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Abstract
There are lots of advancements in e-commerce technologies and the emergence of social commerce paved way for the e-commerce among the customers. Nowadays, customers prefer to enter the new means of retailing and shopping in which they are more active than others in the e-commerce components. So that we propose and test a customer adoption model in B2C level. In this model we study the impact of social commerce components in the e-commerce and in the research to examine the better understanding of customer’s behaviour in India. According to the results User Trust, Perceived Usefulness and Perceived Ease of Use has an impact on customer adoption with the help of social commerce components. Discussion on conclusion, results, limitations and future direction of the research is carried out.
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1. Introduction

In the current trend, the emergence of Web applications and the social media platforms such as Social Networking websites and many more play a major role in our day-to-day life. Nowadays online shopping is one of the important factors in the great revolution of commerce. E-commerce is an easy source of shopping for each and every person in their busy schedule. E-commerce is done with various means of adopted technology. The future of e-commerce is social commerce (Social Media Platform). Because nowadays everyone uses their mobiles for their usage of social commerce and it is handy and helpful for a lot of people to do shopping in the means of e-commerce. We can also see the business transactions from vendors and customers take place mostly on these kinds of
platforms. We can also analyze e-vendors and consumers as they interact with these platforms. Now it is clear that the adoption of e-commerce is because of the emergence of usage of social commerce.

In this research customer adoption towards e-commerce with the influence of new means of commerce called social commerce (s-commerce) is studied. The main aim is to examine how the social commerce components help the customer adoption towards e-commerce. The components underlying s-commerce are considered to be social advertising, ratings, reviews, referrals, and also forums and communities. One of the main constructs to be used is TAM and SCAM. The main purpose of using these is the possibility of enhancing the adoption of customers towards e-commerce.

The need for this study is mainly to understand how the social commerce components influence customer adoption towards the e-commerce sites and platforms and how are the customers influenced by the various factors. Most of the country follows e-commerce for retailing but in India, there is still a setback for few set of customers because of various factors like risk and trust. The adoption of e-commerce is mainly because of the emergence of social commerce components. Still people are using the traditional way of buying the products in-store rather than online. People mostly don’t use online platforms to buy a product because of various reasons which influence them. So this study will make you understand the various reasons and factors for customer adoption with the help of social commerce components. The study is constructed based on few research objectives:

1. To identify the critical factors for the customer adoption towards e-commerce.
2. To understand the relationship between the customer adoption and other independent variables.
3. To determine the influence of customer adoption on the independent variables.

2. Theoretical Foundations of the Research

TAM

Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989) is one of the important aspects of using and understanding the user intention to adapt to the technological system. This TAM considers the high Perceived Ease of Use and the Perceived Usefulness which helps to understand the greater intention to use. This model was developed to understand the customer adoption towards the technology for various aspects in which it helps to understand the customer point to view towards the technology, their mode and level of acceptance of that technology based on their needs (Hajili, 2012).
Social Commerce

Social Commerce (Hajili, 2012) indicates that this is the new concept that motivates and helps the customers to have and understand the buying behaviour of customers. Trust as well as various platforms for e-commerce plays a significant role in the Social Commerce Acceptance Model (SCAM) where this model was introduced and validated first by (Hajili, 2012) using the empirical study that highly influences the various business platforms.

3. Literature Review

Trust

Trust is one of the important factors for the customer’s adoption because the vendor and the customers do not come face to face. However (Hajili, 2012) the current social commerce component helps us to build trust among the customers.

According to Pavlou (2003), trust is the key factor for customer adoption in e-commerce. Trust has a direct effect on the intention to buy in the e-commerce vendors. Also, trust influences Perceived Usefulness (PU). According to Pavlou (2003), there is not a proper motive for the customers in perceived usefulness if their e-vendor is not trusted in their web interface to social usage. So according to the above research findings and the previous statements the study can link trust to PU and intention to use.

H1: Trust has an influence on Customer Adoption.
H2: There is a relationship between trust and intention to use a web interface.
H3: User trust has a relationship with PU of a web interface.

