.5 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates are effective tools of providing the real time messages to the customers’. A majority of the male (80.49%) and female (63.46%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates were effective tools of providing the real time messages to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.181; P=0.0524) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (66.67%), graduation (76.62%) and post-graduation (77.03%) educational status have stated that the television templates were effective tools of providing the real time messages to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.315; P=0.0007) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (76.74%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (71.28%) respectively have stated that the television templates were effective tools of providing the real time messages to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.094; P=0.4615) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (76.09%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates were effective tools of providing the real time messages to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.171; P=0.5099) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (75.43%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates were effective tools of providing the real time messages to the customers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.0245) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
The television templates are effective tools of providing the real time messages to the customers.
Table No. 5.5.6 The television templates provide the personalized messages to the customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.80</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.38</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.09</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.60</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.17</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.29</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.6 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide the personalized messages to the customers’. A majority of the male (74.80%) and female (73.08%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided the personalized messages to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.044; P=0.8455) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (71.43%) and post-graduation (78.38%) educational status have stated that the television templates provided the personalized messages to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.167; P=0.2880) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (73.91%), business persons (72.09%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (76.60%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided the personalized messages to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.073; P=0.6294) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (77.17%) and low income group (69.23%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided the personalized messages to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.1753; P=0.6483) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (74.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided the personalized messages to the customers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.411) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.7 The television templates provide more frequent communications to the customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.068; P=0.6663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 194</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.86%</td>
<td>21.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.219; P=0.0661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 58.33%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 126</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 81.82%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 118</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.73%</td>
<td>20.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.075; P=0.6081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.35%</td>
<td>20.65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 76.74%</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.79%</td>
<td>20.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.193; P=0.3396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.19%</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 148</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 80.43%</td>
<td>19.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 272</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 77.71%</td>
<td>22.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.7 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide more frequent communications to the customers’. A majority of the male (78.86%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided more frequent communications to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.068; P=0.6663) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (58.33%), graduation (81.82%) and post-graduation (79.73%) educational status have stated that the television templates provided more frequent communications to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.219; P=0.0661) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (76.74%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided more frequent communications to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.075; P=0.6081) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (80.43%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided more frequent communications to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.193; P=0.3396) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (77.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided more frequent communications to the customers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.680) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.8 The television templates enable the service providers to test the marketing messages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.30</td>
<td>18.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.85</td>
<td>21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>23.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.78</td>
<td>16.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.74</td>
<td>28.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.07</td>
<td>20.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.11</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.17</td>
<td>22.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.57</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.8 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement –‘The television templates enable the service providers to test the marketing messages’. A majority of the male (81.30%) and female (78.85%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to test the marketing messages. There is non-significant association (CC=0.143; P=0.1594) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (76.62%) and post-graduation (83.78%) educational status have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to test the marketing messages. There is non-significant association (CC=0.126; P=0.5894) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (71.74%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (85.11%) respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to test the marketing messages. There is non-significant association (CC=0.117; P=0.2964) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (77.17%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to test the marketing messages. There is non-significant association (CC=0.132; P=0.7942) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (80.57%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to test the marketing messages. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.839) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.9 The television templates ensure the wide spread information to the customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 202</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 82.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 78.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 87.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 114</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 74.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 120</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 81.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 73.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 79.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>% 87.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 85.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 83.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 144</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 78.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 84.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 284</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 81.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.9 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates ensure the wide spread information to the customers. A majority of the male (82.11%) and female (78.85%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates ensured the wide spread information to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.085; P=0.5313) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (87.50%), graduation (74.03%) and post-graduation (81.08%) educational status have stated that the television templates ensured the wide spread information to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.169; P=0.2740) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (73.91%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (85.11%) respectively have stated that the television templates ensured the wide spread information to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.128; P=0.2322) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (78.26%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that the television templates ensured the wide spread information to the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.246; P=0.814) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (81.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates ensured the wide spread information to the customers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.119) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.5.9: The television templates ensure the wide spread information to the customers
Table No. 5.5.10 The television templates reduce the overhead costs of the service providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.80</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.08</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.57</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.10 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates reduce the overhead costs of the service providers’. A majority of the male (74.80%) and female (80.77%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the overhead costs of the service providers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.248; P=0.0023) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (75.0%), graduation (72.73%) and post-graduation (81.08%) educational status have stated that the television templates reduced the overhead costs of the service providers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.120; P=0.6326) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (76.74%), public/private employees (74.35%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the overhead costs of the service providers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.152; P=0.1276) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (78.26%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the overhead costs of the service providers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.188; P=0.3775) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (76.57%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates reduced the overhead costs of the service providers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.140) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.11 The television templates enable the service providers to track sales and user engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 190</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 77.24</td>
<td>22.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 80</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 76.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 118</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 76.62</td>
<td>23.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 118</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.73</td>
<td>20.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.26</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.58</td>
<td>24.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.79</td>
<td>20.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 82.26</td>
<td>17.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 136</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73.91</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 83</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.81</td>
<td>20.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 270</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 77.14</td>
<td>22.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.11 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates enable the service providers to track sales and user engagement’. A majority of the male (77.24%) and female (76.92%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to track sales and user engagement. There is non-significant association (CC=0.246; P=0.0246) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (76.62%) and post-graduation (79.73%) educational status have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to track sales and user engagement. There is non-significant association (CC=0.105; P=0.7434) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (78.26%), business persons (75.58%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to track sales and user engagement. There is non-significant association (CC=0.214; P=0.0151) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (82.26%), middle income group (73.91%) and low income group (79.81%) respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to track sales and user engagement. There is non-significant association (CC=0.233; P=0.1642) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (77.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates enabled the service providers to track sales and user engagement. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.947) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.12 The television templates are highly effective tools of advertising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.17%</td>
<td>26.83%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.22%</td>
<td>20.78%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.86%</td>
<td>35.14%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.77%</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53%</td>
