THE ROLE OF FINTECH IN PROMOTING RESPONSIBLE FINANCIAL BEHAVIOUR, FINANCIAL INCLUSION, AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF YOUNG ADULTS

Ms. SNEGA C
Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce (Computer Application)
S.A. College of Arts & Science

ABSTRACT

Digital finance has reshaped how individuals across the world interact with money, and nowhere is this shift more visible than in fast-growing economies like India, where smartphone penetration and government-backed digital payment infrastructure have converged to accelerate FinTech adoption at an extraordinary pace. Much of the scholarship on this transformation, however, treats financial inclusion, responsible money management, and broader economic upliftment as separate research tracks rather than interconnected outcomes of the same technological shift. This paper sets out to close that gap by empirically testing whether FinTech usage among young digital-finance users in India is tied to three outcomes at once: prudent financial habits, expanded access to formal financial services, and perceived contribution to socio-economic progress. Working with a sample of 104 young adults who actively use digital financial platforms, the study gathered responses through a structured, five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and processed the data in IBM SPSS Statistics, applying percentage analysis, descriptive statistics, Cronbach's Alpha reliability testing, and Pearson correlation analysis at a 5 percent significance threshold. The measurement instrument held up well under scrutiny, returning a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.816, and correlation testing uncovered statistically significant, positive relationships ($p < 0.01$) running across every pair of items tied to financial inclusion, saving and investing, responsible spending, and social development outcomes. These results justify discarding the null hypotheses in favour of the alternative ones, lending empirical weight to the claim that FinTech engagement among young adults correlates meaningfully with sound financial behaviour, inclusion, and developmental perception. The paper adds fresh, India-specific data to an evidence base still dominated by reviews and bibliometric studies, with takeaways relevant to regulators, FinTech firms, and financial educators alike.

Keywords: *FinTech, Financial Inclusion, Responsible Financial Behaviour, Socio-Economic Development, Digital Finance, Young Adults, India.*

Introduction

The way people manage money has changed more in the past decade than in several before it. FinTech, the umbrella term for technology-driven financial services spanning mobile wallets to algorithm-based investment advisors, has gradually redrawn who gets to participate in the formal financial system and on what terms. Tools such as peer-to-peer lending apps, UPI-linked payment platforms, and automated savings features have, collectively, worn down barriers that once kept large segments of the population outside the system, creating openings for groups that mainstream banking had historically left behind (Ha et al., 2025; Mishra et al., 2024).

India makes for an unusually fitting setting to examine this shift. Few countries can match its concentration of digitally-native young adults, and state-backed efforts like the Unified Payments Interface and Jan Dhan Yojana have pushed digital financial adoption forward faster than in most other economies. Even so, pockets of exclusion remain, and a more fundamental question has gone largely unanswered: beyond simply widening access, does FinTech also steer people toward smarter money habits, and does that, in turn, feed into broader economic progress? Direct empirical work on this question is still surprisingly scarce.

Personal financial health, and by extension a stable economy, rests on habits like budgeting, building savings, spending with discipline, and planning ahead — what this paper refers to as responsible financial behaviour. The literature is fairly consistent on one point here: access to formal financial services accomplishes little on its own unless people also build the habits to use that access well (Duvendack & Mader, 2020; Kishor et al., 2025).

The third outcome this study considers, socio-economic development, is broader still — it spans rising incomes, improved job prospects, stronger human capital, gender parity, and lower poverty. A substantial body of research connects financial inclusion to progress on each of these fronts, increasingly with FinTech positioned as the mechanism behind that connection (Mamun & Várallyai, 2025; Mishra et al., 2024).

Most existing research, however, treats these three threads — behaviour, inclusion, and development — as separate inquiries, and relies more heavily on systematic reviews and bibliometric mapping than on fresh, ground-level data, particularly from emerging markets. This paper attempts to bring the three threads together in one analysis, using primary survey data from young adults in India to examine whether FinTech engagement is tied, simultaneously, to responsible money habits, broader financial inclusion, and a felt sense of contributing to socio-economic progress.

