References

Barbara Katz, 2005. Development and Current Issues of Interactive Television in the UK. http://www.csd.abdn.ac.uk/~jmasthof/EuroITV04/S01.pdf [accessed April 7, 2010].

Becker, Lee, & Klaus Schoenbach 1999. Audience Responses to Media Diversification. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Byeng-Hee Chang, Sylvia M. Chan-Olmsted, 2006. Audience knowledge, perceptions and factors affecting the adoption intent of terrestrial digital television. http://nms.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/8/5/773 [accessed March 15, 2010].

Central bank of Sri Lanka, 2010. Annual Report. http://www.cbsl.gov.lk /pics_n_docs/10_pub/_docs/efr/annual_report/AR2010/English/content.htm.

Commonwealth of Australia, 2006. The Report of the Australian Senate Standing Committee on the Environment, Communication, Information Technology and the Arts, 6 October 2006. Canberra: The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia.

David Burke, 2000. Spy TV. http://www.whitedot.org/issue/iss_story.asp?slug= shortSpyTV [accessed October 7, 2011].

Daya Kishan Thussu, 2007. The `Murdochization' of news? The case of Star TV in India. http://mcs.sagepub.com/content/29/4/593.short [accessed November 10, 2011].

Dialog Axiata PLC, 2010. Annual Report. http://www.dialog.lk/content /uploads /pdfs/annual_reports/2010_annual_report_en.pdf [accessed September 27, 2011].

Esther Menezes, Cristiane M. Ogushi,Graziella C. Bonadia,Juliano C. Dall'Antonia,Giovanni M. de Holanda, 2000. Socioeconomic Factors Influencing Digital TV Diffusion in Brazil.

John Withnell, 2006. what interactive TV services can be expected to support the growth of IPTV.

Kamila B. Mistry, 2007. Children's Television Exposure and Behavioral and Social Outcomes at 5.5 years: Does Timing of Exposure Matter. http://pediatrics. aappublications.org /content/120/4/762.short [accessed April 7, 2010].

Manross, G. G., & Rice, R. E.,1986. Don't hang up: Organizational diffusion of the intelligent telephone Information & Management.

Matthew Weiss, 2000. T-Commerce: Turning Television Sets Into Cash Registers http://www.skelly.biz/tcommerce.pdf [accessed April 27, 2010].

Niranjala D. Weerakkody, 2003. More Dominant in their Inactivity: Consumer Response and the Adoption of Digital TV in Australia. Deakin University, Geelong VIC, Australia. http://www.deakin.edu.au/dro/eserv/DU:30005234/weerakkody-moredominant-2003.pdf [accessed May 23, 2010].

Niranjala (Nina) D. Weerakkody,2007. The Present and the Future of Digital TV in Australia. Proceedings of the 2007 Computer Science and IT Education Conference. School of Communication & Creative Arts, Faculty of Arts, Deakin University, Geelong, VIC. Australia. http://csited.org/2007/37WeerCSITEd.pdf [accessed May 23, 2010].

Niranjala (Nina) D. Weerakkody, & Tremblay, W., 2003. A cross-impact analysis of the adoption and diffusion of digital TV in Australia and the USA. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Australian and NewZealand Communication Association (ANZCA 2003), July 9-11, Brisbane, QLD, Australia. Retrieved from

http://www.bgsb.qut.edu.au/conferences/ANZCA03/Proceedings/papers/Weerakkody_full.pdf [accessed May 23, 2010].

Owen, B.,1999. The internet challenge to television. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Robert G. Picard,2005. Consumer Perspective on Digital Terrestrial and Interactive Television. http://www.robertpicard.net/PDFFiles/consumerperspectivesdtt.pdf [accessed February 15, 2010].

R. Srinivasan, 2010. DTH Industry in India – Future Prospectus. Economic Affairs Vol. 56 No. 2 June 2011 (Page 185-188). http://www.ndpublisher.in/Last_Issue/EA/12_Economics.pdf [accessed March 11, 2010].

