Ijfans International Journal of Food and Nutritional Sciences
ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876
Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved Journal UGC CARE Listed (Group-I) Volume 11, Issue 06, july 2022

Role of micro finance in Karnataka economy

Dr. Baliram

Associate Professor of Economics, Govt. First Grade College, Basavakalyan-585327

Abstract

This study examines the economic role of microfinance in Karnataka during 2010–2020, a period characterized by the maturation of the Self-Help Group Bank Linkage Programme (SHG-BLP), the expansion of regulated Microfinance Institutions (MFIs), and the deepening of state-sponsored financial inclusion initiatives. Karnataka stands as one of India's most significant microfinance markets, with the SHG-BLP channeling substantial credit to rural women and NBFC-MFIs extending collateral-free loans to underserved households. Using secondary data from NABARD, MFIN, AKMI, and state government sources, the study analyzes the growth, outreach, and economic contribution of microfinance in Karnataka. The central hypothesis posits that microfinance in Karnataka during 2010–2020 functioned less as a poverty-alleviation instrument in the narrow sense and more as a critical credit-delivery mechanism that enabled income diversification, women's economic participation, and small-scale enterprise development in the absence of adequate formal banking penetration. Findings indicate that while the number of SHGs credit-linked to commercial banks grew substantially, credit absorption per group remained modest, and regional disparities persisted. The study concludes that microfinance has been economically consequential in Karnataka, but its transformative potential is constrained by high interest rates, financial illiteracy, and the structural limitations of group-based lending models. Policy recommendations emphasize regulatory strengthening, product diversification, and targeted rural penetration to enhance microfinance's developmental impact.

Keywords:

Microfinance, Karnataka Economy, SHG-Bank Linkage, Financial Inclusion, Women Empowerment, Microcredit, 2010–2020

1. Introduction

Microfinance in Karnataka is not a peripheral phenomenon. It is embedded in the state's rural credit architecture, its women's empowerment discourse, and its informal economy. During 2010–2020, Karnataka emerged as one of India's largest microfinance markets, with the SHG-BLP covering millions of rural households and regulated MFIs expanding their portfolios in both rural and peri-urban districts . Understanding the economic role of microfinance during this decade requires attention to both its scale and its qualitative character: how much credit flowed, to whom, for what purposes, and with what economic consequences.

Karnataka's microfinance landscape is distinctive in several respects. First, the state has been a pioneer in SHG promotion, with the Streeshakti programme launched in 2000–01 predating the national NRLM framework and creating a dense network of women's groups across districts . Second, Karnataka hosts a significant presence of NBFC-MFIs, particularly in districts such

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

as Belagavi, Mysuru, Tumakuru, and Mandya, where joint liability group (JLG) lending has become a major source of working capital for micro-enterprises . Third, the state government has layered its own interest subvention schemes—including the Karnataka Kayaka Yojana (2018–19)—on top of central programmes, creating a complex but substantive policy architecture supporting microcredit .

The economic significance of this architecture lies in what it substitutes for. Karnataka's formal banking network, while extensive, has historically underserved small and marginal farmers, rural artisans, and women-headed households. Microfinance fills this gap, not always efficiently and not always without cost to borrowers, but undeniably. The decade 2010–2020 provides a sufficient time horizon to assess whether this gap-filling has translated into measurable economic outcomes: income diversification, enterprise creation, consumption smoothing, and women's asset ownership.

This study is needed because the existing literature on Karnataka microfinance is fragmented. NABARD district reports document SHG-BLP statistics but rarely analyze their economic implications. MFI industry reports track portfolio growth but focus on institutional performance rather than borrower outcomes. Academic studies tend to examine individual districts or specific empowerment indicators, lacking a state-level synthesis for the 2010–2020 period . This research addresses that gap by bringing together the SHG-BLP and MFI channels within a unified economic framework.

2. Definitions

Microfinance: The provision of financial services—credit, savings, insurance, and sometimes remittances—to low-income individuals or groups who lack access to conventional banking services.

Self-Help Group (SHG): A voluntary association of 10–20 individuals, typically women, who pool savings and lend to members, later becoming eligible for bank credit through the SHG-Bank Linkage Programme.

SHG-Bank Linkage Programme (SHG-BLP): A NABARD-initiated programme through which banks provide loans to SHGs, which then on-lend to members. It is the largest microfinance programme in the world by outreach .

Joint Liability Group (JLG): A group of 4–10 individuals who jointly guarantee each other's loans from MFIs, a model widely used by NBFC-MFIs in Karnataka .

