

# ***The Fintech Effect: Boosting Efficiency, Access, and Trust in Financial Services***

***L'effet Fintech : Améliorer l'efficacité, l'accès et la confiance dans les services financiers***

**Imane BENMIMOUN <sup>1\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> University of Ain temouchent (Algeria), Laboratory of Markets, Employment, Simulation and Legislation in the Maghreb Countries (MESLMC),

[imane.benmimoun@univ-temouchent.edu.dz](mailto:imane.benmimoun@univ-temouchent.edu.dz)

Received: 06/08/2025

Accepted: 05/11/2025

Published: 01/12/2025

## **Abstract:**

*This study aims to identify the effect of fintech on boosting efficiency, access, and trust in financial services, which represents financial inclusion dimensions. We relied on the descriptive and analytical approach. The study concluded that there is a positive effect of fintech on efficiency and access to financial services. And there is no positive effect of fintech on trust in financial services at the Foreign Bank of Algeria and Al-Badr Bank.*

**Keywords:** *Fintech; Financial inclusion; Financial services.*

**Jel Classification Codes :** O33 ; G21 ; G23

## **Résumé:**

*Cette étude cherche à identifier l'impact de la fintech sur la stimulation de l'efficacité, l'accès et la confiance dans les services financiers, ce qui représente les dimensions de l'inclusion financière. L'étude a conclu que la fintech a un effet positif sur l'efficacité et l'accès aux services financiers. Et il n'y a pas d'effet positif de la fintech sur la confiance dans les services financiers à la Banque étrangère d'Algérie et Al-Badr Bank.*

**Mots clés :** *Fintech ; Inclusion financière ; Services financiers.*

**Jel Classification Codes :** O33 ; G21 ; G23

**\* Corresponding author**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

As digitization and globalization accelerate, financial technology is reshaping traditional financial institutions' structure and business model. (Yu, 2024). Fintech, or financial technology, is a game-changing idea in the world of finance. It mixes elements of technological innovation with traditional financial service delivery, producing an innovative environment to suit today's client expectations. Fintech has made it feasible to offer services more quickly, make it easier to get financial information, and make better decisions. As financial institutions, including banks, embrace fintech by revamping their infrastructure, optimizing their performance has become an urgent necessity to face the wave of competition posed by fintech companies.

FinTech is the term used to describe the digitization of traditional financial services, which challenges the current financial system by creating new businesses with independent ecosystems. It attracts significant foreign investment and is thought to be a catalyst for long-term economic growth. (Mhlanga, 2023) .

In the last several years, financial technology have appeared in all major areas of the world, including advanced economies and emerging market and developing economies. But the rate of fintech adoption differs considerably. (Frost, 2020). Fintech is a key tool for adjusting the financial industry to the current environment, which includes the rapid innovation and users' growing demands for easy access to financial services. (Staverska & al, 2023) . And, Algeria is one of the African countries seeking to institutionalize the culture of smart finance in its banks improve the quality of banking services.

### **1.1 The problem of the study:**

Based on the above, the main question of this research is as follows:

What is the impact of financial technology on boosting Efficiency, Access, and Trust in Financial Services in al-badr Bank and the foreign bank of Algeria?

To answer this main question, we proposed the following hypothesis:

- There is a positive effect of financial technology on Access to financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$ .

- There is a positive effect of financial technology on Efficiency of financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$ .
- There is a positive effect of financial technology on trust in financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$ .

### **1.2 Study Objectives:**

This study aims to identify the concept of financial technology and its importance in promoting financial inclusion. It also aims to study the relationship between financial technology and efficiency, access, and trust in financial services.

## **2. The theoretical framework of the study**

Fintech, shorthand for financial technology, disrupts and innovates the business of financial services. A fintech definition can be quite broad, comprising a variety of technological “tools” enhancing, and often replacing, financial services through digitalization. He refers to fintech as “a new financial industry that applies technology to improve financial activities.” (Jourdan & al, 2023). Fintech alludes to the use of new information technology to make banking, payments, investments, and/or (insurance) easier and better. It ranges from digitizing traditional banking to the latest and trendiest technologies like crypto currencies, p2p lending platforms and robo advisor. (Zhang, 2024).

