



Conference Proceedings

BRIDGING THE GAP – UNDERSTANDING DEMOGRAPHIC DISPARITIES IN CONSUMER CREDIT ADOPTION: THE CASE FOR BUY NOW PAY LATER

Naomy Simiyu¹
Santhosh Kumar S.²
Marisennayya Senapathy³
Regina Babu⁴

DOI: 10.5937/EEE24047S
JEL: D11, D12, J11
Original Scientific Paper

ABSTRACT

Financial institutions like banks have a significant role in lending credit to their consumers based on the different criteria that must be considered before issuing the loan. This study investigates the influence of demographic variables on the usage and adoption of financial services. The primary objective of this study was to identify how age, gender, income, education, occupation, and credit score levels impact consumer behavior and their preferences in the “Buy Now and Pay Later” financial services. Using a quantitative approach, an online survey was conducted with 350 valid responses forming the basis of this study. Findings reveal that gender and income significantly influence CIBIL scores, borrowing intention strongly predicts BNPL actual borrowing, and the overall relationships between these variables and financial behavior are generally weak. This indicates that other uninvestigated elements could exist that significantly influence the formation of financial behaviors. The results underscore the necessity for expanded inquiry to incorporate supplementary variables, including psychological factors or access to financial education, to enhance understanding of the determinants of financial behaviour. These differences, according to what has been found in the financial services utilization across different demographic segments, point to a very important need for greater inclusivity in tailoring personalized financial services toward enhancing financial well-being. These findings are very instrumental to financial institutions seeking to reduce demographic disparities and foster a much more inclusive financial ecosystem.

KEYWORDS

demographic disparity, credit adoption, consumer behaviour, financial services, preferences

¹ Cochin University of Science and Technology, School of Management Studies, Kalamassery, Kerala, India, naomysimiyu@gmail.com, ORCID: 000-0002-6366-7844

² Cochin University of Science and Technology, School of Management Studies, Kalamassery, Kerala, India drsan0@cusat.ac.in, ORCID: 0000-0002-9736-8420

³ Wolaita Sodo University, College of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development and Agricultural Extension, Sodo, Ethiopia, drsenapathy@wsu.edu.et, ORCID: 0000-0002-8371-3035

⁴ Cochin University of Science and Technology, School of Management Studies, Kalamassery, Kerala, India, reginaic@gmail.com



Conference Proceedings

INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of the buy now, pay later (BNPL) industry has gained significant attention in recent times, as these innovative financial tools are increasingly favoured by consumers seeking enhanced flexibility in payment. The BNPL industry is expected to reach a market value of \$349.4 billion in 2023, the sector has experienced extraordinary growth caused by evolving consumer behaviours, technological advancements, and the increasing e-commerce landscape. Between 2023 and 2028, it is projected that the market will expand at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) exceeding 19%, with over 2 billion BNPL transactions expected in 2028 (Global Data, 2024). With the seamless integration of these BNPL solutions into the broader e-commerce framework in addition to the proliferation of smartphones and mobile applications, such a service has become not only very practical but also more attractive, facilitating penetration into new domains such as home improvement, healthcare, travel, and education (Vishwakarma, 2024).

Notable factors that could influence digital financial service adoption have been demonstrated through several theoretical frameworks, such as the Technology Acceptance Model, the Theory of Planned Behavior, and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology, among others (Ooi, Tan, 2016; Sharma et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2010). These models revolve around constructs such as perceived usefulness, ease of use, and trust in digital platforms, among other variables assessing perceptions and attitudes (Bailey et al., 2017; Chuang et al., 2020). They often overlook the effect of demographic variables. Some studies have outlined that issues such as age, gender, and previous experience with other digital payment systems shape the adoption and long-term use of digital payment systems (Napis, Daud, 2023). As the adoption of digital finance systems keeps rising, it is of great pertinence to understand the demographic factors influencing their usage. Demographic factors including age, gender, educational background, occupation, credit score, and income, have not been much explored within the framework of financial decision-making in BNPL. Consequently, this research will investigate these demographic variables' influence on financial behaviour. By elucidating their impact, we can learn informative causes of the barriers and enablers to financial service use across different demographic segments. This understanding is critical for businesses and companies aiming to create products that help with financial inclusion.

