



Digital Banking Transformation, Financial Inclusion, and Institutional Trust: Comparative Economic Analysis of Kenya and Singapore, 2020–2026

Evelyn Tan¹

Evelyn Tan

Lee Kong Chian School of Business

Singapore Management University

Email: evelyntan@smu.edu.sg

*Corresponding Author: evelyntan@smu.edu.sg

Citation: Aziz (2026). Digital Banking Transformation, Financial Inclusion, and Institutional Trust: Comparative Economic Analysis of Kenya and Singapore, 2020–2026 (Book Antiqua 14pt Bold). *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Perspectives*, 10(4), xx–xx. <https://doi.org/0000-0000>

Published: 11/05/2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines digital banking transformation and financial inclusion through a comparative institutional analysis of Kenya and Singapore between 2020 and 2026. The study argues that digital banking should be understood not merely as technological modernization within financial services but as an institutional governance mechanism reshaping financial access, market competition, organizational strategy, and socio-economic resilience. Kenya and Singapore provide analytically significant comparative cases because both are globally recognized digital finance innovators, yet they differ substantially in market structure, regulatory coordination, technological infrastructure, and developmental context. Kenya's transformation has been driven by mobile-money ecosystems, fintech-led inclusion, and telecommunications-finance convergence, whereas Singapore emphasizes regulatory innovation, digital banking licensing, smart financial governance, and integrated fintech ecosystems. The findings indicate that digital banking improves economic inclusion and market efficiency only when governance credibility, technological interoperability, institutional trust, and organizational capability are coherently aligned. This article contributes to economics and business literature by conceptualizing digital banking ecosystems as institutional financial infrastructures linking governance, innovation, financial participation, and development outcomes.

Keywords: digital banking; financial inclusion; fintech governance; institutional trust; Kenya; Singapore; digital economy; financial innovation; banking transformation; economic resilience.

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has fundamentally reshaped the architecture of contemporary financial systems. Between 2020 and 2026, digital banking, mobile payments, fintech ecosystems, embedded finance, and platform-based financial services expanded rapidly across both advanced and emerging economies. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated these developments by intensifying demand for remote transactions, contactless payments, online credit systems, and digitally integrated financial services (World Bank, 2023). Simultaneously, governments and regulators increasingly recognized digital finance as a strategic instrument for economic resilience, financial inclusion, and innovation-driven growth.

This study argues that digital banking transformation should not be conceptualized solely as technological modernization within financial institutions. Rather, digital banking constitutes a broader institutional governance transformation affecting market competition, consumer trust, organizational adaptation, regulatory coordination, and socio-economic inclusion. Digital banking systems alter how individuals access financial services, how firms structure financial products, how regulators supervise markets, and how economies distribute financial opportunity. Consequently, digital banking is simultaneously a technological, institutional, and developmental phenomenon.

Kenya and Singapore provide analytically significant comparative cases. Kenya represents one of the world's most influential mobile-money and fintech ecosystems. Mobile banking expansion through M-Pesa and related fintech innovations transformed financial participation across previously excluded populations and significantly reduced barriers to financial access. Singapore represents a highly advanced financial hub characterized by strong regulatory coordination, digital banking licenses, smart financial governance, and integrated fintech innovation ecosystems. While Kenya demonstrates bottom-up financial inclusion through mobile ecosystems, Singapore demonstrates top-down institutional coordination through advanced financial governance and regulatory innovation.

The global economic context reinforces the significance of this comparison. The IMF emphasizes that digital finance increasingly shapes productivity, economic resilience, and monetary system modernization (IMF, 2024). OECD reports similarly indicate that digital financial ecosystems influence competitiveness, innovation capacity, and economic inclusion (OECD, 2024). The World Bank further argues that inclusive digital finance contributes to poverty reduction, SME development, and crisis resilience by lowering transaction costs and expanding financial participation (World Bank, 2023).

Existing economics and business scholarship provides important foundations for understanding digital finance transformation. North (1990) argues that institutions reduce uncertainty and facilitate economic exchange. Rochet and Tirole (2003) conceptualize payment systems as two-sided markets

characterized by network effects and platform dynamics. Teece (2018) emphasizes dynamic capabilities as firms' ability to adapt organizationally under technological disruption. Arner et al. (2020) argue that fintech increasingly transforms financial governance through regulatory technology, digital identity, and platform-based innovation. Other scholars emphasize that financial inclusion depends not only on account ownership but also on trust, accessibility, affordability, and institutional legitimacy (Demirgüç-Kunt et al., 2022).

