



Has the Growth been Pro-poor on Multiple Dimensions among the Marginalised Sections in India?

Jaspreet Kaur¹

Research Scholar,
Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala

Dr. Anupama²

Prof. of Economics,
Department of Economics, Punjabi University, Patiala.

Abstract

Recent literature on poverty i.e. trickle down approach believed that growth is a precondition for the reduction as well as the removal of poverty. Empirical evidences show that generally the growth has benefited the already advantaged strata of the society and ignored the underprivileged which results in the further marginalisation of them. In this sense growth can't be termed as pro-poor for these marginalised sections of the society. The recent literature on pro-poor growth is particularly based on the income indicator only, however with the official recognition of the MDGs, it is widely accepted that poverty is a multidimensional phenomena. Major drawback of the one-dimensional approach (income/expenditure based) is that it does not ensure that with the decline in the income poverty, the poverty on all other non-income dimensions will also reduce. In this context present paper is an attempt to measure the multidimensional poverty and pro-poor growth with special reference to the marginalised sections in India. For this purpose the paper has relied on the NSSO unit level data and employed the FGT methodology for measuring uni-dimensional poverty, Alkire and Foster methodology for multidimensional poverty and finally the pro-poor growth rates are measured with the pro-poor indices. Based on this methodology results depict that although the rates of expenditure poverty as well as non-income poverty has declined with the passage of time but growth has not proved to be pro-poor for the underprivileged sections of the society and among the dimensions considered, deprivation on account of regular salary earner in family, energy source, education and lighting source dimensions, is found to be serious. Therefore, in order to curtail poverty on multiple dimensions, there is need on the government part to design policies and programmes particularly targeting the marginalised sections of the society.

Introduction: Although we have impressively achieved the goal of reducing extreme poverty of the MDGs at the global level, but the gains have not been evenly distributed (OECD, 2015). Estimates of the extreme poverty, as measured by the proportion of people living on less than USD 1.25 per day, were 21 per cent in 2010, down from 43 per cent in 1990 and 52 per cent in 1981 (World Bank, 2013). These estimates shows that world have met the MDG target 1a to halve the rate of extreme poverty, five years ahead of the 2015 deadline. If the poverty line is taken as USD 1.90 per day, then according to this, proportion of population living below poverty line was 34.8 per cent in 1990 and 10.7 per cent in 2013 (World Bank, 2017). According to these estimates it seems that we have impressively targeted the poorest of the poor particularly on the income indicator. But many people who have escaped poverty as defined by MDG 1a would still be counted as poor when using different thresholds of income poverty, or when poverty is measured according to its many other dimensions, or when using relative rather than absolute measures of poverty (OECD, 2015). Thus MDG 1a has overlooked many other non-income dimensions of poverty. This raises the debate among scholars and development practitioners to focus on the multiple dimensions of poverty in order to target the poor population in any manner. Further it is being widely accepted that economic growth is not sufficient to end poverty or to benefit all people.

Recent literature on poverty i.e. trickle down approach believed that growth is a precondition for the reduction as well as the removal of poverty. Empirical evidences show that generally the growth has benefited the already advantaged strata of the society and ignored the underprivileged which results in the further marginalisation of them. In this sense growth can't be termed as pro-poor for these marginalised sections of the society. The introduction of MDGs in 2000 led to the breakdown of trickle down ideology. The recent literature on pro-poor growth is particularly based on the income indicator only, however with the official recognition of the MDGs, it is widely accepted that poverty is a multidimensional phenomena. Major drawback of the one-dimensional approach (income/expenditure based) is that it does not ensure that with the decline in the income poverty, the poverty on all other non-income dimensions (health, education, nutritional intake, energy, housing etc.) will also reduce (Grosse et al., 2005). This implies that income based pro-poor growth does not necessarily indicate the reduction in non-income poverty too. It is well known that the linkages between income (expenditure) and well being are not straight-forward (Berenger & Bresson, 2010). Thus it becomes essential to evaluate the outcome of any growth process related to achievement on front of many dimensions of poverty.