Overall, digitally-based lending platforms appeal to borrowers underserved by traditional banks, such as small enterprises and individuals with limited credit histories, due to their streamlined application procedures, faster approval process times, and more transparent fee structures. Although interest rates may occasionally be higher, the flexibility and possibility of loan customization are highly desirable (Lieberman et al., 2019). On the supply side, these platforms apply sophisticated algorithms and alternative data sources to assess creditworthiness, potentially broadening access to financial resources. Reduced operational costs facilitate competitive interest rates and terms, while substantial capital inflow from institutional investors and the expansion of peer-to-peer lending further strengthen the online lending market (Basha et al., 2021; Pang et al., 2022). Ensuring clarity in loan terms and the implementation of responsible lending practices are essential for sustainable market growth (Basha et al., 2021). Additionally, the efficacy of online lending platforms is significantly affected by macroeconomic variables such as fluctuations in interest rates and recessions, thereby rendering expert credit risk assessment and management essential, particularly in times of economic volatility (Canhoto, Dibb, 2016).

This research to the current literature in a couple of ways: It provides an understanding of the influence of demographic factors on the adoption of new innovative digital financial services. Overall, it underlines the importance of studying differences in individual risk attitudes in relation to financial behaviour. It helps to understand better the clients of various stakeholders who work in this specific lending industry.



Conference Proceedings

The remaining sections of this paper are organized in the following manner: initial literature review, followed by hypothesis development, research methodology, consequent data analysis, and the conclusion containing recommendations for future research endeavours.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous studies on scholarly literature have consistently highlighted the influence of demographic factors in shaping the uptake of financial services. Age constitutes one of the frequently scrutinized demographic variables, constantly proved that younger cohorts are more likely to use digital financial products compared with older segments. This observed phenomenon is primarily attributed to superior technological acumen and an elevated comfort level with digital interfaces among younger cohorts (Huang, 2018; Lee, & Teo, 2019). Furthermore, gender disparities also show in financial behaviors and the adoption of services. Empirical studies have documented that women frequently display more conservative financial tendencies and are less inclined to engage with intricate financial products in comparison to men (Fisher & Yao, 2017). These observed differences could be based on the varying levels of financial literacy and risk tolerance across genders (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014).

The interaction between income and educational significantly linked to demand for financial services. Individuals with higher income brackets tend to have access to the largest possible sets of financial products and services, attributable a phenomenon explained by increased financial capacity and improved levels of financial literacy (Van Rooij et al., 2011). Correspondingly, individuals possessing higher educational qualifications generally demonstrate superior financial knowledge (Radović-Marković, et al., 2013), which serves to facilitate the adoption of financial services (Klapper et al., 2013). The credit score is a numerical representation that evaluates an individual's creditworthiness and the likelihood of fulfilling loan and debt obligations, typically derived from an analysis of the individual's credit report (Arya et al., 2013). This research conceptualizes credit score as a measure of financial risk and creditworthiness, which can significantly influence borrowing intentions and actual borrowing behaviors. A high credit score indicates responsible financial conduct. In contrast, a low score reflects a high-risk appetite, contrasting with the implications of a low-risk appetite associated with a low credit score. Notably, income and age exhibit a strong correlation; however, gender does not exert a significant influence on credit score.

Different occupations may exhibit different borrowing behaviour as well as risk appetites

Borrowing intention derived from behavioral intention refers to

Research Objective:

- To examine how demographic factors (age, gender, occupation, education, income), influence credit scores, borrowing intention, and actual borrowing behavior.
- To examine how credit score influences borrowing intention
- To examine how much behavioral intention influences borrowing behaviour.

Hypotheses Formulation

Gender differences may influence financial behavior and access to credit. Different age groups may exhibit varying borrowing behaviors and intentions. Occupation: Job type and stability can impact financial stability and borrowing behavior. Higher education levels may correlate with better financial literacy and borrowing decisions. Income: Income levels can influence credit scores and the ability to



Conference Proceedings

borrow. CIBIL is a measure of financial risk and creditworthiness, which can impact borrowing intentions and actual borrowing behavior. The individual's intention or plan to borrow money within a certain period. The actual behavior of borrowing money, including the amount and frequency.

