

# **Behavioral Determinants of Digital Finance Adoption and Financial Literacy Among Digital Nomads in the Gig Economy**

**Mr. Raghuveer P<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Hema Patil<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, <sup>2</sup>Associate Professor and Programme Coordinator department of management Studies VTU CPGS Mysuru

## **Abstract**

The quick development of the gig economy and the appearance of numerical nomadism have significantly increased reliance on alphanumeric monetary services. Despite enhanced accessibility through FinTech innovations, the adoption and effective utilization of digital finance remain uneven, revealing a critical gap between access and actual usage. The objective of this research paper is to investigate the behavioral factors affecting the adoption of digital finance and monetary literacy among digital nomads. By adopting a narrative review methodology, the paper synthesizes insights from behavioral finance, technology adoption and monetarist enclosure. The results indicate that cognitive biases (e.g. overconfidence, loss aversion, risk perception) as well as trust and perceived safety have a substantial effect on investment decisions. Digital financial tools have evolved into a fundamental part of our everyday life through the advancements of technology. Financial literacy is a fundamental mediator of use of digital financial tools. Problems associated with technology acceptance such as perceived usefulness and ease of use play a central role in adoption behaviour. According to the study, just having access to technology does not guarantee financial inclusion, and this stresses the need for behavioral interventions and financial literacy to improve usage.

**Keywords:** Behavioral finance, digital finance adoption, financial literacy, gig economy, digital nomads, fintech, financial inclusion

## **1. Introduction**

The rise of the gig economy has distorted out-of-date engagement structures by introducing flexible, platform-based work arrangements. A growing subset of this workforce known as digital nomads is working across the silence of geographical regions but are also digitally employed in their economic and social activities. As a result of this transition, there has been an increased reliance on mobile banking, touchscreen digital wallets, and cross-border payments.

Fintech innovations allow individuals and businesses to participate in the financial system without using traditional banking infrastructure or financial institutions. Yet, the adoption and use have not been as commonplace or consistent as one would imagine. It creates a catch-22 situation where access to finances does not mean usage of finances.

Prior models on financial inclusion considered access and infrastructure but not behaviour influencing financial decisions. The user behavior is greatly affected by the cognitive bias, trust, risk perception, and technology attitude which are behavior factors. Digital nomads - who may face distinct challenges like variability in income sources, the necessity for cross-border transactions, and regulatory uncertainty.

The study aims to identify behavioral predictors of digital finance adoption amongst digital nomads and the protagonist of financial literacy in the process. The training boosts literature by combining communicative backing and technology adoption perspectives to explain the slit amongst access and usage of finances.

### **Conceptual Background**

Digital finance adoption has occurred when consumers start using financial services deployed through technology on mobile phones and computers. It includes access to digital financial tools and using them. Poor financial knowledge is the inability to appropriately use information to take competent financial decision in psycho-economic life specially when individual grow any great. Financial inclusion is not just access to financial services but effectively using them for improving financial health Online workers are working remote with digital technologies and have the capability to be mobile and are often not anchored to traditional financial systems. The psychological and cognitive factors influencing our decisions including biases, perceptions, attitudes; the behavioral determinants.

The behavioral finance theory reveals the reason why individuals do not behave like thinkers. Due to loss aversion, people prefer to avoid losses more than suffering from equivalent gains. The social impact and enabling situations is included in the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Skill further. Together these theories help explain the comportment of digital finance adoption.

### **Literature Review**

#### **Cognitive Biases in Financial Decision-Making**

The role of intellectual preconceptions in monetarist managerial has been expansively surveyed within the domain of behavioral finance, particularly in digitally mediated environments. Individuals often rely on heuristics when making financial decisions under uncertainty, which leads to systematic deviations from rational behavior (Kahneman & Tversky, <sup>1979</sup>; Barberis & Thaler, <sup>2003</sup>). Brashness bias, for instance, leads individuals to miscalculate their financial knowledge and ability to navigate digital financial platforms, follow-on in disproportionate risk-taking and poor decision outcomes (Barber & Odean, <sup>2001</sup>; Baker et al., <sup>2019</sup>). Similarly, loss aversion, a central concept of Prospect Theory, suggests that individuals are more sensitive to losses than gains, discouraging them from adopting unfamiliar financial technologies (Tversky & Kahneman, <sup>1992</sup>).

Risk perception further influences digital finance adoption, as individuals tend to overestimate potential threats associated with online financial transactions (Slovic, <sup>1987</sup>). Studies by Loewenstein et al. (<sup>2001</sup>) demonstrate that emotional responses significantly affect risk evaluation, particularly in uncertain environments. Additionally, ambiguity aversion leads individuals to avoid fintech platforms due to lack of familiarity and perceived uncertainty (Ellsberg, <sup>1961</sup>). Research by Shefrin (<sup>2007</sup>) and DellaVigna (<sup>2009</sup>)

further highlights that behavioral biases are amplified in technology-driven financial ecosystems where information overload and complexity are prevalent.

