

Consumers Resistance to Innovation

Shahimi Bin Mohtar¹, Mazhar Abbas²

¹University Utara Malaysia

²Ph.D Scholar, University Utara Malaysia

Abstract: *The motive behind this conceptual study is to explore and pinpoint consumer resistance towards innovation to know the idea in the field of technological innovation and its resistance behavior. This study aim is to investigate the consumer resistance to innovation from the theoretical point of view and represent its significance in the process of innovation. The study analyze and summarize the complication of resistance to innovation and its effects on consumer attitude towards innovation as well as its effects on the consumer market. Previous mainstream literature focused on the innovation adoption but this study focusing on consumer resistance to innovation by showing its significant ideas about resistance to innovation.*

Keywords: Consumer resistance, Active resistance, Passive resistance

1. Introduction

Resistance to innovations has been relatively an ignored part in educational marketing research. Therefore the literature on innovation has mostly rigorous on acceptance of innovations and on aspects that rapid up the acceptance process (Rogers 2003) rather than finding for reasons that hold up or avoid acceptance. Resistance to innovations is a usual consumer reaction to the alteration that innovations requires to existing behavior and practices (Ram 1987). Thus still booming innovations could be primarily resisted (Ram 1987; 1989). The adoption procedure can establish merely following this primary resistance has been conquer (Ram 1987; Bagozzi & Lee 1999). Marketers can take up diverse strategies to conquer or as a minimum resistance and thus rapid up the adoption (Ram & Sheth 1989).

Furthermore previous decades unavoidably signify an era of marvelous technological revolution. Numerous scientific innovations have altered the mode we survive and work: starting from color television and personal computer to cell phones and online banking. These new products and services propose big opportunities for firms, in condition of development and segregation (Danneels and Kleinschmidt 2001). Innovation viewed as a path of success for corporate sector. Companies that effectively introduced innovative products are extra probable to thrive than individuals that do not (Bayus, Erickson, and Jacobson 2003). Innovations permit firms to launch competitively leading situation, and affords fresh entrants and chance to add a grip into the marketplace (Danneels and Kleinschmidt 2001). On the other hand, even though necessary for firms' continued existence, improvement are too connected through elevated hazard and numerous novel products fail to win more satisfactory customer to be converted into a profitable achievement. Whereas the guess fluctuate as of 40% to 90%, depending on the product type, the criteria used to classify accomplishment, and the phase by which products are incorporated in the investigation, it is obvious that innovations be unsuccessful at considerable time (Gourville 2006). One of the prospective causes in favor of such innovation failures be the resistance to these innovations come across from customers (Ram and Sheth 1989). The type of this

resistance could be different since passive resistance or unawareness (Bagozzi and Lee 1999) to energetic upheaval (Fournier 1998). Though consumer resistance is a significant idea in order to add more approaching in how innovation is established and mellow into the market. Moreover Resistance to innovation is defined resistance presented by consumers to an innovation; moreover as it poses prospective changes commencing an acceptable status quo otherwise it conflicts through consumers' faith pattern (Ram & Sheth 1989). Resistance to innovations can also be resolute as a "liking for existing, well-known products and performance more than new ones" (Arnould et al. 2004, 722). Therefore, resistance to innovations can be considered because a particular shape of resistance to alteration.

2. Literature Review

Consumer's resistance to innovations is a unique case of universal resistance to alteration. Starting from an emotional viewpoint resistance is defined as an aversive motivational status, initiated while single perceives that one's choice is vulnerable, and directing opinion and proceedings towards retrieval the vulnerable choice (Brehm 1966; Brehm and Brehm 1981). Consumer's resistance to innovations reveals itself in diverse shape. The majority of the time innovation resistance occurs passively. Consumers resist innovation exclusive of intentionally allowing for acceptance for innovations. Literature distinguishes numerous drives of this passive resistance towards innovations. At first, passive resistance could be a result of behavior (Bagozzi and Lee 1999). Sheth (1981, p.275) terms habits "the single most powerful determinant in generating resistance." A distinctive human propensity is to attempt for uniformity and status quo, relatively than to accept new behaviors (Chernev 2004; Gourville 2005). This status quo favoritism leads consumers to significance the reward of products they possess more than the payback of innovative one. In addition, innovative products are evaluated comparative to the product they previously possess. People analysis any improvements comparative to the products they previously possess like gains and treats all shortcomings like losses. While losses to be exaggerated comparative to similarly

volume gains, the prospective losses as of adopting an innovative consider extra closely than the prospective gains (Kahneman and Tversky 1979; Tversky and Kahneman 1991). One more driver of passive resistance may be information consumers are open to the elements (Herbig and Kramer 1994). Malhotra (1984) and Keller and Stealin (1987) disagree that consumers processing capability can be converted into congested if they attempt to practice to a large amount of information in a restricted time. Information surplus frequently occurs once innovation evolves so quick that it is not easy on behalf of the consumer to classify all the information and build contrast among the existing alternatives (Hirschman 1987).

