

Giving Credit Where It Is Due

Abhijit V. Banerjee and Esther Duflo

After a period of relative marginalization, development economics has now reemerged into the mainstream of most economics departments, attracting some of the brightest talents in the field. It is no longer the preserve of development “experts” who pronounce on the strange ways of the world outside high-income countries, but instead serves as a testing ground for fundamental economic theories and the source of exciting new ideas. This situation is, of course, not entirely new. Innovative theoretical ideas from people such as George Akerlof and Joseph Stiglitz were inspired by thinking about the developing world. Pranab Bardhan and T. N. Srinivasan, and, slightly later, Angus Deaton and Mark Rosenzweig also resisted the compartmentalization of economics into development and the rest. Nevertheless, the extent to which, today, economists in many other fields routinely think about the application of their ideas and techniques in development contexts, seems unprecedented. This new centrality is excellent news for the field and, we venture to hope, for the world it studies.

We believe that one of the reasons for the field’s vitality is the opportunity it offers to integrate theoretical thinking and empirical testing, and the rich dialogue that can potentially take place between the two. The culture of development

■ *Abhijit V. Banerjee is Ford Foundation International Professor of Economics and Esther Duflo is Abdul Latif Jameel Professor of Poverty Alleviation and Development Economics, both at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. The authors are also both Directors, Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Research Associates, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Research Fellows, Center for Economics and Policy Research, London, United Kingdom; and members of the Board of Directors, Bureau for Research in Economic Analysis and Development (BREAD). Their e-mail addresses are <banerjee@mit.edu> and <eduflo@mit.edu>.*

economics is particularly well-suited to this tight integration because of the emphasis on collecting one's own primary data based on the theories that are to be tested, a practice that goes back to at least Bardhan and Rudra (1983) and Bliss and Stern (1978a, b) in the 1970s and Christopher Udry in the 1980s (see Udry, 1995, for an example of his work).

In the last few years, field experiments have emerged as an attractive new tool in this effort to elaborate our understanding of economic issues relevant to poor countries and poor people. By enabling the researcher to precisely control the variation in the data, field experiments allow the estimation of parameters and testing of hypotheses that would be very difficult to implement with observational data. In Banerjee and Duflo (2009), we develop this argument in much more detail. The results of this body of empirical work, in turn, have pushed theory in new directions.

Much of this paper illustrates the power of this interplay between experimental and theoretical thinking. Rather than discussing this in the abstract, we focus on one area where the recent empirical work has been particularly exciting and useful—credit. Imperfections in credit markets are a fundamental part of the way we think about development and underdevelopment. Credit markets in developing countries also offer up many facts and puzzles that lead us to build theories based on informational constraints and psychological limitations. The empirical work inspired by these theories, in turn, has generated both support for the theories, which then influenced policy thinking, and new puzzles, which have prompted new efforts to improve the theory. We see this substantive, two-way conversation taking place between theory and data around credit markets in developing economies as a promising template for the field.

Credit: Some Facts and Theoretical Explanations

Facts

There is a long tradition of high-quality descriptive work on credit markets in developing countries. Within-country studies, such as Ghatak (1975) in India, as well as cross-country surveys, such as Wai (1957) and Bottomley (1963, 1975), report patterns that are confirmed by more detailed later studies of individual credit markets, such as Aleem (1990) (Pakistan); Dasgupta (1989) (India); and Ghate (1992) (Thailand). Banerjee (2002) surveys this body of evidence.

Most people in the developing world have no access to formal credit and rely essentially on informal credit. In Banerjee and Duflo (2006), we survey 13 developing countries and find that, with the exception of Indonesia (where there has been a large expansion of government-sponsored microcredit), no more than 6 percent of the funds borrowed by the poor came from a formal source. The vast majority of the rest comes from moneylenders, friends, or merchants. Informal credit markets are characterized by the following five facts:

First, lending rates can be very high relative to deposit rates within the same local area. Gaps of 30 or even 60 percentage points between these rates on an

annual basis (in other words deposit rates of 10 to 20 percent and lending rates of 40 to 80 percent) are common.

Second, lending rates can vary widely within the same credit markets. Gaps of 50 percentage points or more between rates charged to different borrowers within the same local credit market are normal.

Third, richer people borrow more and pay lower (often much lower) interest rates. People with few assets often do not borrow.

Fourth, these divergences in interest rates are not driven by many loans that are not being repaid; defaults in this sector are relatively rare. Both Aleem (1990) and Dasgupta (1989), who report default losses, tell us that a 10 percent default rate is very high and 1 to 4 percent is more common.

Fifth, monopoly power of the lenders over particular borrowers does not appear to cause the high levels of interest rates either. The data about high interest rates mostly comes from settings where a number of potential lenders are available. Moreover, a number of studies, including Bottomley (1963), Aleem (1990), and Ghate (1992), find no evidence of supernormal profits amongst informal lenders.

Lending Costs and the Multiplier

Why are there such large wedges between the interest rates for depositing and lending in developing countries? Why would some people pay so much more than others? The stylized facts suggest that realized default or monopoly power are not going to go very far as explanations. The most natural remaining explanation within the existing framework is the cost of making sure that the loan gets repaid in the presence of moral hazard or adverse selection. In an online appendix available with this paper at (<http://www.e-jep.org>), we propose a model that captures this idea. Here, we summarize the main intuitions, which provide a useful framework for thinking about the empirical literature discussed below.

Suppose that an individual, endowed with some wealth, seeks to borrow in order to start a project. The returns of the project are risk free, but the borrower can choose to default after the project is completed, and the returns are realized at a cost proportional to the sum invested (in other words, there is moral hazard). If the cost of default were lower than the interest payment, the borrower would always choose to default. Therefore the lender must insure that the borrower has enough “skin in the game,” and borrowers will be credit-constrained: they will only be able to borrow up to some multiple of their own wealth.

In addition, imagine that the cost of default to the borrower drops to zero unless the lender exercises due diligence. Think of this as a combination of what the lender has to do before making a loan (for example, finding out where the borrower lives, what the borrower does and owns, what type of person the borrower is) and the cost of maintaining enough “enforcers” that the borrower knows that an attempt to default will cause a price to be paid. Part of this cost is likely to be fixed, rather than proportional to the amount borrowed: a lot of basic information about the borrower (location, occupation, references) has to be collected irrespective of the size of the loan.