### **Financial Behavior and Decision-Making Among Gig Workers**

Financial decision-making among gig workers differs significantly from traditional employees due to income volatility and lack of institutional support. Gig workers often engage in short-term financial planning and exhibit present bias, prioritizing immediate consumption over long-term financial security (Laibson, <sup>1997</sup>). Studies by Farrell and Greig (<sup>2016</sup>) and Collins et al. (<sup>2019</sup>) indicate that irregular income patterns lead to reactive financial behavior, reducing the ability to engage in structured financial planning.

Digital nomads face additional complexities due to cross-border financial transactions and fluctuating currencies, which increase financial uncertainty and decision complexity. Research by Wood et al. (<sup>2019</sup>) suggests that gig workers experience financial precarity due to lack of social security and institutional safeguards. It appears as if people have formed separate categories into which money is allocated due to mental accounting.

A gig worker's financial capability could depend on various behavioural and contextual elements including digital literacy, and platform dependency (Xiao & Porto, <sup>2017</sup>; Mogaji, <sup>2020</sup>). Value-induced bias is likely to influence investors with fixed income and mislead them to make questionable decisions accordingly.

### **The growing concerns over trust, risk and security in digital finances.**

If you do not have faith in anyone else, you can embrace digital finance. After all, the transaction is remote, after all. Studies on digital platform trust formation have shown that security and transparency as well as reliability influences trust (Gefen et al., <sup>2003</sup>; McKnight et al., <sup>2002</sup>). On the contrary, sample respondents perceived fraud, data theft and invasion of privacy as critical barriers to adoption (Featherman & Pavlou, <sup>2003</sup>). According to Pavlou (<sup>2003</sup>), Trust positively influences the perceived risk (X). Kim et al.'s enquiry has given away that social media can significantly influence individuals' eating behaviors, particularly regarding unhealthy food consumption. (<sup>2010</sup>) highlights that professed sanctuary knowingly stimulates user willingness to adopt digital financial services. Additionally, online trust is shaped by familiarity and prior involvement with alphanumeric platforms (Jarvenpaa et al., <sup>2000</sup>).

Behavioral studies further indicate that perceived risk is often subjective and influenced by cognitive biases rather than objective measures (Weber et al., <sup>2002</sup>). This suggests that even secure fintech platforms may face adoption challenges due to psychological perceptions of risk.

### **Technology Acceptance and User Behavior**

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) provides a initial agenda for empathetic ordinal finance adoption, emphasizing professed utility and ease of use as key determinants (Davis, <sup>1989</sup>). The Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) expands this model by including the impact of social influence and the presence of facilitating conditions (Venkatesh et al., <sup>2003</sup>). Investigation recommends that these aspects impact fintech adoption significantly, especially for those who have a high level of technology ability (Baptista & Oliveira, <sup>2015</sup>) Yet, even though a computer and the required

technology may be present, innovativeness may be blocked by resistance of innovator, and by perception of complexity (Ram & Sheth, <sup>1989</sup>).

User behavior in digital finance is determined by perceived value, convenience, and trust (Chiu et al., <sup>2014</sup>; Zhou, <sup>2011</sup>) according to further studies. Combining behavioral and technological perspectives helps to produce better knowledge on adoption behavior.

### **Functions of financial literacy in decision-making and sign-up adopting behavior.**

Monetarist reading ability impressions financial behavior as well as digital finance utilization immensely. Publics who take larger finance knowledge and financial capability are better able to assess financial products and manage risks. Studies by van Rooij et al. have noted relationships between sources of enthusiasm and addiction, characterized by either functional or dysfunctional addictive behaviors.<sup>(2011)</sup> indicate that fiscal literacy pointedly stimuli financial participation and investment behavior.

However, numerical pecuniary networks require additional competencies such as digital literacy and cybersecurity awareness (OECD, <sup>2018</sup>). Research by Fernandes et al. (<sup>2014</sup>) suggests that economic tutoring unaided may not always lead to improved financial outcomes, highlighting the role of behavioral factors.

The interaction between fiscal knowledge and communicative predispositions is particularly important, as learning can alleviate the negative effects of biases by enhancing decision-making capabilities (Allgood & Walstad, <sup>2016</sup>). Nevertheless, rapid technological advancements continue to create gaps between user knowledge and system complexity, affecting adoption outcomes.