Innovation too can be resisted actively (Bagozzi and Lee 1999). Because a person decides not to accept an innovation following estimation of the innovation has occurred. Kleijnen et al. (2009) recently differentiate three forms of active innovation resistance that vary from fewer concentrated or active to extra concentrated or active: postponement, rejection and opposition. In case of postponement consumer do not have a pessimistic assessment of an innovation as such, they may perhaps decide to holdup the acceptance, for instance, in anticipation of the conditions for acceptance are extra appropriate. Kleijnen et al (2009) illustrate that monetary reasons (e.g. price) or a clash with on hand practice model at that end in time of the major reasons for postponement. In second case of rejection implies a physically powerful declination to accept the innovation (Rogers 2003). Rejection occurs for example as an innovation is in clash through an accessible faith construction or when an inauspicious figure regarding the innovations is developed (Ram and Sheth 1989). Additionally the extent of supposed hazard related through using an innovation is one of the key hurdles that increase rejection of innovation (Ram and Sheth 1989). Supposed threat represents a consumer's one-sided opinion of ambiguity about the penalty and product of adopting an innovation (Ostlund 1974). Risk look like a multidimensional build consisting of diverse sort of losses (Stone and Grønhaug 1993): financial, physical, social, psychological, performance, time or convenience losses. So in the end innovation may possibly not merely get together with rejection but might even suggest consumer to employ in strategies to stop the innovation accomplishment, like complaint or boycotting (e.g. Pañloza and price 1993; Kozinets/Handelman 1998). This type of resistance is called conflict (Kleijnen et al. 2009). Frequently, these behavioral responses curtail from consumer apprehension both with existing business practices and with the communal collision of innovations (Herrmann 1993). This kind of consumer resistance may possibly vary from group dealings similar to the boycotts, to person proceedings similar to the complaining actions, pessimistic gossip or switching actions (Hirschman 1970).

In addition to understand the different views about consumer resistance to innovation some studies shows the positive responses of consumers towards innovations and the literature shows the detail that In distinction, product bundling this is the focal point, is the incorporation and trade of two or more split products or services that can be presented at any price (Stremersch and Tellis 2002).

Product bundling having a marketing tactic to facilitate and increase significance by packaging paired or correlated products (Harris and Blair 2006; Sarin, Sego, and Chanvarasuth 2003; Stremersch and Tellis 2002), such like a computer system, which bundles hardware, software, network, equipment and secondary devices such like printer. An essential state of product bundles is thus that the bundled products be obliged to fit with each other. Product fit is distinct at the same time as the degree to which the consumers identify the two product types of the bundled products to be well-matched (Simonin and Ruth 1998).

The same as will be argued that elevated supposed fit stuck between the bundled products assist data move from the obtainable products to the innovative products and positively influence the adoption method of the radical innovation. After that to an elevated professed fit, the analysis of the connotation of fresh product is effectively correlated to consumers' previous knowledge in the product area (Wood and Lynch 2002).

Furthermore there are some studies that show negative response towards the innovations and the literature assessment is a significant phase in the adoption method the same as it determines whether a customer will carry on towards adoption of the innovation; but the innovation is assessed negatively, it is extremely not likely that following adoption will cover (Olshavsky and Spreng 1996). Radical innovation have a propensity to extract negative assessment, for the reason that they are dissimilar with presented products concepts and this inappropriateness can be resolute merely with extensive cognitive explanation (Mandler 1982; Meyers-Levy and Tybout 1989). Additionally once a well-built fit stuck between the bundled products is missing, undesirable beliefs and associations are stimulated because the consumer may question the quality and relevance of the product bundle (Aaker and Keller 1990). Introducing radical innovations is critical in favor of firm to improve their aggressive position and to protect their lasting achievement (McDermott and O'Conner 2002). Radical innovations are defined like innovative products that engage significantly innovative technologies, propose significantly larger customer benefits comparative to offered product and insist substantial changes to utilization or usage prototype (Chandy and Tellis 2000; Veryzer 1998). As a result, customer getting of radical innovations depends upon whether, and but thus, how customers are ready to change their intellectual altitude models (Calantone, Chan and Cui 2006). Acknowledged in a different way, radical innovations are probably to meet up an elevated altitude of resistance. Innovation decision hypothesis propose that the implementation of innovative products through consumers is the result of an intellectual course of information explore and dispensation (Gatignon and Robertson 1991; Gregan-Paxton and Roedder John 1997; Olshavsky and Spreng 1996). While confronted through new-fangled products, consumer initially has to achieve a few kind of innovation to figure positive or harsh feelings towards it (Rogers 1995). Product knowledge and product assessment therefore symbolize important preconditions for the receiving of new-fangled

