

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

PN-AAN-946

Number 20

April 1983

**SMALL FARMER LOAN REPAYMENT PERFORMANCE
IN NEPAL**

Krishna H. Maharjan
Chesada Loohawenchit
Richard L. Meyer



HMG - U.S. AID - A/D/C PROJECT
STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY IN THE
FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN NEPAL.

Foreword

This Research Paper Series is funded through the project, "Strengthening Institutional Capacity in the Food and Agricultural Sector in Nepal," which is a cooperative effort by the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) of His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the Agricultural Development Council (ADC). This project has been made possible by substantial financial support from the U.S. Agency for International Development.

One of the most important components of this project is advanced training, at the Masters and Ph. D. levels, of young professional staff of agricultural agencies of the MOA and other related institutions. ADC Fellows have been selected for advanced training in Asia, Australia and the U.S.A. Most of them have written a thesis based on their research of a particular problem area in Nepal's agricultural and rural development. In addition, this project sponsors problem-oriented research activities which are carried out by the staff of agricultural agencies of the MOA and other related institutions with the cooperation of ADC staff.

The purpose of this Research Paper Series is to make the results of these research activities available to a larger audience, and to acquaint younger staff and students with advanced methods of research and statistical analysis. It is also hoped that the publication of this Series will stimulate discussion among policy-makers and thereby assist in the formulation of policies which are suitable to the development of Nepal's agriculture.

The views expressed in this Research Paper Series are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of their respective parent institutions.

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

Number 20

April 1983

SMALL FARMER LOAN REPAYMENT PERFORMANCE
IN NEPAL

Krishna H. Maharjan
Chesada Loohawenchit
Richard L. Meyer

Editors:

Som P. Pudasaini
Michael B. Wallace

HMG-USAID-A/D/C PROJECT

STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY IN THE
FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN NEPAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	1
INTRODUCTION	1
A FARM SURVEY OF REPAYMENT	2
A MODEL OF REPAYMENT	5
POLICY IMPLICATIONS	7
REFERENCES	9

SMALL FARMER LOAN REPAYMENT PERFORMANCE
IN NEPAL

Krishna H. Maharjan*
Chesada Loohawenchit
Richard L. Meyer

ABSTRACT

This study revealed that loan supervision and collection were the most important variables explaining agricultural loan repayment behavior by small farmers in Nepal. Most studies categorize repayment factors into ability and willingness of farmers to repay. Willingness to collect and other institutional problems may be more important in many credit programs.

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural credit programs are in serious difficulties in many developing countries because of heavy loan delinquency and default. The World Bank conducted one of the few comparative analyses of the subject. Data on the arrears rate (defined as 100 minus the repayment rate) were reported for 38 agricultural credit programs in Africa, Asia, and Latin

* Krishna H. Maharjan is a staff member at the Agricultural Development Bank, Nepal. Chesada Loohawenchit is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Economics, Thammasat University. Richard L. Meyer is Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ohio State University and Director of International Programs. This paper is based on Mr. Maharjan's M.A. thesis (Maharjan 1980) submitted to the Department of Economics, Thammasat University, where he studied as an A/D/C fellow from 1978 to 1980. This paper was originally presented at the 1981 meeting of the American Association of Agricultural Economists at Clemson University.

America. The arrears rate varied from 2 to 95 percent. Only six programs reported a rate of 10 percent or less. One-half of the programs had rates exceeding 40 percent, and eight reported rates greater than 60 percent. Although these data are somewhat misleading because of variations in definition and data quality, they clearly show serious problems for many programs.

