International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN (Online): 2319-7064
Index Copernicus Value (2013): 6.14 | Impact Factor (2015): 6.391

To Study the Effect of Selected Parameters on Adoption of Electronic Payment through Application in Selected Region of Aurangabad District

Pooja A. Kulkarni[1], Dr. S. A .Ghumare[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, NBN Sinhgad School of Computer Studies, Pune, Maharashtra, India

[2]Research Guide, Dr. B. A. M. University Aurangabad, Maharashtra, India

Abstract: ***Todays era is an IT era specifically human being depend on computer system for performing their daily routines (Needs) which include from reading newspaper to purchasing of vegetables or foods the banking operations is not an exception for that but while performing such operations human being heisted little bit because money involved in such an operations. This hesitation may leads to not using those services over internet but there are such parameters because of which user attracts for performing the financial transaction over cell phone few of them are user friendliness, convinces, security, platform etc cell phone is an device which user carry 24 by 7 in their pocket because of that user connect with the internet at any moment of time as well as because of latest technology like bootstrap web application develop in such a way that any layman can use those application more smartly. The UI of application very user friendly and attract many users to test the application. This paper is testing the impact of few parameters over the adoption of electronic payment though application. The primary assumptions of researcher is these parameters are responsible for performing the financial transaction by using electronic payment.***

Keywords: Security, Convinces, Platform, User Friendliness, Authentication

1. Introduction

Today's era is era of Information Technology where Information has been provided on figure tip and many devices like Laptop, Palmtop, cell phone, desktop etc. provide those information to user. Software developers has develop many application and make attractive and informative GUI to provide convinces to user to use those application. These application also provide financial transaction. Financial transaction may include E-Commerce. M- Commerce, banking operations, fund transfer, wallets etc.

Today's user are net addict user for every transaction he/she relay in internet like finding nearest route to booking a date with friend, as well as transferring fund to friend or buying gift, in such transaction money has been involved and when there is enrolment of wealth user become conscious, to understand his consciousness to become hassle free transaction over internet many researchers as well as developers of these application provide many parameters, the researcher studying few parameters like security, convinces, platform, user friendliness, authentication in selected region of Aurangabad district.

2. Literature Review

Ms.Vaishnavi.J.Deshmukh, Sapna.S.Kaushik and Mr. Amit.M.Tayade has published article International Journal of Emerging Research in Management &Technology Journal Title of article is " Payment Processing Systems and Security for E-Commerce: A Literature Review" Electronic Commerce is process of doing business through computer networks. A person sitting on his chair in front of a computer can access all the facilities of the Internet to buy or sell the products. Unlike traditional commerce that is carried out physically with effort of a person to go & get products, ecommerce has made it easier for human to reduce physical work and to save time. E-Commerce which was started in early 1990's has taken a great leap in the world of computers, but the fact that has hindered the growth of e-commerce is security. Security is the challenge facing e-commerce today & there is still a lot of advancement made in the field of security, convinces, application development etc.

3. Research Methodology

According to Clifford Woody research comprises "defining and redefining problems, formulating hypothesis or suggested solutions collecting, organizing and evaluating data; making deduction and reaching conclusions and at last carefully testing the conclusions to determine whether they fit the formulating hypothesis."
Data was collected through survey from 30 users located in various geographical location of Aurangabad Region
1. Primary Data
2. Secondary Data

Primary Data: - Primary data are the data which are original in character, obtained for the first time, being collected from the **users of net banking**, either through **questionnaire or through interviews via E-mail**. This can be collected by various methods like

- Surveys
- Observation
- Questionnaires

Secondary data: -
Various sources of secondary data are Catalogues, Brochures, Magazines and Websites, Television etc.

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

Objectives

1) To discuss Security, Convenience, user friendliness, authentication and platform do not differ significance between male and female users.
2) To discuss Security, Convenience, user friendliness, authentication and platform do not differ significance between rural and urban users.
3) To discuss Security, Convenience, user friendliness, authentication and platform do not differ significance between different age groups of users.

Hypothesis

1) Security, Convenience, user friendliness, authentication and platform do not differ significantly between male and female users.
2) Security, Convenience, user friendliness, and authentication do not differ significantly between rural and urban users
3) Platform do not differ significantly between rural and urban users
4) User friendliness and platform do not differ significantly among age groups of users
5) Security, Convenience, and authentication do not differ significantly among age groups of users

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

T-Test

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Security	Male	21	2.2857	1.18924	.25951
	Female	9	1.6667	.50000	.16667
Connivance	Male	21	2.7143	1.61688	.35283
	Female	9	3.3333	.50000	.16667
User friendliness	Male	21	2.8571	1.27615	.27848
	Female	9	3.0000	.00000	.00000
Authentication	Male	21	2.2857	1.52128	.33197
	Female	9	2.0000	.86603	.28868
Platform	Male	21	2.7143	1.61688	.35283
	Female	9	3.6667	1.32288	.44096

