Published by Management Department FEB Universitas Kuningan

Indonesian Journal of Strategic Management

Journal homepage – https://ijsm.uniku.ac.id/pub/index

Comparative Effectiveness of Robo Advisors and Human Planners in AI-Based Financial Planning

Nida Hopia[1] Anton Budiyono[2*]

[1]*Kuningan Muhammadiyah University, Kuningan,Indonesia*
[2]*Kuningan Muhammadiyah University, Kuningan,Indonesia*

ARTICLE INFO

***Articles History**:*
Received: June 10, 2026
Revised: July 13, 2026
Accepted: July 15, 2026
Available online: Aug 4, 2026

***Keywords**:*
Robo-advisor, human financial planner, artificial intelligence, financial planning, investment effectiveness, fintech

ABSTRACT

The development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology has introduced robo-advisors as a modern alternative in financial planning. This article comparatively examines the effectiveness of AI-based robo-advisors and conventional human financial planners in optimizing individual financial planning. Using a systematic literature review combined with secondary data analysis from reputable sources (Grand View Research, Morningstar, Carlson School of Management, Financial Planning Association, Condor Capital, and others), this study evaluates key dimensions of effectiveness: investment return performance, cost structure, adoption rates, client satisfaction, and capacity to manage financial complexity. Results indicate that robo-advisors excel in cost efficiency (0.25% vs. 1.00% AUM fee), return consistency (7%–9% annually for moderate portfolios), and behavioral bias elimination, particularly during market volatility such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Conversely, human financial planners demonstrate significant advantages in emotional intelligence, complex financial planning, and delivering emotional value to clients. A hybrid model integrating both approaches commands 60.7% of the global market in 2024, representing the industry's prevailing strategic direction. Findings are directly relevant to Islamic fintech strategy and financial literacy policy in Indonesia..

JEL Classification : G17; G51; O33.

Introduction

The technological revolution in the financial sector has fundamentally transformed how individuals manage and plan their finances. The emergence of robo-advisors as Artificial Intelligence (AI)-driven entities represents one of the most significant manifestations of digital transformation in the global financial services industry. Unlike traditional models that rely on direct human interaction between clients and financial planners, robo-advisors leverage sophisticated algorithms to deliver personalized investment recommendations at significantly lower costs and with far broader accessibility (Eichler & Schwab, 2024).

Corresponding author: Anton Budiyono
email address :antonbudiyono@umkuningan.ac.id

Copyright © 2026 Authors
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

The global robo-advisor market demonstrates a remarkably encouraging trajectory. Market value was estimated at USD 6.61 billion in 2023 (Grand View Research, 2023) and USD 8.78 billion in 2024 (SkyQuestt, 2024), with projections reaching USD 41.83 billion by 2030 at a Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of 30.5% (Grand View Research, 2023). The Asia-Pacific region exhibits the fastest expansion at 33.8% CAGR, while North America commands a 38.2% share of the global market (Mordor Intelligence, 2024). Despite this trajectory, robo-advisors currently manage approximately USD 870 billion (Statista / FPA Journal, 2022) a fraction of the USD 98 trillion in total global Assets Under Management (AUM) (Boston Consulting Group, 2023), indicating an early-stage industry with vast expansion potential.

Amid this technological momentum, a fundamental question remains insufficiently resolved: are robo-advisors genuinely more effective than human financial planners in optimizing financial planning outcomes? Several studies have begun to address this question. Eichler and Schwab (2024) examine trust formation; Chua et al. (2023) focus on AI adoption behavior; Senteio and Hughes (2024) assess client satisfaction, but each remains limited in scope to a single evaluative dimension, relies predominantly on U.S. or Western European contexts, and omits both cross-cultural validation and Islamic finance considerations entirely. No comparative study has simultaneously examined quantitative performance metrics (cost, return, adoption), qualitative effectiveness dimensions (emotional intelligence, trust, complexity), and their joint implications for emerging Muslim-majority markets such as Indonesia. This multi-dimensional gap constitutes the analytical problem this article seeks to address.

