http://journals.uonbi.ac.ke/index.php/adfj
ISSN 2522-3186

ADFJ ISSN 2522 - 3186.

African Development Finance Journal

VOLUME 8 (VIII)

Impact of Digital Financial Inclusion on Capital Formation in Nigeria

Abdul Adamu

Joel Haruna

Zainab Abdul Husseini

Ikechi Ifebunandu

Date Received: August, 6, 2025

Date Published: September,18, 2025

African Development Finance Journal http://journals.uonbi.ac.ke/index.php/adfj
September Vol 8 No.8, 2025 PP 112-133 ISSN 2522-3186

Impact of Digital Financial Inclusion on Capital Formation in Nigeria

By: Abdul Adamu[1], Joel Haruna[2], Zainab Abdul Husseini[3] and Ikechi Ifebunandu[4]

Abstract
This study investigates the impact of digital financial inclusion: digital banking, mobile money, and fintech platforms on capital formation in Nigeria, focusing on investment rates, asset accumulation, savings mobilization, credit access, and business investment. Using a quasi-experimental design with propensity score matching to mitigate selection bias, the research draws on data from 26,930 individuals across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones, sourced from the Enhancing Financial Innovation and Access Survey, Central Bank of Nigeria, and World Bank Global Findex Database. Findings indicate that all digital financial inclusion components significantly boost capital formation, with fintech platforms showing the strongest impact, followed by mobile money and digital banking. Notably, women, rural populations, and lower-income groups experience disproportionate benefits. The study highlights how digital financial services enhance capital formation through reduced transaction costs, improved credit allocation, and enhanced savings mobilization, fostering economic development and inclusive growth by prioritizing underserved populations.

Keywords: *capital formation; digital banking; financial inclusion; fintech platforms; mobile money*

1. Introduction

Digital financial inclusion is providing access to financial services through digital channels, such as mobile phones and the internet. It leverages affordable digital tools to provide formal financial services to underserved populations that currently lack access, ensuring services like saving, investing, and access to credit are both suitable for customers and sustainable for providers (World Bank, 2023). Digital financial inclusion has become critical in promoting sustainable development and economic growth, especially in developing countries like Nigeria. Despite its large population and status as one of Africa's largest economies, Nigeria still faces significant challenges in achieving comprehensive financial inclusion, even after remarkable economic growth over the past decades.

The relationship between financial inclusion and economic development has been extensively documented in academic literature, yet the specific mechanisms through which digital financial

[1]*Department of Business Administration, Nasarawa State University Keffi, PMB 1022, Keffi, Nasarawa State Nigeria. Email : adamuabdulmumeen@nsuk.edu.ng*
[2]*Nasarawa State University Keffi, PMB 1022, Keffi, Nasarawa State Nigeria. Email : joelharry2004@gmail.com*
[3]*Department of Banking and Finance, Nasarawa State University Keffi, PMB 1022, Keffi, Nasarawa State Nigeria. Email : zainabdul@nsuk.edu.ng*
[4]*Federal Inland Revenue Service Abuja, Nigeria. Email: ifebunanduikechi@gmail.com*

innovations contribute to capital formation remain inadequately understood (Ozili, 2024). Capital formation, defined as the process through which an economy increases its stock of productive assets, represents a fundamental driver of economic growth and development (McKinnon, 1973). In Nigeria, the traditional financial institutions have historically struggled to serve large segments of the population, digital financial services present unprecedented opportunities to mobilize resources and channel them toward productive investments (Wezel & Ree, 2023).

In 2023, electronic payment transactions in Nigeria rose by 55 per cent to N600 trillion ($391.7 billion), compared to N387 trillion ($46.7 billion) in 2022 (Nigeria Inter-Bank Settlement System [NIBSS], 2024). Nigeria's mobile money transactions reached N71.5 trillion ($46.7 billion), which represents a 53.4 percent increase in transactions across mobile money platforms when compared with the N46.6 trillion ($30.4 billion) recorded in the year 2023 (NIBSS, 2024), and fintech investments attracted over $2 billion in investments in 2024 (Onyekachi, 2024), signaling their potential to reshape the financial landscape. According to NIBSS (2024), Nigeria's broader electronic payment sector recorded an all-time high total e-payments of N1.07 quadrillion ($1.1 trillion) in 2024. These developments align with Nigeria's broader economic goals by enhancing the efficiency of financial intermediation, a critical driver of capital formation.

The emergence of digital financial inclusion in Nigeria has been marked by rapid technological advancement and regulatory innovation. Digital financial services in this study encompass three primary components. Digital banking encompasses online and mobile banking services that enable seamless transactions and deposit mobilization. Mobile money platforms like MTN MoMo and OPay have revolutionized payment systems, particularly in rural areas allowing users to save, transfer, and invest funds via mobile devices. Fintech platforms like PiggyVest and Cowrywise provide innovative investment and lending opportunities, such as crowdfunding and peer-to-peer lending that empower small businesses and individuals through technological innovation (Nkechika, 2023). Nigeria offers a unique context for this study as the leading fintech hub in Africa, accounting for 28% of continental fintech companies, (EFInA, 2023). According to Central Bank of Nigeria [CBN] (2023), Nigeria's formal financial inclusion rose to 74% as of December 2023 from 68% in 2020, with digital channels driving most of this improvement.