<td>24.47%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.83%</td>
<td>27.17%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>258</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.71%</td>
<td>26.29%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.12 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates are highly effective tools of advertising’. A majority of the male (73.17%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates were highly effective tools of advertising. There is non-significant association (CC=0.096; P=0.4418) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (64.86%) educational status have stated that the television templates were highly effective tools of advertising. There is non-significant association (CC=0.197; P=0.1329) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (75.0%), business persons (69.77%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates were highly effective tools of advertising. There is non-significant association (CC=0.043; P=0.8513) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (72.83%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates were highly effective tools of advertising. There is non-significant association (CC=0.157; P=0.6168) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (73.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates were highly effective tools of advertising. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.043) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No.5.5.13 The television templates influence consumers and drive purchasing decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 190</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 77.24</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 80</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 76.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 118</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 76.62</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 118</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.73</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 73</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 60</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 69.77</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 79</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 84.04</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 146</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 270</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 77.14</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.13 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates influence consumers and drive purchasing decisions’. A majority of the male (77.24%) and female (76.92%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates influenced consumers and driven purchasing decisions. There is non-significant association (CC=0.246; P=0.1346) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (76.62%) and post-graduation (79.73%) educational status have stated that the television templates influenced consumers and driven purchasing decisions. There is non-significant association (CC=0.105; P=0.7434) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (69.77%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (84.04%) respectively have stated that the television templates influenced consumers and driven purchasing decisions. There is non-significant association (CC=0.214; P=0.0151) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (79.35%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates influenced consumers and driven purchasing decisions. There is non-significant association (CC=0.233; P=0.1642) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (77.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates influenced consumers and driven purchasing decisions. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.947) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.5.13: The television templates influence consumers and drive purchasing decisions
Table No. 5.5.14 The television templates have made lot of difference in television broadcasting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 200</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 81.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 78.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 66.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 128</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 83.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 82.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 84.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 82.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 74.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 79.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 82.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 142</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 77.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 85.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 282</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 80.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.14 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates have made lot of difference in television broadcasting’. A majority of the male (81.30%) and female (78.85%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates had made lot of difference in television broadcasting. There is non-significant association (CC=0.107; P=0.3642) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (78.85%), graduation (66.67%) and post-graduation (83.12%) educational status have stated that the television templates had made lot of difference in television broadcasting. There is non-significant association (CC=0.185; P=0.1832) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (84.78%), business persons (82.56%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that the television templates had made lot of difference in television broadcasting. There is non-significant association (CC=0.128; P=0.2343) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (82.26%), middle income group (77.17%) and low income group (85.58%) respectively have stated that the television templates had made lot of difference in television broadcasting. There is non-significant association (CC=0.214; P=0.2113) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (80.57%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates had made lot of difference in television broadcasting. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.993) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.15 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates promote business relations’. A majority of the male (77.24%) and female (73.08%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates promoted business relations. There is non-significant association (CC=0.044; P=0.8409) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (66.67%), graduation (77.92%) and post-graduation (77.03%) educational status have stated that the television templates promoted business relations. There is non-significant association (CC=0.121; P=0.6266) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (74.42%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates promoted business relations. There is non-significant association (CC=0.144; P=0.1579) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (77.17%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates promoted business relations. There is non-significant association (CC=0.176; P=0.4693) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (76.0%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates promoted business relations. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.095) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.16 The television templates add new energy to commercial broadcasting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.062; P=0.7171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.178; P=0.2219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.086; P=0.5248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.286; P=0.0158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.16 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates add new energy to commercial broadcasting. A majority of the male (71.54%) and female (65.38%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates added new energy to commercial broadcasting. There is non-significant association (CC=0.062; P=0.7171) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (63.64%) and post-graduation (75.68%) educational status have stated that the television templates added new energy to commercial broadcasting. There is non-significant association (CC=0.178; P=0.2219) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates added new energy to commercial broadcasting. There is non-significant association (CC=0.086; P=0.5248) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (69.02%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates added new energy to commercial broadcasting. There is non-significant association (CC=0.286; P=0.0158) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (69.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates added new energy to commercial broadcasting. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.480) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.17 The television templates enhance consumerism in modern times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>68.83</td>
<td>31.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.38</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.83</td>
<td>27.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.21</td>
<td>21.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.54</td>
<td>24.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.14</td>
<td>26.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.17 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates enhance consumerism in modern times’. A majority of the male (73.17%) and female (73.08%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced consumerism in modern times. There is non-significant association (CC=0.044; P=0.8455) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.5.17: The television templates enhance consumerism in modern times
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (68.83%) and post-graduation (78.38%) educational status have stated that the television templates enhanced consumerism in modern times. There is non-significant association (CC=0.167; P=0.2880) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (72.83%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (78.21%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced consumerism in modern times. There is non-significant association (CC=0.073; P=0.6294) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (75.54%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced consumerism in modern times. There is non-significant association (CC=0.153; P=0.6483) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (73.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates enhanced consumerism in modern times. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.411) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.18 The scrolling text advertisements in television templates enhance the business opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.80</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>68.92</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.65</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.93</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.51</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.28</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>30.98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.86</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.18 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The scrolling text advertisements in television templates enhance the business opportunities’. A majority of the male (74.80%) and female (61.54%) respondents respectively have stated that the scrolling text advertisements in television templates enhance the business opportunities. There is non-significant association (CC=0.248; P=0.0023) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (72.73%) and post-graduation (68.92%) educational status have stated that the scrolling text advertisements in television templates enhance the business opportunities. There is non-significant association (CC=0.120; P=0.6326) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (70.93%), public/private employees (70.51%) and housewives/unemployed persons (71.28%) respectively have stated that the scrolling text advertisements in television templates enhance the business opportunities. There is non-significant association (CC=0.152; P=0.1276) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (69.02%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the scrolling text advertisements in television templates enhance the business opportunities. There is non-significant association (CC=0.188; P=0.3775) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (70.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the scrolling text advertisements in television templates enhance the business opportunities. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.140) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.19 The television templates enrich the vocabulary of the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 178</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.36</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.00</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 71.43</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.57</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.83</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 129</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.11</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 246</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.29</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.5.19 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates enrich the vocabulary of the viewers’. A majority of the male (72.36%) and female (65.38%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates enriched the vocabulary of the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.077; P=0.5937) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (75.0%), graduation (71.43%) and post-graduation (67.57%) educational status have stated that the television templates enriched the vocabulary of the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.202; P=0.1126) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (72.83%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates enriched the vocabulary of the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.051; P=0.7935) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (70.11%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates enriched the vocabulary of the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.149; P=0.6820) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (70.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates enriched the vocabulary of the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.182) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.5.20 : The television templates provide the viewers a broader understanding of the world and expose them to new opportunities of life.

