SYMBIOSIS
SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS
॥वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्॥

M.Sc. Economics

Academic Year: 2024 – 2025

Advanced Microeconomics

Assignment

How Microfinance Debt Traps Shape Household Spending and Deepen Poverty

Submitted to:

Dr. Rajan Kumar Dash

Associate Professor

(Symbiosis School of Economics)

Submitted by:

Amritha Srinivasan (24060242012)

Allan Charles (24060202009)

Deepjyoti Dutta (24060242026)

Madhumitha Ramakrishnan (24060242043)

Vipul Sharma (24060242108)

Introduction:

Microfinance has been widely regarded as a transformative tool for poverty alleviation, designed to extend financial services to marginalized communities, especially in low-income regions (Ahmed, 2020). The primary objective of microfinance institutions (MFIs) is to empower individuals, particularly women, who traditionally lack access to conventional banking. This empowerment is achieved by facilitating small loans that encourage entrepreneurship and enable economic resilience (Gonzalez, 2018). By promoting financial inclusion, MFIs aim to raise living standards and contribute to regional development (Chavan & Ramakrishna, 2018).

While many advocates highlight the role of microfinance in addressing poverty, several studies underscore the potential risks, particularly the likelihood of borrowers falling into debt traps. High-interest rates, inflexible repayment terms, and limited financial literacy among borrowers can often exacerbate financial vulnerability rather than alleviate it (Yunus & Banerjee, 2011). Indeed, in certain contexts, microfinance has become a "double-edged sword," as noted by Rhyne (2009), where the very mechanism designed to foster economic growth may instead deepen poverty through unsustainable debt.

Household spending behaviour is notably impacted by microfinance-related debt, with families often forced to prioritize loan repayments over essential expenditures, affecting their consumption patterns and overall welfare (Hashemi, Schuler, & Riley, 1996). Evidence from Bangladesh and East Africa highlights how the burden of debt can lead households to make financial sacrifices, thereby affecting their quality of life (Dugger, 2013; Karlan & Zinman, 2011). Furthermore, the social pressure and stigmatization associated with debt default can push borrowers into deeper cycles of poverty, contradicting the initial intent of microfinance initiatives (Asiedu-Akrofi & Abor, 2020).

This report examines the dual nature of microfinance, with a specific focus on how debt traps influence household spending and contribute to persistent poverty. Through an analysis of the existing literature and emerging trends, this report aims to uncover the extent to which debt cycles erode household welfare, thereby questioning the viability of microfinance as a sustainable solution for poverty alleviation (Bateman & Chang, 2012).

Literature Review:

Banerjee, Duflo, Glennerster, and Kinnan (2015) conducted a study titled The Miracle of Microfinance? Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation to assess how microcredit introduction in new markets affects household borrowing, the formation of businesses, and other development outcomes. Women's empowerment, health, and education were among these results. Half of the 104 Hyderabadi slums that were subjected to the researchers' randomized evaluation were served by Spandana, a well-known microfinance organization. Data on household borrowing, business activities, and expenditure patterns were assessed by means of a comparison between the treated and control groups at 18 and 36 months. The main conclusions showed that borrowers' investments in enterprises or household consumption did not significantly increase as a result of the implementation of microcredit. Rather than using the loans for extremely profitable projects, many households utilized them to balance their spending during times of financial turbulence. Microcredit helped households finance greater purchases and grow their businesses, but it did not significantly alter the economy. The advantages of microcredit seemed to be concentrated among larger companies, indicating that when microcredit is aimed at average households, its effects might be restricted. Portfolios of the Poor, Chapter 6, Rethinking Microfinance: The Grameen II Diaries, in order to better understand the varied financial demands of low-income households, Collins, Morduch, Rutherford, and Ruthven (2009) concentrated on how these households handled their income and expenses over time. The households were directed to keep precise daily financial transaction records in financial diaries. This approach gave important information about cash flows, spending patterns, and financial product usage. Afterwards, the information was utilized to contrast these households' financial practices before and after they gained access to microfinance programs, showing the adjustments and difficulties, they faced. Many Borrow, More Save, and All Insure: Implications for Food and Microfinance Policy (Zeller & Sharma, 2000). This study explores the role of microfinance in alleviating poverty and ensuring food security, focusing on the types of financial services demanded by the poor. Conducted across ten African and Asian countries, the research highlights that rural households heavily rely on financial tools such as savings, credit, and insurance to manage economic uncertainty. However, most microfinance institutions (MFIs) primarily offer credit, neglecting the significant demand for savings and insurance products. This gap limits the ability of poor households to effectively manage risks and improve long-term financial resilience. The study emphasizes that for microfinance to fully alleviate poverty, MFIs should provide a wider range