However, current economics and business literature remains limited in several respects. While previous studies emphasize fintech innovation and mobile payments, they often under-theorize institutional governance and organizational adaptation. Other scholars focus on financial inclusion outcomes without sufficiently examining how governance structures mediate digital banking transformation. Existing comparative research also remains limited in explaining how Kenya and Singapore represent distinct institutional models of digital financial modernization.

This article identifies six major research gaps. First, a theoretical gap persists concerning digital banking as institutional governance rather than technological innovation alone. Second, an empirical gap concerns how governance credibility affects digital financial adoption and trust. Third, a comparative gap exists regarding inclusion-driven and regulation-driven digital banking ecosystems. Fourth, an institutional governance gap concerns coordination among regulators, telecom firms, banks, fintech platforms, and consumers. Fifth, a market transformation gap concerns how digital banking reshapes competition and organizational strategy. Sixth, a developmental gap concerns how digital finance contributes to economic resilience and inclusive growth.

The novelty of this article lies in its comparative institutional analysis of Kenya and Singapore as alternative digital banking models. Rather than treating digital banking as isolated financial innovation, the article conceptualizes digital banking ecosystems as institutional financial infrastructures linking governance coordination, organizational capability, financial inclusion, and socio-economic transformation. The article contributes theoretically by developing a framework connecting digital financial governance, organizational adaptation, market trust, and inclusive development.

The analytical framework proceeds through the following causal relationship: institutional governance shapes digital financial infrastructure; digital infrastructure influences market participation and banking innovation; innovation reshapes organizational strategy and financial access; financial access affects inclusion and economic resilience; and these outcomes contribute to broader developmental transformation. The research objective is to examine how Kenya and Singapore implemented digital banking transformation between 2020 and 2026 and to evaluate how governance systems, institutional trust, and organizational capability shaped financial inclusion and socio-economic outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a comparative institutional political economy methodology integrating fintech

governance analysis, financial inclusion analysis, and organizational strategy interpretation. Kenya and Singapore were selected because both are globally recognized digital finance innovators, yet they differ substantially in developmental context, regulatory structure, institutional capacity, and market organization. Kenya represents a mobile-money-centered financial inclusion model driven by telecommunications-finance convergence and platform-led market expansion. Singapore represents a digitally integrated financial governance model characterized by advanced regulatory coordination, digital banking licenses, and state-supported fintech ecosystems. The unit of analysis is the digital banking ecosystem, including regulatory frameworks, digital payment infrastructures, organizational adaptation strategies, fintech participation, consumer trust mechanisms, market competition structures, and socio-economic outcomes.

The empirical basis consists of IMF digital finance reports, OECD fintech governance analyses, World Bank financial inclusion datasets, central bank publications, institutional strategy documents, market indicators, fintech investment reports, and peer-reviewed economics and business literature published between 2020 and 2026. Analytical techniques combine comparative institutional interpretation, document-based process tracing, and cross-case synthesis to identify causal mechanisms linking governance systems to digital banking outcomes. Triangulation is achieved through comparison of financial participation indicators, regulatory frameworks, institutional reports, organizational strategy disclosures, and scholarly evidence. Ethical considerations concern digital exclusion, cybersecurity, algorithmic discrimination, consumer-data governance, financial surveillance, and unequal bargaining power between platforms and consumers. The principal limitation is uneven availability of proprietary fintech performance data and cross-country comparability challenges in digital banking indicators. Nevertheless, the comparative design enables robust analysis of digital banking transformation as a governance-driven institutional process.

Findings and Discussion

1. Institutional Governance and Digital Banking Ecosystem Formation

The first finding is that governance structure strongly shapes digital banking ecosystem formation. Kenya's financial transformation emerged through telecommunications-finance convergence in which mobile operators became central financial intermediaries. M-Pesa and related mobile-money platforms reduced barriers to financial participation by enabling low-cost digital transactions without requiring traditional banking infrastructure.