Sri Lanka Telecom, 2010. Annual Report. http://www.slt.lk/data/investor/pdf/annual_report_2010/annual_report_2010.pdf [accessed November 15, 2011].

Varan, D., & Morrison, T. 2003. Digital television in Australia: 2002 Industry survey. Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Authority.

Bibliography

Amal Punchihewa, Ann Malsha De Silva, Yongseng Diao,2010. Internet Protocol Television (IPTV).

John Barrett, 2006. The IPTV Conundrum in Asia, A Parks Associates White Paper.

Juliana Abdul, 2010. Malaysian Reality TV between Myth and Reality University Sains Malaysia.

Julia Livaditi, Konstantina Vassilopoulou, Christos Lougos and Konstantinos Chorianopoulos, 2002. Needs and Gratifications for Interactive TV Applications Implications for Designers.

Kennedy D Gunawardana,2007. Current Status of Information Technology And Its Issues in Sri Lanka, International Journal of The Computer, the Internet and Management Vol. 15.No.3.

Konstantinos Chorianopoulos, 2008. Personalized and mobile digital TV applications,

Nimmi Rangaswamy, 2006. There is no entertainment without TV, Changing TV environments - A case-study from India Microsoft Research Labs.

Nimmi Rangaswamy, Sumitra Nair, Kentaro Toyama,2007. Personalizing TV for the Indian Audience.

Raimund Schatz, Siegfried Wagner, Sebastian Egger, Norbert Jordan, 2008. Mobile TV becomes Social – Integrating Content with Communications, Telecommunications Research Center Vienna, Austria.

Sudath Arumapperuma,2008. The role of Information Technology in Disseminating Innovations in Agribusiness : A comparative Study of Australia and Sri Lanka.

T.Y. Lau, Guangchao Feng, 2004. Digital Television in China: Opportunities and Challenges, University of Washington, United States, Henan University, China.

Appendix A

The questionnaire used for the organizations in the main survey is given below.

Questionnaire on the Use of interactive television in Sri Lanka

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a student of University of Moratuwa, conducting a research under the supervision of Dr. Chandana Gamage, Head of the Department, Department of Computer Science& Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Moratuwa, as partial fulfillment of MBA in Information Technology program.

This research is on the use of interactive television in Sri Lankan. As part of the research, this questionnaire has been designed to identify interactive television usage as well as the factors which adoption of interactive television in Sri Lankan. Thus, I really appreciate your valued response to identify the required information.

Your survey response will be strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. Further, this study is entirely for academic purposes and your responses to the questions will only be used for the purpose of this study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Priyantha Bethmage,
Student - MBA-IT (2008),
Dept. of Computer Science & Engineering,
University of Moratuwa.
Email : priyantharp@yahoo.com

Questioner for the support details for a Research of MBA in University Of Moratuwa

1. Is your profession in the telecommunication field?
    a. Mainly Telecommunication Field ☐
    b. Partially Telecommunication Field ☐
    c. Not In telecommunication Field ☐

2. What are your professional Qualifications?

3. How many years of experience do you have?

4. What is your gender?
    a. Male ☐
    b. Female ☐

5. What is your age
    a. Bellow 30 years ☐
    b. 30-40 years ☐
    c. 40-50 years ☐
    d. Over 50 years ☐

******If your answer is " c" for question no 01 please answer up to question number 17.**

6. Have you used any kind of interactive television?
    a. Very often ☐
    b. Often ☐
    c. Occasionally ☐
    d. Rarely ☐
    e. Never ☐

7. Which is the service you use?
    a. LBN TV ☐
    b. Dialog TV ☐
    c. Peo TV ☐
    d. Other ☐

8. Do you get enough content?
    a. Too much content ☐
    b. More than required ☐
    c. Somewhat required ☐
    d. Less than required ☐
    e. Completely inadequate ☐

