

# Factors Affecting Mobile Payment Adoption: A Systematic Literature Review and Some Future Research Directions

Xuan Hung Nguyen<sup>1</sup>, Hoang Duong Nguyen<sup>2</sup>, Bui Thanh Hang Le<sup>3</sup>,  
Thi Tra My Tran<sup>4</sup>, Thi Minh Phuong Nguyen<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate professor, School of Trade and International Economics, National Economics University, Vietnam, 207 Giai Phong, Hai Ba Trung, Ha Noi, Vietnam

<sup>2</sup>School of Trade and International Economics, National Economics University, Vietnam, 207 Giai Phong, Hai Ba Trung, Ha Noi, Vietnam

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of International Economics, Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam, 69 Chua Lang Street, Dong Da, Hanoi Hanoi, Vietnam

<sup>4</sup>School of Advanced Education Program, National Economics University, 207 Giai Phong, Hai Ba Trung, Ha Noi, Vietnam

<sup>5</sup>College of Economics, Vinh University, 182, Le Duan Street, Vinh City, Nghe An, Vietnam

Corresponding Author: Xuan Hung Nguyen

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230447>

## ABSTRACT

This study analyzes previously published research on the topic of mobile payments. The authors have selected 85 English-written studies in reliable journals from 2017 to 2022 through various scientific data sources. The objective of this study was to investigate the factors influencing mobile payments adoption. From the results obtained, this research found that Subjective Norms/Social Influence and Facilitating Conditions were the most mentioned in the research on mobile payment adoption. India is the country with the most research on mobile payment adoption, followed by China and Indonesia. Developed countries need to be more active in this area of research. Finally, most of the research on mobile payments regarding mobile payment adoption comes from the customer's perspective. Future studies should explore the factors influencing the decision to use mobile payments from different perspectives not only from customers but also from governments and businesses providing this service.

**Keywords:** mobile payment, systematic literature review, adoption

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, mobile phones are gradually becoming an extremely important device in daily life with many useful features that keep pace with the development trend of the times. Innovations in technology and the development of the digital age have promoted the mobile phone as a powerful tool with many features for integrating online products and services, and allowing easy information search, money transfer transactions (Bauer, Reichardt, Barnes & Neumann, 2005; Hsu & Kulviwat, 2006; Varshney & Vetter, 2002). Mobile payment is defined as the payment for goods and services through mobile devices such as smartphones, tablets or smart watches using wireless communication technologies (Choi, & et al., 2020; Oliveira et al., 2016). In 2022, the total amount of mobile payment transactions worldwide increased to around 1.5 trillion U.S. dollars, up more than 15% compared to the previous year of 2021 (WorldPay, 2022). Developed countries continue to lead in the use of mobile payments, with China, India, and the United States being the top three countries with the

highest volume of mobile payment transactions in 2022 (Statista, 2023). According to Statista's forecast, the mobile payment situation is expected to continue its positive growth in 2023. The total value of mobile payment transactions worldwide is expected to reach approximately \$4.9 trillion in 2023, up more than 50% from 2020. Additionally, the number of global mobile payment users is expected to reach over 1.31 billion in 2023, up more than 60% from 2019.

Many models have been established for use in the adoption of new technology, such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Both of these models have been used in nearly 80% of empirical studies on the factors influencing the decision to use mobile payments (Karsen et al., 2019). Many previous studies on mobile payment adoption have applied factors from both models (Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Performance Expectation, Effort Expectation, and Social influence) to analyse the factors affecting the decision to use mobile payments (Oliveira et al., 2016; Kalinic et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2019). Some authors may add some other constructs in their proposed research models, such as Trust (Patil et al., 2020; Baganzi & Lau, 2017), Perceived Security (Patil et al., 2020; Baganzi & Lau, 2017; Khalilzadeh et al., 2017; Al-Okaily et al., 2020), Personal Innovativeness (Liébana-Cabanillas et al., 2018), Anxiety (Verkijika et al., 2020; Bailey et al., 2017), Cost (Bailey et al., 2017; Phonthanakitithaworn et al., 2016), and other factors, of which, both TAM and UTAUT have been successfully deployed to identify these factors.

The purpose of this study is to find and fill in the gap from previous studies by presenting and evaluating current research on factors affecting the decision to use mobile payment. The results of this study can be used by researchers to better understand the topic of mobile payments,

especially in deciding to use mobile payments. Furthermore, this study provides valuable information regarding mobile payment acceptance to all stakeholders, including the factors that influence the adoption of mobile payment, the countries in which the studies were conducted, the regulatory factors used in the theoretical model, and the perspective of the study (customer or merchant view)

The research structure consists of 5 parts: (1) Introduction, (2) Research methodology, (3) Literature Review, (4) Research Gaps and Recommendations, (5) Conclusion.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The authors systematically review previous academic studies. The study uses qualitative and quantitative research methods to thoroughly understand the competitiveness of mobile payments, research methods and theories used in previous publications.

### 2.1. Research process

This study follows an academic method including several steps. The first step begins with defining the research question, followed by identifying the data sources of previous studies. This study used articles published recently in reliable online databases such as: 1) Emerald Insight, 2) Science Direct, 3) ProQuest, 4) Wiley Interscience and 5) Google Scholar. To collect relevant articles for use in the research, inclusion criteria were defined. Only English-language articles published in reputable journals between 2017 and 2022 were considered in this study. This study found 116 studies that related those keywords. After carefully reading the collected articles and removing duplicates, the author obtained 85 articles for use in this study.

### 2.2. Research Scope

All research articles were selected by the authors based on the following criteria:

*Firstly*, the study must include some of the following keywords: "mobile payment", "mobile payment acceptance", "intention to

use mobile payment", "e-wallet", "acceptance of e-wallet usage", "intention to use e-wallet".

Secondly, international articles selected must be published in reputable journals evaluated by experts to ensure the quality and reliability of research results. For studies conducted in Vietnam, the search scope was expanded as the author group also considered studies published in less well-known journals to find suitable research.

### 2.3. Evaluating Methods

The authors conducted the research based on 85 research articles published between 2017 and 2022. After the process of searching and selecting relevant studies, the studies were synthesised and classified. Firstly, this research lists out a number of highly-cited papers in this field. Then, this study identifies the nation in which researched studies were conducted. Additionally, the authors identified and

presented some important factors that influence the decision to use mobile payment. After collecting data from previous studies and using supporting tools, the authors accurately and differentially evaluated the results. From there, recognizing the issues and scopes mentioned in related works, pointing out research gaps in previous research and proposing some research directions in the specific context of Vietnam.