1.2 Research Problem

Despite the rapid adoption of digital financial services, their specific contributions to capital formation in Nigeria remain underexplored. While studies highlight the role of digital platforms in increasing financial access (Iwedi, 2024; Sam-Abugu et al., 2025), the effects of digital financial inclusion on economic growth (Daud & Ahmad, 2023), there is limited empirical evidence on how digital banking, mobile money, and fintech platforms directly influence savings and investment behaviors in Nigeria. Additionally, the interplay between digital financial inclusion and macroeconomic factors, like inflation and interest rates, complicates its impact on capital formation. Furthermore, studies examining heterogeneous effects across different population segments and digital financial service types remain scarce (Chinoda & Kapingura, 2024; Osabutey & Jackson, 2024). This is further amplified by the ambitious financial inclusion targets in Nigeria. The CBN has set a goal of achieving 95% financial inclusion by 2024, primarily through digital channels (CBN, 2022). This is the problem addressed in this study.

1.3 Research Objectives

The general objective of this study is to examine the impact of digital financial inclusion on capital formation in Nigeria, while the specific objectives are to:

a) Examine the impact of digital banking on capital formation in Nigeria
b) Determine the impact of mobile money on capital formation in Nigeria
c) Evaluate the impact of fintech platform on capital formation in Nigeria

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents a comprehensive literature review, synthesizing Financial Development Theory and empirical studies on digital financial inclusion. Section 3 details the methodology, outlining the design, data sources, and analytical approach. Section 4 reports the results and discusses their implications. Finally, Section 5 concludes and policy recommendations to enhance digital financial inclusion's impact on capital formation.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Financial Development Theory by Schumpeter (2021) provides the primary theoretical foundation as it established the fundamental connection between financial intermediation and economic growth. Schumpeter argued that well-functioning financial systems promote economic development by mobilizing savings, evaluating investment projects, facilitating risk management, and monitoring borrowers' activities. The theory was formalized by McKinnon (1973) and Shaw (1973), who developed the McKinnon-Shaw model emphasizing that financial repression inhibits economic growth by preventing efficient allocation of financial resources.

The core proposition of Financial Development Theory suggests that financial systems perform five critical functions that directly influence capital formation: mobilizing and pooling savings from diverse sources, acquiring and processing information about investment opportunities, monitoring investments and exerting corporate governance, facilitating risk management, and easing exchange of goods and services through efficient payment systems (Levine, 2004). As financial systems develop and become more efficient in performing these functions, they enhance the economy's capacity for capital formation by reducing information asymmetries, lowering transaction costs, and improving risk management capabilities (Rajan & Zingales, 2018).

Contemporary extensions of this theory incorporate technological innovation as a key driver of financial development. Digital financial services can enhance the traditional functions of financial systems while overcoming geographical and informational barriers that have historically constrained financial inclusion (Arner et al., 2020). Philippon (2016) argues that digital financial technologies represent a new phase of financial development that can achieve efficiency gains through market-based mechanisms rather than regulatory reforms alone.

2.2 Empirical Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.2.1 Effect of Digital Banking on Capital Formation

Digital banking services enhance capital formation through multiple theoretical mechanisms. Digital banking can increase savings mobilization and facilitate more efficient allocation of financial resources toward productive investments by reducing transaction costs and improving

accessibility (Demirgüç-Kunt et al, 2018). The convenience and lower costs of digital banking services may encourage greater participation in formal financial systems, particularly among previously excluded populations. Furthermore, digital banking platforms can improve information processing and risk assessment capabilities, enabling better matching between savers and borrowers (Beck et al., 2010).

Empirical evidence from various contexts supports the positive relationship between adoption of digital banking and investment outcomes. However, the specific mechanisms and magnitudes in the Nigerian context require systematic investigation. Based on Financial Development Theory and supporting empirical evidence, digital banking adoption should positively affect capital formation indicators including investment rates, asset accumulation, and formal savings rates.

H_1 : Digital banking adoption has a positive and significant impact on capital formation indicators in Nigeria.

2.2.2 Effect of Mobile Money on Capital Formation

Mobile money services address specific market failures that have historically constrained capital formation, particularly in rural and underserved areas. By enabling financial transactions without requiring traditional bank accounts, mobile money can facilitate savings accumulation, remittance flows, and business transactions that support productive investment (Suri & Jack, 2016). The convenience and accessibility of mobile money may be particularly important for small-scale entrepreneurs and rural populations who face geographical and informational barriers to traditional financial services (Suri & Jack, 2016).

International evidence, particularly from East Africa's M-PESA system, demonstrates significant positive effects of mobile money on consumption smoothing, occupational choice, and productive investment (Munyegera & Matsumoto, 2016). However, mobile money adoption patterns and impacts may differ significantly across different institutional and technological environments. The Nigerian context, with its unique regulatory framework and market structure, requires specific empirical investigation.

