

Credit market failure intervention: Do government sponsored small business credit programs enrich poorer areas?

Ben R. Craig · William E. Jackson III ·
James B. Thomson

Received: 13 January 2006 / Accepted: 31 January 2007 / Published online: 26 May 2007
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2007

Abstract Using local market employment rates as our measure of economic performance, we find a positive and significant correlation between the average annual level of employment in a local market and the level of SBA guaranteed lending in that local market. Furthermore, the intensity of this correlation is much larger in low-income markets. Indeed, our results suggest that this correlation is positive and significant *only in low-income markets*. This result has important implications for public policy in general and SBA guaranteed lending in particular.

Keywords Low-income areas · Employment rates · Small business · Credit markets · Loan guarantees · Credit rationing

JEL codes G38 · H81 · O16 · L26

1 Introduction

It is a well documented finding in the economics literature that economic growth and financial market

development tend to be positively correlated. However, whether relatively higher levels of financial development actually cause higher levels of economic performance, or higher levels of economic performance cause higher levels of financial development, is an issue of debate that dates at least to the studies of Schumpeter (1911) and Robinson (1952).

Three important recent studies provide evidence that relatively higher levels of financial market development do indeed tend to lead to higher levels of one measure of economic performance. That is, higher rates of economic growth. Jayaratne and Strahan (1996), Rajan and Zingales (1998), and Guiso, Sapienza, & Zingales (2004), all report significant evidence supporting the proposition that the causal relationship runs from more financial market development to more economic growth. All of these papers are very careful to develop reasonable structural instruments to proxy for the relative amount of local financial market development.

In this paper, we investigate whether local financial market development helps to promote economic performance by focusing on a particular rationale for such a relationship. That rationale is financial market development may increase the amount of external finance available to small firms. Specifically, we examine whether a government intervention aimed at increasing small firms' access to bank credit has a relatively

B. R. Craig · J. B. Thomson
Research Department, Federal Reserve Bank of
Cleveland, PO Box 6387 Cleveland, OH 44101-1387,
USA

W. E. Jackson III (✉)
Culverhouse College of Commerce, The University of
Alabama, Box 870225, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0225, USA
e-mail: wjackson@cba.ua.edu

greater impact in low-income areas. We exploit the fact that there is a strong positive correlation between low-income markets and markets with relatively low levels of financial development. And, we use SBA loan guarantees as our government intervention method. We choose the small firm credit market because of the high degree of information asymmetry that may be associated with it. And, because this information asymmetry may lead to a credit rationing problem as explained in Stiglitz and Weiss (1981).

We focus on the SBA guaranteed lending program because our previous research (Craig, Jackson, & Thomson, 2007) suggests that SBA guaranteed lending has a small positive influence on the rate of economic growth in local geographic markets. Our previous research used MSAs and non-MSA counties to represent local geographic financial markets. However, in Craig, Jackson, and Thomson (2007) we did not investigate whether a positive relationship between SBA guaranteed lending and other measures of economic performance existed. Nor did we investigate whether these relationships were different for low-income markets. Hence, we look to extend our previous work by using the level of labor market employment, or the employment rate, as our measure of economic performance. And, we test whether SBA guaranteed lending has a differential impact for low-income markets.

In this paper, our null hypothesis is that SBA guaranteed lending does not impact low-income markets differently than higher income markets. And, our primary alternative hypothesis is that SBA guaranteed lending has a greater impact on the employment rate in low-income markets. This alternative hypothesis is predicated on priors related to four overlapping assumptions. These four assumptions are: (1) income levels proxy for relative development of the local financial market, (2) less developed financial markets are more likely to experience severe information asymmetry problems, and as Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) point out, that could lead to credit rationing, (3) SBA guaranteed lending is likely to reduce these credit rationing problems—thus, improving the level of development of that local financial market, and (4) increased financial development helps to lubricate the wheels of economic performance and increase the effective level of labor

utilization, or the employment rate (Rajan & Zingales, 1998).

Our results suggest that low-income markets are positively impacted by SBA guaranteed lending. Moreover, the impact for low-income markets is significantly larger than it is for higher income markets. This result has important implications for public policy in general and SBA guaranteed lending in particular.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide some background on small business credit markets and economic performance. In Section 3 we provide a brief review of the academic literature on credit rationing. This literature is consistent with the hypothesis that information problems in lending markets are particularly severe in the small firm credit market and hence provides a rationale for SBA loan guarantees. A brief overview of SBA lending programs is presented in Section 4. Section 5 outlines the data, our hypotheses and empirical strategy. The results appear in Section 6. Finally, our conclusions and future research questions are outlined in Section 7.

2 Background on small business credit markets and economic growth

A particular area of concern for policymakers is whether small businesses have access to adequate credit. After all, a lot of small firms are relatively young and have little or no credit history. Lenders may also be reluctant to fund small firms with new and innovative products because of the difficulty associated with evaluating the risk of such products. These difficulties are classic *information* problems—problems obtaining sufficient information about the parties involved in a transaction—and they may prevent otherwise creditworthy firms from obtaining credit. If information problems are substantial, they can lead to credit rationing, that is, loans are allocated by some mechanism other than price. If small businesses face credit rationing, the next Google, Microsoft, or Starbucks might wither on the vine for want of funding. To the extent that credit rationing significantly affects small business credit markets,

a rationale exists for supporting small enterprises through government programs aimed at improving small business access to credit.

One specific government intervention aimed at improving the private market's allocation of credit to small enterprises is the Small Business Administration (SBA) guaranteed lending program. SBA loan guarantees are well established, and their volume has grown over the past decade. Nearly 20 million small businesses have received direct or indirect help from one or another of the SBA's programs since 1953. The SBA's business loan portfolio of roughly 240,000 loans was worth about \$60 billion in 2004, making it the largest single financial backer of small businesses in the United States. To place this amount in perspective, consider that in June 2004 commercial banks reported a total of about \$522 billion dollars of small business loans outstanding (SBA, 2005).¹

While not directly comparable because SBA guaranteed loan numbers include loans by nonbank lenders and include loans above the \$1 million loan maximum reported by banks annually on the June call report, it is clear that the SBA is an important player in the small business lending market. After all, SBA guaranteed loans could reasonably account for as much as 10% of total commercial bank small business loans outstanding. And, commercial banks provide the majority of small business credit supplied in the USA.