“FinTech” provides feasible technological solutions for financial innovation, offering more intelligent and cost-effective financial services that are not limited by time and location, thus meeting the preference choices of financial service demanders and increasing the marginal utility level of financial consumers. (Wang, 2024).

Fintech aims to reduce costs, provide greater privacy, and enhance speed and efficiency (Mousli & Bentaleb, 2024). There are five main subsectors. Each has some breakthrough technology it is using to delight customers and do a better job of providing services. And it includes: Digital payments that allow for the efficient transferring of money (Ermolaev & Nedorezova, 2021). And also digital lending, which provides alternative lending solutions by using AI to evaluate creditworthiness and facilitate the loan process (Kiran V. U & Suleman, 2024). Sectors also include InsurTech,

which into insurance services (Agrawal & Goyal, 2024). Also, WealthTech is facilitated through online platforms that provide investment advice and portfolio management services (Rohilla & JindaL, 2024). And Regulatory technology that assists firms to meet financial regulations effectively.(Kiran & Suleman, 2024).

FinTech services have the potential of promoting financial inclusion. The following related points can be made on this relationship. By enhancing access to services, fintech has pushed the ownership of accounts at formal financial institutions from 51% in 2011 to 76% in 2021, worldwide. (Cevik, 2024). Moreover, the incorporation of digital financial literacy as a mediator strengthens the effectiveness of FinTech in encouraging financial inclusion, as individuals with high freedom levels are more likely to appreciate the merits of these (Amnas & Parayitam, 2024). Furthermore, The Regulatory Support helps to guarantee a secure and reliable environment for its users. (Amnas & Parayitam, 2024).

Financial Inclusion can play a critical role in promoting economic growth and poverty reduction as improved access to finance can help in furthering job creation, minimizing one's susceptibility to shocks and enhancing investment in human capital (Shihadeh, 2021). It is a process, stage of development, or state of development characterized by a communicative interface of the financial market entities and consumers in order to ensure equal opportunity to usage of financial instruments (Anufriieva & Shkliar, 2019).

Inclusive finance experts are generally unanimous that the new forms of inclusive finance development should ride on the back of the development of fintech. It is the only way that fintech can more successfully address some of the problems of traditional financial inclusion. (Cheng, 2021).

Financial inclusion tries to remove barriers that keep people from using financial services, foster economic development, and reduce poverty. Aims of financial inclusion include: to offer access to a full range of financial services--such as saving accounts, credit, insurance, and investment opportunity -- to all at affordable costs to clients, delivered by a range of providers, that are transparent and responsive to the usage and

needs of the individuals, and are sustainable and benefit the wider society as well. These goals are essential for promoting more inclusive economic growth and tackling income gaps (Panwar & al, 2022).

### **3. Methods and Materials:**

#### **3.1 Study tool:**

To achieve the objective of the current study, a questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. It included two sections. The first contained personal data for the sample, while the second included 21 questions to collect information about the independent variable (financial technology) and the dependent variables (access to financial services, efficiency of financial services, and trust in financial services). A five-point Likert scale was used to determine the respondents' responses, and the program SPSS was also used for statistical analysis. The study population consisted of bank executives. A purposive sample was selected, consisting of executives and employees at Al-Badr Bank and the Foreign Bank of Algeria in Aïn Témouchent. 80 questionnaire forms were distributed to the study sample, and 64 valid questionnaires were retrieved, representing 80% of the total distributed questionnaires.

