Financial Risk and Management:
An International Journal
Volume 3, Number 2, 2024

Microfinance Risks and Sustainability Challenges: A Literature Review

Sri Hardianti Nur[1]

[1] Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

Abstract

Article history:
Received: August 24, 2024
Revised: September 8, 2024
Accepted: October 13, 2024
Published: December 30, 2024

Keywords:
Financial Sustainability,
Microfinance Institutions,
Over-Indebtedness,
Risk Management,
Social Performance.

Identifier:
Zera Open
Page: 96-109
https://zeraopen.com/journal/frmij

This article reviews recent evidence on how financial, social, and institutional risks shape the sustainability of microfinance institutions in an era of expanding financial inclusion and competitive pressure. The study uses a systematic literature review of peer reviewed journal articles published between 2019 and 2023 to consolidate findings on portfolio quality, financial performance, client over-indebtedness, governance, and emerging environmental and digital risks. The results show that resilience depends on the interaction between core financial indicators, such as portfolio quality and cost efficiency, and less visible social risks related to multiple borrowing, coercive collection, and borrower vulnerability. The article discusses the evidence by grouping studies into institutional-level financial risks, client-level social risks, and broader challenges linked to regulation, digitalization, and new models such as green and Islamic microfinance. Overall, the review finds that sustainable microfinance requires integrated risk management frameworks that jointly address financial sustainability, social protection, and long-term mission alignment.

1. Introduction

Microfinance institutions have become central to strategies for financial inclusion and poverty reduction, especially in low- and middle-income economies. By extending small scale financial services to households and microenterprises excluded from formal banking, they are expected to smooth consumption, support entrepreneurship, and enhance resilience to shocks. At the same time, microfinance institutions must remain financially viable in increasingly competitive and regulated environments, which creates a persistent tension between outreach to poorer clients and the need to cover costs and generate surpluses (Navin & Sinha, 2021; Puteri et al., 2022). Recent evidence shows that this dual mission is complicated further by macroeconomic volatility, digitalization, and changing donor and investor expectations about social and environmental performance (Xu et al., 2019; Memon et al., 2022).

In this evolving landscape, risk management has emerged as a critical determinant of microfinance sustainability. Studies document that exposure to credit, liquidity, and operational risks can erode capital buffers, deteriorate portfolio quality, and threaten institutional survival, particularly in periods of crisis or regulatory tightening (Memon et al., 2022; Mata et al., 2023). On the client side, concerns about over indebtedness, aggressive lending, and coercive collection practices have raised questions about the social sustainability of microfinance and its ability to deliver net welfare gains (Brickell et al., 2020; Kasoga & Tegambwage, 2021). These vulnerabilities became especially visible during the COVID 19 pandemic, when income disruptions and mobility restrictions challenged repayment capacity and business models in many markets (Brickell et al., 2020).

A growing empirical literature examines how governance structures, revenue models, and diversification strategies shape the financial resilience of microfinance institutions. Findings suggest that revenue diversification, cost efficiency, and appropriate capital structures can strengthen financial sustainability, although the benefits may vary across regions and institutional types (Githaiga, 2022; Memon et al., 2022; Mata et al., 2023). Other studies explore the relationship between social and financial performance, with mixed evidence on whether there is a trade off or complementarity between deep outreach and financial self-sufficiency (Navin & Sinha, 2021; Fadikpe et al., 2022; Puteri et al., 2022). Recent work from South Asia and Bangladesh also highlights the role of institutional characteristics, such as size, age, and governance quality, as predictors of long-term sustainability (Xu et al., 2019; Maeenuddin et al., 2023).

Despite this progress, the literature on microfinance risks and sustainability remains fragmented across themes, regions, and methodological approaches. Many studies focus on specific risk types, such as credit risk or over indebtedness, or on narrow performance indicators, which makes it difficult to obtain a comprehensive view of how different risk channels interact to influence both financial and social outcomes. This article addresses this gap by conducting a systematic literature review of peer reviewed studies published between 2019 and 2023 that examine microfinance risks and sustainability challenges. By synthesizing recent evidence across institutional, client, and macro level risk factors, the review aims to clarify the main channels through which risks affect sustainability, identify common patterns and divergences across contexts, and highlight emerging issues such as digital credit and environmental sustainability. The study contributes to the literature by integrating dispersed findings into a coherent framework and by outlining key implications for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers concerned with building more resilient and socially responsible microfinance systems.

