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Abstract
One of the new intelligent daily usable technology is a mobile phone for foreigners’ students, which help them in different sphere of life such as navigation of ways, connectivity with one another, and education, besides that the mobile companies target foreigners with different types of advertisements for buying their products. The data was taken through a convenient sample technique with a standardized questionnaire with a reliability of (.853) from international hostels at Gujarat University. Moreover, the data were analyzed through SPSS by applying the t-test, Pearson correlation, and one-way ANOVA. The result showed that the gender of the participants and age have significant importance with mobile buying decision behavior. However, the education levels, marital status, and Type of Advertisement do not have significant importance with mobile buying decision behavior.
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INTRODUCTION
Mobile phone is an indispensable part of human life. The current generation mediates with digital mobile communication for personal and organizational perspectives. Individuals are gradually using this digital technology since last decade for different purposes (Karjaluoto et al., 2005), for instance, communications, navigation of roads, selling and buying, business and civil transactions, official usages, academic learning, tourism, advertisement of hotels and airlines (Hadjem et al., 2010; Kang et al., 2013; Nobre & Silva, 2014; Rahaman, 2017; Sadekur Rahman et al., 2020). Hence, exploring the advertisement’s influence on international students’ mobile buying decision behavior is crucial.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Consumer buying decision behavior is the study of how, where, why, and when consumers do or do not buy goods and services (Sandhusen & Richard, 2000). Ahmed et al. (2019) proved that digital technologies, especially mobile phones and tablets, are essential sources for advertisement. Moreover, the mobile buying decision behavior of the users has a strong positive association with advertising. Malik et al. (2013) proved that buying decision behavior is strongly associated with advertisements. Furthermore, adults are positively influenced by advertisement buying behavior. According to Zia (2016) define Advertisements, and the purchase behavior of the customers, an increase in the advertisement has a direct positive significant impact on consumers’ purchase decision behavior in Pakistan. In other words, when there is an excellent advertisement of a product, the customer is affected more by buying decision behavior. Similarly, Christohn Louse (2018) proved that advertising significantly affects consumer buying decisions. On the contrary, F. U. Rehman et al. (2014) argued that advertisements have a negative significant influence in rural places on buying decision behavior of the participants.

Kotler & Armstrong (2001) from the individual and household who buy goods and services for personal consumption has related to the consumer buying behavior. These consumers have many types, such as income, age, level of education, and preferences, that may influence the services and goods. Sandhusen & Richard (2000) shows that changing the features of mobile phones (a handset of reputed brand, smart appearance, and with advanced value-added features, pleasure ability, and usability) is chosen by young consumers, females,
postgraduates, and students in the occupational group plays a more prominent role in mobile buying decision behavior. According to the study of Rehman et al. (2014) argued that digital advertisement, primarily through Facebook, has a negative significant effect on buying decision behavior of the young participants. The study also noted that females have more negative effects compared to male participants. However, Eshra & Beshir (2019) proved that age significantly affects consumer buying decision behavior. Rana & Tirthani (2011) discovered in the garments sector that education level has a significant effect on the consumer buying decision behavior and the gender of the participants do not have a significant influence on buying decision behavior.

2.1 Problem Statement
According to researchers’ observations for international students’ mobile phones (smartphone) is one of the essential parts of life, especially the overseas students, such as for academic purposes, navigation of places via digital maps, enjoyment purposes, connectivity social interaction, and for different types of transactions. However, it is not clear which kinds of advertisements mobile companies target international students to buy their products. Because of these reasons, this research assesses the advertisement buying decision behavior of international students at Gujarat University, Ahmedabad.

2.2 Objectives of the study
- The researcher was focused on the following specific objectives:
  - To differentiate the gender of the participants on mobile buying decision behavior through advertisement.
  - To find the relationship between ages with an advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior.
  - To recognize the education level on mobile buying decision behavior through advertisement.
  - To explore the marital status on mobile buying decision behavior through the advertisement of the participants.
  - To evaluate the influence of types of advertisement on buying decision behavior of foreign students’ mobile consumers’ of Gujarat University.

