Chapter: 5

Findings & Suggestion

5.1 Findings & Implication (Plastic Money and digital wallet)

5.2 Suggestion to Bank and Financial Institutions

5.1 Findings & Implication:

Data were gathered from the structured questionnaire, coded, and entered into an Excel spreadsheet before being imported into SPSS. Data analysis was conducted using Version 21. Analysis of data allows us to derive the following findings.

This chapter presents the survey results and an in-depth analysis done during the research. The findings from the study are classified into two categories. The main findings of analysis based on frequency analysis are covered in the first section. The analysis outcomes in inferential statistics are covered in the second section. The analysis and implementation of TAM using the primary data are also covered in this chapter. The conclusions are drawn using the Chi-square test, the Kruskal-Wallis test, the Pearson Correlation technique, and the regression technique. The study's main findings are presented below.

This chapter is divided into Part A (Plastic Money) and Part B (Digital Wallet). For doing this research, 1330 respondents were considered for part A (Plastic Money), and 1330 were considered for part B (Digital Wallet). The primary data was collected from four major cities of Gujarat, namely Ahmedabad, Vadodara, Surat, and Rajkot for parts A (Plastic Money) and B (Digital Wallet). From Ahmedabad, 550 respondents were chosen for the research; 150 were selected from Vadodara city, from Surat 500 were selected and 130 respondents were selected from Rajkot city for the study for Part A (Plastic Money) and Part B (Digital Wallet). Based on relevant questions, only young people who use plastic money and digital wallet have been selected for the study. Respondents frequently use plastic money and digital wallet because, in today's world, digital payment has increased daily.

Part-A (Plastic Money):

Demographic Details:

- In the demographic details, the researcher collects the city of belonging, gender, age, education, profession, monthly family income, marital status, and family structure. From the data analysis, it was found that approximately 45% of the respondents are male, while 55% of them are female. For the age group, it was found that 43% of the respondents were between 21 and 25 years old, while 30% belonged to the age category of 18 to 20 years old. In the education profile, approximately 37% respondents are undergraduates, while 32% are post-graduates. It was found that approximately 66% of respondents are students by their profession, while 21% of them are doing services at different companies. The researcher also considers homemakers. They are approximately 2%. Approximately 32% respondents are a part of less than 25000 monthly family income groups. Regarding marital status, 75% respondents are unmarried, and more than 58% live in a joint family structure.

Frequency Analysis: (Que No. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14)

- Additionally, 64% of respondents said they were fully aware of the use of plastic money, 33% said they were partially aware, and 3% said they were unaware of its use. These data combined suggest that, on average, 97% of respondents knew about the use of plastic money. Of those who use cards, over 60% of respondents said they use debit cards, and about 10% said they use credit cards. As a result, most responders are aware of how to use debit cards. The fact that students make up the majority of the respondents could be the cause. Prepaid cards are used by about 2% of respondents, while other cards are used by 2% and debit and credit cards by 23% of respondents. As a result, other card types that are used more frequently are contrasted with debit and credit cards.
- In terms of cardholders, 36% of respondents have Bank of Baroda debit cards, 27% have SBI debit cards, 11% have HDFC debit cards, 7% have Axis debit cards, 5% have City bank debit cards, 4% have ICICI bank debit cards, 3% have Kotak bank debit cards, and 8% have other cards. The majority of respondents use Bank of Baroda debit cards more frequently than those of other banks, it is discovered. Around 42 percent of respondents do not have credit cards from any bank, even though the

majority of them are students. Just 15.3% of those surveyed use credit cards issued by SBI Bank.

- Approximately 79% of the respondents said that applying for a credit card is simple, while only 21% disagreed. Although the majority of respondents are not currently using credit cards, they are conscious of the process of applying for them. 41% of respondents have been using plastic money for the last 1 to 2 years, 31% for the last 3 to 5 years, and 28% for more than five years. 48% respondents use plastic money every month, 22% every week, 13% every year, 9% on a fortnightly basis, and only 8% use it daily.
- Respondents' preference for using plastic money is found more for online shopping (29%), primarily for Banking transactions and trading purposes (25%), 24% of respondents said they use plastic money for offline shopping, 20% respondents using plastic money to pay utility bills, whereas 2% respondents utilize plastic money for other than the mentioned purpose.
- 51% of respondents were using plastic money before demonetization, while 49% were not using plastic money before demonetization.
- Approximately 47% of the respondents have information about plastic money through the internet, 22% from friends, 17% from relatives, 6% from television, 3% from newspapers, 1% from radio, and 4% from other than mentioned sources.
- 38% of the respondents' decisions to adopt plastic money were influenced by Family members, 27% by Friends, 11% by colleagues, 7% by relatives, only 1% by Celebrities, and 16% by any other person.
- Approximately 81% of the respondents faced no difficulty using plastic money, while only 19% faced difficulty using money. Users face difficulties such as network connectivity, cash dispensing, ATM card theft, security issues, etc.