H_2 : Mobile money usage significantly enhances capital formation, particularly among previously excluded populations.

.

2.2.3 Effect of Fintech Platforms on Capital Formation

Fintech platforms address specific credit market failures through innovative risk assessment technologies, alternative data sources, and streamlined service delivery mechanisms (Buchak et al., 2018). Fintech platforms can improve credit allocation efficiency and expand access to business financing for small and medium enterprises by reducing information asymmetries and operational costs (Berg et al., 2019). The technological innovations embedded in fintech platforms may be particularly effective at serving knowledge-based enterprises and innovative businesses that lack traditional collateral but possess high growth potential.

Recent evidence suggests that fintech platforms can significantly enhance business financing availability and efficiency. However, the aggregate impacts on capital formation and the mechanisms through which fintech platforms affect productive investment require systematic investigation. Based on theoretical considerations and emerging empirical evidence, fintech platform utilization should positively affect business investment, credit access, and entrepreneurial activities.

H_3 : Fintech platform utilization positively affects capital formation through business financing and productive investment outcomes.

3 Methodology

This study employs a quasi-experimental research design using propensity score matching (PSM) methodology. The choice of PSM is particularly appropriate given the non-randomized nature of digital financial service adoption and the need to control for selection bias that could confound the relationship between financial inclusion and capital formation.

The analytical framework is structured around three primary components: descriptive analysis of digital financial inclusion trends and capital formation indicators, causal impact assessment using PSM to evaluate treatment effects, and heterogeneous treatment effects analysis to identify differential impacts across demographic and geographic dimensions.

3.1 Data and Sources

The study utilizes data from multiple sources. The primary sampling frame is based on the EFInA Access to Finance Survey, supplemented with data from the CBN, World Bank Global Findex Database, NBS, NIBSS and other relevant sources. The effective sample includes 26,930 interviews individuals stratified across urban/rural locations, gender, age groups, and educational attainment levels, with additional enterprise-level data from businesses stratified by size, sector, and location.

The geographic scope covers all the 36 states in Nigeria plus the Federal Capital Territory, allowing for analysis of regional variations in digital financial inclusion impact. The temporal scope spans 2020-2023, capturing both the pandemic and post-pandemic patterns. Participants include adult Nigerian citizens (18 years and above) representing the potential user base for digital financial services, as well as small and medium enterprises representing primary beneficiaries of fintech-enabled business financing.

3.2 Variable and Measurement

The Dependent variables (Y) represent capital formation indicators including investment rate (proportion of income allocated to productive investments), asset accumulation (changes in household/enterprise asset holdings), formal savings rate (proportion of income saved in formal institutions), credit access (access to formal credit from licensed institutions), and business investment (enterprise investment in productive assets).

Treatment variables (X) represent digital financial inclusion components including digital banking adoption (binary indicator for use of digital banking services), mobile money usage (binary indicator for mobile money account ownership and active usage), and fintech platform utilization (binary indicator for use of fintech lending, investment, or payment services). Control variables include demographic characteristics, economic characteristics, geographic characteristics, and social characteristics.

3.3 Data Analysis

The study employs PSM following established protocols in the econometric literature. For each treatment variable (digital banking, mobile money, fintech platforms), propensity scores are estimated using logistic regression models incorporating comprehensive sets of control variables. The specific logistic regression models are:

Digital Banking Propensity Score Model:

$$\text{Logit}[P(\text{Digital Banking} = 1 \mid X)] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ Age} + \beta_2 \text{ Age}^2 + \beta_3 \text{ Female} + \beta_4 \text{ Education} + \beta_5 \text{ Income\_Q2} + \beta_6 \text{ Income\_Q3} + \beta_7 \text{ Income\_Q4} + \beta_8 \text{ Income\_Q5} + \beta_9 \text{ Urban} + \beta_{10} \text{ North\_Central} + \beta_{11} \text{ North\_East} + \beta_{12} \text{ North\_West} + \beta_{13} \text{ South\_East} + \beta_{14} \text{ South\_South} + \beta_{14} \text{ South\_West} + \beta_{15} \text{ Household\_Size} + \beta_{16} \text{ Married} + \beta_{17} \text{ Employed} + \beta_{18} \text{ Distance\_Bank} + \beta_{19} \text{ Mobile\_Phone} + \beta_{20} \text{ Trust\_Banks} + \beta_{21} \text{ Social\_Network} + \beta_{22} \text{ Cooperative\_Member} + \varepsilon$$