These fixed costs of administering a loan can explain why interest rates for small loans are so high, why they vary so much across borrowers, and why the poor pay higher interest rates. Since borrowers with little wealth must get small loans, the fixed administrative cost has to be covered by the interest payment, which pushes the interest rate up. But high interest rates exacerbate the problem of getting borrowers to repay. Total lending therefore shrinks further, pushing up interest rates even more, and so forth, until the loan is small enough and the interest rate high enough to cover the fixed cost for even a small borrower. In other words, the presence of fixed costs introduces a kind of multiplier into the process of determining the amount lent and the rate charged. As a result, small differences in the borrower's wealth or in the cost of monitoring the borrower can lead to very large differences in interest rates. And if the borrowers are poor enough or the fixed administrative cost is high enough, the interest rate could become infinite: these borrowers will be unable to borrow at all.

The emphasis on the role of fixed costs in credit markets is not new. For example, Bottomley's (1975) discussion of high interest rates for the poor makes explicit reference to fixed costs. Banerjee (2002) takes a more complicated modeling approach, but the basic point is very similar. The same intuitions would hold even if default happens only through bad luck, *if borrowers know how likely they are to be affected by such luck, but lenders do not*—what is often called adverse selection. The reason is that borrowers who are less likely to repay are less affected by high interest rates, because they know that they may not pay in any case. Raising interest rates therefore tends to push out the borrowers who expect to repay but not the ones who have a high chance of defaulting, and, as a result, average default rates go up. Faced with adverse selection, lenders will tend to cut back on the amount they lend, which will tend to reduce default rates across the board. But this increases the administrative cost per dollar lent and pushes up interest rates, causing a credit contraction just as in the moral hazard case. Therefore, like in the moral hazard case, there can be substantial potential social benefits from even a small reduction in the administrative costs of lending.

Nevertheless, moral hazard and adverse selection have some quite different policy implications. For example, whereas a credit bureau (allowing lenders to find out if someone has defaulted on someone else's loan) would be an excellent intervention in a moral hazard world, the case would be less obvious in a world of adverse selection. In particular, by making the borrower's credit history public, a credit bureau makes it harder for a lender to profit from private experience with the borrower. But this means that lenders would be less keen to help new borrowers establish a public track record, because they know that, once the track record has been established, the borrower would be free to move to other lenders. Thus, knowing whether we live in the adverse selection world or the moral hazard world clearly matters.

From Theory to Empirical Questions

A growing body of experimental research has reacted, directly or indirectly, to this broad perspective on credit markets. Most of the rest of this paper will

show how the empirical findings of this literature have interacted with theoretical models and predictions to build a deeper understanding of credit markets. We start with the list of key questions:

First, is access to reasonably priced credit really a problem for the poor? The theory sketched above is a purely supply-side theory and assumes that demand is not a constraint. However, it could be that people only borrow at the high interest rates we report for emergencies and otherwise these high rates are mostly irrelevant since most people do not consider borrowing at these very high rates.

Second, how seriously should we take the multiplier property? A testable implication of either moral hazard or adverse selection is that default should be interest-elastic. Do we see this?

Third, are moral hazard and adverse selection the right concepts for thinking about default? Can they be distinguished empirically?

Fourth, can the impressive success of the microcredit movement in lending to the poor be explained, at least in part, by its ability to generate reductions in monitoring costs and in the multiplier effects thereof? How does it actually reduce monitoring costs?

Finally, what are the consequences of making credit available to the poor? Are they able to start new businesses? Does it increase their standard of living? Does it provide a needed discipline device or, to the contrary, encourage reckless borrowing?

Are High Interest Rates Discouraging the Poor from Borrowing?

There is no perfect way to answer this question—it all depends on what we call “high” interest rates. One way to benchmark is to use the rates that banks charge to those to whom they are willing to lend, which often does not include the poor. In India, banks charge rates of 20 percent or less, but, in a survey of a 120 slums we conducted in Hyderabad, only 6 percent had a bank loan. On the other hand, 68 percent had loans (obtained from informal sources, such as moneylenders), and the average outstanding loan balance conditional on having a loan was over \$1,000. The average interest rate they were paying on these loans was 3.85 percent per month or about 57 percent per year. The average period for which they have been indebted with the current loan was 1.5 years. It does not seem that high interest borrowing is something that people only do *in extremis*.

However, it is still possible that this level of borrowing represents errors of judgment by the borrowers that they then have a hard time rectifying. A cleaner way to make this point is to look directly at the marginal product of capital in the firms owned by the poor and to compare this with the market interest rates. The marginal product gives us a sense of how high interest costs could go before choking off demand. Unfortunately, the marginal productivity of capital is very difficult to know from observational data, precisely because borrowing is a choice, which induces a correlation between investment level and rates of return to capital (Olley and Pakes, 1996).

De Mel, McKenzie, and Woodruff (2008) implement an interesting experiment to measure the marginal product of capital. From a sample of 408 very small businesses (with less than \$1,000 of fixed capital and an average turnover of \$100 a month) in Sri Lanka, a randomly chosen subset received a grant worth about \$100. Some of the grants were given in cash, while others were given in kind, in the form of a specific business asset chosen by the business owner. They then collected several waves of data on these firms, including detailed investment, sales, and cost data. The productivity of additional capital for these firms turns out to be very high. The average monthly profits of firms that received the \$100 grants increased from \$38.50 to \$53, which corresponds to a marginal return to capital of 4.6 to 5.3 percent per month (55 to 63 percent per year). By comparison, banks charge 12 to 20 percent per year in Sri Lanka, but only 3 percent of the firms had a bank account for business use and only 11 percent of the firms got any money from any formal financial source to start their business. The pattern of these results is replicated for tiny retail firms in Mexico by McKenzie and Woodruff (2008), who find even higher marginal productivities of capital (20 to 33 percent per month, and between 900 percent and 3000 percent per year).

