

A Conceptual Investigation of Consumer Resistance to Innovations

¹Shahimi Bin Mohtar and ¹Mazhar Abbas

¹University Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

²Oxford College Multan, Pakistan

Abstract: The present conceptual paper represents a new framework about consumer resistance to innovation. This conceptual paper represents a deep review of literature on the subject. A huge amount of literature has been go through to find the factors influencing the consumer resistance to innovation and the significance role of these factors for the adoption of new innovation in the competitive market. This conceptual paper identified these factors as a predictor of consumer resistance to innovation. Through using probable research tactics, the present study finds out that above-mentioned factors related to consumer resistance to innovation are significant and play important role for the success or failure of innovation in the market. The present review of the literature on the consumer resistance of innovation and its influencing factors are very limited studied which requires further intellectual research contribution to better know and theorized characteristics of consumer and innovation towards consumer resistance to innovation. The present study propose a conceptual framework based on the gaps in the literature for further research and its importance related to consumer resistance to innovation.

Key words: Resistance to Innovation • Radical Innovation • Incremental Innovation

INTRODUCTION

The innovations have been studied in a series of perspective, as well as management, economics, technology, sociology and engineering. So, there is a great organizing approaches and operating the construct innovation. The innovation may transmit to the act of introducing amazing innovative (for example, the procedure for innovation) or large recently introduced (for example, a body). The literature on the dispersion of innovation has defined innovation as "an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption" [1]. In agreement with this last description, in this thesis we focus on innovation as an object (for example, a product, service or technology) Instead of innovation as a practice. Note that in this definition the term 'perceived' is used, demonstrating that the innovation is not to be substantially neutral again, but something that can be considered as an innovation so long as a particular target mass perceives the present invention, service, or given as again. According to [2] "No matter if the idea is 'objectively' again as calculated by the fall of the time since its first use or innovation. The apparent innovation of the idea for the individual

determines his response to it. If the plan appears again to the body, it is a novelty.

Types of Innovation: Innovation having two kinds first one is radical innovation and second one is incremental innovation. In this paper our main focus is radical innovation. Innovation which is basically radical is "a product, process or service with presentation features extraordinary or family characteristics that offer significant improvements in performance or cost that transform existing markets or create new ones"[3]. Similarly it is too distinguished as "innovation that breaks with tradition in the field." Retain as well considered like radical, irregular, infiltration or generational [4] and even troublemaking innovation [5]. Innovation like radical are important and well known for a manufacturer / marketing due to their ability to take innovative resources of aggressive performance; furthermore it is also essential for customers as they are the major social cause as well as economic diversity into everyday life [6]. The acceptance of radical innovation involves much more effort and expense and risks requires privileged (including the costs of learning and psychological effort) that the acceptance of incremental innovations [7].

Technological Innovation: Technological "innovation" is an iterative development in progress by the observation of a new market and / or new perspectives for innovation (technological), who heads to progress / enhancement, built-up and then marketing responsibilities important for the achievement of marketable innovation [2]. This reveals two significant prospects, in the first place, the method "innovation" includes the technological improvement of an invention with the addition the commercial introduction of this invention is that of customers, in the second place, the development of innovation is iterative and therefore, spontaneously includes the first chance of a new product and the reopening of a better and developed innovation [8]. The marketing of innovative product has been defined as the most significant movement and also critical that makes its realization [9]. The above definition prepared to significantly simplify and distinguish between a discovery and innovation. "A creation / establishment that moves to begin manufacturing in the laboratory and adds value for cost-effective for the company (even if the cost savings only) is measured a novelty "[10]. An invention cannot get twisted into a novelty unless and until it passes through the actions of manufacturing / production and marketing, so and invention / discovery that do not move towards commercialization remains an invention [11].