of financial services, including savings and insurance, rather than focusing solely on credit. By doing so, poor households can stabilize their income and enhance food security. While the research offers valuable insights, its scope is limited to rural areas and a select group of MFIs, which may not represent the global microfinance landscape. Moreover, the findings are primarily relevant to rural contexts, limiting their applicability in urban settings. Microfinance Mission Drift? (Mersland & Strøm, 2010) This study examines whether microfinance institutions (MFIs) are experiencing "mission drift," shifting focus from serving the poor to wealthier clients. Using data from 379 MFIs across 74 countries (2001–2008), the research analyses factors like loan size, lending methods, and client demographics. While no significant evidence of widespread mission drift was found, the study shows that institutions focusing on maximizing profits may experience drift, offering larger loans and catering to wealthier clients. However, improving cost efficiency helps MFIs maintain their social mission without compromising financial sustainability. The research highlights that mission drift can be controlled when MFIs focus on cost management rather than profit maximization. This allows them to continue serving poor clients effectively while achieving financial sustainability. While comprehensive, the study is limited by its reliance on data from rated MFIs, which may not represent the broader microfinance sector. Additionally, the data focuses on a specific period (2001–2008), potentially missing more recent trends in microfinance practices. Despite these limitations, the findings offer useful insights for balancing financial performance with social outreach. Is Microfinance a 'Magic Bullet' for Women's Empowerment? (Kabeer, 2005). This study investigates whether microfinance enhances women’s empowerment by increasing their economic independence, decision-making power, and participation in public life. Conducted in Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan, the research utilizes surveys, interviews, and longitudinal case studies to analyses the impact of microfinance on women borrowers. It considers regional differences and institutional variations in the delivery of microfinance services. The findings reveal that while microfinance helps some women achieve greater financial independence and a more significant role in household decision-making, it does not consistently empower them across the board. In many cases, cultural norms limit the transformative potential of microfinance, and women’s workloads increase without corresponding shifts in power dynamics. Thus, microfinance cannot be viewed as a "magic bullet" for empowerment, as it often requires additional social and institutional support to bring about broader societal changes. Microfinance Institutions in India: A Study on Financial Performance (Manoharan, Ramachandra & Nirmala Devi). This study evaluates the financial performance of microfinance institutions (MFIs) in India, focusing on key financial indicators such as

profitability, sustainability, and growth. Using a quantitative approach, the research analyses secondary data from various MFIs, including non-banking financial companies (NBFCs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Key metrics like return on assets (ROA), return on equity (ROE), and active client numbers are assessed. The study finds that the financial performance of Indian MFIs has shown a positive trend, with many institutions achieving profitability and sustainability. However, there are disparities between different types of MFIs. Efficient management, risk control, and diversified funding contribute to the financial success of MFIs, but challenges such as high operational costs and loan defaults remain significant obstacles. Impact of Microfinance on Social, Economic, and Capability Well-Being of Families in Deoghar District, Jharkhand (Priyadarshini, 2017). This study investigates how microfinance interventions improve the quality of life for impoverished families in Deoghar district, Jharkhand. Using a mixed-methods approach, the research combines surveys, interviews, and focus group discussions to assess financial, social, and capability outcomes for households below the poverty line. The findings indicate significant improvements in economic well-being, such as higher income levels, better access to services, and asset ownership. Socially, microfinance fosters community involvement and empowers women, with enhanced decision-making power within households. However, the benefits vary, with some families experiencing only modest gains. The Impact of Microfinance on Poverty Reduction: Empirical Evidence from Malaysia (Samer et al., 2015). This research analyses the impact of microfinance on poverty reduction in Malaysia, using survey data from low-income households across multiple states. Statistical analyses, including regression models, examine the relationship between microfinance and poverty alleviation. The results show that microfinance significantly enhances income levels, asset ownership, and economic stability, while also improving access to education and healthcare. However, the impact varies based on individual factors like financial literacy and prior business experience. The study underscores microfinance's potential as a poverty alleviation tool but stresses the need for supportive policies that ensure sustainability and adaptability to diverse needs. The use of cross-sectional data limits the ability to draw long-term conclusions, and the sample may not fully represent the country's low-income populations. Microfinance and Its Impact on Poverty Alleviation: A Study of the Debt Trap Phenomenon (Yunus & Banerjee, 2011). This study explores whether microfinance serves as a tool for poverty alleviation or perpetuates a cycle of debt. Quantitative data from surveys and qualitative insights from interviews were used to examine borrowers' financial outcomes and psychological effects of long-term engagement with microfinance. While microfinance can enhance income for some, a significant number of borrowers fall into a "debt trap," unable to

