सत्यमेव परमो धर्मः

CHILD RIGHTS AND YOU

Multidimensional Poverty Index

Poverty Reduction across Social Groups
India, 2005-06 to 2019-21



Introduction

The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 1 established a mandate to end poverty in all its forms everywhere by 2030.[1] Poverty is widely acknowledged as a multifaceted phenomenon that includes multiple deprivations, including but not limited to health, education, and other often overlooked dimensions. Consequently, an assessment of poverty necessitates a multidimensional approach. This multidimensional perspective on resource scarcity has gradually emerged as a critique of mainstream economic development paradigms, historically prioritizing growth in per capita Gross National Product (GNP).[2] Nevertheless, poverty analysis in many countries continues to be constrained by a unidimensional framework. These analyses rely solely on equivalent consumption as a proxy for poverty, thereby neglecting to capture the full extent of deprivations experienced by populations.

In response to these methodological limitations, scholars have proposed various refinements to poverty measurement frameworks. from the Human Poverty Index (HPI) and Human Development Index (HDI), which first introduced multidimensional perspectives in the late 1990s,[3,4] to the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) developed by Alkire and Foster.[5,6] The MPI represents a pivotal advancement, enabling direct measurement of cumulative deprivations at the household level through a dual-cutoff counting methodology for poverty classification. Unlike its predecessors, the MPI's theoretical architecture covers three dimensions operationalized through ten distinct indicators, facilitating granular analysis of both the nature and intensity of household-level deprivations. India has adopted a domestically adapted MPI developed by the NITI Aayog, adhering to the Alkire and Foster (AF) methodology employed in the global MPI. While incorporating all ten global MPI deprivation indicators, the national index expands its scope to include maternal health and bank accounts, aligning with India's development priorities.[6]

The Multidimensional Poverty Index offers valuable insights into the multifaceted nature of poverty beyond simple headcount measures. Existing research has explored multidimensional poverty patterns in India,[7,8] consistently demonstrating significant correlations between poverty indices and deprivation patterns among marginalized groups, particularly Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes,[7,9,10] Muslim communities,[8] and rural inhabitants.[11] This study presents a comprehensive analysis of multidimensional poverty dynamics across three National Family Health Survey rounds (2005-06, 2015-16, and 2019-21), with a specific focus on understanding complex poverty transformations. Employing a detailed Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition, a methodological approach that, to the best of our knowledge, has not previously been applied in the MPI context, we investigate how demographic shifts and inherent socioeconomic disadvantages impact poverty across different wealth quintiles, social groups, and states. Our analysis goes beyond net differences, critically examining whether MPI reductions stem from a decrease in the multidimensional poor population or changes in poverty intensity. By exploring persistent poverty challenges, we provide a granular understanding of how health, education, and living standard dimensions contribute to multidimensional poverty. This comprehensive approach not only highlights intersectional disparities but also aims to identify targeted intervention opportunities, ultimately aiming to develop more precise and effective strategies for poverty alleviation.

Methodology

The global multidimensional poverty index has undergone important methodological evolutions since its inception in 2010. Currently, the dual-cutoff counting methodology developed by (Alkire and Foster., 2011)[5] is being utilised in the calculation of global multidimensional poverty index. The Alkire-Foster framework for measuring multidimensional poverty is grounded in Amartya Sen's concept of capability deprivation and Atkinson's counting methods. This methodology employs a two-step approach: identification and aggregation. The dual cut-off method involves setting thresholds for both poverty and deprivation. An individual is considered poor if their deprivation score reaches or surpasses the poverty cutoff, 'k.' A universal cutoff of one-third (k=0.333) has been established. The global MPI structure constitutes of three dimensions including health, education and living standards and ten indicators with both dimensions and indicators equally weighted. A deprivation profile is established for each person pointing towards the deprived indicators. Along with it, a headcount ratio (H) indicating the proportion of multidimensionally poor people in the population and intensity of poverty (A) represented by the average percentage of weighted deprivations experienced by the poor is obtained. MPI is calculated as a multiplicative sum of H x A.[13] The H and A are defined as :

$$H = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho(g_i^0, w, k),\ A = \frac{1}{q}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\rho(g_i^0, w, k) \times c_i),$$

where $q = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\rho(g_i^0, w, k)$

Consequently, the adjusted poverty headcount ratio (MPI) is calculated as :

$$\text{MPI} = M_0 = H \times A = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\rho(g_i^0, w, k) \times c_i)\,.$$

The NITI Aayog constructed a national MPI adhering to the Alkire and Foster (AF) methodology employed in the global MPI creating an indigenized measure of assessing multidimensional poverty. While incorporating all ten global MPI indicators, the national index expands its scope to include maternal health and bank accounts, aligning with India's development priorities.[13] India's Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) approach defines individuals under five years of age and within the working-age range of 15 to 54 for men and 15 to 49 for women as relevant population segments. However, when assessing child-adolescent mortality, a narrower age group is employed, including children aged 0 to 59 months and adolescents aged 10 to 18 years. In contrast to traditional monetary poverty assessments based on consumption expenditure, the national MPI provides a granular analysis of deprivations at the district level.

The dual cut off methodology employs majorly two steps namely identification and aggregation. Identification involves building a deprivation profile by applying cutoffs within an indicator and identifying the incidence of multidimensional poverty by applying a cut-off across all indicators. The deprivation of each individual is marked as either 0 or 1 indicating not deprived (0) and deprived (1). If the achievement of an individual i in indicator j is denoted by xij, the first order cut off for indicator j is denoted by zj, and the status of the individual is denoted by g_{ij}° , then

$$g_{ij}^{\circ} = 1 \text{ if } x_{ij,<} z_j \text{ and } g_{ij}^{\circ} = 0$$

otherwise for all i = 1,2,....n and j = 1,2,....d.

The counting vector or deprivation score is the sum of the weighted status of all the indicators for an individual.

The deprivation score of the individual i can be denoted as:

$$c_i = w_1 g_{i1}^{\ 0} + w_2 g_{i2}^{\ 0} + ... + w_j g_{ij}^{\ 0}, \text{ or } c_{i = \sum_{j=1}^{d}} w_j g^0_{ij}$$

where ci is the counting vector for individual i upto the jth indicator, $g_{ij}^{\ 0}$ is the status of each indicator and wj is the weight assigned to each indicator.

The poverty cut-off also mentioned as the second order cut-off is deployed to be 0.33 (33%) is the minimum deprivation score as individuals having a deprivation score greater than or equal to the second order cut off are considered to be multidimensionally poor. A score less than second order cut off is replaced with 0.

Headcount Ratio (H), where q is the total number of multidimensionally poor people in a population n is computed as,

$$H = \frac{q}{n}$$

Similarly, the average proportion of deprivations experienced by multidimensionally poor individuals denoted by Intensity of Poverty (A) is computed as,

$$A = \frac{1}{q}\sum_{i=1}^{q} c_i(k)$$

MPI is represented as M0 = H x A,

$$Or\ H\,x\,A = \frac{q}{n} * \frac{1}{q}\sum_{i=1}^{q} c_i(k) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i(k) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\ \sum_{j=1}^{d} w_j\, g_{ij}^{\circ}(k)$$

Table 1: Dimension, Indicators, and Derivation conditions (NITI Aayog)

Dimension of Poverty	Indicator	Deprivation condition	Weight
Health (1/3)	Nutrition	Any person under 70 years of age for whom nutritional information is available is undernourished.[1]	1/6
	Child -Adolescent Mortality	A child under 18 has died in the household in the five years preceding the survey	1/12
	Maternal Health	Any woman in the household who has given birth in the 5 years preceding the survey, has not received at least 4 antenatal care visits for the most recent birth or has not received assistance from trained skilled medical personnel during the most recent childbirth	1/12
Education (1/3)	Years of Schooling	No eligible household member has completed six years of schooling	1/6
	School Attendance	Any school-aged child[3] is not attending school up to the age at which he/she would complete class [8]	1/6
Standard of Living (1/3)	Cooking Fuel	A household cooks using solid fuel, such as dung, crops, shrubs, wood, charcoal, or coal	1/21
	Sanitation	The household has unimproved or no sanitation facility or it is improved but shared with other households	1/21
	Drinking Water	The household's source of drinking water is not safe or safe drinking water is a 30-minute walk or longer walk from home, roundtrip	1/21
	Electricity	The household has no electricity	1/21
	Housing	The household has inadequate housing materials in any of the three components: floor, roof, or wall	1/21
	Assets	The household does not own more than one of these assets: radio, TV, telephone, computer, animal cart, bicycle, motorbike, or refrigerator, and does not own a car or truck	1/21
	Bank Account	No household member has a bank account or a post office account.	1/21

(where, $c_i(k)$ is the censured deprivation score up to the ith individual and q is the number of multidimensionally poor individuals. Further, g_{ij}^0 is household member status and w_j is the weight of jth indicator. Here, n is the total population and d is the number of dimensions)

Deprivation Score = 1/3 Health_i + 1/3 Education_i + 1/3 Standard of Living_i,

[1/3 Health_i = 1/6 Nutrition_i + 1/6 Child – Adolescent Mortality_i + 1/12 Maternal Health_i

1/3 Education_i = 1/6 Years of schooling_i + 1/6 School Attendance_i

1/3 Standard of Living_i = 1/21 Cooking Fuel_i + 1/21 Sanitation_i + 1/21 Drinking Water_i + 1/21 Electricity_i + 1/21 Housing_i + 1/21 Assets_i + 1/21 Bank Account_i]

Data

The National Family Health Survey (NFHS), a representative of the Indian Demographic Health Survey (DHS), is executed by the International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), Mumbai under the mandate of India's Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. The primary objectives of the NFHS constitutes the provision of data and technical assistance to inform the formulation and implementation of health and family welfare policies and programs. Moreover, the NFHS offers valuable insights into contemporary health and family welfare challenges. This study employs micro survey data from three rounds of NFHS surveys, (NFHS-3, NFHS-4 and NFHS -5) analysing socio – economic characteristics such as age, caste, religion, place of residence, wealth status, household size etc of different social groups such as Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST), Other Backward Classes (OBC) and Others.[14]

Outcomes

Primarily, our research study presents a comprehensive analysis of multidimensional poverty across diverse socioeconomic and social groups in India, examining three critical time periods (2005-06, 2015-16, and 2019-21). Through the systematic computation of Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) values, we evaluated poverty dynamics across various socio-economic groups and geographical regions. Our investigation extended beyond conventional poverty metrics to capture the temporal evolution of multidimensional deprivation patterns across different social groups. The research systematically decomposed the contributing factors to MPI variations, with particular attention to the interplay between headcount ratios and intensity of poverty. Furthermore, we conducted an in-depth examination of specific deprivation indicators and their relative contributions to overall poverty measures. By implementing decomposition techniques to analyze mean differences in MPI across groups, we identified and quantified the fundamental drivers of poverty disparities, thereby providing insights into both observed characteristics and underlying structural factors that perpetuate poverty across different social segments.

Socioeconomic Status Characteristics

The analysis incorporated multiple socioeconomic status indicators through a comprehensive set of demographic and social parameters. Age stratification comprised four distinct categories: early childhood (0-5 years), school-age (6-14 years), working-age adults (15-59 years), and elderly (60+ years), enabling examination across the complete lifespan. Marital status was classified into three categories: married, unmarried, and widowed/separated/divorced. Household composition was categorized by size: small (≤4 members), medium (5-6 members), and large (>6 members). The analysis was deepened by examining the data through the lens of social groups, including caste (Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, and Others) and religion (Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh, and Others). Economic status was assessed through wealth quintiles (poorest, poorer, middle, richer, richest). Additional demographic variables comprising gender (male/female) and residential location (rural/urban) were also utilised in the analysis.

