Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education Vol.12 No.12 (2021), 3666-3674

Research Article

Seller's Perception: Preference and Significance of Payment Platforms

Gautam Barthakur[1], Ajanta Borgohain Rajkonwar[2]
[1]Centre for Management Studies, Dibrugarh University, NH-37, Dibrugarh, 786001, India.
E-mail: g.barthakur@gmail.com.
[2]Department of Commerce, Dibrugarh University, NH-37, Dibrugarh, 786001, India. E-mail: ajanta_konwar@yahoo.co.in.

Article History: Received: 11 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 23 May 2021

Abstract: Payment Instruments are a group of most prominent and promoted digital applications for mobile. These instruments have been instrumental in conducting a digital transaction, thereby helping the seller to facilitate a sales process. For many cash might still be undisputable if proper methods, processes and procedure are not adopted and updated time to time. From proper education, awareness to being courteous to users thereby encouraging the use of digital means to complete a transaction is still felt necessary. Cash along with digital platforms, can shape the future of payment processing. Therefore, there is a need to facilitate the use of Online Payment Instruments including Prepaid Payment Instruments and UPI applications. To be specific, an e-Wallet carries most of the financial services that is built into it, which is encouraging. Electronic Payment Instruments including plastic cards, e-Wallets, UPI apps etc. have always been a fast to use digital platform for digital transactions. Therefore, the present study will focus on important payment platforms being actively used by sellers and study their perception of these services including willing customers. Moreover, the study makes an attempt to find the significance of one platform over the other. Hence, the authors have highlighted the significance of various payment platforms including Cash, e-Wallets, Plastic Cards and Other available means in the City of Dibrugarh (India). These services are used by shopkeepers, restaurants and businesses when they enter into a sale process with customers.

Keywords: Payment Instruments; Plastic Card; Cash; e-Wallet; Seller; Customer; UPI.

I. INTRODUCTION

Business operations are closely guided, monitored and facilitated by Information Technology. Most of the business transactions are becoming a part of the digitalisation process or have become an end result of a digital transaction. It is more evident of the fact that the millions of daily transactions are now happening around the world with the press of a button on our handheld devices. A recent report highlighted the growing importance of emerging payment technologies introduced by FinTech[1] firms and equally important BigTechs such as Facebook and Google. Smartphones has given us a lot of opportunities to use technology in a different way every now and then. This has been possible because of technologies like Unified Payments Interface (UPI), e-Wallet, Virtual Debit or Credit Card, etc.

To take the step further ahead, we have now with us Online Prepaid Payment Instruments [2] including e-Wallets such as Paytm, PhonePe, Amazon Pay, ICICI Pockets, HDFC PayZapp, etc. In light of the above even companies like Google has introduced Google Pay (formerly Tez) in India which takes the advantage of a real time system known as Unified Payment Interface developed by National Payments Corporation of India. The UPI based platform provides a real time settlement mechanism of accounts engaged in a financial transaction. For the user, the process is handled quite easily with little or no use of personal data at the transactional front except the mandatory unique UPI ID and PIN. On similar grounds, the existence of e-Wallets cannot be nullified either, it is not only a digital wallet to store money like a prepaid payment instrument but also a medium to use UPI ID to confirm and complete a financial transaction successfully.

The virtual relationships are very difficult to sustain. The virtual relationship can be developed through more and more transactions. Ji Xiaojing (2017)[3]explained how using a red packet can symbolize a transfer of emotions during an ongoing interpersonal communication; that may serve in strengthening weak virtual interpersonal relationships among people. Kholi dasari et al. (2019)[4] emphasized the implementation of forecasting methods in the business retailer by incorporating human judgment. The study found that the decisions of the manager of the case organization are based on his/her intuition and experience (i.e. human judgment) and have no appropriate procedure. Similarly in an another study, Devarapalli (2014)[5]found the importance of bringing innovations to IT services to make it more acceptable and propel the growth in business.

Therefore, it becomes inevitable that the concerns and issues are addressed carefully by looking at users' judgment, adoption of proper communication methods and service innovations.