Table No. 5.5.20 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide the viewers a broader understanding of the world and expose them to new opportunities of life’. A majority of the male (69.11%) and female (69.23%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided the viewers a broader understanding of the world and exposed them to new opportunities of life. There is non-significant association (CC=0.049; P=0.8071) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (75.0%), graduation (72.73%) and post-graduation (63.51%) educational status have stated that the television templates provided the viewers a broader understanding of the world and exposed them to new opportunities of life. There is non-significant association (CC=0.140; P=0.4767) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (73.40%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided the viewers a broader understanding of the world and exposed them to new opportunities of life. There is non-significant association (CC=0.079; P=0.5775) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (67.93%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided the viewers a broader understanding of the world and exposed them to new opportunities of life. There is non-significant association (CC=0.248; P=0.0759) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (81.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided the viewers a broader understanding of the world and exposed them to new opportunities of life. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.9379) and perception of the respondents about the uses of television templates for customization.

Testing of Hypothesis

H3. The television templates are not useful to the respondents across the state of Karnataka.

The data which are presented in the above tables mainly 5.5.1 to 5.5.20 clearly reveal that the respondents have found the usefulness of television templates. Hence, the above hypothesis stands disproved according to the data analysis.

5.6 Gratifications of Television Template Customization

There are well established norms and guidelines for television templates. The users try to get as far away as possible from the world of commercials and sites. The television channel templates offer the perfect solution for quick and efficient site refreshment with tons of benefits for the service providers and users. The designers prepare the layout and offer a plethora of features in one easy-to-install and cost-effective package. These layouts are focused on simplicity and elegance, wowing the viewers with smooth visual
effects and high-quality images. These images are used in the demo templates which are free and they will be delivered with the theme. The television templates are completely customizable and serve the purpose with the help of modern technologies and strategies. The following tables delineate the gratifications obtained by the audience through television templates.

