Beyond the Numbers: Social Factors in Credit Risk

Asuamah Yeboah, Samuel and Mogre, Diana and Nartey Menzo, Benjamin Prince

Sunyani Technical University, Sunyani Technical University, Catholic University of Ghana Fiapre

13 July 2024

Beyond the Numbers: Social Factors in Credit Risk

Samuel Asuamah Yeboah
Faculty of Business and Management Studies,
Sunyani Technical University, Ghana.
Corresponding Author Email address: nelkonsegal@yahoo.com
Phone: 0244723071
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9866-6235

Diana Mogre
Department of General Agriculture
Faculty of Applied Science and Technology
Sunyani Technical University
Phone: 0543630296
Email: dnmogre@ yahoo.com

Benjamin Prince Nartey Menzo
Catholic University of Ghana Fiapre
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
Email: aggorrmp@yahoo.com
Phone: 0209394353

ABSTRACT

This review explores the critical impact of social and cultural factors on credit risk assessment and lending practices, especially in developing countries. By examining existing research, we delve into how cultural norms, social relationships, and community dynamics shape the evaluation of creditworthiness for small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs). Our findings offer valuable insights for policymakers, financial institutions, and researchers aiming to enhance the accuracy and cultural sensitivity of credit risk management strategies for SMEs in these contexts.

KEYWORDS: Credit risk assessment, lending decisions, social factors, cultural dynamics, small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs), developing countries, community relationships, cultural norms, creditworthiness evaluation, financial inclusion.

JEL CODES: G21: O16: D14: Z13

INTRODUCTION

In the dynamic landscape of global finance, understanding the nuanced factors that shaped credit risk assessment and lending decisions was paramount (Dash et al., 2021; Ekai, 2023; Lip, 2023). This systematic review embarked on a journey to unravel the intricate influence of social and cultural factors on the evaluation of creditworthiness and subsequent lending practices, with a particular emphasis on small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) in developing countries. The symbiotic relationship between economic activities and sociocultural dynamics often plays a pivotal role in determining the success or failure of lending initiatives (Uskul, 2015; Von Jacobi, 2017), making it imperative to dissect these factors comprehensively.

The significance of SMEs in driving economic growth, fostering employment, and promoting entrepreneurship was universally acknowledged (Nasr & Rostom, 2013; OECD, 2000; 2017; 2019). However, the extent to which credit risk management models catered to the diverse social and cultural landscapes in developing countries remained an underexplored terrain. This review aimed to bridge this gap by synthesising existing literature and providing a holistic understanding of how social and cultural intricacies shaped credit risk assessment and lending decisions.

The evaluation of creditworthiness went beyond traditional financial metrics, venturing into the realm of community relationships, cultural norms, and social networks (Shi & Veenstra, 2020; Muñoz-Cancino et al., 2022). It was within this intricate tapestry that financial institutions operated, making decisions that impacted the livelihoods of individuals and the economic trajectories of communities. By examining the existing body of knowledge, this review sought to shed light on the multifaceted nature of credit risk in diverse cultural contexts, offering insights that could inform more robust and culturally sensitive lending practices.

As the exploration unfolded, the review addressed several key questions: How did cultural norms influence perceptions of creditworthiness? To what extent did social relationships and community dynamics impact credit risk evaluation? Could a deeper understanding of sociocultural factors enhance the accuracy of credit risk management models? The answers to these questions held the potential to shape not only the strategies of financial institutions but also the policies of governments aiming to foster inclusive and sustainable economic development.

In the subsequent sections, the review systematically analysed literature from various disciplines, extracting themes, patterns, and best practices that illuminated the nexus between social and cultural factors and credit risk management. The ultimate goal was to provide actionable insights for policymakers, financial institutions, and researchers, fostering a paradigm shift toward more inclusive, culturally attuned, and effective credit risk assessment and lending practices in the challenging landscapes of developing countries.

The scope for the study is as follows: *Geographic Focus***:** The systematic review focuses primarily on developing countries to ensure a contextualised examination of credit risk management within the unique socio-cultural landscape characteristic of these regions. However, studies from other countries that enrich the discussions are included.

Target Population: The primary focus is on small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs), recognising their significant role in economic development, employment generation, and entrepreneurship within developing countries.

Cultural and Social Factors: The review explores a broad spectrum of cultural and social factors, including but not limited to trust, reciprocity, community dynamics, communication styles, and gender roles, aiming to provide a comprehensive understanding of their influence on credit risk assessment.

Multidisciplinary Approach: The scope encompasses a multidisciplinary examination, drawing insights from fields such as sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics, and finance. This approach enriches the review by capturing diverse perspectives on the intersection of cultural dynamics and credit risk management.

The study limitations are as follows: *Publication Bias:* The review may be susceptible to publication bias, as positive results are more likely to be published. Efforts have been made to mitigate this bias by conducting a thorough search across multiple databases.

Language Limitation: The review is limited to studies published in English, potentially excluding relevant research published in other languages. This language constraint may introduce a bias toward English-language literature.

*Study Quality Variation***:** The included studies may exhibit variability in terms of methodological rigour and quality. Despite employing quality assessment tools, the review acknowledges the potential impact of variations in study quality on the overall findings.

Generalizability: The findings may not be universally generalisable due to the diverse cultural contexts under investigation. While efforts have been made to include studies from various regions, caution is warranted in applying the results to all developing countries.

Dynamic Nature of Sociocultural Factors: Sociocultural factors are dynamic and subject to change over time. The review captures a snapshot of existing literature but may not fully account for ongoing or emerging cultural shifts that could influence credit risk management.

Heterogeneity of Study Designs: The review includes studies with diverse methodologies, including qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches. This heterogeneity may pose challenges in synthesising findings but is essential for capturing the multidimensional nature of the research questions.

Availability of Data: The review relies on the availability of data within the selected studies. Incomplete or insufficient data may limit the depth of the analysis in certain areas.

Despite these limitations, the systematic review endeavours to provide a nuanced exploration of the cultural lens on social dynamics in lending decisions, contributing valuable insights to the field of credit risk management and informing future research and practices.

METHODOLOGY

The research questions guiding this systematic review were formulated to explore the influence of cultural factors on credit risk assessment and the extent to which social dynamics impact credit risk evaluation in different cultural contexts. The methodology follows the works of previous research works such as Win (2018), Kunz and Heitz (2021), and Goel and Rastogi (2023).

In determining study eligibility, clear inclusion and exclusion criteria were established, focusing on SMEs in developing countries and emphasising the cultural or social aspects related to credit risk assessment. A comprehensive literature search was conducted across databases such as PubMed, JSTOR, Scopus, and relevant journals, utilising a combination of keywords and controlled vocabulary related to credit risk, cultural factors, social dynamics, SMEs, and developing countries.

The systematic screening process involved a team-based approach to assess titles, abstracts, and full texts based on the defined criteria. Selected studies underwent data extraction using a standardised form, capturing information on study characteristics, methodological details, and key findings related to cultural and social factors influencing credit risk.

Quality assessment was performed using established appraisal tools such as CASP for qualitative studies and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for observational studies. Only studies meeting satisfactory quality criteria were included to ensure the robustness of the evidence.

A thematic synthesis approach was employed to identify patterns, themes, and relationships within the selected studies. Findings were categorised based on cultural and social factors, providing a comprehensive understanding of the intricate tapestry of credit risk under investigation.

For studies exhibiting homogeneity, a meta-analysis was conducted to quantify the impact of cultural and social factors on credit risk assessment. Sensitivity analyses were performed to explore the robustness of the review findings in the face of variations in study design, quality, or other factors.

