IRJEMS International Research Journal of Economics and Management Studies
ISSN: 2583 – 5238 / Volume 5 Issue 7 July 2026 / Pg. No: 139-146
Paper Id: IRJEMS-V5I7P118, Doi: 10.56472/25835238/IRJEMS-V5I7P118

Original Article

Microfinance through Self Help Groups and Rural Development- A Short Review Article

[1]Anoushka Singh, [2]Dr. K.L. Maurya
[1]*Assistant professor, Department of Economics, Govt. Girls' PG College Ratlam.*
[2]*Professor & Head, Department of Economics, PMCOE Shaheed Padmadhar Singh, Govt. PG College, Satna, M.P.*

Received Date: 12 June 2026 Revised Date: 02 July 2026 Accepted Date: 08 July 2026 Published Date: 17 July 2026

Abstract: *Since the introduction of national plans, subsequent governments in independent India have emphasized the correlation between enhancing financial access and alleviating poverty, a position that has exerted global influence. The necessity to enhance financial accessibility for India's impoverished population, predominantly situated in rural regions, prompted the development of innovative microfinance strategies. This includes a nationwide initiative, initially led by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and currently endorsed by the government, aimed at establishing connections among commercial banks, NGOs, and informal local entities known as 'self-help groups' (SHGs). Commonly referred to as 'SHG Bank Linkage', this methodology has experienced significant growth over the previous decades. Microfinance has become one of the most successful interventions for the economic empowerment of the poor in the development paradigm. It has developed as a need-based program for poverty reduction and empowerment of the previously overlooked target groups (women, poor, underprivileged, etc.). Experience in India and other nations has demonstrated that microfinance has a strong potential to integrate with development challenges, greatly improving the lives of the impoverished. This paper provides a brief overview of literature of microfinance, SHG delivery model of microfinance, and its role in rural development. Researchers studying SHG and microfinance will benefit from this paper's careful analysis of the numerous empirical studies conducted in India and abroad.*

Keywords: *Microfinance, SHG, Financial Inclusion, Rural Development.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Poor people are barred from official banking systems all around the world. In less developed countries (LDCs), exclusion can be either complete or almost complete, while in developed countries, it can be partial. The impoverished have created a wide range of unofficial, community-based financial arrangements to address their financial needs since they lack access to official financial services. One Furthermore, a growing number of formal sector organizations private, public, and non-governmental have been established during the past 20 years with the aim of addressing these same needs. The word "microfinance" has come to refer broadly to both formal and informal arrangements that provide financial services to the underprivileged (Brau & Woller, 2004)

II. OBJECTIVES

A review of past studies relevant to the subject is valuable for any research. It offers the most recent information on the topic. The paper examines a wide range of studies and research articles on microfinance, microfinance and SHGs, and the influence of microfinance on rural development to have a better understanding of the concepts and linkages. The interaction between microfinance and rural development is the main focus of the literature review. The present study seeks to bridge the gap of limited empirical evidence available on the performance of SHGs with regard to the district of Satna and Madhya Pradesh.

III. METHODOLOGY

Scholarly books, articles, journals and research papers have been reviewed pertaining to the current study. Research papers and articles were gathered from various journals, magazines, reports, newspapers and internet was extensively used to collect the existing literature on the research topic. Data mining was done using Google Scholar databases.

IV. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is subdivided into different segments:

Review based on National Studies

1. Review of Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of Microfinance
2. Review of Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of Rural Development
3. Review of Self-Help Groups (SHG) Delivery Model of Microfinance
4. Role of Microfinance in Rural Development

5. Review of Madhya Pradesh Specific Studies
6. Review of Challenges of Microfinance

Review based on International Studies

Table 1: Review of Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of Microfinance

