Volume: 8 | Issue: 4 | DOI: 10.376/jclp.455.899.679

Artificial Intelligence Adoption and Financial Performance in Fintech Firms: The Mediating Role of Operational Efficiency and the Moderating Role of Regulatory Environment

Authors: Olusegun Babatunde Adeyinka[1], Mei-Ling Chen[2], Ivan Petrov[3]

[1]Department of Finance and Banking, University of Ibadan Business School, Ibadan, Nigeria
[2]Institute of Financial Innovation, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan [3]Faculty of Economics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Corresponding Author: Olusegun Babatunde Adeyinka (ob.adeyinka@ui.edu.ng)

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies into financial services—commonly characterized as the fintech revolution—represents one of the most consequential technological disruptions in the history of financial intermediation. Yet the relationship between AI adoption and financial performance in fintech firms remains empirically contested, with mixed evidence attributable to the theoretically underspecified role of mediating operational mechanisms and moderating regulatory conditions. Grounded in Technology-Organization-Environment (TOE) framework and Agency Theory, this study investigates the mediating role of operational efficiency in the AI adoption–financial performance relationship, as well as the moderating influence of regulatory environment stringency. Panel data from 186 publicly listed fintech firms across 14 countries over a six-year period (2018–2023) were analyzed using fixed-effects panel regression and bootstrapping-based mediation testing. Results reveal that AI adoption significantly enhances financial performance (ROA: $\beta = 0.189$, $p < .001$; ROE: $\beta = 0.214$, $p < .001$), fully mediated by operational efficiency (indirect ROA effect: 0.142, 95% CI [0.091, 0.193]). Regulatory environment stringency significantly moderates the AI adoption–operational efficiency pathway ($\beta = -0.127$, $p < .01$), with findings indicating a non-linear inverted-U relationship: moderate regulatory stringency maximizes operational efficiency gains from AI adoption, while excessive stringency constrains them. These findings contribute to fintech performance literature by establishing operational efficiency as the dominant value-creation mechanism of AI adoption and delineating the Goldilocks regulation zone within which fintech AI investments yield optimal financial returns.

Keywords: artificial intelligence adoption, fintech, financial performance, operational efficiency, regulatory environment, TOE framework, panel data analysis

1. Introduction

The financial services industry stands at the intersection of two transformative trends: the relentless advance of artificial intelligence technologies and the fundamental restructuring of financial

Volume: 8 | Issue: 4 | DOI: 10.376/jclp.455.899.679

intermediation driven by digital innovation. Fintech firms—defined as companies that use technology to deliver financial services more efficiently, accessibly, or innovatively than traditional incumbents (Arner et al., 2016; Philippon, 2016)—have emerged as the primary engines of AI adoption in financial services, deploying machine learning algorithms for credit scoring, natural language processing for customer service, robotic process automation for back-office efficiency, and predictive analytics for fraud detection and risk management (Buckley & Arner, 2020; Chen et al., 2019).

The financial press and consulting reports are replete with claims that AI adoption generates substantial financial returns for fintech firms. McKinsey (2021) estimates that AI could generate USD 1 trillion in additional value annually for the global banking and financial services sector. Accenture (2021) identifies AI-driven operational automation as capable of reducing operational costs by up to 40% in financial services. Yet academic research on the AI adoption–financial performance relationship in fintech is relatively nascent, methodologically heterogeneous, and characterized by mixed findings that preclude definitive conclusions about the performance returns of AI investment (Chen et al., 2019; Gomber et al., 2018).

A critical limitation of extant research is the failure to specify the intermediate mechanisms—or value-creation pathways—through which AI adoption translates into superior financial performance. Theoretical frameworks suggest two primary pathways: operational efficiency enhancement, whereby AI automates and optimizes routine processes to reduce costs and errors; and revenue enhancement, whereby AI enables personalized financial products, predictive customer engagement, and new revenue streams (Gomber et al., 2018; Philippon, 2016). Empirically distinguishing these pathways is essential both for advancing theoretical understanding and for providing actionable investment guidance to fintech managers.

Furthermore, the regulatory environment within which fintech firms operate represents a critical exogenous moderating condition that has received disproportionately limited attention in AI performance research. Financial services are among the most heavily regulated industries globally, and the degree to which regulations facilitate or constrain AI deployment substantially determines the operational efficiency gains that fintech firms can realize from AI investment (Arner et al., 2016; Buchak et al., 2018). Overly restrictive regulations may impose compliance costs and AI deployment limitations that attenuate performance returns, while regulatory sandboxes and principle-based regulatory frameworks may amplify them. Yet empirical tests of this moderation remain rare in the academic literature.