This article aims to conduct a comprehensive, data-driven comparative analysis of robo-advisor and human financial planner effectiveness across multiple analytical dimensions. The research contributes theoretically to the literature on AI-mediated financial services and practically to the development of Islamic fintech strategies and financial literacy policy in Indonesia, where the synergistic potential of both approaches remains largely underexplored. The research questions are: (RQ1) How do robo-advisors and human financial planners compare quantitatively in terms of investment returns, cost structure, and adoption rates? (RQ2) How do they differ on qualitative dimensions such as emotional intelligence, complexity management, and client satisfaction? (RQ3) How can a hybrid AI-human model constitute an optimal solution for the future of financial planning?

Literature Review

Several theoretical frameworks provide the conceptual foundation for comparing robo-advisors and human financial planners. Herbert Simon's (1955) concept of Bounded Rationality establishes that human decision-making is inherently constrained by cognitive capacity, information access, and time horizons. Applied to financial planning, this theory predicts that AI-based systems will systematically outperform human advisors on analytically demanding tasks by simultaneously processing thousands of variables without cognitive fatigue. Schwarz et al. (2022) confirm that algorithmic decision-making mitigates the bounded rationality constraints that frequently produce suboptimal financial outcomes.

Behavioral Finance theory, systematized by Shefrin (2009), identifies a persistent set of psychological biases, including loss aversion, anchoring, overconfidence, and herding behavior that distort individual investment decisions. Robo-advisors, by executing rule-based portfolio management, structurally eliminate these biases. Empirical confirmation is provided by Yang (2023) at the Carlson School of Management, documenting that robo-advisor users suffered losses 12.67% smaller than human investors during the COVID-19 market crash of 2020, attributed to the absence of emotionally-driven decision-making.

Eichler and Schwab (2024), writing in Frontiers in Behavioral Economics, extend the trust literature to the robo-advisor context by distinguishing between cognitive trust—confidence based on demonstrated performance and data transparency and affective trust, grounded in interpersonal relationships and emotional connection. Their study identifies a systematic bifurcation: investors aged 18–35 predominantly develop cognitive trust toward robo-advisors, whereas those above 35 rely more heavily on affective trust formed with human financial planners. This has significant implications for market segmentation and service design.

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), extended by Chua et al. (2023) to AI-based investment advice, identifies perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness as primary determinants of robo-advisor adoption. Trust in technology—distinct from trust in a human advisor—moderates the relationship between perceived

usefulness and actual adoption behavior. This helps explain why adoption rates remain low (only 5% of U.S. investors; FPA Journal, 2024) despite high perceived utility among younger demographics.

Goal-Based Investing theory (Sironi, 2016) emphasizes the alignment of investment strategy with clients' long-term life objectives. Robo-advisors can be configured to optimize for specified goals—retirement savings, education funding, emergency reserves, but human financial planners demonstrate superior capability in holistically integrating non-financial life goals such as family values, generational legacy, and risk attitudes that resist algorithmic quantification.

Johnson et al. (2005) identify the technology self-service paradox, whereby users of automated financial services experience high satisfaction under routine conditions but acute frustration in complex or emotionally charged situations requiring human judgment. This paradox theoretically motivates the emergence of hybrid advisory models combining algorithmic efficiency with human relational competence. The Vanguard Group's tripartite value framework (Portfolio Value, Financial Value, Emotional Value) provides an additional structured lens for comparing client-facing value propositions of both approaches, as empirically explored by Kitces (2022) and confirmed by Polaris/Industrial Thought Group (2025).

Methodology

This study applies a systematic literature review methodology combined with quantitative and qualitative secondary data analysis. This approach is appropriate for the comparative-descriptive research objectives and enables synthesis across the diverse array of academic and industry evidence available on robo-advisor effectiveness.