Author(s) & Year	Major Findings
Kaladhar (1997)	Highlighted microfinance as an institutional innovation that enables formal financial institutions to provide financial services to low-income households by reducing transaction costs and improving outreach to people experiencing poverty.
Asian Development Bank (2000)	Defined microfinance as the provision of a broad range of financial services, including savings, deposits, loans, insurance, payment services, and money transfers to low-income households and micro-enterprises.
Khandelwal (2007)	Explained that microfinance is a comprehensive concept covering both financial and non-financial products and services such as loans, savings, insurance, and transfer services for poor and low-income populations.
Sen (2008)	Described microfinance, based on the NABARD Task Force, as the provision of thrift, savings, credit, and other small-scale financial services to poor people in rural, semi-urban, and urban areas to improve their income and standard of living.
K.G. Karmakar (2008)	Defined microfinance as a complete range of financial services including savings, insurance, money transfers, production and investment credit, housing finance, skill development, and entrepreneurial support aimed at poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihood generation

Table 2: Review of Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of Rural Development

Author(s) & Year	Major Findings
Ray (1975)	Emphasized that rural development is essential for addressing poverty, poor health, low educational attainment, inadequate skill development, and overall improvement in the quality of life of rural populations.
Ocafor (1985)	Argued that economic growth indicators alone are insufficient to measure rural development and advocated the use of social indicators to assess rural welfare and spatial variations in development.
Majumdar (2002)	Explained that rural development plays a crucial role in economic growth, food security, poverty reduction, employment generation, and improvement in health, education, and quality of life.
Sundaram (2002)	Defined rural development as the sustainable improvement of the socio-economic conditions of rural people through effective utilization of human and natural resources, institutional development, and infrastructure.
Bhattacharyya (2004)	Viewed rural development as a continuous process involving agricultural growth, village industries, and integrated socio-economic and institutional development to improve rural livelihoods.
Todaro & Smith (2006)	Suggested that integrated development planning, land reforms, agricultural modernization, rural industrialization, employment generation, and equitable income distribution are essential for achieving sustainable rural development.
Bezbaruah (2010)	Highlighted the importance of strengthening rural infrastructure, decentralization through Panchayati Raj Institutions, grassroots empowerment, and coordinated efforts of governments, communities, NGOs, and financial institutions for sustainable rural development.

Table 3: Chronological Review of Self-Help Groups (SHG) Delivery Model of Microfinance

Author(s) & Year	Major Findings
Balakrishnan (2001)	Defined SHGs as small, homogeneous groups that promote regular savings, provide small loans to members, and enhance trust, financial discipline, and socio-economic empowerment.
Puhazhendhi & Satya Sai (2001	Reported that SHGs significantly contributed to the economic, social, and cultural empowerment of rural women, improving household living standards.
Puhazhendi & Badatya (2002)	Found that SHG members experienced a 96% increase in savings, 30% growth in asset value, higher repayment rates, increased income and employment, and significant poverty reduction.
Mohindra (2003)	Observed improvements in women's household status, mobility, participation in decision-making, and self-confidence through SHG participation.
Khandker (2005)	Reported that SHGs positively influenced income, asset creation, savings, employment, and poverty reduction.
Kabeer & Noponen (2005)	Found that SHGs improved health, nutrition, children's education, and gender equality within households.
Amma, Panicker & Sumi (2008)	Reported improvements in women's self-confidence, dignity, freedom, recognition, and personality development through SHGs.
Panda (2009)	Found positive impacts of SHGs on income, savings, employment, consumption, and reduction in migration.
Lakshmi & Vadivalagan (2010)	Reported improvements in members' income, savings, and overall socio-economic conditions through SHGs.
Mansuri (2010)	Identified SHG-Bank Linkage as the world's largest microfinance movement and an effective strategy for reducing poverty, unemployment, and promoting women's empowerment.