Familiarity

Familiarity makes the customers reduce ambiguity in the usage of online platforms (Gefen, 2000). This sympathetic knowledge and the experiences help the user to buy for the online environment. For instance, online platforms like Amazon and Flipkart have their familiarity among the customers in the web interface which helps them to build their trust in their online shopping (Hajili, 2012).
Nowadays Familiarity among the customer helps them for the adoption towards the e-commerce environment. So according to the above statements and the previous research familiarity is related to trust and adoption.

H4: Customer Adoption has an influence with the degree of familiarity.
H5: There is a relationship between degree of familiarity and user trust.

4. Social Commerce Components

The next level of advancement in e-commerce is social commerce. It is the new platform for a lot of customers and businesses which enhances a lot of opportunities. In social commerce the components like ratings, reviews, forums, webinars, communities which in different Social Networking Sites like Facebook, Instagram, etc. support the marketing process in the businesses. These SNS platforms also help to bring new shapes in the business outcomes.

On the other side, these SCC’s will make the users familiar with a website with the help of their components in their platforms were their friends and would give a comment or ratings there. This brings the users familiarity and less ambiguity in an online environment (Gefen, 2000).

H6: Social commerce components will have a relationship with the user’s familiarity of a website or vendor.

According to the previous research (Weisberg, Te’eni, and Arman, 2011) there will be an increase in the social presence of customers because of the social commerce components. A higher level of social presence can be attained through SNSs such as Facebook that connects buyers to e-vendors by the aim of s-commerce components.

H7: Social Commerce components have a relationship with social presence of users.

Now with these above hypotheses it can be seen that the customer adoption is based on the customer’s familiarity and their presence. The following statement hypothesis

H8: Social commerce components will have an influence of Customer Adoption.

Social Presence

The social presence of the user will positively enhance customer adoption in an online environment. Basically, the User experience and the presence in the e-commerce platform can influence customer adoption.

H9: The level of social presence in the online shopping influences the customer adoption.
Social presence can also create an influence in users trust with the items like sense of human contact and the social sensibility considered (Gefen & Straub 2004).

H10: The level of social presence embedded in an online shopping website has a relationship to customer trust.

H11: The level of social presence has a relationship with familiarity.

User Experience

User Experience can be one of the main factors which may affect shopping behaviour. When the users have more experience on the internet or on the usage of social networking sites they have less difficulties and barriers in buying online (Hajili, 2012). People do not prefer to buy online because of the lack of knowledge and online shopping experiences. Users with the knowledge of internet usage have a sense of comfort and have stronger decision-making behaviour. But this will reduce the perception of risk and uncertainty (Rodgers & Nicewander, 1988) which will affect the trust.

H12: Customer Web Experience has influence on the customer adoption.

H13: There is a relationship between Customer web Experience and perceived ease of use.

Perceived Usefulness & Perceived Ease of Use

The most widely accepted Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) by the user technology acceptance the two important variables are perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. According to Davis (1989), users believe that using new technology will increase their performance which is perceived usefulness and then they assume that technology adoption and acceptance will give the ease of use. So it has a significant influence on intention to use online shopping. As per the previous research, these paths lead to the social commerce adoption with a significant impact of social components factors (Hajili, 2012). Accordingly the study hypothesizes the following:

H14: The user’s perceived usefulness has a positive effect on the user’s intention to use the website.

H15: User’s perceived ease of use has a relationship on the user’s intention to use the website.

Also, user trust is affected by the perceived ease of use that users trust the e-vendors and others in the acceptance of the model and also that commits the businesses provided for the customers.
(Gefen et al., 2003). So by the influence of the social commerce components and the perceived ease of use the trust of the user affects. The research hypothesis the following:

H16: The Users perceived ease of use has a relationship on the trust.

Social commerce components can make their shopping decisions easier. So that with the above statement, it is hypothesized:

H17: Social commerce components have a relationship with the user’s perceived ease of use.

Now with the above all statements and the pervious researches all these constructs are considered for the user adoption is influenced by the perceived usefulness and the perceived ease of use.

