ISSN: 2755-0214

Journal of Economics & Management Research

SCIENTIFIC Research and Community

Research Article

Open Access

Digital Payments and Financial Psychology: Understanding Human Behavior in Cashless Economies

Shankar Subramanian Iyer[1]*, Raman Subramanian[2], Rajesh Arora[3] and Brinitha Raji[4]

[1]Faculty Business, Westford University College, Sharjah, UAE

[2]Associate Dean, Westford University College, Al Tawuun, Sharjah, UAE

[3]Westford University College, Al Khan, Sharjah, UAE

[4]Faculty, Global Business Studies, DKP, Dubai

ABSTRACT

The rapid proliferation of digital payment systems has fundamentally transformed consumer financial behavior, creating unprecedented opportunities to examine the psychological mechanisms underlying economic decision-making in cashless economies. This mixed-methods study investigates the complex interplay between digital payment adoption and financial psychology, examining how technological affordances reshape spending patterns, impulse buying, trust formation, and financial well-being. Phase 1 employed a quantitative survey (n=487) utilizing validated instruments including the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), Trust Scale, and Financial Anxiety Scale to assess adoption determinants and behavioral outcomes. Phase 2 conducted semi-structured interviews (n=32) to explore lived experiences and psychological processes underlying digital payment usage. Quantitative findings reveal that perceived ease of use (β=0.42, $p<0.001$), trust (β=0.38, $p<0.001$), and hedonic motivation (β=0.31, $p<0.001$) significantly predict adoption intentions, explaining 68% of variance. Digital payment users exhibited 34% higher spending frequency, 28% increased impulse purchases, and diminished price sensitivity compared to cash users. Qualitative analysis identified five major themes: psychological distance from money, convenience-driven behavioral change, trust paradoxes, financial anxiety amplification, and cognitive bias exploitation. The study introduces "Spendception" a novel construct describing how reduced transaction visibility in digital payments diminishes the psychological pain of paying, leading to unconscious overspending. Findings demonstrate that while digital payments enhance financial inclusion and convenience, they simultaneously exploit cognitive vulnerabilities, particularly mental accounting biases and present bias. This research contributes to financial psychology theory by integrating behavioral economics principles with technology acceptance frameworks, offering practical implications for consumer protection, financial literacy interventions, and ethical fintech design. The study concludes that sustainable cashless economies require balanced approaches that preserve digital payment benefits while implementing psychological safeguards against exploitative design patterns.

***Corresponding author**

Shankar Subramanian Iyer, Faculty Business Westford University College, Sharjah, UAE.

Received: June 30, 2026; **Accepted:** July 07, 2026; **Published:** July 15, 2026

Keywords: Digital Payments, Financial Psychology, Consumer Behavior, Cashless Economy, Behavioral Economics, Fintech Adoption, Impulse Buying, Mental Accounting, Trust, Financial Well-Being

Introduction

The global transition toward cashless economies represents one of the most profound transformations in consumer financial behavior witnessed in the 21st century. Digital payment systems encompassing mobile wallets, contactless cards, peer-to-peer payment platforms, and unified payment interfaces have fundamentally altered how individuals perceive, manage, and transact money [1]. This technological revolution extends beyond mere convenience, penetrating the psychological foundations of economic decision-making and reshaping the cognitive and emotional processes that govern spending behavior [2]. As physical currency increasingly gives way to digital abstractions, understanding the psychological mechanisms underlying this transition has become imperative for researchers, policymakers, and financial institutions a like.

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated digital payment adoption by an unprecedented 156% between 2020 and 2021, catalyzing a behavioral shift that might have otherwise taken decades [1]. This rapid transformation has created a natural experiment for examining how payment modality influences financial psychology. Emerging evidence suggests that digital payments are not psychologically neutral substitutes for cash; rather, they fundamentally alter the cognitive and emotional experience of spending [3]. The reduced tangibility and visibility of digital transactions appear to diminish what behavioral economists term the "pain of paying" the psychological discomfort associated with parting with money leading to systematic changes in spending patterns, impulse control, and financial decision-making [2].

Contemporary research has documented several concerning behavioral consequences of digital payment adoption. Studies indicate that digital payment users exhibit 28-34% higher spending frequency and increased susceptibility to impulse purchases compared to cash users [4]. The psychological mechanisms underlying these effects appear rooted in cognitive biases that digital payment systems inadvertently or deliberately exploit. Mental accounting theory suggests that consumers maintain separate psychological accounts for different payment methods, with digital payments often perceived as less "real" than physical cash [3]. This cognitive distortion, combined with the frictionless nature of digital transactions, creates conditions conducive to overspending and diminished financial self-control.

However, the relationship between digital payments and financial psychology is multifaceted and cannot be reduced to simple narratives of technological determinism. Digital payment systems have demonstrably enhanced financial inclusion, particularly in emerging economies, providing previously unbanked populations with access to formal financial services [5]. Research indicates that digital payment users exhibit 45% higher savings rates and 32% greater access to formal credit compared to cash-dependent populations [1]. Furthermore, digital payments facilitate superior expense tracking, budgeting capabilities, and financial transparency features that can enhance financial literacy and promote responsible money management when properly leveraged.

The psychological determinants of digital payment adoption have been extensively studied through technology acceptance frameworks, particularly the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). These models identify perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, trust, and social influence as primary adoption drivers [6]. However, traditional technology acceptance theories inadequately account for the behavioral economics principles that govern post-adoption usage patterns. The present study addresses this theoretical gap by integrating TAM and the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) with behavioral economics constructs including mental accounting, present bias, and the pain of paying.

Trust emerges as a particularly critical psychological factor in digital payment adoption, yet its role is paradoxical and complex. While security concerns remain significant barriers to adoption, research reveals that certain perceived risks particularly psychological and financial risks may paradoxically enhance trust in mobile payment systems [7]. This counterintuitive finding suggests that the relationship between risk perception and trust in digital contexts differs fundamentally from traditional financial services. Understanding these trust dynamics is essential for designing digital payment systems that balance security, usability, and psychological comfort.

Despite growing research interest, significant gaps remain in our understanding of digital payment psychology. First, most existing studies employ exclusively quantitative methodologies, limiting insights into the lived experiences and subjective interpretations that shape digital payment behavior. Second, research has insufficiently examined individual differences in vulnerability to the psychological effects of digital payments, particularly regarding financial anxiety and self-control. Third, the ethical implications of fintech design patterns that exploit cognitive biases remain underexplored. Finally, existing theoretical frameworks inadequately integrate technology acceptance models with behavioral economics principles, limiting explanatory power.

This study addresses these gaps through a comprehensive mixed-methods investigation of digital payments and financial psychology. The research is guided by three primary objectives: (1) to identify the psychological determinants of digital payment adoption using validated technology acceptance and behavioral frameworks; (2) to examine the behavioral consequences of digital payment usage on spending patterns, impulse buying, and financial well-being; and (3) to explore the lived experiences and subjective interpretations that mediate the relationship between payment modality and financial behavior. By integrating quantitative measurement with qualitative depth, this study provides a holistic understanding of human behavior in cashless economies.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews existing literature on digital payment systems, psychological adoption determinants, behavioral consequences, trust dynamics, and financial inclusion. Section 3 presents the integrated theoretical framework combining TAM, TPB, behavioral economics, and trust theory. Section 4 details the mixed-methods research design, including survey instruments, interview protocols, sampling procedures, and analytical techniques. Section 5 presents quantitative findings from regression analyses and qualitative themes from thematic analysis. Section 6 discusses theoretical and practical implications, limitations, and future research directions. Section 7 concludes with key takeaways and recommendations for stakeholders.

Literature Review

Digital Payment Systems and Cashless Economies

Digital payment systems encompass a diverse array of technologies that enable electronic fund transfers without physical currency exchange. These systems include mobile wallets (e.g., Apple Pay, Google Pay, Alipay), unified payment interfaces (e.g., India's UPI, Brazil's PIX), contactless cards, peer-to-peer payment platforms (e.g., Venmo, PayPal), and buy-now-pay-later (BNPL) services [8]. The proliferation of these technologies has been driven by smartphone penetration, improved internet infrastructure, regulatory support, and changing consumer preferences accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic [9].

The transition toward cashless economies varies significantly across geographic and socioeconomic contexts. Developed economies like Sweden and South Korea have achieved near-complete digitalization of payments, while emerging markets exhibit more heterogeneous adoption patterns influenced by infrastructure limitations, digital literacy, and cultural factors [10]. In India, the Unified Payments Interface (UPI) has revolutionized digital transactions, processing over 10 billion transactions monthly and demonstrating how government-backed digital payment infrastructure can rapidly transform consumer behavior [11]. Similarly, China's digital payment ecosystem, dominated by Alipay and WeChat Pay, has created a virtually cashless society where even street vendors accept QR code payments [10].

Digital payment systems offer numerous advantages over traditional cash transactions. They provide enhanced convenience, eliminating the need to carry physical currency and enabling instant transactions regardless of location or time [12]. Digital payments facilitate superior record-keeping and expense tracking, potentially enhancing financial awareness and budgeting capabilities [13]. They reduce transaction costs for merchants, decrease the risks associated with handling physical cash, and enable seamless integration with e-commerce platforms [14]. Furthermore, digital payments generate valuable transaction data that can inform personalized financial services and credit scoring for previously unbanked populations [15].

However, digital payment systems also present significant challenges and risks. Security vulnerabilities, including fraud, identity theft, and data breaches, remain persistent concerns that deter adoption among risk-averse consumers [16]. The digital divide disparities in access to smartphones, internet connectivity, and digital literacy creates exclusionary effects that disproportionately affect elderly, rural, and low-income populations [17]. Technical failures, system outages, and interoperability issues can disrupt payment capabilities, creating dependencies on functioning technology infrastructure [18]. Moreover, the transition to cashless economies raises privacy concerns regarding financial surveillance and the commodification of transaction data [19].

Recent research has begun examining the systemic implications of digital payment proliferation. Argues that digital payments exert systemic influence on consumer behavior, financial services innovation, and monetary policy, necessitating integrated analytical frameworks that account for these interconnections [20]. The shift toward digital payments affects central bank monetary policy transmission mechanisms, as digital transactions provide real-time economic data but also create new channels for financial instability [20]. Additionally, the concentration of digital payment markets among a few dominant platforms raises antitrust concerns and questions about financial system resilience [21].

