

**EXPLORING MOBILE SHOPPING INTENTION:
SYSTEMATIC REVIEW USING WEIGHT ANALYSIS APPROACH**

*Meenu ** Dr. Manpreet Kaur

*Research Scholar, Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh, Punjab

**Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management & Commerce,
Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh, Punjab

Abstract

The bulk of people use 'mobile phones' to 'access products' and 'services' for their daily requirements, making them an essential element of human lives. However, the global adoption of mobile shopping is not as rapid or widespread as anticipated. Additionally, relatively less studies have been done to comprehend different 'factors' that predicts the 'adoption of mobile shopping' by consumers. 'This research' paper 'aims to investigate the factors' influencing mobile shopping intention among consumers. To reach a conclusion, the research aims to synthesize information from previous studies. Using a weight analysis approach, the study identifies the most significant predictors of mobile shopping intention and provides insights into how these factors impact consumer decisions. For this investigation, 51 quantitative research studies in all were consulted and ten "best" predictors of intention to be used in the weight analysis approach are identified by the study. The TAM, UTAUT and UTAUT2 models were mostly used by researchers as theoretical background.

Keywords: [Weight Analysis, Behavioural Intention, Mobile Apps, Mobile Shopping and Online Shopping]

INTRODUCTION

Mobile commerce (MC) has been compelled to go global over the past few years by innovations in 'mobile devices' (e.g., smartphones) and 'technologies' (e.g., 5G) (Celik, 2016). 1.2 billion of India's mobile customers existed in 2021, of which more than 750 million used smartphones and this 'smartphone market' is anticipated to have '1 billion smartphone' customers by the year 2026 based on Deloitte's 2022 Global TMT projections (Pti, 2022). India's e-commerce sector is expanding quickly and is predicted to reach \$200 billion in 2027 due to favourable conditions and a rising trend of internet users (Statista, 2021). The expansion of India's e-commerce sector was spurred by the rise in internet connections and smartphone adoption. India's e-commerce sector is predicted to grow from \$46.2 billion in 2020 to \$188 billion by 2025 and \$350 billion by 2030, demonstrating how the country's business practices have changed (IBEF, 2022).

With a 25 to 30 percent 'annual growth' and 'doubling' its 'market penetration' within the 'next five years', 'Indian e-commerce' business is estimate to hit \$150 billion to \$170 'billion by 2027' (Business Standard News, 2022). Online purchasing is a rapidly emerging trend in India. The growth of India's e-commerce market was driven by augmented use of the 'internet' and 'smartphones'. 'India's e-commerce industry', which has transformed

India's 'business practices', is projected to rise from '\$46.2 billion in 2020' to '\$188 billion by 2025' and '\$350 billion by 2030' (Khurana, 2022). A discernible shift in consumer behaviour towards online purchasing may be seen in the rise in internet penetration. In India, consumers have been shifting from conventional to internet purchasing. The COVID epidemic encourages people to make purchases online, which helps the e-retail business develop by 25–30 percent by FY 2026 and reach between \$120 billion and \$140 billion (Tandon, 2021). Online shoppers are drawn to online purchasing, which has affected 'the retail industry' as a whole and contributed significantly to the 'growth' of the e-commerce sector. In addition to growing quickly, online shopping is having a favourable economic impact. Therefore, in order to create and execute marketing strategies that would satisfy online shoppers and create a solid relationship, e-retailers need to understand their buying intentions. Many researchers carried out empirical investigations the online purchasing intention of consumers in various nations or areas. Researchers found a wide range of variables, characteristics, and constructs using various study models that influence the intention of online purchasers in these studies. Since various studies were carried out in various nations, the grades of the mainstream of these 'studies' varied due to the differences in place, sample size and target

population, etc. As the results are frequently ambiguous and inconsistent, concluding the factors influencing the behaviour intention of online shoppers is extremely challenging without assessing, integrating, and synthesising the results of these studies. Thus, this study is undertaken in order to identify the predominant determinants of customers' intention towards mobile shopping. It is thus imperative to bring into focus, summarize, and explain the consequences of presented research 'in order to provide' a 'holistic description' of the behaviour of online consumers. With the application of weight analysis, 'this study aims' at identifying the determinants of customers' intention towards 'mobile shopping'. A weight analysis (Jeyaraj et al., 2006) has developed into a potent tool for analyzing the findings of prior studies (Rana et al., 2015), and it has helped to provide a clear, succinct, and comprehensive understanding of the factors.

