

Transforming Online Shopping in India Through Augmented Reality: A Consumer-Centric Analysis of Technology Adoption and Acceptance

Dr. Nisha*

Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Government College for Women, Ambala City, Haryana, India.

*Corresponding Author: nishiburak@gmail.com

Citation: Nisha, N. (2026). *Transforming Online Shopping in India Through Augmented Reality: A Consumer-Centric Analysis of Technology Adoption and Acceptance*. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Commerce, Management & Social Science*, 09(03(III)), 157–164. [https://doi.org/10.62823/ijarcms/9.3\(III\).9464](https://doi.org/10.62823/ijarcms/9.3(III).9464)

Abstract

Online retail has expanded rapidly, but a basic weakness remains: shoppers often have to judge products without experiencing them in a realistic setting. Augmented Reality (AR) can narrow this experiential gap by allowing digital product representations to be viewed or manipulated within a consumer's own surroundings. This paper re-examines the author's doctoral data to evaluate AR as a consumer-oriented instrument of change in Indian online shopping. The analysis uses responses from 600 participants and concentrates on actual usage, acceptance, behavioural association and demographic variation. Sixty-eight per cent of respondents had used AR shopping features at least occasionally, while 42 per cent reported using them often or very often. AR usage was positively associated with reported changes in consumer behaviour ($r = .399$, $p < .001$). Adoption was substantially higher among urban respondents than rural respondents, while gender did not produce a significant difference in adoption. Age, however, was relevant to perceptions and to the way respondents assessed AR-related challenges and opportunities. The evidence indicates that AR can strengthen the experiential side of digital commerce, but wider transformation will depend on whether applications are useful, trustworthy, accessible and easy for diverse consumers to operate. The paper therefore interprets AR as a multidisciplinary retail innovation situated at the intersection of commerce, technology, marketing and consumer behaviour.

Keywords: Augmented Reality, E-commerce, Online Shopping, Technology Adoption, Consumer Acceptance, Consumer Behaviour, Digital Transformation, India.

Introduction

The movement from store-based retailing to digital marketplaces has altered both the convenience of shopping and the way purchase decisions are formed. Consumers can compare alternatives quickly and buy without visiting a physical outlet, but they also lose the opportunity to handle, try or position a product before payment. This limitation becomes especially visible for products whose appeal depends on fit, appearance, scale or compatibility with the consumer's personal environment.

AR offers one route for addressing this limitation because it places computer-generated content into the user's physical setting. A shopper may, for example, preview furniture in a room, simulate the appearance of cosmetics or accessories, or inspect a product in three dimensions. The significance of AR is therefore experiential rather than merely visual: it can turn a conventional product page into an interactive decision environment. The doctoral research on which this paper is based approached this issue across marketing, technology and psychology and examined adoption, acceptance, usability, value, trust and behavioural response.

In the Indian context, digital transformation should be assessed by more than transaction volumes or the number of available technologies. The quality and reach of the consumer experience are equally important. An AR feature has limited transformative value if shoppers find it difficult, unnecessary or unreliable, or if access conditions prevent regular use. The relevant question is therefore whether consumers actually incorporate AR into shopping and whether that interaction is connected with meaningful behavioural change.

To examine this issue, the paper uses the author's existing doctoral dataset of 600 respondents but reorganises the evidence around a narrower research purpose. Attention is given to exposure to AR, regularity of use, consumer perceptions, demographic and geographic differences, and the statistical relationship between AR usage and behavioural change. The intention is not to reproduce the thesis; it is to interpret selected results through the specific lens of consumer-centred digital transformation.

Conceptual Background and Review of Literature

- **Augmented Reality as an E-commerce Innovation**

AR is distinguished by its capacity to integrate digital objects with the physical environment and permit real-time interaction. Billinghurst, Clark and Lee (2014) describe AR within the broader human-computer interaction landscape, while Van Krevelen and Poelman (2010) emphasise the technological foundations, applications and limitations of augmented environments. For e-commerce, the significance of this technology lies in its ability to make digital product information more vivid, spatial and interactive than conventional two-dimensional images.