Innovation Adoption Process: The adoption of innovation is the development of process "through which an individual decision or further switches from first understanding innovation, forming way in the direction of innovation, the decision to accept or reject the execution of the innovative idea and for the authorization of such a decision "[12]. This thesis focuses on the consumers of innovations, that is, the development of individual acceptance, rather than the acceptance by institutional units or other organization. The literature recognizes a number of key factors that convince the decision to accept individual: the uniqueness of the innovation itself [13, 14, 15], individual uniqueness [16, 17] the collective point of view [18, 19, 20, 21] and the atmosphere marketing [22, 23] Moreover, the assumption innovation decision suggests that the acceptance of new products by consumers is the result of a cognitive process of exploring and processing information [24, 25]. Literature Innovation acceptance identifies five distinct phases mental through which a person progresses in this decision to accept a novelty: the awareness,

consideration, the goal, the acceptance and continuous use [26, 27]. preferably, an individual passes from first made an innovation to form a positive attitude towards innovation for obvious ways adoption. However, in practice, the awareness of innovation is not all the time leads to a constructive manner, much less to the behavior acceptance”.

Consumer Resistance to Innovation: Consumer resistance to innovation is very important factor of particular resistance to general change. Less number of studies is given the important role of innovation in the process of adoption of new services and products. By a psychosomatic viewpoint resistance is defined as a state the aversive motivational, started as your sense of that their freedom is being threatened and directing the thoughts and actions to regain freedom under threat [28, 29]. With regard to the resistance to innovation, [30] the following definition shall: "Innovation is the resistance of the resistance offered from consumers for an innovation, either because poses potential will change from no change in policy satisfactory or because it conflicts by their faith structure. "consumer resistance to the innovations reveals itself in various forms. The majority of the resistance of time innovation happens passively. The consumers resist innovations free intentionally considering such innovations for adoption. The literature distinguished different drivers of this passive resistance to innovation. "Firstly, the passive resistance may be a result of habit [31, 32] terms habit."The most powerful factor in generating resistance" A typical human tendency is to strive for consistency and the status quo, rather than adopt new behaviors [33]. This status quo bias leads consumers to evaluate the benefits of the products they own more than the benefits of the new. In addition, the new products are valued compared to products already in possession. People see the improvements to the products they already own gains and treat all the defects, such as losses. Since the losses tend to be exaggerated compared to gains of the same size, the potential losses arising from adopting an innovation weigh more heavily than potential gains [34, 35]. Another driver of passive resistance could be information overload due to the huge amount of information consumers are exposed to [36, 37] and Keller and [38] argue that the processing power of consumers can become overloaded if they try to process too much information in a limited time. Information overload often occurs when an innovation evolves so quickly (and there

are many alternatives available) that it is difficult for the consumer to organize all the information and make comparisons between the available alternatives [39]. Innovations can be countered actively [40]. In this case, a person decides to adopt an innovation after the occurrence of the evaluation innovation. [41] recently identified three forms of innovation active resistance ranging from beginning less intense or more intense or active: reference, rejection and opposition." First, it can cause the reference. While consumers do not have a negative evaluation of an innovation in itself, may choose to delay the adoption, for example, until the circumstances of adoption are more suitable. [42] show the economic reasons (such as price) or a conflict with existing usage patterns at that point in time are the main reasons for the postponement. Second, the refusal involves a strong reluctance to adopt innovation [43]. Rejection occurs for example when an innovation is in conflict with a belief exists or when the picture would not have supported innovation is developed [44]. Furthermore, the degree of perceived risk associated with the use of an innovation is one of the main obstacles that promote innovations refusal [45]. Perceived risk is the subjective perception of consumers' uncertainty about the consequences and outcomes of adoption of an innovation [46]. The risk can be seen as a multidimensional construct composed of different types of losses [47] financial, performance, physical, psychological, social, time or loss of convenience. Finally, a novelty not only able to meet the rejection, but can also summons consumers to engage in strategies to prevent the success of innovation, in protest or boycott [48; 49]. This form of resistance is called opposition. Often, these behavioral responses are derived from consumer concern and with the current business practices and with the social impact of innovations. This type of resistance can vary from collective actions of consumers, such as boycotts, individual actions, such as the behavior that complain, negative word of mouth or switching behavior.