BACKGROUND AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The term "online shopping intention" describes a consumer's desire to make purchases via online shops or sites rather than more conventional brick-and-mortar stores. It is necessary to review previous research in this field or related fields of information technology, as well as the theories and models employed by these studies, to comprehend and analyze the factors affecting consumers' intention towards mobile shopping. This part provides an overview of all 'the included studies', including the 'year', 'sample size', 'technology', 'nation' in which the experiments were done, and a review and description of the theoretical models. Numerous studies have scrutinized the determinants of internet users' purchasing intention, but the literature in this area is fragmented and unique. This study has considered different contexts, including mobile shopping applications (Singh & Srivastava, 2018a; Chopdar et al., 2018; Chopdar & Sivakumar, 2019; Khurna & Jain.,2019; Soni et al.,2019; Human et al., 2020; Chadha et al.,2022), 'online shopping' (Celik, 2016; Singh & Srivastava,

2018a; Dewi et al., 2020; Raman, 2019; Rehman et al., 2019; Tandon & Kiran, 2018), m-commerce (Asastani et al., 2018), m-banking (Farah et al., 2018; Singh & Srivastava, 2018b; Foroughi et al., 2019), m-payment applications(Luarn & Juo, 2010; Migliore et al.,2022; Gupta & Arora, 2020; Patil et al., 2020; Upadhyay et al., 2022), and travel applications (Gupta et al., 2018). As already discussed studies on the factors influencing customer behavioural intention in online settings have been inconsistent and dispersed, as was previously mentioned. Researchers have employed several methodologies to ascertain the variables influencing the conduct of online behavior intention. A description and definitions of all the major elements are included in Table 4. The descriptions of the IS theories that were employed by earlier researchers and examined in this study are provided below.

'Theory of Reasoned Action' (TRA): As per Ajzen (1991), TRA is a very crucial and basic theory of human behavior. Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) suggested that, 'attitudes' and 'subjective standards' play a 'significant role' in predicting the behavioral intention of a given activity, such as online shopping.

'The Technology Acceptance Model' (TAM): The foundations of the 'Technology Acceptance Model' (TAM) are 'Perceived Usefulness' (PU) and 'Perceived Ease of Usage' (PEOU), which capture individuals' attitudes towards and 'use of new technology' (Davis et al., 1989).

UTAUT, UTAUT2: Venkatesh et al. (2003) formulates Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) is among the most comprehensive theories. It is based on eight various technology models or theories to formulate its four 'independent variables'—'performance expectancy', 'effort expectancy', 'social influence', and 'facilitating conditions'—and its 'dependent variables', which are users' behavioural intentions and new technology use behaviour. As per Venkatesh et al. (2003), voluntariness, experience, 'gender', and age serve as moderators in this hypothesis.

'Venkatesh et al. (2012)' commenced the 'UTAUT2 model' as an conservatory of the 'UTAUT model' with three additional factors: 'price', 'habit', and 'hedonic motivation'. The model was intended to be used in a consumer setting rather than an employee one for the adoption of technology. According to Gupta and Arora (2020), UTAUT2 has been utilised by several researches in various fields and has been shown to be more effective in envisaging 'behavioural intention' and 'usage'.

'Theory of Planned Behaviour' (TPB): The concept of 'planned behaviour' was introduced by 'Ajzen (1991)' as a 'development of theory of reasoned action', which links viewpoint to action ('Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980'; 'Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975'). In the 'TPB', an individual's 'attitude', 'subjective norms', and 'perceived behavioural control' are the three critical predictors of their behavioural intention, which is a very accurate predictor of how individuals will employ their behaviour.