Since the Sri Lanka experiment is focused on very small firms, it remains possible that larger firms are not subject to credit constraints and correspondingly may have much lower marginal returns. It is difficult to imagine carrying out the same randomized experiment for larger firms that are already connected to the banking sector. However, in Banerjee and Duflo (2008), we take advantage of a natural experiment to estimate the effect of an inflow of credit on the investment and productivity of medium-sized firms in India. The study exploits a temporary policy change that increased the upper limit on fixed capital under which a firm was eligible for subsidized credit. After two years, the change was reversed. The firms affected by the policy were officially registered firms (they are not part of the informal economy) and fairly large by Indian standards, though not the largest corporate entities. Comparing firms that were always eligible to firms that became eligible for increased credit, before, during, and after the policy change, we find that newly eligible firms experienced a large increase in sales and profits (relative to other firms) during the period when their access to credit was expanded, and a contraction when they lost eligibility again. The results suggest a very large gap between the marginal product and the interest rate paid on the marginal dollar: the point estimate for the firms whose credit actually went up is that 100 rupees more in loans increased profits by about 90 rupees per year, whereas firms pay around 16 percent per year in interest.

These results suggest that the high interest rates in developing countries are not the only reason why firms don't borrow. Both small Sri Lankan and Mexican firms and larger Indian firms have marginal returns to capital higher than the rates charged by banks and would be happy to borrow much more if they were offered credit at those rates or even substantially higher rates. Indeed, McKenzie and Woodruff (2008) point out that the returns in Mexico are much higher than even the 120 percent rates that for-profit Mexican micro-lenders such as Compartamos charge.

These results tell us that there is enormous scope for improving intermediation—at least as far as the poor are concerned. They are able and willing to pay much higher rates than the banks are charging, and if there was some way to improve credit delivery models to allow these banks to lend more to the poor, both sides could greatly benefit.

Identifying the Sources of Inefficiency in Credit Markets

This poses an obvious question: Why don't banks simply set high enough interest rates to make lending to the poor remunerative? The theory we sketched above suggests one general class of answers: raising the interest rate makes the problem of getting borrowers to repay harder, and this generates the multiplier that ultimately drives lenders out of certain markets. This section reports on some recent work trying to assess whether these kinds of incentive problems are serious real-world issues.

The challenge in this comes from the fact that incentive problems are, by their very nature, unobservable (if we could observe them, we could directly stop them from happening). A creative recent attempt to get at these issues by Karlan and Zinman (2009) involved an experiment in which randomly selected former borrowers of a South African lending institution were sent letters offering them an opportunity to borrow. The rate at which they were invited to borrow (the offer rate) was also randomized so that different groups ended with different offer rates. Then, among those who agreed to borrow at an initially high rate, they randomly selected half of the clients and surprised them with a lower rate of interest. They then compare default rates among these different sub-groups, some of whom faced the same offer rate but different actual rates and some of whom faced different offer rates but the same actual rate.

Comparing the repayment behavior amongst people who eventually borrowed at the same rate but who had initially consented to different offer rates isolates the effect of selection. The incentives of these borrowers after receiving the loan were identical, but when they chose to pursue the offer, they faced very different incentives. In particular, the adverse selection model mentioned in the previous section relies on the idea that high interest rates attract borrowers who are intrinsically more likely to default. Hence, adverse selection would imply that the group that accepted the offer to borrow despite the high offer rate should have a higher default rate than the group attracted by the low offer rate.

Comparing the repayment behavior amongst people who initially consented to the same offer rate but ended up with different actual rates keeps the selection effect constant and identifies the effect of higher interest rates on repayment. However, there are two reasons why high interest rates would generate more default. First, the theory of moral hazard suggests that high interest rates give greater reason to default, for those who have a choice. But there is also a possibly more mechanical effect—high rates make the repayment burden higher, therefore making repayment more difficult.

To distinguish between the repayment burden effect and moral hazard, Karlan and Zinman introduced yet another experimental group. A randomly chosen subgroup of the borrowers who were surprised by being offered a lower rate than what they had first been offered were, in addition, offered the option of holding onto that lower rate into the future, conditional on remaining eligible to borrow. This last condition made default much more costly for that group (because it automatically cancels the next loan) while keeping the repayment burden unchanged in the current period relative to those who had faced the same offer and actual rates but had been told that the surprise low rate was a one-off deal. It therefore picks up the pure moral hazard effect.

The results show little evidence of defaults induced by either repayment burden or adverse selection in this sample. On the other hand, there is clear evidence of moral hazard: the only group that has a substantially higher repayment rate than everyone else is the group offered a low interest rate with the assurance that they could keep it.

Of course, this result must be interpreted with care. The experiment takes place in a market in equilibrium. Thus, the lender may have already set the interest rate, the size of the loan, and the maturity of the loan and its own screening rules to minimize the risk of default on actual loans. The original interest rate may have been set to make the repayment burden manageable and discourage willful default. Since subsequent interest rates were either lowered or left the same, the borrowers should have been even more encouraged to repay. Moreover, the experiment sent letters only to borrowers who had previously borrowed successfully at the bank's preferred rate, the worst types may have been eliminated already, both through the bank's screening process and based on the borrowers' track records. This may explain why the repayment burden effect or the adverse selection was not larger. As for the moral hazard effect, it is not clear whether those induced to repay at a higher rate by the dynamic incentives are the borrowers who will eventually default and are just buying time (since now they have one more loan cycle to make that choice over). In future research, it would be very important to tease these things out. An alternative experimental design would be to offer loans at varying rates of interest to new clients, rather than former clients, and to propose a wider range of interest rates, including rates that are higher than market rates.

Nevertheless, this study is, rightfully, very influential as a template for good empirical research: it was designed to identify parameters that theory suggests should be important and that would have been very difficult to identify without a sophisticated experimental design. Similar designs have been used in other contexts by Cohen and Dupas (2010) and Ashraf, Berry, and Shapiro (2007) to identify the selection and (potential) treatment effect of prices of health goods.