2. Literature Review

The recent literature on microfinance highlights that risks to institutional sustainability operate through multiple, interrelated channels. Studies on financial performance and efficiency show that portfolio quality, cost control, capital structure, and revenue diversification are key determinants of the ability of microfinance institutions to remain solvent while expanding outreach (Githaiga, 2022; Memon et al., 2022; Mata et al., 2023). Evidence from South Asia, Sub Saharan Africa, and cross-country samples suggests that institutions with stronger capitalization, better cost management, and diversified income sources are more resilient to macroeconomic shocks and regulatory changes (Navin & Sinha, 2021; Maeenuddin et al., 2023). At the same time, several contributions point out that an exclusive focus on financial ratios can obscure underlying fragilities in risk management and client quality, which may only become visible in periods of stress (Xu et al., 2019; Mata et al., 2023).

A second strand of research examines social sustainability and client level risks, with a particular focus on over indebtedness and borrower vulnerability.

Empirical work from Cambodia, Tanzania, Indonesia, and other markets documents that competitive lending, multiple borrowing, and aggressive collection practices can push low-income clients into debt cycles that undermine the developmental promise of microfinance (Brickell et al., 2020; Kasoga & Tegambwage, 2021). Saefullah et al. (2022) show that mapping over indebtedness in Indonesia and Tanzania reveals high repayment burdens and reliance on informal borrowing, indicating that conventional outreach and portfolio indicators may underestimate client distress. Green et al. (2023) similarly find that strong financial performance metrics can coexist with widespread informal debt and coercive repayment strategies in Cambodia, reinforcing the argument that standard measures of portfolio quality and repayment rates only capture part of the social risk landscape.

More recent contributions extend the discussion of microfinance risks into new domains such as digitalization, green and Islamic microfinance, and macro level uncertainty. Digital transformation is often presented as a way to reduce transaction costs and expand outreach, but it also introduces operational and consumer protection risks related to rapid credit scoring, opaque pricing, and weaker face to face screening (Fadikpe et al., 2022; Memon et al., 2022). Work on Islamic microfinance shows that credit risk dynamics are shaped by client characteristics and lending models, with evidence that lending to women, group-based mechanisms, and rural borrowers can reduce default risk when designed appropriately (Mohamed & Elgammal, 2023). Other studies call for a broader sustainability agenda that integrates environmental and climate related considerations into microfinance portfolios, arguing that exposure to climate shocks and the design of green microfinance products will increasingly affect both risk profiles and long-term institutional viability (Uddin et al., 2021). Overall, the literature suggests that microfinance sustainability depends on the interaction between internal risk management practices, client level vulnerabilities, and evolving regulatory, technological, and environmental contexts.

3. Methods

This study adopts a systematic literature review approach to synthesize recent evidence on microfinance risks and sustainability challenges. The review focuses on peer reviewed journal articles published between 2019 and 2023. Relevant studies were identified through keyword searches in major academic databases using combinations of terms such as "microfinance", "microfinance institutions", "risk", "credit risk", "over-indebtedness", "financial sustainability", "social performance", and "outreach". The search was restricted to articles written in English and published in academic journals. After removing duplicates, titles and abstracts were screened to exclude studies that did not focus on microfinance institutions or did not address risk or sustainability outcomes. Conceptual papers, policy reports, book chapters, and non-refereed working papers were excluded to maintain a consistent level of methodological rigor.

Articles that passed the initial screening were read in full to confirm their relevance. A simple coding template was used to extract information on country or region, institutional type, research design, risk categories (for example credit, operational, social, or macro level risks), sustainability indicators (financial, social, or combined), and main findings. The evidence was then synthesized using a combination of descriptive and thematic analysis. Descriptively, the studies were mapped by year, region, and main focus. Thematically, the findings were grouped into clusters covering institutional level financial risks, client level social risks such as over indebtedness, and broader challenges linked to regulation, digitalization, and environmental or climate related factors. This structure provides a clear basis for comparing results across contexts and for identifying gaps and emerging themes in the microfinance risk and sustainability literature.

4. Results and Discussion

The review shows that most recent studies converge on the importance of core financial risks for the long term sustainability of microfinance institutions, but they also highlight substantial heterogeneity across regions and business models. Empirical work on financial performance and efficiency finds that portfolio quality, operating costs, capitalization, and revenue diversification are central drivers of institutional resilience, especially during periods of macroeconomic stress (Githaiga, 2022; Memon et al., 2022; Mata et al., 2023). Cross country and regional studies indicate that microfinance institutions that rely excessively on rapid credit expansion without matching improvements in screening and monitoring are more likely to experience deteriorating portfolio quality and lower self-sufficiency, underscoring the importance of prudent growth strategies (Tehulu, 2022). At the same time, evidence from Sub Saharan Africa and South Asia suggests that strong financial sustainability can coexist with relatively modest outreach to poorer or rural clients, reinforcing earlier concerns about a potential trade-off between depth of outreach and financial self-sufficiency (Churchill, 2020; Navin & Sinha, 2021).

