Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences
Volume 4, No. 4.4 Quarter IV 2013
ISSN: 2229 – 5313

SHIFTING POLICY PARADIGM FROM CASH-BASED ECONOMY TO CASHLESS ECONOMY: THE NIGERIA EXPERIENCE

Princewell N Achor
Public Relations and Management Consultant, McStallon Consult, Enugu, Nigeria
Anuforo Robert
Department of Marketing, Micheal Opkara University, Umudike, Nigeria

ABSTRACT
This paper examines issues in economic policy drift in payment systems with reference to Nigeria's shift from a cash-based economy to a cashless society. Since the gradual introduction of the cashless policy, stakeholders are divided along divergent views. Using survey method, the study sampled 650 stakeholders (respondents) comprising Businessmen, University Students, and civil servants. Results show that majority of the stakeholders support the policy. Key reason why they support the policy is because of its potential in reducing cash-related robberies, corruption, and other fraudulent practices among others. On the other hand stakeholders who are against the policy shift hinged their reasons on payment fraud associated with the cashless economy; high rate of illiteracy and infrastructural decay in Nigeria. It is recommended that massification of cashless literacy be encouraged across the strata of Nigerian population. Stakeholders must be engaged by relevant implementing authorities of the policy shift through demonstration enlightenment sessions, seminars and workshops. Not-literate or less literate Nigerians should be taught in the dialect they understand if they are to key into the cashless system.

Keywords: policy shift, cash-based, payment system, cashless economy, Nigerian economy

1. Introduction

Globally, economic policy drift and/or a shift in policy paradigm is usually necessitated by a need to address certain perceived anomalies in the economic landscape. Policy switch is a function of prevailing circumstance which experts believe must have potential to drive the entire process of economic transformation or change. It must also impact positively on human development indicators. Some economic policies are either completely phased out or modified largely due to inherent problems associated with their modus operandi. In global setting, payment system is one of such policies that have undergone substantial change. Over the course of history, different forms of payment systems have been in existence. Initially, trade by barter was common. However, the problems of barter such as the double coincidence of wants necessitated the introduction of various forms of money. This era became the cash-based economy, which most countries are gradually phasing out, modified or integrating into a new cash-less-based system (Daniel, Swartz & Fermar (2004). Nevertheless, pundits have been predicting the complete demise of study instruments and the emergence of potentially superior substitute for cash or monetary exchanges, that is cashless society (Odior & Banuso, 2012, Nweke 2012),. Recent development in technology for financial transaction has increasingly fuelled the use of electronic-based payment instruments globally.

In advanced economy like the United States, the use of cash for purchasing consumption goods has declined since 1980 (Humphrey, 2004). Most less Developed Countries (LDCs) like Nigeria are on the transition from a pure cash economy to cash-less one for developmental purposes. To fast tract this transition or policy shift, the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) recently introduced a cashless policy. According to CBN (2012) a key reason for the introduction of the cashless policy is to drive development and modernization of Niger’s payment system in line with Nigeria’s vision 2020 goal of being amongst the top 20 economies by the year 2020. It is a truism that an efficient and modern payment system is a key enabler for economic growth and must positively correlate with economic development. Another key reason for this policy adoption is basically to reduce the cost of banking services (including cost of credit) and drive financial inclusion by providing more efficient transaction options and greater reach and to improve the effectiveness of monetary policy in managing inflation and driving economic growth. Also the policy aims at curbing some of the negative consequences associated with the high usage of physical cash in the economy.

Inspite of these reasons advanced by CBN, key economic stakeholders have expressed mixed feelings towards the policy drift. While some stakeholders applauded CBN for the initiative, others are skeptical about it success given failures of past of policy initiations in Nigeria. Recall that since Nigeria’s Independence in 1960, there have been different governments, constitutional reforms, change in economic policies and banking reforms, mainly directed at enhancing social welfare and achieving developmental goals but there has been no substantial positive change in Nigeria's Human Development Indicators (Odior & Banuso, 2012). Nigeria's preparedness in adopting this new policy has been questioned by stakeholders given her socio-cultural milieu and other social vices associated with electronic payments that drive the cashless policy.