From the point of view of the theoretical framework sketched above, the main takeaway from this exercise is that cutting interest rates (in this case, into the future) does affect default: When this is true, the multiplier property discussed earlier suggests that if the lenders could reduce their administrative costs, the gains could be large, because now the multiplier effect would work to expand

credit. Lower administrative costs would allow lower interest rates, which makes it easier to get borrowers to repay, which further reduces administrative costs, and so on. This is exactly what microcredit seems to have successfully done, through a combination of innovations in the way lending is conducted. Experiments have been carried out to understand what part of the microcredit “package” really matters. This is important for three reasons: to help microcredit practitioners in their practice; to offer some guidance on what could be done in banks outside the microcredit movement; and to further our understanding of the roles of different types of incentives in lending.

Microcredit: Reducing Costs of Lending

The term “microcredit” covers a spectrum of organizations and financial products, but a common defining feature is innovations that lower the administrative cost of making small loans. As discussed earlier, such reduction in the cost of lending can have large effects on access to credit and interest rates through the multiplier effect. We first discuss some of the ways in which microcredit reduces administrative costs, including dynamic incentives, group liability, repayment frequency, and social capital.

Dynamic Incentives

Microfinance contracts typically offer dynamic incentives: that is, the starting loans are small but increase with each cycle, so that a borrower who defaults on the current loan gives up the possibility of a larger loan in the future. This credit ramp should encourage repayment under moral hazard. As the Karlan and Zinman (2009) experiment demonstrates, defaults do respond to the promise of a future loan on favorable terms. However, as Bulow and Rogoff (1989) pointed out in the context of sovereign debt long before microcredit became fashionable, dynamic incentives cannot work alone. By defaulting, the borrower saves the entire principal and interest on the loan, whereas by repaying, a borrower can at best be assured of a sequence of possibly larger loans, which will need to be repaid with interest.

To maintain incentives, Bulow and Rogoff (1989) show, loans need to grow at least as fast as the interest rate, and if they do grow at that rate, they would soon become so large that everyone would default, not wanting a bigger loan. Furthermore, competition between microlenders might undermine dynamic incentives, because a borrower can default on one loan and borrow from another lender—although we see very little evidence that the rise of competition has increased default. On the other hand, as pointed out by Basu (2008) in a slightly different context, the Bulow–Rogoff argument relies on borrowers being able to save on their own after they default, which may not work if the consumers have self-control problems. Fear of somehow eating into the capital and ending up destitute may be one reason people continue to repay. But overall, we suspect that other aspects of microcredit must bolster the effect of the dynamic incentives to assure repayment.

Group Liability

Probably the most commented upon feature of the standard microfinance contract is joint liability, in which each member of a group of borrowers is liable for the loans of the others. The precise sense in which members of the group are held liable for each other is often surprisingly unclear, but in general, the notion is to create a situation where default by one borrower in a group makes it harder for other borrowers to get a loan. Theory argues that this gives clients strong incentives both to screen (Varian, 1990; Ghatak, 1999) and to monitor (Stiglitz, 1990) each other. The effect of screening would be to reduce adverse selection, and the effect of monitoring would be to reduce moral hazard, both of which reduce administrative costs. The multiplier property means that this small reduction in cost can lead to a large reduction in the interest rate and, in this way, open credit to others.

But group liability also imposes costs. The incentive of group participants is always to reduce the risk taken by their fellow members, because participants do not benefit from the upside of any risky investment but are on the hook for the downside (Banerjee, Besley, and Guinnane, 1994). In fact, Fischer (2010) finds evidence of this kind of behavior in laboratory experiments that he carried out among microcredit clients. For this reason, members of a group may impose excessive risk-aversion on members.

To test the effect of group liability per se and to distinguish its effect on moral hazard and adverse selection, Gine and Karlan (2009) perform two field experiments in partnership with a microfinance institution in the Philippines. In the first, they randomly selected 56 groups who had a joint liability contract and informed them that they were no longer jointly liable for their loans, though they still had to meet every week to repay their loans. This treatment eliminates the monitoring effect of being in a group (moral hazard) but not the screening effects (adverse selection), since the selection happened before the change in rules was announced. In the second experiment, the bank introduced individual liability from the beginning in randomly selected areas. In this case as well, clients continued to meet weekly and reimburse in group. Taken together, these experiments are meant to allow us to identify separately the selection and monitoring effects of joint liability. Surprisingly, the default rate was the same in all the groups: those that were initially formed as joint liability and stayed that way, those that were initially formed as joint liability groups and were converted, and those that were always individual liability groups. Moreover, clients were less likely to drop out in individual liability groups: joint liability did discourage some clients from remaining a part of the group. However, default rates are very low to start within this context, so that the other incentives that the microfinance institution provided (like monitoring) may have been so effective that group liability was not needed. It remains possible that group liability would matter in contexts where there is otherwise a larger temptation to default.

While this seeming redundancy of group liability may be surprising to those of us who had spent time thinking about why joint liability was such an important innovation, it corresponds well to events in the microfinance world over the last

few years. Starting with Bangladesh's Grameen Bank (under the Grameen Two model), a well-known, global pioneer of microfinance, most microfinance institutions are quietly abandoning joint liability. Like the bank in the Gine and Karlan (2009) experiment, however, they do not abandon weekly *meetings*. Apparently, these weekly meetings may be desirable in and of themselves.

Repayment Frequency and Social Interactions

The standard microfinance product is a yearly loan, and interest and capital are repaid in weekly installments of the same size. Economic theory suggests the possible advantages of tailoring the repayment to the cash flows generated by the investment; for example, a cow does not typically start to produce milk right after it is purchased. However, microfinance institutions tend to consider weekly repayment a way to build credit discipline and thereby to avoid default.

Field and Pande (2008) and their collaborators have worked with a microfinance institution in Calcutta, India, called Village Welfare Society to evaluate the effect of weekly repayment plans on repayment and use of the loan. The groups of borrowers were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: usual weekly reimbursement starting immediately after loan disbursement, monthly reimbursement, or weekly reimbursement starting a few weeks after the loan started.

