Review of Futures Markets (RFM)
ISSN: 1993-7116
Volume 32 Issue 2 (2024)
Website: https://fra.st

Behavioural Economics and Digital Consumer Decision-Making: A Cross-Disciplinary Look at How People Adopt New Technologies

Prof. Selene R. Whitcombe
School of Behavioural Economics, Crescent International University, Dublin, Ireland
Dr. Mateo J. Aranda
Department of Digital Commerce, Universidad Nova del Sur, Córdoba, Argentina
Dr. Ines V. Halvorsen
Nordic Institute for Consumer Research, Bergen, Norway

Submission: 25.07.2024; Acceptance: 04.10.2024; Publication: 23.12.2024

Abstract
The way consumers make, evaluate, and repeat choices has changed a lot because of digital technologies. When people shop online, they see more than just the features and prices of products. They also see automated suggestions, interface designs, personalised offers, social proof tools, platform nudges, default settings, and too much information. Because of these factors, behavioural economics is a very useful way to understand how people use and adopt technology. This article looks at how digital consumers make decisions from different fields of study by combining research in consumer psychology, technology adoption theory, behavioural economics, and digital commerce. It makes the case that rational-choice assumptions or utility-maximizing models alone can't fully explain why people adopt new technologies in digital markets. Instead, limited reasoning, shortcuts, preferences, feelings, trust, risk awareness, technology readiness, and socially mediated learning all play a role in how people adopt new technologies. This article talks about how the ideas behind consumer technology adoption research have changed over time. It looks at the role of major frameworks like the Technology Acceptance Model, diffusion-based perspectives, and hybrid consumer-behavior approaches. It also looks at how digital environments can make behavioural biases stronger or change them. It also talks about how personalisation, social impact, trust, and interface design are playing a bigger part in how people choose what to buy online. The conclusion of the article is that digital consumer decision-making is a situation-dependent process that is shaped by both psychological architecture and technological design. It also says that responsible innovation means paying attention to more than just how quickly new technologies are adopted. It also means paying attention to consumer welfare, autonomy, and openness.

Keywords
Behavioral economics; digital consumer behavior; technology adoption; digital commerce; consumer decision-making; nudging; technology acceptance; online platforms

Introduction

People search for, compare, evaluate, buy, and use goods and services in very different ways now that digital commerce is growing so quickly. There are now a lot of everyday economic activities that happen on digital platforms. These include digital payments and online shopping, as well as streaming services, app-based transportation, subscription services, financial technologies, and social commerce. Because of this, people are making decisions less and less in traditional marketplaces and more and more in environments created by algorithms, interfaces, and dynamic information architectures.

Because of this change, traditional economic models of consumer choice aren't as good as they used to be. Classical frameworks usually believe that people have stable preferences, consistently process information, and make choices that maximise their own utility. Digital environments, on the other hand, have issues like limited attention, unequal access to information, personalised persuasion, quick comparison cycles, and emotionally charged cues. When these things happen, they show how important bounded rationality and behavioural influences are in shaping how people actually choose, especially when they are unsure or having a lot to think about.

Behavioral economics offers a powerful framework for interpreting these realities. It helps to explain why people often make choices that aren't what fully rational models would predict by looking at things like heuristics, biases, mental shortcuts, framing effects, reference dependence, loss aversion, social influence, and preferences that rely on the situation. In digital markets, these patterns of behaviour are not random; they are often planned for, tracked, and strategically used by the way platforms are built.

At the same time, study on how people adopt new technologies gives us more information about why people accept or reject new systems. Models like the Technology Acceptance Model, innovation diffusion perspectives, and others have focused on how useful something is seen to be, how easy it is to use, social norms, trust, and behaviour purpose. But digital consumer environments need a bigger, cross-disciplinary view now, because emotional design, interface architecture, platform reputation, algorithmic mediation, and the ethics of digital influence all play a role in adoption, not just technical functionality.

