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Abstract

This study addresses the changes in the use of non-cash payments by individuals during the COVID-19 pandemic at the level of individual banks in Poland. In hypothesis H1 we assumed that during the pandemic there was a change in the payment behaviour towards an increased use of mobile payments. In order to verify H1, we calculated the average values of the indicators characterising non-cash payments for each first quarter in 2019–2022. In hypothesis H2 we assumed that in each period it is possible to distinguish a group of banks whose clients actively used mobile payments (H2a) and a group of banks whose clients more often used traditional forms of non-cash payments (H2b). To verify H2, we used the farthest-neighbour clustering method. The general findings of the research show that the payment behaviour of banks’ clients before and during the COVID-19 pandemic differed. This resulted in a change in the position of some banks on the non-cash payments market in Poland.
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1. Introduction

Non-cash payments include a variety of methods of transferring money accumulated in bank (payment) accounts. It is worth noting that nowadays this transfer often takes place with the indirect participation of banks. The landscape of non-cash payments is undergoing significant transformations as a result of the spread of innovations, the initiators of which are non-financial entities, in particular so-called FinTech\(^1\) companies (Tut 2020). Nevertheless, in Poland and other countries around the world, banks still play a key role as payment service providers, and bank payment instruments enjoy a quantitative and valuable advantage on the payments market.

The payment behaviour of individual bank customers was significantly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in changes in retail trade and services, including limits on the number of customers, and the obligation for customers to observe social distancing and to cover their mouths and noses. Some recommendations included promoting cashless payments for purchases. Therefore, it is worthwhile determining the changes that occurred in the use of various forms of cashless payments in Poland by individual customers during the COVID-19 pandemic. These changes may be observed on various levels, one of which is the number, size and structure of transactions carried out through particular types of payment systems or payment schemes. Another level is the scale of use of individual payment instruments. Analysis may also be carried out at the level of individual payment service providers. This study addresses the changes in the latter area. Based on an analysis of indicators characterizing the use of cashless payments by individual customers, we attempted to diagnose the changes in the payment behaviour of retail clients of selected banks operating in Poland during the COVID-19 pandemic. We also decided to verify whether these changes had an impact on the position of the banks studied on the domestic payment market.

2. Empirical research review

Extant empirical research on payments made during the COVID-19 pandemic focused on three main areas (Table 14). The authors of such research examined consumer payment behaviour, the demand for and use of cash, and the relations between payments and the economy. Measurements were based on system data, as well as information derived from questionnaire and diary surveys. Research studies conducted among consumers in various countries confirmed an increase in the use of non-cash transactions during the pandemic (Alber, Dabour 2020; Cubides, O’Brien 2022; Kraenzlin, Meyer, Nellen 2020; Kulisz, Bojanowska, Toborek 2021), in particular contactless and mobile transactions (Ardizzi, Nobili, Rocco 2020; Akana 2021; Jonker et al. 2020). The authors generally agree that the pandemic was a trigger that led to permanent changes in payment policy and in the payment behaviour of consumers (Rafdinal, Senalasari 2021; Shishah, Alhelaly 2021; Wiśniewski et al. 2021; Kotkowski, Polasik 2021).

In research on cash demand and use, the role of money as a means of payment and a storage of value has been explored. In the first aspect, it was confirmed that the use of cash in everyday transactions was limited due to fears of the spread of the virus (e.g. Caswell et al. 2020). In some studies, the problem of the acceptance and availability of cash was raised (Auer, Cornelli, Frost 2020; Auer et

\(^1\) In this context, FinTech refers to technological innovations in financial services that shape new business models, applications, processes or products (FSB 2017). Alongside the term FinTech, which stands for Finance and Technology, other neologisms are appearing, e.g. PayTech (Harasim, Mitrega-Niestroj 2018).
al. 2020). There was a noticeable and lasting effect of the substitution of cash transactions by cards, in particular through contactless and mobile payment options in e-commerce (Auer et al. 2020). Research confirmed that there was also a marked increase in demand for cash, mainly for precautionary reasons, which is a natural phenomenon in a period of significant economic uncertainty and various tensions (Chen et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2022; Guttmann et al. 2021; Rösl, Seitz 2021; Kim, Kumar, O’Brien 2020).

Research on the relationship between payments and the economy shows that payment data provides fast and high-quality information about transactions in the national economy (e.g. Carvalho et al. 2020). The main conclusion arising from this group of studies is that digital payments facilitated consumption despite limitations relating to time and location, thereby increasing the resiliency of the economy during the pandemic (Liu, Pan, Yin 2020; Kraenzlin, Meyer, Nellen 2020; Bounie, Camara, Galbraith 2020; Alfonso et al. 2021).

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected both the functioning of the entire payments sector and consumer habits. Research has been conducted mainly from the perspective of the consumer. Some authors have focused on the macroeconomic perspective, and the results of their research confirm the effectiveness and validity of actions aimed at accelerating the digital transformation of the economy and introducing innovations in payments. This has made economies more resilient to unexpected shocks, as well as making them more efficient and competitive.