Statistical Analysis

Our analytical framework incorporates multiple methodological approaches to examine multidimensional poverty across social groups. Initially, we compute the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) values across various socioeconomic status (SES) categories by calculating their respective headcount ratios and intensities spanning three National Family Health Survey (NFHS) periods (2005-06, 2015-16, and 2019-21). This analysis is extended to state-level disaggregation of MPI values across different social groups for the corresponding time periods. To assess the probability of experiencing multidimensional poverty by background characteristics, we employ pooled logistic regression analysis, generating odds ratios based on unadjusted headcount ratios while controlling for relevant covariates performed using STATA 17 and MLwiN 3.09. We further employ the

Kitagawa Decomposition Method to analyze the relative contributions of headcount ratio and intensity to multidimensional poverty across social groups over consecutive NFHS periods (NFHS 3-4, NFHS 4-5, and NFHS 3-5), along with the net differences in MPI across these intervals. Finally, we implement the Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition to analyse mean differences in multidimensional poverty across different groups over the appended time periods (NFHS 3-4, NFHS 4-5, and NFHS 3-5).

Decomposition

Kitagawa Decomposition

Decomposition techniques serve as essential analytical tools for disaggregating demographic variables into their constituent components, thereby addressing the methodological challenges posed by confounding compositional effects.[15] Building upon Kitagawa's (1955)[16] seminal work on 'components of a difference between two rates,' which advanced beyond the limitations of traditional standardisation techniques, our analytical framework focuses on decomposing inequalities across distinct social groups (Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, and Others). The temporal analysis spans three intervals of the National Family Health Survey (NFHS): between NFHS-3 and NFHS-4, NFHS-4 and NFHS-5, and the comprehensive period between NFHS-3 and NFHS-5. This approach enables the examination of variations in both the headcount ratio (H) and intensity (A) of multidimensional poverty across different socio-economic strata.

The overall rate of difference in headcount ratio across two groups can be decomposed as:

$$\Delta = MPI^A - MPI^B = \sum_i H_i^B . A_i^B - \sum_i H_i^A . A_i^A$$

where MPI denotes the value of Multidimensional Poverty Index, H denotes headcount ratio and A represents the intensity of poverty across two time periods A and B.

Each of these terms will be divided into two equal parts with certain additional terms added and subtracted, implying that the difference (Δ) will be constant :

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= \frac{\Sigma_i H_i^B \cdot A_i^B}{2} + \frac{\Sigma_i H_i^B \cdot A_i^B}{2} - \frac{\Sigma_i H_i^A \cdot A_i^A}{2} - \frac{\Sigma_i H_i^A \cdot A_i^A}{2} \\ &+ \frac{\Sigma_i H_i^B \cdot A_i^A}{2} - \frac{\Sigma_i H_i^B \cdot A_i^A}{2} + \frac{\Sigma_i H_i^A \cdot A_i^B}{2} - \frac{\Sigma_i H_i^A \cdot A_i^B}{2}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\Delta = \sum_i (H_i^B - H_i^A) . [\tfrac{A_i^B + A_i^A}{2}] + \sum_i (A_i^B - A_i^A) . [\tfrac{H_i^B + H_i^A}{2}] .$$

Here, the proposition attributable to each category is calculated over the specific decomposition time periods.[17]

Oaxaca – Blinder Decomposition

The Oaxaca - Blinder decomposition facilitates an extension of the Kitagawa Decomposition method as a counterfactual decomposition technique applied in terms of linear regression models. Primarily, it sets forth the estimation of mean difference in the outcome variable between two different groups. This is further supplemented with the fact that the OB decomposition emphasizes on the interaction between the group parameter differences as well as the group characteristics.[18,19]

Within this analytical framework, we designate two population groups, A and B, corresponding to the respective time periods in the National Family Health Survey (NFHS) rounds (3, 4, and 5). The outcome variable Y, designated for decomposition, represents the aggregate deprivations experienced by an individual, computed as the product of the unadjusted headcount ratio and the counting vector. The sample sizes for populations A and B are denoted by N^A and N^B respectively. The methodological approach incorporates a set of K mutually exclusive indicator variables, consolidated into a single categorical explanatory variable X, such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} X_{ik} \; \forall \; i$$

where i denotes the ith individual within a sample group. The outcome indicator variables for the respective population groups are represented by YiA and YiB.[20]

The group mean proportions are given by

$$\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{A}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N^A} Y_i^A}{N^A} = \frac{N_Y^A}{N^A}$$

$$\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{B}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N^B} Y_i^B}{N^B} = \frac{N_Y^B}{N^B}$$

Hence,

$$\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{A}} - \bar{Y}^{\mathrm{B}} = \frac{N_Y^A}{N^A} - \frac{N_Y^B}{N^B}$$

Let the outcome rates in the k^{th} category of the predictor variable X for groups A and B be :

$$\bar{Y}_k^A = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N^A} Y_i^A X_{ik}}{N_k^A}, \mathrm{k} = 1,\ldots..,\mathrm{K}$$

$$= \frac{N_{Yk}^A}{N_k^A}$$

$$\bar{Y}_k^B = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N^B} Y_i^B X_{ik}}{N_k^B}, \mathrm{k} = 1,\ldots..,\mathrm{K}$$

$$= \frac{N_{Yk}^B}{N_k^B}$$

The linear probability regression model for the two population groups is presented as :

$$\mathrm{Y_i^A} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} X_{ik}\beta_k^A + \varepsilon_i, i = 1,\ldots.,N^A$$

$$\mathrm{Y_i^B} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} X_{ik}\beta_k^B + \varepsilon_i, i = 1,\ldots.,N^B$$

The OLS estimator corresponding to the separate linear regressions of Y_i on each X_{ik} indicator variable will be

$$b_k^A = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N^A} X_{ik}Y_i^A}{\sum_{i=1}^{N^A} X_{ik}^2}, \mathrm{k} = 1,\ldots..,\mathrm{K}$$

$$= \frac{N_{Yk}^A}{N_k^A} = \bar{Y}_k^A$$

$$b_k^B = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N^B} X_{ik}Y_i^B}{\sum_{i=1}^{N^B} X_{ik}^2}, \mathrm{k} = 1,\ldots..,\mathrm{K}$$

$$= \frac{N_{Yk}^B}{N_k^B} = \bar{Y}_k^B$$

In Blinder Oaxaca Decomposition, one group is assigned as the reference group and we execute the simple averages of the two groups estimated coefficients such that,

$$b_k^* = \frac{(b_k^A + b_k^B)}{2}, \mathrm{k} = 1,\ldots..,\mathrm{K}$$

$$= \left(\frac{\bar{Y}_k^A + \bar{Y}_K^B}{2}\right)$$

Therefore, the OLS decomposition can be explained as the following :

$$\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{A}} - \bar{Y}^{\mathrm{B}} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \bar{X}_k^A b_k^A - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \bar{X}_k^B b_k^B$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\bar{X}_k^A - \bar{X}_k^B\right) b_k^* +$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \bar{X}_k^A \left(b_k^A - b_k^*\right) +$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \bar{X}_k^B (b_k^* - b_k^B)$$

The initial component of the equation, represented by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\bar{X}_k^A - \bar{X}_k^B\right) b_k^*$$

quantifies the differential attributed to group variations in the explanatory variables, termed as the endowment effect . Along with it, the second component

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \bar{X}_k^A \left(b_k^A - b_k^*\right)$$

comprises the contribution arising from differences in coefficients, constituting the unexplained component, designated as the coefficients effect. Furthermore, interaction effect which is represented by the final part of the equation

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} \bar{X}_k^B (b_k^* - b_k^B)$$

captures the simultaneous manifestation of differences in both endowments and coefficients between the two groups under consideration.[21,22]

Results

India's MPI exhibited significant reductions across three NFHS rounds (2005-06 to 2019-21), declining substantially from 0.282 to 0.066 (Table 2). This decline was driven by both a decrease in the headcount ratio (from 52.3% to 14.7%) and a moderate improvement in intensity (from 53.9% to 44.5%). The annual rate of reduction increased from 8.5% between NFHS 3 and 4 to 10.5% between NFHS 4 and 5. Among demographic groups, changes were observed in wealth quintiles, with the poorest wealth quintile experiencing a reduction in multidimensionally poor population, declining from 92.8% to 42.1% between NFHS 3 and 5. While children aged 0-14 years demonstrated improvements (from 63.0% to 23.4%), they consistently remained the most vulnerable age group across all rounds. The Scheduled Tribes consistently exhibited the highest poverty rates (26.8% in 2019-21), significantly exceeding other groups. The rural-urban divide persisted, with rural areas (18.9%) exhibiting higher multidimensionally poor populations compared to urban areas (5.3%) in 2019-21. Furthermore, despite similar household characteristics, females consistently displayed slightly higher MPI scores than males across all three rounds.

The MPI for Indian states reveals significant disparities in poverty levels across different social groups in India (Table 3). Examining the NFHS-5 (2019-21) data, the Scheduled Tribe population emerges as the most disadvantaged population group with several states showing high headcount ratios and MPI scores. Jharkhand (H: 54.6%, MPI: 0.271), Chhattisgarh (H: 42.1%, MPI: 0.185), and Madhya Pradesh (H: 57.1%, MPI: 0.280) have the highest poverty levels among the ST population. The Scheduled Caste and Other Backward Classes also exhibit elevated poverty, though generally lower than the STs. Comparing the NFHS-4 (2015-16) and NFHS-3 (2005-06) data, some states have shown progress in reducing multidimensional poverty, particularly among the ST population. For instance, Andhra Pradesh witnessed a significant decrease in ST headcount ratio (from 73% to 40.2%) and MPI (from 0.420 to 0.181) over this period. Rajasthan also saw a decline in ST headcount ratio (from 89.1% to 58.8%) and MPI (from 0.532 to 0.304). However, other states like Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand continue to struggle with high poverty levels, especially among the ST and SC communities, with limited improvement over the years. Notably, the intensity values, remain relatively similar across social groups and states.

A pooled regression analysis examining the multidimensional poverty headcount ratio revealed that Scheduled Castes (NFHS-5: OR 1.62, 95%, CI: 1.59-1.65), Scheduled Tribes (NFHS-5: OR 1.75, CI: 1.71-1.78), and Other Backward Classes (NFHS-5: OR 1.42, CI: 1.4-1.44) consistently demonstrated significantly higher likelihood of being multidimensionally poor across all three rounds (2005-06 to 2019-21) (Table 4). The poorest quantile showed a substantial reduction in the percentage of population experiencing multidimensional poverty, decreasing from 203.17 in NFHS-3 to 76.82 in NFHS-5.

Similarly, the middle and poorer wealth quintiles showed significant decrease in odds of being multidimensional poor over the three rounds while being relatively higher in the same round than the richest and richer wealth quintiles. Households with more than six members exhibited increased likelihood of being multidimensionally poor (NFHS-5: OR 3.8, 95% CI: 3.75-3.84), while the 15-59 years' age cohort demonstrated a lower probability of multidimensional poverty (NFHS-5: OR 0.79, CI: 0.77-0.81) than under 14 age group. Rural populations, and certain religious groups, like Hindus and Muslims, also faced significantly higher risks of being multidimensionally poor. Despite similar household characteristics, females showed slightly more odds of being multidimensionally poor than males across all three rounds (NFHS-5: OR 1,07, CI:1.06-1.08).

The Kitagawa Decomposition analysis of multidimensional poverty headcount ratio and intensity reveals that the maximum net reduction in the MPI was observed between the NFHS 3 and NFHS 5 (0.216) (Table 5). The net MPI reductions observed between the consecutive survey rounds of NFHS 3-4 and NFHS 4-5 were 0.167 and 0.049, respectively. The headcount ratio demonstrated a substantial contribution to the observed MPI reduction throughout all survey rounds, increasing from 85% to 89% across consecutive periods (NFHS 3-4 and NFHS 4-5). The most significant MPI reduction was reported among the ST population, which experienced a 0.334 reduction between NFHS 3 and NFHS 5. This improvement can be attributed to both, a decrease in the proportion of the ST population living in multidimensional poverty and a decrease in the intensity of their poverty. In contrast, the proportion attributable to intensity marginally decreased across other social groups.

