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Abstract
Whereas E-Shopping has been accepted worldwide due to its capability and flexibility to ease the shopping process in terms of costs, time, risks and quickly identifying products of interest among others, supermarkets customers in Uganda have failed adopt e-shopping. Supermarkets have showed readiness to operate the e-shopping system, through availing the required processes and infrastructure like internet, websites, visa cards, credit card readers among others, but customers have been reluctant to easily accept the new technology. This could be attributed to lack of awareness, negative perceptions and mistrust in the e-shopping system. The purpose of the study was to customers’ perceptions and readiness to accept e-shopping in Uganda. A questionnaire was designed and tested for validity and reliability before it was administered in collecting data. A total of 207 questionnaires were fully filled in and analyzed. The researchers used descriptive statistics together with correlation and regression methods to analyze the collected data. Results reveal a positive significant relationship between Perception and readiness to accept e-shopping (r=.637**, p<.01), which means perception influences readiness to accept e-shopping. This reveals that when customers perceive e-shopping positively, probably they will be ready to accept e-shopping. The study concludes that perception is very important in acceptance of e-shopping. This is also because of the positive significant relationship between customer perception and readiness to accept e-shopping. The way the customers perceive e-shopping in terms of usefulness, ease of use and the risks attached to it influences their readiness to accept it. Since perception had a positive relationship with readiness to accept e-shopping, customers perception towards supermarkets that are preparing to adopt e-shopping should be considered especially those concerning the way they perceive the usefulness of the shopping technology, its simplicity in the process of using it and whether customers will be able to operate it or not. Having a positive perception on these issues will psychologically prepare them to adopt e-shopping.
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Introduction
Whereas e-shopping has been accepted worldwide (De Kare-Silver, 2008) due to its capability and flexibility to ease the shopping process in terms of costs, time, risks and quickly identifying products of interest among others (Daily monitor, 17/02/2007),
supermarkets in Uganda have failed to apply e-shopping (Kakuru, 2009). Supermarkets have showed readiness to operate the e-shopping system, through availing the required processes and infrastructure like internet, websites, visa cards, credit card readers among others, but customers have been reluctant to easily accept the new technology (Behter, 2010). This could be attributed to lack of awareness, negative perceptions and mistrust in the e-shopping system (Davis, 1989).

The purpose of the study was to customers’ perceptions and readiness to accept e-shopping in Uganda. The study will help academicians to explore the importance of e-shopping as a marketing tool for attracting and retaining customers, its challenges and prospects for supermarkets in Uganda. This will also add on the literature available for marketers in the area of adoption of e-shopping and e-marketing in general. It is expected that the results of this study will help managers to explore the reasons why customers accept e-shopping reluctantly and investigate whether customer awareness can ease e-shopping acceptance. Furthermore, the study will help to explore the importance of e-shopping as a marketing tool for attracting and retaining customers, its challenges and prospects for supermarkets in Uganda. The study will also form the basis future research in customers’ adoption of e-shopping and e-marketing.

**Customer Readiness to Accept E-Shopping**

Customers who are ready to accept e-shopping have a positive attitude about e-shopping. Attitude is “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor” (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993, p. 1). Attitude has a strong influence on consumers' buying intention (e.g. Ryan, 1982), the immediate precursor of actual behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Previous studies have observed a positive association between attitude, behavioral intention and readiness to accept the new technology (e.g. Chang et al., 1996; Chiou, 2000; Ryan, 1982; Shimp & Kavas, 1984; Taylor and Todd, 1995), including in an online shopping context (Shim et al., 2001). Applied to the present study, attitude toward online purchasing is considered to be a function of the consumer's beliefs about an e-shopping's characteristics and the degree of subjective importance a consumer attaches to those attributes (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Based on the foregoing prior work, then, an e-tailer's failure to foster a favorable attitude toward its Web site will likely lead consumers to eschew online purchases with that particular e-tailer.

