

# Impact Of Consumers' Risk Perception On Their Online Purchase Intention With Special References To Purchase Of Electronics

\*Brijesh Kishore Goswami

Assistant Professor, Institute of Business Management GLA University, Mathura

Email: brijeshksgoswami@gmail.com

DOI: 10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S08.214

## Abstract

The most pertinent problem post pandemic is about the risk perception in the minds of consumers specially pertaining to online purchase of durables like electronics. This study throws light on this significant issue. Primary data responses were collected online via structured questionnaire from 120 consumers Pan India to understand the consumer's risk perception regarding their online purchase intentions. Multiple regression was administered to identify the issues. On the basis of analysis, it was found that product risk as well as risk of losing money and other financial details significantly impacts the consumer's perception. The study paves a way for understanding consumer's intentions and will help marketers design better strategies for increasing online purchase of electronics.

**Keywords:** Consumer's perception, online purchase intentions, online risks

## Introduction

Online shopping opens a brand new world of opportunities and experiences for purchasers. Various types of products and services that online purchasing supply at totally different cost that creates an incredible market. Most customers have opened their hearts tailored to online shopping, while others are terrified of various types of risks associated with online shopping. These risks act as an obstacle to online purchasing. Online shopping websites such as Amazon, Flipkart, Snapdeal, EBay etc. provide wide variety of products online that includes Consumer Electronics, Mobiles & Tablets, Laptops, household products, furniture, home decoration items, automobile accessories etc. These websites launch various offers and discounts at different occasions. Also shopping website like Amazon provides its customers with prime membership which various advantages over normal accounts such as fast delivery (in 1 or 2 days), its web series. Hence a customer apart from purchasing products can view online webseries too which helps Amazon acquire more customer base and also helps to make its customers loyal. Also online shopping websites provides its customers to choose among variety of products just at sitting at his home or in his office. Customers also have options to rate any product based on its delivery and performance and which helps other customers to purchase any product based on past customer's ratings of that product which certainly is an added advantage over offline purchasing from physical stores.

In this paper the researchers have tried to check the background of online purchases. This includes the web and its users, increment and expansion of online purchasing, its merits and demerits and recent trend in online shopping challenges faced by customers and various concepts related to online shopping.

## Internet usage and its penetration in India

According to a report published by Statista:- The Statistics Portal in 2018. India had 483 million internet users. This figure is estimated to grow to 666.4 million internet users in 2023. India is the second-largest online market worldwide, despite the untapped potential. In India, the majority of internet users are the ones who use internet through their mobile phones & who take advantage of cheap alternatives to the expensive landline connections that require desktop PCs and infrastructure. In 2016, India had 320.57 million mobile phone internet users and forecasts estimate 492.68 million Indian mobile phone internet users by 2022. The following table 1 shows the year wise data of internet users in India and their penetration rate.