**Table No. 5.6.1 The television templates are sources of advertisement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 180</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73.17</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 76</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73.08</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university Graduates</td>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 106</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 68.83</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 116</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.38</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.83</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.21</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 139</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.54</td>
<td>24.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>F 256</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 73.14</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.1 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates are sources of advertisement’. A majority of the male (73.17%) and female (73.08%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates were
effective sources of advertisement on products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.044; P=0.8455) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (68.83%) and post-graduation (78.38%) educational status have stated that the television templates were effective sources of advertisement on products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.167; P=0.2880) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (72.83%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (78.21%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates were effective sources of advertisement on products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.073; P=0.6294) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (75.54%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates were effective sources of advertisement on products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.153; P=0.6483) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (73.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates were effective sources of advertisement on products and services. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.411) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.2 The television templates enhance marketing of news, products and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.54</td>
<td>28.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.68</td>
<td>24.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.65</td>
<td>29.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>30.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.71</td>
<td>30.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.2 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates enhance marketing of news, products and services’. A majority of the male (71.54%) and female (65.38%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced marketing of news, products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.062; P=0.7171) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (63.64%) and post-graduation (75.68%) educational status have stated that the television templates enhanced marketing of news, products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.178; P=0.2219) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced marketing of news, products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.086; P=0.5248) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (69.02%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced marketing of news, products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.286; P=0.0158) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (69.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates enhanced marketing of news, products and services. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.480) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.6.2: The television templates enhance marketing of news, products and services
Table No. 5.6.3 The television templates increase consumerism among the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.36</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.83</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.11</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.29</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.3 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates increase consumerism among the viewers’. A majority of the male (72.36%) and female (65.38%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates increased consumerism among the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.077; P=0.5937) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (75.0%), graduation (71.43%) and post-graduation (67.57%) educational status have stated that the television templates increased consumerism among the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.202; P=0.1126) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (72.83%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates increased consumerism among the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.051; P=0.7935) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (70.11%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates increased consumerism among the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.149; P=0.6820) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (70.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates increased consumerism among the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.182) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.4 The television templates encourage business management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.4 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates encourage business management’. A majority of the male (69.11%) and female (69.23%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates encouraged business management. There is non-significant association (CC=0.049; P=0.8071) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (75.0%), graduation (72.73%) and post-graduation (63.51%) educational status have stated that the television templates encouraged business management. There is non-significant association (CC=0.140; P=0.4767) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (73.40%) respectively have stated that the television templates encouraged business management. There is non-significant association (CC=0.079; P=0.5775) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (67.93%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates encouraged business management. There is non-significant association (CC=0.248; P=0.0759) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (69.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates encouraged business management. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.937) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.5 The television templates fulfill the information needs of the customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 184</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 74.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 80.77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 75.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 112</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 72.73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 120</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 81.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 78.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 73.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 74.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 79.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 82.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 134</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 72.83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 79.81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 268</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 76.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.5 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates fulfill the information needs of the customers’. A majority of the male (74.80%) and female (80.77%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates fulfilled the information needs of the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.248; P=0.0023) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (75.0%), graduation (72.73%) and post-graduation (81.08%) educational status have stated that the television templates fulfilled the information needs of the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.120; P=0.6326) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (78.26%), business persons (73.26%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that the television templates fulfilled the information needs of the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.152; P=0.1276) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (82.26%), middle income group (72.83%) and low income group (79.81%) respectively have stated that the television templates fulfilled the information needs of the customers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.188; P=0.3775) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (76.57%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates fulfilled the information needs of the customers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.140) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.6 The television templates promote seller – buyer relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.24</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.73</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.58</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.79</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.26</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.81</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.6 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates promote seller – buyer relations’. A majority of the male (77.24%) and female (76.92%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates promoted seller – buyer relations. There is non-significant association (CC=0.246; P=0.0246) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (76.62%) and post-graduation (79.73%) educational status have stated that the television templates promoted seller – buyer relations. There is non-significant association (CC=0.105; P=0.7434) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (78.26%), business persons (75.58%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that the television templates promoted seller – buyer relations. There is non-significant association (CC=0.214; P=0.0151) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (82.26%), middle income group (73.91%) and low income group (79.81%) respectively have stated that the television templates promoted seller – buyer relations. There is non-significant association (CC=0.233; P=0.1642) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (77.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates promoted seller – buyer relations. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.947) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.7 The television templates increase the awareness of customers about products and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.54</td>
<td>28.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.68</td>
<td>24.32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.65</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>30.98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.71</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.7 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement ‘The television templates increase the awareness of customers about products and services’. A majority of the male (71.54%) and female (65.38%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates increased the awareness of customers about products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.062; P=0.7171) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (63.64%) and post-graduation (75.68%) educational status have stated that the television templates increased the awareness of customers about products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.178; P=0.2219) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates increased the awareness of customers about products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.086; P=0.5248) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (69.02%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates increased the awareness of customers about products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.286; P=0.0158) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (69.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates increased the awareness of customers about products and services. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.480) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.6.7: The television templates increase the awareness of customers about products and services
Table No. 5.6.8 The television templates provide socially beneficial contents to the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.22</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.86</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.77</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.83</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.71</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.8 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide socially beneficial contents to the viewers’. A majority of the male (73.17%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided socially beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.096; P=0.4418) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (64.86%) educational status have stated that the television templates provided socially beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.197; P=0.1329) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (75.0%), business persons (69.77%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided socially beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.043; P=0.8513) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (72.83%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided socially beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.157; P=0.6168) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (73.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided socially beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.043) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.9 The television templates provide economically beneficial contents to the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.072; P=0.6302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 166</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.48</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.195; P=0.1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.17</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 86</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 55.84</td>
<td>44.16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 106</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 71.62</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.212; P=0.0162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.39</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 62.79</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>F 48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.21</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.218; P=0.1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 61.29</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 122</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 66.30</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.31</td>
<td>32.69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 230</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 65.71</td>
<td>34.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.9 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide economically beneficial contents to the viewers’. A majority of the male (67.48%) and female (61.54%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided economically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.072; P=0.6302) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (79.17%), graduation (55.84%) and post-graduation (71.62%) educational status have stated that the television templates provided economically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.195; P=0.1398) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (67.39%), business persons (62.79%), public/private employees (61.54%) and housewives/unemployed persons (70.21%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided economically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.212; P=0.0162) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (61.29%), middle income group (66.30%) and low income group (67.31%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided economically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.218; P=0.1881) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (65.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided economically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.974) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.10 The television templates provide politically beneficial contents to the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 136</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.28%</td>
<td>44.72%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.31%</td>
<td>32.69%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.93%</td>
<td>35.07%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.35%</td>
<td>48.65%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.87%</td>
<td>39.13%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.81%</td>
<td>44.19%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.83%</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 112</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.87%</td>
<td>39.13%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.69%</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>F 206</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.86%</td>
<td>41.14%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.10 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide politically beneficial contents to the viewers’. A majority of the male (55.28%) and female (67.31%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided politically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.117; P=0.2999) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (62.50%), graduation (64.93%) and post-graduation (51.35%) educational status have stated that the television templates provided politically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.248; P=0.0217) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (60.87%), business persons (55.81%), public/private employees (53.85%) and housewives/unemployed persons (63.83%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided politically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.090; P=0.4910) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (54.84%), middle income group (60.87%) and low income group (57.69%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided politically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.260; P=0.0486) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (58.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided politically beneficial contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.861) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.11 The television templates enable the viewers to obtain useful inputs in their day to day lives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 220</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 89.43</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.85</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 95.83</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 132</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 85.71</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 124</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.78</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 86.96</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 81.40</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 87.18</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 89.36</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.87</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 162</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 88.04</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 302</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 86.29</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.11 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement –‘The television templates enable the viewers to obtain useful inputs in their day to day lives’. A majority of the male (89.43%) and female (78.85%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the viewers to obtain useful inputs in their day to day lives. There is non-significant association (CC=0.145; P=0.1542) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (95.83%), graduation (85.71%) and post-graduation (83.78%) educational status have stated that the television templates enabled the viewers to obtain useful inputs in their day to day lives. There is non-significant association (CC=0.164; P=0.3061) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (86.96%), business persons (81.40%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the viewers to obtain useful inputs in their day to day lives. There is non-significant association (CC=0.040; P=0.8667) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (88.04%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that the television templates enabled the viewers to obtain useful inputs in their day to day lives. There is non-significant association (CC=0.127; P=0.8273) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (86.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates enabled the viewers to obtain useful inputs in their day to day lives. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.154) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.6.11: The television templates enable the viewers to obtain useful inputs in their day to day lives.
Table No. 5.6.12 The television templates enhance social mobility among the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.22</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.86</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.77</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.83</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.71</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.12 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates enhance social mobility among the viewers’. A majority of the male (73.17%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced social mobility among the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.096; P=0.4418) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (64.86%) educational status have stated that the television templates enhanced social mobility among the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.197; P=0.1329) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (75.0%), business persons (69.77%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced social mobility among the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.043; P=0.8513) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (72.83%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates enhanced social mobility among the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.157; P=0.6168) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (73.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates enhanced social mobility among the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.043) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.13 The television templates improve business transactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.42</td>
<td>23.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.15</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.03</td>
<td>25.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td>27.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.77</td>
<td>30.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.86</td>
<td>25.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.13 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates improve business transactions’. A majority of the male (76.42%) and female (71.15%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates improved business transactions. There is non-significant association (CC=0.094; P=0.4609) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (74.03%) and post-graduation (72.97%) educational status have stated that the television templates improved business transactions. There is non-significant association (CC=0.211; P=0.0857) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (69.77%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates improved business transactions. There is non-significant association (CC=0.090; P=0.4922) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (75.0%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates improved business transactions. There is non-significant association (CC=0.139; P=0.7501) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (74.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates improved business transactions. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.789) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.14 The television templates introduce new lifestyles to the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 178</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.36</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 71.43</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.57</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.83</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 129</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.11</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 246</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.29</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.14 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates introduce new lifestyles to the viewers’.