## 3. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 3.1. Highly-cited articles

Table 1 presents some of the highly-cited papers in the field of mobile payments. It is noted that the most cited article belongs to Technological Forecasting & Social Change, written by De Luna, Liébana-Cabanillas, Sánchez-Fernández, & Muñoz-Leiva (2018). Overall, the research papers listed in the table below all had more than 200 citations, a large enough number to demonstrate the reliability of these studies.

Table 1: Highly-cited articles

Paper's Name	Authors	Publication	Cited Frequency
Mobile payment is not all the same: The adoption of mobile payment systems depending on the technology applied	De Luna, Liébana-Cabanillas, Sánchez-Fernández, & Muñoz-Leiva (2018)	Technological Forecasting & Social Change	367
Understanding consumer adoption of mobile payment in India: Extending Meta-UTAUT model with personal innovativeness, anxiety, trust, and grievance redressal	Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020)	International Journal of Information Management	327
Point of adoption and beyond. Initial trust and mobile-payment continuation intention	Talwar, Dhir, Khalil, Mohan, & Islam (2020)	Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	213
An integrated framework for the adoption and continuance intention to use mobile payment apps	Humbani, & Wiese (2019)	International Journal of Bank Marketing	212

### 3.2. Geographical Characteristic of Papers

Table 2 shows the frequency of studies based on the geographical distribution where they were published. Table 2 lists 24 countries, with the highest number of studies being India, followed by China, Indonesia and the US. Spain, the United Kingdom, Bangladesh, Oman, Vietnam, Thailand, Hungary, South Africa, Greece, Jordan, Morocco, Portugal, and Ghana were each listed between one and six studies. Most of the research on mobile payments is written by authors from universities in India and published mainly in 2020. This is

understandable since these are all developing countries and in general the development of the banking digital transformation industry in these countries is often faster than in developed countries (King, 2018). Statistically, the authors found that the majority of research papers from the US and China were published between 2017 and 2021, while the latest research came from China. From the data obtained, the authors find that mobile payment is becoming a global trend and the number of studies in this field will be increasingly replicated.

**Table 2: Geographical Characteristic of Papers**

Country	Frequency	Studies
India	18	Talwar, Dhir, Khalil, Mohan, & Islam (2020); Khanra, Dhir, Kaur, & Joseph (2021); Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Sobti (2019); Upadhyay, Upadhyay, Abed, & Dwivedi (2022); Sreelakshmi, & Sangeetha (2020); Kaur, Dhir, Singh, Sahu, & Almotairi (2020); Gupta (2022); Singh, Sinha, & Liébana-Cabanillas, (2020); Shankar & Datta (2018); Viniitha (2020); Sivathanu (2019); Verma et al. (2019); Pal et al. (2020); Jadil et al. (2021); Purohit & Arora (2021); Prakash et al. (2022); Saxena et al. (2022)
China	12	Zhao, Anong, & Zhang, (2019); Wei, Luh, Huang, & Chang (2021); Zhao, & Bacao (2021); Chen, Chen, & Chen (2019); Lin, Wang, & Huang (2020); Liu, Ben, & Zhang (2019); Yan et al. (2021); Sun et al. (2019); Gong et al. (2019); Wu et al. (2021); Tang et al. (2021); Mombeuil, & Uhde (2021)
Indonesia	11	Widyanto, Kusumawardani, & Yohanes (2022); Purba et al. (2021); Indrawati & Putri (2020); Johari (2021); Santosa et al. (2021); Ardiansah et al. (2020); Maharoesman & Wiratmadja (2016); Riskinanto et al. (2017); Handarkho et al. (2020); Musyaffi et al. (2021); Suhartanto et al. (2020)
United States	8	Flavián, Guinaliu, & Lu (2020); Esfahani, & Bulent Ozturk (2019); Park, Ahn, Thavisay, & Ren (2019); Jung, Kwon, & Kim (2020); Zhang, & Mao (2019); Bailey et al. (2019); Rabaa'i and Zhu (2021); Khalilzadeh et al. (2017)
Malaysia	8	Moorthy, Chun T'ing, Chea Yee, Wen Huey, Joe In, Chyi Feng, & Jia Yi (2019); Leong et al. (2021); Lui et al. (2021); Balakrishnan & Shuib (2021); Loh et al. (2020); Arrifin et al. (2020); Jusoh & Jing (2019)
Spain	6	De Luna et al. (2018); Flavián, Guinaliu, & Lu (2020); Liébana-Cabanillas et al. (2020); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Kalinić, et al. (2020); Kalinić et al. (2019)
Pakistan	3	Rahi et al. (2019); Rahi & Abd. Ghani (2019); Farah et al. (2018)
Oman	2	Al-Saedi, Al-Emran, Ramayah, & Abusham (2020); Sharma et al. (2019)
Taiwan	2	Lu & Wung (2020); Kuo (2020)
Greece	2	Giovanis et al. (2021); Giovanis et al. (2019)
South Korea	2	Lee, Lee, & Rha (2019); Lim et al. (2018)
Others	1	Karimi, & Liu (2019)

### 3.3. Theories utilised

The review results from Table 3 show that the technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Unified Technological Acceptance and Use Theory (UTAUT) or the extended version are still the two most used theories in the research. This finding has similarities

to the results of several other reviews in the same field (Al-Saedi et al., 2019; Susanto, Solikin, & Purnomo, 2022). Some of the less commonly used theories include Innovation Resistance Theory (IRT) or Transaction Cost Economics (TCE).

