Index

Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index	results of, 26–28
(AGFI), 129, 168	Brundtland report (see United Nations
Adoption intention, 157	World Commission on
Age	Environment and
impact of age on usage of	Development (1987))
e-payment following five	•
null hypotheses, 92	Capital market, 1–2
analyze influence of demographic	Cash on delivery (COD), 39
characteristics on e-payment	Chi-square test, 115
based on, 89-97	Chi-square value normalized by
effect on SEPS model, 174-177	degrees of freedom (CMIN/
Agenda 2030, 9	df), 144
Analysis of variance (ANOVA), 41	Clear theory conceptualization, 70
Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP),	Co-authorship visualization, 26–27
191	Comma-separated values (CSV), 25
method, 41–42	Communication, 140
Attitude (ATT), 30	benefits offered by e-payment,
Automated-teller-machine (ATM), 5	84–85
Autonomy to Use Technology	Comparative Fit Index (CFI), 129, 168
(AUTT), 134, 157, 174,	Competition, Confidence, Cost, and
178–179, 186, 190	Convenience (4C), 6
validation of AUTT through CFA,	Confirmatory analysis, 69–70
134–135	Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)
Average Variance Extracted (AVE),	(see also Bibliometric
144	analysis), 14, 32, 70, 116,
	144, 155–156, 162, 186
Bartlett Test of Sphericity, 126	validation of AUTT through,
Bartlett's measure tests, 125–126	134–135
Behavioural intention (BI), 39	validation of e-payment system
Bharat Interface for Money (BHIM),	factors through, 129-143
35–36	validation of FSI through, 137–138
Bibliometric analysis (see also	validation of PIS through, 143
Confirmatory factor analysis	validation of TC through, 138–140
(CFA)), 23–25, 28	validation of TCP through,
influential authors, 26–27	141
influential countries, 27	Consumer demographics, 58–61
influential keywords, 27–28	Coverage, Confidence, Cost,
influential sources, 28	Convenience and
phase, 25	Convergence (5C), 6

Cronbach's reliability statistics of all	impact of education on usage of
statements, 122–125	e-payment following five
Cronbach's α , 118	null hypotheses, 92–97
	features make e-payment as
Data extraction, 25	financial innovation, 87–88
Data reduction technique, 126	feedback of respondents on, 79-80
Databases, 191	gateway, 6
selection, 25	impact of gender on usage of EP
Demographic dossier of respondents,	following five null
74–77	hypotheses, 91–92
Demographics, 161–162	impact of income on usage of
Demonetization', 32–33	e-payment following five
Department of Investment and Public	null hypotheses, 97
Asset Management	innovative features of financial
(Dipam), 3–4	service of e-payment, 87
Descriptive analysis of online payment,	innovative features of financial
78–89	technology of e-payment, 85
Descriptive approach, 68	preference for e-payment over other
in e-payment system, 68	modes of payment, 80–83
Descriptive statistics, 115	preference for payment mode, 79
Diagnostic approach in e-payment	quality of, 89
system, 68	reasons for use of, 80
Digital banking and payment (DBP),	reasons resist use of, 89
38	E-payment system (EPS), 2–4, 23–24,
Digital India, 6	53, 73, 113, 115, 155–157,
project, 3–4	186
Digital payment (DP), 24–25, 53	AUTT, 132–135
Digital payment systems (DPSs), 32–33	Cronbach's reliability statistics of
Digital transactions, 5	all statements, 122–125
Digital wallets (DWs), 36	and data security, 52
Digitalization, 73	descriptive and diagnostic approach
Diversity in customers, 74	in, 68
	and e-commerce, 44–51
E-payment (EP), 5-6, 9-10, 29, 78-79,	Eigen value, 126
186	and financial services, 44–51
impact of age on usage of	and financial technology,
e-payment following five	51
null hypotheses, 92	FSI, 136–138
barriers faced using, 83	identification of factor structure of
barriers in acceptance of, 84	E-payment system through
based on gender, age, education and	EFA, 118–129
income, analyze influence of	and network security, 52
demographic characteristics	perception of users towards, 102
on, 89–97	PIE, 131–132
communication benefits offered by,	PIS, 142–143
84–85	predictive approach in 68–71

