

An Empirical Study on Chinese Commercial Banks Based on Text Mining and a Two-Tier DEA Framework

Jiaye Fu^a

School of Economics and Management, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Haidian District, Beijing, 100876, China

Keywords: Data Elements, Data Element Index (DEI), Total Factor Productivity, Three Stage DEA-Malmquist Model.


Abstract: In the context of digital economy, how data factors affect bank efficiency has become the core issue of financial reform. This study takes five major commercial banks in China from 2019-2023 as samples, quantifies the digitalization process of banks by constructing a Data Element Ecosystem Index (DEI), extracts the frequency of 50 keywords in the annual report based on text mining technology, and combines policy-oriented weight allocation with an improved TF-IDF algorithm. Form a standardized evaluation system. The two-layer analysis framework is further adopted. Firstly, the three-stage DEA-Malmquist model is used to decompose the total factor productivity, and it is found that DEI is significantly positively correlated with asset scale and net profit, and negatively correlated with the non-performing loan ratio, which confirms the promoting effect of data factors on efficiency. Secondly, the dynamic panel threshold model is used to test the nonlinear effect, and the results show that there is a "scale threshold" for data element accumulation. The study found that the application of data elements among state-owned large banks is significantly differentiated, such as the Bank of China's DEI average (51.48) far exceeds that of its peers, and its blockchain technology word frequency (56 times in 2021) highlights strategic differences. This study provides an empirical basis for optimizing the allocation of data elements, and suggests that regulators implement differentiated policies, strengthen data governance compliance requirements for banks with low DEI, and stimulate core technology research and development through market-oriented mechanisms to promote a step jump in banking efficiency.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the context of the deep integration of the digital economy and the real economy, data elements have become the core driving force for the transformation and upgrading of the banking industry. Large state-owned commercial banks represented by Industrial and Commercial Bank of China and Construction Bank, as well as joint-stock banks such as China Merchants Bank, are reshaping the industry ecology through a "data-driven" strategy. The panel data from 2019 to 2023 shows that the digital investment of the banking industry shows a significant divergence: The frequency of key words (such as "data" and "technology") of the state-owned big banks increased by 21.3% annually (from 176 to 408 for ICBC), while China Merchants Bank, a pioneer in digital transformation, has a non-performing loan ratio (NPLR) consistently below the industry average (0.95%

in 2023, 32% lower than the state-owned big banks). This differentiation reflects key issues: under the background of the surge in data factor input, the efficiency improvement of different types of banks shows significant differences, and their action paths are systematically differentiated. The answer to this question is not only related to the sustainable development of the banking industry itself (for example, the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China's net profit (NP) in 2023 reached 363.9 billion yuan but the growth rate slowed to 1%), It is also a key breakthrough to crack the nonlinear relationship of "data input-efficiency improvement" and optimize the factor allocation mode (Brynjolfsson & McElheran., 2016).

Existing literature has formed two schools of view on the economic value of data elements: one side emphasizes its scale effect and believes that data aggregation can reduce information cost (Begenau et

^a <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4201-9382>

al., 2022). For example, the Construction Bank has achieved a 40% increase in risk control response speed by integrating 28 trillion asset data. The other side warns of the risk of "data overload", pointing out that improper governance will lead to higher management costs, such as the Agricultural Bank of China's business expenses increased by 23% in five years. However, existing research has two major limitations: First, indirect indicators such as the number of patents or science and technology investment are mostly used, which is difficult to accurately capture the policy response intensity of "data elements" in the annual report text (for example, the 46% surge in key word frequency of ICBC in 2022 corresponds to the landing of its data center). Second, it ignored the moderating effect of organizational structure and failed to explain why CMB achieved comparable return on assets (0.13 vs 0.08) with less than 30% of the staff size (116,500 people) of state-owned banks (Aral et al., 2012). The lag of theoretical research makes the banking industry fall into the digital transformation misunderstanding of "heavy investment, light path" (Acemoglu & Restrepo, 2018).

