

Comparative Analysis of Poverty Approaches in Sonapat District: A Case Study

Ms. Anju Rani, Assistant Professor

Department of Economics, Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishwavidyalaya, Khanpur Kalan Sonapat (Haryana)

Abstract: Income as a sole indicator of poverty is not only injustice with measurement of poverty but with government efforts to alleviate the poverty. Among various measures of poverty MPI is the latest which is developed by UNDP on the replacement of the HPI and whereas HPI reflects aggregate deprivation in living condition, health and education MPI reveals how many deprivations they face in individual dimensions. So, goal of study is to analyse multidimensional poverty analysis in Khanpur Kalan and finds differences in Income base poverty and multidimensional poverty in this village at aggregate and disaggregated level in 2016.

Keywords: Development, Multidimensional Poverty, Income, Khanpur Kalan

I. INTRODUCTION

Development is a complex issue, with many different definitions and a basic perspective equates development with economic growth; when continuous increase in GDP of a country occurs then it's considered development, but in (1960-70) decades large number of third world countries as Libya, Kuwait, Iran, Iraq etc achieved higher growth in GDP like developed countries but living conditions were not improved in these countries. So, in the later large number of development economists define development in terms of people welfare, now debate was started on how to measure welfare. There are lot of measure available but broad measure was given by economist Morris in this direction with the name PQLI based on three indicators, Life expectancy, infant mortality, and literacy rate give equal weight age to all indicators. But one of the drawbacks of this measure was that it provides equal weight to all indicators which is not a real approach and to overcome the drawbacks other measure i.e. HDI is a summary measure of average achievements in key dimensions of human development as healthy life, being educate and have a better standard of living is emerged but HDI also has some shortcomings as, the gross enrolment index is one of the components of HDI, which measure the percentage of children joining the school at primary level but it ignores the percentage of drops out at primary level and another drawback of HDI is that equal weight is attached to all its three components as POLI. One of the major shortcoming of all these measure was that they are not directly related to poverty alleviation in any measure and one economist rightly said that countries should take care their poverty development is a automatic process. So it generated a new debate that without poverty reduction even the imagination of development is not possible. Then questions arise how to measure poverty. There are different measure in this direction as initial measure were related income and consumption approach But despite the outstanding growth in Asian countries poverty remains one of the crucial issues in these countries because of inaccurate measure of it. In most of countries the basic definition of poverty is focused on income base or consumption base but only income alone is not a suitable measure about the well- being of the people. There is no doubt that income is one of strong dimension of poverty but it is not put a true picture of well being of people.

So income as a sole indicator of poverty is not only injustice with measurement of poverty but with government efforts to alleviate the poverty. Among various measures of poverty MPI is the latest which is developed by UNDP on the replacement of the HPI and whereas HPI reflects aggregate deprivation in living condition, health and education MPI reveals how many deprivations they face in individual dimensions So, goal of paper is to analyse multidimensional poverty analysis in Khanpur Kalan and find differences in Income base poverty and multidimensional poverty in this village. The paper is organised as follows Section1 leads to review of theory and empirics on multidimensional poverty. Section 2,3&4 describe the significance, objectives and research methodology for present paper. Section 5 explores the findings of paper and last section is devoted to conclusion and policy implication and suggestions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on the subject of multidimensional poverty is abundant and burgeoning. An attempt is made here to touch upon a selected review of literature in different countries, agencies and individually singly or collectively to tackle the problem of poverty in global and Indian context. **Ayala et al.(2009)** described a comparison of income base and multidimensional poverty in Spain using Income and Living Survey Condition Report(2008) and decomposition technique and showed that traditional approach have been placed in question in recent time by multidimensional approach of poverty. The study also explored that although level of

