International Journal of Advance and Applied Research
www.ijaar.co.in
ISSN – 2347-7075 Impact Factor – 8.141
Peer Reviewed Bi-Monthly
Vol. 6 No. 42 November - December - 2025

Impact of Finance Commission on Development of Rural Entrepreneurship and Inclusive Growth

Mhaske Atul Abasaheb[1] & Dr. Parag Pramod Kadam[2]
[1]*Research Schola,. R B N B Borawake, Shrirampur*
[2]*Professor Ahmednagar College, Ahmednagar*
Corresponding Author –Mhaske Atul Abasaheb
DOI - 10.5281/zenodo.17905771

Introduction:

The Finance Commission of India[1] determines fiscal transfers between the Union, States, and local governments. With a growing emphasis on strengthening Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), these transfers are expected to improve rural infrastructure and support local economic activities, including entrepreneurship. This paper investigates the impact of Finance Commission transfers on rural entrepreneurship, focusing on how fiscal devolution shapes opportunities for small business creation, self-employment, and innovation in rural India. The study employs secondary data from Finance Commission reports, rural entrepreneurship surveys, and government statistics, supplemented with case studies from selected states. A qualitative and analytical approach is used to assess the link between fiscal transfers and entrepreneurial outcomes.

Results indicate that Finance Commission transfers enhance rural infrastructure, expand financial inclusion, and build local capacity, which together foster entrepreneurship. However, the outcomes are uneven, with governance quality, institutional capacity, and regional disparities influencing effectiveness. The paper concludes that Finance Commission transfers, when integrated with complementary measures such as skill development and credit access, can significantly strengthen rural entrepreneurship and contribute to inclusive and sustainable rural development.

Keywords: **Finance Commission, Fiscal Federalism, Rural Entrepreneurship, Panchayati Raj Institutions, Inclusive Growth**

[1] The Finance Commission is a constitutional body in India, established under Article 280 of the Constitution, that reviews the distribution of financial resources between the central government and state governments.

Objectives:

1. To analyze the role of Finance Commission transfers in supporting rural entrepreneurship.
2. To study the regional variations in outcomes.
3. To suggest policy measures for strengthening rural entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Review of Literature:

Oates (1972) highlighted that fiscal decentralisation can improve efficiency if local governments are empowered. In his *fiscal federalism* that focused on theoretical basis of fiscal decentralisation had given a significance of decentralisation their finding included local government can allocate resources more efficiently as they are closer to citizens needs but they didn't study the entrepreneurship outcomes directly. Oates framework useful for linking finance Commission transfer with local development but not specifically related to rural entrepreneurship.

Schumpeter (1934) in their *Theory of economic development* highlighted the role of entrepreneurs in economic growth and development they discussed the role of entrepreneurs with their function such as entrepreneurship and innovation drive economic transformation. They emphasized role of entrepreneur as an active driver in innovation but they did not address fiscal transfers. What are the sources of Finance for innovation as well as entrepreneurship.

Bagchi (2007) in *Finance Commission and fiscal transfers* examined historical evolution of finance commissions. Their key findings was growing importance of transfers to States and local bodies. They thoroughly discussed the evolution of finance commissions their importance towards local bodies.

Rao and Singh (2010) in their *Political economy of federalism in India* discussed federal fiscal relations in India. They highlighted how finance commissions balance equity and efficiency but they did not connected transfers with entrepreneur outcomes at grassroots levels.

World Bank (2018) in their *Decentralisation and local development* discussed global evidence on fiscal devolution. In that they find out that fiscal transfers improve infrastructure and service delivery in developing countries. They focused on services such as health education but not directly on entrepreneurship.

NABARD (2021) examined the current state of rural businesses and credit support. Their findings was regarding access to finance and infrastructure remain critical for rural enterprise growth but they didn't explicit link with finance Commission transfers and suggested lot of complementary role for rural entrepreneurship.

14th finance Commission report (2015) had recommended enhanced transfers to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRI's) the motive behind was to increase allocations to strengthen local governance that also impacted on evolution on entrepreneurship but limited scale.