The thesis identifies several AR applications relevant to online retail: marker-based and markerless AR, object recognition, virtual try-on and fitting, product visualisation, interactive packaging and gamification. These applications can support different stages of the customer journey. Virtual try-on can assist evaluation of fashion or beauty products; product visualisation can help consumers judge furniture or home décor in their own surroundings; and interactive information can reduce the effort required to understand product characteristics. Consequently, AR has the potential to reduce the psychological distance between an online consumer and the product being considered.

- **Consumer Experience, Engagement and Purchase Behaviour**

Prior research has repeatedly connected AR with interactivity, vividness and consumer engagement. Yim, Chu and Sauer (2017) examined AR as an e-commerce tool and highlighted the importance of interactivity and vividness in shaping consumer responses. Hilken et al. (2017) illustrated how the use of AR can be beneficial to online service experiences through the improved manner in which customers mentally simulate the products within their environments. On his part, Javornik (2016) offered an agenda for research on the characteristics of the media and the influence on consumer behavior in the context of augmented reality, emphasizing on the notion that AR is not just a display media but a distinct type of mediated experience.

Recent literature further extends this view. For example, Kowalczyk, Siepmann and Adler (2021) considered cognitive, affective and behavioral responses of consumers to AR in e-commerce. Qin, Osatuyi and Xu (2021) discussed the relationship between mobile AR, continued usage and purchase intention from a cognition-affect-conation perspective. Lastly, Riar et al. (2022) provided synthesis of AR-induced shopping behavior and the importance of studying the process underlying the impact of augmented experience on consumer outcomes. These studies support the consumer-centered view where adoption is affected not just by technical aspects but also usefulness, enjoyment, immersion, trust and quality of interaction.

- **Adoption, Acceptance and the Need for an Inclusive Perspective**

There are discrepancies in technology adoption among the consumers. Age, gender and geographic location were some of the factors analyzed in the thesis, and it is crucial to understand the barriers and opportunities associated with the same. This was necessary from an Indian point of view as digital revolution leads to discrepancies when different consumer groups have varied levels of access, knowledge and comfort. Diffusion theory by Rogers (1995) provides a useful theoretical framework in this scenario.

Research on AR also points to the importance of personalisation and consumer control. Alimamy and Gnoth (2022) connect perceptions of personalisation in AR-enabled online shopping with customer intentions to co-create value, while Smink et al. (2019) show that AR shopping can influence

brand responses and data-disclosure decisions. Rauschnabel, Felix and Hinsch (2019) further demonstrate how mobile AR applications can support brands through inspiration. Taken together, the literature suggests that the transformative capacity of AR depends on an ecosystem of technology, consumer psychology, marketing design and responsible data practices.

Research Gap and Purpose of the Paper

The broader literature establishes the experiential and marketing potential of AR, but the practical question for digital transformation is whether consumers actually adopt the technology and whether usage is associated with behavioural change. The original doctoral study addressed a wide range of issues surrounding AR in e-commerce. The present paper narrows that evidence to a transformation-oriented question: how far does consumer adoption and acceptance of AR indicate a shift toward more interactive online shopping, and what barriers to inclusive diffusion are visible in the data?

The paper is therefore not presented as a new independent survey. It is a focused secondary analysis and reinterpretation of the author's own primary doctoral dataset. Such a distinction is crucial from the point of academic transparency, and will help in analysing the current empirical data through a fresh perspective, which is specific to consumer-driven digital transformation in India.

Objectives of the Study

- Investigate the scale and frequency of consumer usage of AR technologies while shopping online.
- Conduct an analysis of consumer attitudes towards AR-assisted online shopping.
- Conduct an investigation into the connection between the use of AR and alterations in consumer behavior.
- Look into geographic and demographic differences that pertain to the AR adoption.
- Draw managerial and policy implications for the online shopping transformation in India.

