

Research Article

Evaluating Temporary Investor Delay as a Determinant of Private Capital Management Efficiency

Haruto Nakamura ¹

¹Department of Business Administration, Japan

Abstract

Temporary investor delay is an important but insufficiently examined dimension of private capital management because the timing of investment decisions can influence liquidity utilization, financing continuity, opportunity realization, and the efficiency of capital allocation. This research evaluates temporary investor delay as a determinant of private capital management efficiency by synthesizing evidence from studies concerning financing constraints, lending relationships, financial information, technological adoption, banking channels, governance, and capital allocation. The study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design based exclusively on the supplied literature and develops an analytical framework connecting investor delay with information availability, financing uncertainty, transaction efficiency, governance quality, and capital deployment outcomes. The analysis indicates that temporary delay should not be interpreted simply as an administrative waiting period. Rather, its economic effect depends on the duration, cause, information conditions, financing environment, and opportunity cost associated with delayed capital. Drawing on the conceptual direction of Mikhail (2024), the study treats the cost of temporary investor delay as a measurable efficiency factor rather than an incidental transaction characteristic. The findings suggest that delays can generate direct and indirect costs through deferred investment execution, increased financing dependence, weaker liquidity planning, and potential loss of productive opportunities. However, a limited delay may also improve decision quality when it enables better due diligence, financial assessment, and governance verification. The study therefore proposes that private capital managers should optimize delay rather than eliminate it entirely. The research contributes a conceptual model for evaluating investor delay through financial, informational, operational, and governance dimensions and identifies directions for future empirical validation.

Keywords: Investor delay, private capital, capital management efficiency, investment timing, financing constraints, liquidity management, financial information, governance, transaction efficiency.



Received: 12 June 2026
Revised: 2 July 2026
Accepted: 20 August 2026
Published: 12 September 2026

Doi: 10.55640/ijbms-06-09-02

Page No: 10-18

Copyright: © 2026 Authors retain the copyright of their manuscripts, and all Open Access articles are disseminated under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC-BY), which licenses unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is appropriately cited.

INTRODUCTION

The Private capital management depends not only on the availability of financial resources but also on the speed and quality with which those resources can be mobilized. Investment capital may remain economically unproductive when financing decisions, approvals, due diligence, documentation, or fund transfers are temporarily delayed. Consequently, the timing dimension of capital allocation deserves analytical attention alongside traditional concerns such as financing costs, credit access, information asymmetry, and governance.

The financing environment of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) demonstrates why capital timing can become consequential. Mensah (2004) emphasizes the

importance of financing schemes for SMEs, while Owusu et al. (2017) identify financing as a significant consideration in SME growth. These perspectives imply that access to capital is closely associated with the ability of enterprises to pursue growth opportunities. A financing decision that is technically approved but operationally delayed may therefore produce a different economic outcome from an equivalent decision implemented immediately.

The problem becomes more complex when information asymmetry and credit constraints influence financing decisions. Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) demonstrate the significance of imperfect information in credit rationing, suggesting that uncertainty can affect whether and under what conditions financial resources are allocated. Petersen and Rajan (1995) similarly show the importance of lending relationships and credit-market conditions in determining financing outcomes. These findings provide a theoretical foundation for examining investor delay as part of a broader capital allocation process rather than as an isolated administrative phenomenon.

Investor delay can have several forms. A temporary delay may occur because an investor requires additional information, evaluates risk, negotiates terms, verifies governance arrangements, or experiences internal approval constraints. The economic effect of such delay depends on whether the additional waiting period produces sufficient improvement in decision quality to compensate for the opportunity cost of postponed capital deployment. Mikhail (2024) directly positions the cost of temporary investor delay as a factor in improving the efficiency of private capital management processes, providing the central conceptual direction for this study.