This study employs panel data from 186 publicly listed fintech firms across 14 countries over six years (2018–2023) to address these gaps, contributing to the Technology-Organization-Environment (TOE) framework (Tornatzky & Fleischer, 1990) and Agency Theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) literatures on technology adoption and firm performance.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Artificial Intelligence in Fintech: Definitional Scope and Adoption Landscape

AI in the fintech context encompasses a diverse array of technologies including machine learning (ML), deep learning, natural language processing (NLP), computer vision, robotic process automation (RPA), and knowledge graphs (Chen et al., 2019). Each technology addresses distinct operational challenges: ML algorithms enhance credit risk modeling and fraud detection; NLP powers conversational AI for customer service; RPA automates repetitive back-office processes; computer vision enables document processing and KYC automation. The deployment of these technologies across the fintech value chain constitutes an AI adoption ecosystem that is theorized to generate systematic efficiency and revenue advantages over non-AI-enabled competitors.

Global fintech AI investment reached approximately USD 22 billion in 2023, representing a CAGR of 28% since 2018 (CB Insights, 2023). However, the distribution of AI adoption across fintech subsectors—lending, payments, insurance (insurtech), wealth management (wealthtech), and regulatory compliance (regtech)—is highly heterogeneous, with lending and payments platforms exhibiting the most advanced AI deployment profiles (Deloitte, 2023; PwC, 2023).

2.2 Technology-Organization-Environment Framework

The TOE framework (Tornatzky & Fleischer, 1990) provides a widely applied theoretical lens for understanding technology adoption decisions and outcomes at the organizational level. The framework identifies three contextual domains that shape both the adoption decision and its performance consequences: the technological context (characteristics and availability of technologies relevant to the organization), the organizational context (firm size, managerial capacity, resources, and internal processes), and the environmental context (external competitive pressures, regulatory environment, and industry structure).

Applied to fintech AI adoption, the TOE framework directs attention to the regulatory environment as a critical environmental factor that moderates the organizational and technological determinants of AI deployment and its operational outcomes. Studies applying TOE to AI adoption include Oliveira et al. (2019) in cloud computing, Wang et al. (2020) in big data analytics, and Kurnia et al. (2015) in e-commerce; however, its application to fintech AI performance has not been systematically explored.

2.3 Agency Theory and AI-Enabled Operational Efficiency

Agency Theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) provides a complementary theoretical foundation for understanding how AI adoption reduces operational inefficiencies arising from agency problems. Principal-agent relationships in financial services are characterized by significant information asymmetries, moral hazard, and adverse selection problems that generate substantial monitoring and contracting costs. AI technologies—particularly ML-based credit scoring, fraud detection, and compliance

Volume: 8 | Issue: 4 | DOI: 10.376/jclp.455.899.679

monitoring—reduce information asymmetries and agency costs by enabling more accurate, faster, and lower-cost information processing than human agents (Buchak et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019).

The Agency Theory perspective predicts that AI adoption will enhance financial performance primarily through operational efficiency improvements—cost reduction, error minimization, process acceleration, and compliance cost reduction—rather than through direct revenue effects, which depend more strongly on market positioning and product differentiation strategies. This prediction provides the theoretical grounding for operationalizing operational efficiency as the primary mediating mechanism in the AI adoption–financial performance model.

2.4 Regulatory Environment and Fintech AI Performance

The regulatory environment facing fintech firms is multidimensional, encompassing prudential regulations (capital adequacy, liquidity requirements), consumer protection regulations (data privacy, algorithmic accountability, fair lending), and operational regulations (KYC/AML compliance, cyber security standards) (Arner et al., 2016; Zetzsche et al., 2020). The stringency of these regulations affects AI adoption in fintech through multiple mechanisms: compliance costs directly constrain operational budget allocations for AI investment; algorithmic explainability requirements limit the deployment of complex ML models in high-stakes decision contexts; and data privacy regulations affect the availability of training data required for AI model development.

Regulatory sandbox programs—established in the UK (Financial Conduct Authority), Singapore (Monetary Authority of Singapore), Australia (ASIC), and other jurisdictions—represent attempts to create regulatory spaces where fintech firms can test AI innovations with relaxed compliance requirements, facilitating faster innovation cycles and more ambitious AI deployment (Buckley & Arner, 2020; FCA, 2021). The theoretical prediction from both TOE and Agency Theory is that moderate regulatory stringency—sufficient to ensure consumer protection and systemic stability but not so excessive as to stifle AI deployment—maximizes the operational efficiency gains from AI adoption, suggesting a non-linear (inverted-U) moderation relationship.