Research Methodology

The data behind this paper is collected in the context of doctoral research entitled "Adoption and Acceptance of Augmented Reality in E-Commerce: Analysis and Exploration" (2024). The original study utilized a structured design to explore AR adoption, consumer perceptions, behavioral influence, business aspects, and challenges/opportunities. The quantitative part of this dissertation involved 600 participants.

In the course of the doctoral research, the descriptive and inferential statistical techniques have been utilized. Specifically, frequency distribution was used for categorical responses, and descriptive statistics for perceptions. According to the thesis, t-test should be used to compare the two groups, analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare several groups, and the correlation technique to establish a relationship between AR usage and changes in consumer behavior. The original hypotheses also tested adoption depending on age, gender, and geographic location as well as perceptions/attitudes across demographics.

This paper will consider only those findings of the original study that are consistent with the proposed argument about consumer transformation. There are no new respondents in the analysis, there are no any fabricated or extrapolated values.

Core Hypothesis

- H₀:** There is no correlation between the use of augmented reality in e-commerce and changes in consumer behaviour.
- H₁:** There is a correlation between the use of augmented reality in e-commerce and changes in consumer behaviour.

Results and Analysis

Experience and Frequency of AR Use

Experience seems to be the most concrete ground to make any assessment of adoption. Out of the total of 600 surveyed individuals, 150 people (25%) said that their interaction with AR was frequent, while 258 people (43%) considered it occasional, yet 192 respondents (32%) stated that they had never interacted with AR for shopping purposes. In other words, more than two-thirds of the survey participants have interacted with AR, yet almost one-third still had not.

Table 1: Experience of AR Features in Online Shopping

AR experience	Frequency	Percent
Yes, frequently	150	25%
Yes, occasionally	258	43%
No, never	192	32%
Total	600	100%

Source: Author's doctoral dataset (2024)

The more refined frequency-based measure strengthens this distinction further. In total, twenty-two per cent used AR very frequently and 20% fairly frequently, and a further 23% used it sometimes. On the other hand, 10% used it rarely and 25% did not use it at all. Therefore, trial and adoption cannot be considered as one and the same thing. The customer can test out the AR function once, but true transformation needs the AR function to be useful enough for decision-making.

Table 2: Frequency of AR use in Online Shopping

Frequency of Use	Percent
Very often	22%
Often	20%
Occasionally	23%
Rarely	10%
Never	25%

Source: Author's doctoral dataset (2024)

• Consumer Perceptions of AR's Influence

Descriptive analysis shows a diverse yet significant consumer reaction. Using the scale that was applied in the thesis research, the following results were obtained: 'AR experience affects the level of consumer engagement with the online store' – mean value was 2.92 (SD 1.333); 'AR experience influences the choice of the product' – mean value was 2.90 (SD 1.278); 'Trust in the information obtained through AR' – mean value was 2.86 (SD 1.297). Mean value for 'Being more willing to buy after AR experience' was 2.65 (SD 1.439) and 'Product visualization' – 2.56 (SD 1.323). Variation in SDs shows that consumers did not react uniformly.

Table 3: Selected Descriptive Statistics on AR Influence

Consumer Dimension	N	Mean	SD
Influence on product choices	600	2.90	1.278
More likely to purchase after AR use	600	2.65	1.439
Helps visualise products	600	2.56	1.323
Increases engagement with online stores	600	2.92	1.333
Trust information provided through AR	600	2.86	1.297

Source: Author's doctoral dataset (2024)

An interesting point of view is presented through the question whether AR improves the shopping experience on the Internet: 9% strongly agree and 20% agree, whereas 11% are neutral, 26% disagree and 34% strongly disagree. It would be wrong to ignore such a sceptical viewpoint since it contributes to the formulation of the main point of the paper. The acceptance and adoption of technologies are interrelated concepts but are not synonymous. Users may use AR technology, act behaviourally according to it and still not believe in its effectiveness as a means to improve their shopping experiences.