repay loans due to high interest rates and rigid repayment terms. The study emphasizes the need for more borrower-centric loan structures and financial literacy programs to mitigate this issue. The Dark Side of Microcredit: Evidence from Bangladesh (Karlan & Zinman, 2011). This study examines the unintended negative consequences of microcredit in Bangladesh using household surveys and econometric analysis. The findings show that while microcredit can help some borrowers, especially those with business experience, many fall into debt traps due to high-interest rates and inflexible repayment schedules. The research suggests integrating financial literacy with microcredit to reduce risks and enhance its positive impact. However, the study's focus on Bangladesh may limit its generalizability to other regions with different microfinance structures. Microfinance: A Double-Edged Sword? (Rhyne, 2009). This study evaluates microfinance's dual role in promoting financial inclusion and poverty alleviation, while also exposing risks. Data from microfinance institutions and borrowers revealed that some thrive with increased income, while others struggle with over-indebtedness due to high interest rates and rigid repayment schedules. Interviews highlighted both success stories and financial hardships. Microfinance can either elevate borrowers or deepen financial distress, depending on its implementation. The study calls for stricter regulations to curb predatory lending practices and emphasizes financial education to protect borrowers. Understanding Over-Indebtedness Among Women Borrowers in Ghana (Asiedu-Akrofi & Abor, 2020). This study explores the causes and socio-economic impact of over-indebtedness among women in Ghana's microfinance programs. Quantitative data showed that high debt ratios lead to financial instability, asset loss, and family tensions. Interviews revealed personal struggles in loan management, worsened by inadequate borrower protection and poor financial planning. The study urges policy changes to regulate interest rates and improve financial counselling, reducing debt risks. However, its focus on a specific region may limit generalizability, and self-reported interview data poses potential bias challenges.

Analysis

The dataset on the Number of Self-Help Groups (SHGs) and Outstanding Loans (O/S Loans), classified by year and state, was sourced from data.gov.in, India’s national data repository. This platform provides comprehensive and credible datasets that facilitate public access to governmental data across various sectors, including finance and social development.

Rationale

The rationale for choosing this dataset lies in its relevance to understanding the impact of SHG growth on outstanding debt levels. SHGs play a crucial role in microfinancing, often providing low-income and rural households with access to credit. However, as the number of SHGs grows, there is concern that an increase in outstanding loans could signify potential debt traps for SHG members if repayments are difficult to manage. Therefore, analyzing the relation between SHG growth and outstanding loan amounts can provide insights into whether SHG-based microfinance supports sustainable economic development or potentially exacerbates financial vulnerability.

Methodology

This study employs a quantitative approach to analyse the impact of the number of Self-Help Groups (SHGs) on outstanding loan amounts across various states in India. The dataset, sourced from Data.gov.in, includes yearly and state-wise data on the number of SHGs and the corresponding outstanding loan amounts. The methodology is organized as follows:

1. Descriptive

   First, descriptive statistics will be computed for both the number of SHGs and outstanding loan amounts, broken down by year and state. Descriptive measures such as mean, median, standard deviation, and range will be used to summarize the central tendency, variability, and distribution of these variables. By examining these statistics on a yearly and state-wise basis, we can gain initial insights into trends and patterns in SHG proliferation and outstanding loan growth over time and across regions.