### **Thematic Analysis / Discussion**

Behavioral factors—particularly cognitive favoritisms like bullishness, loss dislike, and ambiguity aversion—strongly shape digital finance adoption among digital nomads and gig workers, who face irregular incomes and heightened perceived risks (financial loss, privacy breaches, service overload) that often outweigh objective system reliability; while financial literacy improves comprehension and partly mitigates biases, it is insufficient alone as intrinsic behaviors and situational uncertainty still drive poor decisions. Empirical findings are mixed—some studies prioritize trust, others apparent expediency and effortlessness of use—pointing to the need for integrated frameworks that simultaneously address cognitive, emotional, technological, and contextual drivers rather than single-factor explanations.

### **Research Gaps**

The evaluation of literature identifies several serious breaches that permit more investigation. To begin with, there is a considerable absence of research on digital nomads as a subgroup of the gig economy. While researchers broadly categorize gig workers, existing studies overlook the unique challenges posed by geographic mobility, cross-border payments, and multi-currency exposure.

Second, current frameworks for financial inclusion focus primarily on access and infrastructure while neglecting behavioral aspects. Owing to the deficiency of investigation, we have limited understanding of adoption behavior due to cognitive biases, trust and resistance. The online financial ecosystem shows the largest access–usage gap, driven by user perceptions and attitudes, yet empirical research has

underexplored how these behavioral drivers differ across regions and regulatory environments—especially for digital nomads operating under diverse institutional contexts. The paucity of reasonable studies assessing regional and institutional variation, and the role of financial literacy as a mediator or moderator of cognitive biases remains unclear, limiting the design of embattled interventions that instantaneously address informational and behavioral barriers to meaningful fintech engagement.

## **Conceptual Framework**

The proposed conceptual framework integrates behavioral finance and technology adoption perspectives to get output of collaborative consideration of digital finance adoption. Financial decision-making is impacted by independent variables that include cognitive biases: overconfidence, loss aversion, risk perception. Perceived risk and psychological trust shape digital finance use, while technology acceptance hinges on seeming helpfulness, luxury of practice, and facilitating conditions. Financial literacy acts as a mediator/moderator, improving users' ability to interpret financial information, reducing uncertainty and bias, and strengthening links between behavioral drivers and adoption. The dependent outcome is digital finance adoption, leading to financial inclusion when use is sustained and supports financial well-being. The proposed framework holds that behavioral factors exert direct and indirect effects on adoption, with financial literacy enhancing decision quality and amplifying behavioral impacts—offering a more comprehensive explanation of digital financial behavior than access-only models.

## **Implications**

The study offers significant theoretical contributions by bridging the gap between behavioral finance and fintech adoption literature. Integrating behavioral theories with technology-acceptance models deepens understanding of financial inclusion by addressing psychological alongside technological barriers; fintechs should adopt user-centric designs—simplified interfaces, transparent communication, stronger security, nudges, personalized recommendations, and defaults—to reduce cognitive load and build trust, while policymakers must implement behaviorally informed financial literacy programs and bias-mitigation measures; digital nomads need tailored solutions for cross-border payments, tax issues, and irregular incomes, and coordinated programs and policies that educate and protect users are essential to convert access into sustained, inclusive usage.

## **Conclusion**

Expanded access to financial services through FinTech is not enough to guarantee usage and optimal usage because the user's behavior is always behaviourally influenced. Such psychological barriers hamper decent decision making and do not allow meaningful adoption. Progress in financial literacy will not be enough alone to remove the behavioural barriers to decision-making. The break amongst access and use shows that the supply-side models of economic enclosure focusing on infrastructure isn't enough. You can return to the site and choose more sentences to help you with seamless paraphrasing.

Digital nomads working in a complex and uncertain financial environment must consider behavioural constraints. There is a need for future research and policy interventions in ICTs to adopt a multidisciplinary approach to make financial ecosystems more inclusive and sustainable.

