Research Paper Engineering

A Study on Search Engine Optimization and its Influence on The Users

Archana Devi. K Final Year Student, Department of Management Studies, Info Institute of Engineering, Kovilpalayam, Coimbatore – 641107.

S.Nitesh Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Info Institute of Engineering, Kovilpalayam, Coimbatore – 641107.

ABSTRACT

This study intends to know about the SEO and how its influence the users. The data were collected from both primary and secondary sources the primary data is collected from various users of internet. The primary data was collected through questionnaire which was collected by mailing the structured questionnaire to various users. The sample size taken was 150. The secondary data were collected from various journals, magazines, articles, various sites. The main objective of my study is to analyze the various factors that influence users towards SEO. We tried to study if personal factors such as gender, education and working category can be an influencing factor for the users to get influenced or whether it helps to increase the traffic. The whole study is giving a whole new dimension in understanding the influence of SEO on various categories of the users.

KEYWORDS SEO, Influence, Personal-factors, internet, internet-users, traffic

INTRODUCTION

According to Abiteboul and Vianu (1997), the search engine optimization, it can be understood that the search engine optimization has acquired a crucial place in the daily life of the web users as common as checking their emails. The first proto of the search engine optimization model was commenced by an experimental study by the students of McGill of Montreal University. This was later employed in to the World Wide Web services where the web pages are accumulated and searched as per requirement. Then the advancement of the technology has created an option for the huge search index for example like Google, yahoo, AOL, MSN, ASK etc. from the below figure it is evident that, the mostly searched search engine is Google and the remaining are comparatively less. Bivings (2008) stated in the term SEO is a short form of 'Search Engine Optimization'. Generally the optimization process meant for highlighting in the search results carried by the abusers in the search engines such as Google, Overture of Yahoo etc. the web pages of these websites are rated upon the top ranks.

Willoughby (2009) stated that the ranking or rating of the websites will be given to the webpage's of the crawler type of a search engine depending on the degree of significance. The significance of a matching of the phrase with the defined key words is done by employing the algorithm that will differ with each type of a search engine however the functioning of the algorithms is similar such as.

According to Zhang and Dimitroff, Search Engine Optimization (SEO) is the process of identifying factors in a webpage which would impact search engine accessibility to it and fine-tuning the many elements of a website so it can achieve the highest possible visibility when a search engine responds to a relevant query. Search engine optimization aims at achieving good search engine accessibility for WebPages, high visibility in search engine results, and improvement of the chances the WebPages are retrieved.

According to Wallace (2003) has predicted that as the search engine optimization method has various issues to get identified or ranked this will be an optimistic and innovative approach. As the SEO will confide with the difficulty in the coining of specific idioms or keywords which is very much significant with the current commerce may end up with the client trafficking concern. If the search words are not appropriate these websites are not listed. The Search engine Optimization has gained a lot of boom with the growing technological imp edition and with the increased abusers of internet have further increased the importance. The Search engine optimization has various benefits for a business as follows. (King, 2008)

Fetterly *et al.* (2004) point out that there are some SEO firms that guarantee high placements for web sites in search engine result lists. Barker (2005) describes how meta search engines work by explaining that once a searcher submits a keyword to a meta search engine search box, the search query is transmitted simultaneously to several search engines and their databases. However, Perkins (2001) has defined spam as 'any attempt to deceive search engine relevancy rankings'. This type of spam is different from the traditional e-mail spam, which refers to sending bulk messages to different e-mail addresses without the consent of the e-mail account holder (Adam 2002:91).

Green (2000:125) describes a directory as 'a predefined list of Web sites compiled by human editors and categorized according to a certain topic or subject'. The same author claims that Web sites that are listed in a directory are likely to stay there longer than Web sites that have been indexed by a search engine, due to the manual process involved in compiling a directory. According to Thurow (2003:29), top directory listings are based on the following criteria:

- Directory category
- Web site's title
- Web site's description.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To analyze the users have a positive influence by Search Engine Optimization (SEO).
- To find out how the website creates high traffic among the users through SEO.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is a descriptive study. It is a fact finding study which would aid in managerial decision making.