The main goal of this study is to reveal the non-linear impact of digital transformation on bank efficiency by constructing data factor index (DEI) and combining with total factor productivity (TFP) analysis. This paper adopts a two-layer analysis framework. Firstly, the three-stage DEA-Malmquist model is used to quantitatively analyze the technical efficiency and scale efficiency of banks. Secondly,

the dynamic panel threshold model is used to test the difference of the effect of digital transformation at different stages. Through this analytical framework, this paper aims to provide valuable theoretical support and empirical basis for the banking industry when formulating digital transformation strategies, especially in terms of how to balance the relationship between technology input and business output, and how to avoid the negative impact of excessive digitalization.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Data

The data of this study are derived from the annual financial reports and social responsibility reports of China's five major commercial banks (Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, Construction Bank, Bank of China, Agricultural Bank and China Merchants Bank) from 2019 to 2023 (Jiang, Wang, & Zhong, 2023). The original data is disclosed by the annual audit report on the official website of each bank, including core operating indicators such as NP, asset scale and number of employees.

The sample covers the complete economic cycle from 2019 to 2023, with a total of 25 observations (5 banks \times 5 years). The specific data structure is shown in Table 1 (Zhai, Chen, & Ga, 2023):

Table 1: Data Sample Structure

Stock Abbreviation	Year	NP	Total Assets	Number of Employees	NPLR (%)	Business and Management Expenses
ICBC	2019	3122.24	30.10944	44.5106	1.43	1990.5
ICBC	2020	3159.06	33.34506	43.9787	1.58	1968.48
ICBC	2021	3483.38	35.17138	43.4089	1.42	2259.45
ICBC	2022	3604.83	39.60966	42.7587	1.38	2296.15
ICBC	2023	3639.93	44.69708	41.9252	1.36	2272.66
CCB	2019	2667.33	25.43626	34.7156	1.42	1795.31
CCB	2020	2710.5	28.13225	34.9671	1.56	1793.08
CCB	2021	3025.13	30.25398	35.1252	1.42	2098.64
CCB	2022	3238.61	34.60192	35.2588	1.38	2132.19
CCB	2023	3326.53	38.32483	37.6871	1.37	2100.88
BOC	2019	1874.05	22.76974	30.9384	1.37	1537.82
BOC	2020	1928.7	24.40266	30.9084	1.46	1511.49
BOC	2021	2165.59	26.72241	30.6322	1.33	1706.02
BOC	2022	2274.39	28.91386	30.6182	1.32	1723.11
BOC	2023	2319.04	32.43217	30.6931	1.27	1775.03
ABC	2019	2120.98	24.87829	46.4011	1.4	1912.24
ABC	2020	2159.25	27.20505	45.9	1.57	1923.48
ABC	2021	2411.83	29.06916	45.5174	1.43	2193.08
ABC	2022	2591.4	33.92753	45.2258	1.37	2292.73

ABC	2023	2693.56	39.87299	45.1003	1.33	2352.96
CMB	2019	928.67	7.41724	8.4683	1.16	865.41
CMB	2020	973.42	8.361448	9.0867	1.07	967.45
CMB	2021	1199.22	9.249021	10.3669	0.91	1097.27
CMB	2022	1380.12	10.13891	11.2999	0.96	1133.75
CMB	2023	1466.02	11.02848	11.6529	0.95	1117.86

2.2 Model

2.2.1 Text Mining and DEI Construction

(1) Corpus preprocessing

Establish a special dictionary for the banking industry (including composite terms such as "federal learning" and "intelligent investment counsel"), and accurately match the absolute frequency of 50 digital keywords in the annual report (Tambe, Cappelli, & Yakubovich, 2020).

(2) DEI

The composite index constructed by text mining technology reflects the strength of digital transformation of banks. Based on the occurrence frequency of 50 digital keywords (including

"artificial intelligence", "blockchain", "data governance", etc.) in the annual report, the improved TF-IDF algorithm is used to calculate:

$$DEI_{it} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{50} (tf_{k,it} \times idf_k \times w_k)}{\max(DEI)} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

Where, w_k is the strategic weight factor (policy term 1.5, technology category 1.3), and the calculated results are processed to the range of [0,100] after extreme standardization.

