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Abstract
Uses of cellular phone among the university students are increasing in Bangladesh. To capture this growing market segment and meeting their diverse demand, it is important for the manufacturers and marketers of cellular phone to know about the factors that these young truly judge. This study is undertaken to find out the factors that affect young Bangladeshi university students’ intention to purchase cellular phone. Through using a structured questionnaire, completed responses of 350 respondents were collected by applying convenience sampling technique. To test the reliability of the collected data, Cronbach’s alpha was measured. Besides this, Regression and ANOVA is used to explain the relationship between the factors affecting university students’ cell phone purchase intention and test the proposed hypotheses. Statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 was used to perform the statistical tests. This study found significant influence of cell phone price, cell phone feature, brand name and social influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention. Findings of the study will help the cellular phone manufacturers and marketers to design their youth centric marketing strategies. Moreover, managerial implications along with the directions for future research have also been discussed.
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1. Introduction
As we are now living in an age of digitalization, the application of sophisticated technological devices in our daily life is rising rapidly. The size and shape of these devices are also changing quickly to match the changing taste and needs of customers (Rahim, Safin, Kheng, Abas & Ali, 2016). The people of different social classes, ages and income levels are very much accustomed with a wide range of technological devices and accessories. The introduction and development of mobile phones in our everyday life is one of the indications of these technological changes (Adekunle & Ejechi, 2018). The invention of mobile phones has changed the basic purpose of communication from reaching and exchanging views with other to a new way of interaction and assistance. Mobile phones have become part and parcel of our daily life (Smura, Kivi & Toyli, 2009; Sata, 2013). This is the device by which we can now express our thoughts and views, get our works done, assist others in their way of life and share our joys and hurts with others. Mobile phones are now considered as an inseparable part of our personal communication context (Karjaluuoto et al., 2005). Among the diverse modes of communication, mobile phone is one of the most reliable and efficient vehicles to reach wide range of persons within a very short time (Uddin, Lopa & Oheduzzaman, 2014). This device had one of the quickest household adoption rates of any other technological devices in the modern history (Comer & Wikle, 2008).

The mobile phone is an electronic communication device that the users use for companionship and telesociability (Kopomaa, 2000). It is not only a device that links an individual with social networks (Oksman, 2010) but also a mechanism to get connected, a plaything to fun, a means for entertainment, a device for surfing the web, a reliever to tedious life and device to keep the people busy (Uddin, Xu & Azim, 2015). Martin Cooper invented mobile phone and made the very first cellular call from Manhattan on April 3, 1973 (Cooper, 2001). Mobile phone technology is still evolving (Lin, Chao and Tang, 2017) and this technological advancements then lead mobile phone a journey from 0G (mobile radio telephone) to first generation’s 1G (analog signal) to second generation’s 2G (digital signal) to third generation’s 3G (digital signal and data) and very recent to fourth generation’s 4G (high speed audio and video streaming) technology (Bhalla & Bhalla, 2010), Li, Gani, Salleh & Zakaria (2009) predicted the bunch usages of fifth generation’s 5G (World Wide Wireless Web), sixth generations 6G (cellular system), and seventh generation’s 7G (space roaming system) mobile technology by 2020, 2030, and 2040 correspondingly.

The mobile phone handset was launched in Bangladesh in early nineties (Uddin et al., 2014) and Nokia pioneered the journey leading from the front. Currently many mobile phone brands such as Samsung, Symphony, Walton, Nokia, Sony, HTC, Apple, Huawei, Motorola, Panasonic, LG, Micromax, Vivo, Oppo, Xiaomi etc. are available in Bangladesh from where the consumers usually choose their preferred mobile phone. At the end of November, 2018, the total number of subscribers of different mobile phone operators has reached 157.048 million in Bangladesh (BTRC, 2018). Although there are various types of cellular phones or mobile phones like smartphone, camera phone, mp3/music phone, and basic phone that are available in the global market
The objectives of this study includes-

- To explore the prior studies related to the young customers cellular phone purchase intention.
- To find out the most influential factors that influence young student’s intention to purchase of cellular phone.