Against the background, the study seeks to critically assess stakeholders' views/opinions on the purported benefits or otherwise of cashless policy/economy with a view to ascertaining stakeholders stand on this policy drift from a cash-based economy to cashless one. Based on the above, the objectives of the study include: to identify different stakeholder groups' stand on the policy drift from cash-based economy to a cashless one; to identify their reasons for supporting or against the policy drift; and to harmonies these divergent stakeholders opinions for enhanced stakeholder engagement, education and cashless literacy.

2. Literature Review

Literature is reviewed in three strands for proper examination of all facets of the subject matter. First, attention is being paid to both theoretical and empirical review of literature. In this strand a review of evolution of conventional money is presented followed by empirical study. Strand two is a presentation on contemporary studies in global cash-less payment; and structure of Nigeria's payment systems. The third strand gives a brief review of the recent introduction of cash less policy.

2.1 Evolution of Conventional Money

Money performs a number of roles in economic activity: it is a unit of account, store of value, medium of exchange and means of deferred payment. Over the centuries, money has evolved as a means to minimize the friction of transaction costs that are involved in mediating exchange. For example, conducting economic transaction in barter economies involved high transaction costs as considerable time and effort was required in finding suitable partner (Odior & Banus, 2012). Hence, finding the suitable partner gave rise to the development of the very first monetary products. Beyond resolving problems of barter system, another aspect in the evolution of money, experts noted was the need for fungibility and divisibility, (Ajayi & Ojo, 2006). The advent of notes and coins (money) made the process less costly by allowing people specialize in production based on their strengths and by enabling the monetary authorities to mint coins in convenient denominations, thereby creating divisibility

(Baddeley, 2004; Ajayi & Ojo, 2006). Presently there has been policy shift/drift towards electronic money. Basel Committee (1998); BIS (1996) expressed the difficult in rightly defining the electronic money but agree that it blends technological and economic characteristics. Other renowned institutions and experts have tried to define concept of electronic money which they all believe is the backbone of the cashless economy. For ECB (1998), electronic money is broadly defined as an electronic store of money value on a technical device that maybe widely used for making payments to undertakings other than the issuer without necessarily involving bank accounts in the transactions, but acting as a prepaid bearer instrument.

Costa and De Grauwe (2001) provided a definition that is analogous to that of cashless economy. To Costa and De Grauwe cashless economy is an economy where there exist no notes and coins issued by central banks but by private financial institutions. Better put, a cashless society is a regime in which currency issued by the central bank has ceased to exist. All the money is private money issued by banks in the form of deposits, or some fancier e-money issued by institutions that are not necessarily banks. Cashless economy does not refer to an outright absence of cash transactions in the economic setting but one in which the amount of cash-based transactions are reduced to the barest minimum.

However, a synthesis of scholarly attempts presents a comprehensive evaluation of cashless banking implications in developing countries. In these scholarly attempts or studies often ignored are economic benefits of the cashless system. Others too present incomplete assessment of its negative implications. This anomaly may be attributable to unreliable data for monetary and macroeconomic indicators. It must be noted here that it is difficult to translate cashless studies from one country to another. Anchoring on this truism, Daniel et al (2004) note that payment instrument that look similar across countries on the surface may be different due to historical and legal variations. Fisher (1996) and Patinkin (1965) in their studies attempted to explain the root cause of price indeterminacy which posed problem in the early beginnings of the transition from barter to money/cash – based system.

From the pioneering works of fisher (1996) and Patinkin (1965) it was established that for any given real demand for money, there are infinitely many combinations of money stock and price levels that will do the job of bringing about money market equilibrium. For the reason, economic agents do not care whether additional money desires are realized by increases in money stock or declines in price level.

