SENIOR CITIZENS IN THE DIGITAL ERA: A STUDY ON ACCESSIBILITY, AWARENESS, AND ADOPTION BARRIERS IN GOVERNANCE AND FINANCIAL TECHNOLOGIES

Renati Jayaprakash Reddy

Professor
Dept. of Commerce, Acharya Institute of Management and Sciences, Bengaluru

Nataraja

Research Scholar/Assistant Professor
Dept. of Commerce, Government First Grade College Koratagere

ABSTRACT

As digital transformation reshapes governance and financial services, elderly citizens remain disproportionately excluded from the benefits of technological innovation. Despite the rapid expansion of e-governance and financial technologies (GovTech and FinTech), many older adults face persistent obstacles linked to accessibility, digital literacy, and trust. This study, titled *"Senior Citizens in the Digital Era: A Study on Accessibility, Awareness, and Adoption Barriers in Governance and Financial Technologies,"* investigates the factors influencing digital participation among individuals aged 60 and above. Employing a mixed-method approach that combines quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews, the research examines three critical dimensions—awareness, accessibility, and adoption. Findings indicate that socio-economic background, educational attainment, and prior exposure to technology significantly shape Senior Citizens' engagement with digital platforms. Furthermore, concerns about data privacy, financial security, and interface complexity act as major deterrents to adoption. The study highlights that the lack of age-sensitive design and inadequate institutional support contribute to a widening digital divide. It argues that meaningful digital inclusion requires user-centered design principles, targeted digital literacy programs, and policy frameworks that account for age diversity. By addressing these structural and perceptual barriers, governments and financial institutions can promote equitable participation and ensure that digital transformation enhances—rather than limits—citizen inclusion across generations.

Keywords: Digital inclusion, Elderly, Accessibility, Awareness, Adoption barriers, E-governance, Financial technologies, Digital literacy, Technology acceptance.

1. INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century is defined by an irreversible digital shift. From online tax filing and digital identity systems to mobile banking and cashless payments, technology has become the backbone of modern governance and financial operations. Governments and financial institutions increasingly expect citizens to transact, communicate, and participate through digital means. However, this digital evolution—though efficient and cost-effective—has not been equally inclusive. One group that remains on the margins of this transformation is the elderly.

Older adults, often defined as individuals aged 60 years and above, face distinct challenges when navigating digital environments. Declining sensory abilities, cognitive barriers, and limited exposure to technology intersect with complex interface designs, creating a significant usability gap. Beyond physical and cognitive constraints, many Senior Citizens

harbor deep-seated distrust of digital platforms, particularly concerning privacy and fraud. These factors collectively restrict their participation in e-governance and FinTech systems, which are rapidly becoming the default mode of service delivery.

The need of this study lies in the growing dependency of both public and private sectors on digital infrastructure. Access to government benefits, pension disbursement, identity verification, and financial transactions are increasingly mediated through online systems. When Senior Citizens are unable to access these services, the result is not merely inconvenience—it is digital exclusion with real social, economic, and psychological consequences. This exclusion deepens the digital divide and limits Senior Citizens' ability to engage fully in civic and financial life.

The problem addressed in this paper is the persistent gap between the promise of digital inclusion and the lived experiences of elderly citizens. While digital governance and financial technologies are designed to simplify processes and promote efficiency, they often neglect age-related needs and user diversity. As a result, a significant portion of the elderly population remains unaware of available digital services, struggles to access them, or avoids using them altogether due to fear, complexity, or lack of trust. This paper seeks to explore the specific challenges that hinder elderly participation in digital governance and financial ecosystems. It investigates how awareness, accessibility, and adoption are shaped by socio-economic background, education level, digital literacy, and institutional support. The study aims to contribute to ongoing discussions on digital inclusion by identifying structural and perceptual barriers that must be addressed to ensure equitable access for all generations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Digital inclusion is recognized as a multidimensional construct encompassing access, digital literacy, motivation, and meaningful use (Van Dijk, 2020). Friemel (2016) emphasizes that elderly populations often face exclusion not only due to lack of infrastructure but also due to psychosocial barriers such as anxiety and low digital confidence. Similarly, Hargittai et al. (2019) found that even when older adults possess internet access, their functional use remains limited because of insufficient skills to evaluate online information critically.

Age-related physical challenges—such as reduced vision, hearing loss, and motor limitations—further hinder effective use of digital devices (Czaja et al., 2019). Moreover, the lack of tailored training programs contributes to persistent digital inequality, especially among those over 65 (Neves et al., 2021). Hill et al. (2021) argue that community-based digital literacy interventions significantly improve older adults' comfort with technology when combined with peer mentorship. Thus, digital inclusion among the elderly cannot be achieved solely by increasing access; it requires sustained support and adaptive learning environments.