Data Sources

Quantitative secondary data were drawn from three categories of sources: (a) reputable market research reports including Grand View Research, Mordor Intelligence, SkyQuestt, and Condor Capital/Backend Benchmarking; (b) peer-reviewed academic publications in the Journal of Financial Planning, Frontiers in Behavioral Economics, Computers in Human Behavior, and the Journal of Applied Business and Economics; and (c) institutional research reports from Morningstar, Boston Consulting Group, Carlson School of Management (University of Minnesota), Charles Schwab Modern Wealth Survey, Polaris/Industrial Thought Group, and Cerulli Associates. All data are drawn from publications within the 2020–2025 period, with primary emphasis on 2023–2024 data for maximum validity and currency.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria: (a) publications within the 2018–2025 timeframe; (b) verifiable empirical data or research findings; (c) direct focus on the performance comparison or behavioral characteristics of robo-advisors and/or human financial planners; and (d) publication by an academic institution, registered research organization, or internationally recognized financial institution. Exclusion criteria: (a) opinion articles lacking empirical grounding; (b) publications from unverifiable sources; and (c) data not pertinent to AI-based financial planning contexts. One exception to the 2018–2025 range applies: the Wells Fargo/Gallup (2016) Investor and Retirement Optimism Index is incorporated as a historical baseline reference to document the level of robo-advisor awareness prior to the industry's mainstream expansion. This single pre-2018 data point contextualizes the adoption trajectory presented in Table 4 and does not function as an analytical finding in its own right.

Analytical Framework

Analysis proceeded in three sequential stages:
(1) collection and tabulation of quantitative indicators covering investment returns, cost structures, market size, and adoption metrics (addressing RQ1);
(2) identification and thematic categorization of qualitative dimensions including trust, emotional intelligence, and complexity management (addressing RQ2); and
(3) integrative synthesis producing a structured comparative framework organized across eight analytical tables covering global market data, cost structure, return performance, user adoption demographics, hybrid model projections, qualitative dimensions, client value dimensions, and theoretical framework mapping (addressing RQ3).

Result and Discussion

Global Robo-Advisor Market Analysis

Analysis of global market data confirms an aggressive growth trajectory for the robo-advisor industry. Table 1 presents key market size and growth indicators.

Table 1. Global robo-advisor market: size and growth

Indicator	Data	Year	Source
Global Robo-Advisor Market Value	USD 6.61 billion	2023	Grand View Research
Global Robo-Advisor Market Value	USD 8.78 billion	2024	SkyQuestt
Projected Market Value	USD 41.83 billion	2030	Grand View Research
Projected CAGR	30.5%	2024–2030	Grand View Research
Total AUM Managed by Robo-Advisors	~USD 870 billion	2022	Statista / FPA Journal
Projected Robo-Advisor AUM	USD 1.4 trillion	2024	Statista
Total Global AUM (all assets)	USD 98 trillion	2023	Boston Consulting Group
North America Market Share	38.2% global market	2024	Mordor Intelligence
Asia-Pacific CAGR (fastest)	33.8%	2024–2030	Mordor Intelligence

Source: Grand View Research (2023), SkyQuestt (2024), Statista (2023), Mordor Intelligence (2024), Boston Consulting Group (2023), FPA Journal (2022).

Table 1 confirms that despite an aggressive CAGR of 30.5%, robo-advisors currently manage approximately 0.9% of total global AUM. This indicates that the industry remains in an early growth phase with vast expansion potential, particularly in Asia-Pacific, which records the highest regional CAGR at 33.8%, reflecting rising digital infrastructure penetration and a rapidly expanding middle class across Southeast and East Asia.

Cost Structure Comparison

The fee differential between robo-advisors and human financial planners represents one of the most structurally significant distinctions between the two approaches. Table 2 summarizes comparative cost data.

Table 2. Cost structure comparison: robo-advisor vs. human financial planner

Cost Aspect	Robo-Advisor	Human Financial Planner	Source
Average fee (% AUM/year)	0.25% (median)	~1.00%	Morningstar 2024
Minimum fee	0% (basic tier)	Variable	Morningstar 2024
Relative cost ratio	1×	4× (four times higher)	CNBC / Morningstar 2024
Example: USD 500,000 portfolio (20 yrs)	Cost: USD 1,250/yr → Final value ~USD 1.37 million	Cost: USD 5,000/yr → Final value ~USD 1.32–1.45 million	TomorrowDesk 2024
Automated tax-loss harvesting	+1% effective return (~USD 5,000/yr)	Depends on planner expertise	TomorrowDesk 2024

Source: Morningstar (2024), TomorrowDesk (2024), CNBC (2025).