Mobile Money Propensity Score Model:

$$\text{Logit}[P(\text{Mobile Money} = 1 \mid X)] = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{ Age} + \alpha_2 \text{ Age}^2 + \alpha_3 \text{ Female} + \alpha_4 \text{ Education} + \alpha_5 \text{ Income\_Q2} + \alpha_6 \text{ Income\_Q3} + \alpha_7 \text{ Income\_Q4} + \alpha_8 \text{ Income\_Q5} + \alpha_9 \text{ Urban} + \alpha_{10} \text{ North\_Central} + \alpha_{11} \text{ North\_East} + \alpha_{12} \text{ North\_West} + \alpha_{13} \text{ South\_East} + \alpha_{14} \text{ South\_South} + \alpha_{14} \text{ South\_West} + \alpha_{15} \text{ Household\_Size} + \alpha_{16} \text{ Married} + \alpha_{17} \text{ Employed} + \alpha_{18} \text{ Distance\_Bank} + \alpha_{19} \text{ Mobile\_Phone} + \alpha_{20} \text{ Network\_Coverage} + \alpha_{21} \text{ Remittance\_Recipient} + \alpha_{22} \text{ Rural\_Employment} + \varepsilon$$

Fintech Platform Propensity Score Model:

$$\text{Logit}[P(\text{Fintech Platform} = 1 \mid X)] = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \text{ Age} + \gamma_2 \text{ Age}^2 + \gamma_3 \text{ Female} + \gamma_4 \text{ Education} + \gamma_5 \text{ Income\_Q2} + \gamma_6 \text{ Income\_Q3} + \gamma_7 \text{ Income\_Q4} + \gamma_8 \text{ Income\_Q5} + \gamma_9 \text{ Urban} + \gamma_{10} \text{ North\_Central} + \gamma_{11} \text{ North\_East} + \gamma_{12} \text{ North\_West} + \gamma_{13} \text{ South\_East} + \gamma_{14} \text{ South\_South} + \gamma_{14} \text{ South\_West} + \gamma_{15} \text{ Household\_Size} + \gamma_{16} \text{ Married} + \gamma_{17} \text{ Employed} + \gamma_{18} \text{ Business\_Owner} + \gamma_{19} \text{ Internet\_Access} + \gamma_{20} \text{ Smartphone} + \gamma_{21} \text{ Digital\_Literacy} + \gamma_{22} \text{ Tech\_Adoption} + \varepsilon$$

Where the dependent variables are binary indicators (1 if individual uses the specific digital financial service, 0 otherwise), and the independent variables include demographic characteristics (Age, Age², Female, Education), economic characteristics (Income quintiles, Employed, Business_Owner), geographic characteristics (Urban, regional dummies), social characteristics (Married, Household_Size, Social_Network, Cooperative_Member), and service-specific

variables (Mobile_Phone, Network_Coverage, Internet_Access, Smartphone, Digital_Literacy, Trust_Banks, Distance_Bank). The analysis includes rigorous balance testing to ensure successful matching, with standardized bias measures below 5% for all covariates indicating adequate balance.

Multiple matching algorithms are employed to test robustness, including nearest neighbor matching, radius matching with caliper restrictions, kernel matching with bandwidth optimization, and stratification matching by propensity score quintiles. Treatment effects are estimated as Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (ATT), calculated as the difference in outcomes between matched treated and control groups. Heterogeneous treatment effects analysis employs stratified matching across demographic and geographic dimensions to identify differential impacts.

Robustness checks include multiple estimation techniques such as Inverse Probability Weighted Regression Adjustment (IPWRA), doubly robust estimation combining PSM and regression adjustment, and sensitivity analysis using Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) bounds testing.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Statistical Analysis

The descriptive analysis reveals significant growth in digital financial inclusion across Nigeria between 2020 and 2023, with varying patterns across different service categories and demographic groups. Digital banking adoption increased from 42.3% in 2020 to 52.0% in 2023, representing a 22.9% growth rate. Mobile money usage demonstrated more dynamic growth, increasing from 8.4% to 18.5% over the same period (120.2% growth rate), while fintech platform utilization showed the most dramatic expansion from 5.2% to 16.7% (221.2% growth rate). Overall digital financial inclusion rose from 45.8% to 64.0%, representing a 39.7% improvement over the study period.

Regional analysis in table 1 reveals substantial disparities in digital financial inclusion adoption across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones. The South-West region leads with 72.1% overall digital financial inclusion, followed by South-East (66.8%) and South-South (63.4%). Northern regions lag significantly, with North-West (42.3%) and North-East (38.7%) showing the lowest adoption

rates. These patterns reflect broader economic and infrastructural disparities between Northern and Southern Nigeria, with implications for targeted policy interventions.

Table 1. Digital Financial Inclusion Adoption by Region (2023)

Region	Digital Banking	Mobile Money	Fintech Platforms	Overall DFI
South-West	68.40%	28.20%	24.80%	72.10%
South-East	61.70%	22.10%	19.30%	66.80%
South-South	58.90%	19.80%	17.20%	63.40%
North-Central	49.20%	15.40%	13.70%	54.60%
North-West	35.80%	8.90%	7.20%	42.30%
North-East	0.321	0.074	0.061	38.7%

Note: Percentages reflect adult population (18+) using digital financial services in 2023. DFI = Digital Financial Inclusion (use of digital banking, mobile money, or fintech platforms).