A majority of the male (65.38%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates introduced new lifestyles to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.077; P=0.5937) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (75.0%), graduation (71.43%) and post-graduation (67.57%) educational status have stated that the television templates introduced new lifestyles to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.202; P=0.1126) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (72.83%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates introduced new lifestyles to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.051; P=0.7935) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (70.11%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates introduced new lifestyles to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.149; P=0.6820) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (70.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates introduced new lifestyles to the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.182) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.6.15 The television templates provide multi-faceted advertising contents to the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 176</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 71.54</td>
<td>28.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 63.64</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 112</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.68</td>
<td>24.32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.65</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.53</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 127</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 69.02</td>
<td>30.98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 244</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 69.71</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.6.15 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide multi-faceted advertising contents to the viewers’. A majority of the male (71.54%) and female (65.38%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided multi-faceted advertising contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.062; P=0.7171) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (63.64%) and post-graduation (75.68%) educational status have stated that the television templates provided multi-faceted advertising contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.178; P=0.2219) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (75.53%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided multi-faceted advertising contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.086; P=0.5248) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (69.02%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided multi-faceted advertising contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.286; P=0.0158) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (69.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided multi-faceted advertising contents to the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.480) and perception of the respondents about the gratifications of television templates for customization.