development achieved by new approach is not so much clear and accurate and does not show a relationship that exist between household's income and situation of multidimensional deprivation . Similarly **Awan et al.(2012)** also explored multidimensional poverty for four provinces of Pakistan as Sindh, NWFP, Baluchistan and Punjab by using Alkire and Foster technique in nine dimension as water, electricity, sanitation, education housing empowerment, land and expenditure and revealed that overall Baluchistan is more deprived and followed by NWFP, Sindh and Punjab and put a worst picture in both rural and urban provinces. Study also presented that major contributing aspect of multidimensional poverty are land, housing assets, sanitation and empowerment and evidence showed that there is a significant overlap in one-dimensional and multidimensional approach of poverty in Pakistan. **Santosh(2013)** estimated the multidimensional poverty index as an acute poverty which shows inability of population as a core function of MDG goals for 100 developing countries using Alkire and Foster dual cut-off methodology in ten indicators of three broad dimension living standards, health and education in 2010. The result explored that MPI does not seems to be higher in households which have more children and women and it also added a new insights in measurement of poverty at global level. **Saini(2013)** also described the multidimensional poverty for Cameroon for the period 2001-2007 using Alkire-Foster technique and came to conclusion that income base poverty is a partial understanding of poverty measurement which fails to capture many broad aspects of deprivation as lack of education, sanitation, water facilities and electricity. The inferences also showed that although there is drastic reduction in income poverty in Cameroon in above mentioned period but it is accompanied by a significant increase in a multidimensional approach of poverty. Over the period Chile, Mexico, Elsalvador and Brazil has experienced a significant reduction in multidimensional poverty between 1992 to 2006, whereas Uruguay showed a small change especially in urban region (**Battionston et al.(2013)**). In all selected nations deprivation in access to proper sanitation and household head's education are more contributor to overall poverty. **Correa (2014)** also presented the selection criterion of dimensions under multidimensional poverty for Chile, Ecuador, Peru and Colombia within a household data. The study used Alkire and Foster and Sen.'s Capability approach to generate multidimensional index for the dimension living conditions, healthy education and labour. Results of the study showed that Chile was still the least multidimensional poor country followed by Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. **Le et al. (2014)** showed multidimensional poverty from households in five aspects as education, social support, health, insurance, living condition and social participation for 2010-12. The results revealed that multidimensional poverty has declined in above period but there is wide difference between income base and multidimensional poverty. Among five dimensions social insurance and social assistance is core of multidimensional poverty. Similarly **Saini (2015)** also discussed that most often poverty is assessed by monetary variables which split the population into poor and non poor only but he focused on change in the traditional one-dimensional aspect of poverty and explored again one of the broader perspective of poverty using Fuzzy set approach for Cameroon and found almost half of population is poor. The results also presented that population is more deprived in durables households items as television and refrigerator and also provide many policy recommendation as improve access of safe drinking water, coverage of electricity and need of strengthen of human capital. **Pasha (2015)** also analysed the consequences of different weight age provided to each indicator within MPI for 22 countries using the Demographic and Health Survey Report and principal Component Analysis and Multiple Correspondence Analysis at country level and results of the study reveals that equal weighting of all three dimension is not statistically significant so weight age should be given to according to importance of indicators. The study also led to many queries that have yet to be answered, relating to the difference in multidimensional poverty within countries and regions across the world.

In short review of literature indicates that developing countries is more multidimensional poor as compared to developed countries. With this review also shows that there few studies have been conducted on micro level which provides an ample scope to researcher for research work on micro level.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

The official approach to define and measuring poverty in India as well as among in different states is based on monetary aspect, but this aspects not a sufficient measurement of poverty because it does not give a the guarantee of better life as some households is even above the poverty line but yet deprived from basic amenities as health, education, sanitation facilities and safe drinking water etc. On the other hand although a number of studies have been conducted on multidimensional poverty in India as well as in different states but a very few studies is carried out a micro level. So there is ample scope of research in this area especially at village level which provides a true picture of living condition of rural population. So this study is a sincere effort in this direction which put a light on a broad measure of poverty at micro level.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

The broad objective of study is to analyse the multidimensional poverty in one of the village of Sonapat District with this there are some support objective as

- To compute Multidimensional poverty index of selected village as a whole (Aggregated level) and caste base (disaggregated level).
- To make a comparative analysis of two approaches of poverty as multidimensional poverty and income poverty in the selected village at aggregated and disaggregated level.
- To provides some suggestions for further policy implication.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Keeping in mind the broad objective of study following is the various component of research methodology for current study.