The interpretation of findings centred on the research questions, offering insights into the cultural lens of social dynamics in lending decisions. Practical recommendations were derived based on the synthesised results for policymakers, financial institutions, and future research initiatives.

The comprehensive systematic review report, prepared following PRISMA guidelines, serves as a platform for disseminating the findings through academic publications, conferences, and other relevant channels, with the aim of reaching the target audience and contributing to the understanding of credit risk management practices in the challenging landscapes of developing countries.

CULTURAL NORMS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON PERCEPTIONS OF CREDITWORTHINESS

The assessment of creditworthiness is not a purely quantitative endeavour; it is deeply entwined with cultural norms that shape perceptions of financial responsibility and trustworthiness within a given society. Cultural norms, encompassing shared values, beliefs, and behavioural expectations, play a crucial role in influencing how individuals and communities view financial transactions and obligations.

Trust and Reciprocity: Cultural norms often dictate the importance of trust and reciprocity within social relationships. In many societies, trust is built over time through personal connections and shared experiences. Lenders may rely on these social networks as indicators of an individual's commitment to financial obligations. Conversely, a lack of adherence to reciprocal norms may signal a higher credit risk (Lisa et al., 2003; Osrom & Walker, 2005; Karlan et al., 2009; Chai et al., 2018; Barajas et al., 2020).

Attitudes Towards Debt: Cultural attitudes towards debt vary significantly across different societies. In some cultures, taking on debt may be stigmatized, while in others, it could be considered a normal part of financial management. Understanding these attitudes is crucial for accurate credit risk assessment, as individuals may prioritize repaying debts differently based on cultural expectations (Brennan et al., 2011; Polletta & Tufail, 2014; Almenberg et al., 2021; Finance.Gov.Capital, 2023).

Community Endorsement: In closely-knit communities, individuals might seek endorsement or co-signatories from respected community members when applying for credit. This communal approach reflects a cultural reliance on collective responsibility and community support. Financial institutions need to recognise and incorporate these community dynamics into their assessment models (Somashekar, 2009; Collier & Hampshire, 2010; Wilson, 2012; Turvey, 2017; Yadav et al., 2018).

Communication Styles and Decision-Making Processes: Cultural variations in communication styles and decision-making processes impact the negotiation and fulfilment of financial agreements. For instance, in cultures where indirect communication is preferred, individuals may express financial difficulties implicitly. Understanding these nuances is vital for lenders to interpret borrower behaviour accurately (Salacuse, 1998; Cohen, 1997; Kerr & Tindale, 2004; Brett, 2007; Kester et al., 2011).

Cultural Perceptions of Success and Failure: Cultural norms also shape perceptions of success and failure. In societies where entrepreneurship is highly valued, taking financial risks might be more acceptable. Conversely, in cultures where stability is prized, a willingness to take risks might be viewed with skepticism. These cultural nuances influence how lenders interpret entrepreneurial ventures and risk tolerance (Lee & Peterson, 2000; Mueller & Thomas, 2001; Kreiser, 2010; Autio et al., 2013; Ucbasaran et al., 2013; Ozaralli & Rivenburgh, 2016).

Impact of Gender and Social Hierarchies: Cultural norms often dictate gender roles and social hierarchies, influencing financial behaviour. Lenders need to be cognisant of how these factors may affect credit risk. For example, in societies where women traditionally manage household finances, overlooking their creditworthiness may lead to inaccurate risk assessments (Courtenay, 2000; Handy et al., 2002; Fletschner & Carter, 2008; Jones & Boyd, 2011; Karim, 2011; Han et al., 2017; Rashid & Ratten, 2020; Rudman & Glick, 2021).

Understanding and incorporating these cultural dimensions into credit risk assessment models are imperative for financial institutions aiming for accuracy and relevance in diverse cultural contexts. Acknowledging the role of cultural norms not only enhances the precision of credit risk evaluations but also contributes to the development of more inclusive and culturally sensitive lending practices. This nuanced understanding is vital for fostering financial inclusion and supporting the economic empowerment of individuals and communities worldwide.

IMPACT OF SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AND COMMUNITY DYNAMICS ON CREDIT RISK EVALUATION

The evaluation of credit risk extends beyond individual financial metrics, incorporating the intricate web of social relationships and community dynamics. The extent to which these factors influence credit risk assessment is substantial, as they provide valuable insights into an individual's reliability, commitment, and ability to fulfil financial obligations. This section explores the multifaceted ways in which social relationships and community dynamics impact the evaluation of credit risk:

Social Capital and Trust: Social relationships contribute to the formation of social capital, a valuable asset in assessing credit risk. Borrowers embedded in robust social networks are often deemed more trustworthy, as the support of friends, family, and community members can act as a safety net during challenging financial times. Lenders may consider the borrower's social capital as a mitigating factor in assessing credit risk (Pretty & Ward, 2001; Grootaert & Van Bastelaer, 2002; Narayan, 2002; Portes & Landolt, 2000; Dasgupta, 2005; Karlan, 2005; Dowla, 2006; Castiglione et al., 2008; James, 2023).

Community-Endorsed Guarantees: In closely-knit communities, the concept of community endorsement is prevalent. Individuals seeking credit may present guarantees or co-signatories from respected community members, adding a layer of assurance for lenders. The endorsement from the community acts as a form of collateral and can influence the lender's perception of creditworthiness (Bhatt, 1997; Klaßen, 2008; Bush, 2009; Hawley, 2018; Muluh et al., 2019; Ely, 2022; Reisman et al., 2022).

Informal Social Controls: Communities often have informal mechanisms for enforcing financial commitments. Reputation within a community can serve as a powerful motivator for individuals to honour their financial obligations. Lenders may tap into these informal social controls to gauge the likelihood of timely repayments (Sáez et al., 2021; Vaghefi, 2023).

Network-Based Information: Social relationships provide lenders with additional sources of information. The borrower's network may offer insights into their character, reliability, and financial habits. Lenders may use this network-based information to corroborate or supplement formal credit data, enhancing the overall accuracy of credit risk assessments (Dufhues et al., 2011; Heuven & Groen, 2012; Tan & Phan, 2018; Giudici et al., 2020; Muñoz-Cancino et al., 2023).

Social Support as a Risk Mitigation Factor: Individuals with strong social support systems may be more resilient in the face of financial challenges. Lenders may view borrowers with robust social support as less risky, anticipating that the community can act as a buffer against unforeseen economic hardships (Holzmann & Jørgensen, 2001; Uchino, 2004; Feeney & Collins, 2015; Xu et al., 2024).

Cultural Practices of Mutual Assistance: In some cultures, mutual assistance and communal support are deeply ingrained. Lenders need to understand and appreciate these cultural practices, as they may impact how individuals manage financial responsibilities. Ignoring these dynamics could result in an incomplete understanding of credit risk (Patel, 2013; Rodima-Taylor, 2014; Mati, 2017; Shimei, 2022).

Social Stigma and Reputation: Negative social perceptions or stigma associated with defaulting on financial obligations can significantly impact an individual's reputation within the community. Fear of social repercussions may act as an additional deterrent, influencing borrowers to prioritise repayments. Lenders may factor in the potential social consequences when evaluating credit risk (Efrat, 2005; 2006; Guiso, 2009; Burke, 2012; Mishina & Devers, 2012).

Community Economic Conditions: The economic conditions of a community can also affect individual credit risk. Lenders may consider the overall economic health of a community when assessing the financial stability of an individual borrower, recognizing the interdependence between individual and community well-being (Afriyie & Akotey, 2012; Zhang, 2014; Lassoued, 2017; Koju et al., 2020; Dimitrova-Grajzl, et al., 2022; Dunyoh, 2022; Jain, 2023).

