

Discouraged Borrowers: Measurement, Determinants and Impact



Ross Brown

Centre for Responsible Banking & Finance, School of Management,
University of St Andrews

Ross.Brown@st-andrews.ac.uk

Jose Liñares Zegarra

Essex Business School, University of Essex and Centre for Responsible Banking
& Finance, School of Management, University of St Andrews

jmlina@essex.ac.uk

John O.S. Wilson

Centre for Responsible Banking & Finance, School of Management,
University of St Andrews

jsw7@st-andrews.ac.uk

SOTA Review No 2: September 2018

In recent years there has been an increasing focus paid on SMEs who do not apply for bank finance for fear of rejection. These so-called discouraged borrowers constitute a major proportion of SMEs with some recent research suggesting they number as many as half a million UK SMEs. To date, empirical studies have adopted different definitions of discouragement which makes comparisons difficult. The growing literature on borrower discouragement suggests firm size and age are significant determinants, with smaller more nascent SMEs are more likely to be discouraged. Other personal characteristics associated with discouragement are entrepreneurs who are older, female, ethnic minorities and those with lower levels of human capital. The evidence base on the potential impact of borrower discouragement is less well established. However, the available evidence suggests discouragement may result in reduced investment levels and weaker firm performance. The broader and disaggregated definitions of borrower discouragement used in recent studies provide a useful basis for future comparisons and longitudinal tracking.

Background

Small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) are informationally opaque and often lack certified financial statements and collateral required by lenders to access the finance necessary to fund day-to-day operations and longer term fixed capital investment. Extensive evidence confirms the difficulties faced by SMEs which seek credit, and are rejected.

Recent evidence suggests that there is a significant proportion of SMEs which require finance, but do not apply for fear of rejection. To date there is limited understanding of these so-called '*discouraged borrowers*'. First identified by Levenson and Willard (2000), discouragement amongst SMEs is a relatively neglected topic. This is somewhat surprising given that some discouraged borrowers are likely to be creditworthy, which may unnecessarily forgo possible funding opportunities for investment, with potentially negative implications for their own future growth as well as job creation, innovation and economic growth.

Academic contributions define a discouraged borrower as: '*a good firm, requiring finance, that chooses not to apply to the bank because it feels its application will be rejected*' (Kon and Storey 2003, p.47). Within this categorisation, discouraged borrowers are strictly limited to bank borrowers. However, there is a degree of ambiguity concerning the precise definition of borrower discouragement within the SME literature. Table 1 summarises various definitions of borrower discouragement. In most surveys investigating access to finance issues, questions tend to ask whether SMEs enact self-imposed credit constraints for fear of rejection. However, in some studies the definition of discouragement is much more expansive, extending to issues such as collateral requirements, credit history and the complexity of loan procedures. This suggests that the definitions of borrower discouragement require clear articulation prior to any empirical investigation.

Table 1: Definitions of Discouraged Borrowers

Study	Data Source	Technical Definition of Discouraged Borrowers
Brown et al 2018	UK Longitudinal Small Business Survey (LSBS)	SME had a need for finance but did not apply because of any of the following reasons: 'You thought you would be rejected; you thought it would be too expensive; you didn't want to take on additional risk; now is not the right time because of economic conditions; you didn't know where to find the appropriate finance you needed; poor credit history; decision would have taken too long/too much hassle'
Gama et al 2017	EDRB and World Bank Group's Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey (2008/09 BEEPS)	'if it does not apply for a loan for different reasons, such as tough loan prices or loan contract procedures or fear of rationing, that is, the scale of discouragement as a function of bank screening errors, application costs, and the difference in interest rates between the bank and other money lenders' (p. 35)

Moro et al 2017	ECB Survey on the access to Finance of SMES (SAFE)	'did not apply due to anticipated rejection' (p. 122)
Neville et al 2017	US Federal Reserve Board's Survey of Small Business Finances (SSBF)	'During the last three years, were there times when the firm needed credit, but did not apply because it thought the application would be turned down' (p. 21)
Tang et al 2017	Bespoke Survey in Hanan and Guangdong province, China	'Have you decided not to apply for a loan anticipating a bank rejection' (p. 529)
Rostamkalaei 2017	UK SME Finance Monitor	'thought they would be turned down, that is was not the right time to borrow, or that banks were not lending' (p.398)
Cole and Sokolyk 2016	US Federal Reserve Board's Survey of Small Business Finances (SSBF)	'is a firm that did not apply for a loan during the previous 3 years because the firm feared rejection, even though it needed credit' (p. 47)
Cowling et al 2016	UK SME Business Barometer Surveys	'demand for but not applying for any finance either because the firm feared rejection or the owner thought the finance was too expensive' (p. 1054)
Mac an Bhaire et al 2016	ECB Survey on the access to Finance of SMES (SAFE)	'With respect to banks' loans (either new or renewal): did you apply for them over the past 6 months, or not? 1. Applied. 2: No, because of possible rejection' (p. 49)
Chakravarty and Xiang 2013	World Bank Enterprise Surveys	'as firms with a need for a loan who nevertheless choose to not apply for a bank loan because (1) the loan procedure was too complicated; (2) interest rates were too high; (3) collateral requirement were too high; and (4) there was corruption in allocation' (p. 67)
Freel et al 2012	UK biennial survey by the Federation of Small Businesses	'in the past two years has the fear of rejection stopped you from seeking a bank loan for your business' (p. 407)

