

WORKING
PAPERS IN
RESPONSIBLE
BANKING &
FINANCE

**Shocks, Uncertainty and Regional
Resilience: The Case of Brexit and
Scottish SMEs**

*By Ross Brown, Ronald V. Kalafsky,
Suzanne Mawson, Lori Davis*

Abstract: Regional resilience is a topic of growing academic and policy maker interest. This paper empirically examines this concept by scrutinising the impact of Brexit on Scottish small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). The research adopted a novel mixed methods approach examining the Longitudinal Small Business Survey together with in-depth interviews with SMEs. It is clear from the survey analysis that certain types of SMEs (i.e. innovators and exporters) were disproportionately fearful of Brexit. This was strongly corroborated by the interview data which found these same firms to be the most detrimentally impacted, manifesting in reductions in employment, exports and innovation. In contrast, the majority of domestically focused less innovative SMEs were much less concerned and less negatively affected. While a small minority managed to deploy adjustment mechanisms to mitigate these negative effects, overall many firms had major difficulties operationally and strategically coping with this uncertain and turbulent environment. The findings suggest proactive public policies will be needed to help mitigate the difficulties caused by Brexit for certain types of SMEs.

WP N° 20-009

2nd Quarter 2020



Shocks, Uncertainty and Regional Resilience: The Case of Brexit and Scottish SMEs

Ross Brown, Centre for Responsible Banking and Finance, School of Management, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK Email: Ross.Brown@st-andrews.ac.uk

Ronald V. Kalafsky, Department of Geography, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, US
Email: kalafsky@utk.edu

Suzanne Mawson, Stirling Management School, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK
Email: suzanne.mawson@stir.ac.uk

Lori Davis, School of Management, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK
Email: lld2@st-andrews.ac.uk

Abstract

Regional resilience is a topic of growing academic and policy maker interest. This paper empirically examines this concept by scrutinising the impact of Brexit on Scottish small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). The research adopted a novel mixed methods approach examining the Longitudinal Small Business Survey together with in-depth interviews with SMEs. It is clear from the survey analysis that certain types of SMEs (i.e. innovators and exporters) were disproportionately fearful of Brexit. This was strongly corroborated by the interview data which found these same firms to be the most detrimentally impacted, manifesting in reductions in employment, exports and innovation. In contrast, the majority of domestically focused less innovative SMEs were much less concerned and less negatively affected. While a small minority managed to deploy adjustment mechanisms to mitigate these negative effects, overall many firms had major difficulties operationally and strategically coping with this uncertain and turbulent environment. The findings suggest proactive public policies will be needed to help mitigate the difficulties caused by Brexit for certain types of SMEs.

Key Words:

Regional Resilience

Shocks

Brexit

Uncertainty

SMEs

1. Introduction

The June 2016 referendum vote to leave the European Union (henceforth Brexit) dramatically increased business uncertainty in the United Kingdom (Brown et al, 2019). Brexit entails such a legally complex and highly unpredictable set of outcomes (Jessop, 2017; Lee et al, 2018; Pollard, 2018), its impact is perhaps best encapsulated by a single word: “uncertainty”. Uncertainty is an “*amorphous concept*” reflecting ambiguity in “the minds of consumers, managers and policy makers about possible futures” (Bloom, 2014, p.153). Prior evidence suggests that small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) may be disproportionately impacted by chronic uncertainty given their lower resilience to unexpected shocks (Ghosal and Ye, 2015; Monsson, 2017; Doshi et al, 2018). Yet, to date, however, there has been a paucity of research examining how different types of regions and the firms within cope, adjust and adapt to unforeseen shocks such as Brexit and its related uncertainty. Therefore, following pleas for more “agency” and “firm-centred” approaches towards analysing regional resilience (Pike et al, 2010; Bristow and Healy, 2014; Soroka et al, 2019), this paper empirically scrutinises the impact of Brexit on Scottish SMEs.

Since the early 1970s the institutions, regulatory frameworks and the cumulative body of EU laws (the so-called *acquis communautaire*) established the legal framework governing how firms undertake economic transactions within the EU (Grabbe, 2002). Brexit is therefore dramatically rewriting the “rules of the game” governing how UK firms conduct business (Brown et al, 2018). While the withdrawal of the UK from the EU has stimulated academic interest in the resilience of economies to such shocks (Bristow and Healy, 2020), to date much of the analysis of its potential impact has centred on the expected macroeconomic effects on future growth, trade and inflation (Van Reenen, 2016; Los et al, 2017; Born et al, 2019). Evidence at the firm level has typically focused on how large firms (often foreign-owned) are likely to be affected by Brexit (Dhingra et al, 2018).

While such evidence provides valuable insights, it fails to provide the necessary information to assess the likely impact of Brexit for SMEs, despite these firms being crucial for regional economies such as Scotland. In March 2018 there were 343,535 SMEs operating in Scotland, accounting for 99.3% of all private sector businesses and 54.9% of private sector employment (Scottish Government, 2018). While some commentators have speculated that Brexit could have “dire consequences” for these small business (Cumming and Zahra, 2016; p. 690), to date there has been a paucity of hard empirical evidence on the actual impact of Brexit at a sub-national level (Los et al, 2017; Brown et al, 2019). Given their crucial importance for the Scottish economy, SMEs are therefore a good “unit of analysis” for measuring regional resilience.

There are compelling arguments for examining Brexit-related resiliency within the Scottish context. One study by the Fraser of Allander think tank estimated that a “no deal” Brexit could result in the loss of 80,000 jobs in Scotland¹. While Scotland is less directly exposed to EU trade than the rest-of-the UK (Figus et al, 2018) the Scottish economy retains a strong reliance on intra-EU trade, especially key export-oriented industries such as oil and gas, whisky, food production. Indeed, the EU accounts for £14bn or 45% of Scotland’s international exports, supporting 144,000 jobs (Kalafsky and Brown, 2018). Scotland is also highly dependent on EU sources of human capital and regional funding which disproportionately benefit Scottish SMEs². Hence, small firms may be acutely (and disproportionately) affected by the ongoing political and institutional uncertainty. Indeed, recent research examining the perceived impact of Brexit revealed that Scottish SMEs exhibited higher reservations about Brexit compared to their counterparts elsewhere in the UK (Brown et al, 2019). This may in part owe to the fact that voting patterns strongly diverged

¹ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-37564729>

² For example, a recent study by the Federation of Small Business found that more than a quarter of all small firms in Scotland employed EU workers (FSB Scotland, 2017).

between Scotland and the rest of the UK during the Brexit referendum, with the former country much more strongly predisposed towards remaining (McHarg and Mitchell, 2017).³

Our interest this topic speaks to a wider preoccupation in the increasingly prominent construct of “regional resilience”, a term invoked by spatial scholars to describe how regions respond to shocks and disequilibrium (Hassink, 2010; Bristow and Healy, 2014; Boschma, 2015). Despite accusations of opacity and conceptual “fuzziness” (Pendall et al, 2010; Fröhlich and Hassink, 2018), regional resilience helps stimulate important new ways of thinking about changes to our economic landscape (Pike et al, 2010; Martin, 2018). Consequently, it has “become a fashionable lens for understanding the factors that shape and determine the nature of economic change and performance over time” (Williams and Vorley, 2018, p. 1). Indeed, much of the regional economic debate since the onset of the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) has focused on factors which explain the resilience or vulnerability of regions to sudden economic change (Bachtler and Begg, 2018). Consequently, over the last decade the impact of “shocks” has recently become a prominent subject of empirical enquiry in economic geography and regional research (Martin and Gardiner, 2018).