Behavioural economics and technology adoption studies are used together in this article to look at how digital consumers make decisions. It says that the best way to understand how people use digital technologies is as a dynamic process in which the design of the technologies and the way people think and feel are always interacting with each other. The article starts by looking at the theoretical bases of technology adoption and digital consumer behaviour. It then moves on to look at how behavioural economics adds to these frameworks. Finally, it looks at what nudging, personalisation, trust, and platform governance mean for the future of how consumers make decisions.

How Technology Adoption Research Has Changed Over Time

There have been several basic stages in the research on how people use technology. In the beginning, researchers tried to figure out what makes people or groups accept new technologies. The Technology Acceptance Model was one of the most important frameworks. It said that how useful and easy something is seen to be are two of the most important factors that determine how people will act and what they plan to do. This model gained popularity because it offered a parsimonious explanation of why users choose to engage with information systems.

Over time, researchers came to realise that people accept technology for more reasons than just how well it works. It turned out that social influence, perceived risk, confidence, innovativeness, compatibility, enjoyment, anxiety, facilitating conditions, and habit were all important factors. This led to additions to the original TAM and the creation of frameworks that bring together different ideas, like the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology. These methods showed more of the complexity of how people actually use technology, especially when they're online or on their phones.

Another important strand of research came from innovation diffusion theory, which emphasized how new technologies spread through social systems over time. This point of view focused on ways of communicating, types of adopters, how innovations are seen, and the social dynamics of their spread. It helped me understand why adoption isn't just a person's mental choice, but also a process of relationships and communication.

At the same time, research in consumer behaviour grew the study of adoption by focusing more on feelings, symbols, meanings, and experiences. Individuals don't choose to use technologies just because they work well. They also react to technology based on their identity, position, uncertainty, ease of use, anxiety, novelty, and cultural stories. This bigger picture view is especially important in digital markets, where one site can be a service, a social space, a way to have fun, and a way to change people's behaviour all at the same time.

Recent systematic review research suggests that the field is moving more and more toward hybrid models, which combine several theories instead of relying on just one. This shift reflects an awareness that no one theory fully captures the complexity of digital consumer behavior. Adoption of technology today is affected by how it is designed, how it is used, how people think about risk, how they communicate, and how platforms make choices.

Behavioural economics and how people make decisions when they're online

Behavioural economics grew out of the idea that standard rational-choice models made things too easy. It doesn't say that customers don't have goals or respond to incentives; rather, it shows that cognitive limitations, emotional responses, and environmental framing affect how people think and make decisions. People usually settle for less than the best, use heuristics when they're not sure what to do, and strongly react to how options are presented.

These ideas are very useful for digital business. Internet users have to deal with a lot of different kinds of information, the ability to quickly compare products, a lot of different kinds of product information, persuasive interface elements, a lot of time pressure, and social signals that affect their decisions. A lot of the time, the mental demands of digital choice are too much for consumers to handle carefully. As a result, they rely on shortcuts like visual prominence, star ratings, rankings, or well-known brands.

In this situation, a number of behavioural rules are especially important. Anchoring changes how people understand prices, discounts, and offers that are similar to each other. When you change the words and how you present an option, framing effects change how appealing or risky it seems. Loss aversion is one reason why messages about scarcity, deals that end quickly, or free trials that end can be so powerful. People's mental accounting affects how they group their digital spending, especially when it comes to digital wallets, payments, and in-app purchases. When costs or benefits are delayed, like with subscription lock-in, installment payments, or freemium improvements, present bias can affect the choice.

Behavioural economics also helps explain why people who use technology may choose to use technologies that aren't objectively better or miss out on technologies that seem like they would be helpful. Adoption isn't just based on how well something works; it's also based on trust, effort, emotional comfort, expected regret, and social meaning. A method that works technically may still fail if it causes stress, doubt, or mental friction.

Limited Reasoning in Digital Settings for Making Choices

Understanding how digital consumers act depends on bounded rationality. People don't always have the time, attention, or drive to look at all of their options. In digital settings, where product choice is often vast and constantly changing, the challenge of cognitive overload becomes even greater. Instead of carefully considering all of their options, people often pick the ones that are "good enough," well-known, or easiest to understand.