**Table 1: Internet Usage and its penetration in India**

Year	Internet Users *	Penetration (%of Pop.)	Total Population	Non-Users (Internet -Less)	1-Yr User Change	1-Yr User Change	Population Change
2016	46,21,24,989	34.80%	1,32,68,01,576	86,46,76,587	30.50%	10,80,10,242	1.20%
2015	35,41,14,747	27%	1,31,10,50,527	95,69,35,780	51.90%	12,09,62,270	1.22%
2014	23,31,52,478	18%	1,29,52,91,543	1,06,21,39,065	20.70%	3,99,48,148	1.23%
2013	19,32,04,330	15.10%	1,27,94,98,874	1,08,62,94,544	21.50%	3,42,43,984	1.26%
2012	15,89,60,346	12.60%	1,26,35,89,639	1,10,46,29,293	26.50%	3,33,42,533	1.29%
2011	12,56,17,813	10.10%	1,24,74,46,011	1,12,18,28,198	36.10%	3,32,93,976	1.34%
2010	9,23,23,838	7.50%	1,23,09,84,504	1,13,86,60,666	48.50%	3,01,57,710	1.38%
2009	6,21,66,128	5.10%	1,21,41,82,182	1,15,20,16,054	18.60%	97,34,457	1.43%
2008	5,24,31,671	4.40%	1,19,70,70,109	1,14,46,38,438	12.50%	58,34,088	1.47%
2007	4,65,97,582	4%	1,17,96,85,631	1,13,30,88,049	42.90%	1,39,95,197	1.51%
2006	3,26,02,386	2.80%	1,16,20,88,305	1,12,94,85,919	19.30%	52,75,016	1.55%
2005	2,73,27,370	2.40%	1,14,43,26,293	1,11,69,98,923	22.80%	50,67,787	1.59%
2004	2,22,59,583	2%	1,12,64,19,321	1,10,41,59,738	19.10%	35,67,041	1.63%
2003	1,86,92,542	1.70%	1,10,83,69,577	1,08,96,77,035	11.50%	19,26,786	1.67%
2002	1,67,65,756	1.50%	1,09,01,89,358	1,07,34,23,602	136.90%	96,89,725	1.71%

2001	70,76,031	0.70%	1,07,18,88,190	1,06,48,12,159	27.30%	15,18,576	1.75%
2000	55,57,455	0.50%	1,05,34,81,072	1,04,79,23,617	96.50%	27,29,647	1.79%

Source: **Internet Live Stats** ([www.InternetLiveStats.com](http://www.InternetLiveStats.com))

\* Estimate for July 1 , 2016

\*\* **Internet user** = Any user who can connect to the internet via any device or connection.

## LITERATURE iREVIEW

In recent years, the world has experienced phenomenal growth of the Internet and the user base. In 2014 Almost 75% (2.1 billion) of all Internet users in the world (2.8 billion) live in the top 20Countries .The remaining 25% (0.7 billion) are distributed among the other 178 countries. Each of them represents less than 1% of the total number of users (Internetlivesates.com). China, the country with the majority of users (642 million in 2014) account for almost 22% of the total and have more users than the next three countries together (United States, India, and Japan). Among the top 20 countries, India has the lowest penetration: 19% and the highest annual growth rate. About Another part of the range are the United States, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Canada Penetration: In these countries, more than 80% of the population has an Internet connection.(Internetliveates.com).According to the 2015 FICCI KPMG Annual Report on the Media and Entertainment Industry in India, the rate of penetration of Internet users in India is 19%, which is very slow, but in the future, it is growing and India is about to replace EE. UU as the second largest activated market with a number of Internet users. In 2016, the statistics of Internetlivesates.com justify this. to report. The United States has been replaced by India as the second country with the largest number of Internet users. The penetration rate will also reach 27% and 34.8% in 2015 and 2016, respectively. Each. Nevertheless, the gap between Internet users and non-Internet users is relatively large. The phenomenal growth of the Internet and its user base has affected all sectors of the economy. Consumers also influence buying behavior. The Internet offers a new platform for buying the type of online shopping. Online shopping opens up a new world of possibilities and opportunities& experiences for customers. The product and service offering of online shopping in another price range makes it an incredible market. The majority of consumers are openadapted to online shopping, while others fear different types of risks. TheseRisks are a deterrent to online shopping. According to ASSOCHAM, the online average isPurchases are expected to increase from 66% in 2015 to 78% in 2016. Around 55 millionConsumers bought online in 2015. Despite the explosive growth of Internet usersBasically, youcan see a clear gap between the number of internet users and the number of online shoppers.What could be a challenge for “marketers? The analysis of the literature has made clear that an obstacle to online shopping usually exists in terms of risk perception checked .