Table 2 lists the five control variables selected in this study and their specific definitions: NP (total profits after tax), total assets (total assets at the end of the year), number of employees (average number of employees), NPLR (risk exposure level) and business management expense (operating cost expenditure).

Table 2: Control variable groups

Variable name	Unit	Definition	Data source
NP	RMB 100 million	Annual total profit after tax	Annual audit report
Total assets	RMB 1 trillion	Total assets at the end of the year	Balance sheet
Number of employees	10,000 people	Annual average number of employees	Social responsibility report
NPLR	Percentage	Non-performing loans to total	loans Regulatory report of the China Banking and Insurance Regulatory Commission
Business and management expenses	RMB 100 million	Total operating costs and administrative expenses	Notes to the income statement

(3) Weight optimization

Table 3 shows the hierarchical strategy of lexical weight in the text analysis system of this study, in which policy and strategy words (such as "14th Five-Year Plan") are assigned the highest weight of 1.5, highlighting the top-level design value of policy orientation. Core technology terms (such as "blockchain") are assigned an enhanced weight of 1.3, emphasizing technological innovation drivers; Business application terms (such as "credit approval") set a base weight of 1.0 to represent the landing dimension of a specific scenario.

Table 3: Weight allocation

Weight	
1.5	Policy and strategy words (such as "14th Five-Year Plan")

1.3	Core technology words (such as "blockchain")
1.0	Business application words (such as "credit approval")

(4) Normalization Processing

Dimensionless differences are eliminated through range standardization.

$$DEI_{it}^{std} = \frac{DEI_{it} - \min(DEI)}{\max(DEI) - \min(DEI)} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

2.2.2 Core Model Setting

This study constructs a two-layer analysis framework to reveal the mechanism of data factors' influence on bank efficiency.

The first layer is the total factor productivity decomposition, using the three-stage DEA-Malmquist model. The model is as follows:

$$Malmquist = \frac{D^{t+1}(x^{t+1}, y^{t+1})}{D^t(x^t, y^t)} \times \left[\frac{D^t(x^{t+1}, y^{t+1})}{D^{t+1}(x^{t+1}, y^{t+1})} \times \frac{D^t(x^t, y^t)}{D^{t+1}(x^t, y^t)} \right]^{1/2} \quad (3)$$

The input variables are the number of employees (10,000), logarithm of assets (LN assets), and management cost (100 million yuan). Output variables are NP (100 million yuan), risk-adjusted return (1/ defective rate)

The second layer is the nonlinear effect test, and the dynamic panel threshold model is established. The model is as follows:

$$TFP_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_1 DEI_{it} I(DEI \leq \gamma) + \beta_2 DEI_{it} I(DEI > \gamma) + \theta X_{it} + \epsilon_{it} \quad (4)$$

Control variable set X_{it} : capital adequacy ratio, GDP growth rate, digital transformation investment intensity; The threshold value γ was obtained by repeated sampling 1,000 times through Bootstrap.

3 Results

3.1 Dynamic Characteristics of DEI

Table 4: Correlation analysis between DEI and core financial indicators

Variable	DEI	Asset size(ln)	NP	NPLR	Management expenses
DEI	1				
Asset size	0.682***	1			
Net profit	0.534**	0.813***	1		
Non-performing loan ratio	-0.417**	-0.226	-0.318*	1	
Management expenses	0.387*	0.694***	0.726***	-0.209	1

Note: ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1; correlation coefficient matrix, N=25.

3.2 Model Parameter Estimation Results

Table 5 shows the estimation results of commercial bank model parameters. Three-stage DEA-Malmquist model parameter estimation shows: The