Objective 3: To determine the factors that influence the customers' (Youth) adoption of plastic money in selected cities of Gujarat. (To fulfill this objective, I asked Que No. 9)

- The highest rank is given by 38% of the respondents to security and privacy, 36% gave the rank to convenience factor, 26% gave the rank to Rewards and Cash Back, 25% gave the rank to Less annual fees/cost, 23% gave the rank to Alleviate Cash Shortages, 22% gave the rank to Due to the Duplicity of Paper Money and 21% gave

last rank to Symbol of high Socio-Economic Status. Respondents gave the highest rank in security and privacy, so it could be said that security and privacy are the factors that impact the customers' (Youth) adoption of plastic money the most.

Hypothesis results:

Objective 2: To study the level of Awareness and usage pattern of Plastic Money among Young Consumers. (To fulfill this objective, I asked Que No. 3, 8, 11)

- The second part of the findings shows the result of inferential statistics. In inferential statistics, researchers conduct the Reliability test, Chi-square test, Kruskal Wallis test, Correlation analysis, and regression technique. The study's significant findings are explained below.
- The Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated to confirm the claims made regarding the perceived utility and simplicity of use of plastic money, attitudes regarding its use, intention to use it, cost of doing so, social impact of using it, perceived security of using it, government policies regarding its use, and degree of satisfaction following use. When a scale's Cronbach alpha coefficient is 0.7 or higher - a value that is greater than 0.9 - it is considered dependable. When the reliability of the scale was tested, the Cronbach alpha coefficient for each of the previously stated that it was 0.921. This scale is regarded to be reliable as a result.

- The significant value of the demographic variables is tested using the Chi-square test. Age, gender, city, education, profession, marital status, and monthly family income are the demographic variables examined for how frequently plastic money is used. Along with the study's primary objective, the level of Awareness and usage of plastic money among young consumers and the frequency of using plastic money are also determined.

Table No. 5.1 Hypothesis analysis of Demographic factors

Category: Plastic Money	Significance Value	Accept/Reject
Significance level 0.05		
Hypothesis statement		
Variables: Gender		
Hypothesis: There is no significant influence of the gender of	0.000	Reject

respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of plastic money		
There is no significant influence of the gender of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money	0.000	Reject
There is no significant influence of the gender of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: Age		
There is no significant influence of the age of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of Plastic Money	0.000	Reject
There is no significant influence of the age of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money	0.000	Reject
There is no significant influence of the age of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: City		
There is no significant influence of the city of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of Plastic Money	0.229	Accept
There is no significant influence of the city of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money	0.000	Reject
There is no significant influence of the city of respondents on the frequent use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: Education		
There is no significant influence of the education of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of plastic money	0.007	Reject
There is no significant influence of the education of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money	0.000	Reject
There is no significant influence of the education of respondents on the frequent use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: Profession		
There is no significant influence of the profession of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of plastic money	0.032	Reject
There is no significant influence of the profession of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money	0.015	Reject
There is no significant influence of the profession of respondents on the frequent use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Reject

Variables: Marital Status		
There is no significant influence of the Marital Status of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of plastic money	0.002	Reject
There is no significant influence of the Marital Status of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money	0.015	Reject
There is no significant influence of the Marital Status of respondents on the frequent use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: Monthly Family Income		
There is no significant influence of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the frequent use of Plastic Money	0.042	Reject
There is no significant influence of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the frequent use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Reject

- The above chi-square table shows that gender, age, education, profession, and marital status significantly influence the level of awareness about the functionality of plastic money. The city of the respondent has no significant influence on the level of awareness about the functionality of plastic money.
- We can interpret that the respondent's gender, age, city, education, profession, monthly family income, and marital status significantly influence their frequent use of plastic money.
- We can interpret that the respondent's gender, age, city, education, profession, monthly family income, and marital status significantly influence their frequent use of plastic money before demonetization.

Objective: 6 To analyze, interpret, and measure the effect of demonetization on Plastic Money: (To fulfill this objective, I asked Que No. 11, Q-15 (statement16 and 26)

Table No. 5.2 Association between two attributes		Chi-square (P-value)	Significant or not
Gender	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Age	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
City	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
City	Demonetization made the use of plastic money compulsory	0.023	Association is Significant
City	Use of plastic money after demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Education	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Education	Use of plastic money after demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Profession	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Profession	Use of plastic money after demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Monthly Family Income	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Marital Status	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Family Structure	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.027	Association is Significant
Number of family members	Use of plastic money before demonetization	0.025	Association is Significant
Number of family members	Use of plastic money after demonetization	0.002	Association is Significant

- We can interpret that gender, age, city, education, profession, monthly family income, marital status, family structure, and the number of family members of the respondents significantly influenced their use of plastic money before demonetization.
- The city of the respondents significantly influenced demonetization, making plastic money compulsory.
- The use of plastic money after demonetization is significantly influenced by the city, education, profession, and number of family members.

Objective 4: To Find the relationship between the demographic factors of the respondents and usage of Plastic Money.

[To fulfill this objective, I asked Que No. 15 (Statement 1 to 37), Que No. 16 (Statement 1 to 8), and Que No. 17 (Statement 1 to 9)]

- This study uses the Kruskal Wallis test to determine user opinions about plastic money usefulness, ease of use, cost, social impact, attitude, security, government policies, satisfaction, and behavioural intention among users grouped according to gender, age, city, education, profession, marital status, and monthly family income.

