

Association for Information Systems AIS Electronic Library (AISeL)

AMCIS 2001 Proceedings

Americas Conference on Information Systems
(AMCIS)

December 2001

An Empirical Study of the Interaction of Electronic Payment Systems in Mexico

Eduardo Jallath
Banco de México

Jose Negrin
Banco de México

Follow this and additional works at: <http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2001>

Recommended Citation

Jallath, Eduardo and Negrin, Jose, "An Empirical Study of the Interaction of Electronic Payment Systems in Mexico" (2001). *AMCIS 2001 Proceedings*. 299.
<http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2001/299>

This material is brought to you by the Americas Conference on Information Systems (AMCIS) at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in AMCIS 2001 Proceedings by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF THE INTERACTION OF ELECTRONIC PAYMENT SYSTEMS IN MEXICO

Eduardo S. Jallath
Banco de México
ejallath@banxico.org.mx

Jose L. Negrin
Banco de México
jlnegrin@banxico.org.mx

Abstract

This work proposes a model to analyze the interrelation that exists in the use of different payments mechanisms. It augments the traditional technology adoption models by defining a set of substitution and complementary effects among wholesale and retail payments. To test the model we use four years of data that include transactions of the most important non-cash payments mechanisms in Mexico. Preliminary results show an increasing importance of electronic transfers and debit card payments.

Introduction

The payment system structure at the international level has recently received increasing attention. Several studies have been carried out by institutions like the Bank for International Settlements and the Federal Reserve System [BIS, 2000, BIS, 1999, Weiner, 1999] attempting to determine the non-cash payment structure for some countries. Such studies have shown the growing importance of electronic payments. However, these studies have two limitations. First, they are mainly descriptive studies of the non-cash payments structure, leaving out the interactions –complementarities or substitutions- that may exist among payment systems. Second, they have concentrated on developed countries for which electronic payments are highly advanced and payment statistics are readily available. This paper attempts to extend the literature in both directions.

We consider it important to assess the structure of the payment systems in Mexico because it is a country where the financial system has limited depth. This lack of depth may represent a constraint for the development of electronic payments. We go a step beyond of the mere description of the structure by developing a model for Mexican non-cash payment systems. This model allows us to analyze the interrelations among selected non-cash payment mechanisms. We hypothesize that the adoption of a particular payment instrument is determined by the stage of technology adoption which this payment mechanism has reached and the existence of alternative means of payment.

Model

The literature on technology adoption has its roots in the traditional model proposed by Bass (1960) and has developed empirical applications along several strands [Mahajan et al, 1990]. One of these strands explains the technology diffusion process by using market level information; that is, adoption is explained by marketing expenses, prices of new products and the like. Another strand looks for consumer characteristics and explains adoption using variables such as individual income and education. For both strands of empirical applications, adoption is considered to be a function of time. The behavior of the time adoption curve can have several stages, ranging from early (slow adoption rate) to mature (no adoption or even negative adoption rate), passing through a dynamic adoption stage that occurs once a critical mass of users has been achieved. We apply this framework by identifying where in its adoption curve each cashless payment system is placed.

As we have mentioned, the actual process of adoption of a particular payment mechanism is affected by the existence of other payment instruments that may be substitutes or complements. For instance, in Mexico debit cards have been adopted very rapidly; however, only those clients that have a banking account –often a checking account- have a debit card. Hence, we expect a positive correlation between the use of debit cards and the use of checks. In this context we expect a positive sign on the regression to

indicate complementarity and a negative sign to indicate substitution. Table 1 describes the expected relationships among payment instruments and includes our entire set of hypotheses. As we can see in the table, in some cases, we do not expect an interaction and therefore the relationship will not be statistically significant.

To control for changes not attributed to the above model, we include some variables that measure economic activity, changes in the regulations and the number of accounts. In particular, we include sales at the retail level, the number of checking accounts and the number of debit and credit cards.