The objective of this research is therefore to evaluate how temporary investor delay can influence private capital management efficiency. The study specifically examines the relationship between delay, information conditions, financing constraints, transaction processes, governance, and capital deployment. It further develops a conceptual framework explaining when delay is likely to reduce efficiency and when a controlled delay may contribute positively to investment quality.

The significance of the study lies in shifting attention from a binary understanding of investment availability toward a time-sensitive understanding of capital efficiency. The scope is conceptual and literature-based, relying exclusively on the references supplied by the researcher. No primary financial dataset is used; consequently, the proposed relationships should be interpreted as theoretically grounded propositions requiring subsequent empirical testing.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Financing Access and Capital Allocation

The literature establishes that financing availability is fundamental to enterprise development. Mensah (2004) examines SME financing schemes in Ghana, while Owusu et al. (2017) propose a conceptual framework concerning financing SME growth in Ghana. Together, these studies establish financing access as an important organizational resource. However, access alone does not guarantee efficient capital management. The timing of capital availability can determine whether resources can be used when investment opportunities arise.

Schiffer and Weder (2001) examine firm size and the business environment, providing further context for understanding constraints faced by smaller firms. Smaller enterprises can experience greater sensitivity to financing disruptions because their financial buffers may be limited. Thus, temporary delays may have disproportionate effects when organizations have fewer alternative sources of liquidity.

Ngaruiya (2014) examines mobile money transactions and financial performance among

SMEs. Although the study concerns financial transactions rather than investor delay specifically, it provides relevant support for the proposition that transaction mechanisms can influence financial performance. Faster and more accessible financial transactions may reduce operational frictions, whereas delays can increase the period between financial commitment and effective capital use.

2.2 Information Asymmetry and Investor Decision-Making

Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) provide a strong theoretical foundation through their analysis of credit rationing under imperfect information. When investors or lenders cannot perfectly observe borrower characteristics, risk, or project quality, they may restrict or delay capital allocation. Temporary investor delay can therefore emerge as an information-management response.

Sen and Taylor (2007) examine information needs among SMEs and identify information as a critical factor in organizational decision-making. Their findings are particularly relevant because investors frequently require reliable financial, operational, and strategic information before committing capital. A delay associated with obtaining high-quality information may impose a short-term cost while reducing the probability of an inefficient investment.

Lopez-Nicolas and Soto-Acosta (2010) investigate ICT adoption and its effects on knowledge creation in SMEs. Their work supports the broader argument that information technologies can improve knowledge processes. From the perspective of investment management, stronger information capabilities can reduce uncertainty and potentially shorten the period required for investor evaluation.

2.3 Financial Intermediation and Transaction Efficiency

Mols et al. (1999) analyze distribution channel strategies in Danish retail banking, while Pyun et al. (2002) examine Internet banking across the United States, Japan, and Europe. Prakash and Malik (2008) similarly investigate Internet banking in India, and Sohail and Shanmugham (2003) study e-banking and customer preferences in Malaysia. Collectively, these studies illustrate the growing role of technology and financial channels in reducing transaction friction.

Mansor et al. (2012) examine awareness of Islamic financial institution e-banking among Malaysian SMEs. The relevance to investor delay lies in the interaction between financial awareness, channel availability, and transaction execution. Efficient financial channels may reduce the operational component of delay, although they cannot independently eliminate delays caused by risk evaluation or governance approval.

2.4 Governance, Risk, and Financing Discipline

OECD (2004) places corporate governance principles within the broader framework of responsible organizational management. Governance affects how capital decisions are authorized, monitored, and controlled. Accordingly, eliminating investor delay indiscriminately may not necessarily improve efficiency. A rapid decision without adequate governance verification can create larger long-term costs.

Peek and Rosengren (1996) discuss the use of capital ratios to trigger intervention in problem banks and demonstrate the importance of timely intervention mechanisms in financial management. Their work reinforces the concept that timing is economically relevant: intervention that occurs too late may lose effectiveness.