In addition to this conceptual focus, this paper also has strong implications for both UK and Scottish public policy more generally given the applicability of the resilience construct for policymakers (Healy and Bristow, 2020; Martin and Sunley, 2020). As scholars have noted institutions acutely matter for regional resilience, especially their role in mitigating “the impact of shocks” such as Brexit (Boschma, 2015, p. 744). This is important because having significant devolved powers may potentially enable Scotland to mitigate some of the negative Brexit-related impacts on the economy via bespoke policy interventions. Indeed, some scholars have noted how Scotland was one of the first parts of the UK to respond to the impact of Brexit with new support packages designed to assist SMEs (Brown et al, 2019).

³ During the referendum Scotland voted by a majority of 62% to 38% in favour of remaining within the EU.

To empirically assess the concept of firm-level resilience when faced by exogenous shocks, this paper investigates the impact of Brexit on Scottish SMEs by employing a novel mixed methods empirical research design (Molina-Azorín et al, 2012). This dual approach enabled the research to examine *ex ante* the concerns immediately following the referendum and then explore the actual impacts arising from Brexit-related uncertainty. In order to obtain an overview of how Brexit will impact Scottish SMEs, it draws upon the UK's main small business survey. To delve deeper into the current and likely future impact of Brexit, the research also involved in-depth interviews with a wide cross-section of Scottish SMEs (n = 21) to gauge the firm-level effects emanating from the Brexit process. This method provides a novel empirically grounded contribution to literature on regional resilience by answering the following research question: *what types of Scottish SMEs are most concerned by Brexit and how they are being impacted.*

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. First, we examine the literature on regional resilience uncertainty and how this could impact smaller firms. Second, we outline the methodology adopted. Third, we examine the quantitative data to see the types of Scottish SMEs most likely to be affected by Brexit. Fourth, we outline the results of the qualitative data collected. The paper ends with a discussion, conclusions and policy recommendations.

2. Literature Review

This literature review draws upon two overlapping streams of academic research pertinent to the empirical focus of the paper. First, we explore the concept of *regional resilience* and how this manifests itself when areas are faced with unforeseen or “exogenous shocks”. Second, it examines the literature on *economic uncertainty* and firm-level behaviour and outcomes.

2.2 Regional Resilience

While the resilience metaphor has been deployed disparately across various disciplines it is commonly conceptualised as the capacity for an entity (such as a region or firm) to “resist, absorb, adjust to, and recover successfully from shocks or disturbances that disrupt that entity’s or system’s pre-shock state” (Martin and Gardiner, 2018, p. 1802). Resilience signifies an organisation’s ability to maintain reliable and effective functioning throughout disruption and adversity (Williams et al. 2017). This in part has stemmed from the increased economic, environmental and political volatility which has constantly shaped and reshaped the world economy over the last twenty years, meaning that disequilibrium is very much the norm. Recent exogenous shocks such as the onset of the GFC, the unexpected Brexit vote and most recently the coronavirus pandemic all testify to uncertainty becoming the “new normal”.

While originally invoked to depict resilience and in fields such as engineering and ecology (Healy and Bristow, 2020), in recent years there has been an upsurge of academic interest in the concept of “regional resilience” (Hassink, 2010; Boschma, 2015). This concept is of critical importance because a key implication from this literature is that differences in resiliency to major shocks can contribute to determining the long-run growth paths of different regions (Bristow and Healy, 2014). Indeed, an expanding empirical literature has revealed how different locations have differing capabilities to deal with exogenous or unforeseen shocks.

A common focus within the literature has been to examine how different locations cope with unexpected shocks such as major recessions and crisis events (Martin, 2018). A number of studies have also examined the impact on regional resilience generated by the shock of the GFC (Dijkstra et al, 2015; Giannakis and Bruggeman 2017; Marquet and Miralles-Guasch, 2018). An interesting recent study assessed credit scores to assess firm resilience during the post-GFC period (Soroka et al, 2019). This showed firm closure was often precipitated by falling credit scores in the years prior to foreclosure. One Spanish study found that the regions least affected by the crash were those specialising in the most dynamic and productive

industries (Cuadrado-Roura and Maroto, 2016). In an empirical study of the UK it was found that regional resilience to the GFC was highest in areas where the stock of knowledge intensive service firms was greatest (Bishop, 2019). Similarly, a Canadian study also found that regions with the greatest resilience were those dominated by business services, which act as “regional shock absorbers” (Ray et al, 2017). Blažek et al (2020) found that major European financial centres such as Frankfurt, Paris and London were those demonstrating the greatest resilience to the GFC.

While this body of evidence shows how aggregate economic performance is affected by cyclical shocks, it fails to properly explain how different types of firms (specifically SMEs) adapt, change and reconfigure themselves to accommodate destabilising unforeseen shocks. Indeed, while overall only a limited body of work has examined resilience in SMEs (Wishart, 2018), some studies have vividly illustrated that entrepreneurship is central to creating more resilient regional economies (Williams and Vorley, 2014). Conversely, regional resilience can be undermined in peripheral economies with low levels of entrepreneurial ambition and dynamism (Gherhes et al, 2018). This latter point is crucially important and shows the path-dependent nature of resilience within some entrepreneurial ecosystems (Roundy et al, 2017).

Consequently, there is now growing awareness of the importance of better understanding firm “agency” to adapt to shocks as a means of better appraising the resilience of the regions in which they are based (Bristow and Healy, 2014). In other words, not all firms are equally resilient when faced by destabilising shocks. Therefore, there seems “good reason” to argue that a fuller conceptualisation of regional resilience must incorporate “*an understanding of the resilience of individual firms and their specific capacities to cope with, adapt to and reconfigure their technological, network and organizational structures within a constantly evolving economic environment*” (Soroka et al, 2019, p. 3).

2.2 *Uncertainty and Firm Behaviour*

We now turn attention to a related micro-level literature to see how different types of SMEs may cope with profound uncertainty caused by events such as Brexit. Research from a wide range of disciplines including economics, entrepreneurship and strategic management have all examined the fundamental role of uncertainty in affecting firm-level decision-making processes (Milliken, 1987; Baker et al, 2016; Bylund and McCaffrey, 2017). Almost a century ago, the US economist Frank Knight (1921) first examined the crucial role of uncertainty in shaping economic behavior by making the important distinction between risk and uncertainty. For Knight the essential fact is that risk can be measured, but true uncertainty (or Knightian uncertainty) is not readily quantifiable. Rare, so-called “black swan events” (Orlik and Veldkamp, 2014), such as Brexit have consequences so far-reaching they represent something of an “unknowable risk” for firms (Diebold et al, 2010).

