

A SCALE TO MEASURE THE GROUP DYNAMICS EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MEMBERS OF SELF-HELP GROUPS

Chethan Patil N. D¹, J. K. Patel² and Rahul Dundesh Bellagi³

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar - Lovely Professional University

² Director, Extension Education Institute, Anand- 388110

³ Ph.D. Scholar, Division of Dairy Extension, ICAR- National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, Haryana-132001
Email - chethanpatilnvl@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted to develop and standardize the reliable and valid scale to measure the group dynamics effectiveness of the members of self-help groups. For the development of the scale, Normalized Rank Order Method recommended by Guilford (1954) was used. A total of eight indicators out of fourteen indicators that determine the group dynamics effectiveness were selected based on the relevancy per cent, relevancy weightage and mean relevancy scores. Scale values of each selected indicator were obtained through the rank order method. 84 subitems for the selected indicators were obtained through the relevancy test. Validity (Internal consistency technique) and Reliability (test-retest) were used to know the developed scale is valid and reliable.

Keywords: group dynamics effectiveness, self-help group, scale, guilford, rank order

INTRODUCTION

Many forms of group-based poverty alleviation initiatives have associated social action with finance over the past few decades to boost the living conditions and well-being of the people (Anderson, 2014). The group-based approach not only helps vulnerable citizens to accumulate capital by small savings but also provides them with access to structured credit facilities (Shylendra, 1998). Among such group-based initiatives Self-help group stands at the front. SHGs are the influential media for solving many of rural India's problems, such as poverty eradication, raising living standards, expanding the rural economy, empowering women and creating a democratic way of life (Raj, 2006). The self-help groups are the small economically homogeneous and harmonious group of rural women who voluntarily adjudicate to contribute to a collective fund to be given to their members in conjunction with the group's commitment to strive towards unity, self-esteem and group consciousness, social and economic empowerment through democratic functioning (Patil *et al.*, 2020). Via shared liability these groups allow the poor to solve the collateral protection issue and thus free them from the clutches of moneylenders (Stiglitz, 1993). The notion of self-help groups (SHGs) emphasizes the principle of "for the people, by the people, and of the people". SHG is characterized as a collective group of 15-20 homogeneous individuals with the same kind of desires or problems that are not addressed by others (Sharma, 2001). The empowerment of women through self-help groups will give rise to

opportunities not only for the individuals or groups of women but also for their families and society as a whole through collective development action (Patil *et al.*, 2021). These self-help groups have a shared sense of need and an inclination to concerted action. Empowering women is not only about fulfilling their economic wants and also about making their social development more holistic. Group dynamics is focused on the relationship of forces in a group environment between the group members (Lewin, 1936). This is the group's internal existence as to how it is created, what its frameworks and processes are, how a group works and impacts individual members, other entities and the organization (Lewin *et al.*, 1960).

In light of this, one area remains mostly uninvestigated, i.e. the field of self-help group dynamics in which the precise purpose behind SHG is to be known whether it is a transient trend or can persist sustainably. Through studying the group dynamics, one may analyze the internal structure of the group and the predominant forces that lead to its success. Such complex powers interplay and contribute greatly to efficiency among the members of every self-help group. Studying them therefore is quite imperative. Taking into consideration this, a study was conducted to develop and standardize the reliable and valid scale to measure the group dynamics effectiveness of the members of women's self-help groups in Gujarat.

METHODOLOGY

The standardized test as defined by Noll (1957) is that the experts have carefully constructed in light of the acceptable objectives, the procedures for the administration, scoring and interpretation of the scores are specified in detail, so that the results should be comparable and the standards or average for different age status should be predetermined, regardless of whether the test has been carried out or where it can be carried out. In light of this definition, a standardized group dynamics effectiveness scale to measure the effectiveness of group dynamics of the SHG members was developed by using the Normalized Rank Order Method recommended by Guilford (1954). The method consists of the following steps for the development of a scale to measure the effectiveness of group dynamics effectiveness.