products. Prior literature shows so as to the height of inappropriateness of the innovation by offered product kind schemes persuade the temperament of information dispensation and thus cause the innovation decisions procedure (Mandler 1982; Meyers-Levy and Tybout 1989). in favor of radical innovations, which require an elevated point of cognitive attempt as a effect of their inappropriateness with offered product schemas and density compared to offered products (Goldenberg, Lehmann, and Mazursky 2001; Mandler 1982; Meyers-Levy and Tybout 1989). This implies so as to consumer resistance might be there far above the ground regardless of their benefits (Veryzer 1998).

3. Conclusion

This paper pinpoints the main concepts and significance of the consumer resistance to innovation. This concept is not opposite to the adoption concept but this adoption concepts leads consumer towards resistance to innovation. Innovation resistance is not only related to consumer characteristics it is also important for the different organization to recognize the significant factors which caused the consumer resistant to innovation. This concept is also important for the new product failure in the consumer market.

This conceptual paper researcher discussed the importance of the consumer resistance to innovation through mainstream of literature that which factor is one of the main causes of the new product failure in the market. Researcher discussed the important concepts and definition of resistance to innovation and also discussed the factors influencing the consumer resistance to innovation. Consumer also resists passively and actively it also important to the organization and it is discussed in the above literature.

In conclusion consumer opposes, postpone or reject the innovation directly. In this situation where consumer rejects the innovation directly organizations are not able to change the consumer decision even though organization knowing the resistant factor which cause the rejection of innovation or product failure in the market. So resistance to innovation is very significant concept in our economy and to know the factors influencing the consumer resistance to innovation give deep insight to know the consumer attitude towards innovation.

References

- [1] Aaker, David A. and Kevin Lane Keller 1990, Consumer Evaluation of Brand Extensions, *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1), 27-41.
- [2] Arnould, E., Price, L. & Zinkhan, G. 2004. *Consumers*. 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- [3] Bagozzi, R.P. & Lee, K, 1999. Consumer resistance to, and acceptance of, innovations. *Advance in Consumer Research*. Vol. 26. No. 1, 218-225
- [4] Bagozzi, Richard P. and Kyu-Hyun Lee 1999. Consumer Resistance to, and Acceptance of, Innovations, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26, 218-225.
- [5] Bayus, Barry L., Gary Erickson, and Robert Jacobson 2003. The Financial Rewards of New Product Introductions in the Personal Computer Industry. *Management Sciences*, 49 (2), 197-210.
- [6] Brehm, Jack W. 1966. *A Theory of Psychological Resistance*. New York: Academic Press Inc.
- [7] Brehm, Sharon S. and Jack W. Brehm 1981. *Psychological Resistance: A Theory of Freedom and Control*. New York: Academic Press.
- [8] Calantone, Roger J., Kwong Chan, and Anna S. Cui 2006, Decomposing Product Innovativeness and its Effects on New Product Success, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 23, 408-421.
- [9] Chandy, Rajesh K., and Gerard J. Tellis 2000, the Incumbent Curse? Incumbency, Size and Radical Product Innovation, *Journal of Marketing*, 16(3), 1-17.
- [10] Chernev, Alexander 2004. Goal Orientation and Consumer Preference for the Status Quo, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(December), 557-565.
- [11] Danneels, Erwin and Elko J. Kleinschmidt. 2001. Product innovativeness from the firm's Perspective: Its Dimensions and Their Relation with Their Project Selection and Performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 18, 357-373.
- [12] Fournier, Susan 1998. Special Session Summary, Consumer Resistance: Societal Motivations, Consumer Manifestations, and Implications in the Marketing Domain, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 25, 88-90.
- [13] Gatignon, Hubert and Thomas S. and Robertson 1991, Innovative Decision Processes, In *Handbook of Consumer Research*, T. S. Robertson and H. H. Kassarian, eds. Englewood Cliff s, NJ: Prentice Hall, 316-348.
- [14] Goldenberg, Jacob, Sangman Han, Donald R. Lehmann, and Jae Weon Hong 2009, The Role of Hubs in the Adoption Process, *Journal of Marketing*, 73(March), 1-13.
- [15] Gourville, John T. 2005. The course of Innovation: Why Innovative New Product Fail, *MSI Reports* 05-044.
- [16] Gourville, John T. 2006. Eagers Sellers, Stony Buyers. *Understanding the Psychology of New-Product Adoption*, *Harvard Business Review*, June, 98-106.
- [17] Gregan-Paxton, Jennifar and Deborah Roedder John 1997, Consumer Learning by Analogy: A model of Internal Knowledge Transfer, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(December), 266-284.
- [18] Harris, Juddy and Edward A. Blair 2006. Functional Compatibility Risk and Consumer Preference for Product Bundles, *Journal of the Academy of the Marketing Sciences*, 34(1), 19-26.
- [19] 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.
- [20] Herrmann, Robert O. 1993, The Tactice of Consumer Resistance: Group Actions and the Marketplace Exit, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 130-134.