The Social Cognitive Theory SCT: In accordance with Bandura (1977, 1982), 'social cognitive theory' is a 'theory' of learning that describes 'human behaviour' in terms of 'three' key 'behavioural drivers': cognitive, behavioural, and ecological variables. These elements all share a triadic mechanism. The well recognised theory of social cognition, which studies how people adopt specific behaviours, is concerned with individual conduct (Bandura, 1977, 1982).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In categorize to determine the general 'link' between variables or constructs, researchers have concentrated on synthesising the findings of a subset of studies conducted during the previous 14 years. i) Only English-language publications and studies from after 2010 were allowed. This date was selected because, in India, e-commerce will become more commonplace after then, ii) The only empirical research that measures the important 'variables of intention' to make an 'online purchase' and 'actual behaviour' is included, iii) Only research with measurable purchase intentions or actual purchases or use as a result is included. The study

employed a blend of "systematic review" and "weight-analysis" practices to aggregate the results of included research studies. It engaged a 'keyword-based search' in databases such as 'Google Scholar', 'Scopus' and 'Web of Science'. The search terms used included "mobile shopping," "m-shopping," "mobile apps," and "mobile purchasing," as well as "adoption," "acceptance," "usage," and "intention." This initial search, covering the period from 2010 to 2023, resulted in the identification of 544 related articles. After identifying the important authors of linked studies, the prior selected database was searched for their names. A total of 315 articles were eliminated due to duplication or finding the same item in several databases or not fully downloadable. Only 229 of the remaining articles were fully downloaded. Following that, researchers opened and reviewed each article to ensure it met the specified criteria for study selection. Most of these publications were qualitative investigations without statistical evaluations such as sample size. In preventing biases, Baptista and Oliveira (2016) omitted qualitative research and secondary database investigations. Following the research requirements were discovered after verification, only 51 publications were included in our study. 'The sample selected' in this 'research' was originated 'suitable' according to comparison with previous research studies presented in 'accredited journals', i.e., those selected by 'Pelaez et al. (2019)' (35 studies) and Tamilmani et al. (2020) (60 studies). After careful examination of each article, the following details were extracted: the names of authors, publication year, size of the sample, variables (dependent and independent), whether the relationship is significant or not, the context (online shopping, mobile payment app etc.), the name of the nation where the sample was taken, the target population, and the theory used. During the procedure, the study discovered that while the authors of the chosen studies used various names for the same variables or constructs, those had smiler meanings. This was discovered throughout the data extraction procedure. The

'intention to adopt', 'intention', 'behavioural intention', 'intention to use', and 'intention to purchase' were all merged into a single term, "behavioural intention".

RESULTS

The weighted score reflects 'independent variable's' analytical capability over the 'dependent variable' in one specific relationship (Jeyaraj et al., 2006). The authors noted 46 correlations between 'independent variables' and the 'dependent variable'-behavioural intention-when they studied their selected researches. Adopting Baptista and Oliveira's (2016) and Rana et al.'s (2015) approach, we considered all relationships examined three times or more.

To meet this requirement, 19 independent constructs are found, and Table 1 presents these 19 relationships. Weight is determined in this study by taking into account all 'significant' relationships and the total relations between two variables. The (a)/(b) method is used to determine weight; (a) denotes 'significant relationships' between the 'independent' and 'dependent variables', and (b) denotes 'total number of relationships' between the 'independent' and 'dependent variables' (Rana et al., 2015; Tamilmani et al., 2021). In all the studies included here, if weight remaining after 'dividing (a)/(b)' is one '(1)', there exists a 'significant' relationship between the 'two variables'; if 'weight' is zero (0), then there is no 'significant' relationship between the two variables (Rana et al., 2015). Further, the independent variables in the selected studies may be said to as "well-utilized" if they have been examined five times or more, and as "experimental" predictors of dependent variables if they have been researched less than five times (Jeyaraj et al., 2006). Also, as per Jeyaraj et al. (2006), "experimental" is the "promising" predictor when weight = 1, and "well-utilized" is the "best" predictor of the dependent variable when weight = or > 0.80. Tables 2 and 3 present independent variables that were "well utilized" and those which satisfied "best predictor" criteria status of the dependent variable. Seventeen variables were identified as being the "well-utilized" predictors of mobile shopping intentions with five or