3. Literature Review and Development of Hypotheses

There are number of factors that influence consumers’ intention to purchase cellular phone. A good number of scholars (e.g. Cooper, 2001; Campbell and Russo, 2003; Park and Yang, 2006; Van Biljon and Kotzé, 2008; Petruzzellis, 2010; Azad and Safaei, 2012; Sata, 2013; Uddin et al., 2015; Walia and Singla, 2017) have already conducted quality research in this area. Based on the findings of the prior research, the researcher choose six factors namely product price, product feature, brand name, social influence, ease of use and promotion of the brand that influence customers purchase intention of cellular phone.

3.1 Cellular Phone

The cellular phone, popularly known as cell phone or mobile phone, is an electronic communication device that the users use for companionship and telesociability (Kopomaa, 2000). It is a device that links an individual with social networks (Oksman, 2010) and provide a mechanism to get connected, a plaything to fun, a means for entertainment, a device for surfing the web, a reliever to tedious life and device to keep the people busy (Uddin, Xu & Azim, 2015). There are various types of cell phones such as basic phone or feature phone that are mainly used for telephony purposes; mp3 or music phone that are used specially for listening music; camera phone which is designed with superior photo capturing capability; and smartphone that are equipped with sophisticated...
connectivity, faster internet accessibility and enhanced computing capability (Techspirited, n. d.; Falayi and Adedokun, 2014). But customers in Bangladesh are familiar mainly with two grouping of mobile phones- basic or feature phone, and smartphone.

3.2 Purchase Intention
Purchase intention is the customers preplanning of purchasing specific products in future (Warshaw & Davis, 1985). It shows the consumers’ tendency of potential purchasing action that helps in measuring their actual purchase behavior (Trivedi & Raval, 2016). It explains the consumer’s product categorization and formation of their preference for purchasing the product (Zeithaml, 1988). It is the consumers’ willingness to buy a product. Consumer’s willingness to purchase is reflected in his or her intention to purchase (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2000). Consumer’s intention to buy and use a product can be explained through the traditional five-step process involving knowing the need, searching for accessible information, assessing the alternatives, buying the product and making the post-buying appraisal; which is applicable for both individual product and brand choice (Dorsch, Grove, and Darden, 2000). Consumer’s intention to buy mobile phone also follows this traditional buying approach (Karjaluoto et al., 2005). Whenever any consumer intend to buy a smartphone, they usually considers brand name, product quality, product price, recreational capability, function ability, durability etc. (Rahim et al., 2016; Tran, 2018) which also applicable for basic or features phones.

3.3 Product Price
Mobile phones’ price is an important factor that many consumers considered in choosing a mobile phone model (Karjaluoto et al., 2003). In particular, younger customers considers price besides the technological advancements while purchasing any mobile phone (Karjaluoto et al., 2005). Price is the sum of money that consumers usually pay for acquiring and using any product (Kotler, Armstrong, Agnihotri & Haque, 2010). Whether the consumer buy a mobile handset often significantly affected by its price (Chapman & Wahlers, 1999; Munnukka, 2005; Uddin et al., 2015). Suki (2013) also argued that product price significantly affect young university students’ smartphone choice and buying behavior. That means, consumers’ intention to buy a mobile phone, whether feature or smartphone, depends largely on the price of that mobile phone. Many prior studies (e.g. Lay-Yee, Kok-Siew and Yin Fah, 2013; Suki, 2013; Falayi and Adedokun, 2014; Kaushal and Kumar, 2016; Lin et al., 2017) also suggest that price of the product have significant influence on intention to purchase the product. Hence, the researcher proposed the following hypothesis:

H1: Product price has significant influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention.

