Amity Business School, Amity University Madhya Pradesh
ISSN: 2347-1832 (Print)| ISSN: 2581-5261 (Online)

DEMYSTIFYING THE DRIVERS: INFLUENCE OF CORE AND PERIPHERAL CUES ON CONSUMER DECISION-MAKING IN CASHLESS TRANSACTIONS

Dr. Ratish C Gupta [1], Yashvi Patle [2] Renu Gupta [3]

ABSTRACT

Cashless transactions in India have witnessed rapid growth in recent years, driven largely by advancements in technology and the increasing use of smartphones. Traditional methods like cheques and demand drafts continue to exist, but digital options such as mobile wallets, internet banking, and debit or credit cards are becoming more common in everyday financial dealings. These modern modes of payment offer convenience, speed, and ease of access, which make them appealing to a large section of the population. However, despite their many advantages, the widespread adoption of cashless transactions still faces certain challenges. These include concerns about security, lack of trust in digital systems, limited digital literacy among some user groups, and occasional technical glitches. This research aims to understand how people perceive cashless transactions in India. It focuses on assessing the general awareness among users, their willingness to use such methods, and the factors that influence their attitudes. In doing so, it seeks to highlight the barriers that prevent wider acceptance and provide insights into how these obstacles can be addressed. Ultimately, the study hopes to contribute to the ongoing conversation around building a more inclusive and efficient digital payment ecosystem in the country.

Keywords: Cashless transactions, Digital payments, economy, financial

INTRODUCTION

Exchange has always been at the core of human interaction. It began with the barter system, later progressed to the use of coins and then paper currency. As the need for speed and convenience grew, the payment system evolved into cashless modes. Cashless transactions today include both traditional non-cash methods like cheques and demand drafts, as well as digital methods such as credit and debit cards, internet banking, NEFT, RTGS, mobile wallets, USSD, and Aadhar-enabled payment systems.Technological advancement has played a crucial role in this transition, making digital payments more accessible and user-friendly. The Government of India has been actively encouraging digital transactions to build a digitally empowered economy (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, n.d.). Reports suggest that India is witnessing one of the fastest growth rates in digital payments globally (Detrixhe, 2019).As digital payments continue to grow, it becomes essential to understand the public's level of awareness, usage patterns, and the concerns they may face while adopting such systems. This research aims to explore these aspects in detail, providing insights into the current scenario of cashless transactions in India. Understanding these factors can help strengthen the framework for a more inclusive and trusted digital payment ecosystem.

1. Associate Professor, Daly College Business school, Indore & Chartered Marketer CIM UK, Email: rcrgupta@dcbsinida.org

2. Research Analyst PSB Insights UK
Email: dcbs18yashvipatle@gmail.com

3. State Head Customer Service Sundaram Asset Management Company Ltd
Email: renugupta@sundarammutual.com

LITERATURE REVIEW

Yuvaraj and Eveline (2018) in their research paper 'Consumers' perception towards cashless transactions and information security in the digital economy' state that maximum number of consumers prefer to use cards (Credit/Debit) for transactions. It is also revealed that educational qualification has a positive association with awareness about potential threats and risks involved in cashless transactions. This study also indicated that privacy and security are highly influential factors during an online transaction.

Goel et al (2019) in their study 'Moving from cash to cashless economy: A study of consumer perception towards digital transactions' have illustrated the level of awareness among people towards cashless transactions. The figures in the study point to the lack of trust among individuals in relation to cashless transaction methods in addition to low awareness about cashless modes of payments. The key findings

include the notion people are worried about the safety issue concerning their financial information over the internet.

Podile and Rajesh (2017) conducted a research 'Public perception on cashless transactions in India' and they found that bad internet connectivity and complicated POS machines were the cause of low adoption of cashless methods of transactions. They also found that delayed reimbursement after failure of a transaction was also a major inconvenience which limited people from going cashless. The study also found that lack of technical knowledge causes obstruction in cashless transactions.