**Table 3: Theories Utilised**

Theory	Frequency	Studies
Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)	19	Liébana-Cabanillas et al. (2020); Flavián, Guinaliu, & Lu (2020); Zhao, Anong, & Zhang, (2019); Talwar, Dhir, Khalil, Mohan, & Islam (2020); Karimi, & Liu (2019); Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Sreelakshmi, & Sangeetha (2020); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Park, Ahn, Thavisay, & Ren (2019); Singh, Sinha, & Liébana-Cabanillas, (2020); Liu, Ben, & Zhang (2019); Zhang, & Mao (2019); Mohammed, Ibrahim, Ammar (2022); Gbongli (2022); De Luna et al. (2018); Purba et al. (2021); Shankar & Datta (2018); Viniitha (2020); Yan et al. (2021)
Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology Extended (UTAUT/UTAUT 2)	15	Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Sobti (2019); Upadhyay, Upadhyay, Abed, & Dwivedi (2022); Singh, Sinha, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Moorthy, Chun T'ing, Chea Yee, Wen Huey, Joe In, Chyi Feng, & Jia Yi (2019); Balakrishnan & Shuib (2021); Chaveesuk et al. (2021); Indrawati & Putri (2020); Johari (2021); Rahi et al. (2019); Santosa et al. (2021); Sivathanu (2019); Tang et al. (2021); Thi & Diep (2021); Arrifin et al. (2020)
Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology Extended (UTAUT)	11	Wei, Luh, Huang, & Chang (2021); Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Widyanto, Kusumawardani, & Yohanes (2022); Sobti (2019); Al-Saedi, Al-Emran, Ramayah, & Abusham (2020); Nur, & Panggabean (2021); Singh (2020); Zhao, & Bacao (2021); Jung, Kwon, & Kim (2020); Mohammed, Ibrahim, Ammar (2022); Lee, Lee, & Rha (2019); Saxena et al. (2022)
Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)	7	De Luna et al. (2018); Flavián, Guinaliu, & Lu (2020); Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Upadhyay, Upadhyay, Abed, & Dwivedi (2022); Park, Ahn, Thavisay, & Ren (2019); Park, Ahn, Thavisay, & Ren (2019); Zhang, & Mao (2019)
Innovation Resistance Theory (IRT)	2	Khanra, Dhir, Kaur, & Joseph (2021); Kaur, Dhir, Singh, Sahu, & Almotairi (2020)
Others	1	Talwar, Dhir, Khalil, Mohan, & Islam (2020)

### 3.4. Factors affecting mobile payment adoption

According to the statistics presented in Table 4, the most studied mobile payment

adoption influencing factors are Social Influence, Facilitating Conditions, and Trust/Perceived Trust. These studies were all used in at least 19 different studies



between 2017 and 2022. In addition, the two factors Perceived Usefulness and Perceived Ease of Use were also studied in 18 different researches. However, the authors also found that contrary to the factors mentioned above, some factors have not

been considered much during this period. Typically, demographic-related factors such as Gender or Age were only considered in one study, as were factors such as Financial Incentives or Knowledge.

**Table 4: Factors Influencing Mobile Payment Adoption**

Factors	Frequency	Studies
Social Influence	30	De Luna et al. (2018); Flavián, Guinaliu, & Lu (2020); Widyanto, Kusumawardani, & Yohanes (2022); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Zhao, & Bacao (2021); Chen, Chen, & Chen (2019); Gupta (2022); Singh, Sinha, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Lin, Wang, & Huang (2020); Liu, Ben, & Zhang (2019); Jung, Kwon, & Kim (2020); Zhang, & Mao (2019); Shankar & Datta (2018); Baabdulah et al. (2019); Daragmeh et al. (2021); Handarkho et al. (2020); Kalinić et al. (2020); Kalinić et al. (2020); Sun et al. (2019); Verma et al. (2019); Khalilzadeh et al. (2017); Jadil et al. (2021); Raza et al. (2019); Wu et al. (2021); Thusi & Maduku (2020); Farah et al. (2018); Hussain et al. (2019); Moorthy et al. (2020); Alalwan et al., (2017), Goncalo Baptista & Oliveira (2017); Owusu Kwateng et al. (2019); Arrifin et al. (2020)
Facilitating Conditions	20	Wei, Luh, Huang, & Chang (2021); Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Widyanto, Kusumawardani, & Yohanes (2022); Sobti (2019); Upadhyay, Upadhyay, Abed, & Dwivedi (2022); Nur, & Panggabean (2021); Moorthy, Chun T'ing, Chea Yee, Wen Huey, Joe In, Chyi Feng, & Jia Yi (2019); Baabdulah et al. (2019); Khalilzadeh et al. (2017); Jadil et al. (2021); Raza et al. (2018); Wu et al. (2021); Thusi & Maduku (2020); Giovanis et al. (2020); Giovanis et al. (2019), Farah et al. (2018); Hussain et al. (2019); Alalwan et al. (2017); Goncalo Baptista & Oliveira (2017); Owusu Kwateng et al. (2019); Arrifin et al. (2020)
Trust/Perceived Trust	19	Hossain (2019); Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Widyanto, Kusumawardani, & Yohanes (2022); Upadhyay, Upadhyay, Abed, & Dwivedi (2022); Al-Saedi, Al-Emran, Ramayah, & Abusham (2020); Nur, & Panggabean (2021); Singh (2020); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Zhao, & Bacao (2021); Liu, Ben, & Zhang (2019); Jung, Kwon, & Kim (2020); Poerjoto et al. (2021); Musyaffi et al. (2021); Thi & Diep (2021); Bailey et al. (2019); Gong et al. (2019); Loh et al. (2020); Pal et al. (2020); Rabaa'i and Zhu (2021)
Perceived Ease of Use	18	De Luna et al. (2018); Flavián, Guinaliu, & Lu (2020); Zhao, Anong, & Zhang (2019); Karimi, & Liu (2019); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Singh, Sinha, & Liébana-Cabanillas, (2020); Liu, Ben, & Zhang (2019); Zhang, & Mao (2019); Alhassan et al. (2020); Sharma et al. (2019); Bailey et al. (2017); Suhartanto et al. (2020); Johnson et al. (2018); Giovanis et al. (2021); Giovanis et al. (2019); Baabdullah et al. (2019); Purohit & Arora (2021); Francisco Liébana-Cabanillas et al. (2018)
Perceived Usefulness	18	De Luna et al. (2018); Flavián, Guinaliu, & Lu (2020); Liébana-Cabanillas et al. (2020); Zhao, Anong, & Zhang, (2019); Talwar, Dhir, Khalil, Mohan, & Islam (2020); Karimi, & Liu (2019); Sreelakshmi, & Sangeetha (2020); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Gupta (2022); Singh, Sinha, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Liu, Ben, & Zhang (2019); Zhang, & Mao (2019); Shankar & Datta (2018); Ardiansah et al. (2020); Maharoesman & Wiratmadja (2016); Rahi & Abd. Ghani (2019); Riskinanto et al. (2017); Yan et al. (2021)
Perceived Risk	12	Liébana-Cabanillas et al. (2020); Zhao, Anong, & Zhang, (2019); Wei, Luh, Huang, & Chang (2021); Hossain (2019); Sobti (2019); Al-Saedi, Al-Emran, Ramayah, & Abusham (2020); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Chen, Chen, & Chen (2019); Gupta (2022); Singh, Sinha, & Liébana-Cabanillas, (2020); Lin, Wang, & Huang (2020); Liu, Ben, & Zhang (2019); Tang et al. (2021); Balakrishnan & Shuib (2021)
Performance Expectancy	12	Wei, Luh, Huang, & Chang (2021); Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Widyanto, Kusumawardani, & Yohanes (2022); Upadhyay, Upadhyay, Abed, & Dwivedi (2022); Al-Saedi, Al-Emran, Ramayah, & Abusham (2020); Nur, & Panggabean (2021); Singh (2020); Zhao, & Bacao (2021); Moorthy, Chun T'ing, Chea Yee, Wen Huey, Joe In, Chyi Feng, & Jia Yi (2019); Jung, Kwon, & Kim (2020); Baabdulah et al. (2019); Arrifin et al. (2020)
Convenience of Use/Convenience Benefit	8	Liébana-Cabanillas et al. (2020); Park, Ahn, Thavisay, & Ren (2019); Handarkho et al. (2020); Humbani & Wiese (2019); Leong et al. (2021); Lu & Wung (2020); Lui et al. (2021)
Perceived Cost	8	Sobti (2019); Al-Saedi, Al-Emran, Ramayah, & Abusham (2020); Lin, Wang, & Huang (2020); Humbani & Wiese (2019); Kuo (2020); Rabaa'i & Zhu (2021); Yeh (2020)
Individual's Personal Innovation/Personal Innovativeness	5	Liébana-Cabanillas et al. (2020); Patil, Tamilmani, Rana, & Raghavan (2020); Upadhyay, Upadhyay, Abed, & Dwivedi (2022); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Chen, Chen, & Chen (2019)
Customer Satisfaction/Individuals' Level of Satisfaction	4	Hossain (2019); Sreelakshmi, & Sangeetha (2020); Singh (2020); Singh, Sinha, & Liébana-Cabanillas, (2020)
Perceived Enjoyment	3	Nur, & Panggabean (2021); Lara-Rubio, Villarejo-Ramos, & Liébana-Cabanillas (2020); Park, Ahn, Thavisay, & Ren (2019)
Relative Advantage	3	Chen, Chen, & Chen (2019); Lin, Wang, & Huang (2020); Zhang, & Mao (2019)
Perceived Value	2	Liébana-Cabanillas et al. (2020); Lin, Wang, & Huang (2020)