more examinations in this research. Out of these seventeen variables, ten variables were found "best" predictors of Behavioural Intention. These variables comprise attitude (1), habit (.92), hedonic motivation (0.86), PE (0.87), PU (0.94), PI (0.87), 'self-efficacy' (0.8), 'subjective norm' (0.90), 'trust' (0.84), and 'utilitarian motivation' (1), identifies as the "best predictor" for 'behavioural intention' where the weight of these "well-used" predictors is equal to or higher than 0.80. The remaining seven variables that are deemed to be "well-utilized" are: social influence (0.60), price value (0.71), 'perceived risk' (0.53), 'perceived ease of use' (0.71), 'perceived behavioural control' (0.71), 'facilitating conditions' (0.68), and 'effort expectancy' (0.56). with a weighing of less than 0.80 was found to be the least/worst 'predictor' of factors of 'behavioural intention' (Jeyaraj et al., 2006). E-service quality and satisfaction were "experimental" predictors (fewer than five tests) of behavioural intention. Satisfaction has a perfect weight of one (1) and is the "promising predictor" of consumers' behavioural intention among these two "experimental" predictors. Researchers need to evaluate such "promising predictors" for further research to make them "best predictors" because no relationship was found to be 'non-significant' in "promising predictor".

DISCUSSIONS

Researchers have used various fictitious models, theories, and constructs in several observational studies on online commerce and retail over the past several years. The study of 'these studies', assist of "weight analysis" provides a strong foundation for the outcomes and concerned approach of the dependent variable indicators. On the basis of "weight analysis" ten of the dependent variables' found "best" predictors of intention to shop with mobile apps. According to the analysis, the most prevalent theories are 'TAM' (Davis et al., 1989), 'UTAUT' (Venkatesh et al., 2003), and 'UTAUT2' (Venkatesh et al., 2012), which include the majority of the best predictors. The study also makes the case that an empirical investigation of these determinants and their

connections should be carried out to validate the value of weight analysis findings. To avoid being constrained by a specific model or type of e-technology/e-service, the current study provided an arrangement plot for the basic attributes of behavioural intention. The advantage of this technique is that it provided us with a more thorough and integrated structure/framework and a synthesis of the qualities of good researchers.

IMPLICATIONS AND PRACTICE

The study's 'findings' also suggested implication for 'theory and practice'. The most commonly employed theories are UTAUT2 and TAM, followed by UTAUT and TPB. This study also concerned with this practise and believed that it enhanced the theoretical model and provided new knowledge. This research also suggests that new theories, like UTAUT2, the most employed 'theory' in this work with extra 'constructs of other theories', be used as an alternative of 'traditional theories' ('IDT, TRA, SCT, SOR' etc.). Future 'researchers' can utilize the study's results to determine whether or not a given construct belongs in the research model by using an actual and strong selection of constructs for empirical investigations conducted for adoption of mobile shopping apps. For illustration, the 'best predictors of dependent variables' with 'significant results' must be utilized for additional 'empirical study', while "promising predictors" must be studied more before they can be labeled as the "best predictors" of dependent variables.

CONCLUSIONS

Our study aims to evaluate 51 chosen studies over the past 14 years about mobile shopping and to do a "weight analysis" of the notions used. This was done by determining the 'significant and insignificant relationships' between the 'constructs, sample size, respondent type, research country, and the other necessary data'. The article enumerates the "best," "worst," and "promising" determinants of behavioural intention ('Jeyaraj et al., 2006'; 'Rana et al., 2015'). The element that is recognized as the "best predictor" of behavioural intention is 'attitude', 'habit', 'hedonic motivation',

'performance expectancy', 'perceived usefulness', 'personal innovativeness', 'self-efficacy', 'subjective norms', 'trust', and 'utilitarian motivation'. As a result, this result offers a solid and secure foundation for future research on consumers' intention to purchase online and their usage patterns. The Technology Acceptance Model's most frequently utilised constructs were identified as UTAUT and UTAUT2. Based on the study's result, the UTAUT2 theory can be extended or integrated with other theories or constructs to examine the more effective amplification of behavioural intention. Table 4 of the research provides definitions for all significant factors found in the relevant literature.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