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Security	Equal variances assumed	6.045	.020	1.494	28	.146	.61905	.41435	-.22971	1.46781
	Equal variances not assumed			2.007	27.995	.054	.61905	.30842	-.01273	1.25083
Connivance	Equal variances assumed	25.857	.000	-1.116	28	.274	-.61905	.55475	-1.75539	.51730
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.586	26.609	.124	-.61905	.39021	-1.42025	.18216
User friendliness	Equal variances assumed	17.157	.000	-.332	28	.742	-.14286	.42970	-1.02307	.73735
	Equal variances not assumed			-.513	20.000	.614	-.14286	.27848	-.72376	.43804
Authenticati on	Equal variances assumed	4.311	.047	.525	28	.604	.28571	.54443	-.82950	1.40093
	Equal variances not assumed			.649	25.389	.522	.28571	.43993	-.61963	1.19106
Platform	Equal variances assumed	.916	.347	-1.554	28	.132	-.95238	.61300	-2.20806	.30329
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.686	18.491	.109	-.95238	.56474	-2.13661	.23184

H0: Security, Convenience, user friendliness, authentication and platform do not differ significantly between male and female
H1: Security, Convenience, user friendliness, authentication and platform differ significantly between male and female

Since, p>0.05, we accept null hypothesis and conclude that Security, Convenience, user friendliness, authentication and platform do not differ significantly between male and female

T-Test

Group Statistics					
	Location	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Security	Urban	24	2	0.88465	0.18058
	Rural	6	2.5	1.64317	0.67082
Connivance	Urban	24	2.75	1.51083	0.3084
	Rural	6	3.5	0.54772	0.22361
User friendliness	Urban	24	2.875	1.191	0.24311
	Rural	6	3	0	0
Authentication	Urban	24	2.125	1.2959	0.26452
	Rural	6	2.5	1.64317	0.67082
Platform	Urban	24	2.5	1.35133	0.27584
	Rural	6	5	0	0

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Security	Equal variances assumed	11.2	0.002	-1.033	28	0.311	-0.5	0.48412	-1.49168	0.49168
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.72	5.744	0.5	-0.5	0.6947	-2.21838	1.21838
Connivance	Equal variances assumed	7.953	0.009	-1.183	28	0.247	-0.75	0.63387	-2.04842	0.54842
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.969	23.572	0.061	-0.75	0.38093	-1.53696	0.03696
User friendliness	Equal variances assumed	8.547	0.007	-0.254	28	0.802	-0.125	0.49269	-1.13423	0.88423
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.514	23	0.612	-0.125	0.24311	-0.62791	0.37791
Authentication	Equal variances assumed	2.426	0.131	-0.602	28	0.552	-0.375	0.62276	-1.65067	0.90067
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.52	6.641	0.62	-0.375	0.72109	-2.09898	1.34898
Platform	Equal variances assumed	14.632	0.001	-4.472	28	0	-2.5	0.55902	-3.64509	-1.35491
	Equal variances not assumed			-9.063	23	0	-2.5	0.27584	-3.07062	-1.92938

H0: Security, Convenience, user friendliness, and authentication do not differ significantly between rural and urban users
H1: Security, Convenience, user friendliness, and authentication differ significantly between rural and urban users
Since, p>0.05, we accept null hypothesis and conclude that Security, Convenience, user friendliness, and authentication do not differ significantly between rural and urban users
H0: Platform do not differ significantly between rural and urban users
H1: Platform differ significantly between rural and urban users
Since, p<0.05, we reject null hypothesis and conclude that platform differ significantly between rural and urban users

Oneway

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Security	Between Groups	17.100	3	5.700	9.500	.000
	Within Groups	15.600	26	.600		
	Total	32.700	29			
Connivance	Between Groups	18.300	3	6.100	4.130	.016
	Within Groups	38.400	26	1.477		
	Total	56.700	29			
User friendliness	Between Groups	3.600	3	1.200	1.072	.378
	Within Groups	29.100	26	1.119		
	Total	32.700	29			
Authentication	Between Groups	23.700	3	7.900	7.058	.001
	Within Groups	29.100	26	1.119		
	Total	52.800	29			
Platform	Between Groups	17.400	3	5.800	2.762	.062
	Within Groups	54.600	26	2.100		
	Total	72.000	29			

H0: User friendliness and platform do not differ significantly among age groups of users
H1: User friendliness and platform differ significantly among age groups of users
Since, p>0.05, we accept null hypothesis and conclude that User friendliness and platform do not differ significantly among age groups of users