In view of the above, the present research is being conducted among retailers in the city of Dibrugarh in the state of Assam (India) to understand the complicacies of the e-Wallet system. Further, the study would help learners to identify the practical details of the subject i.e. e-Wallet. The study would provide an understanding of the e-Wallet system and how people find it as relevant as other digital mediums. The study intends to highlight the satisfaction among retailers in accepting and using such a technology in their retail outlets or as a point of service.

A payment system may be comprised of Unified Payment Interface based technology like BHIM, plastic cards including debit, gift card, credit card etc., Internet Banking and Mobile Banking platforms, crypto currencies, cash, electronic wallets, etc. Böhme, R. et al. (2015)[6] stated "Bitcoin is of interest to economists as a virtual currency with the potential to disrupt existing payment systems and perhaps even monetary systems." It has been a challenge to promote the use of e-Wallets as users are getting more and more benefits through plastic cards and UPI based platforms. Soon after the announcement and implementing zero charges for wired transactions such as RTGS and NEFT by State Bank of India-India's Largest Bank, the work for e-Wallet service providers have become more challenging.

A. Concept of e-Wallet

Digital platforms in Finance are always been a hotbed to technologists. From stock markets to international banking, from consultancy to providing customer services, and then the importance in international marketing (Joshi)[7], cannot be neglected. The financial decisions are taken by being more active, creating plans, following standard operating procedures and innovating at regular intervals and current situations. Today, there exist a platform more common to us as electronic wallets, being used by different corporates including private and government entities. An e-Wallet is a unique type of electronic account or identity basedapplication on which transactions are made online through user coordinated digital device. Its primary utility is similar to that of our pocket wallet with minor change which includes loading digital cash or acting as a payment gateway by using plastic card, or UPI etc. An E-wallet may be linked with the individual's bank account to add money (preload) or make digital payments on different platforms or at Service Points that is in the form of brick and mortar shop. Here, a service point can be used to deposit cash in an e-Wallet account. Such payment systems has been successful to an extent in improving service quality dimensions (Khan, et al.)[8] and has proliferated digital marketing (Ahuja)[9] environment. E-wallet services are even clubbed with Payments Banks[10] to mobilize funds and accelerate digital transactions.

B. Components or Parts required

e-Wallet has mainly three components, hardware i.e., a computer or a smartphone, software application or app and Authentic User information. Software component stores personal information and provides security and encryption of the data whereas information component is a database of details provided by the user which includes their name, shipping address, payment method, amount to be paid, credit or debit card details, etc. Major payment e-Wallet apps now comes integrated with either UPI, Payments Bank account, ecommerce platform, or electronic Debit or Credit Cards or comes with all these additional services in one single app. Digital Payment Services including Prepaid Payment Instruments[11], together have been aggressively marketing (Ramaswamy et al.)[12] various products to acquire market share, e-Wallets are no different.

II. MATERIAL AND METHOD

The study aims to understanding the various payment options available to the retailers in the city of Dibrugarh. The study aims to find the effective payment options for a seller and identifying new emerging digital payment platforms which may be conducive for a business with less difficulties. A transaction needs to be a rewarding experience for the buyer and a seller. Hence, the study aims at finding the widely used or accepted payment means by the sellers and provide an easy and acceptable option to customers in the city. Further, the study helps to identify sellers who are using more than one payment systems and/or platforms while accepting payments from customers.

A. Objectives of the Study

1) To identify the various payment options available to sellers in Dibrugarh.
2) To compare the various payment options and measure its significance with respect to each other.

The following Hypothesis has been formulated More Offers to Customers, Error Free Transaction, Customer Preference, Accessing Customer Information and Seller Preference.

The study is descriptive in nature of various major payment options available in the city of Dibrugarh, India. The area covered is under the Dibrugarh Municipality Board which has 22 wards The study is based on primary data collected from Merchants using any e-Wallet Product.