#### **3.2 Internal consistency validity:**

It refers to the extent to which all questions of the questionnaire are consistent with the axis. The statement measures what it is designed to measure and does not measure something else. To confirm this, we calculated internal consistency by the Spearman correlation coefficients between each of the statements. The correlation coefficients and the level of significance for this axis were as follows:

#### **✓ Internal consistency validity of the Fintech axis**

**Table N°1: Internal consistency validity test**

<b>Statements</b>	<b>Spearman's rho correlation coefficient</b>	<b>Sig</b>
Q1	0.448 **	0.000
Q2	0.600**	0.000

Q3	0.391**	0.002
Q4	0.528**	0.000
Q5	0.384**	0.002
Q6	0.381**	0.002
Q7	0.587**	0.000
Q8	0.704**	0.000
Q9	0.610**	0.000

**The source:** From the output of Spss v.29

The table above shows the results of the Spearman correlation coefficient, which shows that all of the correlation coefficients are significant at a significance level of 0.05, which means that the statements of this axis are true to what they were designed to measure.

✓ **Internal consistency validity of the financial inclusion dimensions**

**Table N°2: Internal consistency validity test**

Access to Financial services axis		Efficiency of Financial services axis		Trust in Financial services axis	
statements	Spearman coefficient Sig	statements	Spearman coefficient Sig	statements	Spearman coefficient Sig
Q10	0.817** 0.000	Q15	0.642** 0.000	Q18	0.688** 0.000
Q11	0.760** 0.000	Q16	0.708** 0.000	Q19	0.705** 0.000
Q12	0.674** 0.000	X17	0.834** 0.000	Q20	0.768** 0.000

***The Fintech Effect: Boosting Efficiency, Access, and Trust in Financial Services***

---

<b>Q13</b>	0.780** 0.000	-----	-----	<b>Q21</b>	0.798** 0.000
<b>Q14</b>	0.737** 0.000	-----	-----	-----	-----

**The source:** From the output of Spss v.29

Based on the results from each axis, we conclude that all correlation coefficients are significant at the 5% level. So the statements of the three axis are true to what they were designed to measure.

**3.3 Stability of the study instrument:**

The stability of the study tool indicates that the questionnaire results remain consistent and do not change significantly when redistributed to the sample over specific periods.

**Table N°3: Reliability statistics**

<b>Number of statements</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient</b>
<b>21</b>	<b>0.831</b>

**The source:** From the output of Spss v.29

The table above indicates that the alpha coefficient is 0.831. Therefore, we conclude that the study instrument is valid, stable, and suitable for application to the sample.

**3.4 Statistical indicators of the study:**

 **Statistical indicators of Fintech:**

**Table N°4: Mean and standard deviation of Fintech axis**

	<b>Statements</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Importance level</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Q1	The bank is interested in continuously checking the ATMs to avoid expected malfunctions	<b>4,17</b>	<b>0,606</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>3</b>
Q2	Your organization provides the possibility to search for real opportunities to finance a private project or service using the Internet	<b>3,69</b>	<b>0,833</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>7</b>
Q3	There are websites that provide access to consumer loans	<b>2,97</b>	<b>1,218</b>	<b>medium</b>	<b>8</b>
Q4	The financial system provides the necessary protection for loan providers and beneficiaries	<b>4,09</b>	<b>0,729</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>5</b>
Q5	E-payment services save time and effort	<b>4,16</b>	<b>0,979</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>4</b>
Q6	Using e-payment services does not incur additional fees or charges	<b>2,87</b>	<b>1,303</b>	<b>medium</b>	<b>9</b>
Q7	Money can be transferred via smartphone banking apps	<b>4,19</b>	<b>0,814</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>2</b>
Q8	Many smartphone apps are available to manage and control financial transactions	<b>3,80</b>	<b>0,946</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>6</b>
Q9	Financial services apps allow access to balance	<b>4,34</b>	<b>0,541</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>FINTECH</b>		<b>3,8103</b>	<b>0,43992</b>	<b>high</b>	


**The source:** From the output of Spss v.29

***The Fintech Effect: Boosting Efficiency, Access, and Trust in Financial Services***

---

From the table above, it is observed that statement Q9 ranked first according to the studied sample, with an average score of 4.34, indicating a "high importance" level. This is because the financial services apps allow access to balances in banks. On the other hand, Statement Q6 ranked lowest with an average of 2.87, indicating a "medium importance" level. This lower ranking is attributed to using e-payment services, which does not incur additional fees or charges.