3.4 Product Feature
The attributes of product that the consumers’ acquire and use to satisfy their needs and wants can be termed as the product feature (Kotler et al., 2010). Physical attributes of the product such as artistic and stylish design, storage space or capacity, battery durability, screen size, buttons and related parts and processes etc. affect the choice of consumers (Brewster, 2002; Haverila, 2011; Haverila, 2012; Suki, 2013). Consumers often consider design as the most significant determinant of their purchase decision (Crilly, Moultrie & Clarkson, 2004). Both the hardware and software components of cellular phone are developing continuously that the customers consider before purchase (Osman, Talib, Sanusi, Shiang-Yen & Alwi, 2012; Lay-Yee et al., 2013). Besides basic calling and texting, modern customers also value the entertaining capability such as playing games, listening music, watching movie, and connecting to people using social networking sites (Moon & Kim, 2001; Uddin et al., 2015). Previous studies also found that the young students of colleges and universities consider phone size, weight, color, physical appearance, menu organization, and related programs and processes of a Smartphone before purchasing (Lay-Yee et al., 2013; Suki, 2013; Suki & Suki, 2013; Falayi & Acedukun, 2014; Rahim et al., 2016).

Thus, the researcher developed the following hypothesis:

H2: Product features have significant influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention.

3.5 Brand Name
Brand can be viewed as a name, term, sign, symbol, design, or a combination of all these aspects that identify and differentiate seller’s products from its competitors (Kotler & Keller, 2006). Brands are not just names and symbols, but more than that which links customers with the company. Brand name significantly affects consumer's purchase behavior (Kaushal & Kumar, 2016). Brand or brand name reflects status symbol, helps in exhibiting product information, and specify product in the market (Suki, 2013). Brand name of products or services is increasingly treated as one of the most precious assets of the company (Cornelis, 2010). Brand names are such priceless assets that suggest precious knowledge structures and quality related to the brand (Srinivasan & Till, 2002). Users often prefer a broadly recognized and accepted brand of cellular phone. Khasawneh and Hasounneh (2010) suggested that the brand name of product’s influence consumers’ product evaluation and
affects their actual purchase intention. Prior research in this field also confirms the effects of brand name on consumers purchase intention of cellular phone (Lay-Yee et al., 2013; Suki, 2013; Wollenberg & Thuong, 2014; Kaushal & Kumar, 2016).

Therefore, the researcher projected the following hypothesis:

**H3: Brand name has significant influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention.**

### 3.6 Social Influence

Another important factor that influence consumers purchase intention is the society they belong, the family, friends and peers they are associated with. When a person’s feelings, thoughts, attitude, and behavior changed with the intentional or unintentional influence of other persons in the society, then it can be treated as social influence (Rashotte, 2007). Consumers are naturally influenced by the persons whom they treat as important while making the buying decision of a particular product or brand (Kaushal & Kumar, 2016). Social influence includes the influence of consumer’s parents and other family members, social group, community feelings, media, opinion leaders, peers, and friends etc. that also restricts consumer’s purchase behavior (Jiang, 2004; Nelson & McLeod, 2005; Auter, 2007). Before buying a cellular phone, young consumers’ often thinks of whether their friends, family members or peers like it. In many previous studies, social influence has been confirmed as having significant influence on consumer's cellular phone purchase decision (Ibrahim, Subari, Kassim & Mohamood, 2013; Suki, 2013; Uddin et al., 2015).