However, other scholars bring in the element of interactivity. Interactivity on the Internet refers to the degree to which customers and retailers can communicate directly with one another anywhere, any time (Blattberg & Deighton, 1991). For e-tailers, the degree of interactivity influences the perceived quality of the Web site (Ghose & Dou, 1998). Ghose & Dou, (1998) surveyed 101 Web sites to identify key interactivity factors that influence Web site appeal by usage frequency of each factor. They found that customer support was the interactivity aspect most frequently used by customers. In addition to customer support, several additional dimensions can be classified as “interactivity” characteristics – personal-choice helper, surfer postings, and promotion. E-tailers provide several types of online service that can increase interactivity with customers, such as software downloading, e-form inquiry, order status tracking, customer comment, and feedback. In a physical supermarket, customers interact with sales personnel; their friendliness and knowledge can affect consumers' purchasing decision (Berry, 1969; Lindquist, 1974; McDaniel and Burnett, 1990; Tigert, 1983). On the Internet, e-tailers offer consumers with sales clerk service in different
forms, such as a toll-free phone number, e-mail addresses, FAQs, and customer feedback. Research has found that having FAQ sections and feedback increases e-shopping visits and sales (Lohse & Spiller, 1998). Empirical work about the usage frequency of customer support functions (e.g. e-inquiry, comments, and feedback) reveals that customers prefer two-way communication with e-tailers rather than merely being passive recipients of information (Ghose & Dou, 1998).

Online outlets provide various forms of search functions for customers to locate items for which they are searching. Ghose and Dou (1998, p. 32) define a personal-choice helper as “a function that can make relatively sophisticated recommendations on consumers’ choices based on their input of preferences and decision criteria”. This function (such as a keyword search) gives customers more refined alternatives. For example, multi-layered information assists customers to narrow down target items based on their decision criteria (www.apartmentsplus.com; Shankar et al., 1999). Web sites provide customers with interactivity not only with e-tailers but also with online communities. Ghose and Dou (1998) found that online customers frequently use surfer postings, which are customers’ reports of their feelings and experiences with products and e-tailers. E-tailers often provide a page of customer reviews (e.g. www.amazon.com), which gives customers indirect experience with the products and service.

Consumer behavior tends to be influenced by external environments, such as promotion. The behaviorist approach in consumer research posits that “the reinforcement of a series of behaviors will gradually bring the consumer to the desired final behavior” (Wilkie, 1994, p. 271). For instance, a “clearance sale” sign on a supermarket window can stimulate consumer supermarket traffic. In physical supermarkets, the purpose of promotional activities for particular products is to encourage consumers to buy either a particular product or some other products. Spiller and Lohse (1998) have drawn analogies among retail supermarket, paper catalogs, and online catalogs and have characterized e-shopping promotion activities as being special offers, online games and lotteries, links to other sites of interest, and appetizers. Subsequently, they have also discerned that hours of promotion on the e-shopping entrance appears to increase consumers’ buying decisions (Lohse & Spiller, 1998).

**Perception and Readiness To Accept E-Shopping**

According to Koufaris (2002), a positive perception towards e-shopping creates enjoyment and perceived control among the customers. Customer’s perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness is directly generated from the perceived control (Hampton, 2002) but customer’s positive perception about ease of use and usefulness remains a challenge to discover whether it creates willingness to accept e-shopping among the customers (Jarvenpaa et al, 1999-2000). Cirewell et al, (2004), explained Perception as the way people change, see things, shifting altitudes and creating recognition (Robles-de-la-torre, 2006), this in its self explains the concept of readiness to accept e-shopping. When customers perceive the new e-shopping technology to be easy, useful and with less risk, they will also automatically accept and adopt the system since they have not seen any burden in implementing the system.

According to Webster and wind, (1972), decision making process of buyers is determined by the levels of awareness and how they perceive the knowledge gained through the process, this has a link with the teachings in e-shopping, where perception is commonly seen in perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness and perceived risk (Davis, 1989) which characterized by
psychological preparation of the customers mind to prepare for new technological adoption (Robles-de-la-torre, 2006). As Devis explained, Perceived risk could come from insecurity, (Parasuraman, 2000) privacy concerns, ordering, delivering and distrust which are all associated with risk (Furnell & Karweni, 1999).

According to Liang and Huang, (1998), its better for customers to perceived a new technology as less risky which helps them to evaluate the system and hence its acceptance. In e-shopping, customers have a fear that since there is no direct contact with the suppliers there could be missing gaps in communication or even delay in the delivery of goods and services (Hine & Eve, 1998)

Several studies of (Raab & Bennet, 1998, Funel & Karweni, 1999, Baker, 1999, Keeney, 1999) found that transaction security including personal information and credit card information is the most important concern for e-shopping, however Fishbein & Ajzen, (1975) indicated that customers perceiving e-shopping as risky is acceptable especially when it comes to the modes of payment, he therefore concluded that payment modes are the most important concern of security in e-shopping.