15th finance Commission report (2021) continued focus on local bodies with performance grants added. They emphasized capacity building and service delivery but they have not given entrepreneurship as a priority such type of potential policy gap found in 15th finance Commission.

While several literature discusses finance commissions impact on decentralisation and service delivery but the entrepreneurial dimension has been neglected by different studies.

Research Methodology:

This paper uses mixed method including secondary data and several case studies to analyze the objectives. Secondary data sources including finance Commission reports especially 14th and 15th finance Commission report, RBI, NABARD reports NSSO data on rural enterprises and MSME ministry statistics. Several EPW case studies used.

Variables used in the study:

Independent variable: finance Commission transfer as a percentage of GDP, per capita allocation and share to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs).

Dependent variable: Growth in rural enterprises, SHG formation, MSME registrations.

Controls : Governance quality, literacy, credit access.

Approach is to analyze trends of transfers and rural entrepreneurship indicators and Comparative case studies including Kerala (strong PRI), Gujarat(industrial clusters), Bihar (weak governance).

Analysis and Findings:

1. Overview:

This section analyses the impact of Finance Commission transfers on the promotion and sustainability of rural entrepreneurship in India. The analysis combines secondary data, trends across successive Finance Commissions, and comparative case evidence from selected states—Kerala, Gujarat, and Bihar—to understand the relationship between fiscal devolution and entrepreneurial outcomes.

2. Trends in Finance Commission Transfers to Local Governments:

(a) Growth in Transfers:

The Finance Commission has progressively expanded the fiscal space of local governments.

Finance Commission	Period	Total Grants to Local Governments (₹ lakh crore)	Share of Total Transfers (%)	Focus Area
10th	1995–2000	0.10	1.0	Basic civic services
11th	2000–2005	0.20	1.2	Maintenance of core services
12th	2005–2010	0.25	1.6	Infrastructure & capacity building
13th	2010–2015	0.63	2.5	Empowering PRIs & rural infrastructure
14th	2015–2020	2.87	3.6	Empowering local bodies, autonomy
15th	2021–2026	4.36	4.2	Performance-based, tied grants for growth

Source: Finance Commission Reports (10th–15th)

The data reveals a **tenfold increase** in grants to local governments between the 10th and 15th Finance Commissions. A growing share of transfers is being directed to Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), reflecting a shift toward deepening fiscal decentralization.

(b) Composition of Transfers:

The 14th and 15th Finance Commissions introduced performance-based grants linked to service delivery, sanitation, and digital initiatives. These create a favorable environment for entrepreneurship by improving local infrastructure, enhancing transparency, and incentivizing efficient governance.

3. Correlation between Fiscal Transfers and Rural Entrepreneurship Indicators:

To explore the relationship between fiscal transfers and rural entrepreneurship, secondary indicators such as the number of rural enterprises, MSME registrations, and SHG-linked businesses were analyzed across major states.

(a) Growth in Rural Enterprises:

Between 2015–2022, when Finance Commission transfers to PRIs increased substantially, rural MSME registrations rose from **22.5 lakh to 34.7 lakh**, an increase of over **54%** (MSME Annual Report, 2023). States that effectively utilized Finance Commission funds for local infrastructure and enterprise facilitation—such as Kerala, Maharashtra, and Gujarat—recorded higher growth rates.

(b) Financial Inclusion and SHG Growth:

According to NABARD data, the number of Self-Help Groups (SHGs) engaged in entrepreneurial activities increased significantly in the same period. The share of SHGs linked to formal credit rose from 67% in 2015 to 84% in 2022, coinciding with improved financial access facilitated through local governance structures supported by Finance Commission transfers.

(c) Infrastructure Improvement:

Finance Commission grants were critical in financing rural roads, electricity, market sheds, and digital connectivity—all of which are essential prerequisites for entrepreneurship. For example, under the 14th Finance Commission, over 60% of panchayats reported using grants for basic infrastructure, sanitation, and skill-building centers (MoPR Evaluation Report, 2019).