NBFC-MFI: A Non-Banking Financial Company–Micro Finance Institution, regulated by the Reserve Bank of India, that provides small-ticket collateral-free loans primarily to women borrowers.

Financial Inclusion: The process of ensuring access to appropriate financial products and services for vulnerable groups at an affordable cost.

3. Need for the Study

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

The need for a systematic analysis of microfinance's economic role in Karnataka during 2010–2020 rests on three considerations. First, the scale of the sector demands scrutiny. As of March 2020, Karnataka had 7.84 lakh SHGs with savings accounts and ₹10,879 crore in credit outstanding to 4.33 lakh SHGs . By March 2020, the MFI gross loan portfolio alone had reached ₹42,265 crore, serving over 63 lakh unique borrowers . A sector of this magnitude warrants economic analysis beyond institutional reporting.

Second, the policy environment has been active but not always evidence-based. Interest subvention schemes, the Karnataka Kayaka Yojana, and NRLM alignment have been implemented with limited published evaluation. Understanding whether these interventions achieved their intended effects—particularly in terms of reaching the poorest and supporting productive activity—is essential for future policy design.

Third, the decade 2010–2020 includes critical stress events: demonetization (2016), the IL&FS crisis affecting NBFC liquidity (2018), and the early stages of the COVID-19 disruption (2020). How Karnataka's microfinance sector absorbed these shocks and continued to serve borrowers provides lessons for resilience-building in financial inclusion policy.

4. Aims

The primary aim of this study is to analyze the economic role of microfinance in Karnataka during 2010–2020, examining the growth and outreach of both the SHG-BLP and MFI channels, assessing their contribution to income generation, women's economic participation, and enterprise development, and identifying the structural constraints that limit microfinance's developmental impact.

5. Objectives

1. To document the growth trends in SHG-BLP savings linkage, credit linkage, and loan outstanding in Karnataka from 2010–11 to 2020–21.
2. To analyze the expansion of NBFC-MFI lending in Karnataka, including portfolio size, borrower outreach, and district-level distribution.
3. To assess the economic contribution of microfinance to income-generating activities, with attention to agriculture, livestock, petty trade, and handicrafts.
4. To evaluate the role of microfinance in women's economic empowerment, including decision-making authority and asset ownership.
5. To identify the principal challenges—interest rates, financial literacy, over-indebtedness, and regional disparities—that constrain microfinance effectiveness.
6. To examine the policy interventions (interest subvention, Kayaka Yojana, NRLM) and their alignment with ground-level credit needs.

6. Hypothesis

H_0 (Null): Microfinance in Karnataka during 2010–2020 did not have a statistically significant effect on income diversification or enterprise creation among borrower households.

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

H_1 (Alternative): Microfinance in Karnataka during 2010–2020 had a positive and significant effect on income diversification and micro-enterprise creation among borrower households, but this effect was mediated by loan size, purpose, and borrower education level.

Operational Hypothesis: The SHG-BLP channel, with its savings-first approach and lower interest rates, was more effective in reaching the poorest borrowers and supporting consumption smoothing, while the MFI channel, with larger loan sizes and faster disbursement, was more effective in supporting existing micro-enterprises and income diversification among moderately poor households.

7. Literature Search

A structured search was conducted across Google Scholar, Shodhganga, NABARD publications, MFIN reports, and AKMI data releases. Search terms included "microfinance Karnataka," "SHG-BLP Karnataka," "MFI Karnataka," "women empowerment microfinance Karnataka," and "financial inclusion Karnataka." Priority was given to studies covering the 2010–2020 period and using quantitative or mixed methods.

Key sources include: NABARD district development reports for Raichur, Shivamogga, and Yadgir, which document SHG-BLP statistics and state schemes ; a Karnataka University doctoral study on women's empowerment through microfinance in Koppal district, which provides detailed commercial bank and RRB data for 2010–2016 ; a 2020 field survey of SHG members in Dharwad and Belgaum districts analyzing savings and loan behavior ; MFIN and AKMI data on MFI portfolio growth and district-level concentration ; and a 2020 synthesis of microfinance challenges in India, including high interest rates, financial illiteracy, and gender-specific constraints .

The literature reveals a bifurcated picture. SHG-BLP studies tend to emphasize empowerment and savings behavior, often finding positive but modest effects. MFI-focused studies emphasize access and enterprise finance, but raise concerns about interest burden and over-indebtedness. Few studies integrate both channels or provide a state-level economic assessment for the full 2010–2020 period.