Hedonic Motivation	2	Moorthy, Chun T'ing, Chea Yee, Wen Huey, Joe In, Chyi Feng, & Jia Yi (2019); Hussain et al. (2019)
Usage Barrier	2	Khanra, Dhir, Kaur, & Joseph (2021); Kaur, Dhir, Singh, Sahu, & Almotairi (2020)
Image Barrier	2	Khanra, Dhir, Kaur, & Joseph (2021); Kaur, Dhir, Singh, Sahu, & Almotairi (2020)
Others	1	Park, Ahn, Thavisay, & Ren (2019)

## 4. RESEARCH GAPS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1. Research Gaps

Through studying 85 different articles published between 2017 and 2022, the authors found a number of research gaps as follows:

*First*, there remains an excess of research utilising traditional technology acceptance theories like TAM, UTAUT, and TRA, leading to a shortage of studies using other directions. Although in the period from 2017 to 2022, the number of studies using less commonly used theories has increased, this number is still not enough to create a solid knowledge base.

*Second*, the number of people surveyed is only representative of a certain demographic group. This is likely to cause inaccuracies in the study results if applied to other demographics.

*Third*, there are still many factors that have not been thoroughly examined by studies. These factors usually only appear in 1 or 2 studies when the author investigates papers from 2017 to 2022, such as Mindfulness, Technology Anxiety, or Experiential Benefit.

*Fourth*, studies have not yet made specific recommendations for the Government in developing mobile payments. In general, the studies only aim to suggest recommendations for mobile payment providers, while the Government and policy-making units also have a certain power in governing this field.

### 4.2. Research Recommendations

Based on the limitations of the reviewed research and research recommendations from previous studies, the authors make the following recommendations for future research directions:

*First*, further studies can compare the differences in usage determinants for different types of mobile payments by

applying previously used research models. With studies in this direction, researchers can propose solutions so that mobile payment providers can build a more comprehensive mobile payment ecosystem, especially in the context of mobile payment being on the rise as it is today.

*Second*, the following studies can shift focus to study the factors affecting the decision to use mobile payment of subjects with different demographic characteristics from previous studies. Later studies with more potential could expand the sample size to study larger populations. With research groups of similar or lower potential, it can be directed to study the factors affecting mobile payment decisions of specific target groups, such as office workers in an area or phone users in a city or geographic unit. The selection of research samples can also be based on separating the population into groups of subjects with similar demographic characteristics. In addition, it is possible to compare the factors affecting the decision to use mobile payment of these target groups with each other, aiming to clarify the differences in order to come up with more in-depth recommendations and recommendations for businesses, businesses, mobile payment providers in the process of identifying potential customers.

*Third*, subsequent studies may consider other factors that also influence the decision to use mobile payments but are rarely used in previous studies. Some factors that need to be considered and investigated further include:

*Fourth*, future studies can also try to focus on in-depth research on a single influencing factor, such as Trust or the impact of government policy on the decision to use mobile payments. This is a potential direction for analysing indirect factors affecting a key factor, and has the potential to apply more different types of theoretical models. However, until now, the number of

studies going in this direction is still relatively limited.

*Fifth*, the following studies can build a research model with higher complexity to study the interplay between factors. Currently, this research direction has been practised a lot in the world when studying the factors affecting the decision to use mobile payment, so it is necessary to review the literature carefully to evaluate the advantages, shortcomings of old complex models objectively, then draw new directions for his research.

*Sixth*, the following studies may study other issues related to mobile payments, instead of focusing on the determinants of mobile payment usage. The research on mobile payments has also appeared in the world for a long time (Bauer, Reichardt, Barnes & Neumann, 2005; Ondrus & Pigneur, 2006) with the research direction on the decision to use mobile payment as one of them. the most popular directions (Dahlberg et al., 2015). This makes research on other issues of mobile payments limited, and indirectly leads to an undue limit of human knowledge.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Mobile payment has become a trend of the payment field around the world, especially in the context of an integrated economy with strong growth momentum. Therefore, it is extremely necessary to focus on the factors affecting the decision to use this payment model. Through this study, the authors draw some conclusions as follows:

*Firstly*, this study has synthesised 85 international studies on the factors affecting mobile payment adoption between 2017 and 2022. From that, this study has enumerated a number of highly reliable papers in this field. In addition, the geographical characteristics of the studies were also determined.

*Secondly*, this study compiles the theories and factors considered in mobile payment adoption studies. From there, the study shows the general trend in building research

models of authors in this field from 2017 to 2022.

*Finally*, based on the information obtained from the above 85 studies and the arguments of the authors themselves, this study has pointed out the existing research gap. From there, the study comes to propose future research directions.