- H1a:** Age is positively related to credit score (older individuals may have better credit scores due to longer credit history).
- H1b:** Age is positively correlated with borrowing intention
- H1c:** Age is positively related to actual borrowing
- H2a:** Gender influences credit score (e.g., women may have different credit behaviors than men).
- H2b:** There is a significant difference in borrowing intention between different genders
- H2c:** There is a significant difference in actual borrowing between different genders
- H3a:** Higher income positively relates to credit score (more financial resources lead to better credit management).
- H3b:** There is a significant difference between different income groups and their borrowing intention
- H3c:** There is a significant difference between different income groups and their actual borrowing
- H4a:** There is a significant difference in the credit scores of people from different occupations
- H4b:** There is a significant difference in the borrowing intention of people from different occupations
- H5a:** Higher education levels are positively related to credit score (better financial literacy).
- H5b:** Higher education levels are positively related to borrowing intention
- H5c:** Higher education levels are positively related to actual borrowing
- H6a:** Higher credit scores are positively related to borrowing intention (individuals with higher credit scores are more confident in obtaining credit).
- H6b:** Higher credit scores are positively related to actual borrowing behavior (those with higher scores are more likely to be approved for loans).
- H7:** Borrowing intention is positively related to actual borrowing (intentions translate into actual behavior).

RESEARCH METHODS

Responses were solicited through an online platform www.clickworker.com, from a diverse population all across India due to lack of a sampling frame. We used a non-probabilistic sampling approach to conduct a cross-sectional online survey of Indian customers. In order to ensure a broad participant pool, participants were recruited using Clickworkers.com, a reliable crowdsourcing site that has been extensively utilized in prior research (Ettinger et al., 2021; Rauschendorfer et al., 2022). Since online surveys are so accessible, we were able to reach a bigger and more varied sample of individuals across the nation of India.

The following data is coded in SPSS:

Conference Proceedings

Variable	Category	REP	No.	%	Variable	Category	REP	No.	%
Gender	Male	1	228	65	Occupation	Student	1	56	16
	Female	2	121	35		Public sector Employee	2	18	5
Age	18-29 years	2	186	53		Private sector Employee	3	134	38
	30-39 years	3	115	33		Business person	4	12	3
	40-49 years	4	39	11		Retired	5	3	1
	50-59 years	5	6	2		Self-employed	6	96	27
	Above 60 years	6	4	1		Unemployed	7	31	9
Income	Below Rs.50,000	1	248	71	Education	Less than 12 th standard	1	2	1
	Rs.50,001 -100,000	2	73	21		12th Class graduate	2	37	11
	100,000-150,000	3	15	4		Diploma/ Certificate	3	20	6
	Above 150,000	4	14	4		Bachelors	4	193	55
CIBIL	Below 550	1	70	20		Masters	5	93	27
	550-650	2	67	19		PhD and Above	7	5	1
	650-750	3	123	35					
	Above 750	4	90	26					

$$\text{CreditScore}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Age}_i + \beta_2 \text{Gender}_i + \beta_3 \text{Occupation}_i + \beta_4 \text{Education}_i + \beta_5 \text{Income}_i + \epsilon_i$$

Descriptive statistics and correlation

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Gender	1.35	.477	1	.143**	-.052	.077	.114*	-.159**	.040	-.008
2. Age	2.65	.832	.143**	1	.068	.209**	.139**	.042	.036	-.009
3. Income	1.41	.755	-.052	.068	1	.024	.219**	.236**	.122*	.030
4. Occupation	3.86	1.980	.077	.209**	.024	1	.107*	-.088	-.053	.003
5. Education	4.02	.963	.114*	.139**	.219**	.107*	1	.055	-.007	-.079
6. CIBIL	2.67	1.068	-.159**	.042	.236**	-.088	.055	1	.124*	.029
7. BI	3.3657	.93168	.040	.036	.122*	-.053	-.007	.124*	1	.271**
8. Use	2.1486	.49575	-.008	-.009	.030	.003	-.079	.029	.271**	1

The data reveals several significant yet generally weak correlations among the variables. Gender shows a weak positive correlation with Age and a weak negative correlation with CIBIL scores, suggesting the presence of some influence of gender on these factors. Income is positively correlated with both CIBIL scores and Education, indicating that higher education levels and income are linked to better creditworthiness. Behavioral Intention (BI) shows a moderate positive correlation with Use, implying that stronger intentions lead to higher usage. Occupation is also positively correlated with Age,

Conference Proceedings

indicating that occupation type may vary with age. Overall, most correlations fall within the weak to moderate range, reflecting limited but notable relationships between these variables.

