

# IMPACT OF DEMOGRAPHICS OF CONSUMERS TOWARDS ONLINE SHOPPING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ONLINE CONSUMERS IN INDIA AND US

Bharti Motwani\*, Sharda Haryani\*\*, Sukhjeet Matharu\*\*\*

**Abstract** *In spite of having a considerable number of Internet users and growing organised retail market; the online retailing in India is less than that in USA. It has been speculated that non-availability of proper technology and demographic variables might be the reason for lesser online shopping. Thus, it is important to understand the difference between the perception of USA and Indian online consumers. This study mainly focuses on age, gender, and income group parameters to study the difference between USA and Indian online consumers. Online survey was done to collect the data from the two countries.*

**Keywords:** *Shopping, Age, Income, Gender*

## INTRODUCTION

Since the advent of the Internet and the rapid rise and spread of the World Wide Web, researchers have been fascinated with the phenomenon of retail shopping over the Web (Chiang and Dholakia, 2003; Childers, Carr, Peck, and Carson, 2001; Joines, Scherer, and Scheufele, 2003; Wolfenbarger and Gilly, 2001). Online shopping is the process whereby consumers directly buy goods or services from a seller in real-time, without an intermediary service, over the Internet. E-shopping has the potential to replace traditional in-store shopping. It is well perceived that information and communication technologies (ICTs) have had pervasive impacts on modern society - they are changing how and where we work, shop, and in other ways live our lives Xinyu Cao *et al.* (2012). While exploring the implications of the Internet for consumer marketing, Peterson, R. A., Bal Subramanian, S., and Bronnenberg, B. J. (1997) express that through online shopping, business houses have been able to reach out to more customers at less cost. In fact, these are acting as stepping stones to concept of global village. Moreover, the inventory management overheads also decrease significantly through online shopping.

Juxtconsult (2008) points out that in online shopping, shoppers can visit web stores from the comfort of their homes and shop as they sit in front of the computer. Consumers can buy a huge variety of items from online stores, and

just about anything can be purchased from companies that provide their products online. Books, clothing, household appliances, toys, hardware, software, and health insurance are just some of the hundreds of products consumers can buy from an online store.

Sultan, F., and Henrichs, R. B. (2000) state that online shop, e-shop, e-store, Internet shop, web shop, web store, online store, or virtual store evokes the physical analogy of buying products or services at a bricks-and-mortar retailer or shopping centre. The process is called business-to-consumer (B2C) online shopping. When a business buys from another business it is called business-to-business (B2B) online shopping. The largest online retailing corporations are EBay and Amazon. com, both of which are US-based.

Indian customers are embracing the varied retail opportunities. Consumers have begun to enjoy the choice of shopping at a variety of retail formats including the traditional corner shops, the Internet and the big organised retail outlets in shopping mall catering to the desires of India's growing middle class, which after the recent economic reforms have increased disposable income (Srivastava, 2008; Desai, 2006). The Indian consumer has developed a greater exposure to the Western lifestyle and adopted Western shopping patterns (Bailay, 2003). A survey conducted by MasterCard worldwide (2008), on 5037 respondents across 10 markets: Australia, China, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Thailand, UAE, and South Africa,

\* Assistant Professor (Systems), Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India.  
E-mail: bharti\_motwani@pimrindore.ac.in

\*\* Assistant Professor (Maths), Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India.  
E-mail: sharda\_haryani@pimrindore.ac.in

\*\*\* Assistant Professor (Finance), Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India.  
E-mail: sukhjeet\_matharu@pimrindore.ac.in

revealed that online shopping in the Asia-Pacific region is accelerating at an annual rate of 23.3 percent to hit US \$168.7 billion by 2011, with the region's new markets such as China and India fuelling this growth.

Recently, e-shopping has become a centerpiece of ICTs because of its unprecedented proliferation. According to AcNielsen (2007), more than 627 million people in the world have shopped online. Forrester (2006) research estimates e-commerce market will reach \$228 billion in 2007, \$258 billion in 2008 and \$288 billion in 2009. By 2010 e-commerce will have accounted for \$316 billion in sales, or 13 percent of overall retail sales. Retail sales for e-commerce in the United States have grown at a compounded annual growth rate of about 25% for the first six years of this millennium, attaining a value in the fourth quarter of 2006 of over US\$29 billion, or about 3.3% of all retail sales (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2007). In the U.S., online retail spending grew by 19% a year to \$136.4 billion in 2007, which accounted for 4% of total retail sales (InternetRetailer.com, 2008).

