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#### Abstract

Consumer in the cutting edge aggressive society is the focal point of all consideration. The emotional relationship over the most recent few decades has raised him to a place of remarkable sway, and has constrained the business firms to plan and offer items that better fulfill the consumer needs and needs. The quintessence of advertising, idea is that all components of a business ought to be outfitted as per the general inclination of its consumers. Working under the advertising idea requires an exhaustive comprehension of consumer conduct. The intend to lead the analysis on the exploration of Consumer Perception on online versus offline shopping in chosen urban communities of Andhra Pradesh-A study, is to investigate the conventional and virtual shopping and to learn about the mindfulness among purchasers about the two unique platforms.
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## Introduction

Until A decade ago people were making an allowance for shopping from the nearest convenience store but today the scenario has changed and now people are shopping online by using mobile phones, laptops, PC's etc. There is a radical change in the pattern of shopping.

Online shopping can be a keen buyer's closest companion, with the capacity to effectively contrast with shop, look for rebates and make acquisitions with a couple of clicks of mouse. Consumer could always hop for shopping comparison sites, such as Amazon, Snapdeal, Myntra, Make my trip, Flipkart etc, with this online shopping has been put out of place bricks-and-mortar trips for many consumers.

## Review of literature

Online ${ }^{1}$ costs are progressively utilized for estimation and research applications, yet little is thought about their connection to costs gathered disconnected, where most retail exchanges occur. I direct the main expansive scale examination of costs at the same time gathered from the sites and physical stores of 56 vast multi-divert retailers in 10 nations. I find that value levels are indistinguishable around 72 percent of the time. Value changes are not synchronized but rather have comparative frequencies and normal sizes. These outcomes have suggestions for national measurable workplaces, specialists utilizing on the web information, and anybody intrigued by the impact of the Internet on retail costs.

This ${ }^{2}$ examination analyzes the impacts of buyers' view of retailers' beguiling practices on their assessments of on the web and disconnected retailers. Results from two examples of buyers (shopping in online versus disconnected channels) demonstrate the immediate and aberrant impact of purchasers' view of retailers' tricky practices on buyers' assessments, including item fulfillment, retailer fulfillment and informal. View of double dealing impact retailer fulfillment through item fulfillment, and verbal exchange through retailer fulfillment. These intervened impacts are additionally directed by the online versus disconnected buy channel. Suggestions for hypothesis and administration are examined.

The ${ }^{3}$ creators utilize confirm from store openings by a blocks and-snaps retailer to look at the drivers of substitution and complementarity amongst on the web and disconnected retail channels. The confirmation underpins the concurrence of substitution crosswise over diverts and complementarity sought after. In places where the retailer has a solid nearness, the opening of a disconnected store is related with a reduction in online deals and inquiry; be that as it may, in places where the retailer does not have a solid nearness, the opening of a disconnected store is related with an expansion in online deals and hunt. The confirmation recommends that though on the web and disconnected directs might be substitutes in circulation, they are supplements in promoting interchanges. In particular, the kind of promoting correspondence driving complementarity is by all accounts data about the presence of the brand. For instance, the creators watch an extensive increment in new client securing and deals, and little distinction amongst fit and feel items and different items. Therefore, it is the nearness of the store, as opposed to data about the traits of the items in the store that drives complementarity.

The ${ }^{4}$ principle goal of this investigation is to examine online versus disconnected contrasts in buyer conduct. To this end, through a proposition connected to silver screens in strip malls, this examination considers esteems and ways of life as central point that impact practices and expectations. The incomplete minimum squares (PLS) approach is utilized to assess the model. A multi-amass investigation is directed to contrast customers who purchase tickets on the web and the individuals who do as such at a film industry. We think about 391 legitimate cases. The outcomes got demonstrate a connection between the utilization of innovation and its consequences for conduct. The connections amongst qualities and conduct and in addition amongst conduct and future expectation are more grounded among online purchasers than the impacts of ways of life on conduct. We consider important hypothetical and exact points of view and offer basic proposals of utilization to strip mall directors, film theaters, and middle people of this part.

## Research methodology

This study is based on both the primary and secondary data. The available information was collected at various levels. The data was collected personally with the respondents, by administering the questionnaire. Cross tabulation and chi square tools are used to analyse the data.

## Objectives of the study:

1. To study socio-economic profile of the online and offline consumers in Anantapuramu.
2. To study the perception of online and offline consumers.

## Hypothesis of the study

$\mathrm{H}_{1}$ Price has insignificance influence on consumer perception towards online and offline shopping.
$\mathrm{H}_{2}$ Convenience of shopping has insignificance influence on consumer perception towards online and offline shopping.
$\mathrm{H}_{3}$. Impact of tangibility has insignificance influence on consumer perception towards online and offline shopping.

## Sample size:

Marketing research means field study. . The researcher, being a scholar of marketing has more interest in this presentation plan. Where consumer's inclinations were taken as subject of study i,e online versus offline shopping. Anantapuramu ${ }^{5}$ is a city was shaped as a locality in the year 1882 having been alienated from Bellary district. The District has been divided into five Revenue Divisions consisting of sixty three revenue mandals. An official information of Anantapuramu district has been announced by Directorate of Census Operations of Andhra Pradesh through Census 2011. The total population of Anantapuramu district as on 2011 was $40,81,148$ and of which male are $20,64,653$ and female are $20,16,653$ respectively. Out of which 2, 62,340 people live in Anantapuramu City.