What explains loan repayment performance by farmers? Boakye-Dankwa (1979) recently reviewed the literature and concluded that the reasons can be divided into factors related to ability to repay and willingness to repay. Several studies have been conducted to determine which factors are most important in specific programs. This paper reports on loan repayment by small farmers in Nepal, a country which fairly recently expanded agricultural credit. Historically, Nepal has not had serious repayment problems, but the data available from the Agricultural Development Bank (ADB) and the farm survey results reported in this paper suggest an emerging problem. Furthermore, these results suggest that loan supervision and collection procedures are the most serious factors affecting repayment. It appears that Nepal is following an all too familiar pattern of expanding agricultural lending with insufficient attention to collection. It is hard to see how the agricultural lenders, in this case largely the ADB, can survive with such high delinquency and probable default unless the government and foreign donors continue to pump in fresh funds. We think this same type of situation underlies many of the problems found in credit programs in other countries.

A FARM SURVEY OF REPAYMENT

Institutional credit is available from four principal sources in Nepal: the ADB, commercial banks, cooperative societies, and Sajha institutions which are like small-scale cooperatives. Little published data on repayment exist except for the ADB, and even in this case it is reported in such a way that it is difficult to clearly understand the degree of default. It appears that a large proportion of the expansion in the ADB portfolio has been due to an inflow of outside funds rather than relending repaid loans.

To clarify debt repayment generally and analyze factors associated with repayment, the first author conducted a survey

of 150 farmers located in the Terai area of southern Nepal (Maharjan 1980). This is one of the most productive areas of the country. Paddy, wheat, tobacco, sugarcane, jute, and vegetables are the primary crops. The area is easily accessible and has a relatively good road system. The sample farmers were randomly selected from a list of borrowers compiled from the local cooperatives and ADB branch. Interviews were conducted in the end of 1979 and the survey period covered the previous year. Farmers were asked to report all loans, repayment schedules, amount of principal and interest paid, and information on the year's farming operation.

Table 1 reports outstanding principal and interest due at the beginning of the year, principal and interest due on loans made during the year, and amount repaid by the end of the year as reported by the farmers. It was assumed that farm size and proportion of production marketed would affect repayment, so the sample farms were divided into three groups. Von Pischke (1980) argued that measurement problems in analyzing loan repayment have been ignored. Choice of measure can sharply change the reported status of a lender's portfolio, so repayment rate--defined as the proportion paid of total interest and principal due--is a preferred measure. That is the definition used in this study.

Overall, the sampled farmers had a repayment rate of only about 28 percent for the year. Farmers with more than 4 bighas of land (MED) repaid only 26 percent. Farmers with less than 4 bighas and at least 40 percent of farm production marketed (SFL) repaid 43 percent, while farmers with less than 4 bighas and less than 40 percent marketed (SFS) repaid about 24 percent. There was no clear pattern of the larger farms having a lower repayment rate than smaller farms as found in some other studies. Surprisingly, only about five percent of the total principal and interest due was owed to noninstitutional sources including landlords, moneylenders, and friends. The repayment rate on these noninstitutional loans considered separately was somewhat better at 38 percent, but still much lower than expected.

The farmers were asked to identify the factors that affected their loan repayment performance. Thirty-eight percent of the responses concerned causes beyond their control including poor weather conditions, failure of dug wells, and other natural calamities. These factors can be associated with ability to repay. Another 27 percent of the responses were associated with lender policies and procedures. Other factors

TABLE 1. Repayment Requirement and Repayment Performance of Sample Farms by Farm Type

Items	Average Amount per Farm (Nepalese Rupees) ^a			
	Total Sample	MED Farms	SFL Farms	SFS Farms
Sample Size	150	45	45	60
Outstanding Loans ^b	7,376	19,361	3,455	1,327
Outstanding Interest ^c	1,340	3,335	697	326
Current Borrowings ^d	2,487	7,568	495	170
Current Interest ^e	1,222	3,334	459	210
Total Amount Due	12,425	33,598	5,105	2,034
Amount Repaid	3,507	8,838	2,204	487
Repayment Rate (percent)	28.2	26.3	43.2 ^f	23.9 ^f

a MED have 4 bighas or more of land. SFL farms have less than 4 bighas and 40 percent or more of production is marketed. SFS farms have less than 4 bighas, but market less than 40 percent of total production. One bigha equals 0.6825 hectares.

b The portion of debt outstanding at the beginning of the survey year which is due on or before the last day of the survey year.

c The outstanding interest due at the beginning of the survey year.

d Borrowings made during the survey year which fall due within the survey year.

e Total interest that is due on or before the last day of the survey year.

f The repayment rate for these two groups averaged together was 37.6 percent.

included unfavorable market conditions and high social expenditures. Nine percent of the responses were associated with political factors such as the rumor that some loans were going to be forgiven.