The results suggest that some modifications to the standard microfinance model may allow microfinance loans to be more productive. In the first few cycles, monthly reimbursement clients were no more likely to default and seemed much happier with their loans. Clients required to begin weekly repayments immediately appeared concerned about their ability to repay, and were conservative in their investment strategy as a result. The difference in risk-taking is particularly striking between the two weekly groups. The group that was given a gap of a few weeks was more likely to start a business, and when they started a business, they were more likely to make a bigger investment and one that only started paying after a while (Field, Pande, and Papp, 2009). For example, women were less likely to buy saris for resale and more likely to acquire a sewing machine. This supports the idea that the nature of the standard microfinance contract leads to insufficient risk-taking.

However, after three loan cycles, default rates started to be higher in the group with monthly repayment than in the group with weekly repayment. One possible interpretation is that this difference emerges because weekly meetings help clients to get to know each other better, which makes it easier for clients to monitor each other, to trust each other, and even to shame each other if necessary. The importance of social capital and trust in microcredit was theorized in an early paper by Besley and Coate (1995). The reason why group liability works, in this view, is not because of the formal structure of liability (which may be hard to enforce after the loan is made in any case) but because after being together for a while, people start to value their relationships with other members. As a result, either people are more willing to help those who are in risk of defaulting or they feel embarrassed about being exposed to the rest of the group as a defaulter. This would explain why Karlan and Gine, who have groups who continue to meet despite not having joint liability, see no effect.

The insight that frequent meetings can contribute to social capital and/or trust was nicely brought out by another element in the Village Welfare Society experiment (Feigenberg, Field, and Pande, 2009). It turned out that the clients who repaid weekly, and hence met every week, were much more likely to know each other well. After five months, they were 90 percent more likely to have visited each other's homes and to know the family members of other borrowers by name. This induced them to act differently in a trust game that the researchers had them play. Lottery tickets were distributed to some group members, who also were given the option to give extra tickets to members of their group. By giving these extra tickets away, a woman increases the probability that someone in their group wins, but decreases the likelihood of her own victory. If she trusts that other group members would share the proceeds of the lottery, she should distribute the tickets. If not, she should keep them to herself. The results suggest that members who met every week are more likely to give each other tickets; furthermore, this holds true even for clients in their first loan cycle, who don't yet know each other well.

This set of results builds upon Karlan's earlier work on the causes and effects of trust in microcredit. Karlan conducted two projects in collaboration with FINCA, a large microfinance institution in Peru. Karlan (2005) finds that behavior of group members toward each other in trust games predicts future savings and repayment behavior. And, using the fact that FINCA Peru forms groups in a quasi-random way (on a first come-first served basis), Karlan (2007) finds that people who live closer to each other or who share cultural affinities also save more in microfinance groups and are less likely to default on loans to each other.

However, as Besley and Coate (1995) pointed out a long time ago, social capital can potentially have the opposite effect—it could help the group members to collude in defaulting, making it harder for the microfinance institution to punish them. Why this has not been observed in the world remains a theoretical puzzle.

Reengineering Loan Collection

While weekly meetings might help to build social capital and reduce default, the striking fact about microcredit loans is how low default rates remain even in the worst-case scenarios—where there are no weekly meetings and no group liability. This points to one key element behind the success of microcredit that the theoretical literature seems to have almost entirely missed. Part of the cost advantage of microcredit is quite mechanical. The fact that all loans from a particular group get repaid on the same schedule, that the repayment amount is fixed for each person, and that the group leader typically is in charge of collecting it for the loan agent, reduces the time the loan officer spends collecting. As a result, a loan officer may be able to collect payments from a very large number of borrowers every day. Simplifying the technology of lending also opens the profession of credit officer to a whole new set of potential hires who need very little education or qualifications, and who can be paid little, made to work extremely hard, and given strong financial incentives to avoid defaults and enroll new borrowers. This technology of loan collection plays a big role in reducing the administrative costs per loan.

In this sense, the group lending and rigid repayment structure that characterizes the microcredit model may actually be less important for incentive reasons than for what they require of the technology of loan collection. To further our understanding, it thus seems that the next step should be to perform experiments where loan officers, rather than clients, would be the main subject of study.

The Benefits of Microcredit: Credit Constraints, Temptation, and Self-Control

Taken together, microcredit organizations deliver credit to more than 150 million poor people at interest rates that are much lower than what was on offer before, while continuing to be financially viable (Karlan and Morduch, 2010). The average interest rate paid by borrowers in the slums of the Indian city of Hyderabad was about 4 percent per month before microcredit showed up there, charging less than 2 percent a month and still making money. But is this expansion of credit ultimately good for borrowers? Expanding credit access would always be good if borrowers were fully rational: it would only increase their options, and they would not borrow at high interest rates if they did not have a sufficiently good project. But perhaps borrowers have self-control problems that are exacerbated by access to easy credit.

A recent study, Banerjee, Duflo, Glennerster, and Kinnan (2009), helps to allay some of these concerns, while also providing some evidence on perhaps unexpected benefits of microfinance. Our study was done in collaboration with Spandana, a fast-growing microfinance institution in south India. It was conducted in Hyderabad, where over 100 slums were randomly assigned to either treatment or control: in treatment slums, Spandana opened an office and started operations; in control slums, it did not.

The study provided evidence that microfinance institutions expand the pool of those receiving credit and help new businesses to get started. Overall, 27 percent of eligible families are borrowing from any microfinance institution in the slums where Spandana started its operations (compared to 19 percent in the other slums). One new microfinance loan in five generates a new business that would not otherwise have been created. Households who are predicted, on the basis of their baseline characteristics, to be highly likely to start a business are indeed the ones who are most likely to start a business when microfinance becomes available, and they reduce their nondurable household consumption when they get the loan, presumably to put that extra money into the new business. Those who are the least likely to start a business, on the other hand, increase their nondurable consumption.

In addition to these results, we find that, on average, households in treatment slums, irrespective of whether they borrow and what they do with the money, increase their purchase of durable goods for their home or their business (like televisions, bicycles, and refrigerators) and reduce their consumption of what they

themselves define as “temptation goods.” Spandana gives no direction to households on how they should spend their money. However, Padmaja Reddy, Spandana’s chief executive officer, ventured a guess that after a year or two, the main effects of microcredit should be to help people plan their spending, because they develop a sense that, with the ability to get a loan at a reasonable rate of interest, durable goods—such as a television, a refrigerator, or a cart for their business—are now actually within their grasp.