8. Research Methodology

Research Design: Descriptive and analytical, based on secondary data, supplemented by synthesis of published field studies.

Study Area: Karnataka state, with district-level analysis where data permit.

Period: 2010–11 to 2019–2020 (11 financial years).

Data Sources: NABARD (Status of Microfinance in India, district reports), MFIN (Micrometer reports, state factsheets), AKMI (Association of Karnataka Microfinance Institutions) data releases, Karnataka State Rural Livelihood Promotion Society (Sanjeevini), Directorate of Economics and Statistics Karnataka, and published academic studies.

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

Variables: Number of SHGs savings-linked and credit-linked; amount of savings and loan outstanding; number of MFI borrowers; gross loan portfolio; average loan size; district-level portfolio concentration; interest rates; and scheme coverage.

Analytical Tools:

1. **Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR)** for SHG-BLP and MFI portfolio metrics.
2. **Descriptive trend analysis** of credit linkage ratios and average loan per SHG.
3. **Regional disparity analysis** using district-level portfolio and borrower data.
4. **Synthesis of field study findings** on income, savings, and empowerment outcomes from published surveys in Karnataka districts.

Limitations: The study relies on institutional data that may not capture informal microfinance channels. Borrower-level economic outcomes are drawn from published studies of specific districts and may not be representative of the entire state. District-level MFI data are available only for recent years.

9. Strong Points of the Study

The principal strength of this research is its dual-channel framework. By examining both the SHG-BLP and the NBFC-MFI channel, the study captures the full spectrum of microfinance in Karnataka, from the smallest savings-first groups to larger individual enterprise loans. Most existing analyses focus on one channel or the other; this integration provides a more complete picture of the credit landscape available to low-income households.

A second strength is the use of official institutional data that is verifiable and comparable across years. NABARD's SHG-BLP statistics and MFIN's portfolio data are collected through standardized reporting systems and are widely used by policymakers and researchers. This ensures that the study's findings are grounded in the same evidentiary base that informs policy, enhancing their relevance.

Third, the study's engagement with the 2010–2020 period captures a full cycle of growth, stress, and recovery. The demonetization shock of 2016 and the NBFC liquidity crisis of 2018 tested the resilience of Karnataka's microfinance sector. By covering the full decade, the analysis can distinguish between structural growth trends and cyclical disruptions, providing a more nuanced understanding than a snapshot analysis would allow.

Fourth, the study's attention to regional disparities—particularly the concentration of MFI lending in a handful of districts and the persistent credit linkage gaps in northern Karnataka—adds spatial depth to the analysis. This is essential for policy targeting, as aggregate state-level figures can mask significant intra-state variation.

10. Weak Points of the Study

The most significant weakness is the absence of primary borrower-level data. While the study can document the scale and growth of microfinance in Karnataka, it cannot directly measure the income, consumption, or asset outcomes of borrowers. The synthesis of published field studies partially addresses this gap, but those studies are limited in geographic scope and cannot be generalized to the entire state.

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

A second limitation is the inconsistency in district-level data. NABARD district reports are available for selected districts but not uniformly across all years. MFIN data are more consistent but cover only regulated MFIs, excluding the SHG-BLP channel entirely. This makes it difficult to construct a unified district-level picture of total microfinance penetration.

Third, the study cannot adequately address the issue of over-indebtedness. Multiple borrowing from different sources—SHGs, MFIs, moneylenders—is a known phenomenon in Karnataka, but the available data do not allow for measurement of household-level debt burden. Without this, the study cannot assess whether microfinance has been uniformly beneficial or has created new vulnerabilities.

Fourth, the study period ends in 2020, immediately before the full impact of COVID-19 on microfinance became apparent. The pandemic's effects on borrower incomes, repayment behavior, and MFI portfolio quality are therefore outside the scope of this analysis, though they would be essential for a contemporary assessment.

11. Current Trends

Several trends characterize Karnataka's microfinance sector as it emerged from the 2010–2020 period. The most significant is the rapid growth of the MFI channel. Between March 2019 and March 2020, the gross loan portfolio of MFIs in Karnataka nearly tripled from ₹16,946 crore to ₹42,265 crore, with over 63 lakh unique borrowers . This growth outpaced the SHG-BLP channel, reflecting both the expansion of NBFC-MFIs and the preference of some borrowers for larger, faster-disbursing loans.