Based on the theory of reasoned actions (TRA) (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) as the beginning point for the development of the Technology Acceptance model of (TAM), Fishbein and Ajzein put great emphasis on perceived ease of use as a key determinant of readiness to accept e-shopping. Perceived ease of use is the degree to which a person believes that using an e-shopping system would enhance the purchasing process (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). This according them is the central point of appreciating the system and therefore preparations to adopt it usually come from the perception that they can ably use the new system.

Rodgers, (1995) explained that perception is based on the types of products that the customer will intend to purchase during the process of using e-shopping. Products that are very expensive and luxuries were given higher levels of risk compared to products that are relatively cheap. This also happened to products that are required for immediate use compared to those required for later consumption. In a cross cultural study of Hirschman & Halbrook (1982), it was concluded that perception of the customer regarding e-shopping depends on peoples culture and traditional beliefs and therefore, most western countries in the United Kingdom and United States of America are more prone to accepting new technologies (Halbrook, 1982) and more African countries are less attractive to new technologies (Hirschman, 1982), However the findings of Hirschman & Halbrook didn’t give us the factors that can induce customers to adopt e-shopping. It can however be stated based on the findings of (Tavenpaa & Tractinaley 1999) that acceptance of new technologies like e-shopping varies among countries and regions.

Scholars contend that the implication of e-shopping differ among shopping locations and therefore perception of e-shopping and readiness to accept it is based neither on products the supermarket is dealing in nor on cultural issues but on the location being either urban or rural. (Weltevreden, 2007). It was further discovered that shoppers in urban areas usually have internet facilities and have some knowledge about e-shopping that put them in a better position to accept e-shopping (Rietbargen, 2007) while those from rural areas always perceive e-shopping as difficult to use and therefore not ease to accept it (Rietbargen, 2007).
Dixon & Morton (2002) interviewed 450 shoppers in southern England and found out that there were more interested in e-shopping compared to the normal shopping of going to the retailing shop because of the perception that it is easy to use. Despite the growing number of empirical studies concerning the implications of e-shopping for in store shopping, there are few that take into account the concept of shopping centre and therefore creation of a positive perception remain a key contributor to readiness to accept e-shopping (Lohse & Spiller, 1998). Scholars added convenience as a key motive behind in-home shopping (Eastlick & Feinberg, 1994). Convenience is measured by effort savings (e.g. ease of locating a product in a supermarket) and locational convenience (e.g. ease of locating a supermarket and finding a parking space) (Lindquist, 1974). In online shopping, convenience includes timely delivery, ease of ordering, and product display (Lohse & Spiller, 1998). Lohse & Spiller, (1998) discerned that several factors can be subsumed under the convenience attribute of online shopping: number of links into the site, number and type of different shopping modes, average number of items per product menu listing, number of lists that require scrolling, presence of price information in product listings, and type of product lists. Among these attributes, they found that product display has a significant impact on site visits and sales, therefore contributes to perceived ease of use which prepares customers to accept e-shopping (Ghose & Dou, 1998). Specifically, displaying product lists using both click buttons and pictures leads to more positive reactions from consumers than simply displaying a product list using only a button or pictures in online catalogs which generates a new debate where by customers to have a positive perception about e-shopping, websites designs and display will be of great help (Ghose & Dou, 1998).

Ease of ordering appears to influence home-shoppers’ buying decisions (Eastlick, 1989; McDonald, 1993). Therefore, order processing on Web sites should be easy for customers to do, Moreover, receiving order confirmations via e-mail, including information about shipping, returns, and order tracking numbers, facilitates order-processing behavior. If order processing is time consuming and complicated, customers will likely become frustrated and give up purchasing from the e-tailer (Lohse & Spiller, 1998). With in-home shopping, physical supermarket dimensions of convenience, such as geographical location and parking, do not exist (Lohse & Spiller, 1998). Instead, in-home shoppers seek convenience through use of mail or phone shopping and through timely delivery (to home). A Price Waterhouse Coopers study revealed that “the biggest sources of dissatisfaction among e-shoppers had to do with gifts not arriving on time for the [Christmas] holidays” (eMarketer, 2001d) and times of delivery will affect customers readiness to accept e-shopping. There is a gap in accumulating evidence in the Ugandan context indicating that when customers are willing to use the system, there is continues reduction in perceived risk among customers and increased usefulness of the system, reputation and image (Ngulumi, 2003) which brings in the need to examine customers awareness, trust, perception and readiness to accept e-shopping in the Ugandan context.

Methodology
This section presents the procedure and methods used to carry out the research. It discusses the study population, research variables, data sources, data collection instruments, measurement of validity and reliability of research instruments, how data was processed and analyzed.
Sample selection
Simple random sampling methods were used to select 393 respondents from four supermarkets operating in Kampala. These supermarkets included Uchumi, Nakummat, Capital shoppers and Shoprite.