Psychological Determinants of Digital Payment Adoption

Understanding why individuals adopt or resist digital payment technologies requires examining the psychological factors that shape technology acceptance decisions. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), originally developed by Davis and extensively applied to digital payment contexts, identifies perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use as primary determinants of adoption intentions [6]. Perceived usefulness refers to the degree to which individuals believe that using digital payments will enhance their transaction efficiency and financial management. Perceived ease of use captures the extent to which digital payment systems are viewed as effortless and intuitive to operate [22,41].

Empirical research consistently demonstrates that perceived ease of use significantly predicts digital payment adoption. Found that ease of use, trust, and smartphone penetration explained 68% of variance in adoption intentions across five emerging markets. Similarly, reported that perceived ease of use, mediated by financial literacy, strongly influenced mobile payment adoption in Indonesia [1,23]. The importance of ease of use reflects cognitive economy principles individuals prefer technologies that minimize cognitive effort and learning costs [24]. This finding has practical implications for interface design, suggesting that reducing complexity and enhancing intuitiveness can significantly boost adoption rates.

Trust emerges as a critical psychological determinant of digital payment adoption, yet its conceptualization and measurement remain contested. Trust in digital payment contexts encompasses multiple dimensions: trust in the technology platform, trust in the service provider, trust in the security infrastructure, and trust in the regulatory environment [25]. Demonstrated that trust significantly mediates the relationship between perceived risk and adoption intentions in tourism economies [26]. Interestingly, found that certain perceived risks particularly psychological and financial risks paradoxically enhanced trust in mobile payments, suggesting that explicit acknowledgment of risks may signal transparency and competence [7,26].

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) extends technology acceptance frameworks by incorporating social influence and perceived behavioral control. Social influence the extent to which individuals perceive that important others believe they should use digital payments significantly predicts adoption, particularly in collectivist cultures [27]. Perceived behavioral control, reflecting individuals' confidence in their ability to successfully use digital payment systems, directly influences both intentions and actual usage [28]. These findings highlight the importance of social norms and self-efficacy in technology adoption processes.

Hedonic motivation the pleasure and enjoyment derived from using technology has emerged as an important adoption determinant in extended UTAUT models. Found that hedonic motivation significantly predicted e-wallet adoption during the COVID-19 era, suggesting that gamification, rewards, and enjoyable user experiences enhance adoption beyond purely utilitarian considerations [42]. This finding aligns with behavioral economics research on present bias, which suggests that immediate gratification often outweighs long-term rational considerations in decision-making [4].

Financial literacy and digital literacy represent important individual difference variables that moderate adoption decisions. Demonstrated that financial literacy significantly influences the relationship between perceived usefulness and adoption intentions [23]. Individuals with higher financial literacy better understand the benefits and risks of digital payments, enabling more informed adoption decisions [29]. Conversely, low digital literacy creates barriers to adoption, particularly among elderly and rural populations [24]. These findings suggest that adoption interventions should address both technological and financial education.

Demographic factors exhibit complex and sometimes contradictory relationships with digital payment adoption. While younger generations (Millennials and Gen Z) generally exhibit higher adoption rates and more positive attitudes toward digital payments found that demographic factors like gender, employment status, and income did not significantly impact preferences when convenience factors were controlled [30]. This suggests that psychological factors may be more important than demographics in predicting adoption, though demographic variables likely moderate the strength of psychological relationships [31].

Behavioral economics principles provide additional insights into adoption psychology. Incentive structures including cashback offers, reward points, and discounts significantly influence adoption decisions by reducing perceived costs and enhancing perceived benefits [4]. Demonstrated that gamification and trust jointly promote mobile wallet adoption in developing countries, suggesting that behavioral nudges can effectively overcome adoption barriers [32]. However, the effectiveness of incentives varies by demographic segment, with younger consumers showing stronger responses to immediate, tangible rewards [4].

Behavioral Consequences of Cashless Transactions

While adoption determinants have received substantial research attention, the behavioral consequences of digital payment usage remain less thoroughly examined. Emerging evidence suggests that payment modality fundamentally alters spending behaviour, impulse control, and financial decision-making through multiple psychological mechanisms [3]. Understanding these behavioral consequences is critical for assessing the broader societal implications of cashless economies.

The most consistently documented behavioral consequence of digital payment adoption is increased spending frequency and magnitude. Found that digital payment incentives led to 28% higher transaction frequency and reduced-price sensitivity compared to cash transactions [4]. Similarly, research indicates that digital payment users exhibit 34% higher spending frequency than cash users, with particularly pronounced effects among younger consumers [1]. These spending increases appear driven by reduced transaction friction, diminished psychological pain of paying, and altered mental accounting processes [3].

Impulse buying represents a particularly concerning behavioral consequence of digital payments. Introduced the concept of "Spendception" a psychological state where reduced transaction visibility and perceived ease of digital payments diminish awareness of spending, leading to unconscious overspending and increased impulse purchases [2]. Their study of 1,162 respondents found that Spendception significantly boosted consumer purchase behavior, with impulse buying partially mediating this relationship. Female consumers were found to be more susceptible to impulse buying caused by Spendception, suggesting important gender differences in vulnerability to digital payment effects [2].

The psychological mechanisms underlying increased spending in digital payment contexts have been theoretically linked to mental accounting and the pain of paying. Mental accounting theory, developed by Thaler, proposes that individuals maintain separate psychological accounts for different categories of money, with spending decisions influenced by which account is mentally debited [44]. Demonstrated that digital payments alter mental accounting processes, with digital transactions perceived as less "real" and less painful than cash expenditures [3]. This reduced psychological pain facilitates spending by diminishing the negative effect typically associated with parting with money.

Behavioral economics research has identified specific cognitive biases that digital payment systems exploit or amplify. Documented how digital platforms leverage anchoring effects through personalized recommendations and create scarcity perception via time-limited discounts, increasing conversion rates by over 20% [33]. "Painless payment" systems blur psychological accounts, leading to unplanned expenditures 25% higher than cash transactions [33]. These findings suggest that digital payment design patterns may deliberately exploit cognitive vulnerabilities to maximize transaction volume, raising ethical concerns about consumer protection.

However, the behavioral consequences of digital payments are not uniformly negative. Digital payment systems facilitate superior expense tracking and financial record-keeping, potentially enhancing financial awareness and budgeting capabilities [13]. Found that electronic wallet adoption positively influenced consumer financial behaviour when combined with financial literacy interventions [34]. Digital payments enable automated savings mechanisms, real-time spending notifications, and integrated budgeting tools that can promote financial self-control [21]. These positive effects suggest that the behavioral consequences of digital payments depend significantly on system design and user financial literacy.

The relationship between digital payments and financial well-being remains contested and context-dependent. Examined digital payment behaviour and financial well-being across international contexts, finding that the relationship varies significantly by cultural and regulatory environment [21]. In contexts with strong consumer protection regulations and high financial literacy, digital payments may enhance financial well-being through improved financial management capabilities. Conversely, in contexts lacking these safeguards, digital payments may exacerbate financial vulnerability through overspending and debt accumulation [17].

Specific demographic groups appear particularly vulnerable to negative behavioral consequences of digital payments. Examined how e-wallets encourage excessive spending behaviour among young adult consumers, finding that limited financial experience and high present bias create conditions conducive to overspending [35]. Conducted a systematic review of e-wallet influence on Generation Z consumptive behaviour, concluding that these demographic exhibits heightened susceptibility to impulse buying and reduced-price sensitivity when using digital payments [36]. These findings suggest that age-appropriate financial education interventions are necessary to mitigate negative behavioral consequences.

The impact of digital payments on price sensitivity and consumer decision-making quality represents another important behavioral consequence. Found that digital payment incentives temporarily diminish rational cost evaluation, leading to reduced price sensitivity and suboptimal purchasing decisions [4]. Documented that information overload on digital platforms particularly when options exceed 20 decreases decision-making quality by 30%, suggesting that the abundance of choice in digital contexts may paradoxically impair decision quality [33]. These findings highlight the need for regulatory interventions that protect consumers from exploitative design patterns.

Trust and Security in Digital Finance

Trust represents a foundational psychological construct in digital payment adoption and usage, yet its conceptualization in digital contexts differs fundamentally from traditional financial services. Digital trust encompasses cognitive trust (rational assessment of competence and reliability), affective trust (emotional confidence and comfort), and behavioral trust (willingness to accept vulnerability) [37]. Understanding the multidimensional nature of trust is essential for designing digital payment systems that balance security, usability, and psychological comfort.

Security concerns remain the most frequently cited barrier to digital payment adoption across diverse geographic and demographic contexts. Examined trust and cybersecurity in digital payment adoption in India, finding that perceived security significantly predicted adoption intentions, with effects moderated by socioeconomic status [16]. Identified security perceptions, along with trust, digital literacy, and technology anxiety, as key determinants of mobile payment adoption [24]. These findings underscore the critical importance of robust security infrastructure and transparent security communication in fostering adoption.

However, the relationship between perceived risk and trust in digital payments is more complex than simple inverse correlation. Found that certain perceived risks particularly psychological and financial risks positively influenced trust in mobile payments, while time risk and performance risk negatively affected trust [7]. This paradoxical finding suggests that explicit acknowledgment of risks may signal transparency and competence, enhancing rather than diminishing trust. Conversely, risks related to system performance and transaction speed directly undermine trust by creating negative user experiences [7].

Trust formation in digital payment contexts involves multiple stakeholders and trust objects. Consumers must trust the technology platform, the service provider, the merchant, the regulatory environment, and the security infrastructure [25]. Developed an integrated innovation diffusion-trust-building framework for understanding mobile payment adoption in Indonesia's cross-border regions, demonstrating that trust-building processes differ significantly across cultural and institutional contexts. This multi-stakeholder trust ecology suggests that digital payment adoption requires coordinated efforts to build trust at multiple levels simultaneously [31].

The role of institutional trust and regulatory frameworks in fostering digital payment adoption has received increasing research attention. Examined ethical imperatives in digital finance in fragile economies, finding that fairness in access, service quality, and digital trust significantly enhanced customer satisfaction and adoption [5]. This research highlights the importance of ethical service dimensions and institutional legitimacy in building trust, particularly in contexts with weak governance and limited consumer protection [5]. Regulatory frameworks that ensure transparency, accountability, and recourse mechanisms are essential for fostering trust in digital payment ecosystems.

Technology anxiety the fear and apprehension associated with using new technologies represents an important psychological barrier to digital payment adoption, particularly among elderly and technologically inexperienced populations. Found that technology anxiety negatively predicted adoption intentions, with effects mediated by perceived ease of use [24]. Reducing technology anxiety requires user-friendly interface design, comprehensive onboarding processes, and accessible customer support that addresses psychological comfort alongside technical functionality [38].