A MODEL OF REPAYMENT

An ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model was estimated using some of the variables identified in the literature as important in explaining loan repayment. The results are reported in Table 2 for the overall sample as well as the three subgroups. The R^2 values were reasonable for this type of study, and many coefficients were significant with signs as expected from the literature.

Farm size was significant and had the expected negative sign for the entire sample, but, as expected, that significance disappeared when the sample was subdivided. Thus, farm size is a significant factor across the wide range of farm sizes found in the sample, but not for the narrower range found within each group. Higher income should lead to better repayment as the farmer has more resources to meet cash requirements. That result was borne out by the positive sign for the gross receipts variable in three out of four models.

The higher the proportion of production marketed, the greater the repayment potential should be. First, it is expected that basic family consumption needs will have been largely met so the household has a surplus to market. Second, the greater the marketings the greater the income for use in paying cash requirements. That relationship was also confirmed in two of the four cases. On the other hand, cash expenditures for other purposes would be expected to be negatively related to loan repayment. That was true in the overall model, but a positive sign was found for the SFS model.

The most interesting results were obtained from the four dummy variables introduced to capture various aspects of loan management and collection. The first of these (D_1) was given a value of 1 if the lender made at least one pre-loan supervision visit to the farm. The second (D_2) was given the value of 1 if at least one post-loan supervision visit was made. D_3 was given the value of 1 if the lender sent a formal letter requesting repayment. D_4 was given the value of 1 if the

TABLE 2. Ordinary Least Squares Model Results

Independent Variables	Total Farms	MED Farms	SFL Farms	SFS Farms
Sample size	150	45	45	60
Intercept	-17.48	-24.99	-26.43	2.09
Farm Size in Bigha (X_1)	-0.81 ***(-2.39)	-0.39 (-0.83)	0.97 (0.34)	1.62 (0.39)
Gross Receipts per 100 Bigha (X_2)	0.33 *** (2.50)	0.20 (0.52)	0.50 ** (2.48)	0.39 * (1.45)
Proportion of Production Marketed in Percent (X_3)	0.30 *** (2.37)	0.43 * (1.58)	0.03 (0.10)	0.31 (0.77)
Ratio of Household Cash Expenses to Total Income (X_4)	-10.06 * (-1.59)	-7.18 (-0.46)	0.35 (0.05)	7.23 * (1.48)
Pre-loan Supervision (D_1)	22.71 *** (4.32)	25.05 ** (2.39)	34.79 *** (3.66)	5.47 ** (1.78)
Post-loan Supervision (D_2)	8.56 * (1.45)	3.29 (0.29)	14.30 (1.38)	6.59 (0.67)
Reminder Letters (D_3)	14.54 *** (3.26)	5.94 (0.70)	11.89 ** (2.53)	6.42 ** (1.88)
Collection Visits (D_4)	18.70 *** (4.31)	19.19 ** (1.98)	15.78 ** (2.55)	1.89 ** (2.55)
R^2	0.43	0.37	0.71	0.35
F-Ratio	13.13	2.61	11.22	3.38

The t-statistics are shown in parentheses.

- * Significant at .10 level.
- ** Significant at .05 level.
- *** Significant at .01 level.

lender made formal collection visits to the farm.

The coefficients for all four of these variables in all models were positive. The pre-loan (D_1) and collection visit (D_4) variables were significant in all models, while the post-loan (D_2) variable was significant in one model, and reminder letters (D_3) in three out of four cases.