Singapore's digital banking transformation followed a more regulator-driven pathway. The Monetary Authority of Singapore established digital banking licenses, fintech regulatory sandboxes, open banking initiatives, and integrated digital finance governance frameworks. The state functioned as a strategic coordinator facilitating innovation while maintaining regulatory credibility and financial stability.

The comparative evidence demonstrates that both systems achieved rapid digital finance expansion through different institutional logics. Kenya's model emphasized accessibility and market diffusion through mobile ecosystems, whereas Singapore emphasized regulatory coordination and institutional integration. Both systems

reduced transaction costs and expanded digital participation, but they differed in governance structure and organizational leadership.

This finding extends institutional economics by demonstrating that financial innovation depends not only on technological availability but also on institutional trust and governance coordination. Financial systems become digitally transformative when institutions reduce uncertainty, ensure interoperability, and maintain consumer confidence.

The policy implication is that successful digital banking transformation requires governance systems capable of balancing innovation, stability, inclusion, and market competition.

2. Organizational Adaptation and Competitive Financial Strategy

The second finding is that organizational adaptation mediates the relationship between digital banking innovation and market competitiveness. In Kenya, telecommunications firms, fintech companies, and banks increasingly integrated digital services, microfinance tools, mobile lending, and digital commerce solutions into broader financial ecosystems. Traditional banks adapted by partnering with mobile operators and fintech firms rather than competing solely through branch-based models.

Singapore's financial institutions increasingly adopted AI-supported financial services, digital onboarding systems, cloud banking, embedded finance, and platform-based customer engagement strategies. Digital banks entered the market through regulatory licensing structures designed to stimulate innovation and competition within a highly sophisticated financial environment.

The comparison reveals that digital transformation affects organizational strategy differently depending on market maturity and governance structure. Kenya's ecosystem prioritizes accessibility, transaction volume, and financial inclusion, while Singapore's ecosystem prioritizes innovation quality, cybersecurity, and integrated financial services.

This finding aligns with dynamic capability theory by demonstrating that firms capable of integrating technological adaptation with institutional learning are better positioned for long-term competitiveness (Teece, 2018). The business implication is that digital banking transformation requires organizational restructuring, ecosystem partnerships, and customer-centric innovation rather than isolated technological adoption.

3. Financial Inclusion, Trust, and Socio-Economic Participation

The third finding is that financial inclusion depends fundamentally on institutional trust and usability rather than digital access alone. Kenya's mobile-money ecosystem dramatically expanded participation among previously unbanked populations by lowering transaction costs and simplifying access. Digital finance supported informal workers, small merchants, rural households, and microenterprises.

Singapore's digital banking ecosystem expanded convenience, efficiency, and service integration within an already highly banked population. Financial inclusion in Singapore therefore focused more on SME innovation,

digital literacy, and integrated financial accessibility rather than first-time banking participation.

The comparative evidence demonstrates that inclusion operates differently across developmental contexts. In Kenya, digital banking primarily addressed structural exclusion from formal financial systems. In Singapore, digital banking focused on deepening financial sophistication and innovation capacity.

This finding contributes to development economics by showing that financial inclusion is institutionally mediated. Digital finance becomes economically meaningful only when consumers trust platforms, understand systems, and perceive benefits from participation. Trust depends on cybersecurity, transparency, dispute resolution, and governance credibility.

The developmental implications are substantial. Inclusive digital finance can strengthen household resilience, expand entrepreneurial participation, improve SME liquidity, and support economic adaptation during crisis periods.

4. Digital Risk, Regulatory Adaptation, and Economic Resilience

The fourth finding is that digital banking transformation generates new governance risks requiring adaptive regulatory capacity. Kenya’s rapidly expanding mobile-finance ecosystem faces concerns regarding fraud, over-indebtedness, platform dependency, and data governance. Digital lending systems may intensify financial vulnerability when consumer protection mechanisms remain weak.

Singapore’s highly integrated financial ecosystem faces cybersecurity, data privacy, and systemic digital-risk challenges. As financial systems become increasingly interconnected, operational disruption and cyberattack exposure become central regulatory concerns.

The comparative evidence indicates that economic resilience depends on adaptive governance rather than technological sophistication alone. Digital banking ecosystems require continuous regulatory learning capable of responding to evolving technological and market conditions.