prescriptive approach in, 71	Factor-analysis-method, 69–70, 118,
TC, 138–140	121
TCP, 140–141	Feedback of respondents on e-
total variance, 126	payment, 79–80
validation of e-payment system	Financial innovation, 6–7, 53–54, 115
factors through CFA,	analyze influence of demographic
129–143	characteristics on e-payment
validation of explored factors for,	based on gender, age,
143–144	education and income,
validity test for sample adequacy,	89–97
125–126	customer perception towards, 73
Ease of use (EOU), 31, 46, 51, 157–158	demographic dossier of
Economic sustainability, 8	respondents, 74–77
Education	descriptive analysis of online
analyze influence of demographic	payment, 78–89
characteristics on e-payment	features make e-payment as, 87–88
based on, 89–97	justification, 73–74
impact of education on usage of	justification, 115–116
e-payment following five	methodology for scale development,
null hypotheses, 92–97	116–118
effect on SEPS Model, 177–178	perception of users towards
Eigen Value, 126	e-payment system, 102
Electronic commerce, 27–28	results, 102–114
Electronic Commerce Research and Applications (ECRA), 33	shopping e-payment generally used for, 78–79
Electronic payment (e-payment), 2–3	validation of e-payment system
Electronic word-of-mouth (e-WOM),	factors through CFA,
39, 46, 51	129–143
Electronic-Clearing-Service (ECS), 5	validation of explored factors for
Elimination process, 116	e-payment system, 143–144
Empirical analysis, methodology for,	Financial market, 1–2, 23
68–71	bibliometric analysis, 25–28
Environmental sustainability, 8	citation reporting, 44
Epistemology, 57	contribution, 187
Exploration, 63	contribution of research work, 18
Exploratory factor analysis (EFA), 14,	descriptive and diagnostic approach
32, 69, 116, 186	in e-payment system, 68
identification of factor structure of	e-payment, 5–6
e-payment system through,	financial innovation, 6–7
118–129	framework and design in financial
Exploratory Principal Component	market research, 57–58
Factor Analysis (EPCFA),	future of financial market, 44–53
122	justification, 58–61
Exploratory research, 63	limitation and scope of work, 191
inplotatory research, 02	managerial implication, 187–191
Facilitating conditions (FC), 30, 46, 51	methodology, 24
(10, 51	

methodology for empirical analysis, 68–71	Government-to-person (G2P), 41
motivation for study and gap analysis, 9–11	Hypothesis testing, 14
predictive approach in e-payment system, 68–71	Immediate-Payment-Service (IMPS), 5 Income
prescriptive approach in e-payment system, 71	analyze influence of demographic characteristics on e-payment
research design, 63–68 research design and outcomes, 12–14	based on, 89–97 effect on SEPS Model, 179–180 impact of income on usage of
research gaps, 53–55 research insights, 23–24	e-payment following five null hypotheses, 97
research-work organization, 14-17	India, 2–3
review of studies, 28–44 review of studies undertaken	review of studies undertaken in, 30–37
abroad, 37–44	Innovate', 7
review of studies undertaken in India, 30–37	Innovative payment system, 137
scope and objectives of study, 11–12 SLR, 24–25	Intention to adopt (ITA), 157–158 ITA EPS, 157–158
sustainability, 7–9	mobile payments, 168–169
theoretical perspective, 5–9	Intention to use (ITU), 30
Financial service of e-payment,	ITU MPs, 30
innovative features of, 87	Internal consistency, 118
Financial sustainable innovation (FSI), 136–138, 157, 186, 190	estimation of reliability, 118 estimation of validity, 118
validation of FSI Through CFA, 137–138	International Journal of Electronic Commerce (IJEC), 28, 33
Financial system, 1–2, 23, 52–53 core of, 2	Interpretive Structural Modelling (ISM), 191
Financial technology of e-payment,	Item statistics, 118
innovative features of, 85	ITU-quick-response-MP
Food Sustainability, 53–54	(ITU-QR-MP), 39
Gender	Jordan MP system (JoMoPay system),
analyze influence of demographic	38
characteristics on e-payment based on, 89–97	Journal of Banking and Finance (JBF), 33
effect on SEPS Model, 170–174 impact of gender on usage of EP	Journal of Money, Credit and Banking (JMCB), 33
following five null	JSON (database), 25
hypotheses, 91–92	JSTOR (database), 191
Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), 129, 168	
Goodness-of-Fit (GOF), 69–70, 129	Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO), 125
Government-of-India, 5–6	Keyword Search, 25