The broadest and most comprehensive research on the non-cash and mobile payments market in Poland was conducted by Narodowy Bank Polski. So far, several surveys of consumer payment behaviour in Poland have been conducted – before the pandemic in 2011 and 2012 (Koźliński 2013), as well as during it (Wiśniewski et al. 2021; Kotkowski, Polasik 2021). Similar research, although not as detailed, was conducted by a research team from the University of Warsaw (Kaźmierczak, Kotkowski, Maciejewski 2022). Their interest focused on the use of cash for payments and changes in consumer payment behaviour. Similar data in terms of content is also included in a report published by the Chamber of Digital Economy in 2021 (Izba Gospodarki Elektronicznej 2020). Although the individual studies were prepared on the basis of different sources and research methods, their results are convergent. They show that during the pandemic, Polish consumers quickly and effectively changed their views in favour of preferring non-cash payments, especially mobile payments.

In addition to the cited results of research and reports, data characterizing the payment services market is published in Poland on an ongoing basis, including data provided by banks or other payment service providers. Such a rich supply of secondary sources allows for the research described in this article to also be continued in subsequent years.

This study focuses on consumer behaviour in the use of non-cash payments. However, the source and nature of the data, and thus the adopted perspective, differ from previous research. The analysis uses secondary data processed into indicators of non-cash payments made by retail clients of selected banks. In addition, the research was extended to include the impact of changes in consumer payment behaviour on the position of banks on the non-cash payments market.

3. Data and research methods

The number and type of indicators used in the analysis were determined by the availability of statistical data characterising the banking services market, including services available through mobile channels.
The source database was Q1 data for 2019–2022 published in PRNews.pl reports. In the analysis, six variables characterising the position of the analysed banks on the non-cash payments market were taken into account (variables x2–x7), while in addition, information on the number of individual customers was also used (variable x1). Among the variables analysed were:

- x1 – number of individual clients,
- x2 – number of “mobile-only” clients (customers who use banking services only on mobile phones and do not log in to transaction systems on PCs),
- x3 – number of active payment cards available on mobile devices (with HCE technology, cards connected to Google Pay, Garmin Pay, Fitbit Pay and Apple Pay wallets (partially)),
- x4 – number of active mobile application users (customers who log in at least once a month),
- x5 – number of active e-banking users (customers who log in to their current account using electronic banking at least once a month),
- x6 – number of active debit cards,
- x7 – number of active credit cards.

Based on variables x1–x7, nine indicators characterising the situation of banks in terms of non-cash payments were determined. These are:

- w1 – number of active “mobile only” customers per 100 individual customers,
- w2 – number of active mobile payment cards per 100 individual customers,
- w3 – number of active users of applications on mobile phones per 100 individual customers,
- w4 – number of active e-banking users per 100 individual customers,
- w5 – number of active debit cards per 100 individual customers,
- w6 – number of active credit cards per 100 individual customers,
- w7 – number of “mobile-only” customers per 100 mobile phone application users,
- w8 – number of “mobile-only” customers per 100 e-banking users,
- w9 – number of active mobile phone application users per 100 e-banking users.

We formulated several research hypotheses. In hypothesis H1, we assumed that during the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a change in the payment behaviour of retail clients of selected banks in Poland towards an increased use of non-cash payments, especially mobile payments. To verify hypothesis H1, the average values of the indicators for all banks for each first quarter in the years 2019–2022 were calculated.

Moreover, we formulated the following hypotheses:

H2a: In each of the periods analysed, it is possible to distinguish a group of banks whose clients were actively using mobile banking.

H2b: In each of the periods analysed, it is possible to distinguish a group of banks whose clients were more likely to use traditional forms of non-cash payments (payment cards).

For their verification, based on the values of the indicators, the farthest-neighbour clustering method (also known as complete linkage clustering) was used to position the 9 banks on the market of non-cash payments. This method belongs to the group of hierarchical cluster analysis methods. In this method, the distance between clusters is determined by the largest of the distances between any two objects belonging to different clusters (i.e. “farthest neighbours”).

The average values of the indicators for all banks in the quarters analysed in the years 2019–2022 are shown in Table 1, while the indicators for individual banks in particular quarters are included in Tables 10–13. Tables 2–5 contain the average values of the indicators for groups of banks identified by the cluster analysis method. Tree diagrams with the clustering results are presented in Figures 1–4.
To determine the significance of the differences between the averages in the clusters formed, the ANOVA F-test was used (Tables 6–9). In light of this test, there are statistically significant differences in the average values of most of the analysed indicators, with some variation from quarter to quarter. In Q1 2019, there were no significant differences for w2 and w6, nor were there in Q2 2020 for indicator w9. In Q1 2021, the same was true for indicators w7–w9, while in Q1 2022, no significant differences were observed for indicators w5–w9.