According to North (1990), institutions exist due to the uncertainties involved in human interaction and the institutional environment determines the formal and informal *rules of the game*. As such a stable institutional environment is crucial for mediating entrepreneurial activity and firm-level strategic behaviour (Rodrik, 1991; Minniti, 2008). Conversely, prior evidence suggests that unforeseen events can hinder the effective operation of institutions (such as banks during the global financial crisis) generating acute levels of uncertainty, which in turn leads to reductions (and delays) in tangible and intangible investments (Julio and Yook, 2012; Doshi et al, 2018).

Extant prior evidence suggests that SMEs may be disproportionately impacted by uncertainty given their lower resiliency to unexpected shocks (Ghosal and Loungani 2000; Ghosal and Ye, 2015; Lee et al, 2015; Doshi et al, 2018). Most SMEs are often controlled by resource-constrained entrepreneurs and managers with limited contingency planning or foresight capabilities, making it difficult for such firms to deal with heightened levels of

uncertainty (Brown et al, 1998; Morikawa, 2016). By contrast, some studies attest to the fact some astute SMEs can overcome adversity through their business acumen and firm-level innovation (Bamiatzi and Kirchmaier, 2014). Of course, it should be borne in mind that not all SMEs have the same levels of resources and innovative competences. Very small so-called micro-sized SMEs employing less than 10 people are considerably different to larger medium-sized enterprises. This may manifest itself in more limited risk mitigation capabilities. Heightened uncertainty can also inhibit SMEs investing for the future, thereby preventing firms undertaking riskier growth-related activities such as innovation (Lee et al, 2015).

Overall, therefore the impact of uncertainty when faced with exogenous shocks is likely to vary significantly across SMEs according to their size, strategic orientation and sectoral orientation. As a consequence, an investigation of the types of SMEs likely to be affected by Brexit, and how this is likely to affect future strategic intentions and decisions is a highly relevant exercise from both a conceptual focus on regional resilience and from a policy perspective.

3. Methodology

In response to calls for more multi-level approaches towards studying entrepreneurial resilience (Korber and McNaughton, 2017), this research adopted a mixed methods approach involving both quantitative survey analysis and qualitative interviews with SMEs. This approach is recognized to be of significant value, particularly when research needs to be contextualized in wider phenomena (Molina-Azorín et al., 2012) (e.g. Brexit) or there are interaction effects at play (Creswell, 2014). Given longitudinal approaches are often need to monitor resilience over time (Bristow and Healy, 2020), this method enabled the collection of ‘baseline’ views on perceptions on the impact of Brexit via the survey and further exploration

and triangulation of these views and emerging impacts two years later via interviews.⁴ This complementarity is a key strength of mixed methods work (Molina-Azorín et al., 2012).

In terms of the survey, we utilised the Longitudinal Small Business Survey (LSBS) compiled by the UK Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). The LSBS is one of the largest annual attitudinal surveys of SMEs undertaken in the UK, sampling approximately 10,000 firms. In the immediate aftermath of the referendum result in June 2016, a number of specific questions were added to the LSBS in order to gauge the nature and potential economic impact of Brexit on SMEs. This included specific questions such as whether entrepreneurs and/or small business managers perceived the UK's exit from the EU as a *major obstacle to the success of your business in general*.

The data presented in this paper are from the 2017 survey (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills 2018) – the most recent year for which the complete LSBS data were available. While the data is over two years old, the results provide insights into the performance and challenges of Scotland's SMEs since the Brexit vote. For the purposes of the present analysis, the larger UK-wide dataset mentioned above was further refined to the Scottish-based SMEs surveyed during 2017. In 2017, 1042 Scottish SMEs took part in the survey, of which 739 had employees. The LSBS data is weighted to ensure that the results are representative of the overall Scottish SME population. A series of statistical tests (informed by previous research on Brexit and uncertainty) were carried out on these largely categorical data in order to discover possible relationships between Brexit-related competitive issues and various firm-level metrics.

In terms of interviews, the researchers undertook 21 interviews with a wide and diverse cohort of Scottish SMEs. Qualitative interviews are particularly appropriate during times of

⁴ Note that survey respondents and interviewees were discrete groups, so it was not possible to trace the development of individuals' views. We thus report on sentiments from wider populations.

intense economic and social change (e.g. Schoenberger, 1991; Birkinshaw et al, 2011), where complex issues require nuanced probing. The firms interviewed were randomly selected from a list of Scottish SMEs obtained from the commercial business database Financial Analysis Made Easy (FAME). The inclusion criteria were that SMEs had to be employers with 1 to 249 employees, registered in Scotland and actively trading in Scotland. In total, 189 firms were approached with 21 agreeing to be interviewed, giving a response rate of 11%. These firms operated in a very wide range of different sectors and geographic locations, and were of various sizes, ages and ownership structures.

Interviews were conducted Spring to Autumn 2019, when political uncertainty about the Brexit process was at its peak due to the fraught nature of the negotiation process. The interviews were conducted with owner-managers and entrepreneurs and typically lasted between 30 and 60 minutes. They were semi-structured to explore commonalities and differences (Patton, 1990) and primarily focused on Brexit-related concerns, the type of impacts detected, adjustment strategies deployed and the role of policy support for SMEs. All interviews were recorded and transcribed immediately upon completion. The data were analysed based on an *a priori* coding framework developed from the regional resilience and uncertainty literatures, although a number of themes and codes emerged from the data analysis process (i.e. types of firms most affected). Each transcript was analysed independently by the researchers, before codes were compared and reassessed by the researchers in order to ensure analytical rigour (Miles and Huberman, 1994). While direct quotations are used to ensure transparency of collected data (Healy and Perry, 2000) and to allow the data to “let the data speak” for itself (Easterby-Smith et al., 2006, p. 119), companies have been anonymised and any identifying information withheld.


4. Quantitative Analysis

This section examines Scottish SMEs as a whole, utilizing the LSBS data described earlier. As a starting point for these analyses, it was critical to ascertain how these SMEs viewed Brexit overall. To Scottish-based SMEs, the UK's departure from the EU ranks only sixth in terms of competitive challenges, well behind other, commonly-cited barriers such as market competition, taxation, and other issues. On this matter, Scotland did not differ from the rest of the United Kingdom in terms of whether Brexit was an issue for the surveyed SMEs (29.8 versus 28.2 percent of surveyed SMEs). For the most part, Brexit was seen as a one of many key competitive issues confronting SMEs.

With this in mind, a majority of the ensuing analyses encompass the nearly 30 percent of Scottish SMEs (311 firms) that cited Brexit as a competitive issue. For this group of Scottish SMEs (and for a particular subset of these firms, to be detailed below), Brexit was indeed a salient concern. Figure 1 suggests that exporters viewed Brexit differently relative to non-exporters in terms of whether it posed a challenge to their firm, by a statistically significant margin of 50.3 to 25.4 percent, respectively (chi-square, $p < 0.01$). Again, this dovetails with the opaqueness about the future, and with a strong reluctance to engage internationally due to uncertainty about the international trade environment. International markets (especially new, untested markets) inevitably provide some degree of uncertainty, particularly when set against domestic customers. Indeed, the Brexit scenario and its incumbent uncertainty seems to pose a relevant threat to exporters. For these SMEs, the very possibility of increased barriers to EU markets increases the amount of perceived administrative or psychic distance between buyer and seller⁵.

