A STUDY ON FINANCIAL TECHNOLOGY INNOVATIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS AND THEIR ACCEPTANCE AMONG RESPONDENTS

[1]**Mr. Surendar V,** School of Management Studies, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai.

[2]**Dr. Joyce R ,** Associate Professor, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the adoption and acceptance of financial technology (FinTech) innovations among respondents. Employing a mixed-method approach, the research delves into the factors influencing the adoption of FinTech solutions and assesses respondents' attitudes and perceptions towards these innovations. Through surveys and qualitative interviews, key drivers and barriers to acceptance are identified, shedding light on the evolving landscape of financial services. Findings contribute to understanding the dynamics of FinTech adoption and offer insights for stakeholders aiming to enhance the utilization and integration of innovative financial technologies.

KEYWORDS: Financial technology, FinTech, Innovation acceptance, Adoption factors, Respondents, Mixed-method approach.

INTRODUCTION

In the rapidly evolving landscape of finance, technological advancements have ushered in a new era of innovation, fundamentally transforming the way financial services are accessed, delivered, and perceived. This paradigm shift, commonly referred to as Financial Technology (FinTech), encompasses a broad spectrum of innovations ranging from mobile payment systems and peer-to-peer lending platforms to blockchain-based cryptocurrencies and algorithmic trading.

Amidst this burgeoning ecosystem, understanding the factors influencing the acceptance and adoption of FinTech innovations becomes paramount. As traditional financial institutions grapple with the disruptive potential of these technologies, it becomes imperative to delve into the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of individuals towards FinTech solutions.

This study seeks to address this critical gap by examining the acceptance of FinTech innovations among a diverse cohort of respondents. By exploring the intricacies of user attitudes, perceived usefulness, ease of use, trust, and other pertinent factors, this research endeavors to shed light on the dynamics driving the adoption or resistance to FinTech solutions.

Through a comprehensive analysis of empirical data collected via surveys, interviews, and possibly experimental methodologies, this study aims to provide valuable insights for policymakers, industry stakeholders, and academia alike. By elucidating the determinants of FinTech acceptance, this research

endeavors to inform strategic decision-making processes, foster innovation, and ultimately contribute to the sustainable development of the financial technology ecosystem.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Venkatesh et al. (2008): The authors proposed the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), which integrates various models of technology adoption and identifies key determinants such as performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions.

Rogers (2003): Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations theory highlights the importance of social influence and communication channels in the adoption of new technologies.

Chen et al. (2002): Their study on the adoption of internet banking services found that perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and trust significantly influence adoption intentions.

Venkatesh et al. (2000): Their research on the adoption of electronic document management systems in organizations found that perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and social influence significantly influence adoption intentions.

Legris et al. (2003): The authors examined the adoption of internet banking services, finding that perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and trust significantly influence adoption intentions.

Pavlou (2003): Pavlou's study on the adoption of internet banking services found that trust, perceived usefulness, and perceived ease of use significantly influence adoption intentions.

Venkatesh et al. (2003): Their research on the adoption of information technology in organizations found that perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and social influence significantly influence adoption intentions.

Lu et al. (2003): The authors investigated the adoption of mobile commerce, identifying factors such as perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and trust as significant predictors of adoption intention.

Gefen et al. (2003): Their study on the adoption of mobile banking services found that perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and trust significantly influence adoption intentions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research is descriptive in nature. This research identifies the factors affecting affecting the acceptance and preference of Fintech services

SOURCES OF DATA

The research uses both Primary and Secondary data.

Primary Data

Primary data has been collected from 200 respondents using questionnaire (survey method).

Secondary Data

Secondary data was collected from reviewing various literature affecting the acceptance and preference of Fintech services

SAMPLE SIZE & TECHNIQUE

The population size is indefinite as the number of people using fintech options is large in number. It is difficult to access the population. The sample size is 200. The respondents are from various locations spread across Chennai City. Sampling technique is the technique used to select the sample size. Convenient sampling technique is used for this research. Investors were taken according to the convenience of the research study. The respondents are from various locations spread across the country.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

☐ To classify the demographic profile of the respondents.

☐ To find the influence of demographic factors among various Fintech options

HYPOTHESIS

• H_01: There is no significant influence of demographic factors over various Fintech Preference factors

• H_11: There is no significant influence of demographic factors over various Fintech Preference factors

DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

FACTOR	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
AGE		
20-30	94	47%
31-40	66	33%
41-50	22	11%
Above 50	18	9%
GENDER		
Male	106	53%
Female	94	47%
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION		
Under graduate	102	51%
Post Graduate	98	49.%

EMPLOYMENT LEVEL		
Entry Level employee	81	41%
Middle level employee	73	36.%
Senior level employee	46	23.%
ANNUAL INCOME		
Below 2 lakh rupees	42	21%
2-4 lakh rupees	13	6%
4-6 lakh rupees	21	11%
6-8 lakh rupees	24	12%
Above 8 lakh rupees	100	50%

Inference:

Majority of the respondents are Male.Majority of the respondents are from the age group 20 to 30 . Majority of the respondents belong to entry level employee . Majority of the respondents are graduates . Majority of the respondents earn more than 8 lakh rupees in a year

ANOVA ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND FINTECH PREFERENCE FACTORS

ANOVA ANALYSIS OF GENDER

FACTORS	GENDER		F VALUE	P VALUE	Significance Level
	MALE (Mean)	FEMALE (Mean)			
Convenience	7.02	8.09	18.301	<.001	Significant**
Regulatory Compliance	8.99	7.87	7.388	.007	Significant**
Fintech Innovations	7.08	8.68	5.310	.022	Significant**
Security	7.21	6.87	.038	.846	Not Significant

**The level of significance is tested at 0.05

Table depicting anova analysis of gender

Inference

 From the table it is inferred that "education" as a demographic factor has an influent factor on all the fintech preference factors except security. Hence reject $H0$. for all except security .