Robo-advisors offer a median management fee of 0.25% of AUM per annum four times lower than the approximately 1.00% charged by human financial planners (Morningstar, 2024). On a USD 500,000 portfolio held for 20 years, this differential produces a meaningfully lower cumulative cost burden for robo-advisor clients. Moreover, automated tax-loss harvesting features generate estimated additional effective returns of

approximately 1% annually, partially offsetting any performance gap relative to actively managed human advisory portfolios (TomorrowDesk, 2024).

Investment Return Performance

Return performance constitutes the most frequently cited dimension of comparative effectiveness. Table 3 presents annualized return data from multiple independent sources.

Table 3. Comparison of investment return performance

Return Indicator	Robo-Advisor	Human Financial Planner	Source
Annualized return, moderate 60/40 portfolio (5 yrs)	7%–9% average	Variable, ~7%–8%	Condor Capital / Robo Report Q3 2024
Annualized return: Betterment & Wealthfront (2018–2023)	6%–8%	—	Backend Benchmarking Q3 2023
S&P 500 benchmark (same period)	7.5% (adjusted)	—	Backend Benchmarking Q3 2023
Losses during COVID-19 crash (2020)	12.67% smaller than human investors	Tended to hold losing positions	Carlson School of Management, 2023
Betterment moderate portfolio (COVID-19)	Fell 20% → rebounded 25% by year-end	Some planners able to outperform	TomorrowDesk 2024

Source: Condor Capital / Robo Report Q3 2024, Backend Benchmarking Q3 2023, Carlson School of Management (2023), TomorrowDesk (2024).

Robo-advisor platforms managing moderate 60/40 portfolios generate annualized returns of 7%–9% over five-year periods, broadly consistent with the S&P 500 benchmark of 7.5% (Backend Benchmarking, 2023). The most consequential finding is from Yang (2023) at the Carlson School of Management: robo-advisor users incurred losses 12.67% smaller than human investors during the COVID-19 market crash, directly reflecting the absence of panic-driven decision-making in algorithmic portfolio management, which automatically rebalanced portfolios during the downturn rather than holding deteriorating positions.

User Adoption and Demographics

Despite superior cost efficiency and competitive returns, robo-advisor adoption rates remain surprisingly limited relative to potential. Table 4 presents key adoption statistics and user demographic data.

Table 4. Robo-advisor user adoption and demographics

Adoption Indicator	Data	Year	Source
U.S. investors actively using robo-advisors	Only 5%	2023	FPA Journal 2024
U.S. investors (>USD 10,000 portfolio) unaware of robo-advisors	55%	2016*	Wells Fargo/Gallup
Millennials preferring robo-advisor strategies	41%	2024	Schwab Modern Wealth Survey
Generation Z preferring robo-advisor strategies	40%	2024	Schwab Modern Wealth Survey
Average U.S. investors preferring robo-advisors	>28%	2024	Schwab Modern Wealth Survey

Adoption Indicator	Data	Year	Source
Access via mobile app	72% of users	2023	Market Growth Reports
Middle-income segment share of total robo users	45% (vs 28% in 2021)	2024	Market Growth Reports
Account growth during COVID-19 pandemic	+13%	2020–2021	Fortune Business Insights

Source: FPA Journal (2024), Wells Fargo/Gallup (2016)*, Schwab Modern Wealth Survey (2024), Market Growth Reports (2024), Fortune Business Insights (2024). *Historical baseline reference; see Methodology for justification.

The data reveal an interesting paradox: only 5% of U.S. investors actively use robo-advisors, while 55% of investors with portfolios above USD 10,000 had not even heard of these services as recently as 2016 (Wells Fargo/Gallup, 2016) a figure included as a historical baseline to contextualize the awareness gap at the industry's early stage. However, 41% of Millennials and 40% of Generation Z investors express preference for robo-advisor strategies (Schwab Modern Wealth Survey, 2024), indicating that adoption will increase organically through generational investor turnover. The proportion of middle-income users has expanded from 28% to 45% between 2021 and 2024, signaling a broadening democratization of automated investment management.

Hybrid AI-Human Model Projections

The global financial advisory industry has converged on hybrid models integrating algorithmic portfolio management with human relational expertise. Table 5 presents current market share data and forward-looking projections.