9. Are you satisfied with the content delivered so far?
    a. Excellent ☐
    b. Very good ☐
    c. Good ☐
    d. Less satisfactory ☐
    e. Not satisfactory ☐

10. According your experience, is the Service affordable to subscriber?
    a. Very affordable ☐
    b. Completely Affordable ☐
    c. Manageable ☐
    d. Not affordable ☐
    e. Completely unaffordable ☐

11. According to Sri Lankan lifestyle, is Interactive television useful to the subscriber?
    a. Very useful ☐
    b. Useful ☐
    c. somewhat useful ☐
    d. not useful ☐
    e. completely not useful ☐

12. Is the society threatened in any way by interactive television?
    a. Severely threatened ☐
    b. Very much threatened ☐
    c. Threatened ☐
    d. Somewhat threatened ☐
    e. No threat at all ☐

13. Is there any cultural damage created by interactive television?
    a. Severely damaged ☐
    b. Very much damaged ☐
    c. Damaged ☐
    d. Somewhat damaged ☐
    e. No damage at all ☐

14. Are you satisfied with the quality of the picture in interactive television?
    a. Extremely satisfied ☐
    b. Very much satisfied ☐
    c. Satisfied ☐
    d. Somewhat satisfied ☐
    e. Not satisfied ☐

15. Are you satisfied with the infrastructure used for watching interactive television?
    a. Extremely satisfied ☐
    b. Very much satisfied ☐
    c. Satisfied ☐
    d. Somewhat satisfied ☐
    e. Not satisfied ☐

16. According your experience do subscribers have enough knowledge to use interactive television?
    a. Excellent ☐
    b. Good ☐
    c. Satisfactory ☐
    d. Enough ☐
    e. Not enough ☐

17. Interactive television is worthwhile for the spent money. Do you agree?
    a. Extremely agree ☐
    b. Very much agree ☐
    c. Agree ☐
    d. Somewhat agree ☐
    e. Totally disagree ☐

******If your answer is "'a " or "b" for the question no 01 please answer up to question number 22.**

18. Are you confident that the existing infrastructure for providing this service is sufficient?
    a. Extremely satisfied ☐
    b. Very much satisfied ☐
    c. Satisfied ☐
    d. Somewhat satisfied ☐
    e. Not satisfied ☐

19. What is the best way to transmit contents to the home from provider
    a. By air ☐
    b. By cable ☐
    c. No difference by air or by cable ☐

20. Is there a potential market for interactive television
    a. Excellent market ☐
    b. Very good market ☐
    c. Good market ☐
    d. Poor market ☐
    e. No potential market ☐

21. Is there a competition in this market?
    a. Extreme competition ☐
    b. Very high competition ☐
    c. Little Competition ☐
    d. Poor Competition ☐
    e. No competition ☐

22. The competition is good for interactive television market. Do you agree?
    a. Extremely agree ☐
    b. Very much agree ☐
    c. Agree ☐
    d. Somewhat agree ☐
    e. Thoroughly Disagree ☐

23. Are you satisfied with the existing earning model in the business of interactive television (earning from subscriber for contents)
    a. Extremely satisfied ☐
    b. Very much satisfied ☐
    c. Satisfied ☐
    d. Somewhat satisfied ☐
    e. Not satisfied ☐

24. The interactive Television business is threatened when regulations are drawn on contents. Do you agree?
    a. Extremely agree ☐
    b. Very much agree ☐
    c. Agree ☐
    d. Somewhat agree ☐
    e. Thoroughly Disagree ☐

25. Is it good practice when mandated licenses for the business?
    a. Excellent ☐
    b. Very Good ☐
    c. Good ☐
    d. No harm ☐
    e. Bad ☐

26. Regulations of business will affect the business of interactive television. Do you agree?
    a. Extremely agree ☐
    b. Very much agree ☐
    c. Agree ☐
    d. Somewhat agree ☐
    e. Thoroughly Disagree ☐

Appendix B

EXTENDED ANALYSIS FOR PeoTV

B.1. Introduction

As Sri Lankan operators use both full duplex and half duplex broadcasting in TV industry, every operator is not in a position to offer interactive services. Currently PeoTV use full duplex broadcasting and it is the only operator which can offer interactive services in Sri Lanka because they have cable network throughout the country which is owned by Sri Lanka Telecom ; the mother company of PeoTV.