5.1 Study Area

To endeavour the above objectives, the study is based on cross section data of the one of village Khanpur Kalan of Sonapat District in Haryana in 2016.

5.2 Sample and Method of Data Collection

The primary data technique schedule is used to collect the information from respondent of selected area. At the first stage a well structured questionnaire is prepared and a pilot survey of 20 respondents is tested for it. Sample is made on the base of strata probability sampling. At very first, stage of strata sampling total population 2000 households of selected village is divided into three strata on the based of category. In 2000 households, 900 households lies in general category, 270 in OBC and remaining 830 in SC category. Then a 10 % from each stratum is sampled. In this way 200 household in which 90 belongs to general, 27 from OBC and 83 from SC is sampled.

5.3 Statistical Tools

For fulfilling the objectives of study, data is analysed by econometric and statistical methods. The used Body Mass Index (BMI) for measuring health conditions like malnourished and overweight age population. Percentage and ratio is used for measuring the size of households is having dirty fuels, floor, no access of safe drinking water, toilet facilities. The main analysis is done by Alkire-Foster techniques "Multidimensional Poverty Index". Tabulation analysis is used to compare income base poverty approach and multidimensional poverty approach.

5.4 Multidimensional Poverty Index: Dimensions and Basic Concepts

5.4.1 Dimensions

The multidimensional poverty index defines the multiple deprivations of households at individual level. There are ten indicators, having maximum deprivation score of 100 and each person is assigned a deprivation score according to his or her deprivation in household. Since there are three broad indicators as living condition, education and health so maximum deprivation 100 is divided into three indicators and attains 33% by each. Further health and education have two components so maximum deprivation score of each component is 16.7%. Living standard of household is measured by measured by nine components as assets as Radio, TV, Refrigerator etc so maximum derivation in this category is 5.56. The Indicators threshold for household to be considered deprived as follows.

Education:

- School Attainments (Six years of schooling is not attained by a single member of household.).
- School Attendance (School going children does not attend school up to 8th grade)

Health:

Nutrition (Malnourished is defined in a household in terms of Body Mass Index for the age group 15-59 and for children under age 5 , Z score is calculated by height for age)

- Child Mortality: Child mortality is defined in first five years of survival of a child.
- Living Condition:
- Electricity (does not have access to electricity
- Drinking Water (do not have safe drinking water and source of clean drinking water is located more than 30 minutes away by walking distance.
- Sanitation (do not have access to sanitation facilities, or if have it is shared)
- Cooking fuel (use of dirty cooking fuel as dung, wood or charcoal)
- Having home with a dirt, sand or dung floor

- Assets (do not have at least one assets of information, mobility and livelihood separately in following assets as radio, TV, telephone bike, motorbike, car trunk, animal cart, motorboat refrigerator, arable land, livestock)

To identify the multidimensional poor, the deprivation scores for each indicator are summed to obtain the household deprivation score c . A cut-off 33.3 percent, which is equivalent to 1/3 of the weight indicators, is used to distinguish between the poor and not poor. If the deprivation score is 33.3 percent or greater, the whole household is multidimensional poor. Household with a deprivation score greater than or equal to 20 percent but less than 33.3 percent are considered to be near multidimensional poverty. Household with a deprivation score of 50 percent or higher are severely multidimensional poor.

5.4.2 Basic Concepts

Head Count Ratio (H) :- It's the proportion of the multidimensional poor in the population.

$$H = q/n$$

q = Number of people who are multidimensional poor.

n = Total population.

Intensity of Poverty (A) :- It's proportion of the weighted component indicators in which, on average, poor people are deprived. For poor households only the deprivation scores are summed and divided by the total number of poor people.

$$A = \sum q_i.c_i / q$$

c =Deprivation score of i th poor household.

i = i th poor household.