2.2 Review on Global Payment Systems

A solid platform on which; further discussions on cash and non cash payment was raised in the preceding section. Here, more attempts to explore the payment system globally are made in order to unravel some theoretical underpinnings of shifting policy paradigm. Humphrey and Berger (1990) did one of the earliest attempts or study that comprehensively estimated the private and social costs of nine separate payment instruments – cash, cheques, credit cards, money orders, point of sale (POS), Automated Clearing House Transfer (ACH), ATM bill payments, travelers' cheques and wire transfers. From a social cost perspective they discovered that cash is the cheapest payment instrument, followed by ACH, POS and ATM bill payment. Also, from private point of view, cheques emerge as the cheapest payment method followed by cash, ACH and POS bill payments. Given the failure of this study to provide calculation of net benefits of such payments instruments, Daniel et al, (2004) noted the influence government intervention in the payment system. As recently observed, there is a consensus that central banks have the capacity to control the price level. The monetarists advocate that one of the approaches to control price level is through controlling money supply. This has led many central banks to implement money-supply-targeting procedures (Claudia, 2001). The Taylor-principle is another approach, which calls for adjusting short-term interest rate in response to movements in expected inflation and state of economic activity. This principle is demonstratively shown in Taylor (1993), Clarida et al (1997) and Woodford (2003). A review of empirical issues as it concerns cashless economy shows that money demand equation can be derived without influencing output and inflation (Gali, 2008). In this situation, money performs the role of a unit of account and the amount of real money balances follows residually after output, inflation and interest rate have been determined (Odior & Banuso, 2012).

The cost implications of cashless banking instruments have also been studied. Using Norwegian banks as example, Gresvik and Owre (2002) studied how much it costs to process various payment instruments. It was found that payment cards used for cash withdrawals at ATMs cost considerably more since the transactions involves cash replenishment, maintenance and security. The cost of using cheques for cash withdrawals was also found to be three times more expensive than cash withdrawals at ATMs. Humphrey et al (1996) in their cross country study analyzed patterns in the use of cash and other e-payment instruments in 14 developed countries, including the United States. The researchers conceiving payment instruments as traditional goods construct measures of the cost (similar to prices) of various payment methods in order to study whether differences in cashless instrument usage across countries. The result indicated that such price difference failed to determine the usage of e-banking instruments. However, Carrow and Staten (200) noted the exclusion of ‘convenience’ of using a particular instrument – a factor that users face. De Grauwe et al (2000) did a comparative cost study across nations by examining the cost of cash and payment in Iceland and Belgium. These European countries were selected because they provide a clear contrast as Iceland has one of the lowest rate of cash usage while Belgium is at the other extreme. Exploring cash payment system in Iceland, the study estimated the cash production and distribution costs incurred by Central Bank and subtracted the revenues obtained through interest foregone on cash in circulation. For the card-based system, the study examined the Card and Merchants.

Examining from social perspective, it was discovered that a Card-based system is considerably more efficient than a Cash-based system for two reasons (Odior & Banus, 2012). The first reason is that diseconomies of scale in cash supply rises as Cards displace cash, while economies of scale improve for cards. Secondly, the displacement relegates cash to smaller transactions because smaller transactions must cover the fixed costs of the cash system. Further studies such as Kriwoluzky and Stoltenberg (2010) estimated the cashless and monetary economy in the United States by using Bayesian estimation techniques. The data set, was splited into two parts ranging from first quarter 1964 to third quarter 2009 as earlier done in Lubik and Schordeide (2004), and Clarida et al (2000). However, treating GDP deflator, Output per capita and real wages as observable, the study suggests that interest rate policy was passive in the monetary but active in the cashless economy.

Studies by Stock and Watson (2002); Kim and Nelson (1999); Gali and Gambetti (2009) reached similar conclusion that Volatilities in output and inflation declined due to observed loss in the predictive power of money in a monetary economy. Central Bank, the Coordinator and facilitator cum regulator of the cashless society may lose their monopoly position in the provision of liquidity combined with its subsequent small size which makes it hard to control the short term interest rates (Clausia and De Grauwe 2001). On the contrary Marco and Bandiera (2004) reasoned differently. They argued that increased usage of cashless banking instruments strengthens monetary policy effectiveness and that the current level of e-money usage does not pose a threat to the stability of the financial system. Hence, they did conclude that central banks can lose control over monetary policy if the government does not run a responsible fiscal policy.