When the data analysis was done in this research, every sample of data which concerns all TV beyond free-to-air was analyzed. Appendix B elaborates the extended analysis of data which belongs only to PeoTV in order to study the adoption of PeoTV in better perspectives to obtain more value to the research.

B.2. Testing Hypothesis 8

Hypothesis 8 is given below and the SPSS output for testing Pearson correlation for hypothesis 8 is shown in table B-1 and table B-2.

$H8_O$: There is no relationship between availability of contents and adoption of PeoTV.

$H8_A$: There is a relationship between availability of contents and adoption of of PeoTV.

According to table B-1, the p-value is 0.187, which is much greater than 0.05 thus the null hypothesis of H8 can be accepted.

For extended analysis purposes table B-2 provides the Pearson correlation under the 2-tailed analysis.

Table B-1: Correlation between availability of contents and the adoption of PeoTV

1-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Availability
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.298
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.187
	N	11	11
Availability	Pearson Correlation	.298	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.187	
	N	11	11

According to table B-2, the p-value is 0.374, which is much greater than 0.05 thus, the null hypothesis of H8 can be accepted. Therefore; the results are such that there is no relationship between availability of contents and adoption of PeoTV.

Table 0-2: Correlation between availability of contents and the adoption of PeoTV

2-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Availability
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.298
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.374
	N	11	11
Availability	Pearson Correlation	.298	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.374	
	N	11	11

B.3. Testing Hypothesis 9

Hypothesis 9 is given below and the SPSS output for testing Pearson correlation for hypothesis 9 is shown in table B-3 and table B-4.

$H9_O$: There is no correlation with the acceptability of contents and the adoption of PeoTV.

$H9_A$: There is a correlation with the acceptability of contents and the adoption of PeoTV.

Table 0-3: Correlation between acceptability of contents and the adoption of PeoTV 1-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Acceptability
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.604*
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.025
	N	11	11
Acceptability	Pearson Correlation	.604*	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.025	
	N	11	11

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

According to table B-3, the significance or the p-value is 0.025, which is much less than 0.05 thus, the null hypothesis of H9 can be rejected.

Table 0-4: Correlation between acceptability of contents and the adoption of PeoTV 2-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Acceptability
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.604*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.049
	N	11	11
Acceptability	Pearson Correlation	.604*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.049	
	N	11	11

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For extended analysis purposes table B-4 provides the Pearson correlation under the 2-tailed analysis.

According to table B-4, the significance or the p-value is 0.049, which is less than 0.05 thus; the null hypothesis of H9 can be rejected. Therefore, the results are such that there is a strong relationship between level of the acceptability of contents and the adoption of PeoTV.

B.4. Testing Hypothesis 10

Hypothesis 10 is given below and the SPSS output for testing Pearson correlation for hypothesis 10 is shown in table B-5 and table B-6.

$H10_O$: There is no strong correlation between affordability of service and adoption of PeoTV.

$H10_A$: There is a strong correlation between affordability of service and adoption of PeoTV.

Table 0-5: Correlation between affordability and the adoption of PeoTV

1-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Affordability
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.230*
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.021
	N	79	79
Affordability	Pearson Correlation	.230*	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.021	
	N	79	79

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

According to table B-5, the significance or the p-value is 0.021, which is much less than 0.05 thus, the null hypothesis of H10 can be rejected.