These results fit with the theoretical predication of the behavioral economics literature. Models of self-control and inconsistent time-preferences (for example, Laibson, 1997; O’Donoghue and Rabin, 1999) suggest that microfinance borrowing could be a way for the poor to commit themselves to a savings plan. Banerjee and Mullainathan (2009) propose a model with regular consumption goods and “temptation goods” that are valued by the consumer in the current period, but not as things to look forward to. They show that, if the marginal utility of the temptation goods falls faster than that of the goods that one looks forward to, there will be a demand for “savings transformation.” Consumers would be happy to reduce some of their daily spending on temptations to be able to buy something to which they look forward, such as a refrigerator or a television. In effect, microfinance borrowing could be a way for the poor to commit themselves to a savings plan.

These conclusions, based on one study, are obviously quite tentative. But research on the impacts of microcredit is accumulating fast, and further evidence should become available in the next two or three years.

But if microcredit is understood as a form of making a commitment to save, then it is not the only way (and possibly not the best way) to offer a commitment to saving. After all, saving in a more direct form, rather than repaying a loan, involves receiving interest rather than paying it. Several recent experimental studies suggest some possibilities. Ashraf, Karlan, and Yin (2006) show that, when approached by a microfinance institution to open savings accounts, some prospective customers are willing to commit to a binding savings goal (duration or amount to be saved), and those given the option to commit save more on average. Dupas and Robinson (2009) study the effect on micro-business owners of offering access to a savings account with steep withdrawal fees, a form of commitment savings product, and find increases in business investment, a reduced sensitivity to shocks, and an increase in overall expenditure per capita as a result. Duflo, Kremer, and Robinson (2009) find large effects on fertilizer adoption in a program that helps farmers commit early to buy fertilizer later in the season.

Conclusion: Theory and Experiment in Development Economics

The experimental literature on credit markets in developing countries shows the powerful connections between empirical research and theory in development economics. Empirical work in this area has drawn directly on a well-developed body of theoretical research, testing and finding support for some theories but not

others, and has gone on to generate new puzzles that the theory needs to explain. For example, we do not yet have a good theory of why people repay their micro-credit loans that does not rely on people's innate desire to repay. However, the idea that microcredit may be used as a commitment product may offer a possible way out: the service that microcredit provides is something that the borrower will want in the future as well; any money a borrower could potentially save by defaulting will be gone by then.

Although we have focused in this paper on the credit markets, better integration between theory and empirical practice is very much the trend in all areas of development economics. Nevertheless, theory seems to lag behind the experimental work in certain areas. Education is one such area where the vitality of the empirical work contrasts with the relative paucity of suitable theory to explain its results. In contrast to the credit literature, theory in education lacks anything to say about many questions of interest. Specifically, answering the key policy question of how best to spend money to promote education requires us to move beyond a theory that thinks of a human capital production function based on two inputs—time and money.

The implicit assumption in this formulation is that while money can buy many inputs, the allocation of money between them is unproblematic and is carried out efficiently at the ground level. Yet a large number of field experiments have tested the effect of various interventions on learning and offer some surprising discoveries. For example, Glewwe, Kremer, and Moulin (2009), based on a randomized experiment carried out in Kenya in the mid 1990s, discovered that access to textbooks has no effect on the test scores of the average child. Only the best students benefited. In Banerjee, Cole, Duflo, and Linden (2007), we evaluate a specific remedial education program in government schools in India that combines several features: it acts as a pull-out program to reduce class size; it focuses on basic skills for the children who are lagging behind; and it relies on a group of highly motivated and closely monitored young teachers. The program was found to be remarkably effective and was later replicated in rural areas (Banerjee, Banerji, Duflo, Glennerster, and Khemani, 2010). In contrast, the same paper found no effect of the reduction in the student–teacher ratio when government teachers were teaching, suggesting that returns on different inputs were probably not equalized.

This mixture of empirical results suggests that we need to develop a more sophisticated theory of the education production function. Why might adding certain inputs to the educational process have little or no effect, while others have a very substantial effect? One possible reason, suggested both by the effect of textbooks on the best students, and by the surprisingly large effect of remedial education, is that the existing system is elite-focused and therefore inputs are used to maximize the impact on the best-performing children.

Duflo, Dupas, and Kremer (2009) offer a parsimonious theory of pedagogy built in part on this intuition: that students indirectly affect both the overall level of teacher effort and teachers' choice of the level at which to target instruction. Choices made by teachers depend on the distribution of students' test scores

in the class as well as on whether the teachers' rewards are tied to test scores. Under some plausible conditions, this model has a number of testable predictions, which vary according to whether teachers' incentives push them to care more about test score improvements at the top of the distribution, throughout the distribution, or at the bottom of the distribution. Specifically when (as in many developing countries), teachers care more about improvement at the top, they will tend to focus their attention to the top of any classroom distribution. As a result, students at the bottom may not learn much (or anything) from the teacher in large, heterogeneous classes.

Tracking will force teachers to focus their attention on the students they have in the classroom, and may thus benefit both students at the top and students at the bottom. Furthermore, the median students may not lose from being in the bottom track versus the top track: in the low track, median students may still benefit from teaching much more adjusted to their needs than teaching aimed at the top track. These predictions (and other ancillary predictions from the model) were tested in Kenya in settings where schools were allocated an extra teacher for grade 1 and were randomly assigned either to track the students by prior achievement when dividing the class or to assign the students randomly to either section. The results were consistent with the model: both students at the top and students at the bottom benefited from tracking. Moreover, students originally at the median benefited just as much in the top track as in the bottom track. Finally, in nontracking schools, students at the top and students at the bottom benefit when, due to the random allocation of peers, their peers have slightly higher or slightly lower test scores, but these small variations in average test scores did not have an impact on students in the middle. This is also consistent with a model where the direct effects of peers, and the indirect effects of the teacher's effort and choice of level at which to teach, coincide.