This has big effects on how people use technology. People might choose to use a digital payment platform, a shopping app, a streaming service, or a fintech tool based on a small group of clues rather than a full evaluation. Because they require less mental work, interface clarity, onboarding simplicity, obvious trust markers, social endorsement, and the first-use experience can become disproportionately important.

In a strange way, having too much information can make decisions less good. There may be confusion, deferral, or dependence on superficial signals when there are too many choices, too many features, or too much data. As a result, digital companies often make interfaces easier to use by highlighting defaults, bundling options, or using recommendation systems. These kinds of strategies can make things run more smoothly, but they also give designers and platforms more control over what users choose to do.

From a cross-disciplinary point of view, bounded rationality connects architecture, information systems, psychology, economics, and psychology. It shows that customer behavior is not only a result of preferences, but also of cognitive constraints interacting with technological environments.

How Online Choice Works: Heuristics, Biases, and the Structure of Choice

The way digital consumers make decisions is shaped by how behavioural heuristics and interface design work together. Heuristics are mental short-cuts that help people make quick choices when they don't know what to do or when the situation is complicated. They help us and are often adaptive, but they can also cause errors that we can see coming.

When you shop online, anchoring happens when the first price you see affects how much something is worth later on. Putting up a "regular price" next to a discounted price can make the deal look even better, even if the regular price isn't often paid. People use social proof when reviews, ratings, purchase counters, and signs of popularity help them figure out if something is good or trustworthy based on how other people seem to be acting. Availability bias can make people think that a product is better or safer than it really is based on reviews they remember or brand messages that stick out. Fear of missing out and loss aversion are sparked by scarcity and pressing cues, which further shape choice. Messages like "only 2 left," "10 people are viewing this item," or "offer ends in 5 minutes" can get more people to buy by making inaction seem like a loss. Default settings affect behaviour because many users choose options that are already chosen because they are easier to use or seem like a good idea. This is especially important for privacy settings, renewing subscriptions, buying add-ons, and bundling services.

These features show that platforms don't just watch how people behave online; they actively shape that behaviour. The choice of architecture becomes part of the choice. This is why you need to know about behavioural economics to understand digital markets: platform design is becoming more and more like changing people's behaviour.

Trust, Risk, and How People Use Digital Technologies

One of the most important factors in how people use modern technologies is trust. When people shop in real stores, they can often directly judge the products, the sellers, and the stores themselves. In digital settings, on the other hand, transactions aren't always safe because of concerns about privacy, payment security, the authenticity of products, the reliability of delivery, and the purposes of platforms or third parties. So, trust is a mental bridge between not knowing what to do and taking action.

Research on how people adopt new technologies has shown over and over that perceived usefulness and ease of use are important. However, trust and security are often just as important in digital settings. This is especially clear in online banking, platform markets, digital payments, and services that run on apps. People may not use a technology even if it is handy if they are afraid of fraud, personal data misuse, or hidden costs.

Behavioural economics adds to this understanding by showing that how people think about risk is not always objective. People tend to overreact to risks that are clear or emotionally important to them while underestimating risks that are less clear or less visible. A single high-profile data breach can make people less trusting in general, while appealing design and reputational cues may make people overconfident in platforms that still pose big risks.

Trust is also based on relationships and symbols. Consumers can tell if a platform is trustworthy by its ratings, how easy it is to use, how well-known the brand is, how well-known the customer service team is, and even by the way it talks. These signs make things less uncertain, but they can also be changed. The governance challenge is therefore not simply to build trust, but to ensure that trust cues correspond to genuine reliability.

Nudging and Behavioural Change in the Digital World

The rise of digital nudging is one of the most important changes in digital consumer environments. A "nudge" is a small change to the way choices are made that changes behaviour without taking away choices. Nudges can show up in digital settings through the way the interface is laid out, as well as through visual emphasis, social comparison, progress bars, reducing friction, making the experience more like a game, and personalised suggestions.