## Perceived irisk

The basic concept of perceived risk was introduced for the first time in a subjective and psychological manner. Build for the elucidation of the phenomena of the search for information and brand loyalty (Bauer, 1967). Perceived risk is considered a basic concept of consumer behavior and is common and is explained as the perception of consumer risk and risk mitigation methods (Shin, 2010) . Schiffman et al. (2007) define online the perceived risk of consumers as uncertainty. Consumers face when they cannot predict the consequences of their purchase decision. The shows the subjective confidence of consumers regarding the probability of an undesirable result of Purchase decisions relative to the perceived risk. It is also proven by many researchers who the perceived risk develops from the uncertainty of consumers, especially when buying online (Bako's, 1997, Martín and Camaro, 2008). Cunningham (1967) recommended this risk. It contains two dimensions of risk: uncertainty and consequences. The consequences can be Performance

objectives (for example, will the product meet my expectations?), Psychosocial Objectives (for example, what impact do others have on me?) Or resources such as Money, time and effort to achieve these objectives. The risks can be perceived by the consumer. The obstacle to Internet transactions (Gerrard and Cunningham, 2003). Jahankhani (2009) confirmed that consumers deal with each purchase situation, they always take risks. It also defines that the risk perceived by the consumer is a Function of two variables, d. h. The number of consequences and feelings of individuals. Biased certainty of failure and success. Park and Stole (2005) have found that the level or degree of perceived risk depends on the subjectivity Explanation "of the uncertainty associated with the online shopping environment. Dowling and Staelin (1995) describe consumer behavior in online purchases. When a consumer perceives a risk when making an online purchase, he begins to work Strategies to reduce the risk until it is acceptable, otherwise, they will withdraw their risk. The purchase decision. Bettman (1973) distinguishes perceived risk in two ways: inherent and in treated risk. Inherent risk is called risk before consumers use risk mitigation strategies. Risk is defined as the risk after the consumer applies risk mitigation strategies. According to Lu et al. (2005), online technologies and applications must be protected Threats such as viruses, worms, crackers, tracking passwords and identity theft, personal injuries Privacy, money theft, and hacker attacks.

Dowling and Staelin (1995) describe consumer behavior in online purchases. When a consumer perceives a risk when making an online purchase, he begins to work Strategies to reduce the risk until it is acceptable, otherwise, they will withdraw their risk. The purchase decision. Bettman (1973) distinguishes perceived risk in two ways: inherent and in treated risk. Inherent risk is called risk before consumers use risk mitigation strategies. Risk is defined as the risk after the consumer applies risk mitigation strategies. According to Lu et al. (2005), online technologies and applications must be protected Threats such as viruses, worms, crackers, password tracking and phishing, personal injuries Privacy, money theft, and hacker attacks .

Perceived risk is cited as one of the main reasons preventing the consumer from buying online. The perceived risk results from consumer uncertainty, especially when shopping via the internet (Bakos, 1997, Martín and Camarero, 2008). Li Guo (2011) led an investigation Factors influencing the buying behavior of consumers in cyberspace in China, and the outcome of A study shows that the safety of online purchases, prices, and commercial loans is in the foreground Factors that influence consumer buying habits and store and gender design. Consumption values are secondary influencing factors. A study of network settings. The purchases and the internet that Teo made in 2002 have analyzed several factors including the perceived risk of consumers, and he identifies the perceived risk as a crucial determinant of the willingness of consumers to shop online. He said that both experts and non-experts differ in their risk perception depending on the type of product purchased .

The perceived risk was examined in excess of research studies and all identified a Negative connection with consumers' online purchasing intentions. In addition, risk is perceived. has the property of creating a limiting aspect in the willingness of consumers to participate in Online shopping because it has been perceived that the susceptibility to online shopping is increasing (Pavlou, 2003). In 2013, Khaled Faqih conducted and confirmed an investigation in Jordon Consumer perceived risk is a strong indicator to explain consumer behavior Consumers are more likely to avoid mistakes than to increase the value of online purchases. He said it was very important to understand the perception of consumer risk and its risk. This can be reduced by implementing risk mitigation techniques during online shopping. Theodosius Tsiakis (2012) has analyzed the security risk perceived by consumers. It is the main factor or reason for the decrease in the willingness of consumers in electronic commerce Perceived security risks in online transactions. Nepomuceno et al. (2012) carried out a study on the relationship between intangibles and perceived risk in North America and also examine the moderating effects of privacy, system security and general influence Security concerns for the online shopping environment. The result shows that consumers the perception of risk increases when two negative data are processed simultaneously with the inviolability of the product and privacy. In addition, the security of the system is given Identified as the most relevant concern in the online shopping environment Chang and Wu (2012) have analyzed the moderating effect of decision-making in the perceived risk of consumers and their consequences for the intention of buying