Obamuyi (2009) examines loan delinquency among SMEs, highlighting the risks associated with financing outcomes and repayment behavior. Scott and Dunkelberg (2003) examine bank mergers and small-firm financing, further demonstrating that changes in financial institutions can affect access to external capital.

2.5 Research Gap

The supplied literature extensively addresses financing access, information requirements, financial technology, lending relationships, governance, and financial performance. However, these dimensions are rarely integrated around the specific construct of temporary investor delay. The research gap therefore concerns the absence of a consolidated framework that treats time delay as a determinant of private capital management efficiency.

Mikhail (2024) provides the most direct conceptual basis for this issue by emphasizing the cost of temporary investor delay in private capital management. Building on that direction, the present research conceptualizes delay as a multidimensional variable incorporating time cost, opportunity cost, liquidity effects, information benefits, transaction friction, and governance quality.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative conceptual research methodology based exclusively on the literature supplied by the researcher. The methodological purpose is not to estimate a statistical causal effect but to synthesize theoretically relevant relationships and develop a structured framework for evaluating temporary investor delay.

3.1 Research Design

The study uses thematic synthesis. The supplied references were conceptually grouped into five analytical dimensions: financing access, information availability, transaction efficiency, governance and risk control, and capital deployment. These dimensions were then connected to the central construct of temporary investor delay.

The independent conceptual variable is temporary investor delay, defined as the period between an expected or initiated investment decision and the actual availability or deployment of committed private capital. The dependent construct is private capital management efficiency, defined as the ability to allocate, mobilize, deploy, and control capital in a manner that balances financial returns, liquidity requirements, risk, and opportunity realization.

3.2 Analytical Framework

The proposed framework can be represented as:

Temporary Investor Delay → Information/Risk Evaluation → Capital Deployment Timing
→ Financial and Operational Outcomes → Capital Management Efficiency

However, the relationship is not necessarily linear. Delay can produce either negative or positive effects depending on its cause.

A useful conceptual expression is:

Net Delay Cost = Direct Delay Cost + Opportunity Cost + Liquidity Cost + Transaction Cost
– Information/Risk Reduction Benefit

Direct delay cost represents expenses associated with prolonged processing. Opportunity cost represents the economic value of investment opportunities that may be postponed or lost. Liquidity cost represents the impact of unavailable capital on organizational cash management. Transaction cost includes additional administrative and financing expenses. The information/risk reduction benefit captures the potential advantage obtained when additional time improves due diligence and decision quality.

3.3 Information Dimension

The information dimension is supported by Sen and Taylor (2007), who emphasize the importance of information needs, and Lopez-Nicolas and Soto-Acosta (2010), who connect ICT adoption with knowledge creation. In practical terms, an investor may delay a decision because financial statements, market information, management data, or project documentation are incomplete.

For example, an investor considering a private enterprise may initially identify substantial growth potential but postpone capital release until financial projections are verified. If the additional five-day evaluation identifies a material financial weakness, the delay can be interpreted as efficiency-enhancing rather than inefficient. Conversely, if the information was already available and the delay resulted solely from unnecessary administrative procedures, the same five-day period represents avoidable inefficiency.

3.4 Financing and Liquidity Dimension

The financing literature suggests that capital constraints can influence organizational development (Mensah, 2004; Owusu et al., 2017). Temporary investor delay can therefore increase dependence on alternative financing. An enterprise awaiting investment capital may use short-term borrowing, defer supplier payments, reduce operational expenditure, or postpone expansion.

Petersen and Rajan (1995) demonstrate that lending relationships can influence access to credit. Consequently, an enterprise with strong financial relationships may be able to absorb investor delays more effectively than one with limited financing alternatives. Schiffer and Weder (2001) further support consideration of firm-level constraints when evaluating the consequences of financing conditions.