3. Global Trends in Non-cash Payment Systems

An analysis of global cashless (or non-cash) payment landscape is presented showing its competitive, social and policy developments as well as the behavioural patterns among users of non-cash payment systems in sub-Sahara Africa. The World payments Report 2011 sponsored by the Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS) and the European Financial Markets Association (EFMA) explored the trends in payment volumes and instruments usage among other issues. Capgemini & Royal Bank of Scotland (2011) descriptively summarized the key findings of the Report thus:

(a) **The global volume of non-cash payments has continued to grow, driven by emerging markets:** Global volume of non-cash payment transaction has grown by 7% annually to an estimated 280 billion transactions in 2010 from 154 billion since 2001. This trend has been largely driven by the surge in transaction volumes in the emerging market regions of Central Europe, Middle East and Africa (CEMEA), Asia (ex-China and India) – all three regions have grown by an average 25% in the past year compared to an estimated 3% growth in North America and Europe.

(b) **Electronic payments and mobile payments collectively accounted for an estimated 22.5 billion transactions in 2010:** This figure is expected to rise to 48.2 billion in 2013. Also by 2013, significant advancements in mobile technology are expected to cause m-payments to rise to 34% share of transactions (from 20%) versus e-payments which would reduce to 66% (from 80%).

(c) **Card usage has continued to grow while cheque usage declined:** Cards remain the preferred non-cash payment instrument globally, with an average market share of more than 40% and a high of 68% in Canada. On the other hand, cheque usage continued to decline across the globe and accounted for 16% of all non-cash global transactions down from 22%. This is a clear indicator of the global shift toward electronic payments.

(d) **E-Government initiatives are emerging as a key enabler of non-cash payments.** E-Government payments could spur overall non-cash payments usage in countries where an e-governance system combines with developed non-cash payment infrastructure and behaviour. This could also have a knock-on effect in area of the market still relying on dated technologies.

Having reviewed trends in global cashless payment, it is also imperative to briefly explore payments and money transfer behaviour in sub-Saharan Africa. Such brief expose will perhaps indicate key reason while Nigerian government adopted the cashless-based payment system.

In 2012, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation supported a Gallup polls that undertook an in-depth study of the payment behaviour of sub-Saharan Africans. Eleven African countries were surveyed, namely South Africa, Zambia, Nigeria, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Sierra Leone, Botswana, Mali and Rwanda. Godoy et al (2012) as replicated in Nweke (2012) statistically by summarized the report findings as follows:

First, it noted that the market for financial services in sub-Saharan Africa is significant and remains largely untapped. Out of 134 million adult respondents surveyed, 79 million (or 59%) still use only informal cash payments. This represents a major opportunity for providers of mobile money or similar services. Another significant finding shows that the rate of domestic remittances dwarfs that of international remittances, sometimes by a high multiple. Approximately 80 million people (or 60%) received at least one domestic remittance in the 30 days prior to the survey. This compares to the 10 million people (70%) who said they received international remittances in the same time frame.

It was also found out that East African countries exceeded Southern African and Nigeria in mobile money transfers. Reportedly, 90%, 68% and 60% of senders of remittance in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania respectively use mobile money services. In contrast, mobile money transactions were negligible in South Africa, Botswana, and Nigeria where 50%, 47% and 44% of senders of domestic remittances, respectively, used bank transfers. Finally, Nigeria alone accounted for 34.8 million consumers who are using only informal cash payment options. This offers exciting investment opportunities for providers of financial services (Nweke, 2012).

3.1 Cash – Based Nigeria Versus "Cashless" Nigeria: The Rationale for Policy Shift in Payment System and Cashless Policy

In spite of the recent introduction of cashless policy in Lagos, Abia, Anambra, Kano, Ogun, Rivers and Abuja, Nigeria is best described as a cash-based economy. This is true considering the size of retail and commercial activities transacted primarily in cash as well as the value of these transactions as a share of income per capita (CBN 2012). In 2011, it was estimated that 99% of over 215 million customer transactions in Nigerian banks were cash-related (i.e; through ATM and over-the-counter) and this was valued at about N2.1 trillion or 5% of GDP. It is estimated that an average Nigerian transacts about N65 in cash out of every N100 income earned.