Overall, the general average of the statements within this axis is 3.8103, with a standard deviation of 0.43992, indicating a low dispersion of values around the mean. Therefore, the results reflect a high level of agreement.

 **Statistical indicators for Sub- axis “access to financial services”:**

**Table N°5: Mean and standard deviation of AFS statements**

	<b>Statements</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Importance level</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Q10</b>	There are a sufficient number of access points (branches of financial service providers)	<b>3.66</b>	<b>0.979</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Q11</b>	There is a sufficient number of ATMs in the financial institutions you do business with	<b>3.70</b>	<b>1.049</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Q12</b>	Bank customers have an online account to access financial services	<b>3.92</b>	<b>0.783</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Q13</b>	All financial service points offer the same level of service.	<b>3.58</b>	<b>1.005</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Q14</b>	There is easy access to available financial services	<b>4.00</b>	<b>0.836</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Access to financial services</b>		<b>3.7719</b>	<b>0.714</b>	<b>high</b>	

**Source: the output of SPSS V.29**

From the table N°5, it is observed that statement Q14 ranked first,

with an average score of 4.00, indicating a "high importance" level. This is because There is easy access to available financial services. On the other hand, Statement Q13 ranked lowest with an average of 3.58, indicating a "high importance" level.

Overall, the general average of this sub-axis is 3.7719, with a standard deviation of 0.714, indicating a low dispersion of values around the mean. Therefore, the results reflect a high level of agreement.

**✚ Statistical indicators for sub-axis “Efficiency of financial services”:**

**Table N°6: Mean and standard deviation of EFS statements**

	Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation	Importance level	Rank
Q15	Bank customers have a formal financial account	4.02	0.766	high	1
Q16	Smartphone payment transactions are used	3.55	0.975	high	3
Q17	The number of cashless retail transactions (number of payments by check, credit transfers and credit card payments)	3.75	0.992	high	2
<b>Efficiency of financial services</b>		<b>3.7708</b>	<b>0.689</b>	<b>high</b>	

**Source:** the output of SPSS V.29

According to table N°6, it is observed that statement Q15 ranked first, with an average score of 4.02, indicating a "high importance" level. This is because the Bank customers have a formal financial account. On the other hand, Statement Q16 ranked lowest with an average of 3.55, indicating a "high importance" level.

Overall, the general average of this sub-axis is 3.7708, with a standard deviation of 0.689, indicating a low dispersion of values around the mean. Therefore, the results reflect a high level of agreement.

**✚ Statistical indicators for sub-axis “Trust in financial services”:**

**Table N°7: Mean and standard deviation of TFS statements**

	<b>Statements</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Importance level</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Q18</b>	The cost of utilizing available financial services is affordable for customers	<b>4.08</b>	<b>0.674</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Q19</b>	Your financial institution gains the trust of its customers in terms of the security of their data and information	<b>4.14</b>	<b>0.663</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Q20</b>	Customers are satisfied and satisfied when using your organization's financial services	<b>4.14</b>	<b>0.663</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Q21</b>	Complaints from your financial institution's customers are listened to and addressed	<b>4.19</b>	<b>0.639</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Trust in financial services</b>		<b>4.1367</b>	<b>0.479</b>	<b>high</b>	

**Source:** the output of SPSS V.29

According to table N°7, it is observed that statement Q21 ranked first, with an average score of 4.19, indicating a "high importance" level. This is because - according to the sample's opinion- "Complaints from financial institution's customers are listened to and addressed". Otherwise, Statement Q18 ranked lowest with an average of 4.08, indicating a "high importance" level.

Overall, the general average of this sub-axis is 4.1367, with a standard deviation of 0.479, indicating a low dispersion of values around the mean. Therefore, the results reflect a high level of agreement.

