European Economic Letters
ISSN 2323-5233
Vol 15, Issue 2 (2025)
http://eelet.org.uk

The Evolution of Fintech: Disrupting Traditional Financial Services

Dr. Diksha Tripathi
Assistant Professor

Abstract
Traditional financial services have undergone tremendous change as a result of the explosive expansion of the financial technology (FinTech) industry. Examining the way in which technology is changing banking, payment, lending, and making an investment offerings, this research paper examines the improvement of FinTech and its disruptive effects on traditional monetary establishments. FinTech groups are hard the dominance of conventional economic structures through addressing client desires for speed, accessibility, and comfort by using using techniques like blockchain, artificial intelligence, and apps. 220 respondents provided data that was analyzed to compare consumer preferences, trust levels, accessibility, and overall user satisfaction with FinTech services to conventional financial institutions. The results show patterns that highlight the potential and constraints in both industries, providing important insights into consumer behavior. The research clarifies the potential benefits of FinTech for improving user experience and financial inclusion, as well as the continuous difficulties with regard to security, legislation, and market competitiveness. This research emphasizes the necessity for traditional financial institutions to innovate and adapt to stay relevant in a financial environment that is changing quickly due to FinTech's ongoing expansion.

Keywords
FinTech, Traditional Financial Services, Financial Technology, Digital Banking, Blockchain, Artificial Intelligence, Mobile Payments, Financial Inclusion, Customer Experience.

1. Introduction

Through revolutionary solutions that have democratized access to financing, improved operational efficiency, and promoted financial inclusion, financial technology, or Fintech, has drastically changed the traditional financial services sector. Digital payment structures, robo-advisors, peer-to-peer lending, blockchain, and different fintech technology have upended traditional banking methods and spawned new enterprise models (Jiang et al., 2021). The emergence of fintech is generally due to tendencies in mobile, artificial intelligence (AI), and records analytics, which have given groups and clients get right of entry to to extra individualized and easily to be had financial services (Ibrahim, 2024).

One of the most notable ways Fintech has made it possible for more inclusive financial ecosystems is via the development of digital wallets and mobile banking. The unbanked and underbanked, as an instance, who were previously close out of conventional economic structures, now have get right of entry to banking offerings way to cellular charge systems like Paytm and M-Pesa (Anton et al., 2024). The regulatory environment remains a chief obstacle to Fintech's growth. To establish a fair framework that promotes innovation while preserving the public interest, policymakers and financial institutions must negotiate complicated problems pertaining to data privacy, cybersecurity, and consumer protection (Drasch et al., 2018).

In the field of wealth management, where robo-advisors are opening up investing ideas to a wider audience, Fintech has the potential to completely transform financial services. But the emergence of automated advisory services also calls into question the importance of human monitoring and the precision of algorithm-driven financial advice (Bhattacharjee et al., 2024). As Fintech becomes increasingly integrated into the financial sector, there are worries about algorithmic biases and regulatory issues despite the many opportunities (Asif et al., 2023).

In order to create a more egalitarian, effective, and accessible financial system, the Fintech sector is also upending the traditional financial services sector. It presents both opportunities and difficulties, especially with regard to regulation and striking a balance between consumer protection and innovation.

2. Review of Literature

The literature review on how fintech is upending the traditional financial services industry highlights a number of noteworthy changes in the sector. Ioannou et. al. (2024) noted that traditional banking institutions now face significant problems as a result of the emergence of fintech. Consumer behavior has changed as a result of fintech companies' ability to provide more effective, frictionless, and customer-focused services because to the development of technology like blockchain and artificial intelligence (AI). The speed and inventiveness of fintech startups have outpaced traditional banks' reliance on legacy systems, forcing them to engage in digital transformation or risk obsolescence (Ioannou et. al., 2024).

In support of this argument, Han & Melecky (2013) highlighted how traditional financial institutions have been compelled to reconsider their operating strategies due to the competitive pressure from fintech. According to their research, when traditional banks attempt to incorporate digital solutions, they encounter both competition and rising operating expenses. According to Han & Melecky (2013), they came up with a plan for banks to work with fintech companies in order to innovate in the market while preserving financial stability. The requirement for technology improvements to maintain consumer loyalty and market relevance is addressed by this partnership.