Multidimensional Poverty Index: - The MPI value is the product of the multidimensional poverty headcount ratio and the intensity of poverty.

$$MPI = H . A$$

Contribution of deprivation in health, education and living condition:-

$$\text{Contributor } j = \sum q_i.c_j / n \div MPI$$

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 explores the deprivation situation of different household among different indicators. For the simplicity only four household situations is explained in the table. If a household is deprived in particular indicators then it has the score 1 or in the case of not deprivation score is 0. Household 1 total deprivation score is 50 % whereas for household 2, household 3 and household 4 this score is 0, 5.56 and 61 percent respectively. Table 2 describes how total deprivation score is calculated for different household since for simplicity we explained the deprivation situation of only household in above table so this table shows the calculation of total deprivation score of above household. Total score is sum of multiplication of individual score and number of indicators which is showing deprivation situation of household. In Household 1 total deprivation score is 50 % whereas for household 2, household 3 and household 4 this score is 0, 5.56 and 61 percent respectively. Table 3 analyses some basic concepts of multidimensional poverty as MPI, head count ratio, Intensity of Poverty, and deprivation of each dimensions as health education and living standard of multidimensional poverty index of selected village. Figures show that 55 % household is multidimensional poor in this village whereas as average poor person is deprived 47.7 % of the weightage indicators. At disaggregated level 32.5 % population is deprived in terms of education, 40 % in health and only 27.5% in terms of living standard. Important observation is that population is more deprived in health and education in comparison to income.

Table 4 shows the intensity of poverty in Khanpur Kalan village. Figures represent that only 17 % household is non-poor in selected village whereas 83 % household has some degree of poverty as moderate or severe Out of 83% 28% household is nearer to poor and remaining 31.5 and 23.5% household is exactly and extent poor respectively. It means 55% population is severing poor in selected village whereas on income base this percentage is only 27.5%. One of the observable analyses is that income base poverty is only a partial approach of poverty measurement. Table 5 describes the multidimensional poverty for general category in selected village. Figures show that 38 % household is multidimensional poor in this village whereas as average poor person is deprived 44.4 % of the weightage indicators. At disaggregated level 42% population is deprived in terms of education, 36 % in health and only 22.5% in terms of living standard. Important observation is that population is more deprived in health and education in comparison to income with this figure also reflects that general category is less deprived in comparison to other category or aggregated level and one of cause may be it has resources as land as comparison to other category. Table 6 shows deprivation score of general category in Khanpur Kalan village. Figures represent that only 22.72 % household is non-poor in selected village whereas 77 % household has some degree of poverty as moderate or severe Out of 77% more than half i.e 40.55

household is nearer to poor and remaining 29.94 and 6.79 household is exactly and extent poor respectively. In short figure explains that general category in good state as only 6.79 % population is extreme poor.

Table 7 describes the multidimensional poverty for other backward caste category in selected village. Figures show that two third household is multidimensional poor in this village whereas as average poor person is deprived more than half of the weightage indicators. At disaggregated level 37% population is deprived in terms of education, 33 % in health and 30% in terms of living standard. Important observation is that population is almost same level in all indicators with minor difference in health, education and income with this figure also reflects that general category is more deprived in comparison to general category or aggregated level and one of cause may be it has less paternal resources as land as comparison to general category.

Table 8 shows deprivation score of OBC Category in Khanpur Kalan village. Figures represent that less than 1% population in this category is non-poor in selected village whereas 99 % population has some degree of poverty as moderate or severe Out of 99% more than half i.e 50.34 household is extreme poor and remaining 24.82 and 15.18 household is near to poverty and exactly poor respectively. In short figure explains that in OBC category more than half population is severe poor. Table 9 represents the multidimensional poverty for Schedule caste category in selected village. Figures show that two third household is multidimensional poor in this village whereas as average poor person is deprived nearer to half of the weightage indicators. At disaggregated level more than one third population is deprived in terms of education, 30 % in health and 30% in terms of living standard. Important observation is that population has almost same level of deprivation in health, and income but more deprived in education with this figure also reflects that schedule category is more deprived as OBC in comparison to general category or aggregated level and one of cause may be it has less paternal resources as land as comparison to general category.