Review of Literature

Scholarly interest in FinTech, financial inclusion, and socio-economic development has grown considerably over the past few years. The discussion below draws on ten recent systematic reviews that together shape the conceptual backbone of this study.

FinTech and Financial Inclusion

Ha, Le, and Nguyen (2025) synthesised 96 studies and organised the field around three recurring themes: the emergence of new financial products, structural change in how financial markets operate, and the shifting roles of participants across the FinTech ecosystem. Across this body of work, the link between FinTech and financial inclusion came through consistently, although the authors noted that comparatively little is known about its longer-term socioeconomic consequences or the regulatory questions that follow from wider adoption.

A considerably broader sweep of 325 studies by Mishra, Kandpal, Agarwal, and Srivastava (2024) reached a similar conclusion from a wider angle: financial inclusion opens access not just to banking, but to savings, credit, and insurance products as a bundle. The authors went further, treating digital finance — and FinTech in particular — as close to indispensable for inclusive growth strategies, with the strongest payoffs showing up in poverty reduction and in expanding women's financial autonomy.

Lower transaction costs and broader access are recurring findings, and Kishor, Bansal, and Kumar (2025) arrive at the same place from a sustainability angle: across 189 studies, they trace how FinTech serves inclusion and sustainability goals simultaneously rather than as separate agendas. What remains open, in their assessment, are digital literacy gaps, the maturity of regulatory frameworks, and how well consumers are protected as adoption scales up.

Financial Inclusion and Socio-Economic Development

Zooming out further, Duvendack and Mader (2020) synthesised 32 systematic reviews and arrived at a broadly favourable, if uneven, verdict: financial inclusion programs tend to produce gains in savings, women's empowerment, and access, but the magnitude of these gains varies considerably by country context. Their sharpest criticism was directed at a gap in the evidence base itself — the field, they argued, still struggles to show that inclusion initiatives translate into measurable behavioural change.

A related synthesis published in Qualitative Market Research (2023), spanning 107 studies across a fifteen-year window (2008–2023), arrives at much the same destination: financial inclusion is tied to economic growth, falling poverty, and a more stable financial system. Where this review adds value is in its forward-looking note, calling specifically for research into how digital financial tools shape user behaviour as it unfolds over time, rather than as a one-time snapshot.

FinTech, Sustainability, and Vulnerable Groups

Sustainability enters the picture more directly in Mamun and Várallyai (2025), who frame financial inclusion and sustainable finance as overlapping rather than parallel agendas. In their account, FinTech serves sustainability goals on two fronts at once — by widening access and by gradually steering users toward more responsible financial habits — with the strongest effects among groups that formal finance has historically overlooked. Their call to action is for closer coordination between FinTech strategy and sustainability policy.

A 2025 review in Discover Sustainability narrows the lens to vulnerable populations specifically — women, rural communities, and low-income households — and finds that mobile banking, digital wallets, and AI-driven financial tools produce real gains in access across developing economies. The caveat attached to this finding is consistent with several others in this literature: those gains depend on digital literacy, which remains an unresolved gating factor.

FinTech Innovation, Stability, and Developing Nations

One tension running through the policy side of this literature is whether expanding inclusion comes at the cost of financial stability. A 2024 study in Emerging Markets Review takes this question on directly and lands on a cautiously affirmative answer: digital financial products can bring unbanked populations into the formal system without destabilising it, but only where regulatory oversight keeps pace with the innovation.

Working specifically with developing-country evidence, a 2024 review in the Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management — covering 65 studies — reaches a familiar conclusion: FinTech expands access to digital payments, credit, and investment products in meaningful ways. Its more distinctive observation is methodological: the behavioural side of adoption, as opposed to the access side, remains comparatively thin in the evidence base.