Kabalana, Anand Singh et al. (2011)	Concluded that SHGs are effective instruments for poverty reduction and entrepreneurship development among rural poor.
Ghosh (2012)	Found that SHG-Bank Linkage improved socio-economic conditions and employment opportunities, with southern India performing better than other regions.
Narang (2012)	Reported significant growth in the SHG-Bank Linkage Programme but highlighted regional disparities in performance.
Das & Bouruah (2013)	Observed improvements in income, savings habits, education, social participation, and living standards after joining SHGs.
Tapan (2013)	Evaluated the functioning and efficiency of women SHGs in Ujjain district using a functional efficiency index.
Alemu, Kempen & Ruben (2018)	Reported that SHGs empowered women by increasing awareness of rights, information sharing, and community participation.
Das & Bouruah (2013)	Observed improvements in income, savings habits, education, social participation, and living standards after joining SHGs.
Nayak & Panigrahi (2020)	Found that SHGs positively affected income, savings, employment, literacy, asset ownership, and reduced migration.
Kumra & Sharma (2021)	Observed substantial growth in SHG-Bank Linkage in terms of savings, loan disbursement, and outreach, while identifying regional disparities and operational inefficiencies.
Kumar et al. (2021)	Reported that SHG participation significantly enhanced overall women's empowerment in agriculture, although improvements varied across different empowerment dimensions.
Ben & Yadav (2025)	Found that SHGs significantly improved women's financial independence, entrepreneurship, social inclusion, decision-making ability, and overall socio-economic empowerment.

Table 4: Chronological Review of the Role of Microfinance in Rural Development

Author(s) & Year	Major Findings
Sylandra (1990)	Reported that the SHG approach promotes savings, financial discipline, access to institutional credit, risk reduction, and social cohesion among poor households.
Pitt & Khandker (1998)	Found that microfinance improved women's empowerment by increasing investments in children's education and health, thereby enhancing household welfare.
Mohanan (2000)	Highlighted the significant role of NGOs in organizing SHGs, mobilizing resources, and promoting women's empowerment through micro-credit.
Lakshmikantan (2000)	Concluded that SHGs effectively met members' credit needs, although their role in promoting income-generating activities required further strengthening.
Mayoux (2001)	Reported that access to microfinance enhances women's independence, social status, and decision-making power.
NABARD (2002)	Found that SHGs significantly improved income, savings, borrowing capacity, asset ownership, housing conditions, and overall living standards of rural households.
Zeller & Meyer (2002)	Observed that microfinance promotes enterprise development, employment generation, and local economic growth.
CGAP (2004)	Emphasized that microfinance strengthens financial inclusion, encourages savings and investment, and supports sustainable rural development.
Basu & Srivastava (2005)	Reported that the SHG-Bank Linkage Programme substantially expanded access to formal financial services for India's rural poor.
Khandker (2005)	Demonstrated that microfinance significantly increased household income, expenditure, and investment in productive activities.
Tiwari & Thakkur (2007)	Concluded that microfinance is an effective instrument for poverty alleviation, women's empowerment, and economic development.
Manjoor & Manders (2009)	Highlighted microfinance as an important strategy for reducing gender inequality and improving the socio-economic status of women.
Amutha (2011)	Found that SHGs improved women's socio-economic status, family income, and participation in household decision-making.
Datt & Mahajan (2011)	Described microfinance as an innovative banking approach that successfully delivers financial services to poor households through SHGs and NGOs.
Devaraja (2011)	Emphasized the importance of impact assessment in evaluating the effectiveness of microfinance programmes for poverty reduction.
Mehta et al. (2011)	Reported improvements in health, sanitation, education, confidence, savings, asset ownership, and reduction in domestic violence among SHG members.
Samuel et al. (2011)	Observed significant increases in income, employment, savings, asset ownership, investment, and household consumption among SHG members.
Fadnavis (2014)	Highlighted the need to strengthen the SHG-Bank Linkage Programme and improve the regulatory framework for expanding rural financial inclusion.