For the study, Dibrugarh City has been selected and Pre-testing is considered for checking the face validity and reliability in the questionnaire and data collected. For carrying out data analysis and compilation, we have used Microsft Excel 2019 MSO (Version 1902, Build 11328.20158) Copyright 2018[13].

A. Population & Sample Selection Procedures

The merchants/retailers/sellers using any of the e-Wallet Applications will be part of Population. Here, the population is unknown and hence, an initial Pilot Survey was conducted to identify all the active Merchant users of e-Wallet applications since the year of demonetization in India i.e. 2016.

Sample Unit Definition: A Field Survey on Merchant Points: A Seller who is a Promoter as well as an User once or still using a particular e-Wallet Service in his/her retail unit.

The present paper is based on primary data conducted and analysed to study the Merchant users only who are engaged with at least one of the e-Wallet Service Providers in India.

Judgmental Sampling was undertaken to conduct the field survey. As such, fifty-five (55) outlets were identified but due to weak/incomplete/delayed responses from a few such sellers, only thirty-one (31) of them have been considered. Hence, the analysis reflects the trends based on all major responses, that includes thirty-one (31) outlets.

B. Sellers/Transaction Points

Here, the number of retail outlets who are offering e-Wallet services is not available, the Researcher has identified the retail outlets who are offering e-Wallet services and was successful to tape down sellers or users who facilitate digital transactions in Dibrugarh City. Judgmental Sampling is used to select the stores/retail outlets providing or using any of the selected e-Wallet Services for the study to carry out transactions with customers.

C. Sources of Data

Primary Data was collected from Merchant Users of e-Wallet Services.

D. Testing

Face Validity: Through a Pilot Survey conducted among the Merchant Users of e-Wallet Services.

Reliability: We have used Rank Questions in the Questionnaires, test the reliability was exercised through a pilot survey.

The field survey was conducted among fifty five merchant users of e-Wallet Applications in Dibrugarh. The data patterns reflects thirty one outlets who actively responded. Preliminary study reflects the following observations:

a) It was found that the following were most common among sellers and in Dibrugarh: PayTM, Mobikwik, Google Pay. PayTM was found to have market presence and frequency of usage was the highest among all the e-Wallet Applications.
b) The study found that there is a growing presence of UPI platform based Google Pay, even being accepted and recommended by merchants for its quick processing.

Friedman Test (Sheldon et al.)[14] to be used for rank questions to test the validity of the null hypothesis given by F_T.

$$F_T = \left[\frac{12}{b(k)(k+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} T_j^2 \right] - 3b(k+1)$$

$b =$ the number of nows (blocks)

$k =$ number of columns (treatments)

$T_j^2 =$ the squared sum of the ranks for sample treatment (column) j

"The Friedman test is a useful method of analysis for nonparametric data, especially in human competence research. The method allows producing test results of groups, comparable with each other, regardless of the size of the group, even with small respondent numbers." Further, if null hypothesis is rejected then a post hoc test (Stoll)[15]to be conducted and payment services will be compared to find the payment service which may be significantly different from the rest of payment services adopted by the outlets.

E. Data Collection Procedures

Observation: The Researcher analysed the data provided by the respondents and observe the respective behaviour, platform interactions and day-to-day affairs. The observations are well recorded when found significant for the research purpose.

Personal Interview: The Researcher conducted interviews as and when required with the Merchant/Seller of the respective e-Wallet Applications to know in detail about various services offered and address any issue related to satisfaction of the services on service quality dimensions and related issues of usage.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The field survey reveals that eight retailers were registered merchant users of an e-Wallet platform. Prominently the services of PayTM was found to be more active than any other services. Since, SBI 'ebuddy' e-Wallet stopped its operations and migrated to a new Payment Facilitator i.e. SBI 'Yono' from the Month of November 2018, it is not considered for the analysis.

The questionnaire method was used to collect various demographical parameters on one set and on the other payments related information was sought from the sellers.