Closing out this strand of the literature, a 2025 synthesis in Cogent Economics & Finance distils the conditions under which FinTech actually delivers inclusive growth down to three: the state of digital infrastructure, the level of financial literacy, and the degree of user trust. Without these three in place together, the authors suggest, access alone does not reliably translate into inclusion — a finding that points future research toward the behavioural drivers behind FinTech uptake.

Research Gap

FinTech and financial inclusion have attracted substantial research attention, but much of it converges on the same handful of concerns: technology uptake, digital payment infrastructure, mobile banking penetration, and macro-level economic indicators. The behavioural dimension — whether FinTech actually changes how people manage money on a day-to-day basis — receives comparatively little attention, a gap that several recent reviews have explicitly noted (Emerging Markets Review, 2024; Cogent Economics & Finance, 2025; Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management, 2024).

The way this literature is organised compounds the problem: financial inclusion and economic development are typically studied as parallel but disconnected tracks, and few studies ask whether FinTech drives responsible money habits, inclusion, and development outcomes together, as facets of one process rather than three separate stories.

There is also a methodological imbalance worth noting: a large share of the published work relies on systematic reviews, bibliometric mapping, and macro-level analysis rather than fresh, primary survey data. Studies that ask users directly — through their own words or structured instruments — how they perceive FinTech's role in shaping their financial habits remain relatively rare, and this is even more pronounced in developing-economy settings like India, where digital finance has expanded unusually quickly and getting policy right carries high stakes.

A further gap follows from how financial inclusion research tends to define its own scope: largely in terms of access and usage metrics, with much less attention paid to whether FinTech actually moves people toward better financial habits — budgeting, consistent saving, sustainable spending, long-term planning — the behaviours that arguably matter most for converting access into real development outcomes.

This study aims to address these gaps directly. Using primary data collected from active digital-finance users, it examines responsible financial behaviour, financial inclusion, and socio-economic development within a single empirical framework, contributing ground-level evidence to a literature still dominated by reviews and meta-analyses.

Research Objectives

This study sets out to accomplish four things:

1. Examine whether FinTech encourages responsible financial behaviour among the young adults who actively use digital financial services.
2. Assess how much FinTech services contribute to expanding financial inclusion among this same user group.
3. Evaluate FinTech's influence on socio-economic development, focusing specifically on improvements in saving habits, investment activity, and financial planning.

4. Capture how users themselves perceive FinTech's combined impact across responsible financial behaviour, inclusion, and socio-economic development.

Research Hypotheses

Drawing on the objectives above and the patterns identified in the literature, the following hypotheses were formulated for testing at a 5 percent significance threshold ($p < 0.05$):

Null Hypothesis (H0)	Alternative Hypothesis (H1)
H01: There is no significant relationship between the role of FinTech and responsible financial behaviour among young adults.	H11: There is a significant positive relationship between the role of FinTech and responsible financial behaviour among young adults.
H02: There is no significant relationship between the role of FinTech and financial inclusion among young adults.	H12: There is a significant positive relationship between the role of FinTech and financial inclusion among young adults.
H03: There is no significant relationship between the role of FinTech and socio-economic development among young adults.	H13: There is a significant positive relationship between the role of FinTech and socio-economic development among young adults.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study follows a quantitative approach, blending descriptive and analytical elements. Quantitative methods made sense here given the goal of statistically testing relationships between FinTech usage and three separate outcome variables. The descriptive piece paints a picture of who the respondents are and how they think about FinTech, while the analytical piece is what actually allows the hypotheses to be tested and patterns between variables to be uncovered.

Sources of Data

Primary Data: Gathered directly from young adults who actively use digital financial services, via a structured questionnaire.

Secondary Data: Drawn from academic journals, books, institutional reports, and prior research, used to build the theoretical grounding and inform the literature review.

Population and Sampling

The target population is young adults engaged with digital financial services in some form — mobile banking apps, digital wallets, UPI payments, or other FinTech platforms. Given the exploratory nature of the research and the practical constraints of reaching this population, convenience sampling (a non-probability method) was used. This yielded 104 usable responses, which form the basis of the analysis that follows.