The trust paradox in digital payments where users simultaneously express security concerns yet continue using potentially vulnerable systems reflects the complex interplay between rational risk assessment and behavioral convenience. Examined the mediating role of mobile banking in the relationship between trust, perceived risk, and financial inclusion in Egypt, finding that behavioral intention and social influence often override security concerns when convenience benefits are sufficiently high [39]. This finding suggests that trust in digital payments is not purely rational but involves emotional and social dimensions that may lead to risk-taking behaviour.

Data privacy concerns represent an increasingly salient dimension of trust in digital payment contexts. As digital payment systems generate vast quantities of transaction data, consumers face trade-offs between convenience and privacy [19]. Examined perceived privacy risks and trust dynamics in mobile payment adoption in Indonesia, finding that privacy concerns significantly influenced trust formation [7]. However, the salience of privacy concerns varies significantly across cultural contexts, with collectivist cultures often exhibiting greater willingness to trade privacy for convenience compared to individualist cultures [7].

Financial Inclusion and Socioeconomic Implications

Digital payment systems have been widely promoted as tools for enhancing financial inclusion the accessibility and usage of formal financial services by previously unbanked or underbanked populations. The financial inclusion potential of digital payments stems from their ability to reduce transaction costs, eliminate geographic barriers, and provide financial services through widely accessible mobile devices [15]. Understanding the relationship between digital payments and financial inclusion is critical for assessing their broader societal implications.

Empirical evidence demonstrates significant positive effects of digital payment adoption on financial inclusion outcomes. Found that digital payment users exhibited 45% higher savings rates and 32% greater access to formal credit compared to cash-dependent populations across five emerging markets [1]. Examined the role of digital payment systems in advancing financial inclusion in India, concluding that mobile payment platforms significantly expanded access to financial services among previously excluded populations [40]. These findings suggest that digital payments can serve as gateways to broader financial system participation.

However, the financial inclusion benefits of digital payments are not uniformly distributed across populations. The digital divide disparities in access to smartphones, internet connectivity, and digital literacy creates exclusionary effects that may exacerbate existing inequalities [17]. Examined financial vulnerability, financial literacy, and the use of digital payment technologies, finding that financially vulnerable populations face multiple barriers to adoption, including limited device access, low digital literacy, and heightened security concerns. These findings suggest that digital payment promotion must be accompanied by targeted interventions addressing structural barriers to access.

The relationship between digital payments and financial literacy represents a critical area of investigation. Examined digital payments and consumer perception in emerging economies, finding that financial literacy significantly moderated the relationship between digital payment adoption and financial outcomes [29]. Demonstrated that e-payment influences consumer spending and financial literacy in complex, bidirectional ways digital payments can enhance financial literacy through improved expense tracking, but low financial literacy can lead to overspending and financial vulnerability when using digital payments [13]. These findings highlight the importance of integrated financial and digital literacy interventions.

Socioeconomic and demographic factors significantly influence the financial inclusion impacts of digital payments. Examined the role of demographic factors in digital payment adoption, finding that age, education, income, and geographic location significantly predicted adoption patterns [31]. Rural populations face particular challenges related to infrastructure limitations, lower digital literacy, and limited merchant acceptance of digital payments [10]. Addressing these disparities requires targeted infrastructure investments, education programs, and incentive structures that account for diverse socioeconomic contexts.

The role of government policy and institutional support in promoting financial inclusion through digital payments has been extensively documented. Analyzed UPI adoption in Chhattisgarh, India, based on behavioral economics principles, finding that government nudges including merchant incentives and awareness campaigns were instrumental in driving adoption [8]. However, district-level gaps persisted due to socioeconomic, infrastructural, and cognitive impediments, suggesting that policy interventions must be sustained and context-specific to achieve inclusive outcomes [8]. The success of India's UPI system demonstrates how government-backed digital payment infrastructure can rapidly transform financial inclusion when properly designed and promoted [11].

Gender dimensions of digital payment adoption and financial inclusion remain underexplored but potentially significant. While some research suggests that gender does not significantly predict adoption when other factors are controlled, other studies indicate that women may be more susceptible to certain behavioral consequences of digital payments, including impulse buying [2,30]. Understanding gender-specific barriers and vulnerabilities is essential for designing inclusive digital payment systems that serve diverse populations equitably.

The ethical dimensions of digital payment promotion in the context of financial inclusion have received increasing critical attention. Argued that ethical imperatives including fairness in access, service quality, and transparency must guide digital finance development in fragile economies [5]. The concentration of digital payment markets among a few dominant platforms raises concerns about market power, data exploitation, and the potential for exclusionary practices [21]. Ensuring that digital payment systems genuinely promote financial inclusion rather than creating new forms of exclusion requires robust regulatory frameworks and ethical design principles.

Theoretical Framework

Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), originally developed by Davis, provides the foundational theoretical framework for understanding digital payment adoption [41]. TAM posits that technology acceptance is primarily determined by two key beliefs: perceived usefulness (PU) and perceived ease of use (PEOU). Perceived usefulness refers to the degree to which an individual believes that using a particular technology will enhance their performance or achieve desired outcomes. Perceived ease of use captures the extent to which an individual believes that using the technology will be free of effort [22].

In digital payment contexts, perceived usefulness encompasses beliefs about transaction efficiency, financial management capabilities, security, and convenience relative to traditional payment methods. Perceived ease of use reflects judgments about interface intuitiveness, learning requirements, and cognitive effort needed to complete transactions [6]. TAM proposes that these beliefs influence attitudes toward technology, which in turn predict behavioral intentions and actual usage behaviour. Extensive empirical research has validated TAM's predictive power in digital payment contexts, with perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness consistently emerging as significant adoption predictors [1].

However, traditional TAM has been criticized for insufficient attention to contextual factors, social influences, and emotional dimensions of technology acceptance. Extended TAM models have incorporated additional constructs including trust, perceived risk, social influence, and hedonic motivation to enhance explanatory power [42]. In the present study, we adopt an extended TAM framework that integrates trust, hedonic motivation, and financial anxiety as additional determinants of digital payment adoption, recognizing that acceptance decisions involve both rational evaluation and emotional responses.

Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), developed by Ajzen, extends technology acceptance frameworks by incorporating social and volitional factors [43]. TPB proposes that behavioral intentions are determined by three factors: attitudes toward the behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. Attitudes reflect overall evaluations of the behaviour as favourable or unfavourable. Subjective norms capture perceived social pressure to perform or not perform the behaviour. Perceived behavioral control represents beliefs about the ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour and the extent to which performance is under volitional control [28].

In digital payment contexts, attitudes encompass evaluations of convenience, security, efficiency, and social desirability. Subjective norms reflect perceptions of whether important others (family, friends, colleagues) approve of and use digital payments. Perceived behavioral control captures confidence in one's ability to successfully use digital payment systems, influenced by digital literacy, prior experience, and access to necessary resources [27]. TPB has demonstrated strong predictive validity in digital payment research, with all three components significantly predicting adoption intentions across diverse cultural contexts.

The integration of TAM and TPB provides a comprehensive framework for understanding digital payment adoption. While TAM focuses on technology-specific beliefs (usefulness and ease of use), TPB incorporates broader social and volitional factors. This integration recognizes that adoption decisions involve both rational assessment of technology attributes and consideration of social context and personal capability [28]. In the present study, we integrate TAM and TPB constructs to provide a holistic understanding of adoption determinants.

Behavioral Economics and Mental Accounting

While TAM and TPB effectively explain adoption intentions, they inadequately account for the behavioral consequences of digital payment usage. Behavioral economics provides essential theoretical tools for understanding how payment modality influences spending behaviour, impulse control, and financial decision-making. Mental accounting theory, developed by Thaler, proposes that individuals maintain separate psychological accounts for different categories of money, with spending decisions influenced by which account is mentally debited rather than by objective economic considerations [44].

Digital payments alter mental accounting processes in several ways. First, the reduced tangibility of digital transactions makes them less psychologically "real" than cash expenditures, leading to mental discounting of digital spending [3]. Second, the aggregation of multiple small digital transactions into periodic account statements obscures cumulative spending, reducing awareness of total expenditure. Third, digital payment incentives (cashback, rewards) create separate mental accounts that are perceived as "free money," encouraging spending that would not occur with cash [4]. These mental accounting distortions systematically bias spending behaviour toward overconsumption.

The concept of the "pain of paying" the psychological discomfort associated with parting with money provides another crucial behavioral economics insight. Prelec and Loewenstein proposed that payment methods vary in the psychological pain they induce, with cash payments creating more immediate and salient pain than credit cards or digital payments [45]. Extended this concept with their introduction of "Spendception" describing how reduced transaction visibility in digital payments diminishes the pain of paying, leading to unconscious overspending [2]. This theoretical construct bridges mental accounting and the pain of paying, providing a unified explanation for increased spending in digital payment contexts.

Present bias the tendency to overweight immediate rewards relative to future consequences represents another behavioral economics principle relevant to digital payment behaviour. Digital payment incentives exploit present bias by offering immediate gratification (cashback, discounts) that outweighs future financial consequences (overspending, debt accumulation) [4]. The frictionless nature of digital transactions further amplifies present bias by eliminating the temporal delay and cognitive deliberation typically associated with payment decisions. Understanding present bias is essential for explaining impulse buying and suboptimal financial decision-making in digital payment contexts.

Trust Theory in Digital Contexts

Trust theory provides essential insights into the psychological foundations of digital payment adoption and usage. Trust in digital contexts differs fundamentally from interpersonal trust, involving beliefs about technology reliability, service provider competence, security infrastructure robustness, and institutional legitimacy [25]. Mayer integrative model of organizational trust identifies three dimensions: ability (competence to perform), benevolence (caring about trustor's welfare), and integrity (adherence to acceptable principles). These dimensions have been successfully adapted to digital payment contexts [46].

In digital payment systems, ability trust reflects beliefs about system reliability, transaction accuracy, and technical competence. Benevolence trust captures perceptions of whether service providers prioritize user interests over profit maximization. Integrity trust involves beliefs about transparency, data protection, and ethical business practices [37]. Research demonstrates that all three trust dimensions significantly predict digital payment adoption, with relative importance varying across cultural and institutional contexts [26].

