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ABSTRACT
The rapid technological environment (especially information technology) and globalization has changed everything from routine life to business in the 21st century. The rapid explosion of mobile technologies and devices presents marketers with innovative and exclusive possibilities to interact with their existing and potential customers. Thus mobile phones are no longer used for communication alone. The world has entered into an era called "the mobile era". The mobile phones, often said smart phones performs everything from browsing internet to online shopping, mobile banking and mobile payments. Thus the mobile phone turns out to be a third screen after TV and computer. Which was 200 million only in the year 1998; the convergence of wireless telephony and internet, higher penetration rate of the mobile phone have pooled together to present a new platform for advertising, known as mobile marketing. This paper attempts to discuss about the difference in customer attitude towards mobile advertising across demographic factors.

1. Introduction
Nowadays mobile phones have become so popular that it is very difficult to find single person without it. It has become a necessity and integral part of our life. As it can be used 24/7 irrespective of time and place, the user can surf internet, listen music, or play games. Message services in forms of short message service (SMS) and multi-media service (MMS) are also increasingly popular and widely used. The subscriber base in India amounts to 867.80 million as on 31st March 2018. (TRAI, 2017) This throws enormous prospect for marketers to penetrate more in Indian customer market and even to the integral rural parts of the company. This has made mobile phone technology human convergence easy. According to Sultan (2005), the growing pace of mobile industry, enabled the marketers to have direct and two way communication with the customers and also helped in developing relationships with the customers. Demographics are evidently a basis for segmentation in marketing (Kotler 2010), which portrays the customers. Demographics have apparently developed an aversion to the mobile advertisements. The study reveals that the mobile users have apparently developed an aversion to the mobile marketing messages, to which they are being subjected.

Mobile Marketing
According to Macmanus and Scomavacca (2005), "mobile marketing offers an astonishing chance to marketers to investigate the exclusive advantages of the mobile medium as a channel of promotional direct marketing."

2. Literature Review
Bauer and Greyser (1968) reported that more people held favorable attitudes toward advertising than unfavorable attitudes.

Later studies have provided more evidence of the unfavorable public attitude toward advertising (Mittal, 1994). Bogart (1990) found different media affects consumer attitudes.

Internet has emerged as a new medium for communication and advertising has motivated a substantial amount of research that focuses on the Internet (Eighmey, 1997, Korgaonkar, 1999). It has also driven studies on attitudes toward Internet of the Internet, some surveys report that respondents viewed Internet advertising as more informative and trustworthy than a demographically similar sample found in general advertising (Schlosser, Shavitt and Kanfer, 1999).

Many direct-response advertisements and some brand building ones have been used for time-sensitive communication (Barwise, P., and Strong, 2002). Mobile advertising and Internet advertising have many features in common both are emerging media used to deliver digital texts, images, and voices with interactive, immediate, personalized, and responsive capabilities (Yoon and Kim, 2001).

Consumer Attitude towards Mobile Marketing
Malhotra & Malhotra (2014) revealed that efforts have been made to detect the attitude of the consumers towards mobile advertisement. The study reveals that the mobile users have apparently developed an aversion to the mobile marketing messages, to which they are being subjected.

Chang (2013) in his study revealed that for all age groups, expectation is the most influential predictor when a message is read, and perceived relevance is the most prominent predictor of how much of a message is read. Different age groups exhibits similar reading behaviours, and the mechanisms underlying the reading behaviours differs across different age groups.

Park and Ohm (2014) conducted a study indicated that mobile advertisements elicited more positive attitudes towards such advertisements and purchase intention. The results also exhibits that pop-ups elicited more positive attitudes and purchase intention.
Coursaris et al., (2012) revealed that mobile advertising study conducted with college students evaluated the effect of a mobile advertisement's message length on the receiving mobile user's perceptions of informativeness, entertainment and consequent attitude toward the advertisement, as well as cultural, gender or age differences. A PLS data analysis indicates positive effects of mobile ads' message length on the perceived informativeness and entertainment of the mobile ad, which in turn positively influence both attitude toward the mobile ad and the mobile user's intention to learn more about the advertised brand.

3. Theoretical Framework

The variables used in this paper are Perceived Value, Trust, Control and Interactivity.

H1: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on Age brackets regarding perceived value for mobile marketing.

H2: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on Age brackets regarding Trust for mobile marketing.

H3: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on Age brackets regarding control for mobile marketing.

H4: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on Age brackets regarding interactivity for mobile marketing.

H5: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on Age brackets regarding consumer attitude towards mobile marketing.

H6: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on Age brackets regarding purchase intention.

H7: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on gender regarding Perceived Value for mobile marketing.

H8: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on gender regarding Trust for mobile marketing.

H9: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on gender regarding Control for mobile marketing.

H10: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on gender regarding Interactivity for mobile marketing.

H11: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on gender regarding Consumer Attitude towards mobile marketing.

H12: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on gender regarding Purchase Intention.

H13: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on occupation regarding Perceived Value for mobile marketing.

H14: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on occupation regarding Trust for mobile marketing.

H15: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on occupation regarding Control for mobile marketing.

H16: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on occupation regarding Interactivity for mobile marketing.

H17: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on occupation regarding Consumer Attitude towards mobile marketing.

H18: Significant differences do not exist between respondents based on occupation regarding Purchase Intention.

4. Methodology

Data for this study was collected through a questionnaire survey from 387 Mobile Users of Udaipur City, consist of questions pertaining to, Perceived Value, Control, Trust, Interactivity, Attitude and Purchase Intention. The reliability of the questionnaire was tested using Cronbach’s alpha. The results are shown in Table 1. Results of the reliability test confirm that the data collected are reliable and suitable for further analysis.