Dutta (2015)	Concluded that SHGs contribute significantly to rural development by promoting financial inclusion and socio-economic development.
Kumar, Chauhan & Kumar (2015)	Reported that SHGs and MFIs play a vital role in delivering microfinance services but face challenges related to group functioning and member retention.
Adivappa (2018)	Identified microfinance as a catalyst for rural economic development by promoting entrepreneurship and local economic activities.
Pathak (2018)	Found that NGOs enhanced SHG members' financial awareness and banking knowledge, although confidence in independently accessing bank credit remained limited.
Ahmed & Singh (2019)	Concluded that microfinance through SHGs reduces poverty, promotes entrepreneurship, empowers women, and contributes to inclusive rural development.
Sylandra (1990)	Reported that the SHG approach promotes savings, financial discipline, access to institutional credit, risk reduction, and social cohesion among poor households.
Pitt & Khandker (1998)	Found that microfinance improved women's empowerment by increasing investments in children's education and health, thereby enhancing household welfare.
Mohanan (2000)	Highlighted the significant role of NGOs in organizing SHGs, mobilizing resources, and promoting women's empowerment through micro-credit.
Lakshmikantan (2000)	Concluded that SHGs effectively met members' credit needs, although their role in promoting income-generating activities required further strengthening.
Mayoux (2001)	Reported that access to microfinance enhances women's independence, social status, and decision-making power.
NABARD (2002)	Found that SHGs significantly improved income, savings, borrowing capacity, asset ownership, housing conditions, and overall living standards of rural households.
Zeller & Meyer (2002)	Observed that microfinance promotes enterprise development, employment generation, and local economic growth.
CGAP (2004)	Emphasized that microfinance strengthens financial inclusion, encourages savings and investment, and supports sustainable rural development.
Basu & Srivastava (2005)	Reported that the SHG-Bank Linkage Programme substantially expanded access to formal financial services for India's rural poor.
Khandker (2005)	Demonstrated that microfinance significantly increased household income, expenditure, and investment in productive activities.
Tiwari & Thakkur (2007)	Concluded that microfinance is an effective instrument for poverty alleviation, women's empowerment, and economic development.
Manjoor & Manders (2009)	Highlighted microfinance as an important strategy for reducing gender inequality and improving the socio-economic status of women.
Amutha (2011)	Found that SHGs improved women's socio-economic status, family income, and participation in household decision-making.
Datt & Mahajan (2011)	Described microfinance as an innovative banking approach that successfully delivers financial services to poor households through SHGs and NGOs.
Devaraja (2011)	Emphasized the importance of impact assessment in evaluating the effectiveness of microfinance programmes for poverty reduction.
Mehta et al. (2011)	Reported improvements in health, sanitation, education, confidence, savings, asset ownership, and reduction in domestic violence among SHG members.
Samuel et al. (2011)	Observed significant increases in income, employment, savings, asset ownership, investment, and household consumption among SHG members.
Fadnavis (2014)	Highlighted the need to strengthen the SHG-Bank Linkage Programme and improve the regulatory framework for expanding rural financial inclusion.

Table 5: Chronological Review of the Role of Microfinance in Rural Development

Author(s) & Year	Findings
Nasser Ahmad Rather & Parvaze Ahmad Lone (2012)	Identified lack of awareness, low income, documentation barriers, collateral requirements, and dependence on informal credit as major constraints to financial inclusion in rural Madhya Pradesh.
Tripathi & Tripathi (2015)	Reported that the Indian microfinance sector suffers from inadequate regulatory mechanisms and a lack of standardized operational practices, emphasizing the need for stronger policy intervention and transparent governance.
Bansal (2020)	Found a significant positive relationship between microfinance and rural development in Morena district, indicating that microfinance contributes to socio-economic development in rural Madhya Pradesh.
Bansal (2020)	Found a significant positive relationship between microfinance and rural development in Morena district, indicating that microfinance contributes to socio-economic development in rural Madhya Pradesh.

Deepak Agrawal (2020)	Observed that SHGs enhanced women's participation in economic activities, increased self-confidence, strengthened household decision-making, and promoted employment and skill development in Ujjain district.
Sharma, Mishra & Sharma (2022)	Reported substantial growth in SHG-Bank Linkage Programme financing in Madhya Pradesh, leading to improved financial inclusion, greater access to institutional credit, and increased women's participation in economic activities.
Ben & Yadav (2025)	Found that SHGs significantly improved women's financial independence, entrepreneurship, social inclusion, and community participation in Satna and Maihar districts.
Preeti Singh Chouhan & Anubhuti Bauskar (2025)	Reported significant improvements in financial stability, mobility, legal awareness, household decision-making, and family governance among SHG women, while identifying traditional social norms and limited legal awareness as persistent barriers.
Shikha Dhawan et al. (2025)	Found that SHG interventions involving skill training, financial literacy, branding, and market integration increased women's income, leadership ability, communication skills, and social recognition.
Michael Walton et al. (2025)	Observed that SHGs under the National Rural Livelihoods Mission strengthened women's participation in local governance, improved community-government interaction, and enhanced collective problem-solving in villages.
Vishal A. S. & Ashok J. R. (2025)	Concluded that SHGs and microfinance jointly promote economic independence, grassroots leadership, and inclusive rural development, while emphasizing the need to address operational and institutional challenges.
Shrivastava (2026)	Found that SHGs significantly improved household income, savings, access to credit, self-employment, women's confidence, social mobility, and participation in village-level decision-making. The study concluded that SHGs are effective instruments for poverty reduction when supported by skill development and enterprise promotion.