Identification of indicators

The possible indicators of self-help group dynamics were identified after reviewing the related literature. After thorough scrutiny and comprehensive understanding, these indicators were consulted with the experts. Finally, fourteen possible indicators which determine the self-help group dynamics were included for the scale construction and standardization. The selected indicators are participation, teamwork, group atmosphere, decision-making procedure, group cohesiveness, group leadership, interpersonal trust, task function, achievement of SHGs, interpersonal

communication, group democracy, norms, empathy, and attitude towards collectivism.

Selection of judges

A group of 50 experts consisting of social scientists and extension educationists from different agricultural universities across the country, traditional universities, heads of Krishi Vigyan Kendra's were selected as judges to develop and standardize the self-help group dynamics effectiveness scale.

Judges opinion

An official letter was mailed to all the selected judges with a request letter to give their valuable opinion regarding the relevancy and importance of the listed indicators to develop and standardize the self-help group dynamics scale. Their opinion about the indicator's relevancy in terms of most relevant, relevant, somewhat relevant, less relevant and not relevant was collected and scoring is done as 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively for the above-listed indicators.

Relevance of scale items

From the data so gathered were tabulated and analyzed to calculate "Relevancy Per cent", "Relevancy Weightage" and "Mean Relevancy Score" for all the 14 items/statements by using the following formulae:

$$\text{Relevancy \%} = \frac{(MR \times 5) + (R \times 4) + (SWR \times 3) + (LR \times 2) + (NR \times 1)}{\text{Maximum Possible score}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Relevancy Weightage} = \frac{(MR \times 5) + (R \times 4) + (SWR \times 3) + (LR \times 2) + (NR \times 1)}{\text{Maximum Possible score}}$$

$$\text{Mean Relevancy Score} = \frac{(MR \times 5) + (R \times 4) + (SWR \times 3) + (LR \times 2) + (NR \times 1)}{\text{Number of judges responded}}$$

Table 1: Relevancy per cent, relevancy weightage and mean relevancy score of the components of GDE as opinioned by experts (n=50)

Sr. No.	Indicators	Relevancy %	Relevancy weightage	Mean Relevancy Score	Remarks
1	Participation	88.80	0.888	4.44	Selected
2	Team work	90.80	0.908	4.54	Selected
3	Group atmosphere	88.00	0.880	4.40	Selected
4	Decision making procedure	86.40	0.864	4.32	Selected
5	Group cohesiveness	84.40	0.844	4.22	Selected
6	Group leadership	86.80	0.868	4.32	Selected
7	Interpersonal trust	87.20	0.872	4.36	Selected
8	Task function	49.20	0.492	2.46	Not-Selected
9	Achievement of SHGs	78.40	0.784	3.92	Selected

Sr. No	Indicators	Relevancy %	Relevancy weightage	Mean Relevancy Score	Remarks
10	Interpersonal communication	51.60	0.516	2.58	Not-Selected
11	Group democracy	42.80	0.428	2.14	Not-Selected
12	Norms	50.40	0.504	2.52	Not-Selected
13	Empathy	50.00	0.500	2.50	Not-Selected
14	Attitude towards collectivism	44.40	0.444	2.22	Not-Selected

Ranking of the selected indicators

To obtain the rank of the selected indicators of the scale items, 50 judges were requested to rank the selected indicators according to their relative importance for measuring the group dynamics effectiveness.

Item analysis

After receiving the responses of the judges, the data was transformed and tabulated to a master table based on the judge's ranking.

As shown in Table 2, the ri column represents the ranks, followed by Ri, which were reversed (reverse ranking). Each component's ranking frequency was tabulated accordingly.

For example, in the case of the indicator "participation", the fifty judges ranked nine times as first, followed by twelve times as second, seven times as third, eight times as fourth, six times as fifth, twice as sixth, four times as seventh and twice as eighth as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Method of working the scale values based on the ranks given by fifty judges on eight variables.