Garg and Panchal (2016) concluded that cashless transactions can play a key role in reducing corruption by curbing black money and preventing currency counterfeiting. They argue that shifting to digital payments increases transparency and accountability in financial dealings. However, the study also points out several barriers to adoption. People's attitudes, especially resistance to change and fear of technology, along with widespread illiteracy and inefficiencies in the digital payment infrastructure, hinder the growth of cashless transactions. These challenges must be addressed to ensure broader acceptance and effective implementation of a cashless economy in India.

Jayalakshmi & Venkateshwarlu (2017) comment that use of digital payment methods will enable the Indian economy to save billions of rupees since the cost of cash will be brought down. They elucidated the challenges in transforming India into a cashless economy and list low level of financial education as a major concern. They also state that India has a large number of small retailers who are financially incapable of moving towards a cashless economy.

Kaur (2019) explains that a cashless economy does not imply the complete absence of cash, but rather minimal reliance on it for transactions. The study highlights that limited banking infrastructure and a strong dependence on cash are key factors that hinder the widespread adoption of cashless payment methods.

Dominic et al (2018) in their research 'A study on transformation in behavior of individuals towards cashless economy' revealed that majority of the population was not aware of latest government implementations to strengthen cashless system in India. They also pointed out that most people were satisfied with the present cash system and unsatisfied with the existing system of credit. In addition to this, their research also reveals that it was people's general consensus that India is not ready to become a cashless economy.

Kousalya and Shankar (2018) studied cashless economy with respect to India and found that the two key barriers to digital payments are that people are habitual of using cash and find digital payments rather complex to use. A very informative 5 A's model has been pointed out in their study that states availability, accessibility, acceptability, affordability and awareness are the 5 major pillars that would prove instrumental in encouraging cashless payments using available tools.

Gupta (2017) elucidated the cashless achievements with respect to Haryana state. They also state that the problem with adopting cashless payments is because people have developed a habit of using cash in daily lives. They point out that illiteracy combined with daily wage system wherein bank accounts aren't considered a requirement are the two major hindrances towards going cashless.

Tripathi and Dixit (2020) studied adoption of mobile payments in Gujrat state. Their findings reveal that people are increasingly using mobile payment applications for rewards such as cashbacks and discounts. They also found out that people's preference towards mobile payment applications is positively impacted by the time-saving, convenient and systematic nature of digital payments. Their study also shows that illiteracy, trust issues and transaction charges negatively impact adoption of cashless payments through mobile applications.

Dhanda and Arora (2017) in their study also found out that most people feel that payments through cash are convenient. They revealed that people think plastic money is cheaper and more popular than other modes of cashless transactions. A very large number of people agreed that plastic money will replace paper money. Their conclusion elucidates the need of supportive services from the banks to promote plastic money.

Kavitha and Kumar (2018) studied how adoption of digital means of payment is affects the consumers of banking sector of India. They

found out that increased use of digital mode for monetary transactions resulted in smoother functioning of banking sector and boosted its performance. Their key findings include that awareness about payment gateways is low among the older population.

Singh and Rana (2017) in their research paper 'study of consumer perception of digital payment mode' found that education level largely affects the adoption of digital transactions. They state that more educated individuals are more likely to use digital means for payments. Their study reveals that people's perception is affected by brand, convenience and security of transactions. Their study reflects that people agree digital payments are beneficial as they are more helpful than traditional means and provides incentives.

Shivanthu (2017) studied the adoption of digital payment systems during the demonetization phase of India. The study reveals that due to unavailability of cash people turned to digital payments. This research also identified low rate digital literacy and unavailability of proper infrastructure as severe challenges that limited adoption of digital transactions. Apart from this the issue of privacy and safety concern were also found to affect the adoption levels.

Tiwari and Kumari (2014) further comment that plastic money usage is directly associated with a life style symbol and convenience.

Neevlathi, Chavali and Rao (2017) studied the impacts of plastic money usage and concluded that young adults are more motivated to use plastic money than any other age group. Choice of mode of transaction is dependent on the nature of payment and feasibility of transaction at any given time. The listed demotivating factors towards usage of plastic money are safety concerns, bank negligence and inefficient services. Their study also stated low levels of knowledge about plastic money as a cause for low adoption of the same.