4. Research results

4.1. Analysis of indicators

The analysis of indicators characterizing non-cash payments in the years 2019–2022 shows that in subsequent quarters, the value of all of them except for w6 increased (Table 1). The number of active credit cards per 100 individual customers decreased from 14.1 in the first quarter of 2019 to less than 12 in the first quarter of 2022. The cashless payments market in Poland is based primarily on debit cards – before the COVID-19 pandemic, the w5 indicator was 59.3%, and after the end of the fourth wave it was 66.5%. Other non-cash payment channels are used by fewer individual customers, with the largest using electronic banking (w4 ratio), for which the percentage increased from 39.7% to 50.7%. During the COVID-19 pandemic, by far the greatest increase concerned the popularization of the mobile distribution channel for banking services, which is fully reflected in the comparison of the values of the indicators from the first quarter of 2020 with those from the first quarter of 2022. The value of the active customers “mobile only” indicator (w1) increased from 14.8% to 24.3%, and customers actively using mobile banking applications (w3) from 27.2% to 39.5%. Thus, the high growth dynamic observed in 2020 and 2021 for the w3 index was maintained. In addition, the number of active payment cards available on mobile devices per 100 individual customers (w2 index) increased from less than 9 to 20. With regard to the mobile channel, it is worth noting that for the users of mobile applications, this channel is increasingly becoming the main or even only means of access to banking services. This regularity is confirmed by changes in the value of w9, which is the quotient of the number of active users of the mobile application on a mobile phone and the number of users of electronic banking. Its value increased from 64.7% in the first quarter of 2020 to 77.8% in the first quarter of 2022, with the largest increase, amounting to as much as 19.1 percentage points, between 2019 and 2020. The w8 index, which measures the share of mobile-only customers among e-banking users, also recorded a significant increase (from 34.8% to 48.3%).

Thus, in light of the analysis of the indexes, hypothesis H1 should be positively verified. During the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a change in the payment behaviour of bank customers in Poland towards increased use of non-cash payments, especially mobile payments.

The changes in the average values of the w1–w9 indexes, which are shown in Table 1, are the result of changes in the values of these indicators for individual banks (these values are shown in Tables 10–13). The changes in their values reflect differences in the payment behaviour of retail clients of individual banks in the period before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. These changes result in the different positions of banks in the ranking in individual quarters. For example, in terms of the w2 index (number of active mobile payment cards per 100 individual customers) mBank advanced from third
position in Q1 2019 to first position in Q1 2022, while in terms of the w5 index (number of active debit cards per 100 individual customers) Bank Millennium occupied the first position in Q1 2019, falling to third position in Q1 2022.

Based on the values of the calculated indexes, the banks were grouped using the cluster analysis method, which allows the differences between banks in the use of non-cash payments by individual clients to be determined, as well as the changes that took place in this area during the COVID-19 pandemic. The grouping of banks was carried out in each of the four analysed periods. The reference point for comparing the results are the results for the same period the previous year.

4.2. Bank grouping for Q1 2019

Group 1 includes two banks: Pekao and mBank (Figure 1, Table 2). Among their individual customers, in the first quarter of 2019, more than half actively used electronic banking, and 2/3 of them used a debit card. Both banks were also market leaders in mobile banking – 27.6% of individual customers (w3) and every second user of electronic banking (w9) were active users of the banking application. At the same time, only 4.9% had a payment card “connected” to a smartphone (w2), and 10% of the customers of these banks had a credit card (w6).

Group 2 consists of four banks: PKO BP, Millennium, ING and Santander, and their characteristic feature are higher than average values (compared to all banks) of all indicators except w6. In the first quarter of 2019, an average of 11.8% of customers used a credit card, while over 3/4 of people used a debit card. In this group of banks, every fourth individual customer (w1) and more than half of electronic banking users used banking services via a mobile application. In addition, this group of banks is also distinguished by having a very favourable ratio of the number of “mobile-only” customers in relation to users of the mobile application for mobile phones and people using electronic banking, which is confirmed by the values of w7 (61.0%) and w8 (33.3%).

Group 3 consists of three banks: Credit Agricole, BNP Paribas and Alior. Against the background of all the banks, they are distinguished by much lower values of almost all indicators. In the first quarter of 2019, only every fifth customer of these banks used electronic banking (w4), and only 6.4% used the mobile banking application (w3). As a result, the w9 index, which measures the number of active users of the mobile application among electronic banking users, was also relatively low (30.3%). A marginal group in these banks were “mobile-only” customers (2.4%). A relatively small percentage of customers, only 30.6%, actively used a debit card (w5), while a credit card was relatively popular compared to the customers of other banks – the value of the w6 ratio was 19.6%.

4.3. Bank grouping Q1 2020 vs Q1 2019

In the first quarter of 2020, compared to the first quarter of 2019, the composition of two groups of banks changed as a result of mBank’s “transition” from group 1 to group 2 (Table 3, Figure 2). A comparison of the values of the indicators in both quarters shows that this change was caused by differences in the value of indicators for mobile-only customers. Compared to the banks in group 2,
Bank Pekao is characterized by much higher values of indicators w1, w7 and w8. The mobile channel of access to banking services is used by 21.1% of its customers (w1), 59.3% are users of the bank’s mobile application (w7) and 41.5% are users of electronic banking (w8).