Data Collection Instrument

Data collection relied on a self-administered, structured questionnaire split into two parts: respondent demographics, and a set of Likert-scale statements covering FinTech usage alongside responsible financial behaviour, inclusion, and socio-economic development. Every

construct was measured on a standard five-point scale running from 1 (Strongly Disagree) through 5 (Strongly Agree).

Variables

The variable structure for this study is laid out below:

Variable Type	Variable
Independent Variable	Role of FinTech
Dependent Variable 1	Responsible Financial Behaviour
Dependent Variable 2	Financial Inclusion
Dependent Variable 3	Socio-Economic Development

Statistical Tools and Analysis

All data processing was carried out in IBM SPSS Statistics, using the following techniques:

- Percentage Analysis – to map out the demographic makeup of the sample.
- Descriptive Statistics (Mean and Standard Deviation) – to capture overall patterns in how respondents rated each item.
- Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) – to check that the measurement scale was internally consistent.
- Pearson Correlation Analysis – to test the strength and direction of relationships between FinTech-related perceptions and the outcome variables.

Every hypothesis was tested against a 5 percent significance threshold ($p < 0.05$). Table 1 below pulls the full research design together in one place.

Table 1: Summary of Research Methodology

Research Design Parameter	Details
Research Design	Quantitative; descriptive and analytical
Type of Data	Primary (structured questionnaire) and Secondary (journals, reports, books)
Population	Young adults using digital financial services
Sampling Technique	Convenience sampling (non-probability)
Sample Size	104 valid responses
Measurement Scale	Five-point Likert Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree)
Software	IBM SPSS Statistics
Statistical Tools	Percentage Analysis, Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha), Pearson Correlation Analysis
Level of Significance	5% ($p < 0.05$)

Source: Primary Data

Data Analysis and Interpretation

This section walks through what the SPSS analysis of the 104 collected responses actually showed, covering the respondent demographic profile, descriptive statistics, scale reliability, and the Pearson correlation results.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 2 breaks down the sample by gender. Female respondents made up the larger share of the 104 total, pointing to relatively stronger engagement from young women in this particular sample of digital-finance users.

Table 2: Gender Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent (%)	Cumulative %
Female	66	63.46	63.46
Male	38	36.54	100.00
Total	104	100.00	—

Source: Primary Data

Specifically, 66 respondents (63.46%) identified as female against 38 (36.54%) male, skewing the sample noticeably toward women. This imbalance is worth keeping in mind when reading too much generalisability into the results, and a more evenly split sample would strengthen future iterations of this research.

Descriptive Statistics

Mean scores and standard deviations were worked out for each of the five items capturing how respondents view FinTech's role across financial inclusion, saving and investment, responsible financial behaviour, and socio-economic development. Table 3 lays these out.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Study Items (N = 104)

Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	Median	Range
Item 1 (Financial Inclusion)	2.51	1.03	2	1–5
Item 2 (Saving & Investment)	2.46	0.99	2	1–5
Item 3 (Responsible Behaviour)	2.63	1.05	3	1–5
Item 4 (Social Development)	2.56	0.97	3	1–5
Item 5 (Motivation/Continuance)	2.55	0.97	3	1–5

Source: Computed Data

Mean values across the five items fall in a fairly tight band, between 2.46 and 2.63 on the five-point scale, with standard deviations sitting between 0.97 and 1.05. These numbers land just under the scale's neutral midpoint of 3, which tells us respondents weren't strongly endorsing the idea that FinTech drives inclusion, savings, responsible behaviour, or development — agreement was present, but muted rather than emphatic. The highest mean belonged to Item 3 (Responsible Behaviour, Mean = 2.63), hinting that respondents felt

FinTech platforms do somewhat encourage budgeting and disciplined spending, whereas Item 2 (Saving & Investment, Mean = 2.46) came in lowest of the five.

7.2.1 Frequency Distribution of Item Responses

Breaking each item down by response category sharpens the picture considerably.