Hasan, Ali & Amaan (2017) suggest that low awareness in the rural areas impedes the usage of cashless transactions. Another important factor that negatively impacts the adoption of cashless means is pointed out as the lack of a proper grievance settlement community for cyber-crime.

Gaonkar (2018) also pointed out that illiteracy, unavailability of internet, transaction fees and poverty are the top most reasons that limit people from using cashless means of transactions. In addition to these, inadequate financial knowledge and dormant/un-operational bank accounts have hindered people's adoption further.

Pal and Jain (2018) studied transaction patterns of salaried class. Their conclusions reflects that most people use cashless means of transactions over cash. Cash is preferred at places where there is a lack of proper infrastructural facilities or when the transaction value is small.

Mahapatra (2018) researched cashless transaction behaviors with a focus on the urban middle class population. The research indicates that debit card is the most popular means of cashless transaction regardless of the age group. Younger population leaned more towards the use of mobile wallets that their older counterparts.

International Journals

Bezhovski (2016) concluded that most preferable mode of digital payment is the use or cards. The study's findings suggest that digital payments are increasing proportionately with increasing number of mobile phone users. Also, smaller payments are generally made using mobile phones because of the convenience and security they offer.

Soutter et al (2019) studied adoption of digital transactions in sub-Saharan Africa and identified that it is necessary to create demand of digital payments which will further lead to developments in awareness and digital literacy among customers. Simplification of transaction process and elimination of risk will boost adoption levels.

Kurniawan et al (2019) comment that digital payments affect the purchase behavior of consumers. Users have shifted from cash to cashless and the contributing factors for this shift include availability and accessibility involved in transactions.

Nair (2016) elucidated that infrastructural incapacity is a major cause that hinders the adoption of cashless transaction of the Filipino society.

Azali (2016) pointed out that Indonesia is lagging in cashless transaction adoption because of poor understanding of financial services among its citizens. Internet unavailability and

poor cellular service penetration are the infrastructural gaps that hinder people from going cashless. Another impediment is the lack of information in an understandable language for the local population.

Kraiwanit, Panpon and Thimthong (2019) studied cashless transactions patterns in Thailand. They found that most electronic transactions were made for online shopping. Most people have readily accepted cashless transaction methods. Some still lack awareness on many financial fronts.

Farida, Ardyan and Yakin (2016) found differences in use of electronic money in relation to gender. Their study indicates that parities in male and female attitudes cause a significant effect in using digital mode of transactions. Subjective norms were found to have a significant positive effect on men but no such significance was found in women.

Onyia and Tagg (2011) studied the effect of demographic factors on the adoption of internet banking facilities in the Nigerian population. They concluded that gender and level of education majorly affect the adoption of this particular mode of cashless transaction. Employment status was also found to affect the usage of internet banking.

Najdawi et al (2019) analyzed the adoption of e-payments in the United Arab Emirates. Their analysis revealed that the awareness levels in the population for modes of cashless transactions were high. Apart from food, clothing and utilities road tolls were also significantly paid for using cashless means. The most popular means was again found out to be contactless cards and online payments.

Teoh et al (2013) researched the factors that affect perception of electronic payments in Malaysia. It was found that the three most prominent factors that affect the perception were benefits of e-payments, ease of use and the self-efficacious feeling in using a cashless method of transaction.

Lin and Nguyen (2011) aimed to study the consumers' intention for e-payment adoption in Taiwan and Vietnam. Their research also indicates that ease of use and the usefulness factors attached to e-payment significantly affect the usage of electronic payments in a positive manner. They also found that perceived risk negatively impacts adoption levels.

Research Gaps

Despite extensive research on digital payments and consumer perceptions, certain critical gaps remain unexplored or only partially addressed. While previous studies have investigated awareness levels, user attitudes, and infrastructural challenges, there is a lack of cohesive understanding of how demographic variables and regional disparities shape consumer behavior—especially in semi-urban and tier-2 Indian cities. Furthermore, evolving patterns post-demonetization and during the digital push lack updated empirical validation. Many studies also underrepresent emerging concerns around security perceptions, limited exposure to lesser-known payment modes, and resistance rooted in habit or fear of technology. These identified gaps are summarized in the table 1 below