**Testing of Hypothesis**

**H4.** The television templates have not satisfied the needs of the respondents across the state of Karnataka.

The data which are presented in the above tables mainly 5.6.1 to 5.6.15 clearly reveal that television templates have satisfied the needs of the respondents. Hence, the above hypothesis stands disproved according to the data analysis.
5.7 Effects of Television Template Customization

The television templates are broadcast regularly in modern television news channels. The after effects templates for broadcasting are compatible with after effects coming with openers and backgrounds. The television templates can suit all subjects and the broadcasters easily customize them and enjoy the power they have to deliver. The television templates have unique design, motions, backgrounds and FX. The television templates are easy to customize and have very fast render time. They are known for both advantages and disadvantages. The following tables amplify the views of the respondents about the effects of television templates from customization point of view.
Table No. 5.7.1 The television templates reduce the reading habits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.23</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.96</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.59</td>
<td>36.41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.86</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.1 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates reduce the reading habits’. A majority of the male (65.85%) and female (69.23%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the reading habits of the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.035; P=0.9003) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (58.33%), graduation (66.23%) and post-graduation (70.27%) educational status have stated that the television templates reduced the reading habits of the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.107; P=0.7331) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (61.96%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (73.40%) respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the reading habits of the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.119; P=0.2851) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (63.59%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates reduced the reading habits of the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.244; P=0.0858) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (66.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates reduced the reading habits of the audience. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.004) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.2 The television templates affect the cultural ethos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.48</td>
<td>32.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55.84</td>
<td>44.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.62</td>
<td>28.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>38.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
<td>32.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.15</td>
<td>30.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.38</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.41</td>
<td>38.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>27.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>34.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.2 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates affect the cultural ethos’. A majority of the male (67.48%) and female (61.54%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates affected the cultural ethos. There is non-significant association (CC=0.072; P=0.6302) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (79.17%), graduation (55.84%) and post-graduation (71.62%) educational status have stated that the television templates affected the cultural ethos. There is non-significant association (CC=0.195; P=0.1398) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (61.96%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (65.38%) and housewives/unemployed persons (69.15%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the cultural ethos. There is non-significant association (CC=0.212; P=0.0162) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (67.74%), middle income group (61.41%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the cultural ethos. There is non-significant association (CC=0.218; P=0.1881) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (65.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates affected the cultural ethos. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.974) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.7.2: The television templates affect the cultural ethos
Table No. 5.7.3 The television templates affect the moral values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.35</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.31</td>
<td>32.69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-university</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.23</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post – Graduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.11</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.30</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public/ Private Service</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>42.31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housewives/ Unemployed</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.89</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Income Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.68</td>
<td>40.32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Income Group</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Income Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.71</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.3 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates affect the moral values’. A majority of the male (59.35%) and female (67.31%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates affected the moral values. There is non-significant association (CC=0.199; P=0.0266) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (58.33%), graduation (66.23%) and post-graduation (58.11%) educational status have stated that the television templates affected the moral values. There is non-significant association (CC=0.159; P=0.3391) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (64.13%), business persons (59.30%), public/private employees (57.69%) and housewives/unemployed persons (64.89%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the moral values. There is non-significant association (CC=0.031; P=0.9172) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (59.68%), middle income group (62.50%) and low income group (61.54%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the moral values. There is non-significant association (CC=0.186; P=0.3960) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (61.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates affected the moral values. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.679) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.4 The television templates affect family relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.85</td>
<td>34.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55.77</td>
<td>44.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>45.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.04</td>
<td>38.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>32.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.13</td>
<td>35.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.95</td>
<td>36.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>42.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.89</td>
<td>35.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.13</td>
<td>33.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>62.86</td>
<td>37.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. No. 5.7.4 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates affect family relationships’. A majority of the male (65.85%) and female (55.77%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates affected the family relationships. There is non-significant association (CC=0.125; P=02490) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (54.17%), graduation (61.04%) and post-graduation (67.57%) educational status have stated that the television templates affected the family relationships. There is non-significant association (CC=0.101; P=0.7694) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (64.13%), business persons (63.95%), public/private employees (57.69%) and housewives/unemployed persons (64.89%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the family relationships. There is non-significant association (CC=0.102; P=0.4013) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (66.13%), middle income group (62.50%) and low income group (61.54%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the family relationships. There is non-significant association (CC=0.273; P=0.0285) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (62.86%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates affected the family relationships. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.448) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.7.4: The television templates affect family relationships
Table No. 5.7.5 The television templates affect the linguistic aptitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. No. 5.7.5 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates affect the linguistic aptitude’. A majority of the male (81.30%) and female (88.46%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates affected the linguistic aptitude of the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.107; P=0.3603) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (81.82%) and post-graduation (89.19%) educational status have stated that the television templates affected the linguistic aptitude of the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.218; P=0.0681) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (78.26%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the linguistic aptitude of the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.067; P=0.6772) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (82.61%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the linguistic aptitude of the viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.222; P=0.1698) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (83.43%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates affected the linguistic aptitude of the viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.275) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.6 The television templates affect the health of viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.6 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates affect the health of viewers’. A majority of the male (82.93%) and female (78.85%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates affected the health of viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.143; P=0.1594) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (83.78%) educational status have stated that the television templates affected the health of viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.126; P=0.5894) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (82.61%), business persons (80.23%), public/private employees (79.49%) and housewives/unemployed persons (84.04%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the health of viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.117; P=0.2964) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (77.42%), middle income group (80.98%) and low income group (85.58%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the health of viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.132; P=0.7942) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (81.