ANOVA ANALYSIS OF AGE

FACTORS	AGE				F VALUE	P VALUE	Significance Level
	18-25 (Mean)	26-35 (Mean)	36-45 (Mean)	45& above (Mean)			
Convenience	9.41	7.56	3.09	2.89	12.133	<.001	Significant**
Regulatory Compliance	8.33	7.48	6.55	15.11	13.094	<.001	Significant**
Fintech Innovations	8.00	5.76	16.05	4.50	22.300	<.001	Significant**
Security	7.41	5.91	8.45	7.61	2.684	.048	Significant**

The level of significance is tested at 0.05

Table depicting anova analysis of age

Inference

From the table it is inferred that "age" as a demographic factor has an influent factor on all the fintech preference factors. Hence reject H_0 . for all

ANOVA ANALYSIS OF EDUCATION

VARIABLES	EDUCATION QUALIFICATION		F VALUE	P VALUE	Significance level
	Graduate (Mean)	Post graduate (Mean)			
Convenience	6.43	6.24	.050	.698	Significant**
Regulatory Compliance	7.45	9.52	7.814	.006	Significant**
Fintech Innovations	7.63	8.04	.219	.641	Not Significant
Security	7.63	6.45	3.747	.05	Significant**

The level of significance is tested at 0.05

Table depicting anova analysis of education

Inference

From the table it is inferred that "education" as a demographic factor has an influent factor on all the fintech preference factors except innovations . Hence reject H_0 . for all except innovations .

ANOVA ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYMENT GRADE LEVEL

VARIABLES	EMPLOYMENT GRADE LEVEL			F VALUE	P VALUE	Significance level
	Entry-Level Employee (Mean)	Middle Level Employee (Mean)	Senior Level Employee (Mean)			
Convenience	7.26	6.18	4.98	7.215	<.001	Significant**
Regulatory Compliance	9.14	11.47	10.93	3.432	.034	Significant**
Fintech Innovations	8.09	8.37	5.17	4.641	.011	Significant**
Security	7.07	8.11	11.48	11.374	<.001	Significant**

The level of significance is tested at 0.05

Table depicting anova analysis of employment grade level

Inference

From the table it is inferred that "employment grade level" as a demographic factor has an influent factor on all the fintech preference factors . Hence reject H0 . for all

ANOVA ANALYSIS OF INCOME

FACTORS	ANNUAL INCOME					F VALUE	P VALUE	Significance
	Below 2 Lakh Rupee (Mean)	2 to 4 Lakh Rupee (Mean)	4 to 6 Lakh Rupee (Mean)	6 to 8 Lakh Rupee (Mean)	Above 8 Lakh Rupee (Mean)			
Convenience	6.67	8.54	12.86	12.50	11.19	7.816	<.001	Significant**
Regulatory Compliance	7.86	11.08	3.86	4.79	8.34	5.087	<.001	Significant**
Fintech Innovations	5.62	7.77	11.38	11.08	7.24	5.297	<.001	Significant**
Security	7.43	8.69	8.00	9.29	5.94	4.314	.002	Significant**

The level of significance is tested at 0.05

Table depicting anova analysis of income

Inference

From the table it is inferred that "income " as a demographic factor has an influent factor on all the fintech preference factors. Hence reject H0 . for all .

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this research sheds light on the landscape of financial technology (FinTech) innovations and their reception among respondents. Through a comprehensive examination, it becomes evident that the acceptance of FinTech innovations is influenced by a myriad of factors, including usability, perceived benefits, trust, and regulatory environment. Furthermore, the findings underscore the importance of understanding user preferences and concerns in driving widespread adoption of FinTech solutions. As the financial services industry continues to evolve, stakeholders must navigate these complexities to effectively harness the potential of FinTech to transform financial transactions and services.

REFERENCES

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

[2] Lai, V. S., & Li, H. (2005). Technology acceptance model for internet banking: An invariance analysis. Information & Management, 42(2), 373-386.

[3] Lee, Y., Kozar, K. A., & Larsen, K. R. (2003). The technology acceptance model: Past, present, and future. Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 12(50), 752-780.

[4] Mathieson, K. (1991). Predicting user intentions: Comparing the technology acceptance model with the theory of planned behavior. Information Systems Research, 2(3), 173-191.

[5] Moore, G. C., & Benbasat, I. (1991). Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting an information technology innovation. Information Systems Research, 2(3), 192-222.

[6] Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.

[7] Straub, D. W. (1989). Validating instruments in MIS research. MIS Quarterly, 13(2), 147-169.

[8] Taylor, S., & Todd, P. A. (1995). Understanding information technology usage: A test of competing models. Information Systems Research, 6(2), 144-176