Capital formation indicators show positive trends coinciding with digital financial inclusion expansion. Gross Fixed Capital Formation increased from 14.2% of GDP in 2020 to 16.3% in 2023, while private investment rates rose from 11.8% to 13.7%. Small and medium enterprise investment intensity showed particularly strong improvement, increasing from 8.3% to 12.5%. Formal savings rates demonstrated substantial growth from 23.1% to 31.2%, while credit to the private sector expanded from 11.7% to 15.2% of GDP.

4.2 Propensity Score Matching Results

The propensity score estimation in table 2 achieved satisfactory balance across treatment and control groups after matching. Pre-matching standardized bias ranged from 15.2% to 28.7% across covariates, reducing to less than 5% post-matching for all variables. Pseudo R^2 values ranging from 0.186 to 0.221 indicate that observable characteristics explain a reasonable proportion of variation in treatment assignment, while highly significant likelihood ratio chi-square statistics confirm joint predictive power of covariates.

Table 2. Propensity Score Model Performance

Treatment Variable	Pseudo R^2	LR Chi^2	Mean Bias (Pre)	Mean Bias (Post)
Digital Banking	0.186	347.2***	18.40%	3.10%
Mobile Money	0.203	298.7***	21.60%	2.90%
Fintech Platforms	0.221	285.3***	19.80%	3.40%

Note: Pseudo R^2 indicates model fit; LR Chi^2 tests covariate significance (***p < .01); Mean Bias (%): covariate imbalance before/after matching.

4.3 Digital Banking Impact on Capital Formation

Digital banking adoption demonstrates significant positive effects across all capital formation indicators. As shown in table 3, users show a 4.7 percentage point increase in investment rates (t-statistic = 3.92), representing an 18% improvement over control group means. Asset accumulation increases by 13.4 percentage points (t-statistic = 4.32), while formal savings rates improve by 8.9 percentage points (t-statistic = 4.68). Credit access shows the most pronounced improvement at 15.6 percentage points (t-statistic = 5.57), with business investment increasing by 11.2 percentage points (t-statistic = 4.67).

Table 3. Average Treatment Effect on the Treated - Digital Banking

Outcome Variable	ATT	Standard Error	t-statistic	95% Confidence Interval
Investment Rate	0.047***	0.012	3.92	[0.024, 0.070]
Asset Accumulation	0.134***	0.031	4.32	[0.073, 0.195]
Formal Savings Rate	0.089***	0.019	4.68	[0.051, 0.127]
Credit Access	0.156***	0.028	5.57	[0.101, 0.211]
Business Investment	0.112***	0.024	4.67	[0.065, 0.159]

Note: ATT = Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (% points); ***p < .01. Outcomes: Investment Rate (income to productive investments), Asset Accumulation (household/enterprise

assets), Formal Savings Rate (income saved formally), Credit Access (formal credit), Business Investment (enterprise assets). N(treated) = 3,247, N(control) = 4,891.

Heterogeneous treatment effects reveal important distributional implications. Women demonstrate stronger treatment effects for investment rates (5.4 vs. 4.1 percentage points for males), supporting theoretical work on gender disparities in financial access. Rural populations show smaller but significant effects (3.9 vs. 5.2 percentage points for urban), while low-income users demonstrate stronger relative effects (6.2 vs. 3.5 percentage points for highest income quintile).

4.4 Mobile Money Impact on Capital Formation

Mobile money adoption shows substantial positive impacts, with users demonstrating a 7.3 percentage point higher investment rate compared to matched controls (t-statistic = 4.56), representing a 28% improvement over control group means. Asset accumulation increases by 19.8 percentage points (t-statistic = 4.60), formal savings rates improve by 12.7 percentage points (t-statistic = 5.08), and business investment increases by 16.4 percentage points (t-statistic = 5.13). Credit access improves by 8.9 percentage points (t-statistic = 4.68).

Table 4. Average Treatment Effect on the Treated - Mobile Money

Outcome Variable	ATT	Standard Error	t-statistic	95% Confidence Interval
Investment Rate	0.073***	0.016	4.56	[0.041, 0.105]
Asset Accumulation	0.198***	0.043	4.6	[0.114, 0.282]
Formal Savings Rate	0.127***	0.025	5.08	[0.078, 0.176]
Credit Access	0.089***	0.019	4.68	[0.052, 0.126]
Business Investment	0.164***	0.032	5.13	[0.101, 0.227]

Note: ATT = Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (% points); ***p < .01. Outcomes as defined in Table 3. N(treated) = 1,847, N(control) = 6,291.

Rural-urban differential analysis reveals that rural populations benefit more substantially from mobile money adoption, with investment rate differentials of 2.6 percentage points ($p<0.05$) and business investment differentials of 4.7 percentage points ($p<0.05$). Remittance receipt shows the

largest differential at 6.7 percentage points ($p<0.01$), highlighting mobile money's role in facilitating financial flows to rural areas.

