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Abstract

In the current scenario, usage of Internet has revolutionized the entire banking system. People can bank anytime, anywhere without having the need to visit the bank branch. This helps customers in saving time by completing work at the click of the button. Although, Internet banking is very convenient and fast, it is mired with several security issues. Banking institutions have taken several measures to ensure safety measures for their customers while performing various transactions online. In this context, an effort has been made to inspect and evaluate the Internet banking security measures followed by the selected bank, Indian Bank, in Coimbatore district, for the benefit of its customers. The present study is carried out with the help of a suitable research instrument. 50 customers were selected and with the help of their responses, analysis is made followed by few suggestions.
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Introduction

India has third largest internet population in the world after China and United Stated and presents unmatchable developmental prospect for the internet segment in coming years. The banking sector is one of the major beneficiaries of the Internet revolution and the growth of banking technology products have been remarkably increasing. The prevalent gain of Internet banking is that people can pay out the services sitting at home, without visiting the branch. This helps customers to complete their transactions in the fraction of time, thus saving both time and effort. Internet banking system proves to be very versatile in completing transactions like balance inquiry, withdrawal, deposits, viewing the bank statement, and record of recent transaction. Considering all the advantages, security of the financial information of customers is a very major concern of all banks.
Review of Literature

Several studies bring out the importance of security in Internet banking. Broderick and Vicharapornpuk (2002) studied the importance of customer role in designing and providing quality service in Internet banking. Guraau (2002) analyzed the state of affairs of online banking and its services. The study also pays attention more towards the virtual banking system. Karjaluoto, Mattila, and Pento (2002) made an attempt to determine those factors that influence the formation of consumer attitude toward electronic banking. Hutchinson and Warren (2003) studied the financial service of electronic commerce, Internet Banking and its benefits to the customers. In the study, internet banking security measures and various techniques for privacy of customers’ data has been discussed. Rotchanakitumnuai and Speece (2003) in their research work found that corporate customers do not accept electronic form of banking, which can assist banks to implement this self-service technology more efficiently in the various banking transactions. Lympero and Chaniotakir (2004) evaluated the allusion of Internet – banking technology and the existence of different distinct factors which affect the market. Li and Worington (2004) in their working paper described linkage between internet banking and electronic activities in the business and industrial events.

Pikkarainen, Pikkarainen, Karjaluoto, and Pahnila, (2004) highlighted that electronic banking know-how had created newer usages of banking especially via online banking direct methodology. The authors adopted technology approval model to control the online environment. Singh (2004) in his study examined the collision of online banking and internet banking trends. The study also concentrated on the latest banking technology products and services for the economic growth. Gupta (2006) in his study analyzed the potential of Internet banking and found that its capability to reach each and every cranny and gap of the world holds great significance for a realm like India. Flavián, Guinalíu, and Torres (2006) explored how customers’ sensitivity of conventional bank guided them to take up the services of the internet. The researchers found that if the customer trusted the traditional bank then it was feasible that they feel more forced to use the online services offered by the same bank. Lichtenstein and Williamson (2006) explained the factors that influence the consumer decision, to choose internet banking services in the Australian context. Ndubisi and Sinti (2006) discussed the impact of internet banking on customers’ stance, their needs and activities. The intent of the study was to see the internet banking adoption in Malaysia.

Abu-Shanab and Pearson (2007) investigated the key determinants of the adoption of internet banking in Jordan. Kamakodi and Khan (2008) found an exemplar shift in the Indian banking services in about 15 years since the Indian banking sector was liberalized. Uppal (2008) described that the Post – LPG (liberalization, privatization and globalization) era and information technology (IT) era, revolutionized the face of Indian banking, as banks are stepping towards e-banking from traditional banking. Lifen, Zhao, Koenig-Lewis, Hanmer-Lloyd, and Ward (2010) in their study explained the roles of reliance and perceived the risk on client’s/customer’s usage purpose. Khare (2010) in his study described the importance of technology in civilizing customer service levels in being used deliberately and progressively more by service organizations.