Table 10 shows deprivation score of schedule caste Category in Khanpur Kalan village. Figures represent that only one-tenth population in this category is non-poor in selected village whereas 99 % population has some degree of poverty as moderate or severe Out of 99% more than one-third i.e 37.79 population is exactly poor and remaining 31.58% is extreme poor and 15.18 household is near to poverty. In short figure explains that in SC category more than half population is severe poor as OBC category.

Table 11 explores the multidimensional poverty level in selected village at aggregated and disaggregated level in 2015. Figures show that schedule caste has highest deprivation in total and it is followed by other backward classes and general category. But intensity of poverty is more in backward class in comparison to schedule caste and general category. Other surprising result is that general category although has less deprivation in income but it has high deprivation in health even than schedule and other backward classes and it shows that income is a partial measure of poverty. At aggregated level more than half population is poor and this population is more deprived in education and health in comparison to income in selected village.

Table 12 describes the deprivation score in selected village at aggregated and disaggregated level in 2015. Figures show that at maximum only one fourth at disaggregated level and one-fifth at aggregated level in selected village is non-poor and remaining 805 populations in total is poor at moderate or severe level on the other income poverty shows that this percentage is 27.5. This gap shows that income base poverty is not only an injustice with poverty measure but a hurdle in path of government efforts to alleviate poverty. Socking result of research when we analyse multidimensional poverty at disaggregated level this level reached to 99% in OBC category and 50% population is extreme poor in this category. But in general category it is only 6.67% and 22.73 at aggregated level. In short figure shows that only at disaggregated level true picture of poverty arose.

Table 13 explores the comparison of income base poverty and multidimensional poverty in selected village at aggregated and disaggregated level. Figures show that in general category only 15% population is poor on income base as 32 rupees per person per day in rural areas whereas as more than double percentage of population at aggregate and disaggregated level. In shows that multidimensional poverty is real indicator of poverty in comparison to income base poverty

VII. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Using the Alkire- Foster methodology the study has analyzed the poverty on the basis of different dimensions as education, health and standard of living. The results of the study shows that in selected village people are more deprived in terms of education and health in comparison to living standard. The results are crucial because the village has one of state university and post graduate medical college, Ayurveda College and some other medical and education institute in it. The findings of the study show that at aggregated level more than half i.e 55% population is poor in selected village whereas only 27.94% population is poor on income base poverty i.e 33 rupees per person per day in rural person. If we see at disaggregated level than 2/3 population in schedule caste and OBC category is poor and 1/3 in general category. Intensity of poverty also reflects the severity of poverty in selected areas as 38.5% in general, 68% in OBC and 69% in schedule caste, is deprived 47.7%, 47.26% and 55.73% deprived of weightage indicators respectively. Results also show that in general category population is more deprived in health and education in comparison to income whereas for other

categories it is vice a versa. Comparison of two approaches of poverty reflects that almost double percentage of population is poor on multidimensional bases at aggregate and disaggregated level both. Deprivation score explores that 22.72% population is non-poor in general category, 11% in schedule caste and less than 1% in OBC category respectively.