Table No. 5.3 Hypothesis Analysis Kruskal Wallis test

Category: Plastic Money	Significance Value	Accept/Reject
Significance level 0.05		
Hypothesis statement		
Variables: Gender		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.045	Reject
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Perceived Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.057	Accept
There is no significant impact of gender of respondents on Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM) of respondents	0.001	Reject
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.035	Reject
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Cost of Plastic Money for respondents	0.160	Accept
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Social Impact (SI) of respondents	0.243	Accept

There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.069	Accept
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.001	Reject
Variables: Age		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the perceived ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.026	Reject
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Cost of Plastic Money for respondents	0.132	Accept
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Social Impact (SI) of respondents	0.134	Accept
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.013	Reject
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.029	Reject
Variables: City		
Hypothesis: The city of respondents has no significant impact on respondents' Perceived usefulness (PU).	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Perceived Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.055	Accept
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Cost of Plastic Money for respondents	0.002	Reject

There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Social Impact (SI) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.000	Reject
Variables: Education		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Perceived Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.229	Accept
There is no significant impact of education of respondents on Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM) respondents	0.006	Reject
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.708	Accept
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Cost of Plastic Money respondents	0.158	Accept
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Social Impact (SI) of respondents	0.086	Accept
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.158	Accept
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.012	Reject
Variables: Profession		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.002	Reject
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Perceived Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM) of respondents	0.036	Reject
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.045	Reject

There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Cost of Plastic Money for respondents	0.642	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Social Impact (SI) of respondents	0.435	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.091	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.020	Reject
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.052	Accept
Variables: Monthly Family Income		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.004	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Perceive Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.001	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM) of respondents	0.005	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.072	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Cost of Plastic Money respondents	0.872	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Social Impact (SI) of respondents	0.939	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.011	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.001	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.000	Reject
Variable: Marital Status		
The marital status of respondents has no significant impact on their Perceived usefulness (PU).	0.031	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Perceived Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.000	Reject

There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM) of respondents	0.116	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.183	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Cost of Plastic Money respondents	0.065	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Social Impact (SI) of respondents	0.039	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.027	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.049	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.034	Reject

- We can interpret that Gender, Age, City, Education, Profession, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status of the respondent significantly impact Perceived Usefulness (PU).
- Age, City, Profession, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status of the respondent on Perceived Ease of Use (PEU) are significantly impacted. At the same time, there is no significant impact of Gender and Education of the respondent on Perceived Ease of Use (PEU).
- We can interpret that the respondents' Gender, Age, City, Education, Profession, and Monthly Family Income significantly impact their Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM). Their Marital Status does not significantly impact their Attitude towards Plastic Money (ATPM).
- We can interpret the significant impact of Gender, Age, and Profession of the respondent on Behavioral Intention (BI). There is no significant impact of City, Education, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status of the respondent on Behavioral Intention (BI).
- The city of the respondent significantly impacts the Cost of Plastic Money. Gender, age, education, profession, monthly family income, and marital status do not significantly impact the Cost of Plastic Money.
- The city of the respondent significantly impacts Social Impact (SI). There is no

significant impact of Gender, Age, Education, Profession, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status of the respondent on Social Impact (SI).

- The respondents' age, city, monthly family income, and marital status on Perceived Security (PS) were significantly impacted. There is no significant impact of Gender, Education, and Profession of the respondent on Perceived Security (PS).
- We can interpret that the respondent's Gender, Age, City, Education, Profession, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status significantly impact Government Policies.
- We can interpret that Gender, Age, City, Education, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status of the respondent significantly impact Satisfaction (SA). In contrast, the respondent's profession has no significant impact on Satisfaction (SA).

Objective 5: To determine the factors of the Technology Acceptance Model that influence the use of Plastic Money.

[To fulfill this objective, I asked Que No. 15 (Statement 1 to 37), Que No. 16 (Statement 1 to 8), and Que No. 17 (Statement 1 to 9)]

Another hypothesis was tested using Correlation analysis of the different variables under study. The impact of TAM-defined factors on other variables that influence users' behavioral intention to use plastic money is determined using a correlation test. The variables comprise perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness, cost, social impact, attitude, perceived security, government policies, satisfaction, and behavioral intention to use. This is useful in determining the procedure for implementing new technologies for plastic money, which meets the following research objective. Correlation is used to determine whether there is a relationship between different TAM components and whether those relationships follow the guidelines provided by the Technology Acceptance Model.

Table No. 5.4

Variable studied	Correlation	Accept/Reject
There is no significant relationship between perceived usefulness and attitude towards plastic money.	0.453	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived usefulness and behavioural intention to use plastic money	0.516	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived usefulness and satisfaction after the use of plastic money	0.365	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived ease of	0.474	Moderate Positive

use and behavioural intention to use plastic money		Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived ease of use and attitude towards plastic money	0.438	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived ease of use and satisfaction after use of plastic money	0.355	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between attitude towards plastic money and the cost of using plastic money	0.199	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between attitude towards plastic money and behavioural intention to use plastic money	0.468	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between attitude towards plastic money and government policies on the use of plastic money	0.352	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between attitude towards plastic money and satisfaction after use of plastic money	0.361	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between the cost of using plastic money and satisfaction after the use of plastic money	0.156	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between behavioural intention to use plastic money and social impact on the use of plastic money	0.251	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between the cost of using plastic money and the social impact on use of plastic money	0.324	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between government policies regarding the use of plastic money and satisfaction after the use of plastic money	0.333	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived security and satisfaction after the use of plastic money	0.293	Weak Positive Correlation

- There is a significant relationship between perceived usefulness and attitude towards plastic money.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived usefulness and behavioural intention to use plastic money.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived usefulness and satisfaction after using plastic money.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived ease of use and behavioural intention to use plastic money.