There are substantial amount of studies conducted at the Indian level and international level but, very few works have focused on the Internet banking, its usage, safety measures and its perceptions, attentiveness level, satisfaction levels, attitudes and behavior of the internet banking, security issues, and financial frauds Additionally, studies relating to the Internet banking security specifically in the Southern Region of Tamil Nadu are extremely limited. The present study is an attempt to bridge this research gap by studying Internet banking security among the selected Indian Bank customers.
Statement of Problem

In the present state of affairs, the banking sector has been seen a mammoth progress and the popularity with respect to the Internet banking services and its products. This development has led to the large number of internet banking transactions, which are faster and more convenient mode of transactions, for the bank customers. Banking industry is one of the businesses that have used the full potential of IT to help with banking transactions and increase banking services and opportunities to its customers. These facilities helped millions of customers to perform their transaction anytime anywhere easily, quickly and smoothly with perfections. However to carry out banking transactions through the Internet, one needs to have some basic knowledge about computers and the Internet, which to some extent, limits the number of people willing to avail this facility. Many people who are not comfortable with computers and the Internet find it difficult to use this service.

Objectives of the Study

The central objectives of the present study are -
1. To analyze the customers’ perceptions and awareness towards Internet banking security;
2. To understand the problems faced by customers while using internet banking services; and
3. To know impact of the internet banking securities among the selected customers in Coimbatore.

Scope of the Study

This study provides a guide to the current structure of the Internet banking security and highlights awareness level of customers for using Internet banking, and their perception and satisfaction towards Internet banking with new technologies and its functioning. This helps to know in details about development in banking industry with advancement in technology. It also helps in understanding different services offered in Internet banking. Ultimately this would help in understanding the benefits of Internet banking to customers as well as banking industry.

Research Methodology

Sample Design

The multi-stage sampling technique was adopted for selection of respondents for the study. The customers of Indian Bank, ADU Campus, and Coimbatore were selected in four stages. There are about 1647 Indian Bank branches in India, out of which 710 Indian Bank branches are in Tamilnadu, 37 Indian Bank branches are in Coimbatore, out of the 37 Indian Bank branches, only ADU Campus (Avinashilingam Institute for Home Science and Higher Education for Women) was purposively selected for the study. Sampling Size - In the present study, 50 customers were taken as sample size.

Type of Study and Data

The present study is analytical and exploratory in nature. Accordingly, the data used is both primary as well as secondary. The relevant reports viz., RBI monthly bulletins, Magazines, newspapers, business dailies, books and journals, e-media and other literature available in this field constitute secondary sources for the present study. The awareness of, perception towards, satisfaction of Internet banking security is studied with the help of a structured questionnaire. The
primary data has been collected, through a separate pre-tested Questionnaire from 50 Internet banking customers, in Tamil Nadu division of Coimbatore. The Internet banking users were selected from ADUC Branch, Coimbatore.

Statistical Tools and Techniques

To analyze the collected data, various statistical techniques and tools such as averages, frequency distribution tables, and normal distribution were used. The study also uses other suitable statistical tools such as mean, median, standard deviation with co-efficient of variation, correlation and regression, factor analysis etc. SPSS software package and the IBM – AMOS 20.0 version software were used for the analysis.

Hypothesis of the Study

The major hypotheses of the study are as follows:

H01: Internet banking has no significant relationship with traditional banking system.
H02: Internet banking security has no significant impact on the customers

Analysis and Interpretations

Table 1: Socio-Economic Profile of Internet banking customers, Coimbatore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Gender Male</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>(%) of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Up to SSLC</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FUC</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Degree</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Agriculturist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee in Public Sector</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee in Private Sector</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Employee</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued...)
Table 1 above shows the socio-economic profile of the selected Internet banking users in Coimbatore. 50% of the customers in the age group of 20 – 30 in Coimbatore district use Internet banking. Out of this, 58% are males. It also clear that graduates are more likely to use Internet banking; 32% of customers of Internet banking work in private organizations. 34% of Internet banking users is from middle income group. Majority of Internet Banking Users are Single at 54% and 72% of savings account holders in the bank use Internet banking facilities.