This cash-based system has come at significant cost to the Nigerian economy. It is estimated that cash distribution costs account for 60% cost over-heads in the banking industry while cash management operations require up to 80% of the industry's infrastructure base and staff strength (CBN 2012). According to CBN, the direct costs of transporting, processing and storing (vault) huge volumes of cash, borne by the financial system was valued at N115 billion in 2009; and it was estimated to rise to N192 billion by the end of 2012. Further, with heavy cash users (i.e. those with transaction volumes above N150000) accounting for only 10% of transaction volumes but 71% of the transaction value (₦1.5 trillion). It appears that implicit cash handling costs for this class of cash users are being subsidized by all other classes of consumers (Nweke, 2012).

Based on the foregoing backdrop, CBN by its wisdom and legal mandate initiated the policy drift from cash-based system to a cash less one. In 2005 CBN initiated the National payment systems (NPS) specifically to achieve the objectives of promoting efficiency and effectiveness of payment systems; promoting safety and protection of systemic risks. It also set the objective of migrating to cashless modes of payment, such as electronic debit/credit instruments, credit/debit cards, ATM – sharing and Electronic Fund Transfer at point of sales and real – Time Gross settlement system (RTGs). Other objectives of NPS included to ensure payment systems audit transparency and full transaction reporting; and to achieve public acceptance and confidence via information dissemination, customer convenience and total quality delivery.

According to CBN, the cash-less policy aims at reducing (not eliminating) the amount of [physical cash in circulation in the economy, and encouraging more electronic – based transactions (payments for goods, services, transfers, etc). The policy is initiated to achieve the following objectives: To drive development and modernization of Nigeria payment system in line with Nigeria's vision 2020 goal of being among the top 20 economies by the year 2020; to reduce the cost of banking services (including cost of credit_ and drive financial inclusion by providing more efficient transaction options and greater reach; to limit high cash usage outside the formal sector and thereby improve the effectiveness of monetary policy in managing inflation and encouraging economic growth; and to curb some of the negative consequences associated with the high usage of physical cash, including high cost of cash; robberies, corruption and leakages through money laundering, fraud and other cash – related crimes (CBN 2011).

However there are key issues or instruments of the cashless policy. First, there is a threshold of daily cumulative cash of N500,000 and N3 million on free cash withdrawals and lodgments by individual and corporate bodies respectively. At the inception of the policy it was pegged at N150,000 and N1 million but reviewed upward as stated above. The limits apply to the account so far as it involves cash, irrespective of the channel (e.g. over the counter (OTC), ATMs, third party cheques encashed OTC etc) in which cash is withdrawn or deposited. Second, there are processing fees for withdrawals above limit, 3% for individual and 5% for corporate customers. There are downward reviews from the respective 10% and 20% fees set in January 2012. The service charge for daily cumulative deposits above the limits into an account shall be borne by the account holder. Again, and the processing fees for lodgments above limit is fixed at 2% for individual and 3% for corporate bodies; initially, the charges were pegged at 10% and 20% but reviewed downward respectively.

Thirdly, there are exemption fees which apply to accounts operated by ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) of the federal and state governments, solely for the purpose of revenue collections. Exemptions are also extended to embassies, diplomatic missions and multi-lateral and aid-donor agencies, as well as micro finance banks (CBN, 2012).

4. Methodology

This study was carried out, using a survey method with a sample of 650 stakeholders comprising businessmen, civil servants, and university students drawn from Anambra and Enugu States respectively. Both primary and secondary data were used in the study. Questionnaire was used as data collection instrument with questions on stakeholders' reasons for either supporting or against the policy drift and stakeholders' opinions on how to promote cash-less literacy and education in Nigeria. Descriptive statistical technique/tools used in the presentation and analysis were frequency tables, simple percentages and charts. The secondary data sources include journals, book e-books, reports etc. Extracts from these sources helped in the literature review section of the study.