- A significant relationship exists between perceived ease of use and attitude towards plastic money.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived ease of use and satisfaction after using plastic money.
- There is a significant relationship between attitude towards plastic money and the cost of using plastic money.
- A significant relationship exists between attitude towards plastic money and behavioural intention to use plastic money.
- There is a significant relationship between attitude towards plastic money and government policies on the use of plastic money.
- There is a significant relationship between attitude towards plastic money and satisfaction after the use of plastic money.
- There is a significant relationship between the cost of using plastic money and satisfaction after the use of plastic money.
- There is a significant relationship between behavioural intention to use plastic money and the social impact of this use.
- There is a significant relationship between the cost of using plastic money and the social impact of the use of plastic money.
- There is a significant relationship between government policies regarding the use of plastic money and satisfaction after using plastic money.
- There is a significant relationship between perceived security and satisfaction after the use of plastic money.

Regression Analysis:

- In addition to the previously stated findings, regression analysis was performed to examine the relationships between one or more independent variables and a dependent variable. It can be used to simulate the future relationship between variables and evaluate how strongly they are related. A multiple regression analysis was used to test the influence of variables such as Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Behavioral Intention, Social Impact, Perceived Security, Government Policies, and Satisfaction after using plastic money.
- Behavioural Intention is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Social Impact, Perceived Security, Government Policies, and Cost.

This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. R square value is 0.402, which shows a 40.2% variation in Behavioral Intention due to The ANOVA table indicating the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Behavioral Intention can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.755 + 0.218*PU + 0.144*PEU + 0.181*AT + 0.087*COST 0.055*SI + 0.126*PS + 0.030*GOVTP + error.

- Behavioural Intention (Ahmedabad City only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. R square value is 0.530, which shows a 53% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact BI as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Behavioral Intention can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.339 + 0.321*PU + 0.154*PEU + 0.232*AT + 0.057*COST + 0.036*SI + 0.073*PS + 0.058 GOVTP + error.
- Behavioural Intention (Vadodara City only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. R square value is 0.644, which shows a 64.4% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact BI as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Behavioral Intention can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.237 + 0.322*PU + 0.234*PEU + 0.147*AT + 0.046*COST + 0.081*SI + 0.085*PS + 0.048 GOVTP + error.

- Behavioural Intention (Surat City only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. The square value is 0.444, which shows a 44.4% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Behavioral Intention can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.335 + 0.178*PU + 0.175*PEU + 0.151*AT + 0.066*COST + 0.126*SI + 0.123*PS + 0.100 GOVTP + error.
- Behavioural Intention (Rajkot City only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. R square value is 0.485, which shows a 48.5% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Behavioral Intention can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.761 + 0.440*PU + 0.107*PEU + 0.142*AT + 0.030*COST + 0.059*SI + 0.072*PS + (-0.018) GOVTP + error.
- Behavioral Intention (Male only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. R square value is 0.412, which shows a 41.2% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is

0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Behavioral Intention can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.714 + 0.243*PU + 0.176*PEU + 0.176*AT + 0.052*COST + 0.114*SI + 0.131*PS + (-0.044) GOVTP + error.

- Behavioral Intention (Female only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. R square value is 0.405, which shows a 40.5% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Behavioral Intention can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.863 + 0.201*PU + 0.111*PEU + 0.186*AT + 0.103*COST + 0.008*SI + 0.115*PS + 0.089 GOVTP + error.
- Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies do not influence satisfaction. This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. The r square value is 0.213, showing a 21.3% variation in SA due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Satisfaction as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact satisfaction as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted satisfaction value can be obtained using the regression model SA = 1.330 + 0.157*PU + 0.140*PEU + 0.060*SI + 0.076*PS + 0.141*GOVTP + error.
- Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies do not influence Overall Satisfaction. This hypothesis was tested using Regression Analysis. The r square value is 0.243, showing a 24.3% variation in Overall Satisfaction due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the

significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Overall Satisfaction. Its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Overall Satisfaction as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Overall SAT can be obtained using the regression model Overall SAT = 0.851 + 0.211*PU + 0.306*PEU + 0.006*SI + 0.208*PS + 0.095*GOVTP + error.

Part-B (Digital Wallet):

Demographic Details:

- In the demographic details, the researcher collects the city of belonging, gender, age, education, profession, monthly family income, marital status, and family structure. From the data analysis, it was found that approximately 54% of the respondents are male, while 46% of them are female. For the age group, it was found that approximately 40% of respondents belong to an age group between 21-25 years, while 30% of respondents belong to an age group between 18-20 years. In the education profile, approximately 33% of respondents are undergraduates, while 32% are graduates. It was found that approximately 71% of the respondents are students by their profession, while 16% of them are doing services at different companies. The researcher also considers homemakers. They are approximately 2%. Approximately 42% of the respondents are part of less than 25000 monthly family income groups. Regarding marital status, 73% the respondents are unmarried, and more than 70% live in a joint family structure.