## References (APA 7th Edition)

1. Allen, F., Gu, X., & Jagtiani, J. (2021). A survey of fintech research and policy discussion. *Review of Corporate Finance*, 1(3–4), 259–339.
2. Allgood, S., & Walstad, W. B. (2016). Financial literacy and behavior. *Economic Inquiry*, 54(1), 675–697.
3. Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2016). The evolution of fintech. *Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business*, 37(1), 127–170.
4. Baker, H. K., Kumar, S., Goyal, N., & Gaur, V. (2019). Behavioral biases. *Managerial Finance*, 45(1), 124–146.
5. Banna, H., Hassan, M. K., & Rashid, M. (2021). Fintech-based financial inclusion. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 48(6), 1045–1061.
6. Baptista, G., & Oliveira, T. (2015). Mobile banking adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 50, 418–430.
7. Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2001). Overconfidence. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1), 261–292.
8. Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. (2003). Behavioral finance. *Handbook of Economics of Finance*, 1, 1053–1128.
9. Beck, T. (2020). Fintech and financial inclusion. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 44, 100844.
10. Berg, T., Burg, V., Gombović, A., & Puri, M. (2020). Fintech lending. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 136(1), 1–27.
11. Chiu, C. M., et al. (2014). E-commerce behavior. *Information Systems Journal*, 24(1), 85–114.
12. Claessens, S., Frost, J., Turner, G., & Zhu, F. (2018). Fintech credit markets. *BIS Quarterly Review*, 29–49.
13. Collins, J. M., Urban, C., & Xu, Y. (2019). Financial capability of gig workers. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 53(2), 719–739.
14. Davis, F. D. (1989). Technology acceptance model. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
15. DellaVigna, S. (2009). Behavioral economics. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(2), 315–372.
16. Demirgüç-Kunt, A., et al. (2018). Global Findex Database. World Bank.
17. Ellsberg, D. (1961). Risk and ambiguity. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 75(4), 643–669.
18. Fernandes, D., et al. (2014). Financial literacy outcomes. *Management Science*, 60(8), 1861–1883.
19. Feyen, E., Frost, J., Gambacorta, L., & Natarajan, H. (2021). Fintech and inclusion. World Bank.
20. Frost, J. (2020). Fintech adoption forces. *BIS Working Papers*, 838.
21. Goldfarb, A., & Tucker, C. (2019). Digital economics. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(1), 3–43.
22. Gomber, P., et al. (2018). Fintech revolution. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 35(1), 220–265.
23. Haddad, C., & Hornuf, L. (2019). Fintech startups. *Small Business Economics*, 53(1), 81–105.

24. Jagtiani, J., & Lemieux, C. (2018). Fintech lending. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 100, 43–54.
25. Jarvenpaa, S. L., et al. (2000). Online trust. *Information Technology and Management*, 1(1–2), 45–71.
26. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–292.
27. Kim, D. J., et al. (2010). Trust and risk. *Information Systems Research*, 20(2), 237–257.
28. Klapper, L., & Singer, D. (2017). Financial inclusion digital age. World Bank.
29. Laibson, D. (1997). Hyperbolic discounting. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2), 443–478.
30. Lee, I., & Shin, Y. J. (2018). Fintech ecosystem. *Business Horizons*, 61(1), 35–46.
31. Loewenstein, G. F., et al. (2001). Risk perception. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(2), 267–286.
32. Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2014). Financial literacy. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1), 5–44.
33. Lyons, A. C., & Kass-Hanna, J. (2021). Financial literacy and inclusion. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 57(9), 2699–2731.
34. Marr, B. (2020). AI in fintech. *Forbes Insights*.
35. McKnight, D. H., et al. (2002). Trust measures. *Information Systems Research*, 13(3), 334–359.
36. Mogaji, E. (2020). Financial vulnerability. *Research in Globalization*, 2, 100037.
37. Morgan, P. J., & Trinh, L. Q. (2019). Fintech literacy Asia. ADBI Working Paper.
38. Navaretti, G. B., et al. (2018). Fintech and banking. *Economic Policy*, 33(95), 383–437.
39. OECD. (2018). Financial literacy toolkit. *OECD Publishing*.
40. Ozili, P. K. (2020). Financial inclusion research. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance*, 28(3), 329–340.
41. Pavlou, P. A. (2003). E-commerce adoption. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 7(3), 101–134.
42. Puschmann, T. (2017). Fintech models. *Electronic Markets*, 27(1), 69–76.
43. Ram, S., & Sheth, J. N. (1989). Innovation resistance. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 6(2), 5–14.
44. Sarma, M., & Pais, J. (2011). Inclusion index. *Journal of Economic Development*, 36(2), 25–50.
45. Senyo, P. K., et al. (2020). Fintech ecosystem. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 151, 119788.
46. Shefrin, H. (2007). Behavioral corporate finance. McGraw-Hill.
47. Slovic, P. (1987). Risk perception. *Science*, 236(4799), 280–285.
48. Thakor, A. V. (2020). Fintech banking. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 41, 100833.
49. Thaler, R. H. (1999). Mental accounting. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 12(3), 183–206.
50. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Prospect theory. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5(4), 297–323.
51. van Rooij, M., et al. (2011). Financial literacy. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 101(2), 449–472.
52. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). UTAUT model. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425–478.
53. Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y. L., & Xu, X. (2012). UTAUT2. *MIS Quarterly*, 36(1), 157–178.
54. Vives, X. (2019). Digital banking. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 11, 243–272.
55. Weber, E. U., et al. (2002). Risk-attitude scale. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 15(4), 263–290.



56. Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Gig economy. *Work, Employment and Society*, 33(1), 56–75.
57. Xiao, J. J., & Porto, N. (2017). Financial satisfaction. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 35(5), 805–817.
58. Zetsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Barberis, J. N. (2017). Fintech regulation. *Fordham Journal of Corporate & Financial Law*, 23(1), 31–103.
59. Zhou, T. (2011). Mobile behavior. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 30(2), 241–250.