### **3.5 Testing the study's hypotheses:**

We tested the study hypotheses using simple regression analysis.

#### **The first Hypotheses:**

- **H0:** There is no positive effect of financial technology on Access to financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$
- **H1:** There is a positive effect of financial technology on Access to financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$

**Table N°8: Correlation coefficient between fintech and Access to financial service**

<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>
<b>1</b>	0,377 <sup>a</sup>	0,142	0,128	0,66696
a. Predictors : (Constant), Fintech				

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

It is clear from the above table, that the value of the correlation coefficient is 0.377, which is a medium value indicating a moderate positive correlation. Between “financial technology” .and “AFS”.

As for the coefficient of determination is 0.142, and the value of the coefficient of determination explains that 14.2% of the change in “access to financial services” is due to the change in the level of interest in applying “financial technology”. And the remaining is due to other factors affecting access to financial services, and although this percentage is weak, this does not indicate the lack of quality of the model without testing the significance of the model, which was confirmed through the following table:

**Table N°9: ANOVA analysis**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4,570	1	4,570	10,273	0,002 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	27,580	62	0,445		
	Total	32,149	63			
<b>a. dependent Variable : Access</b>						
<b>b. Predictors: (Constant), Fintech</b>						

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

The statistical significance value of 0.02 is below the significance level of 0.05, indicating that the model is significant. Therefore, the model should not be evaluated solely based on the coefficient of determination; the significance test provides a clearer understanding of its validity.

**Table N°10: Results of a linear regression analysis (fintech on access to financial service)**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,439	0,733		1,965	0,054
	Fintech	0,612	0,191	0,377	3,205	0,002
<b>a. Dependent Variable: Access</b>						

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

It is clear from the table that the equation of the regression model is:

$$\text{Access to financial services} = 0.612 * \text{Financial Technology} + 1.439$$

It is also clear that the degree of influence B is estimated at 0.612. Which means that a change in the value of “Fintech” by one unit corresponds to a change of 0.612 in “AFS”. And the significance of this effect is confirmed by the value of t-test 3.205, which is significant at

0.002. which is less than the adopted significance level of  $\alpha=0.05$ ; thus, we reject  $H_0$  and accept  $H_1$ , which assumes that there is a positive and statistically significant effect of “Fintech” on “access to financial services” for the two banking agencies under study.

 **The second Hypotheses:**

- **H0:** There is no positive effect of financial technology on Efficiency of financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$
- **H1:** There is a positive effect of financial technology on Efficiency of financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$

**Table N°11: Correlation coefficient between fintech and Efficiency**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0,351 <sup>a</sup>	0,123	0,109	0,65106
a. Predictors : (Constant), Fintech				

**of financial services**

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

It is clear from the above table, that the value of the correlation coefficient is 0.351. Which is a medium value indicating a moderate positive correlation. Between “financial technology” .and “FFS”.

As for the coefficient of determination is 0.123, and the value of the coefficient of determination explains that 12.3% of the change in “EFS” is due to the change in the level of interest in applying “financial technology”. And the remaining is due to other factors affecting Efficiency of financial services, and although this percentage is weak, this does not indicate the lack of quality of the model without testing the significance of the model, which was confirmed through the following table:

**Table N°12: ANOVA analysis**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3,692	1	3,692	8,709	,004 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	26,281	62	,424		
	Total	29,972	63			
a. Dependent Variable : Efficiency						
b. Predictors : (Constant), Fintech						

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

We can see from the above table that the significance level (0.04) is lower than the significance level assumed in the study ( $\alpha=5\%$ ), so the model is significant as a whole .

