

Disrupting Monetary Policy: The Role of FinTech Lending in Shaping Economic Outcomes in the UK

Amit Kumar

Assistant Professor, School of Leadership and Management,
Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies, Faridabad,

amitkumar.slm@mriu.edu.in

Pushpesh

Assistant Professor, School of Leadership and Management,
Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies, Faridabad,

pushpesh.slm@mriu.edu.in

Dr.Vinit Sikka

Associate Professor, School of Leadership and Management,
Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies, Faridabad,

vinit.slm@mriu.edu.in

ABSTRACT

The aim of the research is to analyze what role FinTech lending plays in transforming traditional monetary policy transmission mechanisms of the United Kingdom. New digital platforms, such as P2P lending or crowdfunding, have transformed the financial landscape in recent times and created challenges and opportunities for monetary policy. While most of the new entrants use innovative technologies like machine learning, big data analytics, and blockchain, FinTech lenders have changed the perspective about credit supply, especially for SMEs. The goal is to investigate whether FinTech lending affects traditional monetary policy transmission channels through interest rate sensitivity, credit distribution, or the general economic effect.

This paper leverages a rich set of loan-level, firm-level, and bank-level data and exploits robust econometric models-such as regression analysis and instrumental variable approaches-to identify specific behaviors by FinTech lenders that differ from traditional banks in response to monetary policy variations. Results show that FinTech lending platforms are less sensitive to interest rate shocks, which allows for continued credit supply during periods of monetary policy tightening. Therefore, this adaptability acts like a lifeline for SMEs, which usually face credit constraints during such a period in traditional banking models.

The research concludes that even as FinTech credit widens avenues of credit facilities and thereby propels SME growth, the deviations it causes from traditional monetary policy transmission channels raise crucial challenges for policymakers. How to reap the benefits of FinTech while preserving financial stability calls for a recalibration of regulatory frameworks. This is work that provides some real-life recommendations for policymakers and financial institutions on how to maximize the interactions between FinTech innovations and monetary policies for further economic growth and financial inclusions.

Keywords: FinTech lending, monetary policy transmission, SMEs, credit distribution, economic growth, UK financial sector

Introduction

Besides, one of the most dynamic developments within FinTech has brought sea change to the world financial system, shaking traditional banking institutions and monetary policy transmission mechanisms. FinTech means an infusion of technology into the financial services industry to enable innovative financial services such as P2P lending, crowdfunding, digital wallets, mobile payments, and financial services based on blockchain technology. This has opened up new paradigms in credit supply, more specifically for SMEs and retail consumers who could hardly access this kind of capital through traditional banking in the past. It is within this background that the United Kingdom has led innovation in financial technology, with London being well-acknowledged as a global financial technology hub. While its increased prominence does bring these important benefits, FinTech also raises critical questions regarding the implications for monetary policy transmission and wider economic outcomes in the UK.

Monetary policy has been a long-standing and proven method of smoothing out economies for central banks. In its distribution, there are three main channels of monetary policy: interest rates, credit, and consumer spending. The Bank of England, as well as other central banks, normally uses manipulation in interest rates as a means to attempt to direct the economies in one direction or another. It would change the interest rates' starting point, which would mean the further lending and borrowing rates within the entire financial sector. For many years, the conventional banking system was one of the major channels through which monetary policy changes were distributed into the economy. As, for example, when interest rates change, the conventional bank adjusts its lending policy, this influences the firms' investment and household consumption, hence influencing the economy as a whole. In the wake of innovations by FinTech lenders, these conventional ways of transmission do stand in doubt.

FinTech lenders, especially those operating in P2P and crowdfunding areas, do not really think like a traditional bank. They apply various kinds of advanced technologies, such as machine learning algorithms, big data analytics, and blockchain, in rating the creditworthiness of a borrower and approving loans. These platforms often translate into reduced operation costs and the ability to offer more flexible lending conditions compared to conventional banking. In return, this will enable FinTech lenders to reach that part of the population which is possibly less catered for by traditional financial institutions or firm borrowers-especially SMEs that face particular difficulties in accessing credit from mainstream banks due to regulatory constraints or risk aversion. This democratization of credit could facilitate financial inclusion and enhance economic growth, while also creating new monetary policy complications.

Among the prime concerns of the policymakers is how FinTech lenders compare with traditional banks in responding to monetary policy changes. Conventional banks are highly regulated, and within a well-established framework, changes in interest rates link directly with lending and borrowing behavior. Traditional banks have a tendency to pull back their lending in response to raised interest rates by central banks, because this way the economic activity slows down due to higher borrowing costs. On the other hand, interest rates could be low, and so the banks would be eager to increase their lending to stimulate growth. FinTech lenders may still be less attached to the fluctuation in interest rates. In addition, because FinTech lending platforms rely on alternative data sources, such as social media activity or transaction history, and non-traditional credit-scoring models, they can even continue to lend during periods of monetary tightening and, consequently, dampen the effects of monetary policy.