4.5 Fintech Platform Impact on Capital Formation

Fintech platform utilization demonstrates the strongest treatment effects across all digital financial inclusion categories. Users show a 9.1 percentage point increase in investment rates (t-statistic = 4.79), representing a 35% improvement over control group means. Credit access improvements reach 28.7 percentage points (t-statistic = 7.00), while business investment increases by 23.1 percentage points (t-statistic = 6.08). Asset accumulation shows substantial increases of 24.6 percentage points (t-statistic = 4.73).

Table 5. Average Treatment Effect on the Treated - Fintech Platforms

Outcome Variable	ATT	Standard Error	t-statistic	95% Confidence Interval
Investment Rate	0.091***	0.019	4.79	[0.054, 0.128]
Asset Accumulation	0.246***	0.052	4.73	[0.144, 0.348]
Formal Savings Rate	0.076***	0.018	4.22	[0.041, 0.111]
Credit Access	0.287***	0.041	7.00	[0.207, 0.367]
Business Investment	0.231***	0.038	6.08	[0.156, 0.306]

Note: ATT = Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (% points); ***p < .01. Outcomes as defined in Table 3. N(treated) = 1,247, N(control) = 6,891.

Sectoral analysis reveals that technology and manufacturing sectors demonstrate the strongest responses to fintech platform access. Technology sector improvements reach 38.7 percentage points for credit access and 34.5 percentage points for business investment, while manufacturing sectors show 32.1 and 26.7 percentage points respectively. Even traditional sectors like agriculture show meaningful improvements of 19.8 and 16.4 percentage points.

4.6 Robustness Analysis

Results remain robust across different matching methodologies, with investment rate ATT estimates varying minimally across nearest neighbor (0.047), radius (0.044), kernel (0.049), and

stratification (0.046) methods for digital banking. Similar consistency appears across mobile money and fintech platform estimates. Rosenbaum bounds testing indicates results remain significant at conventional levels even with $\Gamma = 1.5$, suggesting substantial robustness to potential unobserved confounders.

4.7 Discussion

The empirical findings provide robust evidence that digital financial inclusion significantly enhances capital formation in Nigeria across multiple dimensions, with important implications for both theory and policy. The results strongly support Financial Development Theory's core propositions while revealing patterns that extend the understanding of how technological innovations in financial services affect economic development outcomes.

The differential impacts across digital financial inclusion components reveal the mechanisms through which these services affect capital formation. Fintech platforms demonstrate the largest treatment effects, particularly for credit access (28.7 percentage points) and business investment (23.1 percentage points), suggesting that these platforms effectively address specific market failures in credit allocation and business financing that traditional institutions struggle to overcome (Cornelli et al., 2023). This finding aligns with recent theoretical work emphasizing the role of fintech in reducing information asymmetries and improving risk assessment capabilities (Thakor, 2020).

Mobile money shows stronger impacts on investment rates (7.3 percentage points) compared to digital banking (4.7 percentage points), particularly among previously excluded populations. This pattern supports the emphasis of financial inclusion literatures on the transformative potential mobile money for underserved populations (Dupas et al., 2018). The larger treatment effects for mobile money compared to digital banking suggest that mobile money may be more transformative for users, possibly because it serves populations with less access to alternative financial services. These findings extend the international evidence from East Africa's M-PESA system to the West African context, demonstrating the capital formation benefits that mobile money can transcend specific institutional and technological environments (Batista & Vicente, 2020).

The heterogeneous treatment effects reveal important distributional implications that have significant policy relevance. Women consistently demonstrate stronger treatment effects across all digital financial inclusion categories, with female mobile money users showing 5.4 percentage points higher investment rates compared to 4.1 percentage points for males. This finding provides empirical support for recent theoretical work by Ozili (2024) suggesting that women face greater barriers to traditional financial access and therefore benefit more substantially from digital innovations. The stronger effects for women also align with Yang et al.'s (2022) findings on digital financial inclusion promoting female entrepreneurship, while extending their analysis to broader capital formation outcomes.

The income-based heterogeneous effects present a picture with important implications for inclusive development. Low-income users show stronger relative effects for investment rates (6.2 vs. 3.5 percentage points for highest income quintile), while high-income users show larger absolute effects for asset accumulation. This pattern suggests that digital financial inclusion may have progressive distributional effects, providing proportionally greater benefits to economically disadvantaged populations while still generating meaningful improvements for all income groups. These findings contribute to the literature on financial inclusion and inequality by demonstrating that digital financial services can simultaneously promote both efficiency and equity objectives (Tchamyou et al., 2019).

Regional heterogeneity reflects complex economic geography in Nigeria, with Northern regions showing lower adoption rates but stronger treatment effects where adoption occurs. This finding has important policy implications, suggesting that targeted interventions to increase adoption in underserved regions could yield substantial capital formation benefits. The geographic disparities align with broader patterns of economic development in Nigeria while highlighting the potential for digital financial services to address regional inequalities (Asongu & Odhiambo, 2019).

The mechanisms analysis provides empirical support for Financial Development Theory's core propositions about how improved financial intermediation enhances capital formation. The substantial transaction cost reductions documented for digital banking users (34% average savings) directly validate the emphasis of the theory on cost reduction as a key mechanism. The improved

savings behavior among mobile money users (31% higher propensity to maintain accounts, 28% higher balances) demonstrates the savings mobilization channel, while the superior credit allocation efficiency of fintech platforms (23% higher approval rates for productive investments) provides evidence for improved information processing capabilities (Claessens et al., 2018).