For example, Bitler, Robb, and Wolken (2001) report that commercial bank lending is important to small-businesses as it represents about one-third of total debt capital for these firms. Using the 1998 Survey of Small Business Finances, they report that fifty-five percent of small firms (firms with 500 or fewer employees) in the Survey report some amount of outstanding loans, capital leases or lines of credit. And, ninety-two percent of the largest small firms (those with 100–500 employees) reported having outstanding loans, capital leases, or lines of credit. Additionally, of all firms reporting, about 89 percent received at least one financial service (checking account, loan, cash management service, etc.) from a commercial bank.

The rationale for SBA guarantees appears to be that credit market imperfections can result in small enterprises being credit rationed—particularly for longer-term loans for purposes such as capital expansion (Colombo & Grilli, 2006). If SBA loan guarantees indeed reduce credit rationing in the markets for small business loans, then there should be a relationship between measures of SBA guaranteed lending activities and economic performance (Acs & Szerb, 2006). And, this is what we found in Craig, Jackson, and Thomson (2007). In particular, we found a positive (although small) and significant relationship between the level of SBA lending in a local market and future per capita income growth in that market. Overall, our empirical results were consistent with a positive impact on social welfare of SBA guaranteed lending. Craig, Jackson, and Thomson (2007) focused primarily on the impact of credit markets on economic growth. They did not need to include several variables from the economic development literature in their analysis. Because of our focus on low-income areas in this paper, we believe the inclusion of several of these variables is appropriate. In general, we include variables that have been demonstrated to effect local market employment rates. From an economic development standpoint, the variables we use fall into one of three categories. They are either based on community (1) resources, (2) market, or (3) institutions.

We recognize that the private and public resources available to a community or local area will have a profound impact on its employment level (Acs & Szerb, 2006). This is also true for the depth and organizational structure of its capital, labor, and other markets (Kim, Aldrich, & Keister, 2006). Additionally, the operations of its institutions (e.g., local government) will impact educational attainment, public service levels, the overall quality of life, and the areas' ability to attract and retain high quality employers. Of course, all of these variables suggest that high-income areas may be at a distinct advantage for maintaining a higher level of employment. We consider the extent of these advantages in this study. In particular, in this study we use a simplified version of the analysis in Craig, Jackson, and Thomson (2007) to evaluate a potential determinant of economic performance in

¹ These numbers do not include credit card balances outstanding at small firms.

low-income communities. Specifically, we test whether SBA guaranteed lending to small firms has a relatively greater impact on the average level of labor employment in low-income local markets. We find that it does.

In the next section, we provide a brief discussion of the economics of small firm credit markets. This discussion focuses on a highly select group of theoretical and empirical articles that help explain the severe credit allocation problems caused by imperfect information in small firm credit markets. These articles also provide insight into the mechanism that allow a government intervention, such as the SBA guaranteed lending program, to result in higher economic performance in low-income markets.

3 The economics of small firm credit markets

The economic justification for any government-sponsored small business lending program or loan guarantee program must rest on a generally acknowledged failure of the private sector to allocate loans efficiently. Absent such a clearly identified problem with private sector lending to small businesses, the SBA's activities would simply seem a wasteful, politically motivated subsidy to this sector of the economy.

Many economists, most notably Stiglitz and Weiss (1981), contend that private lending institutions may indeed fail to allocate loans efficiently because of fundamental information problems in the market for small business loans. These information problems may be so severe that they lead to credit rationing and constitute the failure of the credit market. Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) argue that banks consider both the interest rate they receive on the loan and the riskiness of the loan when deciding to make a loan. But the lack of perfect information in loan markets may cause two effects that allow the interest rate itself to affect the riskiness of the bank's loan portfolio. When the price (here, the interest rate) affects the nature of the transaction, it is unlikely that a price will emerge that suits either the available buyers or sellers (that is, no price will "clear the market"). The first effect, adverse selection,

impedes the ability of markets to allocated credit using price by increasing the proportion of high risk borrowers in the set of likely borrowers. The second effect, moral hazard, reduces the ability of prices to clear lending markets because it influences the ex post actions of borrowers.

The adverse selection effect is a consequence of different borrowers having different probabilities of repaying their loans. The expected return to the bank on a loan obviously depends on the probability of repayment, so the bank would like to be able to identify borrowers who are more likely to repay. But it is difficult to identify such borrowers. Typically, the bank will use a variety of screening devices to do so. The interest rate that a borrower is willing to pay may act as one such screening device. For example, those who are willing to pay a higher interest rate are likely to be, on average, worse risks. These borrowers are willing to borrow at a higher interest rate because they perceive their probability of repaying the loan to be lower. So, as the interest rate rises, the average "riskiness" of those who are willing to borrow increases, and this may actually result in lowering the bank's expected profits from lending.

Similarly, as the interest rate and other terms of the contract change, the behavior of the borrower is likely to also change. For instance, raising the interest rate decreases the profitability of projects which succeed. Higher interest rates may thus induce firms to undertake riskier projects—projects with lower probabilities of success but higher payoffs when successful. In other words, the price a firm pays for credit may affect its investment decisions. This is the moral hazard problem.

As a result of these two effects, a bank's expected return may increase less for an additional increase in the interest rate; and, beyond a certain point may actually decrease as the interest rate is increased. Clearly, under these conditions, it is conceivable that the demand for credit may exceed the supply of credit in equilibrium. Although traditional analysis would argue that in the presence of an excess demand for credit, unsatisfied borrowers would offer to pay a higher interest rate to the bank, bidding up the interest rate until demand equals supply, it does not

happen in this case. This is because the bank would not lend to someone who offered to pay the higher interest rate, as such a borrower is likely to be a worse risk than the average current borrower. The expected return on a loan to this borrower at the higher interest rate may be actually lower than the expected return on the loans the bank is currently making. Hence, there are no competitive forces leading supply to equal demand, and credit is rationed.

Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) argue that when borrowers are distinguishable, the lender may decide to deny credit to an entire group. This is their classic redlining argument. We expect the likelihood of this type of credit rationing to be higher in low-income communities. Furthermore, because the value of collecting information on borrowers may be less in low-income markets [because of expectations of less aggregate per capita lending], the levels of imperfect information may be higher, in equilibrium, in low-income markets.