Table 1

S. No.	Identified Research Gap	Support from Literature
1	Limited awareness of less-known digital modes like USSD and Aadhaar-enabled payment systems	Goel et al. (2019), Dominic et al. (2018), Podile & Rajesh (2017)
2	Lack of technical literacy and experience inhibits adoption	Podile & Rajesh (2017), Shivanthu (2017), Gaonkar (2018), Kavitha & Kumar (2018)
3	Security and privacy concerns persist as major barriers	Yuvaraj & Eveline (2018), Hasan et al. (2017), Teoh et al. (2013), Lin & Nguyen (2011)
4	Infrastructural issues like poor internet, POS limitations, and digital payment ecosystem inefficiencies	Kaur (2019), Nair (2016), Azali (2016), Gupta (2017), Shivanthu (2017), Gaonkar (2018)
5	Demographic influence not studied comprehensively in Indian tier-2 or tier-3 city contexts	Onyia & Tagg (2011), Singh & Rana (2017), Mahapatra (2018), Tripathi & Dixit (2020)
6	Resistance due to behavioural and attitudinal factors like fear of technology or cash-dependence	Garg & Panchal (2016), Kousalya & Shankar (2018), Farida et al. (2016), Bezhovski (2016), Mahapatra (2018)
7	Lack of uniform findings on usage motivations such as incentives, trust, or convenience	Tripathi & Dixit (2020), Teoh et al. (2013), Kavitha & Kumar (2018), Najdawi et al. (2019)

8	Sparse research on post-COVID behavioural shift and adoption trends in semi-urban and rural populations	Recent studies lack longitudinal analysis capturing changes in digital payment habits over time in India post-2020.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Objectives

a) To identify the key factors influencing consumers' decision-making when opting for cashless modes of transaction.
b) To examine the strength of the relationship between demographic variables and the identified influencing factors.

Research Design

a) A snowball sampling method, a variant of non-probability sampling, was used where initial participants referred others. Out of 658 individuals approached online, 432 responded, resulting in a 65% response rate.
b) Data was collected between December 2024 and March 2025 from tier-2 cities in central India with populations over 10 lakhs as per the 2011 Census. The selected cities were Indore, Bhopal, Gwalior, and Jabalpur.
c) A self-administered questionnaire was shared via Google Forms. The instrument was designed with closed-ended and Likert scale-based questions to collect quantitative data, and the study followed a mono-method approach.
d) Secondary data was obtained from journals, books, and newspapers to support the analysis and establish context.
e) Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 23.0, applying techniques such as reliability testing, KMO and Bartlett's Test, factor analysis, mean analysis, Chi-square test, Cramér's V, and contingency coefficient.

Methodology Compendium

Table 2

Parameter	Brief Note
Type of Research	Cross-sectional study with a descriptive approach
Data Collection Method	Combination of primary and secondary sources (mixed data approach)
Data Collection Time	Data was gathered over a period from December 2024 to March 2025
Research Instrument	Structured survey designed for hypothesis testing; validated through a preliminary pilot
Survey Administration	Distributed and collected through Google Forms
Instrument Validity Testing	Internal consistency assessed using Cronbach's Alpha
Sampling Type	Non-probability method involving convenience and snowball sampling techniques
Sample Size	A total of 432 participants formed the final dataset
Analysis	Included reliability checks, descriptive measures, average score analysis, and KMO Bartlet Test, factor extraction techniques
Hypothesis Testing	Statistical testing involved Chi-Square test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)
Software Tools	SPSS software, version 23, used for data analysis

Hypothesis

A critical review of existing literature reveals that while numerous studies have explored consumer perceptions towards cashless transactions, limited attention has been paid to the influence of demographic variables on the underlying factors (cardinal and peripheral) that guide transaction decisions. Most research either focuses on general awareness or barriers to adoption, without categorically linking demographic dimensions to specific influencing components. To bridge this gap, the current study formulates hypotheses as presented in table 3, to empirically test the association between demographic attributes (such as age, gender, education, occupation, and income) and the identified cardinal and peripheral factors. This approach aims to uncover whether these associations are statistically significant, thus adding a new dimension to the literature.