5. Result and Discussions

Data on demographics show that business men accounted for 36.1% (or 235) of the respondents, University students accounted for 208 (or 32%) while civil servants are 207 representing 31.8% of the total respondents**.**

Table 1: Respondents who support or against the policy drift to cash less economy

Respondents category	Yes	No	Total
Business men	170 (72.3%)	65 (27.6%)	235
University students	136 (65.3%)	72 (34.6%)	208
Civil servant	128 (61.8%)	79 (38.1%)	207
Total	434 (66.7%)	216 (33.2%)	650

Source: Field survey

Table 1 above indicates that 170 (72.3%) out of 235 business men sampled support the policy drift to cashless payment/economy, while 65 (27.6%) are not in support. Of 208 respondents representing university students, close to two third (i.e. 136 or 65.3%) answered in the affirmative while 72 (34.6%) answered in the negative. 128 (61.8%) out of 207 respondents representing Civil servants are in total support of the policy drift while 79 (38.1%) are not in support of the policy. Meanwhile, more than two third of the total respondents (i.e. 434 or 66.7%) are in support of the policy drift while 216 respondents accounting for 33.2% are not in support of the policy drift.

Table 2: Reasons for Respondents' support of the policy drift

Benefits of cashless economy or reasons for support	Percentage
Reduce cash related robbery	197 (45.3%)
Reduce cash related corruption	95 (21.8%)
Attract more foreign investment	80 (18.4%)
Reduction in cost	62 (14.2%)

Source: Field survey

From table 2, the major reason why supporters of the cashless policy/or policy drift is because of its potential to reduce cash related robbery (i.e. 197) or 45.3% out of 434 respondents who support the policy drift affirmed that. Reduction in cash related corruption ranked second among the reasons why stakeholders support the policy drift to cash less policy/economy. Hence, 95 or 21.8% respondents attested to the above position. 80 (18.4%) voted attraction of more foreign investors as reason for supporting the policy drift while 62 respondents accounting for 14.2% support the policy drift because of its potential to reduce cost of carrying money and producing cash by banks.

Table 3: reasons for Non support of the policy drift

Reasons	Percentage
Fraud	50 (23.1%)
High rate of illiteracy	80 (37%)
Inefficiency brought by poor infrastructure	40 (18.5%)
Indiscriminate Deductions from accounts	46(21.2%)
Total	216 (100)

Table 3 indicates reasons why stakeholders sampled do not support the policy drift. High rate of illiteracy ranks first amongst the reasons why some stakeholders do not support the cash less policy/policy drift. Hence 37% or 80 respondents attested to that position. 50 (23.1%) do not support the policy drift because of fraud associated with e-payment channels, 40 (18.56) do not support the policy because of inefficiency brought by poor infrastructure in Nigeria. Finally, 46 (21.2%) respondents are not in support of the policy drift to cash les economy because of indiscriminate deductions from Accounts by commercial banks. There is a huge support of the policy drift in payment system/cashless policy or economy by the three categories of stakeholders (respondents) sampled. Given the rate of armed robbery in the Nigerian society, the introduction of cashless economy will definitely reduce cash related robberies. Studies before this are in support of this reason (Omotunde, Tunmibi & John-

Dewole, 2013; Akhalumeh & Ohiokha 2011 Echekoba & Ezu 2012; CBN, 2011). A cash-based economy encourages corruption manifesting in form of money laundering, leakages etc, while a cash less society reduces such social vices or fraudulent practices. More importantly, a cash-based economy is associated with high cost of cash along the value chain-from the CBN and the banks to corporate bodies and individuals. Hence everybody bears the high costs associated with volume of cash handling. A shift towards a cashless economy will definitely reduce these costs. Operational costs emerged due to the high costs accrued in cash management, currency sorting, cash movements and frequent printing of currency notes (Ovat, 2012). In as much as majority of stakeholders sampled support the cashless economy, the challenges of associated in the implementation in Nigeria are enormous. The policy faces the challenge of payment fraud. ATM fraud across the country is a typical fallout of the cashless economy. Also experience of the pilot scheme in Lagos has indicated high incidence of fraud. High rate of illiteracy plagues Nigeria and this poses a strong challenge to the country's shift towards a cashless society.