Consumer Resistance: Resistance Innovation is the reaction of consumers towards innovation, both because they create potential changes to the status quo or satisfactory because it conflicts with their belief structure. Resistance is one feature of innovation; changes forced by innovation create resistance (for example modification in products or consumptions) and is named opposition to modification, well-defined this as "any behavior that serves to maintain the status quo in the face of pressure

to alter the status quo." "Resistance to change is a natural response of a human being with all the changes that disturb the balance of Environment or shares of companies" As regards the resistance to innovation, "is not a novelty in itself, that people resist but the changes associated with it". It creates postulation of pro-change of the polarization, meaning that all innovation is superb and all must deploy / adopt them, as success of innovation is unavoidable. Innovation Resistance was named one of the significant serious aspects of success for the acceptance of technological innovation and selection of product has been showed as the result of overcoming the consumer resistance to innovation. In other researches the resistance and adoption named as both edges of a continuum in reply to innovation revealed that the root grounds of resistance curtail innovation to one or more of the barriers to the adoption. Such barriers are utilized, the value, the risk, the image and the traditional barriers. The barrier of use arrives when the newness is incompatible with consumers' existing workflow, practices, or habits. The value of the barrier is based on the economic value of an innovation that innovation does not offer a good price performance than the alternatives. Barrier risk is the degree of innovation may involve potential risks. Traditional barrier generally involve changes can cause a breakthrough in daily routine, even "a preference for existing products, family and behaviors than the new ones" so furthermore image barrier related with new product, brand, or any other country origin. The Consumer resistance shows a significant for the accomplishment of advanced innovation, as so it may delay or inhibit the adoption of innovation by consumer.

Perceived Risk: Based on these results, it can be determined that the perceived risks increase at higher social influence and perceived complexity and lower trust. With respect to the degree of the influence of the selected factors on the Perceived risk, social influence had the greatest influence, followed by perceived complexity and trust. Perceived risk refers to 'a consumer's belief about the potential uncertain negative outcomes from the transaction' classified six types of perceived risk: financial, performance, physical, psychological, social and time/opportunity. Studied financial, performance, psychological, social, time, privacy and the overall risks. Previous research found that perceived risk negatively influences one's intention to use technology. These researches model the relationship between

perceived risk and intention in two ways: direct link between perceived risks and intention and perceived risk acting as a moderator between perceived usefulness and intention to use. In the case of smartphone adoption, perceived risk is also believed to have effect on consumers' intention to use the device. This effect can be a direct effect or a moderating effect between perceived usefulness and intention to use. As mentioned before, via the focus group discussion session, two subdimensions of perceived risks were extracted for the context of smartphone adoption: perceived financial risks and perceived device risk. Perceived financial risk refers to extra expenses in monetary form incurred by consumers as a result of using smartphones. Perceived device risk refers to risks associated with the performance and physical characteristics of a smartphone such as product defect or malfunctioning. "brought the risk as an extra measurement in the adoption and diffusion of innovation that is then added by the 89) and 90) like another factor that affects consumer resistance. Here we are talking about the degree of perceived risk associated by adopting and innovation. And 'regarded as positively correlated with consumer resistance and negatively correlated to the adoption. Recent technologies / products can be perceived by consumers to be more dangerous. The research showed that risk perceptions is a primary determinant of a consumer 's intention to adopt an innovation. As it is very hard to catch the risk as objective reality , it is interpreted as the "consumer" s personal expectation of incurring losses in pursuing of a desired result " With respect to the impact of an action, including the perceived risk, are critical aspects that formulate the attitude toward action, the perceived risk may rise consumer resistance resulting from 'adoption of a innovative product. Thus, the perceived risk is believed to have good relations with consumer resistance. Although a situation where the consumer has assessed and regarded to adopt an innovation, risk and uncertainties perceived create significant barriers to adoption innovation always entails some degree of perceived risk because of the uncertainty in order that the innovation related with significant risk perceived, has the slower rate of diffusion and for consumers superior ". Generally, the perceived risk is defined as a characteristic of innovation, however argued that the majority of the time, the risk is rather a perception of a consumer than simply a characteristic of an innovation. But looking at the dominant literature, we included the risk perceived characteristics of innovation researchers identified six key

