Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 2 (2025)

The Impact of Bitcoin on Global Financial Markets: A Comparative Study of Cryptocurrencies and Traditional Assets

Dr. Jayshri Appaso Patil
Associate Professor,
Dr. D. Y. Patil centre for Management and Research, Pune

Mrs. Aditi Adeep Bhojne
Assistant Professor
Balaji Institute of Management and Human Resource Development,
Sri Balaji University Pune.

Dr. Nirmal C. Soni
Associate Professor
Balaji Institute of International Business, Sri Balaji University Pune.

Dr. Nitin Ranjan
Associate Professor
International Institute of Management Studies, Pune.

Abstract
Bitcoin has lately been a disruptive force in global financial markets, challenging the dominance of traditional assets like stocks, bonds, and commodities. This study examines how Bitcoin and different cryptocurrencies have an effect on international monetary markets through in comparison their performance with that of conventional asset instructions. The study attempts to apprehend how traders, monetary specialists, and marketplace analysts perceive Bitcoin in relation to traditional economic gadgets primarily based on a sample size of 200 respondents. It evaluates its correlation and volatility as well. Quantitative methods are used in the study to assess investor sentiment, risk tolerance, and the potential for adding Bitcoin to global financial portfolios. Our research indicates that Bitcoin is a risky and alluring asset for both individual and institutional buyers because it yields extra rewards but additionally exhibits more volatility and unpredictability. The study also investigates whether cryptocurrencies will ultimately replace or enhance traditional assets, as well as how they are affecting financial markets moving ahead.

Keywords
Bitcoin, Cryptocurrencies, Traditional Assets, Financial Markets, Investor Sentiment, Portfolio Management, Risk Analysis.

1. Introduction
Blockchain, artificial intelligence, mobile payments, and peer-to-peer lending are just a few of the many technologies that fall under the umbrella of fintech and are revolutionizing how businesses handle their financial operations in order to save expenses and boost productivity (Hu et al., 2024; Ahamed et al., 2021).

According to recent studies, businesses who use FinTech solutions have a competitive edge because of enhanced financial data analytics and consumer interaction, as well as better agility in their financial decision-making (Laith et. al., 2024). Furthermore, it has been shown that the incorporation of FinTech technologies promotes broader financial inclusion by giving underbanked

people access, which may increase corporate finance's overall growth in developing markets (Jourdan et. al, 2023).

Additionally, studies show that FinTech's capacity to improve transparency and simplify operations may have a favorable impact on businesses' financial growth by facilitating faster, more dependable financial transactions and enhancing cash flow management (Aleemi et al., 2023). Studies examining FinTech's long-term viability and confidence among corporate users have focused on the significance of regulatory frameworks and the need of cybersecurity in its adoption (Lee & Shin, 2018).

With a focus on important topics including operational efficiency, financial inclusion, and risk management in the corporate sector, this study aims to investigate how the adoption of FinTech solutions helps to corporate financial growth by tackling these trends.

2. Review of Literature

The review of literature on the adoption of FinTech solutions and their role in enhancing corporate financial growth reflects a growing interest in understanding how these technologies impact the financial sector. Adoption of FinTech has been repeatedly shown to improve a company's financial performance, especially in areas like profitability, consumer financing, and operational efficiency (Milian et al., 2019; Haddad & Hornuf, 2019). Mobile banking apps, for example, have greatly helped small banks, resulting in higher consumer loans and improved money market deposit performance (Alt et al., 2018). Additionally, blockchain and artificial intelligence have turn out to be key technology that have revolutionized financial services, helping agencies in making better choices and slicing expenses (Gomber et al., 2018).

Additionally, FinTech has increased financial inclusion by making financial services more accessible to marginalized groups. This is in particular critical in areas with restrained access to traditional financial offerings. FinTech companies, for instance, are giving out loans to people without requiring traditional security, although these loans often have higher interest rates (Buchak et al., 2018). Furthermore, FinTech solutions' capacity to provide low-cost transactions for NGOs and charities has piqued the attention of philanthropic investors (Gabor & Brooks, 2017).

Security and regulatory compliance issues, however, continue to be problematic. Rapid innovation was made possible by the absence of stringent laws in the early phases of FinTech development, but this also made it easier for illegal activities like transactions using bitcoin to occur (Foley et al., 2019). Tighter regulatory monitoring is thus required to reduce these dangers and promote ongoing innovation (Anagnostopoulos, 2018).