Another challenge to the implementation of the policy drift is inefficiency brought be decayed or poor infrastructure. For instance, on different occasion people witness difficulties with ATMs during withdrawals. It is either cash are not dispensed or the system debits their accounts for money not dispensed. Network failure during transactions at ATMs, POS machines work against the policy in Nigeria. Epileptic public power supplies also militate against the successful implementation of the cashless economy in Nigeria.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The essence of policy drift or change has been highlighted in the study, particularly as it concerns payment system. Nigeria drift towards cashless economy was necessitated by articulated economic policy objectives. According to CBN, the new cashless policy was introduced primarily to drive development and modernization of Nigeria's payment system in line with her vision 2020 goal of being amongst the top 20 economies by the year 2020. Bearing this in mind, an efficient and modern payment system is a key enabler of economic growth. Other reasons for the adoption of cashless economy exist in the literature as documented in the study. Inspite of the reasons for adopting cashless policy/economy, stakeholders are still divided on the issue. This study has explored the areas of divergent stakeholders' views by indentifying and discussing reasons for stakeholders support or non support for the policy drift/adoption. Hence, it is concluded that Nigeria drift towards cashless society must be approached with caution given inherent social vices, infrastructure problem and literacy level in Nigeria.

To be able to get mass support for the policy drift, various stakeholders opinions must be evaluated. Both supporters and non supporters of the policy drift have essential points for taking their sides, but their views must be factored into a comprehensively action plan for educating the public. For this reason the study recommends that both the CBN, commercial banks and other relevant stakeholders at implementation level must engage stakeholders who are end-users of e-payment channels. A continuous public enlightenment campaign aimed at encouraging or attaining high degree of cash-less literacy must be mounted by CBN, commercial banks, etc. That is to say, that educating every end user stakeholder on the values and pitfalls of cashless system must be encouraged by relevant authorities in Nigeria. This should be done through practical demonstration of using POS, ATMs and other electronic – payment platforms. Our higher institution of learning should help in this direction by organizing seminars and workshops for different vulnerable stakeholders who by design are end-users of the cashless banking products. Different Traders' Associations Town Unions, Women Groups, and Civil Society groups must be involved in the campaign to educate the masses on the benefits of cashless society. At least the use of local dialect should be adopted during practical sessions, so that not-literate or less literate Nigerians understand the 'A – Z' of cashless policy and e-payment instruments or modes available for transaction or exchange mediation.

REFERENCES

Ajayi, S.I. & Ojo, O. O. (2006). *Money and Banking: Analysis and Policy in the Nigerian context*. Second Edition, Ibadan: daily Graphics Nigeria Ltd.

Akhalumeh, P.B; and Ohiokha, F. (2011). Nigeria's Cashless Economy: The Imperatives, *International Journal of management & Business Studies*. 2 (2): 31 – 36.

Baddeley, M. (2004). Using E-cash in the New Economy: An Economic Analysis of Micro-payment Systems, *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, Vol. 5. No. 4 UK Cambridge.

Basel Committee, (1998). "Risk Management for Electronic banking and Electronic Money Activities", *Basel Committee Publications*, No.35.

BIS, (2001). Bayesian Approach Based on a Markov-switching Model of the Business Cycle" *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 81 (4), 608 – 616.

Bank for International Settlements (BIS) (1996). "Implication for Central Bank for the Development of Electronic Money" *Basel Publication*.

Carow, K. A. Staten, M. E. (2000). Plastic Choices: Consumer Usage of Bank cards Vs Proprietary Credit cards *working study*, April.

Central Bank of Nigeria (2011), Money Market Indicators & Money and Credit Statistics, *CBN Statistical Bulletin*, CBN publication, Abuja.

Central Bank of Nigeria (2012). Payment System. Retrieved June 20, from *http://www.cenbank.org/paymentsystem/*

Central Bank of Nigeria (2011). Toward a cashless Nigeria: Tools & Strategies *Nigeria Journal of Economy* 3 (2): 344 – 350.

Capgemini & Royal Bank of Scotland. (2011). World Payment Report 2011. Retrieved July 20 2013, from *http://www.capgemini.com/insights-and-resources/by-publication/world-payments-report-2011/*

Clarida, R; Gali, J., & Gertler (1997), Monetary Policy Rules in practice: some International Evidence, *CEPR Discussion study* No. 1750.