Table 3

Hypothesis	Statement
H1	No notable linkage exists between the cardinal factors and the respondent's age.
H2	No noteworthy relationship is observed between the cardinal factors and gender.
H3	Cardinal factors are not significantly related to educational qualification.
H4	There is no major association between cardinal factors and occupation.
H5	No meaningful correlation exists between cardinal factors and family annual income.
H6	Peripheral factors do not show significant association with age.
H7	Peripheral factors are not notably influenced by gender.

H8	There is no substantial connection between peripheral factors and education level.
H9	Peripheral components and occupation are not significantly associated.
H10	No significant relationship is found between peripheral components and family income.

DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive Statistics

Essential background information of respondents was collected using key demographic variables such as gender, age, occupation, and annual income. The respondent profile includes 284 males and 148 females from four tier-2 cities in Madhya Pradesh—Indore, Bhopal, Gwalior, and Jabalpur. A significant share of the sample, around 66.7%, falls within the 15–25 age group. In terms of occupation:

- 30.1% of respondents were from the service sector,
- 15% identified as self-employed,
- 53.2% were students, and
- 1.8% reported being homemakers.

Regarding income levels, a notable proportion of participants reported annual earnings in the range of 5 to 15 lakhs. However, the majority of the respondents fall under the lower income category. These demographic insights provide a clearer understanding of the respondent base and set the foundation for examining their behaviour toward cashless transactions.

Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis was performed on all variables that use Likert's scale. The Cronbach's alpha value came out to be 0.703, which indicates an acceptable internal consistency as per the rule of thumb for interpreting alpha for dichotomous questions (Gileum & Gileum, 2003).

KMO and Bartlett's Test

The suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity presented in table 4. The KMO value was found to be 0.831, which indicates a high level of sampling adequacy. According to standard guidelines, values above 0.80 are considered meritorious for factor analysis. (IBM, 2019) Bartlett's Test of Sphericity yielded a Chi-square value of 1488.345 with 36 degrees of freedom and a significance level of 0.000. This result confirms that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix, validating the use of factor analysis for further examination.

Table 4

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.831
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1488.345
	df	36
	Sig.	.000

Factor Analysis

The influencing factors were evaluated using a 4-point rating scale where 1 indicated "Not Important," 2 "Least Important," 3 "Important," and 4 "Very Important." Based on the results shown in Table 5, nine variables were considered in the analysis. Variables with relatively higher Eigenvalues were extracted, as they contribute significantly to the factor structure. According to the rotated component matrix, variables with loadings near or above 0.7 were identified as meaningful and grouped under two distinct factors. These two major dimensions were named as follows:

1. Cardinal
2. Peripheral

The **Cardinal** factor includes variables such as transaction security, digital connectivity, cost efficiency, processing time, and ease of use. These are core to the transaction experience. On the other hand, the **Peripheral** factor covers aspects like mobile app interface design, brand image, post-transaction service, and access to ATM facilities. These elements, while secondary, still influence user decisions toward cashless modes.

Table 5

Rotated Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	2
Security	.801	.236
Internet Connectivity	.752	.169
Cost	.584	.297
App Design	.398	.470
Transaction Time	.768	.146
Ease of transaction	.776	.296
Brand Name	.251	.752
Post Transaction Service	.120	.824
ATM Location	.238	.704
Extraction Method: Principal Component		
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

Table 6

Analysis of Association - Demographic Factors with Cardinal Factors						
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi Square Value	Hypothesis
Age	Not Important	13	1.6923	1.31559	.000	H1 Rejected
	Important	187	1.2567	.58512		
	Very Important	232	1.6810	.82807		
	Total	432	1.4977	.77967		
Gender	Not Important	13	1.6154	.50637	.096	H2 Accepted
	Important	187	1.3209	.46806		
	Very Important	232	1.3448	.47634		
	Total	432	1.3426	.47513		
Education Level	Not Important	13	3.2308	1.01274	.000	H3 Rejected
	Important	187	2.0053	.80654		
	Very Important	232	2.2931	.96266		
	Total	432	2.1968	.92688		
Family Annual Income	Not Important	13	1.6923	1.31559	.000	H4 Rejected
	Important	187	2.1818	1.21774		
	Very Important	232	2.2026	.96133		
	Total	432	2.1782	1.09128		
Occupation	Not Important	13	1.6923	1.31559	.000	H5 Rejected
	Important	187	1.5027	.80572		
	Very Important	232	1.7672	.72503		
	Total	432	1.6505	.79181		