dimensions of risk perception, which are, financial, performance, physical, time, social and risks psychological"

Proposition: Perceived risk have positive relationship between consumer resistances to innovation.

Relative Advantage: Relative advantage is used in other research diffusion of innovation and captures many of the tangible aspects of innovation. Rogers believes that the concept of comparative advantage to be made up of shares in the fight with (a) the economic viability, (b) a low initial cost, (c) decreased discomfort, (d) the social prestige, (and) savings of time and effort and (f) immediacy of reward (2003). In addition, Rogers says that relative advantage has been found to be one of the strongest predictors of adoption of innovation, as the ratio of expected benefits and expected costs (2003). Agree that comparative advantage is the best predictor of the degree of adoption, especially for an organization in which the differential advantage of using an innovation compared to the alternatives is important for the productivity of its business. Relative advantage was positioned as influencer of adoption in a majority of the studies mentioned above. This is due to the belief and attitude by the prospective adopter that the relative advantages are economic improvements for the individual or organization than the idea it supersedes. In turn, relative advantage can be considered as a direct antecedent to the value models using multi-attribute utility and connect indirectly attributes intrinsic value. Findings of an adopter, or the attitude towards innovation, are normally done as part of the excellence or superiority of the product or idea that is measurable or verifiable to some standard or standard predetermined. The component of social prestige relative advantage is not addressed in the studies mentioned above. Prestige can be associated with the technology modular plant, as it is a new and interesting technology for engineers. The novelty of a technology is attractive for engineers, as Rogers stood in an analogy that the first users of home computers in which individuals with engineering and scientific background. This dimension is related to this study, as Rogers provides a good topic associated with the underlying desire for some users to be one of the first to use an innovation, as is the case with this technology being in the early stages of adoption curve "The relative advantage of an innovation is the "degree to which an innovation is perceived as better / higher of the idea

replaces". This definition has been mentioned by The comparative advantage may be presented economic return and social benefits, saving time, risks removed and also perceived usefulness (PU) have found relative advantage to be a major factor in determining the adoption of innovations by influencing negative resistance of consumers have found his edge, like a dominant factor which involves the intention of consumers from adopting or resist innovation. Generally, perceived relative advantage of an innovation is positively associated to its adoption rate of and negatively related by consumer resistance. Relative advantage, besides its direct and negative effect on the strength of consumers, was indirectly impacting on the perceived risk. Whether significant benefits are provided with a product / service, the expected risk maybe decreased consumers' ignore deficiencies / defects. Moreover, the relative advantage is positively correlated to compatibility and negatively correlated to the complexity such as a compatible product can be effectively used and it may increase his advantage, but relative advantage can decrease if the new product is complex and consumers have not be able to make effective use.

Proposition: Relative advantage have negative relationship between consumer resistances to innovation