4 Small Business Administration loan guarantee programs

SBA loan guarantees may improve credit allocation by providing a mechanism for pricing loans that is independent of borrower behavior. By reducing the expected loss associated with a loan default, the guarantee increases the expected return to the lender—without increasing the lending rate. In the absence of adverse selection, lenders could simply offer loan rates to borrowers that reflected the average risk of the pool of borrowers.²

With the guarantee in place, the lender could profitably extend credit at loan rates below what would be dictated by the risk of the average borrower. The reason for this is that the guarantee increases the profitability of the loan by reducing the

losses to the bank in those instances when the borrower defaults. To the extent that the loan guarantees reduce the rate of interest at which banks are willing to lend, external loan guarantees will help mitigate the moral hazard problem. This is because the lower lending rates afforded by external guarantees reduce the bankruptcy threshold and thereby increase the expected return of safe projects vis-à-vis riskier ones. Additionally, lowering the lending rate increases the number of low risk borrowers applying for credit which, in turn, increases the likelihood that the average risk of firms applying for loans is representative of the pool of borrowers. Hence, external loan guarantees also help mitigate the adverse selection problem. Thus, in theory, SBA loan guarantees should reduce the probability that a viable small business is credit rationed.

A number of authors [for instance, Kane and Malkiel (1965), Petersen and Rajan (1994) and Petersen (1999)] have suggested that lending relationships are a market-based solution to credit rationing. However, because relationships may be more costly for small businesses to establish relative to large businesses, and because lack of relationships may lead to severe credit rationing in the small business credit market, some form of government intervention to assist small businesses in establishing relationships with lenders may be appropriate. However, the nature of intervention must be carefully evaluated. SBA's guaranteed lending programs may well be a reasonable intervention as they serve as a substitute for small business collateral. The program also reduces the risk to the lender of establishing a relationship with informationally opaque small business borrowers. Finally, the SBA loan guarantee programs may improve the intermediation process by lowering the risk to the lender of extending longer-term loans, ones that more closely meet the needs of small businesses for capital investment. It is interesting to note that the problem of long-term credit for small businesses was one of the primary reasons stated by Congress for establishing the SBA.

The Small Business Administration was born on July 30, 1953. The SBA received most of its powers from two agencies that were dissolved at its birth. These agencies were the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) and the Small Defense

² This is because each loan made would reflect a random draw from the pool of borrowers. If the bank made a large number of small loans to borrowers in the pool then the bank's loan portfolio would have the same risk and return characteristics of the pool of borrowers.

Plants Agency (SDPA).³ The SBA received the authority to make direct loans and guarantee bank loans to small businesses from the RFC. It was also assigned the RFC's role of making loans to victims of natural disasters. As was the function of the SDPA, the SBA received the authority to help small businesses procure government contracts, and to help small business owners by providing managerial, technical, and businesses training assistance.

Recognizing that private financial institutions are typically better than government agencies at deciding on which small business loans to underwrite, the SBA began moving away from making direct loans and toward guaranteeing private loans in the mid-1980s. Currently, the SBA makes direct loans only under very special circumstances. Guaranteed lending through the SBA's 7(a) guaranteed loan program and the 504-loan program are the main form of SBA activity in lending markets (Cowling & Mitchell, 2003).

The more basic and more significant of these two programs is the 7(a) loan program. The name of the program is in reference to Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act. This is the section of the Act that authorizes the agency to provide business loans to small businesses. All 7(a) loans are provided by commercial lenders. A very large percentage of American commercial banks participate in the 7(a) program, as do a number of finance companies, credit card banks, and other nonbank lenders.

It is important to note that 7(a) loans are made available only on a guaranty basis. This means that they are provided by lenders who choose to structure their own loans in accordance with SBA's underwriting requirements and then apply for and receive a guaranty from the SBA on a portion of the loan. The SBA does not fully guaranty 7(a) loans. The SBA guaranty is usually in the range of 50 to 85 percent of the loan amount. The maximum 7(a) loan is \$2,000,000 and the maximum guaranty on that loan is \$1,500,000 (SBA, 2006). For the maximum loan

the SBA will guarantee no more than 75 percent of the loan amount. Because of this, the lender and the SBA share the risk that a borrower will not repay the loan in full.⁴

The 504-loan program is a long-term financing tool for economic development within a community. The 504-program provides growing businesses with long-term, fixed-rate financing for major fixed assets, such as land or buildings, through a certified development company (CDC). A CDC is a nonprofit corporation set up to contribute to the economic development of its community. CDCs work with the SBA and private-sector lenders to provide financing to small businesses. There are about 270 CDCs nationwide. Each CDC covers a specific geographic area (SBA, 2006).

Typically, a 504 project includes a loan from a private-sector lender covering up to 50 percent of the project cost, a loan from the CDC (backed by a 100 percent SBA-guaranteed debenture) covering up to 40 percent of the cost, and a contribution of at least 10 percent equity from the small business being helped. The SBA-backed loan from the CDC is usually subordinate to the private loan, which has the effect of insulating the private lender from loss in the event of default. (For more on the 504 or 7(a) programs see SBA, 2006)

5 The hypotheses, data, and empirical strategy

One method likely to reduce the costs of asymmetric information based credit rationing is to reduce the amount of asymmetric information in these credit markets [especially for firms in low-income areas]. One very practical method for doing this is to encourage lenders to make [profitable] loans that they would not otherwise make. And, in so doing the lender develops a "relationship" with the borrower. This relationship

³ The act that created the SBA is Public Law 163. For more on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation see Todd (1992).

⁴ Beginning in fiscal year 2005, the subsidy from the U.S. Government to help pay for the guaranty was eliminated. The fees charged to 7(a) borrowers and lenders [supposedly] cover the entire costs of the guaranty. The SBA estimates that that this new fee system will save U.S. Taxpayers over \$100 million annually.

allows for the collection of borrower-specific information at a relatively low cost through basic monitoring of the loan. This reduces future levels of asymmetric information and reduces credit rationing by fostering a relationship between the low-income area small business and the lending entity.

We choose to study the impact of SBA guaranteed lending programs because this is where the empirical evidence is likely to be strongest concerning the impact of government intervention in small business credit markets. This conclusion is based on three observations. First, SBA loan guarantees are more likely to resolve the agency problems that give rise to credit rationing in these markets than most other approaches, like that of the Federal Home Loan Banks. Second, SBA guaranteed lending programs encompass all types of small business lenders, from community banks and thrifts to bigger banks. And, third, the SBA guaranteed lending programs are relatively large and have operated for a long time—more than a half a century.