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates affected the health of viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.839) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.7 The television templates text cause ethical deterioration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 204</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.93</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.85</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 132</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.43</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.79</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.26</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 146</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.58</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 286</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.71</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.7 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates text cause ethical deterioration’. A majority of the male (82.93%) and female (78.85%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates text caused ethical deterioration. There is non-significant association (CC=0.107; P=0.3642) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (66.67%), graduation (85.71%) and post-graduation (82.43%) educational status have stated that the television templates text caused ethical deterioration. There is non-significant association (CC=0.185; P=0.1832) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (84.78%), business persons (82.56%), public/private employees (79.49%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that the television templates text caused ethical deterioration. There is non-significant association (CC=0.128; P=0.2343) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (82.26%), middle income group (79.35%) and low income group (85.58%) respectively have stated that the television templates text caused ethical deterioration. There is non-significant association (CC=0.214; P=0.2113) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (81.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates text caused ethical deterioration. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.993) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.7.7: The television templates text cause ethical deterioration
Table No. 5.7.8 The television templates scrolling speed affects the eyesight of the viewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.24%</td>
<td>22.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.83%</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.62%</td>
<td>23.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.73%</td>
<td>20.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.91%</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.23%</td>
<td>19.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.79%</td>
<td>20.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.26%</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.91%</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.81%</td>
<td>20.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.14%</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.8 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates scrolling speed affects the eyesight of the viewers’. A majority of the male (77.24%) and female (76.92%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates scrolling speed affected the eyesight of the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.033; P=0.9095) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (76.62%) and post-graduation (79.73%) educational status have stated that the television templates scrolling speed affected the eyesight of the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.214; P=0.0768) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (73.91%), business persons (80.23%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that the television templates scrolling speed affected the eyesight of the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.090; P=0.4930) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (82.26%), middle income group (73.91%) and low income group (79.81%) respectively have stated that the television templates scrolling speed affected the eyesight of the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.282; P=0.0193) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (77.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates scrolling speed affected the eyesight of the audience. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.499) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.9 The television templates are like a junk food in the television news.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 204</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.93</td>
<td>17.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.023;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 136</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.31</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 116</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.38</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.264;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.07</td>
<td>20.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 84</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>89.36</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.070;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 152</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.242;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 292</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.43</td>
<td>16.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.9 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates are like a junk food in the television news’. A majority of the male (82.93%) and female (84.62%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates were a like a junk food in the television news. There is non-significant association (CC=0.023; P=0.9065) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (83.33%), graduation (88.31%) and post-graduation (78.38%) educational status have stated that the television templates were a like a junk food in the television news. There is non-significant association (CC=0.264; P=0.0718) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (78.26%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that the television templates were a like a junk food in the television news. There is non-significant association (CC=0.070; P=0.4130) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (82.61%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that the television templates were a like a junk food in the television news. There is non-significant association (CC=0.242; P=0.0173) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (83.43%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates were a like a junk food in the television news. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.429) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.10. The television templates colors disturb the concentration of viewers while watching television news.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>60.98</td>
<td>39.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.74</td>
<td>40.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.51</td>
<td>36.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.96</td>
<td>38.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.30</td>
<td>40.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>42.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.89</td>
<td>35.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.68</td>
<td>40.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.41</td>
<td>38.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.14</td>
<td>38.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.10 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates colors disturb the concentration of viewers while watching television news’. A majority of the male (60.98%) and female (61.54%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates colors disturbed the concentration of viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.039; P=0.8757) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (58.33%), graduation (59.74%) and post-graduation (63.51%) educational status have stated that the television
templates colors disturbed the concentration of viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.081; P=0.8865) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (61.96%), business persons (59.30%), public/private employees (57.69%) and housewives/unemployed persons (64.89%) respectively have stated that the television templates color disturbed the concentration of viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.158; P=0.1071) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (59.68%), middle income group (61.41%) and low income group (61.54%) respectively have stated that the television templates color disturbed the concentration of viewers. There is non-significant association (CC=0.186; P=0.3905) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (61.14%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates colors disturbed the concentration of viewers. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.260) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.11 The television templates affect the wisdom of audience to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of advertising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 206</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 83.74 % 16.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 90.38 % 9.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 79.17 % 20.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 128</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 83.12 % 16.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 134</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 90.54 % 9.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 89.13 % 10.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 81.40 % 18.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 87.18 % 12.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 85.11 % 14.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 54</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 87.10 % 12.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 158</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 85.87 % 14.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 84.62 % 15.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 85.71 % 14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.11 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates affect the wisdom of audience to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of advertising’. A majority of the male (83.74%) and female (90.38%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates affected the wisdom of audience to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of advertising. There is non-significant association (CC=0.044; P=0.8455) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization. A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (79.17%), graduation...
(83.12%) and post-graduation (90.54%) educational status have stated that the television templates affected the wisdom of audience to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of advertising. There is non-significant association (CC=0.167; P=0.2880) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (89.13%), business persons (81.40%), public/private employees (87.18%) and housewives/unemployed persons (85.11%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the wisdom of audience to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of advertising. There is non-significant association (CC=0.073; P=0.6294) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (87.10%), middle income group (85.87%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that the television templates affected the wisdom of audience to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of advertising. There is non-significant association (CC=0.153; P=0.6483) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (85.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates affected the wisdom of audience to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of advertising. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=2.411) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Figure 5.7.11: The television templates affect the wisdom of audience to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of advertising.
Table No. 5.7.12 The television templates provide incomplete information to the audience about products and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.61</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>23.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.73</td>