In terms of social sustainability, the results point to persistent risks related to over indebtedness, client vulnerability, and the quality of lending practices. Qualitative and mixed methods studies from Cambodia, Tanzania, Indonesia, and other markets document that intense competition, multiple borrowing, and coercive collection practices can push low-income borrowers into debt cycles that undermine the developmental goals of microfinance, even when portfolio indicators appear sound (Brickell et al., 2020; Kasoga & Tegambwage, 2021; Saefullah et al., 2022; Green et al., 2023). These findings suggest that standard indicators such as high repayment rates and low portfolio at risk may mask underlying social risks that only become visible when households face shocks or when loan rescheduling and refinancing practices are examined more closely. At the same time, studies on social and financial performance interactions report mixed results, with some evidence that institutions with stronger social performance systems can also achieve robust financial outcomes, while others identify tensions when profit targets dominate lending and incentive structures (Navin & Sinha, 2021; Fadikpe et al., 2022; Puteri et al., 2022).

The review also highlights several emerging themes that broaden the understanding of microfinance risks and sustainability. First, digitalization and fintech enabled models offer opportunities to reduce transaction costs and expand outreach, but they introduce new operational and consumer protection risks, particularly when automated credit scoring and remote lending weaken in person screening and relationship-based monitoring (Memon et al., 2022). Second, studies on institutional characteristics and governance show that size, age, ownership structure, and board composition can influence both efficiency and risk taking, with some evidence that more mature and better governed institutions are able to balance growth, portfolio quality, and social objectives more effectively (Bardhan et al., 2023; Maeenuddin et al., 2023). Third, green and Islamic microfinance are gaining prominence as vehicles for aligning financial inclusion with environmental and ethical goals, yet the evidence indicates that these models are not automatically less risky; their sustainability still depends on sound credit appraisal, appropriate product design, and effective risk sharing mechanisms (Uddin et al., 2021; Mohamed & Elgammal, 2023).

Taken together, these strands of evidence suggest that microfinance risks cannot be reduced to a single dimension or indicator. Financial sustainability on its own does not guarantee that client level risks are well managed, just as strong social orientation does not automatically shield institutions from portfolio deterioration if growth is too rapid or underwriting standards are weak. The interaction between internal policies, incentive structures, and local market conditions appears crucial: where competition is intense and regulation is weak, pressures to maintain high repayment rates and profitability may encourage practices that shift risk onto borrowers, increasing vulnerability despite apparently healthy balance sheets (Brickell et al., 2020; Saefullah et al., 2022; Green et al., 2023). These patterns point to the need for integrated risk management frameworks that jointly monitor financial, social, and emerging environmental risks rather than treating them as separate agendas.

Overall, the findings suggest that microfinance sustainability is shaped by the interaction of internal risk management practices, client level vulnerabilities, institutional governance, and broader regulatory, technological, and environmental contexts, and that addressing one dimension of risk in isolation is unlikely to be sufficient.

5. Conclusion

This review shows that microfinance sustainability is shaped by a complex web of financial, social, institutional, and contextual risks rather than by single indicators such as repayment rates or portfolio at risk. On the financial side, portfolio quality, cost efficiency, capitalization, and prudent growth strategies emerge as core determinants of resilience. Institutions that combine careful credit screening and monitoring with diversified revenue structures are better positioned to withstand macroeconomic shocks, regulatory changes, and shifts in donor or investor priorities. However, strong financial performance can coexist with shallow outreach, particularly in competitive markets, which raises persistent concerns about mission drift and the extent to which the poorest and most vulnerable clients are effectively served.

At the same time, the evidence makes clear that social risks, especially over indebtedness and client vulnerability, can remain hidden behind apparently robust portfolios. Intense competition, multiple borrowing, and coercive collection practices can push borrowers into debt cycles that undermine the developmental promise of microfinance. Standard performance metrics may therefore understate social risk, especially when loan refinancing, rescheduling, and informal borrowing are not captured. Emerging themes around digitalization, green and Islamic microfinance, and the growing use of fintech tools show that innovation creates new opportunities but also new layers of operational, consumer protection, and environmental risk that must be actively managed rather than assumed to be benign.