At 5% level of significance, hypotheses H1, H3, H4, and H5 are rejected as the p-values are less than 0.05. This indicates that there is a statistically significant association between cardinal factors and demographic variables such as age, education, income, and occupation. To determine the strength of these associations, further analysis using Cramer's V and Contingency Coefficient is suggested. On the other hand, hypothesis H2 is accepted, implying that the null hypothesis holds true and no significant association exists between gender and cardinal factors. The findings presented in table 6, suggest that cashless transaction preferences are influenced by age, education, income, and occupation, indicating the need for targeted awareness and policy measures. Since gender shows no significant impact, communication strategies can remain neutral in that regard, focusing instead on other key demographic drivers to boost adoption.

Table 7

Strength of Association - Demographic Factors with Cardinal Factors		
	Cramer V	Contingency Cooeficient
Age	.316	0.408
Education Level	.235	0.316
Family Annual Income	.235	0.315
Occupation	.331	0.424

Based on value of Cramer V and contingent coefficient value it can be inferred that the association is Strong for H1 H3 H4 & H5 as all values lie above .30 value.

Table 8

Analysis of Association - Demographic Factors with Peripheral Factors						
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Chi Square Value	Hypothesis
Age	Not Important	13	1.6923	1.31559	.36488	0.000	H 6 Rejected
	Least Important	26	1.7308	.82741	.16227		
	Important	232	1.3707	.67779	.04450		
	Very Important	161	1.6273	.82780	.06524		
	Total	432	1.4977	.77967	.03751		
Gender	Not Important	13	1.6154	.50637	.14044	0.000	H 7 Rejected
	Least Important	26	1.0000	0.00000	0.00000		
	Important	232	1.3793	.48626	.03192		
	Very Important	161	1.3230	.46907	.03697		
	Total	432	1.3426	.47513	.02286		
Education Level	Not Important	13	3.2308	1.01274	.28088	0.000	H 8 Rejected
	Least Important	26	2.0000	.74833	.14676		
	Important	232	2.0603	.88556	.05814		
	Very Important	161	2.3416	.93612	.07378		
	Total	432	2.1968	.92688	.04459		
Family Annual Income	Not Important	13	1.6923	1.31559	.36488	0.000	H 9 Rejected
	Least Important	26	1.6538	1.09334	.21442		
	Important	232	2.4569	1.07222	.07039		
	Very Important	161	1.9006	.98872	.07792		
	Total	432	2.1782	1.09128	.05250		
Occupation	Not Important	13	1.6923	1.31559	.36488	0.000	H 10 Rejected
	Least Important	26	2.0769	.89098	.17474		
	Important	232	1.5862	.76807	.05043		
	Very Important	161	1.6708	.73973	.05830		
	Total	432	1.6505	.79181	.03810		

As per table 8 all hypothesis are rejected as value of chi square is less than .05 at 5% significance level. It can be inferred that there is some association between peripheral elements and the given demographic factors. Cramer V and Contingency coefficient will be applied to know the exact strength of association between given variables.

Table 9

Analysis of Association - Demographic Factors with Peripheral Factors		
	Cramer V	Contingency Cooeficient
Age	.226	0.365
Gender	.213	0.208
Education Level	.193	0.317
Family Annual Income	.222	359
Occupation	.229	0.368

As per table 9, strength is association between education level and peripheral variables is weak as value of Cramer V lie below .20. All other variables like age, gender, income and occupation show moderate strength of association as value of Cramer V lie between .20 -.29. Value of Contingency Coefficient also concur with above interpretation.

CONCLUSION

This Research has opened new idea and discussion on this much talked about subject globally. After conducting the research, it

uncovered some very interesting inputs related to various influencing variables and their impact on various demographic elements.

KEY FINDINGS

Objective one was to identify the factors that influence the transaction decision making of consumers towards cashless mode. Following are the observations made related to this.