This finding extends governance literature by demonstrating that digital financial resilience depends on trust, regulatory credibility, and institutional adaptability. Financial innovation without credible governance may increase instability and inequality.

The policy implication is that governments and regulators should integrate cybersecurity, consumer protection, financial literacy, and competition oversight into digital finance strategies.

Table 1. Comparative Matrix of Economic Governance, Organizational Strategy, and Development Outcomes

Variable	Case 1: Kenya	Case 2: Singapore	Empirical Evidence	Analytical Interpretati on
----------	------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

Governance Model	Telecom-finance convergence and inclusion-oriented ecosystems	Regulator-driven integrated financial governance	Central bank and fintech policy reports	Institutional design shapes digital finance pathways
Core Financial Infrastructure	Mobile money and agent-based ecosystems	Digital banks, fintech integration, smart finance systems	Financial participation indicators	Infrastructure influences inclusion models
Organizational Strategy	Platform partnerships and mobile financial expansion	AI-enabled financial services and integrated digital banking	Corporate strategy and fintech reports	Firms adapt differently according to market structure
Financial Inclusion Logic	Expanding first-time financial participation	Deepening digital financial sophistication	World Bank financial inclusion datasets	Inclusion reflects developmental context
Institutional Strength	Accessibility and rapid ecosystem diffusion	Regulatory credibility and financial coordination	OECD and IMF governance reports	Different strengths support resilience differently
Market Competition	Telecom-fintech-bank ecosystem competition	Licensed digital banking and fintech innovation	Market and investment indicators	Governance shapes competitive dynamics
Governance Risk	Fraud, over-indebtedness, platform dominance	Cybersecurity and systemic digital-risk exposure	Financial governance literature	Risks reflect ecosystem maturity
Consumer Trust Mechanism	Accessibility and usability	Regulatory transparency and institutional credibility	Consumer and regulatory reports	Trust mediates adoption sustainability
Developmental Outcome	Poverty reduction and SME participation	Innovation competitiveness and financial efficiency	World Bank and OECD reports	Digital banking affects broader economic resilience
Strategic Limitation	Uneven regulation and digital vulnerability	High compliance complexity and cybersecurity costs	Comparative institutional evidence	Governance must evolve with market complexity

The table demonstrates that Kenya and Singapore represent two distinct but complementary digital banking
 Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. 39

transformation pathways. Kenya emphasizes inclusion-driven mobile ecosystems, while Singapore emphasizes integrated financial governance and digital innovation coordination. The deeper analytical interpretation is that digital banking ecosystems generate sustainable developmental value only when institutional governance aligns technological innovation with consumer trust, organizational capability, and regulatory adaptability.

Conceptual Framework

Digital Financial Governance Framework

Institutional Governance → Digital Financial Infrastructure → Organizational Adaptation → Financial Inclusion and Trust → Market Resilience → Socio-Economic Development

This framework conceptualizes digital banking ecosystems as institutional financial infrastructures rather than technological service platforms alone. Institutional governance shapes regulation, interoperability, security standards, and innovation incentives. Digital financial infrastructure determines market accessibility and participation pathways. Organizational adaptation mediates how banks, fintech firms, and telecom operators restructure strategies around digital systems. Financial inclusion and trust influence legitimacy, adoption, and long-term sustainability. Market resilience emerges when digital ecosystems support adaptability, stability, and consumer confidence. Socio-economic development results when resilient financial systems strengthen entrepreneurship, household resilience, productivity, and inclusive participation.

The framework contributes to economics and business scholarship by demonstrating that digital banking transformation depends fundamentally on institutional capability, trust governance, and organizational adaptation rather than technological diffusion alone.

CONCLUSION

This article examined digital banking transformation and financial inclusion in Kenya and Singapore between 2020 and 2026. The study directly answers the research objective by demonstrating that digital banking ecosystems improve economic inclusion and resilience only when governance coordination, institutional trust, technological infrastructure, and organizational capability are coherently integrated.

The findings reveal substantial comparative divergence. Kenya demonstrates the strengths of inclusion-oriented mobile-finance ecosystems capable of rapidly expanding participation among previously excluded populations. Singapore demonstrates the strengths of advanced regulatory coordination, institutional credibility, and integrated fintech governance. Both systems also reveal important limitations. Kenya faces governance challenges related to consumer vulnerability and platform concentration, while Singapore faces increasingly complex cybersecurity and systemic digital-risk pressures.