Digital nudges work because they usually go for quick, automatic processing instead of slow, deliberate thought. They can help good things happen, like getting people to buy healthier foods, saving more money, using less energy, or filling out complicated forms. But in business settings, nudges are often used to get people more involved, keep them from leaving, boost conversion rates, or draw attention to options that will make them money.

The behavioral power of digital nudges becomes especially strong when paired with real-time tracking and personalization. Platforms can test various versions of messages, track responses right away, and keep improving interventions. This makes a feedback process that makes changing people's behaviour more flexible, accurate, and scalable than it would be in most offline situations. But it can be hard to tell the difference between nudging and manipulating at the same time. Digital design that takes advantage of people's inertia, confusion, emotional weakness, or hidden information imbalances may hurt people's freedom instead of helping them. There is more and more worry about dark patterns and the morality of convincing design because of this.

Personalisation, algorithms, and environments that change based on choices

One thing that makes digital consumer settings unique is the ability to personalise things. More and more, online platforms make product suggestions, interface layouts, price promotions, content ranking, alerts, and search results more and more specific to each user based on their habits and how they use the platform. This has clear practical advantages: it can reduce search costs, improve relevance, and make digital experiences more efficient.

Personalisation does, however, change the way people choose what to buy. People don't just pick from a set of options; they pick in environments that are constantly changing based on their assumed

preferences, past actions, and the platform's goals. The market changes, and the choices that consumers see become more limited.

Personalisation has a big effect on heuristics and biases from the point of view of behavioural economics. Familiarity effects can get stronger with repeated contact. Algorithmic suggestions can make it look like something is relevant and trustworthy. Targeted offers may exploit emotional states, spending habits, or times of vulnerability. People may also come to rely too much on advice systems, giving digital middle-men their judgement.

This brings up an important question that cuts across fields: what exactly is being adopted when adaptive systems shape technology adoption? When people choose a tool, they're actually starting a relationship with a system that learns from them and changes based on how they usually act. This makes problems of openness, being able to explain, and being able to be contested more important in public policy and consumer research.

Adoption and Social Influence in the Digital World

Adopting digital technologies is a very social process. Consumers don't usually make choices on their own; they watch what other people do, compare themselves to their peers, follow social norms, and think about products through the lens of shared stories. This social aspect has become much stronger thanks to peer-to-peer platforms, social media, review systems, influencer marketing, user-generated content, and review systems.

For a long time, research on how innovations spread has focused on how communication routes and social systems affect adoption. These channels are faster, easier to see, and more interactive now that they are digital. Recommendations get around on social networks, demonstrations get around on video and live streams, and large amounts of reputational signals are put together. In other words, communication between people in traditional networks is no longer the only thing that drives diffusion. Platform-mediated exposure is also important.

Behavioural economics helps us understand why these cues are so strong. Social proof lowers risk by implying that other people have already looked into the option. When people figure out value from how popular something is instead of how well it is evaluated directly, this is called "herd behaviour." Adoption is also affected by the desire for status and the need to show one's identity. This is especially true for technologies that people can see, like wearable tech, smart devices, electric cars, and premium apps.

At the same time, social impact may distort decision-making. Viral visibility can make hype stronger, set unrealistic goals, or encourage widespread use before people fully understand a product's limits. Because of this, the social aspects of adopting technology can speed up both good ideas and bad decisions made by the group.

The well-being of consumers, their freedom, and the morality of digital choice design

The integration of behavioral data into digital commerce raises important ethical and regulatory questions. If companies can guess and change how people will act by using interface design,

personalisation, and "nudges," then the line between helping people and taking advantage of them becomes more clear.

From the point of view of welfare, we ask if digital choice structures help people make better decisions, make less mistakes, and act in ways that help them reach their own goals. Yes, there are times when the answer is yes. Clear defaults, simple design, and timely reminders can help people take action that is good for them. But sometimes, digital systems are designed to engage, convert, or make money instead of improving the well-being of customers.