The analysis of the contribution of various indicators across the NFHS periods reveals that the Standard of Living dimension had the most significant contribution to the overall MPI in NFHS 3 (Table 5). However, this trend shifted over time, with the Health dimension emerging as the largest contributor, accounting for 42.8% of the MPI in NFHS 5 (Table 6). The Nutrition indicator was consistently the most significant contributor across all three NFHS rounds, demonstrating almost 6%

increase in its contribution, from NFHS 3 to NFHS 5. This was followed by the education dimension, with the Years of Schooling indicator showing an increase from 13% in NFHS 3 to 17% in NFHS 5 accompanied by a decreasing headcount ratio. Within the Standard of Living dimension, the Bank Account indicator saw a significant decline, decreasing from a 7% contribution in NFHS 3 to just 1% in NFHS 5. While, certain other indicators, such as Assets, and Electricity, demonstrated substantial reductions in their contributions, indicators such as Housing and Cooking Fuel, maintained relatively consistent contributions.

The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition analysis of the changes in the MPI across the NFHS periods was conducted (Table 7). Examining the household size, the endowment effect shows a positive contribution of 1.32% between NFHS 3-4 and 3.04% between NFHS 4-5, indicating that that population shift towards smaller household sizes has been potentially favourable in reducing multidimensional poverty. The positive coefficient effect for larger household sizes is 6.93% and 9.04%, respectively, suggesting that the adverse impact of larger household sizes on multidimensional poverty has decreased over time.

The endowment effects for the Poorest and Poorer wealth groups are substantial and negative, at -3.11% and -1.48% respectively, implying that the population movements towards these economically disadvantaged groups have hindered progress in alleviating multidimensional poverty. However, the coefficient effects for the Poorest (87.25%), Poorer (94.52%), and Middle (38.54%) wealth quintiles are positive and significant, indicating that the relationship between poverty and these wealth groups has become less severe. The analysis of social groups shows that the endowment effects for Scheduled Castes (-0.54%), Scheduled Tribes (-0.42%), and Other Backward Classes (-0.18%) are negative, suggesting that the demographic shifts towards these socially marginalized communities have contributed to the persistence of multidimensional deprivation.

The coefficient effects for these social groups are also positive, implying that the inherent disadvantages associated with these communities have diminished. Examining the regional disparities, the endowment effect for several states, such as Bihar (-1.50%), Odisha (-1.50%), and Jharkhand (-5.08%), is negative, indicating that population movements towards these states with higher levels of multidimensional poverty have hindered overall progress. Conversely, the coefficient effects for Uttar Pradesh (38.54%), Bihar (38.54%), West Bengal (38.54%), and Andhra Pradesh (4.73%) suggest that the adverse impact of residing in these states on multidimensional poverty has diminished over time.

Discussion

The analysis of multidimensional poverty across three NFHS rounds revealed several key insights. Firstly, the Multidimensional Poverty Index demonstrated a significant decline across the three NFHS rounds, with the most substantial reductions observed among the poorest wealth quintiles, rural populations, and children aged 0-14 years. Notably, children, Scheduled Tribes, rural populations, and females consistently exhibited the highest poverty rates, with states like Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand continuing to manifest multidimensional poverty. Additionally, despite overall national-level improvements, the Scheduled Tribe population's multidimensional poverty remained relatively high. Furthermore, the health dimension, particularly the nutrition indicator, emerged as the most significant contributor to MPI, accounting for the largest share of multidimensional poverty in 2019-21. The reductions in MPI were primarily attributable to improvements in weighted headcount ratios, with notable advancements in publicly provided variables such as health, education (years of schooling), bank accounts, assets, and electricity access. Lastly, the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition revealed that, while population movements towards economically disadvantaged groups appeared to hinder poverty reduction, the analysis showed some improvements.

The coefficient effects were positive and significant for the Poorest, Poorer, and Middle wealth quintiles, indicating a diminishing severity of poverty. Conversely, for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes, negative endowment effects suggested persistent demographic challenges, even as the coefficient effects implied reducing inherent disadvantages across different social groups and states.

The analysis reveals a significant reduction in multidimensional poverty in India, declining to 0.066 by 2019-21, aligning with NITI Aayog's findings.[13] The national headcount ratio demonstrated a substantial 38% reduction between 2005-06 and 2019-21, effectively challenging South Asia's historical narrative of widespread poverty.[23] This reduction was most pronounced among the poorest wealth quintiles, with vulnerable populations experiencing more substantial improvements in absolute terms.[24,25] Geographically, the poverty landscape revealed significant disparities, with states like Bihar, Meghalaya, Jharkhand, and Uttar Pradesh consistently demonstrating the highest Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) levels.[26] Furthermore, the poverty indicators remained significantly higher in rural areas compared to urban regions.[27] Additionally, women consistently experienced a higher likelihood of being multidimensionally poor.

This trend extends beyond India, as evidenced by research on African nations, where women face similar challenges due to factors such as limited access to education, healthcare, and economic opportunities, as well as social norms and cultural practices that perpetuate gender inequality.[28]

In India, 40% of children live in severe child food poverty.29 Furthermore, health emerged as the most critical dimension, contributing over 40% to the MPI, with nutrition alone accounting for nearly 30% of multidimensional poverty. The Global Hunger Index's ranking of India at 105th further highlights the persistent challenges of the 'Triple Burden of Malnutrition' (Undernutrition, Overnutrition, and Micronutrient Deficiency)29,30 Approximately 40% of children experience severe food poverty, with alarming rates of stunting (35.5%), wasting (19.3%), and underweight (32.1%) conditions.31 Low-quality infant and young child feeding (IYCF) practices significantly contribute to poor nutritional outcomes32,33, while the burden of nutritional deprivation disproportionately affects vulnerable groups, including poor households, scheduled castes, children of underweight mothers, and illiterate women compared to affluent groups.34 Raghunathan et al. (2021) estimated that 63-76% of rural poor cannot afford recommended diets, highlighting the critical need for targeted nutrition interventions and safety net programs.35 Studies have consistently emphasized that affordable prices coupled with safety net programs covering nutritional norms, dietary allowance, and adjusted calorie intake are vital in mitigating the multidimensional aspects of nutrition deprivation.35,36,37

Consistent with the existing literature, our analysis revealed that the Scheduled Tribe population demonstrated the highest Multidimensional poverty index values.[25,7] The rate of multidimensional poverty among Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes significantly exceeds other socioeconomic groups in India, stemming from complex historical and contemporary social dynamics characterized by systemic discrimination and social injustice.[38,39] Scheduled Tribes face a compounded disadvantage of socio-economic and spatial marginalization, with job insecurity in the unorganized sector being a substantial contributor to their economic vulnerability.[40] The limited participation in economic growth among STs substantially widens the inequality scale, with chronic poverty largely attributable to social exclusion that systematically denies equitable resource access.[41,42] Empirical studies, including our findings and research by Kaibarta et al.(2022)[10] and Pradhan et al.(2022)[7], consistently demonstrate that the standard of living dimension contributes most significantly to the ST population's multidimensional poverty. While the Government of India has established the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment to address these issues, further efforts are needed to improve the coverage and quality of existing public welfare programs, ensuring they effectively target these vulnerable sections of society. These bottlenecks could be largely addressed by improving the coverage and provisions of existing public welfare programs such as Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (PMAY), Jal Jeevan Mission (JJM), Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM), Pradhan Mantri Sahaj Bijli Har Ghar Yojana (Saubhagya) and Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana (PMUY) or setting up of more targeted programs designed to address vulnerabilities of the population.

The Multidimensional Poverty approach, as envisaged by the UNDP, enables significant flexibility in incorporating country-specific indicators and weights. India's NITI Aayog, utilizing the Alkire-Foster methodology, innovatively added bank account (weight = 1/21) and maternal health (weight = 1/12) as additional indicators, reflecting the nation's unique developmental context.[13] This methodological adaptation, driven by the success of large-scale policy programs such as Janani Suraksha Yojana(JSY), Pradhan Mantri Surakshit Matritva Abhiyan(PMSMA), and Pradhan Mantri Jan-Dhan Yojana(PMJDY), resulted in marginal variations in MPI calculations. While UNDP reported India's MPI for 2019-21 to be 0.069, the NITI Aayog report estimated it to be 0.066.43 Similarly, UNDP reported a poverty intensity of 42% for 2019-21, while NITI Aayog estimated it to be 44.39%. These findings indicate substantial progress in reducing multidimensional poverty in India, highlighting the effectiveness of equitable pro-poor programs and policy initiatives. The inclusion of additional indicators relevant to India's specific context provides a more comprehensive picture of poverty reduction efforts.

Targeted government interventions have been pivotal in addressing multidimensional poverty. Various interventions across health, education, and living standards have demonstrated significant improvements in multidimensional poverty over the years. Schemes like Poshan 2.0, Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS), Anemia Mukt Bharat, and the Midday Meal Programme directly addressed nutritional deprivations. Additionally, maternal health interventions like Pradhan Mantri Surakshit Matritva Abhiyan, National Health Mission, and Ayushman Bharat have targeted maternal and child health indicators. The standard of living dimension has also seen improvement through initiatives providing electricity (Pradhan Mantri Sahaj Bijli Har Ghar Yojana), sanitation (Swachh Bharat Mission), drinking water access, and banking services (Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana). The Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment has played a crucial role in improving public provisioning for marginalized communities. However, persistent multidimensional poverty remains evident among vulnerable populations.

Flow characteristics suggest that continued focus on health, nutrition, and education dimensions could further reduce MPI, particularly among dependent populations and marginalized communities. For instance, the Integrated Child Development Programme played a major role in uplifting nutritional standards.8 Nevertheless, continued refinement of intervention strategies remains crucial for sustained poverty reduction.44 Regular follow-up and evaluation of these programs are pivotal to ensure they achieve their objectives in the targeted groups. Furthermore, analysis at the administrative level is required to rigorously understand the causes of implementation gaps.

This study was subject to several methodological limitations that warrant careful consideration. The cross-sectional nature of the data inherently restricted our ability to establish any causal relationships. Methodological constraints require the omission of variables with missing values, and the reliance on self-reported data from the National Family Health Survey (NFHS) introduces potential reporting inaccuracies and bias. While our findings demonstrated broad consistency with the NITI Aayog report, slight variations arose from the nuanced methodology of indicator specification and weighting. The study was constrained to utilizing NITI Aayog's predefined indicators, predominantly focused on publicly provisioned metrics, which may not comprehensively capture the full complexity of individual poverty experiences. These methodological limitations highlight the need for further research to develop more refined approaches that can comprehensively capture the multidimensional nature of poverty. Future research could benefit from incorporating more granular data collection and analysis techniques to provide a nuanced understanding of socioeconomic deprivation.

The analysis reveals a significant decline in multidimensional poverty in India, primarily driven by targeted government interventions. However, disparities persist across regions and socioeconomic groups. While the headcount ratio has shown substantial improvement, the intensity of poverty remains a concern. Several Government initiatives have made strides in addressing these issues; however, the health dimension, particularly nutrition, continues to be a significant contributor to the MPI. To further accelerate poverty reduction, a sustained focus on vulnerable groups, especially Scheduled Tribes, females, children under 14 years of age, and rural populations, is essential. Additionally, enhancing the quality and coverage of public services, promoting inclusive growth, and addressing the root causes of poverty, such as inequality and social exclusion, will be crucial for achieving equitable growth.

References

1. United Nations. Global Indicator framework. SDG Indicators. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/Global-Indicator-Framework-after-2024-refinement-English.pdf

2. Roy, Poulomi & Ray, Soma & Haldar, Sushil. (2018). Socio-economic Determinants of Multidimensional Poverty in Rural West Bengal: A Household Level Analysis. Journal of Quantitative Economics. 17. 10.1007/s40953-018-0137-4.