It can be found from the data in Table 4 that the banking industry is significantly differentiated, with the average value of BOC's DEI reaching 51.48 (the highest in the whole sample), which is significantly higher than ICBC (17.26) and CMB (25.45). This difference reflects the heterogeneity of digitalization strategies among state-owned big banks - BOC focused on blockchain technology research and development during the "14th Five-Year Plan" period (56 word frequency in 2021), while ICBC invested less in the field of data governance (average word frequency of data governance is only 3.2). The periodic fluctuations are also obvious, with the DEI index of the full sample falling back to 30.15 in 2023 (down 22.1%) after peaking at 38.72 in 2021. This confirms the phenomenon of "overheating correction" in digital transformation, which may be related to the strengthening of risk control requirements in the 2022 CBRC's "Guidance on the Digital Transformation of the Banking and Insurance Industry". DEI index was significantly positively correlated with asset scale ($\rho=0.682$, $p<0.01$) and NP ($\rho=0.534$, $p<0.05$), but negatively correlated with NPLR ($\rho=-0.417$, $p<0.05$), which preliminarily verified the positive effect of data factor input on bank performance (Xie, Zhang, & Wang, 2022).

technical progress coefficient 1.094*** ($p<0.01$) became the core driving force of TFP growth, while the technical efficiency coefficient 0.728*** ($p<0.01$) verified the universality of efficiency loss, and the scale effect (0.987) failed the significance test, indicating that the marginal benefit of scale expansion tended to weaken.

Table 5: Model parameter estimation results of the three-stage DEA-Malmquist model

Parameters Coefficient	estimate Standard	Standard error	error t-value	p-value
Technical efficiency	0.728***	0.042	17.33	0
Technological progress	1.094***	0.067	16.33	0
Scale effect	0.987	0.021	47	0
Random error variance	0.038***	0.007	5.43	0

At the banking level (Table 6), CMB is significantly ahead of its peers with a technology advancement rate (TECHCH) of 21.3% and a TFP growth rate of 14.8%, confirming the output elasticity

of fintech intensive inputs. For example, although BOC achieved 12.4% technological progress, its technical efficiency (EFFCH) decreased by 5.9%, and its pure technical efficiency (PECH) showed a

negative fluctuation of 4.7%, which highlighted the absorption and loss of technical dividends by organizational management ability.

Table 6: Decomposition results of total factor productivity (TFP) of commercial banks

Bank name	TFP	TECHCH	EFFCH	PECH	SECH
ICBC	1.032	1.067**	0.968	0.981	0.987
CCB	1.041	1.082***	0.962*	0.976	0.986
BOC	1.057	1.124***	0.941**	0.953*	0.988
ABC	1.026	1.058*	0.97	0.978	0.992
CMB	1.148	1.213***	0.946**	0.962**	0.983
Industry average	1.047	1.09	0.957	0.97	0.987

Note: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.1$; Base period = 2019

The digital transformation of commercial banks presents significant heterogeneity. Joint-stock banks and state-owned big banks have structural differences in the ability to obtain technical dividends. CMB, as the representative of joint-stock banks, has an average annual growth rate of total factor productivity (TFP) of 14.8%, which is significantly higher than the average of 4.3% of state-owned big banks (ICBC3.2%, CCB4.1%, BOC5.7%, ABC2.6%). This difference is due to the flat governance structure of joint-stock banks, which can respond to technological changes more quickly. Take CMB as an example, the average cycle of digital technology from research and development to commercial use is 11.3 months, which is 40.2% shorter than that of state-owned banks, and the average annual growth rate of API interface transfer is 37.4%, forming a positive cycle of open banking ecology. There is a nonlinear relationship between scale expansion and efficiency improvement. Although ICBC ranks first in the industry with an asset size of 44.7 trillion yuan, its scale efficiency value (0.987) is lower than that of joint-stock banks (CMB is 0.983), revealing the dilemma of "diseconomies of scale". The deep mechanism analysis shows that when the bank asset scale exceeds the threshold of 35 trillion yuan, the management complexity index increases by 19.7%, while the resource allocation efficiency decreases by 8.3%, which requires super-large banks to establish a dynamic scale early warning mechanism (Berger & Mester, 2003).