3.5 Transaction and Technology Dimension

Technology-enabled financial channels may reduce certain categories of delay. Research on Internet banking and e-banking across different contexts indicates that electronic financial services can improve transaction accessibility and processing mechanisms (Pyun et al., 2002; Prakash & Malik, 2008; Sohail & Shanmugham, 2003). Ngaruiya (2014) also provides a relevant perspective on mobile money transactions and SME financial performance.

Nevertheless, technological efficiency does not eliminate decision-making delay. An investment may be digitally transferable but still require governance approval, risk assessment, or negotiation. Therefore, delay should be decomposed into decision delay and transaction delay. This distinction is important because technological interventions are more capable of reducing transaction delay than strategic or governance-related delay.

3.6 Governance and Risk Dimension

Governance creates a counterweight to the objective of accelerating investment. OECD (2004) emphasizes governance principles, while Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) demonstrate how information imperfections can affect financial allocation. Together, these perspectives indicate that decision speed should not be optimized independently from decision quality.

The methodology therefore treats an optimal investment process as one in which delay is minimized subject to an acceptable level of information and risk control. The objective is not zero delay but efficient delay.

3.7 Conceptual Evaluation Criteria

Temporary investor delay can be evaluated through five questions: whether the delay was necessary, whether it improved information quality, whether it increased financing

or liquidity pressure, whether it reduced transaction efficiency, and whether it protected against an economically significant investment risk.

This framework allows managers to distinguish productive delay from avoidable delay. Mikhail (2024) is particularly relevant to this conceptual distinction because the cost of temporary investor delay becomes meaningful when incorporated into the broader efficiency of private capital management processes.

RESULTS

The conceptual synthesis identifies five principal findings concerning temporary investor delay and private capital management efficiency.

First, temporary investor delay has an economic cost even when capital is eventually delivered. The literature on SME financing indicates that access to finance is closely connected with growth and operational capacity (Mensah, 2004; Owusu et al., 2017). Therefore, a delay between financing commitment and capital deployment can postpone activities that depend on those resources. The cost may include delayed expansion, additional short-term financing, or missed investment opportunities. The effect becomes stronger where enterprises have limited financial reserves or alternative credit sources.

Second, the effect of delay depends substantially on its cause. Information-related delay may be economically justified when investors require additional evidence to address uncertainty. Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) demonstrate why imperfect information can constrain financial allocation, while Sen and Taylor (2007) emphasize the importance of adequate information for SME decision-making. A short delay that materially improves risk assessment may therefore increase overall efficiency. In contrast, an administrative delay that does not improve information or risk assessment represents a direct efficiency loss.

Third, financial technology can reduce transaction-related delay but cannot eliminate decision-related delay. Studies of Internet banking and e-banking demonstrate the development of more efficient financial channels (Pyun et al., 2002; Prakash & Malik, 2008; Sohail & Shanmugham, 2003). Mols et al. (1999) similarly highlight changes in banking distribution channels. These developments suggest that digital financial infrastructure can shorten the period required for executing transactions. However, technology cannot independently resolve delays originating from investor due diligence, governance requirements, or negotiation.

Fourth, financing relationships moderate the consequences of delay. Petersen and Rajan (1995) show that lending relationships affect financing conditions, while Schiffer and Weder (2001) highlight the importance of firm-level and business-environment factors. An enterprise with established financing relationships may temporarily substitute external funds during an investor delay. An enterprise without such relationships may face considerably higher liquidity pressure.

Fifth, the optimal objective is not necessarily minimum delay but minimum net delay cost. This finding represents the central conceptual contribution. Mikhail (2024) provides the basis for treating the cost of temporary delay as an efficiency consideration. The proposed framework extends this perspective by distinguishing between the cost imposed by waiting and the potential benefit generated by better information, stronger governance, or improved risk assessment.

Overall, the findings indicate an inverted conceptual relationship between delay and efficiency. Excessive or avoidable delay reduces efficiency, whereas a controlled and purposeful delay can improve decision quality. The critical management task is therefore to identify the threshold at which additional waiting no longer produces sufficient informational or risk-reduction benefits to justify its economic cost.

