

# A Study on Financial Inclusion and Penetration of Banking and Financial Services in India

#### \*Jyoti

\*Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, MDU, Rohtak

#### Abstract:

The landscape of financial inclusion and the reach of banking and financial services in India have undergone significant transformations in recent years. This research paper undertakes a comprehensive study to examine the state of financial inclusion and the extent of penetration of banking and financial services across the diverse socio-economic strata of the Indian population. Through an intricate analysis of various factors such as education, income, gender, residence, and occupation, this study aims to shed light on the multifaceted dimensions of financial inclusion and the accessibility of banking services in the Indian context. The paper commences by contextualizing the importance of financial inclusion and penetration within the broader framework of economic growth, social equity, and technological advancements. It delves into the evolution of financial inclusion initiatives, including policy measures, technological innovations, and the role of government and regulatory bodies.

# Key Words: Financial Inclusion, Penetration, Banking

# Introduction:

In the realm of economic development and social progress, the concepts of financial inclusion and the pervasive reach of banking and financial services have emerged as pivotal drivers of growth and equitable prosperity. In the Indian context, a nation marked by its diverse demographics and evolving economic landscape, the pursuit of comprehensive financial inclusion and the effective penetration of banking services take on profound significance. This research paper embarks on an exploratory journey to dissect and analyse the intricacies of financial inclusion, delving into the multifaceted dimensions that define the accessibility of banking and financial services across different strata of society.

The trajectory of India's financial inclusion narrative is intertwined with its quest for inclusive growth, poverty alleviation, and the empowerment of marginalized segments. Over the years, the country has witnessed an array of policy measures, technological innovations, and collaborative efforts aimed at extending the benefits of formal financial services to every citizen, regardless of their socio-economic background. The integration of digital

technologies, mobile banking, and innovative financial instruments has further reshaped the contours of financial accessibility, redefining how individuals engage with banking services.

As we embark on this study, it is imperative to underscore the multifaceted nature of financial inclusion. It is not merely about access to bank accounts; it encompasses a spectrum of services that enable individuals to participate in the formal financial ecosystem. Whether it is availing credit, insurance, savings, or investment opportunities, comprehensive financial inclusion embodies the spirit of economic empowerment and social upliftment.

The ensuing sections of this paper delve into the historical context of financial inclusion, the evolution of policies, and the technological advancements that have catalyzed its progress. We will then transition into the methodological framework, highlighting the rationale for our approach and the tools we have employed to gather insights from a diverse cross-section of Indian society. By examining the empirical findings and their implications, we hope to contribute to the ongoing discourse on financial inclusion, facilitating informed decision-making for policymakers, financial institutions, and stakeholders invested in fostering a more inclusive financial landscape.

#### **Review of Literature**

The study on financial inclusion and the penetration of banking and financial services in India is situated within a broader global context where access to formal financial services is increasingly recognized as a critical driver of economic development and poverty reduction. The literature in this area highlights the multifaceted dimensions of financial inclusion, examining its implications for various socio-economic groups, the role of technology, government policies, and the challenges that persist. This review aims to synthesize and analyze key findings from existing research, shedding light on the diverse perspectives and insights that contribute to our understanding of this complex landscape.

#### The Global Financial Inclusion Agenda:

The global discourse on financial inclusion gained prominence with initiatives from organizations like the World Bank and the United Nations. Scholars such as Beck, Demirgüç-Kunt, and Levine (2007) have emphasized the link between financial development and economic growth, fostering a global push for comprehensive financial inclusion strategies.

### **Factors Shaping Financial Inclusion:**

Research has identified a multitude of factors that influence financial inclusion. Demographic variables, including education, income, gender, residence, and occupation, play a pivotal role in determining the extent of financial access. Jha and Sarangi (2017) found that education positively affects financial inclusion, while gender disparities remain a critical concern (World Bank, 2019).

#### **Technological Advancements and Digital Financial Services:**

The rise of digital technologies has revolutionized financial services and expanded their reach. Mobile banking, digital payment systems, and the advent of fintech have been instrumental in increasing financial accessibility. Suri

and Jack (2016) explore the impact of mobile money on financial inclusion in Kenya, highlighting the potential of technology in bridging gaps.

# **Government Initiatives and Policies:**

Government policies and regulatory frameworks are instrumental in shaping financial inclusion efforts. India's Jan Dhan Yojana and the Pradhan Mantri Mudra Yojana are notable examples. Khandker et al. (2012) emphasize the importance of policy interventions in creating an enabling environment for financial inclusion.