Knowledge generation process, 57	Perceived risk (PR), 31, 46, 51 Perceived security (PS), 38, 46, 51, 169
Literature review (LR), 12, 24	Perceived usefulness (PU), 31, 46, 51, 157–158
Majlis-Bandaraya-Shah-Alam-and-	Performance expectancy (PE), 30, 46,
Majlis-Daerah-Kampar	51
(MBSAMD), 43	Personal descriptive, 74
Measure of Sampling Adequacy	Post-demonetization phase, India, 3
(MSA), 125	Post-IT phase, India, 3
Meta-literature review, 191	Pre-IT phase, India, 3
Ministry of Electronics & Information	Predictive approach, 68
Technology (MeitY), 6	in e-payment system, 68–71
Mobile payments (MPs), 30	methodology for formulation of
Mobile point-of-sale (MPOS), 42	structural model, 70–71
Monte Carlo methods, 66–67	methodology for scale development,
Multi-factor model approach, 143–144	69
	methodology for scale validation,
National Capital Region (NCR), 36	69–70
National-Electronic Fund Transfer	Prescriptive approach, 68
(NEFT), 5	in e-payment system, 71
New technology (NT), 7–8	Principal component analysis (PCA),
Normed Fit Index (NFI), 129, 168	69, 116, 121–122
0.00	method, 118
Offline-data-collection questionnaire,	PubMed (databases), 25
64	
0-1:	O1:4f4 00
Online payment, descriptive analysis	Quality of e-payment, 89
of, 78–89	Questionnaire, design of, 63-65
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire,
of, 78–89	Questionnaire, design of, 63-65
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS),	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS), 137, 142–143, 157, 186, 190	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63 and outcomes, 12–14
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS), 137, 142–143, 157, 186, 190 validation of PIS through CFA, 143	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63 and outcomes, 12–14 population and sampling area,
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS), 137, 142–143, 157, 186, 190 validation of PIS through CFA, 143 Payment infrastructure ecosystem	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63 and outcomes, 12–14 population and sampling area, 65
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS), 137, 142–143, 157, 186, 190 validation of PIS through CFA, 143	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63 and outcomes, 12–14 population and sampling area, 65 process, 12
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS), 137, 142–143, 157, 186, 190 validation of PIS through CFA, 143 Payment infrastructure ecosystem (PIE), 131–132, 157,	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63 and outcomes, 12–14 population and sampling area, 65
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS), 137, 142–143, 157, 186, 190 validation of PIS through CFA, 143 Payment infrastructure ecosystem (PIE), 131–132, 157, 178–179, 186, 190	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63 and outcomes, 12–14 population and sampling area, 65 process, 12 sample size, 65–67
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS), 137, 142–143, 157, 186, 190 validation of PIS through CFA, 143 Payment infrastructure ecosystem (PIE), 131–132, 157, 178–179, 186, 190 validation of PIE through CFA, 132	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63 and outcomes, 12–14 population and sampling area, 65 process, 12 sample size, 65–67 Research-work organization, 14–17
of, 78–89 Online questionnaire, 67 Ontology, 57–58 Payer, purchase, physical technology and payment instrument (4p), 41 Payment and Settlement Act (2007), 5 Payment and Settlement Systems (PSS), 6 Payment information security (PIS), 137, 142–143, 157, 186, 190 validation of PIS through CFA, 143 Payment infrastructure ecosystem (PIE), 131–132, 157, 178–179, 186, 190 validation of PIE through CFA, 132 Payment system, 147	Questionnaire, design of, 63–65 elements of survey questionnaire, 64–65 R-matrix, 125–126 Reliability, estimation of, 118 Research design, 63–68 data, 67–68 data collection, 67 design of questionnaire, 63–65 exploratory research, 63 and outcomes, 12–14 population and sampling area, 65 process, 12 sample size, 65–67 Research-work organization, 14–17 Respondents, demographic dossier of,