2.3 Hypotheses of the study
- H1: The gender of the participants has a significant difference in mobile buying decision behavior through advertisement.
- H2: There is a positive significant relationship among age with an advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior.
- H3: There is a significant difference in education level on mobile buying decision behavior through advertisement.
- H4: Marital status does not have any difference in mobile buying decision behavior through an advertisement of the participants.
- H5: Type of Advertisement has a significant influence on buying decision behavior of foreign students’ mobile consumers’ of Gujarat University.

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Material
The questionnaire of Advertisement buying decision behavior had demographic and six dimensions standardized scale with Cronbach alpha (0.853). The data was taken through a convenient sample technique with a standardized questionnaire. Its dimensions consist of Influence, Necessity, Pleasure, Dominance, Remind/Recall, and Stimulation. Overall this questionnaire assessed the measures on Five Likert Scale, which were (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) Strongly agree. This raw questionnaire score ranged from 25 to 125, and mean soccer was 75. The raw score of 25 means the participants are strongly disagreed. The 75 score means the participants want to be natural. They do not want to show their idea, and the 125 score means the participants strongly agree and are influenced by mobile buying decision behavior.

3.2 Sample size
There were 75 international students from 16 countries at Gujarat University hostels 45 were males, 30 were females, and there were 50 samples taken from the population. The standardized questionnaire was distributed equally (25 samples) to each gender with a random sample technique. It was requested from each participant to participate voluntarily, and if they refused, then requested from other students.
RESULT

The below tables shows the result of the data.

Table 1
Descriptive statistics of the research participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age (ranged)</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N: 50</td>
<td>Total N: 50</td>
<td>Total N: 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 explains descriptive statistics of the participants’ sample. There were 25 males and 25 females, and the age ranged from 18 to 38. Moreover, the marital status of the sample consisted of 42 singles and 8 married, and the education level consisted of BA (22), MA (22), and Ph.D. (6) samples.

Table 2
Group Statistics and Independent Samples t-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisement of Mobile Buying Decision Behavior</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.25</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>83.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01. N=49. T-test is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 depicts an independent-samples t-test among the gender with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior variable (Advertisement Influence, Advertisement Necessity, Advertisement Pleasure, Advertisement Dominance, Advertisement Remind/Recall, and Advertisement Stimulation). There was a significant difference between gender and advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior variable. The mean scores for males (M=93.25, SD=11.5) and females (M=83.16, SD=13.05) conditions; t (47) =3.81, p <.01, at the 0.01 level on two-tailed test. These results suggest that gender does affect advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior. Specifically, our results suggest that males are more influenced than females through mobile buying decision behavior advertisements.

H1: The gender of the participants has a significant difference in mobile buying decision behavior through advertisement.

The H1 hypothesis was accepted because there was a significant difference between genders regarding mobile buying decision behavior advertisement. The result proves that males have been influenced more by advertisements of mobile buying decision behavior than females.

Table 3
Descriptive statistics and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations of the participants’ age with mobile buying decision behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1. Advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior</th>
<th>2. age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88.1020</td>
<td>13.21496</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.54</td>
<td>4.505</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.288*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05. N=50. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, which computed the age with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behaviors (Influence of Advertisement, Necessity of Advertisement, Pleasure of Advertisement, Dominance of Advertisement, Remind/Recall of Advertisement, and Stimulation of Advertisement). Overall there were 50 participants, and one was missing. Age and advertisement of mobile buying decision behaviors have a strong positive correlation between the two variables, $r = .288^*$, $N = 49$. Moreover, the relationship is significant at 0.05 level and $p=.045$. Overall, participants’ age appears to be associated with advertisements of mobile buying decision behaviors. In other words, an increase in age is positively correlated with increases in the advertisement of mobile buying decision behaviors of the participants.

H2: There is a positive significant relationship among age with an advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior. The above H2 hypothesis was accepted. It means there was a significant positive correlation between the ages of the participants with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behaviors. In other words, increasing age has a positive relationship with an increase in the participants’ mobile buying decision behaviors. Despite, the decrease in period showed the same time decreasing in the advertisement of mobile buying decision behaviors.

Table 4
One way ANOVA: Education level & advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>519.074</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>259.537</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7863.416</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>170.944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8382.490</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P>.05. Between groups, variance is not significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4 explained, one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of education level (BA, MA, and Ph.D.) conditions with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior. The result showed that there was not a significant effect level on advertising of mobile buying decision behavior at the $p>.05$ level for the three conditions $[F(2, 46) =1.518, p =.23]$. In other words, education level did not have significant differences through advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior.