For extended analysis purposes table B-6 provides the Pearson correlation under the 2-tailed analysis.

According to table B-6, the significance or the p-value is 0.042, which is less than 0.05 thus, the null hypothesis of H10 can be rejected. Therefore, the result is such that there is a strong relationship between level of the affordability of the services and the adoption of PeoTV.

Table 0-6: Correlation between affordability and the adoption of PeoTV

2-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Affordability
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.230*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.042
	N	79	79
Affordability	Pearson Correlation	.230*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	
	N	79	79

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

B.5. Testing Hypothesis 11

Hypothesis 11 is given below and the SPSS output for testing Pearson correlation for hypothesis 11 is shown in table B-7 and table B-8.

$H11_O$: There is no negative correlation between socio-cultural issues important for Sri Lankans and adoption of PeoTV.

$H11_A$: There is a negative correlation between socio-cultural issues important for Sri Lankans and adoption of PeoTV.

According to table B-7, the significance or the p-value is 0.006, which is much less than 0.01 thus, the null hypothesis of H11 can be rejected.

Table 0-7: Correlation between socio-cultural issues and the adoption of PeoTV

1-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Socio-Cultural Issues
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.719**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.006
	N	11	11
Socio-Cultural Issues	Pearson Correlation	.719**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.006	
	N	11	11

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

For extended analysis purposes table B-8 provides the Pearson correlation under the 2-tailed analysis.

Table 0-8: Correlation between affordability and the adoption of PeoTV

2-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Socio-Cultural Issues
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.719*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.013
	N	11	11
Socio-Cultural Issues	Pearson Correlation	.719*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	
	N	11	11

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to table B-8, the significance or the p-value is 0.013, which is much less than 0.05 thus, the null hypothesis of H11 can be rejected.

Therefore, the results are such that there is a strong negative correlation between level of the socio-cultural issues and the adoption of PeoTV.

Further, the Pearson correlation coefficient is positive. This means that the direction of the relationship is positive. Therefore, when the level of socio cultural issues decreases, it indicates that the adoption of PeoTV would increase.

B.6. Testing Hypothesis 12

Hypothesis 12 is given below and the SPSS output for testing Pearson correlation for hypothesis 12 is shown in table B-9 and table B-10.

$H12_O$: There is no strong positive correlation between end user experience and adoption of PeoTV.

$H12_A$: There is a strong positive correlation between end user experience and adoption of PeoTV.

Table 0-9: Correlation between end user experience and the adoption of PeoTV
1-Tailed Test

		Adoption	End User Experience
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.819**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.001
	N	11	11
End User Experience	Pearson Correlation	.819**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.001	
	N	11	11

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

According to table B-9, the significance or the p-value is 0.001, which is much less than 0.01 thus, null hypothesis of H12 can be rejected.

For extended analysis purposes table B-10 provides the Pearson correlation under the 2-tailed analysis.

According to table B-10, the significance or the p-value is 0.002, which is much less than 0.05 thus, the null hypothesis of H12 can be rejected.

Table 0-10: Correlation between end user experience and the adoption of PeoTV

2-Tailed Test

		Adoption	End User Experience
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.819**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	11	11
End User Experience	Pearson Correlation	.819**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	11	11

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Therefore, the result is such that there is a strong relationship between level of the end user experience of the services and the adoption of PeoTV.

Further, the Pearson correlation coefficient is positive. This means that the direction of the relationship is positive. Therefore, when the level of end user experience increases, it indicates that the adoption of PeoTV also would increase.

B.7. Testing Hypothesis 13

Hypothesis 13 is given below and the SPSS output for testing Pearson correlation for hypothesis 13 is shown in table B-11 and table B-12.

$H13_O$: There is no strong relationship between operator motivation and adoption of PeoTV.

$H13_A$: There is a strong relationship between operator motivation and adoption of PeoTV.