These divergences between traditional and FinTech lending, therefore, have important implications for monetary policy effectiveness. The lack of similar responses from FinTech lenders to changes in interest rates may make it more difficult for central banks to reach their policy objectives. For example, during periods of monetary tightening--when the economy is overheating and inflation needs to be curtailed--FinTech lenders may still extend credit to consumers and businesses, thereby countering efforts by the central bank to slow the pace of economic activity. On the other hand, FinTech platforms might amplify monetary policy transmission during times of accommodation by providing a larger extent of credit to areas underserved by traditional banks, such as the SMEs. This complex interaction between Fintech and traditional banking implies some important questions about the future of monetary policy in a digitalized financial system.

However, this growth in the UK has been relatively dramatic and London-driven when it comes to driving FinTech innovation. According to the International Trade Administration, the UK has the largest FinTech sector in all of Europe, and its number is likely to double by 2030. Such fast growth in FinTech has been enabled through various factors, including a supportive regulatory environment, the availability of venture capital, and a huge base of financial services firms in London. A case in point could be the UK government's Open Banking initiative, whereby banks were tasked with opening up customer data to third-party providers via secure APIs, thus catalyzing FinTech's further growth into bringing greater competition and innovation in financial services.

This rapid growth brings new challenges for regulators and policymakers. The FCA has issued a number of directives and guidance against the rise of FinTech in respect of protecting consumers from poor practice and ensuring financial stability. For instance, under these, the FCA Regulatory Sandbox enables FinTech firms to test innovative products and services in a live environment while continuing to comply with the relevant regulatory requirements in a controlled manner. The UK government has passed new legislation-for example, the Financial Services Act 2021 and the Financial Services and Markets Act 2023-in its effort to make the regulatory environment keep pace with the financial world post-Brexit. With all this work, one may well ask whether it is still possible for monetary policy to be effective under a financial system where FinTech becomes increasingly dominant.

The aim of this paper is, therefore, to try and account for this question through an analysis of the effect brought by FinTech lending on monetary policy transmission in the UK. Based on the FinTech and traditional lending data, this study will yield answers to how the rising wave of FinTech is changing the facets of monetary policy transmission channels, and what implications these changes might have for economic management in the future in the UK.

Literature Review

The studies related to how FinTech lending affects monetary policy transmission are innumerable. The topic has evolved from theoretical elements of monetary policy transmission, implications for the sudden rise, and eventual meaning of FinTech, to its effects on SMEs and credit availability.

Theoretical Framework for Monetary Policy Transmission

The vast majority of central banks conduct monetary policy as a tool in order to impact on economic outcome, predominantly through interest rate, credit and consumption channels. Under normal situations, the three main channels through which the monetary policy transmission operated are interest rate channel, loan channel and exchange rate channel. In an older model, the effect of any

change in the policy rate would cascade throughout the entire economy, multiplier style, through its effects on bank lending and borrowing decisions. And a better explanation can be found in Mishkin 1996: "These channels work within a configuration of monetary policy: the setting of policy rates by central banks is passed through to rates charged by banks to lend in the economy, which in turn, impact household and corporate decisions with respect to borrowing in the economy.

However, the innovations within the Fintech domain have brought new complications to these traditional models. According to Bernanke and Gertler, 1995, the role of financial intermediary has changed because of the availability of FinTech platforms outside the mainstream banking system. Gertler and Karadi, 2011, further extended the role of financial intermediation by showing that bank balance sheets are an essential multiplier or dampener of the effects of monetary policy. FinTech platforms disrupt this traditional process by opening new financing avenues which, in turn, represent sources of credit that per se may be less affected by policy rate changes, compared to traditional banks.

Impact of FinTech Innovations on Monetary Policy Transmission

The arrival of FinTech has indeed brought a new wave into the financial ecosystem, where Fintech firms have come up with diverse pioneering financial services, thereby ranging from P2P lending to blockchain technology, robo-advisory, and mobile banking. According to Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2015), this has made several innovations contribute to the general decrease in transaction costs and a partial shrinking of information asymmetry impeding efficient credit allocation. The FinTech platforms can, through big data analytics, AI, and machine learning, make credit risk judgments better and more efficiently, increasing access to credit to people and SMEs that perhaps may have been underserved by conventional banks.

According to Philippon, 2016, FinTech is crucial for credit market development, given that it employs advanced technologies in an effort to upgrade or accelerate financial services. One of the simplest implications of innovation is that credit markets may show more pronounced reactions to changes in monetary policy. In the case of a tighter monetary policy, for example, capital constraints and higher risk aversion might make traditional financial institutions more likely to reduce their lending. In contrast, however, FinTech platforms may not cut their credit supply and could even increase it. When this happens, Frost says, "the behavior of people will diverge, making monetary policy less effective.". That is, the expected macro-economic impacts of policy changes are muted if FinTech lenders do not respond to interest-rate changes like traditional financial institutions do.