Table 1. Expected Interrelationships Among Payment Mechanisms

| | Wire Transfers | ACHs | Checks | Credit Cards | Debit Cards |
|----------------|----------------|------|--------|--------------|-------------|
| Wire Transfers | | - | - | NR | NR |
| ACHs | - | | - | NR | NR |
| Checks | - | - | | - | +/- |
| Credit Cards | NR | NR | - | | +/- |
| Debit Cards | NR | NR | -/+ | -/+ | |

- Substitute
 + Complement
 NR No Relationship

Data

We use monthly data from two sources. The first is the Mexican Central Bank. This data includes high-value wire-transfers, the Automated Clearing House (ACH), and check information. The second source is a company that operates one of the main credit and debit card switches. It includes credit card and debit card transactions, in both Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) and Points of Sale (POS). For each instrument we analyze data on both value and number of transactions from January 1997 to December 2000. We split the instruments analyzed into high volume and high value. Table 2 presents the cashless payment structure in Mexico for the high volume instruments. In terms of the total number of transactions, there is an important increase registered in the period; such an increase is not matched by an increase in the value of transactions. In terms of the structure of high volume transactions, debit cards and ACHs are rapidly becoming more relevant while checks and credit cards are losing ground.

Table 3 presents the structure for the high volume cashless Mexican instruments. In terms of total value, the system that performs stock and bonds transactions (SIDV) represents around 60% of the total value, while SPEUA (a system similar to Fedwire) represents around 30% of the total value.

Preliminary Results

Table 4 presents the results of the regressions that test our hypotheses about high volume instruments. In terms of the number of transactions, the coefficient of the time trend indicates that debit cards and ACH are at the expansionary stage of adoption, while checks and credit cards are in a mature stage of adoption. In the case of value of transactions, there is also an indication that ACH and debit cards are in an expansionary stage, credit cards are in a mature stage and checks are in the process of disadoption. In addition, debit cards seem to complement the use of checks in terms of number of transactions, while in terms of value, none of the relationships are statistically significant.

Table 2. Cashless High-Volume Payment Structure in Mexico

| | | Year | Checks | ACH | Credit Card | Debit Card | Total |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------|-------|-------------|------------|-------|
| Number of Transactions | Millions of Transactions | 1997 | 182 | 0.3 | 123 | 234 | 540 |
| | | 1998 | 196 | 0.7 | 123 | 446 | 766 |
| | | 1999 | 198 | 1.6 | 139 | 574 | 913 |
| | | 2000 | 196 | 4.5 | 155 | 667 | 1,022 |
| | | Annual Growth (%) | 2.4 | 137.6 | 8.1 | 41.7 | 23.7 |
| | Market Share (in percentage) | 1997 | 33.8 | 0.1 | 22.8 | 43.4 | 100 |
| | | 1998 | 25.5 | 0.1 | 16.1 | 58.3 | 100 |
| | | 1999 | 21.7 | 0.2 | 15.2 | 62.8 | 100 |
| | | 2000 | 19.1 | 0.4 | 15.2 | 65.2 | 100 |
| | | Annual Growth (%) | -17.3 | 92.1 | -12.6 | 14.6 | |
| Value of Transactions | Billions of Pesos* | 1997 | 2,798 | 29 | 83 | 230 | 3,139 |
| | | 1998 | 2,783 | 88 | 81 | 289 | 3,241 |
| | | 1999 | 2,688 | 102 | 86 | 359 | 3,235 |
| | | 2000 | 2,724 | 170 | 104 | 407 | 3,405 |
| | | Annual Growth (%) | -0.9 | 80.9 | 8.2 | 20.9 | 2.7 |
| | Market Share (in percentage) | 1997 | 89.1 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 7.3 | 100 |
| | | 1998 | 85.8 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 8.9 | 100 |
| | | 1999 | 83.1 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 11.1 | 100 |
| | | 2000 | 80.0 | 5.0 | 3.1 | 11.9 | 100 |
| | | Annual Growth (%) | -3.5 | 76.0 | 5.3 | 17.7 | |

* Figures in constant pesos of December 2000.
Source: Banco de Mexico and Prosa.

