

Multidimensional poverty in Uttar Pradesh: trends and patterns

Irfana Unjum, P. K. Mishra

Department of Economic Studies, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda-151001, India
malikin16@gmail.com, pkmishra1974@gmail.com

Abstract

Objectives: it is a review of the previous studies concerning the multidimensional poverty in Uttar Pradesh, and analyses the incidence and intensity of poverty in the state.

Methods/Statistical analysis: This paper relies upon the secondary data collected from various published sources so as to examine the trend and patterns of the multidimensional poverty in the state. It basically focuses on two specific measures of multidimensional poverty – incidence and intensity. Incidence of poverty is the percentage of people in the state who are MPI poor whereas intensity of poverty is the proportion of indicators in which they are deprived.

Findings: It has been found from the review of extant literature that Uttar Pradesh ranks almost the lowest among the major States of India in terms of human development. The per capita income of the state continues to be lower in comparison to less developing states like Odisha, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. Such a slow growth performance of the economy of Uttar Pradesh has been reflected in high rate of illiteracy, high rate of infant mortality, gender disparity and growing burdens of unemployment among others. All these infer the presence of multidimensional poverty in the State which is dragging backward the real growth and development of the state. The problem of multidimensional poverty in the state is similar to that of India. The significant factors contributing to it are income, problematic occupational pattern, unhealthy fuel used for cooking purposes, unhealthy sanitation facilities, lack of proper nutritional intakes, and low level of education.

Application/Improvements: This finding is significant for the policy makers focusing on the socio-economic indicators which must be accorded priority for improving human well-being in the long-run.

Keywords: Poverty, incidence, intensity, MPI, Uttar Pradesh.

1. Introduction

Poverty is characterized as a state of 'Protuberant denial in well-being' [1]. One of the first notions of poverty occurs in wealth of Nations of Adam Smith (1776), where he links the concept of economic poverty to the want of necessities [2]. In nineteenth century, poverty was considered essential as a motivation for work efforts by labourers [3]. The sub-culture concept of poverty suggests that poorest section of a society tend to form a special sub-group with distinctive traits [4] and therefore, need special attention of policy makers. In the literature, the term poverty is interpreted as a concept when there are insufficient resources available to a person to meet his/her minimum needs including social participation [5].

It is an income or resource driven concept. In other words, poverty refers to be hungry, lack shelter and clothing, not be cared for illness, be illiterate, social exclusion, etc [6]. They are actually vulnerable to adverse conditions from which they are unable to evacuate themselves [7]. The powerful establishments of the society treat these vulnerable people negligently and are socially excluded [1]. The vulnerable population appears to have grown susceptible [8]. In order to understand the perils posed by the poverty, the familiarity of the dimensions of poverty, and the process through which it excavates is necessary [9]. The fusing characteristic of poverty is lack of resources through which decent standard of living can be achieved [10]. The poor lack ownership of productive assets, high income levels, good health, clean water, voice etc [1].

Therefore, poverty is presently seen as multidimensional as all the dimensions in which people of either gender are deprived are included [11]. The most topical perception is that poverty is multidimensional in nature, as put forward by Oxford poverty and human development initiative (OPHI) in 2010 which has suppressed the traditional notion of poverty in terms of income or consumption/expenditure deprivations [12]. A

multidimensional measure can incorporate a wide range of indicators to capture the complexity of poverty and better inform policies to exterminate it [13]. It measures both the incidence and the intensity of poverty [14]. The core of MPI is to capture the poverty nature and its intensity at the individual level, and the deprived people in multiple dimensions are considered as poor, and the extent of deprivation is considered as the measure of the extent of poverty [15].

The nature and extent of multidimensional poverty has been examined by various researchers across time and space with different indicators and dimensions [14-27]. In 2016, a total of 1.6 billion people are living in multidimensional poverty which is roughly 30 percent of all people living in 102 countries [28]. In India one third of world's poor are residing. As per the report of OPHI, 53.80 percent people are multidimensional poor in 2016, and out of total 1.6 billion people globally, 440 million poor people are living in poorest eight major Indian states. These states are Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Odhisa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal [29]. These eight states have similar numbers of poor as in 25 African countries [30]. Uttar Pradesh, being among eight poorest Indian states draws the attention of researchers, economists, and policy makers.