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient (B)	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient (Beta)	t-value	p-value	Collinearity (VIF)
(Constant)	2.552	0.308	-	8.275	<0.001	-
Gender	-0.340	0.117	-0.152	-2.894	0.004	1.040
Age	0.084	0.069	0.065	1.220	0.223	1.079
Income	0.312	0.075	0.221	4.168	<0.001	1.060
Occupation	-0.053	0.028	-0.098	-1.849	0.065	1.054
Education	0.028	0.059	0.025	0.466	0.642	1.087

Model Summary	Value
R ²	0.089
Adjusted R ²	0.076
F-value	6.714
p-value (Model)	<0.001
Standard Error	1.027

The regression analysis reveals that the model, which includes predictors such as Education, Occupation, Gender, Income, and Age, significantly predicts CIBIL scores ($F = 6.714$, $p < 0.001$), though the explained variance is modest ($R^2 = 0.089$). Notably, Gender ($B = -0.340$, $p = 0.004$) and Income ($B = 0.312$, $p < 0.001$) are significant predictors, with males potentially having lower CIBIL scores and higher income associated with better CIBIL scores. However, Age, Occupation, and Education do not significantly predict CIBIL scores. The model suggests a weak relationship between these factors and CIBIL scores, indicating that other variables might be necessary to explain the variance better. Multicollinearity is not a concern, as indicated by VIF values close to 1.

Statistic	Value	Dimension	Eigenvalue
R-Square	0.033	1	6.327
Adjusted R-Square	0.016	2	0.231
F-Statistic	1.968	3	0.162
Significance of F (p-value)	0.070	4	0.127
Sample Size (N)	350	5	0.076
Standard Error of Estimate	0.92402	6	0.056

Coefficients for Predictors:

Predictor	Unstandardized Coefficient (B)	Standardized Coefficient (Beta)	t-value	p-value	VIF
Constant	2.926	-	9.625	<0.001	-
Gender	0.129	0.066	1.210	0.227	1.065
Age	0.036	0.032	0.576	0.565	1.084
Income	0.135	0.109	1.951	0.052	1.113
Occupation	-0.025	-0.054	-0.982	0.327	1.065
Education	-0.041	-0.043	-0.774	0.439	1.088
CIBIL	0.092	0.105	1.887	0.060	1.098



Conference Proceedings

The regression analysis conducted to examine the relationship between Borrowing Intention (BI) and the predictors (Gender, Age, Income, Occupation, Education, and CIBIL score) yielded an R-Square of 0.033, indicating that the model explains only 3.3% of the variance in Borrowing Intention. The F-statistic was 1.968 with a p-value of 0.070, suggesting that the overall model is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Among the predictors, the coefficients for Income ($B = 0.135$, $p = 0.052$) and CIBIL score ($B = 0.092$, $p = 0.060$) were the closest to significance, but neither reached the conventional threshold. The other predictors (Gender, Age, Occupation, Education) did not show significant relationships with Borrowing Intention, as all p-values were above 0.05. Additionally, the collinearity diagnostics showed that multicollinearity was not a concern, with VIF values close to 1 for all predictors.

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient (B)	Standardized Coefficient (Beta)	t-value	p-value	VIF
(Constant)	1.824	-	10.245	<0.001	-
Gender	-0.009	-0.009	-0.168	0.867	1.070
Age	-0.008	-0.013	-0.235	0.815	1.085
Income	0.010	0.015	0.275	0.784	1.126
Occupation	0.007	0.029	0.532	0.595	1.068
Education	-0.042	-0.081	-1.491	0.137	1.090
CIBIL	-0.001	-0.002	-0.036	0.971	1.109
BI	0.144	0.271	5.132	<0.001	1.034

The regression analysis, which examined the relationship between "Use" (dependent variable) and seven predictors (BI, Education, Occupation, Gender, CIBIL, Age, and Income) based on a sample size of 350, reveals that the model explains 8% of the variance in "Use" ($R^2 = 0.080$). The F-statistic indicates that the overall model is statistically significant ($F(7, 342) = 4.264$, $p < 0.001$). However, among the predictors, only Borrowing Intention (BI) shows a significant positive effect on "Use" ($\beta = 0.271$, $p < 0.001$). Other variables, including Gender, Age, Income, Occupation, Education, and CIBIL, do not have a statistically significant impact on "Use" in this model. Collinearity diagnostics suggest that multicollinearity is within acceptable limits, as indicated by variance inflation factors (VIFs) below 10.