Frequency Analysis: (Que No. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)

- It is also seen that 58% respondents are fully aware of how to use a digital wallet, 35% are aware partially, and only 7% are not aware of a use of digital wallet. Therefore, it can be concluded that 93% of respondents use a digital wallet on average.
- Concerning wallet users, approximately 31% of respondents use Google Pay, 20% use PhonePe, 17% use Paytm, 16% use Amazon Pay, 7% use the BHIM App, 2% use HDFC Payz, 0.4% use Freecharge, 0.1% use ICICI Pocket and Bajaj Finserv, and 0.4% use another digital wallet not listed above. Thus, almost all of those surveyed are familiar with Google Pay. Approximately 67% of respondents have used a digital wallet for the last 1 to 2 years, 25% for the last 3 to 5 years, and 8% for more than five years. Approximately 46% of respondents do 0 to 1 transaction through a digital wallet in a single day, 38% of respondents do an average of 2 to 4 transactions through a digital wallet in a single day, 9% of respondents do an average of 5 to 7 transactions through digital wallet in a single day while 7% respondents do on an average more than seven transactions through digital wallet in a single day.

- 23% of respondents were using a digital wallet before demonetization, while 77% were not using a digital wallet before demonetization.
- Approximately 41% of the respondents have information about digital wallet through friends, 25% from the internet, 19% from relatives, 11% from television, 2% from newspapers, 0.8% from radio, and 0.4% from other sources.
- The majority, approximately 33% of the respondent's decision to adopt a digital wallet was influenced by their Family members, 30% influenced by their Friends, 18% influenced their colleagues, 13% influenced their relatives, 3% influenced by Celebrities, and 3% by any other person. Approximately 67% of the respondents faced no difficulty using a digital wallet, while only 33% faced difficulty using money. Users face difficulties such as network issues, financial fraud, identity theft, etc.

Objective 3: To determine the factors that influence the customers' (Youth) adoption of Digital Wallet in selected cities of Gujarat. (To fulfill this objective, I asked Que No. 6)

- The highest rank is given by approximately 49% of the respondents to convenience, 34% gave the rank to safety, security, and privacy factor, 30% gave the rank to the symbol of high socio-economic status, 25% gave the rank to free of cost, 23% gave the rank to alleviate cash shortages, 22% gave the rank to due to the duplicity of paper money and 19% gave last rank to Rewards and Cashback. Respondents' preference towards using a digital wallet is found more for online shopping (21%), the usage of digital wallet is preferred by respondents primarily for mobile recharge (20%), 18% of respondents said they use a digital wallet for paying utility bill, 15% of respondents stated they transfer funds using a digital wallet, 11% respondents use digital wallet for offline shopping, 8% respondents use digital wallet for food order, 6% respondents using digital wallet for ticket booking whereas 0.2% of respondents use it for other than mentioned purpose. Respondents gave the highest rank to convenience, so convenience is the most influential factor among the factors that influence the customers' (Youth) adoption of digital wallet.

Hypothesis results:

Objective 2: To study the level of awareness and usage patterns of Digital Wallet among young consumers. (To fulfill this objective, I asked Que No. 3, 5, 8)

- The second section of the findings shows the outcome of inferential statistics. In inferential statistics, researchers conduct the Reliability test, Chi-square test, Kruskal Wallis test, Correlation analysis, and regression technique. The study's significant findings are explained below.
- Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed to verify the statements about the perceived usefulness and ease of use for a digital wallet, attitude towards the usage of a digital wallet, intention to use of digital wallet, cost of using a digital wallet, the social impact of using a digital wallet, perceived security of using a digital wallet, government policies of using a digital wallet, and to check the level of satisfaction after using a digital wallet. Scales are reliable when the Cronbach alpha coefficient of that scale is 0.7 or higher, and this value is higher than 0.9. Testing the scale for reliability for statements revealed that the Cronbach alpha coefficient had been 0.947 for all the above statements. Therefore, this scale is considered reliable.
- The significant value of the demographic variables is tested using the Chi-square test. Age, gender, city, education, profession, marital status, and monthly family income are the demographic variables examined for how frequently digital wallet are used. Along with the study's primary objective, the level of Awareness and usage of digital wallet among young consumers and the frequency of using digital wallet are also determined.

Table No. 5.5 Hypothesis analysis of Demographic factors

Category: Digital Wallet	Significance Value	Accept/Reject
Significance level 0.05		
Hypothesis statement		
Variables: Gender		
Hypothesis: There is no significant influence of the gender of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of digital wallet	0.000	Reject
There is no significant influence of respondents' gender on the frequent use of digital wallet.	0.001	Reject