A second trend is the concentration of MFI lending in specific districts. Belagavi, Mysuru, Bengaluru (Rural and Urban), Tumakuru, and Mandya account for the largest share of both accounts and portfolio . This concentration reflects market maturity and infrastructure availability, but it also means that districts with weaker MFI presence rely more heavily on the SHG-BLP, which has its own limitations in terms of loan size and flexibility.

Third, the SHG-BLP in Karnataka has shown steady growth but persistent credit linkage gaps. As of March 2020, 7.84 lakh SHGs had savings accounts, but only 4.33 lakh had credit outstanding—a 55% linkage gap . This suggests that many SHGs are formed and savings-active but never access bank credit, either because they are too new, lack adequate grading, or face bank reluctance. NABARD has identified the need to sanitize SHG data and weed out inactive groups to arrive at a realistic picture of active groups .

Fourth, the policy environment has become more supportive through interest subvention. The Karnataka government's alignment with NRLM allows women SHGs to access loans at effective rates as low as 0–4% through cooperative banks, and the Kayaka Yojana provides up to ₹10 lakh at zero interest for loans below ₹5 lakh . These schemes reduce the cost of SHG credit, but their reach and utilization vary across districts.

12. History

The history of microfinance in Karnataka predates the 2010–2020 study period by at least two decades. The SHG movement in Karnataka gained momentum in the late 1990s and early

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

2000s, supported by NABARD's pilot linkage programme and the state government's Streeshakti initiative launched in 2000–01 . Streeshakti created a network of women's groups that later became the foundation for NRLM implementation under the Sanjeevini society.

The 2000s also witnessed the entry of NBFC-MFIs, initially as small local operators and later as regulated entities. The Andhra Pradesh microfinance crisis of 2010—triggered by allegations of coercive recovery and borrower suicides—had ripple effects across South India, prompting the RBI to establish a regulatory framework for NBFC-MFIs in 2011. This framework, which included interest rate caps and margin requirements, shaped the operating environment for Karnataka's MFIs throughout the study period.

The period 2010–2020 itself can be divided into three phases. The early years (2010–2013) saw consolidation after the AP crisis and the establishment of the RBI regulatory framework. The middle years (2013–2017) witnessed rapid expansion, with MFI portfolios growing and SHG-BLP coverage deepening. Demonetization in November 2016 caused a temporary disruption, particularly for MFIs dependent on cash disbursement and collection, but the sector recovered within a year. The later years (2017–2020) saw continued growth alongside emerging concerns about over-indebtedness and the impact of the NBFC liquidity crisis on smaller MFIs.

Throughout this period, Karnataka remained a relatively stable microfinance environment compared to Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, with lower delinquency rates and stronger institutional presence. This stability, however, should not obscure the persistent challenges of financial illiteracy, high operating costs, and the limited capacity of many borrowers to absorb larger loans productively .

13. Discussion

The findings of this study must be interpreted against the broader question of what microfinance can and cannot do in an economy like Karnataka's. The evidence from 2010–2020 suggests that microfinance has been economically consequential, but its impact has been uneven and its transformative potential constrained by structural factors.

The SHG-BLP channel has been most effective in promoting savings behavior and providing small, low-cost credit for consumption smoothing and petty income-generating activities. The field survey of Dharwad and Belgaum districts found that the majority of SHG members saved between ₹401 and ₹600 per month, and that group savings were the first source of loanable funds . This savings-first model builds financial discipline and creates a buffer against shocks, but the loan sizes that SHGs can support are modest. The average loan per SHG in Raichur district was ₹1.38 lakh in 2020–21, and in Shivamogga it was ₹1.92 lakh . These amounts are sufficient for livestock purchase, small trade inventory, or agricultural inputs, but not for larger enterprise investments.

The MFI channel, by contrast, has been more effective in reaching borrowers with existing income-generating activities who need larger working capital. The rapid growth of MFI portfolios in Karnataka—from ₹16,946 crore to ₹42,265 crore between 2019 and 2020—indicates substantial demand for this type of credit . Case studies from Chitradurga,

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

Chamarajanagar, and Udupi document women who used MFI loans to invest in bore wells, silk reeling units, and handicraft production, generating income and employment . These are meaningful economic outcomes, but they represent the upper tail of the borrower distribution, not the average.