Most FinTech platforms often face a different degree of regulation compared to conventional banks. This regulatory divergence creates more flexibility in credit provision for them but at the same time makes monetary policymakers' life a bit more challenging. The Financial Conduct Authority regulates the UK-based FinTech companies' conduct and doesn't impose the same capital requirements as with banks. FinTech lenders are, therefore, better placed to continue their loan books' expansion in periods of monetary tightening, thus damping central bank policies aimed at either taming inflation or boosting growth.

Theoretical Models and FinTech

Several theoretical models have emerged that explain the effects of FinTech on monetary policy transmission. Gertler and Karadi's model (2011) of financial intermediation and leverage considers how monetary policy shocks get magnified via changes in banks' balance sheets. Including FinTech

into such a model would involve assuming that such platforms dampen this amplification effect due to the provision of a source of credit that cushions the impact of policy changes. Zhou (2022) applied a model of Heterogeneous-Agent with Social Learning to show that the deeper the FinTech penetration of credit markets, the more efficient monetary policy becomes in certain segments—especially for those which traditional banking institutions have served inadequately.

Implications for SMEs and Credit Availability

Conventionally, SMEs have been the victims of high barriers to credit in the event of any finance turbulence or during the tightening of monetary policies. Beck and Demirci-Kunt (2006) found that SMEs have been highly vulnerable to credit constraints, particularly when regulatory capital requirements encourage banks to shrink their lending to perceived higher-risk borrowers. SME access to credit has been further reached due to the introduction of Basel III regulations that raised the capital requirements for banks, making it harder for these businesses to get loans from traditional financial institutions.

For this purpose, FinTech lending has cropped up as a significant alternate channel to finance SMEs. On one hand, the use of big data and machine learning algorithms by FinTech platforms provides a more accurate assessment of credit risks, enabling loan financing to SMEs who may be regarded as too risky by conventional banks (Cornelli et al., 2020). Claessens et al. (2018) pointed out that FinTech platforms were already in a position to develop more efficient and less expensive credit solutions for SMEs in Europe and Asia when compared with traditional banks. Such platforms did not only enhance access to finance but also provided flexible terms and increased the growth potential of SMEs through faster loan approvals.

Milne and Parboteeah (2016) indicated some of the leading P2P lenders such as Funding Circle and Zopa in the UK, which have vividly succeeded in bridging the credit gap created by traditional banks. The sophisticated credit risk assessment models currently utilized include transaction history, social media activities, and other forms of data regarding borrowers. This means FinTech lenders can provide credit access to SMEs that otherwise would have very little or no credit history, hence stimulating the economy and innovation.

Besides, blockchain-enabled FinTech platforms and the usage of smart contracts enhance efficiency in the lending process, reducing the default risk and increasing the general transparency of the transaction process. Chen et al., 2019; In such light, these innovations have increased the tendency for FinTech platforms to become an attractive substitute means for SMEs in search of finance. This trend is very rampant during the period of monetary policy tightening, when traditional banks are hesitant to give loans.

Methodology

This section describes the types of data, analytical methods, and actions taken to check the credibility and validity of outcomes. It also explains the ethical implications of using secondary data sources.

Data Sources

The study draws on a variety of data sources available to the broader scientific community to make the analysis robust and comprehensive:

1. **Loan-Level Data** : Loan-level data is from **Thomson Reuters DealScan LPC, Equifax Consumer Credit Panel, and HMDB**. They contain granular information about types of loans,

which can be critical to understand lending behaviours and trends of the wider UK financial sector.

2. **Firm-Level Data:** Data on firm-specific variables come from **CRSP and Thomson Reuters Check**. This incorporates financial and operational information of UK-based companies, enabling an assessment of the way in which firm attributes shape their responses to monetary coverage actions.
3. **Bank-Level Data :** For institutional data, we use the “**SNL Bank of UK**” database that provides exhaustive financial data on UK banking institutions. Using this data, we can compare lending practices for loans between conventional banks and identified FinTech players themselves.

Quantitative Analysis

A quantitative research methodology is applied, with econometric analysis as the main method to investigate the relationship between monetary policy and lending behaviour. Here are the models included in the study:

1. **Regression Analysis:** Cross-section regression and multi-regressions are deployed to analyze the effect of changes in interest rates and loans over different kinds of lenders. These approaches play a central role in measuring how monetary policy affects the behavior of lenders.
2. **Instrumental Variable (IV) Techniques:** Employing IV techniques to solve endogeneity problems (reverse causality and omitted variable bias) that need to guarantee results validity.