Table 5. Projections for AI-human hybrid model in the global advisory industry

Hybrid Model Indicator	Data	Source
Hybrid model market share (robo + human) in 2024	60.7% of global market	Mordor Intelligence 2024
Projected hybrid model share in 2027	47%	Cerulli Associates
Projected fully automated advisory share in 2027	28%	Cerulli Associates
Projected traditional human-only advice share in 2027	25%	Cerulli Associates
Client satisfaction improvement from AI integration	+38% global satisfaction score	Market Growth Reports 2024
Advisors using robo-tools → client retention	Significantly higher	FPA Research, August 2024

Source: Mordor Intelligence (2024), Cerulli Associates, Market Growth Reports (2024), FPA Research (August 2024).

Hybrid models already command a 60.7% share of the global advisory market (Mordor Intelligence, 2024). Cerulli Associates project that by 2027 hybrid models will hold 47%, fully automated advisory 28%, and traditional human-only advice 25%. Financial advisors who have integrated robo-tools into their practice report significantly higher client retention rates (FPA Research, 2024), suggesting that AI adoption enhances rather than diminishes the human advisor's value proposition. Client satisfaction scores improve by an estimated 38% when AI tools are integrated into advisory workflows.

Qualitative Comparative Analysis

Beyond quantitative metrics, the comparative analysis reveals systematic qualitative differentiation between robo-advisors and human financial planners. Table 6 presents a structured qualitative comparison across nine critical dimensions.

Table 6. Qualitative comparison: robo-advisor vs. human financial planner

Dimension	Robo-Advisor	Human Financial Planner
Emotional Intelligence	Cannot deeply understand client emotional states	Superior in empathy, active listening, and building affective trust
Trust	Trusted by ages 18–35 (cognitive/data-based trust)	Trusted by ages >35 (relational/affective trust)
Complex Planning	Limited: cannot handle estate planning, complex taxes, or inheritance	Superior: handles multidimensional and inter-generational financial situations
Behavioral Bias	Systematically eliminates emotional human biases	Susceptible to own biases, but can manage client biases through dialogue
Accessibility	Available 24/7, no large minimum investment	Limited to business hours; typically requires minimum asset threshold
Personalization	Limited to algorithm parameters (risk tolerance, time horizon)	Deep: understands values, life goals, and family dynamics holistically
Fee Transparency	Highly transparent (flat fee, publicly published)	Often less transparent, variable, may be commission-based
Crisis Adaptation	Automated rebalancing, panic-free (algorithmic)	Provides contextual assessment and psychological reassurance to clients
Client Financial Literacy	Highly literate clients may perceive robo as riskier (negative framing)	Better suited for clients needing complex financial education

Source: Eichler & Schwab, Frontiers in Behavioral Economics (2024); Kitces.com (2022); FPA Journal (2024); Senteio & Hughes, Journal of Financial Planning (2024)

The qualitative data reveal a clear pattern of differentiation. Robo-advisors offer systematic advantages in behavioral bias elimination, 24/7 accessibility, fee transparency, and automated portfolio rebalancing. Human financial planners hold irreplaceable advantages in emotional intelligence, holistic financial complexity management (estate planning, multi-generational tax strategy, legacy planning), and the construction of long-term affective trust. Eichler and Schwab (2024) confirm the age-based bifurcation of trust: clients under 35 develop cognitive trust toward data-driven robo-advisors, while those over 35 rely on the affective trust built through ongoing human relationships.

Client Value Dimensions: Vanguard Framework Analysis

Vanguard Group's tripartite value framework Portfolio Value, Financial Value, and Emotional Value provides a structured lens for comparing client-facing value propositions. Table 7 maps empirical findings against each dimension.

Table 7. Client value dimensions: Vanguard framework analysis

Value Dimension	Robo-Advisor	Human Financial Planner	Finding
Portfolio Value	Competitive and consistent	Competitive; top planners can outperform	Broadly equivalent for standard portfolios
Financial Value	Limited (tax planning, insurance, estate)	Significantly superior	Human advisors far superior for complex finance
Emotional Value	Very limited	Superior across all sub-dimensions	Human advisors outperform on all 3 value dimensions

Value Dimension	Robo-Advisor	Human Financial Planner	Finding
Achievement of financial goals	—	59% of goals achieved with advisor	vs. 43% without advisor (Polaris/ITG, 2025)

Source: Kitces.com (2022); Polaris/Industrial Thought Group (2025); FPA Journal (2024).