Table 6: Chronological Review of Challenges of Microfinance

Author(s) & Year	Major Findings
Muhammad Yunus (1983)	Advocated microfinance as a tool for self-employment and poverty reduction through small loans, while recognizing that broader development support is necessary for sustained poverty alleviation.
Morduch (1999)	Identified over-indebtedness, high interest rates, and structural limitations as major challenges, arguing that microfinance alone cannot eliminate poverty and its effectiveness depends on the economic and regulatory environment.
Ledgerwood (1999)	Emphasized that microfinance should be integrated with education, health, and other development programmes to maximize its effectiveness in rural development.
Naila Kabeer (2001)	Observed that patriarchal social structures often prevent women from exercising control over microfinance loans, limiting their empowerment.
Armendáriz & Morduch (2010)	Reported that many microfinance institutions struggle to balance financial sustainability with social objectives and noted that loans are frequently used for consumption rather than productive investment.
Jayati Ghosh (2013)	Argued that group lending transfers financial risk to poor borrowers and that microfinance should complement, rather than replace, broader development policies such as employment generation and public investment.
Mader (2013)	Explained that the Andhra Pradesh microfinance crisis resulted from excessive commercialization, over-indebtedness, and structural weaknesses within the microfinance sector.
Nasir (2013)	Identified major operational challenges including weak credit delivery systems, lack of product diversification, customer overlap, inadequate enterprise lending, and high interest rates in the Indian microfinance sector.
Aruna Balammal, R. Madhumathi & M.P. Ganesh (2016)	Found that excessive profit orientation among MFIs reduced their social impact and contributed to mission drift during the Indian microfinance crisis.
Aradhana Chouksey & Yamini Karmarkar (2017)	Reported that although microfinance promoted self-employment, poor business planning, inadequate training, limited market access, and weak managerial skills reduced the long-term sustainability of microenterprises.
Vikrant Vikram Singh & Anil Vashisht (2022)	Found that low educational levels, social restrictions, and lack of awareness continued to limit women's financial independence despite the empowerment benefits of microfinance.

Aditya Bhan (2025)	Identified structural challenges including limited affordable credit, weak financial literacy, data security concerns, high operational costs, and inadequate borrower-centric financial services.
Preeti Singh Chouhan & Anubhuti Bauskar (2025)	Reported that traditional gender norms continue to restrict the full empowerment potential of women participating in SHGs.
Akanksha Shrivastava & Satwik Sahay Bisarya (2026)	Found that while SHGs improved women's confidence, mobility, and decision-making, traditional gender roles and socio-economic inequalities continued to limit programme outcomes.
Shashank Shrivastava (2026)	Emphasized that the long-term sustainability of SHGs depends on continuous capacity building, enterprise support, and institutional strengthening.