Data collection and analysis
A questionnaire was designed and tested for validity and reliability before it was administered in collecting data. A total of 207 questionnaires were fully filled in and analyzed. The researchers used descriptive statistics together with correlation and regression methods to analyze the collected data.

Measurement of Variables
This study adapted a five point likert scale to measure the study variables. The study utilized established measurement items by earlier researchers to operationalise and measure the variables under study. 
Perception was measured by perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness and perceived risk as used in the technology acceptance model (Davis, 1989). 
Readiness to accept e-shopping was measured by attitude, behavioral intention, and actual benefits toward using were adopted from Davis (1989), Suh & Han (2003), Chau & Hu (2002).

Validity and Reliability
Validity was ensured by calculating the content validity index following evaluations from the subject experts. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s Coefficient alpha.

Table 1: Reliability
All values were above 0.6 indicating that the research instrument was both valid and reliable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Anchor</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>5 Point</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness To Accept E-Shopping</td>
<td>5 Point</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Validity
All values were above 0.5 indicating that the research instrument was valid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Anchor</th>
<th>CVI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>5 Point</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness To Accept E-Shopping</td>
<td>5 Point</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINDINGS
This section presents and interprets the results from the data analysis. These results include the demographic profile of the respondents presented in a frequency table and cross tabulations, the descriptive statistics and inferential findings. The data combined in the different tables in this section were generated from questionnaires filled and collected from 207 shoppers of supermarkets around Kampala district during March to April, 2010.
Demographic profile of respondents
To describe the sample, a simple frequency table was used to present data related to age, gender, marital status, Education level, favorite supermarkets, period of dealing with the supermarket, ownership of a shopping card, frequency in using the shopping card and intention to get one for those who don’t have it. This data is indicated in the frequency table 3 below:

Table 3: Frequency table showing demographic profile of supermarket customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 yrs</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 yrs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 yrs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below O level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A level</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supermarket to which you go for shopping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Shoppers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakumatt</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoprite</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCHUMI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of dealing with the Supermarket</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years and above</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you have a shopping card?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in the frequency table 3 above show that the sample respondents were dominantly male (54.1%) while females on the other hand, comprised 45.9%. Of these customers, 57.5% were single, 39.1% married and those who were divorced and widow were 1.9% and 1.4% respectively. It should also be noted that most customers interviewed were in the 20-29 year age bracket (68.6%). Customers below 20 years of age, were 2.9% of the sample while those in the 30-39 and 40-49 year age brackets, were 21.7% and 6.8% respectively. It was also noted that the average respondent was between (20-29) years (Mean = 2.32) with a minimal standard deviation of (0.64). This indicates that the majority of supermarket customers in Uganda are the young and single.

As regards to the education level, majority of the customers interviewed (79.7%) were at University level compared to 8.7% at Tertiary level, 6.3% A Level, 4.3% O level and 1.0% below O level. It was observed that the average respondent was at the University level (Mean=4.62) with a minimal deviation from the mean of (SD=0.86). This also indicates that shopping in Uganda is more for the educated group than the uneducated. It was further indicated that 36.2% of the respondents shopped from Capital shoppers’ supermarket, 12.1% shopped from Nakkumat, 15.5% shopped Shoprite, 11.1% shopped from UCHUMI, 5.3% from Standard supermarket and 19.8% from other supermarket in Kampala District which indicates that majority of the respondents were shopping from Capital shoppers.

It is noted from the analysis that 21.3% of the respondents had shopped from their respective supermarket for less than a year compared to 40.6% who had shopped for 1-2 years, 27.1 had shopped for 3-4 years and only 11.1 had shopped for above 5 years from their respective supermarkets. It was further noted that the average respondent had spent (1-2 years) (Mean=2.28) dealing with his/her respective supermarket, with a standard deviation of 0.92. This is an indication that the practice of shopping from supermarkets is probably new in Uganda.