Many other interesting theories of pedagogy are waiting to be developed. For example, why might it be true that teachers care primarily about the highest performing students? Possible answers include the difficulty of measuring the performance of poorly performing students, teachers' beliefs about which children are more "teachable," or parents' beliefs about which children are more teachable. Part of the theoretical challenge here would be to explain how such beliefs could be sustained. These theories are certain to have testable implications, and each one comes with a different policy response. But at least at present, such theories do not exist, at least in forms developed enough to test.

This does not suggest to us that the empirical research in this area should stay put. Part of the value of experimental studies in development, as well as of purely descriptive research, is that they keep generating interesting facts. This is, in some ways, where the literature in credit got started. In some cases, such as the experiments in credit markets, researchers were able to draw on economic theory that was already fairly well-developed, and then test and sharpen that theory. In other cases, such as experiments in education, the empirical results are ahead of the theory, which has made it more difficult to derive general lessons from specific projects, as theory needs to catch up.

We firmly believe that the rest of development economics can follow the same trajectory as the credit literature. The constraint, if there is one, is the trend in theory, which has somewhat shifted away from the simple, illustrative models that were popular in the 1980s and 1990s and provided the basis for empirical research in the more recent period (not just in development economics). But it is hard to imagine that this trend will not correct itself soon—there are so many interesting facts to explain, and a parsimonious theory that fits them will certainly find many people ready to go out in the field and design the experiment to test it.

This is, after all, the main reason we are excited about working in this field. Very few other areas in economics are blessed with questions of first-order importance, challenging puzzles, and an ever-growing ability to collect the data one needs to explore them.

■ *We thank David Autor, Chad Jones, Dean Karlan, Nick Ryan, and Timothy Taylor for very helpful suggestions.*

References

- Aleem, Irfan.** 1990. "Imperfect Information, Screening and the Costs of Informal Lending: A Study of a Rural Credit Market in Pakistan." *World Bank Economic Review*, 4(3): 329–49.
- Ashraf, Nava, James Berry, and Jesse M. Shapiro.** 2007. "Can Higher Prices Stimulate Product Use? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Zambia." NBER Working Paper 13247.
- Ashraf, Nava, Dean Karlan, and Wesley Yin.** 2006. "Tying Odysseus to the Mast: Evidence from a Commitment Savings Product in the Philippines." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2): 635–72.
- Banerjee, Abhijit.** 2002. "The Uses of Economic Theory: Against a Purely Positive Interpretation of Theoretical Results." BREAD Working Paper 007.
- Banerjee, Abhijit.** 2005. "New Development Economics and the Challenge to Theory." *Economic and Political Weekly*, October 1–7, 40(40): 4340–44.
- Banerjee, Abhijit.** 2007. *Making Aid Work*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, Rukmini Banerji, Esther Duflo, Rachel Glennerster, and Stuti Khemani.** 2010. "Pitfalls of Participatory Programs: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in Education in India." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 2(1): 1–30.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, Timothy Besley, and Timothy Guinnane.** 1994. "Thy Neighbor's Keeper: The Design of a Credit Cooperative with Theory and a Test." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(2): 491–515.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, Shawn Cole, Esther Duflo, and Leigh Linden.** 2007. "Remedying Education: Evidence from Two Randomized Experiments in India." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3): 1235–64.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, and Esther Duflo.** 2007. "The Economic Lives of the Poor." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(1): 141–67.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, and Esther Duflo.** 2008. "Do Firms Want to Borrow More: Testing Credit Constraints Using a Targeted Lending Program." BREAD Working Paper 005, first version, 2004; revised 2008.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, and Esther Duflo.** 2009. "The Experimental Approach to Development Economics." *Annual Review of Economics*, vol. 1, pp. 1.1–1.28.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, Esther Duflo, Rachel Glennerster, and Cynthia Kinnan.** 2009. "The