The growth of e-shopping has reshaped consumers' shopping behaviour. Chang *et al.* (2005) classified the determinants of e-shopping behaviour into three categories: perceived characteristics of the web as a sales channel, online consumer characteristics, and vendor and product characteristics. Online buying could be a substitute for traditional shopping media, and may well dominate the exchange of certain products (e.g., digital assets) in the future (Cao and Mokhtarian, 2005). From a consumer perspective, Farag (2006) addressed the impacts of geography on e-shopping and the interactions between shopping and traditional shopping.

According to Peter J. Ostrowski *et al.* (2009), while functional factors such as price, convenience, and availability seem to be predictive of web shopping, the role of demographics-age, gender, and education has not been as clear. Hence, this study was undertaken to compare perception of online shopping by consumers of India and USA.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Office of Fair Trading by Europe Economics report revealed that Internet shopping continues to grow rapidly and there is evidence that this is beneficial to consumer in terms of lower prices, increased access to information and increased choice. A framework to increase researchers' understanding of consumers' attitudes toward online shopping and their intention to shop on the Internet was proposed by group of researchers. It was showed that attitude toward online shopping and intention to shop online are not only affected by ease of use, usefulness, and enjoyment, but also by exogenous factors like consumer traits, situational factors, product characteristics, previous online shopping

experiences, and trust in online shopping.

For Internet buyers, gender, marital status, residential location, age, education, and household income were frequently found to be important predictors of Internet purchasing (Fram and Grady, 1997; Kunz, 1997; Mehta and Sivadas, 1995; Sultan and Henrichs, 2000). Although few studies have examined impact of demographics - there are some exceptions. For instance previous research has examined gender differences related to online social presence and enjoyment (Cyr, Hassanein, Head and Ivanov, 2007), website design and satisfaction (Cyr and Bonanni, 2005), email usage (Gefen and Straub, 2003), social norms (Venkatesh and Morris, 2000), online trust (Garbarino *et al.*, 2004), trust (Awad and Ragowsky, 2008; Cyr and Bonanni, 2005) or technology acceptance (Awad and Ragowsky, 2008).

Xianfengmou's ([www.Xianfengmousrainbow.wordpress.com](http://www.Xianfengmousrainbow.wordpress.com)) found interconnections between privacy and security issues in online shopping. He said that anyone who tends to shop online will think twice before they buy anything as to consider the privacy and security issues related to it. Xia and Monroe (2004) stated that consumers will save in monetary, when there are price promotions on specific products. Their study revealed that consumers with a shopping goal are more responsive towards promotional messages such as pay less and discount while consumers without shopping goal are responsive towards promotional messages such as save more and free gift. They stated that price promotion have several benefits such as to increase demand, adjust fluctuations in supply and demand, and increasing consumers' purchasing over time. Shergill and Chen (2005), Kin and Lee (2002) and Than and Grandon's (2002) identified website design characteristics as the dominant factor which influences consumer perceptions of online purchasing. Ranganthan and Ganapathy (2002) found four key dimensions of online shopping namely web sites; information content, design, security, and privacy.

A consumer's trust in an Internet store can be thought as the consumer's trust directly in the store. Nevertheless, Hoffman *et al.* (1999) argued that the effectiveness of third-party trust, certification bodies and the public key encryption infrastructure for ensuring financial security, are the central success factors for building consumer trust in Internet shopping. Online shops make comparison and research of products and prices possible. Online stores also give you the ability to share information and reviews with other shoppers who have actual experience with a product or retailer.

But, in online shopping, customer has unlimited choice, he/she can fall a victim to over choice. Customer may spend a good amount of time without taking any final decision. Besides, the biggest disadvantage is that there is no touch

and feel factor involved in on-line shopping. Apart from item/ product cost, transaction cost is also very important. Therefore, it is very much possible that customer purchases from Internet by just looking at price, but ultimately may land up paying more due to transaction cost.