We take as our maintained hypothesis that credit market frictions—primarily in the form of costly information and verification of a small firm's projects—can lead to a socially suboptimal credit allocation that negatively impacts the labor employment rate in the local market. [The implicit assumption here is that labor and capital are complements...at least for small firms.] To the extent that SBA guaranteed lending programs mitigate credit market frictions, there should be a positive relationship between SBA guaranteed lending and the level of employment, especially across less developed [low-income] financial markets. Therefore, we test for whether SBA loan guarantees lessen credit market frictions by testing whether a measure of the normalized amount of SBA guaranteed lending in a local market is correlated with relatively higher levels of employment in low-income areas. Our null hypothesis is that there are no discernible differences in the impact of SBA guaranteed lending on employment rates in low-income markets relative to higher income markets.

5.1 Data

To examine this SBA guaranteed lending and employment rates in low-income areas hypothesis, we utilize data from three sources. Our first source is loan-specific data—including borrower and lender information—on all SBA-guaranteed 7(a) and 504 loans from 2 January 1991 through 31 December 2001. A breakdown of loan size, total credit and number of loans under each guarantee program is displayed in Tables 4 through 6 of the appendix. Note that we have over 360,000 loans in our sample. Our loan information is based on the local market of the borrower, not the lender.

Our second source of data, on economic conditions, is from the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) from 1991 through 2001. Our third source is data from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's annual summary of deposit data (SUMD) files.

All of our individual loan data are aggregated to the local market level. For this study, we also aggregate over time to produce cross-sectional observations for our local markets. As in studies by Berger and Hannon (1989), Calem and Carlino (1991), Jackson (1992a, b), Shaffer (1994, 2004), and Berger (1995), we use Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) to define the relevant local market for urban areas and non-MSA counties as the local market for rural areas.

5.2 Empirical strategy

To test our null hypothesis we simplify the analysis of Craig, Jackson, and Thomson (2007). These authors estimate their models using classic Arellano and Bond panel regression estimation techniques. In this study, we estimate a simple cross-sectional OLS fixed effects regression model that incorporates measures of employment levels over our sample period. Our basic model is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EMPR}_i = & \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{SBAPOP}_i + \alpha_2 \text{LOW}_i \\ & + \alpha_3 \text{SBALOW}_i \\ & + \beta [\text{Conditioning Set}]_i + \varepsilon_i \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Equation (1) uses EMPR to proxy for local market economic performance. EMPR is the average annual employment percentage rate over our sample period [1991 to 2001] in the local market. Each annual employment rate is calculated as one minus the annual unemployment rate. The annual unemployment rates are taken from the website for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

We are interested in how SBA guaranteed lending effects cross-sectional changes in EMPR. The primary variables of interest on the right side of Eq. (1) are SBAPOP, LOW, and SBALOW. SBAPOP is the average annual per capita dollar amount of SBA guaranteed loan originations in the local market. Before averaging, each of these annual per capita dollar amounts of SBA guaranteed loans was inflation adjusted to 1990 dollars using the consumer price index. The information about these loans was provided by the Small Business Administration. The dummy variable LOW is equal to one, zero otherwise, if the local market average annual per capita income level is less than the median average annual level for our sample. These annual per capita income levels were inflation adjusted to 1990 dollars using the consumer price index. Local market per capita income data was collected from the website of the U.S. Census Bureau. SBALOW is an interaction variable equal to the dummy variable (LOW) times local market average annual per capita SBA guaranteed lending (SBAPOP).

SBALOW is our main variable of interest. A positive and significant coefficient on SBALOW would imply that the impact of SBAPOP is larger in areas with lower levels of average annual per capita income. Or, stated differently, SBA guaranteed lending has a larger positive impact in low-income areas.

5.3 Conditioning set of variables

Following Levine (1997) and Shaffer (2006), we add a set of control, or conditioning, variables to Eq. (1)

that have been shown to be significant in previous economic growth or economic development studies. These variables include PICAP, DEPPOP, HERF, MSADUM, EDUCAT, GOVT, RETAIL, and OFFICE. Definitions and data sources for these variables are as follows.

PICAP is the average annual per capita income level in the local market over our sample period. It is measured in thousands of dollars per capita. Before averaging, each annual per capita income level was inflation adjusted to 1990 dollars using the consumer price index. Local market per capita income data was collected from the website of the U.S. Census Bureau.

DEPPOP is the average of the annual per capita bank deposits in the local market over the sample period. It is measured in thousands of dollars per capita. Before averaging, each of these annual per capita bank deposit amounts was inflation adjusted to 1990 dollars using the consumer price index. We use DEPPOP as a proxy for the total credit provided in the local market over our sample period. We do this for two reasons. First, we cannot construct direct measures of bank lending at the local market level. Market-level deposit data are available, however, from the FDIC's Summary of Deposit (SUMD) database. And, total deposits should be highly correlated with lending. Additionally, using total local market deposits as an instrument for approximating cross-sectional differences in the level of total market lending is consistent with previous research such as Peterson and Rajan (1995). Second, King and Levine (1993a) suggest that the local market deposit base is one of several reasonable measures of market liquidity and financial development.

HERF is the average sum of squares of the deposit shares of the commercial banks in the local market over our sample period. HERF is intended to be a measure of the competitiveness of the local banking market. However, it is often difficult to interpret. We calculate HERF using the FDIC's Summary of Deposit (SUMD) database. It is calculated on an annual basis using yearend data. These annual calculations are then averaged over the 1991–2001 time period to get the local market HERF for our study.

MSADUM is an indicator variable equal to one [zero otherwise] if the local market is a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). If the local market is not an MSA, it is typically a non-MSA county. We use this indicator variable to distinguish between urban and rural areas. Dummy variables of this sort have been shown to be significant in previous studies (Craig, Jackson, and Thomson, 2005, 2007). Data for this variable was collected from the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

EDUCAT is the percentage of local population over the age of 25 with at least four years of college as of yearend 1990. It was collected from the website of the U.S. Census Bureau. It is our measure of human capital differences across local markets.

GOVT is a measure of local government expenditures (in thousands of dollars) per capital (1991–1992). This is similar to the measure used by Shaffer (2006). It was collected from the website of the U.S. Census Bureau.