Ali et al. (2024) determined that fintech offerings including virtual payments, robo-advisors, and mobile banking applications have been significantly embraced from the perspective of the purchaser. Because those advances have made financial services more accessible, handy, and tailored, they have got completely changed how consumers have interaction with them. However, the authors also noted that as fintech companies collect vast quantities of sensitive financial data, consumers' concerns over privacy and data security are growing (Ali et al., 2024). According to these worries, the fintech industry has to concentrate on fostering trust by implementing stronger data security measures.

Anute, Ingale (2019) states that educated elderly persons have a high level of awareness of e-banking services, with urban residents having a little greater level than rural residents. Debit cards have the highest levels of knowledge, use, simplicity of use, and satisfaction among all e-banking services. While urban residents are more aware of, use, and find e-banking services easier to use, rural residents are more satisfied with these services than urban residents. Credit cards, online banking, and mobile applications are not widely used. Seniors with education in both urban and rural areas struggle to utilize online banking and mobile applications.

Regarding regulations, Zetzsche et. al. (2017) looked at how difficult it is for legislators to control fintech while encouraging innovation. According to their results, fintech presents additional dangers including cybersecurity threats and systemic weaknesses in addition to opportunities for financial inclusion and economic development. Maintaining the delicate balance among selling innovation and making certain financial stability is the duty of policymakers. For the fintech sector to thrive while safeguarding consumers and the economy, this equilibrium is essential (Zetzsche et. al., 2017).

All things considered, the literature shows how fintech has a significant influence on regulators, consumers, and traditional financial institutions. By encouraging traditional banks to undergo digital transformation, improving customer access, and making it difficult for regulators to keep up with the quick advances in financial technology, it has completely transformed the financial services industry.

3. Research Methodology

The current study examines the development of fintech and its impact on traditional financial services, hence a cross-sectional survey research design was determined to be acceptable. Financial service experts, fintech specialists, and consumers who have actively used both traditional and fintech services were included in the sample size of 220 respondents. In order to get a huge variety of viewpoints on the shifting dynamics inside the financial zone, those respondents were decided on from sectors such as banking, investment management, and monetary technology businesses.

Stratified random sampling was used to guarantee representative and varied data gathering. Geographical areas (e.g., North America, Europe, Asia-Pacific) and industry affiliation (e.g., banking, fintech, investment companies) were used to stratify the population. After that, respondents were chosen at random from each stratum to guarantee that each group was represented proportionately. The aim of this method become to collect numerous views and studies on fintech offerings and how they're upending conventional monetary establishments.

Online questionnaires were used for statistics series, permitting effective records collection from a geographically allotted pattern. The survey consisted of eighteen closed-ended questions that asked about respondents' experiences with fintech innovations, how they felt about the impact they had on traditional financial services, and how they thought fintech will evolve in the future. In order to contextualize the replies and facilitate insightful subgroup evaluation, four demographic questions addressing age, gender, industry, and geographic region had been also included.

The study's main objective was to investigate how fintech innovations are changing the competitive environment and upending traditional financial services. Evaluating traditional financial institutions' projected opportunities and problems in reaction to the fintech industry's explosive growth was a secondary objective.

The study's hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 1:

H0: "There is no significant relationship between the adoption of fintech services and the disruption of traditional financial services."

H1: "There is a significant relationship between the adoption of fintech services and the disruption of traditional financial services."

Hypothesis 2:

H0: "There is no significant difference in consumer perceptions of fintech services across different geographic regions."

H1: "There is a significant difference in consumer perceptions of fintech services across different geographic regions."

4. Empirical Results

Table 1: Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
18–25	46	20.91%	20.91%	20.91%
26–35	82	37.27%	37.27%	58.18%
36–45	55	25.00%	25.00%	83.18%

46–55	25	11.36%	11.36%	94.55%
56 and above	12	5.45%	5.45%	100.00%
Total	220	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents fall in the 26–35 age group, accounting for 37.27% of the sample. This suggests that fintech services are more popular among younger professionals and middle-aged users, while older age groups (46 and above) are less represented, indicating lower fintech adoption in these groups.

Table 2: Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Male	112	50.91%	50.91%	50.91%
Female	106	48.18%	48.18%	99.09%
Other	2	0.91%	0.91%	100.00%
Total	220	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation:
Males constitute 50.91% which is almost half of the sample, while females make up 48.18%. A small proportion of respondents identified as "Other" (0.91%). This gender distribution shows relatively balanced fintech usage across male and female users, though slightly more males engage with fintech services.