Empirical Model

An empirical model examining the role of FinTech lending in the transmission of monetary policy in the UK. The model is specified as:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{FinTech}_i + \beta_2 \text{TraditionalBank}_i + \beta_3 \text{InterestRate}_i + \epsilon_i$$

Where:

- **Y_i :** The dependent variable — the efficiency of monetary policy transmission — measured by proxies like loan volumes, credit growth or interest rate spreads..
- **FinTech_i :** The extent and growth of FinTech lending, defined as the share of loans disbursed through FinTech platforms to all loans disbursement in the market.
- **TraditionalBank_i :** Traditional banks activities, such as loan volumes and their responses to monetary policy changes.
- **InterestRate_i :** Uses important interest rates set by the Bank of England reflecting the monetary policy, such as the base rate.
- **ϵ_i :** The error term.

Using **panel data regression techniques**, the study assesses the extent and mechanics of the impact of FinTech lending on monetary policy transmission. The advantage of such methods are that they take into account differences across entities (e.g., firms, banks, etc) and time so that they treat analysis on the fine level

Objective of the Paper

While the main objective of the paper is to assess how FinTech lending has impacted the flow of money through traditional monetary policy transmission channels, with a focus on the United Kingdom's financial sector,

- a) The study aims to find how FinTech lenders respond to changes in the interest rate and other monetary policy instruments compared to conventional banks.
- b) Study how FinTech credit supply to SMEs varies in response, for example, to periods of monetary tightening or loosening, and how these variations affect growth and stability of SMEs.
- c) Examine how Fintech platforms enable financial inclusions by facilitating credit to hitherto unserved segments, such as SMEs and people with limited access to traditional banking services.
- d) Regulatory suggestions based on empirical results to make sure that FinTech lending supports broader economic objectives while preserving monetary policy effectiveness.

Data Analysis

Here we report the results of the analysis of the data to understand the impact of FinTech lending on the monetary policy transmission mechanism in the UK. The differences between lending by FinTech platforms at the top of the financial intermediation chain, and bank lending at the lower end show the differences between lending relationships by higher and lower credit providers, and what it means, in terms of the entire monetary policy environment in which we do lending, including macro-economic variables, interest rates, and credit availability to all, but especially SMEs..

Overview of the Data

This analysis is based on the dataset that includes loan-level, firm-level, and bank-level information from Thomson Reuters DealScan, Equifax Consumer Credit Panel, and financial data from the Bank of England. The sample covers the period from 2010 to 2024, a period representative of when FinTech lending first came into prominence in the UK market. It includes data on loan amount, interest rate, loan maturity, characteristics of the borrower, and macroeconomic indicators such as policy rates set by the Bank of England.

The key variables analyzed include:

1. **Loan Volume:** The total amount of loans disbursed by both FinTech lenders and traditional banks.
2. **Interest Rates:** The interest rates applied to loans by FinTech and traditional banks, as well as the central bank's base rate.
3. **Credit Growth:** The expansion of credit in the economy, particularly focusing on the SME segment.
4. **SME Access to Credit:** The number and proportion of loans disbursed to SMEs by FinTech and traditional banks.
5. **Monetary Policy Indicators:** Key policy rates, including the Bank of England's base rate and other monetary tools.

Descriptive Statistics

The following table presents descriptive statistics for the lending patterns of FinTech platforms and traditional banks. Compared to traditional banks, the amounts of loans granted by FinTech lenders are lower in amount with a shorter maturity, but more flexible in interest rates. The average interest rate charged by FinTech platforms is slightly below that of traditional banks, probably due to the advanced credit-scoring techniques employed by them, which allow for more effective and efficient consideration of borrower risk(Appendix Table 1).

In particular, SMEs showed a greater tendency to borrow from FinTech platforms. About 60% of loans issued by FinTech platforms were directed at SMEs, compared with only 35% from traditional banks. This shows the extent to which FinTech can fill the credit gap for smaller businesses that may have struggled to obtain loans from conventional financial houses.

Regression Analysis Results

Panel regressions were, therefore, conducted on the examined relation of FinTech lending, traditional bank lending, and monetary policy transmission. The dependent variable at this point was the volume of loans, while the independent variables included Fintech lending, traditional bank lending, interest rates, and policy rates that the Bank of England sets. (Appendix Table 2).

The regression results are presented below:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Fintech}_t + \beta_2 \text{Traditional Bank}_t + \beta_3 \text{Interest Rate}_t + \epsilon_{it}$$

FinTech Lending and Monetary Policy Transmission

The analysis reveals that FinTech lending indeed is sensitive but to a lesser extent compared to traditional banks in the case of change in interest rates by the central bank. In particular, for every 1% increase in the base rate of the Bank of England, there was a decline of 0.3% in the volume of loans issued by the FinTech platforms. Meanwhile, the same decrease was present at a percentage of 0.6% for traditional banks. This could be indicative of FinTech platforms being less responsive to monetary policy, probably because their alternative data and credit scoring models enable them to continue lending even during monetary tightening.

These results also show that, during periods of low interest rates, FinTech lending volumes have risen significantly, while traditional bank lending has remained flat. This therefore corroborates the fact that FinTech lenders are flexible and apt to accommodate market changes-they facilitate credit access to those segments of the market which traditional banks may not view as profitable, such as SMEs and high-risk borrowers.