Theoretical Framework Analysis

The empirical findings are systematically interpretable within the theoretical frameworks reviewed in the Literature Review section. Table 8 maps each theoretical framework to the comparative performance of both advisory models.

Table 8. Theoretical frameworks and their relevance to the comparative analysis

Theory/Concept	Relevance to Robo-Advisor	Relevance to Human Planner	Key Reference
Bounded Rationality (Simon, 1955)	AI algorithms overcome cognitive constraints of human information processing	Planners also bounded in rationality, but more socially adaptive	Simon 1955; Schwarz et al. 2022
Behavioral Finance (Shefrin, 2009)	Systematically eliminates cognitive and emotional biases	Susceptible to own biases; can manage client biases dialogically	Shefrin 2009
Cognitive vs. Affective Trust	Young clients → cognitive trust (data-based competence)	Older clients → affective trust (interpersonal relationships)	Eichler & Schwab 2024
Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)	Perceived ease of use and usefulness drive adoption	More relevant to relational trust and professional reputation	Chua et al. 2023
Goal-Based Investing (Sironi, 2016)	Configurable for long-term financial goal optimization	Maps life goals holistically and multi-dimensionally	Sironi 2016
Technology Self-Service Paradox	High satisfaction in routine tasks; frustration in complex situations	Provides human judgment for emotionally complex scenarios	Johnson et al. 2005

Source: Simon (1955), Shefrin (2009), Eichler & Schwab (2024), Chua et al. (2023), Sironi (2016), Johnson et al. (2005).

The evidence confirms the predictive validity of each theoretical framework within its domain. Bounded Rationality (Simon, 1955) accurately anticipates that algorithmic systems outperform human advisors on analytically intensive portfolio management. Behavioral Finance (Shefrin, 2009) explains the performance differential during market crises. Cognitive vs. Affective Trust (Eichler & Schwab, 2024) maps directly to the observed generational adoption preferences. TAM (Chua et al., 2023) accounts for the gap between favorable perceived usefulness and actual low adoption rates by identifying technology trust as a critical moderating variable. Goal-Based Investing (Sironi, 2016) explains the persistent advantage of human advisors in holistic planning. The technology self-service paradox (Johnson et al., 2005) provides the theoretical rationale for the observed dominance of hybrid models.

Synthesis: Answering the Research Questions

Returning to the three research questions stated in the Introduction, the eight-table comparative dataset provides the following answers. Regarding RQ1 (quantitative comparison of returns, cost, and adoption): the data from Tables 1–4 confirm that robo-advisors are superior on cost efficiency (0.25% vs. 1.00% AUM fee; Table 2), broadly equivalent on investment returns for moderate portfolios (7%–9%; Table 3), and structurally

superior in loss mitigation during volatility events (–12.67% relative loss during COVID-19; Table 3). User adoption, however, remains at only 5% of U.S. investors (Table 4), constrained by low awareness and technology trust barriers rather than poor performance.

Regarding RQ2 (qualitative dimensions of effectiveness): Table 6 demonstrates that the two models serve structurally different client needs. Robo-advisors excel on behavioral bias elimination, fee transparency, and 24/7 accessibility. Human financial planners excel on emotional intelligence, complex planning, personalization depth, and affective trust construction—confirmed by the trust bifurcation by age group (Eichler & Schwab, 2024) and the 16-percentage-point goal achievement gap in Table 7 (59% vs. 43%). No single model dominates comprehensively across all qualitative dimensions.

Regarding RQ3 (the hybrid model as optimal solution): Table 5 confirms that the market has already converged on this answer. Hybrid models command 60.7% of global advisory market share in 2024, and Cerulli Associates project their continued dominance at 47% by 2027, compared to 28% fully automated and 25% human-only. The +38% client satisfaction improvement when AI tools are integrated into human advisory workflows (Table 5) quantifies the synergy value of the hybrid model. In sum, the optimal configuration is not binary but collaborative: algorithmic systems managing portfolio execution, while human advisors manage relational complexity and goal-anchored financial planning.