⁵ Psychic distance denotes factors preventing flows of information between firms and markets, such as languages and cultural issues, that incur learning costs (Child et al 2009).


Figure 1. Is Brexit a competitive issue? Scottish SME exporters versus non-exporters (Percentage of surveyed firms selecting)



Source: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2018)

The theme of uncertainty surrounding Brexit follows in Figure 2, which provides a breakdown of three types of innovation (a new product, service, or process developed within the past three years) and whether these groups of firms viewed Brexit as an obstacle to their firm-level operations. In each case, there were significant differences between innovators and non-innovators. In terms of product innovation, the difference was 38.0 to 27.8 percent (chi-square, $p < 0.01$). With regard to service-oriented innovation, the difference was 35.1 to 27.5 percent (chi-square, $p < 0.01$). Finally, in terms of process innovation, the results were again significant by a margin of 38.1 to 27.8 percent (chi-square, $p < 0.01$). As in the case of the exporters, the data suggests Brexit was perceived as a significant competitive challenge for a particular subset of Scottish SMEs, most notably innovative firms. Importantly, these are often the types of ambitious and outward-looking firms that policymakers actively attempt to grow and nurture (Mason and Brown, 2013).


Figure 2. Is Brexit a competitive issue? Scottish SME innovators versus non-innovators* (percentage of surveyed firms citing Brexit as a competitive issue)



Source: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2018)

As seen above, Brexit impacts (or is perceived to impact) a certain type of firm. We now probe “why” Brexit is perceived as a competitive concern. As shown in Figure 3, the top two Brexit-related concerns focus on *uncertainty*. Uncertainty is often cited as a reason firms are reluctant to explore new markets or engage in risk-taking business in general, especially for SMEs with limited resources (Bylund and McCaffrey, 2017). The Brexit referendum has undoubtedly introduced a large degree of uncertainty to firm-level plans and operations. The combination of uncertainty about a new regulatory environment, coupled with market uncertainty (i.e. will firms need to find new export destinations) provides considerable barriers for Scottish SMEs moving forward, potentially impacting strategic decisions and innovation.

Figure 3. Brexit-related challenges for Scottish SMEs (percentage of surveyed firms selecting)



Source: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2018)

The remaining Brexit-related competitive issues concern the movements of goods, services, capital, or labour leading up to the UK’s withdrawal from the EU. But again, even these obstacles encompass some degree of uncertainty. For example, potentially higher import costs for components or other inputs provides yet another obstacle for firms operating in cost-competitive environments. Additionally, a potential decrease in investment could have detrimental effects on capital-challenged SMEs. And while the labour-related issues (both unskilled and skilled) were selected by comparatively few of the surveyed firms, it remains a

salient issue, especially if firms are to remain competitive in comparatively tight labour markets.

Whilst uncertainty generates concerns about current activities it equally mediates future-oriented plans. The data notes that comparatively few Scottish SMEs see positive effects from the UK exiting the EU – a combined 5.5 percent of firms see any positive impacts from the referendum. By contrast, a full third of SMEs foresaw some sort of negative impact stemming from the UK's departure from the EU viewing it as either very (or fairly) detrimental. Just under half of the surveyed SMEs were neutral with regard to Brexit. In essence, a third of the surveyed Scottish SMEs either viewed Brexit very negatively whilst a very small minority viewed it favourably.

Table 1 provides a look at the ways in which Scottish SMEs perceived their plans to be impacted by Brexit. Note that a rather small percentage of all surveyed Scottish SMEs (typically less than 10%, see Table 1) were impacted in terms of their plans for exports, innovative practices and capital investment and so on. However, these proportions change markedly when one examines the group of Scottish SMEs that originally indicated that Brexit was a critical obstacle that could impact their operations. All of the plans were selected by a comparatively large percentage of firms in this subgroup. For a start, fully 80% of these firms estimated that their export expansion plans were influenced by Brexit. Once more, this ties into the role that uncertainty is playing in firm decision making. Within the Scottish context, this lends further support to earlier concerns over Scottish SMEs finding new (i.e. outside the EU) export markets (see Kalafsky and Brown, 2018). Firms appear to be holding back on export plans until they ascertain what the future trading landscape will entail.

The next two plans that were mentioned by these SMEs concerned innovation in terms of products, services, or new processes. Again, the uncertainty surrounding the UK's departure has caused this group of Scottish firms to hold back on their innovative plans. Importantly,

Brexit also appeared to have potentially negative effects on plans for capital investment and workforce training. Essentially, SMEs might refrain from longer-term investment strategies if there is a large degree of opaqueness about the trade and overall economic environment moving forward.

Table 1. Scottish SME business plans impacted by Brexit

Planned strategy	Percentage of firms selecting that also cited Brexit as an issue	Percentage of all surveyed firms whose plans were affected
Increase exports or begin new int'l markets	80.0	11.5
Develop or launch new products or services	64.3	8.1
New working practices	64.0	4.5
Capital investment	54.1	7.2
Increase skills of workforce	53.1	4.4
R&D investment	47.4	8.6
Increase leadership skills of managers	44.0	6.0

Source: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2018)

When taken together, the findings within this section lend strong support to previous literature (e.g. Ghosal and Ye 2015; Morikawa 2016) concerning the negative impacts of uncertainty on SME operations and performance. More specifically, the survey data intimates that innovative and export-oriented Scottish SMEs see Brexit as a major impediment to their business plans, corroborating previous evidence (Brown et al, 2018). These analyses in turn provide a context for the next section, which presents results from firm-level interviews providing an in-depth look at the micro-foundations of this endemic uncertainty.

5. Qualitative Findings

The interviews with the 21 SMEs were undertaken to augment, probe and triangulate the aggregate survey analysis outlined above. In this regard the interviews uncovered a number

of important aspects concerning the types of firms most affected, key Brexit-related concerns, the type of impacts detected and the role of policy support for SMEs.

5.1 Types of Firms Most Affected

In line with the survey analysis, our interviews strongly suggested that certain types of companies are more acutely and deleteriously affected by Brexit than others. Of the interviewed SMEs, roughly two-thirds were domestically oriented firms with little or no export or internationalisation activities. These firms are engaged in a wide variety of different service and manufacturing activities such as printing, food and drink production, logistics, training and events management. Overall, this cohort of SMEs were quite stable in terms of their growth, employment levels and export-intensity. In the main, this group of firms were relatively unconcerned with the potential impact of Brexit. While some did detect some possible pitfalls such as regulatory change and the devaluation of the pound, these were deemed as relatively insignificant: *“at the moment, it is business as normal”*. Another common trait across these organisations was a lack of any pre-planning to respond to Brexit or to enhance their resilience to the shock of Brexit. This relative insulation from the entire Brexit process was reflected by a number of participants, as per the following statements:

“We have not seen any impacts on our organisation.”

“I don’t think we thought it [i.e. the referendum] would affect our growth at the stage. And in fact, it has not affected our growth at all.”

“We have not been adversely or positively affected by Brexit – but we’re just a bit bored with it.”

“The organisation has not done anything to prepare in any department.”