2. Regression

   Following the descriptive analysis, a regression analysis will be conducted to assess the relationship between the number of SHGs (independent variable) and the outstanding loan amount (dependent variable) on a year-wise basis. This regression model will be performed individually for each year, allowing us to observe how changes in the number of SHGs may have influenced outstanding loan amounts state-wise within each specific year.

By modelling outstanding loan amounts as a function of the number of SHGs, the regression analysis will provide insights into:

The degree of association between SHG numbers and outstanding debt across different states. Whether there is a statistically significant relationship between SHG expansion and increases in outstanding loans, which may indicate risks associated with rising indebtedness in regions with high SHG activity.

3. Ratio Analysis of (Os_loan/ #SHG) : The Outstanding Loans per SHG ratio (O/S Loan per SHG) indicates the average debt burden per group, providing insight into the sustainability of SHG-driven microfinance. A rising ratio suggests increased debt levels per SHG, which may signal greater financial vulnerability if loans grow faster than members' repayment capacity, especially if not matched by income growth. Analyzing this ratio over time and across regions helps assess whether SHG credit access supports economic empowerment or risks over-indebtedness, offering a valuable gauge of microfinance impact and lending practices.

Results and Interpretations:

Please refer to the below link for results.

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1gCkcJR1pCcAgn8scokj7XkoHvaDb9MWk/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=106411496424701835327&rtpof=true&sd=true

SHGs is a positive indicator of microfinance reaching more people, primarily from low-income households, which is central to the empowerment objectives of microfinance institutions (MFIs). The average number of SHGs increases significantly each year, with a sharp rise observed between 2020 and 2021, indicating expanding reach. Similarly, the loans outstanding also show a comparable upward trajectory, which suggests that while more people are gaining access to credit, the risk of over-indebtedness may simultaneously be increasing.

Descriptive Statistics Interpretation

- Mean Values: The mean for SHGs shows a steady increase from 141,037 in 2019 to 179,598 in 2021. This suggests an expanding reach of microfinance institutions, which aligns with the intention to alleviate poverty and empower marginalized communities by increasing financial access. The average outstanding loans for the same period, however, rise from 241,939.32 million INR in 2019 to 386,403.93 million INR in 2021. This points to a growing volume of debt accumulated by these groups.

- Standard Deviation & Variability: The high standard deviation values for both the number of SHGs and outstanding loans indicate significant variability in the data. This suggests that while some regions may benefit from substantial microfinance support, others may be struggling with increased indebtedness. The large deviation in loan amounts is especially concerning, as it highlights that some SHGs may face extreme debt burdens compared to others, raising questions about the equitable distribution of microfinance benefits.
- Kurtosis & Skewness: The kurtosis and skewness values provide further insight into the distribution of the data. The positive skewness values (ranging from 1.74 in 2019 to 3.35 in 2021 for loans outstanding) indicate a long tail to the right, meaning there are a few regions or groups experiencing disproportionately high levels of debt. Similarly, high kurtosis values in the 8–12 range point to a "peaked" distribution, where most of the SHGs and outstanding loans are concentrated in a small subset of regions. This highlights a potential problem of debt concentration, where a few SHGs may be responsible for a significant portion of the outstanding loans, possibly indicating debt traps in these areas.
- Median and Range: The median values for both SHGs and loan amounts, when compared with the mean, show a disparity. For example, in 2020, the median number of SHGs was 16,751, while the mean was 157,696. This suggests that the majority of SHGs are relatively small, but a few large SHGs are driving up the averages, possibly indicating a concentration of microfinance activity in specific areas or sectors. The wide range of values, particularly in loan amounts, from a minimum of zero to maximum values in the hundreds of millions, further supports this interpretation of highly unequal distribution.

