MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 2, 2026, Pages 1769-1775

IMPACT OF DIGITAL PAYMENTS ON SPENDING AND SAVING BEHAVIOUR OF USERS IN SALEM DISTRICT

Dr. V. Ramanithilagam[1], Dr. T. Neela Rajesh[2], Dr. I. Carmel Mercy Priya[3], R.Vidya[4], M.Kavinkumar[5]
[1,2,3] Assistant Professor, Department of Management and Research,
AVS College of Arts and Science (A),
Affiliation to Periyar University, Salem
[4, 5] Research Scholar,
Department of Management and Research,
AVS College of Arts and Science (A), Affiliation to Periyar University, Salem

ABSTRACT
Digital payment adoption has expanded rapidly across India, driven by flagship policy initiatives such as Digital India and the Unified Payments Interface (UPI). Despite this growth, the behavioural determinants of adoption and financial transaction transparency remain insufficiently understood, particularly in semi-urban and district-level contexts. This study investigates how technological literacy, regulatory awareness, institutional trust, and perceived money laundering risk collectively influence digital payment adoption and financial transaction transparency among users in Salem District, Tamil Nadu. Drawing on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Institutional Trust Theory, and Perceived Risk Theory, an integrated conceptual framework with eight hypotheses is developed and empirically tested. Primary data were collected from 187 valid respondents using a structured questionnaire and purposive sampling. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) confirmed a six-factor structure, and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) validated the measurement model. Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) with path analysis was used to test the hypothesised relationships. Results reveal that technological literacy, regulatory awareness, and institutional trust positively and significantly influence both digital payment adoption and financial transaction transparency, while perceived money laundering risk exerts a significant negative effect on both outcomes. The study contributes an integrated theoretical framework to the digital finance literature and provides actionable policy implications for regulators, fintech service providers, and financial inclusion practitioners in India.

Keywords: digital payment adoption; financial transaction transparency; technological literacy; regulatory awareness; institutional trust; money laundering risk; UPI; India; SEM
JEL Classification: G20; G28; O33; E42; D83

1. Introduction

The rapid proliferation of digital technologies has transformed financial transactions across the globe, particularly in emerging economies such as India. Over the past decade, the Indian government and financial institutions have aggressively promoted cashless economies through initiatives such as Digital India and the Unified Payments Interface (UPI). As a result, digital payments in India have witnessed exponential growth, with transactions crossing billions monthly and reshaping consumer financial behavior (*Mukherjee & Roy, 2022*). Despite this momentum, adoption rates remain uneven across regions, demographics, and income groups, raising questions about the underlying drivers of digital payment adoption and the transparency of financial transactions that accompany such usage (*Patel & Trivedi, 2020*). The challenge, therefore, lies not only in promoting digital adoption but also in ensuring that such adoption enhances financial accountability and reduces reliance on unrecorded cash dealings.Existing researchers emphasize the importance of consumer capabilities and institutional frameworks in enabling digital adoption. For instance, Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) Theory and its extensions highlight perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness as core drivers of adoption (*Davis, 1989; Venkatesh et al., 2003*). In the digital finance context, these perceptions are strongly mediated by consumer technological literacy, which determines the ability to navigate payment applications, protect data, and troubleshoot issues (*Sharma et al., 2019*). Consumers with higher literacy are not only more likely to adopt digital payment platforms but also better positioned to engage in transparent transactions, thereby leaving audit trails and complying with financial regulations *(Jain & Sharma, 2023*).Equally significant is the role of regulatory awareness, which shapes consumer perceptions of legitimacy, risk, and compliance. Studies in financial technology adoption suggest that informed users-aware of Know Your Customer (KYC) requirements, Anti-Money Laundering (AML) norms, and Reserve Bank of India (RBI) policies-are more confident in engaging with digital platforms (*Sinha & Mehrotra, 2022*). Regulatory awareness thus not only mitigates uncertainty but also encourages transparent usage by aligning consumer behavior with legal and compliance frameworks. This perspective draws on Institutional Theory, which argues that formal rules and regulatory pressures exert significant influence on organizational and consumer practices (*DiMaggio & Powell, 1991*).Furthermore, institutional trust has been consistently identified as a cornerstone in the adoption of new financial technologies. Trust in banks, digital service providers, and regulatory institutions alleviates consumer concerns about privacy, fraud, and systemic vulnerability (*Bansal, 2017; Chandel & Chandel, 2025*). According to Trust Theory in digital finance, institutional assurances such as data protection laws, cyber fraud monitoring, and RBI-endorsed platforms reduce uncertainty and foster adoption (*Gefen et al., 2003*). Importantly, such trust also reinforces financial transparency, as consumers are more likely to rely on regulated platforms with strong audit trails rather than unmonitored cash or informal systems (*Giri & Biswas, 2025*).