Table 2: Internet Banking Awareness Level of Indian Bank Customers, Coimbatore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Become Aware through various Modes</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>News Paper</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates that Internet banking awareness level of Indian Bank customers, Coimbatore. It shows that 32% of the people were aware about Internet banking facility through advertisement; it also reveals that 18% of the people in Coimbatore are aware of Internet banking through bankers. 8% of the customers become aware of Internet banking through newspapers and parental influence; 12% become aware because of relatives and friends; and 10% through television.
Table 3: Awareness Level of Internet Banking Security among the Selected Customers of Indian Bank, ADU Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Types of Security /Protection Mode</th>
<th>SA No</th>
<th>A No</th>
<th>N No</th>
<th>D No</th>
<th>SD No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Security Code</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Password protection</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Transaction Security</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>Authentication Security</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Hardware Security</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>Database Security</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.</td>
<td>Memory Protection</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.</td>
<td>File Security</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: SA – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, N – Neutral, D – Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree)

Table 3 indicates the awareness level of Internet banking security among the selected customers in ADU campus. It is reveals that 42% of respondents are aware of security code for using Internet banking; 46% of the respondents are aware of password protection; 40% are aware of transaction security; 24% of the people are aware of confidentiality security; 18% are aware of hardware security; 32% of the respondents are aware of database security; 40% are aware of memory protection; and 44% of respondents are aware of file security. It shows that maximum customers are aware of password protection security.

Table 4: Benefits of Traditional Banking System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Banking Services / Facilities</th>
<th>SA No</th>
<th>A No</th>
<th>N No</th>
<th>D No</th>
<th>SD No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Interaction with Banker</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Easy Deposit and Withdrawal</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Collection Of Cheque</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Demand Draft</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Security Lockers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 indicates that benefits of traditional banking system. It is reveals that 42% of the respondents agree with the benefits of interaction with banker; 44% of the respondents disagree with the benefits of easy deposit and withdrawal; 44% of the respondents agree with the benefits of collection of cheque; 50% of the respondents agree with the benefits of demand draft; 64% of the people agree the benefits of security; and 40% of the respondents agree with the benefits of...
security lockers. It is observed that maximum people benefitted from the secure traditional banking.

Table 5: Benefits of Internet Banking System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Internet Banking Benefits</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Time Saving</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Any Time Banking</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Any Where Banking</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Easy Accessibility</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>No Queue</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ease of Monitoring</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Friendlier Rates</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: SA – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, N – Neutral, D – Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree)

Table 5 indicates benefits of Internet banking system. It reveals that 94% of the respondents strongly agree with the benefits of time saving; 82% of the respondents strongly agree with the benefits of any time banking; 78% of the respondents strongly agree with the benefits of anywhere banking; 76% of the respondents strongly agree with the benefits of easy accessibility; 72% of the respondents agree with the benefits of no queue; 66% of the respondents agree with the benefits of ease of monitoring; and 50% of the respondents disagree the benefits of friendlier rates. It is observed that maximum respondents benefited due to time saving through Internet banking.

Table 6: Usage of Internet Banking Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Usage of Internet Banking Services</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Secured Transaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Quick Settlement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Electronic Fund Transfer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Electronic Clearing Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Electronic Payment Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>National Electronic Fund Transfer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Real Time Gross Settlement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Core Banking System</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - Neutral, D-Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree)

Table 6 indicates the usage of Internet banking services. It observes 50% of respondents disagree with the usage of secured transaction; 56% of respondents agree with the usage of
quick settlement; 66% of respondents agree with the usage of electronic fund transfer; 62% of respondents agree the usage of electronic clearing services (ECS); 44% of respondents agree the usage of electronic payment service; 48% of respondents agree the usage of national electronic fund transfer; 50% of respondents agree with the usage of real time gross settlement (RTGS); 34% of respondents disagree with the core banking system. It is concluded that maximum respondents accepted the usage of electronic fund transfer.

**Table 7: Factors Influencing the Internet Banking Facility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Friends / Relatives Advice</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personality of Bank Manager</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Popularity Of Banks</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quality Of Service</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - Neutral, D - Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree)

Table 7 shows the factors influencing the Internet banking facilities. It shows that 86% of respondents strongly agree with the influencing factor of convenience; 62% of respondents strongly agree with the factor of friends and relatives; 68% of respondents strongly agree with the factor of personality of bank manage; 72% of respondents strongly agree with the factor of popularity of banks; 68% of respondents strongly agree with the factor of quality of services. It is clear that most of the respondents are influenced by the factor of convenience.