## Limitations

An attempt is made to show how consumers opine about the various shopping models in today's competitive world. The researcher has gone in depth to check the different satisfaction levels. However, there are certain limitations of the study,

1. The present study is limited to Anantapuramu city.
2. All the data provided by the respondents is considered as accurate.
3. Since the population of Anantapuramu city is much more, bearing in mind the time and other factors as constrains, the study is limited to 150 .

## Analysis of data:

| Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the respondents |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Particulars | Frequency ( $\mathrm{n}=150$ ) | Percent |
|  |  |  |
| Age in years |  |  |
| 16-26 years | 90 | $60 \%$ |
| 27-36 years | 18 | $12 \%$ |
| 37-46 years | 30 | $20 \%$ |
| 46 years and above | 12 | $8 \%$ |
| Gender |  |  |
| Male | 63 | $42 \%$ |
| Female | 87 | $58 \%$ |
| Educational |  |  |
| qualification | 12 | $8 \%$ |
| Inter | 30 | $20 \%$ |
| Degree | 105 | $88 \%$ |
| PG | 3 | $2 \%$ |
| Others | 84 | $56 \%$ |
| Marital status | 66 | $44 \%$ |
| Married |  |  |
| Unmarried | 45 | $30 \%$ |
| Occupation | 30 | $20 \%$ |
| Student | 57 | $38 \%$ |
| Home maker | 12 | $8 \%$ |
| Pvt employee | 6 | $4 \%$ |
| Govt employee |  |  |
| Business |  |  |

From table 1 it can be inferred that 90 respondents $60 \%$ fall in the age group of 16 to 26 years, followed by 30 respondents $20 \%$ comes in the bracket of 37 to 46 years, next is 18 respondents $12 \%$ between 27 to 36 and lastly 12 respondents $8 \%$ are between the age group of 46 and above. When it comes to gender female are 87 in count $\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{e} 58 \%$ and men are $63 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{e} 42 \%$. In terms of educational qualification 105 respondents $88 \%$ have PG as their education background, followed by 30 respondents $20 \%$ as degree holders, later 12 respondents $8 \%$ are undergoing studied and lastly 3 respondents $2 \%$ have other degrees. In case of marital status 84 respondents $56 \%$ are married trailed by 66 respondents $44 \%$ who are still unmarried. Lastly comes the occupation of the respondents 57 respondents $38 \%$ are private employees, 45 respondents $30 \%$ are students, 30 respondents $20 \%$ are home makers, 12 respondents $8 \%$ are government employees and lastly 6 respondents $4 \%$ are business people.

Table 2 online price * offline price Cross tabulation


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Chi-Square Tests |  |  |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic <br> Significance (2- <br> sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $15.829^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  | 16 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 17.929 | 16 | .465 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .018 | 1 | .328 |
| N of Valid Cases | 150 |  | .893 |

a. 14 cells $(56.0 \%)$ have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is 1.25 .
Inference:

Since the calculated value is 15.829 is less than the table value at 0.01 level of significance for 16 degrees of freedom hence the null hypothesis Price has no significance influence on consumer perception towards online and offline shopping, is accepted. The researcher therefore concludes that there is no significance of price in online and offline shopping.

Table 3 online convenience * offline convenience Cross tabulation

|  |  | offline convenience |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | strongly disagree | disagree | neutral | agree | strongly agree |  |
| online convenience | strongly disagree | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
|  | disagree | 10 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 33 |
|  | neutral | 0 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
|  | agree | 11 | 12 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 41 |
|  | strongly agree | 11 | 27 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 54 |
| Total |  | 34 | 57 | 29 | 13 | 17 | 150 |

Chi-Square Tests

| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $21.824^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 16 | .149 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 26.132 | 16 | .052 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .575 | 1 | .448 |
| N of Valid Cases | 150 |  |  |

a. 14 cells $(56.0 \%)$ have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is .61 .

## Inference:

Since the calculated value is 16.824 is less than the table value at 0.01 level of significance for 16 degrees of freedom hence the null hypothesis Convenience of shopping has insignificance influence on consumer perception towards online and offline shopping., is accepted. The researcher therefore concludes that there is no significance of convenience of shopping on different platforms.

Table 4 online tangibility * offline tangibility Cross tabulation

|  | offline tangibility |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | neutral |  | agree | strongly agree |  |
| online tangibility | strongly disagree | 4 | 70 | 70 | 144 |
|  | disagree | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Total |  | 4 | 70 | 76 | 150 |

Chi-Square Tests

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Value | df | Asymptotic <br> Significance (2- <br> sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | $6.086^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  | 2 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 8.402 | 2 | .048 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 5.542 | 1 | .015 |
| N of Valid Cases | 150 |  | .019 |

a. 4 cells $(66.7 \%)$ have expected count less than 5 . The minimum expected count is .16.

## Inference:

Since the calculated value is 6.086 is more than the table value at 0.01 level of significance for 2 degrees of freedom hence the null hypothesis impact of tangibility has insignificance influence on consumer perception towards online and offline shopping. Is rejected. The researcher therefore concludes that there is significance impact of tangibility while shopping on different platforms.

## Conclusion

This Study has documented a number of respondents who advocated in what way the perception of the respondents is. Some of the people had access to a far wider range of operations and communications via social networks than earlier. The belief of intimacy was strengthened by further responses which indicated that greater personal online access has changed the concept of private space. However, the online shopping has empowered actions conducted by online sellers. This study supports how consumer perception vary from one individual to another. Buying and selling online can is very convenient and rewarding but at the same time seller always have to protect the buyer. Consumer make sure that the computer is well protected before beginning any transaction that involves sensitive information. There are a lot of scams on the internet that can negatively affect credit score and costs money.
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