For the following reasons, a correct arrangement may not be obtained when weight analysis is used to ascertain the link between constructs: (i) A few subjective and 'experimental studies' were excluded; (ii) the editorial selection was limited to 'English-language' articles; (iii) this review focused primarily on papers published in journals; therefore, unpublished theses and conference papers were not included. Further 'studies' may 'consider' socioeconomics, the 'legal environment', and 'social concerns' as disconnect components of the assessment in addition to the above-mentioned restrictions. A 'meta-analysis' using 'weight analysis' (Jeyaraj et al., 2006) has developed into a potent tool for analyzing the findings of prior studies ('Rana et al., 2015'), and it has helped to provide a clear, succinct, and comprehensive understanding of the predictive factors (Baptista & Oliveira, 2016), so the future study can be conducted with "meta-analysis". The future study prompted a closer examination of the most popular model to determine whether any other relationships exist that weren't considered in this analysis. Based on the crucial investigations that were outside the scope of this study, future research utilizes another analysis approach to examine the relationships between the relevant components. To validate the results of this review, empirical research might be conducted using data acquired from important sources.

Table 1: Variables examinations.

SN	"Independent Variables"	Dependent	(a)	Non-Significant	(b)	(a/b)
1.	'Attitude'	BI	22	0	22	1
2.	'Effort Expectancy'		13	10	23	0.56
3.	'E-Service Quality'		3	1	4	0.75
4.	'Facilitating Conditions'		17	8	25	0.68
5.	'Habit'		12	1	13	.92
6.	'Hedonic Motivation'		19	3	22	0.86
7.	'Perceived Behaviour Control'		5	2	7	0.71
8.	'Performance Expectancy'		21	2	23	0.875
9.	'Perceived Ease of Use'		5	2	7	0.71
10.	'Perceived Usefulness'		18	1	19	0.94
11.	'Personal Innovativeness'		7	1	8	0.87
12.	'Perceived Risk'		7	6	13	0.53
13.	'Price Value'		10	4	14	0.71
14.	'Satisfaction'		3	0	3	1
15.	'Self-efficacy'		4	1	5	0.8
16.	'Social Influence'		15	10	25	0.60
17.	'Subjective Norm'		10	1	11	0.90
18.	'Trust'		16	3	19	0.84
19.	'Utilitarian Motivation'		5	0	5	1

(a) Significant relations, (b) Total relations, (a/b) Weight

Table 2: “Well-Utilized Predictors”

SN	'Independent' Variables	DV	(a)	Non-Sig	(b)	(a/b)
1.	'Attitude'	BI	22	0	22	1
2.	'Effort Expectancy'		13	10	23	0.56
3.	'Facilitating Conditions'		17	8	25	0.68
4.	'Habit'		12	1	13	.92
5.	'Hedonic Motivation'		19	3	22	0.86
6.	'Perceived Behaviour Control'		5	2	7	0.71
7.	'Performance Expectancy'		21	2	23	0.875
8.	'Perceived Ease of Use'		5	2	7	0.71
9.	'Perceived Usefulness'		18	1	19	0.94
10.	'Personal Innovativeness'		7	1	8	0.87
11.	'Perceived Risk'		7	6	13	0.53
12.	'Price Value'		10	4	14	0.71
13.	'Self-efficacy'		4	1	5	0.8
14.	'Social Influence'		15	10	25	0.60
15.	'Subjective Norm'		10	1	11	0.90
16.	'Trust'		16	3	19	0.84
17.	'Utilitarian Motivation'		5	0	5	1

(a) Significant relations, (b) Total relations, (a/b) Weight

Table 3: “Best predictor”

SN	'Independent Variables'	DV	(a)	Non-Sig	(b)	(a/b)
1.	'Attitude'	BI	22	0	22	1
2.	'Habit'		12	1	13	.92
3.	'Hedonic Motivation'		19	3	22	0.86
4.	'Performance Expectancy'		21	2	23	0.875
5.	'Perceived Usefulness'		18	1	19	0.94
6.	'Personal Innovativeness'		7	1	8	0.87
7.	'Self-efficacy'		4	1	5	0.8
8.	'Subjective Norm'		10	1	11	0.90
9.	'Trust'		16	3	19	0.84
10.	'Utilitarian Motivation'		5	0	5	1