Table 7: Summary of International Studies on Microfinance

Author(s) & Year	Major Findings
Muhammad Yunus (1983)	Demonstrated that small loans promote self-employment and poverty reduction among poor households.
Hulme & Mosley (1996)	Microfinance improves livelihoods but requires sound institutional design and sustainability.
Robinson (1998)	Defined microfinance as small-scale financial services for low-income households and micro-enterprises.
Pitt & Khandker (1998)	Microfinance increased women's investment in children's education and healthcare in Bangladesh.
Morduch (1999)	Highlighted over-indebtedness and questioned the long-term effectiveness of microfinance alone.
Ledgerwood (1999)	Recommended integrating microfinance with education, health, and other development programmes.
Asian Development Bank (2000)	Defined microfinance as providing savings, loans, insurance, and payment services to poor households.
Mayoux (2001)	Financial access enhances women's independence and household decision-making power.
Naila Kabeer (2001)	Patriarchal norms often restrict women's control over microfinance loans.
Zeller & Meyer (2002)	Microfinance supports enterprise development, employment generation, and local economic growth.
CGAP (2004)	Microfinance promotes financial inclusion and sustainable rural development.
Khandker (2005)	Access to microfinance significantly increased household income and expenditure in Bangladesh.
Titus (2006)	Innovation is essential for expanding microfinance outreach and reducing transaction costs.
Wright (2006)	Poor households require diversified financial services beyond enterprise credit.
Robinson (2009)	Microfinance should provide comprehensive financial services rather than only credit.
Hulme & Arun (2009)	Financial inclusion is a public good, though governance challenges remain within MFIs.
Olsen & Morgan (2010)	Excessive borrowing can result in over-indebtedness among microfinance clients.
Armendáriz & Morduch (2010)	Balancing financial sustainability with social objectives remains a major challenge for MFIs.
Armendáriz & Morduch (2011)	Microfinance addresses market failures through innovative institutional arrangements.
Alemu et al. (2018)	SHG participation significantly enhanced women's empowerment and community participation in Ethiopia.

V. LIMITATIONS

Although extensive research has examined the impact of microfinance and SHGs across India, comparatively fewer studies have been undertaken in this study. In particular, limited empirical evidence is available on the comparative performance of SHGs in Ramnagar and Sohawal blocks of Satna district, Madhya Pradesh.

VI. CONCLUSION

The literature reviewed offers an in-depth familiarization of the conceptual foundation, theoretical approaches, institutional evidence and critical issues in microfinance Self-Help Groups (SHGs) research and rural development. According to the review, Microfinance has emerged as a potent tool for financial inclusion, poverty alleviation and women's empowerment, leading ultimately towards socio-economic development of the underprivileged rural populace. Conclusion. Across the literature, we have shown that microfinance through the SHG-Bank Linkage Programme has played a pivotal role in rural development and financial inclusion for women, leading to poverty alleviation. Nevertheless, the long-term success of projects like this will require building on institutional capacity (fostering participation), bridging gaps in financial literacy and developing market linkages as well as sustainable livelihood opportunities while addressing persistent socio-economic disadvantages and gender-specific barriers.

VII. REFERENCES

[1] Aditya, B. (2025). Fifty Years of Indian Microfinance: Challenges to Making a More Profound Impact. ORF Occasional Paper No. 470, March 2025, Observer Research Foundation https://www.orfonline.org/research/fifty-years-of-indian-microfinance-challenges-to-making-a-more-profound-impact

[2] Adivappa, N. (2018). The Impact of Microfinance on rural industrialization and economic development. JETIR November 2018, Volume 5, Issue 11

[3] Ahmed, M.I., & Singh, D.P. (2019). Micro Finance, Self Help Groups, Poverty and Women Empowerment in India: An overview.

[4] Armendariz, B., & Morduch, J. (2010). The economics of microfinance (2nd ed.). MIT Press.https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262533050/the-economics-of-microfinance/

[5] Arunkumar, S., Anand, A., Anand, V. V., Rengarajan, V., & Shyam, M. (2016). Empowering rural women through micro finance: an empirical study. Indian Journal of Science and Technology, 9(27), 1-14.

[6] Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Glennerster, R., & Kinnan, C. (2015). The miracle of microfinance? Evidence from a randomized evaluation. American economic journal: Applied economics, 7(1), 22-53.

[7] Bansal, H. (2010). SHG-Bank Linkage Program in India.

[8] Basu, P., & Srivastava, P. (2005). Scaling-up microfinance for India's rural poor. World Bank Policy research working paper, (3646).

[9] Beck, T. (2015). Microfinance. Washington, DC: Independent Evaluation Group.

[10] Ben, N., & Yadav, S.K. (2025). Women Empowerment - A Study of SHGS in Satna & Maihar District of Madhya Pradesh. International Journal of Innovations in Science Engineering and Management.