Table 0-11: Correlation between operator motivation and the adoption of PeoTV

1-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Operator Motivation
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.533
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.056
	N	10	10
Operator Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.533	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.056	
	N	10	10

According to table B-11, the p-value is 0.056, which is much greater than 0.05 thus the null hypothesis of H13 can be accepted.

Table 0-12: Correlation between operator motivation and the adoption of PeoTV

2-Tailed Test

		Adoption	Operator Motivation
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	.533
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.113
	N	10	10
Operator Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.533	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.113	
	N	10	10

For extended analysis purposes table B-12 provides the Pearson correlation under the 2-tailed analysis.

According to table B-12, the p-value is 0.113, which is much greater than 0.05 thus, the null hypothesis of H13 can be accepted. Therefore; the results are such that there is no relationship between operator motivation and adoption of PeoTv.

B.8. Testing Hypothesis 14

Hypothesis 14 is given below and the SPSS output for testing Pearson correlation for hypothesis 14 is shown in table B-13 and table B-14.

$H14_O$: There is no strong relationship between license / regulation and adoption of PeoTV.

$H14_A$: There is a strong relationship between license / regulation and adoption of PeoTV.

Table 0-13: Correlation between license / regulation and the adoption of PeoTV

1-Tailed Test

		Adoption	License and Regulation
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	-.753**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.006
	N	10	10
License and Regulation	Pearson Correlation	-.753**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.006	
	N	10	10

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

According to table B-13, the significance or the p-value is 0.006, which is much less than 0.01 thus, the null hypothesis of H14 can be rejected.

For extended analysis purposes, table B-14 provides the Pearson correlation under the 2-tailed analysis.

Table 0-14: Correlation between license / regulations and the adoption of PeoTV

2-Tailed Test

		Adoption	License and Regulation
Adoption	Pearson Correlation	1	-.753*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.012
	N	10	10
License and Regulation	Pearson Correlation	-.753*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	
	N	10	10

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to table B-14, the significance or the p-value is 0.012, which is less than 0.05 thus; the null hypothesis of H14 can be rejected.

Therefore, the result is such that there is a strong relationship between the level of the license / regulation and the adoption of PeoTV.

Further, the Pearson correlation coefficient is negative which means that the direction of the relationship is negative. Therefore, when the level of the license / regulation increases, it indicates that the adoption of PeoTv would decrease.

B.9. Summary of the Appendix B

Table B-15 shows the summery of the results of all hypotheses testing which were done to identify the factors effecting for the adoption of PeoTV in Sri Lanka.

Table 0-15: Summary of the appendix B

Independent variable	**Adoption of PeoTV**
Content Availability	No relationship
Content Acceptability	Strong correlation
Affordability	Strong correlation
Socio – Cultural Issues	Strong negative correlation
End User Experience	Strong correlation
Operator Motivation	No relationship
License and Regulation	Strong negative correlation

Table B-16 shows the comparison between, 'the relationship between variables (independent variable studied in this research) and adoption of iTV" (all TV services beyond free-to-air), and 'the relationship between variables and adoption of PeoTV".

With reference to table B-16, the research proves that all variables except operator motivation has the same effect on both adoption of PeoTV and adoption of iTV(all TV beyond free-to-air) in Sri Lanka. Therefore all the recommendations in this research except the one regarding the increasing of operator's motivation can be used for both TV industries, irrespective of the fact that they use full duplex broadcasting or half duplex broadcasting.

Table B-16: Comparison of summary of the research

Independent variable	**Adoption of iTV**	**Adoption of PeotTV**
Content Availability	No relationship	No relationship
Content Acceptability	Strong correlation	Strong correlation
Affordability	Strong correlation	Strong correlation
Socio – Cultural Issues	Strong negative correlation	Strong negative correlation
End User Experience	Strong correlation	Strong correlation
Operator Motivation	Strong correlation	No correlation
License and Regulation	Strong negative correlation	Strong negative correlation