2.5 Financial Performance in Fintech

Financial performance in fintech is typically operationalized through accounting-based measures—including return on assets (ROA), return on equity (ROE), and net interest margin—and market-based measures including Tobin's Q and market-to-book ratio (Chen et al., 2019; Gomber et al., 2018). Panel data designs are particularly well-suited for fintech performance research because they control for time-invariant firm heterogeneity (through firm fixed effects) and capture performance dynamics over multiple periods, addressing the temporal lag between AI investment and performance realization (Arner et al., 2016).

---

3. Research Gap

This study addresses three specific gaps. First, while multiple empirical studies have

Volume: 8 | Issue: 4 | DOI: 10.376/jclp.455.899.679

examined the direct AI adoption–financial performance relationship, no panel data study has rigorously tested the mediation of operational efficiency as the primary value-creation pathway. Second, the regulatory environment has been discussed theoretically as a moderator but has not been empirically tested as such in a quantitative cross-national panel study of fintech AI performance. Third, the theorized non-linear (inverted-U) moderation by regulatory stringency—the Goldilocks regulation hypothesis—has not been empirically examined, constituting a significant gap given the active global policy debate on optimal fintech regulation.

---

4. Research Objectives

1. To examine the panel data evidence on the direct relationship between AI adoption intensity and financial performance (ROA, ROE) in publicly listed fintech firms.
2. To test whether operational efficiency mediates the AI adoption–financial performance relationship.
3. To investigate whether regulatory environment stringency moderates the AI adoption–operational efficiency pathway.
4. To assess whether the moderation effect is linear or non-linear (inverted-U), testing the Goldilocks regulation hypothesis.

---

5. Hypotheses Development

H1: AI adoption intensity is positively associated with financial performance (ROA and ROE) in fintech firms.

H2: Operational efficiency mediates the relationship between AI adoption intensity and financial performance.

H3: Regulatory environment stringency moderates the relationship between AI adoption intensity and operational efficiency.

H4: The moderating effect of regulatory stringency on the AI adoption–operational efficiency relationship is non-linear (inverted-U), with moderate stringency maximizing efficiency gains.

---

6. Research Methodology

6.1 Sample and Data Sources

Panel data were compiled from multiple sources: AI adoption intensity was hand-coded from annual reports and earnings call transcripts of 186 publicly listed fintech firms across 14 countries (United States, United Kingdom, China, Germany, Singapore, Australia, Brazil, India, South Korea, Sweden, Netherlands, Canada, Israel, and South Africa) over 2018–2023, yielding 1,116 firm-year observations. Financial performance data (ROA, ROE, cost-to-income ratio as operational efficiency proxy) were obtained from Bloomberg and Compustat. Regulatory environment stringency was measured using the World Bank's Financial Regulation Stringency Index (FRSI), supplemented by the IMF Financial Access Survey.

Volume: 8 | Issue: 4 | DOI: 10.376/jclp.455.899.679

6.2 Variable Operationalization

AI Adoption Intensity was constructed as a normalized composite index (0–10 scale) based on: (1) annual AI-related capital expenditure as a percentage of total CAPEX; (2) number of AI patent filings; (3) AI-related employee headcount proportion (using LinkedIn workforce analytics); and (4) frequency of AI technology mentions in annual reports (text analytics).

Operational Efficiency was measured as the inverse of the cost-to-income ratio (CIR)—a standard banking sector efficiency metric—where higher values indicate greater operational efficiency.

Financial Performance was measured by ROA and ROE.

Regulatory Environment Stringency was measured using the FRSI (0–100 scale) for each country-year observation.

Control variables included firm size (log of total assets), leverage ratio, years since founding, national GDP growth rate, and fintech subsector dummies.

6.3 Analytical Approach

Two-way fixed-effects panel regression (firm and year fixed effects) was the primary analytical method, using the Hausman test to confirm fixed-effects specification over random effects. The Baron-Kenny (1986) mediation procedure, combined with the Sobel test and delta method bootstrapping, was used to test the mediation hypothesis. Polynomial (quadratic) regression was employed to test the non-linear moderation hypothesis (H4). All standard errors were clustered at the firm level to account for within-firm serial correlation.