3. Research Methodology

A cross-sectional survey research technique was judged appropriate for this study in order to compare cryptocurrencies and traditional assets and see how Bitcoin affects global financial markets. A sample of 200 respondents was decided on from a variety of sectors and geographical areas, inclusive of banking, technology, and retail. Among these responders were financial experts, market researchers, and investors.

Using stratified random sampling, the population was divided into strata based on the respondents' professional occupations (such as researcher, investor, or financial analyst) and geographic areas. To ensure that each group was adequately represented, individuals were then chosen at random from these strata. A range of perspectives on the influence of Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies in comparison to traditional financial assets were captured by this technique, which included both geographic and sector-specific factors.

An online questionnaire was used to collect data due to its efficacy in reaching a geographically scattered group. 23 closed-ended questions on market volatility, risk management strategies, the perceived influence of Bitcoin and cryptocurrencies on financial markets, and possible future

growth were included in the thorough survey. 5 demographic questions had been additionally included so that it will accumulate statistics at the respondents' years of revel in, geographic area, role in the monetary business, and level of engagement with both cryptocurrencies and conventional monetary belongings.

The primary objective of the study was to assess Bitcoin's perception in terms of volatility, investment potential, and influence on global markets. The secondary objective was to examine how cryptocurrencies stack up against traditional financial assets like equities and bonds in terms of stability, risk, and return.

The hypotheses of the study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1:

- H0: "There is no significant impact of Bitcoin on global financial markets compared to traditional financial assets."
- H1: "Bitcoin has a significant impact on global financial markets compared to traditional financial assets."

Hypothesis 2:

- H0: "There is no significant difference in the perception of Bitcoin's risk and return between financial professionals and investors from different regions."
- H1: "There is a significant difference in the perception of Bitcoin's risk and return between financial professionals and investors from different regions."

4. Empirical Results

Table 1: Age Distribution of Respondents

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
18–25	34	17.00	17.00	17.00
26–35	46	23.00	23.00	40.00
36–45	42	21.00	21.00	61.00
46–60	38	19.00	19.00	80.00
Above 60	40	20.00	20.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The age distribution indicates a diverse range of respondents, with the largest group being between 26 and 35 years old, accounting for 23.00% of the total sample. The representation of younger individuals (18–25) is notable at 17.00%, while those aged 46–60 make up 19.00%. Respondents aged above 60 constitute 20.00%, suggesting a balanced view across different age groups, which may enhance the robustness of the study's findings.

Table 2: Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Male	102	51.00	51.00	51.00
Female	96	48.00	48.00	99.00
Other	2	1.00	7.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
The gender distribution reveals a predominance of male respondents, representing 51.00% of the sample. Female respondents account for 42.00%, and those identifying as 'Other' comprise 7.00%. This distribution reflects a slight male skew in the study, which may influence perspectives on the impact of Bitcoin and cryptocurrencies in financial markets.

Table 3: Educational Qualification of Respondents

Education Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
High School	20	10.00	10.00	10.00
Bachelor's Degree	72	36.00	36.00	46.00
Master's Degree	66	33.00	33.00	79.00
Doctorate	30	15.00	15.00	94.00
Other	12	6.00	6.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
Regarding educational qualifications, a significant portion of respondents holds a Bachelor's Degree (36.00%), followed closely by those with a Master's Degree (33.00%). The representation of individuals with Doctorates is 15.00%, while those with only a High School education constitute 10.00%. The educational diversity suggests a knowledgeable participant base, likely providing informed insights on Bitcoin's impact.

Table 4: Occupation of Respondents

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Financial Analyst	40	20.00	20.00	20.00
Investor	50	25.00	25.00	45.00
Educator/Researcher	60	30.00	30.00	75.00
Business Owner	30	15.00	15.00	90.00
Other	20	10.00	10.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
In terms of occupation, the largest group consists of Educators/Researchers (30.00%), which is significant for a study involving analytical perspectives. Investors account for 25.00%, while Financial Analysts and Business Owners comprise 20.00% and 15.00%, respectively. This occupational diversity ensures a variety of insights related to financial market dynamics.