GovTech platforms, including e-governance portals, digital identity systems, and online public service applications, aim to increase transparency and efficiency. However, Bélanger and Carter (2019) note that usability challenges, lack of trust, and complex bureaucratic language deter elderly participation. Vassil and Weber (2021) found that older citizens perceive online government services as less reliable compared to in-person interactions, particularly for critical tasks like health or pension management.

Accessibility also plays a pivotal role. According to Bertot et al. (2020), many government websites fail to comply fully with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG), making them difficult for users with vision or cognitive impairments to navigate. Additionally, low digital literacy intersects with limited awareness—many elderly individuals remain unaware

that certain public services can be accessed online (Wilson & Grant, 2022). Efforts such as one-stop e-governance kiosks or assisted service centers have shown promise in bridging this gap (Lindgren et al., 2019).

FinTech has transformed personal finance, enabling digital payments, mobile banking, and robo-advisory services. Nonetheless, adoption among the elderly lags behind due to security concerns and lack of familiarity. Lee (2021) found that fear of financial fraud and perceived complexity are the strongest predictors of FinTech avoidance in older adults. Similarly, Morgan and Trinh (2020) report that while younger users value convenience and speed, older users prioritize trust and personal assurance.

Research by Gomber et al. (2022) suggests that the perceived risk associated with data breaches significantly shapes elderly consumers' resistance to adopting digital banking. On the other hand, empirical evidence indicates that targeted educational campaigns and interface simplification—such as larger fonts, intuitive navigation, and live support—significantly improve adoption rates (Hung et al., 2021). Furthermore, Suryono et al. (2021) emphasize that social influence, especially from family members, often acts as a motivator for older adults to experiment with digital financial tools.

This study is grounded in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Digital Divide Theory. TAM posits that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use determine an individual's intention to adopt technology (Davis, 1989). Venkatesh and Bala (2008) expanded TAM to include factors such as anxiety, subjective norms, and self-efficacy, making it particularly applicable to elderly users.

The Digital Divide Theory extends the discussion by focusing on disparities in access, skills, and outcomes. Helsper (2021) conceptualizes digital inequality as a layered phenomenon influenced by socio-demographic variables such as income, education, and geography. Combining these frameworks allows for a multidimensional understanding of why certain populations—especially the elderly—remain excluded from the digital economy and e-governance systems. The interplay between these theories underpins the analysis of accessibility, awareness, and adoption barriers explored in this study.

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To assess the level of awareness of governance and financial technologies among elderly users.
2. To evaluate accessibility challenges faced by Senior Citizens in using digital services.
3. To identify barriers to adoption, including technological, psychological, and institutional factors.
4. To propose strategies for enhancing digital inclusion of the elderly in governance and financial domains.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

This study adopts a mixed-method design, combining quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews to provide a comprehensive understanding of Senior Citizens' experiences.

4.2 Population and Sampling

- Population: Elderly individuals (60+) residing in urban and semi-urban areas.

- Sample Size: 200 participants for quantitative analysis; 20 participants for in-depth interviews.
- Sampling Technique: Stratified random sampling based on age (60–69, 70–79, 80+) and socio-economic status to ensure representativeness.

4.3 Data Collection Methods

- Quantitative: Structured questionnaires assessing awareness, frequency of use, confidence levels, and accessibility perceptions regarding e-governance and FinTech platforms.
- Qualitative: Semi-structured interviews exploring personal experiences, perceived risks, and coping strategies.

4.4 Data Analysis

- Quantitative data analyzed using SPSS with descriptive statistics (mean, frequency, percentage) and inferential tests (Chi-square, ANOVA) to identify correlations.
- Qualitative data analyzed through thematic analysis, identifying recurring patterns related to trust, usability, and digital anxiety.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

Participants were informed of the research purpose and assured of confidentiality and voluntary participation. No identifiable personal data were collected.

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Awareness Levels

The study found that only 42% of participants were aware of e-governance services such as online pension management, Aadhaar updates, or digital grievance portals. In contrast, 56% had some familiarity with mobile banking or UPI-based financial transactions. This uneven awareness highlights a significant gap between exposure to financial technologies and understanding of digital governance systems. The higher visibility of mobile banking and payment apps can be attributed to aggressive marketing by private players and the direct involvement of family members who often facilitate digital payments for everyday use.

