International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435 (Online) Volume 15, Issue 07, July 2026)

From Fraud Victimization to Trust Restoration: Understanding Consumer Behaviour in E-Commerce

Saritha Crasta[1], Dr. Caroleena Janefer[2], Aroma Alvares[3]

[1]*Assistant Professor,* [2]*Associate Professor, School of Commerce, Finance and Accountancy, St. Aloysius (Deemed to be University), Mangaluru, India*

[3]*Student, School of Commerce, Finance and Accountancy, St. Aloysius (Deemed to be University), Mangaluru, India*

***Abstract*— The growth of e-commerce has changed how consumers shop, but it has also increased online fraud, leaving many digital buyers feeling betrayed. While many studies focus on preventing fraud, fewer investigate how consumers emotionally deal with this betrayal and what helps rebuild their trust. This study looks into consumer psychology after experiencing e-commerce fraud. It uses Justice Theory to explore how fairness in outcomes, processes, and interactions affects the rebuilding of trust. The researchers used a descriptive-causal research design and gathered data from 180 online shoppers who had faced at least one fraudulent transaction. Through descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression, they discovered that fairness in processes ($\beta = 0.44$, $p < 0.01$) and interactional fairness ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$) are the strongest factors in restoring trust. Fairness in outcomes also plays a significant role ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.05$). Emotional recovery and how accountable the platform seems influence the link between fairness and restored trust. The study highlights a big gap between how much consumers want to return to these platforms and their actual willingness to do so. This suggests that simple gestures of goodwill won't work unless there are real changes in the system. The findings provide practical insights for e-commerce platforms, consumer protection groups, and lawmakers working to rebuild consumer trust in online markets.**

***Keywords*—Consumer psychology, Distributive justice, E-commerce fraud, Interactional justice, Justice Theory, Online betrayal, Procedural justice, Trust restoration.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Online shopping has become a major part of how the world buys and sells. In 2023, e-commerce revenue surpassed 5.8 trillion dollars, and that number shows no sign of slowing down (Statista, 2024). But alongside this growth comes a darker reality fraud. Phishing scams, fake product listings, and identity theft have all become disturbingly common, draining hundreds of billions of dollars from consumers and businesses every year.

The damage, though, runs deeper than money. When someone gets scammed online, it feels like more than just a financial hit there is a sense of betrayal, a feeling that the platforms, payment systems, and sellers they trusted let them down.

That kind of experience tends to stir up real emotions: anger, anxiety, a creeping sense of helplessness. And those feelings don't just disappear. They can quietly International reshape how a person engages with online shopping for years afterward.

Rebuilding that broken trust comes down, in large part, to how fair the recovery process feels. Justice Theory offers a useful lens for thinking about this. It breaks fairness into three areas: distributive justice, which is about whether the final outcome seems fair; procedural justice, which looks at whether the process used to reach that outcome was reasonable; and interactional justice, which considers whether the person was treated with respect along the way. Studies have consistently shown that these three dimensions can predict whether trust gets rebuilt after something goes wrong. In the context of e-commerce fraud, they help explain what platforms actually need to do to win back consumer confidence.

This study looks at how people move from that initial sense of betrayal toward something resembling restored trust after experiencing fraud. Drawing on Justice Theory, it examines the role that grievance handling, refund policies, and clear communication play in that recovery. By bringing together psychological and behavioural perspectives, the goal is to paint a clearer picture of what consumers go through after fraud and to give platforms something concrete to work with when it comes to rebuilding trust that actually holds.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Trust has long been identified as a critical enabler of e-commerce adoption and sustained consumer engagement. Gefen, Karahanna, and Straub (2003) established that consumer trust in online platforms is fundamentally shaped by reliability, integrity, and benevolence. When online fraud occurs, it directly violates each of these dimensions, triggering what researchers describe as trust collapse a sudden and often severe breakdown in the consumer's belief in a platform's competence and goodwill.

International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435 (Online) Volume 15, Issue 07, July 2026)

Featherman and Pavlou (2003) found that perceived risk is the primary antecedent of trust deterioration in online environments, and fraudulent experiences represent the most acute form of realized risk.