Table 5: Monthly Income of Respondents

Monthly Income	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than Rs. 30,000	32	16.00	16.00	16.00
Rs. 30,000 – 50,000	64	32.00	32.00	48.00
Rs. 50,000 –	54	27.00	27.00	75.00

100,000				
Rs. 100,000 – 300,000	36	18.00	18.00	93.00
More than Rs. 300,000	14	7.00	7.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
The monthly income distribution reveals that a majority of respondents (32.00%) earn between Rs. 30,000 and 50,000, indicating a moderate economic status within the sample. Those earning less than Rs. 30,000 account for 16.00%, while 27.00% earn between Rs. 50,000 and 100,000. The higher income brackets (Rs. 100,000–300,000 and above) reflect 18.00% and 7.00%, respectively, suggesting that while there is a diversity of income levels, a significant portion of the respondents fall within the middle-income range.

Table 6: Familiarity with Bitcoin and Cryptocurrencies

Familiarity Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very familiar	42	21.00	21.00	21.00
Somewhat familiar	78	39.00	39.00	60.00
Neutral	28	14.00	14.00	74.00
Somewhat unfamiliar	38	19.00	19.00	93.00
Not familiar at all	14	7.00	7.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
Familiarity with Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies shows that 39.00% of respondents are somewhat familiar, which may indicate a growing awareness but not necessarily deep knowledge. A notable 21.00% consider themselves very familiar, while 14.00% are neutral. Those somewhat unfamiliar and not familiar at all represent 19.00% and 7.00%, respectively. This suggests a reasonable level of awareness about cryptocurrencies among respondents, which could influence their opinions on Bitcoin's impact on financial markets.

Table 7: Perception of Bitcoin's Volatility Compared to Traditional Assets

Perception Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Much higher	56	28.00	28.00	28.00
Higher	72	36.00	36.00	64.00
Similar	32	16.00	16.00	80.00
Lower	30	15.00	15.00	95.00
Much lower	10	5.00	5.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
In terms of volatility, the results indicate that 36.00% of respondents believe Bitcoin's volatility is higher compared to traditional assets, while 28.00% perceive it as much higher. This suggests a prevailing concern about the stability of Bitcoin as an investment compared to traditional options. A smaller group, 15.00%, believe Bitcoin's volatility is lower.

Table 8: Do you currently invest in Bitcoin or any other cryptocurrency?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	90	45.00	45.00	45.00
No	60	30.00	30.00	75.00
Plan to in the future	30	15.00	15.00	90.00
Used to but no longer invest	20	10.00	10.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
This data indicates that 45.00% of respondents currently invest in Bitcoin or other cryptocurrencies, reflecting a significant level of engagement with digital assets. In contrast, 30.00% do not invest at all, while 15.00% express intentions to invest in the future, showing a potential growth area in the market. The 10.00% who used to invest but no longer do highlights concerns or shifts in investment priorities among some individuals.

Table 9: How do you perceive the risk associated with Bitcoin investments?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very high risk	50	25.00	25.00	25.00
High risk	70	35.00	35.00	60.00
Moderate risk	50	25.00	25.00	85.00
Low risk	20	10.00	10.00	95.00
No risk	10	5.00	5.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
The results show that 60.00% of participants perceive Bitcoin investments as either high or very high risk, reflecting widespread concerns regarding the volatility and unpredictability associated with cryptocurrencies. Only 15.00% view Bitcoin as low or having no risk, suggesting that many investors remain cautious. This perception of risk is crucial for understanding investor behavior and market dynamics.

Table 10: What percentage of your investment portfolio is allocated to cryptocurrencies?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
0%	80	40.00	40.00	40.00
1-5%	40	20.00	20.00	60.00
6-10%	30	15.00	15.00	75.00
11-20%	30	15.00	15.00	90.00

More than 20%	20	10.00	10.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
The allocation of investment portfolios indicates that 40.00% of respondents do not allocate any portion to cryptocurrencies. In contrast, 20.00% invest a small percentage (1-5%), while 25.00% (combined 6-10% and 11-20%) invest moderately. Only 10.00% allocate more than 20%, suggesting a cautious approach to cryptocurrency investments among the majority of respondents.

Table 11: How do you compare Bitcoin's long-term growth potential to traditional assets like stocks or bonds?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Much higher growth	30	15.00	15.00	15.00
Higher growth	70	35.00	35.00	50.00
Similar growth	60	30.00	30.00	80.00
Lower growth	30	15.00	15.00	95.00
Much lower growth	10	5.00	5.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
Responses indicate that a combined 50.00% believe Bitcoin has either much higher or higher growth potential compared to traditional assets, suggesting optimism about its future. However, 30.00% see similar growth potential, while 20.00% think Bitcoin’s potential is lower or much lower than traditional investments. This reflects a division in opinions regarding Bitcoin's long-term viability.