---

7. Data Analysis and Findings

7.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 *Descriptive Statistics and Pairwise Correlations (N = 1,116 firm-years)*

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. AI Adoption (AI)	5.21	1.84	—					
2. Operational Efficiency (OE)	0.62	0.14	.412***	—				
3. ROA	0.048	0.031	.389***	.541***	—			
4. ROE	0.112	0.071	.371***	.498***	.849***	—		
5. Regulatory Stringency (RS)	62.4	18.7	−.089**	−.141***	−.063*	−.071*	—	
6. Firm Size (Log Assets)	8.91	1.42	.318***	.289***	.248***	.234***	.109***	—

Volume: 8 | Issue: 4 | DOI: 10.376/jclp.455.899.679

Note. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001. Two-tailed correlations.

7.2 Panel Regression Results: Direct Effects (H1)

Table 2 *Fixed-Effects Panel Regression: AI Adoption on Financial Performance*

	ROA		ROE	
Variable	β	SE	β	SE
AI Adoption	0.189***	0.041	0.214***	0.048
Firm Size	0.124***	0.029	0.139***	0.033
Leverage	−0.083**	0.031	−0.094**	0.036
GDP Growth	0.041*	0.019	0.048*	0.022
Within R^2	0.342		0.318	
F-statistic	47.83***		43.21***	
Firm FE	Yes		Yes	
Year FE	Yes		Yes	
N	1,116		1,116	

Note. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001. Clustered standard errors at firm level. H1 supported.

7.3 Mediation Analysis: Operational Efficiency (H2)

Table 3 *Mediation Results: Operational Efficiency Mediating AI → Financial Performance*

Step	Path	Coeff.	SE	t	Indirect Effect	95% CI
Step 1	AI → OE	0.214***	0.039	5.49	—	—
Step 2	OE → ROA	0.663***	0.052	12.75	—	—
Step 3	AI → ROA (Direct)	0.047†	0.027	1.74	—	—
	AI → OE → ROA	—	—	—	0.142***	[0.091, 0.193]
	AI → OE → ROE	—	—	—	0.161***	[0.104, 0.218]
Sobel Z					6.83***	

Note. †p < .10; ***p < .001. Full mediation for ROA (direct effect non-significant at p < .05 threshold after OE entered); partial mediation for ROE. H2 supported.

7.4 Moderation Analysis: Regulatory Stringency (H3 and H4)

Table 4 *Polynomial Moderation: Regulatory Stringency Moderating AI → Operational Efficiency*

	OE	
Variable	β	SE
AI Adoption (AI)	0.264***	0.041

Volume: 8 | Issue: 4 | DOI: 10.376/jclp.455.899.679

	OE	
Regulatory Stringency (RS)	−0.127**	0.046
RS² (Quadratic)	−0.089***	0.021
AI × RS	−0.127**	0.038
AI × RS²	−0.074***	0.019
Firm Size	0.092***	0.026
Within R^2	0.421	
F-statistic	58.71***	

Note. **p < .01; ***p < .001. H3 supported (AI × RS interaction, p < .01). H4 supported (AI × RS² quadratic interaction, p < .001).

Figure 1 (described): The inverted-U relationship plots predicted operational efficiency against regulatory stringency at mean AI adoption level. Predicted OE rises from FRSI = 30 to a peak at FRSI = 58 (the "Goldilocks zone"), then declines at higher stringency values, confirming H4. The optimal regulatory stringency score (58/100) corresponds closely to the regulatory profiles of Singapore, the United Kingdom (post-FCA sandbox era), and Australia.

7.5 Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Table 5 *Hypothesis Testing Summary*

Hypothesis	Description	Result
H1	AI adoption → Financial performance (positive)	Supported (ROA β = 0.189; ROE β = 0.214, p < .001)
H2	Operational efficiency mediates AI → Performance	Supported (indirect ROA = 0.142, CI [0.091, 0.193])
H3	Regulatory stringency moderates AI → OE	Supported (interaction β = −0.127, p < .01)
H4	Non-linear (inverted-U) moderation	Supported (quadratic interaction β = −0.074, p < .001)

8. Discussion

The panel data findings provide robust confirmation of the AI adoption–financial performance relationship (H1) and, critically, establish operational efficiency as the primary mediation pathway (H2). The full mediation of ROA (with the direct AI effect becoming marginally significant rather than clearly significant after OE is controlled) and partial mediation of ROE suggest that AI generates performance returns predominantly through cost-side operational improvements—process automation, error reduction, and compliance efficiency—rather than through direct revenue enhancement. This finding has important implications for fintech managers seeking to maximize AI ROI: operational AI applications (RPA, automated underwriting, NLP-driven customer service) should receive strategic prioritization over customer-facing AI applications whose performance returns depend more heavily on market positioning and product differentiation.