Item 1 — Financial Inclusion: 15 Strongly Agree (14.4%), 39 Agree (37.5%), 41 Neutral (39.4%), 9 Strongly Disagree (8.7%).

Item 2 — Saving & Investment: 17 Strongly Agree (16.3%), 36 Agree (34.6%), 44 Neutral (42.3%), 7 Strongly Disagree (6.7%).

Item 3 — Responsible Behaviour: 12 Strongly Agree (11.5%), 36 Agree (34.6%), 45 Neutral (43.3%), 11 Strongly Disagree (10.6%).

Item 4 — Social Development: 12 Strongly Agree (11.5%), 38 Agree (36.5%), 46 Neutral (44.2%), 8 Strongly Disagree (7.7%).

Item 5 — Motivation/Continuance: 12 Strongly Agree (11.5%), 39 Agree (37.5%), 45 Neutral (43.3%), 8 Strongly Disagree (7.7%).

A clear pattern runs through all five items: 'Neutral' is consistently the most common response (between 39.4% and 44.2%), with 'Agree' close behind (34.6% to 37.5%). Very few respondents picked 'Strongly Disagree' (6.7% to 10.6%), and most answers cluster somewhere between Neutral and Agree. Read together, this points to a cautiously positive picture: many young FinTech users do see real value in terms of inclusion, savings discipline, and responsible money habits, but a sizeable chunk are still on the fence — which could reflect patchy awareness, irregular usage patterns, or simply a still-forming relationship with these digital tools.

Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha)

Before drawing conclusions from the correlation results, it's worth checking whether the five-item scale actually measures something coherent. Cronbach's Alpha was run for exactly this purpose, with results shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistic	Value
Cronbach's Alpha	0.816
Number of Items	5
Sample Size (N)	104

Source: Computed Data

At 0.816, the Alpha value comfortably clears the conventional 0.70 benchmark (Nunnally, 1978), which is a strong signal of internal consistency across the five items. In practical terms, this means the scale is doing a reliable job of capturing perceptions tied to FinTech's role in inclusion, responsible behaviour, and development, and it gives the correlation analysis that follows a solid foundation to stand on.

Table 5's item-total statistics back this up further: corrected item-total correlations sit between 0.548 and 0.650 for every item, comfortably above the usual 0.30 cutoff, and removing any single item wouldn't meaningfully push the Alpha higher than it already is.

Table 5: Item-Total Statistics

Item	Scale Mean if Deleted	Scale Var. if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Corr.	Alpha if Item Deleted
Item 1 (Financial Inclusion)	10.20	9.79	0.574	0.790
Item 2 (Saving & Investment)	10.25	9.59	0.650	0.767
Item 3 (Responsible Behaviour)	10.08	9.39	0.632	0.772
Item 4 (Social Development)	10.15	9.80	0.628	0.774
Item 5 (Motivation/Continuance)	10.16	10.22	0.548	0.797

Source: Computed Data

Pearson Correlation Analysis

Next, Pearson correlation was used to test how strongly — and in what direction — the five items relate to one another, covering financial inclusion, saving and investment, responsible financial behaviour, and socio-economic development. Table 6 presents the full matrix.

Table 6: Pearson Correlation Matrix (N = 104)

Item	Item 1 (FI)	Item 2 (SD)	Item 3 (RB)	Item 4 (SOC)	Item 5 (MOT)
Item 1	1	.477**	.387**	.491**	.448**
Item 2	.477**	1	.524**	.368**	.624**
Item 3	.387**	.524**	1	.519**	.523**
Item 4	.491**	.368**	.519**	1	.340**
Item 5	.448**	.624**	.523**	.340**	1

Source: Computed Data

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Every single pairing in the matrix comes back positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$) — a result that lends solid support to Hypotheses H11, H12, and H13. A closer look at individual pairings reveals some interesting patterns:

- Item 1 (Financial Inclusion) correlates positively with everything else in the set, most strongly with Item 4 (Social Development, $r = .491$, $p < .01$) — a sign that respondents who see FinTech as inclusion-enabling also tend to view it as contributing to broader development.
- Item 2 (Saving & Investment) pairs most strongly with Item 5 (Motivation/Continuance, $r = .624$, $p < .01$), suggesting that people who feel FinTech genuinely helps them save and invest are also the ones most inclined to keep using it for its perceived societal value.