online. The discovery<sup>31</sup> indicates that the consumer perceived risk to the website and the product influences online Purchase intent through attitudes based on knowledge and effect. The result shows that lower the perceived risk can increase cognition, affection and online attitudes Purchase intention. In 2006, Lin and Fang, investigated the impact of perceived risks of word of mouth (WOM) Sender and receiver. The result of the study found that people avoid WOM Communication if they perceive risky products, such as purchase consequences the product can be more serious than if a product is not risky and the person can feel it regretful and guilty because he/she has proposed the same product .

The perceived risk affects the ability of consumers to try new products or services. The perceived risk also influenced the attitude towards online purchases and consumer intent buy online (Vijayarathy and Jones, 2000). On the other side, Miyazaki and Fernández (2001) reveals that perceived risk could be reduced as the experience of consumers In simple words, online consumers initially assume a higher risk This risk intensity gradually decreases with every online purchase experience.

The quality of the information perceived has been proposed as an important factor in the EU Perceived risk and trust. The perceived risk and belief in consumer confidence are of immediate influence on online purchase intentions. The quality of the information perceived also has two background: Control of transparency and feedback of results. The Perception of Online Consumers of the quality of the information is much higher with high transparency of the control. If during the first Online shoppers have access to information about interactions that can help build trust. Conviction and reduction of the perceived risk of change (A. Nicolaou and D. Mcknight, 2006). In the year 2008 Chang and Chen discovered that the quality of the website plays an important role and influences the consumer perceived risk. Tsai and Chao Yeh (2010) are also investigating the effects of Quality of the website in terms of the perceived security risk and the privacy of information, especially in focus Information on product quality, efficient service quality, website design style, and transaction and delivery capability. They also analyze the relationship between the perceived risks when buying intentions. The result of their study shows that consumers who have bought ecologically sustainable products attach more importance to the quality of the website they bought one. They focused mainly on the information security of the website .

Huang, Cabinet, and Dubinsky (2004) have their research analyzing the relationship between brand names and the perceived risk of consumers for both online and offline buyers. No buyers the result of the study shows that the brand influences online buyers perceived risk. Online buyers were found to be less risky than non-buyers. Buyer's online users of the age group (18-29 years) are more sensitive to the brand in comparison with other age groups of consumers. C. Bosh off et al (2011) have conducted a study and found that the performance risk and the social risk have a strong negative impact on the intentions of Buy on a brand website. On the other hand, personal risk has no effect Intention to buy on a brand website. It also shows that the knowledge of the brand works.

as the dominant variable between performance risk and buying intention on a branded website, Marina A-Simonian et al. (2012) identified the impact of the brand image of the product and the online store. Illustration of different types of perceived risk in online purchases. Find an example of this the brand image of the product affects the buying intent of online shoppers by reducing the perceived risk directly or indirectly, on the other hand, the image of the online shop influences the purchase of consumers Indirect intentions to reduce risk perception .

D'Alessandro et al. (2012) identified the impact of perceived risk and consumer confidence. Online shopping for a risky and expensive product like the precious stone. You have to identify the three determinants of perceived risk. These determinants refer to privacy, the vendor uses marketing strategies and security practices. They found that Privacy, the type of marketing strategy and the security measures used by the seller. It influences the perceived risk of consumers when buying gems online. It is also found this perceived risk reduces trust and purchase intention in the online space .