**Table N°13: Results of a linear regression analysis (fintech on Efficiency of financial services)**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,674	0,715		2,341	0,022
	Fintech	0,550	0,186	0,351	2,951	0,004
a. Dependent Variable : Efficiency						

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

It is clear from the table that the equation of the regression model is:

$$\text{Efficiency of financial services} = 0.550 * \text{FinTech} + 1.674$$

It is also clear that the degree of influence B is estimated at 0.550. Which means that a change in the value of “Fintech” by one unit corresponds to a change of 0.550 in “EFS”. And the significance of this effect is confirmed by the value of t-test. Which is estimated at 2.951, which is significant at a significance level of Sig=0.004. which is less than the adopted significance level of  $\alpha=0.05$ , thus we reject H0 and

accept H1, which assumes that there is a positive and statistically significant effect of “financial technology” on “Efficiency of financial services” for the two banking agencies under study.

**✚ The third Hypotheses:**

- **H0:** There is no positive of financial technology on Trust in financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$
- **H1:** There is a positive effect of financial technology on Trust in financial services at  $\alpha=5\%$

**Table N°14: Correlation coefficient between fintech and trust in financial services**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
<b>1</b>	0,183 <sup>a</sup>	0,033	0,018	0,47530
a. Predictors : (Constant), Fintech				

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

It is clear from the results, that the value of the correlation coefficient is 0.183. Which is a small value indicating a weak positive correlation. Between “Fintech” and “TFS”.

As for the determination coefficient is 0.033, which explains that 3.3% of the change in “TFS” is due to the change in the level of interest in applying “financial technology”. And the remaining is due to other factors affecting the dependent variable.

**Table N°15: ANOVA analysis**

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
<b>1</b>	Regression	0,484	1	0,484	2,145	0,148 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	14,007	62	0,226		
	Total	14,491	63			
a. Dependent Variable : Trust						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Fintech						

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

From the table above, we note that the Sig value reached 0.148, which is a value greater than the significance level of 0.05, indicating that the model is not significant, meaning that the regression equation does not fit the data.

**Table N°16: Results of a linear regression analysis (Fintech on trust**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3,377	0,522		6,469	0,000
	Fintech	0,199	0,136	0,183	1,464	0,148
a. Dependent Variable : Trust						

**in financial services)**

**The source:** the output of Spss v.29

The influence degree B is estimated at 0.199. Which means that a change in the value of the independent variable by one unit corresponds to a change of 0.199 in the dependent variable. And the value of the t-test is 1.464, which is not significant at Sig=0.148. So, we reject H1 and accept H0, which assumes that there is no positive and statistically significant effect of “financial technology” on “trust in financial services”.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Fintech is an enabler for economic and financial development and is promoting a more sustainable and inclusive financial system. So investment in financial technology is a key strategic investment you can make to drive long-term economic growth and prosperity.

The two research banks are eager to catch the FinTech to do better financial performance. In order to achieve its purpose and respond to the study's questions, it intends to explore the effects of Fintech on access,

efficiency and trust in financial services. And we got the following results:

- There is a high importance level of FinTech and Access, efficiency, trust in financial services to according to the study sample.

-There is a positive effect of fintech on Access and Efficiency of financial services at a significance level 5%.

- There is no positive effect of FinTech on trust in financial services at a significance level 5%.

The lack of a positive impact between financial technology and trust in financial services is due to several reasons; most notably cybersecurity risks and data breaches, weak regulation and oversight, and the digital divide due to some users' incomplete experiences.

• **Recommendations and suggestions:**

- The need to spread awareness in society to achieve financial education, in order to increase trust in financial services and reach a better level of financial inclusion.

- Establishing regulatory frameworks that integrate ICT and the financial sector.

- Develop education and awareness activities (campaigns) for clients over the safe and effective use of FinTech services that will enable clients to protect their accounts, and avoid online financial fraud.

- Partner with Fintech tech companies and early stage companies building FinTech solutions such as Blockchain wallets, Agent algorithms and AI ETC to create more sophisticated through e-payment by using smartphones, crowdfunding, and protecting customer data and fi and efficient financial solutions.

- Encourage investment in machine learning and big data analytics to analyze financial data and predict market trends, helping them make strategic financial decisions.

- Innovation in financial services financial transactions from cyber threats.