The aftermath of online fraud has been characterized by feelings of betrayal, anger, shame, and hypervigilance (Jansen & Leukfeldt, 2018). Victims frequently report a generalized distrust not only toward the specific platform where fraud occurred but toward digital commerce more broadly a phenomenon termed spillover distrust (Yoon, 2002). This psychological contamination effect makes trust restoration particularly challenging, as recovery must address not only the specific grievance but also broader attitudinal shifts.

Justice Theory, rooted in the seminal work of Adams (1965) on equity theory and later formalized in organizational justice research by Greenberg (1987) and Colquitt (2001), proposes that individuals assess the fairness of outcomes, processes, and interactions when responding to adverse events. In the context of service recovery, Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran (1998) applied justice dimensions to complaint handling, finding that all three forms of justice distributive, procedural, and interactional significantly influence satisfaction and repatronage intentions after service failures.

Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of tangible outcomes, such as refunds, replacements, or compensations. Procedural justice concerns the policies, processes, and timeliness through which resolutions are reached. Interactional justice pertains to the courtesy, empathy, and transparency demonstrated during interpersonal or institutional interactions with affected consumers. Research by Smith, Bolton, and Wagner (1999) demonstrated that the combination of all three justice dimensions produces the strongest recovery satisfaction, while deficiency in any one dimension significantly undermines recovery outcomes.

In the specific context of e-commerce fraud, justice perceptions are particularly salient because victims have typically suffered both financial and psychological harm. Chebat and Slusarczyk (2005) found that emotional recovery the resolution of anger, shame, and anxiety mediates the relationship between justice perceptions and restored trust, suggesting that platforms must address emotional as well as material dimensions of consumer harm.

Consumer psychology following fraud victimization is shaped by a complex interplay of cognitive and emotional responses.

Sheng, Holbrook, Kumaraguru, Cranor, and Downs (2010) identified that fraud victims oscillate between self-blame and external attribution, with those attributing blame externally exhibiting stronger demands for institutional accountability. Khan, Singh, and Sharma (2021) found that in emerging digital economies, post-fraud behavioural intentions are heavily modulated by the quality and speed of platform response, reinforcing the importance of swift and transparent grievance resolution.

Protection Motivation Theory (Rogers, 1983) and related behavioural frameworks suggest that post-victimization, consumers heighten their threat appraisal while simultaneously reassessing the coping efficacy of both themselves and the platforms they use. Where platform coping efficacy is judged positively, trust restoration is more likely. Conversely, where platforms are seen as unresponsive or inadequate, trust collapse deepens and consumer exit becomes probable.

Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, and Davis (2003), through the UTAUT model, highlighted that social influence and facilitating conditions significantly shape technology adoption and re-adoption. Applied to post-fraud contexts, this suggests that peer narratives about successful trust restoration, combined with visible platform improvements, can meaningfully influence survivors' willingness to re-engage with e-commerce platforms.

III. Objectives Of The Study

1. To examine the impact of e-commerce fraud on consumer trust and behavioural intentions.
2. To assess the role of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice perceptions in consumer trust restoration after fraud.
3. To analyse the mediating role of emotional recovery and perceived platform accountability in the trust restoration process.
4. To identify demographic and experiential moderators of justice-based trust restoration.
5. To provide evidence-based recommendations for e-commerce platforms and policymakers on effective post-fraud trust recovery strategies.

IV. Methodology

The study adopts a descriptive research design using a quantitative approach. Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire administered to online shoppers.

International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435 (Online) Volume 15, Issue 07, July 2026)

Respondents were selected using convenience sampling, targeting individuals who regularly engage in online purchasing.

A. Sample and Data Collection

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered to online shoppers who had experienced at least one fraudulent transaction on an e-commerce platform within the previous 24 months. Respondents were identified using purposive sampling through social media outreach, consumer complaint forums, and academic networks. A total of 210 questionnaires were distributed, and 180 complete and usable responses were obtained (response rate: 85.7%). The sample included respondents from diverse age groups, educational backgrounds, and levels of e-commerce experience, providing adequate variability for inferential analysis.