The inverted-U moderation finding (H4) is theoretically novel and practically significant. Confirming the Goldilocks regulation hypothesis, it establishes that moderate regulatory stringency (approximately FRSI = 58) is optimal for AI-driven operational efficiency, while both regulatory permissiveness and excessive stringency constrain these gains. Regulatory permissiveness may lead to investment uncertainty, competitive instability, and consumer trust deficits that reduce operational efficiency gains; excessive stringency imposes compliance costs and algorithmic deployment constraints that directly attenuate AI efficiency benefits.

---

9. Theoretical Implications

This study advances the TOE framework by empirically establishing the regulatory environment as an inverted-U moderator of the AI adoption–operational efficiency relationship, providing the first quantitative evidence for the Goldilocks regulation hypothesis in the fintech context. It extends Agency Theory by demonstrating that AI's efficiency-enhancing mechanisms operate through information asymmetry reduction and monitoring cost minimization, consistent with theoretical predictions. The full mediation finding advances fintech performance theory by establishing operational efficiency as the primary mechanism through which AI creates value, distinguishing fintech AI from other digital transformation investments that generate both efficiency and revenue effects.

---

10. Practical Implications

Fintech executives should prioritize AI investments in operational domains—specifically robotic process automation, ML-based fraud detection, and NLP-driven customer service—where performance returns are mediated through operational efficiency. Financial regulators seeking to maximize the social benefits of fintech AI should aspire to the moderate stringency profile exemplified by Singapore's MAS, the FCA's regulatory sandbox model, and Australia's ASIC approach, which combine innovation facilitation with essential consumer protection standards. Fintech firms operating in excessively stringent regulatory environments should engage in active regulatory dialogue and advocate for principles-based rather than rules-based AI governance frameworks.

---

11. Conclusion

Drawing on the TOE framework and Agency Theory, this six-year panel study of 186 fintech firms demonstrates that AI adoption enhances financial performance through operational efficiency, with the magnitude of this mediation pathway moderated by regulatory environment stringency in an inverted-U pattern. Regulatory sandboxes and principle-based frameworks appear to approximate the optimal stringency level for maximizing fintech AI performance returns. Future research should incorporate qualitative case studies to examine the organizational mechanisms of AI-efficiency translation and extend the analysis to unlisted fintech firms whose AI adoption and performance patterns may differ substantially from publicly listed entities.

References

Accenture. (2021). *Banking technology vision 2021*. Accenture.

Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2016). The evolution of Fintech: A new post-crisis paradigm? *Georgetown Journal of International Law, 47*(4), 1271–1319.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173–1182. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173

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

Buckley, R. P., & Arner, D. W. (2020). *FinTech regulation: Who regulates whom?* Oxford University Press.

CB Insights. (2023). *Global fintech report Q4 2022*. CB Insights.

Chen, M. A., Wu, Q., & Yang, B. (2019). How valuable is FinTech innovation? *Review of Financial Studies, 32*(5), 2062–2106. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhy130

Deloitte. (2023). *2023 banking and capital markets outlook*. Deloitte Insights.

Financial Conduct Authority. (2021). *Regulatory sandbox: Year 6 report*. FCA.

Gomber, P., Kauffman, R. J., Parker, C., & Weber, B. W. (2018). On the fintech revolution: Interpreting the forces of innovation, disruption, and transformation in financial services. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 35*(1), 220–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2018.1440766

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X

Kurnia, S., Choudrie, J., Mahbubur, R. M., & Alzougool, B. (2015). E-commerce technology adoption: A Malaysian grocery SME retail sector study. *Journal of Business Research, 68*(9), 1906–1918. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.12.010

McKinsey. (2021). *The promise and challenge of the age of artificial intelligence*. McKinsey Global Institute.

Oliveira, T., Thomas, M., & Espadanal, M. (2019). Assessing the determinants of cloud computing adoption: An analysis of the manufacturing and services sectors. *Information & Management, 51*(5), 497–510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2014.03.006

Philippon, T. (2016). The fintech opportunity. *BIS Working Papers No. 655*. Bank for International Settlements.

PwC. (2023). *Financial services technology 2020 and beyond: Embracing disruption*. PricewaterhouseCoopers.

Tornatzky, L. G., & Fleischer, M. (1990). *The process of technological innovation*. Lexington Books.

Wang, Y., Kung, L., & Byrd, T. A. (2020). Big data analytics: Understanding its capabilities and potential benefits for healthcare organizations. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *126*, 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.12.019

Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Barberis, J. N. (2020). From FinTech to TechFin: The regulatory challenges of data-driven finance. *New York University Journal of Law and Business*, *14*(2), 393–446.