The regression analysis exploring the relationship between Borrowing Intention (BI) and various predictors, including Gender, Age, Income, Occupation, Education, and CIBIL score, shows that the model explains 3.3% of the variance in BI ($R\text{-Square} = 0.033$). The model itself is not statistically significant ($F = 1.968$, $p = 0.070$). Among the predictors, Income ($B = 0.135$, $p = 0.052$) and CIBIL score ($B = 0.092$, $p = 0.060$) were the most closely associated with Borrowing Intention, though they did not reach statistical significance. Other predictors (Gender, Age, Occupation, Education) had p-values well above 0.05, indicating no significant impact on Borrowing Intention. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values were all close to 1, suggesting that multicollinearity was not an issue in this model.

Gender

Dependent variable	F-Value	p-Value	Significant?	Eta-squared	Interpretation
CIBIL	8.989	0.003	Yes	0.025	Small but significant effect
BI	0.545	0.461	No	0.002	No significant effect
Use	0.020	0.888	No	0.000	No significant effect



Conference Proceedings

Income

Variable	Between Groups Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Eta-squared	Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) Results
CIBIL	24.631	3	8.210	7.611	<.001	0.062	Significant differences: Below 50,000 vs. 50,000-100,000 (p = 0.002) Below 50,000 vs. Above 150,000 (p = 0.031)
BI	6.206	3	2.069	2.412	0.067	0.020	No significant differences among income groups.
Use	3.142	3	1.047	4.386	0.005	0.037	Significant differences: 100,000-150,000 vs. Below 50,000 (p = 0.021) 100,000-150,000 vs. Above 150,000 (p = 0.005)

The Oneway ANOVA results reveal significant differences in CIBIL and Use scores across different income groups. For CIBIL, there are notable differences between individuals with incomes below 50,000 and those earning between 50,000-100,000 or above 150,000. For Use, significant variations are observed between those with incomes of 100,000-150,000 compared to those with incomes below 50,000 or above 150,000. The effect sizes indicate medium effects for CIBIL and small to medium effects for Use. In contrast, no significant differences in BI scores are found across income groups.

Age

Variable	Between Groups Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Eta-squared	Post Hoc Test (Tukey HSD) Results
CIBIL	3.038	4	0.760	0.664	0.618	0.008	No significant differences among age groups.
BI	6.234	4	1.558	1.812	0.126	0.021	No significant differences among age groups.
Use	0.267	4	0.067	0.269	0.898	0.003	No significant differences among age groups.

The SPSS Oneway ANOVA output assesses the impact of age on three variables: CIBIL, BI, and Use. For CIBIL, no significant differences are found between age groups ($F = 0.664$, $p = 0.618$), and effect sizes are very small, indicating minimal influence of age on CIBIL. Similarly, BI shows no significant age differences ($F = 1.812$, $p = 0.126$), with small to negligible effect sizes. The Use variable also reveals no significant differences across age groups ($F = 0.269$, $p = 0.898$), with similarly minimal effect sizes. Post hoc tests using Tukey's HSD were conducted but did not identify significant differences between age groups for any of the variables.



Conference Proceedings

Occupation

Variable	Between Groups p-value	Eta-squared	Significant Differences (Post Hoc)
CIBIL	0.105	0.030	None
BI	0.009	0.049	Significant: Private sector employee vs. Student
Use	0.179	0.025	None

The One-Way ANOVA analysis examines differences in CIBIL, BI, and Use scores among various occupational groups. For **CIBIL** scores, the test reveals no significant differences between groups ($p = 0.105$), with small effect sizes (eta-squared = 0.030). The Tukey HSD post hoc test indicates no significant pairwise differences between specific occupations. In contrast, **BI** scores show significant differences among groups ($p = 0.009$), with moderate effect sizes (eta-squared = 0.049). Post hoc comparisons reveal significant differences specifically between private sector employees and students. Lastly, for **Use** scores, there are no significant differences between groups ($p = 0.179$), and the effect sizes are small (eta-squared = 0.025). The Tukey HSD post hoc test similarly shows no significant pairwise differences.