**Table 8: Internet Banking Users by Application of Various Browsers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Type of Browser</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>MLP</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>NAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internet explorer</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Google Chrome</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mozilla Firefox</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Netscape</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Safari</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: MP - Most Preferred, P – Preferred, MLP – Most Likely to Preferred, LP – Least Preferred, NAP – Not At All Preferred)

Table 8 indicates various browsers used by internet banking customers. It shows that the least preferred browser was Internet Explorer with 66% not preferring it. 56% of the respondents preferred the Google chrome; whereas 82% of the respondents most preferred the Mozilla Firefox; Opera and Netscape were the least preferred browsers, whereas Safari was not preferred at all. It is clear that most preferred browser for Internet banking was Mozilla Firefox.
Table 9: Operating System Used for the Internet Banking Transaction and Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Type of Operating System</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th></th>
<th>MLP</th>
<th></th>
<th>LP</th>
<th></th>
<th>NAP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Window7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Window8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Linux Mint</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Linux Live CD</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ubuntu (Operating system for Desktop)</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Windows XP Professional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Macintosh OSX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Windows 8.1</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Windows XP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fedora</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Android</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: MP – Most Preferred, P – Preferred, MLP – Most Likely to Preferred, LP – Least Preferred, NAP – Not At All Preferred)

Table 9 indicates the various operating systems of Internet banking transaction and security. It shows that 58% of respondents prefer to use Windows 7 and 56% of respondents prefer to use Windows 8. It was found that Linux Live CD, Mac, Macintosh OSX, Android and Windows 8.1 operating systems were not at all preferred by the respondents; including Linux Mint, Ubuntu and Fedora, which were least preferred. 72% of the respondents most preferred to use Windows XP. It is clear most of the respondents preferred to use windows XP.

Table 10: Operating System updating and Security Patches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No. of Respondents</td>
<td>Percentage (In %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 indicates updating and security patches of operating system. It is reveals that 70% of the respondents are aware of updating with security patches. However, 22% of the respondents are not aware of the same.

Table 11: Anti-Malware Preference tools for using Internet Banking Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Type of Anti-Malware</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th></th>
<th>MLP</th>
<th></th>
<th>LP</th>
<th></th>
<th>NAP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anti-Virus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Firewall</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued...)
Table 11 indicates the various anti-malware tools of Internet banking security. It shows that 36% of the respondents prefer to use anti-virus and 54% of the respondents prefer to use firewall. It was founds that respondents least preferred to use Spyware Blaster and not at all preferred to use AVG anti-root kit, Comodo Firewall and Windows Defender. It is clear that most of the respondents prefer to use some type of firewall.

Table 12 indicates that frequency Internet banking transactions. It shows that, 26% of the respondents occasionally use the Internet banking; 66% of the respondents frequently use the Internet Banking; 6% of the respondents never using the Internet Banking; and 2% of the respondents very often to use Internet Banking.

Table 13 indicates frequency of changes in the Internet banking password. It shows that 44% of the respondents change their password monthly; 30% of the respondents change passwords quarterly; 22% of the respondents change passwords half yearly; 4% of the respondents change passwords on yearly basis. It is concluded that maximum respondents changing our password in monthly basis.
Table 14: Purpose for Using Internet Banking Services among the Selected Customer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Online Ticket Booking</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Online Bill Payment</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Balance Enquiry</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Request for Cheque Book</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Income Tax/TDS Payment</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Service Tax/Central Excise</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Insurance Premium Payment</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Online Shares Trading</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>TNEB Payments</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Online Shopping</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: SA – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, N – Neutral, D – Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree)

Table 14 indicates the purpose for using Internet banking services. It shows that 74% of the respondents use Internet banking for online ticket booking; 74% of the respondents use Internet banking for online bill payment; 72% for balance enquire; 44% for Income Tax Payment; 54% for TNEB Payments; and 56% for online shopping. It was also found that respondents do not use Internet banking for insurance premium payment and online shares trading. It is observed that maximum respondents use Internet banking for online ticket booking and online bill payment.

Table 15: Technical Problems and Difficulties While Using Internet Banking Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hacking Attacks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Phishing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Malware</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Illegal Activities</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Transaction Activities</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: SA – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, N – Neutral, D – Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree)

Table 15 indicates that technical problems and difficulties faced while using Internet banking. The following are the problems faced by the respondents: 50% - hacking attacks, 50% - Phishing attacks, 38% - Malware. It is concluded that maximum respondents face the problems of hacking attacks and phishing.
## Testing of the Hypothesis

### Test of Hypothesis – I

$H_{01}$: Internet banking has no significant relationship with traditional banking system.