The critical constraint on both channels is the cost and quality of credit. MFI interest rates in the range of 18–26% are high relative to the returns available from many micro-enterprises, particularly in agriculture where margins are thin and weather-dependent . Financial illiteracy compounds this problem: borrowers who do not fully understand interest calculations or repayment schedules are at greater risk of over-indebtedness. The 2020 stress episode in Karnataka's microfinance sector, when delinquency rates reached 8.59% before declining, illustrates the fragility of borrower repayment capacity under adverse conditions . While this occurred after the study period, it reflects structural vulnerabilities that were present throughout 2010–2020.

The regional disparity dimension is also significant. MFI lending is concentrated in districts with better infrastructure and more mature markets, while the SHG-BLP is the primary microfinance channel in the more remote northern districts. This is not necessarily a problem—different channels serve different needs—but it does mean that the quality and cost of microfinance services vary substantially depending on where a borrower lives. Policy efforts to promote rural penetration and strengthen SHG quality in underserved districts are therefore essential for equitable financial inclusion .

14. Results

The analysis yields the following principal results:

SHG-BLP Growth: The number of SHGs credit-linked to commercial banks in Karnataka grew from approximately 977,521 in 2010 to 855,724 in 2015, with women's SHGs consistently comprising over 85% of the total. The amount disbursed by commercial banks increased from ₹978,018 lakh in 2010 to ₹1,733,412 lakh in 2015, representing a CAGR of approximately 12.1% . By March 2020, 7.84 lakh SHGs had savings accounts and 4.33 lakh had credit outstanding, with total credit outstanding of ₹10,879 crore .

Credit Linkage Gap: Despite growth in absolute numbers, the credit linkage ratio remained a constraint. As of March 2020, only 55% of savings-linked SHGs had accessed credit, indicating that a substantial proportion of groups remained savings-only .

MFI Expansion: The gross loan portfolio of regulated MFIs in Karnataka grew from ₹16,946 crore in March 2019 to ₹42,265 crore in March 2020, a nearly threefold increase. Unique borrowers exceeded 63 lakh . District-level data show concentration in Belagavi, Mysuru, Bengaluru, Tumakuru, and Mandya .

Loan Utilization Patterns: Field studies document loan use for agriculture (bore wells, inputs), livestock, petty trade, handicrafts, and silk reeling. Average loan sizes ranged from ₹10,000 for first-cycle MFI loans to ₹1–2 lakh for SHG loans in mature groups .

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

Interest Rate Burden: MFI interest rates of 18–26% were consistently identified as a constraint, particularly for agricultural borrowers with seasonal and uncertain returns .

15. Conclusion

Microfinance in Karnataka during 2010–2020 was neither a panacea nor a failure. It was a substantial, growing, and economically meaningful credit delivery system that reached millions of households excluded from formal banking, but it operated within structural constraints that limited its transformative potential. The SHG-BLP provided a savings-first, low-cost entry point for rural women, building financial discipline and supporting small-scale consumption and livelihood needs. The MFI channel provided larger, faster credit for existing micro-enterprises, enabling income diversification and asset creation for a subset of borrowers with the capacity to absorb and repay commercial-rate loans.

The central hypothesis—that microfinance had a positive but mediated effect on income diversification and enterprise creation—is supported by the available evidence, though the absence of rigorous impact evaluation data for the full state and period means this conclusion is indicative rather than definitive. The operational hypothesis that the SHG-BLP was more effective for the poorest and the MFI channel more effective for the moderately poor is consistent with the structural characteristics of the two models.

The implications for Karnataka's economy are significant. Microfinance has become a permanent feature of the state's financial landscape, not a temporary intervention. Its future contribution will depend on whether the sector can address its persistent weaknesses: high interest rates relative to borrower returns, financial illiteracy that increases over-indebtedness risk, and regional disparities that leave the most remote districts with the weakest access to quality microfinance services.

16. Suggestions and Recommendations

1. Strengthen SHG Quality and Credit Linkage: The 55% credit linkage gap represents a substantial pool of savings-active but credit-constrained groups. NABARD and banks should prioritize grading and capacity building for these groups, with a target of raising the credit linkage ratio to at least 70% by 2020. Regular grading and training for book writers are essential.

2. Expand Interest Subvention Coverage: The Karnataka Kayaka Yojana and NRLM-aligned interest subvention have reduced the cost of SHG credit, but utilization varies. The state should conduct an audit of scheme reach and simplify application procedures to ensure that eligible groups in underserved districts can access subsidized credit.

3. Promote Financial Literacy Alongside Credit: Financial illiteracy is a root cause of over-indebtedness and loan misuse . MFIs and SHG federations should integrate mandatory financial literacy modules into loan orientation, covering interest calculation, repayment scheduling, and debt management.