Table 3. Cashless High-Value Payment Structure in Mexico

| | | Year | SPEUA | SIAC | SIDV | Total |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| Number of Transactions | Millions of Transactions | 1997 | 2.27 | 0.25 | n.a. | 2.53 |
| | | 1998 | 2.90 | 0.22 | n.a. | 3.12 |
| | | 1999 | 3.22 | 0.15 | n.a. | 3.37 |
| | | 2000 | 3.65 | 0.15 | n.a. | 3.80 |
| | | Annual Growth (%) | 17.0 | -15.7 | n.a. | 14.6 |
| | Market Share (in percentage) | 1997 | 90.04 | 9.96 | n.a. | 100.00 |
| | | 1998 | 93.04 | 6.96 | n.a. | 100.00 |
| | | 1999 | 95.50 | 4.50 | n.a. | 100.00 |
| | | 2000 | 96.03 | 3.97 | n.a. | 100.00 |
| | | Annual Growth (%) | 2.2 | -26.4 | n.a. | |
| Value of Transactions | Billions of Pesos* | 1997 | 76,226 | 21,293 | 149,204 | 246,723 |
| | | 1998 | 90,130 | 24,304 | 146,353 | 260,787 |
| | | 1999 | 74,410 | 27,354 | 151,175 | 252,939 |
| | | 2000 | 77,684 | 21,785 | 161,628 | 261,097 |
| | | Annual Growth (%) | 0.6 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 1.9 |
| | Market Share (in percentage) | 1997 | 30.90 | 8.63 | 60.47 | 100.00 |
| | | 1998 | 34.56 | 9.32 | 56.12 | 100.00 |
| | | 1999 | 29.42 | 10.81 | 59.77 | 100.00 |
| | | 2000 | 29.75 | 8.34 | 61.90 | 100.00 |
| | | Annual Growth (%) | -1.2 | -1.1 | 0.8 | |

* Figures in constant pesos of December 2000.
Source: Banco de Mexico and INDEVAL.

Table 4.

| HIGH VOLUME | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| | Number of Transactions | | | | Transactions Value | | | | |
| | interbank payment | check | credit card | debit card | interbank payment | check | credit card | debit card | |
| (Intercept) | 63.627 (49.232) | 6658.322 *** (2422.712) | 1057.763 (4388.803) | -14318.732 (9128.740) | -7.213 (6.813) | 75.076 *** (18.300) | -6.254 ** (2.555) | -3.415 (4.481) | |
| time | 6.308 *** (0.696) | -30.168 (87.478) | 33.372 (33.342) | 1013.102 *** (85.686) | 0.260 ** (0.108) | -1.244 ** (0.555) | -0.002 (0.013) | 0.282 *** (0.046) | |
| interbank payment | | -6.254 (9.084) | | | | 0.414 (0.715) | | | |
| check | -0.004 (0.004) | | 0.175 (0.119) | 1.403 * (0.737) | 0.018 (0.057) | | 0.008 (0.007) | -0.003 (0.040) | |
| credit card | | 0.532 * (0.307) | | -0.219 (1.151) | | 6.421 (4.624) | | 0.509 (0.888) | |
| debit card | | 0.026 (0.052) | -0.006 (0.028) | | | -0.277 (0.906) | 0.052 (0.036) | | |
| atm | | -0.040 (0.069) | | | | -1.040 (3.244) | | | |
| retail | 1.274 *** (0.356) | 29.475 (25.329) | 52.920 *** (11.193) | 92.692 (91.695) | 0.019 (0.078) | 0.928 * (0.467) | 0.040 *** (0.013) | 0.173 ** (0.071) | |
| checking accounts | -11.853 *** (3.385) | 172.727 (189.092) | | | 0.141 (0.431) | 2.678 (1.874) | | | |
| credit card number | | | 0.168 (0.599) | | | | 0.001 ** (0.000) | | |
| R ² | 0.871 | 0.631 | 0.755 | 0.909 | 0.595 | 0.792 | 0.856 | 0.873 | |

*** 1% significance, ** 5% significance, * 10% significance

References

- Bank for International Settlements. Clearing and Settlement arrangements for Retail Payments in Selected Countries, Basle, Switzerland, September 2000.
- Bank for International Settlements. Retail Payments in Selected Countries: A Comparative Study, Basle, Switzerland, September 1999.
- Bank for International Settlements. Statistics on Payments Systems in a Group of Ten Countries, Basle, Switzerland, December 1998.
- Belton, Terrence M. "Daylight Overdrafts and the Payment System Risk", *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, November 1998.
- VanHoose, David D.; Sellon, Gordon H. "Daylight Overdrafts, Payments System Risk, and Public Policy", *Economic Review*, September-October 1989.
- Vijay, M., E. Muller and F.M. Bass. "New Product Diffusion Models in Marketing: a Review and Directions for Research", *Journal of Marketing*, V. 54, 1990, pp.1-26.
- Weiner, Stuart "Electronic Payments in the U.S. Economy: An Overview", *Economic Review, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City*, Fourth Quarter 1999, pp.1-12.