This relatively sanguine view of Brexit did not occur in the remaining third of SMEs interviewed. In the main these were growth, innovation- and export-oriented SMEs. These firms were typically found in more high-tech oriented industries such as aquaculture, technical

textiles, pharmaceuticals, biotech and chemicals. Many of these firms were highly innovative undertaking ongoing R&D and other activities. On the whole, this cohort of firms undertook some exporting activity but many were predominantly UK-focused. From the outset of the Brexit process many of these firms were deeply concerned by its potential impact. During the turbulence caused many of these firms had been negatively affected by the Brexit shock, primarily due to uncertainty which is “*the last thing you want as a business*”. Most had encountered reductions in their growth and decreased levels of employment⁶. As a result, many of these firms had adapted and put in place strategies to accommodate the effects emanating from Brexit, often dedicating considerable amounts of management time to this task. These effects are intimated by the following statements by the interviewees:

“Brexit has slowed us down, having to deal with more [internal] bureaucracy”

“The uncertainty is making it difficult to expand and grow in Europe, while at the same time, the company is also hesitant to compete in North America”

“Basically, we have all the steps in place, so really until a final decision and path is decided on, we’re at a point where there’s nothing more we can do until we know more”

“We had plans, but they did not incorporate the situation whereby a government could not come to any solution. While they were extending the uncertainty, our customers took that time to source elsewhere”

5.2 Key Concerns

In terms of concerns expressed by the SMEs in relation to Brexit, the main issues identified across the entire population of firms related to the problem of uncertainty, especially in relation to the future regulatory environment. This remained the case for most SMEs irrespective of size, age, sector and level of export-orientation. Given the interviews were conducted almost three years after the Brexit referendum, many firms were deeply concerned

⁶ In one instance, a very export-oriented SME encountered a significant reduction in its employment from 90 to 65.

about the lack of clarity about the future trade and regulatory environment. In many cases this had negatively affected the SMEs to varying degrees, especially the longer the negotiations between the UK and the EU had gone on. The nature and opaqueness caused by pervasive uncertainty is reflected in the following statements:

“Concerned – but concerned because you actually don’t know. We didn’t know what to be concerned about yet.”

“The indecisive nature of it and the fact that it is still unclear whether it will happen. I’m not certain it will even happen.”

“Fundamentally, nothing has changed. And since nothing has changed legally, the only thing that has changed is our customers thought they couldn’t get products from us, so they sourced elsewhere.”

“I suspect we will do less business in the EU than we planned to do. We will probably not seek out European business unless it comes to us. We’ll look for internal business or possibly tackle the US instead of Europe. Europe is no longer the easy option.”

For the most part, this resulted in a lack of action rather than proactive measures to adapt or accommodate changes to the future environment⁷. Again, this applied equally across all types of SMEs who in the main lacked the type of strategic capacity to enact strategies to mitigate any harmful effects. In the main there was a feeling that all that could be done was to “*wait and see*” and then react. In very small micro-businesses this lack of planning or preparedness was primarily due to a lack of management time. One individual stressed: “*I simply don’t have the time, so many question marks remain*”. However, this was even the case for the SMEs who had dedicated a considerable amount of managerial time to examining how the changes may affect the firms in the future. The lack of action is revealed in the following remarks:

“Until we know what the result is, I can’t make any plans.”

⁷ For some rare exceptions see section 5.4

“At this point, until we know about tariffs and free trade information, there is very little we can do.”

“How am I supposed to know? How is anyone supposed to know? I don’t think anyone knows! How am I to prepare for Brexit when I don’t know what I am preparing for? I can’t. It is unknown what is going to happen. So how am I supposed to prepare for that?”

“Basically, we have all the steps in place, so really until a final decision and path is decided on, we’re at a point where there’s nothing more we can do until we know more.”

5.3 Operational Impacts

The research discovered a range of different Brexit-related effects and impacts within the SMEs interviewed that were primarily designed to negate the problems caused by chronic Brexit-induced uncertainty. A number of the firms seemed to be focusing on cost reduction strategies to provide a buffer for any declines in sales caused by the uncertainty and turbulence. This approach was described as *“battening down the hatches”* by one seasoned entrepreneur so that the firm could withstand the financial shock due to a decline in sales or the loss of key customers. This was very common across the two-thirds who were less internationally exposed. SMEs described themselves as:

“wary of spending money at the moment, just in case we have to get through as short-term blip, if that makes sense.”

“reluctant to invest [into new computers], because I want to have the money available in the bank if it all goes wrong just after Brexit.”

For other more growth-oriented firms this also entailed actual reductions in capital expenditure. One firm stated bluntly: *“we [now] have problems with expansion”*. Perhaps most worryingly from a longer-term competitive perspective, Brexit seemed to be weighing most heavily on the minds of the more export-oriented and innovative firms. This meant that these types of firms were actively scaling back their plans for growth-oriented activities such as exporting and innovation expenditures. In one SME, the money previously spent on R&D

was allocated into a so-called “*buffer fund*” in case a collapse in orders arose. These adverse effects seemed to be particularly affecting manufacturing product-based firms rather than service-based firms. As a result of the Brexit process, one SME had to “*dramatically restructure the business (including layoffs) in light of the sales reductions*”. Overall, the main negative effects from Brexit across growth oriented SMEs had been reduced capital expenditure, reduced innovation expenditure and a reduced EU export focus, as reflected by the following statements:

“Yes – we have put on hold any product developments for the EU market, such as irrigation and pipe rehabilitation.”

“[We were] looking to invest into a capital expenditure specifically designed for products in Europe, but those sales have stalled, so the expense has been put on hold.”

“90% of the business is in the UK, but we are getting to the stage where there isn’t enough business in the UK not to expand overseas. And now we don’t know whether to expand into Europe or not.”

“In terms of exports, it has completely hampered our planned entry into other EU markets.”

5.4 Adjustment Strategies

While the above operational impacts had been quite a reactive response to Brexit, some SMEs had been more proactive via various *adjustment strategies*. These strategies seemed to be firm specific and often pre-determined by the nature of their industry and sector they operated within. In some cases, this was fairly minor in that firms had taken on extra stock from suppliers from the EU. The devaluation of the pound following the referendum had encouraged some firms to consider sourcing more suppliers from the UK rather than overseas. Of greater strategic importance were the changes adopted by some companies which entailed SMEs seeking to break into new and different markets. For example, a conference organising business had started to target the US market to help reduce their reliance on the EU as Brexit had made Scotland a “*harder sell*” to European customers.

In some SMEs, there had been discernible changes as a result of the experimentation of the founders/entrepreneurs. For example, in one fisheries business this had resulted in the change to their business model⁸. Due to Brexit-related concerns, the business now enables customers to lease rather than buy their products to reduce the sunk costs entailed for their customers. This arose due to uncertainty facing customers because of their dependence on the EU as the core marketplace for Scottish shellfish. In another company, an adjustment strategy deployed by the entrepreneur led them to begin a side-line property-related business to insulate themselves from any further collapse of their core business.