### **Challenges and Barriers:**

Despite progress, challenges persist in achieving universal financial inclusion. Access to banking services in rural and remote areas remains a concern due to infrastructural limitations. Research by Kumar et al. (2016) highlights the need for improved infrastructure to enhance financial access in underserved regions.

# **Social and Cultural Factors:**

Socio-cultural factors also influence financial behavior. Singh and Bhowmik (2020) analyze how cultural norms and social networks affect financial inclusion, shedding light on community-based financial practices.

# **Research Methodology**

# **Objectives of Study**

- To study the demographic profile of customers using banking and Financial Services in India
- To Study the impact of financial inclusion and penetration on the base of demographic variables

# **Sampling Design**

The study is descriptive cum exploratory design having sampling size 100 respondents. The statistical techniques used is Descriptive and Two Way Anova .

# **Data Analysis and Interpretation**

# **Overall Impact of Demographic variables on Financial Inclusion and Penetration**

	Tests of Between-Subjects Effects									
Dependent Variable: The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial Services										
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Type III SumdfMean SquareFSiof Squares </th								
Corrected Model	8.978 <sup>a</sup>	12	.748	1.620	.101					
Intercept	176.400	1	176.400	381.932	.000					
Gender	.188	1	.188	.408	.525					
Residence	.126	1	.126	.272	.603					

International Journal of Novel Research and Development (www.ijnrd.org)

Occupation	2.610	1	2.610	5.652	.020	
Age	2.211	3	.737	1.596	.196	
Education	2.155	2	1.078	2.333	.103	
Income per month	.881	4	.220	.477	.752	
Error	40.182	87	.462			
Total	1830.000	100				
Corrected Total	49.160	99				
a. R Squared = .183 (Adjusted R Squared = .070)						

The table presents the results of a between-subjects effects analysis for the dependent variable "The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial." The analysis examines the impact of different independent variables on the dependent variable. The table includes various sources of variance, degrees of freedom (df), mean squares, F-values, and significance levels (Sig.).

Interpretation:

- 1. **Corrected Model:** The "Corrected Model" row represents the overall impact of all the independent variables together on the dependent variable. The Type III Sum of Squares for the corrected model is 8.978. The degrees of freedom are 12, resulting in a Mean Square of 0.748. The associated F-value is 1.620, and the significance level (Sig.) is 0.101. This indicates that the model as a whole does not have a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable, as the p-value (Sig.) is greater than the common significance level of 0.05.
- Intercept: The "Intercept" row represents the constant term in the model. The Type III Sum of Squares is 176.400, with 1 degree of freedom. The associated F-value is 381.932, and the significance level is very low (Sig. = 0.000), indicating that the intercept is statistically significant.
- 3. Gender, Residence, Occupation, Age, Education, Income per month: These rows represent the individual independent variables being tested. Each row provides the Type III Sum of Squares, degrees of freedom, Mean Square, F-value, and significance level for the respective variable. For example, the "Gender" row indicates that the variable "Gender" does not have a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable, as the Sig. value is 0.525 (greater than 0.05).
- Error: The "Error" row presents the within-group variability that is not explained by the independent variables in the model. The Type III Sum of Squares for error is 40.182, and the degrees of freedom are 87. The Mean Square value is 0.462.
- 5. **Total:** The "Total" row represents the total variability in the dependent variable. The Type III Sum of Squares for the total is 1830.000.
- 6. **R Squared and Adjusted R Squared:** The R Squared value is 0.183, indicating that the model explains approximately 18.3% of the variability in the dependent variable. The adjusted R Squared value (0.070) adjusts for the number of predictors in the model.

In summary, the table presents an analysis of the impact of various independent variables on the dependent variable related to under-banked and financial inclusion perceptions. The model as a whole is not statistically significant, but certain individual variables like "Intercept" and "Occupation" show significant effects.

Estimates								
Dependent Va	Dependent Variable: The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of							
financial inclu	financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial							
Gender	Gender Mean Std. Error 95% Confidence Interval							
Lower Bound Upper Bound								
Male	4.141	.218	3.708	4.575				
Female	4.243	.239	3.768	4.719				

The table presents estimates for the dependent variable "The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial Services," categorized by gender. The estimates include the mean values, standard errors, and 95% confidence intervals for the two gender categories: Male and Female.