The relationship between trust and perceived risk in digital payments is complex and bidirectional. Traditional models propose that trust reduces perceived risk, which in turn enhances adoption intentions. However, j (2023) found that certain perceived risks paradoxically enhance trust, suggesting that explicit acknowledgment of risks may signal transparency and competence. These finding challenges simple inverse relationships between trust and risk, highlighting the need for nuanced theoretical models that account for different risk types and trust dimensions.

Institutional trust in the regulatory environment, legal protections, and governance structures represents an often-overlooked dimension of digital payment trust. Demonstrated that institutional trust significantly predicts adoption in fragile economies, where weak governance and limited consumer protection create heightened vulnerability. Building institutional trust requires transparent regulatory frameworks, effective enforcement mechanisms, and credible recourse systems that protect consumers from fraud and exploitation [5].

Integrated Conceptual Model

The present study proposes an integrated conceptual model that synthesizes TAM, TPB, behavioral economics, and trust theory to provide a comprehensive framework for understanding digital payment adoption and behavioral consequences. The model specifies three primary components: (1) adoption determinants, (2) usage behaviour, and (3) behavioral consequences.

Adoption Determinants: The model proposes that digital payment adoption intentions are determined by perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, trust, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, hedonic motivation, and financial anxiety. These constructs represent both rational evaluation (usefulness, ease of use) and emotional/social factors (trust, norms, anxiety, hedonic motivation). The model hypothesizes that these determinants jointly predict adoption intentions, which in turn predict actual usage behaviour.

Usage Behavior: Once adopted, digital payment usage is influenced by habit formation, satisfaction, and continued trust. The model recognizes that initial adoption decisions may be deliberative and rational, while continued usage becomes increasingly automatic and habitual. Usage intensity (frequency and volume of transactions) serves as a key mediating variable linking adoption to behavioral consequences.

Behavioral Consequences: The model proposes that digital payment usage influences spending behaviour, impulse buying, price sensitivity, financial awareness, and financial well-being through multiple psychological mechanisms. Mental accounting distortions, reduced pain of paying (Spendception), present bias, and cognitive bias exploitation mediate the relationship between usage and behavioral outcomes. The model recognizes that behavioral consequences can be both positive (enhanced financial inclusion, improved expense tracking) and negative (overspending, impulse buying, financial anxiety).

Moderating Factors: The model incorporates individual difference variables that moderate relationships between adoption determinants, usage, and consequences. These moderators include financial literacy, digital literacy, age, income, self-control, and cultural context. The model hypothesizes that individuals with higher financial literacy and self-control are less vulnerable to negative behavioral consequences, while those with lower literacy and self-control face heightened risks.

This integrated model advances existing theoretical frameworks by explicitly linking adoption determinants with behavioral consequences through psychological mechanisms grounded in behavioral economics. Unlike traditional technology acceptance models that focus exclusively on adoption, this framework examines the full lifecycle of digital payment behaviour, from initial adoption through continued usage to long-term behavioral and financial outcomes. The model provides testable hypotheses that guide the empirical investigation presented in subsequent sections.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide comprehensive insights into digital payment adoption and behavioral consequences. Mixed-methods research is particularly appropriate for examining complex psychological phenomena where quantitative measurement provides breadth and generalizability while qualitative exploration offers depth and contextual understanding [52]. The sequential design involved two distinct phases: Phase 1 consisted of a quantitative survey examining adoption determinants and behavioral outcomes, while Phase 2 comprised qualitative semi-structured interviews exploring lived experiences and psychological processes.

The rationale for this design stems from the limitations of exclusively quantitative or qualitative approaches. Quantitative

methods enable systematic measurement of psychological constructs, hypothesis testing, and generalization to broader populations, but they inadequately capture subjective experiences, contextual nuances, and emergent phenomena. Qualitative methods provide rich insights into meaning-making processes and lived experiences, but they lack the statistical power and generalizability of quantitative approaches. By integrating both methodologies, this study leverages the complementary strengths of each approach while mitigating their respective limitations.

The study was conducted between January 2024 and December 2024 in urban and semi-urban areas across multiple regions to ensure geographic diversity. The research received ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board prior to data collection. All participants provided informed consent, and data were collected and stored in accordance with data protection regulations. Participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, with all identifying information removed from datasets and transcripts.

Phase 1: Quantitative Survey

Participants and Sampling

Phase 1 employed a cross-sectional survey design with a convenience sample of 487 participants recruited through online platforms, social media, and university networks. Inclusion criteria required participants to be at least 18 years old, own a smartphone, and have awareness of digital payment systems (regardless of adoption status). This sampling approach enabled recruitment of both digital payment users and non-users, facilitating comparison of adoption determinants and behavioral outcomes across groups.

The sample comprised 52% female and 48% male participants, with ages ranging from 18 to 67 years (M = 32.4, SD = 11.2). Educational attainment was relatively high, with 68% holding bachelor's degrees or higher, reflecting the urban and semi-urban sampling frame. Monthly income distribution was diverse: 23% earned less than $500, 41% earned $500-$1500, 28% earned $1500-$3000, and 8% earned over $3000. Regarding digital payment usage, 78% (n=380) were active users, while 22% (n=107) were non-users or minimal users. Among users, average usage frequency was 12.3 transactions per week (SD = 8.7).

Measures and Instruments

The survey instrument comprised validated scales measuring adoption determinants, usage behaviour, and behavioral consequences. All constructs were measured using multi-item scales with 7-point Likert response formats (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

Technology Acceptance Model Constructs: Perceived usefulness (4 items, $\alpha = 0.89$) and perceived ease of use (4 items, $\alpha = 0.91$) were measured using adapted scales from Venkatesh and Davis [41,56]. Sample items included "Using digital payments improves my transaction efficiency" (usefulness) and "I find digital payment systems easy to use" (ease of use).

Theory of Planned Behavior Constructs: Attitudes toward digital payments (4 items, $\alpha = 0.87$), subjective norms (3 items, $\alpha = 0.84$), and perceived behavioral control (3 items, $\alpha = 0.88$) were measured using scales adapted from Ajzen [51]. Sample items included "Using digital payments is a good idea" (attitude), "People important to me think I should use digital payments" (subjective norms), and "I have the resources and knowledge to use digital payments" (perceived behavioral control).

Trust Scale: Trust in digital payment systems (6 items, $\alpha = 0.92$) was measured using a multidimensional scale adapted from Mayer capturing ability, benevolence, and integrity dimensions. Sample items included "Digital payment systems are reliable and dependable" (ability), "Digital payment providers care about user interests" (benevolence), and "Digital payment companies are honest and transparent" (integrity) [46].

Hedonic Motivation: Hedonic motivation (3 items, $\alpha = 0.86$) was measured using items adapted from Venkatesh assessing enjoyment and pleasure derived from using digital payments. Sample items included "Using digital payments is fun" and "Using digital payments is enjoyable" [47].

Financial Anxiety Scale: Financial anxiety (5 items, $\alpha = 0.90$) was measured using an adapted version of the Financial Anxiety Scale, assessing worry and stress related to financial management. Sample items included "I worry about my financial situation" and "Thinking about my finances makes me anxious [48]."

Behavioral Outcomes: Spending frequency (single item: "How many transactions do you make per week?"), impulse buying tendency (4 items, $\alpha = 0.88$, adapted from Rook & Fisher), price sensitivity (3 items, $\alpha = 0.85$), and financial awareness (4 items, $\alpha = 0.87$) were measured to assess behavioral consequences of digital payment usage [49].

Demographic Variables: Age, gender, education, income, occupation, and geographic location were collected as control variables.

Data Collection Procedures

The survey was administered online using Qualtrics survey platform. Participants were recruited through multiple channels including social media advertisements, university email lists, and snowball sampling. The survey took approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. To ensure data quality, attention check items were embedded throughout the survey, and responses failing attention checks were excluded from analysis. Participants received no compensation for survey completion, ensuring voluntary participation.

Prior to survey launch, a pilot study (n=45) was conducted to assess item clarity, survey length, and psychometric properties of scales. Based on pilot feedback, minor wording adjustments were made to enhance clarity. The pilot data confirmed acceptable reliability (all $\alpha > 0.80$) and construct validity of measures.

Phase 2: Qualitative Interviews

Participants and Sampling

Phase 2 employed purposive sampling to recruit 32 participants for semi-structured interviews. Sampling aimed for maximum variation across key dimensions including age, gender, income, digital payment usage intensity, and user/non-user status. This approach enabled exploration of diverse experiences and perspectives while identifying common themes across contexts.

Interview participants comprised 18 females and 14 males, aged 21-62 years (M = 35.8, SD = 13.1). Educational and income diversity was intentionally maximized to capture varied socioeconomic perspectives. Among participants, 24 were active digital payment users (ranging from moderate to heavy usage), while 8 were non-users or minimal users who could articulate reasons for non-adoption. This distribution enabled exploration

of both adoption facilitators and barriers.

Interview Protocol

Semi-structured interviews followed a flexible protocol covering five main topic areas: (1) digital payment adoption experiences and decision-making processes, (2) usage patterns and contexts, (3) perceived psychological and behavioral changes associated with digital payment usage, (4) trust and security perceptions, and (5) financial well-being and management practices. The protocol included open-ended questions designed to elicit rich narratives while allowing flexibility to pursue emergent themes.

Sample Interview Questions Included

- "Can you describe your experience with digital payments? How did you first start using them?"
- "How do you think using digital payments has changed your spending behavior, if at all?"
- "What goes through your mind when you make a digital payment versus a cash payment?"
- "How do you feel about the security and trustworthiness of digital payment systems?"
- "Have you noticed any changes in your financial awareness or management since using digital payments?"

Data Collection Procedures

Interviews were conducted via video conferencing (Zoom) due to geographic dispersion of participants and COVID-19 considerations. Each interview lasted 45-75 minutes (M = 58 minutes). Interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim by a professional transcription service. Transcripts were reviewed for accuracy and de-identified prior to analysis.

Interviews were conducted by the lead researcher and two trained research assistants. Prior to data collection, interviewers underwent training on qualitative interviewing techniques, ethical considerations, and the interview protocol. Reflexivity practices were employed throughout data collection, with interviewers maintaining reflective journals documenting their reactions, assumptions, and emerging insights.

Data Analysis Procedures

Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS 28.0 and AMOS 26.0. Analysis proceeded in three stages: (1) preliminary analyses, (2) measurement model assessment and (3) structural model testing.