- Factors influencing cashless transaction decisions were first identified through secondary sources and observation. Post factor analysis, they were grouped into two major categories: cardinal and peripheral factors.
- Application-based modes emerged as the most recognized form of cashless transactions (95%), followed closely by internet-based methods (93%).
- Traditional methods show lower awareness, with only 19% aware of USSD and 26.2% familiar with Aadhaar Enabled Payment Systems.
- A significant 94.4% of respondents find cashless transactions easy to perform.
- Around 60% of respondents reported using cashless modes frequently in their routine transactions.
- Credit and debit cards are the most commonly used tools for executing cashless payments.
- Key factors influencing transaction choices include ease of use, time efficiency, and security.
- Notably, 83.2% of respondents believe that electronic transactions increase the likelihood of fraud.

Objective 2 was to examine strength of relationship between demographic factors and identified factors. Following results from data analysis establishes certain intriguing observations.

- Age education family income and occupation has strong association with cardinal factors like security, connectivity, cost, transaction time & ease of process. Any of these variables can influence the decision making of customer for cashless transaction. Gender has no relation.
- peripheral factors like App design , brand, after service and ATM location has close association with all demographic factors. It means that All service providers must take these factors very seriously as it may influence the decision making of customers towards cash less transaction.

The study conducted by Podile and Rajesh (2017) highlights negative perceptions associated with cashless transactions, particularly concerning online fraud and insufficient technical knowledge. These observations align with the present research, where a considerable number of respondents agreed that electronic transactions increase the risk of fraud and require a certain level of experience to navigate effectively. Similarly, Goel et al. (2019) observed that awareness about digital payment systems remains relatively low. This finding is partially consistent with the current study, which shows that while most respondents are familiar with common cashless modes such as mobile wallets and net banking, awareness of platforms like USSD and Aadhaar Enabled Payment System continues to be limited.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the government, workplaces, and educational institutions take active steps to increase awareness about cashless transactions. Efforts should focus on addressing misconceptions, particularly the belief that technical expertise is essential. Additionally, concerns related to security and safety should be systematically resolved to promote wider adoption of digital payment methods.

LIMITATIONS

The sample size is relatively small and limited to specific geographic areas, which may affect the generalizability of the findings.

The sampling approach shows bias, with limited diversity in terms of gender representation and variation in family annual income levels.

Reference List

Azali, K. (2016). Cashless in Indonesia: Gelling mobile e-frictions? *Southeast Asian Economies, 33*(3), 364–386.

Bezhovski, Z. (2016). The future of the mobile payment as electronic payment system. *European Journal of Business and Management, 8*(8), 127–132.

Cashlessindia.gov.in. (n.d.). *Cashless India*. http://cashlessindia.gov.in/digital_payment_methods.html

Detrixhe, J. (2019, December 3). Cashless payments are growing faster in India than just about anywhere else. *Quartz India*. https://qz.com/india/1746910/cashless-payments-growing-faster-in-india-than-almost-anywhere-else/

Dhanda, K., & Arora, U. (2017). Genesis of cashless society: A study on growing acceptability of plastic money. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Development, 2*(5), 478–485.

Dominic, A., Saranya, K., & Rajani, K. (2018). A study on transformation in behaviour of individuals towards cashless economy. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 118*(18), 1365–1372.

Farida, N., Ardyan, E., & Yakin, N. (2016). Gender differences in interest in using electronic money: An application of theory planned behavior. *International Review of Management and Marketing, 6*(4), 898–903.

Gaonkar, S. (2018). Moving towards cashless India. *SANSMARAN Management Research Journal, 8*(1), 10–16.

Garg, P., & Panchal, M. (2017). Study on introduction of cashless economy in India 2016: Benefits & challenges. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 19*(4), 116–120.

Gliem, J., & Gliem, R. (2003). *Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales*. https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/344/Gliem%20%26%20Gliem.pdf

Goel, R., Sahai, S., Vinaik, A., & Garg, V. (2019). Moving from cash to cashless economy: A study of consumer perception towards digital transactions. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE), 8*(1), 1220.