Because for a number of observations the dependent variable has a zero value, the regressions were rerun using Tobit procedures to test for truncation bias. The signs for all the coefficients were the same as in the OLS models and the significance level was somewhat higher for some variables. Thus, we believe the results are quite reliable.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

These results imply that variables associated with loan supervision and collection are very important in loan repayment in Nepal. Usually these types of variables have been analyzed in other studies under the heading of the borrower's willingness to repay. We feel the emphasis is misplaced. Rather, these variables should be defined as willingness of the lender to collect and the Nepal case suggests a broader, overlooked issue in much research. When lenders demonstrate clear concern that loans funds should be carefully used and repaid, farmers respond by improved loan repayment. However, when lenders demonstrate a casual or even indifferent attitude, farmers correctly perceive that repayment is not so essential either for the lender or for their own future borrowing prospects. It is not surprising that farmers respond this way, but it is surprising that lenders all too frequently fail to adopt these standard loan management and collection procedures.

Why? Obviously, supervision and collection represent costs which must be compared to expected benefits, and the benefits may not be clearly anticipated in the early stages of a credit program. We suspect the real answer is likely to be even more fundamental, however. Nepalese policy during the past several years emphasized an expansion in credit supplies and the ADB has been charged with the primary responsibility of achieving this objective. Donor agencies have provided large amounts of external resources to the ADB. Although the ADB has some of the best talent found in Nepal, it is clearly

overextended. It is logical that it has spent relatively more effort in meeting lending targets, many associated with donor programs, than in monitoring loan repayment. Willingness and ability to collect have been limited. Simply improving loan collection procedures will not resolve all the Nepalese loan repayment problems, but it would likely lead to an improvement.

This problem is symptomatic of many agricultural credit programs. The emphasis in the early stages of a program is on lending. Accounting procedures concerning loan repayment are neglected. Decision makers frequently do not identify repayment problems early in the life of the program and the continued inflow of new funds permits an expansion in total loan portfolio. Once these funds are lent out, however, the total portfolio begins to decline as new loans can only be made by recycling repayments of old loans. The program eventually withers and may even die. The lucky farmers with unpaid loans end up receiving nice income transfers, but the unlucky ones that received loans and repaid or received no loans must wait for a new or reincarnated credit program. Paradoxically, honest farmers are penalized and dishonest ones rewarded. We hope this is not the scenario that will emerge in Nepal, but the current repayment situation must be quickly and seriously addressed if it is to be avoided.

REFERENCES

- Boakye-Dankwa, K., "A Review of the Farm Loan Repayment Problems in Low Income Countries," *Savings and Development*, 4, 1979.
- Maharjan, K. H., "An Analysis of Factors Affecting the Loan Repayment Performance of Small Farmers in Nepal," unpublished M.A. thesis, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand, October, 1980.
- Maharjan, K. H., C. Loohawenchit, and R. L. Meyer, "Loan Repayment Performance of Small Farmers in Nepal," Columbus: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Economics and Sociology Occasional Paper #809, Ohio State University, April 1981.
- Tobin, J., "Estimation of Relationships for Limited Dependent Variables," *Econometrica*, 26, 1958.
- Von Pischke, J. D., "Rural Credit Project Design, Implementation and Loan Collection Performance," *Savings and Development*, 2, 1980.
- World Bank, *Agricultural Credit : Sector Policy Paper*, Washington: May, 1975.