### *Declaration by Authors*

**Acknowledgement:** None

**Source of Funding:** None

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

1. Bailey, I. Pentina, A. S. Mishra, and M. S. Ben Mimoun, "Mobile payments adoption by US consumers: an extended TAM," Int. J. Retail Distrib. Manag., vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 626-640, Jun. 2017.
2. Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50, 179-211.
3. Al-Saedi, K., Al-Emran, M., Abusham, E., & El Rahman, S. A. (2019). Mobile Payment Adoption: A Systematic Review of the UTAUT Model. 2019 International Conference on Fourth Industrial Revolution (ICFIR). doi:10.1109/icfir.2019.8894794
4. Al-Saedi, K., Al-Emran, M., Ramayah, T., & Abusham, E. (2020). Developing a general extended UTAUT model for M-payment adoption. Technology in Society, 101293. doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101293
5. Al-Saedi, Karrar & Al-Emran, Mostafa & Abusham, Eimad & Rahman, Sahar. (2019). Mobile Payment Adoption: A Systematic Review of the UTAUT Model. 1-5. 10.1109/ICFIR.2019.8894794.
6. Alalwan A, Dwivedi YK and Rana NP (2017) Factors influencing adoption of mobile banking by Jordanian bank customers: Extending UTAUT2 with trust. International Journal of Information Management. 37(3): 99-110.
7. Ameerbakhsh, Omair & Alfadli, Ibrahim & Ghabban, Drfahad. (2021). Factors Affecting Saudi Consumers' Acceptance Towards the Use of Electronic Payment. Design Engineering (Toronto). 2021.
8. Ardiansah, Muhammad & Chariri, Anis & Rahardja, Surya & Udin, Udin. (2020). The

- effect of electronic payments security on e-commerce consumer perception: An extended model of technology acceptance. *Management Science Letters*. 10. 1473-1480. 10.5267/j.msl.2019.12.020.
9. Ariffin, Shaizatulaqma & Lim, Khor. (2020). Investigating Factors Affecting Intention to Use Mobile Payment Among Young Professionals in Malaysia. 10.2991/aebmr.k.200514.002.
  10. Bailey, Ainsworth & Pentina, Iryna & Mishra, Aditya & Ben Mimoun, Mohamed. (2017). Mobile payments adoption by US consumers: an extended TAM. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*. 45. 10.1108/IJRDM-08-2016-0144.
  11. Balakrishnan, Vimala & Shuib, Nor. (2021). Drivers and inhibitors for digital payment adoption using the Cashless Society Readiness-Adoption model in Malaysia. *Technology in Society*. 65. 101554. 10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101554.
  12. Baptista, Goncalo & Oliveira, Tiago. (2017). Why so serious? Gamification impact in the acceptance of mobile banking services. *Internet Research*. 27. 118-139. 10.1108/IntR-10-2015-0295.
  13. Chaveesuk, Singha & Khalid, Bilal & Chaiyasoonthorn, Wornchanok. (2021). Digital payment system innovations: A marketing perspective on intention and actual use in the retail sector. *Innovative Marketing*. 17. 109-123. 10.21511/im.17(3).2021.09.
  14. Chawla and H. Joshi, "Consumer attitude and intention to adopt mobile wallet in India - An empirical study," *Int. J. Bank Mark.*, vol. 37, no. 7, pp. 1590-1618, Oct. 2019.
  15. Chen, W.-C., Chen, C.-W., & Chen, W.-K. (2019). Drivers of Mobile Payment Acceptance in China: An Empirical Investigation. *Information*, 10(12), 384. doi:10.3390/info10120384
  16. Daragmeh, Ahmad & Sági, Judit & Zoltan, Zeman. (2021). Continuous Intention to Use E-Wallet in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Integrating the Health Belief Model (HBM) and Technology Continuous Theory (TCT). *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*. 7. 132. 10.3390/joitmc7020132.
  17. Davis, F. (1989) Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13, 319-340.
  18. Davis, F.D., Bagozzi, R.P. and Warshaw, P.R. (1989) User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models. *Management Science*, 35, 982-1003.
  19. De Luna, I. R., Liébana-Cabanillas, F., Sánchez-Fernández, J., & Muñoz-Leiva, F. (2018). Mobile payment is not all the same: The adoption of mobile payment systems depending on the technology applied. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*.
  20. Esfahani, S. S., & Bulent Ozturk, A. (2019). The influence of individual differences on NFC-based mobile payment adoption in the restaurant industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 10(2), 219–232. doi:10.1108/jhtt-01-2018-0009
  21. F. D. Davis, "Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology," *MIS Q.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 319-340, Sep. 1989.
  22. F. Liébana-Cabanillas, V. Marinkovic, I. Ramos de Luna, and Z. Kalinic, "Predicting the determinants of mobile payment acceptance: A hybrid SEM-neural network approach," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, vol. 129, pp. 117-130, Apr. 2018.
  23. Farah, Maya & Hasni, Muhammad & Abbas, Abbas. (2018). Mobile-banking adoption: empirical evidence from the banking sector in Pakistan. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*. 36. 10.1108/IJBM-10-2017-0215.
  24. Flavián, C., Guinaliu, M., & Lu, Y. (2020). Mobile payments adoption – introducing mindfulness to better understand consumer behavior. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 38(7), 1575–1599. doi:10.1108/ijbm-01-2020-0039
  25. Gbongli, K. (2022) Understanding Mobile Financial Services Adoption through a Systematic Review of the Technology Acceptance Model. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 10, 2389-2404. doi: 10.4236/ojbm.2022.105119.
  26. Giovanis, Apostolos & Athanasopoulou, Pinelopi & Assimakopoulos, Costas & C., Sarmaniotis. (2019). Adoption of mobile banking services: A comparative analysis of four competing theoretical models.