Bhatnagar et Alabama (2000) found a link between the perceived risk and their choice Buy products from the channel. They explain that the level of perceived risk varies according to choice of the product category is changed. It has been shown that shopping mode also plays an important role. If the consumer

decides to buy, not in the store, so online shopping Purchases in traditional businesses where risk was perceived tend to be higher (Dollin et al., 2005). Bhatnagar et. Alabama He also suggested a negative correlation between knowledge and risk aversion. However, his study focuses on financial risk, product risk, and security risk. The consumer takes the risk when they start searching and selecting the information of their necessary products and services before purchasing decisions. When the actual experience with consumer purchases varies Because of their buying goals, they will take greater risks (Pires, Stanton and Dubinsky, 2004). In 2005, Cunningham et al. researched that the use of the online booking system is perceived. More risk-averse than conventional airlines on purchases. You also have the types of a perceived risk that affect consumers during the consumption phase were examined. Buying the booking airline online or traditional. It's being investigated the perceived risk occurred at every stage of the consumer's buying process. Thaw, Mahmood, and Demonic (2009) has conducted studies to examine the relationship between perceived risk Consumer confidence in online transactions, institutional trust and economic incentives E-seller the result shows that consumer confidence in online transactions is reversed Consumer perceived risk. On the other hand, these are not institutional trust and economic incentives. It cannot reduce the perception of the risk of consumers .

Martin, Camarero, and José (2011) have conducted a research study in Spain to develop a Model that reflects the mediating role of the risk in the transaction and the social risk between the transactions The channel and intention of repeated purchase and also testing of the moderator role of the country in This model has found that the online risk has a multi-dimensional structure. It is that Combination of risk in the channel, social risk, and risk in the transaction. It was found that the risk in the channel has a positive effect on the other two types of risk. As an intercultural effect noted that Spain has a smaller impact of the risk on the purchase intent than in this case by Japan Martin and Camarero (2008) have studied this in their other research study Internet users who shop online more often can only trust a website based on their previous data. Satisfaction, while users who take more risks should realize that the company is a good Reputation and experience in brick

And mortar, apart from other signs such as the quality of the service Guilherme Pires, John Stanton and Andrew Eckford have analyzed this in their research study. Consumer perceived risk for online shopping varies with the frequency of Purchases, satisfaction with previous shopping experiences, good service and the level of Participation in the purchase decision is required. The result shows that there is no connection between frequencies of online purchases and perceived risk, but satisfaction with the previous online purchase shopping experiences are negatively associated with consumer perceived risk. It is revealed this good service is important to the online consumer and reduces the perceived risk in the climate it was a product of high or low participation .

In 2006 Buttner et al they conducted a study on online pharmacies to analyze consumers. Behavior towards them. This experiment influences the impact of product class risk and the retail class Risk in the willingness of consumers towards the selection of retailers when making an online purchasing decision it has been found that high risk to the retailer's class may lead to a negative rating the result is considered higher. On the other hand, the product class risk has a negative impact on online consumer's attempts. Korgaonkar and Karson (2007) have investigated analyzed the impact of the perceived risk of the product on the buying preferences of online consumers Northeast and the southeastern United States. The result shows an interaction between the perceived risks of the product. And e-store format. It has been established that multi-channel trading is a beneficiary and has a lower risk Perception. On the other hand, Pure Play e-tailors always have a high-risk perception and less trust among online shoppers .

## Types of perceived risk:

### Perceived risk in the traditional market:

Bobbitt and Dabhlok (2001) explained the perceived risk as an integral concept and could do so not to be covered by a single concept. Different types of risks have been suggested including financial risks, performance risks, physical risks, social risks, convenience risks, Psychological risk, source and risk of privacy. According to Phillip Kotler, consumers can do this functional risk, physical risk, financial risk, social risk, psychological risk of buying and using a product .