ri	Ri	Participation	Team work	Group atmosphere	Decision making procedure	Group cohesiveness	Group leadership	Inter-personal trust	Achievement of SHG	n	P	C
1	8	9	12	7	9	4	5	2	2	50	93.75	8
2	7	12	13	4	3	8	6	3	1	50	81.25	7
3	6	7	10	8	9	7	3	5	1	50	68.75	6
4	5	8	5	9	6	7	8	4	3	50	56.25	6
5	4	6	1	11	10	10	2	4	6	50	43.75	5
6	3	2	6	5	3	8	7	6	13	50	31.25	5
7	2	4	2	4	6	4	12	10	8	50	18.75	4
8	1	2	1	2	4	2	7	16	16	50	6.25	4
Σf_{ji}		50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	400	-	
Σf_{ji}		310	324	290	288	286	269	245	238	2250		
MC=Ri		6.20	6.48	5.80	5.76	5.72	5.38	4.90	4.76	45		
Rc (Scale value)		7.60	8.26	6.67	6.57	6.47	5.67	4.54	4.21			

1. ri= Rank given by judges to ten variables

2. Ri= rank values (in the reverse order of ranks i.e., rank one getting eight, rank two getting seven)

3. Σ =total number of judges (frequency distribution) among several variables

$$4. P=\text{centile value} = \frac{(Ri-0.5)}{n} \times 100$$

Where Ri=rank value; n=number of variables ranked; C=values determined to each centile value.

5. Σf_{ji} =Total number of judges who have ranked eight components.

6. Σf_{ji} = Ca or C_j

7. Rc=2.357XRj-7.0

Computing the scale values

To determine the scale value of each item, ranked by judges, the centile position “P” based on the method suggested by Guilford (1954) was worked out. The “C” value (value determined to each centile value), R_j value and finally scale value, i.e., R_c value, were worked out by using the following formula:

$$R_c = 2.357R_j - 7.01$$

The computed scale values for all eight selected components are shown in table 3.

Relevancy of sub-items of the indicators of GDE

Eight components were included in the scale to measure Group Dynamics Effectiveness. For each component, sub items were prepared and they were also sent to thirty judges to seek their relevance in the measurement of the component under consideration. The judgment sheets were prepared with suitable instructions and sent to all the identified judges for their judgment on each of the items on a five-response category as most relevant, relevant, somewhat relevant, less relevant and non-relevant with 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 scores, respectively for indicating the degree of relevance. Based on the thirty judges' responses relevancy weightages

were calculated for all the statements. Those subcomponents having relevancy per cent more than 75 per cent, relevancy weightage more than 0.75 and mean relevancy score of more than 3.75 of the judges were selected. Finally, a total of 84 statements were selected.

Table 3: The computed scale values for eight components

Sr. No.	Components	Scale value
1	Participation	7.60
2	Team work	8.27
3	Group atmosphere	6.67
4	Decision making procedure	6.57
5	Group cohesiveness	6.47
6	Group leadership	5.67
7	Interpersonal trust	4.54
8	Achievement of the SHGs	4.21
Total		50.00

The calculated relevancy per cent, relevancy weightage and mean relevancy score of those sub-components of group dynamics effectiveness are indicated in Table 4.

Table 4: Relevancy per cent, relevancy weightage and mean relevancy score of the sub-components of GDE as opinioned by experts (n= 30)

Sr. No.	Items	Obtained scores	Relevancy %	Relevancy weightage	Mean relevancy score
A. Participation					
1	Are all the group members involved in the group activities?	122	0.81	81.33	4.07
2	Do you participate actively in group meetings and other activities?	140	0.93	93.33	4.67
3	Do you feel that the members are not interested and enthusiastic to participate in group activities?	132	0.88	88.00	4.40
4	Is any group discussion directed away from the group as a whole?	144	0.96	96.00	4.80
5	Do you feel that the members are verbally and physically active in all group undertakings?	111	0.74	74.00	3.70
6	Do the members make it possible for another to participate actively in group meetings, discussions, workshops and other activities?	132	0.88	88.00	4.40
7	Do you remain silent and aloof if any discussion concerning a group?	142	0.95	94.67	4.73
8	Is there adequate group attendance wherever required?	110	0.73	73.33	3.67
9	Do you involve actively in producing as well as in marketing the produce?	132	0.88	88.00	4.40