It is the most populous state in India and is the home of 19.98crores of population as per census survey 2011 which was 16.62 crores as per 2001 census survey. According to the World Bank, poverty in Uttar Pradesh was slightly above the national average (29 percent) in 2012. The poverty line as per planning commission report 2011-12 for Uttar Pradesh was 783 for rural and Rs.981 for urban areas. The number of people living below the poverty line in Uttar Pradesh was 598.2 lakh (29.4 percent) as per the estimates [31]. As per a survey conducted by economic and statistic division 2014, the per capita net state domestic Product for UP on both current prices and constant prices have increased. However, the pattern of growth during 2004-05 to 2009-10 was not satisfactory and pro-poor.

The head count poverty rate for UP fell from 40.9 percent in 2004-05 to 37.7 percent in 2009-10. But, in absolute terms number of poor in UP has not declined for the same period. According to census 2011, 21.69 lakh people in Uttar Pradesh were employed out of which 5.42 lakh were working in the private sector and 16.27 lakh were working in the public sector respectively. Out of 3, 29, 24, 266 total households, 23.3 lakh households are having muddy floor which means they are deprived in respect of good housing conditions, 27.3 lakh people are having safe drinking water sources, 35.6 lakh have toilet facility within their premises, 29.0 lakh are having bathroom facility, 12.9 lakh have closed drainage, and 40.7 lakh households are having kitchen facilities. Thus, it can be claimed that the problem of poverty in Uttar Pradesh is a multidimensional one. Therefore, this paper examines the trend and progress of multidimensional poverty in Uttar Pradesh. It is with this backdrop, the rest of the paper is summarized as follows: Section 2 elaborates the materials and methods; Section 3 discusses the results; and Section 4 makes a concluding remark.

2. Data and methodology

The primary objective of this paper is to examine the trend and pattern of multidimensional poverty in the Uttar Pradesh state of India. For this purpose, the paper uses secondary data collected from various publications by OPHI, UNDP, and previous research studies. The important dimensions of multidimensional poverty including health, education, income, work and employment have been taken into consideration. Finally, the multidimensional poverty index (MPI) has been examined.

3. Results and discussion

At the outset, the relative position of Uttar Pradesh among other states of India in terms of MPI has been determined in light of the data presented in a very recent study by Kumar and others [32]. Table 1 presents the most recent picture of multidimensional poverty in the 29 States of India for the year 2011.

Table 1. State-wise status of MPI in India in 2011

Sl. No.	States of India	MPI poor	MPI poor in percentage
1	Andhra Pradesh	0.209	44.5
2	Arunachal Pradesh	0.274	53.0
3	Assam	0.316	60.1
4	Bihar	0.479	79.3
5	Chhattisgarh	0.367	69.7
6	Delhi	0.054	12.4
7	Goa	0.085	19.4
8	Gujarat	0.201	41.0
9	Haryana	0.186	39.3
10	Himachal Pradesh	0.125	29.9
11	Jammu and Kashmir	0.194	41.0
12	Jharkhand	0.441	74.8
13	Karnataka	0.206	43.2
14	Kerala	0.051	12.7
15	Madhya Pradesh	0.374	68.1
16	Maharashtra	0.184	37.9
17	Manipur	0.191	40.8
18	Meghalaya	0.307	56.6
19	Mizoram	0.094	21.0
20	Nagaland	0.264	51.7
21	Orissa	0.339	63.2
22	Punjab	0.112	24.6
23	Rajasthan	0.33	62.8
24	Sikkim	0.150	31.8
25	Tamil Nadu	0.130	30.5
26	Tripura	0.269	54.6
27	Uttar Pradesh	0.369	68.1
28	Uttaranchal	0.185	39.5
29	West Bengal	0.304	57.4

Source: Kumar et al. (2015)

It is observed that out of these states, eight States, namely, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh are having more than 60 percent of MPI poor people. It also revealed that the percentage of MPI poor people is highest in Bihar (79.30 percent) followed by Jharkhand (74.80 percent), Chhattisgarh (69.70 percent), Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh (68.10 percent each), Odisha (63.20 percent), Rajasthan (62.80 percent), and Assam (60.1 percent). This clearly indicates that the gravity of the problem of multidimensional poverty in India.