### Perceived risk in the online market:

Due to the presence of countless online providers, the importance of the perceived risk increases. It is likely that perceived risk becomes a crucial factor in influencing consumer behavior. This is because consumers perceive a higher level of risk towards online shopping when they believe the security is insufficient. Nena Lim (2003) examined the phenomena of risk perceived by the consumer through the realization of an approach Group and the result reveals that there are three sources of risk perceived by the consumer. These the sources are technology, supplier and product. Technology facilitates the online shopping process and efficient. Electronic sellers can provide reliable products and the products should be easy to use. YE Naiyi (2004) conducted an investigation on the dimensions of the risk perceived by consumers in online shopping. The result of the study explains seven factors of perceived risk. These factors Risk of fraud, delivery risk, financial risk, process and time, product risk, privacy risk. And the risk of information. In 2003, Forsythe and Shi analyzed the effect that the performance risk, financial risk, time and privacy risk have in the adoption of online purchases and observe that the first three facets affect the purchase frequency, while the expense is only influenced by the economic component. Based on C. Boshoff et al. (2011) research study, Consumers have three types of risk perceptions associated with intentions to purchase online, namely, risk of performance, social risk and personal risk. A research study was conducted and defined in Taiwan by Pi and Sangruang (2011) seven parameters of the perceived risk. These are comfort risk, financial risk, and performance. Risk, physical risk, psychological risk, social risk, and temporary risk. The results show that risk factors perceived as comfort risk, physical risk, performance risk, and social risk have the biggest impact on the attitude to online shopping in Taiwan. C. Bianchi and L. Andrews (2011) conducted a research study in Chile to examine the relationship between perceived consumer risk, behavior, and buying behavior online. The result shows that the perceived consumer risk is inversely related to the attitudes of consumers and consumer's attitude has a positive relationship with consumers 'intention to continue shopping online .

Stone and Gronhaug (1993) have defined several dimensions of perceived risk (financial risk, psychological risk, time risk, performance, and physical risk). You suggested that Financial and psychosocial risks generally covered the majority of risk perception Comparison with others. Korgaonkar (1982) has selected two types of perceived product risk rather influence consumer behavior in the online environment, d. H. the economic risk and Psychosocial risk for his study. In 2004, Gupta et al. The perception of consumer risk related to Online shopping environment. You have used a gauge that consists of four different types' of Risks and global risk. Four types of risks are financial risk, performance risk, Psychological risk, and social risk. All these types of risks are diverse on the internet. Environment and reported a much lower reliability coefficient. It was also found that all sorts of perceived risk have a negative impact on the consumer's buying intentions .

### Study Objectives

- To Analyse different types of risk associated with online purchases .
- To Identify different factors which increases the risk perception of Customers.

### Research Methodology

In this research paper the primary data were collected by the online media. Total numbers of 120 Internet users who they have purchased online at least once they have been surveyed. The essence of the survey

method can be explained as "questioning individuals on a topic or topics and then describing their answers "(Jackson, 2011, p.17). In consumer behavior the survey method of primary data collection studies is used to reflect the attitude of the people, test concepts, perform segmentation research, and establish the level of customer satisfaction and a set of other purposes. The questioning in this research study is carried out in a structured way so it is called as a method of collecting structured data. Multiple Regression technique was used to analyse the data.

## Hypothesis iDevelopment

- 1) **H1:** The Risk of Losing Money & Financial Details will have negative effect on attitude towards online Shopping (Financial Risk).
- 2) **H2:** The Product Risk will have negative effect on attitude towards online shopping of electronics products ( Product Risk )

## Data ianalysis i& iHypothesis testing

A total of 120 respondents were questioned about their demographics. Their demographic profile consists of gender, age, qualification, income, occupation and their frequency of online purchase in the last six months. Responses of respondents are presented in the following table. The pie chart is used to present characteristic wise respondent profile and for better understanding, its interpretation is also given with the chart .