In the past three decades India has emerged as one of the fastest growing economies of the world. At the same time it has attracted the worldwide attention from development practitioners, scholars and policy makers on the severe picture of poverty in the country at the global level. As the extent and depth of Indian poverty is severe and its contribution to world poverty is significant, thus one can ask whether or not growth is benefitting the poor, particularly the lower rungs of the society (marginalised sections). Present paper is dealing particularly with the marginalised social groups i.e. Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes in the Indian context. Paper tries to examine whether the growth has been pro-poor on multiple dimensions for the marginalised social groups of India which are the major sufferers of the deprivations. Average number of deprivations suffered by the STs and SCs are more as compared to the other social groups. In India focus of government on the pro-poorness of growth started exclusively with the Eleventh(2007-2011/12) and Twelfth(2012/13-2017/18) five year plans, which focused on the goal of inclusive growth which is the core of growth strategy. According to Eleventh five year plan (Planning Commission, 2008, pp.2)

"target is not just faster growth but also inclusive growth, that is, a growth process which yields broad based benefits and ensures equality of opportunity for all, especially the poor, SCs/STs, other backward castes(OBCs), minorities and women."

Whereas the approach paper on Twelfth five year plan focus on broad picture of inclusion as (Planning Commission, Oct. 2011, pp. 2),

"The progress towards inclusiveness is more difficult to assess, because inclusiveness is a multidimensional concept. Inclusive growth should result in lower incidence of poverty, broad-based and significant improvement in health outcomes, universal access for children to school, increased access to higher education and improved standards of education, including skill development. It should also be reflected in better opportunities for both wage employment and livelihood, and in improvement in provision of basic amenities like water, electricity, roads, sanitation and housing. Particular attention needs to be paid to the needs of the SC/ST and OBC population. Women and children, minorities and other excluded groups also need special programmes to bring them into the mainstream."

Above concepts of inclusive growth give special attention to the disadvantaged sections of the society alongwith the goal of high growth rates. Besides these efforts to include the STs and SCs in the mainstream agenda, they together accounts for major share in the poor population on many fronts till today. This implies that high growth economies with underlying social and economic inequality need to worry about whether the growth is sufficiently inclusive (Deshpande, 2013). In the present context an attempt has been made to check the pro-poorness of growth on income as well as non-income indicators for the socially discriminated groups. We have two different set of methodologies - one measuring pro-poor growth another measuring the multidimensional poverty. The multidimensional poverty indices measure the headcount ratio, poverty gap and squared poverty gap (or severity of poverty) (however, this paper is restricted only to multidimensional poverty index i.e. headcount ratio), while the pro-poor growth indices show whether the benefits of growth have been larger for the poor or not. This poses a question that can we have a synergy of two types of indices? Since we already have a range of methodologies to measure the extent, degree and severity of poverty using the income indicators (e.g. FGT indexes) and the attempts to measure the pro-poorness of growth on multiple dimensions are scanty, here an attempt would be made to compare the pro-poor growth rates on account of income indicators with that of the non-income indicators. In this perspective, this paper discusses the deprivations on account of many cardinal and ordinal measures. This analysis is based upon the Alkire and Foster (2008) methodology for multidimensional poverty and then Pro-Poor growth rates on non-income indicators have been calculated by using Grosse et al.(2005) approach which is further based upon the Ravillion and Chen (2003) index. Thus, this paper has been divided into five sections. Apart from this introductory section, section II sheds the light on data and methodology used in this paper, section III analyses the extent of uni-dimensional and multidimensional poverty among social groups, section IV measures the pro-poorness of growth indicators and finally section V concludes the paper and gives some policy suggestions.

II. Data and Methodology: Recently the definition of poverty lines based on the expenditure or calorie norm is debated strongly due to the political vested interests of the respective governments. Thus many economists are in favour of abandonment of these poverty lines. According to Krishnaji (2012), constructing a single poverty line based on a calorie or expenditure norm is merely an arbitrary setting, ignoring the different dimensions of poverty. Although

expenditure/income is predominant dimension of poverty, yet it represents only an incomplete portrait of the human lives. For instance, someone may be enjoying the good health but his/her being illiterate is an impediment in learning, communicating and interacting with others. Take a case of another person who may be literate and well-educated but being malnourished or facing other physical problems increases his/her tendency to premature death, yet another case of person who may be excluded from decision making process that may affect her life. The deprivation of none of them can be fully captured by the level of their income/expenditure alone (UNDP, 1997). Therefore, to have an entire and clear vision of poverty we have to enlarge the canvas of our study in terms of multiple dimensions instead of deprivation on income only.