H18: Customer Adoption has influence on perceived ease of use & perceived usefulness.

**Perceived Risk**

Risk is one of the main factors considered in online shopping because of various instances. In few countries, most people even know how to adapt to online shopping but they have a barrier of user-perceived risk to make online shopping. People think that doing shopping online they have a risk of losing money or losing the product itself. So it negatively influences customer adoption towards e-commerce.

Suresh and Shashikala (2011) mentioned that the Internet being a relatively new channel of purchase, consumers perceive risk, and electronic commerce is perceived to be riskier than traditional commerce. Further, the main concern for the users is about their “loss of privacy & personal information” and “online transactions”. Although e-commerce is spreading widely people are not ready to adopt it because of the privacy and security issue. By the above statements it can be hypothesized that:

H19: Customer Adoption is influenced by Perceived Risk.

This Perceived Risk factor mainly affects the user trust of shopping online with the social commerce components.

H20: Perceived Risk has a relationship with trust in the e-commerce shopping.

**Learning and Intention to Use**

Learning & Intention to Use will be a key factor for customer adoption because, it indicates that learning will increase the awareness of e-commerce benefits among the customers which will
also help to increase e-commerce adoption (Darch & Lucas, 2002). If the users are not experienced by learning the usage then the intention towards the use will increase which leads to the intention to buy the product.

With help of Social commerce components, the customers can get the information of the product easily online so that it is predicted to increase the customer Perceived Ease of Use (Pavlo & Fygenson, 2006).

H21: Learning and Intention to use has an influence on customer adoption.

5. Research Methodology

A descriptive study has been conducted to understand the acceptance and the customer adoption towards physical commerce to e-commerce with the medium of social commerce. The variables which are defined by Trust, Familiarity, Social Commerce Components, Perceived Risk, Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, User Experience, Social Presence, Learning and intention to use, and Customer Adoption are the variables that are used.

Research Design

The main goal and the focus of the study were to gain insight into the variables which affect the acceptance of customer adoption towards e-commerce. Here the Descriptive study has been performed to check the variables in which all the variables are the causes and Customer Adoption is the effects of those variables.

Data Collection Method

The primary data was collected by using the structural questionnaire in the Google forms to respondents of various age groups, gender, education level, and occupation for the study purpose of customer adoption. Eight variables were measured using four to five questions which were adapted from the past studies of Hajli.M (2012). Also, Customer Adoption and Perceived Risk were measured in a similar manner after referring to the work of Eric Cloete (2002) and Steven Glover (2011). The structured questionnaire containing 36 questions covering all the critical factors defined by the mentioned variables with Trust is 5 item scale, Familiarity is 3 item scale, User Experience is 3 item scale, Learning & Intention to use is 5 item scale, Customer Adoption is 3 item scale, Perceived Risk is 2 item scale, Social Presence is 4 item scale, Perceived Ease of Use is 4 item scale, Social Presence
Commerce Components is a 4 item scale and Perceived Usefulness with a 4 item scale. All scaled items measured from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree” on a 5 point Likert scale.

**Sampling Design and Sample Size**

Quantitative research approach was used to collect data from the general audience all around the country. The sampling unit for this study was collected from all over the country. The sampling technique adopted is convenience non-probability sampling as I collected data from different random people bypassing the Google forms all over. A total of 227 sample sizes are collected from respondents of different gender, age, education, and occupations.

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

The data were collected through the Google survey and analysis was performed over those data and interpretation was done. Data collection collected the demographic details and also with the other variables and factors that influence the customer adoption. The respondents are made to choose details from the given data in the form. The other variables are measured using the 5 point scale or Likert scale. The data were analyzed using Frequency Table and Anova in SPSS and also the Regression and correlation.