After knowing the relative status of multidimensional poverty in Uttar Pradesh, we resorted to the decomposition of such MPI by dimensions and indicators in the State and its various regions. The data were taken from a very recent research study [14]. This decomposition was made with reference to the Indian Human Development Survey (IHDS) 2004-05 conducted by the University of Maryland and the National Council of Applied Economic Research (NACER), New Delhi. It is advantageous use the IHDS data in the analysis of multidimensional poverty because of its coverage of several important indicators of socio-economic development including "Income, consumption expenditure, employment, education, fertility, reproductive health, child health, morbidities, gender relations, social capital and cognitive development of children" [33].

It is revealed from the Table 2 that the value of MPI for Uttar Pradesh (UP) is 0.256 which is greater than that the MPI of all India (0.207). When we examine the decomposed MPI for UP, it is clear that highest number of MPI poor people lives in Eastern region (MPI being 0.287) followed by Central region (0.251), Southern Upper (0.244), Northern Upper (0.208) and Southern region (0.178) respectively.

Table 2. Indicator-wise multidimensional deprivation in Uttar Pradesh

Regions of UP	Health		Education		Income	Work & Employment		Household Environment			MPI
	Any death (<60yrs)	Under weight	Enrolment	Yrs of schooling	Cons. expends	Empt.	Occupation	Source of drinking water	Sanitation facility	Cooking fuel	
UP	1.9	8.1	2.8	6.9	32.0	0.7	18.5	1.1	13.8	14.1	0.256
Central UP	2.5	8.6	1.8	4.7	34.7	1.0	17.9	1.2	13.8	13.9	0.251
Eastern UP	2.0	8.7	2.4	6.7	31.7	0.8	18.5	1.3	13.9	14.1	0.287
Northern Upper Ganga Plain	1.0	5.6	5.0	10.3	30.9	0.6	19.2	0.0	13.2	14.2	0.208
Southern UP	1.5	8.5	5.0	7.9	24.1	0.7	19.9	3.1	14.6	14.7	0.178
Southern Upper Ganga Plain	1.8	7.5	3.2	7.2	32.9	0.3	18.1	1.1	13.8	13.9	0.244
All India	1.4	8.2	2.6	7.7	31.9	0.7	17.8	2.8	13.4	13.6	0.207

Source: Dehury & Mohanty (2015); Indicator values in percentages.

Then we examined indicator-wise each dimension of the multidimensional poverty in UP, and it is compared with all India. It is observed that the highest level of deprivation is in terms of consumption expenditure which is 32% for UP as well as all India.

The next important deprivation indicator is occupation which is 18.5% for UP and 17.8% at the all India level. The third and the fourth significant deprivation indicators are fuel for cooking and sanitation facility available respectively. For UP these deprivation percentages are 14.1 and 13.8 respectively whereas for all India these are 13.6 and 13.4 respectively. The fifth and sixth important deprivation indicators are lack of nutrition and years of schooling (no adult member has completed 5 years of schooling) respectively. For UP these deprivation percentages are 8.1 and 6.9 respectively whereas for all India these are 8.2 and 7.7 respectively. And, it is also clear from Table 2 that all the regions of UP are equivalently deprives in terms of these six important indicators.

Therefore, the factors responsible for poverty and backwardness of Uttar Pradesh are income/consumption, occupational pattern, fuel used for cooking purposes, sanitation facilities available, health hazards due to lack of nutrition, and low level of education due to less than five years of schooling life. This finding corroborates to earlier findings with respect to Jammu and Kashmir State of India. India as a whole also subjects to poverty and backwardness with respect these factors. There are other factors too, but these six factors are the most deprived indicators of human-well being. Such deprivations in most important dimensions keep the State economy of UP at a low level saddled with several problems of socio-economic underdevelopment.