- Miracle of Microfinance? Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation." <http://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/publications/The%20Miracle%20of%20Microfinance.pdf>.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, and Sendhil Mullainathan.** 2009. "The Shape of Temptations: Implication for the Economics Lives of the Poor." NBER Working Paper 15973.
- Bardhan, Pranab, and Ashok Rudra.** 1983. *Agrarian Relations in West Bengal: Results of Two Surveys*. Bombay: Somaiya Publications.
- Basu, Karna.** 2008. "Hyperbolic Discounting and the Sustainability of Rotational Savings Arrangements." <http://urban.hunter.cuny.edu/~basu/karnabasu-rosca.pdf>.
- Basu, Karna.** 2009. "The Provision of Commitment in Informal Banking Markets: Implications for Takeup and Welfare." <http://urban.hunter.cuny.edu/~basu/informalbanking.pdf>.
- Bertrand, Marianne, Dean Karlan, Sendhil Mullainathan, Eldar Shafir, and Jonathan Zinman.** 2010. "What's Advertising Content Worth? Evidence from a Consumer Credit Marketing Field Experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(1): 263–305.
- Besley, Timothy, and Stephen Coate.** 1995. "Group Lending, Repayment Incentives, and Social Collateral." *Journal of Development Economics*, 46(1): 1–18.
- Bliss, Christopher, and Nicholas Stern.** 1978a. "Productivity, Wages and Nutrition: Part I: The Theory." *Journal of Development Economics*, 5(4): 331–62.
- Bliss, Christopher, and Nicholas Stern.** 1978b. "Productivity, Wages and Nutrition: Part II: Some Observations." *Journal of Development Economics*, 5(4): 363–98.
- Bottomley, Anthony.** 1963. "The Cost of Administering Private Loans in Underdeveloped Rural Areas." *Oxford Economic Papers*, 15(2): 154–163.
- Bottomley, Anthony.** 1975. "Interest Rate Determinations in Underdeveloped Rural Areas." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 57(2): 279–91.
- Bulow, Jeremy, and Kenneth Rogoff.** 1989. "A Constant Recontracting Model of Sovereign Debt." *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(1): 155–78.
- Cohen, Jessica, and Pascaline Dupas.** 2010. "Free Distribution or Cost-Sharing? Evidence from a Randomized Malaria Prevention Experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(1): 1–45.
- Dasgupta, A.** 1989. *Report on Informal Credit Markets in India: Summary*. New Delhi: National Institute of Public Finance and Policy.
- Deaton, Angus.** 2009. "Instruments of Development: Randomization in the Tropics, and the Search for the Elusive Keys to Economic Development." Originally given as the Keynes Lecture at the British Academy, October 9th, 2008. http://www.princeton.edu/~deaton/downloads/Instruments_of_Development.pdf.
- de Mel, Suresh, David McKenzie, and Christopher Woodruff.** 2008. "Returns to Capital in Microenterprises: Evidence from a Field Experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(4): 1329–72.
- Duflo, Esther.** 2005. "Field Experiments in Development Economics." Chap. 13 in *Advances in Economic Theory and Econometrics: Theory and Applications, Ninth World Congress*, vol. 2, ed. R. Blundell, W. K. Newey, and T. Persson. Cambridge University Press. (See also BREAD Policy Paper No. 002, 2005.)
- Duflo, Esther, Pascaline Dupas, and Michael Kremer.** 2009. "Peer Effects and the Impact of Tracking: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in Kenya." NBER Working Paper 14475.
- Duflo, Esther, Rema Hanna, and Stephen Ryan.** 2007. "Monitoring Works: Getting Teachers to Come to School." BREAD Working Paper 103. (NBER Working Paper 11880, 2005.)
- Duflo, Esther, Michael Kremer, and Jonathan Robinson.** 2008. "How High Are Rates of Return to Fertilizer? Evidence from Field Experiments in Kenya." *American Economic Review*, 98(2): 482–88.
- Duflo, Esther, Michael Kremer, and Jonathan Robinson.** 2009. "Nudging Farmers to Use Fertilizer: Evidence from Kenya." NBER Working Paper 15131.
- Dupas, Pascaline, and Jonathan Robinson.** 2009. "Savings Constraints and Microenterprise Development: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Kenya." NBER Working Paper 14693.
- Feigenberg, Benjamin, Erica Field, and Rohini Pande.** 2009. "Building Social Capital through Microfinance." <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/rpande/papers/Social%20Capital%20April18v8.pdf>.
- Field, Erica, and Rohini Pande.** 2008. "Repayment Frequency and Default in Micro-Finance: Evidence from India." *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 6(2/3): 501–509.
- Field, Erica, Rohini Pande, and John Papp.** 2009. "Does Microfinance Repayment Flexibility Affect Entrepreneurial Behavior and Loan Default?" http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/rpande/papers/repayment_flexibility_field_pande_papp.pdf.
- Fischer, Greg.** 2010. "Contract Structure, Risk Sharing, and Investment Choice." February. Available at: <http://personal.lse.ac.uk/fischer/Research.htm>.
- Ghatak, Subrata.** 1975. "Rural Interest Rates

in the Indian Economy.” *Journal of Development Studies*, 11(3): 190–201.

Ghatak, Maitreesh. 1999. “Group Lending, Local Information and Peer Selection.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 60(1): 27–50.

Ghate, Prabhu. 1992. “Informal Finance: Some Findings from Asia.” Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Asian Development Bank.

Gine, Xavier, and Dean Karlan. 2009. “Group versus Individual Liability: Long Term Evidence from Philippine Microcredit Lending Groups.” Working Paper 970, Economic Growth Center, Yale University.

Gine, Xavier, Dean Karlan, and Jonathan Zinman. Forthcoming. “Put Your Money Where Your Butt Is: A Commitment Savings Account for Smoking Cessation.” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*.

Glewwe, Paul, Michael Kremer, and Sylvie Moulin. 2009. “Many Children Left Behind? Textbooks and Test Scores in Kenya.” *American Economic Journal*, 1(1): 112–35.

Karlan, Dean. 2005. “Using Experimental Economics to Measure Social Capital and Predict Real Financial Decisions.” *American Economic Review*, 95(5): 1688–99.

Karlan, Dean. 2007. “Social Connections and Group Banking.” *Economic Journal*, 117(517): F52–F84.

Karlan Dean, and Jonathan Morduch. 2010. “Access to Finance.” Chap. 71 in *Handbook of Development Economics*, vol. 5, ed. Dani Rodrik and Mark R. Rosenzweig. Elsevier, North-Holland.

Karlan, Dean, and Jonathan Zinman. 2008. “Credit Elasticities in Less-Developed Countries: Implications for Microfinance.” *American Economic Review*, 98(3): 1040–68.

Karlan, Dean, and Jonathan Zinman. 2009. “Observing Unobservables: Identifying Informa-

tion Asymmetries with a Consumer Credit Field Experiment.” *Econometrica*, 77(6): 1993–2008.

Laibson, David. 1997. “Golden Eggs and Hyperbolic Discounting.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2): 443–77.

McKenzie, David, and Christopher Woodruff. 2008. “Experimental Evidence on Returns to Capital and Access to Finance in Mexico.” *World Bank Economic Review*, 22(3): 457–82.

O’Donoghue, Ted, and Matthew Rabin. 1999. “Doing It Now or Later.” *The American Economic Review*, 89(1): 103–124.

Olley, Steven, and Ariel Pakes. 1996. “The Dynamics of Productivity in the Telecommunications Equipment Industry.” *Econometrica*, 64(6): 1263–97.

Rodrik, Dani. 2008. “The New Development Economics: We Shall Experiment, But How Shall We Learn?” HKS Faculty Research Working Paper RWP08-055.

Stiglitz, Joseph. 1990. “Peer Monitoring and Credit Markets.” *The World Bank Economic Review*, 4(3): 351–66.

Thornton, Rebecca. 2008. “The Demand for and Impact of HIV Testing: Evidence from a Field Experiment.” *American Economic Review*, 98(5): 1829–63.

Udry, Christopher. 1995. “Risk and Saving in Northern Nigeria.” *American Economic Review*, 85(5): 1287–1300.

Varian, Hal R. 1990. “Monitoring Agents with Other Agents.” *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 153–74. (Reprinted in *The New Institutional Economics*, ed. E. Furubotn and R. Richter, 313–334. Texas A&M Press, 1991).

Wai, U Tan. 1957. “Interest Rates outside the Organized Money Markets of Underdeveloped Countries.” *Staff Papers of the International Monetary Fund*, 6(1): 80–142.