## RATIONALE

Online shopping has become an innovative means for the consumers to buy the products in an effective manner. Online buyers in India are only in a negligible percentage compared to total conventional buyers. It is expected to grow substantially, if better measures to assist online buying are being implemented. But in USA, online shopping started long back and they are far ahead of India in terms of information technology. Hence, this study was undertaken to compare the perception of online consumers of USA and India. Besides, demographics play a vital role in online shopping behaviour. These variables justify the investigation of Indian and USA consumers towards online shopping behaviours and the implications.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To examine the difference in the perception of people belonging to India and USA towards online shopping.
- To examine the difference in the perception of people belonging to different genders, age and income groups of India and USA towards online shopping.

## METHODOLOGY

**The Study:** The study is aimed to understand the perception of online customers from India and USA towards online shopping and belonging to different age groups, income groups and gender.

**The Sample:** The data were collected from 250 respondents belonging to India and USA and of different demographics (Table 5).

**Tools for Data Collection:** A self-structured questionnaire was used to collect the relevant data from different individuals. The questionnaire was designed in Google Doc and data were collected online from different parts of India and USA. Questionnaire contains 3 parts where Part A generates the demographic information about the candidate, Part B collects the product information and payment mechanism related to online shopping, and Part C collects the information describing the different characteristics of the online shopping. All items were measured by responses on a five point Likert scale, ranging from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree. When a scale is developed for a particular situation and no other standardized instrument is available,

the reliability index based on reliability coefficient can be taken as equivalent to validity of the scale. The reliability of the scale was determined by Cronbach's alpha method on the data collected. The reliability coefficient alpha ( $\alpha$ ) was found to be 0.886 showing high reliability of the scale, hence the questionnaire was considered as appropriate for the study.

**Tools for Data Analysis:** t-test and one-way Anova were used for the data analysis of the collected data.

## HYPOTHESES

H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference between the perception of customers of India and USA regarding online shopping.

H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference between the perception of male and female customers of India and USA regarding online shopping.

H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant difference between the perception of online customers belonging to different age groups of India and USA regarding online shopping.

H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant difference between the perception of online customers belonging to different income groups of India and USA regarding online shopping.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Hypothesis H<sub>01</sub> is accepted at 5% level of significance (p value is 0.960 – table 1), thus there is no significant difference between perception of customers of India and USA regarding online shopping. This is true, since Online Shopping is increasing at a great level in India. According to the survey by Emarketer (<http://www.emarketer.com>) in 2010, 40% of people use the Online shopping medium daily in USA, and which is the highest percentage among the all the countries. When we compare with India, the percentage of people using the Internet for shopping is 16%. Internet buying prevalence was highest in the United States, where 93% of Internet users have bought on-line and it is growing rapidly in India where 45% had shopped online. Juxtconsult (2010), revealed in its study the results on the Internet user-ship, growth and penetration rate of on-line shopping in India. As per the survey findings, the 'regular' internet users have grown by 25% (compared to 19% last year).

Hypothesis H<sub>02</sub> was also accepted (Table 2(a) and 2(b)). This shows that there is no significant difference between perception of male and female customers of India and USA regarding online shopping. The results by Emerald Group ([www.emeraldinsight.com](http://www.emeraldinsight.com)) contradict our study because their study support the expected differences in men's and

women's shopping orientations and willingness to purchase clothing online. As per the finding on average, consumers indicated reduced difficulty in selecting items was sorely needed when purchasing clothing online. However, when evaluated across different purchasing situations, perceived difficulty in selecting items was an important action barrier only for women. Less fun significantly affected online clothing purchases for men purchasing clothing for themselves, but not for women doing the same. According to a report by the Pew Research Center (2001), the number of women (58%) who bought online exceeded the number of men (42%) by 16%. Among the woman who bought, 37% reported enjoying the experience a lot compared to only 17% of male shoppers who enjoyed the experience a lot.

Our study seems to be true, since now a days, females are also becoming utilitarian which was according to the study by Jarvenpaa and Todd (1997) basically seen more in males all over the world. Utilitarian shoppers are interested in e-tailing because of four specific attributes: convenience and accessibility, selection, availability of information and lack of sociality (Wolfenbarger and Gilly, 2008). DOI research in 2009 has focused on the perceived attributes of an innovation in USA on internet shopping, i.e., relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability. Consequently it is theorised that individuals whether male or female will be influenced by innovation if they perceive that the innovation is superior to an existing one or the status quo; compatible or consistent with existing values, beliefs, needs and practices; not too complex or difficult to use or understand.