In a very small number of cases, some SMEs had undertaken quite major structural adjustments to help deal with and alleviate potential negative effects from Brexit. Despite being quite small companies with less than 50 employees, two of the firms had decided to undertake major organisational changes as a consequence of Brexit. In one instance, a maritime training provider who had become “*a lot more concerned as time has gone on*” decided to seek out a joint venture (JV) with an Italian counterpart. The company was seeking to tender for a major contract from an Italian ferry provider and they were concerned that a lack of certainty around their accreditation status may undermine their chances of success. Therefore, the JV was seen as a means of mitigating any possible regulatory uncertainty caused by being outwith the EU.

In another case, a small Scottish pharmaceutical company focused on the design and development of anti-infective disease treatments had opted to move their head office. According to their CEO “*Brexit has had a major effect on us. We moved our key office to Dublin, Ireland*”. This move was primarily done so that the firm could license their products under the jurisdiction of the EU pharmaceutical authorities. While such a step seems very adept at adjusting to the changing regulatory circumstances, it has nevertheless “*had direct*

⁸ A business model describes “an architecture for how a firm creates and delivers value to customers, encompassing the flows of costs, revenues, and profits” (Teece, 2018, p. 40).

costs, effort and transfer of responsibilities". So rather than being an expansive or growth-oriented move, this step taken was more linked to alleviating any turbulence caused by the UK withdrawal from the EU regulatory frameworks.

5.5 Policy Issues

Linking back to the role of institutions and regional resilience, the final issue examined concerned the usefulness (or otherwise) of support received by the firms from various public and private institutions to help them overcome Brexit-induced uncertainty and upheaval. Across the population of SMEs examined, the vast majority had not proactively sought out advice from external public sector actors or private intermediaries. Most had relied on their own local non-specialist networks for advice (i.e. *"so far, only our accountants"*). The explanation for this was a belief that the problem itself lay with politicians and that *"lack of clarity from the government"* was the key problem facing the firms. In most instances, firms had *"not gone looking for help"*. While some of the larger better resourced SMEs had sought advice from various public and private sector intermediaries, the commonplace view was that the types of advice offered were *"pretty poor"* and provided little in the way of practicable assistance:

"We are part of the [Fife] Chamber of Commerce, so we have discussed it with them."

"We spoke to our bank and financial institute, not to the trade bodies or lawyers."

"I know the Customs do have a help line just now. They refer you to certain Customs notices that aren't always effectual. The one document is 300 pages long, so you get a bit lost in them. To have somebody to listen to your questions and answer them would be helpful."

"We are were happy with the advice, but until we know [the situation], there is very limited things we can do."

In a smaller minority of cases, several of the larger more strategically adept firms had sought out and received dedicated assistance. One larger SME had engaged strategy consultants to examine their business model to better focus on opportunities from operating outside of the EU. A small number of others had accessed public sector assistance packages customised to help SMEs deal with Brexit. The main support accessed by the companies was the Brexit Support Grant funded by the Scottish Government, providing between £2,000-4000 to help SMEs in Scotland manage a wide range of Brexit impacts. This type of assistance was generally viewed much more positively as it provided financial incentives for SMEs to help adjust their strategies in light of Brexit-related uncertainty in ways they themselves felt most beneficial. In a number of cases this had led to the SMEs exploring new markets to enter⁹. However, this type of strategic support is often only accessed by existing Scottish Enterprise account managed businesses, so knowledge of this scheme tends to be restricted to those firms.

6. Discussion and Conclusions

This paper makes a novel contribution to the literature on regional resilience by empirically examining the impact of Brexit on Scottish SMEs. While much of the regional resilience literature has traditionally focused on the macro-level nature of change to entire regional economies, this paper highlights important firm-level behavioural impacts and changes in light of shocks such as Brexit. Another innovative aspect of this research was the mixed methods approach deployed. This enabled the research to examine *ex ante* the types of firms and their concerns identified after the referendum and then compliment this with an in-depth assessment of how the prolonged Brexit process had actually affected SMEs over subsequent years. This mixed-method approach lends itself well to properly understanding complex and contextualized issues (Molina-Azorín et al., 2012) such as Brexit-induced uncertainty which

⁹ An aquaculture firm was exploring a move into the Nova Scotia market in Canada.

endures over the longer-term. Indeed, in some respects the Brexit referendum turned from an exogenous shock to a “*slow-moving crisis*” which has still not fully resolved itself from a regulatory perspective, despite the fact that the UK has now formally left the EU¹⁰. Owing to this, there seems conceptual merit in viewing exogenous shocks such as Brexit as a “process” rather than purely as “events” (Williams et al, 2017).

The research also produced interesting empirical findings to augment our understanding about firm-level resilience. The work clearly shows how protracted uncertainty strongly challenges and undermines the resilience in some SMEs. Whilst two thirds of the companies interviewed did not perceive Brexit to be a central or strategic problem, it is clear from our findings that certain types of SMEs (i.e. innovators, exporters and growth-oriented) were disproportionately concerned by Brexit, echoing other empirical studies (Brown et al, 2019). Our in-depth interviews strongly confirmed these same firms to be the most detrimentally affected in terms of job losses, reduced exports and lower innovation expenditure. In this sense, then, this work adds to the growing bodies of research about uncertainty and innovative SMEs (e.g. Ghosal and Ye, 2015; Morikawa, 2015; Doshi et al, 2018). These findings are also of crucial importance for policy makers, as innovation is thought to play a key role in sustaining regional resilience in the longer-term (Evenhuis and Dawley, 2017).

In terms of the firm-level “agency” explored during the interviews, while the minority of Scottish SMEs had managed to deploy adjustment mechanisms to mitigate these negative effects, many firms’ encountered major difficulties coping with this uncertain and turbulent environment. In the main the default strategy was strategic inaction; such “wait and see” approaches being a commonplace strategic response to uncertainty (Clarke and Liesch, 2017).

¹⁰ Slow moving crisis are defined as “incremental changes to the reigning institutional tissue in organizations and practices can upset the political and social balance of power, creating tensions across generations, regional tenure, ethnicity, political affiliation, and geographic location” (Pendall quoted in Pike et al, 2010, p. 8).

While understandable, this lack of action is likely to make it more difficult for Scottish SMEs to respond to the fast changing regulatory landscape in the longer-term.

A number of SMEs adopted a focus on crude cost reduction strategies to mitigate the innate uncertainty. However, much of this was purely aimed at cutting back growth-enhancing activities like innovation, capital investment and R&D. In contrast to other studies (Bamiatzi and Kirchmaier, 2014), even growth-oriented and innovative Scottish SMEs demonstrated limited resilience in face of adversity, resulting in jobs being lost, expansion plans cut back, reduced exports and less innovation. Interestingly, only a very small minority enacted more radical and innovative structural adjustment strategies (e.g. JVs and headquarter relocation). Clearly, further work involving larger samples is needed to corroborate or refute the veracity of these findings.

Nevertheless, this research thus has clear and important policy implications. First, given that job losses in smaller companies tend be more enduring than from larger enterprises (Nyström, 2018), policymakers will have to make a concerted effort to help alleviate redundancies made by SMEs. This may require a proactive approach given few of the SMEs examined sought advice and support or engaged with relevant institutions. Second, it appears from our analysis that the types of assistance most beneficial to bolster resilience in SMEs are dedicated bespoke financial support packages, such as the Scottish Government's Brexit Support Grant, enabling SMEs to devise their assistance accordingly¹¹. To foster a culture of entrepreneurial adjustment in Scottish SMEs, there seems merit in expanding this programme to a wider range of potential beneficiaries, especially those most affected such as innovative and export-oriented SMEs. This type of proactive policy framework may be particularly relevant in peripheral regions and weaker entrepreneurial ecosystems lacking a strong entrepreneurial culture such as Scotland (Roundy et al, 2017; Gherhes et al, 2018).