Social relationships and community dynamics play a crucial role in determining creditworthiness. Financial institutions must acknowledge and integrate these factors into their credit risk assessment models to gain a comprehensive understanding of borrowers. Ignoring these elements can result in incomplete risk assessments, hindering the development of effective and culturally sensitive lending practices.

ENHANCING CREDIT RISK MANAGEMENT MODELS THROUGH A DEEPER UNDERSTANDING OF SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS

The conventional approach to credit risk management models often relies heavily on financial indicators, overlooking the nuanced sociocultural factors that intricately shape individual and community behaviours. This section explores how a deeper understanding of sociocultural factors can significantly enhance the accuracy of credit risk management models:

Improved Risk Prediction: A nuanced understanding of sociocultural factors allows for more accurate predictions of credit risk. By incorporating cultural attitudes towards debt, community dynamics, and social relationships into models, financial institutions can better assess the likelihood of timely repayments and potential defaults (Crook et al., 2007; Kemshall, 2008; Siddiqi, 2017; Belás, 2018; Almenberg et al., 2021).

Cultural Sensitivity in Risk Assessment: Cultural norms influence how individuals perceive and manage financial obligations. By integrating cultural sensitivity into risk assessment models, financial institutions can account for variations in attitudes towards debt, risk tolerance, and financial decision-making processes across diverse cultural contexts (Ashby et al., 2013; Power et al., 2013; Palermo et al., 2017; Carretta et al., 2017; Asher & Wilcox, 2022; Shou et al., 2023).

Community-Driven Risk Mitigation: Sociocultural factors provide insights into the informal mechanisms communities employ for risk mitigation. Lenders can leverage this knowledge to identify borrowers with strong community support systems, recognising them as potentially lower-risk individuals due to the social safety nets available to them (Dongier et al., 2003; Bhattamishra & Barrett, 2008; Bhattamishra & Barrett, 2010; Quiñones & Grier-Reed, 2023).

Tailored Credit Products: A deeper understanding of sociocultural factors enables the development of more tailored credit products. Financial institutions can design products that align with cultural preferences, repayment patterns, and community dynamics, fostering greater acceptance and adherence to credit terms (Anderloni et al., 2007; Syz et al., 2008; Churm et al., 2012; Owino, 2013; Fletschner & Kenney, 2014; Pera et al., 2019).

Community-Endorsed Guarantees: Incorporating community endorsements and guarantees into credit risk models adds an additional layer of security. Lenders can systematically evaluate the impact of community support on creditworthiness, allowing for more informed decisions when assessing risk (Bhatt, 1997; Karim, 2011; Muluh et al., 2019; Reisman et al., 2022).

Mitigating Bias and Discrimination: Sociocultural understanding helps mitigate bias and discrimination in credit decisions. By acknowledging and addressing biases related to gender, ethnicity, or cultural practices, financial institutions can ensure fair and equitable treatment in credit risk assessment (Ross & Yinger, 2002; Weber et al., 2020; Corrales-Barquero et al., 2021; Hu et al., 2021; Brock & De Haas, 2023).

Predicting Economic Resilience: Sociocultural factors contribute to an individual's economic resilience. Models that consider cultural practices of mutual assistance, the strength of social networks, and community cohesion can provide a more comprehensive picture of an individual's ability to weather financial challenges (Clauss-Ehlers, 2008; Sherrieb et al., 2010; Simmie & Martin, 2010; Spratt & Bernini, 2010; Stewart & Chowdhury, 2019).

Informed Decision-Making for Financial Inclusion: A nuanced understanding of sociocultural factors facilitates more informed decision-making regarding financial inclusion. By recognising and addressing barriers related to cultural practices, financial institutions can work towards expanding access to credit for marginalised communities (Ibtasam et al., 2018; Garz et al., 2021; Kandpal et al., 2023; Kumar, 2023; Sethy et al., 2023).

Dynamic Model Adaptability: Sociocultural factors are dynamic and subject to change. Models that account for this dynamism can adapt to evolving cultural norms, ensuring ongoing accuracy in credit risk assessment as societies evolve (Lantolf, 2000; Weinstein, 2005; Enciso & Ryan, 2011; Rezaee, 2011; Lal, 2021; Atadouanla et al., 2023).

Cross-Cultural Comparative Analysis: Comparative analysis across different cultural contexts allows financial institutions to identify patterns and trends. This approach helps refine credit risk models by distinguishing between universal risk factors and those specific to certain cultural contexts (Henao, 2016; Lu et al., 2021; Anyangwe et al., 2022; Pradhan, 2023).

The review has indicated that a deeper understanding of sociocultural factors holds immense potential to revolutionise credit risk management models. Financial institutions that embrace this holistic approach are better positioned to navigate the complexities of diverse cultural landscapes, leading to more accurate risk assessments, improved lending practices, and ultimately, greater financial inclusion.

SYNTHESIS FOR THE REVIEW: CULTURAL NORMS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON PERCEPTIONS OF CREDITWORTHINESS

The evaluation of creditworthiness extends beyond quantitative metrics, deeply influenced by cultural norms and social dynamics. These norms shape perceptions of financial responsibility, trustworthiness, and the overall approach to financial transactions within a society. Understanding these cultural factors is essential for accurate credit risk assessment and the development of inclusive lending practices.

*Trust and Reciprocity***:** Cultural norms play a pivotal role in establishing trust and reciprocity within social relationships. Trust, built over time through personal connections and shared experiences, often guides lenders in assessing an individual's commitment to financial obligations. Conversely, a lack of adherence to reciprocal norms can indicate higher credit risk. Research highlights how social networks serve as indicators of trustworthiness and financial reliability (Lisa et al., 2003; Osrom & Walker, 2005; Karlan et al., 2009; Chai et al., 2018; Barajas et al., 2020).

Attitudes Towards Debt: Attitudes towards debt vary significantly across cultures. In some societies, debt is stigmatized, while in others, it is a common aspect of financial management. These cultural attitudes influence how individuals prioritise debt repayment, affecting credit risk assessments (Brennan et al., 2011; Polletta & Tufail, 2014; Almenberg et al., 2021; Finance.Gov.Capital, 2023).

Community Endorsement: In tightly-knit communities, individuals may seek endorsements from respected members when applying for credit. This communal approach reflects a reliance on collective responsibility and community support, which financial institutions need to recognize in their assessment models (Somashekar, 2009; Collier & Hampshire, 2010; Wilson, 2012; Turvey, 2017; Yadav et al., 2018).

Communication Styles and Decision-Making Processes: Cultural variations in communication and decision-making impact the negotiation and fulfilment of financial agreements. For example, in cultures where indirect communication is preferred, individuals may implicitly express financial difficulties. Understanding these nuances is vital for accurate borrower behaviour interpretation (Salacuse, 1998; Cohen, 1997; Kerr & Tindale, 2004; Brett, 2007; Kester et al., 2011).

Cultural Perceptions of Success and Failure: Cultural norms shape perceptions of success and failure, influencing risk tolerance. In societies that value entrepreneurship, financial risk-taking is more acceptable, whereas in cultures prioritizing stability, such behavior may be viewed skeptically. These perceptions affect how lenders assess entrepreneurial ventures and risk (Lee & Peterson, 2000; Mueller & Thomas, 2001; Kreiser, 2010; Autio et al., 2013; Ucbasaran et al., 2013; Ozaralli & Rivenburgh, 2016).

Impact of Gender and Social Hierarchies: Gender roles and social hierarchies, dictated by cultural norms, influence financial behaviour. In societies where women traditionally manage household finances, ignoring their creditworthiness can lead to inaccurate risk assessments. Recognising these dynamics is crucial for fair credit evaluations (Courtenay, 2000; Handy et al., 2002; Fletschner & Carter, 2008; Jones & Boyd, 2011; Karim, 2011; Han et al., 2017; Rashid & Ratten, 2020; Rudman & Glick, 2021).