- Item 3 (Responsible Behaviour) shows strong ties to both Item 2 ($r = .524$, $p < .01$) and Item 5 ($r = .523$, $p < .01$) — a plausible link, given that budgeting discipline naturally feeds into both savings outcomes and continued platform engagement.
- Item 4 (Social Development) and Item 5 (Motivation/Continuance) show the weakest, though still significant, relationship in the matrix ($r = .340$, $p < .01$), indicating that perceived societal benefit and ongoing usage motivation are connected, but less tightly than other pairings.

Put simply: across the board, the correlations point the same direction — positive and statistically meaningful — supporting the case that FinTech's role connects in real ways to responsible financial behaviour, financial inclusion, and socio-economic development among this sample of young adults. This gives grounds for rejecting the null hypotheses (H01, H02, H03) in favour of the alternative ones.

Discussion of Findings

Considered together, these results support the broader view that FinTech is not a single-purpose tool — it touches several aspects of how young adults handle money at once. The strong Alpha score (0.816) confirms the underlying measurement is sound, which lends additional weight to the correlational findings discussed below.

The descriptive numbers, however, tell a more measured story than might be expected. Mean scores falling just below the scale midpoint, combined with a heavy concentration of 'Neutral' responses across every item, indicate that young adults are not rejecting FinTech's contribution to inclusion, savings, responsible habits, or development — but neither are they endorsing it wholeheartedly. This tentativeness aligns with earlier work identifying digital literacy and trust as preconditions for FinTech to deliver on its promise (Inclusive FinTech, 2025; Discover Sustainability, 2025). Access to a FinTech platform, in other words, does not by itself persuade users of its broader social value.

It is the correlation results that carry the most direct evidentiary weight for the study's hypotheses. Every item pair was positively and significantly correlated ($p < 0.01$), indicating that the four dimensions measured here — inclusion, saving/investing, responsible behaviour, and perceived development impact — move together rather than independently. This finding speaks directly to the gap identified earlier, where financial inclusion and socio-economic development have typically been treated as separate research streams (Duvendack & Mader, 2020). That these dimensions rise and fall together offers early empirical support for treating them as one unified picture rather than three disconnected ones.

A particularly notable finding is the strength of the relationship between savings/investment perceptions and ongoing motivation to use FinTech ($r = .624$). This implies that the perception of genuinely being helped to save and invest is itself what sustains continued use — a point worth noting for anyone designing FinTech products or retention strategies.

The relationship between responsible financial behaviour and both savings outcomes and continued engagement similarly reinforces a point raised in earlier reviews: the behavioural side of FinTech adoption remains under-researched relative to its access side (Kishor et al., 2025; Emerging Markets Review, 2024).

Pulling it all together, the evidence supports rejecting the null hypotheses (H01, H02, H03) and lends credibility to the alternative hypotheses (H11, H12, H13) — FinTech does appear to be meaningfully tied to responsible financial behaviour, financial inclusion, and perceived socio-economic development among this group of young adults. One caveat worth flagging clearly: these are correlational findings, not causal ones. Multiple regression analysis wasn't part of this phase of the study, so what's being reported here is association, not predictive influence.

Limitations of the Study

A few constraints are worth flagging before drawing too much from these results:

- Convenience sampling, while practical, narrows how far these findings can be generalised beyond the specific group surveyed.
- A sample of 104, though workable for the statistical tests used here, can't capture the full diversity of young digital-finance users across India.
- Women made up nearly two-thirds of respondents (63.46% vs. 36.54% male), an imbalance that could shape how representative the results are.
- Since all data came from self-reported Likert responses, the usual concerns around social desirability bias and subjective interpretation apply.
- A cross-sectional snapshot like this one can't speak to causation or track how FinTech's impact might shift over time.
- This phase of the research stopped at descriptive statistics, reliability checks, and correlation — multiple regression wasn't run, so what's reported here reflects association between variables, not predictive or causal influence.
- Focusing exclusively on young adults means these findings may not transfer cleanly to other groups, such as older adults or rural populations with different digital literacy levels.

