Poverty Landscape in Assam- An Overview

Goriyashi Mahanta
Research Scholar
Department of Economics, University of Science & Technology Meghalaya, Meghalaya

Sujata Choudhury
Associate Professor
Department of Economics, University of Science and Technology Meghalaya, Meghalaya

Abstract
Poverty can be found in every part of the developing world. Countries with lower levels of development are facing numerous challenges, such as poverty, unemployment, inequality, and lack of progress. Poverty represents a situation characterized by a scarcity of opportunities and disparities in treatment. Assam, a state with a developing economy, faces significant challenges related to poverty. The economy of Assam primarily relies on agriculture and related activities, as around 85 percent of its population resides in rural areas. Through this research researcher try to explore nature of poverty in Assam. In this paper, the researcher main objective is to examine the current state of poverty and its characteristics in Assam. The researcher seeks to analyze the trends in poverty over recent years, as well as the present status of poverty in Assam using secondary data. The researcher also puts emphasis on the disparity between rural and urban poverty in Assam. The findings indicate that rural poverty is more susceptible compared to urban poverty, and Assam consistently experiences a more severe poverty situation than the national average. As the development is an important aspect of todays society, this study also provides a scope of research about reason behind the rural-urban poverty gap as well as reasons of lower development of rural Assam.
Keywords: Poverty, Rural-Urban Disparity, Multidimensional Poverty, Vulnerable, Development, Assam

Introduction

People and households experiencing poverty often face challenges such as insufficient housing, access to clean water, nutritious food, and medical care. Poverty is a significant challenge for society. Poverty is evident amidst economic progress, whether considered in absolute or relative terms. Poverty is a driving force behind cyclical development. Each area within the developing world exhibits poverty. Poverty is characterised by the existing standards of living, which vary in response to societal conditions and available opportunities (Gupta,2002).

Subsistence refers to the fundamental resources necessary for maintaining good health and productivity. Inequality involves examining the relative positions of different income groups in comparison to each other. The multidimensional poverty framework has been established in relation to human security, which includes adequate food, fuel for cooking, sufficient clothing for warmth, safety in public spaces, access to shelter, protection from floods, droughts, and unemployment, opportunities for children's education while avoiding illness, and access to basic health care (Sharma,1990).

Assam, situated in northeastern India, functions as the gateway to the region, being the largest and most vibrant of the eight states comprising the Northeast. The region is bordered by seven states: Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Tripura, and West Bengal, and two countries: Bhutan and Bangladesh. The topographical asymmetry is accentuated by the Brail hill range situated between the Brahmaputra and Barak valleys, named after the two significant rivers. Assam covers a geographical area of 78,438 square kilometers, constituting 2.4% of India's total land area and accommodating 2.6% of the country's population. Assam displays a heterogeneous population marked by a diverse array of socio-cultural and ethnic backgrounds. The 2011 Census of India reveals that Assam has a population of 3.1205 million, consisting of 1.5939 million males and 1.5266 million females. Of the total population, 86% inhabit rural areas, while 14% reside in urban regions of the state. The percentage of the rural population in the state surpasses the national average of 69%. Preliminary estimates for 2021-22 indicate that Assam's Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP) at current prices has attained 433,925.44 crore, an increase from 381,003.97 crore in 2020-21, reflecting a growth rate of 13.89 percent. The Gross State Domestic Product at constant (2011-12) prices is anticipated to reach Rs. 273836.71 crore for the fiscal year 2021-22, compared to Rs. 250922.83 crore for 2020-21, reflecting a growth rate of 9.13 percent, as per the Assam Economic Survey.

Despite economic growth, poverty and a reduced standard of living continue to pose substantial challenges for rural communities in Assam. The factors contributing to poverty in Assam include resource underutilisation, sluggish economic development, and escalating prices. Unemployment, capital deficiencies, competent entrepreneurship, and various social factors, political influences, income disparity, and distribution challenges, among others. Poverty is one of the main challenges to the development of Assam's economy. It is important to study the nature and characteristics of poverty in Assam. Numerous studies have been conducted on poverty in rural India and Assam. The main objectives of this study are to understand the ongoing nature and trend of poverty in Assam, as removing poverty from society is an important aspect of the development process of any economy. The researcher also focuses on the inequality of poverty among rural and urban Assam which makes this study different from other poverty-related studies in Assam.