However, the study by Swaminathan *et al.* (1999) reported that female internet buyers were more convenience oriented and motivated by social interaction than men internet buyers irrespective of the country. Alreck and Settle (2008) indicated that women have more positive attitudes toward online shopping. Mathwick *et al.* (2001) discussed the experiential value and enjoyment that women experience should be viewed as hedonic value. Kim and Shim (2008) proposed that women consumers going online are not only for information and products, but also, for emotional satisfaction. Prior research that does examine gender related attitudes and activities on the Internet suggests women are less interested in the Internet than men, spend less time online than men, and are less likely to purchase online (Allen, 2001; Rodgers and Harris, 2003).

Results from Tables 3(a) and 3(b) show that there is no significant difference between online customers of India and USA belonging to different age groups. This seems to be true, since people worldwide belonging to different age groups are participating in online shopping. The study, conducted by Internet and Mobile Association (IAMA), 2006 in collaboration with cross tab marketing services, clearly established the dominance of people-to-people (P2P)

reference in online shopping space, with 31% respondents finding such sites through word of mouth. As much as 55% women visitors to e-commerce sites have adopted internet as a shopping medium, out of which 25% of regular shoppers are in the 18-25 age group, while 46% in the 26-35 age group and 18% in the 35-45 age group.

The study showed that there was no significant difference between online consumers of different income groups of India and USA (Tables 4(a) and 4(b)). Our study is in accordance with the study by Hernandez *et al.* (2011) who in his study "Age, gender and income: do they really moderate online shopping behavior?" analysed whether individuals' country based characteristics-age, gender and income-influence their online shopping behaviour. The individuals analyzed were experienced e-shoppers i.e. individuals who often make purchases on the Internet. The results of their research show that country variable neither influences the use of the Internet nor the perceptions of e-commerce; in short, they do not condition the behaviour of the experienced e-shopper.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The analytical results of our investigation indicate relationships between perception of consumers in India and USA that influence their intention to buy through online. More specifically, consumers' perceptions of the customer service, reliability and trust of online purchasing exhibit significant relationships with their online buying intention. The result also depicted a void gap in perception of male and female customers irrespective of the country depicting a same mind set for same gender.

The growth in online sales can be partially attributed to the Internet's advantages of providing large amounts of information quickly and inexpensively and its growing accessibility. Yet, to reach its full potential, business owners who use ecommerce as a distribution channel need a clearer understanding of who buys online, what they buy online, why they buy online, and how the non-Internet buyer can be transformed into an online buyer in order to increase online sales. Once this information is available, the retailers can develop a clear strategy to retain existing and attract future consumers (Nucifora, 1997; Roha and Henry, 1998).

Companies should set-up a reliable and effective feedback system so that consumer can contact them at anytime. It is necessary not only to create cyber laws to protect customers but also make them aware about it. More flexible modes of payments need to be introduced by online companies. We can increase the online shopping by paying more attention on the factors which according to the consumers were causing a hindrance to promote online shopping. Cost of product and services after online shopping should be also kept in mind to accelerate online shopping. Also, consumers should be

trained for doing correct online shopping and must know all the procedures to be followed in the online shopping like payment mechanism and return policy. Marketers also need to understand how the online marketing environment affects the way consumers view and build strong relationships with them. This study will also provide valuable information to researchers tending to understand the online shopping perspective amongst demographic variables.

## LIMITATIONS

The survey was conducted among a group of respondents from two countries India and USA. Hence, it might not be applicable to other countries. To accurately evaluate Indian and USA consumers' perceptions of online shopping, a larger sample size is desirable. Besides, the data can be collected from many cities of India and USA to understand the behaviour of consumers belonging to different types of cities.