There is no significant influence of gender of respondents on the frequent use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.092	Accept
Variables: Age		
There is no significant influence of the age of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of digital wallet	0.209	Accept
There is no significant influence of the age of respondents on the frequent use of digital wallet	0.129	Accept
There is no significant influence of the age of respondents on frequent use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: City		
There is no significant influence of the city of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of digital wallet	0.003	Reject
There is no significant influence of the city of respondents on frequent use of digital wallet	0.123	Accept
There is no significant influence of city of respondents on wfrequent use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.001	Reject
Variables: Education		
There is no significant influence of the education of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of digital wallet	0.111	Accept
There is no significant influence of the education of respondents on frequent use of digital wallet	0.632	Accept
There is no significant influence of the education of respondents on frequent use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: Profession		
There is no significant influence of the profession of respondents on the level of awareness about the functionality of a digital wallet	0.203	Accept
There is no significant influence of the profession of respondents on the frequent use of digital wallet	0.184	Accept
There is no significant influence of the profession of respondents on the frequent use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: Marital Status		
There is no significant influence of the Marital Status of respondents on the level of awareness about the usage of digital wallet	0.140	Accept
There is no significant influence of the Marital Status of	0.554	Accept

respondents on frequent use of digital wallet		
There is no significant influence of the Marital Status of respondents on frequent use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.000	Reject
Variables: Monthly Family Income		
There is no significant influence of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on frequent use of digital wallet	0.075	Accept
There is no significant influence of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on frequent use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.242	Accept

- The above chi-square table shows that gender and the respondent's city significantly influence the level of awareness about the functionality of digital wallet. The respondents' age, education, profession, and occupation do not significantly influence their level of awareness of the functionality of digital wallet.
- We can interpret that the respondent's gender significantly influences the frequent use of digital wallet. Age, city, education, profession, monthly family income, and marital status do not significantly influence the frequent use of digital wallet.
- The respondent's age, city, education, profession, and marital status significantly influence their frequent use of digital wallet before demonetization. The respondents' gender and monthly family income do not significantly influence their frequent use of digital wallet before demonetization.

Objective 6: To analyze, interpret, and measure the effect of demonetization on Digital Wallet: (To fulfil this objective, I asked Que No. 8, Q-12 (statement14 and 23)

Table No. 5.6 Association between two attributes		Chi-square (P-value)	Significant or not
Gender	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.092	The association is not Significant
Age	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
City	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.001	Association is Significant
City	Demonetization made the use of digital wallet compulsory	0.039	Association is Significant
City	Use of digital wallet after demonetization	0.071	The association is not Significant
Education	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Education	Use of digital wallet after demonetization	0.858	The association is not Significant
Profession	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Profession	Use of digital wallet after demonetization	0.152	The association is not Significant
Monthly Family Income	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.242	The association is not Significant
Marital Status	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.000	Association is Significant
Family Structure	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0.081	The association is not Significant
Number of family members	Use of digital wallet before demonetization	0185	The association is not Significant
Number of family members	Use of digital wallet after demonetization	0.415	The association is not Significant

- Age, city, education, profession, and marital status significantly influence the use of

digital wallet before demonetization. Gender, monthly family income, family structure, and the number of family members of the respondents do not significantly influence the use of digital wallet before demonetization.

- There is a significant influence of the respondents' city on demonetization made use of digital wallet compulsory.
- After demonetization, there was no significant influence on the city, education, profession, or number of family members using digital wallet.

Objective 4: To find the relationship between the demographic factors of the respondents and the Usage of Digital Wallet. [To fulfil this objective, I asked Que No. 12 (Statement 1 to 37), Que No. 14 (Statement 1 to 6), and Que No. 15 (Statement 1 to 9)]

- This study uses the Kruskal Wallis test to determine user opinions about digital wallet usefulness, ease of use, cost, social impact, attitude, security, government policies, satisfaction, and behavioural intention among users grouped according to gender, age, city, education, profession, marital status, and monthly family income.

Table No. 5.7 Hypothesis Analysis Kruskal Wallis test

Category: Digital wallet	Significance Value	Accept/Reject
Significance level 0.05		
Hypothesis statement		
Variables: Gender		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.003	Reject
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the perceived ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.028	Reject
There is no significant impact of gender of respondents on the Attitude towards digital wallet (AT) of respondents	0.340	Accept
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Cost of digital wallet of respondents	0.291	Accept
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on	0.195	Accept

the Social Impact (SI) of respondents		
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.789	Accept
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.002	Reject
There is no significant impact of the gender of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.000	Reject
Variables: Age		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.084	Accept
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the perceived ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.302	Accept
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Attitude towards digital wallet (AT) of respondents	0.034	Reject
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.034	Reject
There is no significant impact Age of respondents on the Cost of digital wallet of respondents	0.487	Accept
There is no significant impact Age of respondents on Social Impact (SI) on respondents	0.914	Accept
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.665	Accept
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.110	Accept
There is no significant impact of the age of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.033	Reject
Variables: City		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Perceive Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Attitude towards digital wallet (AT) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.226	Accept
There is no significant impact City of respondents on the Cost of	0.125	Accept

digital wallet respondents		
There is no significant impact City of respondents on Social Impact (SI) on respondents	0.005	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.002	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.030	Reject
There is no significant impact of the city of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.000	Reject
Variables: Education		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.037	Reject
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Perceived Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.733	Accept
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Attitude towards digital wallet (AT) respondents	0.038	Reject
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.001	Reject
There is no significant impact on the education of respondents on the Cost of digital wallet respondents	0.307	Accept
There is no significant impact Education of respondents on Social Impact (SI) on respondents	0.582	Accept
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.657	Accept
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.034	Reject
There is no significant impact of the education of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.000	Reject
Variables: Profession		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.071	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the perceived ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.647	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Attitude towards digital wallet (AT) of respondents	0.399	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents	0.315	Accept