Compared to the first quarter of 2019, there was clear progress in the use of mobile banking in group 3. The value of the w7 indicator was 48.2% (an increase of 8.8 percentage points) and the w8 indicator was 27.4% (an increase of 15.4 percentage points). The value of the w9 index, which measures the number of active users of the mobile application among electronic banking users, also increased significantly by 25.8 percentage points.

4.4. Bank grouping Q1 2021 vs Q1 2020

In the first quarter of 2021, compared to the first quarter of 2020, as a result of the use of grouping using the outermost proximity method, partially different groups of banks were obtained, with the differences concerning specifically the positions of two of them: Pekao, which was in group 3 (along with Credit Agricole, BNP Paribas and Alior Bank) and mBank, which constituted a separate group by itself (Table 4, Figure 3).

In the first quarter of 2021, the values of mBank’s ratios changed to such an extent that they were reflected in the structure of the created clusters (especially in the scope of popularization of the mobile payment channel and distribution of banking services). Noteworthy is the particularly high value of the w2 indicator (33.1%) measuring the use of active payment cards available on mobile devices by individual customers. The percentage of users of the bank’s mobile application (w3) is also much higher than all the other banks, amounting to 59.6%, and the value of the w9 indicator measuring the number of active users of the mobile application on a mobile phone among electronic banking users was 87.7%. At the same time, however, mBank, which was building its market position as an online bank, had significantly lower w7 and w8 ratios related to the use of only the mobile channel of access to banking services.

4.5. Bank grouping Q1 2022 vs Q1 2021

The grouping results for the first quarter of 2022 do not differ from those obtained in the first quarter of 2021, which allows us to conclude that changes in the scope of non-cash payments proceeded in banks belonging to individual groups in a similar way. Compared to all other banks, mBank significantly improved the values of indicators related to clients using its mobile services (Table 5, Figure 4). The percentage of “mobile only” customers increased to 36.6%, i.e. by 10.7 percentage points. The values of the w7 and w8 indexes also increased by more than 10 percentage points. Progress in the development of mobile payments was also made in other banks. Group 3 is particularly noteworthy, as compared to mBank, an even higher increase in the value of the w8 ratio and the largest increase in the value of the w9 ratio were recorded. On the other hand, in relation to debit cards (w5), demand saturation is clearly observed, while credit cards are a product in which customers are systematically losing interest in every group of banks (w6).
Hierarchical cluster analysis performed in Sections 4.2–4.5 (Tables 2–5, Figures 1–4) gave different results in terms of grouping banks in the first quarter in 2019–2022. This is illustrated in Figure 5. Nevertheless, several regularities can be observed.

1. The leader in the market of non-cash payments in Poland is mBank, whose customers are eager to make payments with payment cards, as well as use mobile payments.

2. In each of the analysed periods, it is possible to distinguish a group of banks for which the percentage of “mobile-only” customers has increased, as shown by the values of indexes w7–w8 and the use of mobile applications by e-banking users, which positively verifies hypothesis H2a. These banks are Santander, PKO BP, ING and Millennium. However, it should be noted that the changes that occurred in the payment behaviour of retail customers during the COVID-19 pandemic, compared to the period before it, significantly reduced the differences between banks in the use of mobile payments. The values of the mobility indicators clearly increased for banks such as Credit Agricole, BNP Paribas and Alior.

3. The H2b hypothesis, which assumes that in each of the analysed periods it is possible to distinguish a group of banks whose clients actively use traditional forms of non-cash payments (payment cards), as indicated by the values of the w5 index on the use of debit cards, has been positively verified. In addition to mBank, which is the market leader in the use of all types of non-cash payments, this group includes such banks as PKO BP, ING, Santander and Millennium. In analysing the use of payment cards, it is also important to pay attention to the w6 index, which provides information on the use of credit cards. Although they are generally used by a much smaller percentage of clients than debit cards, credit cards are a relatively important means of payments for clients of Credit Agricole, Pekao, BNP Paribas and Alior.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the interpreted results do not include all banks due to the unavailability of data; moreover, in several cases the data consisted of estimates. The analysis is based on ratios (data on the use of non-cash payments is presented per number of customers or e-users), not on absolute values. This research approach allows for a more objective determination of the use of the analysed forms of non-cash payments at individual banks.

5. Conclusion

During the COVID-19 pandemic there was a shift towards increased use of non-cash payments, especially mobile payments. This is shown by the indicators for individual banks and the group of banks. The payment behaviour of retail clients of individual banks in Poland in the period before and during the COVID-19 pandemic differed. It resulted in a change in the position of some of them on the non-cash payments market in Poland. The groups of banks identified on the basis of cluster analysis changed their composition slightly in the analysed quarters.