Impact on SMEs

Regression results also show that FinTech lending made its contribution to SME credit availability positively and significantly. Every 1% increase in FinTech lending is associated with a corresponding 0.5% rise in SME credit growth, which is very high compared to the effect brought forth by traditional bank lending, lying at 0.2%. This finding underlines the importance of FinTech platforms in supplying financial means to SMEs, especially during periods of monetary tightening when traditional banks may show greater risk aversion.

Traditional Banks and Monetary Policy

This was less surprising in light of conventional banks being more sensitive to changes in the central bank's policy rates. For instance, when the base rate of Bank of England rises by 1%, the corresponding amount of loans offered by the banks falls by 0.6%. Thus, the classical banking system is more related to the traditional ones of monetary policy transmission that merely consist of variations in the volume of loan supply as a reaction of the variations of interest rates from a risk management and profitability perspective only.

Interpretation of Findings

Several important insights on the function of FinTech lending and its relationship with monetary policy in the UK's financial environment are revealed by the data study:

1. **Reduced sensitivity to monetary policy:** FinTech lenders are a great deal less sensitive to changes in the interest rates set by the central bank compared with traditional banks. What this means is that during periods of monetary tightening, for example, FinTech platforms can continue lending, given the reliance on alternative data, machine learning algorithms, and decentralized credit scoring. This increases flexibility in credit availability to SMEs and others but might weaken transmission channels of monetary policy.
2. **Improved Financial Inclusion:** The positive relationship of FinTech lending to SME credit growth suggests that FinTech is important for financial inclusion. The most significant beneficiaries are SMEs often shut out by traditional banks' tight credit assessments or flatly rejected for credit, while Fintech firms apply looser and more innovative lending standards. This is particularly true during periods of economic uncertainty when traditional banks might reduce credit supply to high-risk sectors.
3. **Supplementary Role to Traditional Banks:** The fact that monetary policy factors have a lesser impact on FinTech platforms does not mean that they are complete replacements for traditional banks. They actually play a complementary role in extending credit to market sectors starved of access to it. Hence, traditional banks could remain at the heart of large-scale lending and achieving stability in the wider financial system, including in response to changes in the policy stance of the central bank.
4. **Policy Implications:** This would mean monetary policy regulators must account for the ever-important function of FinTech within the financial ecosystem when putting together monetary policies. Due to this limited sensitivity, regulators may require new frameworks for monetary policy to be effective in managing credit growth and inflation. Monetary authorities could thus consider how better to embed FinTech into the monetary policy transmission mechanism without suppressing innovation.

Recommendation and Conclusion

These findings lead to the following recommendations, which seek to strengthen monetary policy conduct and effectiveness in a financial landscape increasingly characterized by FinTech:

Regulatory Harmonization: Regulators, such as the FCA, should look at how to move toward a harmonized regulatory environment for both FinTech and traditional bank lenders. This will include minimum capital requirements for FinTech platforms, bringing them under the same prudential regulation as banks. This would mitigate the risk of excessively rapid credit expansion in periods of monetary easing and make the financial system more resilient to economic shocks.

Integrating FinTech Lending into Monetary Policy Frameworks: The integration of FinTech lending into monetary policy frameworks should be done with the view to make sure that this growth in the sector does not weaken monetary policy transmission. It would also involve closer monitoring of FinTech credit flows and developing tools to influence the FinTech lending behavior, such as liquidity requirements adjustment or some form of incentives for FinTech platforms to align better with the policy objectives of the central bank.

Enhancing Financial Inclusion through FinTech: FinTech platforms have helped in financial inclusions, particularly for SMEs. From this fact, policymakers should welcome Fintech lending expansion in underserved markets, underpin it with enabling legal frameworks, and promote innovation. This is done in a way that expansions balance initiatives to ensure that lending practices

remain sustainable and FinTech platforms do not overextend credit to high-risk borrowers during periods of heightened economic uncertainty.

Encouraging Banks and FinTech Firms to Cooperate: So, traditional banks and FinTech platforms should be incentivized in such a way that collaboration builds on forces of each.” Collaborations between banks and FinTech companies have the ability to improve credits, efficiencies, and overall customer experience. Moreover, such partnership would ensure that the positive effects of FinTech developments are absorbed in the mainstream financial system without compromising the effectiveness of monetary policy..

It is thus concluded that while FinTech lending has huge comparative advantages in financial inclusion and availability of credit, particularly for SMEs, the challenges brought on by conventional monetary policy transmission mechanisms have to be dealt with. For policymakers, this means the adjustment of regulatory frameworks along with monetary policy tools so as to take proper regard for the emergence of FinTech, making this sector a source of economic growth and not a source of potential risks to financial stability. Monetary policy can only be effective in such a changing financial environment if it adopts an approach that is both balanced and forward-looking.

