# MRP

*by* Rijul Jain

**Submission date:** 26-May-2026 10:43AM (UTC+0530)
**Submission ID:** 2969635520
**File name:** Major_Project_Rijul.docx (76.22K)
**Word count:** 8818
**Character count:** 53203

# CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background of the Study

No other innovation in the recent history of business has been so fast, so far-reaching, and so lopsidedly distributed among members of a society than the adoption of digital technology by the financial services industry. From what was initially a hesitant foray into online banking in the latter years of the 20th century, the transformation of banking in the space of just one generation into a completely new way of thinking about banks, their offerings, and the relationship between institutions and hundreds of millions of people in terms of money management, lending, payments, and investment has become a complete overhaul of the very concept of personal finance. The term used to refer to this overhaul — Financial Technology, FinTech, in short — is as unpretentious in structure as it is multilayered in meaning. This is because the field comprises not only the digitization of conventional banking products but an entirely new paradigm based on mobile devices, artificial intelligence, blockchain technology, application programming interfaces, and data intelligence.

In the international landscape, the development of FinTech as a disruptor took off in the wake of the 2008 global financial crisis — a period when the public had lost faith in their traditional banking institutions, while a competitive landscape emerged which uniquely positioned technologists to capitalize on the opportunity. The development of Alipay and WeChat pay in China represented a revolution in payment infrastructure that would have been impossible to achieve in the absence of FinTech innovation. The development of the Open Banking Standard, along with the regulation sandbox implemented by the Financial Conduct Authority in the United Kingdom led to the rise of challenger banks such as Monzo, Starling, and Revolut that sought to compete on customer satisfaction, and lower costs through innovation compared to traditional banks. Square, Stripe, and Robinhood similarly transformed the economics of transactions, small businesses lending and investments, respectively, within the United States.

It can be argued however that none of these countries had seen such a fundamental FinTech disruption like the one in India — owing partly to its economic background, population dynamics, and the policy choices of its regulators. India's FinTech story is not simply a story about the adoption of superior digital products by discerning urban

consumers. It is a story about the conscious, state-orchestrated construction of a digital financial public infrastructure — the so-called India Stack — that created the conditions for a leap in financial inclusion and digital adoption of a scale and pace unparalleled anywhere else in the world.

The foundations of this infrastructure were laid in deliberate sequence. With the introduction of Aadhaar, a biometric ID program initiated by the Unique Identification Authority of India in 2009, which registered over 1.38 billion people and laid the foundations of a digital identity system to conduct remote customer verification at no costs whatsoever, FinTech companies could have access to an extensive customer base in India. The Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana scheme, introduced in August 2014, ensured the inclusion of more than 530 million previously unbanked Indians into the financial system and thus considerably increased the population of possible customers of digital services which were not available to these segments in the form of conventional banking solutions. The demonetization of high-value notes announced in November 2016 was perhaps one of the most disruptive measures ever taken by the Indian Government with regard to its economy, but it pushed a considerable number of Indians to adopt digital financial products rather than sticking to traditional ways of making payments in cash. Finally, the establishment of Unified Payments Interface in 2016 facilitated a real-time, interoperable, and account-agnostic transactional environment in India.

The achievements made through this institutional framework, seen not only in quantitative measures but also in practice through the lives of customers of Indian banks, have been truly remarkable. As late as 2016, India fared badly in terms of its performance on global financial inclusion measures and carried out the bulk of its financial transactions in physical cash. By 2024, the use of just UPI had crossed more than 141 billion transactions worth more than India's nominal GDP each year. More than 510 million monthly active users of the UPI system existed by that time. Applications for mobile banking services were being used by a larger population than the total number of adults living in Western Europe. Digital account opening, once an industry aspiration, now takes under 18 minutes from form completion to active account status at the most advanced institutions.

For the Indian banking sector — comprising 12 public sector banks, 21 private sector banks, 43 regional rural banks, 6 payment banks, and a growing number of small

finance banks — this transformation has presented both an extraordinary strategic opportunity and a profound, multi-dimensional competitive challenge. Banks that have embedded FinTech capabilities into their operating models at depth and speed are achieving superior customer experience ratings, declining cost structures, and improving asset quality. Those that have moved more slowly are experiencing customer relationship erosion to more agile competitors — both from within the banking sector and from the FinTech ecosystem of platform companies, digital lenders, and payments specialists that has grown up around them.

**Table 1.1: Growth Trajectory of India's FinTech Sector (2019–2024)**

| Year | FinTech Market (USD Bn) | YoY Growth (%) | Active FinTech Startups | Digital Transactions (Bn) | Internet Banking Users (Mn) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2019 | 35.2 | — | 2,035 | 10.8 | 147 |
| 2020 | 47.6 | 35.2 | 2,174 | 15.6 | 185 |
| 2021 | 66.8 | 40.3 | 2,412 | 25.3 | 264 |
| 2022 | 91.4 | 36.8 | 2,688 | 40.7 | 338 |
| 2023 | 117.6 | 28.7 | 3,102 | 64.2 | 403 |
| 2024 (Est.) | 150.3 | 27.8 | 3,500+ | 98.5 | 472 |

*Source: NASSCOM FinTech India Report 2024; RBIH Annual Report 2024; BCG FinTech Analysis 2024. Compiled by Researcher.*

Table 1.1 documents the scale and momentum of India's FinTech expansion. The sector's market size grew from USD 35.2 billion in 2019 to an estimated USD 150.3 billion in 2024 — a compound annual growth rate of approximately 33.7%. Active FinTech startups grew by over 70% in this period, while annual digital transaction volumes increased nearly tenfold. Internet banking users grew from 147 million to 472 million, a number that underestimates the full digital banking base since many users access services exclusively through mobile applications rather than web portals.

**Table 1.2: UPI Platform — Transaction Volume, Value and Reach (2019–2024)**

| Year | Transactions (Bn) | Total Value (INR Lakh Crore) | Monthly Active Users (Mn) | Share of Digital Payments (%) | Registered Banks on UPI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2019 | 10.77 | 18.36 | 120 | 31.4 | 143 |
| 2020 | 22.33 | 41.04 | 197 | 42.6 | 178 |
| 2021 | 38.74 | 71.54 | 278 | 57.3 | 216 |
| 2022 | 74.05 | 125.94 | 350 | 68.2 | 304 |
| 2023 | 117.60 | 182.74 | 430 | 77.5 | 381 |
| 2024 | 141.28 | 223.41 | 510 | 83.4 | 641 |

*Source: NPCI Annual Reports (2019–2024). Compiled and computed by Researcher.*

The figures given in Table 1.2 by UPI indicate an unprecedented shift. While monthly active users started off at 120 million in 2019, it had grown to 510 million in 2024. Its volume share of all digital transactions had surpassed 83% and it served as the foundational infrastructure for the Indian economy, including its consumers and small enterprises. UPI transaction volumes, valued at INR 223.41 lakh crore, exceeded the nominal GDP of India – a metric that clearly shows the importance of the infrastructure within the country.

The total number of registered banks grew from 143 in 2019 to 641 in 2024.

**1.2 The Indian FinTech Ecosystem – A Structural Overview**

The Indian FinTech ecosystem has evolved from a payments-centric cluster into a multi-vertical, deeply interconnected digital financial services economy that touches virtually every domain of financial intermediation. The heart of the ecosystem remains the payment platforms such as PhonePe, Google Pay, Paytm, and BHIM which operate at the UPI interface layer and account for a bulk of peer-to-peer transactions and merchant payments. The payment platform core is supplemented by several verticals of financial services that have emerged to provide differentiated solutions to end-users: digital lending platforms (Lendingkart, KreditBee, MoneyView, CRED), wealth management and investment platforms (Zerodha, Groww, Angel One, INDmoney), insurance tech (Acko, Digit Insurance, PolicyBazaar), regulatory/identity technology (Signzy, IDfy, Perfios, Bureau), and neo-banking platforms (Jupiter, Fi, Open, RazorpayX).Each vertical is simultaneously competing with and creating opportunities for the incumbent banking sector.

Incumbent banks have responded through two broad strategic postures. The first is internal digital product development — building proprietary digital banking platforms that seek to match or exceed the experience quality of FinTech-native applications. The State Bank of India's YONO super-app, HDFC Bank's Digital 2.0 initiative, ICICI Bank's iMobile Pay, and Kotak Mahindra Bank's 811 digital savings account represent the most prominent examples of this approach. The second posture is collaborative integration — embedding FinTech capabilities within bank platforms through API partnerships, co-lending arrangements, and the Account Aggregator architecture introduced by the RBI in 2021. This 'co-opetition' model increasingly characterises the most progressive strategies in Indian banking and forms a key recommendation of this study.

### 1.3 Problem Statement

Despite the dramatic quantitative growth of FinTech adoption in India, a structured, empirically grounded understanding of its qualitative impact across the spectrum of customer experience and its measurable effect on bank operational efficiency remains insufficiently developed in the academic literature. Three specific knowledge gaps motivate this study.

**Gap 1 — The Integrated Framework Problem:** Existing literature tends to treat customer experience and operational efficiency as separate, independent research questions, studied with different methodologies and by different academic communities. There is a conspicuous absence of research that examines both constructs as co-determined outcomes of a common set of FinTech investments within a single unified empirical framework. This study addresses that gap directly.

**Gap 2 — The Heterogeneity Problem:** Aggregate FinTech adoption statistics mask profound heterogeneity in who is benefiting from digital banking and who is being left behind. The experience of a 28-year-old MBA graduate banking with a leading private sector bank is fundamentally different from that of a 60-year-old retired government servant banking with a public sector bank through a branch Business Correspondent. A study that does not map this heterogeneity cannot generate adequately differentiated policy recommendations.

**Gap 3 — The Post-Pandemic Data Gap:** The COVID-19 pandemic of 2020–2021 functioned as a watershed event for digital banking adoption in India, compressing

what might have been five years of gradual migration into eighteen months of forced adoption. Most published empirical studies on FinTech and Indian banking predate this acceleration. Contemporary empirical evidence that reflects the post-pandemic reality of India's digital banking landscape is needed, and this study provides it.

### 1.4 Objectives of the study

**Research Objectives 1:** The objective of this research is to analyze the level of impact and adoption of FinTech within different customer segments and bank segments in India.

**Research Objectives 2:** It is intended that this research explores the impacts of FinTech adoption, which includes mobile banking, unified payment interface, AI-assisted customer support, know-your-customer digitalization, and automations in lending on customer satisfaction and convenience, amongst others.

**Research Objectives 3:** This research seeks to establish performance efficiency metrics, which include cost-income ratio, transaction processing times, and NPA ratio in relation to the adoption of FinTech in Indian banks.

**Research Objectives 4:** The objective of this research is to identify the main challenges that can affect the adoption of FinTech in Indian banks.

**Research Objectives 5:** The last research objective of this study is to propose recommendations for Indian banks, FinTech firms, and regulatory authorities.

### 1.5 Scope of the Study

This study will be limited to retail banking in the scheduled commercial banks in India covering public sector banks, private sector banks, small finance banks, and payment banks. Corporate and institutional banking, non-banking financial companies, cooperative societies, and insurance-linked FinTech fall out of the purview of this study though they are highly significant and relevant areas of research.

Primary data collection was done in five major cities of India – namely Delhi-NCR, Mumbai, Bengaluru, Hyderabad, and Pune which are the most developed and technology-savvy among Indian urban centers. Timeline of the study goes from FY 2018-19 till 2023-24. FinTech application analysis includes mobile banking apps, Unified Payment Interface (UPI)/real-time payments platforms, artificial intelligence-driven customer interface software, digital Know Your Customer (KYC) processes,

automated lending processes, and data analytics for personalization. Cryptocurrency, cross-border payment platforms, while highly relevant, remain outside this study's purview.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the last decade, there have been significant developments in the academic literature surrounding fintech, the customer experience within banks, and efficiency in operations, with developments in this area closely mirroring the speed with which fintech has risen to prominence in academia. This chapter synthesises the most significant contributions to these interconnected bodies of knowledge, organised

thematically to build toward the conceptual framework guiding this study's empirical design.

### 2.1 Defining FinTech in the Banking Context

Definitional precision in FinTech research matters because the term is deployed variously to describe a narrow technology deployment, a broader organisational transformation, and an emergent industry sector — often within the same policy or academic document. Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2016), in what remains the most cited conceptual framework in the field, traced FinTech's evolution across three epochs: FinTech 1.0, covering the digitalisation of financial infrastructure from the first transatlantic telegraph cable in 1866 through the early internet era; FinTech 2.0, characterised by internet-based banking, electronic trading, and digital back-office systems from 1988 to 2008; and FinTech 3.0, representing the post-global-financial-crisis era of startup-driven disruption, platform finance, and AI-powered services from 2008 onwards. In the Indian context, this periodisation maps well onto domestic milestones, with the post-2016 period — coinciding with UPI's launch, demonetisation, and the rapid scaling of mobile internet — representing an especially concentrated and government-accelerated version of FinTech 3.0 dynamics.

Gomber, Kauffman, Parker, and Weber (2018), writing in the Journal of Management Information Systems, disaggregated FinTech into five domains: digital payments and transactions, financial software and data analytics, digital lending and financing, digital investment and wealth management, and digital insurance. This taxonomy reveals that while all five domains are present in the Indian market, they have developed at very different rates — digital payments having achieved near-ubiquitous urban penetration, while digital insurance and sophisticated robo-advisory products are at considerably earlier stages of consumer adoption. Schueffel (2016), after a systematic review of 200 academic articles, proposed defining FinTech as 'a new financial industry that applies technology to improve financial activities' .

As noted by Malagatti (2024), studying the context of the Indian banking system, customer satisfaction with digital banking services depends on their perception of convenience, reliability, and cost effectiveness of transactions; however, limitations such as cybersecurity threats and lack of digital literacy were systemic, thus needing

an institutional response rather than merely addressing the customers' individual concerns. The author's indication that India constitutes for 14% of global investments into FinTech sector, whereas the domestic market opportunity is estimated to be $2.1 trillion by 2030, highlights the scale of transformation needed in the country.

**2.2 FinTech and Customer Experience – Global and Indian Evidence**

Customer experience in banking — defined by Mbama and Ezepue (2018) as the customer's cumulative cognitive and affective evaluation of all direct and indirect interactions with a bank's service interfaces over the course of the banking relationship — has emerged as the defining competitive currency of the digital banking era. In their landmark study of UK digital banking customers, Mbama and Ezepue identified five key drivers of experience quality: service quality, perceived value, digital innovation, employee engagement, and resultant customer satisfaction. Of these, digital innovation demonstrated the most statistically significant positive effect. Their methodology, which distinguishes between the quality of specific digital service attributes and the holistic quality of the banking relationship, informed the design of Section C of this study's questionnaire instrument.

Adaptation of the well-known SERVQUAL model to the context of digital banking necessitates the change of its fundamental dimensions, namely reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibility to adjust for the unique character of interaction within digital banking services, which are essentially dematerialized; thus, both tangibility and empathy need a completely new interpretation in terms of digital banking. As indicated by Wasan (2018), who researched digital banking in the Indian environment, there are three key factors that should be considered in addition to the aforementioned dimensions: intuitive interface, digital security, and omnichannel integration.

Roy, Balaji, Quazi, and Quaddus (2018) examined the determinants of customer experience quality across 612 Indian retail banking customers, finding that perceived usefulness, ease of use, and trust were the three most significant determinants. Critically, institutional trust — not merely trust in the specific digital interface — emerged as the most important factor. Banks in India, the authors found, were systematically underperforming on customer-centric experience metrics, suggesting

that the rapid expansion of digital channel capacity had outpaced the development of customer experience quality management within those channels.

Kapoor and Singh (2021) provided empirical evidence from a multi-bank Indian study that institutions deploying digital onboarding and AI-assisted underwriting reported both faster loan approval times and higher customer net promoter scores. Their statistically significant positive correlation between digital service breadth and overall satisfaction ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.01$), controlling for bank size and geography, provided a direct methodological precedent for this study's integrated framework. Verma, Sreenu, and Kushwaha (2025) advanced the theoretical argument that customer experience improvements and operational efficiency gains are not independent outcomes but co-determined consequences of the same digital investments — a 'convergence hypothesis' that this study empirically tests.

**2.3 FinTech and Operational Efficiency in Banking**

The relationship between technology investment and banking efficiency has a rich theoretical and empirical foundation. Berger (2003) identified three channels through which information technology generates efficiency gains in banking: cost reduction through process automation; revenue enhancement through data-driven cross-selling; and risk management improvement through superior credit assessment and fraud detection. This framework retains strong explanatory power in the Indian FinTech context and directly informed the design of the operational efficiency variables examined in Section 4.4.

Bhatia and Mahendru (2015), applying Data Envelopment Analysis to 26 Indian public sector banks, found substantial variation in technical efficiency and documented a strong correlation between technology investment intensity and efficiency scores. Tamatam, Dutta, Dutta, and Lessmann (2019) extended this analysis to the full spectrum of Indian scheduled commercial banks over 2008–2017, confirming that institutions with more advanced core banking systems.

The International Finance Corporation (2020) documented that FinTech-enabled financial institutions in emerging markets typically operated at cost-to-income ratios of 40–50%, compared to 60–70% for comparably-sized less-digital peers — a 10–30 percentage-point structural advantage of considerable competitive significance.

Reserve Bank of India data for FY 2023 confirm this differential in the Indian context: leading private sector banks operated at 38–44%, while most public sector banks remained at 55–65%. Agarwal and Zhang (2020) demonstrated that AI-driven credit assessment models significantly outperformed rule-based underwriting in predicting default risk, with adopting institutions reporting gross NPA ratios approximately 1.8 percentage points lower — a channel through which FinTech directly improves balance sheet quality.

**2.4 Technology Acceptance in Indian Banking**

Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) – which suggested that perceptions of ease of use and usefulness jointly impact technology adoption attitudes – has been the key theory guiding FinTech adoption studies to date. In multiple studies of applications in India, perceived usefulness has invariably proved to be the more influential determinant, suggesting that banking clients in India adopt FinTech due to its practical usefulness rather than its novelty or any social compulsion. Sharma and Singh (2022) extended TAM with trust theory in the Indian context, finding that perceived security and institutional trust moderate the usefulness-to-adoption relationship — particularly for older customers and higher-value transactions. This moderation relationship directly informs Hypothesis H2 of this study.

Rastogi (2025) contributed the important observation that FinTech adoption generates positive spillover effects on customer engagement with non-digital banking services — a complementarity dynamic that implies digital and physical channels are mutually reinforcing rather than purely substitutional in India's current stage of digital maturity. This finding has significant implications for branch network strategy and is examined further in the channel preference analysis of Section 4.3.

### *2.5 Barriers to FinTech Adoption*

According to Singh (2025), there are five systemic impediments to FinTech adoption in India. These include cybersecurity concerns, low digital literacy levels, poor last-mile network connectivity, uncertain regulations for digital data privacy, and ingrained preferences for cash transaction due to cultural reasons. According to the

Report on Currency and Finance (2023) by the Reserve Bank of India, 38% of customers based in rural areas were found to be using branches and Business Correspondent channels exclusively due to lack of connectivity and literacy issues in the urban-oriented FinTech environment.

In a multicentric study conducted with a sample size of 500 Indian banking customers, Kosuru and Tatiparti (2024) determined that 67% of customers feared security risks associated with online banking operations. This finding is directly consistent with this study's primary data results and has important policy implications: the sector's ability to sustain FinTech adoption momentum is conditioned not merely on the quality of digital services but on the institutional architecture of trust and security assurance surrounding them.

### 2.6 Conceptual Framework and Research Gap

The literature synthesised in this chapter yields a conceptual framework in which FinTech adoption — operationalised as the breadth, frequency, and depth of digital banking service usage — functions as the independent variable driving two interrelated dependent outcomes: customer experience quality and operational efficiency. The FinTech-to-experience relationship is mediated by perceived usefulness, trust, and digital literacy. The FinTech-to-efficiency relationship is mediated by digital maturity, IT investment intensity, and process automation depth. Both relationships are moderated by bank type and customer demographics.

The research gap this study addresses is threefold: the absence of an integrated analytical framework examining both constructs simultaneously; the limited geographic and post-pandemic temporal coverage of existing India-specific empirical studies; and the absence of granular empirical documentation of the private-public sector experience divide in Indian FinTech banking. This study fills all three gaps through a multi-city, mixed-method, post-pandemic empirical design.

## CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Research Philosophy and Design

The basis of the research design adopted for this study is that of a post-positivist research paradigm. The underlying assumption of the post-positivist paradigm is that of acknowledging the existence of objective reality within the phenomena of interest

(adoption of FinTech solutions, customer satisfaction, efficiency of banks), while at the same time accepting the fallibility of measuring objective reality as it is inherently context-specific. The application of such a research paradigm is evident from the research design, where the use of quantitative measurement instruments, together with statistical inference, constitutes the main form of data analysis, while the results interpretation is done bearing in mind the context-specific nature of the Indian banking system.

The research design is descriptive-cum-analytical. The descriptive component characterises the current state of FinTech adoption across the surveyed population, its patterns across demographic segments and bank types, and its perceived effects on customer experience quality. In the analytic section, there are hypotheses which are derived based on theory that would be subjected to inferential statistics to test out the factors that influence the customer experience as well as the operational efficiency of banks. The use of mixed methods will be employed at the data source aspect where the primary survey involving 200 participants is complemented by secondary analysis of the performance of institutions such as Reserve Bank of India, National Payments Corporation of India, NASSCOM, and Boston Consulting Group.

**3.2 Research Hypotheses**

**H1:** The level of adoption of FinTech has been found to have a strong positive association with customer satisfaction among banks in India.

**H2:** Perceived digital security and institutional trust significantly mediate the relationship between FinTech adoption and customer experience quality.

**H3:** Banks that adopt FinTech at high levels tend to show a significantly lower cost-to-income ratio than less digitized banks.

**H4:** AI-powered credit scoring has shown positive associations with a decline in non-performing assets for banks in India.

**H5:** Cybersecurity concerns, less knowledge regarding digital products , and lack of infrastructure are the most important hinderance to FinTech adoption.

**3.3 Sampling Strategy and Data Collection**

The target population for the primary survey comprised two respondent categories: retail banking customers — individuals holding active accounts at scheduled

commercial banks and using at least one digital banking service regularly — and banking and FinTech professionals, defined as individuals employed in customer-facing, digital product, operations, credit, or risk roles at banks or FinTech companies. This dual-respondent design was deliberately chosen to capture both the demand-side perspective on customer experience quality and the supply-side perspective on operational transformation and FinTech implementation — enabling a triangulation of viewpoints that no single-stakeholder study design could achieve.

A purposive sampling method was utilized to ensure a representative sample concerning different geographical regions, bank types (public, private, small finance), generations, education, and professional experience. In-person interviews combined with reliable online survey forms were used to collect the data. It should be noted that this particular period was carefully chosen since it was associated with normality following the pandemic era when FinTech-powered banking services became an everyday practice rather than a necessity, and it allowed for collecting information concerning the impact on banks' operations that was brought about by acceleration of digital transformation processes in 2020-2021.

After eliminating 22 questionnaires characterized by a percentage of item non-response higher than 15% or inconsistent responses, 200 samples were left, consisting of 160 banking clients and 40 banking and FinTech professionals. As can be seen, this number allows satisfying the commonly accepted requirement of 10 cases per each predictor in multiple regression models (Hair et al., 2019) and the minimum amount of samples needed for conducting chi-square tests on categorical variables.

### 3.4 Measurement Instrument Design

The data collection tool mainly utilized in the study was a four-section structured questionnaire that was developed following the results of a comprehensive review of scales employed in relevant literature on digital banking experience, technology adoption, and FinTech adoption. The instrument was reviewed by experts in financial management and marketing research and pre-tested on 25 respondents to improve its design. As a result of pre-test, rewording of three items, inclusion of an extra item about multilingual user interface and adjustment of anchors of Section D responses were made.

Section A of the questionnaire was aimed at capturing demographic characteristics including gender, age category, highest educational qualification, occupational group, monthly income bracket, and preferred bank. Section B addressed issues related to FinTech adoption, including the FinTech services respondents had adopted, frequency of use of those services, preferred device, time period they used digital banking and reasons motivating them towards the adoption. Section C was designed to measure customer experience satisfaction on eight service dimensions using a five-point Likert scale (Very Dissatisfied = 1, to Very Satisfied = 5) based on the SERVQUAL framework of Wasan (2018) and experience dimensions of digital banking proposed by Mbama and Ezepue (2018). Finally, Section D Measures were taken to evaluate attitudes towards nine barriers that can affect further FinTech penetration with the help of a 5-point agreement scale (1 - Strongly Disagree, 5 - Strongly Agree).

### 3.5 Statistical Methods Employed

All primary data analyses were conducted on SPSS Version 26.0. The following methods were used: Descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, standard deviations, and cumulative percentage values for demographic and adoption pattern analyses. Chi-square tests of independence to examine associations between categorical variables, specifically the relationship between bank type and customer satisfaction level. Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax rotation to confirm the dimensionality structure of the customer experience and adoption barrier measurement scales. Multiple regression analysis — two separate models — to identify the significant predictors of customer experience quality and bank operational efficiency respectively. Reliability analysis using Cronbach's Alpha and item-total correlations for measuring and validating the consistency of all measurement scales.

Secondary efficiency data — cost-to-income ratios, NPA ratios, and transaction processing measures — were gathered from RBI Statistical Tables Relating to Banks in India (Financial Year 2018-2023) and BCG/NASSCOM industry reports. Trend analysis of these secondary data was performed in Microsoft Excel. For the operational efficiency regression model, a cross-sectional secondary dataset of 50 banks was constructed from publicly available RBI disclosures.

### 3.6 Validity and Reliability Testing

**Table 3.2: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients by Measurement Scale**

| Scale / Dimension | No. of Items | Cronbach's Alpha | Standard Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| FinTech Adoption Intensity | 6 | 0.84 | Good |
| Customer Experience Quality | 8 | 0.87 | Good |
| Perceived Digital Security and Trust | 5 | 0.82 | Good |
| Operational Efficiency Perception (Professionals) | 6 | 0.79 | Acceptable |
| FinTech Adoption Barriers | 7 | 0.81 | Good |
| Overall Instrument (All Scales Combined) | 32 | 0.87 | Good |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

It is clear from Table 3.2 below that all individual scales and the total measure surpassed the threshold of reliability of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978). A Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.87 indicates sufficient consistency. While the lowest value of 0.79 for Cronbach's Alpha pertains to the scale of Operational Efficiency Perception evaluated exclusively amongst the bankers, this value also surpasses the threshold of reliability because of the requirement for higher expertise when dealing with certain questions of the scale.

**Table 3.3: KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity**

| Statistic | Value |
|---|---|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy | 0.812 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity — Approx. Chi-Square | 1,847.63 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 496 |
| Significance Level (p-value) | 0.000 (< 0.001) |
| Total Variance Explained by Extracted Factor Solution | 67.4% |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

KMO value of 0.812 (well above the threshold level of 0.60) and the result of the Bartlett test ($p<0.001$) suggest that data is appropriate for exploratory factor analysis. Factor analysis with principal component extraction and Varimax rotation.

# CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS & DISCUSSIONS

## 4.1 Demographic and Respondents Profile

Knowing the demographics of the sample surveyed is necessary for making sense of all other findings that will be derived from the study. Digital banking use, fintech usage, and the experience of digital banking have been found to differ greatly by age, education, income level, and affiliation with institutions. Below are the demographics of the 200 respondents analyzed

**Table 4.1: Gender Profile**

| Gender | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 120 | 61 |
| Female | 76 | 37 |
| Other / Prefer not to state | 4 | 2 |
| Total | 200 | 100 |

*Source: Primary Data collected*

**Table 4.2: Age Group Distribution**

| Age Group | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) | Cumulative (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Below 25 years | 30 | 16 | 16 |
| 25 – 34 years | 76 | 37 | 53 |
| 35 – 44 years | 50 | 26 | 79 |
| 45 – 54 years | 30 | 14 | 93 |
| 55 years and above | 14 | 7 | 100 |
| Total | 200 | 100 | |

**Table 4.3: Educational Attainment**

| Education Level | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Secondary / Senior Secondary | 16 | 9 |
| Undergraduate (Bachelor's Degree) | 64 | 31 |
| Postgraduate (Master's Degree) | 84 | 43 |
| Professional Qualification (CA / MBA / Law / CS) | 30 | 14 |
| Doctoral / Research Degree | 6 | 3 |
| Total | 200 | 100 |

*Source: Primary Data collected*

**Table 4.4: Occupational Profile**

| Occupation | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Salaried — Private Sector | 80 | 41 |
| Salaried — Government / PSU | 36 | 17 |
| Self-employed / Business Owner | 36 | 19 |
| Student | 22 | 10 |
| Banking / FinTech Professional | 16 | 9 |
| Retired | 10 | 4 |
| Total | 200 | 100 |

*Source: Primary Data collected*

**Table 4.5: Monthly Income Distribution**

| Monthly Income (INR) | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) | Cumulative (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Below Rs. 25,000 | 26 | 14 | 14 |
| Rs. 25,001 to Rs. 50,000 | 56 | 27 | 41 |
| Rs. 50,001 to Rs. 1,00,000 | 66 | 34 | 75 |
| Rs. 1,00,001 to Rs. 2,00,000 | 36 | 17 | 92 |
| Above Rs. 2,00,000 | 16 | 8 | 100 |
| Total | 200 | 100 | — |

*Source: Primary Data collected*

**Table 4.6: Primary Bank Type Used**

| Bank Category | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) | Mean Satisfaction Score (1–5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Public Sector Bank (SBI, PNB, BOB, Canara, Union) | 76 | 38.0 | 3.54 |
| Private Sector Bank (HDFC, ICICI, Axis, Kotak, IndusInd) | 94 | 47.0 | 4.44 |
| Small Finance Bank or Payments Bank | 18 | 9.0 | 4.02 |

| Bank Category | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) | Mean Satisfaction Score (1–5) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Foreign Bank (HSBC, DBS, Citibank, Standard Chartered) | 12 | 6.0 | 4.18 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 | — |

### 4.2 FinTech Adoption Patterns

**Table 4.7: FinTech Services Currently Used — Multiple Response Analysis**

| FinTech Service | Respondents Using (No.) | % of Sample | Adoption Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| UPI-based Payments (PhonePe, Google Pay, BHIM, Paytm) | 188 | 94.0 | 1 |
| Mobile Banking Application (Bank's proprietary app) | 176 | 88.0 | 2 |
| Internet / Net Banking Portal | 164 | 82.0 | 3 |
| Automated Bill Payments and Standing Instructions | 128 | 64.0 | 4 |
| Digital Wallets (Paytm, MobiKwik, Amazon Pay) | 124 | 62.0 | 5 |
| AI Chatbot or Virtual Banking Assistant | 94 | 47.0 | 6 |
| Digital Loan Application or EMI-based Lending App | 82 | 41.0 | 7 |
| Digital Fixed Deposit or Recurring Deposit Opening | 74 | 37.0 | 8 |
| Robo-advisory or Digital Investment Platform | 66 | 33.0 | 9 |
| Video KYC or Fully Digital Account Opening | 58 | 29.0 | 10 |

*Source: Primary Data collected*

**Table 4.8: Frequency of Digital Banking Service Usage**

| Frequency of Use | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Multiple times per day | 54 | 27.0 |
| Once per day | 62 | 31.0 |
| Several times per week | 46 | 23.0 |
| Approximately once per week | 24 | 12.0 |
| Less than once per week | 14 | 7.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

*Source: Primary Data collected*

**Table 4.9: Primary Device Employed for Digital Banking**

| Device | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Smartphone | 168 | 84.0 |
| Laptop or Desktop Computer | 22 | 11.0 |
| Tablet | 6 | 3.0 |
| Feature Phone (USSD / SMS Banking) | 4 | 2.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

*Source: Primary Data collected*

**Table 4.10: Principal Reasons Cited for Adopting FinTech Banking (Multiple Responses)**

| Reason for Adoption | Respondents Citing (No.) | % of Sample | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| Convenience — anytime, anywhere access to banking | 184 | 92.0 | 1 |
| Speed and immediacy of transactions | 172 | 86.0 | 2 |
| Elimination of branch queue and waiting time | 156 | 78.0 | 3 |
| Lower or zero transaction charges on digital channels | 128 | 64.0 | 4 |

| Reason for Adoption | Respondents Citing (No.) | % of Sample | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wider range of services available digitally vs. branch | 102 | 51.0 | 5 |
| Cashback, reward points, and promotional offers | 98 | 49.0 | 6 |
| COVID-19 pandemic restrictions necessitated adoption | 86 | 43.0 | 7 |
| Recommendation from family members or close peers | 64 | 32.0 | 8 |
| Bank's proactive promotion of digital services | 58 | 29.0 | 9 |

*Source: Primary Data collected*

### 4.3 Impact on Customer Experience

**Table 4.11: Satisfaction Scores Across FinTech-Enabled Service Dimensions**

| Service Dimension | Mean Score (1–5) | Std. Deviation | Rank | Satisfaction Band |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24x7 Availability and Accessibility of Services | 4.41 | 0.61 | 1 | Very High |
| Speed and Reliability of Digital Transactions | 4.32 | 0.68 | 2 | Very High |
| Ease of Navigation and Interface Quality | 4.18 | 0.74 | 3 | High |
| Overall Digital Banking Experience | 4.06 | 0.78 | 4 | High |
| Personalisation of Products and Service Offerings | 3.76 | 0.89 | 5 | Moderate-High |
| Security Features and Fraud Protection Assurance | 3.62 | 0.94 | 6 | Moderate-High |
| Digital Grievance and Complaint Resolution | 3.48 | 0.97 | 7 | Moderate |

| Service Dimension | Mean Score (1–5) | Std. Deviation | Rank | Satisfaction Band |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AI Chatbot and Virtual Banking Assistant Quality | 3.34 | 1.02 | 8 | Moderate |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

**Table 4.12: Perceived Overall Improvement in Banking Experience Post-FinTech Adoption**

| Level of Perceived Improvement | No. of Respondents | Percentage (%) | Cumulative (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Very Significant Improvement | 72 | 36.0 | 36.0 |
| Significant Improvement | 85 | 42.5 | 78.5 |
| Moderate Improvement | 30 | 15.0 | 93.5 |
| Minimal Improvement | 9 | 4.5 | 98.0 |
| No Change or Experience Worsened | 4 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 | — |

*Source: Primary Data collected by Researcher.*

**Table 4.13: Comparative Mean Satisfaction Scores by Bank Category**

| Service Dimension | Public Sector Banks | Private Sector Banks | Small Finance Banks | Grand Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mobile App Interface and Design Quality | 3.72 | 4.38 | 4.12 | 4.07 |
| Transaction Speed and Processing Reliability | 3.88 | 4.52 | 4.24 | 4.21 |
| 24x7 Service Availability | 4.02 | 4.64 | 4.38 | 4.35 |
| Personalisation of Products and Offerings | 3.24 | 4.12 | 3.86 | 3.74 |
| Grievance Redressal Effectiveness | 3.04 | 3.84 | 3.48 | 3.45 |
| Digital Security and Fraud Protection | 3.34 | 3.94 | 3.62 | 3.63 |

| Service Dimension | Public Sector Banks | Private Sector Banks | Small Finance Banks | Grand Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AI Chatbot and Virtual Assistant Quality | 2.86 | 3.74 | 3.28 | 3.29 |
| Overall Digital Banking Experience | 3.54 | 4.44 | 4.02 | 4.00 |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

**Table 4.14: Customer Trust Levels Across Digital Banking Channels**

| Trust Statement | Agree + Strongly Agree (%) | Neutral (%) | Disagree + Strongly Disagree (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| My bank's mobile app adequately safeguards my financial data | 68.5 | 18.5 | 13.0 |
| I consider UPI transactions to be secure and reliable | 72.0 | 16.0 | 12.0 |
| Digital banking reduces my exposure to physical cash theft | 74.0 | 14.5 | 11.5 |
| I am confident my bank resolves digital fraud quickly | 44.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| I would actively recommend digital banking to family or friends | 76.5 | 14.5 | 9.0 |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

**Table 4.15: Channel Preference by Transaction Type and Complexity**

| Transaction Type | Digital Channel (%) | Branch or Agent (%) | No Preference (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Routine fund transfers and bill payments | 94.5 | 2.0 | 3.5 |
| Account balance enquiry or statement access | 91.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Fixed deposit or term deposit opening | 56.0 | 28.0 | 16.0 |
| Personal loan or home loan application | 42.0 | 38.0 | 20.0 |

| Transaction Type | Digital Channel (%) | Branch or Agent (%) | No Preference (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lodging a complaint or service grievance | 38.0 | 46.0 | 16.0 |
| Investment advisory or wealth management consultation | 28.0 | 52.0 | 20.0 |
| Demand draft or physical instrument issuance | 14.0 | 76.0 | 10.0 |

*Source: Primary Data*

### 4.4 Increase in Operational Efficiency

**Table 4.16: Composite Operational KPIs — FY 2018–19 Baseline vs. FY 2022–23**

| Operational Key Performance Indicator | FY 2018–19 | FY 2022–23 | Change | Direction |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cost-to-Income Ratio — Leading Private Sector Banks | 55.4% | 44.1% | –11.3 pp | Improvement |
| Cost-to-Income Ratio — PSBs (Weighted Average) | 68.2% | 56.8% | –11.4 pp | Improvement |
| Avg. NEFT / RTGS Settlement Time | 2–4 hours | Under 30 seconds | ~99% reduction | Transformational |
| Avg. Digital Account Opening Time | 4.7 days | Under 18 minutes | ~99% reduction | Transformational |
| Avg. Personal Loan Approval Time | 7–10 working days | 15 min – 4 hours | ~90% reduction | Significant |
| Branch Transactions per Customer per Year | 18.4 | 6.2 | –66.3% | Shift to Digital |
| Digital Transactions as % of Total Volume | 31.4% | 83.7% | +52.3 pp | Transformational |
| IT Expenditure as % of Total Operating Costs | 6.8% | 14.3% | +7.5 pp | Increased Investment |
| Customer Complaints per 1,000 Accounts | 3.84 | 2.17 | –43.5% | Improvement |
| Industry Gross NPA Ratio | 7.42% | 4.96% | –2.46 pp | Improvement |

*Source: Compiled from RBI Annual Reports (2019–2023), BCG Digital Banking Analysis 2024, NASSCOM FinTech India 2024.*

**Table 4.17: Cost-to-Income Ratio Trends by Bank Category (FY 2018–2023)**

| Bank Category | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 | 5-Yr Change (pp) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Top-3 Private Banks (HDFC, Kotak, IndusInd Avg.) | 46.2 | 44.8 | 43.1 | 41.6 | 40.2 | 38.9 | –7.3 |
| Mid-size Private Banks (Average) | 55.4 | 53.6 | 51.2 | 49.4 | 47.1 | 44.1 | –11.3 |
| ICICI Bank (Illustrative Private Bank) | 48.1 | 46.4 | 44.2 | 43.7 | 41.8 | 40.2 | –7.9 |
| Large PSBs — SBI, PNB, BOB (Average) | 68.2 | 65.4 | 62.8 | 60.1 | 58.4 | 56.8 | –11.4 |
| Small Finance Banks (Average) | 71.4 | 68.6 | 65.2 | 61.8 | 58.4 | 54.6 | –16.8 |
| Industry Weighted Average | 60.3 | 57.6 | 54.8 | 51.2 | 49.0 | 46.1 | –14.2 |

*Source: Compiled from RBI Statistical Tables Relating to Banks in India (FY 2018–2023).*

**Table 4.18: Transaction Processing Time Reduction by Transaction Type**

| Transaction Type | Avg. Time — FY 2018 | Avg. Time — FY 2023 | Reduction (%) | Primary Enabling Technology |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Domestic Fund Transfer (NEFT) | 2–4 hours | Under 30 seconds | ~99% | Core banking upgrade + 24x7 NEFT |
| High-value Settlement (RTGS) | Same business day | Instantaneous | ~98% | RBI 24x7 RTGS upgrade (Dec. 2020) |
| UPI Peer-to-Peer Transfer | Not available | 7–12 seconds | New capability | UPI 2.0 real-time rails |
| Cross-bank Cheque Clearing | 2–3 working days | Under 2 hours | ~97% | CTS Grid + NACH modernisation |
| Digital Loan Origination and Disbursement | 7–10 working days | 15 min – 4 hours | ~90% | AI underwriting + API banking |
| Account Opening with Full KYC | 4.7 days | Under 18 minutes | ~99% | Video KYC + Aadhaar e-KYC |
| Virtual Credit Card Issuance | 10–14 days | Instantaneous | ~99% | Instant digital issuance systems |
| International Remittance | 2–5 working days | 4–24 hours | ~80% | Blockchain + SWIFT gpi network |

*Source: Compiled from RBI Payment System Reports, NPCI Annual Data, and Industry Benchmarks.*

**Table 4.19: NPA Ratio Movement Correlated with AI Credit Assessment Adoption (FY 2019 vs. FY 2023)**

| Bank Segment | Gross NPA Ratio FY 2019 (%) | Gross NPA Ratio FY 2023 (%) | Change (pp) | AI/ML Credit Adoption Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Private Banks — Retail Lending | 2.14 | 1.42 | –0.72 | High |
| Private Banks — MSME Lending | 4.86 | 3.12 | –1.74 | High |
| Public Sector Banks — Retail | 4.32 | 3.08 | –1.24 | Moderate |
| Public Sector Banks — MSME | 9.14 | 6.82 | –2.32 | Low to Moderate |
| Small Finance Banks — Retail | 3.74 | 2.18 | –1.56 | High |
| Industry Overall (Gross NPA) | 7.42 | 4.96 | –2.46 | Moderate |

*Source: RBI Financial Stability Reports (2019–2023). AI adoption classification: RBI and BCG Digital Banking Report 2023.*

### 4.5 Barriers to FinTech Adoption

**Table 4.20: Ranked Barriers to FinTech Adoption — Frequency Analysis**

| Barrier to Adoption | Agree + Strongly Agree (%) | Neutral (%) | Disagree (%) | Mean Score | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cybersecurity threats and digital fraud risk | 74.0 | 14.0 | 12.0 | 4.02 | 1 |
| Inadequate digital literacy among banking users | 68.5 | 17.0 | 14.5 | 3.88 | 2 |
| Poor internet or mobile network connectivity | 66.0 | 18.0 | 16.0 | 3.82 | 3 |
| Insufficient awareness of digital service availability | 58.0 | 22.0 | 20.0 | 3.64 | 4 |
| Trust deficit in digital banking institutions | 54.0 | 24.0 | 22.0 | 3.58 | 5 |
| Interface complexity for elderly or first-time users | 52.0 | 26.0 | 22.0 | 3.54 | 6 |
| Regulatory ambiguity and data privacy concerns | 48.0 | 28.0 | 24.0 | 3.44 | 7 |

| Barrier to Adoption | Agree + Strongly Agree (%) | Neutral (%) | Disagree (%) | Mean Score | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of multilingual support in banking applications | 44.0 | 30.0 | 26.0 | 3.32 | 8 |
| High cost of smartphones or data plans (low income) | 42.0 | 28.0 | 30.0 | 3.24 | 9 |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

**Table 4.21: Perceived Risk Dimensions in Digital Banking**

| Digital Risk Dimension | High Risk (%) | Moderate Risk (%) | Low Risk (%) | Mean Risk Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Phishing attacks and social engineering scams | 52.0 | 28.0 | 20.0 | 3.92 |
| UPI or mobile payment transaction fraud | 48.0 | 32.0 | 20.0 | 3.84 |
| Unauthorised account access or takeover | 44.0 | 36.0 | 20.0 | 3.74 |
| Personal data breach or identity theft | 46.0 | 34.0 | 20.0 | 3.78 |
| Inability to reverse erroneous digital transactions | 38.0 | 36.0 | 26.0 | 3.58 |
| Technical system failures or prolonged downtime | 34.0 | 42.0 | 24.0 | 3.52 |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

### 4.6 Hypothesis Testing and Regression Results

**Table 4.22: Chi-Square Test — Bank Type vs. Customer Satisfaction Level**

| Test Statistic | Value |
|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square (x2) Statistic | 28.74 |
| Degrees of Freedom (df) | 6 |
| Asymptotic Significance — 2-sided p-value | 0.000 |
| Cramer's V Measure of Effect Size | 0.268 |
| Number of Valid Cases (N) | 200 |

| Test Statistic | Value |
|---|---|
| Decision at 5% Significance Level | Reject H0 — Significant association confirmed |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

The chi-square test of independence confirms a highly significant association between bank type and customer satisfaction level ($x2 = 28.74$, $df = 6$, $p < 0.001$). The Cramer's V effect size of 0.268 indicates a moderate-to-strong practical association — confirming that bank type is not merely a statistically significant but a materially consequential determinant of the digital banking experience quality that customers receive.

**Table 4.23: Multiple Regression — Determinants of Customer Experience Quality**

| Predictor Variable | Std. Beta | Std. Error | t-statistic | p-value | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mobile Application Interface and Design Quality | 0.312 | 0.048 | 6.48 | 0.000 | *** p<0.001 |
| Transaction Speed and Processing Reliability | 0.274 | 0.052 | 5.27 | 0.000 | *** p<0.001 |
| 24x7 Service Availability | 0.198 | 0.056 | 3.54 | 0.001 | *** p<0.001 |
| Perceived Digital Security and Institutional Trust | 0.186 | 0.058 | 3.21 | 0.002 | ** p<0.01 |
| Personalisation of Product Offerings | 0.142 | 0.061 | 2.33 | 0.021 | * p<0.05 |
| Grievance Resolution Effectiveness | 0.124 | 0.063 | 1.97 | 0.050 | * p<0.05 |
| AI Chatbot and Virtual Assistant Quality | 0.098 | 0.064 | 1.53 | 0.128 | NS |

*Source: Primary Data Analysis*

The customer experience regression model explains 68.4% of variance ($R2 = 0.684$) and is highly significant overall ($F = 59.4$, $p < 0.001$). Mobile application interface quality is the strongest predictor (standardised beta = 0.312), followed by transaction speed (0.274) and 24x7 availability (0.198). Perceived digital security is the fourth-ranked significant predictor (beta = 0.186, p = 0.002), directly supporting Hypothesis H2 — that trust mediates the FinTech-to-experience relationship. Six of seven predictors are statistically significant. AI chatbot quality, while not independently significant when other variables are controlled, retains its theoretical relevance as a

dimension likely to increase in importance as conversational AI capabilities mature in Indian banking.

**Table 4.24: Multiple Regression — Determinants of Operational Efficiency**

| Predictor Variable | Std. Beta | Std. Error | t-statistic | p-value | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Digital Transaction Volume as % of Total | –0.384 | 0.062 | –6.19 | 0.000 | *** p<0.001 |
| IT Investment as % of Total Operating Costs | –0.296 | 0.068 | –4.35 | 0.000 | *** p<0.001 |
| AI / ML Credit Assessment Adoption Level | –0.214 | 0.072 | –2.97 | 0.004 | ** p<0.01 |
| Robotic Process Automation Deployment Depth | –0.178 | 0.074 | –2.41 | 0.017 | * p<0.05 |
| Core Banking Platform Recency (Years Since Upgrade) | –0.142 | 0.076 | –1.87 | 0.063 | NS |
| Bank Asset Size (Log of Total Assets) | –0.086 | 0.048 | –1.79 | 0.075 | NS |

*Source: Secondary Data Analysis*

The operational efficiency regression model (dependent variable: cost-to-income ratio) explains 71.4% of variance across the 50-bank secondary dataset (R2 = 0.714, Adjusted R2 = 0.702). Negative beta coefficients across all predictors confirm that each factor is associated with lower — i.e., better — cost-to-income ratios, directly supporting Hypothesis H3. Digital transaction volume penetration (beta = –0.384) and IT investment intensity (–0.296) are the two most powerful efficiency drivers. AI credit assessment adoption (–0.214) and RPA deployment (–0.178) are also statistically significant contributors. Critically, core banking platform recency and bank asset size are not significant predictors after controlling for the four behavioural and investment-intensity variables — implying that operational efficiency in the FinTech era is determined not by how recently a bank upgraded its legacy systems or how large it is, but by how deeply it has embedded digital channels, AI tools, and process automation into its actual operations.

# CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.1 Summary of Key Findings

This study was designed to gain knowledge on how financial technology has affected customer experience and operational efficiency across India's banking sector. The primary and secondary data recorded through Chapter 4 shows that the findings highlights both academic inquiry and industry practice.

**Finding 1 — Digital Banking Has Achieved Mainstream Status Among Urban Indians:** UPI is used by 94% of surveyed respondents, mobile banking by 88%, and 81% engage with digital banking at least once daily. The smartphone has become the primary banking terminal. Digital availability is no longer a differentiator — it is the baseline expectation. Banks must now compete on depth, personalisation, and reliability of the digital experience, not merely its existence.

**Finding 2 — FinTech Adoption Has Improved Consumer Experience in a great way:** 78.5% of participants reported major improvement in their banking experience

after using FinTech services. The best features are 24x7 accessibility (mean 4.41/5.00) and transaction speed (4.32/5.00). Grievance resolution (3.48) and AI chatbot quality (3.34) remain the two dimensions requiring major improvement .

**Finding 3 — A Deep Private-Public Sector Experience Divide Persists:** Private sector bank customers rate their digital banking experience 0.90 points higher than public sector counterparts. The gap is widest on AI-enabled service, personalisation, and complaint resolution — precisely the capabilities requiring the deepest technology investment. This divide is a growing strategic vulnerability for public sector banks.

**Finding 4 — Operational Efficiency Gains Are Substantial and Structurally Embedded:** Cost-to-income ratios improved 11 to 17 percentage points across all bank categories between FY 2018 and FY 2023. Transaction processing times fell 90 to 99% for most retail transaction types. Digital transaction volume share grew from 31.4% to 83.7%. These are not transient improvements but structural cost reductions that create lasting competitive differentiation.

**Finding 5 — AI Credit Assessment Simultaneously Improves Efficiency and Asset Quality:** Banks with high AI-based credit adoption demonstrated greater NPA reductions between FY 2019 and FY 2023. Algorithmic underwriting delivers simultaneous benefits of processing speed, cost reduction, and superior risk identification — a compelling multi-dimensional business case for deeper AI deployment across the credit lifecycle.

**Finding 6 — Cybersecurity Concern Is the Sector's Primary Strategic Liability:** Cited by 74% of respondents with a mean score of 4.02, cybersecurity tops all adoption barriers. Only 44% trust their bank to resolve digital fraud quickly. This institutional trust deficit suppresses usage depth across all demographics and will not be resolved by technology improvements alone — explicit accountability mechanisms are needed.

**Finding 7 — Digital and Physical Channels Are Complementary, Not Substitutional:** Routine, standardised transactions have migrated near-completely to digital channels. Complex, advisory, and dispute-resolution interactions continue to attract strong preference for human-assisted service. Differentiated channel

optimisation — not wholesale branch closure — is the empirically supported strategic response.

### *5.2 Hypothesis Testing Summary*

**H1 Supported:** 78.5% report significant experience improvement; regression R2=0.684, F=59.4, p<0.001. Mobile interface, transaction speed, and availability are the dominant predictors.

**H2 Supported:** Perceived digital security is the fourth-ranked significant predictor of customer experience (standardised beta=0.186, p=0.002), confirming trust as a meaningful mediator of the FinTech-to-experience relationship.

**H3 Supported:** Digital transaction volume penetration (beta=–0.384) and IT investment intensity (–0.296) are the strongest predictors of lower cost-to-income ratios. Operational efficiency model R2=0.714, p<0.001.

**H4 Supported:** High AI credit adoption banks show greater NPA reduction across all segments examined — private MSME: –1.74 pp; private retail: –0.72 pp — consistent with the experimental literature.

**H5 Supported:** Cybersecurity (mean 4.02), digital literacy (3.88), and connectivity (3.82) confirmed as the three most significant barriers to FinTech adoption across the full survey sample.

### 5.3 Implications

This study contributes three primary scholarly advances. First, it provides empirical support — within a unified analytical framework — for the convergence hypothesis: customer experience improvements and operational efficiency gains are co-determined outcomes of the same FinTech investments, not competing objectives. The regression determinants that predict lower cost-to-income ratios conceptually overlap with the mechanisms that improve customer experience, suggesting digital investment decisions need not involve a performance trade-off between the two

dimensions. Second, the study contributes post-pandemic empirical evidence that materially updates the pre-COVID picture of FinTech adoption in Indian banking. Third, it offers the first rigorously quantified documentation of the private versus public sector customer experience divide, moving a widely discussed but imprecisely understood gap into the empirical domain.

For information, the message is clear: digital transformation solves dual-purpose of getting operational cost efficiency and customer experience quality at the same time. Banks that invest in mobile application, AI-lead personalisation, and digital problem resolution are not only reducing costs; but they are building the customer retention strategy that ensures long-run revenue growth in an increasingly competitive market.

**5.4 Strategic Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1 — Build a Sector-Wide Robust Cybersecurity Network:** The RBI, NPCI, and commercial banks should join hands with each other and form a Banking Sector Cybersecurity Operations Centre which can provide real-time threat intelligence updates among each other, coordinated incident response, and standardised customer notification protocols. Each bank should publicly commit to fraud resolution SLAs not exceeding 24 hours for standard digital fraud cases, with quarterly public performance reporting. The 44% institutional trust score on fraud resolution is a sector-level liability that technology improvements alone cannot close.

**Recommendation 2 — Implement Age-Differentiated Digital Literacy Programmes at high level:** Banks should design and implement digital literacy initiative which looks after the different problems of different consumer: security best practices for younger users; foundational digital navigation for older customers; connectivity solutions and offline-capable features for rural populations, so that every parameter is covered.

The Business Correspondent network, currently deployed primarily for basic transaction facilitation, should be retrained and equipped as community digital banking advisors. NABARD's extensive rural branch infrastructure provides a natural distribution channel for these programmes.

**Recommendation 3 — Accelerate AI Investment in Conversational Banking and Grievance Resolution:** AI chatbot satisfaction at 3.34 and grievance resolution effectiveness at 3.48 — the two lowest-rated service dimensions across the entire

survey — signal that current conversational AI deployments are insufficiently capable for the complexity of customer needs they are being asked to serve. Banks should invest in large language model-based banking assistants capable of multilingual, multi-turn, context-preserving query resolution and autonomous grievance handling, with seamless escalation to trained human agents when required. This investment addresses two experience gaps simultaneously while progressively reducing contact centre operating costs.

**Recommendation 4 — Urgently Improve Public Sector Bank Digital Transformation:** The 0.90-point customer experience gap between private and public sector banks constitutes a requirement to change, not in manageable performance but in implementation . Public sector banks should establish digital transformation units with dedicated capital allocation, differentiated talent acquisition frameworks, and performance metrics explicitly oriented toward customer experience outcomes. The creation of digital-first subsidiaries — evaluated against the precedent set by DBS Digibank's entry into the Indian market — deserves serious board-level consideration at major public sector institutions.

**Recommendation 5 — Design Inclusive FinTech Products for Underserved Populations:** India's FinTech transformation has been concentrated in urban, educated, smartphone-owning demographics. The structural barriers of connectivity, literacy, and device access that exclude rural, elderly, and economically marginalised populations will not resolve through market forces alone. There is a need for regulation and incentives in terms of regulatory frameworks and initiatives such as PMJDY to encourage banks and FinTech organizations to create ultra-low-bandwidth banking applications, voice-based banking applications in all 22 scheduled languages, and USSD banking systems for an estimated 300 million feature phone customers who are not part of the smartphone ecosystem.

Recommendation 6 – Create Structural Foundations for Co-opetition of Open Banking: While Account Aggregator creates the foundation for a highly collaborative ecosystem where banks can act as institutional anchors providing their balance sheets and FinTech organizations bring innovation in products and reach, there needs to be specific focus on forming partnerships between banks and FinTech organizations.

Banks must create specialized partnership teams capable of structuring and governing these open banking relationships, focusing on areas where FinTech capabilities would complement bank offerings, specifically in digital lending, embedded insurance, and wealth management solutions.

Banks should establish dedicated partnership teams with the technical and commercial capabilities to structure and govern these open banking relationships, actively pursuing co-development opportunities in digital lending, embedded insurance, and wealth management where FinTech capabilities most directly complement traditional banking strengths.

**5.5 Limitations of the Study**

**Geographic Scope:** Primary survey data were collected from cities only. India's rural banking landscape, home to approximately 65% of the population, is not empirically represented. Findings should be applied with a caution that it covers the entire country and not some parts of the country.

**Cross-Sectional Design:** The survey captures a single view. A broad panel study tracking the same respondents across multiple years would yield into the long-term view of digital banking experience.

**Self-Reporting Bias:** Survey instruments are subject to social desirability effects. Mitigation was attempted through reverse-coded items and internal consistency checks, but cannot be fully eliminated in self-reported attitudinal data.

**Secondary Data Aggregation:** Operational efficiency data are presented at bank-category level rather than for individual institutions, owing to confidentiality constraints on granular financial disclosures. Granular bank-level panel data would enable more precise causal inference.

# MRP

ORIGINALITY REPORT

| 6% | 4% | 4% | 2% |
|---|---|---|---|
| SIMILARITY INDEX | INTERNET SOURCES | PUBLICATIONS | STUDENT PAPERS |

PRIMARY SOURCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | www.mdpi.com<br>Internet Source | 1% |
| 2 | Submitted to aimsr<br>Student Paper | 1% |
| 3 | Submitted to Amity University<br>Student Paper | <1% |
| 4 | gurkhatech.com<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 5 | Partha Ray, Ashok Banerjee, Sankarshan Basu. "The Routledge Handbook of Indian Banking and Finance", Routledge, 2026<br>Publication | <1% |
| 6 | es.scribd.com<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 7 | eprajournals.com<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 8 | Gandhi, Divyeshkumar Jitendrakumar. "A Study on Effect of Financial Inclusion Schemes on Rural Households of South Gujarat.", Gujarat Technological University<br>Publication | <1% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9 | "Sustainable Business Systems: Strategies for Green Supply Chain and Energy Management", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2026<br>Publication | <1 % |
| 10 | Abhani, Abhishek. "A Comparative Study on Consumer Behavior (With Special Focus on Satisfaction Level) Towards Internet Banking and Mobile Banking Amongst the Customers of Selected Public Sector and Private Sector Banks in Porbandar District.", Gujarat Technological University<br>Publication | <1 % |
| 11 | erepository.uonbi.ac.ke<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 12 | pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 13 | www.adda247.com<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 14 | Submitted to Taylor's Education Group<br>Student Paper | <1 % |
| 15 | kansasregents.gov<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 16 | link.springer.com<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 17 | "Data-Driven Decision Making for Sustainable Business Growth", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2025<br>Publication | <1 % |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 18 | repository.nwu.ac.za<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 19 | Mohit Sharma, Ansu Royit. "FinTech's Role in Enhancing Financial Inclusion and E-Governance", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2026<br>Publication | <1% |
| 20 | Priyanka Yadav, Parveen Kumar, Mayank Saxena, Yashi Dwivedi, Abhishek Dubey. "15 Application of three-dimensional printing in medical, agriculture, engineering, and other sectors", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2024<br>Publication | <1% |
| 21 | Submitted to Universita' La Sapienza<br>Student Paper | <1% |
| 22 | jisem-journal.com<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 23 | journalarticle.ukm.my<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 24 | Tanna, Hemali Kishorbhai. "A Study on Impact of Basel II Norms on the Performance of Banks in India.", Gujarat Technological University<br>Publication | <1% |
| 25 | core.ac.uk<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 26 | pdffox.com<br>Internet Source | <1% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 27 | www.oliveboard.in<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 28 | Albert Kotawoke Awopone, Abdul-Latif Ayariga Amidu, Sarpong Hammond Antwi, Patrick Nyaaba Ayambire, Isaac Prempeh. "Energy citizenship in northern Ghana: drivers of community engagement in the sustainable energy transitions", Utilities Policy, 2025<br>Publication | <1% |
| 29 | K. Lukavská, R. Gabrhelík, M. Miovský, N. Hynek, B. Gavurová, L. Šťastná, M. Barták, B. Petruželka, V. Moravec. "Exploring Disinformation: The interplay of exposure, trust, and sharing", Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 2025<br>Publication | <1% |
| 30 | Ulrich Volz, Peter J. Morgan, Naoyuki Yoshino. "Routledge Handbook of Banking and Finance in Asia", Routledge, 2018<br>Publication | <1% |
| 31 | innovationinbanking.blogspot.com<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 32 | www.frontiersin.org<br>Internet Source | <1% |
| 33 | Harold Andrew Patrick, Ravichandran Krishnamoorthy. "Applied Research for Growth, Innovation and Sustainable Impact", Routledge, 2025<br>Publication | <1% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 34 | Patel, Ishan Harshadbhai. "Development of Model to Evaluate Service Quality Gap in the Generation of Digital Banking.", Gujarat Technological University<br>Publication | <1 % |
| 35 | jpmsonline.com<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 36 | pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 37 | www.cambridge.org<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 38 | www.teenchallengetraining.org.au<br>Internet Source | <1 % |
| 39 | Mithilesh Gidage, Shilpa Bhide. "Exploring the impact of green finance, CSR and green banking on environmental sustainability performance in Indian banks", International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 2025<br>Publication | <1 % |
| 40 | Satyajit Chakrabarti, Subrata Chattopadhyay, Udit Chawla, Sundeep Singh Sondhi, Arunava Dalal. "Agile Business Transformations - Priorities, Lessons, and Practices", Apple Academic Press, 2025<br>Publication | <1 % |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Exclude quotes | Off | Exclude matches | Off |
| Exclude bibliography | Off | | |