Multidimensional poverty is wide definition of poverty it shows separately the population who is poor on different indicators. Since multidimensional poverty analyse shows multiple deprivation of individual in all indicators separately so results shows that Khanpur Kalan Village only 27.94 percent population is deprived in terms of living standard whereas this percentage is 32.5 and 40 for education and health deprivation respectively for total population. The results is also crucial because as above said selected village has one of state university and medical college and even after that multidimensional poverty is more in this village and this become the cause of it especially for poor people deprivation in education and health because they get unskilled work as sweeper, gardener supervisor etc easy in this area and rather than send their children school get involved them with itself. The main analysis of the study is that income- based poverty measure will necessary lead to only a partial understanding of poverty which shows the ineffectiveness of different poverty alleviation programme run by government since most of the programme is one of the way to provide earning to people directly or indirectly but they fail to capture many other aspect of poverty as health and education and many more which leads to vicious circle of poverty to people. The analyses also suggests that there is strong need of broader definition of poverty that not only widen the concept of poverty but also reflects the true picture in terms of different aspect of poverty so that government can took action in right direction as access of safe drinking water, more health facilities checkup on education and health programme.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abraham, R.A., Kumar, K.S.K. 2008. Multidimensional poverty and Vulnerability, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(20) :77-87.
- [2] Akire, Sabina & Santos M. 2013. Measuring Acute Poverty in Developing World: Robustness and Scope of the Multidimensional Poverty Index, OPHI Working Paper No.59, March.
- [3] Ayala et al.2009. Income Poverty and Multidimensional Deprivation: Lesson from Cross- Regional Analysis, ECINE Working Paper Series No.2009-106, Feb.
- [4] Correa, A. 2014. An Individual- Centred Approach to Multidimensional Poverty: The case of Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru, UNU-MERIT Working Paper, IISN 1871-9872, Sept 23.
- [5] Duclos, J.y., Sahn, D., Younger, S.D.2006. Robust Multidimensional Poverty Spatial Poverty Comparison in Ghana, Madagascar and Uganda, *The World Bank Economic Review*, 20(1):91-113.
- [6] Human Development Report 2014. Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience, United Nation Development Programme, 11-29.
- [7] Jayaraj, D., & Subramanian, S.2010. View of Multidimensional Deprivation: Some Estimates from India, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(6):53-65.
- [8] Kubi, K.2007. Multidimensional Poverty in Ghana Using Fuzzy Set Theory, PMMA, No 21.
- [9] Le at al.(2014). Multidimensional Poverty: First Evidence from Vietnam, MRPA Paper No.64704, Posted 31 May 12.21 UTC.
- [10] Masood et al.2012. Multidimensional Measurement of Poverty in Pakistan: Provincial Analysis, MRPA Paper No.42119, Posted Oct 22.
- [11] Pasha, A. 2015. Regional Perspectives to the Multidimensional Poverty, Discussion Paper No. 188, Sept.
- [12] Saini, J.2013. Has Poverty Decreased in Cameroon between 2001 to 2007? An Analysis based on Multidimensional Poverty Measure, *Economic Bulletin*, 33(4), 3059-3069.
- [13] Van Der Walt, S.2004. A Multidimensional Analysis of Poverty in Eastern Cape Provinces, South Africa, Bureau for Economic Research, No.3.

Table1. Deprivation Situation of Different Household

Indicators	Households			
	1	2	3	4
Household Size	5	3	6	8
Education				
No one has completed six years of schooling	1	0	0	1
At least one school age child not enrolled in school	0	0	0	0
Health				
At least one member is malnourished	1	0	0	1
One or more children have died	0	0	0	1
Standard of Living				
No electricity	0	0	0	0
No access to clean drinking water	1	0	0	1
No access to adequate sanitation	1	0	0	0
House has dirt floor	0	0	0	0
Household uses “dirty” cooking fuel	1	0	1	1
Household has no assets to information and has no assets related to mobility or assets related to livelihood	0	0	0	0
Results				
Households deprivation score, c (sum of each deprivation multiplied by its weight)	50% (poor)	0%(non-poor)	5.56% (non-poor)	61.0% (non-poor)

Source: Author’s Calculation

Table2. Calculation of Deprivation Score of above four Households

Household 1 :- $(1 \times 16.67) + (1 \times 16.67) + (3 \times 5.56) = 50.0\%$
Household 2 :- $(0 \times 16.67) + (0 \times 16.67) + (0 \times 5.56) = 0\%$
Household 3 :- $(0 \times 16.67) + (0 \times 16.67) + (1 \times 5.56) = 5.56\%$
Household 4:- $(1 \times 16.67) + (2 \times 16.67) + (2 \times 5.56) = 61.1\%$