Clarida, R. Gali. J. & Gertler, M. (2000), Monetary Policy Rules and Macroeconomic Stability: "Evidence and some Theory". *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(1), 147 – 180.

Claudia, C. & De Grauwe, P. (2001). "Monetary Policy in a cashless Society" Brussels, CEPR Discussion study.

Daniel, D.G., Swartz, W., & Fermar A. (2004) Economics of a cashless society: An analysis of costs and benefits of payment instruments", *AEI – Brookings Joint Centre*.

De Grauwe, P., Buyst. E., & Rinaldi, L. (2000). The Cost of Cash and cards compared: The C*ases of Iceland and Belgium* London. De Brook Ltd.

European Central Bank, (1998), *Reports on Electronic Money*, Frankfurt, Angush ECB publications.

Echekoba, F.N., & Ezu, G.K. (2012): Electronic retail payment systems: User acceptability & payment problems in Nigeria. *Arabian Journal of Business & Management* Review Vol. 5. Pp 60 – 63.

Fisher, I. (1896). *"Appreciation and Interest" AEA publication.* 3 (II). 331 – 442.

Gali, J. (2008). *Monetary Policy, Inflation and the Business Cycle: An Introduction to the New Keynesian* Framework, Princeton University Press.

Godoy, J., Tortora, B., Sonnenschein, J., & Kendall. J. (2012). *Payments and Money Transfer*

Behaviour of sub-Saharan Africans. Retrieved June 25 2013, from *http://paper3.ssrn.com/sol/3/papers.cfm?abstract-id=2116449*.

Gresvik, O., & Owre, G. (2002). 'Banks' Costs and Income in the Payment Systems in 2001". *Norges Bank Economic Bulletin*.

Humphrey, D.B. (2004) Replacement of Cash by Cards in U.S. Consumer payments, *Journal of Economic and Business*, 56:211 – 225.

Humphrey, D.B., & Berger, A.N. (1990). Market Failures and Resource use: Economic Incentives to use different Payment Instruments, New York *Monograph series in Finance and Economics*.

Humphrey, D. B., Pulley, L.B., & Vesala, J.M. (1996) Cash, study and electronic Payments: A Cross country Analysis. *Journal of Money, Credit and banking* Vol. 6 No. 3.

Kim, C. J., & Nelson, C.R. (1999) "Has the U.S. Economy Become More Stable? In E.S. Odior & F.B. Banuso (2012) Cashless banking in Nigeria: challenges, benefits and policy implications. *European Scientific Journal* 8(12): 289 – 315.

Kriwoluzky, A., & Stoltenberg, C. (2010). *Money and reality* Department of Economic, University of Amsterdam.

Lubik, T.A., & Schorfheide, F. (2004). "Testing for indeterminacy: An Application to U.S. Monetary policy" *American Economic Review 94(1), 190 – 217.*

Marco, A. & Bandiera (2004). Monetary Policy, Monetary Areas and Financial Development with Electronic Money". *IMF Working Study* IMF.

Nweke, F. (2012). *The Nigeria in 2012: The Vision of Cashless Economy,* Abuja. The Nigerian Economic Summit Group.

Odior, E.S, & Banuso, F.B. (2012) Cashless banking in Nigeria: Challenges, benefits and policy implications. *European Scientific Journal 8 (12): 289 – 315*.

Omotunde, M., Tunmibi, S., & John-Dewole, A.T (2013). Impact of cashless economy in Nigeria. *Greener Journal of Internet Information and Communication Systems* 1 (2): 040 – 043.

Patinkin, D. (1965). *Money, Interest and Prices second edition* News York, Harper & Row.

Stock, J. H., & Watson, M.W. (2002). Has the Business Cycle changed and why? *NBER Working Study's* 9127, National Bureau of Economics Research. Inc.

Taylor, C. (1993) Cash-based economy and implication in technology driven era. *Journal of Credit and Finance* 6 (12) 201 – 215.

Woodford, M. (2003). *Interest and prices: Foundations of a theory of monetary policy*, Princeton University Press.

Ovat, O. O. (2012). The Central Bank of Nigeria's cashless policy in Nigeria: Benefits and challenges. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development 3 (14): 128 – 132.*