The regression analysis between CIBIL and Gender shows there is significant effect where men.

Education

Variable	Between Groups Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Value	p-value	Significant Differences in Tukey HSD
CIBIL	7.870	5	1.574	1.388	0.228	No significant differences among education levels
BI	2.589	5	0.518	0.593	0.705	No significant differences among education levels
Use	3.866	5	0.773	3.247	0.007	Significant differences noted, especially between certain groups (e.g., "7" vs. "Bachelors")

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the impact of education level on three variables: CIBIL scores, Borrowing Intention (BI), and Use of financial products. The results show that there were no significant differences among education levels for CIBIL scores ($F = 1.388$, $p = 0.228$) and Borrowing Intention ($F = 0.593$, $p = 0.705$). However, for the Use of financial products, significant differences were observed ($F = 3.247$, $p = 0.007$). Tukey HSD post-hoc tests revealed that some education groups, such as those labeled "Ph.D and above" and "Bachelors," differed significantly in their usage patterns. Despite this, no other variable exhibited significant differences across the education levels.



Conference Proceedings

DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis reveal several important insights into the relationships between demographic and socioeconomic variables and their influence on financial behavior, particularly in terms of creditworthiness, borrowing intention, and usage of financial products. Although the correlations observed among the variables are generally weak, they provide meaningful indications of underlying patterns.

Gender and Age show a weak positive correlation, suggesting a potential age-related trend in gender distribution. Similarly, the observed weak negative correlation between gender and CIBIL scores suggests a potential trend indicating that males may, on average, possess lower credit scores (high risk appetite), a supposition that is proven by regression analysis which gender was statistically found to be a very significant negative predictor of CIBIL scores. This outcome aligns with prior empirical studies demonstrating differences in financial behaviors and credit outcomes across genders, possibly due to different income levels, risk aversion, or access to financial resources (Bover et al., 2019, Croson, Gneezy, 2009).

In fact, the positive impact of being high on income on CIBIL scores, following educational levels, does give a statistical handle to the assertion that along with increases in income and education levels, creditworthiness also enhances. This association is valid in concept, since individuals with higher income and education tend to have better financial literacy and more stable economic conditions, which foster credit practices that are more cautious and less risky (Brown, Taylor, 2008, Jappelli, Padula, 2013, Klapper et al., 2013). In this context, too, income emerges as a significant predictor of CIBIL scores when it comes to explaining variance, although only to a moderate degree on the results from the regression analysis. This means that income is one factor but other variables not included in the model could play a significant role in deciding credit scores.

The correlation between Behavioral Intention (BI) and Use warrants particular attention. The moderate correlation, which is positive between the two constructs, means those respondents who have a higher intention of borrowing have a higher tendency of using financial services. The consistency of the finding is in alignment with the theory of planned behavior, stating that intention is considered to be an excellent predictor of actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). This is further supported by regression analysis – the identification of BI as the only significant predictor derived from the approach for prediction of Use clearly underlines the importance of intention within the frame of the decision process in finances.

The positive correlation between occupation and age calls for little more than indicating that there might be more diversity in the type of occupation with increasing age, probably indicating a progression of change like the career with the advancing years but is nevertheless irrelevant to the announcement outcome, since occupation did not predict membership in any of the four groups in the regression analyses. This fact suggests that the nature of the influences of occupation is too complex and could be carried out by factors not directly represented in this research.

The ANOVA results yield additional insights regarding the influence of education, occupation, and income on financial behavior. Although education has no significant effect on CIBIL scores or BI, it does carry some influence in using financial product usage, and there are some distinguishably different differences in the usage of such products among different educational cohorts. This says that a possible level of education could indicate a certain way through which individuals interact with financial products. The reason could be the level of financial literacy or financial resources at their disposal. Occupation and income levels have similar different effects on financial behaviors, though it presented great differences across BI and Use scores by different income categories. This underlines the



Conference Proceedings

importance of socioeconomic status, though with effect sizes generally small and moderate, in the influence of financial behavior. They mean that these variables do not operate singly.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, although a number of demographic and socioeconomic variables prove to have statistically significant correlations with financial behaviors, most of these correlations are rather weak. They might, therefore, reflect the role of other unobserved factors. Gender and income emerge as slightly vital predictors of CIBIL scores, with males potentially showing lower scores, while higher income correlates with enhanced creditworthiness. Borrowing intention is a robust predictor of actual borrowing, highlighting the importance of intention within financial decision-making.