Conclusion

FinTech has become a genuine driver of social and economic change, a pattern especially visible in fast-developing economies such as India. By making financial services more affordable, accessible, and user-friendly, FinTech does more than widen who can reach formal finance — it also has the potential to influence how people manage money and, through that, to contribute to wider economic progress.

This study aimed to connect three threads that prior research has largely kept separate: FinTech's role in encouraging responsible financial habits, expanding inclusion, and supporting socio-economic development among young adults. Based on responses from 104 active digital-finance users and analysed using IBM SPSS, the results pointed to a reliably consistent measurement scale (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.816) and statistically significant positive correlations ($p < 0.01$) across every item tied to inclusion, savings and investment, responsible behaviour, and perceived development outcomes.

On this basis, the null hypotheses are rejected in favour of the alternative ones — FinTech appears to be significantly and positively linked to responsible financial behaviour, inclusion, and socio-economic development among the young adults surveyed.

At the same time, the moderate mean scores and the substantial share of neutral responses indicate that this relationship is not yet uniformly strong across the board. There is clear room for stronger digital financial literacy programs and for FinTech products designed more deliberately to make their benefits visible and tangible to users, rather than relying on access alone to do that work.

Several directions could extend this work. Incorporating multiple regression analysis would help identify which factors actually predict each outcome individually, rather than simply co-varying with it. A longitudinal design would allow these relationships to be tracked as they evolve. Moving beyond convenience sampling toward a more diverse, geographically distributed sample would strengthen generalisability, and combining the quantitative results with qualitative interviews could help explain the behavioural and cultural mechanisms underlying these patterns.

References

1. A systematic literature review of fintech, financial inclusion and vulnerable groups. (2025). Discover Sustainability.
2. Duvendack, M., & Mader, P. (2020). Impact of financial inclusion in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review of reviews. Journal of Economic Surveys, 34(3), 594–629.
3. Dheenadhayalan, V. (2010). Automation of banking sector in India. *Yojana, 54*, 32–35.
4. Dheenadhayalan, V., & Vijai, C. (2024, March 7). *FinTech*. Vijay Nicole Imprints Private Limited (ISBN: 9788119243426)
5. Dheenadhayalan, V. (2015). A study on the awareness of financial inclusion among rural people in Cuddalore district. *International Journal of Management Research and Social Science, 2*(3), 15–21.
6. Financial inclusion and the financial and economic development: Review of the literature, evidence gaps and the road ahead. (2023). Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal.
7. Fintech innovation: Is it beneficial or detrimental to financial inclusion and financial stability? A systematic literature review and research directions. (2024). Emerging Markets Review.
8. Fintech services and financial inclusion: A systematic literature review of developing nations. (2024). Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management.
9. Ha, D., Le, P., & Nguyen, D. K. (2025). Financial inclusion and fintech: A state-of-the-art systematic literature review. Financial Innovation, 11, Article 69.
10. Inclusive fintech: A systematic review and agenda for future research. (2025). Cogent Economics & Finance.
11. Kishor, K., Bansal, S. K., & Kumar, R. (2025). The role of FinTech in promoting financial inclusion to achieve sustainable development: An integrated bibliometric analysis and systematic literature review. Journal of the Knowledge Economy.
12. Mamun, A. Y., & Várallyai, L. (2025). Advancing sustainability through financial inclusion and sustainable finance: A systematic literature review. Digital Finance.
13. Mishra, D., Kandpal, V., Agarwal, N., & Srivastava, B. (2024). Financial inclusion and its ripple effects on socio-economic development: A comprehensive review. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 17(3), 105.
14. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.