Conversely, concerns about money laundering risk act as a barrier to adoption and transparency. While digital finance offers speed and accessibility, it also creates vulnerabilities to illicit activities such as money laundering, anonymous wallet transactions, and crypto-enabled frauds (*Karat et al., 2022*). Studies show that heightened perceptions of these risks discourage consumers from adopting digital payments or lead them to split transactions to avoid regulatory detection, undermining the transparency agenda (*Ganie, 2025*). Here, Perceived Risk Theory provides useful insights, suggesting that when users associate new technologies with financial or security risks, their adoption propensity declines (*Featherman & Pavlou, 2003).*

1.1 Research Gap: Although prior studies have examined each of these variables-technological literacy, regulatory awareness, institutional trust, and money laundering risk-most have done so in isolation. For example, *Mukherjee and Roy (2022)* investigated digital competencies in adoption, while *Sinha and Mehrotra (2022)* emphasized regulatory awareness. Similarly, *Bansal (2017)* studied trust in *FinTech, and Karat et al. (2022)* focused on money laundering risks. Yet, no comprehensive framework integrates these four critical predictors to assess their joint influence on both digital payment adoption and financial transaction transparency. This fragmentation of research limits theoretical development and practical policy insights in the Indian context, where both adoption and transparency are equally pressing policy goals. Salem District in Tamil Nadu, with its diverse socioeconomic demographics and growing digital infrastructure, remains understudied in the extant literature, presenting a clear geographical and contextual gap that this study addresses.

1.2 Objectives of the Study: This study addresses this research gap by developing and empirically testing a framework that links the four independent constructs to two dependent outcomes. Specifically, the study aims to:

1. Investigate the impact of technological literacy on digital payment adoption and transparency in Salem.
2. Examine the influence of regulatory awareness on consumer digital behaviour in Salem.
3. Assess the role of institutional trust in shaping adoption and transparency.
4. Explore the negative effect of perceived money laundering risk on these outcomes.

By doing so, this research not only advances the theoretical understanding of digital financial ecosystems but also provides actionable insights for regulators, policymakers, and service providers seeking to enhance adoption while safeguarding transparency in India's digital economy.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Technological Literacy : Technological literacy has long been recognized as a foundation for digital financial participation. Early conceptualizations by *Gilster (1997)* defined it as the capacity to navigate, evaluate, and utilize digital tools effectively. In the financial domain, this literacy extends to competencies such as safeguarding data, identifying secure platforms, and troubleshooting during transactions *(Sharma et al., 2019).* Empirical evidence indicates that technological literacy significantly facilitates the adoption of digital financial platforms, as digitally literate individuals perceive these services as less complex and more beneficial *(Mukherjee & Roy, 2022; Jain & Sharma, 2023).* Beyond adoption, technological literacy also enhances the ability to maintain digital transaction records, thereby contributing to transparent financial behavior *(Hasan et al., 2021; George & Sunny, 2022*). Grounded in the Technology Acceptance Model *(Davis, 1989)*, individuals with higher technological literacy exhibit stronger behavioral intention to adopt digital payments and greater capacity for transparent usage. Thus, it is proposed that technological literacy will positively influence both adoption and transparency.

H1a: *Technological literacy positively influences digital payment adoption.*
H1b: *Technological literacy positively influences financial transaction transparency.*

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 2, 2026, Pages 1769-1775

2.2 Regulatory Awareness: Regulatory awareness reflects an individual's understanding of compliance mechanisms such as KYC, AML policies, and RBI rules *(Kumar & Rani, 2021*). Greater awareness of financial regulations increases confidence in digital systems, as consumers perceive institutional safeguards to reduce risks *(Sinha & Mehrotra, 2022; Liébana-Cabanillas et al., 2021*). Studies consistently show that individuals knowledgeable about regulatory frameworks are more inclined to adopt digital payments and engage in transparent financial practices (*Gupta & Rani, 2021; Khan & Joseph, 2022*). Institutional theory suggests that when individuals perceive regulatory structures as credible, they align their behavior with system expectations, thereby promoting both adoption and accountability. Hence, the following hypotheses are advanced:

H2a: *Regulatory awareness positively influences digital payment adoption.*

H2b: *Regulatory awareness positively influences financial transaction transparency.*

2.3 Institutional Trust: Institutional trust further shapes how individuals interact with financial technologies. Defined as confidence in banks, fintech providers, and regulators to act fairly and competently (*Gefen et al., 2003*), institutional trust reduces uncertainty and encourages consumers to adopt digital platforms (*Bansal, 2017; Alalwan et al., 2021*). Research in emerging economies underscores that trust in government-backed platforms and banking institutions increases adoption, particularly among underserved populations (*Chandel & Chandel, 2025; Giri & Biswas, 2025*). Moreover, trust not only drives adoption but also reinforces transparent engagement, as individuals are more willing to maintain digital trails when they believe institutions will protect them from fraud (*Luo et al., 2010; Dwivedi et al., 2021*). Institutional trust theory supports the notion that credible institutions foster responsible behavior. Therefore, the following are hypothesized:

H3a: *Institutional trust positively influences digital payment adoption.*

H3b: *Institutional trust positively influences financial transaction transparency.*

2.4 Money Laundering Risk Perception: Conversely, perceptions of money laundering risk act as a deterrent to digital financial participation. *Karat et al. (2022)* define such risks as the belief that digital platforms can be exploited for illegal financial flows through anonymity, fraudulent transfers, or crypto-based laundering. Studies demonstrate that heightened awareness of these risks diminishes users' willingness to adopt digital payment modes *(Das & Rout, 2021; Ganie, 2025; Zainuddin et al., 2020).* In addition, concerns about laundering often discourage users from leaving transparent financial trails, as they perceive vulnerability in exposing digital records *(Patel & Trivedi, 2020; Singh & Sharma, 2023).* Perceived Risk Theory suggests that when individuals sense vulnerability, they exhibit avoidance behavior, reducing both adoption and transparency. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H4a: *Perceived money laundering risk negatively influences digital payment adoption.*

H4b: *Perceived money laundering risk negatively influences financial transaction transparency.*

Together, this framework suggests that technological literacy, regulatory awareness, and institutional trust act as enabling factors that foster digital payment adoption and financial transaction transparency, while perceived money laundering risk operates as a barrier. By integrating insights from TAM, Institutional Trust Theory, and Perceived Risk Theory, this study provides a comprehensive framework for explaining consumer behavior in India's rapidly evolving digital financial ecosystem.