Sr. No.	Items	Obtained scores	Relevancy %	Relevancy weightage	Mean relevancy score
10	Did your group achieve better with active participation by all the members in various group activities	126	0.84	84.00	4.20
B. Teamwork					
1	Do the members try to pressure group unity while achieving their objectives?	139	0.93	92.67	4.63
2	Is the group working as a team in all activities?	109	0.73	72.67	3.63
3	Is there a no. of individuals in your group who insist on putting on their show at the expense of the group?	119	0.79	79.33	3.97
4	Do you feel that the combined effort of the group brought much success?	127	0.85	84.67	4.23
5	Do you prefer to work alone without the help of your group members?	126	0.84	84.00	4.20
6	Are all the members responsible enough to keep the group on target?	138	0.92	92.00	4.60
7	Do all the members willing to give the major credit of group success to the combined team?	142	0.95	94.67	4.73
8	Does the leader guide the members and lead them as a team?	148	0.99	98.67	4.93
9	Are the returns equally distributed among all the members?	107	0.71	71.33	3.57
10	Are there individuals in your group who claim to have all the recognition for the group achievement?	132	0.88	88.00	4.40
C. Group atmosphere					
1	Do you prefer a friendly and congenial atmosphere in your SHG?	110	0.73	73.33	3.67
2	Is everyone given the freedom to express her ideas, to agree and disagree?	126	0.84	84.00	4.20
3	Do you feel that the environment is not at all made comfortable for the slow shy people to come out and participate in group tasks?	128	0.85	85.33	4.27
4	Are you able to suppress conflicts or unpleasant feelings in your group?	130	0.87	86.67	4.33
5	Is every member given a feeling of warm and friendly acceptance by the others?	111	0.74	74.00	3.70
6	Do you perceive other members to be cool, indifferent and hostile towards you?	139	0.93	92.67	4.63
7	Do you observe some members annoying and provoking others?	127	0.85	84.67	4.23
8	Do you feel that the members do not respect individuals who express points of view different from their own?	109	0.73	72.67	3.63
9	Are the groups open-minded in accepting a new point of view and encouraging novel ideas?	118	0.79	78.67	3.93
10	Is the atmosphere of work and not of unnecessary arguments and conflicts?	120	0.80	80.00	4.00
D. Decision making procedure					
1	I usually decide on the group with the involvement of other members of the SHG	131	0.87	87.33	4.37

Sr. No.	Items	Obtained scores	Relevancy %	Relevancy weightage	Mean relevancy score
2	The group decides the group without the topic drifting	120	0.80	80.00	4.00
3	I did not support another member decision in consensus	142	0.95	94.67	4.73
4	I feel that the majorities decision Is valid in the SHG	110	0.73	73.33	3.67
5	I feel that the other member never seeks my opinion in group decision	132	0.88	88.00	4.40
6	Usually, any group decision is taken jointly by all members in a participative manner	126	0.84	84.00	4.20
7	The leader attempts to get full participation of the members while taking a decision	139	0.93	92.67	4.63
8	I usually prefer to make my decision, whether personal or concerning the groups, all by myself	109	0.73	72.67	3.63
9	Every member is recognized for her contribution to the group decision	119	0.79	79.33	3.97
10	I feel that the group takes high-quality decisions all the time	127	0.85	84.67	4.23
E. Group cohesiveness					
1	I feel that the group worked well because the members are attached emotionally	126	0.84	84.00	4.20
2	I feel dissatisfied and would like to quit the group at the earliest	138	0.92	92.00	4.60
3	Members run to support each other during hardships	142	0.95	94.67	4.73
4	Members do not rely on one another in the group for carrying out the group tasks	148	0.99	98.67	4.93
5	There are unhealthy criticism and competition among the members	107	0.71	71.33	3.57
6	I feel some members do not appreciate my contribution to the group's achievement	132	0.88	88.00	4.40
7	The group members enjoy working with each other and managing any disagreement effectively	119	0.79	79.33	3.97
8	I can sense a feeling of belongingness among the group members	141	0.94	94.00	4.70
9	I do not feel comfortable working with some group members	136	0.91	90.67	4.53
10	The group members always rush to my aid whenever I need their help	106	0.71	70.67	3.53
F. Group leadership					
1	The group organizer is efficient at group work	122	0.81	81.33	4.07
2	The group organizer is sympathetic and helpful to other members in solving the problems at work and in personal life	119	0.79	79.33	3.97
3	The group leader is lazy and leaves all work to group member	137	0.91	91.33	4.57
4	The leader maintains good relationships with members as well as other groups	122	0.81	81.33	4.07
5	The group leader works much for the group's success	143	0.95	95.33	4.77
6	Group leader is less approachable and dependable	111	0.74	74.00	3.70