The Researcher was able to find the following e-Wallet platforms, Payments Systems and Payment Options to be active in the city of Dibrugarh:

e-Wallet: PhonePe, Airtel Payments Bank Wallet, PayTM, Amazon Pay, MobiKwik, ICICI Pockets, HDFC PayZapp.

Payment Systems (other than e-Wallet): GooglePay, BHIM UPI.

Payment Options: Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card, UPI, DD, Cheque. A few sellers use cash credit to facilitate sales.

SBI Buddy has not been considered because its services are now stopped by State Bank of India.

It was also found that the most prominent e-Wallet service providers have also included the newly introduced UPI Payment mode, which now comes built-in with the respective apps.

A. Initial Findings

The summarized ranks from the field survey, for the various parameters i.e. Payment Features, Risk Involved, Fast Closer of Sale, Security and Grievance Redressal can be highlighted as shown below:

TABLE I.OFFERS ON PAYMENT INSTRUMENTS

Cash	e-Wallet	Plastic Card	Others
4	1	2	3

TABLE II.ERROR FREE TRANSACTION

Cash	e-Wallet	Plastic Card	Others
1	3	4	2

TABLE III.CUSTOMER PREFERENCE/SERVICE CUSTOMER OPT FOR

Cash	e-Wallet	Plastic Card	Others
1	3	2	4

TABLE IV.FACCESSING CUSTOMER INFORMATION

Cash	e-Wallet	Plastic Card	Others
4	1	2	3

TABLE V.SELLER PREFERENCE

Cash	e-Wallet	Plastic Card	Others
1	3	2	4

The above tables depicts that e-Wallet is preferable only in case of getting more offers during sales and reveals that the platform provides access to customer information to the seller in case the seller wants to keep a digital track of their customer.

B. Hypothesis Testing

Critical Value Approach: Comparing Test Static and Critical Value has been shown below:

Look up Critical Value = 7.81

Calculated Test Static Value, we will use Friedman Test

Level of Significance, $\alpha = 0.05$

P-Value Approach: We have compared the p-value with the level of significance as depicted below:

It must be noted that smaller the p-value, more are the chances to reject the null hypothesis. Here, we will have to compare the p-Value and Level of Significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) and the result will depend on the following conditions:

If the p-Value <= α; then we must reject the Null Hypothesis,

If the p-Value <= α; then we must accept the Null Hypothesis

1. The hypothesis testing to test the significance of payment services/options i.e. Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others on the parameters of More offers to attract customers has been described below:

H_{01}: There is no significance difference among payment services on Offers associated with the platform.

H_{11}: There is significant difference among payment services on Offers associated with the platform.

TABLE VI.FRIEDMAN TEST-MORE OFFERS

Variable	Test Static Value	p-Value	Result (Null Hypothesis) p-Value<= α; H_{01} rejected p-Value > α; H_{01} accepted
Payment Options	72.68	1.14E-15	Rejected

A test was conducted for the difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services. $F(t) \{ 4, N=31\} = 72.68$; $p < 0.05$. Here, there is statistically significant difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services to conduct a transaction.

Since the null hypothesis is accepted, we will have to find the service or set of services where the significant difference might exist among various payment services after pair wise comparison.

Therefore, C = Number of groups (Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others) = 4;

Number of Comparisons $C(C-1)/2 = 4(4-1)/2 = 6$;

The tabulated values have been presented in the following table and Studentised Range Q Table [16] is used for finding Q value = 3.87:

TABLE VII.TUKEY-KRAMER POST HOC-MORE OFFERS

		Q value	3.87		
		Num df	4	**Den df**	27

Comparison	**Absolute Difference**	**Critical Range**	**Results**		
Cash to e-Wallet	2.39	0.37	Significantly Different		
Cash to Plastic Card	1.68	0.37	Significantly Different		
Cash to Others	0.26	0.37	Not Significant		
e-Wallet to e-Wallet	0.71	0.37	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to Others	2.13	0.37	Significantly Different		
Plastic Card to Others	1.42	0.37	Significantly Different		

Here, a comparison test was conducted by using Tukey Kramer Post Hoc Test, where the Critical Range Value = 0.37 (n = number of observations =31; Q = 3.87; S^2_{pooled}= 0.28 [Q√ S^2_{pooled} /n]
Further, after comparisons we can conclude that except the group relationship from Cash to Others, all other group comparisons are Significantly Different from each other. When the users were asked to consider the number of offers or monetary benefits that may be enjoyed while using various payment options, it was found that Cash, and Other payment methods like Demand Draft, Cheque, etc. enjoys no significant difference or depicts similar number of offers while completing a transaction.