3. Conceptual Model

Based on the earlier discussions and literature reviewed, the following conceptual model has been proposed (Figure 1). The model positions four independent constructs-Technological Literacy (TL), Regulatory Awareness (RA), Institutional Trust (IT), and Money Laundering Risk Perception (MLRP)-as predictors of two dependent constructs: Digital Payment Adoption (DPA) and Financial Transaction Transparency (FTT). TL, RA, and IT are hypothesised to exert positive direct effects on both DPA and FTT (H1a–H3b), while MLRP is hypothesised to exert significant negative effects on both outcomes (H4a–H4b). This eight-path model is grounded in TAM, Institutional Trust Theory, and Perceived Risk Theory, and is tested via SEM. The model is fully aligned with the eight hypotheses stated in Section 2 and the SEM path structure reported in Section 5.3.

Independent Variables (Predictors)		Dependent Variables (Outcomes)	
Technological Literacy (TL)	→	**Digital Payment Adoption (DPA)**	**H1a, H2a, H3a: Positive (+)**
Regulatory Awareness(RA)	→		**H1b, H2b, H3b: Positive (+)**
Institutional Trust(IT)	→	**Financial Transaction Transparency (FTT)**	**H4a, H4b: Negative (−)**
Money Laundering Risk Perception (MLRP)	→		**Theoretical Basis:** TAM + Institutional Trust Theory + Perceived Risk Theory

Figure 1: Conceptual Model - Eight-Path SEM Framework (H1a–H4b)

Note: Single-headed arrows (⟶) represent hypothesised cause-and-effect relationships. Green boxes = positive predictors; Orange box = negative predictor; Blue boxes = dependent outcomes.

Note: Dotted line represents first and second order variables and one headed arrow represents cause and effect relationship.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design and Data Collection: This study adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional research design. To achieve the objectives of the study, primary data were collected from Salem District, Tamil Nadu, by using a structured online questionnaire. Most of the respondents included in the study were people belonging to metropolitan and semi-urban areas who were active users of digital payment systems such as Unified Payments Interface (UPI), mobile wallets, and online banking. Respondents from different occupational, income, and educational backgrounds who regularly used digital payment platforms were contacted for the purpose of data collection. Tamil Nadu was selected for the study because of its strong digital infrastructure and diverse socioeconomic demographics, allowing for a representative understanding of digital payment behavior. A total of 210 questionnaires were administered online during July and August 2025, of which 210 responses were received. Among the total responses, 23 questionnaires were excluded as they were incomplete or inconsistent, and only 187 were considered fit to be included in the study. The final dataset, therefore, comprised 187 valid responses, ensuring adequate representation for further analysis.

4.2 Population, Sampling Method, and Sample Size Justification: The target population of this study consists of active digital payment users in Salem District, Tamil Nadu. Since the population is unknown - no complete or verifiable enumeration of all active digital payment users exists in the study area - a probabilistic sampling frame could not be constructed. Accordingly, purposive sampling, a non-probabilistic technique, was adopted. This method was chosen because it enables the deliberate selection of respondents who meet the study's specific criteria: namely, active and regular use of digital payment platforms such as UPI, mobile wallets, or internet banking. This approach is consistent with prior studies in digital finance adoption that similarly lacked a verifiable population register (*Hair et al., 2019; Creswell & Creswell, 2018).* Since the population size is unknown, the minimum required sample size was estimated using *Cochran's (1977)* formula for an infinite or unknown population:

$$n = Z^2 \times p \times q / e^2$$

Where: $Z = 1.96$ (at 95% confidence level); $p = 0.5$ (maximum variability assumed); $q = 1 - p = 0.5$; $e = 0.05$ (acceptable margin of error). Substituting: $n = (1.96)^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5 / (0.05)^2 = 384.16 \approx 385$. However, as purposive sampling was employed and data collection was conducted online within a specific geographic area, achieving 385 responses was not feasible. Following the recommendation by Hair et al. (2019) that SEM requires a minimum of five responses per observed variable (36 items × 5 = 180), and the guideline that samples of 150–200 are generally adequate for SEM when factor loadings are strong (Kline, 2016), the final valid sample

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 2, 2026, Pages 1769-1775

of N = 187 is considered sufficient and appropriate for the analytical methods employed in this study.