In the above perspective we have tried to identify poverty/deprivations on account of eight dimensions namely: consumer expenditure, education, ownership of land, number of meals per day, dwelling unit, regular salary earner, cooking fuel, source of lighting and calorie intake per capita per diem. The poverty line or cut-off for deprivation of these dimensions has been fixed according to the MDG indicators. These dimensions along with their poverty line are discussed as:

1. **Expenditure:** The consumption expenditure has been taken on monthly per capita basis and official poverty lines (Tendulkar Methodology) given by the Planning Commission have been used as a cut-off to recognise the person as poor. The expenditure in 2011-12 has been deflated and the poverty line for year 2004-05 has been used.
2. **Education:** All the illiterate persons and those having education level below primary are termed as education poor.
3. **Ownership of land:** The persons without ownership of land are termed as land poor.
4. **Cooking Fuel:** This dimension has 10 different categories. These are discussed below along with their ranks:
 1. No cooking arrangements
 2. Firewood and Chips
 3. Dung Cake
 4. Charcoal
 5. Coke, Coal
 6. Others
 7. Kerosene
 8. Gobar Gas
 9. Electricity
 10. LPG

We set $Z=7$ and classify those as non-poor who use kerosene, gobar gas, electricity and LPG.

5. **Lighting:** There are seven different categories discussed as below:
 1. No lighting arrangements
 2. Candle
 3. Kerosene
 4. Other Oils
 5. Gas
 6. Others
 7. Electricity

Here, persons not using electricity for lighting are termed as poor.

6. **Dwelling:** There are four different categories:
-

1. No Dwelling Unit
2. Others
3. Hired
4. Owned

The persons without ownership of the dwelling unit and the unspecified categories are identified as poor.

7. **Regular Salary/Wage Income:** If no person in the family is having a regular source of income, then all the members of the household are identified as poor.
8. **Number of Meals per day:** The persons having less than two meals a day are termed as poor.

Present paper is based on the NSSO (National Sample Survey Organisation) unit level data on 'Consumer Expenditure Survey' for quinquennial rounds covering time span 2004-05 to 2011-2012, for measuring the income as well as non-income poverty.

Multidimensional poverty index (M_0) is estimated with the help of Alkire and Foster (2008) methodology. Important feature of this methodology is that it enables us to break down its value in individual dimensions in order to identify which deprivations are driving multidimensional poverty in different regions or groups. Formally, M_0 : This measure is suitable for the ordinal and binary and qualitative data and it shows the headcount and the breadth of poverty. This is the adjusted headcount index (H) which shows the weighted sum of average deprivations (A). It can be written as

$$M_0 = H * A$$

or average deprivations can be calculated by dividing the M_0 with H i.e. A

$$A = M_0 / H$$

As mentioned earlier that we have taken eight dimensions, thus, for constructing the multidimensional poverty index each dimension is weighted equally i.e. 1/8. Further a person is said to be poor in multidimensional sense if he/she is deprived in atleast three dimensions i.e. cutoff is set at $k=3$.

Pro-poor Growth: Growth is said to be pro-poor if it enables the poor to actively participate in and significantly benefit from economic activity (Kakwani & Pernia, 2000); which benefits poor proportionately more than the non-poor (Pasha & Palanivel, 2004); when the increase in GDP reduces the poverty (Ravallion, 2004) or if poor get more from growth than some predefined benchmark (Duclos, 2008). These definitions gave different views on pro-poor growth and among them we have used the most widely accepted measure of pro-poor growth i.e. Ravallion and Chen Index (2003). They measures the Rate of Pro-Poor Growth (RPPG) which is based upon the concept of "growth incidence curve" (GIC) and marks the area under the GIC up to the headcount ratio. If the RPPG exceeds the mean growth rate, growth is judged to be pro-poor in its relative sense, while pro-poor growth in weak absolute sense means that the mean growth rates are above 0 for the poor. Now we have two methodologies- one, measuring the multidimensional poverty and another, estimating the pro-poorness of the growth. But it is being realized that pro-poorness of growth may or may not be of multidimensional nature; similarly on the other hand, fall in multidimensional poverty may or may not be pro-poor. Therefore improvement of household in the income dimension need not automatically imply the improvement in non-income dimensions as well (Klasen, 2000). Hence, there is a need to have a rational synergy between the pro-poor growth indicators and multi-dimensional poverty indicators. Grosse et al. (2005) have provided

