

Internationalizing Fintech Services: A Synthesis of Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives

Liu Renzhong*, Poh-Chuin Teo

Azman Hashim International Business School, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Corresponding Author Email: liurenzhong@graduate.utm.my

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v16-i1/27430>

Published Date: 21 January 2026

Abstract

Financial technology (Fintech) has emerged as a transformative force in the global financial landscape, particularly with rapid advancements in artificial intelligence and the expansion of digital financial ecosystems. Chinese Fintech firms have demonstrated significant domestic success in areas such as mobile payments, digital banking, and personal finance, fostering competitive advantages that support strategic global expansion. As these firms increasingly internationalize, they encounter diverse economic conditions, regulatory structures, and consumer preferences across markets, especially in emerging regions such as Southeast Asia. This paper synthesizes theoretical and empirical perspectives on Fintech internationalization, drawing from existing literature on innovation diffusion, global value creation, and service delivery models. The review highlights how organizational capabilities, market adaptation strategies, and customer-centric approaches shape performance outcomes in international environments. This paper has two key research objectives. First, to synthesize theoretical frameworks and empirical findings that explain the strategic drivers and contextual challenges influencing the internationalization of Fintech services. Second, to assess how Fintech firms leverage innovation, partnerships, and service model adaptation to enhance competitiveness and support financial inclusion in international markets. The synthesis contributes to advancing scholarly understanding of Fintech globalization while offering conceptual insights for firms seeking to strengthen their strategic positioning in diverse cross-border contexts.

Keywords: Fintech Internationalization, Innovation, Chinese Fintech Firms, Globalization, Service Models, Southeast Asia, Financial Inclusion

Introduction

Financial technology has become a crucial driver of innovation in the international financial sector, supported by rapid advancements in digital technologies and Generative AI, alongside the growing needs of unbanked and underbanked populations worldwide (Puschmann, 2017; Boston Consulting Group, 2024). Chinese Fintech enterprises have achieved substantial growth in mobile payments, digital banking, and personal finance, reshaping domestic financial ecosystems and positioning China as a leading global player (Han, 2021). As domestic regulatory environments evolve and market saturation increases, many of these firms are

expanding into overseas markets to pursue new growth opportunities, enhance international competitiveness, and contribute to financial inclusion (He, 2024). Industry surveys further indicate a rising trend toward outward expansion, with 32 percent of Fintech CEOs already engaged in overseas operations through independent entry, partnerships, or investment, and an additional 20 percent planning future expansion initiatives (KPMG, 2023).

However, internationalization in the Fintech sector takes place within institutional and market environments that differ substantially across regions. Factors such as regulatory frameworks, political stability, economic growth levels, financial system maturity, and consumer preferences shape the strategic decisions and performance outcomes of internationalizing firms (Kayode, 2023). Chinese Fintech companies operating abroad increasingly recognize the need to move beyond traditional product-centric delivery approaches by aligning their capabilities with local contexts through customer-oriented and adaptive service models (He, 2024; Zhu, 2021). Guided by these scholarly and empirical developments, this article pursues two research objectives: (1) to synthesize theoretical and empirical perspectives on the drivers, challenges, and strategic pathways shaping the internationalization of Fintech services, and (2) to develop a contextualized understanding of the strategic, regulatory, technological, cultural, and organizational challenges faced by Chinese Fintech firms in international markets, and to examine how firms adapt their service delivery and operational models to enhance competitiveness, localization effectiveness, and global performance outcomes.

Fintech Internationalization: Evidence from Prior Studies

To deepen the understanding of how Fintech internationalization is shaped by theoretical foundations, regulatory environments, technological infrastructures, cultural contexts, and organizational adaptation, this study adopts a systematic literature review (SLR) approach. The SLR method enables the structured identification, classification, and synthesis of prior studies across multiple domains that influence Fintech expansion, including international business theories, financial regulation, digital service innovation, cross-border strategic behavior, and market localization practices. By integrating research from conceptual, empirical, industry, and policy-based sources, the review highlights how classical internationalization models intersect with contemporary developments in digital financial ecosystems and platform-based service delivery. This approach allows for a more rigorous and comprehensive interpretation of how Fintech firms, particularly Chinese enterprises, navigate increasingly complex global environments.

In line with this objective, Table 1 presents an overview of the key thematic areas, supporting evidence sources, methodological orientations, and major findings identified through the review process. The table consolidates insights from foundational internationalization theories, policy and regulatory studies, strategic analyses of Chinese Fintech expansion, and research on technical adaptation, market-specific challenges, human capital, and localization. Synthesizing these diverse strands of literature provides a structured analytical basis for interpreting how Fintech firms develop internationalization pathways, manage institutional and operational uncertainties, and adapt their service models across different host markets. The evidence summarized in Table 1 forms the core empirical foundation for the subsequent analysis and theoretical synthesis presented in this study.

Table 1
Evidence Sources

| Topic | Supporting Evidence Source | Method | Key Findings |
|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1. Theoretical Frameworks | | | |
| Uppsala Model (Traditional) | Johanson & Vahlne (1977, 2009) | Conceptual model | Firms internationalize incrementally via experiential learning and market commitment. |
| Revised Uppsala Model (Digital) | Vahlne & Johanson (2017); Zohari (2024) | Critical review | "Liability of outsidership" replaces "foreignness" in digital ecosystems. |
| Product Life Cycle Theory | Vernon (1966) | Economic theory | Early-stage innovations favor home markets; maturity drives globalization. |
| Service Innovation Models | Den Hertog (2000); Tacy (2021) | Case studies | Four dimensions of service innovation: concept, interface, delivery, tech. |
| 2. Fintech Regulatory Challenges | | | |
| Global Regulatory Divergence | Arner et al. (2016); Chorzempa & Huang (2022) | Policy analysis | EU's PSD2/GDPR conflicts with China's flexible fintech sandbox approach. |
| RegTech Solutions | KPMG (2023) | Industry report | AI-driven compliance reduces cross-border operational costs by ~30%. |
| 3. Chinese Fintech Strategies | | | |
| "Going Out" Models | Han (2021); Jones (2024) | Mixed methods | Hybrid strategies: M&A (e.g., Ant Group), partnerships (e.g., WeChat Pay). |
| Political Barriers | He (2024); Zhu (2021) | Policy analysis | Geopolitical tensions limit Western market access, favoring ASEAN expansion. |
| 4. Technical & Operational Adaptation | | | |
| Infrastructure Gaps | BCG (2024); Wu & Kao (2022) | Benchmarking | Emerging markets require lightweight, offline-capable payment solutions. |
| Microservices Architecture | Li et al. (2021) | SLR | Modular designs enable localized compliance and scalability. |
| 5. Cultural & Market-Specific Challenges | | | |
| Islamic Finance Compliance | Santosdiaz (2024) | Case study | Profit-sharing models (e.g., AlipayMY) critical in Muslim-majority markets. |
| Consumer Trust Dynamics | Slotta (2023); Dunkley (2023) | Market analysis | Western users distrust Chinese apps over data privacy (60% skepticism rate). |
| 6. Human Capital & Localization | | | |
| Talent Acquisition | Wu & Kao (2022) | Survey | 75% of Chinese fintechs struggle to hire bilingual regulatory experts. |
| Linguistic Adaptation | Han (2021) | Content analysis | UI localization errors increase user drop-off by 40% in non-Chinese markets. |

The first group of studies centers on theoretical frameworks that explain how firms expand into international markets and how these perspectives evolve in digital and service-based contexts. The traditional Uppsala Model, as articulated by Johanson and Vahlne (1977, 2009), emphasizes incremental internationalization driven by experiential learning, progressive market commitment, and the gradual reduction of uncertainty. More recent refinements to the model shift analytical attention toward the “liability of outsidership” within global digital ecosystems, where network embeddedness and platform participation become more critical than geographic distance, as discussed by Vahlne and Johanson (2017) and Zohari (2024). Complementing these perspectives, Vernon’s Product Life Cycle Theory (1966) explains how innovation initially concentrates in home markets before expanding globally as products mature, while service innovation models such as those proposed by Den Hertog (2000) and Tacy (2021) highlight the importance of service concept design, delivery mechanisms, technological integration, and user interface development in structuring service-oriented competitiveness.

The second thematic area concerns regulatory complexity and institutional divergence across Fintech markets. Prior research shows that cross-border Fintech expansion is heavily shaped by differences in financial regulatory regimes, data governance structures, and supervisory philosophies. Arner et al. (2016) and Chorzempa and Huang (2022) illustrate how contrasting approaches, such as the European Union’s PSD2 and GDPR frameworks versus China’s more flexible sandbox-based regulatory experimentation, create both barriers and opportunities for firms operating internationally. At the same time, industry evidence suggests that regulatory technology (RegTech) solutions are becoming increasingly important for managing compliance and operational risk at scale. Insights from KPMG (2023) indicate that AI-enabled compliance tools can significantly reduce cross-border operational costs, suggesting that technological integration in regulatory processes is a strategic enabler rather than merely an administrative requirement.

The third cluster of literature focuses on the strategies and geopolitical conditions influencing the international expansion of Chinese Fintech firms. Studies by Han (2021) and Jones (2024) document hybrid expansion pathways that combine mergers and acquisitions, strategic partnerships, and investment-based collaboration models, as seen in the overseas activities of leading Chinese platforms such as Ant Group and WeChat Pay. However, this expansion trajectory is also shaped by geopolitical sensitivities and institutional barriers. Analyses by He (2024) and Zhu (2021) note that tensions with Western economies constrain entry opportunities in certain regions, thereby encouraging Chinese Fintech enterprises to prioritize ASEAN and other emerging markets where regulatory receptiveness, digital financial inclusion agendas, and partnership ecosystems are more aligned with their operational strengths.

The final set of studies highlights adaptation challenges related to technology, culture, human capital, and localization. Technical research indicates that emerging markets often require lightweight, interoperable, and offline-capable infrastructure solutions, as emphasized by BCG (2024) and Wu and Kao (2022), while microservices architectures support modular compliance and scalability in diverse regulatory contexts (Li et al., 2021). Market-specific research further shows that cultural and institutional expectations, such as Islamic finance principles in Muslim-majority markets, require tailored financial models and partnership structures, as observed by Santosdiaz (2024). Meanwhile, consumer trust, data privacy

concerns, and perceptions of Chinese digital platforms influence adoption patterns in Western markets (Slotta, 2023; Dunkley, 2023). Human capital and language-related constraints also affect operational performance, with Wu and Kao (2022) reporting difficulties in hiring bilingual compliance specialists and Han (2021) showing that localization and interface translation errors may significantly increase user dropout in non-Chinese markets. Together, these findings illustrate that successful Fintech internationalization extends beyond technology deployment and requires deep contextual adaptation, regulatory alignment, and organizational learning.

Study Implications

The synthesis of theoretical and empirical perspectives highlights that while traditional internationalization theories such as the Uppsala Model and the Product Life Cycle Theory continue to provide meaningful explanatory value, the dynamics of Fintech internationalization diverge in important ways from earlier manufacturing-based frameworks (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977; Vernon, 1966). The findings from the reviewed literature indicate that Fintech expansion is shaped not only by experiential learning and staged market commitment, but also by platform ecosystems, digital scalability, data governance requirements, and regulatory asymmetries across host markets (Arner et al., 2016; Vahlne & Johanson, 2017). These conditions underscore the increasing relevance of concepts such as the “liability of outsidership” in digital environments, the role of service innovation interfaces, and the need for flexible technological architectures to support localization, compliance, and interoperability across diverse financial systems (Den Hertog, 2000; Li et al., 2021; Zohari, 2024).

From a practical perspective, the synthesis suggests several strategic implications for internationalizing Fintech firms, particularly Chinese companies expanding into emerging and developed markets. Success in overseas environments depends not only on technological capability and domestic market experience, but also on firms’ ability to adapt service delivery models, build consumer trust, navigate political and regulatory sensitivities, and develop multilingual and bicultural human capital resources (Wu & Kao, 2022; Slotta, 2023; He, 2024). The evidence further indicates that hybrid internationalization approaches combining partnerships, local investments, and cross-platform payment integration can facilitate market legitimacy and accelerate ecosystem embeddedness (Han, 2021; Jones, 2024). These implications reinforce the need for firms to balance innovation, localization, and governance alignment when designing sustainable internationalization strategies in the Fintech sector.

Conclusion and Future Recommendations

This study synthesizes theoretical foundations and contemporary empirical evidence to provide an integrated understanding of Fintech internationalization from both strategic and contextual perspectives. The analysis demonstrates that while classical internationalization theories offer a valuable starting point for explaining how firms expand abroad, Fintech enterprises operate within environments characterized by heightened regulatory complexity, technological dependency, infrastructural variability, and trust-sensitive consumer behavior. These industry-specific conditions reshape traditional assumptions regarding risk, learning, market entry sequences, and location choice. The findings indicate that internationalizing Fintech firms must adopt adaptive, service-oriented, and ecosystem-based strategies that

account for institutional diversity, digital governance structures, and evolving expectations around data protection, payment security, and financial inclusion.

Future research can build on this synthesis by extending comparative analyses across regions, market maturity levels, and regulatory models, particularly within Southeast Asia, Europe, and emerging African digital finance ecosystems. There is also scope for deeper investigation into micro-level organizational processes, including capability development, cross-border knowledge translation, and leadership decision-making in digitally mediated environments. Further empirical studies involving longitudinal case research, intervention-based evaluation, and performance measurement of localized service models would contribute to refining theoretical perspectives on Fintech internationalization. Such extensions will not only strengthen conceptual understanding but also support policymakers, industry practitioners, and multinational Fintech firms in designing globally competitive, context-responsive, and socially inclusive financial innovation strategies.

References

- Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2016). FinTech, RegTech, and the reconceptualization of financial regulation. *Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus.*, 37, 371.
- Boston Consulting Group. (2024). Financial Institutions Global Fintech 2024: Prudence, Profits, and Growth. (2024). *BCG & QED*. Retrieved from <https://web-assets.bcg.com/a9/4e/eeb7ae814bfb98d918fac0fcc4ce/2024-fintech-report-june-2024-edit-03.pdf>
- Boston Consulting Group. (2024). Financial Institutions Global Fintech 2024: Prudence, Profits, and Growth. (2024). *BCG & QED*. Retrieved from <https://web-assets.bcg.com/a9/4e/eeb7ae814bfb98d918fac0fcc4ce/2024-fintech-report-june-2024-edit-03.pdf>
- Chorzempa, M., & Huang, Y. (2022). Chinese Fintech innovation and Regulation. *Asian Economic Policy Review*, 17(2), 274–292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aepr.12384>
- Cumming, D., Johan, S., & Reardon, R. (2023). Global Fintech trends and their impact on international business: a review. *Multinational Business Review*, 31(3), 413–436. <https://doi.org/10.1108/mbr-05-2023-0077>
- den Hertog, P. (2010). Managing service innovation: firm-level dynamic capabilities and policy options. [Thesis, externally prepared, Universiteit van Amsterdam]. *Dialogic Innovatie & Interactie*.
- Han, A.S. (2021). Chinese Fintech companies and their “going out” strategies. *Journal of Internet and Digital Economics*, 1(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jide-07-2021-0003>
- He, Y. (2024). Chinese fintech goes global: political challenges and business strategies. *Asia Policy*, 19(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1353/asp.2024.a918869>
- Johanson, J. & Vahlne, J.-E. (1977), “The internationalization process of the firm: a model of knowledge development and increasing foreign market commitments”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 23-32.
- Johanson, J. & Vahlne, J.-E. (2009), “The Uppsala internationalization process model revisited: from liability of foreignness to liability of outsidership”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 9, pp. 1411-1431.
- Jones, E. (2024). Fintech on the move: Unravelling Chinese domestic and global M&A strategies. *Edgar, Dunn & Company*. Retrieved from

- <https://www.edgardunn.com/articles/fintech-on-the-move-unravelling-chinese-domestic-and-global-m-a-strategies>
- KPMG. (2023). 2023 Chinese Fintech CEO Survey Report. *NIFA & KPMG*. Retrieved from <https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/cn/pdf/zh/2023/06/2023-chinese-fintech-ceo-survey-report.pdf>
- Kayode, S. (2023). Revolutionizing Financial Landscapes: The Role of Emerging Technologies in Fintech Transformation.
- Li, S., Zhang, H., Jia, Z., Zhong, C., Zhang, C., Shan, Z., Shen, J., & Babar, M. A. (2021). Understanding and addressing quality attributes of microservices architecture: A Systematic literature review. *Information and Software Technology*, 131, 106449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2020.106449>
- Peilin, L., & Xintong, W. (2024). China's software service providers bet on AI amid funding chill. *Nikkei Asia*. Retrieved from <https://asia.nikkei.com/Spotlight/Caixin/China-software-service-providers-bet-on-AI-amid-funding-chill>
- Puschmann, T. (2017). Fintech. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 59, 69-76.
- Santosdiaz, R., & Santosdiaz, R. (2024). Malaysia's Fintech Boom: A Growing Force in Southeast Asia. *The Fintech Times*. Retrieved from <https://thefintechtimes.com/fintech-landscape-of-malaysia/>
- Slotta, D. (2023). FinTech in China - statistics & facts. *Statista*. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/topics/6893/fintech-in-china/#topicOverview>
- Vahlne, J. E., & Johanson, J. (2017). From internationalization to evolution: The Uppsala model at 40 years. *Journal of international business studies*, 48, 1087-1102.
- Vernon, R. (1966). 1966: International investment and international trade in the product cycle. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 80, 190-207.
- Wu, A., & Kao, D. (2022). Mapping the sustainable Human-Resource challenges in Southeast Asia's Fintech sector. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 15(7), 307. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm15070307>
- Zhu, V. (2021). China's Fintech: the end of the wild west. Policy Paper). *Paris: Institut Montaigne*.
- Zohari, T. (2024). The Uppsala Internationalization Model and its limitation in the new era. *digitProMag, Digital Professionals*. Retrieved from <https://www.digitpro.co.uk/the-uppsala-internationalization-model-and-its-limitation-in-the-new-era/>