### 6. Data Analysis Approach

**Frequency Table Analysis**

The demographic profile of the respondents includes nine demographic variables. The basic information of the respondent like Gender, Age, Education, Profession, Income, Mode of shopping, Shopping frequency, Frequently bought, and Online platform preferred are represented in table 4.1

From Table 4.1 it is noted that 149 (65.6) percent of the respondents are Male and 78 (34.4) percent are Female. Most of the respondents are in the age of 20-25 i.e. 182 respondents (80) percent of the respondents followed by 24 respondents (10.6) percent from 26-35 age categories respectively. Also, the majority of the respondents consist of the Undergraduate and the Postgraduate respondents with 119(52.4) percent and 99(43.6) percent respectively. Most of the respondents consist of students and colleagues and private sector employees with 86(37.9) percent and 98(43.2) percent respectively. Also, the other professional respondents have a percentage level of 36 respondents with 15.9
percentages in the data as shown. The Household Income data is a drastically mixed variant with 20000-30000 has 80(35.2) percent and the respondents earning 70000 above is 54 respondents with 23.8 percent. The respondents who preferred offline shopping rather than online is 120 respondents i.e. 52.9 percent with compared to 107 respondents i.e. 47.1 percent. The frequency of shopping is also measured from

**Profile of Respondents**

| Profile                          | Details              | Number of Respondents (Percentage) |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| **GENDER**                      | Male                 | 149 (65.6)                        |
|                                 | Female               | 78 (34.4)                         |
| **AGE**                         | 20-25                | 182 (80.2)                        |
|                                 | 26-35                | 24 (10.6)                         |
|                                 | 36-50                | 13 (5.7)                          |
|                                 | Above 50             | 8 (3.5)                           |
| **Level of Education**          | School/Diploma       | 8 (3.5)                           |
|                                 | Undergraduate        | 119 (52.4)                        |
|                                 | Postgraduate         | 99 (43.6)                         |
|                                 | Doctorate            | 1 (0.4)                           |
| **Profession**                  | Student              | 86 (37.9)                         |
|                                 | Government Employee  | 7 (3.1)                           |
|                                 | Private Sector Employee | 98 (43.2)                      |
|                                 | Others               | 36 (15.9)                         |
| **Household Income/month**      | 20,000-30,000        | 80 (35.2)                         |
|                                 | 31,000 - 50,000      | 49 (21.6)                         |
|                                 | 51,000 - 70,000      | 44 (19.4)                         |
|                                 | Above 70,000         | 54 (23.8)                         |
| **Mode of Shopping**            | Offline              | 120 (52.9)                        |
|                                 | Online               | 107 (47.1)                        |
| **Shopping Frequency**          | 15 days once         | 20 (8.8)                          |
|                                 | Monthly Once         | 102 (44.9)                        |
|                                 | 6 months once        | 85 (37.4)                         |
|                                 | Yearly Once          | 14 (6.2)                          |
|                                 | None                 | 6 (2.6)                           |
| **Frequently Bought**           | Electronic Products  | 91 (40.1)                         |
|                                 | Groceries            | 32 (14.1)                         |
|                                 | Fashion Products     | 70 (30.8)                         |
|                                 | Others               | 34 (15.0)                         |
| **Preferred Online Platform**   | Amazon               | 152 (67.0)                        |
|                                 | Flipkart             | 43 (18.9)                         |
|                                 | Big basket           | 6 (2.6)                           |
|                                 | Others               | 26 (11.5)                         |

The respondents as monthly once have 44.9 percent and 6 months once have 37.4 percent and the respondents do not prefer the online shopping has no frequency of shopping which have 2.3
percent of them. The data collection of Frequently Bought product is also collected in which electronic and fashion products gives the higher percent of 91(40.1) and 70(30.8) respectively.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Here it can be seen that the total descriptive analysis of the data collected in which the descriptive analysis is considered for each and every constructs. Since the variables are measured with the 5 point scale the minimum and maximum values are considered to be 1 as minimum and 5 as a maximum as shown in the table.