The theoretical contribution is the Digital Financial Governance Framework, which explains how

institutional governance, digital infrastructure, organizational adaptation, financial inclusion, and resilience interact to shape socio-economic development. The empirical contribution lies in demonstrating that digital banking transformation is fundamentally an institutional governance process rather than a purely technological innovation phenomenon.

The institutional and policy implications are substantial. Governments should strengthen digital financial governance through consumer protection, cybersecurity regulation, interoperable payment systems, and adaptive supervisory frameworks. Policymakers should recognize that financial inclusion requires trust, literacy, and usability rather than technological access alone.

The business implications are equally important. Financial institutions and fintech firms should treat digital transformation as organizational ecosystem adaptation involving partnerships, customer trust, regulatory alignment, and long-term capability development. Competitive advantage increasingly depends on firms' ability to integrate technological innovation with institutional legitimacy.

This study is limited by uneven fintech data availability and rapidly evolving regulatory environments. Future research should examine AI-driven financial services, central bank digital currencies, cross-border digital payment integration, and the long-term effects of platformization within financial ecosystems.

Ultimately, digital banking transformation will contribute to sustainable economic development only if governance systems ensure that innovation remains inclusive, trusted, secure, and institutionally accountable.

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D., & Johnson, S. (2023). *Power and progress: Our thousand-year struggle over technology and prosperity*. PublicAffairs.
- Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2020). FinTech and RegTech in a nutshell, and the future in a sandbox. *Research Foundation Briefs*, 2(4), 1–20.
- Bank for International Settlements. (2023). *Annual economic report 2023: The future monetary system*. BIS Publishing.
- Central Bank of Kenya. (2024). *National payment system annual report 2023/2024*. Government of Kenya.
- Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Klapper, L., Singer, D., Ansar, S., & Hess, J. (2022). *The Global Findex Database 2021: Financial inclusion, digital payments, and resilience in the age of COVID-19*. World Bank.
- FSB. (2024). *FinTech and market structure in financial services*. Financial Stability Board.
- Gomber, P., Koch, J. A., & Siering, M. (2021). Digital finance and FinTech: Current research and future research directions. *Journal of Business Economics*, 91(5), 537–580.
- IMF. (2024). *World economic outlook: Policy pivot, rising threats*. International Monetary Fund.

- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. (2023). *Economic survey 2023*. Government of Kenya.
- Lee, I., & Shin, Y. J. (2021). FinTech: Ecosystem, business models, investment decisions, and challenges. *Business Horizons*, 64(1), 35–46.
- MAS. (2023). *Singapore fintech ecosystem report*. Monetary Authority of Singapore.
- MAS. (2024). *Digital banking and financial innovation annual review*. Monetary Authority of Singapore.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- OECD. (2023). *Financial markets and digital transformation report*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2024). *Digital economy outlook 2024*. OECD Publishing.
- Parker, G., Van Alstyne, M., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). *Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy*. W. W. Norton.
- Rochet, J. C., & Tirole, J. (2003). Platform competition in two-sided markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1(4), 990–1029.
- Singapore Department of Statistics. (2024). *Digital economy report 2024*. Government of Singapore.
- Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 40–49.
- UNCTAD. (2024). *Digital economy report 2024: Shaping an environmentally sustainable and inclusive digital future*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- World Bank. (2023). *Digital progress and trends report 2023*. World Bank.
- World Economic Forum. (2024). *Global risks report 2024*. World Economic Forum.
- Zetsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., Buckley, R. P., & Barberis, J. (2020). Decentralized finance. *Journal of Financial Regulation*, 6(2), 172–203.

- Mishra, D., Das, S., & Patnaik, R. (2024). Application of AI technology for the development of destination tourism towards an intelligent information system. *Economic Affairs*, 69(2), 1083-1095.
- Naramski, M. (2020). The application of ICT and smart technologies in polish museums—towards smart tourism. *Sustainability*, 12(21), 9287.
- Soltani Nejad, N., Rastegar, R., & Jahanshahi, M. (2024). Tourist engagement with mobile apps of E-leisure: a combined model of self-determination theory and technology acceptance model. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 49(4), 714-725.
- Leung, R. (2019). Smart hospitality: Taiwan hotel stakeholder perspectives. *Tourism Review*, 74(1), 50-62.
- Lai, W.C., Hung, W.H., 2018. A framework of cloud and AI-based intelligent hotel. *In Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Electronic Business (pp. 36-43). ICEB, Guilin, China, December 2-6.*
- Li, S., & Jiang, S. (2023). The technology acceptance on AR memorable tourism experience—The empirical evidence from China. *Sustainability*, 15(18), 13349.
- Liu, Y., Henseler, J., & Liu, Y. (2022). What makes tourists adopt smart hospitality? An inquiry beyond the technology acceptance model. *Digital Business*, 2(2), 100042.
- Terrah, A., Ali, F., Abbasi, G. A., Doğan, S., & Cobanoglu, C. (2024). Determinants of Users' Intentions to Use AI-Enabled Technological Innovations in Hotels: A Hybrid Approach Using PLS-SEM and fsQCA. *Advances in Hospitality and Tourism Research (AHTR)*, 12(2), 200-228.
- Tiwari, P., Kaurav, R. P. S., & Koay, K. Y. (2024). Understanding travel apps usage intention: findings from PLS and NCA. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 12(1), 25-41.
- Thusi, P., & Maduku, D. K. (2020). South African millennials' acceptance and use of retail mobile banking apps: An integrated perspective. *Computers in human behavior*, 111, 106405.
- Praveena, K., & Thomas, S. (2014). Continuance intention to use Facebook: A study of perceived enjoyment and TAM. *Bonfring International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Science*, 4(1), 24.
- Pop, R.-A., Săplăcan, Z., & Alt, M.-A. (2020). Social Media Goes Green—The Impact of Social Media on Green Cosmetics Purchase Motivation and Intention. *Information*, 11(9), 447.
- Rahimzhan, S., Ozturen, A., & Ilkan, M. (2020). Emerging realm of 360-degree technology to promote tourism destination. *Technology in Society*, 63, 101411.
- Salam, A. (2024). Internet of things for sustainability: perspectives in privacy, cybersecurity, and future trends. In *Internet of things for sustainable community development: wireless communications, sensing, and systems (pp. 299-326)*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Shen, S., Sotiriadis, M., & Zhang, Y. (2020). The influence of smart technologies on customer journey in tourist attractions within the smart tourism management framework. *Sustainability*, 12(10), 4157.
- Soheilian, M., Fischl, G., & Aries, M. (2021). Smart lighting application for energy saving and user well-being in the residential environment. *Sustainability*, 13(11), 6198.
- Yang, H., Song, H., Cheung, C., & Guan, J. (2021). How to enhance hotel guests' acceptance and experience of smart hotel technology: An examination of visiting intentions. *International journal of hospitality management*, 97, 103000.
- Ying, T., Tang, J., Ye, S., Tan, X., & Wei, W. (2022). Virtual reality in destination marketing: telepresence, social presence, and tourists' visit intentions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(8), 1738-1756.

- Yu, C. H., & Hsu, T. K. (2024). Empirical impact of AI smart hotel technological services on consumer attitudes: A comparison before and after the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Global Tourism Research*, 9(1), 33-41.
- Warren, C., Becken, S., Nguyen, K., & Stewart, R. A. (2018). Transitioning to smart sustainable tourist accommodation: Service innovation results. *Journal of cleaner production*, 201, 599-608.
- Wu, H.-C., Li, M.-Y. & Li, T. (2018). A study of experiential quality, experiential value, experiential satisfaction, theme park image, and revisit intention. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 42(1), 26-73.
- Wynn, M., & Jones, P. (2022). IT strategy in the hotel industry in the digital era. *Sustainability*, 14(17), 10705.
- Xavier, M. F., Susainathan, S., Antonyimuthu, S. V., Antony, P. J. S., & Parayitam, S. (2024). Deciphering the influence of compatibility, trust, and perceived enjoyment on intention to use digital payments. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 1-20.
- Xu, X. (2018, August). Research on the construction and development of smart hotel from the perspective of serving customers. In *2018 2nd International Conference on Education Science and Economic Management (ICESEM 2018)* (pp. 975-978). Atlantis Press.