Source: Author Calculation

Table 3. Multidimensional Poverty at Aggregated Level in 2016

S.No	Characteristics	Percentage of population
1	Head Count Ratio	55
2	Intensity to Poverty	47.5
3	Multidimensional Poverty Index	26.2
4	Contribution of Deprivation in terms	
	Health	40
	Education	32.5
	Living Standard	27.5

Source: Author's Calculation

Table4. Slabs of Multidimensional Poverty at Aggregated Level

Deprivation Score	Deprived Population (In Percentage)
0-20	16.25 (non – poor)
20 – 33.3	29.98 (near to poverty)
33.3 -50	31.04 (exactly poor)
50 - 100	22.73 (extent poor)

Source: Author Calculation

Table5. Multidimensional Poverty in General Category

S.No	Characteristics	Percentage of population
1	Head Count Ratio	38
2	Intensity to Poverty	44.4
3	Multidimensional Poverty Index	16.9
4	Contribution of Deprivation in terms	
	Health	36
	Education	42
	Living Standard	22

Source: Author's Calculation

Table6. Slabs of Multidimensional Poverty in General Category

Deprivation Score	Deprived Population (In Percentage)
0-20	22.72 (non – poor)
20 – 33.3	40.55 (near to poverty)
33.3 -50	29.94 (exactly poor)
50 - 100	6.79 (extent poor)

Source: Author Calculation

Table7. Multidimensional Poverty in Other Backward Caste

S.No	Characteristics	Percentage of population
1	Head Count Ratio	68
2	Intensity to Poverty	55.7
3	Multidimensional Poverty Index	37.9
4	Contribution of Deprivation in terms	
	Health	33
	Education	37
	Living Standard	30

Source: Author's Calculation

Table8. Slabs of Multidimensional Poverty in OBC Category

Deprivation Score	Deprived Population (In Percentage)
0-20	0.9 (non – poor)
20 – 33.3	24.82 (near to poverty)
33.3 -50	15.18 (exactly poor)
50 - 100	50.34 (extent poor)

Source: Author Calculation

Table9. Multidimensional Poverty in SC Category

S.No	Characteristics	Percentage of population
1	Head Count Ratio	69
2	Intensity to Poverty	47.26
3	Multidimensional Poverty Index	32.60
4	Contribution of Deprivation in terms	
	Health	30
	Education	40
	Living Standard	30

Source: Author's Calculation

Table10. Slabs of Multidimensional Poverty in SC Category

Deprivation Score	Deprived Population (In Percentage)
0-20	11 (non – poor)
20 – 33.3	19.63 (near to poverty)
33.3 -50	37.79 (exactly poor)
50 - 100	31.58 (extent poor)

Source: Author Calculation

Table11. Multidimensional Poverty at Aggregated and Disaggregated Level

S.No	Characteristic	Total	General Category	OBC Category	SC Category
1	Head Count Ratio	55	38	68	69
2	Intensity to Poverty	47.5	44.4	55.73	47.7
3	Multidimensional Poverty Index	26.2	16.8	37.9	32.6
4	Contribution of Deprivation in terms				
	Health	40	42	33	30
	Education	32.5	36	37	40
	Living Standard	27.5	22	30	30

Source: Author Calculation

Table: 12 Deprivation Score at Aggregated and Disaggregated Level

Deprivation Score	Total	General Category	OBC Category	SC Category	Description
0-20	16.25	22.72	0.9	11	Non-Poor
20 – 33.3	29.98	40.55	24.82	19.63	Near to Poverty
33.3 -50	31.04	29.94	15.18	37.79	Exactly Poor
50 - 100	22.73	6.79	50.34	31.58	Extent Poor

Source: Author Calculation

Table13. Income Base Poverty at Aggregated and Disaggregated Level

S.No	category	Income Base Poverty (Percentage of Population)	Multidimensional Poverty (Percentage of Population)
1	General	15	38
2	Other Backward Classes	37.2	68
3	Schedule caste	37.5	69
4	Total	27.5	55

Source: Author Calculation