Sr. No.	Items	Obtained scores	Relevancy %	Relevancy weightage	Mean relevancy score
7	Group leader is no control over the members and their actions	142	0.95	94.67	4.73
8	Group leader maintains good contacts with all the organizations that benefit the group one way at the other	123	0.82	82.00	4.10
G. Interpersonal trust					
1	Do you find it difficult to accept and support the ideas and decisions of the majority	129	0.86	86.00	4.30
2	When you interact and give suggestions, do you think others belief in you completely?	137	0.91	91.33	4.57
3	Is the exchange of ideas and feelings with group members a difficult task?	128	0.85	85.33	4.27
4	Do others have a good opinion about your capability to work for the group?	134	0.89	89.33	4.47
5	Do you feel confident to take up any that has group support?	128	0.85	85.33	4.27
6	Are there too many misunderstandings among group members due to a lack of faith?	109	0.73	72.67	3.63
7	If you face any problem do you trust the group to rush to your aid immediately?	132	0.88	88.00	4.40
8	Do you rely on all the group members for taking certain major decisions?	148	0.99	98.67	4.93
9	When a member does something for the group, do you think he does not possess the qualification to do it?	108	0.72	72.00	3.60
10	Do the members work towards achieving the common goals first and not for their interests?	136	0.91	90.67	4.53
H. Achievement of SHG					
1	The group has represented and voiced against atrocities on woman	124	0.83	82.67	4.13
2	The group has participated actively in community asset generation	119	0.79	79.33	3.97
3	The group of women are empowered socially and economically after forming into SHGs	126	0.84	84.00	4.20
4	The group has put in a lot of effort to raise the financial status of its members	130	0.87	86.67	4.33
5	The SHG has repaid its loan after taking up activities	136	0.91	90.67	4.53
6	The SHG has adopted new technology and novel design to produce a better quality product	148	0.99	98.67	4.93
7	The group also takes an interest to solve the personal problems of members	136	0.91	90.67	4.53
8	The group has taken lead in organizing religious, cultural and social activities in the village	116	0.77	77.33	3.87
9	The group has participated in workshops, exhibitions, fairs, emporium, etc. held nationally	129	0.86	86.00	4.30
10	The SHG is also captured the good national and international market for its produce	121	0.81	80.67	4.03
11	I undertake the group activities as planned	109	0.73	72.67	3.63

Sr. No.	Items	Obtained scores	Relevancy %	Relevancy weightage	Mean relevancy score
12	I try to obtain all relevant information about production and marketing from different sources	123	0.82	82.00	4.10
13	I have participated in the training organized under the programme to upgrade my skills	112	0.75	74.67	3.73
14	I always put my skills into practice and have shared them with other members	143	0.95	95.33	4.77
15	I have personally contacted programme officials to update information on new technologies, marketing information, etc.	132	0.88	88.00	4.40
16	I actively participated in exhibitions, fairs, moles, and other market linkages to represent my group products	133	0.89	88.67	4.43

Validity of the scale

The validity of the developed scale was measured by content validity. The content validity of the scale was established in two ways; first, the items selected as inclusion in the scale were based on an extensive review, secondly, the opinion of experts was obtained to find out whether the items suggested were suitable as inclusion in the scale or not.

Reliability of the scale

To know the reliability of the Group Dynamics Effectiveness, the test-retest method was used. In this method, the developed Group Dynamics Effectiveness scale with 84 items was administered twice to the 20 respondents at 15 days intervals, who are neither previously interviewed nor had a chance to come in the final sample of the study. Thus, two sets of scores were obtained for each of the 20 respondents. By calculating the coefficient of correlation between the two sets of Group Dynamics Effectiveness scores, an estimate of the stability of Group Dynamics Effectiveness measurement called stability reliability coefficient was obtained. The Group Dynamics Effectiveness test under study was found to be highly stable and dependable ($r = 0.905$). The reliability coefficient was calculated with the help of Rulon's formula used by Guilford (1979). Thus, the test developed was found highly reliable.