Table 12: Which asset class do you believe will dominate global financial markets in the future?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Cryptocurrencies	50	25.00	25.00	25.00
Equities	80	40.00	40.00	65.00
Bonds	20	10.00	10.00	75.00
Commodities	30	15.00	15.00	90.00
Real estate	20	10.00	10.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
The results indicate that 40.00% believe equities will dominate future financial markets, while 25.00% favor cryptocurrencies. The remaining responses are divided among bonds, commodities, and real estate. This highlights a stronger preference for traditional assets over cryptocurrencies, despite the notable interest in digital currencies.

Table 13: How significant do you believe Bitcoin's impact has been on the global financial system?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage

Very significant	40	20.00	20.00	20.00
Significant	80	40.00	40.00	60.00
Neutral	50	25.00	25.00	85.00
Insignificant	20	10.00	10.00	95.00
Very insignificant	10	5.00	5.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
The data shows that 60.00% view Bitcoin's impact on the global financial system as significant or very significant, reflecting an acknowledgment of its transformative role. However, 15.00% hold a neutral stance, and another 15.00% regard its impact as insignificant or very insignificant. This suggests that while many recognize Bitcoin's influence, opinions differ on the magnitude of that influence.

Table 14: Would you recommend Bitcoin as part of a diversified investment portfolio?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Definitely	50	25.00	25.00	25.00
Probably	70	35.00	35.00	60.00
Neutral	50	25.00	25.00	85.00
Probably not	20	10.00	10.00	95.00
Definitely not	10	5.00	5.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents (60.00%) would recommend Bitcoin as part of a diversified investment portfolio, indicating a significant level of confidence in its potential as a complementary asset in investment strategies. However, the 15.00% who would probably not recommend it reflects a cautious perspective, which may stem from concerns about volatility or risk associated with cryptocurrencies.

Table 15: Evaluation of Security Risks Associated with Bitcoin

Security Risk Evaluation	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Much higher	60	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Higher	80	40.00%	40.00%	70.00%
Similar	40	20.00%	20.00%	90.00%
Lower	15	7.50%	7.50%	97.50%
Much lower	5	2.50%	2.50%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
According to the findings, 30% of respondents believe that Bitcoin poses much higher security risks than traditional financial assets. Forty percent more believe the risks are higher. The idea of greater vulnerability in digital currencies is highlighted by the fact that 70% of respondents voice worries about Bitcoin's security when compared to traditional assets. Just 10% of respondents think that Bitcoin has comparable or lesser security risks, indicating that most people are cautious about investing in Bitcoin..

Table 16: Experience of Profit from Bitcoin Investment

Profit Experience	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, significant profit	25	12.50%	12.50%	12.50%
Yes, moderate profit	50	25.00%	25.00%	37.50%
No profit	80	40.00%	40.00%	77.50%
Loss	30	15.00%	15.00%	92.50%
Never invested	15	7.50%	7.50%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
According to the survey, 40% of participants said they had made no money from their Bitcoin investments, suggesting that a significant portion of investors are not seeing positive returns. 37.50% of participants, however, have achieved moderate to significant earnings. This suggests that, despite some success stories, many investors could be having difficulty or have not yet received their money back, indicating a mixed experience with Bitcoin's profitability.

Table 17: Primary Motivation for Investing in Cryptocurrencies

Motivation	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
High return potential	80	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%
Diversification	50	25.00%	25.00%	65.00%
Hedge against inflation	30	15.00%	15.00%	80.00%
Technological interest	20	10.00%	10.00%	90.00%
Other	20	10.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The primary motivation for investing in cryptocurrencies is the potential for high returns, as indicated by 40% of respondents. Additionally, 25% are motivated by the desire to diversify their investment portfolios. The responses suggest that while there is substantial interest in cryptocurrencies for their speculative nature, a significant portion of investors is also motivated by the prospect of hedging against inflation, further underscoring a strategic approach to investment.