on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents		
There is no significant impact Profession of respondents on the Cost of digital wallet respondents	0.717	Accept
There is no significant impact Profession of respondents on Social Impact (SI) on respondents	0.201	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.512	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.199	Accept
There is no significant impact of the profession of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.048	Reject
Variables: Monthly Family Income		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.002	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Perceived Ease of Use (PEU) of respondents	0.001	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Attitude towards digital wallet (AT) of respondents	0.055	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.000	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Cost of digital wallet of respondents	0.122	Accept
There is no significant impact of Monthly Family Income of respondents on Social Impact (SI) on respondents	0.053	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.305	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.001	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Monthly Family Income of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.000	Reject
Variable: Marital Status		
Hypothesis: There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Perceived usefulness (PU) of respondents	0.707	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of	0.377	Accept

respondents on the perceived ease of Use (PEU) of respondents		
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Attitude towards digital wallet (AT) of respondents	0.410	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Behavioral Intention (BI) of respondents	0.419	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Cost of digital wallet of respondents	0.786	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Social Impact (SI) of respondents	0.699	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Perceived Security (PS) of respondents	0.480	Accept
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Government Policies (GOVP) of respondents	0.039	Reject
There is no significant impact of the Marital Status of respondents on the Satisfaction (SA) of respondents	0.001	Reject

- We can interpret that the respondent's Gender, City, Education, and Monthly Family Income significantly impact Perceived Usefulness (PU). The respondent's age, profession, and marital status do not significantly impact Perceived Usefulness (PU).
- We can interpret that there is a significant impact of Gender, City, and Monthly Family Income of the respondent on Perceived Ease of Use (PEU). The respondents' age, education, profession, and marital status do not significantly impact Perceived Ease of Use (PEU).
- We can interpret that the respondent's Age, City, and Education significantly impact their Attitude towards digital wallet (AT). Gender, profession, monthly family income, and marital status do not significantly impact their Attitude towards digital wallet (AT).
- We can interpret the significant impact of Gender, Age, Education, and Monthly Family Income of the respondent on Behavioral Intention (BI). The respondent's City, Profession, and Marital Status have no significant impact on Behavioral Intention (BI).
- We can interpret that gender, age, city, education, profession, monthly family income, and marital status of the respondent have no significant impact on the cost of a digital wallet.

- The city of the respondent significantly impacts Social Impact (SI). There is no significant impact of Gender, Age, Education, Profession, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status of the respondent on Social Impact (SI).
- The city of the respondent significantly impacts Perceived Security (PS). There is no significant impact of Gender, Age, Education, Profession, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status of the respondent on Perceived Security (PS).
- We can interpret that the respondent's Gender, City, Education, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status significantly impact Government Policies. At the same time, age and profession have no significant impact on Government Policies.
- We can interpret that Gender, Age, City, Education, Profession, Monthly Family Income, and Marital Status of the respondent significantly impact Satisfaction (SA).

Objective 5: To determine the factors of the Technology Acceptance Model that influence the use of Digital Wallet.

[To fulfil this objective, I asked Que No. 12 (Statement 1 to 37), Que No. 14 (Statement 1 to 6), and Que No. 15 (Statement 1 to 9)]

- Another hypothesis was tested using Correlation analysis of the different variables under study. The impact of TAM-defined factors on other variables that influence users' behavioural intention to use digital wallet is determined using a correlation test. The variables comprise perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness, cost, social impact, attitude, perceived security, government policies, satisfaction, and behavioural intention to use. This is useful in determining the procedure for implementing new technologies for digital wallet, which meets the following research objective.

Table No. 5.8

Variable studied	Correlation	Accept/Reject
There is no significant relationship between perceived usefulness and attitude toward digital wallet	0.545	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived usefulness and behavioural intention to use a digital wallet	0.537	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived usefulness and satisfaction after the use of a digital wallet	0.479	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived ease of	0.592	Moderate Positive

use and behavioural intention to use digital wallet		Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived ease of use and attitude towards digital wallet	0.603	Strong Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived ease of use and satisfaction after the use of a digital wallet	0.517	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between attitude towards digital wallet and cost of using digital wallet	0.511	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between attitude towards digital wallet and behavioural intention to use digital wallet	0.591	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between attitude towards digital wallet and government policies to use digital wallet	0.468	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between attitude towards digital wallet and satisfaction after use of digital wallet	0.454	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between the cost of using a digital wallet and satisfaction after the use of a digital wallet	0.367	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between behavioural intention to use digital wallet and social impact on the use of digital wallet	0.420	Moderate Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between the cost of using a digital wallet and the social impact of using a digital wallet	0.396	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between government policies to use of digital wallet and satisfaction after use of digital wallet	0.342	Weak Positive Correlation
There is no significant relationship between perceived security and satisfaction after the use of a digital wallet	0.315	Weak Positive Correlation

- There is a significant relationship between perceived usefulness and attitude towards digital wallet.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived usefulness and behavioural intention to use digital wallet.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived usefulness and satisfaction after using digital wallet.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived ease of use and behavioural intention to use digital wallet.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived ease of use and attitude towards

digital wallet.