The banks analysed are leaders not only in the payment services market, but also in terms of activity on the Polish banking services market. It is therefore relatively easy for them to promote cashless payment services. Thus, they may support the increase in the number of non-cash payments, which is mutually beneficial. Customers pay low fees for payment services, and banks have low unit costs for transactions, as well as benefit from cash flows arising from payment services.
The pandemic and the actions taken by the entire financial sector resulted in an above-average increase in the popularity of non-cash payment services in Poland. Effective promotional activities undertaken by some of the banks analysed had a positive impact on their indicators, and contributed to the observed changes in the position of these banks on the Polish market. However, the gradual easing of the pandemic and the risk of crises of various natures may tempt customers to return to cash transactions. Banks should continue their efforts to increase the popularity of non-cash payments, as in this way they create demand for other banking services.

In subsequent studies, it would be worth attempting to determine what the reasons were for the differences in payment habits of customers of individual banks – this could be marketing activities, the existing structure of clients in terms of age, education or place of residence, or possibly the availability of banking infrastructure. The results of the research allow us to predict that the market position of these banks, which will dynamically develop mobile banking and mobile payment services, will continue to improve. The market position of banks, which will put emphasis on traditional payment cards or online banking services, will gradually deteriorate.

The results of analyses of this study open up the perspective for designing further research on the directions of changes in the sphere of non-cash payments in Poland. This also applies to maintaining the changes observed in non-cash payments, especially mobile ones. Continuation of research in this area of study is necessary in order to be able to shape appropriate policies in the field of both non-cash and mobile payments.
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Table 1
Values of indicators characterising non-cash payments in Q1 for 2019–2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on data from PRNews.pl reports.

Table 2
Values of indicators characterising non-cash payments in selected banks in Q1 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mBank, Pekao</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander, PKO BP, ING, Millennium</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Agricole, BNP Paribas, Alior</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on data from PRNews.pl reports.

Table 3
Values of indicators characterising non-cash payments in selected banks in Q1 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pekao</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander, mBank, PKO BP, ING, Millennium</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Agricole, BNP Paribas, Alior</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on data from PRNews.pl reports.
Table 4
Values of indicators characterising non-cash payments in selected banks in Q1 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mBank</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander, PKO BP, ING, Millennium</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Agricole, Pekao, BNP Paribas, Alior</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on data from PRNews.pl reports.

Table 5
Values of indicators characterising non-cash payments in selected banks in Q1 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mBank</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKO BP, ING, Santander, Millennium</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Agricole, Pekao, BNP Paribas, Alior</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on data from PRNews.pl reports.
Table 6
F-test values for Q1 2019 clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>SS effect</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS effect</th>
<th>SS error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w1</td>
<td>317.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>158.68</td>
<td>133.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w2</td>
<td>31.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>51.34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w3</td>
<td>806.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>403.03</td>
<td>407.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w4</td>
<td>1 591.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>795.73</td>
<td>448.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74.77</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w5</td>
<td>3 797.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 898.64</td>
<td>449.38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w6</td>
<td>140.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70.36</td>
<td>627.36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w7</td>
<td>1 279.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>639.97</td>
<td>489.52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81.59</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w8</td>
<td>854.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>427.07</td>
<td>173.03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9</td>
<td>1 080.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>540.17</td>
<td>614.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102.33</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations.

Table 7
F-test values for Q1 2020 clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>SS effect</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS effect</th>
<th>SS error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w1</td>
<td>454.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>227.06</td>
<td>98.58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w2</td>
<td>100.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.15</td>
<td>152.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w3</td>
<td>1 018.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>509.00</td>
<td>349.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58.22</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w4</td>
<td>1 509.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>754.63</td>
<td>380.73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63.45</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w5</td>
<td>2 729.41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 364.71</td>
<td>399.58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w6</td>
<td>198.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.26</td>
<td>592.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>98.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w7</td>
<td>641.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>320.69</td>
<td>408.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w8</td>
<td>611.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>305.68</td>
<td>201.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9</td>
<td>448.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>224.44</td>
<td>624.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104.04</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations.
Table 8
F-test values for Q1 2021 clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>SS effect</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS effect</th>
<th>SS error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w1</td>
<td>432.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>216.35</td>
<td>124.34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w2</td>
<td>540.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>270.29</td>
<td>183.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.53</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w3</td>
<td>1 349.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>674.55</td>
<td>278.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.37</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w4</td>
<td>1 295.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>647.99</td>
<td>475.03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w5</td>
<td>1 871.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>935.72</td>
<td>1 020.47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>170.08</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w6</td>
<td>87.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.88</td>
<td>419.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.90</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w7</td>
<td>431.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215.75</td>
<td>945.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>157.61</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w8</td>
<td>254.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>127.30</td>
<td>418.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9</td>
<td>549.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>274.54</td>
<td>192.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations.