4. State-Level Case Studies:

Case 1: Kerala – A Model of Decentralized Success:

Kerala demonstrates the most effective utilization of Finance Commission transfers for entrepreneurship promotion. The state has a robust PRI system, transparent fund management, and integration of Finance Commission funds with local development plans.

- PRIs in Kerala used tied grants to establish **rural incubation centers**, women’s **self-help cooperative enterprises**, and **agro-processing units**.
- Finance Commission resources supported local training programs and micro-credit schemes, enhancing self-employment opportunities.
- As a result, Kerala’s rural female entrepreneurship rate is nearly **twice the national average**.

Finding: Effective local governance amplifies the impact of fiscal transfers on entrepreneurship.

Case 2: Gujarat – Leveraging Fiscal Space for Enterprise Clusters:

Gujarat's local bodies utilized Finance Commission funds in synergy with state programs like *Gujarat Industrial Policy* and *Vibrant Village Initiatives*.

- Funds supported rural infrastructure (roads, electricity, internet) that reduced transaction costs for rural enterprises.
- Cooperative movements (especially in the dairy sector) benefited indirectly from improved facilities funded through Finance Commission grants.
- Linkages with industrial training institutes and MSME clusters strengthened entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Finding: Fiscal transfers have a catalytic effect when complemented by proactive state-level industrial and credit policies.

Case 3: Bihar – Constraints in Governance and Implementation:

In contrast, Bihar's utilization of Finance Commission transfers remains suboptimal due to limited administrative capacity, delays in fund release, and weak institutional linkages.

- Evaluation by the 15th Finance Commission (2021) noted underutilization of over **25%** of allocated grants.
- Many panchayats lacked project planning capacity, leading to funds being used for non-productive purposes.
- Consequently, Bihar's rural entrepreneurship indicators (MSME registration, SHG-linked enterprises) remain below the national average.

Finding: Weak institutions and lack of capacity dilute the potential impact of Finance Commission transfers on entrepreneurship.

5. Comparative Insights:

State	Governance Quality	Fund Utilization	Entrepreneurial Outcome	Key Lesson
Kerala	Strong	High	High rural entrepreneurship, inclusive participation	Fiscal devolution effective when linked to capacity building
Gujarat	Moderate–Strong	High	Sectoral clusters strengthened	Complementary policies amplify impact
Bihar	Weak	Low	Limited entrepreneurial activity	Institutional weaknesses hinder effectiveness

This comparative analysis confirms that **the impact of Finance Commission transfers on entrepreneurship is not automatic**; it depends on the quality of governance, local capacity, and complementary policy frameworks.

6. Econometric Observation:

While the study primarily relies on secondary analysis, a simple cross-sectional regression (using NSSO and Finance Commission data, 2015–2020) suggests:

$Y=\alpha+\beta 1X1+\beta 2X2+\beta 3X3+\epsilon$

Where:

- Y = Growth in rural enterprises

- X1 = Per capita Finance Commission transfer
- X2 = Literacy rate (proxy for human capital)
- X3 = Credit availability (per capita rural credit)

Preliminary results indicate **positive and significant correlation** between Finance Commission transfers (X1) and rural enterprise growth (Y), with stronger effects in states having higher X2 and X3.

This supports the hypothesis that fiscal devolution enhances entrepreneurship **indirectly through improved infrastructure and financial inclusion**.

7. Thematic Findings:

(a) Infrastructure as a Foundation:

Finance Commission funds have primarily been used for creating local infrastructure — roads, power supply, water, and digital connectivity — which indirectly supports enterprise operations and market access. This aligns with the **enabling environment hypothesis**, where infrastructure is a precondition for business development.

(b) Financial Inclusion and Credit Linkages:

By empowering local governments and SHGs, Finance Commission transfers have indirectly expanded financial inclusion. Improved credit linkages through banks and cooperatives have reduced rural dependency on informal sources of finance.

(c) Institutional Capacity and Governance:

Strong local institutions are essential to translate fiscal transfers into productive economic outcomes. States with transparent accounting systems and participatory planning have achieved better entrepreneurship results.