this synergy for measuring the pro-poor growth with the income as well as non-income indicators. Thus present paper for calculation of the pro-pooriness of growth in multidimensional sense relied on the Grosse et al. (2005), which is further based on the Ravallion and Chen index (2003).

III. Uni-Dimensional and Multidimensional Poverty in India: Decomposition by Social Groups

By using the FGT indices on each dimension, we have calculated the headcount ratio of the population which is deprived of a particular dimension which is shown in Table 1. We can observe from the table that incidence of poverty on most of the dimensions considered is highest among the Scheduled Tribes(STs) and Scheduled Castes(SCs) both in rural and urban areas. Although incidence of poverty have been declined over the period of time still these marginalised groups have largest share of deprived population, In rural areas, during 2011-12, in the consumer expenditure dimension, head count ratio was around 41 per cent for STs and 30 per cent for SCs while the total poverty incidence was about 24 per cent. As compare to this in urban areas STs accounts for about 23 per cent and SCs 22 per cent poor population while the total poverty incidence was about 14 per cent. Further a considerable decline can be observed for Other Backward Castes(OBCs) and 'Others' social groups both in rural as well as in urban areas. In their case the consumption poverty has declined by about 0.5 times between 2004-05 and 2011-12. In case of human capital dimension, indicator of which is education, STs and SCs accounts for the most of the illiterates. As compare to urban areas deprivation in education is more severe in rural areas. A considerable fall can be seen in the dimension of lighting source for all social groups during 2004-05 and 2011-12, a significant change came for the lower hierarchy of the society. Further, the headcount ratio is highest in case of cooking fuel and regular salary earner dimensions for STs and SCs as compare to forward social groups. From the above table we can conclude that STs and SCs are the major sufferers of the deprivations, whether it is the case of consumption expenditure or any other dimension of living standard. Moreover being in rural area also adds to their misery.

Table 1: Uni-Dimensional Poverty by Social Groups in Rural & Urban Areas during 2004-05 to 2011-12

Dimensions\Social Groups	Rural					Urban				
	STs	SCs	OBCs	Others	All	STs	SCs	OBCs	Others	All
2004-05										
Consumer Expenditure	61.9	52.71	40.95	26.16	41.75	34.99	40.02	31.43	15.84	25.73
Education	73.12	68.54	62.49	50.39	61.73	45.53	49.77	42.76	30.14	38.16
Number of Meals Per Day	1.93	1.90	1.97	1.70	1.89	1.95	1.58	1.58	1.39	1.50
Ownership of Land	10.98	22.05	11.51	6.69	12.43	47.13	52.28	38.95	41.03	42.21
Dwelling Unit	3.20	2.01	1.79	1.93	2.02	8.27	5.81	3.76	3.46	4.08
Cooking Fuel	96.96	95.30	91.25	83.49	90.70	47.98	47.70	40.16	19.88	32.81
Lighting	56.94	53.50	44.82	36.49	45.69	15.82	15.74	9.25	3.94	8.02
Regular Salary Earner	90.81	89.74	89.26	84.82	88.40	55.17	56.58	62.26	53.43	57.11
2011-12										
Consumer Expenditure	40.87	30.41	22.47	13.91	24.19	23.27	21.57	16.23	7.38	13.69
Education	62.21	60.94	55.60	45.20	55.05	40.5	43.17	38.86	27.08	34.80
Number of Meals Per Day	1.16	1.38	1.37	1.28	1.33	1.11	1.28	1.18	1.01	1.12
Ownership of Land	12.40	18.19	11.77	8.63	12.45	38.12	50.78	37.24	38.67	39.77
Dwelling Unit	2.01	1.81	0.98	1.76	1.44	5.89	4.57	2.07	2.43	2.71
Cooking Fuel	94.23	90.90	84.83	76.58	85.24	39.26	34.39	28.75	15.30	24.52
Lighting	27.07	34.34	30.94	20.25	28.76	5.65	6.16	4.56	1.79	3.71
Regular Salary Earner	90.03	89.63	89.30	84.94	88.44	49.98	53.43	61.15	51.04	55.56