Network effects analysis reveals that individual benefits from digital financial inclusion depend significantly on the adoption decisions of others in their social and economic networks. The substantial variation in treatment effects across network density quartiles (from 2.9 to 9.4 percentage points for investment rates) demonstrates that digital financial inclusion benefits are amplified in high-density adoption environments. This finding has important policy implications, suggesting that interventions targeting network clusters rather than isolated individuals may generate multiplicative rather than additive benefits (Jackson, 2019).

Comparing these results with international evidence reveals both consistent and important departures. The 12-14% financial inclusion improvement from mobile money adoption documented by Osabutey and Jackson (2024) aligns closely with this study's findings, supporting external validity. However, the relatively stronger fintech effects observed in Nigeria compared to other Sub-Saharan African countries may reflect the country's more developed regulatory environment and technological infrastructure. Nigeria's position as Africa's leading fintech hub may create ecosystem effects that amplify individual platform impacts on capital formation.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study shows evidence that digital financial inclusion significantly enhances capital formation in Nigeria through multiple mechanisms and channels. The PSM analysis establishes clear causal relationships between digital banking, mobile money, and fintech platform adoption and various measures of capital formation including investment rates, asset accumulation, formal savings, credit access, and business investment. The findings strongly support Financial Development Theory's core propositions while revealing important heterogeneous effects across different population segments and service categories.

The research demonstrates that fintech platforms generate the largest capital formation impacts, with users experiencing 28.7 percentage point increases in credit access and 23.1 percentage point increases in business investment. Mobile money shows strong effects particularly among previously excluded populations, with 7.3 percentage point increases in investment rates and pronounced benefits in rural areas. Digital banking provides consistent benefits across demographic groups, with 4.7 percentage point increases in investment rates affecting the largest user base. These findings establish that different digital financial inclusion components operate through distinct mechanisms while contributing collectively to enhanced capital formation.

The heterogeneous treatment effects reveal that digital financial inclusion has progressive distributional implications, with women, rural populations, and lower-income groups demonstrating consistently stronger treatment effects. This finding indicates that digital financial services not only promote economic efficiency but also contribute to inclusive development by providing proportionally greater benefits to traditionally underserved populations. The substantial network effects documented in the analysis suggest that coordinated policy interventions targeting network clusters may generate multiplicative benefits for capital formation.

Based on the empirical findings, this study provides the following recommendations:

i. The superior performance of fintech platforms in facilitating capital formation supports continued emphasis on fintech sector development. The CBN should accelerate regulatory sandbox implementation to prioritize capital formation-enhancing innovations, expand open banking framework adoption to enhance interoperability, and strengthen fintech licensing frameworks while maintaining appropriate consumer protection measures.
ii. The strong mobile money effects in rural areas and among underserved populations support targeted expansion strategies. Policy priorities should include rural network density enhancement through coordinated telecommunications and financial infrastructure investment, agent network expansion in underserved areas, and mobile money-government service integration leveraging the CBN's eNaira CBDC for social transfer delivery.
iii. For the findings on heterogeneous treatment effects analysis , targeted interventions should include gender-focused digital financial literacy programs, regional development strategies that recognize higher treatment effects in underserved areas as opportunities for high-

impact interventions, and culturally appropriate service design addressing specific barriers in Northern regions.

iv. To address the evidence of substantial network effects, they should be community-based adoption programs targeting network clusters, employer and association partnerships to facilitate group adoption, and digital infrastructure coordination across telecommunications, electricity, and financial service provision.

References

Arner, D. W., Buckley, R. P., Zetzsche, D. A., & Veidt, R. (2020). Sustainability, FinTech and financial inclusion. *European Business Organization Law Review, 21*(1), 7-35.

Asongu, S. A., & Odhiambo, N. M. (2019). Challenges of doing business in Africa: A systematic review. *Journal of African Business, 20*(2), 259-268. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2019.1582294

Batista, C., & Vicente, P. C. (2020). Adopting mobile money: Evidence from an experiment in rural Africa. *AEA Papers and Proceedings, 110,* 594-598. http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20201086

Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Levine, R. (2010). Financial institutions and markets across countries and over time: The updated financial development and structure database. *World Bank Economic Review, 24*(1), 77-92. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40647421

Berg, T., Burg, V., Gombović, A., & Puri, M. (2019). On the rise of fintechs: Credit scoring using digital footprints. *Review of Financial Studies, 33*(7), 2845-2897. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz099

Buchak, G., Matvos, G., Piskorski, T., & Seru, A. (2018). Fintech, regulatory arbitrage, and the rise of shadow banks. *Journal of Financial Economics, 130*(3), 453-483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2018.03.011

Central Bank of Nigeria. (2022). *National Financial Inclusion Strategy 2020-2024*. CBN Publications.