<td>20.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>23.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.28</td>
<td>28.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.09</td>
<td>23.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.43</td>
<td>24.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.12 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide incomplete information to the audience about products and services’. A majority of the male (75.61%) and female (75.0%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided incomplete information to the audience about products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.047; P=0.8256) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (58.33%), graduation (76.62%) and post-graduation (79.73%) educational status have stated that the television
templates provided incomplete information to the audience about products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.138; P=0.4940) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (79.35%), business persons (76.74%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (71.28%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided incomplete information to the audience about products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.008; P=0.99508) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (76.09%) and low income group (75.0%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided incomplete information to the audience about products and services. There is non-significant association (CC=0.110; P=0.9071) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (75.43%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided incomplete information to the audience about products and services. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=3.222) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.13 The television templates disturb the concentrating power of the audience in their understanding of life and environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 204</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 82.93</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 84</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 80.77</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 87.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 122</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.22</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 124</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.78</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.26</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 68</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.07</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 82.05</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 84</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 89.36</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 83.87</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 148</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 80.43</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 288</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 82.29</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.13 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates disturb the concentrating power of the audience in their understanding of life and environment’. A majority of the male (82.93%) and female (80.77%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates disturbed the concentrating power of the audience in their understanding of life and environment. There is non-significant association (CC=0.072; P=0.6302) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (87.50%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (75.68%) educational status have stated that the television templates disturbed the concentrating power of the audience in their understanding of life and environment. There is non-significant association (CC=0.195; P=0.1398) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (78.26%), business persons (79.07%), public/private employees (82.05%) and housewives/unemployed persons (89.36%) respectively have stated that the television templates disturbed the concentrating power of the audience in their understanding of life and environment. There is non-significant association (CC=0.212; P=0.0162) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (83.87%), middle income group (80.43%) and low income group (84.62%) respectively have stated that the television templates disturbed the concentrating power of the audience in their understanding of life and environment. There is non-significant association (CC=0.218; P=0.1881) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (82.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates disturbed the concentrating power of the audience in their understanding of life and environment. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=0.974) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.14 The television templates do not depict a true picture of society which has its adverse impact on the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>61.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>68.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/ Private</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>69.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. No. 5.7.14 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates do not depict a true picture of society which has its adverse impact on the audience’. A majority of the male (73.17%) and female (61.54%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates did not depict a true picture of society which has its adverse impact on the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.248; P=0.0023) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (70.13%) and post-graduation (68.92%) educational status have stated that the television
templates did not depict a true picture of society which has its adverse impact on the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.120; P=0.6326) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (70.65%), business persons (66.28%), public/private employees (70.51%) and housewives/unemployed persons (71.28%) respectively have stated that the television templates did not depict a true picture of society which has its adverse impact on the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.152; P=0.1276) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (74.19%), middle income group (66.85%) and low income group (72.12%) respectively have stated that the television templates did not depict a true picture of society which has its adverse impact on the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.188; P=0.3775) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (69.71%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates did not depict a true picture of society which has its adverse impact on the audience. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.140) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
Table No. 5.7.15 The television templates provide misleading and unhealthy contents to the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>CC=0.013; P=0.9035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>F 194</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.86</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>F 80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 76.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.264; P=0.0718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-university</td>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.83</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>F 122</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.22</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post – Graduates</td>
<td>F 118</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.73</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.080; P=0.4930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>F 72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.26</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>F 69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 80.23</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ Private Service</td>
<td>F 58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives/ Unemployed</td>
<td>F 75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.79</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC=0.232; P=0.0163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income Group</td>
<td>F 51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 82.26</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income Group</td>
<td>F 140</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 76.09</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Group</td>
<td>F 83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 79.81</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F 274</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.29</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 5.7.15 provides the opinion of the respondents about the statement – ‘The television templates provide misleading and unhealthy contents to the audience’. A majority of the male (78.86%) and female (76.92%) respondents respectively have stated that the television templates provided misleading and unhealthy contents to the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.013; P=0.9035) between the gender group and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.
A majority of the respondents representing pre-university (70.83%), graduation (79.22%) and post-graduation (79.73%) educational status have stated that the television templates provided misleading and unhealthy contents to the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.264; P=0.0718) between the educational background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing agriculturists (78.26%), business persons (80.23%), public/private employees (74.36%) and housewives/unemployed persons (79.79%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided misleading and unhealthy contents to the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.080; P=0.4930) between the professional background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents representing high income group (82.26%), middle income group (76.09%) and low income group (79.81%) respectively have stated that the television templates provided misleading and unhealthy contents to the audience. There is non-significant association (CC=0.232; P=0.0163) between the income background and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

A majority of the respondents (78.29%) regardless of gender, education, profession and income background have stated that the television templates provided misleading and unhealthy contents to the audience. There is non-significant association between the demographic features of the respondents (P=1.480) and perception of the respondents about the effects of television templates for customization.

Testing of Hypothesis

H5. The television templates do not have a positive impact on the respondents across the state of Karnataka.

The data which are presented in the above tables mainly 5.7.1 to 5.7.15 clearly reveal that the respondents have experienced several effects of television templates. Hence, the above hypothesis stands disproved according to the data analysis.
Figure 5.7.15: The television templates provide misleading and unhealthy contents to the audience
5.8 Summary

The present study was carried out in the four revenue divisions of Karnataka state to understand the uses and gratifications of television templates. The primary data were gathered from about 350 respondents spread across the state. The study reveals that the respondents have enjoyed the benefit of adequate media exposure. The data analysis clearly indicates that the respondents have identified the appropriate priorities with reference to television templates. The study emphasizes certain proven advantages of television templates for customization. These television templates have satisfied the needs of the respondents. The respondents have also experienced several effects of television templates. The study emphasizes that television templates have become effective instruments of commercial broadcasting in Karnataka state in the present times.