Self-Efficacy: Self efficacy illustrate the degree of confidence one has towards its ability to perform and achieve a particular activity. Self-efficacy reflects an "s self-confidence in the ability to conduct the behavior and is defined as" the judgment of a person "s of his / her ability to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances. Another definition of self-efficacy that is given by: defines self-efficacy as "individual" s awareness of its capability to practice an advanced technology. "Self-efficacy is a key factor of "perceived ease of use" as well as the usability of an article. So the definition is as "an individual" self-possession in their aptitude to execute a good behavior. Self-efficacy states to a self-assurance in the ability "if the expertise to cope and execute the ways of act necessary to achieve the wanted result, and starts from other sources, as well as benefits realization, earlier experiences, individual interests, etc. Many researchers predicted that self-efficacy is strong predictor of consumer intention to utilize number of technological innovative products. Those consumers who have less number of self-efficacy to select innovative

products that may be faster, although there are advanced or better product accessible to every consumer. Stated that empirically like other factor self-efficacy also impact the consumer resistance to technological innovation. Some other different researcher stated that consumers are king and very significant elements to study the diffusion of innovation and consumer resistance to innovation. In this conceptual paper self-efficacy is chosen as one of the good factor, as earlier researches exposed that self-efficacy depict important influence of "perception of its ability to use the new technology product consumer" on its decision to adopt products "It was argued that, without skills, performance is not achievable; without self-efficacy, the performance may not be prosecuted. Consumer self-efficacy and their perceptions determine a causal relationship between the adoption of technological innovation and consumer cognitive factors. Through a wide range of behaviors, self-efficacy has been shown to affect the willingness to act as effective early action. The effect of self-efficacy has also been documented in a study of adoption of Internet banking by. Their study concludes that self-efficacy is a key determinant of perceived behavioral control. Another study by provided further empirical evidence to support the self-efficacy with perceived behavioral control. Their study verifies that self-efficacy has a positive and significant effect on the perceived behavioral control. They add that the effectiveness of the individual's "or the confidence to use the technology could affect their perception of behavioral control, which in turn will influence the intention to use technology.

The discovery similar can also be found in a study on the desire to use mobile coupons showing proof that self-efficacy is a significant and positive effect on the perceived behavioral control. The significant effect of self-efficacy on perceived behavioral control in the mobile context has also been supported. The role has for the self-efficacy was also demonstrated in a study by which states that the effectiveness of self is a determining factor in the adoption of mobile services. Another study of 3G adoption by supported the significant role of self-efficacy. Their study found that self-efficacy is an important determinant of 3G adoption by consumers. This significant role of self-efficacy on the adoption of technology can also be found in other studies also confirm that the effect is significant due to the self-efficacy as a form of self-confidence, that the user is confident in his ability to do something effective and

young users "respondents contribute to significant result because they are fast students of mobile technology. In a study by on the acceptance of multimedia services also confirmed that self-efficacy has a significant effect on the perceived behavioral control. This result is allowed by in his study plan to shop online; the result shows that self-efficacy is positively associated with perceived behavioral control. Concludes that consumers who are confident about engaging in technology are more willing to use the technology, in his case to buy the product online shopping street. All in all, the studies of the past have consistently denounced the significant relationship between positive and self-efficacy and perceived behavioral control. Self-efficacy has also been recognized as an important factor of internal control beliefs that influence technology adoption. Self-efficacy has been shown to have a strong relationship with the perceived behavioral control. Individuals who have a greater self-confidence (i.e self-efficacy) will perceive that they have the capacity (i.e high perceived behavioral control) and should be more likely to perform the behavior. Individuals who are confident that they have the ability to use the technology are more likely to adopt the technology due to their comfortability using innovation. Therefore, incorporating self-efficacy as an antecedent of perceived behavioral control in this study is important. In addition, self-efficacy (internal factor) and conditions that facilitate (external factor) play a key role in the initial phase of user "s use of technology. Therefore, this study also includes two other factors in particular resources that facilitate conditions facilitating technology as an antecedent of perceived behavioral control in determining acceptance of mobile marketing.

Preposition: Self-Efficacy has negative relationship between consumer resistances to innovation.

CONCLUSION

This conceptual paper aim to investigate the factors influencing consumer resistance to innovation. Preposition of all factors have been made on the basis of previous literature review. Through this study author pinpoint that the concept of adoption or selection of products leads to consumer resistance to innovation due to certain factors which directly affect consumer resistance to innovation.