2) The hypothesis testing to test the significance of payment services/options i.e. Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others on the issue of minimum 'Errors' has been described below:

H_{02}: There is no significance difference among payment services on conducting Error Free transaction.
H_{12}: There is significant difference among payment services on conducting Error Free transaction.

TABLE VIII.FRIEDMAN TEST-ERROR FREE TRANSACTION

Variable	Test Static Value	p-Value	Result (Null Hypothesis) p-Value<= α; H_{01} rejected p-Value > α; H_{01} accepted
Payment Options	54.99	6.91E-12	Rejected

A test was conducted for the difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services. F(t) {4, N=31} = 54.99; p < 0.05. Here, there is statistically significant difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services to conduct a transaction.
Since the null hypothesis is accepted, we will have to find the service or set of services where the significant difference might exist among various payment services after pair wise comparison.
Therefore, C = Number of groups (Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others) = 4;
Number of Comparisons C(C-1)/2 = 4(4-1)/2 = 6;
The tabulated values have been presented in the following table and Studentised Range Q Table is used for finding Q value which is found to be 3.87:

TABLE IX.TUKEY-KRAMER POST HOC

		Q value	3.87		
		Num df	4	**Den df**	27
Comparison	**Absolute Difference**	**Critical Range**	**Results**		
Cash to e-Wallet	1.39	0.51	Significantly Different		
Cash to Plastic Card	2.42	0.51	Significantly Different		
Cash to Others	1.16	0.51	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to e-Wallet	1.03	0.51	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to Others	0.23	0.51	Not Significant		
Plastic Card to Others	1.26	0.51	Significantly Different		

Here, a comparison test was conducted by using Tukey Kramer Post Hoc Test, where the Critical Range Value = 0.51 (n = number of observations =31; Q = 3.87; S^2_{pooled} = 0.53 [Q√ S^2_{pooled} /n]
Therefore, after comparisons we can conclude that except the group relationship from e-Wallet to Others, all other group comparisons are Significantly Different from each other, when the users were asked to consider the minimum errors while making a transaction.

3) The hypothesis testing to test the significance of payment services/options i.e. Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others (UPI, Cheque, DD, etc.) on the parameter 'Customer preference' has been described below:

H_{03}: There is no significance difference among payment services towards Customer preference.
H_{13}: There is significant difference among payment services towards Customer preference.

TABLE X.FRIEDMAN TEST-CUSTOMER PREFERENCE

Variable	Test Static Value	p-Value	Result (Null Hypothesis) p-Value<= α; H_{01} rejected

			p-Value > α; H_{01} accepted
Payment Options	81.85	1.23E-17	Rejected

A test was conducted for the difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services. F(t) { 4, N=31} = 81.85; p < 0.05. Here, there is statistically significant difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services to conduct a transaction.
Since the null hypothesis is accepted, we will have to find the service or set of services where the significant difference might exist among various payment services after pair wise comparison.
Therefore, C = Number of groups (Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others) = 4;
Number of Comparisons C(C-1)/2 = 4(4-1)/2 = 6;
The tabulated values have been presented in the following table and Studentised Range Q Table is used for finding Q value = 3.87:

TABLE XI.TUKEY-KRAMER POST HOC-CUSTOMER PREFERENCE

		Q value	3.87		
		Num df	4	**Den df**	27
Comparison	Absolute Difference	Critical Range	Results		
Cash to e-Wallet	2.26	0.27	Significantly Different		
Cash to Plastic Card	1.06	0.27	Significantly Different		
Cash to Others	2.68	0.27	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to e-Wallet	1.19	0.27	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to Others	0.42	0.27	Significantly Different		
Plastic Card to Others	1.61	0.27	Significantly Different		