Root Mean Square Error of

Approximation (RMSEA),	SEPS through SEM,
129, 144, 168	164–170
	methodology for formulation of,
Scale development, methodology for,	70–71
69, 116, 118	Sustainability, 7, 9, 53–54, 157, 187
identification of factor structure of	estimation of structural model of
e-payment system through	SEPS through SEM,
EFA, 118–129	164–170
internal consistency and validity	of financial innovation, 155–156
measurement, 118	justification of study, 156–157
item evaluation and selection,	literature, 9
116–118	measuring moderating effects of
scale refinement, 116	demographic characteristics
,	on SEPS Model, 170–180
Scale validation, methodology for, 69–70	
	research model and hypothesis
Scopus (database), 25–26	development, 157–162
Segmentation Approach to	SEM, 162–164
Sustainability of E-payment	variables/factors used in study, 157
System on Customer	Sustainability of e-payment system
Perspective (SEPSCP),	(SEPS), 4–5, 11, 70,
186–187	164–165, 186–187
Single-factor model approach, 134,	age effect on, 174–177
137, 141, 143	education effect on, 177–178
Small and Medium Enterprises	estimation of structural model of
(SMEs), 38	SEPS Through SEM,
Smart-Partial-Least-Square	164–170
(Smart-PLS), 31	gender effect on, 170–174
Social influence (SI), 30, 46, 51	income effect on, 179–180
Social sustainability, 8	marital status effect on, 179
Standardized Root Mean Square	measuring moderating effects of
Residual (SRMR),	demographic characteristics
129	on SEPS model, 170–180
Statistical package for social sciences	type of family effect on, 178–179
(SPSS), 67–68	Sustainable development goals
Structural equation modelling (SEM),	(SDGs), 158–159
14, 31, 58, 61, 71, 129, 162,	Systematic literature review (SLR), 12,
164	14, 23–25
approach, 155–156	
estimation of structural model of	Technology, 37
SEPS through, 164-170	autonomy to use, 132-135
tests, 70	validation of AUTT Through CFA
Structural equation models (SE	134–135
models), 70, 163	Technology Acceptance Model
Structural model (SM), 155–156	(TAM), 39

estimation of structural model of

Technology Characteristics (TC), 138, University of Ilorin (UI), 43 140, 157, 186, 190 Usage behaviour (UB), 39 validation of TC through CFA, 138-140 Valence-technology-affordances and-constraints-theory' Technology Communication Platform (TCP), 140-141, 157, 186, framework (Valence-TACT framework), 30 validation of TCP through CFA, Validity estimation of, 118 141 estimation of reliability, 118 Total variance, 126 estimation of validity, 118 Trust', 157 measurement, 118 test for sample adequacy, Unified-Theory-of-Acceptance-and-Use-of-Technology model 125-126 (UTAUT model), 30, 38 Variable elimination process, United Arab of Emirates (UAE), 39, 67-68 Variables/factors used in study, 164 United Nations (UNs), 9 United Nations Population Division VOSviewer software, 25–26 (UNPD), 2 United Nations World Commission on Web of Science (database), 25, Environment and 191 Development (1987), 8 World Summit, 8