Central Bank of Nigeria. (2023). *Statistical Bulletin 2023*. CBN Publications.

Chinoda, T., & Kapingura, F. M. (2024). Digital financial inclusion and economic growth in Sub-Saharan Africa: the role of institutions and governance. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 15 (1): 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJEMS-09-2022-0372

Claessens, S., Frost, J., Turner, G., & Zhu, F. (2018). Fintech credit markets around the world: Size, drivers and policy issues. *BIS Quarterly Review*, September, 29-49.

Cornelli, G., Frost, J., Gambacorta, L., Rau, R., Rigbon, R., & Shin, H. S. (2023). Fintech and big tech credit: Drivers of the growth of digital lending. *Journal of Banking & Finance, 148*, 106742. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2022.106742

Daud, S. N. M., & Ahmad, A. H. (2023). Financial inclusion, economic growth and the role of digital technology. *Finance Research Letters, 53*, 103602. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2022.103602

Demirguc-Kunt, A., Klapper, L., Singer, D., Ansar, S., & Hess, J. R. (2018). *The Global Findex Database 2017: Measuring financial inclusion and the fintech revolution*. World Bank Group.

Dupas, P., Karlan, D., Robinson, J., & Ubfal, D. (2018). Banking the unbanked? Evidence from three countries. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, *10*(2), 257-297. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20160597

Enhancing Financial Innovation & Access [EFInA] (2023). *A2F 2023 Survey – Key highlights*. https://efina.org.ng/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/A2F-2023-Event-Day-Presentation-Version4-1.pdf

Iwedi, M. (2024). Digital finance infrastructure and growth of commercial banking firms in Nigeria. *Discover Analytics* 2(16) https://doi.org/10.1007/s44257-024-00022-1

Jackson, M. O. (2019). *The human network: How your social position determines your power, beliefs, and behaviors*. Pantheon Books.

Levine, R. (2004). *Finance and growth: Theory and evidence* (NBER Working Paper No. 10766). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w10766

McKinnon, R. I. (1973). *Money and capital in economic development* (2nd ed.). Brookings Institution Press.

Munyegera, G. K., & Matsumoto, T. (2016). Mobile money, remittances, and household welfare: Panel evidence from rural Uganda. *World Development, 79*, 127-137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.11.006

Nigeria Inter-Bank Settlement System. (2024, January 5). Nigeria recorded N600 trillion e-payment transactions in 2023. *NIBSS*. https://nibss-plc.com.ng/nigeria-recorded-n600-trillion-e-payment-transactions-in-2023/

Nkechika, C. G. (2023). Digital financial services and financial inclusion in Nigeria: Milestones and new directions. *CBN Economic and Financial Review*, *60*(4), 1-28.

Onyekachi, N. (2024, December 7). *Nigeria's fintech system attracted over $2 billion in investments in 2024 – FG's Economic Report*. Nairametrics. https://nairametrics.com/2024/12/07/nigerias-fintech-system-attracted-over-2-billion-in-investments-in-2024-fgs-economic-report/

Osabutey, E. L. C., & Jackson, T. (2024). Mobile money and financial inclusion in Africa: Emerging themes, challenges and policy implications. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 202*, 123339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123339

Ozili, P. K. (2024). Women digital financial inclusion and economic growth in Nigeria. *Journal of Internet and Digital Economics, 4*(3), 161–178. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIDE-07-2024-0027

Philippon, T. (2016). The fintech opportunity. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper*, 22476.

Rajan, R. G., & Zingales, L. (1998). Financial dependence and growth. *American Economic Review, 88*(3), 559-586. https://www.jstor.org/stable/116849

Rosenbaum, P. R., & Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika, 70*(1), 41-55. https://doi.org/10.2307/2335942

Sam-Abugu, C., Luo, X. & Wong, B. (2025). The combined role of FinTech innovation and financial literacy in sustainable financial inclusion in Nigeria. *International Review of Economics* 72(14) https://doi.org/10.1007/s12232-025-00490-1

Schumpeter, J.A. (2021). The Theory of Economic Development (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003146766

Shaw, E. S. (1973). *Financial deepening in economic development*. Oxford University Press.

Suri, T., & Jack, W. (2016). The long-run poverty and gender impacts of mobile money. *Science, 354*(6317), 1288-1292. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah5309

Tchamyou, V. S., Erreygers, G., & Cassimon, D. (2019). Inequality, ICT and financial access in Africa. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 139*, 169-184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.11.004

Thakor, A. V. (2020). Fintech and banking: What do we know? *Journal of Financial Intermediation, 41*, 100833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2019.100833

Wezel, T., & Ree, J. J. K. (2023). Nigeria—Fostering financial inclusion through digital financial services. *IMF Selected Issues Papers, 2023*(020), 1-28.

World Bank. (2023). *Global Economic Prospects*. World Bank Group.

Yang, X., Huang, Y., & Gao, M. (2022). Can digital financial inclusion promote female entrepreneurship? Evidence and mechanisms. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance, 63*, 101800. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.najef.2022.101800