Hence, the researcher proposed the following hypothesis:

**H4: Social influence has significant influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention.**

### 3.7 Ease of Use

People, whether young or aged, normally try to avoid complexity. As cellular phone is a technical product, they often preferred phones that are easy to operate. When buying a mobile phone, most of the people feel comfortable in buying a phone which they can operate easily and with minimum effort (Park & Chen, 2007; Dunlop & Brewster, 2002). Ease of use represents the scope to which a system can be used with a minimum level of efforts by its user (Davis, 1989) and is associated with easy learning, unproblematic and convenient use, flexibility and less complexity (Davis, Bagozzi & Warshaw, 1989). Consumers frequently assess a particular mobile phone brand’s ease of use with convenience that is how easily they can get and use the phone. Consumers are interested to buy a mobile phone which is easily available and involves less complexity in using (Uddin et al., 2015). Previous studies (e.g. Ting, Lim, Patanmacia, Low and Ker, 2011; Lay-Yee et al., 2013; Suki and Suki, 2013) also suggested that convenience and ease of use have significant impact in determining consumer's purchase intention.

Thus, the researcher developed the following hypothesis:

**H5: Ease of use has significant influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention.**

### 3.8 Promotion of the Brand

Manufacturers or marketers not only produce the products, but also communicates products value with their intended users. Success of any product largely depends on the successful promotion of its product value. The tools companies use in communicating the value of product to customers constitutes the promotional mix involving tools like advertising, personal selling, sales promotion, public relations, and direct-marketing (Kotler et al., 2010). By using these tools, sellers inform the customers regarding their cell phone quality, features, price or any other related offers that may persuade the customers for buying their cell phone brand. Duarte and Raposo (2010) argued that advertising is one of the important factors that affect mobile phone users brand preferences. Uddin et al., (2015) suggested that television commercial can inform about the mobile phone and multiplies its appeal to the potential buyers. A study by Chi, Yeh and Tsai (2011) concludes that advertising and celebrity endorsement have significant influence on consumer purchase intention.

Hence, the researcher proposed the following hypothesis:

**H6: Promotion of the brand has significant influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention.**

### 4. Conceptual Framework of the Study

The researcher reviewed lots of books, journals, newspapers etc. to gain important insights regarding the study. After going through a large number of such literatures relevant to this present study, the researcher proposed a conceptual framework for this study. Through the conceptual framework or the proposed model, the researcher tries to demonstrate the causal relationship between the independent variables (product price, product feature, brand name, social influence, ease of use and promotion of the brand) and the dependent variable (purchase intention of cellular phone) regarding the university students intention to purchase cellular phone in Bangladesh.
5. Research Methodology
Through analyzing secondary data and pilot survey consisting of 30 samples, exploratory research was conducted at the primary phase of the study in order to identify the factors that influence university students’ intention to purchase cellular phone. Descriptive research was then conducted through developing and analyzing a self-administered structured questionnaire. Through an extensive review of numerous journals, books and lots of other internet-based websites, the researcher gathered necessary secondary data. Primary data was then collected through face-to-face personal interview with the respondents. This study adopted a non-probabilistic convenient sampling technique that many other researchers have used for this type of study (Lin et al., 2017). The researcher collected responses from 380 respondents. But after eliminating the problematic responses, 350 questionnaires were selected for analysis in the final study. Thus the sample size considered in this study is 350. Sampling unit for the study consists of the students of Begum Rokeya University, Rangpur who bought and were using mobile phones. Cronbach’s alpha is used to test the reliability of the collected data. Regression and ANOVA is used to explain the relationship between the factors affecting university students’ cell phone purchase intention and test the proposed hypotheses. Statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 was used to perform the statistical tests.

6. Data Analysis, Findings and Discussion
6.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondent
Respondents’ demographic profile shows that 69.7% of the respondents are male and 30.3% are female. Major portion of the cell phone users (86.9%) fall in between the age group of 18 to 25 years. Most of the students are
undergraduate students (61.7%) and 28.9% of them have completed their graduation. Students’ income statistics shows that the largest portion of the students (70.9%) earned in between 5,001 to 10,000 Tk. every month whereas 55.1% of the students used both the feature or basic phone and smartphone. The complete demographic profile of the students are shown in the below table (Table-1).