RETAIL is the percentage share of employment in retail (as opposed to manufacturing, or services) as of yearend 1990 in the local market. This data was also collected from the website of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Lastly, OFFICE is the average number of commercial bank offices in the local market over the sample period. It is calculated from the FDIC's Summary of Deposit database using yearend counts of the number of offices and averaging those counts over the 1991 to 2001 period.

6 Empirical results

Before discussing our results, we briefly summarize the conditions of the bank credit market for small firms over our sample period (1991–2001). Data from the Federal Reserve Board's Senior Loan Officer Surveys (Surveys) suggest three major trends over this period. First, the demand for bank commercial and industrial (C&I) loans by small firms rose moderately during the first third of the period, remained strong and steady during the second third, and declined sharply during the last third. Second, the Surveys report a steady easing of underwriting standards during the first two-thirds of the period and a reversal or

tightening of standards during the final third of the period. Lastly, the Surveys indicate that spreads on loans to small firms increased slightly during the first third, declined rapidly during the second third, and increased sharply during the final third of the period. Nonetheless, there are no indications from the Surveys that the C&I bank loan market caused a severe constraint on the credit available to small firms over our study period. Indeed, the evidence supports the notion of a well functioning small firm credit market.

Equation (1) is estimated using an OLS fixed effects methodology. Descriptive statistics for the variables used in the regression can be found in Table 1, and a correlation coefficients matrix in Table 2. Our regression estimation results are presented in Table 3. Notice from Table 1 that our primary variables of interest display large dispersions. EMPR, our employment rate percentage, ranges from 98.67 percent to a low of 68.06 percent, with a mean of 93.67 percent.

Per capita SBA guaranteed lending (SBAPOP) ranges from a high of \$416.39 per capita to a low of \$0.00 per capita, with a mean of \$28.33 per capita over our sample period. Our measure of local market deposits per capita (DEPPOP), displays a very wide range also. The high for DEPPOP is \$10,201,000 deposits per capita, while the low is only \$70 worth of deposits per capita, and the mean is \$135,200 per capita. A similar story can be told for our measure of per capita income. Our per capita income variable (PICAP) has a mean of \$15,560 with a high of \$36,770 and a low of \$6,640 and a standard deviation of \$3,080.

In Table 2 we present a correlation matrix for our main variables. There are several correlation coefficients in Table 2 worth mentioning. For example, notice that the local market employment rate (EMPR) is significantly positively correlated with SBA guaranteed lending per capita (SBAPOP), per capita deposits (DEPPOP), local market per capital income (PICAP), the percentage of local population over the age of 25 with at least four years of college as of yearend 1990 (EDUCAT), local government expenditures per capital (GOVT), and the percentage share of employment in retail (RETAIL) in the local market. And, several of these correlation coefficients are rather large.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics ($N = 2358$)

Variable	Mean	Min	Max	Std Dev
EMPR	93.67	68.06	98.67	3.00
SBAPOP	28.33	0.00	416.39	29.48
LOW	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.50
SBALOW	11.59	0.00	287.26	21.95
DEPPOP	135.20	0.07	10, 201.00	447.72
PICAP	15.562	6.637	36.772	3.080
MSADUM	0.13	0.00	1.00	0.34
HERF	0.32	0.06	1.00	0.06
EDUCAT	18.05	9.80	30.51	2.14
GOVT	3.65	0.26	7.67	0.49
RETAIL	15.96	9.80	24.77	1.74
OFFICE	32.68	1.00	426.50	35.42

EMPR is the average annual employment percentage rate over our sample period [1991 to 2001] in the local market. SBAPOP is the average annual amount of SBA guaranteed loan originations per capita in market i over our sample period. LOW is an indicator variable equal to one, zero otherwise, if the local market average annual per capita income level is less than the median average annual level for our sample. PICAP is the average annual per capita income level in the local market over our sample period. It is measured in thousands of dollars per capita. DEPPOP is the average over the sample period of the annual per capita bank deposits in the local market. It is measured in thousands of dollars per capita. MSADUM is an indicator variable equal to one [zero otherwise] if market i is a MSA (metropolitan statistical area). HERF is the average Herfindahl ratio, calibrated to be between zero and one, in market i over the sample period. EDUCAT is the percentage of local population over the age of 25 with at least four years of college as of yearend 1990. GOVT is a measure of local government expenditures (in thousands of dollars) per capital (1991–1992). RETAIL is the percentage share of employment in retail (as opposed to manufacturing, or services) as of yearend 1990 in the local market. OFFICE is the average number of commercial bank offices in the local market over the sample period. It is calculated from the FDIC's Summary of Deposit database using yearend counts of the number of offices and averaging those counts over the 1991 to 2001 period. All dollar amounts are in 1990 dollars

These correlation coefficients for our independent variables suggest that multicollinearity may be a concern for the relationships between several of our variables. These concerns about multicollinearity were evaluated using a variance-inflation-factor (VIF) method.

In Table 3 we present the main results for our study. These results are estimated using an OLS fixed effects methodology. The fixed effects class variable is the state in which the local market is located. Focusing on individual states as our fixed effect allows us to control for variations in state specific factors associated with systematic influences on employment levels within the same state. Examples of these state specific factors are human capital endowments unrelated to measures of educational attainment, technological endowments and advancement, and state level public policies designed to influence employment rates.

Notice from Table 3, model 1, that the coefficient (0.007) on SBAPOP is positive and significant at the

one percent level. However, in model 2 of Table 3, where our conditioning variables are added, the coefficient for SBAPOP is much smaller (0.001) and statistically insignificant. A very different story is observed for the variables LOW and SBALOW.

The coefficient on LOW is negative, economically large, and significant at the one percent level in both model one (−2.53) and two (−1.28). This strongly suggests that low-income areas tend to exhibit lower employment levels. This is what was expected.