Here, a comparison test was conducted by using Tukey Kramer Post Hoc Test, where the Critical Range Value = 0.27 (n = number of observations =31; Q = 3.87; S^2_{pooled} = 0.15 [Q√ S^2_{pooled} /n]
Hence, after comparisons we can conclude that all group comparisons are Significantly Different from each other, when the sellers were asked what customer preferred the most and hence no similarities among various payment options.

4) The hypothesis testing to test the significance of payment services/options on accessing customer information, has been described below:

H_{04}: There is no significance difference among payment services on access to customer information.
H_{14}: There is significant difference among payment services on access to customer information.

TABLE XII.FRIEDMAN TEST-ACCESSING CUSTOMER INFORMATION

Variable	Test Static Value	p-Value	Result (Null Hypothesis) p-Value<= α; H_{01} rejected p-Value > α; H_{01} accepted
Payment Options	68.92	7.26E-15	Rejected

A test was conducted for the difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services. F(t) { 4, N=31} = 68.92; p < 0.05. Here, there is statistically significant difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services to conduct a transaction.
Since the null hypothesis is accepted, we will have to find the service or set of services where the significant difference might exist among various payment services after pair wise comparison.
Therefore, C = Number of groups (Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others) = 4;
Number of Comparisons C(C-1)/2 = 4(4-1)/2 = 6;
The tabulated values have been presented in the following table and Studentised Range Q Table is used for finding Q value = 3.87:

TABLE XIII.TUKEY-KRAMER POST HOC-ACCESSING CUSTOMER INFORMATION

		Q value	3.87		
		Num df	4	**Den df**	27
Comparison	**Absolute Difference**	**Critical Range**	**Results**		
Cash to e-Wallet	2.45	0.40	Significantly Different		
Cash to Plastic Card	1.65	0.40	Significantly Different		
Cash to Others	0.48	0.40	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to e-Wallet	0.81	0.40	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to Others	1.97	0.40	Significantly Different		
Plastic Card to Others	1.10	0.53	Significantly Different		

Here, a comparison test was conducted by using Tukey Kramer Post Hoc Test, where the Critical Range Value = 0.40 (n = number of observations =31; Q = 3.87; S^2_{pooled} = 0.33 [Q√ S^2_{pooled} /n]
Hence, after comparisons among payment services/options we can conclude that all the group comparisons are Significantly Different from each other, when the users were asked to consider which option gives more access to customer information.

5) The hypothesis testing to test the significance of payment services i.e. Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others on the parameter 'Sellers' Preference' has been described below:

H_{05}: There is no significance difference among payment services when sellers' preference is considered.
H_{15}: There is significant difference among payment services when sellers' preference is considered.

TABLE XIV.FRIEDMAN TEST-SELLERS' PREFERENCE

Variable	Test Static Value	p-Value	Result (Null Hypothesis) p-Value<= α; H_{01} rejected p-Value > α; H_{01} accepted
Payment Options	61.65	2.62E-13	Rejected

A test was conducted for the difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services. F(t) { 4, N=31} = 61.65; p < 0.05. Here, there is statistically significant difference in the proportion of Merchant Users preferring different payment services to conduct a transaction.
Since the null hypothesis is accepted, we will have to find the service or set of services where the significant difference might exist among various payment services after pair wise comparison.
Therefore, C = Number of groups (Cash, e-Wallet, Plastic Card and Others) = 4;
Number of Comparisons C(C-1)/2 = 4(4-1)/2 = 6;
The tabulated values have been presented in the following table and Studentised Range Q Table is used for finding Q value = 3.87:

TABLE XV.TUKEY-KRAMER POST HOC-SELLERS' PREFERENCE

		Q value	3.87		
		Num df	4	**Den df**	27
Comparison	**Absolute Difference**	**Critical Range**	**Results**		
Cash to e-Wallet	2.06	0.46	Significantly Different		
Cash to Plastic Card	1.32	0.46	Significantly Different		
Cash to Others	2.35	0.46	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to e-Wallet	0.74	0.46	Significantly Different		
e-Wallet to Others	0.29	0.46	Not Significant		
Plastic Card to Others	1.03	0.46	Significantly Different		

Here, a comparison test was conducted by using Tukey Kramer Post Hoc Test, where the Critical Range Value = 0.46 (n = number of observations =31; Q = 3.87; S^2_{pooled} = 0.44 [Q√ S^2_{pooled} /n]
Hence, after comparisons we can conclude that except the group relationship from e-Wallet to Others, all other group comparisons are Significantly Different from each other, when the users were asked how much effective the payment mode is in terms of handling queries and issues.

6. The study found that the cash is the most preferred option among sellers but digital platforms such as plastic card, e-Wallet and UPI based technologies enables the merchants to work more effectively.

C. Findings and Suggestions

The efficiency, frequency of use depends on User's acceptance. Therefore, more the number of users uses the systems and utilize payments platform, more willingly the retailers will welcome them through these paths. The e-Wallet app is more equipped with offers and requires proper understanding before a user uses its wide range of features. The marketing environment is changing and marketers and sellers are engaged with variety of services that depends on buyers' ability and frequency at which a service is used. The current changes and issues have highlighted in these following areas:

1) Offers associated with a payment option:

e-Wallet have more offers provided from time to time basis and sometimes built into the app. The study found that more number of offers are associated with e-Wallets but similar results were witnessed when a post hoc test was performed and similarities among e-Wallet and Others was found. This is because of the UPI being part of the group 'Others'. Whereas a cheque and DD provides minimum offers while making a payment.
The sellers believe that more offers can attract or increase the usage frequency among customers. A payment service like e-Wallet may continue to provide offers to keep attracting customers.

2) Transaction Error kept at minimum:

Cash was found to have less or little riskier when it comes to keeping errors at bare minimum.All the payment services have their own advantage in making a transaction successful, but e-Wallet and Other payment services including UPI, Cheque, Demand Draft had no significant difference, which may be interpreted as in terms of keeping a transaction error free, both the options are at equal level according to Sellers.

To minimize the errors and making a transaction successful a business infrastructure needs to be enhanced. Only then, there will less or no connectivity loss. According to Sellers, the digital payment instruments needs to use less data or verify the network or infrastructure capabilities before letting the seller/customer proceed with the transaction.

3) Customer Preference at the Retail Outlet:

Customer preferred digital means only after the demonetization period, then gradually the customers started depending on cash. According to sellers the 'Cash' was found to be mostly preferred, followed by Plastic Cards. The analysis reveals that there exist significant difference among all four payment options.

Since, the customer preference is attach to cash and plastic cards, and it is them who the seller is dependent on, a marketer of an e-Wallet service provider will have to engage in marketing activities that is particular to or very specific towards customers rather than focusing on Sellers.

4) Accessing Customer Information:

According to the respondents, the payment option 'e-Wallet' delivers more information about the customers and vice versa. With a few outlet finding customer information to be helpful in reaching them after a sale process is complete. There has been no significant difference among payment options when there ranks have been compared by Post hoc test.

Customer Service is very crucial after a sale process has ended and therefore, it becomes quite important to the Seller to interact and reach their customers with. Digital payment instruments adds this benefit to the Seller's marketing tool box.

5) Sellers' Preference and Use

When a post hoc test was conducted, it was found that there is no significant difference between e-Wallet and Others in terms of Seller preferring an option. Sellers are dependent on Cash as they consider Cash to have little or no complaints at all except a few mismatch and counterfeits in comparison to e-Wallet, Plastic Cards and other various means of payment services. But it all depends on customer's preference, as they are willing to adopt any means to accept payments that they have made available for their customers in their store.

Therefore, payment services with an e-Wallet platform should be adopted by keeping people's sentiments and usability from time to time.