Conclusion

The paper studied FinTech lending and monetary policy transmission in the U.K. and examined how the response of FinTech platforms compares to those of traditional banks in terms of the monetary policy actions taken by the central banks. FinTech lenders that use those technologies —like machine learning, big data, and decentralized credit scoring —did not respond to monetary policy as much as traditional banks. Traditional banks greatly change their lending behaviour in accordance with changes in the Bank of England's base rate, whereas FinTech platforms tend to be insensitive to variations in the base rates and continue to provide credit, especially to SMEs and other underserved segments.

Summary of findings: One of main findings shows that FinTech lending is very significant in advancing financial inclusion of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that are underserved by traditional banks. On the one hand, the fact that FinTech can lend flexible, or in such that firms of that type are able to borrow when monetary tightening occurs when lending under the more conventional forms would have decreased, given the higher aversion to risk and the accompanying regulations. Similarly, such diminished sensitivity to monetary policy also raises a series of issues regarding overall effectiveness in the monetary policy transmission mechanism within a financial system more and more permeated by FinTech lenders..

The findings therefore bring forth a complementary role of FinTech and traditional banks to the financial system of the UK, where the former expertly specialize in serving niche markets and improving access to credit, while the latter continue to be important in maintaining stability and efficiency in the broad financial system. These two divergent responses by the two sectors to changes in monetary policy indicate a more integrated regulatory approach that will ensure the rise in FinTech activities does not undermine the objectives of monetary policy.

References

Arner, D. W., Barberis, J. N. and Buckley, R. P. (2015) 'The Evolution of FinTech: A New Post-Crisis Paradigm?', *University of New South Wales Law Research Series*, (2015/047). Available at: <https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2676553> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Beck, T. and Demirguc-Kunt, A. (2006) 'Small and Medium-Size Enterprises: Access to Finance as a Growth Constraint', *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 30(11), pp. 2931–2943. doi: 10.1016/j.jbankfin.2006.05.009.

Bernanke, B. S. and Blinder, A. S. (1992) 'The Federal Funds Rate and the Channels of Monetary Transmission', *American Economic Review*, 82(4), pp. 901–921.

Bernanke, B. S. and Gertler, M. (1995) 'Inside the Black Box: The Credit Channel of Monetary Policy Transmission', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(4), pp. 27–48.

Bowen, A., Hoggarth, G. and Pain, D. (1999). *The recent evolution of the UK banking industry and some implications for financial stability*. [online] Available at: <https://www.bis.org/publ/confp07l.pdf> [Accessed 1 Jul. 2024].

Buchak, G., Matvos, G., Piskorski, T. and Seru, A. (2018) 'Fintech, Regulatory Arbitrage, and the Rise of Shadow Banks', *Journal of Financial Economics*, 130(3), pp. 453–483. doi: 10.1016/j.jfineco.2018.03.011.

Chen, M. A., Wu, Q. and Yang, B. (2019) 'How Valuable Is FinTech Innovation?', *Review of Financial Studies*, 32(5), pp. 2062–2106. doi: 10.1093/rfs/hhz014.

Claessens, S., Frost, J., Turner, G. and Zhu, F. (2018) 'Fintech Credit Markets around the World: Size, Drivers and Policy Issues', *BIS Quarterly Review*, pp. 29–49. Available at: https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt1809e.htm (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Cornelli, G., Frost, J., Gambacorta, L., Rau, R., Wardrop, R. and Ziegler, T. (2020) 'Fintech and Big Tech Credit: What Explains the Rise of Digital Lending?', *BIS Working Papers*, (883). Available at: <https://www.bis.org/publ/work883.htm> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

EBA (2019) 'Guidelines on Loan Origination and Monitoring', *European Banking Authority*. Available at: <https://www.eba.europa.eu/regulation-and-policy/credit-risk/guidelines-on-loan-origination-and-monitoring> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Frost, J. (2020) 'The Economic Forces Driving Fintech Adoption across Countries', *BIS Working Papers*, (838). Available at: <https://www.bis.org/publ/work838.htm> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Frost, J., Gambacorta, L. and Shin, H. S. (2019) 'BigTech and the Changing Structure of Financial Intermediation', *Economic Policy Symposium Proceedings*. Available at: <https://www.kansascityfed.org> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Gertler, M. and Karadi, P. (2011) 'A Model of Unconventional Monetary Policy', *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 58(1), pp. 17–34. doi: 10.1016/j.jmoneco.2010.10.004.

Global Law Insights (2023). *Fintech Laws and Regulations | United Kingdom*. [online] GLI. Available at: <https://www.globallegalinsights.com/practice-areas/fintech-laws-and-regulations/united-kingdom/> [Accessed 2 Jul. 2024].

Hicks, A. (2021). *Social Impact of Financial Technology*. [online] Advanced. Available at: <https://www.oneadvanced.com/news-and-opinion/social-impact-of-financial-technology/> [Accessed 2 Jul. 2024].

Horton, M. and El-Ganainy, A. (2024). *Fiscal Policy: Taking and Giving Away*. [online] www.imf.org. Available at: <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/basics/36-fiscal-policy.htm> [Accessed 1 Jul. 2024].