The modest R-squared values for the regression models suggest that these factors alone cannot account for all variations in financial behavior. This necessitates further research to investigate additional variables, such as psychological factors, access to financial education, and social influences, which will explain the determinants of financial behavior in relation to the use of BNPL schemes. Inequalities in this area are also found to exist along education, occupation, and income groups in financial behaviors, making the use of targeted financial education or any other policy interventions beneficial in improving credit outcomes and enabling financial inclusion across different demographic segments

Overall, this study improves the understanding of how these complex demographic and socioeconomic factors interact with financial behaviors, offering valuable insights for policymakers, financial institutions, and researchers dedicated to the promotion of responsible financial behavior and advancement of financial literacy in diverse populations.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Arya, S., Eckel, C., Wichman, C. (2013). Anatomy of the credit score. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 95, 175–185.
- Bailey, A.A., Pentina, I., Mishra, A.S., Ben Mimoun, M.S. (2017). Mobile payments adoption by US consumers: an extended TAM. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 45(6), 626–640.
- Basha, A. Shabeen, Elgammal, M.M., Abuzayed, B.M. (2021). Online peer-to-peer lending: A review of the literature. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 48, 101069.
- Canhoto, A.I., Dibb, S. (2016). Unpacking the interplay between organisational factors and the economic environment in the creation of consumer vulnerability. *Journal of Marketing Management*, Routledge, 32(3-4), 335–356.
- Chuang, L.-W., Chiu, S.-P., Wang, L.-S., Tian, W. (2020). Continuance Intention of Mobile Payment in Smart Service. In: *IEEE Eurasia Conference on IOT, Communication and Engineering*, Yunlin, Proceedings, pp. 203–204.



Conference Proceedings

- Ettinger, J., Walton, P., Painter, J., DiBlasi, T. (2021). Climate of hope or doom and gloom? Testing the climate change hope vs. fear communications debate through online videos. *Climatic Change*, 164(1), 1-19.
- Fisher, P.J., Yao, R. (2017). Gender differences in financial risk tolerance. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 61(Issue C), 191–202.
- Klapper, L., Lusardi, A., Panos, G.A. (2013). Financial literacy and its consequences: Evidence from Russia during the financial crisis. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 37(10), 3904–3923.
- Lipman, B.J., Wiersch, A.M. (2019). Uncertain Terms: What Small Business Borrowers Find When Browsing Online Lender Websites. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System Washington, DC.
- Lusardi, A., Mitchell, O.S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1), 5–44.
- Napis, N.M., Daud, N. (2023). Factors Influencing Adoption of E-Wallet Among Malaysian Young. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(2), 338-355.
- Ooi, K.B., Tan, G.W.H. (2016). Mobile technology acceptance model: An investigation using mobile users to explore smartphone credit card. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 59, 33–46.
- Pang, S., Deng, C., Chen, S. (2022). System Dynamics Models of Online Lending Platform Based on Vensim Simulation Technology and Analysis of Interest Rate Evolution Trend. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 776138, 1-21.
- Radović–Marković, M., Kočović, J., Grozdanić, R. (eds). (2013). *Entrepreneurship, finance and education in the digital age*. Lap Lambert Academic Publishing, Saarbrücken.
- Rauschendorfer, N., Prügl, R., Lude, M. (2022). Love is in the air. Consumers' perception of products from firms signaling their family nature. *Psychology and Marketing*, 39(1), 239–249.
- Van Rooij, M.C.J., Lusardi, A., Alessie, R.J.M. (2011). Financial literacy and retirement planning in the Netherlands. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 32(4), 593–608.
- Sharma, R., Singh, G., Sharma, S. (2020). Modelling internet banking adoption in Fiji: A developing country perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 53, 102116
- Zhou, T., Lu, Y., Wang, B. (2010). Integrating TTF and UTAUT to explain mobile banking user adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(4), 760–767.