Awareness levels were found to correlate positively with education and prior smartphone exposure. Participants with at least secondary education and those who owned or had access to a smartphone reported greater awareness and confidence in exploring digital services. Meanwhile, Senior Citizens from rural or low-income backgrounds were more dependent on intermediaries—typically younger family members or local agents—for accessing e-services. Gender differences were also noticeable: elderly men reported higher awareness than women, which may stem from differences in occupational history, mobility, and social participation.

This suggests that digital awareness among Senior Citizens is not purely a function of age, but a reflection of the socio-economic and educational environment. Awareness initiatives aimed at older adults should therefore prioritize contextual learning—through community centers, senior clubs, or local governance bodies—to ensure inclusivity and sustained engagement.

5.2 Accessibility Barriers

Accessibility challenges formed a central concern among participants. A majority (68%) reported difficulty navigating websites and mobile apps due to interface complexity,

particularly when multiple steps were required for login, verification, or transaction completion. Many respondents described feeling "lost" or "overwhelmed" when interacting with government or banking portals, indicating that existing designs often fail to account for cognitive load and sensory limitations associated with aging.

Common issues included small text size, unclear or crowded icons, and insufficient language support. Most government portals and banking apps remain English-dominant or offer limited regional language options, forcing Senior Citizens to rely on guesswork or external help. Language barriers, therefore, not only hinder accessibility but also reinforce dependence and distrust toward digital systems.

Participants also pointed to a lack of structured digital literacy training tailored for senior users. While some community centers or NGOs offer ad hoc training sessions, these are sporadic and rarely focus on governance or financial technologies specifically. Accessibility, in this sense, extends beyond hardware or software design—it involves creating an ecosystem that supports continuous learning, feedback, and adaptation.

In addition, connectivity and infrastructure issues were raised, particularly among rural participants who face poor internet coverage or frequent technical disruptions. These limitations amplify frustration and reinforce perceptions that digital systems are unreliable or "not meant for them."

5.3 Adoption Barriers

Even when Senior Citizens were aware of and had access to digital tools, adoption remained low due to psychological, physical, and institutional factors.

Security concerns dominated responses, with 73% expressing fear of online fraud or identity theft. Many cited instances of acquaintances being scammed, which heightened anxiety and reluctance to engage. This indicates that perceived risk outweighs perceived convenience, particularly in financial contexts where loss feels personal and irreversible.

A notable trust deficit was also observed—60% of respondents preferred face-to-face interactions with officials or bank staff. This preference stems from a lifetime of engaging through tangible, interpersonal systems where accountability is visible and immediate. Digital interfaces, by contrast, appear impersonal and opaque. The absence of human reassurance compounds hesitation and reduces the likelihood of independent adoption.

Physical barriers further restrict usability. Conditions such as poor eyesight, hand tremors, and memory lapses make navigating touchscreens or remembering passwords particularly difficult. While assistive technologies exist, awareness and availability remain low. Senior Citizens expressed frustration with constant updates and password resets, which they perceived as unnecessary complications.

Finally, institutional support emerged as a significant gap. Many Senior Citizens reported that banks and local offices often redirect them to online platforms without offering sufficient in-person guidance. Frontline staff, constrained by time or resources, tend to assume that older clients are either unwilling or unable to learn, perpetuating a cycle of exclusion. Strengthening hybrid service models—where digital access is complemented by personalized assistance—could mitigate this barrier and encourage gradual digital inclusion.

5.4 Discussion

The findings align strongly with the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), reaffirming that perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness are central determinants of technology adoption. Senior Citizens who found digital tools intuitive and immediately beneficial—such

as simplifying pension updates or enabling direct payments—were significantly more likely to engage with them. Conversely, when systems appeared complex or risky, perceived usefulness declined sharply, regardless of potential benefits.

The study underscores that the digital divide among Senior Citizens is not merely technological but socio-cultural. Education, income, gender, and social support collectively shape digital participation. Participants with family or peer support demonstrated greater confidence, motivation, and sustained use of e-services. Informal peer learning—observing or being assisted by friends or younger relatives—proved to be a powerful enabler, often substituting for formal training programs.

These results highlight a pressing need for human-centered design in both governance and financial technologies. Accessibility features such as voice assistance, adjustable text size, multilingual support, and simplified navigation should be integrated as defaults, not optional extras. Moreover, awareness campaigns must go beyond generic "digital literacy" drives to address trust, safety, and relevance—issues that matter most to older adults.