Source: Authors' calculations from unit level data from 61st and 68th rounds of CES, NSSO

Table 2 shows the profile of multidimensional poverty across social groups. We can observe from the table that in the rural areas as well as urban areas, the relative contribution of the STs and SCs in the adjusted head count ratio (M_0) i.e. multidimensional poverty index is much higher as compared to their share in total population. In rural areas, their combined share in 2004-05 in total population was about 31 per cent while their share in multidimensional poverty index was about 37 per cent. Similarly in urban areas their combined share in total population was about 18 per cent while their relative contribution to M_0 was about 29 per cent. On the other hand the relative contribution of 'others' in M_0 as well as H is much lower as compared to their share in total population. The average number of deprivation (A) is also high for STs and SCs. In 2011-12, in rural areas STs share in population was about 11 per cent while their relative contribution in the index was 13.3 per cent whereas SCs relatively contributes 25 per cent in poverty index as against their share of 21 per cent in total population. Further this table shows that it is only the 'others' category, which has shown improvement on all fronts. Thus, the growth seems to be favouring particular section of the society. In rural areas, Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI or M_0) with cutoff of three dimensions ($k=3$), is found to be 0.47 for STs and 0.452 for SCs as compared to 0.383 for all rural population in 2004-05 while in urban areas it was 0.254 for STs and 0.270 for SCs as compared to 0.170 for the urban population. Although its value has declined during 2011-12 still index value was high for STs and SCs both in rural and urban areas. Thus, one can say that in rural as well as urban areas, the condition of the poorest of the poor has actually worsened even though the average number of deprivations has declined in both the areas. This indicates that the growth of income during 2004-05 and 2011-12 would not have favoured the

marginalised social groups, particularly in case of multidimensional poverty. This gives us inducement to verify if the growth has really been pro-poor on all dimensions?

Table 2: Profile of Poverty by Social Groups; k=3

Social Group	Rural						Urban					
	%age Contribution to Population	H	Relative Contribution	M ₀ (HA)	Relative Contribution	A	%age Contribution to Population	H	Relative Contribution	M ₀ (HA)	Relative Contribution	A
2004-05												
Scheduled Tribes	10.5	0.880	12.2	0.470	12.9	0.534	2.8	0.484	3.9	0.254	4.2	0.525
Scheduled Castes	20.9	0.855	23.6	0.452	24.7	0.529	15.5	0.534	23.5	0.270	24.7	0.506
Other Backward Classes	42.9	0.768	43.4	0.384	43.0	0.500	35.4	0.437	43.8	0.211	43.9	0.483
Others	25.6	0.616	20.8	0.291	19.4	0.472	46.3	0.220	28.8	0.100	27.2	0.455
All	100.0	0.759	100.0	0.383	100.0	0.505	100.0	0.353	100.0	0.170	100.0	0.482
2011-12												
Scheduled Tribes	11.1	0.759	13.1	0.361	13.3	0.476	3.5	0.345	4.6	0.166	4.9	0.481
Scheduled Castes	20.8	0.741	23.9	0.355	24.6	0.479	14.2	0.379	20.6	0.178	21.4	0.469
Other Backward Classes	45.2	0.645	45.3	0.301	45.3	0.467	41.7	0.320	51.2	0.145	51.2	0.453
Others	23.0	0.496	17.7	0.220	16.8	0.444	40.6	0.151	23.6	0.065	22.5	0.430
All	100.0	0.644	100.0	0.300	100.0	0.467	100.0	0.260	100.0	0.118	100.0	0.452

Source: Authors' calculations from unit level data from 61st and 68th rounds of CES, NSSO

IV. Whether Growth had been Pro-poor Growth on Multiple Dimensions or not? : By using the Ravallion and Chen Index (2003) we have estimated the pro-poor growth rates on multiple dimensions, in order to check whether the growth had been pro-poor or not on multiple dimensions of poverty for marginalised social groups. For this purpose we have compared the average growth rates (g) with the pro-poor growth rates (PPGR). The Table 3 shows that the dimension of expenditure had not been pro-poor for any social group in both the rural and urban areas. Same is the case with education (without any exception), even though the average rate of growth of this particular dimension is the highest among all the dimensions for all the social groups. As far as number of meals dimension is concerned, the growth had not been pro-poor for STs in both rural and urban areas and for OBCs in rural areas.