• Geographic Differences in Adoption

One of the most interesting geographic differences was found through the doctoral dissertation research. Urban participants (N = 318) had a mean AR adoption score of 3.94 (SD 1.073), while rural participants (N = 282) had a mean of 2.30 (SD 1.559). Levene's test suggested unequal variances (F = 53.758, $p < .001$), and the independent-samples comparison provided highly significant differences ($t = 15.197$ under equal variances; $t = 14.874$ assuming not equal variances). Thus, the thesis has shown that there is geographic variation in AR adoption.

Table 4: AR Adoption by Geographic Location

Location	N	Mean adoption	SD
Urban	318	3.94	1.073
Rural	282	2.30	1.559

Source: Author's doctoral dataset (2024)

In particular, this discovery bears implications for the digital evolution in India. Inequality of innovation diffusion is possible even if a technology is theoretically appealing. Differences may emerge because of different access, awareness, technological capacity of the device, connectivity, digital literacy, or availability of AR-based services. This dataset does not help to understand what role each of these aspects plays in causing inequality. However, such an inequality justifies the need for inclusive design and consumer education.

• Gender and Age

The doctoral results found no statistically significant gender difference in the adoption of AR technology in e-commerce. This suggests that basic adoption should not be treated as inherently gender-specific. However, gender did matter for the perceived challenges and opportunities associated with AR implementation: the thesis reported significantly higher perception scores among female respondents for this construct. Thus, equal adoption does not necessarily imply identical interpretation of the technology.

Age also emerged as an important factor. The overall mean for consumer perceptions and attitudes was 3.56 (SD 1.367), but mean scores differed across age groups in the original analysis. The thesis further concluded that age significantly influences perceptions of challenges and opportunities. These results indicate that AR interfaces should not assume a single level of digital familiarity or a single preference for immersion. Age-sensitive usability, clear instructions and low-friction interfaces can be important to wider acceptance.

• Relationship Between AR Use and Consumer Behaviour

The central statistical test examined whether AR use and reported behavioural change were related. For the 600 respondents, Pearson's correlation was .399 and the relationship was statistically significant at $p < .001$. On the basis of the original test, the null hypothesis of no relationship was rejected. This result provides empirical support for treating AR usage as meaningfully associated with consumer behaviour in the surveyed e-commerce context.

Table 5: Correlation between AR use and Consumer Behaviour

Relationship	N	Pearson r	Significance
AR use × changes in consumer behaviour	600	0.399	$p < .001$

Source: Author's doctoral dataset (2024)

The direction of the coefficient is positive and its magnitude indicates a moderate association. Respondents reporting greater AR use also tended to report greater behavioural change. This should not be interpreted as proof that AR caused those changes; the design does not establish causality. It does, however, show that AR engagement and consumer behaviour are sufficiently connected in the data to justify further investigation and managerial attention.

Discussion: AR as a Driver of Consumer-Centric Transformation

This shows that there is a more complex answer to the question of whether consumers accept or reject AR than just this dichotomy. Most participants had been exposed to AR and even used it consistently. This shows that augmented shopping had become more than just a novelty for some consumers. On the other hand, the level of scepticism concerning the idea of AR enhancing online shopping suggests that exposure alone is not enough. Change happens when the technology solves the consumer problem more effectively than the earlier interface.

In the view of the consumer, the most strategic contribution made by AR is its ability to enhance the experiential nature of the product evaluation process. Traditional e-commerce is built on text, visuals, videos, and reviews. In addition to these, AR can provide spatial context and interactivity. From a consumer perspective, the dimensions of engagement, product selection, visualisation and trust have proven to be important though reactions vary. These results support those of Yim et al. (2017), Hilken et al. (2017) and Javornik (2016).

The existence of a positive correlation between AR usage and behavioral change bolsters the transformation argument. A technological development becomes commercially relevant once it makes a

difference to attention, evaluation, engagement or action. It is true that the correlation coefficient of .399 cannot determine cause-and-effect relationships, but it certainly supports the notion that AR usage and behavioral change go hand-in-hand in the sample. Retailers can therefore regard AR as being part of customer experience management.