SAMPLING METHOD

1. Sampling unit: The population is taken the users who uses

internet.
2. Sampling size: The samples taken for this study purpose is 150.
3. Sampling plan: In this study the structured questionnaire is prepared and it is send to users through their database available. The questionnaire has been send to 227 users out of 227 users 157 users responded in that 7 didn't fill the questionnaire fully so the sample size is determined for this study is 150.
4. Sampling Technique: Convenient Sampling

DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

Relationship between the personal factor and the various factors that affect influence level of users

- **Null Hypothesis (H0):** There is no significant relationship between personal factor and the users influence level.
- **Alternative Hypothesis (H1):** There is significant relationship between personal factors and the users influence level

Multivariate Tests						
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	0.983	2.010E3[a]	4	142	0
	Wilks' Lambda	0.017	2.010E3[a]	4	142	0
	Hotelling's Trace	56.629	2.010E3[a]	4	142	0
	Roy's Largest Root	56.629	2.010E3[a]	4	142	0
Age Categories	Pillai's Trace	1.337	18.191	16	580	0.001
	Wilks' Lambda	0.044	48.324	16	434.455	0
	Hotelling's Trace	13.727	120.543	16	562	0
	Roy's Largest Root	13.173	4.775E2[c]	4	145	0

Table I: Multivariate test to find out the significant relationship between personal factor and user's influence level

Interference: Pillai trace significance level > 0.05 so null hypothesis H0 is accepted and alternative hypothesis H1 is rejected. There is no significant relationship between the personal factor and the various factors that influence the users. So there is no relationship between the user's personal factors and the factors that influence the users.

Relationship between the personal factor and company links provided by the company

- **Null Hypothesis (H0):** There is no significant relationship between the personal factor and the links provided by the company.
- **Alternative Hypothesis (H1):** There is significant relationship between the personal factor and the links provided by the company.

Multivariate Tests							
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Noncent. Parameter
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	0.942	3.791E2[a]	6	139	0	2274.32
	Wilks' Lambda	0.058	3.791E2[a]	6	139	0	2274.32
	Hotelling's Trace	16.362	3.791E2[a]	6	139	0	2274.32
Age	Pillai's Trace	0.644	41.819[a]	6	139	0.007	250.915
	Wilks' Lambda	0.356	41.819[a]	6	139	0.007	250.915
	Hotelling's Trace	1.805	41.819[a]	6	139	0	250.915
	Roy's Largest Root	1.805	41.819[a]	6	139	0	250.915
Categories	Pillai's Trace	1.724	17.935	24	568	0.001	430.449
	Wilks' Lambda	0.039	31.06	24	486.123	0	607.439
	Hotelling's Trace	7.782	44.585	24	550	0	1070.036
	Roy's Largest Root	5.091	1.205E2[c]	6	142	0	722.981

Table II: Multivariate test to find out the significant relationship between personal factor and the links provided by the company

Interpretation:

From the table according to the Pillai Trace the level of Significance >0.05 so the null hypothesis H0 is accepted and the alternative hypothesis H1 is rejected. There is no significant relationship between the personal factor and the links provided by company. The personal factors of the users didn't increase the website ranking.

RESULT AND CONCLUSION

We find that focusing on personal factor does not affect the ranking of the website. Hence it is not the factor that leads to the ranking or popularity of a website. We also observe from the analysis that personal factors such as age, gender, category of the employment etc, doesn't help much in influencing the user, as 64% of the users belong to the age group of 25-35 years. They are much proficient in using internet. Yet 61% of the users were tensed towards wrong content and 47% of the respondents are strongly disagreed towards the insufficient content. So the management can provide enough content for the users relate to their search the same information. In this study the users were strongly agreed with the various links, updates, news alerts and funding and acquisition details of the company

REFERENCES

1. Abiteboul, S., and Vianu, V., (1997). Queries and Computation on the web. In ICDT. | 2. Adam, R., (2002). Is e-mail addictive? Aslib Proceedings 54(2):85-94. | 3. Barker, J., (2005). Meta-search engines. http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/Teachinglib/Guides/Internet/metaserach.html (Accessed 3 February 2014). | 4. Biving (2008), SEO Basics, June 2008. Washinton D.C., The Bivings Group. | 5. Brin, S., and Page, L., (1998). The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual Web search engine, Journal of Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, 30(1), pp- 107-117 | 6. Fetterly, D., Manasse, M., and Najork, M., (2004). Spam, damn spam, and statistics. Using statistical analysis to locate spam Web pages. In: Proceedings of the Seventh International Workshop on the Web and Databases, Paris, 17-18 June. | 7. Green, D., (2000). The evolution of Web searching. Online Information Review 24(2):124-137. | 8. Perkins, A., (2001). The classification of search engine spam. http://www.silverdisc.co.uk/articles/spam-classification/ (Accessed 12 March 2014). | 9. Thurow, S., (2003). Search engine visibility. Indianapolis: New Riders Publishing. | 10. Wallace, D., (2003). Spamming techniques that you will want to avoid. http://www.searchrank.com/resources/art003.htm (Accessed 3 February 2014) | 11. Zhang, J., and Dimitroff, A., (2005), The Impact of webpage content characterstics on webpage visibility in search engine results. Journal of Information Processing and Management: an International Journal – Special issue: Cross-language information retrieval. 41(3), pp-665-690. |