Table 3. Multidimensional poverty scenario of Uttar Pradesh

Source of data	MPI	Headcount poverty (%)	Intensity of poverty (%)
Alkire & Seth (2013) for 1999	0.348	64.9	53.6
Alkire & Seth (2013) for 2006	0.314	59.5	52.8
Alkire & Santos (2010b) for 2010	0.386	69.9	55.2
Alkire <i>et al.</i> (2011) for 2011	0.369	68.1	54.2
Madan (2012)	0.386	69.9	55.2
Dotter & Klasen (2014)	0.366	67.63	54.26
Dehury & Mohanty (2015)	0.256	55.3	46.4
OPHI (2016)	0.369	68.1	54.2

Source: Compiled from mentioned studies

At the end, we surveyed the most recent literature for examining the extent and intensity of multidimensional poverty in UP. The research outputs of Alkire & Santos [34]-[38] has been used for this purpose. The observations are summarized in Table 3. The MPI reveals a fluctuating pattern propelled by the headcount poverty as well as the intensity of poverty which by themselves depict fluctuating patterns. Such observations are due to differences in data sets used in different research studies. However, on an average we can say that the UP State of India is having serious poverty issues in multidimensional scale which needs

indicator specific interventions by planners and policy makers for accelerating the growth rate of the State economy with improved human well-being.

4. Conclusion

In this era of globalization and information technology revolution, poverty has no longer been considered as an absolute concept measured in money metrics. It has been realized that people may have handsome income, but may be lacking in health, education or in any other dimension which prevents them to benefit from the mainstream economy. In this sense, we call them multidimensional poor. In terms of money metrics, India and her States claim that the extent and the intensity of poverty have been reduced over years through well-designed interventions. The fact is that the nation has not yet been free from the problems of deprivations in many respects including health, education, sanitation, work and employment, etc. The case of Uttar Pradesh is no exception. It is clear from the discussions in section 3 that the problem of multidimensional poverty is prevailing in Uttar Pradesh which is dragging backward the real growth and development of the State. It is observed that the multidimensional poverty problem in UP is at par with that of India. And, the significant factors contributing to it are income, problematic occupational pattern, unhealthy fuel used for cooking purposes, unhealthy sanitation facilities, lack of proper nutritional intakes, and low level of education. On the basis of this finding, it may be suggested that the government should take necessary steps to intervene on the indicators with specifically designed plans and programs. Provision of better free healthcare services, improved education standards, skill development for availing better employment opportunities, etc. would go a long way in reducing the headcounts as well as the intensity of multidimensional poverty in the State so that its economy may be placed on a high growth trajectory.

5. References

1. A. K. Mehta, A. Shah. Chronic poverty in India: overview study. *Chronic Poverty Research Centre*. 2001; 1-81.
2. D. S. Johnson. Measuring consumption and consumption poverty: possibilities and issues. U.S.Bureau of Labour Statistics. 2004; 1-31.
3. P. Townsend. An international approach to the measurement and explanation of poverty: statement by European Social Scientists. University of Bristol. 1997.
4. The children of Sanchez. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Children_of_Sanchez. Date accessed: .01/01/2014.
5. A definition of poverty. <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/definition-poverty>. Date accessed: 14/09/2014.
6. R. Pal. Regional analysis of poverty in India. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*. 2016; 4(5), 225-237.
7. A. Heijmans. Vulnerability: A matter of perception. Disaster management working paper No. 4. Benfield Greig Hazard Research Centre, London. 2001; 1-17.
8. K. Iyengar, S. Viswamathan. Understanding poverty in India. Asian Development Bank, Philippines. 2011; 1-263.
9. F. Bourguignon, S. R. Chakravarty. The measurement of multidimensional poverty. *The Journal of Economic Inequality*. 2003; 1(1), 25-49.
10. D. Philip, M.I. Rayhan. Vulnerability and poverty: What are the causes and how are they related? Centre for development research, University of Bonn. 2004, 1-28.
11. M. Carbone. The European Union and international development: the politics of foreign aid, Routledge/UACES contemporary European studies, UK. 2007.
12. S. Alkire, J. Foster. Understandings and misunderstandings of multidimensional poverty measurement. *The Journal of Economic Inequality*. 2011; 9(2), 289-314.
13. T. Ghoorah. Aiming towards a transformational agenda with gendered lenses. *Sociology and Anthropology*. 2014; 2(6), 246-251.
14. B. Dehury, S. K. Mohanty. Regional estimates of multidimensional poverty in India. *Economics Journal*. 2015.