This conceptual paper discuss with deep insight of consumer resistance to innovation and its importance in

the success or failure of product in the market. Researcher discussed the types of innovation related to consumer resistance to innovation with the discussion of technological innovation. All factors are discuss with different preposition and conclude that relative advantage have negative or inverse relationship with consumer resistance to innovation. Self-efficacy also has negative relationship with consumer resistance to innovation. But on the other side perceive risk of consumer have positive relationship with consumer resistance to innovation. So from all above discussion also conclude that resistance to innovation is very significant for our economy.

REFERENCES

1. Rogers Everett M., 2003. Diffusion of Innovations. 5th edition. New York: The Free Press.
2. Sarin, Shikhar, Trina Seago and Nataporn Chanvarasuth, 2003. Strategic Use of Bundling for Reducing Consumers' Perceived Risk Associated with the Purchase of New High-Tech Products, Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 11(3): 71-83.
3. Assink, M., 2006. Inhibitors of disruptive innovation capability: a conceptual model. European Journal of Innovation Management, 9: 215-233.
4. Dahlin, K. and D.M. Behrens, 2005. When is an invention really radical? Defining and measuring technological radicands. Research Policy, 34(5): 717-37.
5. Tushman, M.L. and P. Anderson, 1986. Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. Administrative Science Quarterly, 31: 439-65.
6. Garcia, R. and R. Calantone, 2002. A critical look at technological innovation typology and innovativeness terminology: A literature review. The Journal of Product Innovation Management, 19: 110-132.
7. Heiskanen, E., K. Hyvönen, M. NivaPantzar, M.P. Timonen and J. Varjonen, 2007. User involvement in radical innovation: are consumers conservative? European Journal of Innovation Management, 10: 489-509.
8. Gourville John T., 2006. Eager Sellers, Stony Buyers. Understanding the Psychology of New-Product Adoption, Harvard Business Review, pp: 98-106.