Gupta, A. (2017). Cashless Haryana: Achievements and challenges in the way. *International Journal in Management and Social Science, 5*(8), 368–372.

Haines, G., Howard, J., & Sheth, J. (1970). The theory of buyer behavior. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 65*(331), 1406.

Hassan, A., Ali, A., & Amaan, A. (2017). Challenges perceived by consumers in cashless transaction. In *National Seminar on Cashless Economy: Aligarh Muslim University*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319349476_Challenges_perceived_by_consumers_in_cashless_transaction

Jayalakshmi, M., & Venkateshwarlu, G. (2017). Cashless economy in India: Challenges and benefits. *International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management, 2*(7), 5–8.

Kaur, P. (2019). Cash to cashless economy: Challenges & opportunities. *International Journal of 360 Management Review, 7*(1), 520–528.

Kavitha, M., & Kumar, K. (2018). A study on digital payments system with perspective of customer's adoption. *Eurasian Journal of Analytical Chemistry, 13*(SP), 189–200.

Kousalya, P., & Shankar, G. (2018). Cashless economy/transaction. *Indian Journal of Applied Research, 8*(2), 40–42.

Krainwanit, T., Panpon, P., & Thimthong, S. (2019). Cashless society in Thailand. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research, 8*(4), 44–56.

Kumar, P. (2015). An analysis of growth pattern of cashless transaction systems. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Business Management, 3*(9), 37–44.

Kurniawan, B., Wahyuni, S., & Valentina, T. (2019). The influence of digital payments on public spending patterns. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1402*, 066085.

Lin, C., & Nguyen, C. (2011). Exploring e-payment adoption in Vietnam and Taiwan. *The Journal of Computer Information Systems, 51*(4), 41–52.

Mahapatra, S. (2018). Cashless financial transaction behaviour of urban middle class in Bhubaneswar. *Parikalpana: KIIT Journal of Management, 14*(1), 91.

Nair, V. (2016). Eschewing cash: The challenges of cashless transactions in the Philippines. *Southeast Asian Economies, 33*(3), 387–397.

Najdawi, A., Chabani, Z., Said, R., & Starkova, O. (2019). Analyzing the adoption of e-payment technologies in UAE based on demographic variables. In *2019 International Conference on Digitization (ICD)*.

Neevlathi, K., Chavali, R., & Rao, U. (2017). A study on impact of usage of plastic money in India. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*: International Conference on "Paradigm Shift in Taxation, Accounting, Finance and Insurance", 64–69.

Onyia, O., & Tagg, S. (2011). Effects of demographic factors on bank customers' attitudes and intention toward internet

banking adoption in a major developing African country. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing, 16*(3–4), 294–315.

Pal, M., & Jain, P. (2018). An empirical study of transaction patterns of salaried class: Cashless versus cash. *IUP Journal of Bank Management, 17*(4), 36–51.

Podile, V., & Rajesh, P. (2017). Public perception on cashless transactions in India. *Asian Journal of Research in Banking and Finance, 7*(7), 63–77.

Singh, S., & Rana, R. (2017). Study of consumer perception of digital payment mode. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce, 22*(3), 1–14.

Sivathanu, B. (2019). Adoption of digital payment systems in the era of demonetization in India. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management, 10*(1), 143–171.

Soutter, L., Ferguson, K., & Neubert, M. (2019). Digital payments: Impact factors and mass adoption in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Technology Innovation Management Review, 9*(7), 41–55.

Teoh, W., Chong, S. C., Lin, B., & Chua, J. W. (2013). Factors affecting consumers' perception of electronic payment: An empirical analysis. *Internet Research, 23*(4), 465–485.

Tiwari, R., & Kumaro, P. (2014). Plastic money: Trend, issues and challenges. *International Journal of Information Technology & Computer Sciences Perspectives, 3*(4), 1249–1254.

Tripathi, S., & Dixit, P. (2020). A study on adoption of digital payment through mobile payment application with reference to Gujarat State. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (IJTSRD), 4*(3), 1110–1115.

Yuvraj, S., & Eveline, S. (2018). Consumers' perception towards cashless transactions and information security in the digital economy. *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology (IJMET), 9*(7), 89–96.

***