The geographic results introduce an equally important caution. Transformation that is concentrated among urban consumers cannot automatically be described as inclusive transformation. The large difference in mean adoption scores indicates that diffusion conditions matter. Indian e-commerce firms seeking wider adoption should therefore design AR for ordinary smartphones, minimise data and processing burdens where possible, provide simple onboarding and ensure that AR functions deliver clear value even to first-time users.

The demographic findings also favour segmentation over a one-size-fits-all approach. Gender may not significantly determine adoption itself, yet perceptions of implementation challenges and opportunities can differ. Age affects perceptions and the interpretation of AR's challenges and opportunities. Consumer-centric design should therefore allow different levels of guidance, control and complexity rather than assuming that every shopper wants the most immersive possible experience.

Multidisciplinary Relevance to Transforming India

AR-enabled e-commerce is inherently multidisciplinary. Information technology provides computer vision, sensors, mobile processing, three-dimensional modelling and interface integration. Marketing determines how the technology is positioned and how it contributes to product presentation, engagement and brand differentiation. Consumer psychology explains perceived usefulness, trust, uncertainty, enjoyment and behavioural response. Commerce and management turn these mechanisms into customer satisfaction, conversion, and competitive advantage.

This multifaceted nature of augmented reality makes it an apt example for the theme of the conference. Transformation of India through innovations involves more than just creation of innovations in terms of technology; it also involves knowing how people embrace these technologies and how these innovations can be implemented. The current findings illustrate that a technological innovation can at once deliver consumer value and highlight new challenges related to inclusion. An optimal research agenda must thus incorporate both capabilities and behaviour.

Managerial and Policy Implications

- Design AR around a clear consumer problem. Virtual try-on, spatial visualisation and contextual product information should reduce uncertainty or improve evaluation rather than simply add visual novelty.
- Prioritise usability and trust. AR representations should be accurate, easy to control and transparent so that the consumer can understand what is simulated and what is actual product information.
- Develop inclusive, low-friction AR experiences. The urban-rural adoption difference supports attention to device capability, bandwidth, digital familiarity and consumer education.
- Use segmentation carefully. Age-related differences justify alternative onboarding and interface complexity, while gender findings suggest that perceptions of implementation may differ even where adoption rates do not.
- Measure behavioural outcomes. Firms should evaluate engagement, conversion, return behaviour, repeat usage and satisfaction rather than measuring AR success only by feature activation.
- Protect privacy and data confidence. AR may involve cameras, spatial information or personal imagery; responsible data practices are essential for sustainable acceptance.
- Encourage multidisciplinary collaboration among commerce researchers, technologists, designers and behavioural researchers to develop AR solutions that are commercially viable and socially usable.

Limitations and Scope for Future Research

This paper is based on a re-analysis of an already existing doctoral dataset and is hence subject to the constraints of design and measures used in the original research. It cannot be said to represent a new nationally representative survey for India. Hence, the results from this paper cannot be extrapolated

to the general Indian population of online consumers. The current study is based on self-reports and perceptions. The positive association found between AR usage and behavioral change is associational and not causal.

Further research can take the following directions in order to build upon the current study. They include the following: Controlled experiments on the usage of AR vs. no-AR for product presentation
Longitudinal studies on the repeated use of AR by the same users
Larger sample sizes including multiple states of India and different segments of consumers
Studies that specifically look at certain product categories
Conversion and return rates
Privacy issues
Accessibility to device usage and how AI and AR can be combined to deliver personalized commerce.

Conclusion

It can be argued that Augmented Reality is an integral part of the evolution process of online shopping, which has shifted from being mostly informational in nature to becoming more interactive and experiential. As evidenced by the survey of 600 people, the level of AR awareness was quite high - 68% had used AR functionalities occasionally, while 42% have used them frequently or very frequently. Furthermore, a significant correlation was found between usage of AR and change in consumer behavior ($r = .399$, $p < .001$).

However, the results of the survey also prove that technology availability doesn't automatically equal consumer adoption. People reacted differently to AR technology's potential in improving online shopping experience, and usage of AR technology varied greatly among respondents depending on whether they lived in urban or rural areas. Age had an influence on perception of AR technology, whereas gender didn't affect it. Thus, the next step in development of AR commerce should be focused on other factors than novelty.