- International Journal of Bank Marketing, 37. 10.1108/IJBM-08-2018-0200.
27. Giovanis, Apostolos & Tsoukatos, Evangelos & Vrontis, Demetris. (2020). Customers' intentions to adopt proximity m-payment services: empirical evidence from Greece. *Global Business and Economics Review*, 22, 3. 10.1504/GBER.2020.10026676.
  28. Gong, X., Zhang, K.Z.K., Chen, C., Cheung, C.M.K. and Lee, M.K.O. (2020), "What drives self-disclosure in mobile payment applications? The effect of privacy assurance approaches, network externality, and technology complementarity", *Information Technology & People*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 1174-1213. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-03-2018-0132>
  29. Gupta, R. (2022). Adoption of mobile wallet services: an empirical analysis. *International Journal of Intellectual Property Management*, 12. 10.1504/IJIPM.2021.10035526.
  30. Handarkho, Yonathan. (2020). The intentions to use social commerce from social, technology, and personal trait perspectives: analysis of direct, indirect, and moderating effects. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 14. 10.1108/JRIM-10-2018-0137.
  31. Hossain, M. A. (2019). Security perception in the adoption of mobile payment and the moderating effect of gender. *PSU Research Review*, 3(3), 179–190. doi:10.1108/prr-03-2019-0006
  32. <https://www.statista.com/outlook/dmo/fintech/digitalpayments/worldwide>. [Accessed: 15-Jan-2020].
  33. Indrawati, Indrawati & Putri, Dianty. (2018). Analyzing Factors Influencing Continuance Intention of E-Payment Adoption Using Modified UTAUT 2 Model. 167-173. 10.1109/ICoICT.2018.8528748.
  34. J. Khalilzadeh, A. B. Ozturk, and A. Bilgihan, "Security-related factors in extended UTAUT model for NFC based mobile payment in the restaurant industry," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 70, pp. 460-474, May 2017.
  35. J.-M. Lee, B. Lee, and J.-Y. Rha, "DETERMINANTS OF MOBILE payment usage and the moderating effect OF GENDER: EXTENDING THE UTAUT MODEL WITH PRIVACY RISK," *Int. J. Electron. Commer. Stud.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 43-64, Jun. 2019.
  36. Jadir, Yassine & Rana, Nripendra & Dwivedi, Yogesh. (2021). A meta-analysis of the UTAUT model in the mobile banking literature: The moderating role of sample size and culture. *Journal of Business Research*, 132. 354–372. 10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.052.
  37. Johari, R. J. (2021). Digital Payment during Pandemic: An Extension of the Unified Model of QR Code Ayatulloh Michael Musyaffi1. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(6), 213–223. <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2021-0166>
  38. Jung, J.-H., Kwon, E., & Kim, D. H. (2020). Mobile payment service usage: U.S. consumers' motivations and intentions. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 1, 100008. doi:10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100008
  39. K. Al-Saedi, M. Al-Emran, T. Ramayah, and E. Abusham, "Developing a general extended UTAUT model for M-payment adoption," *Technol. Soc.*, vol. 62, p. 101293, Aug. 2020.
  40. Kalinić, Z., Liébana-Cabanillas, F.J., Muñoz-Leiva, F. and Marinković, V. (2020), The moderating impact of gender on the acceptance of peer-to-peer mobile payment systems. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol. 38 No. 1. pp. 138-158. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-01-2019-0012>
  41. Kalinic, Z., Marinkovic, V., Molinillo, S., & Liébana-Cabanillas, F. (2019). A multi-analytical approach to peer-to-peer mobile payment acceptance prediction. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 49, 143–153. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.03.016
  42. Karimi, S., & Liu, Y.-L. (2019). The differential impact of "mood" on consumers' decisions, a case of mobile payment adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2019.08.017
  43. Kaur, P., Dhir, A., Singh, N., Sahu, G., & Almotairi, M. (2020). An innovation resistance theory perspective on mobile payment solutions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 55, 102059. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102059
  44. Khalilzadeh, J., Ozturk, A. B., & Bilgihan, A. (2017). Security-related factors in extended UTAUT model for NFC based mobile payment in the restaurant industry.

- Computers in Human Behavior, 70, 460–474. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2017.01.001
45. Khanra, S., Dhir, A., Kaur, P., & Joseph, R. P. (2021). Factors influencing the adoption postponement of mobile payment services in the hospitality sector during a pandemic. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 46, 26–39. doi:10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.11.004
  46. King, B. (2018). *Bank 4.0 - Bank at Everywhere, Never at a Bank*. Wiley.
  47. Krishna, K.Vinitha & Shanmugam, Vasantha. (2020). Determinants of Customer intention to use Digital payment system.
  48. Kuo, Ren-Zong. (2020). Why do people switch mobile payment service platforms? An empirical study in Taiwan. *Technology in Society*. 62. 101312. doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101312.
  49. Lara-Rubio, J., Villarejo-Ramos, A. F., & Liébana-Cabanillas, F. (2020). Explanatory and predictive model of the adoption of P2P payment systems. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 1–14. doi:10.1080/0144929x.2019.1706637
  50. Lee, J.M., Lee, B., & Rha, J.Y. (2019). Determinants of mobile payment usage and the moderating effect of gender: Extending the UTAUT model with privacy risk. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce Studies*.
  51. Leong, M. Y., Kwan, J. H., & Ming Ming, L. (2021). Technology readiness and UTAUT2 in e-wallet adoption in a developing country. *F1000Research*. Retrieved March 28, 2023, from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8453311/>
  52. Liébana-Cabanillas, F., García-Maroto, I., Muñoz-Leiva, F., & Ramos-de-Luna, I. (2020). Mobile Payment Adoption in the Age of Digital Transformation: The Case of Apple Pay. *Sustainability*, 12(13), 5443. doi:10.3390/su12135443
  53. Lim, S. H., Kim, D. J., Hur, Y., & Park, K. (2018). An Empirical Study of the Impacts of Perceived Security and Knowledge on Continuous Intention to Use Mobile Fintech Payment Services. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 1–13. doi:10.1080/10447318.2018.1507132
  54. Lin, K.Y., Wang, Y.T. and Huang, T.K. (2020). Exploring the antecedents of mobile payment service usage: Perspectives based on cost-benefit theory, perceived value, and social influences. *Online Information Review*. Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 299-318. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-05-2018-0175>
  55. Liu, Z., Ben, S. & Zhang, R. (2019). Factors affecting consumers' mobile payment behaviour: a meta-analysis. *Electron Commer Res* 19, 575–601. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-019-09349-4>
  56. Loh, X.-M., Lee, V.-H., Tan, G.W.-H., Ooi, K.-B. and Dwivedi, Y.K. (2021), "Switching from cash to mobile payment: what's the hold-up?", *Internet Research*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 376-399. <https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-04-2020-0175>
  57. Lu, H.-P., & Wung, Y.-S. (2020). Applying Transaction Cost Theory and Push-Pull-Mooring Model to Investigate Mobile Payment Switching Behaviors with Well-Established Traditional Financial Infrastructure. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 16(2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-18762021000200102>
  58. Lui, T.K., Zainuldin, M.H., Yii, K.J., Lau, L.S., & Go, Y.H (2021). Consumer Adoption of Alipay in Malaysia: The Mediation Effect of Perceived Ease of Use and Perceived Usefulness.
  59. M. Al-Okaily, A. Lutfi, A. Alsaad, A. Taamneh, and A. Alsyouf, "The Determinants of Digital Payment Systems' Acceptance under Cultural Orientation Differences: The Case of Uncertainty Avoidance," *Technol. Soc.*, vol. 63, p. 101367, Nov. 2020.
  60. M. Karsen, Y. U. Chandra, and H. Juwitasary, "Technological Factors of Mobile Payment: A Systematic Literature Review," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, vol. 157, pp. 489-498, 2019.
  61. Maharoosman, Z. R., & Wiratmadja, I. I. (2016). Technology Acceptance Model of Internet Banking Service for Student's. *Proceedings of the 2016 IEEE IEEM*, 616–620.
  62. Mohammed, A.H., Ibrahim A.A., Ammar T.Z. (2022). Sustainable Engineering and Innovation. *Sarajevo Vol. 4, Iss. 2*.
  63. Mombeuil, C., & Uhde, H. (2021). Relative convenience, relative advantage, perceived security, perceived privacy, and continuous use intention of China's WeChat Pay: A mixed-method two-phase design study. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*,

