

SOCIAL INEQUALITY AND ACCESS TO DIGITAL FINANCIAL SERVICES

Maya Ariyanti, Arif Budi Raharja

1 Telkom University

2 STIE YKP, Yogyakarta

ariyanti@telkomuniversity.ac.id, budiraharja1970@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Digital financial services can lower the physical cost of reaching customers, but access is only the first step. People need a usable device, connectivity, identification, confidence, affordable products and enough financial resilience to benefit from an account. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including BPS (2026); OECD (2024b). Sources are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. Digitalization can reproduce inequality when services assume constant connectivity, high literacy or confidence with automated interfaces. An account that is technically available but rarely used for saving, borrowing or risk management should not be treated as full inclusion. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for households, small businesses and financial-service providers that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Digital Finance, Financial Inclusion, Social Inequality, Digital Divide, Consumer Protection, Access*

Introduction

Digital financial services can lower the physical cost of reaching customers, but access is only the first step. People need a usable device, connectivity, identification, confidence, affordable products and enough financial resilience to benefit from an account. This question is timely for economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use. Recent institutional and research sources such as OECD (2023); BPS (2026) provide the broader context for the discussion.

Digitalization can reproduce inequality when services assume constant connectivity, high literacy or confidence with automated interfaces. An account that is technically available but rarely used for saving, borrowing or risk management should not be treated as full inclusion. For households, small businesses and financial-service providers, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. OECD (2024c); United Nations (2024) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Households, small businesses and financial-service providers do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial

for one organization and premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for households, small businesses and financial-service providers. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. UNDP (2025); OECD (2023); OECD (2024a) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for households, small businesses and financial-service providers because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. OECD (2024a); BPS (2026) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
Access versus meaningful use	account ownership does not reveal frequency, purpose or quality of financial use	inactive or pass-through accounts can inflate inclusion statistics
Affordability and connectivity	data costs, devices and agent access determine whether digital channels are practical	small recurring fees can matter greatly for low-income users
Literacy, confidence and interface design	simple navigation and understandable terms affect adoption and error rates	complex authentication and product language can exclude users with limited digital experience
Gender, rural and income gaps	social norms, phone ownership and distance to cash-in points can shape who benefits	national averages can hide persistent subgroup gaps
Consumer protection and digital safety	fraud, mistaken transfers and abusive lending can undermine trust quickly	new users often have limited recourse or understanding of permissions
Data-driven inclusion and exclusion	alternative data can expand credit assessment beyond formal records	opaque scoring can create new forms of exclusion without clear appeal

Research Method

The study follows an integrative evidence-synthesis design. Peer-reviewed research is read alongside reports from recognized public and professional institutions so that organizational evidence can be interpreted within its policy and market setting.

The evidence base for this draft includes 8 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
World Bank (2025)	financial inclusion, connectivity and digital safety	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024b)	digital technology, policy, skills and trust	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
UNDP (2025)	human development, inequality and capabilities	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2023)	SME networks, resilience, trade, skills and technology	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
BPS (2026)	official Indonesian economic and social statistics	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024a)	structural conditions and policy issues in Indonesia	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

Access versus meaningful use

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Account ownership does not reveal frequency, purpose or quality of financial use. That distinction matters because inactive or pass-through accounts can inflate inclusion statistics. In economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including United Nations (2024); OECD (2024c), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For households, small businesses and financial-service providers, the practical response is to track saving, payments, credit, resilience and user outcomes separately. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Account ownership does not reveal frequency, purpose or quality of financial use, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Inactive or pass-through accounts can inflate inclusion statistics. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2023) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to track saving, payments, credit, resilience and user outcomes separately, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Account ownership does not reveal frequency, purpose or quality of financial use should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, inactive or pass-through accounts can inflate inclusion statistics. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by World Bank (2025); OECD (2024c) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: track saving, payments, credit, resilience and user outcomes separately. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Affordability and connectivity

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Data costs, devices and agent access determine whether digital channels are practical. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: small recurring fees can matter greatly for low-income users. In economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including BPS (2026); UNDP (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For households, small businesses and financial-service providers, the practical response is to evaluate total user cost rather than nominal account fees alone. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Data costs, devices and agent access determine whether digital channels are practical, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Small recurring fees can matter greatly for low-income users. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024b) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to evaluate total user cost rather than nominal account fees alone, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Data costs, devices and agent access determine whether digital channels are practical should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, small recurring fees can matter greatly for low-income users. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2023); World Bank (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: evaluate total user cost rather than nominal account fees alone. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Literacy, confidence and interface design