Table 3: Degree of Poverty and Pro-Poor Growth Indices by Social Groups



Dimensions	Rural			Urban		
	Average Growth Rate (g)	PPGR	PPGR-g	Average Growth Rate (g)	PPGR	PPGR-g
Schedule Tribes						
Consumer Expenditure	0.249	0.181	-0.068	0.243	0.214	-0.029
Education	0.754	0.431	-0.323	0.572	0.377	-0.195
Number of Meals Per Day	0.022	-0.262	-0.284	0.004	-0.288	-0.292
Ownership of Land	-0.733	-0.000	0.733	0.156	0.000	-0.156
Dwelling Unit	0.006	0.136	0.130	0.014	0.092	0.077
Cooking Fuel	0.079	0.028	-0.051	0.125	0.207	0.083
Lighting	0.252	0.441	0.189	0.065	0.565	0.500
Regular Salary Earner	0.007	0.006	-0.001	0.036	0.065	0.029
Schedule Castes						
Consumer Expenditure	0.285	0.158	-0.127	0.339	0.187	-0.151
Education	0.646	0.376	-0.270	0.601	0.382	-0.219
Number of Meals Per Day	0.022	0.611	0.589	0.012	0.133	0.121
Ownership of Land	-0.129	0.000	0.129	0.077	0.000	-0.077
Dwelling Unit	0.001	-0.003	-0.004	-0.003	0.074	0.077
Cooking Fuel	0.156	0.081	-0.075	0.189	0.297	0.107
Lighting	0.157	0.303	0.146	0.058	0.487	0.428
Regular Salary Earner	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.022	0.038	0.017
Other Backward Castes						
Consumer Expenditure	0.252	0.142	-0.111	0.334	0.167	-0.167
Education	0.633	0.375	-0.258	0.533	0.345	-0.187
Number of Meals Per Day	0.010	-0.353	-0.363	0.004	0.333	0.330
Ownership of Land	-0.186	0.000	0.186	0.206	0.000	-0.206
Dwelling Unit	0.004	0.183	0.179	0.006	0.185	0.179
Cooking Fuel	0.204	0.109	-0.095	0.152	0.330	-0.095
Lighting	0.105	0.257	0.152	0.028	0.432	0.152
Regular Salary Earner	-0.000	0.000	0.000	0.007	0.012	0.000
Others						
Consumer Expenditure	0.222	0.141	-0.081	0.322	0.159	-0.081
Education	0.563	0.359	-0.203	0.443	0.351	-0.203
Number of Meals Per Day	0.028	0.167	0.138	0.007	0.046	0.138
Ownership of Land	-0.238	-0.000	0.238	-0.210	0.000	0.238
Dwelling Unit	0.002	0.049	0.047	0.003	0.118	0.047
Cooking Fuel	0.198	0.155	-0.043	0.055	0.258	-0.043
Lighting	0.116	0.376	0.259	0.012	0.439	0.259
Regular Salary Earner	-0.001	-0.001	0.000	0.016	0.031	0.000

Source: Authors' calculations from unit level data from 61st and 68th rounds of CES, NSSO
 Considering the type of dwelling unit, it has been observed that the growth had favoured all the social groups both in rural and urban areas except for SCs in rural areas. In most of the cases, the growth of mean value had been positive while that of the PPGR been negative particularly in case of marginalised social groups. Thus one can say that growth has been pro-poor neither in absolute nor in relative sense for them. Interestingly, we can see pro-poor growth in case of lighting

facilities for all social groups in rural and urban areas. On the other hand, the dimension of cooking fuel had shown relative pro-poor growth only in case of STs and SCs in urban areas while for rest of the social groups in rural and urban areas and STs and SCs in rural areas it has been pro-poor in weak absolute sense. This is due to the fact that in rural areas, the coverage of LPG is very low and people largely rely on firewood chips, coal or other locally and cheaply available fuel. Finally the dimension of regular salary gives a very different results, its average growth rate is very low and closer to zero in many cases both in rural and urban areas, while PPGR is zero thus growth has proved to be not pro-poor in this dimension. The negligible growth in regular salary earner dimension can be supported by the fact that with the globalisation the informalisation of workforce has increased and around 92 per cent of workforce is engaged in informal sector (IHD, 2014).