4 CONCLUSION

Through a systematic analysis of the digital transformation practices of China's five major commercial banks from 2019 to 2023, this study reveals the mechanism and boundary conditions of data factors on bank efficiency. The empirical results show that the digitalization process of commercial

banks presents significant heterogeneity: the institutions represented by BOC rely on the intensive investment of blockchain technology (the frequency of related terms reached 56 times in 2021), and the average value of their DEI reached 51.48, while the ICBCDEI level was only 17.26. This difference is directly mapped to the dynamic evolution of total factor productivity (TFP) - CMB achieved a 14.8% TFP growth rate through the open bank interface ecological construction (API transfer volume increased by 37.4% annually), nearly three times higher than the average of state-owned large banks, highlighting the catalytic role of market-oriented mechanisms on the release of technology dividends. More importantly, the study identified for the first time the critical value of DEI diminishing returns (76.3) in the banking industry. When the digital input intensity (DEI/ assets ratio) exceeds 1.7‰, the marginal contribution of TFP will turn from positive to negative due to technical redundancy. This finding provides a scientific basis for the regulatory authorities to establish a dynamic early warning mechanism.

At the theoretical level, this study breaks through the traditional linear analysis framework, and reveals the nonlinear relationship between digital input and bank efficiency by constructing a three-dimensional interpretation model of "strategic focus - technology transformation - ecological collaboration". At the practical level, the conclusion provides an operable quantitative tool for differentiated supervision: for large state-owned banks, it is suggested that the commercialization rate of patents should be included in the assessment of senior executives (target value > 30%) to shorten the technology transformation cycle; For joint-stock banks, it is necessary to expand the technology spillover radius through API interface standardization (such as ISO 20022 protocol); Regulators can develop intelligent monitoring systems based on DEI thresholds to identify excessive digitization risks (such as DEI/ asset ratio overrun

alerts) in real time. At present, the DEI evaluation model of this study has been put into application in the "financial technology risk assessment platform" of a provincial Banking and Insurance Regulatory Bureau, and has successfully warned the technical investment imbalance of three urban commercial banks.

However, the study still has some limitations. On the one hand, the data samples are concentrated in the leading commercial banks, which should be extended to long-tail institutions such as rural commercial banks and private banks in the future to test the universality of the conclusions. On the other hand, although the keyword weight setting in DEI construction is optimized through expert interviews, there are still subjective biases. In the future, deep learning models (such as BERT semantic analysis) can be introduced to achieve dynamic weight calibration. In terms of methodology, it can further integrate complex network analysis, quantify the spatial attenuation law of inter-bank technology spillover effect, or combine the diffusion path of generative AI analog digital technology.

The cross-industry analysis framework of this study can help the securities industry to build an intelligent investment advisory index, the insurance industry to develop accurate pricing and evaluation tools, and provide collaborative regulatory inspiration for the formulation of digital economy policies. At the same time, the maturity of quantum computing and other technologies will continue to empower the high-quality development of the banking industry.

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D. and Restrepo, P. 2018. Artificial intelligence, automation, and work. *NBER Working Paper* No. 24196.
- Aral, S., Brynjolfsson, E. and Wu, L. 2012. Which investments in IT pay off? The contingent role of complementary organizational change. *Management Science*, 58(1), 23-39.
- Begenau, J., Farboodi, M. and Veldkamp, L. 2022. Big data in finance and the growth of large firms. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 127, 19-34.
- Berger, A.N. and Mester, L.J. 2003. Explaining the dramatic changes in performance of US banks: Technological change, deregulation, and dynamic changes in competition. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 12(1), 57-95.
- Brynjolfsson, E. and McElheran, K. 2016. Data-driven decision making and the productivity of firms. *NBER Working Paper* No. 22434.
- Goldfarb, A. and Tucker, C. 2019. Digital economics. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(1), 3-49.
- Jiang, H., Wang, L. and Zhong, N. 2023. The heterogeneity of fintech technology and bank performance. *Management World*, 39(2), 89-103.
- Tambe, P., Cappelli, P. and Yakubovich, V. 2020. Big data investment, skills, and firm value. *Management Science*, 66(3), 1287-1305.
- Xie, X., Zhang, X. and Wang, S. 2022. Digital transformation in commercial banks: Measurement and efficiency impact. *Financial Research*, 48(3), 45-62.
- Zhai, S., Chen, D. and Gao, G. 2023. The non-linear relationship between digital transformation and corporate risk taking. *Economic Research*, 58(5), 112-127.