## REFERENCES

- AcNielsen (2009). Indians beat world in cyber . [online document].
- Allen, C. (2000). *Effective online merchandising techniques*. Retrieved from <http://www.clickz.com/cgi-bin/gt/print.html?article=2892>
- Alreck, P., & Settle, R. B. (2002). Gender effects on internet, catalogue and store shopping. *Journal of Database Marketing*, 9, 150-162.
- Awad, N. F., & Rogowsky, A. (2008). Establishing trust in electronic commerce through online word of mouth: An examination across genders. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(4), 101-121.
- Bailay, R. (2003). In India, shopping takes on a whole new meaning. *Wall Street Journal (Eastern edition)*.
- Cao, X., & Mokhtarian, P. L. (2005). The Intended and Actual Adoption of Online Purchasing: A Brief Review of Recent Literature. Research Report UCD-ITS-RR-05-07, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, D. Retrieved from <http://www.its.ucdavis.edu/publications/2005/UCD-ITS-RR-05-07.pdf>.
- Chang, M., Cheung, W., & Lai, V. S. (2005). Literature derived reference models for the adoption of online shopping. *Information & Management*, 42, 543-559.
- Chiang, K. P., & Dholakia, R. R. (2003). Factors driving consumer intention to shop online: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13(1&2), 177-183.
- Childers, T. L., Carr, C. L., Peck, J., & Carson, S. (2001). Hedonic and utilitarian motives for online retail shopping behavior. *Journal of Retailing*, 77, 511-535.
- Cyr, D., & Bonanni, C. (2005). Gender and website design in e-business. *International Journal of Electronic Business*, 3(6), 565-582.
- Cyr, D., Hassanein, K., Head, M., & Ivanov, A. (2007). The role of social presence in establishing loyalty in e-service environments. *Interacting with Computers*, 19(1), 43-56.
- Desai, A. (2006). Adaptive India- Changing Market scenario. *European Association for Comparative Economics Studies EACES 9th Bi-Annual Conference: Development Strategies-A Comparative View*.
- E-marketer (2002). Estate. Retrieved from <http://www.emarketer.com/eStats>.
- Farag, S., Weltevreden, J., van Rietbergen, T., Dijst, M., & van Oort, F. (2006a). E-shopping in the Netherlands: Does geography matter? *Environment and Planning B*, 33, 59-74.
- Farag, S., Krizek, K. J., & Dijst, M. (2006b). E-shopping and its relationship with in-store shopping: Empirical evidence from the Netherlands and the U.S. *Transport Reviews*, 26, 43-61.
- Fram, E. H., & Grandy, D. B. (1997). Internet shoppers: Is there a surfer gender gap?. *Direct Marketing*, 59(1), 46-50.
- Forrester Research Inc. (2002). "NRF/ Forrester online research index." Cambridge, MA: Forrester Research, Inc. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://www.forrester.com>.
- InternetRetailer.com (2008). E-commerce sales rise 19% last year in U.S. Retrieved from <http://www.Internetretailer.com/article.asp?id=25549>.
- Garbarino, E., & Johnson, M. S. (1999). The different roles of satisfaction, trust, and commitment in customer relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(2), 70-88.
- Gefen, D., & Straub, D. (2003). Managing user trust in B2C e-services. *E-Service Journal*, 2(2), 7-24.
- Hoffman, D. L., Novak, T. P., & Peralta, M. (1999). Building consumer trust online. *Communications of the ACM*, 42(4), 80-85.
- Hernández, B., Jiménez, J. M., & Martín, J. (2011). Age, gender and income: Do they really moderate online shopping behaviour? *Follow Online Information Review*, 35(1), 21. Emerald Publishing.
- IAMAI, (2006). Online shopping becomes latest fad in India. E-commerce Report 2006, [Online document]. Retrieved from <http://www.i4donline.net/news/newsdetails.asp?catid=5&newsid=5207>
- Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Todd, P. A. (1997). Consumer reactions to electronic shopping on the World Wide Web', *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 1(2), 59-88.