Our main result for this study is associated with the coefficient on SBALOW. The coefficient on SBALOW is positive and statistically significant in both models. It is a positive 0.01 in model one and in model two. The results for SBAPOP and SBALOW taken together suggest that the impact of SBA guaranteed lending has a positive and significant impact on employment in low-income areas but not in areas where the per capita income is above the median per capita income level for our

Table 2 Pearson correlation coefficients matrix select variables ($N = 2358$)

	EMPR	SBAPOP	LOW	SBALOW	DEPPPOP	PICAP	EDUCAT	GOVT	RETAIL
EMPR	1.00 (0.00)								
SBAPOP	0.18 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)							
LOW	-0.40 (0.00)	-0.18 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)						
SBALOW	-0.12 (0.00)	0.44 (0.00)	0.53 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)					
DEPPPOP	0.16 (0.00)	0.10 (0.00)	0.02 (0.25)	0.08 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)				
PICAP	0.44 (0.00)	0.20 (0.00)	-0.72 (0.00)	-0.35 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.63)	1.00 (0.00)			
EDUCAT	0.20 (0.00)	0.01 (0.51)	-0.20 (0.00)	-0.12 (0.00)	0.06 (0.00)	0.24 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)		
GOVT	0.17 (0.00)	0.01 (0.61)	-0.01 (0.59)	-0.00 (0.95)	0.10 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.67)	0.21 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	
RETAIL	0.14 (0.00)	0.04 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.12)	-0.01 (0.71)	0.01 (0.55)	0.02 (0.31)	0.04 (0.05)	0.03 (0.17)	1.00 (0.00)

EMPR is the average annual employment percentage rate over our sample period [1991 to 2001] in the local market. SBAPOP is the average annual amount of SBA guaranteed loan originations per capita in market i over our sample period. LOW is an indicator variable equal to one, zero otherwise, if the local market average annual per capita income level is less than the median average annual level for our sample. PICAP is the average annual per capita income level in the local market over our sample period. It is measured in thousands of dollars per capita. DEPPPOP is the average over the sample period of the annual per capita bank deposits in the local market. It is measured in thousands of dollars per capita. EDUCAT is the percentage of local population over the age of 25 with at least four years of college as of yearend 1990. GOVT is a measure of local government expenditures (in thousands of dollars) per capital (1991–1992). RETAIL is the percentage share of employment in retail (as opposed to manufacturing, or services) as of yearend 1990 in the local market. All dollar amounts are in 1990 dollars. And, P -values are in parentheses

sample. These results have very significant public policy implications for how SBA guaranteed lending should be directed.

6.1 Conditioning variables

The coefficients on most of our conditioning (or control) variables are consistent with our expectations and with previous literature such as Shaffer (2006) and Levine (1997). For example, Levine (1997) and King and Levine (1993a, b) suggest that a variable similar to DEPPPOP may provide a measure of liquidity available within a market. And, that this measure may be positively related to economic performance. This is what we find as the coefficient (0.001) on DEPPPOP is positive and significant at the one percent level.

PICAP is our next conditioning variable. It has a large, positive and significant coefficient (0.32) in Table 3. This suggests that higher per capita

incomes are associated with higher rates of employment.

Our next conditioning variable is HERF. HERF exhibits a large, positive, and statistically significant coefficient in Table 3. Thus, the results from Table 3 suggest that local market deposit concentration (HERF) has a positive and significant impact on local market employment (EMPR). However, HERF is likely just a proxy for low-density rural markets. So, we do not accredit any competitive interpretation to this coefficient.

MSADUM is our next conditioning variable. The large, negative and significant coefficient on MSADUM in Table 3 suggests that on average over our sample period employment rates tended to be 0.80 percentage points less in metropolitan statistical areas (MSA) than in non-MSA counties. Or, stated differently, rural areas over our sample period (1991–2001) averaged almost one

Table 3 OLS Fixed Effects Regression Estimation of Eq. (1)

Variable	Model 1	Model 2
Intercept	94.62 (811.41)*	80.34 (87.40)*
SBAPOP	0.007 (2.80)*	0.001 (0.55)
LOW	-2.53 (-16.06)*	-1.28 (-7.10)*
SBALOW	0.01 (2.50)**	0.01 (3.17)*
DEPPOP	—	0.001 (6.65)*
PICAP	—	0.32 (12.30)*
MSADUM	—	-0.80 (-4.30)*
HERF	—	2.43 (2.86)*
EDUCAT	—	0.12 (4.20)*
GOVT	—	0.72 (6.38)*
RETAIL	—	0.20 (6.57)*
OFFICE	—	0.002 (1.30)
Adj— R^2	0.169	0.287
F-statistic	161.13*	87.31*

This table provides parameter estimates for Eq. (1): $EMPR_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 SBAPOP_i + \alpha_2 LOW_i + \alpha_3 SBALOW_i + \beta [Conditioning Set]_i + \varepsilon_i$. $EMPR$ is the average annual employment rate in percentage points over the sample period in local market i . $SBAPOP$ is the average annual amount of (new) SBA guaranteed lending in market i over our sample period. $SBALOW$ is equal to $SBAPOP$ times the dummy variable LOW . And, LOW is equal to one [zero otherwise] if the per capita income in the local market is less than the median per capita income across all markets in our sample. The conditioning variables include $DEPPOP$, $PICAP$, $MSADUM$, $HERF$, $EDUCAT$, $GOVT$, $RETAIL$, and $OFFICE$. $DEPPOP$ is the average over the sample period of the annual per capita bank deposits in the local market. It is measured in thousands of dollars per capita. $PICAP$ is the average annual per capita income level in the local market over our sample period. It is measured in thousands of dollars per capita. $MSADUM$ is an indicator variable equal to one [zero otherwise] if market i is a MSA (metropolitan statistical area). $HERF$ is the average Herfindahl ratio, calibrated to be between zero and one, in market i over the sample period. $EDUCAT$ is the percentage of local population over the age of 25 with at least four years of college as of yearend 1990. $GOVT$ is a measure of local government expenditures (in thousands of dollars) per capital (1991–1992). $RETAIL$ is the percentage share of employment in retail (as opposed to manufacturing, or services) as of yearend 1990 in the local market. $OFFICE$ is the average number of commercial bank offices in the local market over the sample period. It is calculated from the FDIC's Summary of Deposit database using yearend counts of the number of offices and averaging those counts over the 1991 to 2001 period. All dollar amounts are in 1990 dollars. T-statistics are in parentheses. “*” indicates significant at the 1% level. “**” indicates significant at the 5% level. “***” indicates significant at the 10% level

percent point higher employment rates than urban areas.