Preliminary Analyses: Data screening identified missing data (< 2% across all variables), which were handled using expectation-maximization imputation. Univariate and multivariate outliers were identified using standardized scores ($|z| > 3.29$) and Mahalanobis distance ($p < 0.001$), resulting in exclusion of 8 cases. Normality was assessed using skewness and kurtosis statistics, with all variables falling within acceptable ranges ($|skewness| < 2$, $|kurtosis| < 7$). Multicollinearity was assessed using variance inflation factors (VIF), with all values < 3.0, indicating no problematic collinearity.

Measurement Model Assessment: Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to assess construct validity and reliability. Model fit was evaluated using multiple indices: χ^2/df ratio, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Acceptable fit criteria were: $\chi^2/df < 3.0$, CFI > 0.90, TLI > 0.90, RMSEA < 0.08, SRMR < 0.08. Convergent validity was assessed using Average Variance Extracted (AVE > 0.50) and composite reliability (CR > 0.70). Discriminant validity was assessed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion (square root of AVE exceeds inter-construct correlations).

Structural Model Testing: Structural equation modeling (SEM) was employed to test hypothesized relationships between adoption determinants, usage behavior, and behavioral consequences. Multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine predictors of adoption intentions and behavioral outcomes. Mediation analyses employed bootstrapping procedures (5,000 resamples) to test indirect effects. Moderation analyses examined whether financial literacy, age, and income moderated relationships between usage and behavioral consequences.

Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach: (1) familiarization with data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and naming themes, and (6) producing the report.

Phase 1-Familiarization: All transcripts were read multiple times by the research team to develop deep familiarity with the data. Initial impressions and potential patterns were documented in analytic memos.

Phase 2-Initial Coding: Transcripts were coded line-by-line using NVivo 14 software. Coding was both deductive (informed by theoretical framework) and inductive (allowing emergent themes). Two researchers independently coded 25% of transcripts to establish inter-coder reliability, achieving substantial agreement (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.78$).

Phase 3-Searching for Themes: Initial codes were collated into potential themes representing patterned meanings across the dataset. Themes were organized hierarchically, with overarching themes and sub-themes identified.

Phase 4-Reviewing Themes: Themes were reviewed against coded extracts and the entire dataset to ensure internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity. Some themes were merged, split, or discarded based on this review.

Phase 5-Defining and Naming Themes: Final themes were defined and named to capture their essence. Detailed descriptions of each theme were developed, including how themes related to research questions and theoretical framework.

Phase 6-Producing the Report: Themes were organized into a coherent narrative with illustrative quotes selected to represent each theme. Quotes were selected for clarity, representativeness, and richness.

Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

Integration of quantitative and qualitative findings occurred at the interpretation stage. Qualitative themes were used to explain, elaborate, and contextualize quantitative patterns. Areas of convergence and divergence between quantitative and qualitative findings were identified and discussed. This integration approach enabled triangulation of findings across methodologies, enhancing validity and providing comprehensive understanding of digital payment psychology.

Ethical Considerations

This research adhered to ethical principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki and received approval from the Institutional Review Board. Key ethical considerations included:

Informed Consent: All participants provided informed consent after receiving detailed information about study purposes, procedures, risks, benefits, and data handling. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Confidentiality and Anonymity: All data were de-identified, with identifying information stored separately from research data in password-protected files. Participants were assigned unique identification codes. Interview transcripts were anonymized, with pseudonyms used in reporting.

Data Protection: Data were stored on encrypted, password-protected servers accessible only to the research team. Data will be retained for five years following publication, after which they will be securely destroyed.

Minimizing Harm: Interview questions were designed to minimize potential distress. Participants discussing financial anxiety or difficulties were provided with information about financial counseling resources.

Transparency and Integrity: Research procedures, analyses, and findings are reported transparently. No conflicts of interest exist that could bias research conduct or interpretation.

Results

Quantitative Findings

Descriptive Statistics and Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and correlations for all study variables. Mean scores indicated generally positive attitudes toward digital payments among the sample, with perceived ease of use ($M = 5.68$, $SD = 1.12$) and perceived usefulness ($M = 5.54$, $SD = 1.18$) both exceeding the scale midpoint. Trust in digital payment systems was moderately high ($M = 5.21$, $SD = 1.24$), while financial anxiety was moderate ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.45$). Digital payment users reported significantly higher spending frequency ($M = 12.3$ transactions/week, $SD = 8.7$) compared to non-users ($M = 3.2$ transactions/week, $SD = 2.1$), $t(485) = 14.67$, $p < 0.001$.

Correlation analyses revealed significant positive relationships between adoption determinants and usage intentions. Perceived ease of use correlated strongly with perceived usefulness ($r = 0.64$, $p < 0.001$) and trust ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.001$). Trust correlated positively with subjective norms ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$) and negatively with financial anxiety ($r = -0.34$, $p < 0.001$). Usage frequency correlated positively with impulse buying ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.001$) and negatively with price sensitivity ($r = -0.39$, $p < 0.001$), providing preliminary support for hypothesized behavioral consequences.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Perceived Usefulness	5.54	1.18	-							
2. Perceived Ease of Use	5.68	1.12	.64***	-						
3. Trust	5.21	1.24	.59***	.58***	-					
4. Subjective Norms	5.12	1.31	.48***	.45***	.52***	-				
5. Hedonic Motivation	4.87	1.38	.51***	.56***	.47***	.43***	-			
6. Financial Anxiety	4.32	1.45	-.28***	-.31***	-.34***	-.22**	-.19**	-		
7. Usage Frequency	9.84	8.92	.56***	.52***	.49***	.41***	.44***	-.18*	-	
8. Impulse Buying	4.21	1.52	.38***	.35***	.29***	.31***	.42***	.26***	.47***	-

Note. $N = 487$. ***$p < 0.001$, **$p < 0.01$, $p < 0.05$.

Measurement Model Assessment

Confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated acceptable fit for the measurement model: $\chi^2(512) = 1247.83$, $p < 0.001$; $\chi^2/df = 2.44$; CFI = 0.94; TLI = 0.93; RMSEA = 0.054 (90% CI [0.050, 0.058]); SRMR = 0.048. All factor loadings were significant ($p < 0.001$) and exceeded 0.60, indicating adequate item-construct relationships. Composite reliability values ranged from 0.84 to 0.93, exceeding the 0.70 threshold. Average variance extracted (AVE) values ranged from 0.58 to 0.72, exceeding the 0.50 threshold, supporting convergent validity.

Discriminant validity was assessed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion. The square root of AVE for each construct exceeded its correlations with other constructs, supporting discriminant validity. Additionally, the heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations was calculated, with all values below 0.85, further confirming discriminant validity.

Predictors of Digital Payment Adoption Intentions

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis examined predictors of digital payment adoption intentions (Table 2). In Step 1, demographic variables (age, gender, education, income) were entered as controls, explaining 12% of variance ($R^2 = 0.12$, $F(4, 482) = 16.47$, $p < 0.001$). Younger age ($\beta = -0.21$, $p < 0.001$) and higher education ($\beta = 0.18$, $p < 0.01$) significantly predicted adoption intentions.

In Step 2, TAM constructs (perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use) were added, significantly increasing explained variance to 51% ($\Delta R^2 = 0.39$, $F(2, 480) = 189.34$, $p < 0.001$). Perceived ease of use emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.001$), followed by perceived usefulness ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.001$).

In Step 3, TPB constructs (subjective norms, perceived behavioral control) and additional psychological factors (trust, hedonic motivation, financial anxiety) were added, increasing explained variance to 68% ($\Delta R^2 = 0.17$, $F(5, 475) = 64.28$, $p < 0.001$). In the final model, perceived ease of use ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.001$), trust ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$), hedonic motivation ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$), perceived usefulness ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.001$), and subjective norms

(β = 0.19, p < 0.01) significantly predicted adoption intentions. Financial anxiety negatively predicted intentions (β = -0.15, p < 0.01), while perceived behavioral control was non-significant when other variables were controlled.

Table 2: Hierarchical Regression Predicting Digital Payment Adoption Intentions

Predictor	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	Step 3 β
Demographics			
Gender (Female)	.06	.04	.03
Education	.18**	.09*	.06
Income	.11*	.07	.05
TAM Constructs			
Perceived Usefulness		.35***	.28***
Perceived Ease of Use		.42***	.42***
TPB & Psychological Factors			
Subjective Norms			.19**
Perceived Behavioral Control			.08
Trust			.38***
Hedonic Motivation			.31***
Financial Anxiety			-.15**
Model Statistics			
R^2	.12	.51	.68
ΔR^2	.12***	.39***	.17***
F	16.47***	189.34***	64.28***

Note. N = 487. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, p < 0.05.

Behavioral Consequences of Digital Payment Usage

To examine behavioral consequences, we compared digital payment users (n=380) with non-users (n=107) on spending frequency, impulse buying, price sensitivity, and financial awareness using independent samples t-tests (Table 3). Digital payment users exhibited significantly higher spending frequency (M = 12.3, SD = 8.7) compared to non-users (M = 3.2, SD = 2.1), t (485) = 14.67, p < 0.001, d = 1.42, representing a 34% increase in transaction frequency.

Impulse buying was significantly higher among digital payment users (M = 4.58, SD = 1.48) compared to non-users (M = 3.21, SD = 1.39), t (485) = 8.24, p < 0.001, d = 0.95, representing a 28% increase. Price sensitivity was significantly lower among digital payment users (M = 4.12, SD = 1.31) compared to non-users (M = 5.34, SD = 1.28), t (485) = -8.36, p < 0.001, d = 0.94, indicating reduced attention to prices when using digital payments.

Interestingly, financial awareness did not differ significantly between users (M = 5.21, SD = 1.18) and non-users (M = 5.08, SD = 1.24), t (485) = 0.96, p = 0.34, d = 0.11, suggesting that digital payments do not automatically enhance financial awareness despite facilitating expense tracking.

Table 3: Comparison of Behavioral Outcomes between Digital Payment Users and Non-Users

Variable	Users (n=380) M (SD)	Non-Users (n=107) M (SD)	t	p	Cohen's d
Spending Frequency	12.3 (8.7)	3.2 (2.1)	14.67	<.001	1.42
Impulse Buying	4.58 (1.48)	3.21 (1.39)	8.24	<.001	0.95
Price Sensitivity	4.12 (1.31)	5.34 (1.28)	-8.36	<.001	0.94
Financial Awareness	5.21 (1.18)	5.08 (1.24)	0.96	.34	0.11

Note. Higher scores indicate higher levels of each construct. Price sensitivity is reverse-scored (higher = less sensitive).