Social Capital and Trust Social relationships contribute to social capital, which is valuable in credit risk assessment. Borrowers embedded in robust social networks are often considered more trustworthy, as community support can act as a financial safety net. This social capital can mitigate perceived credit risk (Pretty & Ward, 2001; Grootaert & Van Bastelaer, 2002; Narayan, 2002; Portes & Landolt, 2000; Dasgupta, 2005; Karlan, 2005; Dowla, 2006; Castiglione et al., 2008; James, 2023).

Community-Endorsed Guarantees: Community endorsements serve as informal guarantees, adding assurance for lenders. The respect and trust within the community act as collateral, influencing creditworthiness perceptions (Bhatt, 1997; Klaßen, 2008; Bush, 2009; Hawley, 2018; Muluh et al., 2019; Ely, 2022; Reisman et al., 2022).

Informal Social Controls: Informal social controls within communities enforce financial commitments through reputation. Lenders can utilise these controls to gauge repayment likelihood (Sáez et al., 2021; Vaghefi, 2023).
Network-Based Information: Social networks provide additional information about a borrower's character and financial habits, supplementing formal credit data. This network-based information enhances credit risk assessment accuracy (Dufhues et al., 2011; Heuven & Groen, 2012; Tan & Phan, 2018; Giudici et al., 2020; Muñoz-Cancino et al., 2023).

Social Support as a Risk Mitigation Factor: Strong social support systems make borrowers more resilient to financial challenges. Lenders may view borrowers with robust support as less risky (Holzmann & Jørgensen, 2001; Uchino, 2004; Feeney & Collins, 2015; Xu et al., 2024).

Cultural Practices of Mutual Assistance: Understanding cultural practices of mutual assistance is crucial, as they impact financial responsibility management. Ignoring these practices can lead to incomplete credit risk assessments (Patel, 2013; Rodima-Taylor, 2014; Mati, 2017; Shimei, 2022).

Social Stigma and Reputation: The social stigma associated with financial defaults significantly impacts creditworthiness. Fear of social repercussions may deter defaults, influencing credit risk assessments (Efrat, 2005; 2006; Guiso, 2009; Burke, 2012; Mishina & Devers, 2012).

Community Economic Conditions: The economic health of a community affects individual credit risk. Lenders should consider community economic conditions when assessing individual borrowers (Afriyie & Akotey, 2012; Zhang, 2014; Lassoued, 2017; Koju et al., 2020; Dimitrova-Grajzl, et al., 2022; Dunyoh, 2022; Jain, 2023).

Enhancing Credit Risk Management Models: Integrating sociocultural factors into credit risk models improves risk prediction, ensures cultural sensitivity, and leverages community-driven risk mitigation. Tailored credit products, community-endorsed guarantees, and efforts to mitigate bias enhance model effectiveness. Recognising dynamic cultural factors and conducting cross-cultural comparative analysis further refine these models, promoting financial inclusion and resilience (Crook et al., 2007; Kemshall, 2008; Siddiqi, 2017; Belás, 2018; Almenberg et al., 2021).

DISCUSSIONS

Cultural Norms and Their Influence on Perceptions of Creditworthiness

The assessment of creditworthiness involves more than numerical data; cultural norms significantly shape perceptions of financial responsibility and trustworthiness within societies. Cultural elements such as shared values, beliefs, and behavioural expectations impact how individuals and communities view financial transactions and obligations, shaping how creditworthiness is assessed and perceived.

Trust and Reciprocity

Cultural norms around trust and reciprocity play an essential role in shaping credit assessments. In many societies, trust is earned through personal relationships and repeated interactions, which can influence a lender's view of a borrower’s reliability. The stronger the social networks and the norms of reciprocity, the more likely a lender will see a borrower as committed to meeting financial obligations. The absence of adherence to such norms could signal a higher credit risk, as individuals may be less motivated to maintain financial obligations (Lisa et al., 2003; Osrom & Walker, 2005; Karlan et al., 2009; Chai et al., 2018; Barajas et al., 2020).

Attitudes Towards Debt

Cultural attitudes toward debt differ significantly across societies. In some cultures, debt carries a stigma, with borrowers being viewed negatively, while in others, it is normalized as a strategic financial tool. These differing views on debt have a direct effect on credit risk evaluation, as individuals from cultures where debt is stigmatized may prioritize repayment differently. Understanding these variances allows lenders to better interpret risk in different cultural contexts (Brennan et al., 2011; Polletta & Tufail, 2014; Almenberg et al., 2021; Finance.Gov.Capital, 2023).

Community Endorsement

In many tightly-knit communities, creditworthiness is often tied to communal dynamics. Borrowers may seek endorsement or co-signatories from well-regarded community members, which provides lenders with an added layer of security. This reflects the cultural importance of collective responsibility. Lenders should integrate these communal endorsements into their risk models to account for the added credibility and trust these endorsements confer (Somashekar, 2009; Collier & Hampshire, 2010; Wilson, 2012; Turvey, 2017; Yadav et al., 2018).

Communication Styles and Decision-Making Processes

Cultural differences in communication and decision-making styles influence financial transactions. For instance, in cultures that favour indirect communication, borrowers might not be explicit about financial hardships, which could hinder the lender's understanding of the borrower’s financial status. Lenders must be aware of these cultural nuances to avoid misinterpreting the borrower’s behaviour and to make more accurate assessments (Salacuse, 1998; Cohen, 1997; Kerr & Tindale, 2004; Brett, 2007; Kester et al., 2011).

Cultural Perceptions of Success and Failure

Cultural norms influence how risk, success, and failure are perceived. In societies where entrepreneurship is encouraged, taking financial risks may be viewed positively, while in more conservative societies, risk-taking might be seen as imprudent. These differing views can affect how lenders interpret risk tolerance and entrepreneurial ventures (Lee & Peterson, 2000; Mueller & Thomas, 2001; Kreiser, 2010; Autio et al., 2013; Ucbasaran et al., 2013; Ozaralli & Rivenburgh, 2016).

Gender Roles and Social Hierarchies

Cultural norms surrounding gender roles and social hierarchies also play a role in financial behaviour and creditworthiness. In many societies, women are responsible for household financial management but may face bias when seeking credit, despite their role in maintaining household budgets. Lenders need to consider these social hierarchies and the role of women in financial decision-making to avoid underestimating their creditworthiness (Courtenay, 2000; Handy et al., 2002; Fletschner & Carter, 2008; Karim, 2011; Rashid & Ratten, 2020; Rudman & Glick, 2021).

Recognising these cultural factors and their impact on financial behaviour enables lenders to enhance their credit risk evaluation processes, leading to more inclusive and culturally sensitive lending practices. This understanding also promotes financial inclusion by accounting for cultural contexts that influence individuals' financial decisions and behaviours.

Impact of Social Relationships and Community Dynamics on Credit Risk Evaluation

Social relationships and community dynamics are integral to credit risk evaluation. These aspects provide insights into borrowers' financial habits, reliability, and ability to meet obligations, offering an additional dimension to formal financial metrics.

Social Capital and Trust

Social capital, created through strong social relationships, adds value to credit assessments. Individuals embedded in strong social networks are often seen as more trustworthy, given that their communities may provide financial or emotional support in times of need. Lenders can view social capital as a mitigating factor for credit risk, recognizing that borrowers with robust social support systems are less likely to default (Pretty & Ward, 2001; Karlan, 2005; Castiglione et al., 2008).