- 59, 102384.  
doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102384
64. Moorthy, K., Chun T'ing, L., Chea Yee, K., Wen Huey, A., Joe In, L., Chyi Feng, P., & Jia Yi, T. (2019). What drives the adoption of mobile payment? A Malaysian perspective. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*. doi:10.1002/ijfe.1756
65. Musyaffi, A. M., Johari, R. J., Rosnidah, I., Sari, D. A. P., Amal, M. I., Tasyrifania, I., Pertiwia, S. A., & Sutanti, F. D. (2021). Digital Payment During Pandemic: An Extension of The Unified Model of QR Code. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(6), 213–223. <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2021-0166>
66. Nur, T., & Panggabean, R.R. (2021). Factors Influencing the Adoption of Mobile Payment Method among Generation Z: the Extended UTAUT Approach. *Journal of Accounting Research, Organization, and Economics* Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 14 - 28
67. Owusu Kwateng, Kwame & Osei Atiemo, Kenneth Afo & Appiah, Charity. (2018). Acceptance and use of mobile banking: an application of UTAUT2. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*. 32. 10.1108/JEIM-03-2018-0055.
68. P. Patil, K. Tamilmani, N. P. Rana, and V. Raghavan, "Understanding consumer adoption of mobile payment in India: Extending MetaUTAUT model with personal innovativeness, anxiety, trust, and grievance redressal," *Int. J. Inf. Manage.*, vol. 54, p. 102144, Oct. 2020.
69. Pal, A., Herath, T., De', R., & Raghav Rao, H. (2021). Why do people use mobile payment technologies and why would they continue? An examination and implications from India. *Research Policy*, 50(6), 104228. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2021.104228
70. Park, J., Ahn, J., Thavisay, T., & Ren, T. (2019). Examining the role of anxiety and social influence in multi-benefits of mobile payment service. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 47, 140–149. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2018.11.015
71. Patil, P., Tamilmani, K., Rana, N. P., & Raghavan, V. (2020). Understanding consumer adoption of mobile payment in India: Extending Meta-UTAUT model with personal innovativeness, anxiety, trust, and grievance redressal. *International Journal of Information Management*, 54, 102144. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102144
72. Phonthanukitithaworn, C. Sellitto, and M. W. L. Fong, "An investigation of mobile payment (m-payment) services in Thailand," *Asia-Pacific J. Bus. Adm.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 37-54, Apr. 2016.
73. Poerjoto, J. I., Gui, A., & Deniswara, K. (2021). Identifying Factors Affecting the Continuance Usage Intention of Digital Payment Services among Millennials in Jakarta. 2021 25th International Conference on Information Technology, IT 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IT51528.2021.9390125>
74. Prakash, A., Mahajan, Y., and Gadekar, A. (2022). Adoption of mobile money among internal migrant workers during the corona pandemic in India: a study focused on moderation by mode of payments. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEBANK.2022.122221>
75. Purba, John & Samuel, Sylvia & Budiono, Sidik. (2021). Collaboration of digital payment usage decision in COVID-19 pandemic situation: Evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*. 5. 557-568. 10.5267/j.ijdns.2021.8.012.
76. Purohit, Drsonal & Arora, Dr. (2021). Adoption of mobile banking at the bottom of the pyramid: an emerging market perspective. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*. ahead-of-print. 10.1108/IJOEM-07-2020-0821.
77. 85. R. Baganzi and A. K. W. Lau, "Examining Trust and Risk in Mobile Money Acceptance in Uganda," *Sustainability*, vol. 9, no. 12, p. 2233, Dec. 2017.
78. Rabaa'i, Ahmad & Zhu, Xiaodi. (2021). Understanding the Determinants of Wearable Payment Adoption: An Empirical Study. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*. 16. 173-211. 10.28945/4746.
79. Rahi, S., Abd.Ghani, M., & Hafaz Ngah, A. (2019). Integration of unified theory of acceptance and use of technology in internet banking adoption setting: Evidence from Pakistan. *Technology in Society*, 58(February), 101120.
80. Rahi, S., Abd.Ghani, M., & Hafaz Ngah, A. (2019). Integration of unified theory of acceptance and use of technology in internet banking adoption setting: Evidence from Pakistan. *Technology in Society*,