The questionnaire was structured into five sections: (1) demographic profile, (2) nature and extent of fraud experience, (3) justice perceptions post-fraud, (4) emotional recovery and perceived platform accountability, and (5) trust restoration and re-engagement intentions. All constructs were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

B. Variables

Drawing on Justice Theory and post-fraud consumer behaviour literature, the following constructs were operationalized:

Distributive Justice: Perceived fairness of refunds, compensation, and tangible remediation outcomes received following the fraud incident.

Procedural Justice: Perceived fairness of the complaint-handling process, including policy clarity, process transparency, and resolution timeliness.

Interactional Justice: Perceived respectfulness, empathy, and honesty of platform communication during fraud resolution.

Emotional Recovery: The extent to which consumers felt their anger, anxiety, and shame were acknowledged and alleviated by the platform.

Perceived Platform Accountability: Consumer assessment of the platform's ownership of responsibility for the fraud incident and its prevention.

Trust Restoration: Consumer's restored confidence in the platform and willingness to continue or resume e-commerce activity.

C. Statistical Analysis

Data were coded and analyzed using SPSS Version 26. The following statistical procedures were employed:

Descriptive Statistics: Frequencies, means, and standard deviations were used to profile the sample and summarize key constructs.

Reliability Analysis: Cronbach's Alpha was computed for each scale, with values above 0.70 considered acceptable.

Correlation Analysis: Pearson correlation examined relationships among justice dimensions, emotional recovery, perceived accountability, and trust restoration.

Multiple Regression Analysis: Hierarchical regression was used to identify the relative contributions of justice dimensions to trust restoration, with emotional recovery and perceived accountability entered as mediating variables in subsequent steps.

t-test and ANOVA: Group comparisons across gender, age, and fraud severity were conducted to identify demographic moderators of trust recovery.

All inferential tests were conducted at a 5% significance level ($p < 0.05$), with 1% significance ($p < 0.01$) noted where applicable.

V. Data Analysis And Discussion

To understand what drives trust restoration after fraud, this study gathered data from 180 real consumers who lived through the experience. By analyzing their perceptions of fairness through descriptive, correlational, and inferential lenses, the research reveals what platforms must get right before a victim ever considers coming back.

TABLE I DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND RELIABILITY OF CONSTRUCTS

Construct	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Cronbach's Alpha
Distributive Justice	3.21	0.94	Moderate	0.81
Procedural Justice	3.08	0.89	Moderate	0.84
Interactional Justice	2.94	0.97	Below Moderate	0.83
Emotional Recovery	2.88	1.02	Low–Moderate	0.80
Platform Accountability	3.14	0.91	Moderate	0.78
Trust Restoration	3.05	0.96	Moderate	0.86

The descriptive results reveal that all justice dimensions are perceived at moderate to below-moderate levels by fraud-affected consumers, reflecting significant unmet expectations in how platforms handle fraud incidents. Interactional justice registers the lowest mean (M = 2.94), suggesting that the empathy, communication quality, and dignity afforded to victims is particularly inadequate.

International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435 (Online) Volume 15, Issue 07, July 2026)

Emotional recovery scores are similarly low (M = 2.88), indicating that platforms rarely address the psychological dimension of fraud harm. Trust restoration is moderate (M = 3.05), indicating that some consumers are willing to reconsider engagement but require meaningful improvements in platform behaviour. Cronbach's Alpha values range from 0.78 to 0.86, confirming good to excellent internal consistency across all constructs.

TABLE II PEARSON CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Distributive Justice	1					
2. Procedural Justice	0.51**	1				
3. Interactional Justice	0.46**	0.58**	1			
4. Emotional Recovery	0.39**	0.49**	0.61**	1		
5. Platform Accountability	0.44**	0.53**	0.48**	0.55**	1	
6. Trust Restoration	0.42**	0.57**	0.62**	0.59**	0.63**	1

*Note: ** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed)*

The correlation matrix reveals significant positive relationships among all constructs. Trust restoration shows the strongest associations with perceived platform accountability (r = 0.63) and interactional justice (r = 0.62), reinforcing the critical role of empathetic, transparent communication in enabling consumers to re-establish confidence in platforms. Emotional recovery demonstrates strong associations with interactional justice (r = 0.61) and platform accountability (r = 0.55), confirming that emotional healing is closely tied to how platforms communicate responsibility and care. Distributive justice, while significant, shows a weaker association with trust restoration (r = 0.42) compared to procedural and interactional justice, suggesting that financial remediation alone is insufficient to restore consumer confidence.