9. Rogers Everett M., 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations*. 4th edition. New York: The Free Press.
10. LaBay Duncan G. and Thomas C. Kinnear, 1981. Exploring the Consumer Decision Process in the Adoption of Solar Energy Systems, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8(3): 271-278.
11. Tornatzky Louis G. and Katherine J. Klein, 1982. Innovation Characteristics and
12. Innovation Adoption-Implementation: A Meta-Analysis of Findings," *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 29(1): 28-45.
13. Rogers Everett M., 2003. *Diffusion of Innovations*. 5th edition. New York: The Free Press.
14. Steenkamp Jan-Benedict E.M., Frenkel ter Hofstede and Michel Wedel, 1999. A Cross-
15. National Investigation into the Individual and National Cultural Antecedents of
16. Consumer Innovativeness, *Journal of Marketing*, 63: 55-69.
17. Im Subin, Barry L. Bayus and Charlotte H. Mason, 2003. An Empirical Study of Innate Consumer Innovativeness, Personal Characteristics and New-Product Adoption Behavior," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(1): 61-73.
18. Fisher Robert J. and Linda L. Price, 1992. An Investigation into the Social Context of Early Adoption Behavior, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19: 477-486.
19. Midgley David F. and Grahame R. Dowling, 1993. A Longitudinal Study of Product Form Innovation: The Interaction between Predispositions and Social Messages," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(4): 611-625.
20. Van den Bulte Christophe and Gary L. Lilien, 2001. Medical Innovation Revisited: Social
21. Contagion versus Marketing Effort, *American Journal of Sociology*, 5: 1409-1435.
22. Goldenberg Jacob, Sangman Han, Donald R. Lehmann and Jae Weon Hong, 2009. The Role of Hubs in the Adoption Process, *Journal of Marketing*, 73: 1-13.
23. Gatignon Hubert and Thomas S. Robertson 1991. Innovative Decision Processes, in *Handbook of Consumer Research*, T.S. Robertson and H.H. Kassarian, eds. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, pp: 316-348.
24. Steenkamp Jan-Benedict E.M. and Katrijn Gielens, 2003. Consumer and Market Drivers of the Trial Probability of New Consumer Packaged Goods, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30: 368-384.
25. Gregan-Paxton Jennifer and Deborah Roedder John, 1997. Consumer Learning by Analogy: A Model of Internal Knowledge Transfer, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24: 266-284.
26. Olshavsky Richard W. and Richard A. Spreng, 1996. An Exploratory Study of the
27. Innovation Evaluation Process, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 13: 512-529.
28. Frambach Ruud, T. and Niels Schillewaert, 2002. Organizational Innovation Adoption. A Multi-Level Framework of Determinants and Opportunities for Future Research, *Journal of Business Research*, 55: 163-176.
29. Brehm Jack, W., 1966. *A Theory of Psychological Reactance*. New York: Academic Press Inc.
30. Brehm Sharon, S. and Jack W. Brehm, 1981. *Psychological Reactance: A Theory of Freedom and Control*. New York: Academic Press.
31. Ram, S. and Jagdish N. Sheth, 1989. Consumer Resistance to Innovations: The Marketing Problem and Its Solutions, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 6(2): 5-14.
32. Bagozzi, Richard P. and Kyu-Hyun Lee, 1999. Consumer Resistance to and Acceptance of, Innovations," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26: 218-225.
33. Sheth Jagdish, N., 1981. Psychology of Innovation Resistance: The Less Developed Concept in Diffusion Research, *Research in Marketing*, 4: 273-282.
34. Chernev Alexander, 2004. Goal Orientation and Consumer Preference for the Status Quo, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31: 557-565.
35. Gourville John, T., 2005. The Curse of Innovation: Why Innovative New Products Fail, *MSI Reports*, pp: 05-044.
36. Kahneman Daniel and Amos Tversky, 1979. Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk, *Econometrica*, 47(2): 263-291.
37. Tversky Amos and Daniel Kahneman, 1991. Loss Aversion in Riskless Choice: A Reference-Dependent Model, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(4): 1039-1061
38. Herbig Paul, A. and Hugh Kramer, 1994. The Effect of Information Overload on the Innovation Choice Process: Innovation Overload, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 11(2): 45-54.

39. Malhotra, Naresh K., 1984. Reflections on the Information Overload Paradigm in Consumer Decision Making, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10: 436-437.
40. Keller Kevin Lane and Richard Staelin, 1987. Effects of Quality and Quantity of Information on Decision Effectiveness, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2: 200-213.
41. Bagozzi, Richard P. and Kyu-Hyun Lee, 1999. Consumer Resistance to and Acceptance of Innovations, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26: 218-225.
42. Kleijnen, Mirella, Nick Lee and Martin Wetzels, 2009. An Exploration of Consumer Resistance to Innovation and Its Antecedents, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 30: 344-357.
43. Rogers, Everett M., 2003. *Diffusion of Innovations*. 5th edition. New York: The Free Press.
44. Ostlund, Lyman E., 1974. Perceived Innovation Attributes as Predictors of Innovativeness, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1(2): 23-29.
45. Stone, Robert N. and Kjell Gronhaug, 1993. Perceived Risk: Further Considerations for the Marketing Discipline, *European Journal of Marketing*, 27(3): 39-50.
46. Penaloza, Lisa and Linda L. Price, 1993. Consumer Resistance: A Conceptual Overview, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20: 123-128.
47. Kozinets, Robert V. and Jay Handelman, 1998. Ensouling Consumption: A Netnographic of the Meaning of Boycotting Behavior, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 25: 475-480
48. Herrmann, Robert O., 1993. The Tactics of Consumer Resistance: Group Action and the Marketplace Exit, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20: 130-134.
49. Hirschman, Albert O., 1970. *Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Pres.