4.3 Scale and Measurement Instrument: All the measurement items used in this study were taken from previously established and validated literature. The items for Digital Payment Adoption were adapted from *Singh and Rana (2020)*. The items for Technological Literacy were taken from *Sharma et al. (2019)*, while the items for Regulatory Awareness were adapted from *Kumar and Rani (2021*). The items for Institutional Trust were taken from *Bansal (2017)*, and the items for Money Laundering Risk were adapted from *Karat et al. (2022)*. Finally, the items for Financial Transaction Transparency were adapted from Patel and *Trivedi (2020)*. All items were measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed in English as the respondents were digitally literate users from Tamil Nadu. To ensure the validity and appropriateness of the measurement items, the instrument was reviewed by domain experts, following the guidelines suggested by *Hair et al. (2019) and Creswell and Creswell (2018)*. Before the main data collection, a pilot study was conducted among 50 respondents representing the target population of active digital payment users in India to assess the clarity, reliability, and suitability of the questionnaire. Based on the feedback received from respondents and experts, minor modifications were made to the wording and sequence of questions to improve the overall design and comprehensibility of the instrument.

Reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha was carried out to assess the internal consistency of the constructs. All values were found to be above the recommended threshold of 0.70 *(Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994)*, confirming the reliability of the measurement instrument. The final validated version of the scale was thus used for the main data collection.

4.4 Demographic Profile and Digital Adoption Profile of Respondents: Out of all the respondents contacted, a majority were males (109), while the remaining 78 were females. With regard to age, most respondents (112) belonged to the 20–25 years age group, followed by 58 respondents in the 26–35 years group, and 17 respondents between 36–40 years. In terms of marital status, 141 respondents were unmarried while 46 were married. Considering educational qualifications, 69 respondents were undergraduates, whereas 118 were postgraduates. With respect to occupation, a large proportion were students (84), followed by private employees (61), government employees (24), and self-employed individuals (18). In terms of monthly income, 42 respondents reported earnings below ₹25,000, 54 fell in the ₹25,001–50,000 range, 38 earned between ₹50,001–75,000, and 53 were in the ₹75,000–100,000 category.

In addition to standard socio-demographic variables, the survey also captured digital adoption-specific indicators including: (a) residential area status - a majority of respondents (98) were from semi-urban areas, 67 from metropolitan areas, and 22 from rural areas; (b) awareness about UPI - 163 respondents (87.2%) reported being aware of UPI and its features, while 24 (12.8%) reported limited awareness; and (c) digital payment adoption status - 152 respondents reported using digital payment platforms daily, 27 used them weekly, and 8 used them occasionally. These indicators confirm that the sample is composed predominantly of active, aware digital payment users, lending validity to the study's findings. The detailed demographic and digital adoption distribution is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample Profile and Digital Adoption Indicators (N = 187)

Variable	Category	Frequency (N = 187)
Gender	Male	109
	Female	78
Age (years)	20–25	112
	26–35	58
	36–40	17
Marital Status	Married	46
	Unmarried	141
Education	Undergraduate	69
	Postgraduate	118
Occupation	Student	84
	Private Employee	61
	Government Employee	24
	Self-employed	18
Monthly Income (INR)	Below ₹25,000	42
	₹25,001–50,000	54
	₹50,001–75,000	38
	₹75,000–100,000	53
Residential Area	Metropolitan	67
	Semi-Urban	98
	Rural	22
UPI Awareness	Aware	163
	Limited Awareness	24
Digital Payment Frequency	Daily	152
	Weekly	27
	Occasionally	8

Source: Primary Data

Limitations & Scope for future research

This study is subject to several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the use of purposive sampling restricts the generalisability of findings, as the sample may not be fully representative of all digital payment users across Tamil Nadu or India. Future studies should employ probability sampling with a larger, geographically diverse sample across multiple states to enhance external validity. Second, the cross-sectional design captures attitudes and behaviours at a single point in time; longitudinal designs would better capture how trust, literacy, and risk perceptions evolve as the digital payments ecosystem matures. Third, the study is geographically confined to Salem District, which, while selected for its socioeconomic diversity, may not represent the heterogeneity of India's urban, semi-urban, and rural digital payment landscape. Fourth, self-reported data are susceptible to common method bias; future research could incorporate objective behavioural data such as transaction logs or platform usage records to triangulate findings. Fifth, the current framework does not examine moderating variables such as age, income, prior banking experience, or gender, which may condition the relationships between the core constructs. Future research could also extend the model to include emerging constructs such as digital self-efficacy, perceived interoperability, and awareness of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs), which are increasingly relevant to India's evolving digital financial ecosystem.

5. Data Analysis

5.1 Purpose and Justification of EFA: In the present study, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted as the first stage of analysis, followed by Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). The purpose of applying EFA was to empirically explore and confirm the underlying latent factor structure of the 36-item measurement instrument before proceeding to hypothesis testing. Although the constructs were theoretically derived from prior validated literature, EFA was necessary to verify that items grouped as expected within the Indian digital payment context, where cross-cultural and contextual variations may alter factor structures. EFA thus serves as a data-driven validation step that ensures the items load cleanly and distinctly onto their respective constructs, providing the empirical justification required for subsequent CFA and SEM analyses *(Hair et al., 2019; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013)*.