**Descriptive Analysis of Constructs**

| Variables                       | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean     | Std. Deviation | Coefficient of variation |
|---------------------------------|----|---------|---------|----------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Trust                           | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.6806   | .72935          | .19816                   |
| Familiarity                     | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.8825   | .88409          | .22771                   |
| User Experience                 | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 4.1189   | .84377          | .20485                   |
| Social Presence                 | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.2797   | .85733          | .26140                   |
| Learning & Intention to Use     | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.4115   | .92097          | .26996                   |
| Perceived Ease of Use           | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.9196   | .77850          | .19861                   |
| Social Commerce Components      | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.6377   | .71104          | .19546                   |
| Perceived Usefulness            | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.7896   | .80860          | .21337                   |
| Customer Adoption               | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.7636   | .76193          | .20244                   |
| Perceived Risk                  | 227| 1.00    | 5.00    | 3.2775   | .88751          | .27078                   |

Here it can be seen that the mean values are spread to the different populations in which the range of User experience goes above 4 in which the population is said to be Agree range in the construct. In the Perceived Ease of Use construct the mean value is 3.91 which is close to the agree value in the population. But we can see that the respondents are not agreed with the Perceived Risk construct and Social Constructs as shown in the table above. Also in the above table, we can see Standard Deviation is the value in which the variation of the results w.r.t to constructs. There is a range of 2SD variation in the Learning and Intention to use variable whereas in Social commerce components there is a low level of variation since the SD is around 71.1%.

**7. Correlation Analysis**

Correlation Analyses are made to find out the insights relationship between each variable and also if says about the significance level and the insignificance level between each variable with the means of correlation. The results are as follows:
In the table, we can see the correlations between each and every variable including customer adoption. It signifies the relationship between the dependent and independent variables and also determines the inter significance level among themselves. These numbers measure the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the two variables. The correlation coefficient can range from -1 to +1, with -1 indicating a perfect negative correlation, +1 indicating a perfect positive correlation, and 0 indicating no correlation at all. A variable correlated with it will always have a correlation coefficient of 1.

In the correlation matrix, the diagonal values are one because the significant relationship between each of among variables will be equal and the same. Also, there is no negative correlation among the variables as per the data given in the table. In Pearson Correlation the significance is considered with two-tailed with the significance criteria of 0.05 and 0.01. Both the significance considered to give a relationship for the variables.

|                          | Trust | Familiarity | User Experience | Social Presence | Learning and Intention to Use | Perceived Ease of Use | Social Commerce Components | Perceived Usefulness | Customer Adoption | Perceived Risk |
|--------------------------|-------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| **Trust**                |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | 1     | .539**      | .400**          | .194**         | .438**                     | .527**                | .506**                 | .560**            | .571**          | .028         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000  | .000        | .003            | .000           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            |              |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **Familiarity**          |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .539**| 1           | .603**          | .100           | .323**                     | .538**                | .477**                 | .553**            | .431**          | .149         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000  | .000        | .131            | .000           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            | .025         |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **User Experience**      |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .400**| .603**      | 1               | .051           | .341**                     | .685**                | .483**                 | .514**            | .481**          | .132         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000  | .000        | .448            | .000           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            | .047         |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **Social Presence**      |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .194**| .100        | .051            | .136           | .425**                     | .471**                | .407**                 | .475**            | .334**          | .193         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .003  | .131        | .448            | .012           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            | .003         |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **Learning and Intention to Use** |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .438**| .323**      | .341**          | .386**         | 1                          | .425**                | .471**                 | .407**            | .475**          | .334         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000  | .000        | .000            | .012           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            | .000         |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **Perceived Ease of Use** |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .527**| .538**      | .685**          | .166           | .425**                     | 1                     | .562**                 | .654**            | .614**          | .175         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000  | .000        | .000            | .012           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            | .008         |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **Social Commerce Components** |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .506**| .477**      | .483**          | .324**         | .471**                     | .562**                | 1                      | .656**            | .561**          | .256         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000  | .000        | .000            | .000           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            | .000         |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **Perceived Usefulness** |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .560**| .553**      | .514**          | .307**         | .407**                     | .654**                | .656**                 | 1                 | .693**          | .136         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000  | .000        | .000            | .012           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            | .041         |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **Customer Adoption**    |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .571**| .431**      | .481**          | .247**         | .475**                     | .614**                | .561**                 | 1                 | .693**          | .197         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .000  | .000        | .000            | .000           | .000                       | .000                  | .000                   | .000              | .000            | .003         |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |
| **Perceived Risk**       |       |             |                 |                |                             |                       |                        |                   |                 |              |
| Pearson Correlation      | .028  | .149**      | .132**          | .193**         | .334**                     | .175**                | .256**                 | .136              | .197**          | .1          |
| Sig. (2-tailed)          | .673  | .025        | .047            | .003           | .008                       | .000                  | .041                   | .003              |                 |              |
| N                        | 227   | 227         | 227             | 227            | 227                        | 227                   | 227                    | 227               | 227            |              |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*
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If the correlation range is greater than 0.5 then it is positive highly correlated. It is moderately correlated if it ranges between 0.5 to 0.3. If the Pearson correlation is less than 0.3 then it is low correlated to each other. Here we can see Customer Adoption (dependent variable) is highly correlated with Trust, Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness, and Social Commerce Components, whereas it is low correlated to Perceived Risk.