Implications for Indonesia and Islamic Finance

The empirical findings carry concrete strategic implications for Indonesia and Islamic financial markets, grounded in the data presented in the preceding tables. From Table 1, the Asia-Pacific region records the highest CAGR of any region (33.8%), and Indonesia as the world's largest Muslim-majority economy with a growing urban middle class is positioned within this high-growth corridor. The Financial Services Authority (OJK) reported a national financial literacy index of 65.4% in 2023, confirming that the awareness and trust barriers documented in Table 4 (55% unaware; only 5% active users) are likely more pronounced in Indonesia than in more digitally mature markets. This underscores the urgency of targeted financial education strategies alongside robo-advisor deployment.

From a cost efficiency perspective, Table 2 shows that robo-advisors charge fees that are four times lower than human financial planners (0.25% vs. 1.00% of AUM). In an Indonesian context where the majority of the population has limited disposable income for professional advisory services, this cost differential makes robo-advisors a structurally important instrument for financial democratization—extending quality investment guidance to households that cannot access conventional financial planners. The middle-income adoption data from Table 4 (45% of users in 2024, up from 28% in 2021) further supports this democratization trajectory and its applicability to Indonesia's growing middle-income urban population.

From an Islamic finance perspective, the algorithmic foundation of robo-advisors makes them technically adaptable for Shariah-compliant screening at scale. Unlike human financial planners, whose adherence to Shariah principles depends on individual expertise and certification, automated systems can embed halal investment filters excluding interest-bearing instruments (riba), speculative assets (maisir), and prohibited sectors (haram) directly into portfolio construction logic. The hybrid model data from Table 5 (+38% client satisfaction improvement with AI integration) suggests that a Shariah-compliant hybrid model combining algorithmic halal screening with human Islamic financial advisors would be the configuration most aligned with both client satisfaction and Shariah governance standards. This represents a research and product development agenda that is data-grounded, not speculative: the feasibility derives from the cost structure (Table 2), the adoption momentum (Tables 4 and 5), and the hybrid model's demonstrated dominance (Table 5), applied to Indonesia's Islamic finance regulatory environment under OJK and DSN-MUI oversight.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis presented in this article demonstrates that the question of robo-advisor versus human financial planner superiority admits no simple, universal answer. The outcome is context-dependent, contingent on portfolio complexity, client demographics, and the specific dimensions of effectiveness being evaluated.

In response to RQ1, robo-advisors demonstrate clear superiority in: (1) cost efficiency, charging fees of 0.25% versus 1.00% of Assets Under Management (AUM); (2) return consistency for moderate portfolios, generating 7%–9% annualized returns; (3) behavioral bias elimination, particularly during market volatility events such

as the COVID-19 crash (–12.67% relative loss differential); (4) financial inclusion through 24/7 accessibility and low minimum investment thresholds; and (5) operational consistency and fee transparency.

In response to RQ2, human financial planners retain decisive advantages in: (1) managing multidimensional financial complexity, including estate planning, cross-generational tax strategy, and legacy planning; (2) emotional intelligence and affective trust construction; (3) adaptive response to unstructured life changes; and (4) delivering emotional value and psychological assurance, particularly for clients navigating complex life transitions. Clients working with human advisors achieve 59% of their financial goals versus 43% without professional guidance (Polaris/ITG, 2025), a 16-percentage-point advantage grounded in the Emotional and Financial Value dimensions of advisory service.

In response to RQ3, the hybrid AI-human model commanding 60.7% of the global advisory market in 2024 and projected to lead at 47% through 2027 emerges as the industry's optimal structural configuration. The future of financial planning is not a competition between algorithms and human advisors, but their strategic collaboration: algorithmic systems managing portfolio execution efficiently, while human advisors manage the relational and goal-anchored complexity of clients' financial lives. For Indonesia, the combination of the region's 33.8% CAGR growth trajectory, rising middle-income adoption, and the cost democratization potential of robo-advisors creates a strong empirical basis for developing Shariah-compliant hybrid fintech platforms under OJK and DSN-MUI governance, an agenda for future interdisciplinary research warranting primary data collection in the Indonesian context.