H3: There is a significant difference in education level on mobile buying decision behavior through advertisement. The H3 hypothesis was rejected because there was not a significant difference between educations levels with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior. In other words, these results suggest that BA, MA, and Ph.D. do not have significant differences among themselves on advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior.

Table 5
Group Statistics and Independent Samples t-Test of Marital status with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>87.19</td>
<td>92.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement Of Mobile Buying Decision Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P>.05. N=49. The T-test is not significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 depicts an independent-samples t-test among the marital status with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior variable (Advertisement Influence, Advertisement Necessity, Advertisement Pleasure, Advertisement Dominance, Advertisement Remind/Recall, and Advertisement Stimulation). There was not a significant difference between marital status and advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior. The mean scores for married ($M=87.19$, $SD=12.35$) and single ($M=92.75$, $SD=17.2$) conditions; $t (47) =-1.09$, $p >.05$, at 0.05 level on two-tailed test. These results suggest that marital status does not affect the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior.

H4: Marital status does not have any difference in mobile buying decision behavior through an advertisement of the participants.

The H4 hypothesis was accepted. Because there was not a significant difference between marital statuses with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior, it means participants’ marital status has not been influenced by advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior.

Table 6
One way ANOVA: Type of Advertisement & Advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>888.660</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>296.220</td>
<td>1.779</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 depicts, one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of Type of Advertisement (Print advertisement, Digital advertisement, Road or banner advertisement) conditions with the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior. The analysis shows that there is no significant effect of Type of Advertisement on Advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior at the p > 0.05 level for the three conditions [F (3, 45) = 1.779, p = 0.165]. In other words, the Type of Advertisement does not have significant differences through advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior.

H5: Type of Advertisement has a significant influence on buying decision behavior of foreign students’ mobile consumers’ of Gujarat University.

The H5 hypothesis is rejected because there was no significant difference between Types of Advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior. In other words, these results suggest that Print advertisement, Digital advertisement, and Road or banner advertisement do not have significant differences among themselves on advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior.

DISCUSSION

The gender of the participants has a significantly different influence on the advertisement of mobile buying decision behavior. Especially males are more influenced than females. Sandhusen & Richard (2000) also proved that female students have a more prominent role in mobile buying decision behavior than males. However, Rehman et al. (2014) proved that females have more negative effects than male participants with digital Advertisement buying decision behavior. On the other side, Rana & Tirthani (2011) proved in research that the gender of the participants does not have a significant influence on buying decision behavior.

The age of the participants also has a positive significant association with the mobile advertisement of buying decision behavior. In other words, increasing age influences mobile advertisement of buying decision behavior and Vice versa. Sandhusen & Richard (2000), Eshra & Beshir (2019) also proved that adults directly relate to mobile buying decision behavior. And Malik et al. (2013) also found that adults are positively significant influenced by advertisement buying behavior.

The participants’ education levels do not have any significant difference with the mobile advertisement of buying decision behavior. However, Kotler & Armstrong (2001) also argued that age and education levels influenced mobile buying decision behavior. Sandhusen & Richard (2000) argued that postgraduates have significant differences compared with other levels of educations. Similarly, Rana & Tirthani (2011) proved that education level significantly affects consumer buying decision behavior.

The participants’ marital status does not have a significant difference with the mobile advertisement of buying decision behavior.

On the other side, types of advertisement do not have a significantly different influence on buying decision behavior of mobile consumers’ of Gujarat University International students. However, some researchers proved that mobile buying decision behavior has strong positive significant effects with types of advertisements (Ahmed et al., 2019; Christohn Louse, 2018; Malik et al., 2013; Zia, 2016). However, F. U. Rehman et al. (2014) argued differently that advertisements have a significant negative influence in rural places on buying decision behavior of the participants.

LIMITATION

There is a very small sample to generalize all international students in the Gujarat State of India.

SUGGESTIONS

- There are many international students at different Universities in Gujarat state. It is highly suggested to take more samples from other universities also.
- A more qualitative method also must be implemented for finding the exact reason.
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