3. Sen, Amartya Kumar, and Sudhir Anand. 1997. Concept of human development and poverty: A multidimensional perspective. In Poverty and Human Development papers 1997. 1–20, New York: United Nations Development Programme

4. United Nations Development Programme. 1997. Human Development Report 1997. http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-1997

5. Alkire, Sabina, and James Foster. 2009. Counting and multidimensional poverty measurement. OPHI working paper 32. Oxford: University of Oxford

6. Alkire, Sabina, and Maria Emma Santos. 2010. Acute multidimensional poverty: A new index for developing countries. OPHI working papers 38. Oxford: University of Oxford

7. Pradhan I, Kandapan B, Pradhan J (2022) Uneven burden of multidimensional poverty in India: A caste-based analysis. PLOS ONE 17(7): e0271806. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0271806

8. Das, P., Ghosh, S. & Paria, B. Multidimensional poverty in India: a study on regional disparities. GeoJournal 87, 3987–4006 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-021-10483-6

9. Bagli, Supravat. (2019). Multidimensional Poverty: An Exploratory Study in Purulia District, West Bengal. Economic Affairs. 64. 10.30954/0424-2513.3.2019.7.

10. Kaibarta, S., Mandal, S., Mandal, P. et al. Multidimensional poverty in slums: an empirical study from urban India. GeoJournal 87 (Suppl 4), 527–549 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-021-10571-7

11. Das, P., Ghosh, S. & Paria, B. Multidimensional poverty in India: patterns of reduction across population subgroups and geographical locations during 2005–06 and 2019–21. GeoJournal 88,

3851–3870 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-023-10833-6

12. Alkire, S., Kanagaratnam, U., and Suppa, N. (2023). 'A methodological note on the global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) 2023 changes over time results for 84 countries', OPHI MPI Methodological Note 57, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative. ©2018 University of Oxford

13. NITI Aayog (2023). India. National Multidimensional Poverty Index: A Progress Review 2023. NITI Aayog, Government of India, New Delhi.

14. IIPS. (n.d.). National Family Health Survey. Retrieved from rchiips.org: http://rchiips.org/nfhsnew/nfhsuser/index.php

15. Canudas Romo, V. (2003). Decomposition Methods in Demography. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. s.n

16. Kitagawa, E. M. (1955). Components of a difference between two rates. Journal of the american statistical association, 50(272), 1168-1194.

17. Preston, S. H., Heuveline, P., & Guillot, M. (2001). Demography: Measuring and modeling population processes. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

18. Oaxaca, R. (1973). Male-female wage differentials in urban labor markets. International economic review, 693-709.

19. Blinder, A. S. (1973). Wage discrimination: reduced form and structural estimates. Journal of Human resources, 436-455.

20. Oaxaca, Ronald L. and Sierminska, Eva, Oaxaca-Blinder Meets Kitagawa: What is the Link?. IZA Discussion Paper No. 16188, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4464602 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4464602

21. Ben Jann, 2008. "The Blinder–Oaxaca decomposition for linear regression models," Stata Journal, StataCorp LP, vol. 8(4), pages 453-479, December

22. Rahimi, E., & Hashemi Nazari, S. S. (2021). A detailed explanation and graphical representation of the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition method with its application in health inequalities. Emerging Themes in Epidemiology, 18(1), 12

23. OPHI (2018).UK. MPI in India: A Case Study. 2018. OPHI, Global Multidimensional Poverty Index, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, University of Oxford.

24. Alkire, S., & Seth, S. (2015). Multidimensional poverty reduction in India between 1999 and 2006: Where and how?. World Development, 72, 93-108.

25. Sabina Alkire, Christian Oldiges, Usha Kanagaratnam,Examining multidimensional poverty reduction in India 2005/6–2015/16: Insights and oversights of the headcount ratio, World Development

26. Tripathi, S., & Yenneti, K. (2020). Measurement of multidimensional poverty in India: A State-level analysis. Indian Journal of Human Development, 14(2), 257-274.

27. Das, P., Paria, B., & Firdaush, S. (2021). Juxtaposing consumption poverty and multidimensional poverty: A study in Indian context. Social Indicators Research, 153(2), 469-501.

28. Rogan, M. (2016). Gender and multidimensional poverty in South Africa: Applying the global multidimensional poverty index (MPI). Social Indicators Research, 126, 987-1006.

29. United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Child Food Poverty. Nutrition Deprivation in Early Childhood. Child Nutrition Report, 2024. UNICEF, New York, June 2024

30. Welthungerhilfe (WHH), Concern Worldwide, and Institute for International Law of Peace and Armed Conflict (IFHV). 2024. 2024 Global Hunger Index: How Gender Justice Can Advance Climate Resilience and Zero Hunger. Bonn/Berlin: WHH; Dublin: Concern Worldwide; Bochum: IFHV.

31. Government of India. Ministry of Health & Family Welfare. National Family Health Survey-5 (2019-21). Available at: http://rchiips.org:80/nfhs/pdf/NFHS5/India.pdf.

32. Menon, P., Bamezai, A., Subandoro, A., Ayoya, M. A., & Aguayo, V. M. (2015). Age appropriate infant and young child feeding practices are associated with child nutrition in India: insights from nationally representative data. Maternal & child nutrition, 11(1), 73-87.

33. Ramachandran, P. (2010). Nutrition and child survival in India. The Indian Journal of Pediatrics, 77, 301-305.

34. Prasad, J. B., Pezhhan, A., & Patil, S. H. (2021). Effect of wealth, social inequality, Mother's BMI,

and education level on child malnutrition in India. Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews, 15(6), 102304.

35. Raghunathan, K., Headey, D., & Herforth, A. (2021). Affordability of nutritious diets in rural India. Food Policy, 99, 101982.

36. Theresa Ryckman, Ty Beal, Stella Nordhagen, Zivai Murira, Harriet Torlesse, Affordability of nutritious foods for complementary feeding in South Asia, Nutrition Reviews, Volume 79, Issue Supplement_1, April 2021, Pages 52–68, https://doi.org/10.1093/nutrit/nuaa139

37. Bhuyan, B., Sahoo, B. K., & Suar, D. (2020). Nutritional status, poverty, and relative deprivation among socio-economic and gender groups in India: Is the growth inclusive?. World Development Perspectives, 18, 100180.

38. Sahoo, P., Mondal, S., & Kumar, V. (2023). Multidimensional deprivations among social groups in rural India: A state level analysis. GeoJournal, 88(6), 6137-6159.

39. Rupavath, R. (2023). Poverty and Education: Attainments and Challenges for Tribal Communities. Contemporary Voice of Dalit, 15(2), 230-247. https://doi.org/10.1177/2455328X211042718

40. Singh, A. (2019). Social Justice and Empowerment for Marginalized Groups: Realities and Responses. Global Initiatives for Sustainable Development: Issues and Strategies, 184.

41. Dubey, A. (2009). Poverty and under-nutrition among scheduled tribes in India: A disaggregated analysis. IGIDR Proceedings/Project Reports Series,[from http://www. igidr. ac. in/pdf/publication/PP-062-13. pdf, accessed on 12-12-2013].

42. Mehta, A. K., & Shah, A. (2003). Chronic poverty in India: Incidence, causes and policies. World Development, 31(3), 491-511.

43. UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2023. 2023 Global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI): Unstacking global poverty: Data for high impact action. New York.

44. Roy, A. (2024). Multidimensional Poverty and Quality of Governance in Indian States. The Indian Economic Journal, 0(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/00194662241278062

Table 2 : Multidimensional Poverty Headcount (H), Intensity (A), and Index values by background characteristics, India

Background Characteristics	NFHS-3 (2005-06)			NFHS-4 (2015-16)			NFHS-5 (2019-21)		
	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI
Age									
0-14 yrs.	0.630	0.571	0.360	0.348	0.494	0.172	0.234	0.462	0.108
15-59 yrs.	0.466	0.522	0.243	0.200	0.461	0.092	0.116	0.436	0.051
60+ yrs.	0.500	0.490	0.245	0.217	0.436	0.094	0.115	0.413	0.048
Sex									
Male	0.512	0.537	0.275	0.232	0.470	0.109	0.139	0.444	0.062
Female	0.535	0.541	0.289	0.255	0.473	0.121	0.155	0.446	0.069
Household size									
<=4 members	0.437	0.502	0.22	0.173	0.453	0.078	0.097	0.432	0.042
5 to 6 members	0.515	0.547	0.281	0.234	0.481	0.113	0.148	0.455	0.067
6+ members	0.620	0.558	0.346	0.349	0.476	0.166	0.228	0.444	0.101
Marital Status									
Married	0.496	0.526	0.261	0.220	0.462	0.102	0.130	0.435	0.057
Unmarried	0.453	0.524	0.238	0.151	0.449	0.068	0.078	0.430	0.033
Widow/separated/Divorced	0.535	0.506	0.271	0.237	0.446	0.106	0.129	0.423	0.055
Wealth Quintile									
Richest	0.055	0.404	0.022	0.012	0.376	0.004	0.010	0.380	0.004
Richer	0.259	0.440	0.114	0.051	0.398	0.020	0.033	0.390	0.013
Middle	0.596	0.477	0.284	0.148	0.413	0.061	0.077	0.403	0.031
Poorest	0.825	0.539	0.445	0.337	0.445	0.150	0.185	0.420	0.078
Poorer	0.928	0.619	0.575	0.654	0.506	0.331	0.421	0.469	0.198
Caste									
SC	0.632	0.545	0.345	0.286	0.474	0.136	0.182	0.450	0.082
ST	0.778	0.587	0.457	0.436	0.490	0.214	0.268	0.458	0.123
OBC	0.552	0.532	0.294	0.240	0.468	0.112	0.138	0.439	0.061
Others	0.341	0.514	0.176	0.137	0.457	0.063	0.074	0.433	0.032
Religion									
Hindu	0.524	0.532	0.279	0.242	0.467	0.113	0.144	0.441	0.063
Muslim	0.590	0.583	0.344	0.297	0.498	0.148	0.189	0.46	0.087
Christian	0.367	0.513	0.188	0.140	0.463	0.065	0.101	0.453	0.046
Sikh	0.218	0.473	0.103	0.058	0.433	0.025	0.048	0.419	0.020
Others	0.477	0.529	0.252	0.211	0.472	0.099	0.140	0.446	0.062
Place of Residence									
Rural	0.651	0.547	0.356	0.319	0.474	0.151	0.189	0.446	0.085
Urban	0.243	0.492	0.120	0.084	0.454	0.038	0.053	0.432	0.023
All India	0.523	0.539	0.282	0.243	0.472	0.115	0.147	0.445	0.066

Table 3 : Multidimensional Poverty Index for Social Groups, Indian States (NFHS-5)