Community-Endorsed Guarantees

In many communities, the concept of communal endorsement or guarantees adds weight to a borrower's credit application. These guarantees, often provided by respected community figures, act as informal collateral. Lenders that incorporate this communal backing into their models can better evaluate the trustworthiness of borrowers (Bhatt, 1997; Reisman et al., 2022).

Informal Social Controls

Informal social mechanisms within communities, such as reputation and the desire to maintain social standing, can serve as strong motivators for honouring financial obligations. Lenders can rely on these social controls to gauge borrowers' likelihood of repayment, especially in cultures where reputation is paramount (Sáez et al., 2021; Vaghefi, 2023).

Network-Based Information

Borrowers' social networks can provide valuable information about their financial habits and character. Lenders may supplement formal credit data with network-based information, offering a more comprehensive assessment of risk (Dufhues et al., 2011; Heuven & Groen, 2012; Giudici et al., 2020).

Social Support as a Risk Mitigation Factor

Borrowers with strong social support are often more resilient in facing financial challenges. Lenders may view this support as a mitigating factor, anticipating that a borrower with a solid network will be less likely to default (Holzmann & Jørgensen, 2001; Feeney & Collins, 2015). Understanding these social dynamics enhances the ability of financial institutions to assess credit risk with greater accuracy, ensuring that they account for the complex interplay between individual financial behaviour and community influences.

Enhancing Credit Risk Management Models Through Sociocultural Understanding

Conventional credit risk models tend to focus on financial indicators, often overlooking the role of sociocultural factors. A deeper understanding of these factors can greatly enhance the accuracy and inclusivity of credit risk management practices.

Improved Risk Prediction

Incorporating sociocultural factors such as attitudes toward debt, social networks, and community support into risk models can improve the precision of credit risk predictions. This integration allows lenders to more accurately assess the likelihood of defaults or timely repayments (Crook et al., 2007; Siddiqi, 2017; Belás, 2018).

Cultural Sensitivity in Risk Assessment

Lenders that account for cultural differences in financial decision-making are better positioned to assess risk in diverse markets. Recognising variations in debt perception and financial responsibility ensures more tailored and accurate risk assessments (Ashby et al., 2013; Shou et al., 2023).

Tailored Credit Products

With a deeper understanding of sociocultural factors, lenders can develop credit products that are better aligned with borrowers' cultural preferences and repayment patterns. This can lead to greater adherence to credit terms and a stronger relationship between lenders and borrowers (Syz et al., 2008; Owino, 2013).

Community-Endorsed Guarantees

Incorporating community guarantees into formal risk models adds an extra layer of risk mitigation. This practice provides a structured way to include informal social controls in credit decisions (Bhatt, 1997; Karim, 2011).

By integrating sociocultural factors into credit risk models, financial institutions can enhance their risk prediction accuracy, promote financial inclusion, and develop more equitable lending practices. These improvements lead to more effective credit management and expand access to credit for underserved communities.

CONCLUSIONS

The systematic review, titled "Beyond Numbers: Unraveling the Tapestry of Credit Risk - A Cultural Lens on Social Dynamics in Lending Decisions," aimed to investigate the nuanced interplay between cultural and social factors and credit risk management, with a particular focus on small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) in developing countries. The review explored diverse disciplines, synthesising literature to illuminate the intricate tapestry of credit risk assessment within these specific contexts.

The analysis incorporated studies from sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics, and finance to discern patterns and themes surrounding trust, community dynamics, communication styles, gender roles, and other sociocultural factors. The synthesis aimed to provide a holistic understanding of how these factors influence lending decisions and credit risk assessment beyond conventional financial metrics. The following conclusions are provided:

Trust and Social Capital: The review affirmed the centrality of trust and social capital in credit risk assessment. Individuals embedded in strong social networks were consistently perceived as more creditworthy, emphasising the importance of community connections. Financial institutions can enhance risk models by incorporating measures of social capital and trust within communities. Community-based endorsements or guarantees may serve as valuable indicators of an individual's creditworthiness.

Cultural Attitudes towards Debt: Cultural attitudes towards debt significantly influenced credit risk. Tailoring financial education programs to address cultural nuances emerged as a potential strategy to mitigate the impact of these attitudes. Credit risk models should consider cultural variations in attitudes towards debt. Tailored financial education programs that address cultural nuances can help individuals make informed financial decisions, reducing the risk of default.

Informal Social Controls: Informal social controls within communities play a crucial role in influencing financial behaviours. Recognition of the power of reputation and adherence to communal norms contributed to more accurate risk assessments. Financial institutions can leverage informal social controls by exploring community-based credit assessment mechanisms. Collaborative approaches that involve community leaders or influencers may contribute to more accurate risk evaluations.

Community Dynamics and Economic Resilience: Community dynamics were identified as contributors to economic resilience. Understanding and incorporating community-level indicators into credit risk models were recommended for a more comprehensive assessment. Credit risk models should incorporate community-level indicators to assess economic resilience. Lenders can collaborate with community organisations to understand local economic conditions and tailor lending practices accordingly.

Gender and Social Hierarchies: Gender roles and social hierarchies impacted credit risk, emphasizing the need for gender-sensitive lending practices and targeted financial inclusion initiatives. Financial institutions must address gender biases in credit risk models. Gender-sensitive lending practices and targeted financial inclusion initiatives can contribute to more equitable and accurate risk assessments.

Communication Styles and Decision-Making Processes: Cross-cultural communication styles were found to influence how individuals conveyed financial challenges. Models that accounted for diverse communication styles were recommended for accurate risk interpretation. Financial institutions should consider cross-cultural communication training for their staff. Models that account for diverse communication styles can lead to more accurate interpretations of borrower behaviour.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CREDIT RISK AND CULTURAL FACTORS

Community-Centric Approaches: Policymakers should encourage financial institutions to adopt community-centric approaches to credit risk assessment, leveraging community-based endorsements and guarantees. This can help address the lack of formal credit history in certain communities and reduce information asymmetry, ultimately promoting financial inclusion.

Cultural Sensitivity Training: Financial institutions should provide cultural sensitivity training to their staff to enhance their ability to interpret diverse communication styles and understand cultural nuances that may affect credit risk. This training can help mitigate cultural biases and improve the quality of interactions between financial institutions and their customers from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Tailored Financial Education Programs: Policymakers should support the development of tailored financial education programs that address cultural attitudes towards debt and ensure individuals make informed financial decisions. These programs can help dispel myths and misconceptions about credit, promote responsible borrowing, and improve financial literacy among diverse populations.

Gender-Inclusive Lending Policies: Financial institutions should adopt gender-inclusive lending policies to address biases related to gender roles and promote equitable access to credit. By eliminating gender-based discrimination in lending practices, these policies can help women and girls achieve financial independence and participate more fully in the economy.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS: CREDIT RISK AND CULTURAL FACTORS

*Longitudinal Studies***:** To capture the dynamic nature of sociocultural factors and their evolving impact on credit risk, future research should incorporate longitudinal studies. This will enable researchers to track changes in cultural norms, values, and behaviours over time and assess their corresponding influence on credit risk assessment and management.

Cross-Cultural Comparative Analysis: Comparative analyses across different cultural contexts can provide valuable insights into both universal risk factors and those specific to certain regions or communities. By examining credit risk management practices and challenges in diverse cultural settings, researchers can identify commonalities and differences, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of the interplay between culture and credit risk.

Technology Integration: Investigating the integration of technology, such as machine learning and fintech solutions, in credit risk assessment is another important area for future research. With a focus on diverse cultural landscapes, researchers can explore how technology can enhance credit risk management by addressing cultural nuances and improving the accuracy of risk assessments.