Papers in this Series:

1. Bekha Lal Maharjan, "Intermediate Technology: Alternative Production Systems for Small Farms in Nepal," February 1980.
2. Devendra Prasad Chapagain, "Agricultural Productivity Pattern in Nepal and Its Regional Variations," February 1980.
3. Som Prasad Pudasaini, "Farm Mechanization, Employment, and Income in Nepal: Traditional and Mechanized Farming in Bara District," February 1980.
4. Ganesh P. Rauniyar, "An Economic Analysis of Flue-Cured Tobacco in Nepal," March 1980.
5. Ramesh P. Sharma, "Uncertainty and Subjective Beliefs in the Adoption of Modern Farming Techniques: A Case Study of Nepalese Farmers," April 1980.
6. Arjun Jung Shah, "The Determinants of Demand for Labor in Agriculture: A Study of Laguna (Philippines) Rice Farms," May 1980.
7. Tek B. Shrestha, Uma M. Shrestha, and Umeswar Pradhan, "Job Environment and Job Consciousness of Agricultural Graduates under the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Irrigation," September 1980.
8. Ganesh B. Thapa and James A. Roumasset, "The Economics of Tractor Ownership and Use in the Nepal Terai," December 1980.
9. Govind Koirala, "The Impact of Agricultural Credit on Farms in the Rupandehi District of Nepal," March 1981.
10. Vijaya Shrestha, "Community Leadership in Rural Nepal," June 1981.
11. Tilak Rawal, "An Analysis of Factors Affecting the Adoption of Modern Varieties in Eastern Nepal," September 1981.
12. Bharat B. Karki, "The Impact of Modern Varieties of Rice on Farm Income and Income Distribution in Eastern Nepal," September 1981.

13. Bharat B. Karki, Tilak Rawal, and John C. Flinn, "Rice Production in the Tarai of Kosi Zone, Nepal," September 1981.
14. Madhab R. Khoju, "The Economics of Pump Irrigation in Eastern Nepal," December 1982.
15. Chandra M. Rokaya, "Impact of the Small Farmers Credit Program on Farm Output, Net Income, and the Adoption of New Methods: A Nepalese Case Study," January 1983.
16. Som P. Pudasaini, "Assessing Relative Economic Efficiency in Agriculture: A Profit Function Approach," March 1983.
17. Dibakar Paudyal, "Evaluating Cropping Pattern Innovations in a Whole-Farm Context: A Case Study from Kaski District, Nepal," March 1983.
18. Sushil Pandey, "Incorporating Risk in Project Appraisal: A Case Study of a Nepalese Irrigation Project," March 1983.
19. Bishnu B. Silwal, "Domestic Resource Cost of Tea Production in Nepal," April 1983.
20. Krishna H. Maharjan, Chesada Loohawenchit, and Richard L. Meyer, "Small Farmer Loan Repayment Performance in Nepal," April 1983.

Suggested Citation:

Maharjan, Krishna H., Chesada Loohawenchit, and Richard L. Meyer, "Small Farmer Loan Repayment Performance in Nepal," Research Paper Series No. 20, A/D/C - APROSC, Kathmandu, April 1983.

The Agricultural Projects Services Centre (APROSC), founded in 1975, is a specialized national institution for project preparation ranging from project identification to baseline and feasibility studies in the fields of rural and agricultural development. As a pioneering consultancy organization, APROSC has conducted project studies in integrated rural development, agriculture, resource conservation and utilization, irrigation, rural institutional development, livestock and dairy development, and evaluation of projects. APROSC organizes training in management skills development, agricultural projects analysis and rural development planning. Recently it has started a monitoring and evaluation system to strengthen the effective implementation of on-going projects. To strengthen research, APROSC is also developing a comprehensive documentation and data processing system.

The Agricultural Development Council (ADC) supports training and research related to the economic and human problems of agricultural development. ADC is a field-based organization which operates through a network of Associates and Specialists stationed in Asian countries. Through its extensive educational activities, the Council is dedicated to developing broader awareness and expertise in the countries of South and Southeast Asia to aid their efforts to meet the major challenges of increased agricultural production and rural development, including the more equitable distribution of gains from development.

*DIS
Pills
ARDA*

Agricultural Projects Services Centre

P. O. Box 1440
Panchayat Plaza
Kathmandu, Nepal.

The Agricultural Development Council, Inc.

725 Park Avenue - 4th Floor
New York, N.Y. 10021, USA.

P. O. Box 1312
Kathmandu, Nepal.