State /UT	SC			ST			OBC			Others			All India MPI
	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	
A&N Islands*	0.078	0.345	0.027	0.036	0.403	0.014	0.003	0.413	0.001	0.032	0.410	0.013	0.010
Andhra Pradesh	0.076	0.411	0.031	0.256	0.433	0.111	0.062	0.404	0.025	0.018	0.371	0.007	0.026
Arunachal Pradesh	0.127	0.427	0.054	0.129	0.419	0.054	0.219	0.475	0.104	0.168	0.456	0.076	0.060
Assam	0.164	0.431	0.071	0.126	0.432	0.054	0.159	0.451	0.072	0.173	0.439	0.076	0.086
Bihar	0.458	0.492	0.225	0.466	0.502	0.234	0.308	0.462	0.142	0.197	0.463	0.091	0.158
Chandigarh	0.030	0.381	0.011	-	-	-	0.060	0.433	0.026	0.025	0.586	0.015	0.017
Chhattisgarh	0.143	0.416	0.059	0.268	0.444	0.119	0.109	0.410	0.045	0.041	0.391	0.016	0.067
D&DH and D&D*	0.023	0.436	0.010	0.169	0.414	0.070	0.048	0.421	0.020	0.041	0.463	0.019	0.042
Goa	0.000	.	0.000	0.016	0.346	0.006	0.001	0.357	0.000	0.004	0.341	0.001	0.003
Gujarat	0.109	0.418	0.045	0.256	0.451	0.116	0.111	0.425	0.047	0.031	0.403	0.013	0.051
Haryana	0.101	0.419	0.042	0.094	0.428	0.040	0.102	0.449	0.046	0.027	0.426	0.012	0.032
Himachal Pradesh	0.089	0.393	0.035	0.077	0.392	0.030	0.022	0.400	0.009	0.037	0.408	0.015	0.020
Jammu & Kashmir	0.061	0.417	0.026	0.145	0.439	0.064	0.091	0.422	0.038	0.030	0.413	0.012	0.021
Jharkhand	0.350	0.460	0.161	0.384	0.479	0.184	0.216	0.434	0.094	0.130	0.436	0.057	0.128
Karnataka	0.098	0.412	0.040	0.133	0.436	0.058	0.062	0.405	0.025	0.049	0.395	0.020	0.032
Kerala	0.012	0.374	0.005	0.066	0.405	0.027	0.006	0.356	0.002	0.001	0.352	0.000	0.002
Ladakh	0.000	.	0.000	0.046	0.408	0.019	-	-	-	0.008	0.405	0.003	0.017
Lakshadweep	0.000	.	0.000	0.009	0.376	0.003	0.000	.	0.000	0.000	.	0.000	0.003
Madhya Pradesh	0.225	0.434	0.098	0.357	0.457	0.163	0.157	0.423	0.066	0.076	0.409	0.031	0.087
Maharashtra	0.067	0.405	0.027	0.243	0.445	0.108	0.047	0.393	0.019	0.047	0.405	0.019	0.032
Manipur	0.116	0.429	0.050	0.155	0.424	0.066	0.062	0.399	0.025	0.047	0.404	0.019	0.036
Meghalaya	0.033	0.425	0.014	0.302	0.479	0.145	0.171	0.589	0.101	0.199	0.468	0.093	0.136
Mizoram	0.189	0.469	0.089	0.051	0.451	0.023	0.333	0.478	0.159	-	-	-	0.026
Nagaland	0.133	0.429	0.057	0.157	0.424	0.066	0.041	0.421	0.017	0.223	0.423	0.095	0.066
NCT of Delhi	0.047	0.423	0.020	0.039	0.510	0.020	0.030	0.425	0.013	0.026	0.415	0.011	0.015
Odisha	0.150	0.429	0.064	0.328	0.468	0.154	0.078	0.419	0.033	0.038	0.400	0.015	0.067
Puducherry	0.010	0.393	0.004	0.000	.	0.000	0.009	0.376	0.003	0.000	.	0.000	0.003
Punjab	0.077	0.414	0.032	0.064	0.399	0.025	0.030	0.412	0.013	0.016	0.390	0.006	0.020
Rajasthan	0.190	0.432	0.082	0.262	0.446	0.117	0.130	0.419	0.054	0.074	0.411	0.030	0.065
Sikkim	0.057	0.430	0.025	0.035	0.390	0.014	0.021	0.431	0.009	0.000	.	0.000	0.012
Tamil Nadu	0.036	0.384	0.014	0.065	0.425	0.028	0.018	0.383	0.007	0.007	0.419	0.003	0.009
Telangana	0.065	0.408	0.027	0.124	0.425	0.053	0.050	0.402	0.020	0.022	0.393	0.009	0.024
Tripura	0.121	0.410	0.050	0.205	0.443	0.091	0.066	0.411	0.027	0.076	0.420	0.032	0.056
Uttar Pradesh	0.287	0.451	0.130	0.353	0.484	0.171	0.227	0.446	0.101	0.129	0.445	0.058	0.101
Uttarakhand	0.119	0.426	0.051	0.083	0.407	0.034	0.149	0.423	0.063	0.052	0.401	0.021	0.039
West Bengal	0.123	0.421	0.052	0.235	0.447	0.105	0.075	0.417	0.031	0.094	0.430	0.041	0.050
All India	0.182	0.449	0.082	0.269	0.458	0.123	0.138	0.439	0.061	0.075	0.433	0.032	0.066

* H: Headcount Ratio, A: Intensity, MPI: Multidimensional Poverty Index Scores
* A&N Islands: Andaman and Nicobar Islands; D&DH and D&D: Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu

Table 4 :Pooled logistic Regression based odds ratio (OR) for unadjusted headcount (H) by background characteristics

Background Characteristics	NFHS-3	NFHS-4	NFHS-5
	OR [95% CI]	OR [95% CI]	OR [95% CI]
Age			
0-14 yrs. (ref)	1	1	1
15-59 yrs.	0.69*** (0.66, 0.71)	0.84*** (0.83, 0.86)	0.79*** (0.77, 0.81)
60+ yrs.	0.59*** (0.56, 0.62)	0.77*** (0.75, 0.78)	0.68*** (0.66, 0.70)
Sex			
Male (ref)	1	1	1
Female	1.06*** (1.04, 1.08)	1.08*** (1.07, 1.09)	1.07*** (1.06, 1.08)
Household size			
Household size <= 4 (ref)	1	1	1
Household size 5-6	1.39*** (1.36, 1.42)	1.33* (1.31, 1.34)	1.55*** (1.53, 1.56)
Household size >6	3.28*** (3.21, 3.36)	3.27*** (3.24, 3.31)	3.80*** (3.75, 3.84)
Marital Status			
Married	1.75*** (1.70, 1.79)	2.16*** (2.13, 2.18)	2.33*** (2.30, 2.36)
Unmarried (ref)	1	1	1
Widow/Seperated/Divorced	1.81*** (1.73, 1.89)	2.29*** (2.25, 2.34)	2.41*** (2.36, 2.47)
Wealth Quintile			
Richest (ref)	1	1	1
Richer	5.50*** (5.29, 5.73)	4.09*** (3.95, 4.24)	3.17*** (3.05, 3.30)
Middle	25.12*** (24.13, 26.15)	12.75*** (12.33, 13.19)	7.89*** (7.60, 8.21)
Poorer	78.01*** (74.70, 81.46)	38.64*** (37.36, 39.95)	21.21*** (20.43, 22.03)
Poorest	203.17*** (193.44, 213.40)	153.29*** (148.19, 158.56)	76.82*** (73.97, 79.79)
Caste			
SC	1.57*** (1.52, 1.61)	1.37*** (1.35, 1.39)	1.62*** (1.59, 1.65)
ST	1.83*** (1.76, 1.91)	1.71*** (1.69, 1.74)	1.75*** (1.71, 1.78)
OBC	1.38*** (1.35, 1.41)	1.36*** (1.34, 1.38)	1.42*** (1.40, 1.44)
Others (ref)	1	1	1
Religion			
Hindu	1.15*** (1.09, 1.22)	1.12*** (1.08, 1.15)	0.98* (0.94, 1.01)
Muslim	2.21*** (2.07, 2.35)	2.16*** (2.10, 2.24)	1.84*** (1.77, 1.92)
Christian	0.97* (0.89, 1.05)	0.81*** (0.77, 0.85)	0.75*** (0.71, 0.79)
Others (ref)	1	1	1
Others	0.477	0.529	0.252
Area			
Rural	1.26*** (1.23, 1.28)	1.14*** (1.13, 1.16)	1.02*** (1.01, 1.04)
Urban (ref)	1	1	1

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1

Table 5: Kitagawa Decomposition for Contribution of Headcount (H) & Intensity (A) to Multidimensional Poverty Index

Caste Groups	MPI Difference NFHS 3- NFHS 4			MPI Difference NFHS 4- NFHS 5			MPI Difference NFHS 3- NFHS 5		
	Prop. Att. To H	Prop. Att. To A	Net Difference	Prop. Att. To H	Prop. Att. To A	Net Difference	Prop. Att. To H	Prop. Att. To A	Net Difference
SC	84%	16%	0.209	89%	11%	0.054	85%	15%	0.263
ST	76%	24%	0.243	88%	12%	0.091	80%	20%	0.334
OBC	86%	14%	0.182	90%	10%	0.052	86%	14%	0.233
Others	88%	12%	0.113	92%	8%	0.03	88%	12%	0.143
All India	85%	15%	0.167	89%	11%	0.049	85%	15%	0.216

Table 6: Contribution of deprivations to Multidimensional Poverty Index Headcount Values

Dimensions	Indicators	Adjusted HCR			Indicator Contribution			Dimension Contribution		
		NFHS-3	NFHS-4	NFHS-5	NFHS-3	NFHS-4	NFHS-5	NFHS-3	NFHS-4	NFHS-5
Education	Years of schooling	0.04	0.02	0.01	13.3%	15.5%	16.8%	24.3%	23.0%	26.0%
	School Attendance	0.03	0.01	0.01	11.1%	7.6%	9.2%			
Nutrition	Nutrition	0.07	0.03	0.02	24.4%	28.0%	29.8%	32.3%	39.2%	42.8%
	Child-Adolescent Mortality	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.0%	1.3%	1.5%			
	Maternal Health	0.02	0.01	0.01	6.9%	9.9%	11.5%			
Standard of Living	Electricity	0.01	0.00	0.00	4.6%	3.4%	1.3%	43.4%	37.7%	31.2%
	Sanitation	0.02	0.01	0.00	8.0%	8.6%	6.6%			
	Drinking Water	0.01	0.00	0.00	2.6%	2.1%	1.6%			
	Housing	0.02	0.01	0.01	7.1%	8.4%	8.6%			
	Cooking Fuel	0.02	0.01	0.01	8.4%	9.4%	8.8%			
	Bank Account	0.02	0.00	0.00	6.6%	2.2%	0.8%			
	Assets	0.02	0.00	0.00	6.0%	3.7%	3.4%			
	Total	0.282	0.115	0.066	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: c=a/b*100

Table 6: Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition of the Multidimensional Poverty Index by Background Characteristics: Contribution to Total Effects

	NFHS 3-4	NFHS 3-5	NFHS 4-5
Endowment Effect			
Age	1.26%	1.25%	1.62%
Sex	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%
Household Size	1.32%	1.52%	3.04%
Marital Status	0.06%	0.14%	0.00%
WQ	-3.11%	-1.48%	-0.20%
Caste	-0.54%	-0.42%	-0.41%
Religion	-0.18%	0.00%	0.41%
Area	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%
States/UTs	-1.50%	-5.08%	-27.59%
Coefficient effect			
Age	-5.03%	-5.54%	-6.49%
Sex	4.91%	-0.79%	-2.23%
Household Size	9.04%	6.93%	2.03%
Marital Status	-1.38%	-1.06%	0.00%
WQ	84.91%	87.25%	94.52%
Caste	8.14%	6.93%	2.43%
Religion	2.40%	2.91%	5.07%
Area	4.73%	4.20%	2.03%
States/UTs	17.07%	16.95%	38.54%
Cons.	-22.04%	-28.45%	-67.95%
Interaction effect			
Age	0.42%	0.60%	0.20%
Sex	-0.12%	0.00%	0.00%
Household Size	0.72%	1.34%	0.41%
Marital Status	-0.30%	-0.28%	0.00%
WQ	-2.28%	-2.91%	0.00%
Caste	-0.66%	-0.74%	0.00%
Religion	-0.12%	0.00%	0.20%
Area	0.06%	-0.05%	0.00%
States/UTs	1.92%	16.49%	54.36%
Total Effect	0.167	0.217	0.049

Figure 1: Contributions of Deprivations to Multidimensional Poverty Index



Figure 2: Contribution of Dimensions to Multidimensional Poverty Index



Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1: Final Analytical Sample for Analysis by Background Characteristics/Deprivations