#### **Interpretation:**

The mean score for the Male category is 4.141. This implies that, on average, male respondents have a perception or opinion related to the under-banked and financial inclusion aspect that aligns with a score of 4.141. The standard error for the Male category is 0.218. This indicates the level of variability or uncertainty associated with the mean estimate. A lower standard error suggests that the mean estimate is relatively stable. The 95% confidence interval for the Male category ranges from 3.708 to 4.575. This interval provides a range within which we can be 95% confident that the true population mean lies. It indicates the potential variability in the estimates if the survey were repeated with different samples. Similarly, for the Female category, the mean score is 4.243. This suggests that, on average, female respondents have a slightly higher perception or opinion compared to male respondents, with a score of 4.243. The standard error for the Female category is 0.239. Like the Male category, this indicates the variability associated with the mean estimate for females. The 95% confidence interval for the Female category is 0.239. Like the Male category, this indicates the variability associated with the mean estimate for females. The 95% confidence interval for the Female category is 0.239. Like the Male category, this indicates the variability associated with the mean estimate for females. The 95% confidence interval for the Female category spans from 3.768 to 4.719. Just like the Male category, this interval provides a range within which the true population mean for females is likely to fall.

In summary, the table provides insights into the mean perceptions or opinions of male and female respondents regarding the under-banked and financial inclusion aspect. The relatively narrow confidence intervals for both gender categories suggest a certain level of precision in the estimates. The slightly higher mean score for females implies a slightly more positive perception compared to males, but the differences appear to be relatively small.

		Estim	ates				
Dependent Variable: The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial							
Residence	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Error 95% Confidence Interval				
Lower Bound Upper Bour							
Metro	4.235	.231	3.777	4.693			
Non Metro	4.150	.229	3.696	4.604			

Pairwise Comparisons								
Dependent Variable: The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial								
(I) Residence (J) Residence Mean Std. Sig. <sup>a</sup> 95% Confidence Interval fo Difference (I- Error Difference						Interval for		
		J)			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Metro	Non Metro	.085	.163	.603	240	.410		
Non Metro	Metro	085	.163	.603	410	.240		
Based on estimated marginal means								
a. Adjustment adjustments).	for multiple co	mparisons: Lea	st Signifi	cant Differe	ence (equivalent	to no		

The table presents the results of pairwise comparisons for the dependent variable "The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial," based on different categories of residence: Metro and Non Metro. The comparisons include the mean difference, standard error, significance level, and confidence interval for each pairwise comparison.

# Interpretation:

The comparison between Metro and Non Metro residences shows a mean difference of 0.085, but the difference is not statistically significant (p = 0.603). The 95% confidence interval for the difference ranges from -0.240 to 0.410. This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions related to the under-banked and financial inclusion aspect between respondents from Metro and Non Metro areas. Similarly, the comparison between Non Metro and Metro residences has a mean difference of -0.085, which is also not statistically significant (p = 0.603). The confidence interval for the difference spans from -0.410 to 0.240. The results are based on estimated marginal means, and no adjustments for multiple comparisons were made (Least Significant Difference).

In summary, the table provides insights into the lack of statistically significant differences in perceptions regarding the under-banked and financial inclusion aspect between respondents from Metro and Non Metro areas. The mean differences are negligible, and the confidence intervals indicate that the differences could potentially range within the specified intervals.

		Estimat	es					
Dependent Variable: The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial								
Education	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval					
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
10+2	4.232	.755	2.732	5.732				
Graduate	3.993	.190	3.616	4.370				
Post Graduate	4.352	.211	3.933	4.771				

\

	Pairwise Comparisons							
Dependent Variable: The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of								
financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial								
(I)	(J) Mean Std. Sig. <sup>b</sup> 95% Confidence Interv							
Education	Education	Difference	Error		for Difference			
		( <b>I-J</b> )			Lower	Upper		
					Bound	Bound		
10+2	Graduate	.239	.859	.781	-1.469	1.948		
	Post Graduate	120	.877	.891	-1.862	1.622		
Craduata	10+2	239	.859	.781	-1.948	1.469		
Graduate	Post Graduate	359*	.168	.035	693	026		
Deat Craduate	10+2	.120	.877	.891	-1.622	1.862		
Post Graduate	Graduate	.359*	.168	.035	.026	.693		
Based on estimated marginal means								
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.								
b. Adjustment	for multiple con	nparisons: Least	t Significar	nt Differen	ce (equivalent to	no		
adjustments).								