(a) Significant relations, (b) Total relations, (a/b) Weight

Table 4: Definitions of major factors

Major factors	Definitions
'Attitude'	"An individual's positive or negative feelings about performing the target behaviour"(Davis et al., 1989).
'Effort Expectancy'	"The degree of ease associated with the use of the system" (Venkatesh et al., 2003).
'Facilitating Conditions'	"The degree to which an individual believes that an organizational and technical infrastructure exists to support the use of the system"(Venkatesh et al., 2003).
'Habit'	"The extent to which people tend to perform behaviors automatically because of learning" (Limayem et al., 2007; Venkatesh et al., 2012).
'Self-efficacy'	"Conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes" (Bandura, 1977).
'Price Value'	"Consumers' cognitive tradeoff between the perceived benefits of the applications and the monetary cost for using them"(Dodds et al., 1991; Venkatesh et al., 2012)
'Social Influence'	"The degree to which an individual perceives that important, others believe he or she should use the new system"(Venkatesh et al., 2003).
'Performance Expectancy'	"The degree to which an individual believes that using the system will help him or her to attain gains in job performance"(Venkatesh et al., 2003).
'Hedonic Motivation'	"The fun or pleasure derived from using a technology" (Venkatesh et al., 2012)
'Perceived Ease of Use'	"The degree to which the user expects the target system to be free of effort" (Davis et al., 1989).
'Perceived Usefulness'	"The user's subjective probability that using a specific application system will increase his or her job performance within an organizational context" (Davis et al., 1989)
'Satisfaction'	"Customers' evaluations of a product or service with regard to their needs and expectations" (Oliver, 1980).
'Subjective Norm'	"The person's perception that most people who are important to him think he should or should not perform the behavior in question" (Davis et al., 1989).
'Trust'	"Trust is a single dimension construct dealing with a consumer's assessment that the vendor is trustworthy"(Gefen, 2000).
'Perceived Behaviour Control'	"The perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior" (Ajzen, 1991).
'E-Service Quality'	"The extent to which a website facilitates efficient and effective shopping, purchasing, and delivery" (Parasuraman et al., 2005).
'Behavioural Intention'	"The strength of one's intention to perform a specified behavior" (Davis et al.,1989).
'Personal Innovativeness'	"The willingness of an individual to try out any new information technology"(Agarwal & Prasad, 1998).
'Perceived Risk'	"The users' subjective evaluation of incurring losses while using a particular system" (Sarkar et al., 2020).
'Utilitarian Motivation'	"An overall assessment (i.e., judgment) of functional benefits and sacrifices" (Overby & Lee, 2006).