Background Characteristics/	NFHS 3		NFHS 4		NFHS 5	
Indicators	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age						
0-14 yrs.	168798	33%	821564	29%	749232	27%
15-59 yrs.	304857	59%	1699596	61%	1725901	62%
60+ yrs.	42536	8%	280380	10%	320405	11%
Sex						
Male	261760	51%	1415327	51%	1392671	50%
Female	254491	49%	1386631	49%	1403068	50%
Household Size						
Household size <= 4	167848	33%	958799	34%	1095009	39%
Household size 5-6	180233	35%	1028234	37%	1025816	37%
Household size >6	168170	33%	814925	29%	675069	24%
Marital Status						
Married	230372	45%	1344568	48%	1399141	50%
Unmarried	147583	29%	591068	21%	580153	21%
Widow/Seperated/Divorced	28618	6%	158300	6%	168973	6%
Wealth Quintile						
Poorest	67544	13%	596858	21%	626151	22%
Poorer	78954	15%	611155	22%	617245	22%
Middle	100045	19%	572247	20%	565628	20%
Richer	121261	23%	521880	19%	515843	18%
Richest	148447	29%	499818	18%	471027	17%
Caste						
SC	86133	17%	505926	18%	548368	20%
ST	70757	14%	521760	19%	525923	19%
OBC	164915	32%	1073944	38%	1040682	37%
Others	171269	33%	570665	20%	542227	19%
Religion						
Hindu	369029	71%	2060881	74%	2098940	75%
Christian	73813	14%	387775	14%	357533	13%
Muslim	45692	9%	215646	8%	201429	7%
Sikh	11407	2%	61139	2%	65500	2%
Others	16180	3%	76517	3%	72492	3%
Area						
Rural	286860	56%	2014677	72%	2118184	76%
Urban	229391	44%	787281	28%	677710	24%
Indicators						
Education	515910	100%	2799462	100%	2795406	100%
Attendance	515689	100%	2801861	100%	2795773	100%
Nutrition	485853	94%	2708074	97%	2675466	96%
Child Mortality	506798	98%	2760805	99%	2754269	99%
Maternal Health	482470	93%	2801958	100%	2795894	100%
Electricity	516143	100%	2801958	100%	2795894	100%
Toilet	515846	100%	2801958	100%	2795887	100%
Water	516211	100%	2788960	100%	2795894	100%
House	516185	100%	2801958	100%	2795894	100%
Fuel	516149	100%	2801958	100%	2795894	100%
Bank Account	508165	98%	2799041	100%	2795290	100%
Asset	516251	100%	2801958	100%	2795894	100%
Total	516251	100%	2801958	100%	2795894	100%

Supplementary Table 2.1: State-wise Multidimensional Poverty Index (H*A=MPI) by Social Groups (NFHS 4)

State /UT	SC			ST			OBC			Others		
	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	0.003	0.357	0.001	0.074	0.377	0.028	0.067	0.391	0.026	0.086	0.38	0.033
Andhra Pradesh	0.18	0.402	0.072	0.402	0.45	0.181	0.156	0.401	0.062	0.11	0.398	0.044
Arunachal Pradesh	0.159	0.463	0.073	0.168	0.455	0.076	0.271	0.548	0.149	0.253	0.517	0.131
Assam	0.258	0.463	0.12	0.262	0.473	0.124	0.313	0.476	0.149	0.341	0.481	0.164
Bihar	0.695	0.551	0.382	0.646	0.538	0.347	0.588	0.523	0.308	0.479	0.527	0.253
Chandigarh	0.029	0.548	0.016	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Chhattisgarh	0.238	0.445	0.106	0.421	0.441	0.185	0.256	0.434	0.111	0.153	0.382	0.058
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	.	.	.	0.384	0.468	0.18	.	.	.	.	.	.
Daman and Diu	0.003	0.357	0.001	0.061	0.432	0.026	0.022	0.377	0.008	0.092	0.381	0.035
Delhi	0.074	0.426	0.032	0	.	.	0.018	0.366	0.007	0.024	0.473	0.011
Goa	.	.	.	0.077	0.375	0.029	0.004	0.357	0.002	0.02	0.426	0.009
Gujarat	0.202	0.445	0.09	0.443	0.469	0.208	0.174	0.434	0.075	0.056	0.43	0.024
Haryana	0.15	0.426	0.064	0.352	0.656	0.231	0.104	0.454	0.047	0.051	0.414	0.021
Himachal Pradesh	0.152	0.413	0.063	0.095	0.47	0.045	0.051	0.382	0.02	0.062	0.384	0.024
Jammu And Kashmir	0.176	0.419	0.074	0.378	0.467	0.177	0.048	0.378	0.018	0.146	0.425	0.062
Jharkhand	0.478	0.494	0.236	0.546	0.495	0.271	0.45	0.476	0.214	0.279	0.495	0.138
Karnataka	0.203	0.433	0.088	0.235	0.424	0.1	0.137	0.404	0.055	0.118	0.411	0.049
Kerala	0.02	0.415	0.008	0.1	0.406	0.041	0.01	0.364	0.004	0.003	0.377	0.001
Ladakh	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Lakshadweep	.	.	.	0.008	0.373	0.003	.	.	.	.	.	.
Madhya Pradesh	0.353	0.448	0.158	0.571	0.49	0.28	0.325	0.446	0.145	0.139	0.417	0.058
Maharashtra	0.129	0.413	0.053	0.402	0.471	0.189	0.151	0.408	0.062	0.094	0.423	0.04
Manipur	0.107	0.407	0.044	0.183	0.434	0.079	0.167	0.438	0.073	0.107	0.409	0.044
Meghalaya	0.184	0.418	0.077	0.315	0.47	0.148	0.061	0.452	0.027	.	.	.
Mizoram	0.206	0.345	0.071	0.065	0.464	0.03	0.065	0.479	0.031	.	.	.
Nagaland	0.291	0.543	0.158	0.167	0.436	0.073	0.358	0.519	0.186	0.063	0.524	0.033
Odisha	0.372	0.445	0.166	0.508	0.475	0.241	0.246	0.441	0.108	0.128	0.428	0.055
Puducherry	0.045	0.358	0.016	.	.	.	0.021	0.365	0.008	0.057	0.417	0.024
Punjab	0.078	0.434	0.034	.	.	.	0.065	0.499	0.033	0.009	0.402	0.004
Rajasthan	0.362	0.48	0.173	0.588	0.516	0.304	0.283	0.469	0.133	0.152	0.436	0.066
Sikkim	0.071	0.515	0.037	0.025	0.398	0.01	0.022	0.35	0.008	.	.	.
Tamil Nadu	0.111	0.399	0.044	0.188	0.405	0.076	0.062	0.405	0.025	0.018	0.385	0.007
Telangana	0.206	0.442	0.091	0.322	0.438	0.141	0.187	0.42	0.078	0.077	0.387	0.03
Tripura	0.161	0.434	0.07	0.284	0.441	0.125	0.108	0.423	0.045	0.169	0.447	0.075
Uttar Pradesh	0.482	0.488	0.235	0.598	0.54	0.323	0.402	0.475	0.191	0.255	0.466	0.119
Uttarakhand	0.25	0.433	0.108	0.169	0.507	0.086	0.2	0.424	0.085	0.135	0.404	0.055
West Bengal	0.291	0.438	0.127	0.452	0.472	0.213	0.111	0.477	0.053	0.188	0.454	0.085
All India	0.327	0.488	0.159	0.43	0.482	0.207	0.293	0.483	0.141	0.176	0.472	0.083

Supplementary Table 2.1: State-wise Multidimensional Poverty Index (H*A=MPI) by Social Groups (NFHS 4)

State /UT	SC			ST			OBC			Others		
	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Andhra Pradesh	0.565	0.484	0.274	0.73	0.575	0.42	0.502	0.49	0.246	0.279	0.462	0.129
Arunachal Pradesh	0.509	0.55	0.28	0.585	0.543	0.318	0.529	0.548	0.29	0.559	0.55	0.307
Assam	0.634	0.534	0.338	0.555	0.543	0.301	0.472	0.487	0.23	0.526	0.54	0.284
Bihar	0.907	0.677	0.614	0.676	0.711	0.481	0.789	0.595	0.469	0.576	0.601	0.346
Chandigarh	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Chhattisgarh	0.698	0.532	0.371	0.824	0.573	0.472	0.645	0.53	0.341	0.284	0.5	0.142
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Daman and Diu	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Delhi	0.219	0.495	0.108	0.226	0.531	0.12	0.182	0.466	0.085	0.082	0.449	0.037
Goa	0.367	0.462	0.17	0.294	0.444	0.13	0.153	0.439	0.067	0.162	0.442	0.072
Gujarat	0.392	0.539	0.212	0.724	0.543	0.393	0.474	0.503	0.238	0.144	0.452	0.065
Haryana	0.508	0.515	0.261	0.585	0.652	0.381	0.391	0.506	0.198	0.301	0.481	0.145
Himachal Pradesh	0.427	0.473	0.202	0.379	0.464	0.176	0.333	0.457	0.152	0.228	0.434	0.099
Jammu And Kashmir	0.51	0.512	0.261	0.666	0.561	0.374	0.401	0.521	0.209	0.285	0.474	0.135
Jharkhand	0.743	0.639	0.475	0.886	0.615	0.545	0.726	0.587	0.426	0.412	0.566	0.234
Karnataka	0.594	0.496	0.295	0.646	0.527	0.341	0.406	0.495	0.201	0.33	0.447	0.148
Kerala	0.268	0.43	0.115	0.579	0.47	0.272	0.087	0.409	0.036	0.112	0.414	0.046
Ladakh	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Lakshadweep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Madhya Pradesh	0.703	0.552	0.388	0.883	0.604	0.534	0.687	0.544	0.374	0.356	0.515	0.183
Maharashtra	0.482	0.479	0.231	0.7	0.562	0.393	0.326	0.449	0.146	0.287	0.473	0.136
Manipur	0.294	0.448	0.132	0.547	0.541	0.296	0.432	0.508	0.22	0.364	0.477	0.174
Meghalaya	0.418	0.513	0.215	0.593	0.583	0.345	0.443	0.466	0.207	0.518	0.669	0.346
Mizoram	0.167	0.429	0.072	0.316	0.49	0.155	0.187	0.471	0.088	0.326	0.372	0.121
Nagaland	0.618	0.642	0.397	0.527	0.538	0.284	0.632	0.555	0.351	0.503	0.596	0.3
Odisha	0.738	0.535	0.395	0.863	0.62	0.535	0.574	0.517	0.297	0.4	0.486	0.194
Puducherry	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Punjab	0.4	0.494	0.198	0.688	0.506	0.348	0.202	0.45	0.091	0.138	0.438	0.06
Rajasthan	0.697	0.563	0.392	0.891	0.597	0.532	0.62	0.537	0.333	0.349	0.554	0.193
Sikkim	0.395	0.552	0.218	0.388	0.496	0.193	0.329	0.495	0.163	0.355	0.471	0.167
Tamil Nadu	0.503	0.454	0.228	0.663	0.533	0.353	0.321	0.432	0.139	0.082	0.456	0.037
Telangana	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tripura	0.56	0.499	0.279	0.645	0.574	0.371	0.399	0.48	0.191	0.434	0.506	0.22
Uttar Pradesh	0.778	0.563	0.438	0.891	0.644	0.574	0.706	0.55	0.388	0.467	0.525	0.245
Uttarakhand	0.465	0.502	0.233	0.611	0.514	0.314	0.398	0.515	0.205	0.301	0.471	0.142
West Bengal	0.643	0.552	0.355	0.846	0.605	0.512	0.437	0.466	0.204	0.442	0.536	0.237
All India	0.631	0.546	0.344	0.779	0.587	0.457	0.553	0.531	0.294	0.341	0.514	0.175

Supplementary Table 3.1: Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition of the Multidimensional Poverty Index by Background Characteristics (NFHS 3-4)