¹¹ For further information: <https://www.prepareforbrexit.scot/updates/brexit-support-grant>

Echoing others (Billing et al, 2019; Brown et al, 2019), to adequately deal with the complex forces entailed by Brexit-induced uncertainty, greater devolved responsibility across all UK regions in policy areas such as immigration and industrial policy will arguably be needed in order to increase firm-level regional resilience in the longer-term.

References

- Bachtler, J., & Begg, I. (2018). Beyond Brexit: Reshaping policies for regional development in Europe. *Papers in Regional Science*, 97(1), 151-170.
- Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2016). Measuring economic policy uncertainty. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4), 1593-1636.
- Bamiatzi, V. C., & Kirchmaier, T. (2014). Strategies for superior performance under adverse conditions: A focus on small and medium-sized high-growth firms. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(3), 259-284.
- Billing, C., McCann, P., & Ortega-Argilés, R. (2019). Interregional inequalities and UK sub-national governance responses to Brexit. *Regional Studies*, 53(5), 741-760.
- Birkinshaw, J., Brannen, M. & Tung, R. (2011). From a distance and generalizable to up close and grounded: Reclaiming a place for qualitative methods in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(5), 573–581 (2011)
- Bishop, P. (2019). Knowledge diversity and entrepreneurship following an economic crisis: an empirical study of regional resilience in Great Britain. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 31(5-6), 496-515.
- Blažek, J., Hejnová, T., & Rada, H. (2020). The impacts of the global economic crisis and its aftermath on the banking centres of Europe. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 27(1), 35-49.

- Bloom, N. (2014). Fluctuations in uncertainty. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(2), 153-76.
- Born, B., Müller, G. J., Schularick, M., & Sedláček, P. (2019). The costs of economic nationalism: evidence from the Brexit experiment. *The Economic Journal*, 129(623), 2722-2744.
- Boschma, R. (2015). Towards an evolutionary perspective on regional resilience. *Regional Studies*, 49(5), 733-751.
- Bristow, G., & Healy, A. (2014). Regional resilience: an agency perspective. *Regional Studies*, 48(5), 923-935.
- Bristow, G., & Healy, A. (2020). Introduction to the Handbook on Regional Economic Resilience. In *Handbook on Regional Economic Resilience*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Brown, R., Liñares-Zegarra, J. M., & Wilson, J. O. (2018). What happens if the rules change? The impact of Brexit on the future strategic intentions of UK SMEs. *The Impact of Brexit on the Future Strategic Intentions of UK SMEs (March 1, 2018)*.
- Brown, R., Liñares-Zegarra, J., & Wilson, J. O. (2019). The (potential) impact of Brexit on UK SMEs: regional evidence and public policy implications. *Regional Studies*, 53(5), 761-770.
- Brown, S. L., Brown, S. I., Brown, S. L., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1998). *Competing on the edge: Strategy as structured chaos*. Harvard Business Press.
- Bylund, P. L., & McCaffrey, M. (2017). A theory of entrepreneurship and institutional uncertainty. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(5), 461-475.
- Child, J., Rodrigues, S. B., & Frynas, J. G. (2009). Psychic distance, its impact and coping modes. *Management International Review*, 49(2), 199-224.
- Clarke, J. E., & Liesch, P. W. (2017). Wait-and-see strategy: Risk management in the internationalization process model. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(8), 923-940.

- Cuadrado-Roura, J. R., & Maroto, A. (2016). Unbalanced regional resilience to the economic crisis in Spain: a tale of specialisation and productivity. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 9(1), 153-178.
- Cumming, D. J., & Zahra, S. A. (2016). International business and entrepreneurship implications of Brexit. *British Journal of Management*, 27(4), 687-692.
- Dhingra, S., Ottaviano, G., Rappoport, V., Sampson, T., & Thomas, C. (2018). UK trade and FDI: A post-Brexit perspective. *Papers in Regional Science*, 97(1), 9-24.
- Diebold, F. X., Doherty, N. A., & Herring, R. J. (2010). *The known, the unknown, and the unknowable in financial risk management: measurement and theory advancing practice*. Princeton University Press.
- Dijkstra, L., Garcilazo, E., & McCann, P. (2015). The effects of the global financial crisis on European regions and cities. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 15(5), 935-949.
- Doshi, H., Kumar, P., & Yerramilli, V. (2018). Uncertainty, capital investment, and risk management. *Management Science*, 64(12), 5769-5786.
- Easterby-Smith M, Thorpe R, Lowe A, 2006, *Management Research: An Introduction* (Sage, London).
- Evenhuis, E., & Dawley, S. (2017). Evolutionary perspectives on economic resilience in regional development. In Williams, N., & Vorley, T. (Eds.) *Creating Resilient Economies*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Fröhlich, K., & Hassink, R. (2018). Regional resilience: a stretched concept?. *European Planning Studies*, 26(9), 1763-1778.
- Figus, G., Lisenkova, K., McGregor, P., Roy, G., & Swales, K. (2018). The long-term economic implications of Brexit for Scotland: An interregional analysis. *Papers in Regional Science*, 97(1), 91-115.