Regression Analysis and Interpretations:

In 2019, the regression analysis reveals a strong positive relationship between the number of SHGs and the outstanding loan amounts, with an R-square value of 0.785, indicating that approximately 78.5% of the variance in the outstanding loan amounts can be explained by the number of SHGs. This suggests that as the number of SHGs increases, the outstanding loans also tend to increase in a highly predictable manner. The coefficients indicate that for each additional SHG, the outstanding loan amount increases by approximately ₹2.01 million. The p-value for the coefficient of SHGs is extremely low (6.62E-13), suggesting that this

relationship is statistically significant at any conventional significance level. The F-statistic of 124.41 and its corresponding significance (6.62E-13) further confirm that the overall regression model is highly significant and that the number of SHGs is an important predictor of the outstanding loan amount. However, the intercept value is negative (-₹41,641), though not statistically significant (p-value = 0.392), which may indicate that if no SHGs existed, the expected loan amount would be negative, which is not meaningful in practical terms. This emphasizes the importance of SHGs in driving outstanding loan amounts.

In 2020, the regression results show a similarly strong and positive relationship between the number of SHGs and the outstanding loan amounts. The R-square value of 0.794 indicates that approximately 79.4% of the variation in outstanding loans is explained by the number of SHGs. This is a slight improvement compared to 2019, highlighting a stable and predictable relationship. The coefficient for the number of SHGs is 2.25 million, suggesting that for each additional SHG, the outstanding loan amount increases by approximately ₹2.25 million. This is consistent with the positive trend observed in the previous year. The p-value of 3.15E-13 for the coefficient is extremely small, indicating a statistically significant relationship between the number of SHGs and the outstanding loans at conventional significance levels. The F-statistic of 131.44, with a significance value of 3.15E-13, indicates that the overall regression model is highly significant, reinforcing that the number of SHGs is a reliable predictor of outstanding loan amounts. The intercept value of -₹53,947 is again negative and not statistically significant (p-value = 0.36), which does not have a meaningful real-world interpretation.

The regression analysis for 2021 reveals a strong positive correlation between the number of SHGs and the outstanding loan amounts, with an R-square value of 0.768, meaning that approximately 76.8% of the variance in outstanding loans can be explained by the number of SHGs. This indicates that the model provides a good fit for the data, although there is a slight decline in explanatory power compared to 2020. The coefficient for the number of SHGs is ₹1.93 million, suggesting that for each additional SHG, the outstanding loan amount increases by ₹1.93 million. This is a slight reduction from 2020, indicating that while the relationship remains positive, the impact of each SHG on loan amounts has slightly diminished. The p-value for the SHG coefficient is 2.51E-12, which is very small and highly significant, confirming that the relationship between the number of SHGs and the loan amounts is statistically robust. Similarly, the F-statistic of 112.57, with a significance level of 2.51E-12, suggests that the overall model is statistically significant and provides strong evidence that the number of SHGs is a reliable predictor of outstanding loans. The intercept of -₹23,288 is

negative, but not statistically significant (p-value = 0.67), and does not contribute meaningfully to the interpretation.

The regression results for 2022 show a continued, though slightly diminished, positive correlation between the number of SHGs and outstanding loan amounts, with an R-square of 0.711. This suggests that 71.1% of the variation in outstanding loans is explained by the number of SHGs, indicating a strong relationship, though lower than in previous years. The coefficient for the number of SHGs is ₹2.54 million, meaning that each additional SHG is associated with an increase of ₹2.54 million in outstanding loans. This increase is slightly higher than in previous years, suggesting a rising impact of each SHG on debt levels. This could reflect growing loan sizes or a shift in SHG lending practices that increases overall borrowing. The p-value for the SHG coefficient is extremely low (1.09E-10), indicating high statistical significance, affirming a strong association between SHG numbers and outstanding loans. Additionally, the F-statistic of 83.66 (significant at 1.09E-10) reinforces the model's robustness in predicting loan amounts based on SHG numbers. The intercept of -₹70,319, although negative, is not statistically significant (p-value = 0.46), and thus holds limited interpretive value.