Table 3: Educational Qualification

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Upto 12th	18	8.18%	8.18%	8.18%
Bachelor’s Degree	96	43.64%	43.64%	51.82%
Master’s Degree	76	34.55%	34.55%	86.36%
PhD	18	8.18%	8.18%	94.55%
Other	12	5.45%	5.45%	100.00%
Total	220	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation:
Most respondents hold a Bachelor’s Degree (43.64%), followed by Master’s Degree holders (34.55%). This indicates that fintech services appeal to well-educated individuals, with a smaller percentage (8.18%) having qualifications up to 12th grade.

Table 4: Employment Status

Employment Status	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Employed	128	58.18%	58.18%	58.18%
Self-employed	40	18.18%	18.18%	76.36%
Student	28	12.73%	12.73%	89.09%
Unemployed	12	5.45%	5.45%	94.55%
Retired	12	5.45%	5.45%	100.00%
Total	220	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents are employed (58.18%), indicating that working professionals form a significant part of the fintech user base. Students (12.73%) and the self-employed (18.18%) also represent notable portions of the sample, suggesting fintech’s versatility across employment categories.

Table 5: How frequently do you use FinTech services?

Frequency of Use	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Daily	76	34.55%	34.55%	34.55%
Weekly	55	25.00%	25.00%	59.55%
Monthly	46	20.91%	20.91%	80.45%
Rarely	28	12.73%	12.73%	93.18%
Never	15	6.82%	6.82%	100.00%

Total	220	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation:
Over one-third of respondents (34.55%) use fintech services daily, and 25% use them weekly, highlighting frequent usage among fintech users. A small portion (6.82%) never use fintech services, indicating a need to explore barriers to adoption for this group.

Table 6: Which of the following FinTech services do you use the most?

Service Type	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Mobile payments	82	37.27%	37.27%	37.27%
Digital banking	65	29.55%	29.55%	66.82%
Online lending	28	12.73%	12.73%	79.55%
Investment platforms	30	13.64%	13.64%	93.18%
Cryptocurrency trading	15	6.82%	6.82%	100.00%
Total	220	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation:
Mobile payments are the most commonly used fintech service (37.27%), followed by digital banking (29.55%). These findings suggest a strong preference for convenience and accessibility in financial transactions, while cryptocurrency trading remains a niche service with only 6.82% using it.

Table 7: How satisfied are you with the accessibility of FinTech services compared to traditional financial services?

Satisfaction Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very satisfied	64	29.09%	29.09%	29.09%
Satisfied	85	38.64%	38.64%	67.73%
Neutral	40	18.18%	18.18%	85.91%
Dissatisfied	20	9.09%	9.09%	95.00%
Very dissatisfied	11	5.00%	5.00%	100.00%
Total	220	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents (38.64%) are satisfied with the accessibility of fintech services, and 29.09% are very satisfied, highlighting overall positive reception towards fintech's accessibility. However, a small proportion (5%) remains very dissatisfied, suggesting room for improvement in user experience or service reach.

Table 8: How would you rate the security of FinTech services?

Security Rating	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very secure	52	23.64%	23.64%	23.64%
Secure	76	34.55%	34.55%	58.18%
Neutral	46	20.91%	20.91%	79.09%
Insecure	28	12.73%	12.73%	91.82%
Very insecure	18	8.18%	8.18%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents (34.55%) rated FinTech services as "Secure," showing that users generally feel confident in their security features. However, 20.91% remain neutral, while a combined 20.91% rate it as either "Insecure" or "Very insecure," indicating some concerns regarding security.

Table 9: To what extent do you trust FinTech companies with your financial data?

Trust Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative

				Percentage
Completely trust	40	18.18%	18.18%	18.18%
Mostly trust	82	37.27%	37.27%	55.45%
Somewhat trust	64	29.09%	29.09%	84.55%
Do not trust	22	10.00%	10.00%	94.55%
Completely distrust	12	5.45%	5.45%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
A significant portion of respondents (37.27%) mostly trust FinTech companies with their financial data. However, 29.09% "Somewhat trust," and 15.45% of the sample is either distrustful or completely distrustful, showing that although there is generally high trust, there is still a portion of users with reservations.

Table 10: How likely are you to recommend FinTech services to others over traditional financial services?

Likelihood to Recommend	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very likely	72	32.73%	32.73%	32.73%
Likely	74	33.64%	33.64%	66.36%
Neutral	42	19.09%	19.09%	85.45%
Unlikely	18	8.18%	8.18%	93.64%
Very unlikely	14	6.36%	6.36%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
Over two-thirds of respondents (66.36%) are either "Very likely" or "Likely" to recommend FinTech services over traditional financial services. This indicates strong customer advocacy, though a notable 19.09% remain neutral.