The significance of AR for India's future depends on the fact that it can make the technology meet the consumer demands. The marriage of commerce, marketing, IT, and consumer psychology can lead to creation of an informed and interactive shopping experience via the Internet. In other words, the significance of AR for India's digital transformation does not depend only on how developed the technology is but also on how widely it is adopted and utilized by consumers.

Originality and data note: This conference paper is a newly written, focused interpretation of the author's doctoral dataset. Numerical results are retained because they are empirical findings from the original research; the surrounding argument, organisation and discussion have been independently rewritten for the present conference theme. Previously published ideas and literature remain cited.

References

1. Alimamy, S., & Gnoth, J. (2022). I want it my way! The effect of perceptions of personalization through augmented reality and online shopping on customer intentions to co-create value. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 128, 107105.
2. Billinghamurst, M., Clark, A., & Lee, G. (2014). A survey of augmented reality. *Foundations and Trends in Human-Computer Interaction*, 8(2-3), 73-272.
3. Chen, R., Perry, P., Boardman, R., & McCormick, H. (2022). Augmented reality in retail: A systematic review of research foci and future research agenda. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 50, 498-518.
4. Hilken, T., de Ruyter, K., Chylinski, M., Mahr, D., & Keeling, D. I. (2017). Augmenting the eye of the beholder: Exploring the strategic potential of augmented reality to enhance online service experiences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(5), 884-905.
5. Javornik, A. (2016). Augmented reality: Research agenda for studying the impact of its media characteristics on consumer behaviour. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 30, 252-261.
6. Jayaswal, P., & Parida, B. (2023). The role of augmented reality in redefining e-tailing: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 160, 113765.
7. Kowalczyk, P., Siepmann, C., & Adler, J. (2021). Cognitive, affective, and behavioral consumer responses to augmented reality in e-commerce: A comparative study. *Journal of Business Research*, 124, 357-373.

8. Kumar, K. N., Chandra, S., Bharati, S., & Manava, S. (2016). Factors influencing adoption of augmented reality technology for e-commerce. *Proceedings of the 20th Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems*.
9. Qin, H., Osatuyi, B., & Xu, L. (2021). How mobile augmented reality applications affect continuous use and purchase intentions: A cognition-affect-conation perspective. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 63, 102680.
10. Rauschnabel, P. A., Felix, R., & Hinsch, C. (2019). Augmented reality marketing: How mobile AR-apps can improve brands through inspiration. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 49, 43–53.
11. Rauschnabel, P. A., Babin, B. J., tom Dieck, M. C., Krey, N., & Jung, T. (2022). What is augmented reality marketing? Its definition, complexity, and future. *Journal of Business Research*, 142, 1140–1150.
12. Riar, M., Xi, N., Korbel, J. J., Zarnekow, R., & Hamari, J. (2022). Using augmented reality for shopping: A framework for AR-induced consumer behavior, literature review, and future agenda. *Internet Research*, 33, 242–279.
13. Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovations*. Free Press.
14. Smink, A. R., Frowijn, S., van Reijmersdal, E. A., van Noort, G., & Neijens, P. C. (2019). Try online before you buy: How does shopping with augmented reality affect brand responses and personal data disclosure. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 35, 100854.
15. Tan, Y. C., Chandukala, S. R., & Reddy, S. K. (2022). Augmented reality in retail and its impact on sales. *Journal of Marketing*, 86, 48–66.
16. Van Krevelen, D. W. F., & Poelman, R. (2010). A survey of augmented reality technologies, applications and limitations. *International Journal of Virtual Reality*, 9(2), 1–20.
17. Wedel, M., Bigné, E., & Zhang, J. (2020). Virtual and augmented reality: Advancing research in consumer marketing. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 37, 443–465.
18. Yim, M. Y. C., Chu, S. C., & Sauer, P. L. (2017). Is augmented reality technology an effective tool for e-commerce? An interactivity and vividness perspective. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 39, 89–103.