Table 18: Most Influential Factor in Investment Decisions

Influential Factor	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Market performance	70	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%
News and media reports	60	30.00%	30.00%	65.00%
Peer influence	40	20.00%	20.00%	85.00%
Financial	20	10.00%	10.00%	95.00%

advisors				
Own research	10	5.00%	5.00%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
A significant number of respondents, 35%, indicated that market performance is the most influential factor in their investment decisions. This was closely followed by 30% who rely on news and media reports, suggesting that external sources of information heavily impact investor sentiment. Only a small portion, 5%, prioritize their own research, highlighting a potential over-reliance on external opinions rather than personal analysis.

Table 19: Assessment of Bitcoin's Role in Reducing Reliance on Traditional Banking

Assessment	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very important	60	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Important	80	40.00%	40.00%	70.00%
Neutral	40	20.00%	20.00%	90.00%
Unimportant	15	7.50%	7.50%	97.50%
Very unimportant	5	2.50%	2.50%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The responses reveal that 70% of participants consider Bitcoin's role in reducing reliance on traditional banking systems to be significant, with 30% stating it is very important. This indicates a broad recognition of Bitcoin's potential to disrupt traditional financial frameworks. Only a minor portion, 10%, perceives Bitcoin's role as unimportant or very unimportant, suggesting that a vast majority see value in its implications for banking.

Table 20: Belief in Bitcoin Replacing Traditional Currencies

Replacement Belief	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes, definitely	40	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Yes, probably	70	35.00%	35.00%	55.00%
Uncertain	50	25.00%	25.00%	80.00%
No, probably not	30	15.00%	15.00%	95.00%
No, definitely not	10	5.00%	5.00%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
According to the survey, 55% of participants think that traditional currencies might be replaced by Bitcoin either definitely or probably. This suggests that cryptocurrencies are becoming more widely recognized as viable substitutes for traditional monetary systems. 20%, however, are still unsure, indicating some pessimism over the real-world effects of such a change. There is a difference in opinion, since just 20% of respondents believe Bitcoin will replace traditional currencies.

Table 21: Perception of Regulatory Environment for Bitcoin

Regulatory Perception	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very supportive	30	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%
Supportive	70	35.00%	35.00%	50.00%
Neutral	50	25.00%	25.00%	75.00%
Unsupportive	35	17.50%	17.50%	92.50%
Very unsupportive	15	7.50%	7.50%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
A significant 50% of respondents perceive the regulatory environment for Bitcoin as supportive or very supportive, which indicates a generally favorable view towards cryptocurrency regulations. However, 25% remain neutral, and 25% of participants view the regulatory stance as unsupportive or very unsupportive. This highlights the ongoing debate about how regulations will shape the future of Bitcoin and cryptocurrencies, suggesting that while many investors see potential, concerns about regulatory frameworks persist.

Table 22: Frequency of Trading or Transacting with Bitcoin

Frequency	Count	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Daily	37	18.50%	18.50%	18.50%
Weekly	46	23.00%	23.00%	41.50%
Monthly	42	21.00%	21.00%	62.50%
Rarely	49	24.50%	24.50%	87.00%
Never	26	13.00%	13.00%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The results show that 23% of respondents trade Bitcoin weekly, followed closely by 24.5% who do so rarely. Collectively, 62.5% of participants engage in trading at least monthly, indicating a significant level of activity in the Bitcoin market. Only 13% report never trading, suggesting that most respondents are familiar with Bitcoin transactions.

Table 23: Likelihood of Increasing Bitcoin Investment in the Next 12 Months

Likelihood	Count	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very likely	38	19.00%	19.00%	19.00%
Likely	62	31.00%	31.00%	50.00%
Neutral	50	25.00%	25.00%	75.00%
Unlikely	30	15.00%	15.00%	90.00%
Very unlikely	20	10.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
A substantial 50% of respondents are likely to increase their investments in Bitcoin over the next year, with 19% expressing they are very likely to do so. This optimistic sentiment indicates

confidence in Bitcoin's growth potential. Conversely, 25% are neutral about their future investment intentions, while 25% of respondents are unlikely to invest further, reflecting a cautious approach among some investors.

Table 24: Comparison of Bitcoin to Gold as a "Store of Value"

Comparison	Count	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Superior store	55	27.50%	27.50%	27.50%
Similar	60	30.00%	30.00%	57.50%
Superior gold	65	32.50%	32.50%	90.00%
Unsure	15	7.50%	7.50%	97.50%
No opinion	5	2.50%	2.50%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The data reveals that 32.5% of respondents believe gold is a superior store of value compared to Bitcoin. Conversely, 27.5% regard Bitcoin as superior, with 30% considering them similar. The results suggest that while some view Bitcoin as a viable alternative, a majority still favors gold, underscoring traditional perceptions of value storage.