Ratio Analysis:

2019: The 2019 O/S Loan per SHG ratio data reveals significant regional variation in the average debt burden per Self-Help Group across India. Andhra Pradesh has the highest ratio at 3.17, followed by Telangana (2.70), Kerala (2.59), and Goa (2.02), indicating that SHGs in these states carry a notably higher debt load. This could reflect a strong demand for credit or more aggressive lending practices, potentially posing a risk of over-indebtedness for SHG members if not matched by adequate income growth. In contrast, states such as Arunachal Pradesh (0.50), Meghalaya (0.49), and Jharkhand (0.52) show much lower ratios, suggesting either lower credit access or more conservative borrowing, which may reflect different economic needs or a cautious approach to debt. Meanwhile, states with moderate ratios, like Punjab (1.48), Tamil Nadu (1.95), and Karnataka (1.94), may indicate a more balanced lending environment. Daman and Diu and Lakshadweep, with very low or negligible ratios (0 and 0.23, respectively), stand out as outliers, possibly due to limited SHG activity or unique regional financial dynamics. Overall, this distribution of O/S Loan per SHG ratios highlights the diverse landscape of microfinance across states, emphasizing the need to balance access to credit with sustainable debt management to avoid financial strain on SHG members.

2020: The 2020 O/S Loan per SHG ratio data shows continued variation across states, with Andhra Pradesh (3.49), Telangana (3.14), and Goa (2.49) having the highest ratios, indicating substantial debt burdens per SHG. This trend may suggest that SHGs in these states are increasingly dependent on credit, raising potential concerns of over-indebtedness if income growth doesn't keep pace. Other high-ratio states like New Delhi (2.50), Karnataka (2.13), and Kerala (2.07) reflect similar trends of increased borrowing. Moderate ratios are seen in states like Punjab (1.82), Puducherry (1.86), and Tamil Nadu (2.17), suggesting a balanced credit environment, though these states also require monitoring to avoid debt escalation. Lower ratios, such as in Uttar Pradesh (0.57), Uttarakhand (0.54), and Madhya Pradesh (0.62), may reflect either conservative lending practices or limited access to credit in these regions..

2021: The 2021 O/S Loan per SHG ratio data continues to show significant differences across Indian states, with Andhra Pradesh (3.32) and Telangana (2.94) leading in debt burden per SHG. High ratios are also observed in Karnataka (2.51), Tamil Nadu (2.24), and Puducherry (2.11), suggesting that SHGs in these states may face substantial repayment pressures, potentially increasing financial vulnerability among members if income levels are insufficient to support the debt. States like Kerala (1.90), Goa (1.80), and West Bengal (1.35) also display relatively high ratios, indicating a robust microfinance presence with moderate debt risks. On the other hand, states such as Uttar Pradesh (0.62), Uttarakhand (0.55), and Madhya Pradesh (0.68) have low ratios, suggesting either more conservative lending or limited credit demand.

2022: The 2022 O/S Loan per SHG ratio data indicates considerable variation among Indian states, with New Delhi showing an exceptionally high ratio of 6.83, suggesting a very high outstanding loan burden per SHG in this region. Andhra Pradesh follows with a high ratio of 4.70, indicating significant debt levels relative to SHG numbers, potentially pointing to elevated financial strain on SHG members in these areas. Other states with high ratios include Telangana (3.42), Tamil Nadu (2.46), and Puducherry (2.19), indicating substantial credit exposure for SHGs. Goa (2.35), Karnataka (2.35), and Kerala (2.03) also display elevated ratios, reflecting active microfinance operations with higher debt levels, which could pose a risk if these loans are challenging to repay. In contrast, states like Uttar Pradesh (0.57), Uttarakhand (0.53), and Tripura (0.59) maintain lower ratios, suggesting either more cautious lending or limited credit access.

Policy Recommendations:

1. Productivity-Linked Loan Structuring: To address the risk of debt traps and promote sustainable lending, microfinance institutions (MFIs) could introduce productivity-linked loan products that incentivize productive investments. Under this model, loan terms such as interest rates, repayment periods, or access to additional credit would be adjusted based on SHGs' economic performance and productivity metrics. For instance:

1.1 Reduced Interest Rates for High-Performing SHGs: SHGs that demonstrate increased productivity—through metrics such as higher crop yields, successful sales, or enhanced revenue generation—could qualify for reduced interest rates. Lower borrowing costs for productive SHGs would lessen their debt burden and reinforce a focus on income-generating activities.