4. Encourage Product Diversification: Microfinance in Karnataka remains heavily credit-centric. MFIs and SHGs should be supported to offer micro-insurance (crop, health, livestock),

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

pension products, and remittance services. NABARD's E-Shakti digitization initiative provides a platform for expanding product offerings .

5. Address Regional Disparities: MFI lending is concentrated in a few districts. The state and RBI should consider incentives for MFIs to expand into northern Karnataka districts where SHG-BLP is the dominant channel and credit needs remain unmet. Technology-enabled delivery models can reduce the cost of serving remote areas .

6. Strengthen Borrower Protection: The 2020 stress episode, while outside the study period, highlights the need for robust borrower protection. The RBI's guardrails on lending should be enforced, and unlicensed lenders should be brought under regulatory scrutiny. A state-level microfinance grievance redressal mechanism would enhance borrower confidence.

17. Future Scope

Future research should prioritize rigorous impact evaluation. A longitudinal panel survey of borrowers in selected districts, tracking income, assets, and debt over 3–5 years, would provide the causal evidence that is currently lacking. Such a study should compare SHG borrowers, MFI borrowers, and non-borrowers to isolate the effect of microcredit from other factors.

Second, the post-2020 period, including the COVID-19 disruption and the 2020 stress episode, offers a natural experiment for understanding how Karnataka's microfinance sector responds to shocks. Research on repayment behavior, borrower coping strategies, and institutional resilience during these periods would inform regulatory and policy responses.

Third, the intersection of microfinance with digital financial services—mobile money, UPI, and digital credit—requires attention. The E-Shakti digitization of SHG books is a step in this direction, but the broader impact of fintech on microfinance access and cost in Karnataka remains understudied.

Fourth, comparative analysis with other South Indian states (Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Kerala) would help distinguish Karnataka-specific dynamics from regional patterns. Such comparison could identify policy lessons that are transferable across state boundaries.

References

1. Kulkarni, K. G. (2020). Monetary analysis and economic performance of Self Help Group members in Dharwad and Belgaum districts. *International Review of Business and Economics*, 4(Special Issue 1), 28–34.
2. Department of Studies in Economics, Karnataka University, Dharwad. (n.d.). *Empowerment of Women through Microfinance – A Study of Koppal District* (Chapter 3). Shodhganga.
3. Zenodo. (2020). *An Overview of the Challenges and Opportunities of Microfinance in India*.
4. NABARD. (2020). *District Development Report: Raichur*.
5. NABARD. (2020). *District Development Report: Shivamogga*.
6. NABARD. (2019). *District Development Report: Yadgir*.

Research Paper © 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved

7. Department of Studies in Economics, Karnataka University, Dharwad. (n.d.). *Empowerment of Women through Microfinance – A Study of Koppal District* (Chapter 4). Shodhganga.
8. Sa-Dhan. (2020). *Bharat Microfinance Report 2020*.
9. MFIN. (2020). *Micrometer Report*. Cited in The Hindu (2020, January 23).
10. Association of Karnataka Microfinance Institutions (AKMI). (2020). Data cited in The Hindu (2020, January 21).
11. MFIN. (n.d.). *Microfinance: Boosting Multiple Trades in Karnataka*.
12. Association of Karnataka Microfinance Institutions. (2020). Data on microfinance portfolio and delinquency in Karnataka. Cited in *The Hindu*, January 21, 2020.
13. Department of Studies in Economics, Karnataka University, Dharwad. (n.d.). *Empowerment of Women through Microfinance – A Study of Koppal District*. Shodhganga.
14. Kulkarni, K. G. (2020). Monetary analysis and economic performance of Self Help Group members in Dharwad and Belgaum districts. *International Review of Business and Economics*, 4(Special Issue 1), 28–34.
15. MFIN. (2020). *Micrometer Report*. Cited in *The Hindu*, January 23, 2020.
16. MFIN. (n.d.). *Microfinance: Boosting Multiple Trades in Karnataka*.
17. NABARD. (2019). *District Development Report: Yadgir*.
18. NABARD. (2020). *District Development Report: Raichur*.
19. NABARD. (2020). *District Development Report: Shivamogga*.
20. NABARD. (2020). *Status of Microfinance in India 2020–21*.
21. Sa-Dhan. (2020). *Bharat Microfinance Report 2020*.
22. Zenodo. (2020). *An Overview of the Challenges and Opportunities of Microfinance in India*.