Also here we can see that, Trust is positive highly correlated to customer adoption and Perceived Usefulness because it has the person correlation value 0.571 and 0.560 respectively which is greater than 0.5, and trust is positive moderately correlated to User experience since it has the value of 0.400 which is in the range of 0.5 to 0.3.

Familiarity is positive highly correlated to trust and moderately correlate to customer adoption as 0.539 and 0.431 respectively as shown in table 4.3

Social Commerce Components is positive moderately correlated to Familiarity and Social Presence with 0.477 and 0.324 respectively and highly correlated with Customer Adoption with 0.561

Social Presence is positive weekly correlated to customer adoption, trust, and familiarity with 0.247, 0.194, and 0.100 respectively which is less than 0.3

Learning and Intention to Use is moderately correlated to customer adoption with 0.475 which is in the range of moderately correlation.

User Experience is positive moderately correlated to Customer Adoption with 0.481 and positively highly correlated with Perceived Ease of Use with 0.685.

Perceived Usefulness is moderately correlated with Learning and Intention to Use with 0.407 and positive highly correlated with Customer Adoption with 0.693

Perceived Ease of Use is moderately correlated to Learning and Intention to Use with 0.425 and positively correlated with Trust, Social Commerce Components and Customer adoption with a range of 0.527, 0.562, and 0.614 respectively.

Perceived Risk is lowly correlated to Customer Adoption and Trust with 0.197 and 0.028 respectively which is less than 0.3 ranges.

Here since there is no negative correlation between the variables, all the variables are positive significantly correlated with each other. With these study and analysis we can conclude the hypothesis testing which is of:
Results of Hypotheses for Correlation Analysis

| Hypothesis | Description                  | P-value Significance | Result        |
|------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| H2         | Trust to User Experience    | .000                 | Supported     |
| H3         | Trust to Perceived Usefulness| .000                 | Supported     |
| H5         | Familiarity to Trust        | .000                 | Supported     |
| H6         | SCC to Familiarity          | .000                 | Supported     |
| H7         | SCC to Social Presence      | .000                 | Supported     |
| H10        | Social Presence to Trust    | .003                 | Supported     |
| H11        | Social Presence to Familiarity | .131            | Not Supported |
| H13        | Perceived Ease of Use to User Experience | .000 | Supported |
| H14        | Perceived Usefulness to Intention to Use | .000 | Supported |
| H15        | Perceived Ease of Use to Intention to Use | .000 | Supported |
| H16        | Perceived ease of use to Trust | .000       | Supported     |
| H17        | SCC to Perceived Ease of Use| .000                 | Supported     |
| H20        | Perceived Risk to Trust     | .673                 | Not Supported |

In the above table it can be seen that the significance value of H11 and H20 have of 0.131 and 0.673 which is greater than 0.05. Therefore we can say that there is not a significant relationship between Perceived Risk to Trust and Social Presence to Familiarity.

Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is made here to find out the effect of independent variables (Trust, Familiarity, Social Presence, Social Commerce Components, Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness, Learning and Intention to use, Perceived Risk and User experience) on dependent variables (Customer Adoption). The results are as follows:

Regression Analysis for Customer Adoption

| Regression Statistics |               |               |               |               |               |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Multiple R            | 0.763         |               |               |               |
| R Square              | 0.582         |               |               |               |
| Adjusted R Square     | 0.565         |               |               |               |
| Standard Error        | 0.50268       |               |               |               |

| Un standardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients |              |               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B                             | Std. Error                | Beta          | t Stat        | Sig           |
| (Constant)                    | 0.311         | 0.245         | 1.270         | 0.205         |
| Trust                         | 0.222         | 0.063         | 0.213         | 3.517         | 0.001         |
| Familiarity                   | -0.092        | 0.053         | -0.107        | -1.722        | 0.087         |
| User Experience               | 0.066         | 0.060         | 0.073         | 1.096         | 0.274         |
| Social Presence               | -0.011        | 0.044         | -0.012        | -0.238        | 0.812         |
| Learning and Intention to Use | 0.100         | 0.047         | 0.120         | 2.128         | 0.034         |
| Perceived Ease of Use         | 0.153         | 0.070         | 0.156         | 2.196         | 0.029         |
| Social Commerce Components    | 0.046         | 0.069         | 0.043         | 0.664         | 0.507         |
| Perceived Usefulness          | 0.387         | 0.065         | 0.411         | 5.911         | 0.000         |
| Perceived Risk                | 0.056         | 0.041         | 0.065         | 1.349         | 0.179         |
From the above table, for the Customer Adoption (dependent variable) it can be observed that: $R^2 = 0.582$ and the Adjusted $R^2 = 0.565$.

It can also be inferred from the above data that, 58.2% of the variation in Customer Adoption is taken and done by the variables like Familiarity, User Experience, Social Presence, Social Commerce Components, and Perceived Risk. This variance of 58.2% explains the strength of the relationship between the study model and the dependent variable of Customer Adoption. The significance level of independent variables towards the variation of $R^2$ value gives the data to be good-fit values.

If the p-value w.r.t to a variable is less than 0.05 then the respective variable is statistically significant. Hence with this, it is found that:

### Hypotheses Result for Regression

| Hypothesis | Description                                      | Significant Value | Result   |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| H1         | Trust to Customer Adoption                       | 0.001             | Accepted |
| H4         | Familiarity to Customer Adoption                 | 0.087             | Not Accepted |
| H8         | Social Commerce Components to Customer Adoption  | 0.507             | Not Accepted |
| H9         | Social Presence to Customer Adoption             | 0.812             | Not Accepted |
| H12        | User Experience to Customer Adoption             | 0.274             | Not Accepted |
| H18        | Perceived Ease of Use to Customer Adoption       | 0.029             | Accepted  |
| H18        | Perceived Usefulness to Customer Adoption        | 0.000             | Accepted  |
| H19        | Perceived Risk to Customer Adoption              | 0.179             | Not Accepted |
| H21        | Learning & Intention to Customer Adoption        | 0.034             | Accepted  |

The constant variable is fixed in the table and the coefficient values are fixed here. Trust, Learning, and Intention to Use, Perceived Ease of Use, and Perceived Usefulness are significant. Also, Familiarity, User Experience, Social Presence, Social Commerce Components, and Perceived Risk are not significant.