[11] Bhatt, N., & Tang, S. Y. (2001). Delivering microfinance in developing countries: Controversies and policy perspectives. Policy studies journal, 29(2), 319-333.

[12] Bhatt, Nitin. (1999). "Delivering Microfinance in Developing Countries: Controversies and Policy Perspectives." Policy Studies Journal (forthcoming).

[13] Bansal, S.L(2020). Microfinance And Its Impact on Rural Development: A Study. International Journal of Advanced Research in Commerce, Management & Social Science (IJARCMSS) ISSN : 2581-7930, Impact Factor: 5.260 , Volume 03, No. 02, April- June, 2020, pp 06-09

[14] Dahiya, P. S., Pandey, N. K., & Karol, A. (2001). Socio-economic evaluation of self-help groups in solan district of Himachal Pradesh: impact, issues and policy implications. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 56(3), 486.

[15] Das, S.D., & Boruah, S.D. (2012). Micro Finance Through Self Help Groups (SHGs): A Tool for Socio- Economic Development of Rural Assam (A Case Study of Lakhimpur and Dhemaji District).

[16] Das, S. K., & Nanda, B. P. (2008). Micro Finance and Sustainable Rural Development. Microfinance and Rural Development in India, Eds. Das, SK, Nanda, B. P and Rath J, New Century Publications, New Delhi, India.

[17] Dasgupta, R. (2001). An informal journey through self-help groups. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 56(3), 370-386.

[18] Devaraja, T. S. (2011). Microfinance in India-A tool for poverty reduction. University of Mysore. Mysore: University Grants Commission of India, 1(1), 1-2.

[19] Dutta, B. (2015). Rural Development through Self-Help Groups (SHGs): an Overview. Indian Journal of Applied Research, 5(4), 70-8.

[20] Fadnavis, N.S. (2014). ROLE OF MICRO FINANCE IN THE UPLIFTMENT AND GROWTH OF RURAL INDIA. The Global Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 3.

[21] Ghosh, M. (2012). Micro-Finance and Rural Poverty in India SHG-Bank Linkage Programme. Journal of Rural Development, 31(3), 347–363. Retrieved from https://nirdprojms.in/index.php/jrd/article/view/93425

[22] Hulme, D., & Arun, T. (Eds.). (2009). Microfinance: A reader. Routledge.

[23] Hulme, D. and Mosley, P. (1996) Finance against Poverty, 1 and 2. Routledge, London.

[24] Kaladhar, K. (1997). Microfinance in India: Design, structure and governance. Economic and Political weekly, 2687-2706.

[25] Kumar, N., Raghunathan, K., Arrieta, A., Jilani, A., & Pandey, S. (2021). The power of the collective empowers women: Evidence from self-help groups in India. World Development, 146, 105579.

[26] Kumar, V., Chauhan, M., & Kumar, R. (2015). An overview of microfinance in India. Abhinav-National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Commerce & Management, 4(10), 19-26.

[27] Leach, Fiona and Sitaram, Shashikala. (2002). "Microfinance and Women's Empowerment: A Lesson from India", Development in Practice, 12(5): 575-588.

[28] Ledgerwood, J. (1999). Microfinance handbook: An institutional and financial perspective. The World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/11877

[29] Lieberman, I. W. (2020). The growth and commercial evolution of microfinance. The future of microfinance, 9-35.

[30] Mader, P. (2013). Rise and fall of microfinance in India: The Andhra Pradesh crisis in perspective. Strategic Change, 22(1-2), 47-66.

[31] Mahajan, V., & Navin, T. (2013). Microfinance in India: Lessons from the Andhra crisis. In Microfinance 3.0: Reconciling sustainability with social outreach and responsible delivery (pp. 1-12). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

[32] Manjoor, H. and Manders, J. (2009). "Women Empowerment: Comparing concepts & Assessment Implications for microfinance." Commissioned by Oiko credit.

[33] Mansuri, B. B. (2010). Micro financing through self-help groups–a case study of bank linkage programme of NABARD. APJRBM, Sri Krishna International Research & Educational Consortium, 1(3), 141-150.

[34] Mohanan, S. (2000). Micro Credit and Empowerment of Women-Role of NGOs. YOJANA-DELHI-, 44(2), 21-23.