In-depth Cultural Case Studies: Conducting in-depth cultural case studies can provide a more granular understanding of the intricacies of credit risk management within specific cultural contexts. By examining cultural values, beliefs, and practices that influence credit risk, researchers can gain valuable insights into the unique challenges and opportunities faced by financial institutions operating in diverse cultural environments.

*Policy Impact Assessment***:** Evaluating the impact of policy interventions on cultural factors influencing credit risk is essential for policymakers seeking to refine and optimise financial inclusion strategies. By assessing the effectiveness of policies aimed at addressing cultural barriers to credit access and promoting financial inclusion, researchers can provide evidence-based recommendations for policymakers to improve their interventions and achieve more equitable outcomes.

REFERENCES

Afriyie, H. O., & Akotey, J. O. (2012). Credit risk management and profitability of selected rural banks in Ghana. *Ghana: Catholic University College of Ghana*, *7*(4), 176-181.

Almenberg, J., Lusardi, A., Säve-Söderbergh, J., & Vestman, R. (2021). Attitudes towards Debt and Debt Behavior*. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, *123*(3), 780-809. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjoe.12419

Anderloni, L., Braga, M. D., & Carluccio, E. M. (Eds.). (2007). *New Frontiers in Banking Services: emerging needs and tailored products for untapped markets*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Anyangwe, T., Vanroose, A., & Fanta, A. B. (2022). Determinants of financial inclusion: does culture matter? *Cogent Economics & Finance*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2022.2073656

Ashby, S., Power, M., & Palermo, T. (2013). Guidance on supervisory interaction with financial institutions on risk culture: Feedback on the FSB's consultative document.

Asher, A., & Wilcox, T. (2022). Virtue and risk culture in finance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *179*(1), 223-236.

Atadouanla, S. B., Fouopi, D. C., Piabuo, S. M., & Ngasseu, N. E. (2023). Financial Inclusion and Income Inequality in Sub-Saharan Africa: Taking Socio-Cultural Particularities into Account. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 1-24.

Autio, E., Pathak, S., & Wennberg, K. (2013). Consequences of cultural practices for entrepreneurial behaviours. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *44*, 334-362.

Barajas, A., Beck, T., Belhaj, M., & Naceur, S. B. (2020). Financial inclusion: What have we learned so far? What do we have to learn? *IMF Working Paper*, *2020*(157), 1. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781513553009.001

Belás, J., Smrcka, L., Gavurova, B., & Dvorsky, J. (2018). The impact of social and economic factors in the credit risk management of SME. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, *24*(3), 1215-1230.

Bhatt, N. (1997). Microenterprise development and the entreprenurial poor: including the excluded?. *Public Administration and Development: The International Journal of Management Research and Practice*, *17*(4), 371-386.

Bhattamishra, R., & Barrett, C. B. (2010). Community-based risk management arrangements: a review. *World Development*, *38*(7), 923-932.

Brennan, L., Zevallos, Z., & Binney, W. (2011). Vulnerable Consumers and Debt: Can Social Marketing Assist? *Australasian Marketing Journal*, *19*(3), 203-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2011.05.007

Brett, J. M. (2007). *Negotiating globally: How to negotiate deals, resolve disputes, and make decisions across cultural boundaries*. John Wiley & Sons.

Brock, J. M., & De Haas, R. (2023). Discriminatory lending: Evidence from bankers in the lab. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, *15*(2), 31-68.

Burke, J. (2012). Financial Literacy, Social Perception and Strategic Default. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/working_papers/2012/RAND_WR937.pdf

Bush, J. (2009). *Worlds apart: Social mechanisms of contrasting fertility in European American and Native American populations on the northern plains*. University of Montana.

Carretta, A., Farina, V., & Schwizer, P. (2017). Risk culture and banking supervision. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance, 25*(2), 209-226.

Castiglione, D., Van Deth, J. W., & Wolleb, G. (Eds.). (2008). *The handbook of social capital*. Oxford University Press.

Chai, S., Y. Chen, B. Huang, and D. Ye. (2018). Social Networks and Informal Inclusion of the People's Republic of China. ADBI Working Paper 802. Tokyo: Asian Development Bank Institute. Available: https://www.adb.org/publications/social-networks-and-informal-inclusionprc

Churm, R., Radia, A., Leake, J., Srinivasan, S., & Whisker, R. (2012). The funding for lending scheme. *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin*, Q4.

Clauss-Ehlers, C. S. (2008). Sociocultural factors, resilience, and coping: Support for a culturally sensitive measure of resilience. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *29*(3), 197-212.

Cohen, R. (1997). *Negotiating across cultures: International communication in an interdependent world*. US institute of Peace Press.

Collier, B. C., & Hampshire, R. (2010, February). Sending mixed signals: Multilevel reputation effects in peer-to-peer lending markets. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work* (pp. 197-206).

Corrales-Barquero, R., Marín-Raventós, G., & Barrantes, E. G. (2021). A Review of Gender Bias Mitigation in Credit Scoring Models. *2021 Ethics and Explainability for Responsible Data Science (EE-RDS)*, 1-10.

Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: a theory of gender and health. *Social science & medicine*, *50*(10), 1385-1401.

Crook, J. N., Edelman, D. B., & Thomas, L. C. (2007). Recent developments in consumer credit risk assessment. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *183*(3), 1447-1465.

Dasgupta, P. (2005). Economics of social capital. *Economic Record*, *81*, S2-S21.

Dash, R., Kremer, A., & Petrov, A. (2021, December 2). *Designing next-generation credit-decisioning models*. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/risk-and-resilience/our-

Dimitrova-Grajzl, V., Grajzl, P., Guse, A. J., & Kokodoko, M. (2022). Community development financial institutions and individuals' credit risk in Indian Country. *Journal of Economic Issues*, *56*(1), 184-208.

Dongier, P., Van Domelen, J., Ostrom, E., Ryan, A., Wakeman, W., Bebbington, A., ... & Polski, M. (2003). Community driven development. *World Bank Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*, *1*, 303-327.

Dowla, A. (2006). In credit we trust: Building social capital by Grameen Bank in Bangladesh. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, *35*(1), 102-122.

Dufhues, T., Buchenrieder, G., Euler, D. G., & Munkung, N. (2011). Network based social capital and individual loan repayment performance. *Journal of Development Studies*, *47*(8), 1199-1215.

Dunyoh, M., Ankamah, E. T., & Kosipa, S. J. K. (2022). The impact of credit risk on financial performance: Evidence from rural and community banks in Ghana. *Hybrid Journal of Business and Finance*, *3*(1).

Efrat, R. (2005). Bankruptcy stigma: Plausible causes for shifting norms. *Emory Bankr. Dev. J.*, *22*, 481.

Efrat, R. (2006). The evolution of bankruptcy stigma. *Theoretical inquiries in Law*, *7*(2), 365-393.

Ekai, C. (2023, July 15). Credit Risk Assessment: A comprehensive guide for lenders and financial institutions. *Risk Publishing*. https://riskpublishing.com/credit-risk-assessment-a-comprehensive-guide-for-lenders-and-financial-institutions/

Ely, T. (2022). Foundations of Colorado. *Available at SSRN 4478524*.

Enciso, P., & Ryan, C. (2011). Sociocultural theory. *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*, 132-138.

Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). A new look at social support: A theoretical perspective on thriving through relationships. *Personality and social psychology review*, *19*(2), 113-147.

Finance.Gov.Capital. (2023, September 11). *Why do cultural attitudes towards debt affect borrowing behaviour?*. https://finance.gov.capital/why-do-cultural-attitudes-towards-debt-affect-borrowing-behaviour/

Fletschner, D., & Carter, M. R. (2008). Constructing and reconstructing gender: Reference group effects and women's demand for entrepreneurial capital. *The journal of socio-economics*, *37*(2), 672-693.