**TABLE 2: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS**

S.No.	Characteristics	Category	Frequency	%
1	Gender	Male	71	59
		Female	48	40
		Prefer not to say	1	1
2	Age Group	Below 20	6	5
		21 – 25	97	81
		25 – 30	16	13
		30 & above	1	1
3	Qualification	Intermediate	4	3
		Graduate	39	32
		Post Graduate	74	62
		Others	3	3
4	Occupation	Student	78	65
		Self Employee	14	12
		Govt.Sector	2	2
		Pvt. Sector	23	19
		Other	3	2
5	Income	Less than 20000	76	64
		20000 to 40000	24	20
		40000 - 65000	4	3
		Above 65000	16	13
6	Family	Nuclear	74	62
		Joint	46	38

H1: The Risk of Losing Money & Financial Details will have negative effect on attitude towards online Shopping (Financial Risk).

In this the consumers were asked about important factors which impacts their online electronics purchases.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics**

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Price	2.8000	1.19944	120
Quality	3.5750	1.32629	120
Product features	3.4750	1.28313	120
Product Review	3.2500	1.27846	120
Ease of use	3.2750	1.30907	120
Warranty	3.3417	1.31887	120
Design of the product	3.0833	1.30663	120
Environment friendliness	3.0833	1.34466	120
Brand Value	3.2833	1.29110	120
Recommendation from someone	2.7667	1.27506	120
Sales person recommendation	2.4917	1.16674	120

**Table 4: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.716 <sup>a</sup>	.512	.457	.88355	1.965

a. Predictors: (Constant)

b. Dependent Variable

**Table 5: ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig,
1	Regression	87.669	12	7.306	9.358	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	83.531	107	.781		
	Total	171.200	119			

a. Dependent Variable

b. Predictors: (Constant)

As per Model Summary the R square Value is .512 which means that when dependent variables will be changed by 1% then the value of the independent variables automatically changes by 51.2%. As per Anova Table it has been shown that the Significance Value is .000, it means that the value of significance is less than 0.05 , So it clearly define that the Hypothesis 1 is Accepted.

H2: The Product Risk will have negative effect on attitude towards online shopping of electronics products (Product Risk ).

In this the consumers were asked about what fears they have while making online purchases.

**Table 6: Descriptive Statistics**

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I am worried about product effectiveness	3.1000	1.17681	120

Fear of choosing poor product or services	3.1917	1.13238	120
Fear that the delivered products would not match those described on the website	3.2250	1.21933	120
Fear of getting proper after sales services of online shopping	3.5750	.77419	120
The description of products shows on the website are accurate or not	3.4417	.96837	120

**Table 7: Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.432 <sup>a</sup>	.186	.087	37.30575	1.885

a. Predictors: (Constant)

b. Dependent Variable

**Table 8: ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig,
1	Regression	33813.053	13	2601.004	1.869	.042 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	147522.247	106	1391.719		
	Total	181335.300	119			

a. Dependent Variable

b. Predictors: (Constant)

As per Model Summary the R square Value is .186 which means that when dependent variables will be changed by 1% then the value of the independent variables automatically changes by 18.6 % As per Anova Table it has been shown that the Significance Value is .042, it means that the value of significance is less than 0.05, so it clearly states that the Hypothesis 2 is Accepted.

## Conclusion i

Consumers online perceived risk and its various dimensions were had been studied by various authors since many years. In this academic research, this study has been conducted in two parts In the first part of the study, various different dimensions of perceived risk were studied through extensive literature review. It was found that there are following two major types of perceived risks namely: Financial Risk and Performance Risk. And the impact of these two factors on various perceived risks were studied Based on statistical result of regression analysis, it was found that various types of perceived risk has a positive and negative on Consumers' attitude towards online shopping of Electronics Products. Similarly consumers' self-efficacy and consumer innovativeness has a great impact on various types of perceived risk

## Implications of ithe istudy

The major contribution of this study is in the field of understanding the various dimensions of perceived risks and it has contributed to the existing body of knowledge on online consumers' perceived risk. In the past researches, a lot of researchers have studied consumer's online perceived risk and its influencing factors

but there was lack of study on consumers' innovativeness and consumers' self-efficacy. This made the way for future researches as this study provides a clear picture of perceived risks and its influencing factors.