Evidence

The growing literature on discouraged borrowers focuses on the extent of borrower discouragement and its determinants. Evidence regarding the extent of borrower discouragement finds varying levels of borrower discouragement. These stark differences may owe to the different definitions adopted in different data sets and empirical studies. As a consequence, considerable caution should be exercised when comparing the empirical findings across different studies of discouraged borrowers. For example, Fraser (2004) and Freel et al, (2012) find that 8% of UK SMEs can be classified as discouraged. Cowling et al, (2016) find that only 2.65% of UK SMEs could be classified as discouraged borrowers post global financial crisis (GFC). Using a different data set Rostamkalaei (2017) confirms low levels of borrower discouragement post-GFC. However, the latest empirical evidence suggests levels of discouragement to be much higher at 9.1%

of SMEs (Brown et al, 2018) [1]. This is similar to earlier UK studies and levels of (8% to 14%) borrower discouragement observed in the US (Cole and Sokolyk, 2016).

Evidence related to the determinants of borrower discouragement examines the nature and characteristics of entrepreneurs and SMEs that become discouraged (see Table 2 below). Ethnic minorities (Fraser, 2009; Neville et al 2017), female entrepreneurs (Moro et al, 2017), older, less well-educated and entrepreneurs with lower levels of personal wealth are significant determinants of discouragement (Cole and Sokolyk, 2016). Gender appears a strong predictor of borrower discouragement with female entrepreneurs almost twice as likely to be discouraged borrowers relative to male counterparts (Freel, 2012). Serial entrepreneurs are also much more likely to be discouraged borrowers (Freel et al, 2012) as well as borrowers with a high credit risk (Han et al, 2009).

Table 2: Characteristics and Impact of Discouragement

<i>Entrepreneurial Characteristics</i>	<i>Firm-Level Characteristics</i>	<i>Potential Impacts</i>
Older	Young	Underinvestment
Female	Small	Reduced growth
Ethnic minorities	Knowledge-intensive/service-sector	Lower employment
Low levels of human capital	Non-family-owned firms	Reduced innovation
Serial Entrepreneurs	Fewer sources of banking relationships	Take-up of costlier or unsuitable sources of finance
Poor credit history	Trust-based banking relationship	Increased reliance on equity rather than debt sources of finance

Source: Brown et al (2018)

Firm characteristics also affect borrower discouragement (see Table 2). Larger and more mature SMEs are less likely to be discouraged borrowers (Freel et al, 2012; Chakravarty and Xiang 2013; Cowling et al, 2016; Mac an Bhaird et al, 2016; Rostamkalaei, 2017). These aforementioned findings hold irrespective of geographic location and methods utilised (Chakravarty and Xiang 2013; Mac an Bhaird et al, 2016). In other words, in line with theoretical expectations, the smallest most informationally opaque firms encounter higher levels of borrower discouragement (Berger and Udell, 1998). Other evidence suggests that discouraged borrowers have fewer sources of finance (Freel et al, 2012; Cole and Sokolyk, 2016; Cowling et al, 2016). A recent study in China finds that borrowers with high levels of trust in their banks are less likely to be discouraged borrowers (Tang et al, 2017).

Borrower discouragement and reduced access to capital is likely to have implications for the future growth and investment intentions of SMEs. In terms of the longer-term impact of borrower discouragement, recent evidence by Ferrando and Mulier (2017) suggests that in the two-years following their decision to not seek finance, investment growth is on average 4.7% lower for discouraged borrowers relative to their non-discouraged counterparts. Another recent study finds that growth-oriented firms are the most affected by borrower discouragement (Brown et al, 2018). Recent estimates suggest that a lack of funding for discouraged borrowers could result in sub-optimal levels of investment within the UK economy of the order £1.5 billion (Cowling et al, 2016).

Evidence gaps

Given it could affect as many as half a million UK SMEs, borrower discouragement is a growing area of interest to policy makers. To date definitional differences and different measurement techniques have made it difficult to compare borrower discouragement across different geographic locations and over time. The broader and disaggregated definitions of borrower discouragement used in recent studies provide a useful basis for future comparisons and analyses.