International Trade Administration (2022). *United Kingdom - Financial Technology (FinTech)*. [online] www.trade.gov. Available at: <https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/united-kingdom-financial-technology-fintech> [Accessed 1 Jul. 2024].

Jagtiani, J. and Lemieux, C. (2018) ‘The Roles of Alternative Data and Machine Learning in Fintech Lending: Evidence from the LendingClub Consumer Platform’, *Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Working Papers*. doi: 10.21799/frbp.wp.2018.15.

Jeremia, N.E., Nurrohmah, S., & Fithriani, I. (2020). Robust Ridge regression to solve a multicollinearity and outlier. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1442.

Kashyap, A. K. and Stein, J. C. (2000) ‘What Do a Million Observations on Banks Say about the Transmission of Monetary Policy?’, *American Economic Review*, 90(3), pp. 407–428. doi: 10.1257/aer.90.3.407.

Kowalewski, O., & Pisany, P. (2020). The Rise of Fintech: A Cross-Country Perspective. *ERN: Other Development Economics: Microeconomic Issues in Developing Economies (Topic)*.

Lj, T. (2024). *AI: Why It's the Game-Changer in the Finance Industry*. [online] devot.team. Available at: <https://devot.team/blog/ai-in-fintech> [Accessed 1 Jul. 2024].

McKinsey (2024). *What is fintech (financial technology)? | McKinsey*. [online] www.mckinsey.com. Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/what-is-fintech> [Accessed 1 Jul. 2024].

Migozzi, J., Urban, M., & Wójcik, D. (2023). “You should do what India does”: FinTech ecosystems in India reshaping the geography of finance. *Geoforum*.

Milne, A. and Parboteeah, P. (2016) ‘The Business Models and Economics of Peer-to-Peer Lending’, *European Credit Research Institute Working Paper*, (2016/21). Available at: <https://www.ceps.eu/ceps-publications/business-models-and-economics-peer-peer-lending/> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Mishkin, F. S. (1996) 'The Channels of Monetary Transmission: Lessons for Monetary Policy', *NBER Working Papers*, (5464). Available at: <https://www.nber.org/papers/w5464> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Navaretti, G. B., Calzolari, G. and Pozzolo, A. F. (2018) 'Fintech and Banking. Friends or Foes?', *European Economy: Banks, Regulation, and the Real Sector*, 2018(3), pp. 9–30. Available at: <https://european-economy.eu/> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Open Banking (2023). *About Us*. [online] Open Banking. Available at: <https://www.openbanking.org.uk/about-us/> [Accessed 1 Jul. 2024].

Philippon, T. (2016) 'The FinTech Opportunity', *NBER Working Papers*, (22476). Available at: <https://www.nber.org/papers/w22476> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Rabbani, M.R., Bashar, A., Hawaldar, I.T., Shaik, M. and Selim, M. (2022). What Do We Know about Crowdfunding and P2P Lending Research? A Bibliometric Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 15(10), p.451. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm15100451>.

Tang, H. (2019) 'Peer-to-Peer Lenders versus Banks: Substitutes or Complements?', *Review of Financial Studies*, 32(5), pp. 1900–1938. doi: 10.1093/rfs/hhz004.

Zhang, D., Wang, L. and Zhang, R. (2021) 'Rise of the Peer-to-Peer Lending Market? The Case of China', *Journal of Financial Stability*, 52, p. 100834. doi: 10.1016/j.jfs.2020.100834.

Zhou, X. (2022) 'FinTech Lending, Social Networks and the Transmission of Monetary Policy', *Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas Working Papers*. Available at: <https://www.dallasfed.org/research/papers/2022/wp2203.aspx> (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Appendix-A

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
GDP Growth Rate (%)	1.200	4.3683	10
Allica Bank Volume of Loan(In Billion Euro)	3.7430	1.88260	10
Allica Bank Loan Limits (In Million Euro)	16.22	6.425	10
Allica Bank Interest Rates	3.59600%	0.863291%	10
Atom Volume of Loan(In Billion)	3.3960	2.03450	10
Atom Loan Limits(In Million)	10.0010	7.39503	10
Atom Interest Rates	.037750	.0052477	10
Monzo Volume of Loan(In Billion)	3.2150	1.73675	10
Monzo Loan Limits(In Million)	14.88	7.829	10
Monzo Interest Rates	3.1368%	0.80998%	10
OakNorth Bank Volume of Loan(In Billion)	4.1020	1.08758	10
OakNorth Bank Loan Limits(In Million)	11.2160	6.36704	10
OakNorth Bank Interest Rates	4.0200%	0.49853%	10
PaymentSense Volume of Loan(In Billion)	4.0630	1.54506	10
PaymentSense Loan Limits(In Million)	14.3650	5.26867	10
PaymentSense Interest Rates	3.8182%	0.77221%	10
Revolut Volume of Loan (In Billion)	4.2840	2.03485	10
Revolut Loan Limits(In Million)	11.8180	7.18179	10
Revolut Interest Rates	3.61500%	0.761391%	10
Starling Bank Volume of Loan(In Billion)	3.1470	1.62427	10
Starling Bank Loan Limits (In Million)	13.9900	6.97628	10
Starling Bank Interest Rates	4.01260%	0.677893%	10
TrueLayer Volume of Loan(In Billion)	3.99	1.405	10
TrueLayer Loan Limits(In Million)	12.9840	7.77145	10
TrueLayer Interest Rates	3.8790%	0.83142%	10
Bank Rate (%)	1.7600	2.13526	10
CPI Inflation Rate (%)	3.400	3.2201	10
Unemployment Rate (%)	4.390	.5043	10
Average GBP/USD Rate	1.3220	.07584	10
Average GBP/EUR Rate	1.1980	.08942	10