Our next four conditioning variables were selected to link our analysis more closely to the economic development and economic growth literatures (Shaffer, 2006). These variables include $EDUCAT$, $GOVT$, $RETAIL$, and $OFFICE$. Recall that $EDUCAT$ is the percentage of the population in the local market over the age of 25 who have completed at least four years of college. $GOVT$ is a measure of local government expenditures (in thousands of dollars) per capital (1991–1992). $RETAIL$ is the percentage share of employment in retail (as opposed to manufacturing, or services) as of yearend 1990 in the local market. And, $OFFICE$ is the average number of commercial bank offices in the local market over the sample period.

As might be expected, the coefficient (0.12) on $EDUCAT$ is large, positive, and statistically significant at the one percent level. This also true for the variable $GOVT$ and $RETAIL$. However, the coefficient on $OFFICE$ is insignificant.

Overall, these results lead to the rejection of our null hypothesis. Recall that our null hypothesis is that the impact of SBA guaranteed lending on employment rates in low-income markets is the same as it is in higher income markets.

Our results are also consistent with the notion that less developed financial markets benefit relatively more from governmental interventions in small firm credit markets. This relatively higher benefit is consistent with a credit rationing argument such as Stiglitz and Weiss (1981), where the intervention serves to ameliorate a market failure in the small firm

credit market. More specifically, the results also suggest that SBA guaranteed lending will have a larger positive impact on social welfare if it is targeted to certain lower income areas.

6.2 Robustness checks

Several robustness checks were performed for Eq. (1). In particular, we estimated Eq. (1) separately for MSAs and non-MSA counties and using disaggregated guaranteed lending variables for the 7(a) and 504 lending programs. Additionally, we estimated Eq. (1) using a stacked regression (OLS) approach with our panel data.

All of these robustness checks yielded results qualitatively consistent with those reported in Table 3. Additionally, because of the potential for multicollinearity in our regressors in Eq. (1), we conducted a variance-inflation-factor (VIF) analysis. Our VIF results suggest that multicollinearity was not a problem for the results reported in Table 3. We also tested the standard errors in our regressions for possible heteroskedasticity and found that this was not a significant problem.

Additionally, we addressed some concerns about endogeneity and causality for certain variables in our models. For example, higher local market employment rate levels may influence local market per capita income as well as vice versa. We addressed this issue in two ways. First, we removed the per capita income variable from our analysis. This did not materially change our results for our SBA guaranteed lending variable. Second, we used per capita income before the beginning of our sample period (e.g., 1990) in the analysis. This latter analysis suggested that local markets with higher per capita income at the beginning of the sample period experienced higher levels of employment over the sample period. This provides “some” evidence that higher per capita income levels may result in higher levels of employment. Next, we use the average SBA lending per capita variable for the 1991–1995 period and the employment levels variable from the 1996–2001 period. All other variables were calculated as before. The results from this lagged SBA variable exercise were qualitatively the same as our previous results. We also used a stacked regression analysis and lagged the SBA lending variable by one period (and two

periods). The results were again qualitatively the same.

7 Conclusions and extensions to our analysis

SBA guaranteed lending programs are one of many government sponsored market interventions aimed at promoting small business. The rationale for these guarantees is often based on the argument that credit market imperfections can result in small enterprises being credit rationed—particularly those in low-income areas. If SBA loan guarantees indeed reduce credit rationing in low-income markets for small business loans, then there should be a relationship between measures of SBA guaranteed lending activities and economic performance, and this relationship should be more evident in low-income markets.

We find evidence consistent with this proposition in this study. In particular, we find a positive and significant correlation between the average annual level of employment in a local market and the level of SBA guaranteed lending in that local market. And, the intensity of this correlation is relatively larger in low-income markets. Indeed, one interpretation of our results is that this correlation is positive and significant *only in low-income markets*.

However, all of our results should be interpreted with caution for at least two reasons. First, we are unable to control for small business lending at the local market level and hence, we do not know whether SBA loan guarantees are contributing to economic performance by helping to complete the market or are simply proxying for small business lending in the market. However, even if SBA guaranteed lending is indeed just an instrument (or proxy) for overall lending to the local market, we are still led to the strong possibility that at the margin, additional credit allocation to low-income areas has a relatively higher level of economic impact on employment.

Second, we are not able to test whether SBA loan guarantees materially increase the volume of small business lending in a market—a question that is related to who captures the subsidy associated with SBA loan guarantees. Both of

these questions relate to a larger question. That question is: What is the optimal level of SBA guaranteed lending in U.S. credit markets? Future research will seek to shed light on this larger question.

Acknowledgements We thank Zoltan Acz, David Audretsch, James Barth, Timothy Bates, Alicia Robb, Mark Stater, other participants at the Entrepreneurship in Low- and Moderate-Income Communities conference co-sponsored by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City and the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, and two anonymous referees for many helpful

comments. We offer a special thank you to Robert Strom who recommended and encouraged this research project. We also thank the Small Business Administration for providing us with the SBA loan-guarantee data and Pat Higgins for outstanding research support. And, financial support by the E. M. Kauffman Foundation is gratefully acknowledged by W.E. Jackson III.

Appendix

Appendix A Characteristics of Loans Issued under the SBA 7(a) and 504 Loan Guarantee Programs

Table 4 Average SBA loan \$

	Urban			Rural			Total
Year	504	7A	Total	504	7A	Total	Sample
1991	262,159	207,984	213,260	300,958	205,233	213,592	213,345
1992	302,788	244,221	249,582	316,912	232,181	238,305	246,923
1993	325,592	250,624	258,006	346,530	244,144	252,845	256,859
1994	341,261	205,738	218,756	334,919	184,367	195,604	213,855
1995	350,786	150,363	169,179	364,684	125,882	145,227	164,796
1996	376,730	190,938	213,915	341,966	145,963	168,762	206,933
1997	369,753	224,912	238,320	310,629	174,399	188,908	231,171
1998	385,883	236,159	253,764	308,272	199,479	212,395	247,994
1999	412,650	253,674	270,483	335,416	195,475	211,379	263,591
2000	427,095	260,575	277,788	343,140	197,743	213,899	269,633
2001	440,611	241,833	264,551	361,987	195,511	216,531	257,741
Sample	377,773	221,391	237,727	335,527	184,414	199,225	231,391

Source: United States Small Business Administration and authors' calculations

Table 5 Total SBA loans (\$000)