The table presents the results of pairwise comparisons for the dependent variable "The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial." The comparisons are based on different levels of education (10+2, Graduate, and Post Graduate). The table includes the mean difference, standard error, significance level, and confidence interval for each pairwise comparison.

# Interpretation:

The comparison between 10+2 and Graduate education levels shows a mean difference of 0.239, but the difference is not statistically significant (p = 0.781). The 95% confidence interval for the difference spans from -1.469 to 1.948, indicating that the difference could potentially range within this interval. The comparison between 10+2 and Post Graduate education levels has a mean difference of -0.120, which is not statistically significant (p = 0.891). The confidence interval for the difference ranges from -1.862 to 1.622. The comparison between Graduate and Post Graduate education levels has a mean difference of -0.359. This difference is statistically significant (p = 0.035) at the 0.05 level. The 95% confidence interval for the difference is -0.693 to -0.026. The results are based on estimated marginal means, and it is noted that the mean difference in the comparison between Graduate and Post Graduate education levels is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. No adjustments for multiple comparisons were made (Least Significant Difference).

Overall, the table provides insights into the differences and significance levels between the education levels in relation to the dependent variable, suggesting that the difference between Graduate and Post Graduate education levels has a notable impact on the under-banked and financial inclusion aspect considered.

Estimates								
Dependent Variable: The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial								
Income per month	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval					
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound				
Less than 20000	4.249	.514	3.228	5.271				
20000-29000	4.025	.341	3.347	4.703				
30000-39000	4.230	.327	3.581	4.880				
40000-49000	4.134	.330	3.479	4.789				
above 50000	4.324	.349	3.630	5.017				

# **Pairwise Comparisons**

# Dependent Variable: The Indian population is largely under-banked with a low level of financial inclusion and under-penetration of Banking and Financial

(I) Income per month	(J) Income per month	J) Income per Mean nonth Difference (I-		·Sig.ª	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
		J)			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	20000-29000	.224	.725	.758	-1.217	1.666
Lass than 20000	30000-39000	.019	.722	.979	-1.415	1.453
Less mail 20000	40000-49000	.115	.724	.874	-1.324	1.555
	above 50000	074	.727	.919	-1.519	1.370
	Less than 20000	224	.725	.758	-1.666	1.217
20000-29000	30000-39000	205	.184	.267	570	.160
20000-29000	40000-49000	109	.240	.651	586	.368
	above 50000	299	.273	.277	842	.244
	Less than 20000	019	.722	.979	-1.453	1.415
30000-39000	20000-29000	.205	.184	.267	160	.570
50000-57000	40000-49000	.096	.210	.647	320	.513
	above 50000	093	.253	.713	596	.409
	Less than 20000	115	.724	.874	-1.555	1.324
40000-49000	20000-29000	.109	.240	.651	368	.586
40000-49000	30000-39000	096	.210	.647	513	.320
	above 50000	190	.254	.456	694	.314
	Less than 20000	.074	.727	.919	-1.370	1.519
above 50000	20000-29000	.299	.273	.277	244	.842
	30000-39000	.093	.253	.713	409	.596
	40000-49000	.190	.254	.456	314	.694
Based on estimate	d marginal means	1	1	ļ		<u> </u>
a. Adjustment for	d marginal means multiple comparisons:	Least Significar	nt Difference	e (equival	ent to no adjustm	ents).

#### Interpretation

The table showcases comparisons between different ranges of monthly income and their impact on perceptions related to the under-banked and financial inclusion aspect. Each section of the table provides comparisons between two specific income ranges (e.g., Less than 20000 vs. 20000-29000, Less than 20000 vs. 30000-39000, and so on).

For each pair of income ranges, the table includes the following information:

- Mean Difference: This represents the average difference in perceptions related to the under-banked and financial inclusion aspect between the two income groups.
- Std. Error: This indicates the variability or uncertainty associated with the mean difference.
- **Sig.a:** This represents the significance level of the difference. A significance level (p-value) below a certain threshold (usually 0.05) indicates that the difference is statistically significant.
- **95% Confidence Interval for Difference:** This interval provides a range within which we can be 95% confident that the true population mean difference lies.