Covariates	Endowment effect		Coefficient effect		Interaction effect	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Age						
0-14 yrs	.	.	.	.	.	.
14-59 yrs	0.0014***	0	-0.006***	0.0004	0.0003***	0
60+ yrs	0.0007***	0	-0.0024***	0.0001	0.0004***	0
Sex						
Male	.	.	.	.	.	.
Female	0.0001***	0	0.0082***	0.0003	-0.0002***	0
Household Size						
<4 members	.	.	.	.	.	.
5-6 members	-0.0001***	0	0.0066***	0.0003	-0.0002***	0
>6 members	0.0023***	0	0.0085***	0.0002	0.0014***	0
Marital Status						
Married	0.0005***	0	-0.000***5	0.0003	0*	0
Unmarred	.	.	.	.	.	.
Widowed	-0.0004***	0	-0.0018***	0.0001	-0.0005***	0
WQ						
Poorest	-0.0044***	0.0002	0.0405***	0.0004	-0.0027***	0.0001
Poorer	-0.0012***	0.0001	0.0499***	0.0004	-0.0018***	0.0002
Middle	0.0001*	0.0001	0.0395***	0.0004	0.0003*	0.0001
Richer	0.0003***	0	0.0119***	0.0003	0.0004***	0
Richest	.	.	.	.	.	.
Caste						
SC	-0.0002***	0	0.0051***	0.0002	-0.0005***	0
ST	-0.0005***	0	0.0027***	0.0001	-0.0003***	0
OBC	-0.0002***	0	0.0058***	0.0004	-0.0003***	0
Others	.	.	.	.	.	.
Religion						
Hindu	.	.	.	.	.	.
Muslim	-0.0003***	0	0.004***	0.0001	-0.0002***	0
Christian	0***	0	0.0002***	0.0001	0	0
Sikh	0***	0	0	0.0001	0	0
Others	0***	0	-0.0002***	0	0**	0
Area						
Rural	0	0	0.0079***	0.0006	0.0001***	0
Urban	.	.	.	.	.	.
States/UTs						
UT	.	.	.	.	.	.
Jammu Kashmir	0.0001***	0	0.0006***	0.0001	-0.0002***	0
Punjab	0.0001***	0	0.0003**	0.0001	0**	0
Uttarakhand	0***	0	0	0	0	0
Haryana	-0.0002***	0	0.0005***	0.0001	-0.0001***	0
Delhi	0***	0	0.0003***	0.0001	-0.0001***	0
Rajasthan	0.0002***	0	0.0024***	0.0002	0.0001***	0
Uttar Pradesh	0	0	0.0047***	0.0006	0	0
Bihar	-0.001***	0	0.0074***	0.0004	-0.0011***	0.0001
Sikkim	0	0	0***	0	0***	0
Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	0**	0	0**	0

Covariates	Endowment effect		Coefficient effect		Interaction effect	
Nagaland	0*	0	0.0001***	0	0**	0
Manipur	0	0	0.0001***	0	0**	0
Mizoram	0	0	0**	0	0	0
Tripura	0***	0	0.0001***	0	0***	0
Meghalaya	0	0	0.0001***	0	0	0
Assam	0.0001***	0	0.0006***	0.0001	0.0001***	0
West Bengal	-0.0001***	0	0.0043***	0.0003	0.0002***	0
Jharkhand	0	0	0.0015***	0.0001	0*	0
Orissa	-0.0019***	0.0002	0.0002	0.0004	-0.0001	0.0003
Chhattisgarh	0	0	0.0005***	0.0001	0*	0
Madhya Pradesh	.	.	.	.	0.0038***	0.0002
Gujarat	0.0001***	0	0.001***	0.0002	0.0001***	0
Maharashtra	0	0	0.0017***	0.0004	0	0
Andhra Pradesh	0.0002***	0	0.002***	0.0003	0.0003***	0
Karnataka	0*	0	0.0009***	0.0002	0.0001***	0
Goa	0*	0	0	0	0	0
Kerala	0**	0	-0.0005***	0.0001	0**	0
Tamil Nadu	0	0	-0.0002***	0.0003	0	0
Himachal Pradesh	-0.0001***	0	-0.0001***	0	0.0001***	0
Cons.			-0.0368***	0.0043		
Total	-0.0043***	0.0003	0.1718***	0.0004	-0.0005	0.0003

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1

Supplementary Table 3.2: Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition of the Multidimensional Poverty Index by Background Characteristics (NFHS 3-5)

Covariates	Endowment effect		Coefficient effect		Interaction effect	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Age						
0-14 yrs	.	.	.	.	.	.
14-59 yrs	0.0014***	0	-0.0087***	0.0004	0.0005***	0
60+ yrs	0.0013***	0	-0.0033***	0.0001	0.0008***	0
Sex						
Male	.	.	.	.	.	.
Female	0***	0	-0.0017***	0.0003	0***	0
Household Size						
<4 members	.	.	.	.	.	.
5-6 members	-0.0001***	0	0.0057***	0.0003	-0.0001***	0
>6 members	0.0034***	0	0.0093***	0.0002	0.003***	0.0001
Marital Status						
Married	0.0005***	0	0.0003	0.0003	0	0
Unmarred	.	.	.	.	.	.
Widowed	-0.0002***	0	-0.0026***	0.0001	-0.0006***	0
WQ						
Poorest	-0.0027***	0.0001	0.0646***	0.0004	-0.0042***	0.0002
Poorer	-0.0007***	0.0001	0.0637***	0.0004	-0.0025***	0.0002
Middle	0	0	0.0466***	0.0004	0	0.0001
Richer	0.0002***	0	0.014***	0.0003	0.0004***	0
Richest	.	.	.	.	.	.
Caste						
SC	-0.0005***	0	0.0047***	0.0002	-0.0007***	0
ST	-0.0003***	0	0.0044***	0.0001	-0.0007***	0
OBC	-0.0001***	0	0.0059***	0.0003	-0.0002***	0
Others	.	.	.	.	.	.
Religion						
Hindu	.	.	.	.	.	.
Muslim	0*	0	0.0062***	0.0001	0*	0
Christian	0*	0	0.0002***	0.0001	0**	0
Sikh	0	0	-0.0001	0	0	0
Others	0***	0	0	0	0	0
Area						
Rural	0***	0	0.0091***	0.0006	-0.0001***	0
Urban	.	.	.	.	.	.
States/UTs						
UT	.	.	.	.	.	.
Jammu Kashmir	-0.0002***	0	0.0002***	0	0.0003***	0
Punjab	0.0001***	0	0.0022***	0.0002	-0.0007***	0.0001
Uttarakhand	-0.0001***	0	0***	0	0.0004***	0
Haryana	-0.0005***	0.0001	0.0001***	0	0.0016***	0.0001
Delhi	-0.0002***	0	0***	0	0.0006***	0.0001
Rajasthan	0.0001***	0	0.0073***	0.0002	-0.0012***	0.0001
Uttar Pradesh	-0.0021***	0	0.006***	0.0002	0.0101***	0.0003
Bihar	-0.0002***	0.0001	0.0013***	0	0.011***	0.0002
Sikkim	0***	0	0.0001***	0	-0.0001***	0
Arunachal Pradesh	0***	0	0.0008***	0.0002	-0.0008***	0.0002

Covariates	Endowment effect		Coefficient effect		Interaction effect	
Nagaland	0.0002***	0	0.0033***	0.0004	-0.0032**	0.0004
Manipur	0.0009***	0	0.0024***	0.0002	-0.0022***	0.0002
Mizoram	0.0003***	0	0.0011*	0.0006	-0.0011***	0.0006
Tripura	0.0004***	0	0.001***	0.0002	-0.0009***	0.0001
Meghalaya	0.0005***	0	0.0025***	0.0002	-0.0022***	0.0002
Assam	0	0.0001	0***	0	0.0014***	0.0001
West Bengal	-0.0018***	0.0004	0***	0	0.0052***	0.0005
Jharkhand	-0.0008***	0.0001	0.0001***	0	0.0028***	0.0001
Orissa	0.0018***	0	0.0059***	0.0003	-0.0031***	0.0002
Chhattisgarh	0***	0	0.0003***	0.0001	0.0002***	0
Madhya Pradesh	0	.	.	.	0.0038***	0.0002
Gujarat	-0.001***	0.0002	0***	0	0.0036***	0.0003
Maharashtra	0.0004***	0	0.0006***	0.0001	0.0015***	0.0002
Andhra Pradesh	-0.0006***	0	0.0018***	0.0001	0.0028***	0.0002
Karnataka	-0.002***	0.0001	0.0002***	0	0.0032***	0.0002
Goa	-0.0033***	0	-0.0004	0.0008	0.0003	0.0008
Kerala	0.0004***	0	-0.0001***	0	-0.0006***	0.0001
Tamil Nadu	-0.0033***	0.0007	0***	0	0.003***	0.0007
Himachal Pradesh	0***	0	0***	0	0***	0
Cons.	.	.	-0.0616***	0.0036	.	.
Total	-0.0084***	0.0009	0.1936***	0.0016	0.0313***	0.0018

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1

Supplementary Table 3.3: Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition of the Multidimensional Poverty Index by Background Characteristics (NFHS 4-5)

Covariates	Endowment effect		Coefficient effect		Interaction effect	
	Beta	SE	Beta	SE	Beta	SE
Age						
0-14 yrs	.	.	.	.	.	.
14-59 yrs	0.0002***	0	-0.0027***	0.0002	0***	0
60+ yrs	0.0006***	0	-0.0005***	0.0001	0.0001***	0
Sex						
Male	.	.	.	.	.	.
Female	0***	0	-0.0011***	0.0001	0***	0
Household Size						
<4 members	.	.	.	.	.	.
5-6 members	0***	0	-0.0008***	0.0001	0***	0
>6 members	0.0015***	0	0.0018***	0.0001	0.0002***	0
Marital Status						
Married	0***	0	0.0008***	0.0001	0***	0
Unmarred	.	.	.	.	.	.
Widowed	0***	0	-0.0008***	0	0***	0
WQ						
Poorest	0	0.0001	0.0241***	0.0002	0	0
Poorer	0	0	0.0137***	0.0002	0	0
Middle	-0.0001***	0	0.0068***	0.0002	0***	0
Richer	0***	0	0.002***	0.0002	0***	0
Richest	.	.	.	.	.	.
Caste						
SC	-0.0002***	0	-0.0006***	0.0001	0***	0
ST	-0.0001***	0	0.0016***	0.0001	0***	0
OBC	0.0001***	0	0.0002	0.0002	0	0
Others	.	.	.	.	.	.
Religion						
Hindu	.	.	.	.	.	.
Muslim	0.0002***	0	0.0024***	0.0001	0.0001***	0
Christian	0**	0	0***	0	0	0
Sikh	0	0	0***	0	0	0
Others	0***	0	0.0001***	0	0***	0
Area						
Rural	0.0001***	0	0.001***	0.0002	0***	0
Urban	.	.	.	.	.	.
States/UTs						
UT	.	.	.	.	.	.
Jammu Kashmir	-0.0003***	0	0***	0	0.0002***	0
Punjab	0.0002***	0	0.0016***	0.0001	-0.0007***	0
Uttarakhand	-0.0001***	0	0***	0	0.0004***	0
Haryana	-0.0006***	0.0001	0.0001***	0	0.0015***	0.0001
Delhi	-0.0002***	0.0001	0***	0	0.0005***	0.0001
Rajasthan	0.0002***	0	0.0042***	0.0002	-0.0009***	0
Uttar Pradesh	-0.0021***	0	0.0043***	0.0001	0.0071***	0.0002
Bihar	-0.0002**	0.0001	0.0006***	0	0.0063***	0.0002
Sikkim	0**	0	0	0	0	0
Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001	0.0001
Nagaland	0.0002***	0	0.0008***	0.0002	-0.0008***	0.0002

Covariates	Endowment effect		Coefficient effect		Interaction effect	
Manipur	0.0009***	0	0.0009***	0.0001	-0.0008***	0.0001
Mizoram	0.0003***	0	-0.0005*	0.0003	0.0005*	0.0003
Tripura	0.0004***	0	-0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
Meghalaya	0.0005***	0	0.0014***	0.0001	-0.0013***	0.0001
Assam	0	0.0001	0***	0	0.0006***	0.0001
West Bengal	-0.0017***	0.0004	0	0	0.0007	0.0004
Jharkhand	-0.0008***	0.0001	0***	0	0.0014***	0.0001
Orissa	-0.001***	0	0.0057***	0.0002	0.0016***	0.0001
Chhattisgarh	0***	0	0	0	0	0
Madhya Pradesh	.	.	.	.	.	.
Gujarat	-0.0009***	0.0002	0***	0	0.002***3	0.0002
Maharashtra	0.0004***	0	0.0001	0.0001	0.0003	0.0002
Andhra Pradesh	-0.0004***	0	0.0009***	0.0001	0.0011***	0.0001
Karnataka	-0.0017***	0.0001	0.0001***	0	0.0019***	0.0001
Goa	-0.0033***	0	-0.0013***	0.0003	0.0013***	0.0003
Kerala	0.0005***	0	0*	0	-0.0002	0.0001
Tamil Nadu	-0.0038***	0.0008	0***	0	0.0036***	0.0008
Himachal Pradesh	-0.0001***	0	0.0001***	0	0.0002***	0
Cons.			-0.0335***	0.0026		
Total	-0.0116***	0.0009	0.0335***	0.001	0.0274***	0.0013