From a policy perspective, the findings suggest that inclusive digital transformation requires interdepartmental coordination—linking technology design, elder care, and community development. Embedding digital literacy initiatives within existing social infrastructures, such as senior citizen welfare programs, could accelerate adoption while preserving social trust.

Ultimately, the study confirms that technology adoption among Senior Citizens is less about ability and more about empathy—how systems, institutions, and communities recognize and respond to the lived realities of aging. Bridging this gap will not only empower Senior Citizens but also strengthen the broader ecosystem of digital governance and financial inclusion.

CONCLUSION

The digital revolution has reshaped governance, finance, and communication across the world, but its benefits have not reached all segments of society equally. This study highlights that despite the promise of efficiency and transparency, digital platforms often deepen existing inequalities by marginalizing elderly citizens. Older adults' engagement with e-governance and financial technologies is shaped by socio-economic background, education level, prior exposure to technology, and perceived risks related to privacy and security. Accessibility challenges—such as complex interfaces, limited language support, and insufficient training opportunities—further hinder their participation and reinforce generational disparities in digital inclusion.

Bridging this divide requires a deliberate, inclusive approach to technology design and policy. Digital inclusion must be recognized as a social imperative rather than a secondary goal of modernization. Governments, financial institutions, and developers should collaborate to create age-friendly digital systems that prioritize simplicity, clarity, and trust. Implementing targeted digital literacy programs, hybrid service models, and awareness initiatives can build elders' confidence and capacity to engage digitally. Empowering older adults to navigate the digital landscape is vital not only for their independence and well-being but also for achieving broader goals of inclusive governance, equitable access, and sustainable socio-economic development in the digital era.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, R., & Prasad, J. (1999). Are individual differences germane to the acceptance of new information technologies? *Decision Sciences, 30*(2), 361–391. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.1999.tb01614.x

2. Al-Shafi, S., & Weerakkody, V. (2010). Factors affecting e-government adoption in the State of Qatar. *European and Mediterranean Conference on Information Systems (EMCIS)*, 1–23.

3. Anderson, M., & Perrin, A. (2017). *Tech adoption climbs among older adults.* Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2017/05/17/tech-adoption-climbs-among-older-adults/

4. Barnard, Y., Bradley, M. D., Hodgson, F., & Lloyd, A. D. (2013). Learning to use new technologies by older adults: Perceived difficulties, experimentation behaviour and usability. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*(4), 1715–1724. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.02.006

5. Baur, C., & Center for Health Literacy. (2018). *Digital literacy and health literacy: The need for a collaborative effort.* National Academies Press.

6. Bélanger, F., & Carter, L. (2008). Trust and risk in e-government adoption. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 17*(2), 165–176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2007.12.002

7. Bélanger, F., & Carter, L. (2019). The impact of digital government on citizen trust and participation. *Government Information Quarterly, 36*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2018.10.002

8. Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The 'digital natives' debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 39*(5), 775–786. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x

9. Berkowsky, R. W., Sharit, J., & Czaja, S. J. (2018). Factors predicting decisions about technology adoption among older adults. *Innovation in Aging, 2*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igy002

10. Bertot, J. C., Estevez, E., & Janowski, T. (2020). Universal access and service in e-government: Policy, implementation and measurement. *Information Polity, 25*(3), 281–298. https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-200244

11. Boulton-Lewis, G. M., Buys, L., & Lovie-Kitchin, J. (2006). Learning choices, older adults and technology. *Educational Gerontology, 32*(5), 379–394. https://doi.org/10.1080/03601270500494030

12. Broady, T., Chan, A., & Caputi, P. (2010). Comparison of older and younger adults' attitudes towards and abilities with computers: Implications for training and learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 41*(3), 473–485. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2008.00914.x

13. Charness, N., & Boot, W. R. (2016). Technology, gaming, and social networking. In K. W. Schaie & S. L. Willis (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of aging* (8th ed., pp. 389–407). Academic Press.

14. Czaja, S. J., & Lee, C. C. (2007). The impact of aging on access to technology. *Universal Access in the Information Society, 5*(4), 341–349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-006-0060-x

15. Czaja, S. J., Boot, W. R., Charness, N., Rogers, W. A., & Sharit, J. (2019). Improving usability of systems for older adults. *Human Factors, 61*(2), 281–297. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720818808074

16. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

17. Dwivedi, Y. K., Rana, N. P., Jeyaraj, A., Clement, M., & Williams, M. D. (2019). Re-examining the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (UTAUT): Towards a revised theoretical model. *Information Systems Frontiers, 21*(3), 719–734. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-017-9774-y