- Ghosal, V., & Ye, Y. (2015). Uncertainty and the employment dynamics of small and large businesses. *Small Business Economics*, (3), 529-558.
- Giannakis, E., & Bruggeman, A. (2017). Economic crisis and regional resilience: Evidence from Greece. *Papers in Regional Science*, 96(3), 451-476.
- Gherhes, C., Vorley, T., & Williams, N. (2018). Entrepreneurship and local economic resilience: the impact of institutional hysteresis in peripheral places. *Small Business Economics*, 51(3), 577-590.
- Ghosal, V., & Loungani, P. (2000). The differential impact of uncertainty on investment in small and large businesses. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 82(2), 338-343.
- Ghosal, V., & Ye, Y. (2015). Uncertainty and the employment dynamics of small and large businesses. *Small Business Economics*, 44(3), 529-558.
- Grabbe, H. (2002). European Union conditionality and the *acquis communautaire*. *International Political Science Review*, 23(3), 249-268.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2(163-194), 105.
- Hassink, R. (2010). Regional resilience: a promising concept to explain differences in regional economic adaptability?. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3(1), 45-58.
- Healy, M., & Perry, C. (2000). Comprehensive criteria to judge validity and reliability of qualitative research within the realism paradigm. *Qualitative market research: An international journal*.
- Healy, A., & Bristow, G. (2020). Supranational policy and economic shocks: the role of the EU's structural funds in the economic resilience of regions. In *Handbook on Regional Economic Resilience*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Jessop, B. (2017). The organic crisis of the British state: Putting Brexit in its place. *Globalizations*, 14(1), 133-141.
- Julio, B., & Yook, Y. (2012). Political uncertainty and corporate investment cycles. *The Journal of Finance*, 67(1), 45-83.
- Kalafsky, R.V. and Brown, R. (2018). Reappraising Scotland's exports and their geographies: Brexit and beyond. *Fraser of Allander Institute Economic Commentary*. 42(3): 25-41.
- Knight, Frank H. (1921) Risk, uncertainty and profit New York. *New York: Harper & Row*.
- Korber, S., & McNaughton, R. B. (2018). Resilience and entrepreneurship: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.
- Lee, N., Sameen, H., & Cowling, M. (2015). Access to finance for innovative SMEs since the financial crisis. *Research Policy*, 44(2), 370-380.
- Lee, N., Morris, K., & Kemeny, T. (2018). Immobility and the Brexit vote. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 11(1), 143-163.
- Los, B., McCann, P., Springford, J., & Thissen, M. (2017). The mismatch between local voting and the local economic consequences of Brexit. *Regional Studies*, 51(5), 786-799.
- Mason, C., & Brown, R. (2013). Creating good public policy to support high-growth firms. *Small Business Economics*, 40(2), 211-225.
- Marquet, O., & Miralles-Guasch, C. (2018). Resilient territories and mobility adaptation strategies in times of economic recession: Evidence from the metropolitan region of Barcelona, Spain 2004–2012. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 25(4), 345-359.
- Martin, R. L. (2018). Shocking aspects of regional development: Towards an economic geography of resilience. In G. Clark, M. Gertler, M. P. Feldman, & D. Wójcik (Eds.), *The New Oxford handbook of economic geography* (pp. 839–864). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Martin, R., & Gardiner, B. (2019). The resilience of cities to economic shocks: A tale of four recessions (and the challenge of Brexit). *Papers in Regional Science*, 98(4), 1801-1832.
- Martin, R., & Sunley, P. (2020). Regional economic resilience: evolution and evaluation. In Bristow, G and Healy A. *Handbook on Regional Economic Resilience*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- McHarg, A., & Mitchell, J. (2017). Brexit and Scotland. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 19(3), 512-526.
- Miles N, Huberman A, 1994, *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods* 2nd edition (Sage, London).
- Milliken, F. J. (1987). Three types of perceived uncertainty about the environment: State, effect, and response uncertainty. *Academy of Management review*, 12(1), 133-143.
- Minniti, M. (2008). The role of government policy on entrepreneurial activity: productive, unproductive, or destructive?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(5), 779-790.
- Molina-Azorín, J. F., López-Gamero, M. D., Pereira-Moliner, J. & Pertusa-Ortega, E. M. (2012) Mixed methods studies in entrepreneurship research: Applications and contributions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(5-6), 425-456.
- Monsson, C. K. (2017). Vulnerability and adaptability: post-crisis resilience of SMEs in Denmark. In Williams, N., & Vorley, T. (Eds.) *Creating Resilient Economies*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Morikawa, M. (2016). Business uncertainty and investment: Evidence from Japanese companies. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 49, 224-236.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nyström, K. (2018). Regional resilience to displacements. *Regional Studies*, 52(1), 4-22.

- Orlik, A., & Veldkamp, L. (2014). *Understanding uncertainty shocks and the role of black swans* (No. w20445). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pendall, R., Foster, K. A., & Cowell, M. (2010). Resilience and regions: building understanding of the metaphor. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3(1), 71-84.
- Pike, A., Dawley, S., & Tomaney, J. (2010). Resilience, adaptation and adaptability. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3(1), 59-70.
- Pollard, J. S. (2018). Brexit and the wider UK economy. *Geoforum*.
- Ray, D. M., MacLachlan, I., Lamarche, R., & Srinath, K. P. (2017). Economic shock and regional resilience: Continuity and change in Canada's regional employment structure, 1987–2012. *Environment and Planning A*, 49(4), 952-973.
- Rodrik, D., Subramanian, A., & Trebbi, F. (2004). Institutions rule: the primacy of institutions over geography and integration in economic development. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 9(2), 131-165.
- Roundy, P. T., Brockman, B. K., & Bradshaw, M. (2017). The resilience of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 8, 99-104.
- Schoenberger, E. (1991). The corporate interview as a research method in economic geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 43(2), 180-189.
- Scottish Government (2018) *Businesses in Scotland: 2018*, Scottish Government, Edinburgh. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/businesses-in-scotland-2018/>
- Soroka, A., Bristow, G., Naim, M., & Purvis, L. (2019). Measuring regional business resilience. *Regional Studies*, 1-13.

- Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 40-49.
- Van Reenen, J. (2016). Brexit's Long-run Effects on the UK economy. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 367-383.
- Williams, N., & Vorley, T. (2014). Economic resilience and entrepreneurship: lessons from the Sheffield City Region. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 26(3-4), 257-281.
- Williams, N., & Vorley, T. (2017). *Creating Resilient Economies: Entrepreneurship, Growth and Development in Uncertain Times*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Williams, T. A., Gruber, D. A., Sutcliffe, K. M., Shepherd, D. A., & Zhao, E. Y. (2017). Organizational response to adversity: Fusing crisis management and resilience research streams. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 733-769.
- Wishart, M. (2018). Business resilience in an SME context: A literature review. *Enterprise Research Centre*. Retrieved from: <https://www.enterpriseresearch.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Resilience-review-Final.pdf>



**The Centre for Responsible Banking & Finance
CRBF Working Paper Series**

School of Management, University of St Andrews
The Gateway, North Haugh,
St Andrews, Fife,
KY16 9RJ.

Scotland, United Kingdom

<http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/business/rbf/>



Recent CRBF Working papers published in this Series

Second Quarter | 2020

20-008 **Ross Brown and Augusto Rocha:** Entrepreneurial Uncertainty during the Covid-19 Crisis: Mapping the Temporal Dynamics of Entrepreneurial Finance.

20-007 **Foly Ananou, Amine Tarazi, John O.S. Wilson:** Liquidity Regulation and Bank Lending.

20-006 **Marc Cowling, Ross Brown, Neil Lee:** The Geography of Business Angel Investments in the UK: Does Local Bias (Still) Matter?

First Quarter | 2020

20-005 **Donal McKillop, Declan French, Barry Quinn, Anna L. Sobiech, John O.S. Wilson:** Cooperative Financial Institutions: A Review of the Literature.

20-004 **Dimitris K. Chronopoulos, Anna L. Sobiech, John O.S. Wilson:** Social Capital and the Business Models of Financial Cooperatives: Evidence from Japanese Shinkin Banks.

20-003 **Ross Brown, Augusto Rocha, Suzanne Mawson:** Capturing Conversations in Entrepreneurial Ecosystems.

20-002 **Georgios A. Panos and Tatja Karkkainen:** Financial Literacy and Attitudes to Cryptocurrencies.

20-001 **Mais Sha'ban, Claudia Girardone, Anna Sarkisyan:** Cross-Country Variation in Financial Inclusion: A Global Perspective.

Fourth Quarter | 2019

19-020 **Ross Brown:** Mission-Oriented or Mission Adrift? A Critique of Plans for a Mission-Oriented Scottish National Investment Bank.



University of St Andrews
Scotland's first university

600 YEARS
1413 – 2013