15. Multidimensional poverty index, available at: <http://www.ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/OPHI-MPI-Brief.pdf>. 2010. Date accessed: 07/2010.
16. W. Hanandita, G. Tampubolon. Multidimensional poverty in Indonesia: Trend over the last decade (2003-2013). *Social Indicator Research*. 2016; 128(2), 559-587.
17. S. Alkire, S. Seth. Multidimensional poverty reduction in India between 1999 and 2006: Where and How? *World Development*. 2015; 72, 93-108.
18. S. Alkire, B. Housseini. Multidimensional poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa: levels and trends. OPHI working paper No.81. Oxford department of international development. 2014, 1-52.
19. S. Alkire, S. Seth. Multidimensional poverty reduction in India between 1999 and 2006: Where and How? OPHI working paper No.60. Department of International Development. 2013.
20. I. Plagvo, M. Kibur, M. Bitew, T. Gebreselassie, Y. Matsuda, R. Pearson. Multidimensional child deprivation trend analysis in Ethiopia further analysis of the 2000, 2005 and 2011 demographic health surveys. USAID and UNICEF, USA, ICF International. 2013; 1-54.
21. A. Shrivani, M. Bakhshoodeh. Investing poverty in rural Iran: The multidimensional poverty approach. *Agricultural Science*. 2012; 3(5), 640-650.
22. D. Guimaraes, A. P. Ribeiro, S. Silva. Macroeconomic fundamentals of poverty and deprivation: an empirical study for developed countries, Working Paper No.460. 2012; 1-35.
23. S. K. Mohanty. Multidimensional poverty and child survival in India. *PLoS one*. 2011.
24. S. Alkire, M. E. Santos. Acute multidimensional poverty: A new index for developing countries. United Nations development programmed human development report office background paper, New York: UNDP. 2010.
25. D. Battiston, G. Cruces, L. F. Lopez-Calva, M.A. Lugo, M.E. Santos. Income and beyond: Multidimensional poverty in six Latin American countries. *Social Indicators Research*. 2013; 112(2), 291-314.
26. R.M. Vijaya, R. Lahoti, H. Swaminathan. Moving from the household to the individual: Multidimensional poverty analysis. *World Development*. 2014; 59, 70-81,
27. A. K. Mehta, A. Shah. Chronic poverty in India: Incidence, causes and policies. *World Development*. 2003.
28. OPHI. Oxford poverty and human development initiative. 2017.
29. Indian states briefs. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2016/05/26/india-states-briefs>. Date accessed: 06/05/2016.
30. More poor in India than Africa. <http://www.bbc.com/news/10609407>. Date accessed: 13/07/2010.
31. Poverty estimation in India. Government of India. Poverty estimates for 2011-12. Planning commission, Government of India. Date accessed: 05/10/2013.
32. V. Kumar, S. Kumar, Sonu. Multidimensional poverty index: A state wise study of India in SARRC countries. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development*. 2015; 3(1), 14-21.
33. B. Dehury. S. K. Mohanty. Multidimensional poverty, household environment, and short-term morbidity in India. *Genus*. 2017; 73(3), 1-23.
34. Multidimensional poverty index country briefing series. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multidimensional_Poverty_Index. Date accessed: 23/10/2017.
35. S. Alkire, J. M. Roche, M. E. Santos, S. Seth. Multidimensional poverty index - winter 2014/2015: Brief Methodological Note and Results Series. 2011; 1-13.
36. S. Madan. Human development and poverty – A perspective across Indian states. *STATISTIKA*. 2012; 49(4), 81-94.
37. C. Dotter, S. Klasen. The multidimensional poverty index: achievements, conceptual and empirical issues, occasional paper. UNDP Human Development Report Office. 2014, 1-45.
38. OPHI. <http://www.ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index/global-mpi-2016/>. Date accessed: 06/2017.

The Publication fee is defrayed by Indian Society for Education and Environment (www.iseeadyar.org)

Cite this article as:

Irfana Unjum, P. K. Mishra. Multidimensional poverty in Uttar Pradesh: trends and patterns. *Indian Journal of Economics and Development*. Vol 5 (11), November 2017.