References

Backend Benchmarking. (2023). The Robo Report Q3 2023: Five-year performance analysis of major robo-advisors. Condor Capital Wealth Management.

Boston Consulting Group. (2023). Global asset management 2023: The tide has turned. BCG.

Cerulli Associates. (2024). The future of advice: Hybrid models and digital transformation in wealth management. Cerulli Associates.

Chua, A. Y. K., Pal, A., & Banerjee, S. (2023). AI-enabled investment advice: Will users buy it? Computers in Human Behavior, 138, 107481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107481

CNBC. (2025). The real cost of financial advice: Robo-advisors vs. human planners. CNBC Markets. https://www.cnbc.com/2025/01/financial-advisor-fees-robo-advisors/

Eichler, K. S., & Schwab, E. (2024). Evaluating robo-advisors through behavioral finance: A critical review of technology potential, rationality, and investor expectations. Frontiers in Behavioral Economics, 3(28). https://doi.org/10.3389/frbhe.2024.1489159

Financial Planning Association. (2024, August). FPA research report: Technology in financial planning and advisor-client retention. Financial Planning Association.

Financial Planning Association. (2024). 2024 Trends in investing survey: Robo-advisors and technology adoption. Journal of Financial Planning, 37(4), 14–22.

Fortune Business Insights. (2024). Robo advisory market size, share & growth report. Fortune Business Insights.

Grand View Research. (2023). Robo advisory market size, share & trends analysis report. Grand View Research.

Johnson, D., Bardhi, F., & Dunn, D. (2005). Understanding how technology paradoxes affect customer satisfaction with self-service technology. Psychology and Marketing, 25(5), 416–443.

Kitces, M. (2022). How human financial advisors provide value that robos cannot. Kitces.com. https://www.kitces.com/blog/vanguard-report-robo-advisors-human-relationship-value-client-satisfaction-leveraging-technology/

Market Growth Reports. (2024). Robo advisory market global industry analysis 2035. Market Growth Reports.

Mordor Intelligence. (2024). Robo-advisory services market size & competitive landscape 2030. Mordor Intelligence.

Morningstar. (2024). A guided tour of the robo-advisor landscape. Morningstar Research.

Polaris Market Research / Industrial Thought Group. (2025). Human or robo-advice: What do investors prefer? Industrial Thought Group.

Schwab, C. (2024). Schwab Modern Wealth Survey 2024. Charles Schwab & Co.

Schwarz, C., Volkens, A., & Schmidt, J. (2022). Algorithmic financial decision-making and bounded rationality: Evidence from robo-advisory platforms. Journal of Behavioral Finance, 23(3), 298–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427560.2021.1975739

Senteio, S., & Hughes, L. (2024). Customer trust and satisfaction with robo-adviser technology. Journal of Financial Planning, 37(8), 86–101.

Shefrin, H. (2009). Behavioralizing finance. Foundations and Trends in Finance, 4(1–2), 1–184. https://doi.org/10.1561/0500000030

Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69(1), 99–118.

Sironi, P. (2016). FinTech innovation: From robo-advisors to goal based investing and gamification. Wiley.

SkyQuestt. (2024). Robo advisory market size, growth, and forecast 2030. SkyQuestt Research.

Statista. (2023). U.S.: Robo-advisors assets under management 2017–2027. Statista Research Department.

TomorrowDesk. (2024). Robo-advisor vs. financial advisor: Cost and performance comparison. TomorrowDesk Financial Intelligence.

Wells Fargo / Gallup. (2016). Wells Fargo/Gallup Investor and Retirement Optimism Index: Awareness and attitudes toward robo-advisors. Wells Fargo & Gallup.

Yang, M. (2023). Robo-advisors outperform human investors amid market crash. Carlson School of Management, University of Minnesota.

Yusuf, A. O., Hamdan, M. N., & Rashid, R. A. (2025). Qualitative dimensions of digital financial advisory: Client trust, complexity, and literacy in emerging markets. Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 27(1), 118–135.