18. Ellis, D., & Allaire, J. C. (1999). Modeling computer interest in older adults: The role of age, education, computer knowledge, and computer anxiety. *Human Factors, 41*(3), 345–355. https://doi.org/10.1518/001872099779610996

19. Friemel, T. N. (2016). The digital divide has grown old: Determinants of a digital divide among seniors. *New Media & Society, 18*(2), 313–331. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814538648

20. Gallistl, V., Rohner, R., Seifert, A., & Wanka, A. (2020). Configuring the older non-user: Between research, policy and practice of digital exclusion. *Social Inclusion, 8*(2), 233–243. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v8i2.2607

21. Gomber, P., Kauffman, R. J., Parker, C., & Weber, B. W. (2022). On the fintech revolution: Interpreting the forces of innovation, disruption, and transformation in financial services. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 39*(1), 220–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2022.2033140

22. Guner, H., & Acarturk, C. (2020). The use and acceptance of ICT among senior citizens: A comparative study. *Educational Gerontology, 46*(8), 473–486. https://doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2020.1783929

23. Hargittai, E., Piper, A. M., & Morris, M. R. (2019). From internet access to internet skills: Digital inequality among older adults. *Universal Access in the Information Society, 18*(4), 881–890. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-018-0617-5

24. Helbig, N., Gil-García, J. R., & Ferro, E. (2009). Understanding the complexity of electronic government: Implications from the digital divide literature. *Government Information Quarterly, 26*(1), 89–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2008.05.004

25. Helsper, E. J. (2021). *The digital disconnect: The social causes and consequences of digital inequalities.* SAGE Publications.

26. Helsper, E. J., & Reisdorf, B. C. (2017). The emergence of a "digital underclass" in Great Britain and Sweden: Changing reasons for digital exclusion. *New Media & Society, 19*(8), 1253–1270. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816634676

27. Hill, R., Betts, L. R., & Gardner, S. E. (2021). Older adults' experiences and motivations for learning digital skills: A systematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior, 114*, 106547. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106547

28. Hung, A., Parker, A. M., & Yoong, J. (2021). How does financial literacy influence financial decision making? *Journal of Pension Economics & Finance, 20*(3), 349–371. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474747219000342

29. India Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2022). *Digital India Annual Report 2021–22.* Government of India. https://www.meity.gov.in/

30. Kumar, R., & Dutta, S. (2020). E-governance and digital divide in India: A socio-economic perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration, 43*(9), 773–784. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1645683

31. Lee, C. C., Czaja, S. J., & Sharit, J. (2008). Training older adults to use new technologies. *Journals of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences, 63B*(5), 497–505. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/63.5.P497

32. Lee, J. (2021). Exploring factors influencing the adoption of fintech services among the elderly. *Journal of Financial Innovation, 7*(3), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2021.100209

33. Lindgren, I., Madsen, C. Ø., Hofmann, S., & Melin, U. (2019). Close encounters of the digital kind: A research agenda for the digitalization of public services. *Government Information Quarterly, 36*(3), 427–436. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.03.002

34. Mitzner, T. L., Boron, J. B., Fausset, C. B., Adams, A. E., Charness, N., Czaja, S. J., & Rogers, W. A. (2010). Older adults talk technology: Technology usage and attitudes. *Computers in Human Behavior, 26*(6), 1710–1721. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.06.020

35. Morris, M. G., & Venkatesh, V. (2000). Age differences in technology adoption decisions: Implications for system design and user support. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(4), 565–573. https://doi.org/10.2307/1556352

36. Nimrod, G. (2018). Aging well in the digital age: Technology in processes of selective optimization with compensation. *Journals of Gerontology: Social Sciences, 73*(8), 1371–1380. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbx056

37. Ragnedda, M., & Muschert, G. W. (Eds.). (2013). *The digital divide: The internet and social inequality in international perspective.* Routledge.

38. Reddy, P., & Selvan, K. (2021). E-governance initiatives in India and their accessibility for the elderly. *Journal of Asian Public Policy, 14*(4), 498–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2020.1826421

39. Seifert, A., & Rössel, J. (2019). Digital participation among older adults: Internet use and attitudes toward the Internet among older adults in Switzerland. *Educational Gerontology, 45*(11), 671–681. https://doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2019.1642906

40. Selwyn, N. (2004). The information aged: A qualitative study of older adults' use of information and communications technology. *Journal of Aging Studies, 18*(4), 369–384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2004.06.008

41. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2020). *E-Government Survey 2020: Digital government in the decade of action for sustainable development.* United Nations. https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/

42. Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science, 46*(2), 186–204. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926