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons								
Dependent Variable		(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Security	LSD	18-24Years	24-30 Years	-0.6	0.37417	0.121	-1.3691	0.1691
			30-36 Years	1.40000*	0.37417	0.001	0.6309	2.1691
			Above 36 Years	1.40000*	0.4899	0.008	0.393	2.407
		24-30 Years	18-24Years	0.6	0.37417	0.121	-0.1691	1.3691
			30-36 Years	2.00000*	0.44721	0	1.0807	2.9193
			Above 36 Years	2.00000*	0.54772	0.001	0.8741	3.1259
		30-36 Years	18-24Years	-1.40000*	0.37417	0.001	-2.1691	-0.6309
			24-30 Years	-2.00000*	0.44721	0	-2.9193	-1.0807
			Above 36 Years	0	0.54772	1	-1.1259	1.1259
		Above 36 Years	18-24Years	-1.40000*	0.4899	0.008	-2.407	-0.393
			24-30 Years	-2.00000*	0.54772	0.001	-3.1259	-0.8741
			30-36 Years	0	0.54772	1	-1.1259	1.1259
Convenience	LSD	18-24Years	24-30 Years	-0.8	0.58704	0.185	-2.0067	0.4067
			30-36 Years	-1.80000*	0.58704	0.005	-3.0067	-0.5933
			Above 36 Years	-1.80000*	0.76862	0.027	-3.3799	-0.2201
		24-30 Years	18-24Years	0.8	0.58704	0.185	-0.4067	2.0067
			30-36 Years	-1	0.70165	0.166	-2.4423	0.4423
			Above 36 Years	-1	0.85934	0.255	-2.7664	0.7664
		30-36 Years	18-24Years	1.80000*	0.58704	0.005	0.5933	3.0067
			24-30 Years	1	0.70165	0.166	-0.4423	2.4423
			Above 36 Years	0	0.85934	1	-1.7664	1.7664
		Above 36 Years	18-24Years	1.80000*	0.76862	0.027	0.2201	3.3799
			24-30 Years	1	0.85934	0.255	-0.7664	2.7664
			30-36 Years	0	0.85934	1	-1.7664	1.7664
Authentication	LSD	18-24Years	24-30 Years	-1.10000*	0.51103	0.041	-2.1504	-0.0496
			30-36 Years	1.40000*	0.51103	0.011	0.3496	2.4504
			Above 36 Years	1.40000*	0.6691	0.046	0.0246	2.7754
		24-30 Years	18-24Years	1.10000*	0.51103	0.041	0.0496	2.1504
			30-36 Years	2.50000*	0.6108	0	1.2445	3.7555
			Above 36 Years	2.50000*	0.74807	0.003	0.9623	4.0377
		30-36 Years	18-24Years	-1.40000*	0.51103	0.011	-2.4504	-0.3496
			24-30 Years	-2.50000*	0.6108	0	-3.7555	-1.2445
			Above 36 Years	0	0.74807	1	-1.5377	1.5377
		Above 36 Years	18-24Years	-1.40000*	0.6691	0.046	-2.7754	-0.0246
			24-30 Years	-2.50000*	0.74807	0.003	-4.0377	-0.9623
			30-36 Years	0	0.74807	1	-1.5377	1.5377
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.								

H0: Security, Convenience, and authentication do not differ significantly among age groups of users
H1: Security, Convenience, and authentication differ significantly among age groups of users

Since, $p<0.05$, we reject null hypothesis and conclude that Security, Convenience, and authentication differ significantly among age groups of users.

Post hoc test revealed that,

- Security in age groups 18-24Years and 24-30 Years differ significantly from age groups 30-36 Years, Above 36 Years
- Convenience in age group 18-24Years, differ significantly from age groups 30-36 Years, Above 36 Years
- Authentication in age groups 18-24Years and 24-30 Years differ significantly from age groups 24-30 Years, 30-36 Years, Above 36 Years and 18-24Years, 30-36 Years, Above 36 Years respectively.

5. Conclusion

The security, convenience, user friendliness, authentication and platform are the major parameters for adoption of electronic parameter through payment among which platform (Application Deployment / user interface) differs significantly between rural and urban users that means platform is major parameter on which Service provider has to think upon.

References

Research Papers & Journals

[1] Kirui, O. K. (n.d.). Impact of mobile phone-based money transfer services in agriculture: evidence from Kenya. International Association of Agricultural Economists (IAAE)

[2] Ms.Vaishnavi.J.Deshmukh, Sapna.S.Kaushik and Mr. Amit.M.Tayade has published article International

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

Journal of Emerging Research in Management &Technology Journal Title of article is " Payment Processing Systems and Security for E-Commerce: A Literature Review"

[3] International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications (IJEBEA), Comparitive Study of Online Banking Security System of various Banks in India Rajpreet Kaur Jassal1 , Dr. Ravinder Kumar Sehgal2 1Computer Science & Engineering, BBSBEC Fatehgarh Sahib Punjab, INDIA. 2 Principal, JSSIET Kauli Patiala, Punjab,INDIA.

[4] Journal of Electronic Commerce Research, VOL. 3, NO. 1, 2002 Page 15 SECURITY CONTROL IN INTER-BANK FUND TRANSFER Dan Zhu Department of Logistics, Operations and MIS Iowa State University

[5] International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication ISSN: 2321-8169 Volume: 3 Issue: 2 391– 398.

[6] Analysis of User Authentication Methods & Impact on Identification Especially in Banking Abdul Samad Shaikh Department of Computer Science & IT GreenfoTech Education, Aurangabad.

[7] http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/126624/2/Owuor.pdf

Books

[8] Research Methodology Methods and Techniques C. R. Kothari

[9] Wireless and Mobile Network Security -HakimaChaouchiMaryline Laurent-Maknavicius

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY