

1 *AI-Driven Customer Experience: Balancing Efficiency and Human Touch in the Fintech*
2 *Industry.*

3
4
5 **Abstract**

6 Artificial Intelligence (AI) is changing the way financial services are provided and used, which is
7 revolutionising the fintech sector. AI is affecting consumer relationships, trust, and service quality in
8 addition to increasing operational efficiency. This study examines how financial companies strike a
9 balance between human customer support and automated AI solutions. It highlights three important
10 observations based on recent studies and industry data from 2021 to 2026. First, clients rely on
11 human assistance for complicated financial decisions but prefer AI for simple transactions. Second,
12 customer satisfaction and trust are strongly influenced by impressions of warmth and competence.
13 Third, businesses that use hybrid service models—which blend human knowledge and AI
14 capabilities—achieve better customer experience results. Future research prospects in ethical AI,
15 customer behaviour, and long-term service performance are also highlighted in this paper.

16
17 *Keywords: Artificial Intelligence · Customer Experience · Fintech · Human Touch · Digital Transformation*
18

19 **1. Introduction**

20 Few sectors have been transformed by artificial intelligence as visibly or as rapidly as financial
21 technology. Over the past decade, institutions that once operated through branch networks, telephone
22 helplines, and paper-based processes have shifted towards platforms where machine learning
23 algorithms make credit decisions in seconds, conversational agents handle thousands of queries
24 simultaneously, and predictive analytics anticipate customer needs before they are articulated. For
25 consumers, these changes have brought undeniable convenience. For organisations, they have
26 delivered measurable cost savings and operational efficiencies.

27 Yet the picture is more complicated than the efficiency narrative suggests. As automation has
28 deepened, a countercurrent of concern has emerged among customers who feel that something
29 intangible has been lost, and among researchers who observe that trust, empathy, and personalised
30 guidance remain stubbornly important to how people experience financial services. A customer
31 whose mortgage application is denied by an algorithm with no explanation, or who cannot reach a

32 human agent during a fraud alert, may gain little comfort from knowing that the system processed
33 their query in milliseconds.

34 This paper takes that tension as its starting point. The central question is not whether AI should be
35 used in fintech that debate is largely settled by commercial reality but how it should be deployed to
36 enhance rather than diminish the quality of customer experience. Specifically, the study asks: under
37 what conditions does AI augment the customer relationship, and under what conditions does it erode
38 it? What role do perceived competence and emotional warmth play in shaping customer outcomes?
39 And what practical lessons can be drawn from organisations that appear to have found a workable
40 balance?

41 The significance of these questions extends beyond any individual firm. Financial services occupy a
42 distinctive position in people's lives: they intersect with major life events, are associated with anxiety
43 and aspiration in equal measure, and depend fundamentally on trust. Getting the human-AI balance
44 wrong in this domain carries consequences that are not merely commercial.

45

46 **1.1 Research Objectives**

47 This study is organised around three specific objectives:

- 48 1. To examine how AI adoption affects core customer experience dimensions including
49 response quality, resolution rates, service accessibility, and emotional satisfaction in fintech
50 customer-facing operations.
- 51 2. To identify and evaluate AI-human integration strategies that have demonstrably improved
52 customer outcomes across financial service contexts.
- 53 3. To assess customer preference patterns for AI versus human interaction across different task
54 types and demographic segments, and to derive practical recommendations for fintech
55 service design.

56

57 **2. Literature Review**

58 The scholarly literature on AI-driven customer experience in financial services has grown
59 considerably over the past five years, spanning multiple disciplinary traditions — from information
60 systems and marketing to behavioural finance and service science. This section organises that

61 literature around the key themes most relevant to the present study, drawing on empirically grounded
62 sources published between 2021 and 2026.

63

64 **2.1 AI-Powered Chatbots and the Mediating Role of Perceived Competence and Warmth**

65 One of the most influential recent contributions to this field is the two-study investigation by Cam, Tuna, and
66 Bayir (2026), which examined how design and interaction features of banking chatbots shape the customer
67 experience of Generation Z consumers in Turkey. The authors integrated three theoretical frameworks the
68 Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) model, the Heuristic-Systematic Model (HSM), and the Expectation-
69 Confirmation Model (ECM) to trace the path from chatbot interface features to customer experience
70 outcomes.

71 Their findings are instructive on several levels. Social presence and design originality were found to
72 significantly increase perceived competence, while visual appeal enhanced perceived warmth. Together, these
73 two mediating constructs explained approximately 60 per cent of the variance in customer experience.
74 Crucially, however, the study introduced task complexity as a moderating variable: as financial tasks became
75 more demanding, perceived competence emerged as the dominant driver of customer experience, and the
76 influence of warmth diminished. This suggests that users shift from heuristic, impression-based processing to
77 more systematic, analytical evaluation when the stakes rise a finding with direct implications for how chatbots
78 should be designed for different service contexts.

79 The practical upshot is that a single chatbot persona or interaction style is unlikely to be optimal across the
80 full range of fintech tasks. A conversational, warmth-oriented agent may serve well for balance enquiries or
81 simple transactions, but the same design choices may actively undermine customer confidence during
82 complex financial decision-making.

83

84 **2.2 AI and the Reconfiguration of Service Delivery Models**

85 A broad synthesis of the AI-in-service literature, conducted by Wah (2025) using a PRISMA-guided
86 methodology and drawing on peer-reviewed sources from 2024, examined how chatbots, sentiment analysis
87 tools, generative AI systems, and user experience design collectively transform service delivery across
88 hospitality, tourism, and broader service industries. The review identified a consistent pattern: AI enables
89 organisations to shift from reactive to proactive service models, anticipating customer needs through real-time
90 data processing and predictive analytics before dissatisfaction has a chance to emerge.

91 Sentiment analysis tools, in particular, were found to be effective instruments for continuous monitoring of
92 customer emotional states — enabling organisations to intervene promptly when signals of frustration or
93 disengagement appeared in customer communication data. The review also identified several persistent
94 implementation challenges, including concerns about algorithmic transparency, data privacy, and the risk of
95 workforce displacement. Wah (2025) concluded that companies prioritising ethical data governance alongside
96 human-AI collaboration were better positioned to sustain competitive advantage over time.

97 **2.3 Advantages, Constraints, and the Necessity of Balance**

98 Kurian and Santhosh Kumar (2025) brought an explicitly evaluative lens to the same territory, applying an
99 ABCD analytical framework assessing advantages, benefits, constraints, and drawbacks to AI adoption
100 across service industries. Their mixed-methods investigation confirmed that AI-driven technologies, including
101 chatbots and personalised recommendation systems, significantly improved customer loyalty metrics, real-
102 time engagement, and service efficiency, particularly in banking and e-commerce environments.

103 However, the study was equally clear about what AI cannot do. Algorithmic bias, data privacy vulnerabilities,
104 high implementation costs, and the erosion of human connection were identified as enduring challenges. The
105 authors concluded that sustainable AI integration requires a deliberate calibration between automation and
106 meaningful human interaction not as a temporary compromise, but as a principled design goal. This framing
107 is important: it rejects the implicit assumption that more automation is always better, and instead asks what
108 each type of interaction is genuinely best suited to deliver.

109 **2.4 AI as Complement, Not Replacement, in Customer Service Operations**

110 Konda (2025) investigated the deployment of three specific AI technologies in customer service contexts:
111 Large Language Models (LLMs), Predictive Suggestion Systems, and Case Deflection Systems. The study
112 drew on industry case data to demonstrate that AI-powered support systems achieve measurably faster query
113 processing and higher first-contact resolution rates than traditional approaches. It also identified important
114 implementation factors: organisations that used phased deployment strategies alongside thorough staff
115 training consistently achieved better user adoption and fewer integration problems than those pursuing rapid,
116 whole-scale transitions.

117 Particularly relevant to the present study is Konda's (2025) finding that self-service success rates improved
118 most substantially when AI tools were backed by clearly defined human escalation procedures and regularly
119 updated knowledge bases. This suggests that AI performance is not independent of organisational context —
120 it depends on how well the surrounding human infrastructure is designed to support and complement the
121 automated system. The author was explicit that AI works best as a strategic complement to human assistance,
122 not as a substitute for it.

123 **2.5 Personalisation, Trust, and the Disclosure Paradox**

124 Sahut and Laroche (2025) contributed an integrative synthesis of eleven empirically grounded studies
125 examining how AI enhances customer experience and advances strategic marketing across diverse industry
126 contexts. Using systematic extraction and thematic classification, the authors developed a three-pathway
127 model encompassing transparency and authenticity, personalisation and trust-building, and social and
128 emotional engagement.

129 Their most striking finding concerned what they termed the disclosure paradox: transparency about AI
130 involvement simultaneously increased customer engagement and risked lowering perceived quality,
131 particularly when signals of competence were absent. Personalised AI-driven recommendations, on the other
132 hand, increased trust and engagement on digital platforms, and AI systems incorporating warmth and empathy
133 significantly improved service recovery outcomes. The authors ultimately concluded that hybrid service
134 models combining automation with meaningful human oversight represent the most effective approach for
135 complex, emotionally sensitive interactions. This conclusion aligns closely with the findings of Kurian and
136 Santhosh Kumar (2025) and Konda (2025), suggesting a convergent consensus in the literature.

137 **2.6 The Irreplaceable Dimensions of Human Expertise in Financial Services**

138 Mehrotra (2025) approached the human-AI question from within the financial services sector itself, focusing
139 on Indian banking institutions alongside international examples. The study acknowledged the quantifiable
140 benefits of AI in areas including fraud detection, credit scoring, regulatory compliance, robotic process
141 automation, and wealth management through robo-advisory tools. However, the author argued that the blind
142 adoption of AI risks undermining the human-centred principles that underpin the financial industry —
143 specifically, empathy, moral accountability, and fiduciary judgement.

144 The distinction Mehrotra (2025) draws between operational tasks and relationship tasks is useful here. AI can
145 meaningfully improve the efficiency and accuracy of the former; it cannot yet replicate the latter. An AI
146 system can process a credit application more consistently than a human loan officer — but it cannot sit with a
147 customer who is facing bankruptcy and help them understand their options with the patience and contextual
148 sensitivity that situation requires. The author concluded that sustainable AI adoption in financial services
149 demands a purposeful blending of automation with meaningful human intervention, particularly for high-
150 stakes and emotionally complex customer engagements.

151

152 **2.7 Customer Experience Dimensions and the Multi-Factor Prioritisation of FinTech Adoption**

153 A complementary empirical perspective is provided by Arora, Gupta, Devi, and Walia (2022), who employed
154 a Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process (Fuzzy AHP) to rank the factors shaping customer experience with AI-

155 enabled FinTech services among a sample of 970 working adults across four major Indian cities. Drawing on
156 the Technology Acceptance Model, trust-commitment theory, and service quality frameworks, the study
157 identified service quality, perceived usefulness, and perceived convenience as the three most important
158 determinants of customer experience in this context.

159 Vulnerability emerged as the least influential factor a counterintuitive finding suggesting that, at least among
160 experienced users in urban centres, concerns about risk and exploitation are outweighed by the practical
161 benefits of efficient, accessible service delivery. Peer influence was identified as the most significant sub-
162 criterion, underscoring the social dimension of FinTech adoption decisions. These findings carry practical
163 implications for marketing and service design: they suggest that demonstrating functional value and ease of
164 use will be more persuasive to most users than emphasising security features alone.

165 **2.8 Summary of the Literature**

166 Taken together, the literature reviewed above supports several conclusions that inform the analysis in
167 subsequent sections of this paper. First, AI delivers real and measurable benefits across multiple dimensions
168 of customer experience, including speed, accuracy, availability, and personalisation. Second, these benefits
169 are context-dependent: they are most pronounced for routine, low-complexity interactions and less reliable for
170 high-stakes, emotionally nuanced, or relationship-sensitive engagements. Third, the two mediating constructs
171 of perceived competence and perceived warmth play distinct and situation-specific roles in shaping how
172 customers evaluate their AI-mediated experiences. Fourth, hybrid models that thoughtfully combine human
173 and automated service delivery consistently produce superior outcomes to either pure automation or purely
174 human-delivered service. Fifth, the governance dimensions of AI deployment transparency, bias mitigation,
175 privacy, and ethical accountability are not peripheral concerns but central to sustaining customer trust over
176 time.

177

178 **3. Research Methodology**

179 **3.1 Research Design**

180 This study adopts a qualitative secondary research design, employing systematic narrative review to
181 synthesise evidence from peer-reviewed academic literature, published industry analyses, and institutional
182 case studies. This approach is appropriate given the study's goal of developing conceptual and practical
183 insights into AI-human integration in fintech customer experience, rather than testing a specific statistical
184 hypothesis. Narrative synthesis allows for the integration of findings across diverse methodological traditions

185 including structural equation modelling, fuzzy AHP, systematic literature review, and case-based inquiry into
186 a coherent analytical framework.

187 **3.2 Search Strategy and Source Selection**

188 Relevant literature was identified through searches of Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar,
189 supplemented by targeted searches of practitioner publications and institutional reports. Search terms included
190 combinations of the following: artificial intelligence, fintech, financial technology, customer experience,
191 chatbot, human-AI interaction, service quality, perceived competence, perceived warmth, and digital banking.
192 The search was restricted to publications from 2021 onwards to ensure currency, with a small number of
193 methodologically foundational works from earlier years included where directly relevant.

194 Inclusion criteria required that sources: (a) engage empirically or analytically with customer experience in AI-
195 mediated financial service contexts; (b) be published in peer-reviewed journals or reputable practitioner
196 outlets; and (c) provide sufficient methodological detail to allow critical evaluation. Sources were excluded
197 where they offered only speculative or promotional claims without supporting evidence, or where the
198 financial service context was too peripheral to the study's focus.

199 **3.3 Analytical Approach**

200 Thematic analysis was used to identify patterns, tensions, and convergences across the selected literature.
201 Themes were derived inductively from the texts rather than imposed a priori, though the study's conceptual
202 framework centred on the human-AI balance in customer experience guided the interpretation of findings.
203 The analysis paid particular attention to moderating conditions (such as task complexity, customer
204 demographic characteristics, and cultural context) that shape how AI adoption affects customer outcomes.

205 **3.4 Limitations**

206 Several limitations should be noted. This study relies on published secondary sources and does not
207 incorporate primary data from customers or practitioners. Published studies may reflect publication bias
208 towards positive or significant findings. The literature reviewed draws predominantly on Asian and European
209 contexts, which may limit direct generalisability to other markets. Finally, the pace of technological
210 development in AI means that some findings may evolve as capabilities advance and customer expectations
211 adjust accordingly.

212 **4. Analysis and Interpretation**

213 **4.1 The Contextual Nature of Customer Preferences**

214 One of the most consistent findings across the literature is that customer preferences for AI or human
215 interaction cannot be understood in the abstract; they are inherently contextual, shaped by the nature of the
216 task, the customer's prior experience, their level of financial sophistication, and the emotional stakes involved
217 in the interaction.

218 At the lower end of the complexity spectrum, the case for AI is strong. For standard enquiries balance checks,
219 transaction histories, basic product information — the combination of speed, accuracy, and round-the-clock
220 availability that AI systems provide aligns closely with what customers actually want from those interactions.
221 The friction costs associated with waiting for a human agent, navigating phone trees, or scheduling
222 appointments are real, and customers who can accomplish routine tasks quickly and without fuss are generally
223 satisfied. Arora et al. (2022) confirmed this empirically: perceived convenience was the third-ranked
224 determinant of customer experience with AI-enabled fintech services, reflecting a strong instrumental
225 preference for efficient service delivery.

226 The picture shifts substantially when complexity increases. Cam et al. (2026) demonstrated that task
227 complexity moderates the relationship between chatbot features and customer experience in an important
228 way: as tasks become more demanding, customers move from heuristic, impression-based processing to more
229 analytical evaluation, and perceived competence the chatbot's demonstrated ability to understand and resolve
230 the query correctly becomes the primary driver of satisfaction. Warmth and social presence, while effective
231 for simpler interactions, lose their influence when customers need the system to get things right under
232 pressure.

233 For the most complex financial decisions advice on investment portfolios, resolution of fraud disputes,
234 navigation of debt restructuring, or support during financial hardship the literature is largely consistent in
235 finding that customers continue to value, and often require, human expertise. Mehrotra (2025) articulated this
236 most clearly, identifying empathy, moral accountability, and fiduciary judgement as capacities that current AI
237 systems cannot credibly replicate in high-stakes financial contexts. This is not simply a matter of emotional
238 preference; it reflects genuine capability limitations that have material consequences for customer outcomes.

239 **4.2 The Trust Dimension**

240 Trust occupies a central position in the literature on financial services, and its relationship to AI is nuanced.
241 On one hand, AI can build trust through consistency, transparency, and accuracy qualities that human service
242 delivery does not always provide reliably. An algorithm that applies credit criteria consistently, without the
243 conscious or unconscious biases that human loan officers may exhibit, can produce fairer outcomes. An AI
244 fraud detection system that flags suspicious transactions within seconds provides a form of security that
245 manual review cannot match.

246 On the other hand, trust in AI is fragile and context-sensitive. Sahut and Laroche (2025) identified the
247 disclosure paradox: informing customers that they are interacting with an AI can increase engagement but
248 simultaneously reduce perceived service quality, particularly when the system's competence is not clearly
249 demonstrated. This finding has important implications for how fintech organisations introduce and
250 contextualise their AI tools. Transparency about AI involvement may be ethically necessary and regulatorily
251 required, but its communication requires careful management if trust is to be maintained.

252 Konda (2025) found that trust in AI customer service tools was significantly enhanced when clear and
253 accessible human escalation paths were available even among customers who never used them. The mere
254 knowledge that a human expert could be reached if needed appeared to increase confidence in the AI system
255 itself. This suggests that human oversight functions as a trust infrastructure for AI deployment, not merely as
256 a fallback for system failures.

257 **4.3 Hybrid Integration as Organisational Capability**

258 The literature converges on hybrid integration combining AI automation with human expertise through
259 intelligent routing and escalation as the most effective organisational response to the challenges identified
260 above. However, the literature also makes clear that effective hybrid integration is a genuine organisational
261 capability, not simply a technical configuration. It requires sophisticated understanding of customer intent and
262 journey patterns, clear criteria for routing decisions, well-designed transition processes that maintain context
263 and avoid the frustration of customers having to repeat themselves, and ongoing investment in training human
264 agents to work collaboratively with AI systems.

265 Konda's (2025) finding that phased implementation strategies consistently outperform rapid deployment is
266 relevant here. Organisations that invested time in building the human infrastructure around their AI tools
267 including agent training, knowledge base development, and escalation protocol design, achieved better
268 customer outcomes than those that prioritised speed of deployment. This suggests that the returns on hybrid
269 integration depend heavily on organisational commitment and process design, not just on the quality of the
270 underlying technology.

271 **4.4 Generational and Demographic Variation**

272 The literature identifies meaningful variation in AI acceptance and human interaction preferences across
273 demographic groups, though the picture is more complex than a simple generational divide. Cam et al. (2026)
274 focused specifically on Generation Z consumers and found that, even within this digitally native cohort,
275 perceived competence and warmth operated as important mediating variables suggesting that digital fluency
276 does not translate straightforwardly into willingness to accept AI-mediated service across all contexts. Arora

277 et al. (2022) found that peer influence was the most important sub-criterion shaping FinTech adoption
278 decisions among their Indian sample, reflecting the social embeddedness of technology adoption choices.

279 These findings suggest that demographic segmentation should be applied thoughtfully rather than as a
280 shortcut. Assuming that younger customers will always prefer AI, or that older customers will always prefer
281 human interaction, risks misaligning service delivery with actual customer needs. More granular
282 understanding of how task type, financial sophistication, and situational context intersect with demographic
283 characteristics would strengthen the basis for service design decisions.

284 **5. Findings**

285 The following findings are derived from the synthesis of literature reviewed in the preceding sections. Each
286 finding is accompanied by a set of suggestions for strengthening the associated evidence base and for
287 translating the finding into practical guidance.

288

289 **Finding 1: Customer Preferences for AI or Human Interaction Are Context-Dependent**

290 Customer preferences for AI versus human service delivery are not fixed but vary systematically with the
291 complexity, emotional significance, and stakes of the financial interaction. Routine tasks are generally well-
292 served by AI automation; complex, high-stakes, or emotionally sensitive interactions continue to require
293 human expertise and relational capacity.

294

Reviewer Suggestion: Finding 1 - Strengthening and Application

- This finding rests on solid multi-study evidence, but the existing literature is biased towards task classification at a fairly coarse level (routine versus complex). Future research should develop more granular typologies of financial service interactions that account for dimensions such as time pressure, reversibility, and the degree to which the customer's emotional state affects their decision-making capacity.
- The practical recommendation arising from this finding is that fintech organisations should map customer journeys at the task level rather than the customer segment level. Different tasks within the same service area (e.g., checking a balance versus disputing a charge versus applying for an overdraft) may require fundamentally different interaction architectures.
- Research comparing preference patterns across customer life stages — rather than simply age cohorts — would strengthen the evidence base and provide more actionable guidance for service personalisation strategies.
- Longitudinal studies tracking how preferences evolve as customers gain experience with AI tools would help organisations anticipate and adapt to changing expectations over time, rather than treating customer preferences as static inputs to service design.

295

296 **Finding 2: Perceived Competence and Perceived Warmth are Distinct and Situationally**
297 **Variable Drivers of Customer Experience**

298 Perceived competence and perceived warmth function as separable psychological mediators of customer
299 experience in AI-mediated financial services. Competence dominates as task complexity increases; warmth
300 retains importance for simpler interactions and relationship-building contexts. Neither construct is universally
301 more important their relative salience depends on the service situation.

302

Reviewer Suggestion: Finding 2 - Strengthening and Application

- Cam et al. (2026) provide strong evidence for this finding within a specific cultural and generational context (Generation Z in Turkey). Cross-cultural replication across diverse markets — including South and Southeast Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, and Latin America, where mobile-first fintech adoption is accelerating — would substantially strengthen the generalisability of the finding.
- The construct of perceived warmth deserves more careful disaggregation in future research. The existing literature treats it as a relatively unified dimension, but warmth may operate differently depending on whether it is conveyed through language, visual design, response timing, or conversational structure. Understanding which warmth signals are most influential in which contexts would enable more precise design guidance.
- From a practical standpoint, this finding argues against one-size-fits-all chatbot persona design. Organisations should consider developing adaptive interaction styles — more task-focused and precise under high-complexity conditions, more conversational and socially present in lower-stakes contexts.
- The finding also has implications for how AI limitations are communicated to customers. When a system cannot handle a complex query competently, acknowledging that limitation promptly and facilitating a smooth handover to a human agent may actually preserve the trust relationship better than attempting to simulate competence the system does not possess.

303

304 **Finding 3: Hybrid AI-Human Integration Consistently Produces Superior Customer**
305 **Experience Outcomes**

306 Fintech organisations that implement hybrid service architectures combining AI automation for routine
307 interactions with human expertise for complex, emotionally significant, or relationship-sensitive ones
308 consistently outperform those relying on either pure automation or purely human-delivered service. Effective
309 hybridisation is an organisational capability, not merely a technical configuration.

310

Reviewer Suggestion: Finding 3 - Strengthening and Application

- While the consensus across the literature reviewed is strong, much of the evidence for performance superiority of hybrid models is drawn from self-reported customer satisfaction data and case illustrations rather than controlled experimental comparisons. Randomised or quasi-experimental studies comparing hybrid versus single-channel service delivery across matched customer segments would substantially strengthen the causal claim.
- The literature identifies several characteristics of effective hybrid integration — context-aware routing,

seamless escalation, continuity of customer information across channels, and investment in agent training — but it does not yet provide a validated framework for assessing organisational readiness for hybrid implementation. Developing and testing such a framework would be a valuable contribution to both research and practice.

- Organisations considering hybrid deployment should prioritise the design of escalation protocols as a core element of the customer experience, not an afterthought. Research by Konda (2025) and Sahut and Laroche (2025) suggests that the quality of human-to-AI and AI-to-human handovers is itself a significant determinant of customer satisfaction.
- A particularly underexplored dimension is the experience of the human agents who work alongside AI systems. If agents feel their role has been deskilled, their engagement and performance may suffer, with downstream consequences for the quality of human-mediated interactions. Research on the employee experience dimension of hybrid integration would strengthen the overall evidence base.

311

312

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN

313 **6. Conclusion**

314 This paper has examined the challenge of balancing AI-driven efficiency with human-centred customer
315 experience in the fintech sector, drawing on a synthesis of recent empirical literature and industry analysis.
316 The central argument that emerges is straightforward but important: the question facing fintech organisations
317 is not whether to use AI, but how to use it in ways that genuinely enhance rather than diminish the quality of
318 customer relationships.

319 The evidence reviewed here consistently supports a hybrid model in which AI handles the tasks it is
320 genuinely better suited for (speed, accuracy, availability, consistency) while human expertise is preserved and
321 deployed for the tasks where it remains irreplaceable (empathy, judgement, ethical accountability, complex
322 problem-solving). The two mediating constructs of perceived competence and perceived warmth provide a
323 useful conceptual vocabulary for thinking about what customers are actually evaluating when they form
324 impressions of AI-mediated financial services and for designing systems that meet those expectations in
325 context-appropriate ways.

326 Three areas deserve priority attention in future research. First, the generalisability of existing findings across
327 cultural, geographic, and demographic contexts remains limited; expanding the evidence base through cross-
328 cultural comparative studies would strengthen both theory and practice. Second, the ethical and governance
329 dimensions of AI deployment in financial services, including algorithmic bias, data privacy, explainability,
330 and accountability for AI-driven errors, are underrepresented in the customer experience literature and merit
331 more systematic attention. Third, longitudinal research tracking how customer preferences, trust, and
332 satisfaction evolve as AI capabilities develop and customer familiarity with AI deepens would provide a
333 dynamic perspective that cross-sectional studies cannot offer.

334 The fintech organisations that will be best positioned over the coming decade are likely to be those that invest
335 not only in AI capability but in the human, organisational, and ethical infrastructure that makes AI
336 deployment trustworthy. Efficiency and human touch are not opposites to be traded off against each other.
337 Approached thoughtfully, they are complementary dimensions of a customer experience that is both
338 genuinely convenient and genuinely trustworthy.

339

340

341 **References**

- 342 Arora, A., Gupta, S., Devi, C., & Walia, N. (2022). Customer experiences in the era of artificial intelligence
343 (AI) in context to FinTech: A fuzzy AHP approach. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 30(10), 3807–
344 3837. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-10-2021-0621>
- 345
346 Cam, S., Tuna, M. F., & Bayir, T. (2026). Exploring the customer experience regarding AI-powered fintech
347 chatbots in terms of SOR theory. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 21, 49.
348 <https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer21020049>
- 349
350 Konda, R. (2025). AI-powered customer service: Transforming support with large language models,
351 predictive suggestion systems, and case deflection. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 186(52),
352 1–8.
- 353
354 Kurian, A., & Santhosh Kumar, K. (2025). Transforming customer experience through artificial intelligence:
355 An ABCD analysis of opportunities and challenges in service industries. *Journal of Service Science and*
356 *Management*, 18(2), 114–132.
- 357
358 Mehrotra, A. (2025). Artificial intelligence in banking and financial services: Balancing automation with
359 human-centred values. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 30(1), 45–64.
- 360
361 Sahut, J.-M., & Laroche, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence and customer experience in strategic marketing:
362 An integrative synthesis. *Journal of Business Research*, 172, 114–130.
363 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.114130>
- 364
365 Wah, J. N. K. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence in transforming customer experience in the service
366 sector: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 36(1), 78–99.