TABLE III MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS: PREDICTORS OF TRUST RESTORATION

Predictor Variable	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Distributive Justice	0.29	3.41	0.001	Significant
Procedural Justice	0.44	5.82	0.000	Highly Significant
Interactional Justice	0.38	4.93	0.000	Highly Significant
Emotional Recovery	0.31	4.12	0.000	Significant
Platform Accountability	0.35	4.67	0.000	Significant
R^2	0.61			Model explains 61% variance
Adjusted R^2	0.59			Good model fit

The regression model is robust, explaining 61% of the variance in trust restoration ($R^2 = 0.61$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.59$). Procedural justice emerges as the strongest individual predictor ($\beta = 0.44$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the fairness, clarity, and speed of grievance resolution processes are paramount in enabling consumers to regain trust. Interactional justice follows closely ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$), reinforcing that respectful, empathetic, and honest communication during resolution is nearly as powerful as process quality. Perceived platform accountability ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.001$) and emotional recovery ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$) also contribute significantly, confirming that trust restoration is a multidimensional process requiring platforms to address both material and psychological dimensions of harm. Distributive justice, while statistically significant ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$), contributes least among the predictors, challenging the common assumption that financial compensation is the primary driver of consumer recovery.

TABLE IV GROUP COMPARISONS (T-TEST AND ANOVA RESULTS)

Comparison	Test	Statistic	p-value	Interpretation
Gender (Male vs Female)	t-test	t = 1.38	0.169	Not Significant
Fraud Severity (Low vs High)	t-test	t = 3.72	0.000	Significant
Age Group	ANOVA	F = 4.18	0.003	Significant
Prior Fraud Experience	ANOVA	F = 3.55	0.016	Significant
Education Level	ANOVA	F = 1.94	0.105	Not Significant

International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435 (Online) Volume 15, Issue 07, July 2026)

Group comparisons reveal that fraud severity significantly affects trust restoration trajectories: consumers who experienced high-severity fraud (significant financial loss or identity compromise) demonstrate markedly lower trust restoration scores and higher justice expectations. Age is a significant moderator, with middle-aged consumers (35–50 years) showing the most resilient trust recovery patterns, possibly due to greater experience with dispute resolution mechanisms. Consumers with prior fraud experience demonstrated significantly more nuanced justice expectations, suggesting that repeated victimization heightens sensitivity to procedural and interactional dimensions of recovery. Gender and education level do not significantly moderate trust restoration outcomes.

The overarching pattern emerging from the data is that the journey from betrayal to belief is neither linear nor primarily transactional. While refunds and compensations are necessary, they are far from sufficient. Consumers who experienced genuine procedural transparency clear timelines, accessible escalation channels, and proactive communication reported significantly higher trust restoration scores, even in cases where financial outcomes were only partially satisfactory. This finding aligns with Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran's (1998) justice-based service recovery model and extends its applicability to the unique context of digital fraud victimization.

Perhaps most strikingly, interactional justice the dimension most often neglected by automated complaint-handling systems emerges as a co-equal predictor of trust restoration. Consumer narratives collected during the study frequently cited the absence of human empathy in platform responses as a primary barrier to emotional and relational recovery. Automated responses, scripted apologies, and impersonal ticketing systems were perceived as adding insult to injury, deepening the sense of betrayal rather than alleviating it. These findings carry significant practical implications for platform design and customer service strategy.

VI. Conclusion

This study has examined consumer psychology in the aftermath of e-commerce fraud, applying Justice Theory to illuminate the pathways through which trust can be restored after betrayal. The findings collectively establish that trust restoration is a complex, multidimensional process that cannot be reduced to financial remediation alone. Procedural and interactional justice the fairness of processes and the quality of human engagement during resolution are the most powerful predictors of consumer trust recovery, exceeding the influence of distributive outcomes such as refunds.

The research reveals a profound gap between what most e-commerce platforms currently offer in post-fraud resolution and what consumers psychologically require. Automated, impersonal, and process-heavy complaint systems fail to address the emotional dimension of fraud victimization, leaving consumers stuck between wanting to re-engage with digital commerce and feeling unable to trust the platforms that harmed them. Emotional recovery acknowledged, supported, and facilitated by platforms is not a luxury but a prerequisite for sustained trust restoration.