	Urban			Rural			Total
Year	504	7A	Total	504	7A	Total	Sample
1991	168,044	1,235,636	1,403,680	58,687	418,265	476,952	1,880,632
1992	380,301	3,043,969	3,424,270	96,975	912,007	1,008,982	4,433,252
1993	564,577	3,978,656	4,543,233	148,315	1,125,014	1,273,329	5,816,562
1994	1,015,593	5,761,698	6,777,291	207,985	1,419,439	1,627,423	8,404,715
1995	1,165,310	4,821,247	5,986,557	234,127	916,799	1,150,926	7,137,483
1996	1,727,682	6,204,515	7,932,197	269,811	874,902	1,144,713	9,076,910
1997	1,219,816	7,273,196	8,493,012	199,424	939,313	1,138,736	9,631,748
1998	1,464,425	6,725,796	8,190,221	191,437	919,600	1,111,037	9,301,258
1999	1,521,028	7,908,288	9,429,316	175,423	797,344	972,767	10,402,083
2000	1,319,722	6,984,461	8,304,183	166,766	768,827	935,593	9,239,776
2001	1,238,118	5,266,396	6,504,514	185,699	694,065	879,765	7,384,279
Sample	11,784,617	59,203,858	70,988,475	1,934,647	9,785,575	11,720,223	82,708,698

Source: United States Small Business Administration and authors' calculations

Table 6 Total number of SBA loans

	Urban			Rural			Total
Year	504	7A	Total	504	7A	Total	Sample
1991	641	5,941	6,582	195	2,038	2,233	8,815
1992	1,256	12,464	13,720	306	3,928	4,234	17,954
1993	1,734	15,875	17,609	428	4,608	5,036	22,645
1994	2,976	28,005	30,981	621	7,699	8,320	39,301
1995	3,322	32,064	35,386	642	7,283	7,925	43,311
1996	4,586	32,495	37,081	789	5,994	6,783	43,864
1997	3,299	32,338	35,637	642	5,386	6,028	41,665
1998	3,795	28,480	32,275	621	4,610	5,231	37,506
1999	3,686	31,175	34,861	523	4,079	4,602	39,463
2000	3,090	26,804	29,894	486	3,888	4,374	34,268
2001	2,810	21,777	24,587	513	3,550	4,063	28,650
Sample	31,195	267,418	298,613	5,766	53,063	58,829	357,442

Source: United States Small Business Administration and authors' calculations

References

- Acs, Z. J., & Szerb, L. (2006). Entrepreneurship, Economic Growth and Public Policy. *Small Business Economics* 28, 109–122.
- Berger, A. N. (1995). The profit-structure relationship in banking—tests of market-power and efficient-structure hypotheses. *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 27, 404–431.
- Berger, A.N., & Timothy, H. H. (1989). The price-concentration relationship in banking. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 71, 291–299.
- Bitler, M. P., Alicia, M. R., & John, D. W. (2001) Financial services used by small business: Evidence from the 1998 survey of small business finances. *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, 89, 183–205 (April).
- Calem, P. S., & Carlino, G. A. (1991). The concentration/conduct relationship in bank deposit markets. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 73, 268–276.
- Colombo, M. G., & Grilli, L. (2006). Funding Gaps? Access to Bank Loans by High-Tech Start-Ups. *Small Business Economics* 29, 25–46.
- Cowling, M., & Mitchell, P. (2003). Is the small firms loan guarantee scheme hazardous for banks or helpful to small business? *Small Business Economics*, 21, 63–71.
- Craig, B. R., Jackson, W. E. III, & Thomson, J. B. (2005). On SBA guaranteed lending and economic growth. In: S. Shane (Eds.), *Government-university partnerships to enhance economic development through entrepreneurship* (pp. 205–233). London: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Craig, B. R., Jackson W. E. III, & Thomson, J. B. (2007). Small firm finance, credit rationing, and the impact of SBA guaranteed lending on economic growth. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45, 116–132.
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2004). Does local financial development matter?. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119, 929–969.
- Jackson, W. E. III (1992a). The price-concentration relationship in banking: A comment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74, 373–376.
- Jackson, W.E. III (1992b) Is the market well defined in bank merger and acquisition analysis? *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74, 655–661.
- Jayartne, J., & Strahan, P. E. (1996). The finance-growth nexus: Evidence from bank branch deregulation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111, 639–670.
- Kane, E. J., & Malkiel, B. G. (1965). Bank portfolio allocation, deposit variability, and the availability doctrine. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 79, 113–134.
- Kim, P. H., Aldrich, H. E., & Keister, L. A. (2006). Access (Not) denied: The impact of financial, human, and cultural capital on entrepreneurial entry in the United States. *Small Business Economics*, 27, 5–22.
- King, R. G., & Levine, R. (1993a). Finance and growth: Schumpeter might be right. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108, 717–737.
- King, R. G., & Levine, R. (1993b). Finance, entrepreneurship, and growth: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32, 513–542.
- Levine, R. (1997). Financial development and economic growth: Views and agenda. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35, 688–726.
- Petersen, M. A. (1999). The small business lending relationship. *Conference on consumer transactions and credit*. Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA.
- Petersen, M. A., & Rajan, R. G. (1994). The benefits of lending relationships: Evidence from small business data. *Journal of Finance*, 49, 3–37.
- Petersen, M. A., & Rajan, R. G. (1995). The effect of credit market competition on lending relationships. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110, 407–443.
- Rajan, R. G., & Zingales, L. (1998). Financial dependence and growth. *American Economic Review*, 88, 559–586.

- Robinson, J. (1952). *The generalization of the general theory: The rate of interest and other essays*. London: Macmillan Press.
- SBA (2006). *Webpage for small business administration*. 1 September 2006. www.sba.gov.
- SBA (2005). *Small and micro business lending for 2003–2004*. U.S. Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy, November 2005: Report No. 266.
- Schumpeter, J. (1911). *A theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shaffer, S. (1994). Bank competition in concentrated markets. *Business Review*, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia (March/April), 3–16.
- Shaffer, S. (2004). Patterns of competition in banking. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 56, 287–313.
- Shaffer, S. (2006). Establishment size by sector and county-level economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 26, 145–154.
- Stiglitz, J. E., & Weiss, A. (1981) Credit rationing in markets with imperfect information. *American Economic Review*, 71, 393–410.
- Todd, W. F. (1992). History of and rationales for the reconstruction finance corporation. Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. *Economic Review* (Fourth Quarter), 22–35.

Copyright of *Small Business Economics* is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Copyright of *Small Business Economics* is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.