

Viability of “Credit Scoring in Microfinance” for Developing Countries

Soumitro Chakravarty

(Corresponding Author)

Faculty Member, Department of Management
BIT Lalpur Campus, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India
ZIP /Postal code: 834001
E-mail: soumitrochakravarty123@gmail.com

Amar Nath Jha

Professor and Centre Director
BIT Lalpur Campus, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India
ZIP /Postal code: 834001
E-mail: anjha06@rediffmail.com

(Received: 11-1-12 / Accepted: 4-2-12)

Abstract

In developed countries lending via decisions arrived at using formulae to predict risks based on the performance of past loans with characteristics similar to current loans have been employed very frequently with reasonable success. This approach is formally referred to as the “credit scoring” approach. A pertinent question is can this approach be viable for microfinance lenders in developing and poor countries as well? The present paper explores this possibility and it suggests that scoring does have a role to play in microfinance lending in developing countries as well. However, this approach may not be as powerful in impact as in rich and developed countries but it has the potential to complement the existing microfinance technologies in developing countries. In the next decade, many of the biggest microfinance lenders will likely make credit-scoring models one of their most important decision tools.

Keywords: Microfinance, credit scoring, performance measurement, innovation, lending etc.

Introduction

Credit scoring uses quantitative measures of the performance and characteristics of past loans to predict the future performance of loans with similar characteristics. For lenders in wealthy countries during the past decade, scoring has been one of the most important sources of increased efficiency. Such lenders, however, score potential borrowers on the basis of comprehensive credit histories from credit bureaus, as well as on the experience and salary of the borrower in formal wage employment. Most microfinance lenders, however, do not have access to credit bureaus, and most of their borrowers are poor and self-employed. The two chief innovations of microfinance—loans to groups whose members use social capital to screen out bad risks, and loans to individuals whose loan officers know them well enough to screen out bad risks—rely fundamentally on qualitative information held in human memory. Scoring, in contrast, relies fundamentally on quantitative information stored in lenders’ computers. Can microfinance lenders use scoring to cut the costs of arrears and loan

evaluations so as to improve efficiency, and thus both outreach and profitability? This paper explores answers to these issues and describes how scoring works, what its capabilities are, and how microfinance lenders should prepare themselves to implement it.

How Scoring Models Work

Scoring assumes that the performance of future loans with a given set of characteristics will be like the performance of past loans with similar characteristics. If the future is not like the past—as is often the case for microfinance lenders who grow, develop new products and niches, confront competition, or work in fluctuating markets—scoring will not work well.

A *credit-scoring* model is a formula that puts weights on different characteristics of a borrower, lender, and loan. The formula produces an estimate of the probability or risk that an outcome will occur.

Databases for Scoring

Microfinance lenders who wish to someday use credit scoring should begin collecting appropriate data now. Without a database on the performance and characteristics of many past loans, scoring is impossible; lenders with small portfolios may never benefit from scoring. The database must be computerized, and ideally it would include both approved and rejected applicants, although most lenders only keep approved applicants' records. The database should also include a full range of borrower, lender, and loan characteristics, as well as data on the timing and length of each arrears spell. Such characteristics are simple and inexpensive to collect, and most microfinance lenders compile them when a loan officer visits a potential borrower. All microfinance lenders who want to use scoring—even those who already have large, comprehensive databases—should start to quantify and record the subjective assessments of loan officers. In the field, loan officers would still be free to “sniff ” for hints of risk as they see fit, but in the office, they should convert their subjective judgments into quantitative forms amenable to scoring. A large, accurate, and comprehensive database on past loan performance is an asset that many microfinance lenders have failed to develop or use to its fullest.

What Type of Risk to Predict?

Once data are in hand, microfinance lenders must choose what types of risk to predict. Scoring is most useful for risks that are costly for the lender and that the lender has some power to control. For example, one day spells of arrears may be frequent but not very costly, whereas fifteen day spells may be infrequent but very costly. Scoring is better used to predict fifteen-day spells than one-day spells. Likewise, scoring can be used to predict default due to borrower's death, but lenders have no control over this risk, even if they can predict it. Most microfinance lenders tend to start with one simple model, and if they find that it works well, they add the other simple models one at a time.

Scoring in a Microfinance Organization

The greatest difficulties in a credit-scoring project are not technical but organizational. Given a database, consultants can straightforwardly derive a scoring formula. The difficult part is the implementation of the formula in an existing organization with an existing lending technology. Managers and board members must understand the strengths and weaknesses of scoring so they can commit to support its adoption and integration within the organization. Otherwise, a scoring model may sit unused; an unused model serves no purpose, and a misused model is worse than no model at all. One way to encourage managers to support a scoring project is to ask them to choose a type of risk to model, suggest which characteristics to include in the formula, and then design the implementation. Loan officers

and credit managers in the branches may feel threatened by scoring; they have devoted time and effort to learning to judge risk and may be suspicious of a computer program—written by someone who has never met one of their clients—that claims to improve on their judgments. The employees who run the management-information system must also be brought onboard. At first, they may view scoring as nothing more than extra work, but they will soon recognize it as a fundamental transfer of organizational power toward their department.