6) Integration of Services

Most of the services are integrated within one platform. From independent financial services, e-commerce, education, OTT and telecommunications services to integration of most of these services in single platform. Brick and mortar shops are not behind as they are integrating their space in the virtual world. Sellers are willing to use more of digital services in the near future when their services are distributed on the online market place.

IV. CONCLUSION

The major sellers considered in the study are selling products and providing services by using most of the differently available platforms very actively. The study prominently highlights the aspects of sellers and their preferences and limitations in Dibrugarh city. The study also highlight the usage of e-Wallet applications over other payment interfaces including plastic cards, UPI enabled platforms and cash, when it comes to offering more benefits on payment. E-Wallets also have an advantage when access to customer information is concerned. Further, the acceptance and performance of e-Wallet platforms with other payment interfaces have been significant based on specific circumstances that includes customer preference. The study also highlight the experiences/ opinion of sellers or retailers regarding the significance among the payment options.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Dibrugarh University, specially Centre for Management Studies, Dibrugarh University for helping and supporting us during our endeavor.

REFERENCES

1. World Payments Report 2018. Retrieve from https://worldpaymentsreport.com/ wpcontent/uploads/sites/5/2018/10/World-Payments-Report-WPR18-2018.pdf.
2. OECD (2006), "Online Payment Systems for E-commerce", OECD Digital Economy Papers, No. 117, OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieve from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/ 231454241135.
3. Ji Xiaojing. (2017), "Digital Environments," Retrieve from https://www.jstor.org/ stable/j.ctv1xxrxw.
4. I. Kholidasari, I., L. Setiawati, and T. Tartila, "The Implementation of Forecasting Method by Incorporating Human Judgment," International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 1982-1988, 2019. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.18517/ijaseit.9.6.10640.

5. H. P. Devarapalli, "Value of IT innovations for a sustainable business," 2014 17th IEEE Int. Conf. Intell. Transp. Syst. ITSC 2014, pp. 184-187, 2014.
6. R. Böhme, N. Christin, B. Edelman, &T. Moore, (2015). "Bitcoin: Economics, Technology, and Governance," The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 29(2), 213-238. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/24292130.
7. R.M., Joshi,(2014). International Marketing (2nd Ed.). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
8. M.S. Khan, M.S., and S.S. Mahapatra, Shreekumar (2009), "Service quality evaluation in internet banking: an empirical study in India," Int. J. Indian Culture and Business Management, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2009.
9. V. Ahuja,(2015). Digital Marketing. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
10. "The business case for payments banks in India (2016)," Retrieve from https://www.gsma.com/mobilefordevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/GSMA_The-business-case-for-payments-banks-in-India_2016-1.pdf.
11. H. Castell, (2017). "DIGITAL PAYMENTS: Broadening the appeal of mobile money," Spore, (185), 22-26. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/44242675.
12. V.S. Ramaswamy&S. Namakumari (2015). Marketing Management-Global Perspective Indian Context (5th Ed.). New Delhi: McGraw Hill Education (India) Pvt. Ltd.
13. Microsoft Corp. (2019). Microsft Excel 2019 MSO (16.0.11328.20156) 32-bit. Downloaded from https://support.office.com/en-us/article/download-and-install-or-reinstall-microsoft-365-or-office-2019-on-a-pc-or-mac-4414eaaf-0478-48be-9c42-23adc4716658
14. M.R. Sheldon, M.J.Fillyaw,W.D. Thompson. "The use and interpretation of the Friedman test in the analysis of ordinal-scale data in repeated measures designs,"Physiother Res Int 1996; 1: 221-8.
15. A. Stoll, A. (2017). "Post hoc tests: tukey honestly significant difference test," In M. Allen (Ed.), *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vol. 3, pp. 1306-1307). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc doi: 10.4135/9781483381411.n452.
16. Studentized Range Distribution table, Retrieve from www.stat.purdue.edu/~lingsong/ teaching/2018fall/q-table.pdf on 20.5.2020.