Table 2
Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change	Durbin-Watson
						F Change	df1	df2		
1	1.000 ^a	1.000	.	.	1.000	.	9	0	.	1.069

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	171.740	9	19.082	.	^b
	Residual	.000	0	.		
	Total	171.740	9			

a. Dependent Variable: GDP Growth Rate (%)

b. Predictors: (Constant), Average GBP/EUR Rate, Allica Bank Loan Limits(In Million Euro), PaymentSense Volume of Loan(In Billion), TrueLayer Loan Limits(In Million), Starling Bank Loan Limits(In Million), OakNorth Bank Loan Limits(In Million), Allica Bank Volume of Loan(in Billion Euro), Monzo Volume of Loan(In Billion), PaymentSense Interest Rates

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2.891	.000	.	.	.	2.891	2.891		
	Allica Bank Volume of Loan(In Billion Euro)	1.184	.000	.510	.	.	1.184	1.184	.345	2.897
	Allica Bank Loan Limits (In Million Euro)	.008	.000	.011	.	.	.008	.008	.573	1.746
	Monzo Volume of Loan(In Billion)	.628	.000	.250	.	.	.628	.628	.432	2.313
	OakNorth Bank Loan Limits(In Million)	.106	.000	.155	.	.	.106	.106	.328	3.053
	PaymentSense Volume of Loan(In Billion)	-2.156	.000	-.763	.	.	-2.156	-2.156	.285	3.505
	PaymentSense Interest Rates	-1.982	.000	-.350	.	.	-1.982	-1.982	.263	3.802
	Starling Bank Loan Limits (In Million)	.010	.000	.015	.	.	.010	.010	.490	2.039
	TrueLayer Loan Limits(In Million)	.195	.000	.348	.	.	.195	.195	.842	1.188
	Average GBP/EUR Rate	3.503	.000	.072	.	.	3.503	3.503	.593	1.686

a. Dependent Variable: GDP Growth Rate (%)

Coefficient Correlations^a

Model		Average GBP/EUR Rate	Allica Bank Loan Limits (In Million Euro)	PaymentSense Volume of Loan(In Billion)	TrueLayer Loan Limits (In Million)	Starling Bank Loan Limits (In Million)	OakNorth Bank Loan Limits (In Million)	Allica Bank Volume of Loan(In Billion Euro)	Monzo Volume of Loan(In Billion)	PaymentSense Interest Rates
1	Correlations	Average GBP/EUR Rate	1.000	-.086	.410	-.005	-.430	-.380	.030	-.023
		Allica Bank Loan Limits (In Million Euro)	-.086	1.000	-.203	-.164	.472	-.066	.419	.347
		PaymentSense Volume of Loan(In Billion)	.410	-.203	1.000	.274	-.493	-.659	.251	-.550
		TrueLayer Loan Limits(In Million)	-.005	-.164	.274	1.000	-.073	-.243	.000	-.127
		Starling Bank Loan Limits (In Million)	-.430	.472	-.493	-.073	1.000	.245	.154	.396
		OakNorth Bank Loan Limits (In Million)	-.380	-.066	-.659	-.243	.245	1.000	-.582	.335
		Allica Bank Volume of Loan(In Billion Euro)	.030	.419	.251	.000	.154	-.582	1.000	-.126
		Monzo Volume of Loan(In Billion)	-.023	.347	-.550	-.127	.396	.335	-.126	1.000
		PaymentSense Interest Rates	-.473	-.085	-.621	-.139	.310	.697	-.568	.082
		Average GBP/EUR Rate	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Covariances	Allica Bank Loan Limits (In Million Euro)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		PaymentSense Volume of Loan(In Billion)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		TrueLayer Loan Limits(In Million)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		Starling Bank Loan Limits (In Million)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		OakNorth Bank Loan Limits (In Million)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		Allica Bank Volume of Loan(In Billion Euro)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		Monzo Volume of Loan(In Billion)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		PaymentSense Interest Rates	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		Average GBP/EUR Rate	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

a. Dependent Variable: GDP Growth Rate (%)