### 8. Findings and Conclusion

#### Findings & Results

The findings from this study discussed. It is found out that out of 227 respondents most of them are young people from the age category of 20-25 who are more interested in e-commerce and most of them prefer to buy electronic and fashion products from the different platforms. From all these respondents Undergraduate and Postgraduate respondents play a major role in e-commerce...
shopping. By the above results, each and every variable is positively correlated between both dependent and independent variables. In the above table, we can see that the given hypothesis is supported and proved with the p-value significance but the Hypothesis of Social Presence to Familiarity is not supported since the significance level is 0.131 which is greater than 0.05. So it is not supported and it’s not statistically significant. We can see that Trust and Perceived Risk are not statistically significant which 0.673 greater than 0.05 which is not supported. Also, we can see that Customer Adoption is significant to all the other constructs in this study. In this study, we can also see that the dependent construct has 58.2% variation with the help of other constructs used in this study. In the descriptive statistics, we can see that there is a variation w.r.t to the constructs in which the standard deviation is compared close to the mean value of the construct in which all the constructs range in 2SD variation compared to the mean values. The values in the Standard Deviation are equally spread compared to the other variables except for the Learning and Intention to Use which has a higher variance of 92%. We can say that there is not a significant influence from Familiarity, Social Commerce Components, Social Presence, User Experience, Perceived Risk to Customer Adoption whereas there is an influence on customer adoption from Trust, Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness and Learning and Intention to Use.

9. Discussion

The main aim of this paper is to reach a better understanding of consumer behaviour with the influence of social commerce components that can help the customer adoption towards e-commerce. We specifically investigated the B2C e-commerce adoption among the customers with the influence of various factors. One of the key constructs of this research is social commerce components which don’t have an impact on customer adoption, because of the lack of knowledge about these components among the customers.

In proposed model H1, H18 and H21 are the constructs of this research that will increase the direct effect on customer adoption among the customers with the help of social commerce components.

This study was conducted to identify the critical factors which influence the customer adoption towards physical commerce to e-commerce with the help of social commerce components. In this study factors like Trust, Familiarity, Social commerce components, Perceived Ease of Use & Perceived Usefulness, and Learning & Intention to Use are the factors that are directly influenced by customer adoption. In past studies, trust is the key factor for e-commerce (Gefen and Straub, 2003),
in which Trust is the factor that helps the customers with Perceived usefulness and Intention to Use. In this study also trust is the influencing factor for customer adoption. In order to accomplish the objectives of the study quantitative methods of analysis is done to find the influence of customer adoption like Descriptive Analysis, Frequency table analysis for the profile of the respondents, Regression analysis w.r.t customer adoption and other variables, and Correlation analysis of each and every construct of the study.

The results of this analysis suggest that the influence of customer adoption highly depends on the factors like Trust, Social Commerce Components, Perceived Ease of Use, and Perceived Usefulness and Learning & Intention to Use. Because of this, it can be understood that customer adoption is based on the user trust factor which influences the intention to use, and the Perceived Usefulness which leads to the customer adoption. This study states that Familiarity is a key factor for the Social Presence of online shopping for the customers. In the previous study, (Hajli, 2012), Social Commerce Components will increase the Perceived Ease of Use in the customers, which increases the intention to buy and Perceived Usefulness. The factors like Perceived Risk and Social Presence are not giving any influence the customer adoption towards e-commerce, but the factors like Trust, Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness and Learning, and Intention to Use have significance on the Customer Adoption towards physical commerce to e-commerce. In this study and with the help of the previous literature we can see that customer adoption is mainly based on the user’s trust which leads to the customer intention to use and helps the customer’s usefulness. The factors like Social commerce components help the customers Perceived Ease of Use for buying the products easily.

In the future of this research, there may be various other issues that affect the e-commerce adoption aspects. However, the main focus of this study was to focus on some of the crucial aspects of social commerce. In regard to the previously taken study trust is the key factor proposed in the model, it is seen that it has many issues with customer trust (Geffen & Straub, 2004).

This research is conducted in the Southern part of India and it should be extended and taken to the other parts of India and countries because in each and every part of the country the customer needs and diversity changes. According to the different cultures and diversity, the results of the study may differ. This can be the future direction for this research to be taken. Here it is proposed that the model with the social commerce components in which it can be further considered for various other media’s and communities.

Moreover, a follow-up study can be made for the variables like Social Presence, Perceived Risk, and Familiarity which can be useful to see why these variables are not supported for the survey.
And furthermore, research can be done on how these variables influence the other geographical locations.
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