- [21] Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [22] Hirschman, Elizabeth C. 1987. Adoption of an Incredibly Complex Innovation: Proposition from a Humanistic Viewpoint, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14, 376-377.
- [23] Kahneman, Daniel and Amos Tversky 1979. Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk, *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263-291.
- [24] Keller, Kevin Lane and Richard Staelin 1987. Effect of Quality and Quantity of Information on Decision Effectiveness, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2, 200-212.
- [25] 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.
- [26] Kozinets, Robert V. and Jay Handelman 1998, Ensouling Consumption: A netnographic of the Meaning of Boycotting Behavior, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 25, 475-480.
- [27] Malhotra, Naresh K. 1984. Reflections on the Information Overload Paradigm in Consumer Decision Making, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10, 436-437.
- [28] Mandler, George 1982, The Structure of Value: Accounting For Taste, In *Effect and Cognition: The 17th Annual Carnegie Symposium*. M. S. Clark, and S.T. Fisk (Eds.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 3-36.
- [29] McDermott, Christopher M. and Gina Colarelli O' Connor 2002, Managing Radical Innovation: An Overview of Emergent Strategy Issues, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 19, 424-438.
- [30] Meyers-Levy, Joan and Alice M. Tybout 1989, Schema Congruity as a basis for product Evaluation, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(1), 39-54.
- [31] Olshavsky, Richard W. and Richard A. Spreng 1996, An Exploratory Study of the Innovation Evaluation Process, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 13, 512-529.
- [32] Ostlund, Lyman E. 1974. Perceived Innovation Attributes as Predictors of Innovativeness, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1(2), 23-29.
- [33] Pañloza, Lisa and Linda L. Price 1993, Consumer resistance: A Conceptual Overview, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 123-128
- [34] Ram, S. & Sheth, J.N. 1989. Consumer resistance to innovations: the marketing problem and its solutions. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*. Vol. 6. No. 2, 5-14
- [35] Ram, S. 1987. A model of innovation resistance, *Advance in Consumer Research*. Vol. 14. No. 1, 208-212
- [36] Ram, S. 1989. Successful innovation using strategies to reduce consumer resistance: an empirical test. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*. Vol. 6. No. 2, 5-14
- [37] 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.
- [38] Rogers, E. 2003. *Diffusion of innovations*. 5th edition. New York: Free Press.
- [39] Sarin, Shikhar, Trina Seago, and Nataporn Chanvarasuth 2003, Strategic use 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.
- [40] Sheth, Jagdish N. 1981. Psychology of Innovation Resistance: The Less Developed Concept in Diffusion Research, "Research in Marketing, 4, 273-282.
- [41] Simonin, Bernard L. and Julie A. Ruth 1998, Is a Company Known by the Company it keeps. Assessing the Spillover Effects of Brand Alliance on Consumer Brand Attitudes, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 35(1), 30-42.
- [42] Stone, Robert N. and Kjell Grønhaug 1993. Perceived Risk: Further Considerations for the Marketing Decipline, *European Journal of Marketing*, 27(3), 39-50.
- [43] Stremersch, Stefan and Gerard J. Tellis 2002. Strategic Bundling of Products and Prices: A new synthesis for Marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, 66(1), 55-72.
- [44] Tversky, Amos and Daniel Kahneman 1991. Loss Aversion in Riskless Choice: A Reference- Dependent Model, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(4), 1039-1061.
- [45] Veryzer, Jr., Robert W. 1998, Key Factors Affecting Customer Evaluation of Discontinuous New Products, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 15(2), 136-150.
- [46] Wood, Stay L, and John G. Lynch Jr. 2002, Prior Knowledge and Complacency in New Product Learning, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(3), 416-426