Dark patterns illustrate this tension clearly. These are interface tricks that make people do things they might not normally do, like subscribing without meaning to, sharing more information than they meant to, or having a hard time cancelling a service. These kinds of actions take advantage of limited reasoning and uneven information rather than helping people make better decisions. So, the ethical question is not just whether digital influence exists, but also how it is controlled. To keep people's privacy safe in digital markets, we need clear rules, consent that means something, personalisation that can be explained, fair default settings, and design standards that put the user first. Behavioural economics shouldn't just be used to get more people to use technology; it should also be used to make digital spaces that are more fair and responsible.

A Framework for Adopting Digital Technologies by People from Different Fields

At least five factors should be included in a framework that spans different fields and helps digital consumers make decisions. The first is the functionality of technology, which includes how useful it is, how easy it is to use, how well it works with other technologies, and how reliable it is. The second part is psychological processing, which includes feelings, cognitive effort, trust judgements, heuristics, and biases. The third type is social mediation, which includes things like social proof, communication networks, cultural meaning, and peer impacts. The fourth part is platform design, which includes interfaces, algorithms, defaults, and systems for personalisation. The fifth is government, which includes rules, ethical design, openness, and protecting consumers. It's important to remember that digital adoption isn't just about the technology. Consumers adopt in settings shaped by design choices, social narratives, institutional trust, and behavioral tendencies. So, for digital systems to work well, they need to be not only technically sound, but also psychologically fit, morally sound, and sensitive to their surroundings.

This means that researchers should look at how these factors interact over time in future studies instead of just looking at single-factor explanations. Longitudinal approaches, experimental methods, platform audits, and mixed-methods study are all very useful because they show how the way people learn in digital environments changes over time.

For people who work in the field, the multidisciplinary view says that responsible innovation depends on making sure that adoption strategies are in line with long-term consumer trust and welfare. Digital technologies are more likely to be successful in the long term if they lower friction

without taking away people's freedom of choice and if they support good decisions rather than just high conversion rates.

Conclusion

One of the most important places where economics, psychology, technology, and business all come together is in digital consumer decision-making. Behavioural economics gives us important ways to understand why people don't act fully rationally online and why framing, defaults, trust signals, social proof, personalisation, and interface design have such a big impact on their choices. But technology-adoption study is still very important because it shows how important things like perceived usefulness, ease of use, compatibility, and behaviour intention are. Not picking between these traditions is the best thing to do; combining them is better. The best way to understand digital adoption is as a process that involves behaviour, technology, and institutions all at the same time. This article makes the case that how people use technology in digital markets relies on how their cognitive architecture and digitally engineered choice environments work together. There are both chances and risks in that encounter. It makes services easier to use and faster to respond, but it also gives platforms more power to change people's behaviour in ways that might not always be good for consumers.

So, the next phase of study on digital consumers should not only look at ways to get more people to use technology, but also at how to make digital choice environments that protect privacy, trust, and fairness. A truly interdisciplinary understanding of digital consumer behavior must treat technology adoption as a matter of both market performance and public ethics.

References

Agarwal, R., & Prasad, J. (1998). A conceptual and operational definition of personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology. *Information Systems Research, 9*(2), 204-215.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179-211.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319-340.

Fadilah, N., & Andriani, N. (2025). Consumer preferences and decision-making in digital payments: A systematic review using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). *Asian Journal of Management Analytics, 4*(2), 531-546. https://doi.org/10.55927/ajma.v4i2.14295

Mick, D. G., & Fournier, S. (1998). Paradoxes of technology: Consumer cognizance, emotions, and coping strategies. *Journal of Consumer Research, 25*(2), 123-143.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly, 27*(3), 425-478.

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science, 46*(2), 186-204.
Vieira, V. A., Santini, F. O., & Araujo, C. F. (2022). Consumer behavior towards technological innovations: A systematic review. *Journal of Information Systems and Technology Management, 19*. https://www.scielo.br/j/jistm/a/nmkgqnwbQb9vkSfRb3Gzc3G/?lang=en