- 58(February), 101120.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2019.03.003>
81. Raza, Syed Ali & Shah, Nida & Ali, Muhammad. (2018). Acceptance of mobile banking in Islamic banks: evidence from modified UTAUT model. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*. 10. 10.1108/JIMA-04-2017-0038.
82. Riskinanto, A., Kelana, B., & Hilmawan, D. R. (2017). The Moderation Effect of Age on Adopting E-Payment Technology. 4th Information Systems International Conference 2017, ISICO 2017, 6-8 November 2017, Bali, Indonesia, 124, 536–543.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.12.187>
83. S. F. Verkijika, “An effective response model for understanding the acceptance of mobile payment systems,” *Electron. Commer. Res. Appl.*, vol. 39, p. 100905, Jan. 2020.
84. Santosa, A. D., Taufik, N., Prabowo, F. H. E., & Rahmawati, M. (2021). Continuance intention of baby boomer and X generation as new users of digital payment during COVID-19 pandemic using UTAUT2. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 26(4), 259–273.  
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41264-021-00104-1>
85. Saxena, N., Gera, N. & Taneja, M (2022). An empirical study on facilitators and inhibitors of adoption of mobile banking in India. *Electron Commer Res*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-022-09556-6>
86. Shankar and B. Datta, “Factors Affecting Mobile Payment Adoption Intention: An Indian Perspective,” *Glob. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 19, no. 3\_suppl, pp. S72-S89, Jun. 2018.
87. Shankar, Amit & Datta, Biplab. (2018). Factors Affecting Mobile Payment Adoption Intention: An Indian Perspective. *Global Business Review*. 19. 097215091875787.  
10.1185/0972150918757870.
88. Sharma, S. K., Sharma, H., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2019). A Hybrid SEM-Neural Network Model for Predicting Determinants of Mobile Payment Services. *Information Systems Management*, 1–19.  
doi:10.1080/10580530.2019.1620504
89. Singh, N., Sinha, N., & Liébana-Cabanillas, F. J. (2020). Determining factors in the adoption and recommendation of mobile wallet services in India: Analysis of the effect of innovativeness, stress to use and social influence. *International Journal of Information Management*, 50, 191–205.  
doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.05.022
90. Singh, S. (2020). An integrated model combining ECM and UTAUT to explain users’ post-adoption behaviour towards mobile payment systems. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 24.  
doi:10.3127/ajis.v24i0.2695
91. Sivathanu, B. (2019). Adoption of digital payment systems in the era of demonetization in India: An empirical study. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, 10(1), 143–171.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTPM-07-2017-0033>
92. Sobti, N. (2019), "Impact of demonetization on diffusion of mobile payment service in India: Antecedents of behavioral intention and adoption using extended UTAUT model", *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 472-497. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAMR-09-2018-0086>
93. Sreelakshmi, C.C., & Sangeetha K.P. (2020). Continuance adoption of mobile-based payments in Covid-19 context: an integrated framework of health belief model and expectation confirmation model. *International Journal of Pervasive Computing and Communications*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). doi:10.1108/ijpcc-06-2020-0069
94. Statista, “Digital Payments.” [Online]. Available:
95. Suhartanto, D., Dean, D., Ismail, T.A.T. and Sundari, R. (2020), "Mobile banking adoption in Islamic banks: Integrating TAM model and religiosity-intention model", *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, Vol. 11 No. 6, pp. 1405-1418.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-05-2019-0096>
96. Sun, S., Law, R., & Schuckert, M. (2020). Mediating effects of attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control for mobile payment-based hotel reservations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 84, 102331.  
doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102331
97. Susanto, E., Solikin, I., & Purnomo, B. S. (2022). A Review Of Digital Payment Adoption In Asia. *Advanced International Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and SMEs*, 4 (11), 01-15.



98. Susanto, Eko & Solikin, Ikin & Purnomo, Budi. (2022). A Review Of Digital Payment Adoption In Asia. *Advanced International Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and SMEs*. 4. 1-15. 10.35631/AIJBES.411001.
99. T. Dahlberg, J. Guo, and J. Ondrus, "A critical review of mobile payment research," *Electron. Commer. Res. Appl.*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 265-284, Sep. 2015.
100. Talwar, S., Dhir, A., Khalil, A., Mohan, G., & Islam, A. K. M. N. (2020). Point of adoption and beyond. Initial trust and mobile-payment continuation intention. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 55, 102086. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102086
101. Tang, Y. M., Chau, K. Y., Hong, L., Ip, Y. K., & Yan, W. (2021). Financial Innovation in Digital Payment with WeChat towards Electronic Business Success. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 16(5), 1844–1861. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer16050103>
102. Thi, L., & Diep, B. (2021). Retention Using Electronic Payment Systems: An Empirical Study of Consumer's Perspective in Vietnam. *Journal of Physics: IRTTEC 2020*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1793/1/012040>
103. Thusi, Philile & Maduku, Daniel. (2020). South African millennials' acceptance and use of retail mobile banking apps: An integrated perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 111. 106405. 10.1016/j.chb.2020.106405.
104. Upadhyay, N., Upadhyay, S., Abed, S.S. and Dwivedi, Y.K. (2022), "Consumer adoption of mobile payment services during COVID-19: extending meta-UTAUT with perceived severity and self-efficacy", *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 960-991. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-06-2021-0262>
105. V. Venkatesh, M. G. Morris, G. B. Davis, and F. D. Davis, "User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View," *MIS Q.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 425-478, 2003.
106. Venkatesh, V., Thong, J.Y.L. and Xu, X. (2012) Consumer Acceptance and Use of Information Technology: Extending the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 36, 157-178
107. Venkatesh, Viswanath; Morris, Michael G.; Davis, Gordon B.; and Davis, Fred D.. 2003. "User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View," *MIS Quarterly*, (27: 3).
108. Verma, S. & Sheth, M. (2018). Use Of Mobile Devices For Health Care Information By Post Graduate Physiotherapy Students. *International Journal of Physiotherapy and Research*. 6. 2905-2908. 10.16965/ijpr.2018.173.
109. Wei, M.-F., Luh, Y.-H., Huang, Y.-H., & Chang, Y.-C. (2021). Young Generation's Mobile Payment Adoption Behavior: Analysis Based on an Extended UTAUT Model. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 16(4), 618–636. doi:10.3390/jtaer16040037
110. Widyanto, H.A., Kusumawardani, K.A. and Yohanes, H. (2022), "Safety first: extending UTAUT to better predict mobile payment adoption by incorporating perceived security, perceived risk and trust", *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 952-973. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTPM-03-2020-0058>
111. Yan, L. Y., Tan, G. W. H., Loh, X. M., Hew, J. J., & Ooi, K. B. (2021). QR code and mobile payment: The disruptive forces in retail. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 58(January 2021), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102300>
112. Yan, L.-Y., Tan, G. W.-H., Loh, X.-M., Hew, J.-J., & Ooi, K.-B. (2021). QR code and mobile payment: The disruptive forces in retail. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 58, 102300. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102300
113. Z. Kalinic, F. J. Liébana-Cabanillas, F. Munoz-Leiva, and V. Marinkovic, "The moderating impact of gender on the acceptance of peer-to-peer mobile payment systems," *Int. J. Bank Mark.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 138-158, Jul. 2019.
114. Zhang, J., & Mao, E. (2019). Cash, credit, or phone? An empirical study on the adoption of mobile payments in the United States. *Psychology & Marketing*. doi:10.1002/mar.21282
115. Zhao, H., Anong, S. T., & Zhang, L. (2019). Understanding the impact of financial incentives on NFC mobile payment adoption. *International Journal of*

Bank Marketing. doi:10.1108/ijbm-08-2018-0229

116. Zhao, Y., & Bacao, F. (2021). How Does the Pandemic Facilitate Mobile Payment? An Investigation on Users' Perspective under the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(3), 1016. doi:10.3390/ijerph18031016

How to cite this article: Xuan Hung Nguyen, Hoang Duong Nguyen, Bui Thanh Hang Le et.al. Factors affecting mobile payment adoption: a systematic literature review and some future research directions. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2023; 10(4): 385-398.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230447>

\*\*\*\*\*