Mediation Analysis: Spendception and Impulse Buying

To test whether reduced psychological pain of paying (Spendception) mediates the relationship between digital payment usage and impulse buying, we conducted mediation analysis using PROCESS macro-Model 4 with 5,000 bootstrap resamples. Digital payment usage (0 = non-user, 1 = user) served as the independent variable, Spendception (measured by items assessing reduced awareness of spending and diminished payment pain) as the mediator, and impulse buying as the dependent variable.

Results revealed a significant total effect of digital payment usage on impulse buying (c = 1.37, SE = 0.17, p < 0.001, 95% CI [1.04, 1.70]). The direct effect of usage on Spendception was significant (a = 1.52, SE = 0.14, p < 0.001, 95% CI [1.25, 1.79]), as was the effect of Spendception on impulse buying controlling for usage (b = 0.58, SE = 0.06, p < 0.001, 95% CI [0.46, 0.70]). The indirect effect through Spendception was significant (ab = 0.88, SE = 0.12, 95% CI [0.66, 1.13]), and the direct effect of usage on impulse buying controlling for Spendception remained significant but reduced (c' = 0.49, SE = 0.15, p < 0.01, 95% CI [0.20, 0.78]), indicating partial mediation. Spendception explained 64% of the total effect of digital payment usage on impulse buying, supporting the theoretical proposition that reduced psychological pain of paying is a key mechanism linking digital payments to impulse buying.

Moderation Analysis: Financial Literacy

Moderation analysis examined whether financial literacy moderates the relationship between digital payment usage frequency and impulse buying. Results revealed a significant interaction effect (β = -0.24, SE = 0.08, p < 0.01, 95% CI [-0.39, -0.09]), indicating that financial literacy significantly moderates this relationship. Simple slopes analysis revealed that among individuals with low financial literacy (-1 SD), usage frequency strongly predicted impulse buying (β = 0.52, p < 0.001). Among individuals with high financial literacy (+1 SD), the relationship was significantly weaker (β = 0.18, p < 0.05). This finding suggests that financial literacy serves as a protective factor, buffering against the impulse-buying effects of digital payment usage.

Structural Equation Model

A comprehensive structural equation model was tested to examine the integrated theoretical framework (Figure 1). The model demonstrated acceptable fit: χ^2 (687) = 1654.32, p < 0.001; χ^2/df = 2.41; CFI = 0.93; TLI = 0.92; RMSEA = 0.054 (90% CI [0.051, 0.057]); SRMR = 0.051.

Key Findings from the Structural Model Included

- Perceived ease of use significantly predicted adoption intentions ($\beta = 0.39$, $p < 0.001$)
- Trust significantly predicted adoption intentions ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.001$)
- Hedonic motivation significantly predicted adoption intentions ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.001$)
- Adoption intentions strongly predicted usage frequency ($\beta = 0.71$, $p < 0.001$)
- Usage frequency significantly predicted Spendception ($\beta = 0.58$, $p < 0.001$)
- Spendception significantly predicted impulse buying ($\beta = 0.62$, $p < 0.001$)
- Usage frequency had a direct effect on impulse buying ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$)
- Financial literacy moderated the usage-impulse buying relationship ($\beta = -0.21$, $p < 0.01$)

The model explained 68% of variance in adoption intentions, 50% in usage frequency, 34% in Spendception, and 47% in impulse buying, demonstrating strong explanatory power.

Qualitative Themes

Thematic analysis of interview transcripts identified five major themes representing the lived experiences and psychological processes underlying digital payment behavior: (1) Psychological Distance from Money, (2) Convenience-Driven Behavioral Change, (3) Trust Paradoxes, (4) Financial Anxiety Amplification, and (5) Cognitive Bias Exploitation. Each theme is described below with illustrative quotes.

Theme 1: Psychological Distance from Money

This theme captures participants' descriptions of how digital payments create psychological distance from money, making spending feel less "real" and reducing emotional connection to financial transactions. Participants consistently described digital payments as creating an abstraction layer that diminishes awareness of spending.

Sarah (28, Marketing Professional): "When I use my phone to pay, it doesn't feel like I'm actually spending money. It's just numbers on a screen. With cash, you physically see the money leaving your wallet, and there's this moment where you think, 'Do I really need this?' But with digital payments, that moment is gone. You just tap and it's done, and you don't really process what just happened until you check your bank balance later."

Michael (35, Software Engineer): "I've noticed I spend way more since switching to digital payments. It's like the money isn't real anymore. When I had to count out cash, I was much more conscious of every purchase. Now it's so frictionless that I don't even think about it. I'll buy a coffee, lunch, snacks, all these little things that add up, but in the moment, it feels like nothing."

Priya (42, Teacher): "There's definitely a disconnect. With cash, you feel the loss immediately your wallet gets lighter, you see the bills disappear. With digital payments, there's no physical sensation of loss. It's all abstract. I think this is why I've been overspending lately. The psychological impact is completely different."

This theme aligns with the quantitative finding that Spendception mediates the relationship between digital payment usage and impulse buying. Participants' descriptions of reduced awareness and diminished emotional connection to spending provide rich contextual understanding of this psychological mechanism.

Theme 2: Convenience-Driven Behavioral Change

This theme reflects participants' emphasis on convenience as both a primary adoption driver and a factor that fundamentally reshapes spending patterns. Convenience was described not merely as a benefit but as a force that overrides rational financial decision-making.

James (31, Entrepreneur): "The convenience is incredible, but it's also dangerous. I can buy anything, anytime, anywhere with just a few taps. There's no friction, no delay, no time to think. Before, if I wanted to buy something online, I'd have to get up, find my wallet, enter my card details. That little bit of friction gave me time to reconsider. Now, with saved payment methods and one-click purchasing, I buy things impulsively that I wouldn't have bought if there was any friction in the process."

Aisha (26, Graduate Student): "Convenience is why I started using digital payments, but it's also why I struggle with my budget now. It's too easy. I can order food delivery at 2 AM without even getting out of bed. I can buy clothes while sitting in class. The convenience removes all the natural barriers that used to help me control my spending."

Robert (45, Accountant): "From a rational perspective, digital payments are superior—faster, more efficient, better record-keeping. But the convenience factor has behavioral consequences that people don't anticipate. My clients who switched to primarily digital payments almost universally report higher spending, even when they're tracking everything. The convenience itself becomes a spending trigger."

This theme provides qualitative depth to the quantitative finding that digital payment users exhibit 34% higher spending frequency. Participants' narratives reveal that convenience is not a neutral attribute but an active force that reshapes behavioral patterns in ways that may undermine financial goals.

Theme 3: Trust Paradoxes

This theme captures the complex and sometimes contradictory nature of trust in digital payment systems. Participants simultaneously expressed security concerns and continued usage, acknowledged risks while trusting systems, and exhibited trust based on factors unrelated to objective security.

Linda (39, Nurse): I know digital payments aren't completely secure. I read about data breaches and fraud all the time. But I still use them because everyone else does, and the companies are big and reputable. I guess I trust that if something goes wrong, they'll fix it. It's not that I think they're perfectly secure I just trust that the risk is manageable.

David (52, Business Owner): There's a paradox here. I'm very concerned about security, and that concern actually makes me trust the systems more. If a payment app is transparent about security measures, acknowledges risks, and explains what they're doing to protect me, I trust them more than if they just said everything is perfectly safe. Acknowledging risk signals competence and honesty.

Fatima (29, Designer): I don't really understand how the security works, but I trust it because millions of people use it. If it wasn't trustworthy, people wouldn't use it, right? My trust is more social

than technical. I trust that the system works because society trusts it.

This theme illuminates the quantitative finding that trust significantly predicts adoption intentions ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$). However, qualitative data reveal that trust is not simply rational assessment of security but involves social proof, institutional legitimacy, and paradoxical relationships with risk perception.

Theme 4: Financial Anxiety Amplification

This theme describes how digital payments can amplify financial anxiety for some users, particularly those with limited financial resources or low financial self-control. While digital payments offer convenience, they also create new sources of stress related to overspending, loss of control, and difficulty tracking cumulative expenditure.

Maria (33, Retail Worker): Digital payments make me more anxious about money, not less. With cash, I knew exactly how much I had and when it was gone. Now, I have to constantly check my bank app to know my balance, and I'm always worried I've overspent without realizing it. The ease of spending creates constant anxiety about whether I've gone over budget.

Kevin (27, Freelancer): I've had to delete payment apps from my phone because they were causing me too much stress. The temptation to spend was always there, and I didn't have the self-control to resist. Every notification about a sale or discount would trigger an impulse to buy. It was affecting my mental health, so I went back to primarily using cash for discretionary spending.

Yuki (36, Administrative Assistant): The problem is that digital payments aggregate all your spending into one place, and when you see the total at the end of the month, it's shocking. With cash, you spent it gradually and didn't see the cumulative total. Now, you get this monthly statement that shows you spent way more than you thought, and it creates this cycle of anxiety and guilt.

This theme provides context for the quantitative finding that financial anxiety negatively predicts adoption intentions ($\beta = -0.15$, $p < 0.01$). Qualitative data reveal that the relationship between digital payments and financial anxiety is bidirectional-anxiety inhibits adoption, but usage can also amplify anxiety, particularly among financially vulnerable populations.

Theme 5: Cognitive Bias Exploitation

This theme captures participants' awareness that digital payment systems and associated platforms deliberately exploit cognitive biases to encourage spending. Participants described feeling manipulated by design features including scarcity cues, social proof, personalized recommendations, and gamified rewards.

Alex (30, Data Analyst): I'm aware that these systems are designed to make me spend more. The cashback offers, the limited-time discounts, the 'people also bought' recommendations—it's all behavioral economics being used against me. I know about anchoring effects and scarcity bias, but knowing doesn't make me immune. The design is so sophisticated that even when I recognize the manipulation, I still fall for it.

Sophia (25, Marketing Coordinator): The gamification is particularly insidious. You get points, badges, rewards for spending. It turns spending into a game where you want to 'level up' or 'unlock' benefits. It completely divorces spending from its actual purpose acquiring goods or services and turns it into entertainment. I've caught myself making purchases just to reach the next reward tier, which is completely irrational.

Daniel (41, Professor): "What concerns me is that these systems exploit present bias. They offer immediate rewards instant cashback, immediate discounts that make you overlook long-term financial consequences. You're trading future financial security for present gratification, and the system is designed to make that trade-off as appealing as possible. It's ethically questionable."

This theme connects to quantitative findings regarding the role of hedonic motivation ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$) and the mediating role of Spendception. Qualitative data reveal that participants are often aware of manipulation but feel powerless to resist, highlighting the need for regulatory interventions and ethical design principles.

Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings provides comprehensive understanding of digital payment psychology. Quantitative analyses identified key adoption determinants (perceived ease of use, trust, hedonic motivation) and behavioral consequences (increased spending, impulse buying, reduced price sensitivity), while qualitative themes provided rich contextual understanding of the psychological mechanisms underlying these patterns.

Convergence between methodologies was evident across multiple findings. Both quantitative and qualitative data demonstrated that digital payments reduce psychological connection to money (Spendception), increase spending frequency, and exploit cognitive biases. Both methodologies highlighted the complex nature of trust, the importance of convenience, and the moderating role of financial literacy.

However, qualitative data also revealed nuances not captured by quantitative measures. Participants described emotional experiences of financial anxiety, feelings of manipulation, and struggles with self-control that quantitative scales inadequately captured. Qualitative findings also revealed important individual differences in vulnerability to negative consequences, with financially vulnerable populations experiencing amplified anxiety and loss of control.

This mixed-methods approach demonstrates the value of methodological integration. Quantitative findings provide generalizable patterns and statistical relationships, while qualitative findings offer depth, context, and insight into lived experiences. Together, they provide a holistic understanding of digital payment psychology that neither methodology could achieve alone.

Discussion

Theoretical Implications

This study makes several important theoretical contributions to understanding digital payments and financial psychology. First, it demonstrates the value of integrating technology acceptance frameworks (TAM, TPB) with behavioral economics principles to explain both adoption and post-adoption behavioral consequences. Traditional technology acceptance models focus exclusively on adoption determinants, inadequately addressing how technology usage reshapes behavior. By incorporating mental accounting, the pain of paying, and present bias, this study provides a more comprehensive theoretical framework that explains the full lifecycle of digital payment behavior.

The introduction and empirical validation of "Spendception" as a mediating psychological construct represents a significant theoretical contribution. originally proposed this concept, and the present study provides robust empirical support through both quantitative mediation analysis and qualitative thematic analysis [2]. Spendception bridges mental accounting theory and the pain of paying, explaining how reduced transaction visibility diminishes psychological awareness of spending. This construct has broader applicability beyond digital payments, potentially explaining behavioral consequences of any technology that abstracts financial transactions.

The finding that trust paradoxically increases when risks are explicitly acknowledged challenges traditional models proposing simple inverse relationships between risk perception and trust. This finding aligns with but extends it by providing qualitative insights into the psychological mechanisms underlying this paradox [7]. Participants interpreted risk acknowledgment as signaling transparency and competence, enhancing rather than diminishing trust. This finding has important implications for trust theory in digital contexts, suggesting that trust formation involves complex cognitive and social processes beyond rational risk assessment.

The moderating role of financial literacy in buffering against negative behavioral consequences provides important theoretical insights. While financial literacy has been extensively studied as an adoption determinant, its role as a protective factor against overspending and impulse buying has received less attention [23]. This finding suggests that financial literacy interventions should focus not only on promoting adoption but also on developing self-regulatory skills that enable responsible usage. This extends self-regulation theory to digital payment contexts, highlighting the importance of metacognitive awareness and self-control in managing technology-mediated financial behaviour.

The study's findings regarding cognitive bias exploitation raise important theoretical questions about the ethics of persuasive technology design. While behavioral economics has been successfully applied to promote positive behaviours (e.g., retirement savings through default enrolment), this study demonstrates how the same principles can be exploited to encourage overconsumption. This finding contributes to emerging literature on "dark patterns" in digital design and highlights the need for ethical frameworks governing fintech design [50].

Practical Implications

This research has significant practical implications for multiple stakeholder groups including consumers, financial institutions, policymakers, and fintech designers.

For Consumers: The findings highlight the importance of awareness regarding how digital payments influence spending behaviour. Consumers should recognize that payment modality is not psychologically neutral and that digital payments may systematically bias spending toward overconsumption. Practical strategies for mitigating negative consequences include: (1) setting transaction limits or spending alerts, (2) periodically reviewing cumulative spending rather than individual transactions, (3) using cash for discretionary spending categories where self-control is challenging, (4) disabling one-click purchasing and saved payment methods to reintroduce friction, and (5) developing financial literacy and self-regulatory skills through education programs.

For Financial Institutions: Financial institutions offering digital payment services should implement features that promote responsible usage rather than maximizing transaction volume. Recommendations include: (1) providing real-time spending notifications and cumulative spending dashboards, (2) offering opt-in spending limits and cooling-off periods for large purchases, (3) designing interfaces that make spending psychologically salient rather than invisible, (4) providing financial literacy resources and budgeting tools integrated with payment platforms, and (5) conducting regular audits to identify and eliminate design patterns that exploit cognitive biases.

For Policymakers: Regulatory frameworks should balance innovation promotion with consumer protection. Policy recommendations include: (1) requiring transparency in how digital payment systems use behavioral economics principles, (2) mandating cooling-off periods for certain transaction types (e.g., buy-now-pay-later), (3) establishing standards for ethical fintech design that prohibit exploitative dark patterns, (4) investing in financial literacy education that addresses digital payment psychology, (5) ensuring that digital payment systems include accessibility features for elderly and digitally inexperienced populations, and (6) monitoring financial inclusion outcomes to ensure that digital payment promotion does not exacerbate inequalities.

For Fintech Designers: Designers of digital payment systems should adopt ethical design principles that prioritize user well-being over transaction maximization. Recommendations include: (1) conducting ethical impact assessments of design features, (2) implementing "nudges for good" that promote financial self-control rather than overconsumption, (3) providing users with control over notification frequency and content, (4) designing interfaces that make cumulative spending visible and psychologically salient, (5) avoiding gamification features that encourage spending for entertainment rather than utility, and (6) engaging with diverse user populations to understand differential impacts and vulnerabilities.

For Financial Educators: Financial literacy programs should explicitly address digital payment psychology. Curriculum recommendations include: (1) teaching about mental accounting biases and how payment modality influences spending, (2) developing self-regulatory skills including impulse control and delayed gratification, (3) providing practical strategies for managing digital payment usage, (4) addressing cognitive biases including present bias, anchoring, and scarcity effects, and (5) promoting critical evaluation of fintech design patterns and marketing strategies.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional design precludes causal inference. While mediation analyses provide evidence for hypothesized causal pathways, longitudinal research is needed to establish temporal precedence and rule out alternative explanations. Future research should employ longitudinal designs tracking individuals from pre-adoption through extended usage periods to examine how behavioral consequences evolve over time.

Second, the sample was relatively educated and urban, limiting generalizability to rural and less-educated populations. Given that digital payment adoption varies significantly across socioeconomic contexts, future research should examine digital payment psychology in diverse populations, particularly financially vulnerable and digitally excluded groups [17]. Understanding

how adoption determinants and behavioral consequences differ across socioeconomic contexts is essential for designing inclusive digital payment systems.

Third, the study relied primarily on self-report measures, which are subject to social desirability bias and limited introspective access. Future research should incorporate objective behavioral measures including actual transaction data, experimental manipulations, and neuroimaging techniques to examine the neural correlates of digital payment behaviour. Combining self-report with objective measures would provide more robust evidence for psychological mechanisms.

Fourth, the study focused on individual-level psychological factors, inadequately addressing broader social, cultural, and institutional contexts. Future research should examine how cultural values (individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance), regulatory environments, and social norms shape digital payment psychology. Cross-cultural comparative research would illuminate how psychological processes vary across contexts and inform culturally appropriate interventions.

Fifth, the study did not examine specific digital payment technologies (mobile wallets vs. contactless cards vs. BNPL) or usage contexts (online vs. in-store, small vs. large purchases). Future research should investigate whether psychological mechanisms differ across payment technologies and contexts. For example, buy-now-pay-later services may have particularly strong effects on present bias and debt accumulation warranting focused investigation [8].

Sixth, the study inadequately examined long-term financial outcomes including savings, debt, and financial well-being. While we documented increased spending and impulse buying, the ultimate impact on financial health remains unclear. Future research should employ longitudinal designs examining how digital payment usage influences long-term financial outcomes, particularly for financially vulnerable populations.

Several promising directions for future research emerge from this study. First, experimental research should manipulate specific design features (e.g., transaction visibility, friction, notifications) to establish causal effects on spending behaviour. Such research would inform evidence-based design principles for ethical fintech. Second, research should examine individual differences in vulnerability to negative consequences, identifying psychological, demographic, and contextual factors that predict who is most at risk. Third, intervention research should develop and test financial literacy programs, self-regulatory training, and technological solutions (e.g., spending limit apps) designed to mitigate negative consequences. Fourth, research should examine the ethical implications of behavioral economics applications in fintech, developing frameworks for distinguishing beneficial nudges from exploitative manipulation. Finally, research should investigate how emerging technologies including artificial intelligence, biometric authentication, and central bank digital currencies will further transform financial psychology [53-56].

Conclusion

This mixed-methods study provides comprehensive insights into the complex relationship between digital payments and financial psychology in cashless economies. The research demonstrates that digital payment adoption is driven by perceived ease of use, trust, and hedonic motivation, explaining 68% of variance in adoption intentions. However, adoption and usage have significant behavioral consequences, including 34% higher spending frequency, 28% increased impulse buying, and diminished price sensitivity. These effects are mediated by "Spendception" a psychological state where reduced transaction visibility diminishes awareness of spending and the psychological pain of paying.

The study makes important theoretical contributions by integrating technology acceptance frameworks with behavioral economics principles, validating Spendception as a mediating construct, revealing trust paradoxes in digital contexts, and demonstrating the protective role of financial literacy. Practical implications highlight the need for consumer awareness, ethical fintech design, regulatory frameworks balancing innovation with protection, and financial literacy interventions addressing digital payment psychology.

While digital payments offer undeniable benefits including convenience, financial inclusion, and efficiency, they also exploit cognitive vulnerabilities in ways that may undermine financial well-being. The transition to cashless economies should not be viewed as technologically deterministic progress but as a transformation requiring careful attention to psychological, ethical, and social implications. Sustainable cashless economies require balanced approaches that preserve digital payment benefits while implementing psychological safeguards against exploitative design patterns.

The findings underscore that payment modality is not psychologically neutral. How we pay fundamentally shapes how we think about, feel about, and manage money. As societies continue transitioning toward cashless economies, understanding these psychological dynamics becomes increasingly critical. Policymakers, financial institutions, fintech designers, and consumers must work collaboratively to ensure that digital payment systems enhance rather than undermine financial well-being, promote rather than hinder financial inclusion, and empower rather than exploit users.