Administrating the scale

The selected 84 statements of eight different indicators for the final format of the scale to measure group dynamics effectiveness were randomly arranged to avoid response biases, which might contribute to low reliability and detract from the validity of the scale. The scale contains 84 statements (60 positive and 24 negative) arranged on a five-point continuum of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree with a scoring of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 for positive and reverse for negative statements. The range of possible scores was 84 to 420. The final group dynamics

effectiveness scale was administered on the sample of SHGs members, who express their agreement or disagreement with each item by selecting any one of five response categories.

Developing the Group Dynamics Effectiveness Index

After obtaining the scale values of individual components of group dynamics effectiveness and total scale value as represented in Table 18, Group Dynamics Effectiveness Index was calculated by using the following formula:

$$GDEI = [(R_1/M_1) \times S_1 / S + (R_2/M_2) \times S_2 / S + \dots + (R_n/M_n) \times S_n / S] \times 100$$

Where,

GDEI = Group Dynamics Effectiveness Index of the respondent

$R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n$ = Group dynamics effectiveness Score obtained by the respondent as the particular group dynamics effectiveness Indicator

$M_1, M_2, M_3, \dots, M_n$ = Potential score of the respondent as a particular group dynamics effectiveness Indicator

$S_1, S_2, S_3, \dots, S_n$ = Scale value of the particular group dynamics effectiveness indicator

S = total scale value of all indicators

CONCLUSION

Finally, a standardized scale to measure the group dynamics effectiveness was developed by using the Normalized Rank Order Method recommended by Guilford (1954) was found to be reliable and valid. The scale consists of eight indicators namely participation, teamwork, group atmosphere, decision-making procedure, group cohesiveness, group leadership, interpersonal trust and achievement of SHG.

REFERENCES

- Anastasi, G. (1976). Book Review Skin Flaps! *New England Journal of Medicine*, 295(7), 399-399.
- Anderson, L. 2014. Self-help groups in development: A review of evidence from South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa.
- Bariya, Minaxi K., Chandravadia, Kiran and Gami, Hansa (2023) Social empowerment of women through self help groups. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.* 35(1):104-108. <https://doi.org/10.56572/gjoe.2023.35.1.0022>.
- Guilford, J. P. (1954). *Psychometric methods*. Tata McGraw-Hill Publication Co. Ltd., Bombay, 378-382.
- Guilford, J. P. (1954). *Psychometric methods*. Tata McGraw-Hill Publication Co. Ltd., Bombay, 378-382.
- Lewin, K. 1936. *A dynamic Theory of Personality*. McGraw Hill, New York.
- Lewin, K.; R. Lippert and R. White. 1960. *Leader behavior reaction in three social climates*. In *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory* (2nd Ed.) Eds. Castwright,
- Noll, V. H. (1957). *Introduction to Educational Measurement*. Boston; Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Noll, V. H. (1957). *Introduction to Educational Measurement*. Boston; Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Patil, C. N., Patel, J. K., Bellagi, R. D., Manunayaka, G., & Gattupalli, N. K. (2021). A study on group dynamics effectiveness of women's self-help groups members in Ahmedabad District of Gujarat. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 57(1), 76-80. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2454-552x.2021.00004.9>
- Patil, N. D., Patel, J. K., Gattupalli, N. K., Bellagi, R. D., & Manunayaka, G. (2020). Direct and indirect effect between the antecedent characteristics of women self-help groups of Gujarat and their group dynamics. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, 38-42. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajaees/2020/v38i430335>
- Raj, K. S. 2006. Micro-finance and empowering rural women. *Journal of Development and Social Change*, 4(1&2): 16-21
- Sharma, K.C. 2001. Micro financing through Self Help Groups. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 56 (3): 460-465.
- Shylendra, H.S. 1998. Institutional reforms and wages rural poor: A study on the distributional performance of a rural bank. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 51(3): 301-314.
- Stiglitz, J. 1993. Peer monitoring and credit markets. *World Bank Economic Review*, 4(3): 351- 366.

Received : January 2024 : Accepted : March 2024