Table 9
F-test values for Q1 2022 clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>SS effect</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS effect</th>
<th>SS error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w1</td>
<td>592.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>296.14</td>
<td>121.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w2</td>
<td>948.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>474.49</td>
<td>391.48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65.25</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w3</td>
<td>1 600.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800.26</td>
<td>294.03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w4</td>
<td>1 655.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>827.96</td>
<td>798.49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>133.08</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w5</td>
<td>1 801.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900.73</td>
<td>1 077.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>179.55</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w6</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>261.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w7</td>
<td>180.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90.33</td>
<td>510.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w8</td>
<td>67.82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.91</td>
<td>634.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>105.80</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w9</td>
<td>194.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97.05</td>
<td>352.96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58.83</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations.
Table 10
Values of analyzed indicators for banks in Q1 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alior Bank</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Millennium</td>
<td><strong>23.2</strong></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td><strong>31.9</strong></td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td><strong>85.0</strong></td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td><strong>72.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.5</strong></td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Pekao</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP Paribas</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Agricole</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Bank Śląski</td>
<td><strong>17.6</strong></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td><strong>28.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.6</strong></td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td><strong>61.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mBank</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td><strong>67.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKO BP i Inteligo</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td><strong>70.5</strong></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td><strong>59.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.5</strong></td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander Bank Polska</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td><strong>11.1</strong></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td><strong>83.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.0</strong></td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations.

Table 11
Values of analyzed indicators for banks in Q1 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alior Bank</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Millennium</td>
<td><strong>23.8</strong></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td><strong>33.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.6</strong></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td><strong>71.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.6</strong></td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Pekao</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP Paribas</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td><strong>22.9</strong></td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Agricole</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td><strong>35.4</strong></td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Bank Śląski</td>
<td><strong>26.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.8</strong></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td><strong>63.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mBank</td>
<td><strong>23.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.5</strong></td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td><strong>84.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKO BP i Inteligo</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td><strong>61.0</strong></td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander Bank Polska</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td><strong>20.3</strong></td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td><strong>83.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.1</strong></td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td><strong>41.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations.
Table 12
Values of analyzed indicators for banks in Q1 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alior Bank</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Millennium</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Pekao</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP Paribas</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Agricole</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Bank Śląski</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mBank</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKO BP i Inteligo</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander Bank Polska</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations.