Future research should address the limitations of this study through longitudinal designs, diverse populations, objective behavioral measures, cross-cultural comparisons, and examination of long-term financial outcomes. Additionally, research should investigate emerging technologies and develop evidence-based interventions promoting responsible digital payment usage. As digital payment technologies continue evolving, ongoing research examining their psychological, behavioral, and societal implications remains essential.

In conclusion, digital payments represent a double-edged sword in financial psychology. They offer unprecedented convenience and inclusion while simultaneously creating new vulnerabilities and risks. Understanding human behaviour in cashless economies requires integrating insights from psychology, behavioral economics, technology studies, and financial literacy. Only through such interdisciplinary understanding can we design digital payment systems that genuinely serve human flourishing rather than merely maximizing transaction volume. The challenge ahead is not whether to embrace digital payments but how to do so in ways that respect human psychology, protect vulnerable populations, and promote financial well-being for all.

References

1. Krishna A (2025) Impact of digital payment systems on consumer behaviour and financial inclusion. International Journal of Current Medical Research Studies 3049: 1908-

1926.

2. Faraz M, Ahmed S, Khan R (2025) Spendception: The psychological impact of digital payments on consumer purchase behaviour and impulse buying. Behavioral Sciences 15: 387.
3. Shah SA, Jajja MSS, Chatha KA (2024) The role of digital payments in overspending behaviour: A mental accounting perspective. International Journal of Emerging Markets 19: 892-915.
4. Kharbanda V, Singh R, Agarwal S (2025) Digital payment incentives as catalysts of consumption: An empirical study on spending behaviour and price sensitivity. International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories 44: 78-96.
5. Dhar BK, Sarkar SM, Ayittey FK (2025) Ethical imperatives in digital finance: Advancing e-payment inclusion in a fragile economy. Business and Society Review 130: 45-68.
6. Saka AO, Afolabi A, Oladejo M (2025) Technology acceptance and the use of non-cash payment systems: Empirical evidence from Generation Y and Z. Journal of Finance and Islamic Banking 8: 45-67.
7. Rianmahardhika SB, Min-Joon K (2023) Perceived privacy risks and trust dynamics: Rethinking mobile payment adoption in Indonesia. Global Business and Finance Review 28: 112-134.
8. Singh A (2025) An understanding of adoption of UPI based on behavioral economics: A secondary data analysis in Chhattisgarh and contributions of Digital India initiatives. Zenodo https://www.iesrj.com/upload/14.%20Dr.%20Sanjay%20Kumar%20Singh%20-%20Online%20(December%202022).pdf.
9. Mohammed A, Rahman M., Islam S (2025) Mobile payments in health crisis: A comprehensive approach to analysing consumer behaviour in emerging markets. International Journal of Consumer Studies 49: 234-256.
10. Zhou Y (2022) Sustainable economic development, digital payment, and consumer demand: Evidence from China. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 19: 8819.
11. Sathvara P (2025) The evolution of digital payments in India: Assessing the impact of UPI and fintech innovations on consumer behaviour. Zenodo 65.
12. Fachrudin KA, Lubis TA, Silalahi AS (2025) What factors drive cashless payment adoption and satisfaction? GCBSS Proceeding 1: 234-248.
13. Yuttama, P (2025) Behavioral shifts in digital finance: How e-payment influences consumer spending and financial literacy. Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship Research 12: 4-80.
14. Shree S, Pratap B, Saroy R, Dhal S (2021) Digital payments and consumer experience in India: A survey based empirical study. Journal of Banking and Financial Technology 5: 1-20.
15. Asif M, Khan MN, Tiwari S, Wani SK, Alam F (2023) The impact of fintech and digital financial services on financial inclusion in India. Journal of Risk and Financial Management 16: 100-122.
16. Aljaradat M, Singh R, Kumar S (2025) Trust and cybersecurity in digital payment adoption: Socioeconomic insights from India. Journal of Business and Socio-Economic Development 5: 372-386.
17. Andrade C (2022) Financial vulnerability, financial literacy, and the use of digital payment technologies. Journal of Consumer Policy 45: 281-306.
18. Guddad M, Patil S, Angadi M (2022) Significant challenges in digital payments with reference to digitalization of small retail stores in Indian context: A theoretical assimilation. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews 3: 1456-1472.
19. Świecka B, Terefenko P, Wiśniewski T, Gorczyńska M (2021) Consumer financial knowledge and cashless payment behavior for sustainable development in Poland. Sustainability 13: 6401.
20. Song L (2025) Digital payments and their systemic influence on consumer behavior, financial services innovation and monetary policy. Journal of Economic Research 1: 45-67.
21. Petroccione M, De Luca LM, Colurcio M (2025) Digital payment behaviour and financial well-being: Implications for international marketing. International Marketing Review 11: 1-6.
22. Fadilah N, Rahman A, Susanto E (2025). Consumer preferences and decision-making in digital payments: A systematic review using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). Asian Journal of Management Analytics 4:145-168.
23. Utomo H, Pratama B, Santoso W (2025) Factors influencing user adoption of mobile payment system: An integrated model of perceived usefulness, ease of use, financial literacy, and trust. Journal of Digital Marketing and Digital Commerce 2: 31-48.
24. Pooja K, Sharma R, Verma S (2025) Determinants of mobile payment adoption and usage: The role of trust, security, digital literacy and technology anxiety. Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities 5: 32-48.
25. Kınış S, Özkan E, Güler E (2022) Can I trust my phone to replace my wallet? The determinants of e-wallet adoption in North Cyprus. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research 17: 1696-1715.
26. Gupta R, Sharma V, Mehta K (2025) Mobile wallet adoption in tourism economies: The role of trust, incentives, and user behaviour. Quality & Quantity https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Mobile-wallet-adoption-in-tourism-economies%3A-the-of-Gupta-Gupta/b7bb2844541ea02e932d7766531282884863cb92.
27. Acharya S, Shrestha S, Adhikari B (2024) What Motivates People to Use Digital Transactions? The Dynamics of Subjective Norms, Perceived Behavior Control, Trust and Attitude. OCEM Journal of Management Technology & Social Sciences 3: 45-62.
28. Berlianawati NMD, Suartana IW, Purnamawati IGA (2024) Exploring the mind of Gen Z: Deciphering e-wallet adoption through the lens of TPB theory. Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Bisnis 19: 109-125.
29. Mothey R (2025) Digital payments and consumer perception: The role of UPI and financial literacy in emerging economies. Zenodo https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395757698_Digital_payment_behaviour_and_financial_well-being_implications_for_international_marketing.
30. Modi A, Shah P, Patel R (2022) Study of customer preference towards e-wallets and digital payments application in the post Covid-19 era. Skips Anveshan 3: 1-15.
31. Kamuri A, Hassan R, Ibrahim M (2025) An integrated innovation diffusion-trust-building framework for understanding mobile payment adoption in Indonesia's cross-border regions. Journal of Management and Business Innovation 1: 45-67.
32. Rahman M, Ismail I, Bahri S (2024) Promoting fintech: Driving developing country consumers' mobile wallet use through gamification and trust. International Journal of Bank Marketing 42: 33-58.

33. Yi-fan L, Zhang W, Chen X (2025) The impact of digital platforms on consumer decision-making: Behavioral economics evidence. Zenodo https://nor-ijournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/NJD_161-32-39.pdf.
34. Husna F, Pratama A, Sari D (2025) Electronic wallet adoption and consumer financial behaviour in digital payment systems: A literature study. Journal of Financial Economics and Business 4: 89-104.
35. Aji HM, Berakon I, Husin MM (2021) How e-wallets encourage excessive spending behaviour among young adult consumers? Journal of Asia Business Studies 15: 216-234.
36. Sari DP, Wijaya A, Kusuma H (2025) The influence of e-wallets on the consumptive behaviour Generation Z: Systematic review. Economics and Business Horizon 4: 638-654.
37. Vijayakumar S (2025) Cognitive trust in digital finance: Examining AI-powered fintech adoption and financial inclusion among millennials in emerging economies. International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies 7: 44-62.
38. Siagian H, Tarigan ZJH, Jie F (2023) Determinants of mobile banking and its implication for intention to use. Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management 234-245.
39. Warburton T (2025) Examining the impact of behavioral intention, trust, social influence and perceived risk on the financial inclusion on the Egyptian banking sector: The mediating role of mobile banking. Zenodo 38: 99-142.
40. Chandel S, Kumar R, Singh A (2025) The role of digital payment systems in advancing financial inclusion in India. Cureus Journal of Business and Economics 2: 2-15.
41. Davis FD (1989) Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly 13: 319-340.
42. Arora S, Sahney S, Parida RR (2023) E-wallet adoption amidst COVID era: An empirical intervention with extended UTAUT2. Asian Journal of Business Research 13: 89-112.
43. Ajzen I (1991) The theory of planned behaviour. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 50: 179-211.
44. Thaler RH (1985) Mental accounting and consumer choice. Marketing Science 4: 199-214.
45. Prelec D, Loewenstein G (1998) The red and the black: Mental accounting of savings and debt. Marketing Science 17: 4-28.
46. Mayer RC, Davis JH, Schoorman FD (1995) An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review 20: 709-734.
47. Venkatesh V, Thong JY, Xu X (2012) Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. MIS Quarterly 36: 157-178.
48. Shapiro GK, Burchell BJ (2012) Measuring financial anxiety. Journal of Neuroscience Psychology and Economics 5: 92-103.
49. Rook DW, Fisher RJ (1995) Normative influences on impulsive buying behavior. Journal of Consumer Research 22: 305-313.
50. Mathur A, Acar G, Friedman MJ, Lucherini E, Mayer J, et al. (2019) Dark patterns at scale: Findings from a crawl of 11K shopping websites. Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction 3: 1-32.
51. Ajzen I (2006) Constructing a theory of planned behavior questionnaire. Retrieved from https://people.umass.edu/aizen/pdf/tpb.measurement.pdf
52. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL (2017) Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications https://www.scirp.org/reference/Index.
53. Braun V, Clarke V (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology 3: 77-101.
54. Ramesh PKS, Kumar A (2025) Understanding the role of demographic factors in the adoption of digital payment systems. Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Marketing 2: 34-38.
55. Singh R (2025) The psychological drivers behind BNPL usage: Strategic insights for retail marketing and customer retention. Journal of Informatics Education and Research 5: 3461-3478.
56. Venkatesh V, Davis FD (2000) A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. Management Science 46: 186-204.