Table 11: Have you ever faced technical issues while using FinTech platforms?

Frequency of Issues	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Never	46	20.91%	20.91%	20.91%
Rarely	66	30.00%	30.00%	50.91%
Occasionally	58	26.36%	26.36%	77.27%
Frequently	34	15.45%	15.45%	92.73%
Always	16	7.27%	7.27%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
While 30.00% of respondents have "Rarely" faced technical issues, a notable 26.36% have experienced them "Occasionally." About 22.72% of respondents reported frequent or consistent issues, which highlights an area of concern for improving platform stability.

Table 12: How do you perceive the cost of using FinTech services compared to traditional financial services?

Cost Perception	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Much cheaper	54	24.55%	24.55%	24.55%
Cheaper	78	35.45%	35.45%	60.00%
About the same	54	24.55%	24.55%	84.55%
More expensive	24	10.91%	10.91%	95.45%
Much more expensive	10	4.55%	4.55%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents perceive FinTech services as either "Cheaper" (35.45%) or "Much cheaper" (24.55%) than traditional financial services. However, 10.91% view them as "More expensive," suggesting mixed perceptions regarding the cost-effectiveness of these services.

Table 13: Which aspect of FinTech do you find most appealing?

Aspect	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative

				Percentage
Convenience	82	37.27%	37.27%	37.27%
Lower fees	38	17.27%	17.27%	54.55%
Speed of transactions	46	20.91%	20.91%	75.45%
User interface	28	12.73%	12.73%	88.18%
Security	26	11.82%	11.82%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
Convenience is the most appealing aspect of FinTech for the majority of respondents (37.27%), followed by the speed of transactions (20.91%). This highlights the emphasis on user experience in driving fintech adoption, although security is a lesser priority (11.82%).

Table 14: How well do FinTech platforms integrate with traditional banks in your experience?

Integration Rating	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very well	60	27.27%	27.27%	27.27%
Well	78	35.45%	35.45%	62.73%
Neutral	50	22.73%	22.73%	85.45%
Poorly	22	10.00%	10.00%	95.45%
Very poorly	10	4.55%	4.55%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
Most respondents (62.72%) find that FinTech platforms integrate "Very well" or "Well" with traditional banks. However, 14.55% report "Poor" or "Very poor" integration, indicating that further improvements could be made in collaboration between FinTech and traditional financial institutions.

Table 15: Do you think FinTech will replace traditional banks in the near future?

Opinion	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Definitely yes	44	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Probably yes	60	27.27%	27.27%	47.27%
Neutral	50	22.73%	22.73%	70.00%
Probably no	46	20.91%	20.91%	90.91%
Definitely no	20	9.09%	9.09%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
A significant portion of respondents (27.27%) believe that FinTech will "Probably" replace traditional banks, with 20% strongly affirming this belief. However, 20.91% think it will "Probably not" happen, reflecting uncertainty about the complete replacement of traditional banking models in the near future.

Table 16: How important is customer support when choosing a FinTech platform?

Importance Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Extremely important	86	39.09%	39.09%	39.09%
Important	74	33.64%	33.64%	72.73%
Neutral	32	14.55%	14.55%	87.27%
Not important	18	8.18%	8.18%	95.45%
Not important at all	10	4.55%	4.55%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:

Customer support is a crucial factor in choosing a FinTech platform, with 39.09% of respondents considering it "Extremely important" and 33.64% finding it "Important." Only a small proportion of the sample (12.73%) finds customer support irrelevant, indicating its overall significance.

Table 17: What is your primary reason for using FinTech over traditional financial services?

Primary Reason	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Better accessibility	64	29.09%	29.09%	29.09%
Faster services	70	31.82%	31.82%	60.91%
Lower costs	46	20.91%	20.91%	81.82%
Innovation/new features	32	14.55%	14.55%	96.36%
I do not use FinTech	8	3.64%	3.64%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The most common reasons for preferring FinTech services are "Faster services" (31.82%) and "Better accessibility" (29.09%), reflecting the efficiency and ease of access provided by FinTech platforms. Only 3.64% of respondents do not use FinTech services, indicating widespread adoption.

Table 18: How has your experience with FinTech affected your view of traditional financial services?