Due to Digitalisations post pandemic, there has been an enormous amount of growth of internet in India. This made a way to increase online shopping in India although there is a huge gap between internet users and online shoppers due to various perceived risk. So it becomes necessary to study this perceived risk and monitor it in a regular interval. It is very important for E-retailers to understand the importance and role of various perceived risks dimensions. And this study will surely help them to understand clearly consumer's online perceived risks

## Limitations of istudy

In spite of pointing out various advantages and benefits, still, this study is not free from limitations. This study has been conducted in a very limited time frame which itself is a major drawback of this study. Non probability sampling is being used in this research because of sampling time, cost constraint and unavailability of the entire list of online shoppers.

## References

1. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1986.
2. Bhatnagar, A., Misra, S., & Rao, H. R. (2000). On risk, convenience, and Internet shopping behavior. *Communications of the ACM*, 43(11), 98-105.
3. Bianchi, C., & Andrews, L. (2012). Risk, trust, and consumer online purchasing behaviour: a Chilean perspective. *International Marketing Review*, 29(3), 253-275.
4. Cunningham, L. F., Gerlach, J. H., Harper, M. D., & Young, C. E. (2005). Perceived risk and the consumer buying process: internet airline reservations. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 16(4), 357-372.
5. Huang, W. Y., Schrank, H., & Dubinsky, A. J. (2004). Effect of brand name on consumers' risk perceptions of online shopping. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 4(1), 40-50.
6. Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Todd, P. A. (1997). Is there a future for retailing on the Internet. *Electronic marketing and the consumer*, 1(12), 139-154.
7. Khare, A., & Rakesh, S. (2011). Antecedents of online shopping behavior in India: An examination. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 10(4), 227-244.
8. Korgaonkar, P. A., & Karson, E. J. (2007). The influence of perceived product risk on consumers' e-tailer shopping preference. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(1), 55-64.
9. Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Age International.
10. Milne, G. R., Rohm, A. J., & Bahl, S. (2004). Consumers' protection of online privacy and identity. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 38(2), 217-232.
11. Miyazaki, A. D., & Fernandez, A. (2001). Consumer perceptions of privacy and security risks for online shopping. *Journal of Consumer affairs*, 35(1), 27-44.
12. Nicolaou, A. I., & McKnight, D. H. (2006). Perceived information quality in data exchanges: Effects on risk, trust, and intention to use. *Information systems research*, 17(4), 332-351.
13. Peter, J. P., & Ryan, M. J. (1976). An investigation of perceived risk at the brand level. *Journal of marketing research*, 13(2), 184-188.
14. Roselius, T. (1971). Consumer rankings of risk reduction methods. *Journal of marketing*, 35(1), 56-61.
15. San Martín, S., Camarero, C., & San José, R. (2011). Dual effect of perceived risk on cross-national e-commerce. *Internet Research*, 21(1), 46-66.
16. Sarkar, A. (2011). Impact of utilitarian and hedonic shopping values on individual's perceived benefits and risks in online shopping. *International management review*, 7(1), 58-65.
17. Sheth, J. N., & Stellner, W. H. (1979). Psychology of innovation resistance: The less developed concept (LDC) in diffusion research (No. 622). Urbana-Champaign, IL: College of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
18. Stone, R. N., & Grønhaug, K. (1993). Perceived risk: further considerations for the marketing discipline. *European Journal of marketing*, 27(3), 39-50.
19. Wang, P. A. (2011). Uncertainties of online phishing risks and consumer decision making in B2C e-commerce. In *Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-6).