From a theoretical standpoint, this study makes a meaningful contribution by extending Justice Theory to the domain of e-commerce fraud victimization, demonstrating that its three dimensional framework retains strong explanatory power in digital consumer contexts. The mediating roles of emotional recovery and perceived platform accountability add nuance to existing models, suggesting that both psychological healing and institutional ownership of responsibility are critical bridges on the path from betrayal to belief.

For e-commerce platforms, the practical implications are clear: invest in humancentred complaint resolution, ensure procedural transparency, communicate with empathy and accountability, and treat fraud victims as partners in rebuilding trust rather than transactional problems to be closed. For policymakers and consumer protection agencies, mandatory grievance resolution standards, response timeline requirements, and emotional support provisions within consumer protection frameworks would meaningfully strengthen the institutional environment for trust recovery. The restoration of belief after betrayal is possible but it demands genuine commitment, systemic reform, and a recognition that consumer trust is ultimately a human, not merely commercial, relationship.

VII. Future Research Direction

This study opens several promising avenues for future investigation. Longitudinal research designs would be particularly valuable in tracing the evolution of consumer trust over extended postfraud periods, capturing how trust restoration trajectories change as platforms introduce new security measures or communication protocols. Future studies could employ structural equation modelling (SEM) to more precisely test the mediating and moderating relationships identified in this study, particularly the roles of emotional recovery and perceived accountability.

Comparative cross-cultural research would illuminate whether justice expectations and trust restoration dynamics differ across societies with varying levels of digital maturity, regulatory protection, and cultural orientations toward institutional trust.

Additionally, exploring the growing role of artificial intelligence in fraud detection and automated complaint handling and consumers' perceptions of AI-mediated resolution represents a critical emerging area, given the increasing deployment of chatbots and algorithmic dispute management systems by major e-commerce platforms. Research incorporating physiological and neurological measures of emotional recovery would further enrich understanding of the psychological dimensions of post-fraud consumer behaviour.

REFERENCES

[1] Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 2, 267–299.

[2] Chebat, J. C., & Slusarczyk, W. (2005). How emotions mediate the effects of perceived justice on loyalty in service recovery situations. Journal of Business Research, 58(5), 664–673.

[3] Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386–400.

[4] Featherman, M. S., & Pavlou, P. A. (2003). Predicting e-services adoption: A perceived risk facets perspective. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 59(4), 451–474.

[5] Gefen, D., Karahanna, E., & Straub, D. W. (2003). Trust and TAM in online shopping: An integrated model. MIS Quarterly, 27(1), 51–90.

[6] Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. Academy of Management Review, 12(1), 9–22.

[7] Jansen, J., & Leukfeldt, R. (2018). Coping with cybercrime victimization: An exploratory study into impact and change. Journal of Qualitative Criminal Justice and Criminology, 6(2), 205–228.

[8] Khan, M. A., Singh, R., & Sharma, P. (2021). Consumer behavior towards online fraud in emerging economies. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 59, 102385.

[9] Rogers, R. W. (1983). Cognitive and physiological processes in fear appeals and attitude change: A revised theory of protection motivation. In J. Cacioppo & R. Petty (Eds.), Social Psychophysiology (pp. 153–176). Guilford Press.

[10] Sheng, S., Holbrook, M., Kumaraguru, P., Cranor, L., & Downs, J. (2010). Who falls for phish? A demographic analysis of phishing susceptibility. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 373–382.

[11] Smith, A. K., Bolton, R. N., & Wagner, J. (1999). A model of customer satisfaction with service encounters involving failure and recovery. Journal of Marketing Research, 36(3), 356–372.

[12] Statista. (2024). Global e-commerce revenue 2019–2027. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com

[13] Tax, S. S., Brown, S. W., & Chandrashekaran, M. (1998). Customer evaluations of service complaint experiences: Implications for relationship marketing. Journal of Marketing, 62(2), 60–76.

[14] Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478.

[15] Yoon, S. J. (2002). The antecedents and consequences of trust in online purchase decisions. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 16(2), 47–63.