## 5. Bibliography List:

- 1) Agrawal, M. I., & Goyal, A. (2024). The Importance of Fintech in Promoting Regulatory Compliance in Major Fintech Subsectors . <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-8-3693-3322-8>. *Advances in Finance, Accounting, and Economics Book Series*, 35–48. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-3322-8>
- 2) Amnas, M. B., & Parayitam, S. (2024). FinTech and Financial Inclusion: Exploring the Mediating Role of Digital Financial Literacy and the Moderating Influence of Perceived Regulatory Support. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17030108>
- 3) Anufrieva, K. &., & Shkliar, A. (2019). Financial inclusion as a factor for socio-economic development. *National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine* , 201, 59–77. doi:<https://doi.org/10.15407/SOCIUM2019.03.059>
- 4) Cevik, S. (2024). Promise (Un)kept? Fintech and Financial Inclusion. *IMF Working Papers*, 131(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400279195.001>
- 5) Cheng, Z. .. (2021). Exploring the Development of Financial Inclusion in the Context of Financial Technology. *Proceedings of Business and Economic Studies*, 4(4), 104–111. doi:<https://doi.org/10.26689/PBES.V4I4.2394>
- 6) Ermolaev, K. N., & Nedorezova, E. S. (2021). Financial Technology Sector in the Context of a New Digital Paradigm . 245–251. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83175-2\\_32](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83175-2_32)
- 7) Frost, J. (2020). The Economic Forces Driving Fintech Adoption Across Countries. *BIS Working Paper*(No. 838,). Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3535904>
- 8) Jourdan, Z., & al, e. (2023). Fintech: a content analysis of the finance and information systems literature . *Electronic Markets* , 33(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-023-00624-9>
- 9) Kiran, V. U., & Suleman, N. (2024). Analysis of trends and segments of fintech in india. . *Deleted Journal*, 07((03(I))), 59–72. doi: [https://doi.org/10.62823/7.3\(i\).6752](https://doi.org/10.62823/7.3(i).6752)

- 10) Mhlanga, D. (2023). *Financial Technology (Fintech) an Introduction. In: Fintech and Artificial Intelligence for Sustainable Development*. (C. Sustainable Development Goals Series. Palgrave Macmillan, Ed.) doi:[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37776-1\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37776-1_3)
- 11) Mousli, T., & Bentaleb, S. (2024). Fintech Startups and Their Role in Achieving Financial Inclusion: The Case of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of EL-Maqrizi for Economic and Financial Studies*, 08(02 ), 434-450. Récupéré sur <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/256089>
- 12) Panwar, & al, e. (2022). .Financial inclusion in india – an assessment. *Sachetas*, 22–31. doi: <https://doi.org/10.55955/110005>
- 13) Rohilla, A., & JindaL, &. (2024). *FinTech Frontier*. IGI Global. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1107-3>
- 14) Shihadeh, F. (2021). *A Conceptual Framework of Financial Inclusion: The Links with Individuals, SMEs, and Banks*. 10.1007/978-3-030-73057-4\_22. Chapter in *Studies in Computational Intelligence* . doi:DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-73057-4\_22
- 15) Staverska, T., & al, e. (2023). Fintech and the future of financial services: innovations in the financial sector. *Ekonomika, Finans, Pravo*(10). doi:<https://doi.org/10.37634/efp.2023.10.16>
- 16) Wang, L. (2024). Impact of Fintech on Commercial Banks. *Advances in Economics . Management and Political Sciences* , 72(1), 211-216 . doi:<https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/72/20240699>
- 17) Yu, M. (2024). The Impact of Financial Technology on Traditional Financial Systems and Future Trends. *Journal of Modern Business and Economics*, 1(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.70767/jmbe.v1i1.134>
- 18) Zhang, E. (2024). Discussion on financial technology innovation and regulatory mechanism in the digital economy environment . *Financial Engineering and Risk Management* , 7(2). doi:DOI: 10.23977/ferm.2024.070203