Prior to conducting EFA, data were checked for suitability. The adequacy of the data was confirmed as the sample size (N = 187) satisfied the subject-to-item ratio required for multivariate analysis (Kline, 2016). The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity were also applied to verify sampling adequacy and factorability. The KMO value was found to be 0.872, indicating sampling adequacy, while Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(630) = 5842.462$, $p < .001$, confirming sufficient correlations among variables to proceed further (Kaiser, 1974). Principal component analysis with Varimax rotation was used to extract factors, which is a widely accepted approach in fintech and behavioral studies (Hair et al., 2019; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Six constructs-Technological Literacy (TL), Regulatory Awareness (RA), Institutional Trust (IT), Money Laundering Risk Perception (MLRP), Financial Transaction Transparency (FTT), and Digital Payment Adoption (DPA)-were extracted, each having an eigenvalue greater than 1. The extracted components accounted for a total variance of 77.86%, which exceeds the recommended minimum threshold of 60% for behavioral research (Yong & Pearce, 2013). All items exhibited strong loadings above 0.80 on their respective constructs, and communalities ranged between 0.71 and 0.92, confirming the robustness of factor representation. The rotated component matrix showed clear and distinct factor loadings without any significant cross-loadings, which confirmed the theoretical structure of the items. The scree plot exhibited a clear inflection point after the sixth component, and rotation converged in 25 iterations, confirming model stability. Therefore, the EFA confirmed a well-defined six-factor structure that was conceptually and statistically sound.

Table 2. KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		**.872**
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	5842.462
	df	630
	Sig.	.000
Total variance explained by cumulative percentage		**77.86%**

Table 3. Rotated Component Matrix

Item	1 (IT)	2 (TL)	3 (RA)	4 (MLRP)	5 (FTT)	6 (DPA)
IT1	**0.893**					
IT2	**0.905**					
IT3	**0.914**					
IT4	**0.876**					
IT5	**0.893**					
IT6	**0.879**					
TL1		**0.902**				
TL2		**0.899**				
TL3		**0.856**				
TL4		**0.885**				
TL5		**0.881**				
TL6		**0.897**				
RA1			**0.839**			
RA2			**0.880**			
RA3			**0.850**			
RA4			**0.847**			
RA5			**0.856**			
RA6			**0.847**			
MLRP1				**0.893**		
MLRP2				**0.879**		
MLRP3				**0.922**		
MLRP4				**0.875**		
MLRP5				**0.892**		
MLRP6				**0.880**		
FTT1					**0.835**	
FTT2					**0.841**	
FTT3					**0.886**	
FTT4					**0.831**	
FTT5					**0.867**	
FTT6					**0.868**	
DPA1						**0.900**
DPA2						**0.868**
DPA3						**0.864**
DPA4						**0.860**
DPA5						**0.850**
DPA6						**0.867**

Notes: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

5.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Measurement Model: To test the validity of the explored constructs, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used. The fitness of the six-factor measurement model comprising Technological Literacy (TL), Regulatory Awareness (RA), Institutional Trust (IT), Money Laundering Risk Perception (MLRP), Financial Transaction Transparency (FTT), and Digital Payment Adoption (DPA) is presented in Table 4. Results show that CMIN/df = 1.142; Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = 0.846, which reflects an acceptable model fit. The Normed Fit Index (NFI) = 0.895, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.985, and Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI) = 0.984 were also well above the recommended threshold values, indicating a well-fitting and parsimonious model. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.028, and p-value = 0.000, confirming the model's adequacy (Hair et al., 2019; Kline, 2016). All standardized factor loadings were found to be significant and above the recommended level of 0.70, ranging between 0.799 and 0.917, signifying strong indicator reliability and unidimensionality.

Table 4. Fit Indices of the Measurement Model

Fit Index	Value
CMIN/DF	**1.142**
GFI	**0.846**
NFI	**0.895**
CFI	**0.985**
TLI	**0.984**
RMSEA	**0.028**
p-value	**.000**

5.3 Reliability and Validity: Reliability of the constructs was tested using Cronbach's α, and the overall reliability value for the 36-item instrument was found to be 0.838, which is well above the acceptable threshold of 0.70 for behavioral studies *(Cronbach, 1951; Nunnally, 197*8). Each construct demonstrated strong reliability, with composite reliability (CR) values ranging from 0.89 to 0.93, confirming the internal consistency and stability of the measurement items.

The validity of the constructs was established through CFA using AMOS 24.0. Convergent validity was verified using Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE), following the criteria proposed by *Fornell and Larcker (1981).* The CR values ranged from 0.93 to 0.95, and AVE values ranged between 0.68 and 0.77, exceeding the recommended thresholds (CR $\geq$ 0.70 and AVE $\geq$ 0.50). Discriminant validity was also achieved, as the square root of AVE for each construct was higher than its inter-construct correlations. The diagonal values ranged from 0.827 to 0.877, all greater than their corresponding correlation values, which ranged from −0.081 to 0.156. Hence, all constructs demonstrated acceptable levels of reliability and validity, confirming that the measurement model was both psychometrically sound and suitable for further SEM analysis *(Bollen, 1989; Pallant, 2001).*

Table 5. Convergent Validity of Digital Financial Readiness

Construct	Item	Factor Loading	CR**	AVE*
Digital Payment Adoption	DPA1	0.889	**0.936**	**0.709**
	DPA2	0.837		
	DPA3	0.839		
	DPA4	0.821		
	DPA5	0.819		
	DPA6	0.846		
Technological Literacy	TL1	0.897	**0.949**	**0.754**
	TL2	0.881		

ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 2, 2026, Pages 1769-1775

	TL3	0.832		
	TL4	0.867		
	TL5	0.855		
	TL6	0.878		
Regulatory Awareness	RA1	0.808	**0.928**	**0.683**
	RA2	0.867		
	RA3	0.820		
	RA4	0.820		
	RA5	0.828		
	RA6	0.815		
Institutional Trust	IT1	0.870	**0.952**	**0.768**
	IT2	0.898		
	IT3	0.906		
	IT4	0.852		
	IT5	0.884		
	IT6	0.848		
Money Laundering Risk Perception	MLRP1	0.876	**0.949**	**0.755**
	MLRP2	0.849		
	MLRP3	0.917		
	MLRP4	0.841		
	MLRP5	0.868		
	MLRP6	0.859		
Financial Transaction Transparency	FTT1	0.800	**0.929**	**0.684**
	FTT2	0.811		
	FTT3	0.864		
	FTT4	0.799		
	FTT5	0.842		
	FTT6	0.845		

*Notes: *AVE = $\Sigma(\text{loading}^2)$ / number of items. **CR = $(\Sigma\text{loading})^2 / [(\Sigma\text{loading})^2 + \Sigma(1 - \text{loading}^2)]$*

Table 6. Discriminant Validity – Fornell-Larcker Criterion

Construct	DPA	TL	RA	IT	MLRP	FTT
DPA	**0.842**					
TL	0.045	**0.869**				
RA	0.030	0.099	**0.827**			
IT	−0.081	0.075	0.156	**0.877**		
MLRP	0.066	0.019	0.042	−0.073	**0.869**	
FTT	−0.005	0.151	−0.031	−0.027	0.040	**0.827**

*Note: Bold diagonal values = square root of AVE. Off-diagonal = inter-construct correlations. * Correlation significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

5.4 Structural Equation Modelling and Path Analysis

Following validation of the measurement model, Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was employed using AMOS 24.0 to test the eight hypothesised relationships specified in the conceptual model. SEM was selected because it simultaneously estimates multiple interdependent relationships, accounts for measurement error, and tests the overall fit of the theoretical model to the data. The analysis is directly aligned with the study's four objectives and eight hypotheses (H1a–H4b). The structural model retained the same fit indices as the measurement model (CMIN/df = 1.142, CFI = 0.985, RMSEA = 0.028), confirming model adequacy. The path analysis results, including standardised path coefficients (β), standard errors (S.E.), critical ratios (C.R./t-values), and support decisions for all eight hypotheses, are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Path Analysis Results – Structural Equation Model

Hyp.	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	β	S.E.	C.R. (t)	Supported?
H1a	Technological Literacy	Digital Payment Adoption	**0.312***	0.067	4.657	**Yes**
H1b	Technological Literacy	Financial Transaction Transparency	**0.278***	0.071	3.915	**Yes**
H2a	Regulatory Awareness	Digital Payment Adoption	**0.241***	0.059	4.085	**Yes**
H2b	Regulatory Awareness	Financial Transaction Transparency	**0.219***	0.063	3.476	**Yes**
H3a	Institutional Trust	Digital Payment Adoption	**0.334***	0.073	4.575	**Yes**
H3b	Institutional Trust	Financial Transaction Transparency	**0.291***	0.069	4.217	**Yes**
H4a	Money Laundering Risk Perception	Digital Payment Adoption	**−0.187***	0.055	−3.400	**Yes**
H4b	Money Laundering Risk Perception	Financial Transaction Transparency	**−0.163***	0.058	−2.810	**Yes**

*Note: * $p < 0.05$; β = standardised path coefficient; S.E. = standard error; C.R. = critical ratio (t-value). All paths are aligned with the conceptual model in Figure 1.*

6. Discussion of Findings

The findings confirm all eight hypotheses, providing strong empirical support for the integrated framework. Institutional trust emerged as the strongest predictor of digital payment adoption (β = 0.334, $p < 0.05$), underscoring the critical role of confidence in banks, fintech providers, and regulators in encouraging consumers to transition to cashless platforms. This is consistent with *Gefen et al. (2003), Bansal (2017),* and *Chandel and Chandel (2025),* and reflects the Indian context where government-endorsed platforms such as BHIM-UPI and Aadhaar-linked services have leveraged institutional credibility to drive adoption.

Technological literacy was the second strongest predictor of both adoption (β = 0.312, $p < 0.05$) and transparency (β = 0.278, $p < 0.05$), validating TAM-based arguments that digitally capable users perceive payment systems as less complex and are more likely to maintain transparent digital trails (*Davis, 1989; Mukherjee & Roy, 2022*). Regulatory awareness also positively influenced both outcomes (H2a: β = 0.241; H2b: β = 0.219), supporting Institutional Theory arguments that knowledge of KYC, AML, and RBI guidelines aligns consumer behaviour with formal compliance expectations (*Sinha & Mehrotra, 2022; DiMaggio & Powell, 1991*). Perceived money laundering risk negatively and significantly affected both digital payment adoption (H4a: β = −0.187) and transparency (H4b: β = −0.163), consistent with Perceived Risk Theory (*Featherman & Pavlou, 2003).* Users who perceive digital platforms as vulnerable to illicit exploitation are less willing to adopt them or engage in traceable transactions.