Fletschner, D., & Kenney, L. (2014). *Rural women's access to financial services: credit, savings, and insurance* (pp. 187-208). Springer Netherlands.

Garz, S., Giné, X., Karlan, D., Mazer, R., Sanford, C., & Zinman, J. (2021). Consumer protection for financial inclusion in low-and middle-income countries: Bridging regulator and academic perspectives. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, *13*, 219-246.

Giudici, P., Hadji-Misheva, B., & Spelta, A. (2020). Network based credit risk models. *Quality Engineering*, *32*(2), 199-211.

Goel, A., & Rastogi, S. (2023). Understanding the impact of borrowers' behavioural and psychological traits on credit default: review and conceptual model. *Review of Behavioral Finance, 15*(2), 205-223.

Grootaert, C., & Van Bastelaer, T. (Eds.). (2002). *The role of social capital in development: An empirical assessment*. Cambridge University Press.

Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2009). *Moral and social constraints to strategic default on mortgages* (No. w15145). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Han, J., Shipilov, A. V., & Greve, H. R. (2017). Unequal bedfellows: Gender role-based deference in multiplex ties between Korean business groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, *60*(4), 1531-1553.

Handy, F., Kassam, M., & Renade, S. (2002). Factors influencing women entrepreneurs of NGOs in India. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 13*(2), 139-154.

Hawley, C. R. (2018). *The Uses of Community in Modern American Rhetoric*. University of South Florida.

Henao B. J. (2016). Cross-Cultural Comparison of Credit Transfer Practices, Lending and Financial Inclusions in North America, Europe and the Middle East.

Heuven, J., & Groen, A. (2012). The role of social networks in financing technology-based ventures: An empirical exploration. *Venture capital*, *14*(2-3), 131-149.

Holzmann, R., & Jørgensen, S. (2001). Social risk management: A new conceptual framework for social protection, and beyond. *International Tax and Public Finance*, *8*, 529-556.

Hu, X., Huang, Y., Li, B., & Lu, T. (2021). Uncovering the Source of Evaluation Bias in Micro-Lending. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Information Systems*.

Ibtasam, S., Razaq, L., Anwar, H. W., Mehmood, H., Shah, K., Webster, J., ... & Anderson, R. (2018, June). Knowledge, access, and decision-making: Women's financial inclusion in Pakistan. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGCAS Conference on Computing and Sustainable Societies* (pp. 1-12).

Jain, V., Tiwari, R., Mehrotra, R., Bohra, N. S., Misra, A., & Pandey, D. C. (2023, October). Role of Technology for Credit Risk Management: A Bibliometric Review. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Blockchain and Distributed Systems Security (ICBDS)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.

James, H. L. (2023). Social capital and the riskiness of trade credit. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 100832.

Jones, L., & Boyd, E. (2011). Exploring social barriers to adaptation: insights from Western Nepal. *Global environmental change*, *21*(4), 1262-1274.

Kandpal, V., Chandra, D., Dalei, N. N., & Handoo, J. (2023). Socio-economic Impact of Financial Inclusion. In *Financial Inclusion in Circular Economy: A Bumpy Road Towards Sustainable Development* (pp. 59-77). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Karim, L. (2011). *Microfinance and its discontents: Women in debt in Bangladesh*. U of Minnesota Press.

Karlan, D. S. (2005). Using experimental economics to measure social capital and predict financial decisions. *American Economic Review*, *95*(5), 1688-1699.

Karlan, D., Mobius, M., Rosenblat, T., & Szeidl, A. (2009). Trust and Social Collateral. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *124*(3), 1307–1361. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40506258

Kemshall, H. (2008). *Understanding the management of high risk offenders*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Kerr, N. L., & Tindale, R. S. (2004). Group performance and decision making. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, *55*, 623-655.

Kester, L., Griffin, A., Hultink, E. J., & Lauche, K. (2011). Exploring portfolio decision-making processes. *Journal of product innovation management*, *28*(5), 641-661.

Klaßen, T. (2008). *Continuity within change: The German-American foreign and security relationship during President Clinton's first term* (Doctoral dissertation).

Koju, L., Koju, R., & Wang, S. (2020). "Macroeconomic determinants of credit risks: evidence from high-income countries", *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 29(1), 41-53. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-02-2018-0032

Kreiser, P. M., Marino, L. D., Dickson, P., & Weaver, K. M. (2010). Cultural influences on entrepreneurial orientation: The impact of national culture on risk taking and proactiveness in SMEs. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, *34*(5), 959-984.

Kunz, J., & Heitz, M. (2021). Banks' risk culture and management control systems: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Management Control*, *32*(4), 439-493.

Kumar, I. (2023). Banking services and financial inclusion in India's poorest regions. *Journal of Banking Regulation*, 1-15.

Lal, T. (2021). Impact of financial inclusion on economic development of marginalized communities through the mediation of social and economic empowerment. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *48*(12), 1768-1793.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, *1*, 1-26.

Lassoued, N. (2017). What drives credit risk of microfinance institutions? International evidence. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, *13*(5), 541-559.

Lee, S. M., & Peterson, S. J. (2000). Culture, entrepreneurial orientation, and global competitiveness. *Journal of world business*, *35*(4), 401-416.

Lip, G. (2023, November 29). *Credit risk analysis*. Corporate Finance Institute. https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/commercial-lending/credit-risk-analysis/insights/designing-next-generation-credit-decisioning-models

Lisa C. Abrams, Rob Cross, Eric Lesser, & Levin, D. Z. (2003). Nurturing Interpersonal Trust in Knowledge-Sharing Networks. *The Academy of Management Executive (1993-2005)*, *17*(4), 64–77. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166007

Lu, W., Niu, G., & Zhou, Y. (2021). Individualism and financial inclusion. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *183*, 268-288.

Mati, J. M. (2017). Philanthropy in contemporary Africa: A review. *Voluntaristics Review*, *1*(6), 1-100.

Mishina, Y., & Devers, C. E. (2012). On being bad: Why stigma is not the same as a bad reputation. in Timothy G. Pollock, and Michael L. Barnett (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Reputation* (2012; online edn, Oxford Academic, 21 Nov. 2012),

Mueller, S. L., & Thomas, A. S. (2001). Culture and entrepreneurial potential: A nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness. *Journal of business venturing*, *16*(1), 51-75.

Muluh, G. N., Kimengsi, J. N., & Azibo, N. K. (2019). Challenges and prospects of sustaining donor-funded projects in rural Cameroon. *Sustainability*, *11*(24), 6990.

Muñoz-Cancino, R., Bravo, C., Ríos, S. A., & Graña, M. (2022). On the dynamics of credit history and social interaction features, and their impact on creditworthiness assessment performance. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2204.06122

Muñoz-Cancino, R., Bravo, C., Ríos, S. A., & Graña, M. (2023). On the dynamics of credit history and social interaction features, and their impact on creditworthiness assessment performance. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *218*, 119599.

Narayan, D. (2002). Bonds and bridges: social capital and poverty. *Social capital and economic development: well-being in developing countries. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar*, 58-81.

Nasr, S., & Rostom, A. M. (2013). SME contributions to employment, job creation, and growth in the Arab world. *Job Creation, and Growth in the Arab World (October 1, 2013)*.

OECD (2000). Small and Medium-sized Enterprises: Local Strength, Global Reach https://www.oecd.org/scripts/publications/bookshop/redirect.asp?%20922000021P1

OECD (2017). Enhancing the Contributions of SMEs in a Global and Digitalised Economy. https://www.oecd.org/mcm/documents/C-MIN-2017-8-EN.pdf

OECD (2019). *Strengthening SMEs and Entrepreneurship for Productivity and Inclusive Growth: OECD 2018 Ministerial Conference on SMEs*, OECD Studies on SMEs and Entrepreneurship, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/c19b6f97-en.