Table 4: Marginal Contribution of Various Dimensions in Extent of Poverty

Dimensions	Rural		Urban	
	STs	SCs	STs	SCs
2004-05				
Consumer Expenditure	16.4	14.5	17.1	18.3
Education	19.0	18.3	17.9	18.4
Number of Meals Per Day	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.7
Ownership of Land	2.9	5.9	14.5	14.6
Dwelling Unit	0.2	0.1	1.1	0.3
Cooking Fuel	23.3	23.4	21.0	19.8
Lighting	15.2	14.7	8.0	7.5
Regular Salary Earner	22.6	22.6	19.7	20.5
2011-12				
Consumer Expenditure	14.0	10.7	16.9	14.6
Education	20.4	20.1	20.3	20.0
Number of Meals Per Day	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7
Ownership of Land	4.1	5.9	12.8	17.1
Dwelling Unit	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.3
Cooking Fuel	26.2	25.7	22.3	20.0
Lighting	9.2	11.9	4.3	4.1
Regular Salary Earner	25.7	25.3	22.3	23.2

Source: Authors' calculations from unit level data from 61st and 68th rounds of CES, NSSO

Table 5: Targeting by Social Groups and Poverty (2011-12)

Social Groups	Rural				Urban			
	Population Share	FGT Index	Impact on Group	Impact on Population	Population Share	FGT Index	Impact on Group	Impact on Population
Scheduled Tribes	11.11	40.87	-0.0011	-0.0001	3.47	23.27	-0.0006	-0.00002
Scheduled Castes	20.80	30.41	-0.0012	-0.0002	14.62	21.57	-0.0006	-0.00009
Other Backward Classes	45.04	22.47	-0.0009	-0.0004	41.61	16.23	-0.0005	-0.0002
Others	23.04	13.91	-0.0007	-0.0002	40.29	7.38	-0.0003	-0.0001
All	100.0	24.19	-0.0009	-0.0009	100.0	13.68	-0.0004	-0.0004

Source: Authors' calculations from unit level data from 61st and 68th rounds of CES, NSSO

Thus, we have observed that even though, the overall poverty rates have been declined and growth seems to be pro-poor for the population in case of income indicator, yet it had not been pro-poor for all population groups and in all dimensions. Therefore, for any policy stance there is need to target these areas. For this purpose, first of all, here an attempt has been made to see the

relative contribution of each dimension in overall multidimensional poverty by social groups. These proportions are shown in Table 4.

Table 4 shows that during 2011-12 in case of STs the dimension of expenditure has only fifth largest share while for SCs this dimension has only fourth largest share in overall incidence of multidimensional poverty with eight dimensions both in rural and urban areas. Education dimension's relative contribution is almost same in both rural and urban areas. Further the relative contribution of regular salary and education dimensions has increased between 2004-05 and 2011-12. Cooking fuel and Regular Salary Earner dimensions are major contributors to STs and SCs misery. This gives us an important policy direction. Finally, here an attempt is made to find the impact of a constant lump-sum amount on overall poverty reduction. For this purpose, we have restricted ourselves to latest round's data only i.e. 2011-12. The results of such targeting schemes have been shown in Table 5, which shows that expenditure of one currency unit (i.e. rupee for Indian case) reduces the poverty for all groups and the impact on the proportion of total population below poverty line is nearly the same in rural as well urban areas. However, in both rural and urban areas, the expenditure of one rupee reduces the poverty rate by a greater amount in case of STs and SCs as compared to all other social groups.