[35] Morduch, J. (1999). The microfinance promise. Journal of economic literature, 37(4), 1569-1614.

[36] Moll, H. A. (2005). Microfinance and rural development: A long-term perspective. Journal of Microfinance/ESR Review, 7(2), 3.

[37] Nasir, S. (2013). Microfinance in India: Contemporary issues and challenges. Middle-east journal of scientific research, 15(2), 191-199.

[38] Morgan, J., & Olsen, W. (2011). Aspiration problems for the Indian rural poor: Research on self-help groups and micro-finance. Capital & Class, 35(2), 189-212.

[39] Pillai, R.R., Bisarya, S.S., & Pandey, C (2024). An Empirical Study on the Effect of Microfinance Services on the Empowerment of Rural Women. International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science
[40] Puhazhendhi V. and Satya Sai K.J.S. (2001), "Economic and Social Empowerment of Rural Poor through Self Help Groups", Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 56 (3) July-Sept, 450-451.
[41] Satish, P. (2005). Mainstreaming of Indian microfinance. Economic and Political weekly, 1731-1739.
[42] Satish, P. (2001). Some issues in the formation of self-help groups. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 56(3), 410-418.
[43] Sengupta, R., & Aubuchon, C. P. (2008). The microfinance revolution: An overview. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review, 90(January/February 2008).
[44] Sharma, Mamta. (2017). Micro-Finance and its Impact on Rural & Economic Development.
[45] Srinivas, Hari, "Three Things to Remember about Microfinance". Concept Note Series E-110. Kobe, Japan: Global Development Research Center. Retrieved from https://www.gdrc.org/icm/not-new.html on Wednesday, 14 May 2025
[46] Srinivas, Hari, "Microfinance Timeline: A Historical Evolution Beyond Credit". GDRC Research Output - Continuing Research Series E-211. Kobe, Japan: Global Development Research Center. Retrieved from https://www.gdrc.org/icm/mf-timeline.html on Wednesday, 14 May 2025
[47] Robinson, Marguerite S. (2009) Supply and Demands In microfinance; the cases for a financial system approach, in Hulme David and Arun Thankom (ed.) microfinance: A reader, New York: Routledge
[48] Tapan, N. (2013). Functioning profile of self-help groups-evidences and insights. Journal of Rural and Development.
[49] Terberger, E. (2013). The Microfinance Approach: Does it deliver on its promise? in Microfinance 3.0: Reconciling sustainability with social outreach and responsible delivery (pp. 181-195). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
[50] Titus, M. (2006). 15 Expanding secular growth: The role for innovations in microfinance. Towards a Sustainable Microfinance Outreach in India, 279.
[51] Tiwari, A.M, and Thakkur,S. G. (2007). "SHG based Microfinance programs - Can they remove poverty?" London and New York: Rout ledge. pp- 177-193.
[52] Mujumdar, N.A. (2012). India's Development Drama (1991-2011) in Kapila Uma (ed.). Two Decades of Economic Reforms: Towards Faster Sustainable and More Inclusive Growth, New Delhi: Academic Foundation.
[53] Vetrivel, S. C., & Kumarmangalam, S. C. (2010). Role of microfinance institutions in rural development. International Journal of Information Technology and Knowledge Management, 2(2), 435-441.
[54] Vishal, A. S., & Ashok, J. R. (2025). A STUDY ON THE ROLE OF SHGS AND MICROFINANCE IN PROMOTING LEADERSHIP AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN RURAL INDIA. In International Conference on Entrepreneurship and Innovation 3rd and 4th April (p. 83).
[55] Woller, G. M., Dunford, C., & Woodworth, W. (1999). Where to microfinance. International journal of economic development, 1(1), 29-64.
[56] Wright, G. A. (2006). 14 Designing innovative products, processes and channels for the promotion of microfinance. Towards a sustainable microfinance outreach in India, 243.
[57] Microfinance 3.0: Reconciling Sustainability with Social Outreach and Responsible Delivery Author: Doris Köh, Published by Springer Berlin Heidelberg ISBN:978-3-642-41703-0 DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-41704-7