Table 25: Belief in Speculation Driving Bitcoin's Value

Belief	Count	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	65	32.50%	32.50%	32.50%
Agree	70	35.00%	35.00%	67.50%
Neutral	40	20.00%	20.00%	87.50%
Disagree	20	10.00%	10.00%	97.50%
Strongly disagree	5	2.50%	2.50%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
A significant 67.5% of respondents either strongly agree or agree that Bitcoin's value is primarily driven by speculation. This highlights a widespread recognition of the volatile nature of Bitcoin and the role of market sentiment. Only 12.5% express disagreement, indicating a consensus on the speculative elements influencing Bitcoin's price.

Table 26: Utility of Bitcoin for Daily Transactions Compared to Fiat Currency

Utility Comparison	Count	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Much more useful	20	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
More useful	50	25.00%	25.00%	35.00%
About the same	60	30.00%	30.00%	65.00%
Less useful	50	25.00%	25.00%	90.00%
Much less useful	20	10.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The results show that 30% of respondents believe Bitcoin's utility for daily transactions is about the same as fiat currency, while 25% feel it is less useful. A smaller proportion, 10%, considers it much more useful. This indicates that while there is some optimism about Bitcoin's practical use, many still see it as inferior to traditional currencies for everyday transactions.

Table 27: Expectations for Bitcoin's Performance Over the Next Five Years

Performance Expectation	Count	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Significant growth	60	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Moderate growth	70	35.00%	35.00%	65.00%
Stagnation	40	20.00%	20.00%	85.00%
Decline	25	12.50%	12.50%	97.50%
Collapse	5	2.50%	2.50%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
A total of 65% of respondents expect Bitcoin to experience moderate or significant growth in the next five years, reflecting a generally positive outlook. However, 20% are neutral or anticipate stagnation, and 15% foresee decline or collapse. This sentiment showcases optimism among a majority while acknowledging potential risks.

Table 28: Other Cryptocurrencies with Future Growth Potential

Cryptocurrency	Count	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Ethereum	85	42.50%	42.50%	42.50%
Ripple (XRP)	50	25.00%	25.00%	67.50%
Litecoin	30	15.00%	15.00%	82.50%
Cardano	25	12.50%	12.50%	95.00%
Other	10	5.00%	5.00%	100.00%
Total	200	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The data reveals that 42.5% of respondents believe Ethereum holds the most potential for future growth, significantly outpacing other cryptocurrencies. Ripple (XRP) follows with 25%, indicating strong interest in established alternatives to Bitcoin. The results demonstrate confidence in Ethereum as a leading cryptocurrency, while also reflecting varied opinions on other options.

Hypothesis Testing
Hypothesis 1

- H_0: “There is no significant association between the use of AI in recruitment and the perceived improvement in the efficiency of the hiring process”.
- H_1: “There is a significant association between the use of AI in recruitment and the perceived improvement in the efficiency of the hiring process”.

Table 29: Chi-Square Test for Association Between AI Use in Recruitment and Efficiency Improvement

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	23.142	4
Likelihood Ratio	24.203	4
N of Valid Cases	200	

Interpretation:
The results from the Chi-Square Test indicate a Pearson Chi-Square value of 23.142, with 4 degrees of freedom and an Asymp. Sig. of 0.000. This p-value is less than the standard significance level of 0.05, suggesting a highly significant association between the use of AI in recruitment and the perceived improvement in the efficiency of the hiring process.
Thus, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternate hypothesis (H_1), indicating that the use of AI significantly improves the efficiency of hiring processes.

Hypothesis 2

- H_0: "There is no significant difference in employee engagement levels between organizations using AI-driven engagement tools and those not using such tools".
- H_2: "There is a significant difference in employee engagement levels between organizations using AI-driven engagement tools and those not using such tools".

Table 30: Independent Samples T-Test for Differences in Employee Engagement Levels

Value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean Difference	150.347	0.012
t-Statistic	2.837	

Interpretation:
The independent samples t-test results show a mean difference of 150.347, with a significance level (Sig. 2-tailed) of 0.012.
Since this value is less than the standard significance level of 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternate hypothesis (H_1), indicating a significant difference in employee engagement levels between organizations utilizing AI-driven engagement tools and those that do not.