Table 1.1: Scale Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Data analysis and findings

Demographic Profile The gender wise analysis revealed that out of the total respondents, about 56 percent are male while 44 percent were female. Majority of respondents are 15-24 year of age (55 percent). Out of the total customers, about 81 percent belong to student class and 12% are employed and only 7 percent are related to business category.

Result of Independent T test and One way Anova.

Table 1.2: One-Way ANOVA for Consumer Attitude and other Factors of Mobile Marketing across Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P_Value</td>
<td>19.349</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>22.990</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact</td>
<td>14.486</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>883.680</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>H6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurchInt</td>
<td>6.185</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>H7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a significant difference between Means, resulting in a significant difference ($F = 19.349; \text{Sig.} = 0.000$). The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_1$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards perceived value of mobile marketing among different age brackets.

There is a significant difference between the Means, resulting in a significant difference ($F = 22.990; \text{Sig.} = 0.000$). The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_2$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards trust for mobile marketing among different age brackets.

There is a significant difference between the Means, resulting in a significant difference ($F = 24.755; \text{Sig.} = 0.000$). The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_3$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards control for mobile marketing among different age brackets.

There is a significant difference between the Means, resulting in a significant difference ($F = 24.755; \text{Sig.} = 0.000$). The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_4$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards interactivity for mobile marketing among different age brackets.

There is a significant difference between the two Means for Attitude, resulting in a significant difference ($F = 883.680; \text{Sig.} = 0.000$). The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_5$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards attitude for mobile marketing among different age brackets.

There is a significant difference between the Means, resulting in a significant difference ($F = 6.185; \text{Sig.} = 0.000$). The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_6$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards purchase intention for mobile marketing among different age brackets.

There is a significant difference between the means, resulting in a significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_7$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards Perceived Value for mobile marketing among gender.

There is a significant difference between Means, resulting in a significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_8$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards Trust for mobile marketing among gender.

There is a significant difference between Means, resulting in a significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_9$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards Control for mobile marketing among gender.

There is a significant difference between the two means, resulting in a non significant difference. The Sig. value is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_{10}$ must be accepted which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards interactivity for mobile marketing among gender.

There is a significant difference between Means, resulting in a significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that $H_{11}$ must be rejected which states that there is no significant difference between opinion of customers towards attitude for mobile marketing among different gender.

| Table 1.3: Independent Sample `t` Test for Consumer Attitude and Other Factors of Mobile Marketing across Gender |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | Sig. | t | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Hypothesis testing |
| PV | .223 | .637 | -3.692 | 385 | .000 | H8 Accepted |
| Trust | .211 | .647 | -3.512 | 385 | .000 | H9 Accepted |
| Control | .027 | .869 | -3.427 | 385 | .001 | H10 Accepted |
| Interact | .484 | .487 | -1.591 | 385 | .112 | H11 Rejected |
| Attitude | 12.587 | .000 | -12.439 | 385 | .000 | H12 Rejected |
| PurchInt | 1.754 | .186 | -1.520 | 385 | .129 | H13 Rejected |

| Table 1.4: One-Way ANOVA for Consumer Attitude and Other Factors of Mobile Marketing across Occupation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | F | Sig. | Hypothesis testing |
| P_Value | 16.889 | .000 | H14 Rejected |
| Trust | 19.090 | .000 | H15 Rejected |
| Control | 20.526 | .000 | H16 Rejected |
| Interact | 11.656 | .000 | H17 Rejected |
| Attitude | 132.849 | .000 | H18 Rejected |
| PurchInt | 2.868 | .058 | H19 Accepted |
There is a no significant difference between Means, resulting in a non significant difference. The Sig. value is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that H12 must be accepted which states that there no significant difference between opinion of customers towards purchase intention for mobile marketing among gender.

There is a significant difference between Means, resulting in a non significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that H13 must be rejected which states that there no significant difference between opinion of customers towards Perceived Value for mobile marketing among occupation.

There is a significant difference between Means, resulting in a non significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that H14 must be rejected which states that there no significant difference between opinion of customers towards trust for mobile marketing among occupation.

There is a significant difference between Means, resulting in a non significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that H15 must be rejected which states that there no significant difference between opinion of customers towards control for mobile marketing among occupation.

There is a significant difference between the two Means, resulting in a non significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that H16 must be rejected which states that there no significant difference between opinion of customers towards interactivity for mobile marketing among occupation.

There is a significant difference between Means, resulting in a non significant difference. The Sig. value is lower than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that H17 must be rejected which states that there no significant difference between opinion of customers towards attitude for mobile marketing among different occupation.

There is a no significant difference between Means, resulting in a non significant difference. The Sig. value is higher than the Sig. level of 0.05. This means that H18 must be accepted which states that there no significant difference between opinion of customers towards purchase intention for mobile marketing among occupation.

6. Conclusion and suggestions

The Mobile phone has become a live platform for marketers to reach potential consumers. In order to understand the function of mobile advertisements and to make them more effective, consumer attitudes and behaviors need to be reviewed elaborately. For this reason, consumer attitudes and their demographic features were analyzed in this study, in order to be closely acquainted with the users who are sent mobile advertisement messages via mobile devices. A successful determination of consumers' attitudes, interests and desires and observing its relationship with demographic factors by the corporations will help them to follow correct marketing strategy applications. With this in mind, "Attitudes towards Mobile Advertising" and "Demographic Features" of the consumers that decide to purchase goods are analyzed with a survey in this study. A attempt was done to know the difference among opinion of respondents with regard to Perceived Value, Trust and Control, interactivity which are considered crucial in influencing customer attitude. The study found that there exists no difference in customer attitude and customer behaviour towards mobile advertising across demographics.
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