- Joines, J. L., Scherer, C. W., & Scheufele, D. A. (2003). Exploring motivations for consumer Web use and their implications for e-commerce. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20(2/3), 90-108.
- Juxtconsult (2008). Understanding on-line Indians and their net usage behaviours and preferences. India online 2009, [online document]. Retrieved from [www.juxtconsult.com](http://www.juxtconsult.com).
- Kim, J., & Lee, J. (2002). Critical design factors for successful e-commerce systems. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 21(3), 185-189.
- Kim Y. M., & Shim K. Y. (2002). The influence of intent shopping mall characteristics and user traits on purchase intent. *Iris Mark. Rev.*, 15, 25-34.
- Kunz, M.B. (1997). On-line customers: identifying store, product and consumer attributes which influences shopping on the Internet. Published doctoral dissertation. The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- MasterCard worldwide (2008). Economic Crisis and Preference for Online Shopping in Asia/Pacific, Middle East and Africa. [online document]. Retrieved from <http://www.zdnetasia.com/news/internet/0,39044908,62043095,00.html>.
- Mathwick, C., Malhotra N., & Rigdon, E. (2001). Experiential value: Conceptualization, measurement and application in the catalog and internet shopping environment. *Journal of Retailing*, 77, 39-56.
- Mehta, R., & Sivadas, E. (1995). Direct marketing on the Internet: An empirical assessment of consumer attitudes. *Journal of Direct Marketing*, 9(3), 21-32.
- Nucifora, A. (1997). Despite the hype, Internet numbers add up. *Business News*, 46(19).
- Ostrowski, P. J. (2009). A Determination of Non-Functional Shopping Motivations of Y-Generation Online Shoppers, 127.
- Peterson, R. A., Balasubramanian, S., & Bronnenberg, B. J. (1997). Exploring the implications of the Internet for consumer marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25, 329-346.
- Pew Research Center (2001). More online, doing more: 16 million newcomers gain Internet access in the last half of 2000 as women, minorities, and families with modest incomes continue to surge online. Retrieved July 24, 2001. [Online]. Available: <http://www.pewinternet.org/reports/toc.asp?Report=30>.
- Ranganathan, C., and Ganapathy, S. (2002). Key dimensions of business-to-customer web sites. *Information & Management*, 39, 457-465.
- Rodgers, S. & Harris, M. A. (2003). Gender and e-commerce: An exploratory study. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 43(3), 322-329.
- Roha, R. R., & Henry, E. (1998). These home business are smokin'. *Kiplinger's Personal Finance Magazine*, 52(3), 142-149.
- Shergil, G. S., & Chen, Z. (2005). Web-based shopping: consumers' attitudes towards online shopping in New Zealand. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 6(2), 79-94.
- Srivastava, R. K. (2008). Changing retail scene in India. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 36(9), 714-721.
- Sultan, F., & Henrichs, R. B. (2000). Consumer preferences for Internet services over time: Initial explorations. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*.
- Swaminathan, V., Lepowska W. E., & Rao, B. P. (1999). Browsers or buyers in cyberspace? An investigation of factors influencing electronic exchange. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 5, 208-221.
- Than, C. R., & Grandon, E. (2002). An exploratory examination of factors affecting online sales. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 42(3), 87-93.
- Wolfenbarger, M., & Gilly, M. (2001). Shopping online for freedom, control, and fun. *California Management Review*, 43(2), 34-55.
- Xia, L., & Kent B. Monroe (2004). Price Partitioning on the Internet. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(4), 63-73.
- Cao, X. J., Douma, F., Cleavel, F., & Xu, Z. (2012). The Interactions between E-Shopping and Store Shopping: A Case Study of the Twin Cities Final Report
- Venkatesh, V., & Morris, M. G. (2000). Why don't men ever stop to ask for directions? Gender, social influence and their role in technology acceptance and usage behaviour. *MIS Quarterly*, 24(1), 115-139.

## WEB REFERENCES

- [www.emeraldinsight.com](http://www.emeraldinsight.com)
- [www.dur.ac.uk](http://www.dur.ac.uk)
- [www.oft.gov.uk](http://www.oft.gov.uk)
- [www.Xianfengmousrainbow.wordpress.com](http://www.Xianfengmousrainbow.wordpress.com)
- [www.ukessays.co.uk](http://www.ukessays.co.uk)
- <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/putrevu10-2001.pdf>
- [http://www.emarketer.com/analysis/ecommerce\\_b2c/20010228\\_b2c.html](http://www.emarketer.com/analysis/ecommerce_b2c/20010228_b2c.html)
- <http://www.pewInternet.org/reports/toc.asp>
- <http://www.twinc.net.tw/download/200307/0801.pdf>.