| Table-1: Samples Demographic Profile |
|-------------------------------------|
| Variables                          | Frequency | Percentage |
| Gender                             |           |            |
| Male                               | 244       | 69.7       |
| Female                             | 106       | 30.3       |
| Age                                |           |            |
| Less than 18 years                 | 11        | 3.1        |
| 18-25 years                        | 304       | 86.9       |
| 26-30 years                        | 35        | 10.0       |
| Education                          |           |            |
| Undergraduate                      | 216       | 61.7       |
| Graduation                         | 101       | 28.9       |
| Post Graduation                    | 33        | 9.4        |
| Monthly Income                     |           |            |
| Less than Tk. 5,000                | 43        | 12.3       |
| 5,001-10,000                       | 248       | 70.9       |
| 10,001-15,000                      | 27        | 7.7        |
| More than Tk. 15,000               | 32        | 9.1        |
| Quantity of Cell Phone Use         |           |            |
| Feature phone only                 | 70        | 20.0       |
| Smartphone only                    | 87        | 24.9       |
| Both- Feature phone & Smartphone   | 193       | 55.1       |

6.2 Reliability Testing
To test the reliability or internal consistency of the collected data, the researcher measured the Cronbach’s Alpha value which is a frequently used technique (Rahime et al., 2016). Cronbach’s Alpha for six independent and one dependent variables were found 0.732 which is acceptable, as minimum accepted threshold value suggested by Nunnally (1978) and Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black (2010) is 0.70 and 0.60 respectively. The reliability statistics are shown in the below table (Table-2).

| Table-2: Reliability Statistics |
|---------------------------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha               | .732    |
| Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | .812 |
| N of Items                      | 7       |

6.3 Relationships among the Influencing Factors with Purchase Intention of Cellular Phone
The model summary table (Table-3) shows that the value of $R$ is 0.694 which indicates a high degree of correlation among the variables under this study. The $R^2$ value 0.482 indicates that 48.2% of the total variation in the cellular phone purchase intention can be explained by the all independent variables namely product price, product feature, brand name, social influence, ease of use, and promotion of the brand.

| Table-3: Model Summary |
|------------------------|
| Model | R       | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1      | .694*   | .482     | .473              | .37327                   |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Product Price, Product Feature, Brand Name, Social Influence, Ease of Use, Promotion of the Brand
b. Dependent Variable: Purchase Intention

The ANOVA table (Table-4) suggests that the regression model predicts this study’s dependent variable significantly well. As the $p$ value (0.000) is less than 0.05, it indicates the statistical significance of the regression model run by the researcher and statistically, the regression model significantly predicts this study’s outcome variable.

| Table-4: ANOVA* |
|-----------------|
| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.     |
| 1      | 44.449         | 6  | 7.408       | 53.168  | .000*    |
| Residual | 47.791       | 343 | .139        |          |          |
| Total     | 92.240         | 349 |             |          |          |

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Intention
b. Predictors: (Constant), Product Price, Product Feature, Brand Name, Social Influence, Ease of Use, Promotion of the Brand
6.4 Coefficient Analysis and Testing of Hypotheses

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. | Results of Hypothesis |
|-------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-----|-----------------------|
|       | B  | Std. Error | Beta |       |            |                     |
| (Constant) | .600 | .254 |       | 2.364 | .019 |                       |
| PP    | .481 | .058 | .439 | 8.358 | .000 | H1: Supported         |
| PF    | .306 | .059 | .284 | 5.182 | .000 | H2: Supported         |
| BN    | .241 | .080 | .213 | 2.995 | .003 | H3: Supported         |
| SI    | -.200 | .082 | -.162 | -2.432 | .016 | H4: Supported         |
| EU    | .006 | .026 | .011 | .240  | .810 | H5: Rejected          |
| PB    | .014 | .026 | .026 | .553  | .581 | H6: Rejected          |

a. Dependent Variable: PI

From the coefficient table (Table-5) the researcher accepts hypotheses H1, H2, H3 and H4 as the significance level of these factors is less than 0.05; and rejects hypotheses H5 and H6 as the level of significance of these factors is greater than 0.05. The factor product price (0.000), product feature (0.000), brand name (0.003) and social influence (0.016) have strong impact on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention. But the factor ease of use (0.810) and promotion of the brand (0.581) has no significant impact on the university students’ purchase intention of cellular phone.