6.1 Theoretical Implications

This study makes three key theoretical contributions to the digital finance literature. First, it extends the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) by demonstrating that technological literacy influences not only adoption intent but also financial transaction transparency, thereby enriching the model beyond its original adoption focus. Second, it contributes to Institutional Trust Theory by establishing that institutional credibility simultaneously drives both adoption behaviour and financial accountability, a dual-outcome effect largely neglected in prior fintech adoption literature. Third, it advances Perceived Risk Theory by showing that money laundering risk perceptions constitute a significant and distinct barrier to financial transparency, beyond their established effect on adoption. The integrated eight-path model developed in this study provides a comprehensive theoretical architecture for future research on consumer behaviour in digital financial ecosystems, particularly in emerging economy contexts.

6.3 Practical Implications

For policymakers and regulators, the findings suggest that financial inclusion programmes must move beyond infrastructure provision to actively build institutional trust through transparent communication about regulatory safeguards, data protection mechanisms, and fraud redress. The Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and Ministry of Finance should design targeted public awareness campaigns to promote regulatory literacy, especially in semi-urban and rural areas where awareness about UPI features and AML regulations remains limited. For fintech service providers, the findings highlight the importance of user interface design that reinforces security cues, simplifies authentication, and communicates compliance credentials clearly. Platforms should invest in in-app digital literacy modules to reduce perceived complexity. Anti-money laundering risk perceptions can be mitigated by enhancing transparency about real-time transaction monitoring mechanisms and fraud detection capabilities, thereby reassuring users about the safety of digital financial trails.

7. Recommendations and Conclusions

This study investigated how technological literacy, regulatory awareness, institutional trust, and perceived money laundering risk collectively shape digital payment adoption and financial transaction transparency among users in Salem District, Tamil Nadu. All eight hypotheses were supported through SEM and path analysis, with institutional trust and technological literacy emerging as the primary enablers, and money laundering risk perception as the key inhibitor. The analysis proceeded through EFA, CFA, and SEM, ensuring both measurement quality and hypothesis testing rigor.

Based on these findings, the following recommendations are offered:

- Expand high-speed internet and mobile network coverage, especially in rural and semi-urban Salem District areas to reduce the digital divide.
- Increase the availability of Point-of-Sale (PoS) terminals and Cash-In/Cash-Out (CICO) machines.
- Implement strong data security and fraud redress mechanisms to build institutional trust.
- Offer discounts, service tax exemptions, or cash back incentives for digital payments (e.g., fuel, insurance premiums).
- Promote UPI app usage and digital wallet adoption through community-level literacy programmes.
- Facilitate NEFT/RTGS/IMPS awareness for instant transfer convenience.
- Explore mobile-first and data-rich payment solutions tailored to semi-urban and low-literacy user segments.

These recommendations, grounded in the study's empirical findings, offer a practical roadmap for regulators, fintech providers, and policymakers seeking to advance India's digital economy agenda while safeguarding financial transparency and accountability.

REFERENCES:

Aboelenein, B. (2023). The adoption of digital banking services in developing countries: Risk and trust perspectives. Journal of Banking and Financial Technology, 27(3), 211–229. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42786-023-00134

Amnas, M. B., Selvam, M., &Parayitam, S. (2024). FinTech and financial inclusion: Exploring the mediating role of digital financial literacy and the moderating influence of perceived regulatory support. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 17(3), 108. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17030108

Arshad, K. (2025). Cashless economy after demonetization and its role in achieving SDGs. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392105672

Bansal, S. (2017). Perspective of technology acceptance model in online banking adoption. Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce, 22(1), 1–14.

Basu, S. (2020). Digital financial inclusion: Policies, challenges, and progress in India. Journal of Financial Economic Policy, 12(4), 543–561. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFEP-01-2020-0012

Bollen, K. A. (1989). Structural equations with latent variables. Wiley.

Chakraborti, P., Chatterjee, S., & Basu, S. (2025). Digital transformation in Indian banking: Trust, adoption, and risk. Asian Journal of Business Research, 15(1), 22–44. https://doi.org/10.14707/ajbr.1502

Chandel, S., & Chandel, S. (2025). The role of digital payment systems in advancing financial inclusion. Cureus Journal.

Chemtai, S. (2023). Barriers to digital adoption in emerging economies: Lessons from India's cashless push. International Journal of Economics and Business Research, 29(1), 67–83. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEBR.2023.130921

Chishti, S., Barberis, J., & Kamal, R. (2020). The regtech book: The financial technology handbook for investors, entrepreneurs and regulators. Wiley.

Cochran, W. G. (1977). Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). Wiley.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE.

Das, S., & Rout, B. S. (2021). Adoption of digital payment systems and its impact on financial inclusion. Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective, 25(2), 221–231.

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

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160.

Desai, R. (2024). Analysing consumer switching behaviour and financial antecedents to determine the intention to use central bank digital currency: Evidence from the Indian economy. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 36(2), 419–438. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-05-2024-0669

Featherman, M. S., & Pavlou, P. A. (2003). Predicting e-services adoption: A perceived risk facets perspective. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 59(4), 451–474.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39–50.

Ganie, A. H. (2025). Risk perceptions and digital payment adoption in emerging markets. Journal of Financial Services Research, 67(1), 55–71.

Gefen, D., Karahanna, E., & Straub, D. W. (2003). Trust and TAM in online shopping: An integrated model. MIS Quarterly, 27(1), 51–90.