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, R., & Prasad, J. (1998). A Conceptual and Operational Definition of Personal Innovativeness in the Domain of Information Technology, *Research* (Vol. 9, Issue 2). <https://about.jstor.org/terms>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior, *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Asastani, H. L., Kusumawardhana, V. H., & Warnars, H. L. H. S. (2018, September). Factors affecting the usage of mobile commerce using technology acceptance model (TAM) and unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (UTAUT), In 2018 Indonesian association for pattern recognition international conference (INAPR) (pp. 322-328). IEEE.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change., *Psychological Review* (Vol. 84, Issue 2).
- Bandura, A. (1982). *Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency*.
- Baptista, G., & Oliveira, T. (2016). A weight and a meta-analysis on mobile banking acceptance research, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 63, pp. 480-489. Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.074>
- Business Standard (2022). India's e-retail market to increase to \$150 bn-\$170 bn by 2027: Report. https://www.business-standard.com/article/companies/india-s-e-retail-market-to-increase-to-150-bn-170-bn-by-2027-report-122101001141_1.html
- Celik, H. (2016). Customer online shopping anxiety within the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use Technology (UTAUT) framework, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 28(2), 278-307. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-05-2015-0077>
- Chadha, P., Gera, R., & Ahuja, V. (2022). Determinants of MSA adoption intentions and usage behaviour of internet savvy and younger consumers: insights from an emerging market, *International Journal of Electronic Business*, 17(1), 87. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijeb.2022.120037>
- Chopdar, P. K., & Sivakumar, V. J. (2019). Understanding continuance usage of mobile shopping applications in India: the role of espoused cultural values and perceived risk. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 38(1), 42-64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2018.1513563>
- Chopdar, P. K., Korfiatis, N., Sivakumar, V., & Lytras, M. D. (2018). Mobile shopping apps adoption and perceived risks: A cross-country perspective utilizing the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 86, 109-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.04.017>
- Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models, *Management Science* (Vol. 35, Issue 8).
- Dewi, C. K., Mohaidin, Z., & Murshid, M. A. (2020). Determinants of online purchase intention: a PLS-SEM approach: evidence from Indonesia, *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 14(3), 281-306. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-03-2019-0086>
- Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of Price, Brand, and Store Information on Buyers' Product Evaluations, *Journal of Marketing Research* (Vol. 28, Issue 3).
- Farah, M. F., Hasni, M. J. S., & Abbas, A. K. (2018). Mobile-banking adoption: empirical evidence from the banking sector in Pakistan, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 36(7), 1386-1413. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-10-2017-0215>
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief attitude, intention and behaviour: An introduction to theory and research*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Foroughi, B., Iranmanesh, M., & Hyun, S. S. (2019). Understanding the determinants of mobile banking continuance usage intention, *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 32(6), 1015-1033. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-10-2018-0237>
- Gefen, D. (2000). E-commerce: the role of familiarity and trust, *Omega*, 28(6), 725-737.
- Gupta, A., Dogra, N., & George, B. (2018). What determines tourist adoption of smartphone apps?: An analysis based on the UTAUT-2 framework, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 9(1), 48-62.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTT-02-2017-0013>

Gupta, K., & Arora, N. (2020). Investigating consumer intention to accept mobile payment systems through unified theory of acceptance model: An Indian perspective, *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 9(1), 88-114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-03-2019-0037>

Human, G., Ungerer, M., & Azémia, J. A. J. (2020). Mauritian consumer intentions to adopt online grocery shopping: An extended decomposition of UTAUT2 with moderation, *Management Dynamics: Journal of the Southern African Institute for Management Scientists*, 29(3), 15-37.

IBEF. (2022). E-commerce in India: Industry Overview, Market Size & Growth. Retrieved July 23, 2022, from <https://www.ibef.org/industry/ecommerce>

Jeyaraj, A., Rottman, J. W., & Lacity, M. C. (2006). A review of the predictors, linkages, and biases in IT innovation adoption research, *Journal of Information Technology*, 21(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jit.2000056>

Khurana, A. (2022, May 21). How tech startups are boosting the growth of small e-commerce businesses in India, *The Economic Times*. <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/small-biz/sme-sector/how-tech-startups-are-boosting-the-growth-of-small-e-commerce-businesses-in-india/articleshow/91703404.cms>

Khurana, S., & Jain. (2019). Applying and extending UTAUT2 model of adoption of new technology in the context of M-Shopping fashion apps, *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 8(9S), 752-759. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.i1122.0789s19>

Limayem, M., Hirt, S. G., & Cheung, C. M. K. (2007). *How Habit Limits the Predictive Power of Intention: The Case of Information Systems Continuance* (Vol. 31, Issue 4).

Luarn, P., & Juo, W.-J. (2010). The role of trust in technology within the TAM in the context of NFC mobile payment, *Journal of Information and Optimization Sciences*, 31(4), 875-896. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02522667.2010.10700000>

Migliore, G., Wagner, R., Cechella, F. S., & Liébana-

Cabanillas, F. (2022). Antecedents to the Adoption of Mobile Payment in China and Italy: an Integration of UTAUT2 and Innovation Resistance Theory, *Information Systems Frontiers*, 24(6), 2099-2122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-021-10237-2>

Oliver, R. L. (1980). A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions, *Journal of Marketing Research* (Vol. 17, Issue 4).