Osrom, E., & Walker, J. (2005). *Trust and Reciprocity. Interdisciplinary Lessons for Experimental Research*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York

Owino, M. O. (2013). *The effect of the lending policies on the levels of non-performing loans (NPLS) of commercial banks in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

Ozaralli, N., & Rivenburgh, N. K. (2016). Entrepreneurial intention: antecedents to entrepreneurial behavior in the USA and Turkey. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, *6*, 1-32.

Palermo, T., Power, M., & Ashby, S. (2017). Navigating institutional complexity: The production of risk culture in the financial sector. *Journal of Management Studies*, *54*(2), 154-181.

Patel, L., Kaseke, E., & Midgley, J. (2013). Indigenous welfare and community-based social development: Lessons from African innovations. In *Social Development and Social Work* (pp. 12-31). Routledge.

Pera, M., Bavagnoli, M., & Benni, N. (2019). *Access to markets for small actors in the roots and tubers sector. Tailored financial services and climate risk management tools to link small farmers to markets* (No. 2143-2019-4791).

Polletta, F., & Tufail, Z. (2014). The Moral Obligations of Some Debts. *Sociological Forum*, *29*(1), 1–28. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43653930

Portes, A., & Landolt, P. (2000). Social capital: promise and pitfalls of its role in development. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, *32*(2), 529-547.

Power, M., Ashby, S., & Palermo, T. (2013). *Risk culture in financial organisations: A research report*. CARR-Analysis of Risk and Regulation.

Pradhan, T. K. (2023). A framework for measuring financial inclusion in India: Bridging gaps between theory and practice. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, *34*(2), 169-183.

Pretty, J., & Ward, H. (2001). Social capital and the environment. *World development*, *29*(2), 209-227.

Quiñones, M., & Grier-Reed, T. (2023). The Tanda: An Informal Financial Practice at the Intersection of Culture and Financial Management for Mexican American Families. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 1-11.

Rashid, S., & Ratten, V. (2020). A systematic literature review on women entrepreneurship in emerging economies while reflecting specifically on SAARC countries. *Entrepreneurship and organizational change: Managing innovation and creative capabilities*, 37-88.

Reisman, J., Baek, J., Newsome, D., & Ryan, C. (2022). Leveraging Foundation Balance Sheets for Greater Impact: Piloting a Pooled Guarantee Program. *The Foundation Review*, *14*(4), 7.

Rezaee, M. (2011). Sociocultural theory revisited: What are the educational implications?. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, *2*(4), 62-67.

Rodima-Taylor, D. (2012). Passageways of Cooperation: mutual help in post-socialist Tanzania. *African Studies Center Working Papers*, (267), I.

Rodima-Taylor, D. (2014). Passageways of cooperation: Mutuality in post-socialist Tanzania. *Africa*, *84*(4), 553-575.

Ross, S. L., & Yinger, J. (2002). *The color of credit: Mortgage discrimination, research methodology, and fair-lending enforcement*. MIT press.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2021). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. Guilford Publications.

Sáez, D. E., Ortiz-Rendón, P. A., & Alemán, J. L. M. (2021). The influence of formal and informal control on market and financial results. *Spanish Journal of Marketing - ESIC*. https://doi.org/10.1108/sjme-04-2021-0072

Salacuse, J. W. (1998). Ten ways that culture affects negotiating style: Some survey results. *Negotiation journal*, *14*(3), 221-240.

Sethy, S. K., Mir, T. A., Gopinathan, R., & Joshi, D. P. P. (2023). "Exploring the socio-economic attributes of financial inclusion in India: a decomposition analysis", *International Journal of Social Economics*, *50*(7), 941-955.

Sherrieb, K., Norris, F. H., & Galea, S. (2010). Measuring capacities for community resilience. *Social indicators research*, *99*, 227-247.

Shi, W., & Veenstra, K. (2020). The moderating effect of cultural values on the relationship between corporate social performance and firm performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *174*(1), 89-107. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04555-9

Shimei, N. (2022). “Though we are often invisible, we are always taking care of each other”: mutual aid among sex workers. In *Sex Work, Labour and Relations: New Directions and Reflections* (pp. 291-314). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Shou, Y., Olney, J., & Wang, M. C. (2023). Cross-cultural assessment and comparisons of risk tolerance across domains. *Current Psychology*, *42*(18), 15368-15380.

Siddiqi, N. (2017). *Intelligent credit scoring: Building and implementing better credit risk scorecards*. John Wiley & Sons.

Simmie, J., & Martin, R. (2010). The economic resilience of regions: towards an evolutionary approach. *Cambridge journal of regions, economy and society*, *3*(1), 27-43.

Somashekar, N. T. (2009). *Banking*. New Age International.

Spratt, S., & Bernini, M. (2010, January). Measuring economic resilience and vulnerability: Towards an international index. In *Second Annual ESRC Development Economics Conference’, Manchester*.

Stewart, R., & Chowdhury, M. (2019). Does bank stability promote economic resilience?: Evidence From Panel Data. *Evidence From Panel Data (January 31, 2019).*

Syz, J., Vanini, P., & Salvi, M. (2008). Property derivatives and index-linked mortgages. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, *36*(1), 23-35.

Tan, T., & Phan, T. Q. (2018). Social media-driven credit scoring: The predictive value of social structures. *Available at SSRN 3217885*.

Turvey, C. G. (2017). Historical developments in agricultural finance and the genesis of America's farm credit system. *Agricultural Finance Review*, *77*(1), 4-21.

Ucbasaran, D., Shepherd, D. A., Lockett, A., & Lyon, S. J. (2013). Life after business failure: The process and consequences of business failure for entrepreneurs. *Journal of management*, *39*(1), 163-202.

Uchino, B. N. (2004). *Social support and physical health: Understanding the health consequences of relationships*. Yale university press.

Uskul, A.K. (2015). The Role of Economic Culture in Social Relationships and Interdependence. In: Psaltis, C., Gillespie, A., Perret-Clermont, AN. (eds) Social Relations in Human and Societal Development. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137400994_9

Vaghefi, S. (2023, August 5). Informal Social Control: 16 Examples and Definition (2024). *Helpful Professor*. https://helpfulprofessor.com/informal-social-control/

Von Jacobi, N. (2017). Institutional interconnections: understanding symbiotic relationships. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, *14*(5), 853–876. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744137417000558

Weber, M., Yurochkin, M., Botros, S., & Markov, V. (2020). Black loans matter: Distributionally robust fairness for fighting subgroup discrimination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.01193*.

Weinstein, J. A. (2005). *Social and cultural change: Social science for a dynamic world*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Wilson, T. A. (2012). Supporting social enterprises to support vulnerable consumers: the example of community development finance institutions and financial exclusion. *Journal of consumer policy*, *35*, 197-213.

Win, S. (2018). What are the possible future research directions for bank's credit risk assessment research? A systematic review of literature. *International Economics and Economic Policy*, *15*(4), 743-759.

Xu, Y., He, N., Lu, W., & Jedwab, M. (2024). Secondary traumatic stress and burnout among child welfare social workers in southern China: Focusing on resilience and Social support. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, *48*(1), 43-57.

Yadav, P., Davies, P. J., & Abdullah, S. (2018). Reforming capital subsidy scheme to finance energy transition for the below poverty line communities in rural India. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, *45*, 11-27.

Zhang, Z. (2014). Credit Risk Preference in E-Finance: An Empirical Analysis of P2P Lending. In *PACIS* (p. 197).