**APPENDIX**

**Table 1: ANOVA Showing the Differences between Consumers of India and USA**

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.472	1	.472	.003	.960
Within Groups	45442.172	248	183.235		
Total	45442.644	249			

**Table 2(a) : ANOVA showing the Differences Etween Consumers of Different Gender of India and USA**

ANOVA					
total					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1482.967	3	494.322	2.766	.042
Within Groups	43959.677	246	178.698		
Total	45442.644	249			

**Table 3(a): ANOVA showing the Differences between Consumers of Different Age Groups of USA and India**

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Between Groups</b>	<b>1552.214</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>310.443</b>	<b>1.726</b>	<b>.129</b>
Within Groups	43890.430	244	179.879		
Total	45442.644	249			

**Table 4(a): ANOVA showing the Differences between Consumers of Different Income Groups of USA and India**

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	218.375	5	43.675	.236	.947
Within Groups	45224.269	244	185.345		
Total	45442.644	249			

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	231.216	5	46.243	.267	.931
Within Groups	34454.560	199	173.138		
Total	34685.776	204			

**Table 2(b): Multiple Comparisons for Consumers Belonging to Different Genders of India and USA**

Multiple Comparisons						
(I) GENDERCOUNTRY	(J) GENDERCOUNTRY	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Female India	Male India	-5.97435	2.33316	.053	-12.0095	.0608
	Female U.S.A	-1.54713	2.48271	.925	-7.9691	4.8748
	Male U.S.A	-4.80678	2.45093	.206	-11.1466	1.5330
Male India	Female India	5.97435	2.33316	.053	-.0608	12.0095
	Female U.S.A	4.42722	2.35582	.240	-1.6665	10.5210
	Male U.S.A	1.16757	2.32231	.958	-4.8395	7.1746
Female U.S.A	Female India	1.54713	2.48271	.925	-4.8748	7.9691
	Male India	-4.42722	2.35582	.240	-10.5210	1.6665
	Male U.S.A	-3.25965	2.47252	.552	-9.6553	3.1360
Male U.S.A	Female India	4.80678	2.45093	.206	-1.5330	11.1466
	Male India	-1.16757	2.32231	.958	-7.1746	4.8395
	Female U.S.A	3.25965	2.47252	.552	-3.1360	9.6553

**Table 3(b): Multiple Comparisons for Consumers Belonging to Different age Groups of India and USA**

(I) AGECOUNTRY	(J) AGECOUNTRY	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
15 - 30 India	31-45 India	-.96132	2.78472	.999	-8.9604	7.0378
	46-60 India	-2.04603	3.10793	.986	-10.9736	6.8815
	15-30 U.S.A	-4.85936	2.54193	.397	-12.1611	2.4424
	31-45 U.S.A	2.94064	2.44768	.836	-4.0903	9.9716
	41-60 U.S.A	.18306	3.26196	1.000	-9.1870	9.5531
31-45 India	15 - 30 India	.96132	2.78472	.999	-7.0378	8.9604
	46-60 India	-1.08471	3.53351	1.000	-11.2347	9.0653
	15-30 U.S.A	-3.89804	3.04760	.796	-12.6523	4.8562
	31-45 U.S.A	3.90196	2.96944	.777	-4.6278	12.4317
	41-60 U.S.A	1.14439	3.66972	1.000	-9.3969	11.6857
46-60 India	15 - 30 India	2.04603	3.10793	.986	-6.8815	10.9736
	31-45 India	1.08471	3.53351	1.000	-9.0653	11.2347
	15-30 U.S.A	-2.81333	3.34551	.960	-12.4233	6.7967
	31-45 U.S.A	4.98667	3.27448	.650	-4.4193	14.3926
	41-60 U.S.A	2.22909	3.92065	.993	-9.0330	13.4912
15-30 U.S.A	15 - 30 India	4.85936	2.54193	.397	-2.4424	12.1611
	31-45 India	3.89804	3.04760	.796	-4.8562	12.6523
	46-60 India	2.81333	3.34551	.960	-6.7967	12.4233
	31-45 U.S.A	7.80000	2.74305	.054	-.0794	15.6794
	41-60 U.S.A	5.04242	3.48907	.699	-4.9800	15.0648
31-45 U.S.A	15 - 30 India	-2.94064	2.44768	.836	-9.9716	4.0903
	31-45 India	-3.90196	2.96944	.777	-12.4317	4.6278
	46-60 India	-4.98667	3.27448	.650	-14.3926	4.4193
	15-30 U.S.A	-7.80000	2.74305	.054	-15.6794	.0794
	41-60 U.S.A	-2.75758	3.42102	.966	-12.5845	7.0693
41-60 U.S.A	15 - 30 India	-.18306	3.26196	1.000	-9.5531	9.1870
	31-45 India	-1.14439	3.66972	1.000	-11.6857	9.3969
	46-60 India	-2.22909	3.92065	.993	-13.4912	9.0330
	15-30 U.S.A	-5.04242	3.48907	.699	-15.0648	4.9800
	31-45 U.S.A	2.75758	3.42102	.966	-7.0693	12.5845