Table 13
Values of analyzed indicators for banks in Q1 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>w1</th>
<th>w2</th>
<th>w3</th>
<th>w4</th>
<th>w5</th>
<th>w6</th>
<th>w7</th>
<th>w8</th>
<th>w9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alior Bank</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Millennium</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Pekao</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP Paribas</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Agricole</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Bank Śląski</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mBank</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKO BP i Inteligo</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander Bank Polska</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations.
Table 14
Selected literature and research on payments during the COVID-19 pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Scope of research</th>
<th>General findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 – focus on payment behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akana (2021)</td>
<td>Trends in payment habits of different segments of the population, based on data from the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia</td>
<td>Person-to-person and mobile payments increased by 6% and 8%, respectively, during 2020 and the first months of 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alber, Dabour (2020)</td>
<td>The impact of social distancing on digital payments, based on the data for 10 countries during the period from March to June 2020</td>
<td>Social distancing affects digital payments measured by transactions' volumes and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardizzi, Nobili, Rocco (2020)</td>
<td>The dynamic effects of the spread of COVID-19 on a number of high-frequency indicators of payment habits and cash demand in Italy between January 2019 and August 2020</td>
<td>A large and persistent substitution effect from cash to card-based transactions, especially using contactless and e-commerce options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubides, O’Brien (2022)</td>
<td>The impact of COVID-19 on consumer payments, based on the diary survey among approx. 4,600 individuals in October 2021 in the USA</td>
<td>Cash use decreased, and credit card use increased for consumers across all household income levels throughout the pandemic. Nearly 20% of the US population remains dependent on cash for everyday payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonker et al. (2020)</td>
<td>The shift in payment behaviour and payment preferences during the first phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, based on payment diary survey data collected among Dutch consumers between 1 January 2018 and 13 October 2020</td>
<td>Since the start of the lockdown the likelihood of debit card usage at the expense of cash has increased by 13 percentage points. About 60% of this shift persisted 7 months after the start of the pandemic and appears to be long-lived. The pandemic has resulted in a shift in payment preferences towards more contactless payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotkowski, Polasik (2021)</td>
<td>Investigation of how the COVID-19 pandemic has changed making payments, based on a survey of over 5,000 respondents from 22 European countries</td>
<td>Consumers who had been making cashless payments prior to the outbreak of the pandemic have been more likely to do so since it broke out. Consumers who had mostly been paying in cash have often continued to do so. The probability of more frequent cashless payments as a result of the pandemic differs considerably between countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14, cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Scope of research</th>
<th>General findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kraenzlin, Meyer, Nellen (2020)</td>
<td>Analysis of debit and credit card payments in retail sector, based on transaction data from the largest merchant acquirer in Switzerland from January 2019 to 31 May 2020</td>
<td>Pronounced shifts in payments persisting post-lockdown can be observed from urban to suburban and rural areas and among cantons. There are two main sources of shifts: “tourists and business travellers” and “e-commerce”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulisz, Bojanowska, Toborek (2021)</td>
<td>Consumers’ payment behaviour during the COVID-19 pandemic, based on a survey among 1,000 Polish consumers in December 2020</td>
<td>In the context of the pandemic, Polish customers are more willing to pay without cash than beforehand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafdinal, Senalasari (2021)</td>
<td>Analysis of the adoption of mobile payment applications during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, based on the data from 400 mobile payment application users in Indonesia</td>
<td>The intention to use mobile payment applications depends on attitude influenced by perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shishah, Alhelaly (2021)</td>
<td>Examination of the experience of utilizing contactless payment technology in Saudi Arabia during the COVID-19 outbreak, based on an online survey</td>
<td>The positive experiences in utilizing contactless payment technology have increased after the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Health safety and hygiene were the main reasons for using contactless technology for payment during the coronavirus crisis, while the security of transactions was the main concern in not using it for payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tut (2020)</td>
<td>Short-term effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the adoption of electronic payment systems in Kenya, based on the data from the Central Bank of Kenya</td>
<td>The COVID-19 pandemic has led to payment concentration via mobile banking in Kenya. It has had a negative impact on the use of all electronic payment cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiśniewski et al. (2021)</td>
<td>Examination of the preferences regarding cash and cashless payments at the point of sale (POS) during the COVID-19 crisis, based on a survey of 5,504 respondents from 22 European countries</td>
<td>Consumers favour cashless transactions when they believe that handling cash presents a higher risk of infection. The habits they develop during periods of restrictions and lockdowns appear to further diminish their intentions of transacting in cash during and after the pandemic is over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Scope of research</td>
<td>General findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auer, Cornelli, Frost</td>
<td>The public concerns about viral transmission via cash, based on worldwide Google search queries</td>
<td>Searches appear to be more prevalent where more small-denomination banknotes are in circulation relative to GDP. The pandemic may amplify calls to defend the role of cash and for central bank digital currencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2020)</td>
<td>The analysis of worldwide data on payments, cash hoarding and withdrawals</td>
<td>The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the shift to digital payments. In some cases, it may be undermining the acceptance and availability of cash. General purpose central bank digital currencies (CBDCs) can help fill the gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auer et al. (2020)</td>
<td>The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cash usage in UK between January 2017 and October 2020</td>
<td>Payment behaviours have changed in response to the virus, with fewer cash transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caswell et al. (2020)</td>
<td>The effects of the pandemic on the demand for cash and on the methods of payment in Canada, based on an in-depth survey from 3 to 22 April 2020</td>
<td>Canadians increased their cash holdings somewhat. A significant share of Canadians reported using cash during the survey period, comparable with the percentage who used Interac e-Transfer, but less than the proportion reporting debit use and credit use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2020)</td>
<td>The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the demand for cash and the use of methods of payment, based on data from consumer surveys conducted in April and August 2021</td>
<td>Cash in circulation remained high throughout 2021, driven mainly by demand for large-denomination notes. A large majority of Canadians reported that they have no plans to go cashless in the next five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2022)</td>
<td>Trends in banknote demand in Australia in 2020, based on the data of the Reserve Bank of Australia</td>
<td>Demand for cash increased substantially during the COVID-19 pandemic. Transactional cash demand fell due to lockdowns and other restrictions, a shift towards online spending, and concerns over transmission of the virus via banknotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttmann et al. (2021)</td>
<td>The impact of COVID-19 on consumer payments, based on the diary survey among approx. 3,000 individuals in May 2020 in the USA</td>
<td>Cash's transactional use has decreased and its role as a store of value has increased, while domestic and international demand continued to substantially increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Kumar, O'Brien</td>
<td>Analysis of the demand for small and large banknote denominations since the 1990s in an international perspective</td>
<td>A global increased cash trend aligned with a shift from transaction balances towards more hoarding, especially in the form of large denomination banknotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14, cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Scope of research</th>
<th>General findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 – focus on relation between payments and economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfonso et al. (2021)</td>
<td>Analysis of transaction card values, based on data for 18 countries and 34 sectors over September 2019 – June 2020</td>
<td>Around the globe, overall card transactions fell during the pandemic as economic activity contracted. Yet among card payments, CNP (card-not-present) transactions in particular have risen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounie, Camara, Galbraith (2020)</td>
<td>The impact of COVID-19 on card transactions in France, measured before and during the COVID-19 epidemic (2019–2020)</td>
<td>The recourse to the online shopping option diminished somewhat the overall impact of the shock on consumption expenditure, thereby increasing the resiliency of the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvalho et al. (2020)</td>
<td>The analysis of credit- and debit-card data from BBVA, the second largest bank in Spain, during the COVID-19 crisis</td>
<td>Transaction data provides high-quality information about household consumption, which makes it a potentially important input into national statistics and research on household consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraenzlin, Meyer, Nellen (2020)</td>
<td>Analysis of debit and credit card payments in the retail sector, based on transaction data from the largest merchant acquirer in Switzerland from January 2019 to 31 May 2020</td>
<td>The COVID-19 crisis seems to have reinforced pre-existing trends that may have faster than anticipated effects on the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, Pan, Yin (2020)</td>
<td>The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on production and life, based on the data from the sampling survey in the first quarter of 2020 among over 2,000 households in China</td>
<td>Mobile payments remain essential in promoting consumption during the pandemic. They can improve transaction efficiency and facilitate consumption while overcoming the traditional space-time limitations. Thus, mobile payments can induce the transition from offline to online consumption. However, it only applies to urban households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own study.
Figure 1
Tree diagram with bank clustering results – Q1 2019