Ease of Use

One key to the acceptance of scoring in an organization is ease of use. This requires that scoring systems be integrated into the existing management-information system and that they require little data entry beyond standard processes. Such integration also allows the estimates of risk to be included in standard reports. In short, a good scoring system allows a lender to continue with business as usual, but with the addition of quantitative estimates of risk.

Out-of-Sample Tests

The acceptance of scoring within an organization also requires a proven track record. One of the greatest strengths of scoring is that it can establish a track record even before being put to use. For example, Schreiner (2000) derived a scoring formula from data on loans disbursed in 1993–1998. This formula was then used to estimate the risk of arrears for loans disbursed in 1999. Because the performance of these loans was already known, the comparison of predicted and observed risk showed how the model would have performed had it been used in 1999. Such inexpensive out-of-sample tests are perhaps the best way to convince skeptical managers that scoring works for microfinance.

Tracking Performance in Use

Once in use, scoring continues to build a track record. Lenders with scoring models must track both predicted risk and actual performance, even if they decide to ignore the risk estimate from the model. Through time, careful records will reveal how well the model works. For example, if scoring works well, 20 percent of loans with a 20 percent estimated risk of “costly arrears” should turn out to have such arrears. Likewise, lenders must track overrides—cases in which credit policy dictates a certain action for loans above (or below) a risk threshold, but in which loan officers or credit managers break with policy because they know something the scoring model does not. They often do know more, and it is important to track the outcomes of overrides to determine how much they improve on the scoring model. Because scoring works only if the past is like the present, and because the recent past is more like the present than the distant past, the performance of scoring models degrades with time; careful tracking helps to signal when a formula needs to be rebuilt.

Selecting a Scoring Model

Scoring is difficult for any lender, and scoring for microfinance is even more exacting. As discussed, the main difficulties are the organizational adjustments required to integrate scoring into the lending process.

Amassing an adequate database is a second challenge, and a third difficulty is that one size does not fit all. Because of differences in lending technology, clientele, competition, and general economic environment, a scoring model developed from the database of one lender will be much less powerful if applied to a second lender. To my knowledge, scoring models have been built for microfinance lenders in Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Chile, México, Panamá, Perú, and Thailand. Only the models in Schreiner (1999a, 1999b, and 2000) use statistics to derive the scoring formula; the rest use simple heuristics or rules of thumb. Such nonstatistical models may be better than no model at all, especially if a lender lacks a

database capable of supporting a statistical model. Statistical models, however, probably have greater predictive power. Furthermore, statistical models derive the relationships between specific characteristics and risk; rule-of-thumb models assume these relationships. Regardless of the technique used to derive the formula, the power of any scoring model should be demonstrated in an out-of-sample test before implementation.

Conclusion

The essence of finance is the prediction of the risk—whether borrowers will keep their promises. Risk estimates are based on information; and in microfinance, this information is usually qualitative and informal—it resides with group members or with loan officers. Credit scoring takes a different tack. It predicts risk based on quantitative information that resides in the management-information system of the lender. Credit scoring for microfinance can work. It is not as powerful as scoring for credit card or mortgage lenders in wealthy countries, and it will not replace the judgments of loan officers or loan groups based on informal, qualitative knowledge, but scoring does have some power to predict risk (and thus to cut costs) even after the group or loan officer makes its best judgment. Thus, scoring complements—but does not replace—current microfinance technologies. Furthermore, scoring not only helps to predict risk, but also reveals how characteristics of the borrower, the loan, and the lender affect risk. This knowledge is useful whether a microfinance lender uses risk predictions from scoring to inform daily decisions.

References

- [1] D. J. Hand and W. E. Henley, Statistical classification methods in consumer credit scoring: a review, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Association Series A*, 160(3) (1997), 523–541.
- [2] E. M. Lewis, *An Introduction to Credit Scoring*, (1990), San Rafael: Athena Press.
- [3] E. Mays, *Credit Risk Modeling: Design and Application*, (1998), New York: Glenlake.
- [4] L. J. Mester, What's the point of credit scoring? *Business Review*, (1997), 3–16, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.
- [5] M. Schreiner, A scoring model of the risk of costly arrears for loans from affiliates of women's world banking in Colombia, *Women's World Banking*, (2000).
- [6] M. Schreiner, The risk of exit for borrowers from a microlender in Bolivia, *Center for Social Development*, (1999a), Washington University in St. Louis, gwweb.wustl.edu/users/schreiner/
- [7] M. Schreiner, A scoring model of the risk of costly arrears at a microfinance lender in Bolivia, *Center for Social Development*, (1999b), Washington University in St. Louis, gwweb.wustl.edu/users/schreiner/
- [8] M. Schreiner, Aspects of outreach: A framework for the discussion of the social benefits of microfinance, *Center for Social Development Working Paper*, 99–3 (1999c), Washington University in St. Louis.
- [9] L. Viganò, A credit scoring model for development banks: An African case study, *Savings and Development*, 17(4) (1993), 441–482.