1.2 Flexible Repayment Schedules Based on Revenue Cycles: For SHGs engaged in seasonal industries like agriculture, MFIs could offer repayment schedules aligned with revenue cycles, such as after harvest seasons. This would reduce pressure to meet monthly repayments during lean periods, helping SHGs manage cash flow more effectively and avoid taking on additional debt for repayment.

1.3 Performance-Based Access to Further Credit: High-performing SHGs with proven productivity gains could receive streamlined access to further credit. This policy would reward SHGs that use loans effectively and prevent unproductive SHGs from accumulating excessive debt, focusing on quality over quantity in microfinance.

By linking loan structuring to productivity outcomes, MFIs would not only minimize default risks but also empower SHGs to focus on long-term income growth rather than short-term credit availability, helping to break the cycle of debt accumulation.

2. Mandatory Capacity-Building Programs for Income-Generating Skills

Ensuring that SHGs can repay loans requires investing in the skills and knowledge of SHG members to enhance productivity. MFIs, in partnership with government agencies or NGOs, could implement mandatory capacity-building programs for SHGs upon loan approval. Key areas of focus could include:

2.1 Skill Development in High-Yield Practices: For agricultural SHGs, training on modern farming techniques, efficient resource use, and sustainable practices can directly boost

productivity. Similarly, non-agricultural SHGs could benefit from training in areas like small-scale manufacturing, marketing, and sales strategies to increase income.

2.2 Financial Literacy and Business Management Training: Teaching SHG members the basics of financial planning, budgeting, and debt management will help them make more informed borrowing decisions, track income, and prioritize loan repayments. Additionally, this training could cover simple business skills, such as profit margin calculations, expense tracking, and investment in profitable activities, to help SHGs build sustainable micro-enterprises.

2.3 Creating Peer-Based Knowledge Sharing and Mentorship: To sustain learning and support, MFIs could establish peer mentoring networks within SHG communities, where more successful groups share strategies with emerging groups. These networks could also provide ongoing support and accountability, reducing the need for external oversight.

Funding for these capacity-building programs could be generated by including a small levy on loan interest, which would be pooled into a fund to support training and resource materials. This investment in skills would improve the capacity of SHGs to turn loans into productive, income-generating activities, reducing dependence on further loans and thereby helping to break the cycle of debt accumulation.

Summary and Conclusion:

This report sheds light on the dual nature of microfinance expansion through Self-Help Groups (SHGs) in India from 2019 to 2022, highlighting both the benefits of enhanced access and the risks of rising indebtedness. As observed, SHG numbers grew from a mean of 141,037 in 2019 to 179,598 in 2021, reflecting increased financial access for underserved communities. However, this expansion also saw a steep increase in outstanding loan amounts, rising from an average of ₹241,939.32 million in 2019 to ₹386,403.93 million in 2021, which raises critical concerns about the financial sustainability of SHGs.

The regression analyses confirm a strong positive relationship between SHG growth and outstanding loan amounts, with R-squared values consistently around 0.71–0.79 over the years. This high level of predictability highlights a positive trend but also points to a pattern where more SHGs result in higher accumulated debt, without necessarily reflecting improved financial health or productivity. For instance, in 2022, each new SHG was associated with an approximate increase of ₹2.54 million in outstanding loans, an uptick from previous years,

which could suggest either an increase in loan sizes or reliance on borrowing to meet operational needs rather than capital for income-generating activities.

Furthermore, the descriptive statistics highlight concerning disparities in loan distribution. The positive skewness and high kurtosis indicate that while many SHGs operate with moderate debt levels, a minority are burdened by disproportionately high loans. The data thus suggests a concentration of debt, where a select few SHGs, potentially in more resource-deprived regions or sectors, bear excessive liabilities. This debt concentration risks creating debt traps, where SHGs, unable to generate sufficient returns, must take on new debt to service existing obligations, deepening the cycle of dependency.