Figure 2
Tree diagram with bank clustering results – Q1 2020
Figure 3
Tree diagram with bank clustering results – Q1 2021

Figure 4
Tree diagram with bank clustering results – Q1 2022
Figure 5
Diagram presenting the grouping of banks using cluster analysis

Source: own elaboration based on calculations.
Bezgotówkowe płatności detaliczne w wybranych bankach w czasie pandemii COVID-19 – przypadek Polski

Streszczenie

Zmiany, które w czasie pandemii COVID-19 zaszły w korzystaniu przez osoby fizyczne z różnych form płatności bezgotówkowych w Polsce, można zaobserwować na poziomie systemów lub schematów płatności oraz instrumentów płatniczych. Analizę ich wykorzystania można przeprowadzić zarówno w skali całego rynku, jak i w odniesieniu do poszczególnych dostawców usług płatniczych. Niniejszy artykuł dotyczy tego ostatniego obszaru. Jego celem jest zdiagnozowanie zmian w zachowaniach płatniczych klientów wybranych banków działających w Polsce oraz zweryfikowanie, czy wpłynęły one na pozycję badanych banków na krajowym rynku płatności.

Sformułowaliśmy kilka hipotez badawczych. W hipotezie H1 założyliśmy, że w czasie pandemii COVID-19 klienci detaliczni wybranych banków w Polsce zaczęli częściej korzystać z płatności bezgotówkowych, zwłaszcza z płatności mobilnych. Aby zweryfikować tę hipotezę, dla wszystkich badanych banków obliczyliśmy średnie wartości wskaźników charakteryzujących płatności bezgotówkowe w każdym pierwszym kwartale w latach 2019–2022.

Sformułowaliśmy również hipotezy H2a oraz H2b. Pierwsza z nich zakłada, że w każdym z analizowanych okresów można wyodrębnić grupę banków, których klienci aktywnie korzystali z bankowości mobilnej. Z kolei według hipotezy H2b w każdym z analizowanych okresów można wyodrębnić grupę banków, których klienci częściej korzystali z tradycyjnych form płatności bezgotówkowych (kart płatniczych). W celu weryfikacji tych hipotez, opierając się na wartościach obliczonych wskaźników, zastosowaliśmy jedną z metod analizy skupień – metodę najdalszego sąsiedztwa (zwaną również metodą pełnego wiązania). Pozwoliło to dokonać pozycjonowania wybranych banków na rynku płatności bezgotówkowych w Polsce.

Wyniki analizy wskaźników charakteryzujących płatności bezgotówkowe w kolejnych pierwszych kwartałach w latach 2019–2022 stanowią podstawę pozytywnej weryfikacji hipotezy H1. Zastosowanie analizy skupień dało częściowo odmienne wyniki w zakresie grupowania banków w analizowanych kwartałach, pozwoliło jednak potwierdzić hipotezy H2a i H2b. Ogólne wnioski z przeprowadzonej analizy są takie, że zachowania płatnicze klientów detalicznych poszczególnych banków różniły się w okresie przed pandemią COVID-19 oraz w jej trakcie. Wpłynęły one na zmiany pozycji niektórych banków na rynku płatności bezgotówkowych w Polsce. Warto także zauważyć, że zmiany w zachowaniach płatniczych klientów detalicznych w czasie pandemii COVID-19, w porównaniu z okresem przed nią, przyczyniły się do zmniejszenia różnic między bankami pod względem korzystania przez ich klientów z płatności mobilnych.

 Wyniki analizy przeprowadzonej w niniejszym opracowaniu stanowią punkt wyjścia do projektowania dalszych badań nad kierunkami zmian w płatnościach bezgotówkowych w Polsce. Analizę oparto na wskaźnikach natężenia (dane o wykorzystaniu płatności bezgotówkowych są prezentowane w przeliczeniu na liczbę klientów lub użytkowników bankowości elektronicznej), a nie na wartościach bezwzględnych. Takie podejście badawcze pozwala bardziej obiektywnie okre-
ślicznie, jak klienci poszczególnych banków korzystali z analizowanych form płatności bezgotówkowych. Ze względu na ograniczoną dostępność danych badaniem objęto tylko wybrane banki reprezentujące dostawców usług płatniczych w Polsce. Ponadto niektóre dane miały charakter szacunkowy.

Słowa kluczowe: płatności bezgotówkowe, rynek płatności, pandemia COVID-19