DISCUSSION

The findings have important theoretical implications for the understanding of private capital management. Traditional financing perspectives frequently emphasize whether capital is available and what it costs. The present analysis adds a temporal dimension by arguing that when capital becomes available can be equally important. A financing arrangement with favorable monetary terms may still produce inefficient outcomes if capital is released after the relevant investment opportunity has weakened.

The first theoretical implication concerns information asymmetry. Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) explain how imperfect information can produce financing constraints. From this perspective, temporary investor delay may be interpreted as an information-acquisition mechanism. The investor incurs a time cost to reduce uncertainty. This creates a trade-off between speed and decision quality. If the probability of avoiding a poor investment increases substantially through additional evaluation, the delay may be justified. However, if additional information has little effect on the decision, the delay becomes economically inefficient.

The second implication concerns relationship-based financing. Petersen and Rajan (1995) suggest that lending relationships influence financing behavior. This indicates that the cost of investor delay is not uniform across firms. Enterprises with strong financing relationships may have access to temporary liquidity and therefore experience relatively low delay costs. Conversely, firms with limited financing access may experience significant operational disruption.

The third implication concerns technology. Research on Internet banking and e-banking suggests that digital financial channels can improve transaction processes (Pyun et al., 2002; Prakash & Malik, 2008; Sohail & Shanmugham, 2003). However, the results indicate that managers should not assume that digitization automatically solves investor delay. Technology primarily addresses processing friction, whereas strategic delay may arise from due diligence, negotiation, governance, or risk evaluation.

Governance introduces an important contradiction. From a narrow operational perspective, faster investment is desirable. From a governance perspective, excessively rapid decisions may increase exposure to poorly assessed risks. OECD (2004) emphasizes the importance of governance principles, supporting the argument that efficiency cannot be measured solely by transaction speed. A high-quality capital management process must balance responsiveness with accountability.

The practical implication is that private capital managers should classify delays according to their underlying cause. Information delay should be monitored according to the additional decision value generated. Transaction delay should be addressed through process redesign and financial technology. Governance delay should be evaluated according to the risk it prevents. Liquidity-related delay should be assessed through its effect on financing requirements and operational continuity.

The framework also reveals several limitations. First, the study is conceptual and does not estimate actual financial costs. Second, the supplied literature largely concerns SMEs, banking, and financing environments rather than private investors specifically. Third, the framework does not establish universal optimal delay thresholds because these would vary according to investment type, capital structure, market conditions, and organizational liquidity. Finally, the relationship between delay and efficiency may be nonlinear, meaning that a small delay and a prolonged delay cannot be assumed to have proportionally equivalent effects.

Future empirical research should therefore measure actual delay duration, financing costs, opportunity losses, transaction expenses, and investment outcomes. Mikhail (2024) provides an important starting point for such measurement by positioning

temporary delay as a cost relevant to private capital management efficiency. A subsequent quantitative model could test whether the proposed relationship differs across firm sizes, investment categories, financing structures, and levels of information availability.

CONCLUSION

This research evaluated temporary investor delay as a determinant of private capital management efficiency through a conceptual synthesis of the supplied literature. The analysis demonstrates that investment efficiency should not be assessed solely through capital availability, financing cost, or investment return. The timing of capital deployment is also economically relevant.

The central conclusion is that temporary investor delay has a dual character. Avoidable delay creates opportunity, liquidity, transaction, and operational costs. Purposeful delay, however, can improve information quality, strengthen governance, and reduce investment risk. Consequently, the appropriate managerial objective is not the complete elimination of delay but the optimization of delay relative to the benefits it generates.

The proposed framework integrates financing constraints, information asymmetry, technology-enabled transactions, lending relationships, governance, and capital deployment into a unified temporal perspective. This extends the conceptual discussion of private capital efficiency by treating investor delay as a measurable management variable.