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1

Supplementary Table 4: Place of residence wise Multidimensional Poverty Index values by Background Characteristics

Background Characteristics	NFHS 3						NFHS 4						NFHS 5					
	Rural			Urban			Rural			Urban			Rural			Urban		
	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI	H	A	MPI
Sex																		
Male	64%	55%	0.35	24%	49%	0.12	31%	47%	0.15	8%	45%	0.04	18%	45%	0.1	5%	43%	0.02
Female	66%	55%	0.36	25%	49%	0.12	33%	48%	0.16	9%	46%	0.04	20%	45%	0.1	6%	43%	0.02
Age																		
0-14 y	74%	58%	0.43	34%	52%	0.18	50%	52%	0.26	15%	47%	0.07	29%	46%	0.1	10%	44%	0.04
15-59y	60%	53%	0.32	20%	48%	0.10	30%	47%	0.14	8%	44%	0.03	15%	44%	0.1	4%	42%	0.02
60 +y	61%	49%	0.30	20%	46%	0.09	39%	43%	0.17	9%	42%	0.04	15%	41%	0.1	3%	41%	0.01
Caste																		
SC	73%	56%	0.41	37%	50%	0.18	35%	48%	0.17	12%	45%	0.05	22%	45%	0.1	8%	44%	0.03
ST	83%	59%	0.49	35%	52%	0.18	48%	49%	0.24	16%	46%	0.08	30%	46%	0.1	10%	44%	0.04
OBC	67%	54%	0.36	28%	49%	0.14	31%	47%	0.15	9%	45%	0.04	18%	44%	0.1	5%	43%	0.02
Others	48%	52%	0.25	15%	48%	0.07	20%	46%	0.09	5%	45%	0.02	11%	43%	0.0	3%	43%	0.01
Religion																		
Hindu	65%	54%	0.35	22%	48%	0.11	37%	48%	0.18	8%	44%	0.04	18%	44%	0.1	5%	43%	0.02
Muslim	73%	60%	0.44	38%	52%	0.20	47%	53%	0.25	16%	46%	0.07	25%	47%	0.1	10%	44%	0.04
Christian	53%	53%	0.28	14%	43%	0.06	22%	45%	0.10	3%	40%	0.01	14%	46%	0.1	2%	41%	0.01
Sikh	27%	48%	0.13	5%	40%	0.02	6%	45%	0.03	1%	39%	0.01	6%	42%	0.0	2%	40%	0.01
Others	70%	54%	0.37	17%	47%	0.08	37%	46%	0.17	5%	40%	0.02	21%	45%	0.1	3%	41%	0.01
Marital Status																		
Marr.	63%	53%	0.33	22%	48%	0.10	29%	46%	0.14	7%	45%	0.03	17%	44%	0.1	4%	42%	0.02
Unmar.	59%	53%	0.31	20%	49%	0.10	21%	45%	0.09	5%	44%	0.02	10%	43%	0.0	3%	42%	0.01
Widow/Seperated/Divorced	65%	51%	0.33	26%	47%	0.12	31%	45%	0.14	8%	44%	0.04	17%	42%	0.1	5%	42%	0.02
All India	65%	55%	0.36	24%	54%	0.13	32%	47%	0.15	8%	45%	0.04	19%	45%	0.1	5%	43%	0.02

Supplementary Table 5: Place of Residence wise Multidimensional Poverty Index values by Social Groups

Caste	Caste*Religion	Rural			Urban			Total		
		NFHS 3	NFHS 4	NFHS 5	NFHS 3	NFHS 4	NFHS 5	NFHS 3	NFHS 4	NFHS 5
Schedule Caste (SC)										
	Scheduled Caste Hindus	0.417	0.173	0.104	0.200	0.055	0.033	0.357	0.142	0.085
	Scheduled Caste Others	0.286	0.107	0.063	0.138	0.038	0.029	0.229	0.084	0.053
Schedule Tribe (ST)										
	Scheduled Tribe Hindus	0.474	0.240	0.135	0.266	0.084	0.046	0.441	0.220	0.124
	Scheduled Tribe Others	0.356	0.205	0.138	0.105	0.043	0.029	0.303	0.173	0.118
Other Backward Class (OBC)										
	Other Backward Caste Hindus	0.390	0.139	0.072	0.130	0.030	0.018	0.323	0.107	0.057
	Other Backward Others	0.424	0.197	0.113	0.139	0.066	0.039	0.321	0.135	0.081
Others										
	Other Caste Hindus	0.216	0.067	0.032	0.052	0.010	0.007	0.145	0.043	0.021
	Other Caste Others	0.408	0.165	0.088	0.156	0.058	0.034	0.302	0.117	0.065

Supplementary Table 6.1: Unadjusted HeadCount Ratio by Social Groups for the different cut-offs of Multidimensional Poverty (NFHS 5)

Cutoff levels	SC		ST		OBC		Others		All
	SCH	SCO	STH	STO	OBCH	OBCO	OH	OO	
0.1	0.589	0.487	0.718	0.644	0.514	0.528	0.360	0.482	0.522
0.2	0.429	0.343	0.542	0.463	0.347	0.379	0.215	0.342	0.363
0.3	0.241	0.146	0.359	0.307	0.171	0.202	0.079	0.175	0.190
0.33	0.189	0.119	0.272	0.252	0.131	0.173	0.057	0.145	0.148
0.4	0.102	0.063	0.159	0.149	0.061	0.106	0.023	0.085	0.077
0.5	0.053	0.030	0.079	0.083	0.029	0.059	0.009	0.045	0.039
0.6	0.022	0.010	0.034	0.040	0.011	0.024	0.003	0.019	0.016
0.7	0.007	0.003	0.011	0.015	0.003	0.009	0.001	0.004	0.005
0.8	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.003	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.001	0.001
0.9	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Supplementary Table 6.2: Adjusted HeadCount Ratio by Social Groups for the different cut-offs of Multidimensional Poverty (NFHS 5)

Cutoff levels	SC		ST		OBC		Others		All
	SCH	SCO	STH	STO	OBCH	OBCO	OH	OO	
0.1	0.173	0.132	0.225	0.203	0.139	0.157	0.087	0.139	0.147
0.2	0.148	0.109	0.197	0.174	0.113	0.133	0.064	0.116	0.122
0.3	0.101	0.061	0.151	0.135	0.069	0.09	0.031	0.075	0.079
0.33	0.085	0.053	0.124	0.118	0.057	0.081	0.024	0.066	0.066
0.4	0.053	0.032	0.083	0.08	0.031	0.056	0.012	0.045	0.04
0.5	0.032	0.017	0.048	0.051	0.017	0.036	0.005	0.027	0.023
0.6	0.015	0.007	0.023	0.028	0.007	0.016	0.002	0.012	0.011
0.7	0.006	0.002	0.008	0.012	0.002	0.007	0.001	0.003	0.004
0.8	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.003	0	0.001	0	0	0.001
0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Supplementary Table 7.1: Kitagawa Decomposition of Multidimensional Poverty Index (NFHS 3-4)

Dimensions	Cont. of H			Cont. of A		
	a	b		c	d	
	H1-H2	A1+A2/2	a*b	A1-A2	H1+H2/2	c*d
Education	0.28	0.072	0.02	-0.002	0.383	-0.001
Attendance	0.28	0.048	0.013	0.024	0.383	0.009
Nutrition	0.28	0.132	0.037	-0.001	0.383	0
Child Mortality	0.28	0.006	0.002	-0.001	0.383	0
Maternal Health	0.28	0.042	0.012	-0.01	0.383	-0.004
Electricity	0.28	0.021	0.006	0.009	0.383	0.003
Toilet	0.28	0.042	0.012	0.002	0.383	0.001
Water	0.28	0.012	0.003	0.004	0.383	0.002
House	0.28	0.039	0.011	-0.001	0.383	-0.001
Fuel	0.28	0.045	0.013	0.001	0.383	0
Bank Account	0.28	0.023	0.006	0.025	0.383	0.01
Asset	0.28	0.025	0.007	0.015	0.383	0.006
Total	3.357	0.505	0.141	0.067	4.6	0.026

Supplementary Table 7.2: Kitagawa Decomposition of Multidimensional Poverty Index (NFHS 4-5)

Dimensions	Cont. of H			Cont. of A		
	a	b		c	d	
	H1-H2	A1+A2/2	a*b	A1-A2	H1+H2/2	c*d
Education	0.096	0.074	0.007	-0.002	0.195	0
Attendance	0.096	0.038	0.004	-0.005	0.195	-0.001
Nutrition	0.096	0.132	0.013	0	0.195	0
Child Mortality	0.096	0.007	0.001	0	0.195	0
Maternal Health	0.096	0.049	0.005	-0.005	0.195	-0.001
Electricity	0.096	0.011	0.001	0.01	0.195	0.002
Toilet	0.096	0.035	0.003	0.011	0.195	0.002
Water	0.096	0.008	0.001	0.003	0.195	0.001
House	0.096	0.039	0.004	0.001	0.195	0
Fuel	0.096	0.042	0.004	0.005	0.195	0.001
Bank Account	0.096	0.007	0.001	0.007	0.195	0.001
Asset	0.096	0.016	0.002	0.002	0.195	0
Total	1.154	0.458	0.044	0.027	2.344	0.005

Supplementary Table 7.3: Kitagawa Decomposition of Multidimensional Poverty Index (NFHS 3-5)

Dimensions	Cont. of H			Cont. of A		
	a	b		c	d	
	H1-H2	A1+A2/2	a*b	A1-A2	H1+H2/2	c*d
Education	0.376	0.073	0.027	-0.003	0.335	-0.001
Attendance	0.376	0.05	0.019	0.019	0.335	0.006
Nutrition	0.376	0.132	0.05	-0.001	0.335	0
Child Mortality	0.376	0.006	0.002	-0.001	0.335	0
Maternal Health	0.376	0.044	0.017	-0.014	0.335	-0.005
Electricity	0.376	0.015	0.006	0.019	0.335	0.006
Toilet	0.376	0.036	0.014	0.014	0.335	0.005
Water	0.376	0.011	0.004	0.007	0.335	0.002
House	0.376	0.038	0.014	0	0.335	0
Fuel	0.376	0.042	0.016	0.006	0.335	0.002
Bank Account	0.376	0.02	0.007	0.032	0.335	0.011
Asset	0.376	0.024	0.009	0.017	0.335	0.006
Total	4.511	0.492	0.185	0.094	4.023	0.032

Contributors

CRY, Child Right and You

Ms Ragini Pant (Associate General Manager)

IEG, Institute of Economic Growth

Komal Ahluwalia

Anirudhan P Edathil

Ajit Kumar Yadav

Ishika Pahuja

Varun Yadav

William Joe

Disclaimer

This assessment is an outcome of collaboration between the Institute of Economic Growth and CRY (Child Rights and You). We gratefully acknowledge the support provided by CRY (Child Rights and You) for the preparation of this assessment. The views expressed in this document are of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Institute of Economic Growth or CRY (Child Rights and You).

Designed by

Pannita Jain and Dhananjay Upadhyay

INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH
University Enclave
University of Delhi (North Campus)
Delhi 110007, India

Fax: +91-11-27667410
Phone: +91-11-27666364/6367, 27667101/7288/7365/7424
Email: system@iegindia.org