Prior evidence suggests, firm size and age are significant determinants of borrower discouragement. However, there remains a paucity of evidence regarding other possible firm-level determinants of borrower discouragement, including industry sector, geographic location and business orientation (growth orientation, internationalisation, innovativeness). Evidence regarding the impact of borrower discouragement on real economic outcomes remains scant. However, given the differential impact of borrower discouragement on growth-oriented SMEs noted above, estimates of the potential impact on SMEs may under-estimate the consequences of borrower discouragement on real economic outcomes.

Endnotes

[1]. Under a much narrower definition the levels of borrower discouragement reported in the SME Finance Monitor are as low as 1% of all SMEs (BVA-BVRC, 2018).

Sources

- Berger, A. N., & Udell, G. F. (1998). The economics of small business finance: The roles of private equity and debt markets in the financial growth cycle. *Journal of banking & finance*, 22(6-8), 613-673.
- Brown, R., Linares Zegarra, J. M. & Wilson, J. O. S (2018b) An Empirical Examination of Discouraged Borrowers in the UK, ERC Research Paper 69. <https://www.enterpriseresearch.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/ERC-ResPap69-BrownLinares-ZegarraWilson.pdf>
- BVA-BDRC (2018) SME Finance Monitor 2018, [www.bva-bdrc.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/BDRC SME Finance Monitor Q2 2018 Final.pdf](http://www.bva-bdrc.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/BDRC_SME_Finance_Monitor_Q2_2018_Final.pdf)
- Chakravarty, S., & Xiang, M. (2013). The international evidence on discouraged small businesses. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 20, 63-82.
- Cole, R., & Sokolyk, T. (2016). Who needs credit and who gets credit? Evidence from the surveys of small business finances. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 24, 40-60.
- Cowling, M., Liu, W., Minniti, M., & Zhang, N. (2016). UK credit and discouragement during the GFC. *Small Business Economics*, 47(4), 1049-1074.
- Ferrando, A., & Mulier, K. (2017). The Real Effects of Credit Constraints: Evidence from Discouraged Borrowers. Available at:

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2518980

- Fraser, S. (2009). Is there ethnic discrimination in the UK market for small business credit?. *International Small Business Journal*, 27(5), 583-607.
- Freel, M., Carter, S., Tagg, S., & Mason, C. (2012). The latent demand for bank debt: characterizing "discouraged borrowers". *Small Business Economics*, 38(4), 399-418
- Gama, A. P. M., Duarte, F. D., & Esperança, J. P. (2017). Why discouraged borrowers exist? An empirical (re) examination from less developed countries. *Emerging Markets Review*, 33, 19-41.
- Kon, Y., & Storey, D. J. (2003). A theory of discouraged borrowers. *Small Business Economics*, 21(1), 37-49.
- Levenson, A. R., & Willard, K. L. (2000). Do firms get the financing they want? Measuring credit rationing experienced by small businesses in the US. *Small Business Economics*, 14(2), 83-94.
- Mac an Bhaird, C., Vidal, J. S., & Lucey, B. (2016). Discouraged borrowers: Evidence for Eurozone SMEs. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 44, 46-55.
- Moro, A., Wisniewski, T. P., & Mantovani, G. M. (2017). Does a manager's gender matter when accessing credit? Evidence from European data. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 80, 119-134.
- Neville F., Forrester, J., O'Toole, J., Riding, A. (2017) Why even bother trying? Examining Discouragement Among Racial-Minority Entrepreneurs, *Journal of Management Studies*, DOI: 10.1111/joms.12319
- Rostamkalaei, A. (2017). Discouraged borrowers aftermath of financial crisis: a UK study. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 24(2), 394-410.
- Tang, Y., Deng, C., & Moro, A. (2017). Firm-bank trusting relationship and discouraged borrowers. *Review of Managerial Science*, 11 519-541.

About the authors



Dr Ross Brown is a Reader in Entrepreneurship & Small Business Finance in the School of Management, University of St Andrews. He is also a member of the Centre for Responsible Banking and Finance at the University of St Andrews. His main research interests lie in the areas of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial ecosystems, funding issues for small businesses, innovation policy and regional development. He can be contacted at: Ross.Brown@st-andrews.ac.uk



Jose Liñares-Zegarra is Senior Lecturer in Finance at Essex Business School. He holds a PhD from the University of Granada (Spain). Jose is also a Honorary Senior Lecturer at University of St Andrews and a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy (FHEA). Previously, he has held visiting teaching/research positions at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, University of St Andrews, University of Alicante, University of Illinois, Florida State University and the Institute of European Finance (Bangor University, UK). He can be contacted at: jmlina@essex.ac.uk



John Wilson is Professor of Banking & Finance and the Director of Research at the School of Management, University of St Andrews. He is also Director of the Centre for Responsible Banking & Finance. He can be contacted at: jsw7@st-andrews.ac.uk



University of St Andrews

Other SOTA Reviews are available on the ERC web site www.enterpriseresearch.ac.uk. The views expressed in this review represent those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the ERC or its funders.