In practical terms, private capital managers should identify the source of delay, quantify its expected cost, determine whether additional waiting produces meaningful information or risk-reduction benefits, and redesign avoidable transaction processes. Digital financial channels can reduce processing friction, while stronger information systems can shorten evaluation periods. At the same time, governance controls should be retained where they provide material protection against inefficient investment.

Future research should empirically validate the proposed framework using investment-level observations and develop quantitative measures of direct delay cost, opportunity cost, liquidity cost, and information benefit. Such research could establish decision thresholds for determining when temporary investor delay shifts from a value-enhancing control mechanism into a source of capital-management inefficiency.

REFERENCES

1. Lopez-Nicolas, C., & Soto-Acosta, P. (2010). Analyzing ICT adoption and use effects on knowledge creation: An empirical investigation in SMEs. *International Journal of Information Management*, 30(6), 521-528.
2. Mansor, N., Shariff, A., & Manap, N. R. A. (2012). Determinants of awareness on Islamic financial institution e-banking among Malaysian SMEs. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(5).
3. Mensah, S. (2004, March). A review of SME financing schemes in Ghana. In A Presentation at the UNIDO Regional Workshop of Financing SMEs (pp. 15-16). Ghana: Accra.
4. Mikhail, S. (2024). Estimating the cost of investor's temporary delay as a factor in improving the efficiency of private capital management processes. *European journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, (3), 34-39.
5. Mols, N. P., Bukh, P. N. D., & Nielsen, J. F. (1999). Distribution channel strategies in Danish retail banking. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*.
6. Ngaruiya, B. (2014). Effects of mobile money transactions on financial performance of small and medium enterprises in Nakuru central business district (Doctoral dissertation, Egerton University).

7. Obamuyi, T. M. (2009). 8.4 An Exploratory Study of Loan Delinquency among Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Labour and management in development*, 8.
8. OECD, O. (2004). The OECD principles of corporate governance. *Contaduría y Administración*, (216).
9. Owusu, J., Osman, M. H. B. M., Ismail, M. B., & Latif, A. A. B. A. (2017). A conceptual framework for financing sme growth in Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 9(19), 11-13.
10. Peek, J., & Rosengren, E. S. (1996). The use of capital ratios to trigger intervention in problem banks: Too little, too late. *New England Economic Review*, 49-58.
11. Petersen, M. A., & Rajan, R. G. (1995). The effect of credit market competition on lending relationships. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(2), 407-443.
12. Prakash, A., & Malik, G. (2008). Empirical Study of Internet Banking in India. *Curie journal*, 1(3).
13. Pyun, C. S., Scruggs, L., & Nam, K. (2002). Internet banking in the US, Japan and Europe. *Multinational Business Review*, 10(2), 73.
14. Safoulanitou, L. N., Zamo-Akono, C., & Ndiwulu, X. B. (2013). PME et Innovation: une Analyse Comparative Entre le Cameroun, le Congo et la RDC/SMEs and Innovation: a Comparative Analysis between Cameroon, Congo and DRC.
15. Schiffer, M., & Weder, B. (2001). Firm size and the business environment: Worldwide survey results. *The World Bank*.
16. Scott, J. A., & Dunkelberg, W. C. (2003). Bank mergers and small firm financing. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 999-1017.
17. Sen, B. A., & Taylor, R. (2007). Determining the information needs of small and medium-sized enterprises: A critical success factor analysis. *Information Research*, 12(4), 12-4.
18. Sohail, M. S., & Shanmugham, B. (2003). E-banking and customer preferences in Malaysia: An empirical investigation. *Information Sciences*, 150(3-4), 207-217.
19. Stiglitz, J. E., & Weiss, A. (1981). Credit rationing in markets with imperfect information. *The American economic review*, 71(3), 393-410.