V. Conclusion and Policy Implications:

To sum up, it can be stated that as India is presenting vast scale poverty at the global landscape, it is necessary to measure it on both uni-dimensional as well as on multiple dimensions. The main findings of this study indicate that among the social groups, the SCs and STs are the poorest categories suffering from the multiple deprivations; moreover growth has been pro-poor neither in absolute nor in relative sense for them. Further, the incidence of poverty in rural areas is found to be more than the urban areas, we can say that being rural also adds a dimension to poverty. The value of MPI is high for STs and SCs as compared to other social groups both in rural and urban areas. Thus, one can say that in rural as well as urban areas, the condition of the poorest of the poor has actually worsened even though the average number of deprivations has declined in both the areas. This indicates that the growth of income during 2004-05 and 2011-12 would not have favoured the marginalised social groups. In this perspective one can say that although government has focused on the inclusiveness still there is a problem of social exclusion. If growth process continue with the exclusion it will not only leads to enhancement of inequalities but will also result in lower growth rate than the potential growth rate for the economy in the near future. Because the productive individuals belonging to the marginalized groups would be either excluded from the productive economy due to discrimination on account of their identities or they would be included on the adverse terms and conditions, due to which their full productive potential cannot be realized.

On the other hand to address the deprivation on other dimensions, it is suggested that the government should spend more on education, as it is most important component of human capital, which will make them more productive and enable them to fight the poverty speedily by themselves. Provision of human capital may open up better income earning opportunities. It has been observed that ST/SC households are more vulnerable sections of the society. Since we cannot change any one's social group, but we can call for affirmative actions for this. To target the marginalised and lower strata of the society, various facilities should be provided at subsidized rates, although many programmes are there for this purpose but there is problem in their implementation i.e. the problem of exclusion and wrong inclusion, moreover benefits are not evenly distributed at lower ends. Thus, there should be timely and proper check on their

implementation if we really wish to curtail the poverty on any dimension. Lastly, policymakers must continue to follow the twofold strategy of letting the economy grow fast and attacking poverty directly through poverty alleviation programmes (in which major focus should be on investment in human capital) i.e. follow the pro-poor growth strategy.

References:

- Alkire, S. & Foster, J., 2008, Counting and multidimensional poverty measurement. Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative (OPHI), Working Paper No. 7, University of Oxford.
- Berenger, V. & Bresson, F., 2010, On the "pro-poorness" of growth in multidimensional context. Paper presented for 31st General Conference of the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth (IARIW).
- Deshpande, A. (2013) Exclusion and inclusive growth. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/india/docs/human-development/exclusion-and-inclusive-growth.pdf>. Accessed 10th Jan., 2018.
- Duclos, J.V., 2008, What is "pro-poor"?, *Social Choice and Welfare*, 32(1), 37-58.
- Grosse, M.; Harttgen, K. & Klasen, S., 2005, Measuring pro-poor growth with non-income indicators, *World Development*, 36(6), 1021-1047.
- IHD (Institute for Human Development). (2014). *India Labour and Employment Report 2014: Workers in the Era of Globalisation*.
- Kakwani, N., Pernia, Ernesto M., 2000, What is pro-poor growth?, *Asian Development Review*, 18(1), 1-16.
- Klasen, S., 2000, Measuring poverty and deprivation in South Africa, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 46(1), 33-58.
- Krishnaji, N., 2012, Abolish the poverty line, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(15), 10-11.
- OECD, 2015, Keeping the multiple dimensions of poverty at the heart of development. *OECD and Post-2015 Reflections*.
- Pasha, H. A.; Palanivel, T.; Chaudhry, F. M. and Khan, D. A., 2004, Pro-poor growth and policies: The Asian experience, *The Pakistan Development Review*, 42(2), 313-348.
- Planning Commission, 2008, *Eleventh Five Year Plan 2007-12: Inclusive Growth, Volume I*. Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Planning Commission, 2011, *Faster, Sustainable and More Inclusive Growth: An approach to the Twelfth five year plan (2012-17)*. Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Ravallion, M. & Chen, S., 2003, Measuring pro-poor growth, *Economics Letters*, 78(2003), 93-99.
- Ravallion, M., 2004, Pro-poor growth: A primer policy, Research Working Paper No. 3242, World Bank: Washington D.C.
- UNDP, 1997, *Human Development Report 1997*, New York: oxford University Press.
- World Bank, 2017, World Development Indicators. World Bank Group: Washington, DC.
- , 2013, World Development Indicators. World Bank Group: Washington, DC.