Impact on View	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Improved view	44	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
No change	62	28.18%	28.18%	48.18%
Slightly negative view	60	27.27%	27.27%	75.45%
Strongly negative view	36	16.36%	16.36%	91.82%
Completely switched	18	8.18%	8.18%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
Although 28.18% of respondents reported no change in their view of traditional services, a substantial portion (43.63%) has a negative outlook ("Slightly" or "Strongly negative"). A small but notable group (8.18%) has completely switched to FinTech services, reflecting a shift in consumer preference.

Table 19: Do you feel FinTech services offer better financial inclusivity compared to traditional financial services?

Opinion	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly agree	66	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
Agree	76	34.55%	34.55%	64.55%
Neutral	42	19.09%	19.09%	83.64%
Disagree	24	10.91%	10.91%	94.55%
Strongly disagree	12	5.45%	5.45%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
The majority of respondents (64.55%) believe that FinTech services offer better financial inclusivity, with 30% "Strongly agreeing" and 34.55% "Agreeing." However, 16.36% disagree, reflecting that while FinTech is seen as inclusive, some users remain unconvinced.

Table 20: How concerned are you about regulatory oversight in the FinTech sector?

Concern Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very concerned	56	25.45%	25.45%	25.45%

Concerned	72	32.73%	32.73%	58.18%
Neutral	58	26.36%	26.36%	84.55%
Not concerned	24	10.91%	10.91%	95.45%
Not at all concerned	10	4.55%	4.55%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
Regulatory concerns are prevalent among respondents, with 32.73% "Concerned" and 25.45% "Very concerned" about oversight in the FinTech sector. A significant portion remains neutral (26.36%), but only 15.46% show little or no concern.

Table 21: In your opinion, which area of traditional financial services has been most disrupted by FinTech?

Area Disrupted	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Banking	62	28.18%	28.18%	28.18%
Payments	68	30.91%	30.91%	59.09%
Lending	46	20.91%	20.91%	80.00%
Investment	30	13.64%	13.64%	93.64%
Insurance	14	6.36%	6.36%	100.00%
Total	220	100%	100%	

Interpretation:
Payments (30.91%) and banking (28.18%) have been the most disrupted areas by FinTech, highlighting these sectors as prime targets for FinTech innovation. Lending also shows significant disruption, while insurance appears to be the least affected area.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

H_0: “There is no significant relationship between the adoption of fintech services and the disruption of traditional financial services”.

H_1: “There is a significant relationship between the adoption of fintech services and the disruption of traditional financial services”.

Table 22: Chi-Square Test Results for the Relationship Between Adoption of Fintech Services and Disruption of Traditional Financial Services

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	25.342	3
Likelihood Ratio	26.523	3
N of Valid Cases	220	

Interpretation:
The findings of the Chi-Square Test for Independence, which was used to investigate the relationship between the adoption of fintech services and the disruption of traditional financial services, are shown in Table 22. With three degrees of freedom, the Pearson Chi-Square value is 25.342, and the Asymptotic Significance (Asymp. Sig.) is 0.000, below the conventional significance limit of 0.05. This indicates a especially extensive relationship between the adoption of conventional economic services and the disruption because of fintech.

As a result, the alternative hypothesis (H1) is supported and the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected, indicating a significant relationship between the disruption of traditional financial services and the adoption of fintech services.

Hypothesis 2

H_0: “There is no significant difference in consumer perceptions of fintech services across different geographic regions”.

H_2: “There is a significant difference in consumer perceptions of fintech services across different geographic regions”.

Table 23: Chi-Square Test Results for Differences in Consumer Perceptions of Fintech Services Across Geographic Regions

Value	Df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	19.287	4
Likelihood Ratio	20.031	4
N of Valid Cases	220	

Interpretation:
The findings of the Chi-Square Test for Independence, which was used to investigate consumer perceptions of fintech services in various geographical areas, are shown in Table 24. With four degrees of freedom, the Pearson Chi-Square value is 19.287, and the Asymptotic Significance (Asymp. Sig.) is 0.002, below the conventional significance limit of 0.05. This suggests that there are significant regional variations in consumer perceptions of fintech services.
As a result, the alternative hypothesis (H1) is supported and the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected, indicating that there is a significant regional variation in consumer perceptions of fintech services.