Here's an example interpretation using the first comparison: For the comparison between "Less than 20000" and "20000-29000" income ranges, the mean difference is 0.224. However, this difference is not statistically significant (p = 0.758), as the p-value is greater than the common significance level of 0.05. The 95% confidence interval for the difference ranges from -1.217 to 1.666, indicating that the difference could potentially fall within this interval. The interpretation for other comparisons follows a similar pattern.

In summary, the table provides insights into the pairwise comparisons of perceptions regarding the under-banked and financial inclusion aspect based on different income ranges. The significance levels and confidence intervals help determine whether these differences are statistically meaningful.

### Conclusion

In an era marked by dynamic socio-economic transformations and rapid technological advancements, the study on financial inclusion and the penetration of banking and financial services in India assumes profound significance. Through a comprehensive analysis of various tables and empirical findings, this research paper has journeyed through the intricate dimensions that define the accessibility and reach of formal financial services across diverse segments of Indian society. The tables presented within this paper have illuminated critical facets that contribute to our understanding of financial inclusion dynamics. The exploration of demographic variables, such as education, income, gender, residence, and occupation, has offered valuable insights into the nuanced interplay between socio-economic factors and financial accessibility. These tables have not only quantified differences and trends but have also facilitated a more holistic comprehension of the challenges and opportunities that define the landscape. The patterns discerned from the analysis of pairwise comparisons underscore the significance of various factors in shaping perceptions and experiences related to financial inclusion. Whether examining differences in education levels, income ranges, or geographical locations, the tables reveal a mosaic of perceptions that demand nuanced

policy responses. These insights are instrumental in directing efforts towards tailored interventions that can cater to the unique needs and requirements of different groups.

The statistical tests of between-subjects effects provide a deeper layer of understanding, revealing the intricate relationships between independent variables and the dependent variable of financial inclusion and penetration. The significance of certain variables, such as occupation, provides valuable cues for policymakers and financial institutions to focus their attention on areas with potential for impactful change. At the same time, the non-significant relationships underscore the need for a holistic approach that considers multiple dimensions of financial inclusion.

The conclusions drawn from the interpretations of pairwise comparisons further emphasize the need for comprehensive policy approaches that recognize the diversity of the Indian population. Whether residing in metro or non-metro areas, or belonging to varying income ranges, the perceptions and experiences related to financial inclusion exhibit subtle variations. These insights advocate for a multi-pronged strategy that addresses regional disparities and caters to specific needs, ultimately contributing to more equitable financial access. As we reflect upon the tables and their implications, it becomes evident that financial inclusion and the penetration of banking and financial services transcend numerical figures. It is a dynamic ecosystem that engages with the aspirations and challenges of individuals from all walks of life. The narrative of financial inclusion in India is an evolving saga, shaped by global trends, technological innovations, and the aspirations of a nation committed to inclusive growth. In conclusion, the synthesis of insights derived from the various tables underscores the need for an inclusive and collaborative approach towards achieving comprehensive financial inclusion in India. The tables not only contribute valuable data but also provide a lens through which policymakers, financial institutions, and stakeholders can navigate the complex landscape. This research paper aspires to contribute to the ongoing discourse, ushering in an era where every citizen, regardless of their socio-economic background, can participate in and benefit from the formal financial ecosystem.

#### References

Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Levine, R. (2007). Finance, Inequality, and the Poor. Journal of Economic Growth, 12(1), 27-49.

World Bank. (2019). Global Findex Database. Retrieved from https://globalfindex.worldbank.org/

Jha, S., & Sarangi, N. (2017). Financial Inclusion in India: A Critical Evaluation. Economic and Political Weekly, 52(3), 51-58.

Suri, T., & Jack, W. (2016). The Long-run Poverty and Gender Impacts of Mobile Money. Science, 354(6317), 1288-1292.

Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B., & Samad, H. A. (2012). Handbook on Impact Evaluation: Quantitative Methods and Practices. The World Bank.

Kumar, A., Chakraborty, D., & Poudel, D. (2016). Determinants of Financial Inclusion in India: A Multilevel Analysis. Review of Development and Change, 21(1), 51-68.

Morduch, J. (1999). The Microfinance Promise. Journal of Economic Literature, 37(4), 1569-1614.

Singh, B. K., & Bhowmik, R. N. (2020). Cultural Impact on Financial Inclusion: A Study on Urban Poor in India. International Journal of Business and Economics, 19(1), 9-23.

Karlan, D., Ratan, A. L., & Zinman, J. (2016). Savings by and for the Poor: A Research Review and Agenda. Review of Income and Wealth, 62(S1), S10-S34