(d) Regional Disparities:

Despite overall improvement, disparities persist. Southern and western states show greater entrepreneurial dynamism, while northern and eastern states lag due to lower administrative capacity and weaker local governance.

(e) Gender Dimension:

In states like Kerala and Tamil Nadu, a significant portion of Finance Commission grants channeled through women's SHGs has boosted female-led entrepreneurship. This demonstrates the potential for **inclusive growth through targeted fiscal transfers**.

8. Synthesis of Findings:

The analysis reveals that Finance Commission transfers are an **enabling mechanism** rather than a direct driver of entrepreneurship. They create fiscal and infrastructural conditions necessary for enterprise formation, but the magnitude of impact depends on:

- **How funds are utilized** (productive vs. consumption expenditure),
- **Who manages them** (local governance efficiency), and
- **Whether supportive policies exist** (credit, skill, market access).

Thus, the Finance Commission acts as a **fiscal catalyst**—its transfers nurture the soil in which rural entrepreneurship can grow, but the actual blossoming requires the nutrients of good governance, institutional support, and human capital development.

Conclusion and Policy Suggestions:

1. Conclusion:

The study concludes that Finance Commission transfers play a catalytic role in promoting rural entrepreneurship by strengthening the fiscal base of local governments. Through improved infrastructure, access to finance, and decentralized planning, these transfers create a supportive environment for small enterprises and self-employment. However, the impact remains uneven across states, depending on institutional capacity, governance quality, and local development priorities.

Finance Commissions have progressively enhanced the share of grants to Panchayati Raj Institutions, but the absence of targeted entrepreneurship components limits their transformative potential. The findings suggest that fiscal decentralisation alone cannot guarantee rural enterprise growth unless complemented by effective implementation and local capacity building.

2. Policy Suggestions:

1. Performance-linked Grants: Introduce entrepreneurship-focused performance grants to incentivize PRIs that promote local enterprises, innovation hubs, or start-up clusters.
2. Credit and Market Linkages: Integrate Finance Commission funds with credit schemes (PMEGP, MUDRA) and rural value-chain networks to sustain enterprises.
3. Inclusive Focus: Prioritize women and youth entrepreneurs through targeted support using Finance Commission grants.

Bibliography:

1. Bagchi, A. (2007). **Role of the Finance Commission in Fiscal Federalism.** Economic and Political Weekly, 42(10), 889–897.
2. Bardhan, P., & Mookherjee, D. (2006). **Decentralization and Local Governance in Developing Countries: A Comparative Perspective.** MIT Press.
3. Finance Commission of India. (2010). **Thirteenth Finance Commission Report (2010–2015).** Government of India.
4. Finance Commission of India. (2015). **Fourteenth Finance Commission Report (2015–2020).** Government of India.
5. Finance Commission of India. (2021). **Fifteenth Finance Commission Report (2021–2026).** Government of India.
6. Ministry of Panchayati Raj. (2019). **Report on Devolution Index and Local Governance Performance in India.** Government of India.
7. National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD). (2021). **Status of Microfinance and Rural Entrepreneurship in India.** NABARD Publications.
8. NITI Aayog. (2020). **Promoting Rural Entrepreneurship in India: Policy Interventions and Pathways.** NITI Aayog Discussion Paper.
9. Oates, W. E. (1972). **Fiscal Federalism.** Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
10. Rao, M. G., & Singh, N. (2010). **Political Economy of Federalism in India.** Oxford University Press.
11. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). **The Theory of Economic Development.** Harvard University Press.
12. Singh, R., & Sharma, V. (2020). Fiscal devolution and local development: An assessment of the 14th Finance

Commission transfers. **Economic Affairs, 65**(4), 511–520.

13. World Bank. (2018). **Fiscal Decentralization and Local Development: Evidence from Developing Countries.** World Bank Publications.
14. Economic and Political Weekly. (2016–2020). Special issues on local governance, decentralization, and Finance Commission transfers.
15. Reserve Bank of India (RBI). (2020). **Handbook of Statistics on Indian Economy.** RBI Publications.