Overby, J. W., & Lee, E. J. (2006). The effects of utilitarian and hedonic online shopping value on consumer preference and intentions, *Journal of Business Research*, 59(10-11), 1160-1166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.03.008>

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Malhotra, A. (2005). E-S-QUAL a multiple-item scale for assessing electronic service quality, *Journal of Service Research*, 7(3), 213-233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670504271156>

Patil, P., Tamilmani, K., Rana, N. P., & Raghavan, V. (2020). Understanding consumer adoption of mobile payment in India: Extending Meta-UTAUT model with personal innovativeness, anxiety, trust, and grievance redressal, *International Journal of Information Management*, 54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102144>

Pelaez, A., Chen, C. W., & Chen, Y. X. (2019). Effects of Perceived Risk on Intention to Purchase: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 59(1), 73-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2017.1300514>

Pti. (2022, February 22). India to have 1 billion smartphone users by 2026: Deloitte, *The Economic Times*. <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/industry/cons-products/electronics/india-to-have-1-billion-smartphone-users-by-2026-deloitte/articleshow/89750324.cms>

Raman, P. (2019). Understanding female consumers' intention to shop online: The role of trust, convenience and customer service, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 31(4), 1138-1160. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-10-2018-0396>

Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Williams, M. D. (2015). A

- meta-analysis of existing research on citizen adoption of e-government, *Information Systems Frontiers*, 17(3), 547-563. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-013-9431-z>
- Rehman, S. U., Bhatti, A., Mohamed, R., & Ayoup, H. (2019). The moderating role of trust and commitment between consumer purchase intention and online shopping behavior in the context of Pakistan, *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-019-0166-2>
- Sarkar, S., Chauhan, S., & Khare, A. (2020). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of trust in mobile commerce, *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 50, pp. 286-301. Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.008>
- Singh, S., & Srivastava, S. (2018a). Moderating effect of product type on online shopping behaviour and purchase intention: An Indian perspective, *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2018.1495043>
- Singh, S., & Srivastava, R. K. (2018b). Predicting the intention to use mobile banking in India, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 36(2), 357-378. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-12-2016-0186>
- Soni, M., Jain, K., & Kumar, B. (2019). Factors affecting the adoption of fashion mobile shopping applications, *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 10(4), 358-376. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2019.1649165>
- Statista. (2021). E-commerce market value India 2014-2027. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/792047/india-e-commerce-market-size/>
- Tamilmani, K., Rana, N. P., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2021). Consumer Acceptance and Use of Information Technology: A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of UTAUT2, *Information Systems Frontiers*, 23(4), 987-1005. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-020-10007-6>
- Tamilmani, K., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Kizgin, H. (2020). Consumer Mobile Shopping Acceptance Predictors and Linkages: A Systematic Review and Weight Analysis, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 12066 LNCS, 161-175. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44999-5_14
- Tandon, S. (2021, August 17). *E-retail to overtake modern trade by '26* | Mint. <https://www.livemint.com/industry/retail/eretail-to-overtake-modern-trade-by-26-11629137968463.html>
- Tandon, U., & Kiran, R. (2018). Study on drivers of online shopping and significance of cash-on-delivery mode of payment on behavioural intention, In *Int. J. Electronic Business*, 14(3).
- Tarhini, A., Alalwan, A. A., Shammout, A. B., & Al-Badi, A. (2019). An analysis of the factors affecting mobile commerce adoption in developing countries: Towards an integrated model, *Review of International Business and Strategy*, 29(3), 157-179. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RIBS-10-2018-0092>
- Taylor, S., & Todd, P. A. (1995). Understanding Information Technology Usage: A Test of Competing Models, *Research* (Vol. 6, Issue 2).
- Thakur, R., & Srivastava, M. (2015). A study on the impact of consumer risk perception and innovativeness on online shopping in India, *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 43(2), 148-166. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-06-2013-0128>
- The economic times. (2020). E-commerce revolution in India gets its second wind, post Covid-19 <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/e-commerce/e-tailing/e-commerce-revolution-in-india-gets-its-second-wind-post-covid-19/77460376>
- Upadhyay, N., Upadhyay, S., Abed, S. S., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2022). Consumer adoption of mobile payment services during COVID-19: extending meta-UTAUT with perceived severity and self-efficacy, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 40(5), 960-991. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbm-06-2021-0262>
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View, *MIS Quarterly* (Vol. 27, Issue 3).
- Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y., & Xu, X. (2012). Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology, *MIS quarterly*, pp.157-178.