SHG (Self-Help Group) ratios from 2019 to 2022 reveals significant regional disparities in debt levels across Indian states, with high ratios indicating substantial credit exposure in states like Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, and Tamil Nadu. Andhra Pradesh's ratio, for instance, rose from 3.17 in 2019 to 4.70 in 2022, suggesting a steady increase in debt burden among SHG members and raising concerns about the risks of over-indebtedness and debt traps in states with high SHG activity. Conversely, states like Uttar Pradesh, Tripura, and Uttarakhand maintained ratios below 1.0, implying either limited loan distribution or conservative lending practices within SHGs, which may help manage debt levels. However, these low ratios could also suggest limited credit access for SHG members in these regions. Fluctuations in loan ratios are seen in states like Kerala and Goa, reflecting changing lending dynamics possibly due to policy shifts or economic conditions. Kerala's ratio decreased from 2.59 in 2019 to 2.03 in 2022, while Goa experienced a notable increase in 2022 (2.35). New Delhi stands out in 2022 with a ratio of 6.83, likely indicating rapid credit expansion and high financial vulnerability among SHG borrowers. Overall, the varied debt exposure across states points to the need for targeted financial policies to promote sustainable growth in microfinance, supporting SHG members in regions with high debt ratios while improving financial outreach in lower-ratio areas.

These insights reveal two critical areas for policy intervention. First, loan accessibility should be more strategically aligned with measures of productivity and economic potential. Implementing productivity-linked credit evaluation criteria could ensure that loans are issued not merely on the basis of SHG growth but with a focus on the group's ability to generate sustainable income. This approach could help reduce over-reliance on borrowing and mitigate the risk of default.

Second, targeted skill-building programs that support income diversification are vital. By equipping SHGs with training in efficient financial management, marketable skills, and access to productivity-enhancing resources, members can better utilize loans for profitable, sustainable enterprises. Such programs would not only support debt repayment but also foster economic resilience, reducing reliance on continued borrowing.

In sum, the report underscores that while microfinance expansion is essential, meaningful support requires an emphasis on productivity and sustainable loan practices. Aligning microfinance efforts with capacity-building and resource development would transform SHGs from channels of credit access into robust drivers of economic empowerment and stability, fostering a healthier and more equitable microfinance ecosystem.

References

1. Ahmed, S. (2020). The role of microfinance in empowering women: A case study of rural Bangladesh. Journal of Rural Studies, 78, 300-308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.06.013

2. Bateman, M., & Chang, W. (2012). Microfinance and poverty alleviation: A critique of the evidence. Journal of Development Studies, 48(7), 918-934. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2011.615087

3. Chavan, P., & Ramakrishna, S. (2018). Microfinance and financial inclusion: Evidence from India. International Journal of Bank Marketing, 36(5), 850-867. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-01-2017-0016

4. Dugger, C. W. (2013). Microfinance as a tool for economic development: Evidence from East Africa. World Development, 50, 154-169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.05.003

5. Gonzalez, A. (2018). The impact of microfinance on women's empowerment: Evidence from Mexico. Gender & Development, 26(2), 219-232. https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2018.1472546

6. Hashemi, S. M., Schuler, S. R., & Riley, A. P. (1996). Rural credit programs and women's empowerment in Bangladesh. World Development, 24(4), 635-653. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(95)00159-6

7. Priyadarshini, P. (2017). Impact of microfinance on social, economic, and capability well-being of families below poverty line, with special reference to Deoghar district, Jharkhand. Indian Journal of Economics and Development, 13(4), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.5958/2322-0430.2017.00027.8

8. Samer, S., Majid, I., Rizal, S., Muhamad, M. R., Halim, S., & Rashid, N. (2015). The impact of microfinance on poverty reduction: Empirical evidence from Malaysian perspective. International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues, 5(3),

785-792. https://www.econjournals.com/index.php/ijefi/article/view/1430

9. Yunus, M., & Banerjee, A. (2011). Microfinance and its impact on poverty alleviation: A study of the debt trap phenomenon. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 25(1), 3-28. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.25.1.3

10. Karlan, D., & Zinman, J. (2011). The dark side of microcredit: Evidence from Bangladesh. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 25(1), 21-36. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.25.1.21

11. Rhyne, E. (2009). Microfinance: A double-edged sword? Journal of Development Studies, 45(7), 1024-1037. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220380902736215

12. Asiedu-Akrofi, K., & Abor, J. Y. (2020). Understanding over-indebtedness among women borrowers in Ghana. International Journal of Financial Studies, 8(3), 56. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijfs8030056