5. Conclusion

Based on current research, traditional financial services are being dramatically disrupted by the adoption of fintech services. Fintech has changed how financial services are accessed and provided by revolutionizing consumer behavior via innovation, speed, and convenience. According to the study's results, fintech services are changing the monetary panorama by using offering easier-to-use and more convenient options to traditional banking as clients turn out to be more depending on virtual structures.
The research offers critical new statistics at the increasing effect of fintech on traditional financial services and the way geographic place affects purchaser perceptions of these offerings. One of the main conclusions is that significant fintech adoption is drastically changing the traditional banking paradigm by providing consumers with increased speed, convenience, and accessibility. This is in keeping with the global trend of monetary services turning into greater digital, as extra purchasers are deciding on virtual bills, monetary structures, and funding services. The study demonstrates the high levels of satisfaction with fintech services relative to their traditional equivalents, demonstrating the disruption of conventional financial services. According to the findings, this change is being driven by fintech's user-friendly platforms and speedy transactions.
The research also reveals a significant difference in consumer perceptions of fintech services across various geographical areas. According to the data, regional access, legal frameworks, and technical infrastructure all affect perceptions of fintech adoption, which is expanding quickly. Both the consumer experience and the degree of confidence in fintech services vary depending on the area.
The study's sample size, which was restricted to 220 respondents, is one of its main limitations. A bigger sample size may have given a more thorough picture of fintech adoption and its impact on traditional financial services, even if the data still supplied insightful information. The study also only looked at a limited geographic area, which restricts the results' applicability to larger global situations.
By using bigger, more varied sample sizes from many nations, future research should examine the long-term impact of fintech on financial institutions and consumer behavior. Insights into the future course of financial technology might be gained by broadening the emphasis to encompass new developments like decentralized finance (DeFi) and the use of artificial intelligence in fintech services. Furthermore, further research into cybersecurity issues and regulatory obstacles may help create a safer and more welcoming fintech industry.

References

6. **Ali, M. A.,** Khan, M. A., Nabi, M. K., & Alakkas, A. A. (2024). CONSUMER ADOPTION OF MOBILE PAYMENT IN THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA AN EMPIRICAL STUDY. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development, 12(2)*, e2452. https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v12i2.2452
7. **Anute, N.,** & Ingale, D. (2019). An approach of urban and rural educated senior citizens towards e banking services. *Journal of Management Research and Analysis*, Page no- 42–44.
8. **Anton, S.,** & Afloarei Nucu, A. E. (2024). The impact of digital finance and financial inclusion on banking stability: International evidence. *Oeconomia Copernicana, 15(2)*, 563–593. https://doi.org/10.24136/oc.3046
9. **Asif, M.,** Khan, M. N., Tiwari, S., Wani, S. K., & Alam, F. (2023). The Impact of Fintech and Digital Financial Services on Financial Inclusion in India. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 16(2)*, 122. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm16020122
10. **Bhattacharjee, I.,** Srivastava, N., Mishra, A., Adhav, S., & Singh, N. (2024). The rise of fintech: Disrupting traditional financial services. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30(4)*, 89–97. https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i4.1408
11. **Drasch, B. J.,** Schweizer, A., Urbach, N., & Muhlreiter, B. (2018). Integrating the 'troublemakers': A taxonomy for cooperation between banks and fintechs. *Journal of Economics and Business, 100*, 26–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconbus.2018.04.002
12. **Han, R.,** & Melecky, M. (2013). Financial inclusion for financial stability: Access to bank deposits and the growth of deposits in the global financial crisis. *World Bank. Policy Research Working Paper*, 6577.
13. **Ibrahim, A. Zeidy.** (2024). The Role of Financial Technology (FINTECH) in Changing Financial Industry and Increasing Efficiency in the Economy. *Online available at:* https://www.comesa.int/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/The-Role-of-Financial-Technology.pdf
14. **Ioannou, S.,** Wójcik, D., & Urban, M. (2024). FinTech and financial instability. Is this time different? *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics, 47(3)*, 542–565. https://doi.org/10.1080/01603477.2024.2315055

15. **Jiang, W.,** Tang, H., Xiao, K., & Yao, L. (2021). Surviving the Fintech Disruption. *NBER Working Papers 28668*, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
16. **Narayan, R.** (2019). FinTech: The role of technology in financial services. *Journal of Banking & Finance, 112*, 105–114.
17. **Zetzsche, D. A.,** Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Barberis, J. N. (2017). From FinTech to TechFin: The Regulatory Challenges of Data-Driven Finance. *New York University Journal of Law and Business, Forthcoming*, European Banking Institute Working Paper Series 2017 - No. 6. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2959925