**Table 4(b): Multiple Comparisons for Consumers belonging to Different Income Groups of India and USA**

Multiple Comparisons						
Total Tukey HSD						
(I) INCOMECOUNTRY	(J) INCOMECOUNTRY	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Low level India	Middle level India	-.32139	2.70026	1.000	-8.0779	7.4351
	High Level India	-.25769	3.74429	1.000	-11.0132	10.4978
	Low level U.S.A	.90283	3.80887	1.000	-10.0382	11.8438
	Middle level U.S.A	.67692	2.75752	1.000	-7.2441	8.5979
	High Level U.S.A	-2.24887	3.19434	.981	-11.4246	6.9269
Middle level India	Low level India	.32139	2.70026	1.000	-7.4351	8.0779
	High Level India	.06370	3.43602	1.000	-9.8063	9.9337
	Low level U.S.A	1.22422	3.50628	.999	-8.8476	11.2960
	Middle level U.S.A	.99831	2.32173	.998	-5.6709	7.6675
	High Level U.S.A	-1.92748	2.82671	.984	-10.0472	6.1923
High Level India	Low level India	.25769	3.74429	1.000	-10.4978	11.0132
	Middle level India	-.06370	3.43602	1.000	-9.9337	9.8063
	Low level U.S.A	1.16053	4.36145	1.000	-11.3678	13.6888
	Middle level U.S.A	.93462	3.48120	1.000	-9.0652	10.9344
	High Level U.S.A	-1.99118	3.83648	.995	-13.0115	9.0292
Low level U.S.A	Low level India	-.90283	3.80887	1.000	-11.8438	10.0382
	Middle level India	-1.22422	3.50628	.999	-11.2960	8.8476
	High Level India	-1.16053	4.36145	1.000	-13.6888	11.3678
	Middle level U.S.A	-.22591	3.55056	1.000	-10.4249	9.9731
	High Level U.S.A	-3.15170	3.89953	.966	-14.3531	8.0497
Middle level U.S.A	Low level India	-.67692	2.75752	1.000	-8.5979	7.2441
	Middle level India	-.99831	2.32173	.998	-7.6675	5.6709
	High Level India	-.93462	3.48120	1.000	-10.9344	9.0652
	Low level U.S.A	.22591	3.55056	1.000	-9.9731	10.4249
	High Level U.S.A	-2.92579	2.88146	.913	-11.2028	5.3512
High Level U.S.A	Low level India	2.24887	3.19434	.981	-6.9269	11.4246
	Middle level India	1.92748	2.82671	.984	-6.1923	10.0472
	High Level India	1.99118	3.83648	.995	-9.0292	13.0115
	Low level U.S.A	3.15170	3.89953	.966	-8.0497	14.3531
	Middle level U.S.A	2.92579	2.88146	.913	-5.3512	11.2028

**Table 5: Tables Showing Description of Various Demographic Variables**

	India	USA	Total
15-30	73	45	118
31-45	34	51	85
46-60	25	22	47
Total	132	118	

Income Groups	India	USA	Total
Low level	39	19	48
Middle level	20	65	85
High level	73	34	107
Total	132	118	250

Gender	India	USA	Total
Male	74	60	134
Female	59	57	116
Total	133	117	250