Giri, A., & Biswas, A. (2025). Institutional confidence and digital financial participation in India. Indian Economic Review, 60(1), 1–18.

Guha, A., & Gupta, R. (2023). Unified Payments Interface (UPI) and financial inclusion in India. Journal of Asian Economics, 85, 101562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2023.101562

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage.

Hasan, M., Aman, A., & Ali, S. (2020). Digital payment systems and IT infrastructure readiness in South Asia. International Journal of Information Management, 55, 102209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102209

Jain, P., & Vyas, V. (2021). Digital literacy and policy awareness in rural India: A case study. Journal of Rural Development, 40(2), 145–160.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. Psychometrika, 39(1), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575

Karat, J., Karat, C., & Yin, M. (2022). Money laundering risk perceptions in digital payment ecosystems. Journal of Financial Crime, 29(4), 1205–1221.

Kline, R. B. (2016). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

Kumar, M., & Rani, V. (2021). Regulatory awareness and digital payment adoption in India. Journal of Financial Innovation, 8(2), 103–118.

Kushwaha, P., &Bairathi, A. (2025). Consumer literacy and risk appetite in adopting digital finance in India. Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 24(2), 233–248. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.2183

Mukherjee, A., & Roy, P. (2022). Digital competencies and cashless adoption in India. Vikalpa, 47(1), 22–38.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Pallant, J. (2001). SPSS survival manual. Open University Press.

Patel, R., & Trivedi, D. (2020). Digital transactions and financial discipline. International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management, 11(2), 112–120.

Putrevu, J., &Mertzanis, C. (2024). The adoption of digital payments in emerging economies: Challenges and policy responses. Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance, 26(1), 55–73. https://doi.org/10.1108/DPRG-06-2023-0077

Sharma, A., Kumar, V., & Pathak, S. (2019). Technological literacy and its impact on digital financial services adoption. International Journal of Bank Marketing, 37(4), 941–962.

Singh, N., & Rana, V. (2020). Determinants of digital payment adoption in India. Australasian Journal of Information Systems, 24, 1–21.

Sinha, M., & Mehrotra, A. (2022). Regulatory environment and digital finance adoption in India. Journal of Public Affairs, 22(3), e2529. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2529

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics (6th ed.). Pearson.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–

478.
Yong, A. G., & Pearce, S. (2013). A beginner's guide to factor analysis: Focusing on exploratory factor analysis. Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 9(2), 79–94.
Zachariadis, M. (2020). The impact of fintech on financial regulation and cashless adoption. Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance, 28(4), 423–438. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRC-03-2020-0045
Zainuddin, M., Kaur, S., & Abdullah, M. (2020). Understanding consumer resistance to digital payments: A risk perception perspective. International Journal of Financial Studies, 8(4), 68.

Appendix: A- Survey Items and sources

Construct	Items	Source
Digital Payment Adoption (DPA)	DPA1 – I frequently use UPI, mobile wallets, or QR code payments. DPA2 – I find cashless payments more convenient than cash. DPA3 – I use digital payment modes for most routine transactions. DPA4 – I prefer digital platforms over cash even for small purchases. DPA5 – I trust digital payment platforms for financial security. DPA6 – I believe digital payments save time in transactions.	Singh & Rana (2020)
Technological Literacy (TL)	TL1 – I know how to use digital platforms for money transfers. TL2 – I can differentiate between secure and insecure payment links. TL3 – I understand basic features of mobile banking apps. TL4 – I can independently troubleshoot issues during digital transactions. TL5 – I know how to protect my data during online payments. TL6 – I am familiar with UPI PIN, OTP, and transaction authentication.	Sharma et al. (2019)
Regulatory Awareness (RA)	RA1 – I am aware of anti-money laundering (AML) policies in India. RA2 – I know the importance of KYC in digital banking. RA3 – I understand the RBI's role in regulating digital payments. RA4 – I am aware of transaction limits and rules in mobile wallets. RA5 – I have read or seen information on financial fraud regulations. RA6 – I know that suspicious transactions are monitored and reported.	Kumar & Rani (2021)
Institutional Trust (IT)	IT1 – I trust government-regulated digital payment platforms. IT2 – I believe my bank maintains privacy in online transactions. IT3 – I am confident in the cyber-security measures of my payment app. IT4 – I feel protected when transacting via Aadhaar-linked services. IT5 – I trust financial institutions to respond to fraud effectively. IT6 – I believe the RBI is effective in securing the digital economy.	Bansal (2017)
Money Laundering Risk Perception (MLRP)	MLRP1 – I believe digital platforms can be used to conceal illegal funds. MLRP2 – I am concerned about the anonymity offered by some digital wallets. MLRP3 – I think certain payment apps may be exploited for laundering. MLRP4 – I believe it's difficult to detect money laundering in digital chains. MLRP5 – I think crypto and cross-platform payments increase laundering risk. MLRP6 – I believe financial frauds are rising with digital expansion.	Karat et al. (2022)
Financial Transaction Transparency (FTT)	FTT1 – My digital payments leave a clear transaction trail. FTT2 – I can easily retrieve records of my online payments. FTT3 – Digital receipts make my transactions more accountable. FTT4 – I believe digital platforms improve financial discipline. FTT5 – Digital payments reduce the scope for unaccounted cash dealings. FTT6 – I find digital audit trails helpful for tax and compliance.	Patel & Trivedi (2020)