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Simple navigation and understandable terms affect adoption and error rates. The point is especially relevant where complex authentication and product language can exclude users with limited digital experience. In economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2023); OECD (2024a), are useful because they

place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For households, small businesses and financial-service providers, the practical response is to test services with target users and provide assisted channels. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Simple navigation and understandable terms affect adoption and error rates, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Complex authentication and product language can exclude users with limited digital experience. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024b) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to test services with target users and provide assisted channels, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Simple navigation and understandable terms affect adoption and error rates should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, complex authentication and product language can exclude users with limited digital experience. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2024b); OECD (2024a) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: test services with target users and provide assisted channels. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Gender, rural and income gaps

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Social norms, phone ownership and distance to cash-in points can shape who benefits. The reason is practical: national averages can hide persistent subgroup gaps. In economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2023); UNDP (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For households, small businesses and financial-service providers, the practical response is to disaggregate inclusion metrics and design interventions around actual barriers. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Social norms, phone ownership and distance to cash-in points can shape who benefits, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. National averages can hide persistent subgroup gaps. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. UNDP (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to disaggregate inclusion metrics and design interventions around actual barriers, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Social norms, phone ownership and distance to cash-in points can shape who benefits should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, national averages can hide persistent subgroup gaps. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-

term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by United Nations (2024); UNDP (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: disaggregate inclusion metrics and design interventions around actual barriers. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Consumer protection and digital safety

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Fraud, mistaken transfers and abusive lending can undermine trust quickly. For managers, the consequence is immediate: new users often have limited recourse or understanding of permissions. In economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including BPS (2026); World Bank (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For households, small businesses and financial-service providers, the practical response is to strengthen dispute resolution, disclosure and transaction-security practices. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Fraud, mistaken transfers and abusive lending can undermine trust quickly, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. New users often have limited recourse or understanding of permissions. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. BPS (2026) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to strengthen dispute resolution, disclosure and transaction-security practices, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Fraud, mistaken transfers and abusive lending can undermine trust quickly should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, new users often have limited recourse or understanding of permissions. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by UNDP (2025); OECD (2023) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: strengthen dispute resolution, disclosure and transaction-security practices. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Data-driven inclusion and exclusion

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Alternative data can expand credit assessment beyond formal records. In operational terms, opaque scoring can create new forms of exclusion without clear appeal. In economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including United Nations (2024); UNDP (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For households, small businesses and financial-service providers, the practical response is to use transparent governance, proportional data collection and human review for consequential decisions.

That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Alternative data can expand credit assessment beyond formal records, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Opaque scoring can create new forms of exclusion without clear appeal. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024c) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use transparent governance, proportional data collection and human review for consequential decisions, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Alternative data can expand credit assessment beyond formal records should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, opaque scoring can create new forms of exclusion without clear appeal. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2024b); World Bank (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use transparent governance, proportional data collection and human review for consequential decisions. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that social inequality and access to digital financial services cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by OECD (2024a); OECD (2024c); OECD (2024b).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Households, small businesses and financial-service providers with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For households, small businesses and financial-service providers, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information needed to judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including UNDP (2025); OECD (2024a), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Track saving, payments, credit, resilience and user outcomes separately	Inactive or pass-through accounts can inflate inclusion statistics
2	Evaluate total user cost rather than nominal account fees alone	Small recurring fees can matter greatly for low-income users
3	Test services with target users and provide assisted channels	Complex authentication and product language can exclude users with limited digital experience
4	Disaggregate inclusion metrics and design interventions around actual barriers	National averages can hide persistent subgroup gaps
5	Strengthen dispute resolution, disclosure and transaction-security practices	New users often have limited recourse or understanding of permissions
6	Use transparent governance, proportional data collection and human review for consequential decisions	Opaque scoring can create new forms of exclusion without clear appeal

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to economies where mobile connectivity and digital payments expand rapidly but income, geography, gender, skills and trust continue to shape actual use.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how long capability building took, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for social inequality and access to digital financial services would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish access versus meaningful use from affordability and connectivity and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention

baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with literacy, confidence and interface design may not transfer directly to settings dominated by gender, rural and income gaps, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of social inequality and access to digital financial services, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of social inequality and access to digital financial services should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined social inequality and access to digital financial services through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: digitalization can reproduce inequality when services assume constant connectivity, high literacy or confidence with automated interfaces. An account that is technically available but rarely used for saving, borrowing or risk management should not be treated as full inclusion. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by households, small businesses and financial-service providers.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

World Bank. (2025). The Global Findex Database 2025. Washington, DC: World Bank.

OECD. (2024). OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2024 (Volume 1): Embracing the Technology Frontier. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a1689dc5-en>

United Nations Development Programme. (2025). Human Development Report 2025. New York: UNDP.

OECD. (2023). OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>

BPS-Statistics Indonesia. (2026). Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia 2026. Jakarta: BPS-Statistics Indonesia.

OECD. (2024). OECD Economic Surveys: Indonesia 2024. Paris: OECD Publishing.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2024). UN E-Government Survey 2024. New York: United Nations.

OECD. (2024). OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions - 2024 Results. Paris: OECD Publishing.