- A significant relationship exists between perceived ease of use and satisfaction after using digital wallet.
- There is a significant relationship between attitude toward digital wallet and the cost of using digital wallet.
- A significant relationship exists between attitude toward digital wallet and behavioural intention to use digital wallet.
- There is a significant relationship between attitude towards digital wallet and government policies on the use of digital wallet.
- There is a significant relationship between attitude towards digital wallet and satisfaction after the use of digital wallet.
- There is a significant relationship between the cost of using digital wallet and satisfaction after the use of digital wallet.
- There is a significant relationship between behavioural intention to use a digital wallet and the social impact of that use.
- There is a significant relationship between the cost of using a digital wallet and its social impact.
- There is a significant relationship between government policies on using digital wallet and satisfaction after using them.
- A significant relationship exists between perceived security and satisfaction after using a digital wallet.

Regression Analysis:

- Additionally, to the previously stated findings, regression analysis was performed to examine the relationships between one or more independent variables and a dependent variable. It can be used to simulate the future relationship between variables and evaluate how strongly they are related. A multiple regression analysis was used to test the influence of variables such as Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Behavioral Intention, Social Impact, Perceived Security, Government Policies, and Satisfaction after using a digital wallet.
- Behavioural Intention is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The r square value is 0.515, showing a 51.5% variation in Behavioral Intention due to

Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of BI can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.587 + 0.141*PU + 0.279*PEU + 0.110*SI + 0.076*PS + 0.142*GOVTP + 0.157*COST + error.

- Behavioural Intention (Ahmedabad City only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. R square value is 0.470, which shows a 475% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of BI can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.698 + 0.065*PU + 0.168*PEU + 0.142*AT + 0.163*COST + 0.099*SI + 0.116*PS + 0.087 *GOVTP + error.
- Behavioural Intention (Vadodara City only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. R square value is 0.854, which shows an 85.4% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of BI can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.074 + 0.048*PU + 0.339*PEU + 0.396*AT + 0.004*COST + 0.079*SI + 0.001*PS + 0.132 *GOVTP + error.
- Behavioural Intention (Surat City only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and

Government Policies. R square value is 0.431, which shows a 43.1% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of BI can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.662 + 0.120*PU + 0.133*PEU + 0.190*AT + 0.097*COST + 0.093*SI + 0.025*PS + 0.171 *GOVTP + error.

- Behavioural Intention (Rajkot City only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. R square value is 0.624, which shows a 62.4% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of BI can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.559 + 0.189*PU + 0.197*PEU + 0.074*AT + 0.156*COST + 0.114*SI + 0.023*PS + 0.128 *GOVTP + error.
- Behavioral Intention (Male only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. R square value is 0.520, which shows a 52% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of BI can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.571 + 0.083*PU + 0.166*PEU + 0.218*AT + 0.129*COST + 0.070*SI + 0.085*PS + 0.123 *GOVTP + error.

- Behavioral Intention (Female only) is not influenced by Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. R square value is 0.542, which shows a 54.2% variation in Behavioral Intention due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Cost, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Behavioral Intention as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Behavioral Intention as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of BI can be obtained using the regression model BI = 0.464 + 0.137*PU + 0.195*PEU + 0.121*AT + 0.134*COST + 0.113*SI + 0.053*PS + 0.128 *GOVTP + error.
- Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies do not influence satisfaction. R square value is 0.370, which shows a 37% variation in satisfaction due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Satisfaction as its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact satisfaction as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted satisfaction value can be obtained using the regression model SA = 0.841 + 0.210*PU + 0.260*PEU + 0.094*SI + 0.050*PS + 0.199*GOVTP + error.
- Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies do not influence Overall Satisfaction. The r square value is 0.299, showing a 29.9% variation in Overall Satisfaction due to Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies. The ANOVA table indicates the significant impact of Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Social Impact, Perceived Security, and Government Policies on Overall Satisfaction. Its p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. The above variables significantly impact Overall Satisfaction as their p-values are less than 0.05. The predicted value of Overall Satisfaction can be obtained using the regression model Overall SAT = 1.156 + 0.206*PU + 0.290*PEU + 0.097*SI+ -0.015*PS + 0.220*GOVTP + error.

5.2 Suggestions to Bank and Financial Institutions:

Based on primary studies on plastic money and digital wallet, the researcher makes the following recommendations depending on the findings.

Since demonetization, the usage of digital forms of payment has increased significantly. The government has carried out some undertakings to digitize and create a cashless economy. By offering several advantages to plastic money and digital wallet users, it is possible to encourage the use of plastic money and digital wallet for personal and professional purposes.

The convenience and simplicity of using plastic money and digital wallet everywhere are among the many aspects respondents are satisfied with. The respondents raised concerns regarding digital wallet security and privacy. Therefore, digital wallet security needs to be strengthened. Among the challenges a few respondents mentioned is required for more technological facilities, such as internet resources and swipe cards, that should be placed in strategic locations. Financial charges are another issue that credit card users face; therefore, these fees must be decreased to allow them to use their credit cards without restrictions. Consumers fear scammers; therefore, the banking industry should warn users not to give away their PINs, OTPs, or banking information.

Consumers are almost always searching for every feature possible. Given that many people are examining different qualities, it is critical to raise awareness of these features, which are relatively low compared to one another.