6.5 Discussions

As the young students make up one of the main segments of the cellular phone market, thus the researcher wants to identify the factors that affect university students’ purchase intention of cellular phone. Prior studies found that product price affects purchase intention of cellular phone (Karjaluoto et al., 2005; Munnuka, 2005; Uddin et al., 2015). This study also confirmed that product price has significant influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention and thus hypothesis H1 is supported. The study also found product feature’s significant influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention and hence supported hypothesis H2. This result is consistent with some other previous research (e.g. Karjaluoto et al., 2005; Lay-Yee et al., 2013; Uddin et al., 2015; Rahim et al., 2016). In case of brand name, young consumers are found brand conscious. The finding of the study revealed that brand name of cellular phone affects young students’ intention to purchase, therefore hypothesis H3 is supported. This finding is also supported by some other previous studies (Lay-Yee et al., 2013; Suki, 2013; Rahim et al., 2016). As the university students influence other fellow students and are influenced by them also, this study found that social influence significantly affects university students’ cellular phone purchase intention. Thus hypothesis H4 is supported. Similar findings were revealed by prior studies (Lay-Yee et al., 2013; Suki, 2013; Uddin et al., 2015; Rahim et al., 2016). Although previous studies (Park and Chen, 2007; Joo and Sang, 2013; Kim, Chun and Lee, 2014; Uddin et al., 2015) found that ease of use or operate has significant influence on consumers’ cellular phone purchase intention, but this study found ease of use did not have a significant impact on intention to purchase cellular phone among university students. Therefore hypothesis H5 is rejected. Even though study conducted by Duarte and Raposo (2010), Chi et al., (2011), Uddin et al., (2015) confirmed that promotion of the brand in different forms like advertising, celebrity endorsement, TV commercials etc. can significantly affect consumers cellular phone purchase intention, but this study did not found any significant impact of promotion of the brand on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention. Hence hypothesis H6 is also rejected.

7. Managerial Implications and Recommendations

We can’t imagine a single day without mobile phones and mobile phones have become a part and parcel of our daily life (Smura et al., 2009; Sata, 2013). Popularity of different types of cellular phones is increasing at all levels, as the users get connected with their family and friends by using different social networking sites (Suki & Suki, 2013), especially among the students of college and university (Suki, 2013; Falayi & Adedokun, 2014). For these reasons, cell phone manufacturers and marketers should pay careful attention to the growing young student segments. This study identified number of factors such as product price, product feature, brand name and social influence that have profound influence on students’ cell phone purchase intention. So producers and marketers should carefully set the mobile phone price so that they can attract this growing segment. Besides, in order to create a superior brand image and value, they should emphasize on the innovative product features that met the young students changing requirements and reinforce these attributes through promotional means like advertisement. This study also provides important insights for the academicians, marketers and marketing researchers.
8. Limitations, Conclusion and Future Research Directions

The objective of the study was to find out the factors that affect young Bangladeshi university students’ intention to purchase cellular phone through exploring preceding studies. This study found significant influence of cell phone price & feature, brand name and social influence on university students’ cellular phone purchase intention. But this study is not free of limitations. This study employs convenient sampling technique, which limits its generalizability. This study also covers a small geographic area. For these reasons, future research can be undertaken with non-probability sampling techniques. Besides university students, other young customer segments such as students from schools and colleges, young job holders or business men must be considered while studying young consumers’ cell phone purchase intention. Further research could also be done by examining the mediating effect of variables such as gender, age, income, education level, lifestyle, culture etc. with the variables of this study.
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