In addition to this, out of the 207 respondents, 41.1% had shopping cards and 58.9% had no shopping cards. It was further noted that majority of the respondents who had shopping cards were using them (6-10 times) a month compared to 27.1% and 7.2 % who use the cards (1-5 times) and (over 10 times) respectively. Out of the respondents who didn’t have a shopping card, 85% had the intention to get one while 15% had no intention of getting a shopping card. This indicates a higher level of acceptance of e-shopping in Uganda.
Relationships between the Variables
The Pearson (r) correlation coefficient was used in testing for the relationships among the study variables as seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Ptn</th>
<th>PEU</th>
<th>PU</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>Rdns</th>
<th>Att</th>
<th>BI</th>
<th>AB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.784*</td>
<td>.768**</td>
<td>.594*</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.784**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.768**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.342**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.317**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.781**</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>.778**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>.781**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>.381**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.432**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>.317**</td>
<td>.778**</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** KEY:**
Ptn= Perception
PEU= Perceived Ease of Use
PU= Perceived Usefulness
PR= Perceived Risk
Rdns= Readiness
Att= Attitude
BI= Behavioural Intension
AB= Actual Benefits towards E-Shopping

Results in Table 4 reveal a positive significant relationship between Perception and readiness to accept e-shopping (r=.637**, p<.01), which means perception influences readiness to accept e-shopping. This reveals that when customers perceive e-shopping positively, probably they will be ready to accept e-shopping. A positive significant relationship between perceived ease of use and readiness to accept e-shopping (r=.532**, p<.01), which means that when customers perceive the e-shopping system to be easy to use, this could easily make them ready to accept e-shopping. A positive significant relationship between perceived usefulness and readiness to accept e-shopping (r=.503**, p<.01), which means perceived usefulness influences readiness to accept e-shopping. The further implication of this would be, that customers in Uganda to have the willingness to accept e-shopping, they need evidence that e-shopping will be useful to them.
A positive significant relationship between perceived risk and readiness to accept e-shopping ($r = .339^*, p < .05$), this reveals that customers perceived risk affected readiness to accept e-shopping. Therefore, the higher the levels of risk perceived by the customers, the lower would be the level of readiness to accept e-shopping.

**Regression Analysis**

Regression analysis was used to test the predicting power of the independent variable (perception) on the dependent variable (readiness to accept e-Shopping) as seen in table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.502</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>8.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>11.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Readiness

The results in table 5 show that Perception significantly predicted Readiness to accept e-shopping ($\beta = .637$). The regression model was noted to be valid ($\text{sig.} < .01$).

**Discussion of Findings**

According to Pearson’s correlation a positive significant relationship between perception and readiness to accept e-shopping was observed, which means that perception influences readiness to accept e-shopping. It is further noted that all the elements of perception (Perceived ease of use, Perceived usefulness and Perceived risk) were positively related with readiness to accept e-shopping. These finding corresponds to the teachings of Koufiris, (2002), that a positive perception towards e-shopping creates enjoyment and perceived control among the customers. Customers’ perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness is directly generated from the perceived control and the ability to own the system that will influence acceptance. Further in support of the results, across cultural study done by Hirschman & Halbrook, 2002) showed that perceived risk is one of the key factors that influence adoption of e-shopping, however, perceived risk should be varying among countries as it was stated by (Javenpaa & Tractinsky, 2009).

However, (Rogers, 2007) didn’t conform to this when he stated that for consumer, products complexity is one of the barriers in the adoption of a new product. The more complexity products and services are, the less certain consumers feel about the performance of those products or services which take us to a conclusion that perception independently can’t exactly dictate readiness to accept e-shopping. The implication of these findings to the Ugandan supermarkets that are preparing to adopt e-shopping is that risk toward online shopping varies by country, indicating that risk perception can be affected by cultural values and e-commerce infrastructure. This necessitates supermarkets to look critically at risk associated with e-shopping and show customers that this risk will not affect them in the process of using e-shopping. In the same vain e-commerce infrastructure should be taken seriously, by the supermarkets preparing to adopt e-shopping in Uganda. These infrastructures would include a stable internet system, modems, computers among others in addition to training and preparing employees psychologically to be ready for e-shopping.
Conclusion and Recommendations
The study also indicated a positive strong relationship between perception and readiness to accept e-shopping. Supermarket customers who perceive the new e-shopping technology as useful, easy to use and with low risks are more likely to adopt e-shopping than customers who have a negative perception on e-shopping. It can also be further concluded that perception is very important in acceptance of e-shopping. This is also because of the positive significant relationship between customer perception and readiness to accept e-shopping. The way the customers perceive e-shopping in terms of usefulness, ease of use and the risks attached to it influences their readiness to accept it. Since perception had a positive relationship with readiness to accept e-shopping, customers perception towards supermarkets that are preparing to adopt e-shopping should be considered especially those concerning the way they perceive the usefulness of the shopping technology, its simplicity in the process of using it and whether customers will be able to operate it or not. Having a positive perception on these issues will psychologically prepare them to adopt e-shopping.
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