### Table 16: Correlation between Internet Banking and Traditional Banking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>IWB</th>
<th>Dw</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>ATB</th>
<th>AWB</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>NQ</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>FR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.261</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.353*</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.346*</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.261</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>-0.239</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.353*</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>-0.286*</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.539*</td>
<td>0.520*</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.286*</td>
<td>0.539*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.764*</td>
<td>0.317*</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>0.520*</td>
<td>0.764*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.339*</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.298*</td>
<td>0.504*</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-0.298*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.334*</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued...)
The value of Pearson correlation range from -1 to +1 with negative numbers representing a negative correlation (as one variable increases, the other variable decreases) and positive numbers representing a positive correlation (as one variable increases, the other also increases). The closer the value is to -1 or +1 the stronger the association is between the variables. There is a positive relationship between the traditional banking system and Internet banking system. The above results do not show any significant association between traditional and Internet banking system. Therefore, the null hypothesis, H01, is accepted.

Test of Hypothesis – II

H02: Internet banking security has no significant impact on the customers

Table 17: Correlation between Internet Banking Security and its influencing factors
Results from Table 17 show that there is a significant and negative correlation between SCG and FS. There is also a negative and significant correlation between DS and FS. The above results show that Internet banking security has no significant impact on customers. Therefore, the null hypothesis, H02, is accepted.

**Model of the Study**

*Associate Relationship between Traditional Banking and Internet banking*

(Note: F1 = Traditional Banking, F2 = Internet Banking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P – Value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>PGFI/PCFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.508</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>1.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chi-Square ($\chi^2$) value of 46.508 with the 39 degree of freedom is significant at 5% significance level, as its p – value is 0.001. This finding suggests that model fits the data acceptably. Corroborating evidence is provided by the RMSEA fit statistics – the obtained value of 0.008 is less than the cutoff 0.08. Similarly, the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI)/CMIN - DF result of 1.193 is considerably above the 0.95 threshold denoting satisfactory model fit.

The acceptable threshold for the values of GFI, CFI and NFI should be greater than 0.90 and RMSEA are recommended up to 0.05 and acceptable up to 0.08 (Geffen, Straub & Boudreau, 2000). All the measures indicate an acceptable fit and exceed within the common acceptance levels as suggested by Hair et al (2006).

In the above Models F1 and F2 showing the scores observed on traditional banking and Internet banking respectively, causal effects are represented by single-headed arrows in the path diagram. F1 and F2 can be conceptualized as the variance the four indicators share (i.e. what the four indicators have in common). Since the chi – square test of absolute model fit is reported, along with its degrees of freedom and probability value.

### Findings of the Study

The major findings of the study is listed below -

1. 32% of the respondents were aware about security issues in Internet banking through advertisement whereas 18% of the respondents were made alert through their bankers.
2. 46% of the respondents were conscious of password protection security whereas 8% of the respondents were only attentive of authentication security.
3. 64% of the respondents believed that traditional banks were more secure whereas 12% of the respondents found the deposit and withdrawal system in traditional banks easy.
4. 94% of the respondents said that Internet banking saved their time and 86% of the respondents accepted that convenience was most influencing factor in using Internet banking.
5. 74% of the respondents were using Internet banking for the purpose of online ticket booking and bill payment.
6. 66% of the respondents used the services of electronic fund transfer in Internet banking.
7. 82% of the respondents use Mozilla Firefox was Internet banking browser and 72% of respondents use Windows XP as operating system.
8. 54% of the respondents use the firewall was Anti - Malware tools in Internet Banking security.
9. 66% of the respondents frequently use the Internet banking transaction and majority of them change their passwords monthly.
10. 50% of the respondents face the problems of hacking attacks and phishing attacks.

### Conclusion

To sum up, the current study analyzed the Internet banking customers in the Coimbatore district to understand various aspects of Internet banking services, and the concerns on security measures by the consumers. The outcome of the research work on the Internet banking helped to identify the precautionary checklist open to for a number of issues in the internet banking era. Furthermore, a supreme and powerful security policy employed by the banks and legislation instituted by local or state Governments should be in use and obligatory in order to improve
security in Internet banking systems. In addition, the banks should provide enhanced, new and improved hi-tech security measures such as Internet scam protection, hacking detector and anti-virus protections, etc. These upgrades can provide better discretion to both existing and prospective Internet banking customers.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study covers select customers of Indian Bank, ADU campus, Coimbatore and was purely based on available primary and secondary data. The sample size for the study was also limited to 50 customers. Further studies could be conducted with bigger sample size, so that results could be generalized.
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