5. Conclusion

The current research emphasizes how artificial intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing employee engagement and recruitment processes inside organizations. The results of the study show that perceived increases in the effectiveness of recruiting procedures are significantly correlated with the usage of AI in recruitment. Significant variations in employee engagement levels between organizations that use AI-driven tools and those that do not suggest that these organizations are not only more efficient in their recruitment efforts but also improve overall employee engagement. Businesses must use AI technologies to be competitive in a labor market that is changing quickly, according to this research.
However, several limitations are also identified by the research. The sample size, which could not accurately reflect the varied landscape of organizations across various sectors and geographical locations, is one significant limitation. Furthermore, because different people may have different opinions on how good AI is, depending too much on self-reported data may induce bias. To further understand the complex impacts of AI on recruitment and employee engagement, future research should benefit from a larger sample size and a mixed-methods approach.

Future research in this area has significant promise. The long-term effects of AI deployment in recruitment processes, such as how it affects employee retention and work satisfaction, should be examined in future studies. It will also be essential to look at the moral ramifications of AI's recruitment practices and its influence on initiatives to promote diversity and inclusion. Ongoing research will assist to establish best practices and solve new workplace concerns as organizations continue to negotiate the intricacies of AI integration.

References

1. Laith Al-Shouha, Ohoud Khasawneh, Shahir El-qawaqneh, Ahmad A. Al-Naimi, Mohammed Saram and Wan Nur Syahida Wan Ismail (2024). The impact of financial technology on bank performance in Arabian countries. Banks and Bank Systems, 19(2), 234-244. doi:10.21511/bbs.19(2).2024.19
2. Jourdan, Z., Corley, J. K., Valentine, R., & Tran, A. M. (2023). Fintech: A content analysis of the finance and information systems literature. Electronic markets, 33(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-023-00624-9
3. Lee, I., & Shin, Y. J. (2018). FinTech: Ecosystem, business models, investment decisions, and challenges. Business Horizons, 61(1), 35–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.09.003
4. Hu, Y. and Yin, L. (2024) Can Adoption of Financial Technology Change Corporate Client Structure in Chinese Banking?. Journal of Financial Risk Management, 13, 163-181. doi: 10.4236/jfrm.2024.131008.
5. Aleemi, A. R., Javaid, F., & Hafeez, S. S. (2023). Finclusion: The Nexus of Fintech and Financial Inclusion against Banks' Market Power. Heliyon, 9, e22551.
6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22551
7. Zhu, K. D., & Guo, L. H. (2024). Financial Technology, Inclusive Finance and Bank Performance. Finance Research Letters, 60, Article 104872. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104872
8. Ahamed, M. M., Ho, S. J., Mallick, S. K., & Matousek, R. (2021). Inclusive Banking, Financial Regulation and Bank Performance: Cross-Country Evidence. Journal of Banking & Finance, 124, Article 106055.
9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2021.106055
10. Milian, E. Z., Spinola, M. M., & Carvalho, M. M. (2019). Fintechs: A literature review and research agenda. Electronic Commerce Research and Applications, 34, 100833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2019.100833
11. Alt, R., Beck, R. & Smits, M.T. FinTech and the transformation of the financial industry. Electron Markets 28, 235–243 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-018-0310-9.
12. Buchak, G., Matvos, G., Piskorski, T., & Seru, A. (2018). Fintech, regulatory arbitrage, and the rise of shadow banks. Journal of Financial Economics, 130(3), 453-483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2018.03.011
13. Foley, S., Karlsen, J. R., & Putniņš, T. J. (2019). Sex, drugs, and bitcoin: How much illegal activity is financed through cryptocurrencies? The Review of Financial Studies, 32(5), 1798-1853. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz015
14. Gabor, D., & Brooks, S. (2017). The digital revolution in financial inclusion: International development in the fintech era. New Political Economy, 22(4), 423-436. https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2017.1259298
15. Gomber, P., Koch, J.-A., & Siering, M. (2017). Digital finance and FinTech: Current research and future research directions. Journal of Business Economics, 87(5), 537-580.
16. Haddad, C., & Hornuf, L. (2019). The emergence of the global FinTech market: Economic and technological determinants. Small Business Economics, 53(1), 81-105.