Overall, the findings imply that building sustainable microfinance requires integrated risk management frameworks that jointly consider financial, social, and emerging environmental dimensions. For practitioners and regulators, this means aligning incentives, governance structures, and supervisory tools so that portfolio growth, profitability, and outreach targets do not come at the expense of client well-being or long-term institutional stability. For researchers, the review highlights the need for more longitudinal, mixed methods, and cross-country work that links institutional level metrics with household level outcomes and explores how regulation, digital finance, and climate related shocks reshape risk profiles over time. A more holistic understanding of microfinance risks can support the design of models that are both financially robust and genuinely supportive of inclusive and sustainable development.

References

Bardhan, A. K., Nag, B., & Mishra, C. S. (2023). Microfinance institutions' efficiency and its determinants: Evidence from India. *South Asia Economic Journal, 24*(2), 109-136.

Brickell, K., Picchioni, F., Natarajan, N., Guermond, V., Parsons, L., Zanello, G., & Bateman, M. (2020). Compounding crises of social reproduction: Microfinance, over-indebtedness and the COVID-19 pandemic. *World Development, 136*, 105087.

Churchill, S. A. (2020). Microfinance financial sustainability and outreach: is there a trade-off?. *Empirical Economics, 59*(3), 1329-1350.

Fadikpe, A. A. A., Danquah, R., Aidoo, M., Chomen, D. A., Yankey, R., & Dongmei, X. (2022). Linkages between social and financial performance: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa microfinance institutions. *Plos one, 17*(3), e0261326.

Githaiga, P. N. (2022). Revenue diversification and financial sustainability of microfinance institutions. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research, 7*(1), 31-43.

Green, W. N., Chhom, T., Mony, R., & Estes, J. (2023). The underside of microfinance: Performance indicators and informal debt in Cambodia. *Development and Change, 54*(4), 780-803.

Kasoga, P. S., & Tegambwage, A. G. (2021). An assessment of over-indebtedness among microfinance institutions' borrowers: *The Tanzanian perspective. Cogent Business & Management, 8*(1), 1930499.

Maeenuddin, Hamid, S. A., Fahlevi, M., Nassir, A. M., & Hashim, P. M. (2023). Predictors of microfinance sustainability: Empirical evidence from Bangladesh. *Cogent Economics & Finance, 11*(1), 2202964.

Mata, M. N., Shah, S. S. H., Sohail, N., & Correira, A. B. (2023). The effect of financial development and MFI's characteristics on the efficiency and sustainability of micro financial institutions. *Economies, 11*(3), 78.

Memon, A., Akram, W., Abbas, G., Chandio, A. A., Adeel, S., & Yasmin, I. (2022). Financial sustainability of microfinance institutions and macroeconomic factors: a case of South Asia. *South Asian Journal of Macroeconomics and Public Finance, 11*(1), 116-142.

Mohamed, T. S., & Elgammal, M. M. (2023). Credit risk in Islamic microfinance institutions: The role of women, groups, and rural borrowers. *Emerging Markets Review, 54*, 100994.

Navin, N., & Sinha, P. (2021). Social and financial performance of MFIs: complementary or compromise?. *Vilakshan-XIMB Journal of Management, 18*(1), 42-61.

Puteri, H. E., Arifin, M., & Arief, H. (2022). Social Performance of Islamic Microfinance Institutions: Examining the Financial Sustainability as Driving Factor. *International Journal of Applied Business Research, 4*(02), 151–167.

Saefullah, K., Sadikin, I., de Bekker, J. C. M., & Chirangi, M. M. (2022). Mapping Over-indebtedness of Microfinance Clients in Indonesia and Tanzania: The Importance of Analysing Microfinance beyond its Outreach and

Sustainability. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences, 5*(1), 4998-5011.

Tehulu, T. A. (2022). Credit expansion and financial sustainability of microfinance institutions: A generalized method of moments panel data analysis. *Cogent Business & Management, 9*(1), 2140490.

Uddin, M. N., Kassim, S., Hamdan, H., Saad, N. B. M., & Embi, N. A. C. (2021). Green microfinance promoting sustainable development goals (SDGs) in Bangladesh. *Journal of Islamic Finance, 10*, 011-018.

Xu, W., Fu, H., & Liu, H. (2019). Evaluating the sustainability of microfinance institutions considering macro-environmental factors: A cross-country study. *Sustainability, 11*(21), 5947.