Review of Related Literature

Ahluwalia (1978), in his study "Growth and Poverty in Developing Countries," published by the World Bank, employs a mathematical framework to forecast the number of individuals living in poverty under various growth scenarios for Gross National Product (GNP), population, and income distribution. The results suggest that the total elimination of absolute poverty by the end of the 20th century is exceedingly improbable. Townsend (1979) defined poverty as the lack of necessary resources that enable individuals to engage in the customary activities, traditions, and diets generally accepted by society. He argues that multiple diverse mechanisms, each operating for every individual, regulate the distribution of resources acquired by people. Poverty is partially caused by the interplay of different systems. Sen (1983) argued that there was a connection between relative deprivation, which refers to a lack of goods, money, and resources, and absolute deprivation, which pertains to a person's skills. At the age of 36, envisions a specific set of inherent abilities that every individual must possess in order to prevent being categorized as living below the poverty threshold. Amarendra (1998) analysed the characteristics, intensity, and origins of pervasive poverty and assessed multiple initiatives aimed at alleviating it, which were implemented based on different approaches. He examines the decision-making process in large-scale policies, distribution of planning authority, hierarchy of power, and organisations responsible for implementing these policies. Karagiannaki (2017) analysed variations in poverty and inequality across countries using the distributional statistics database of the European Union Statistics on incomes and living conditions. The study reveals a robust cross-country correlation between poverty and inequality. The analysis shows that, while it is not as strong as the connection observed when considering the differences in poverty and inequality across countries, there is

still a significant and positive association between poverty and inequality in most cases. Deka (2018) conducted a study on assessed the multidimensional poverty experienced by slum dwellers in Gauhati city, Assam. The objective was to ascertain whether this poverty is linked to income or associated with factors such as migration, employment, social, and literacy statuses. The study revealed that the slum population experienced higher levels of deprivation in terms of assets, housing, water, sanitation, occupation and adult education. The primary determinant of multidimensional poverty is a lack of gainful employment. Das and Saikia (2022) analyze the importance of panchayati raj institution and their role in alleviating poverty in rural area of Kamrup districts. They identified issues such as inadequate planning and beneficiary selection that limited success. Rabha and Deka (2022) studied the livelihood diversification and poverty among the tribal community. They concluded that diversification into non-farm activities significantly reduces poverty among rural households. Hazarika and Talukder (2023) explores the relationship between microfinance and household poverty. This highlights that informal credit use is high among poor households and may not always contribute positively to income generation. Deka (2025) studied socioeconomic vulnerabilities in Assamese char areas and stated that these places are still among the most ecologically vulnerable and backward in Northeast India. It emphasizes how poverty in char areas is multifaceted and intersectional, involving not only insufficient income but also vulnerable ecosystems, limited access to health, education, and sanitation services, social marginalization, and a lack of institutional support, all of which reinforce one another.

Methodology

This study is purely based on secondary data, which were collected from the Assam Economic Survey, Periodic Labour Force Survey, Assam Human Development Report, Planning Commission India, Assam Statistical Handbook, journals, etc. Based on secondary data, the researcher used a descriptive methodology for this study.

Trend of Poverty in Assam

A common method for assessing poverty in India is based on income or consumption levels. If these levels decline below a designated minimum threshold, the household is categorised as Below the Poverty Line (BPL). A specialised committee convened by the Planning Commission and chaired by Suresh Tendulkar was established to assess the methodology for poverty estimation and to propose a shift from calorie consumption-based poverty evaluation. The computations were based on the consumption trends of diverse commodities, including cereals, pulses, milk, edible oil, non-vegetarian products, vegetables, fresh fruits, dried fruits, sugar, salt, spices, additional food items, intoxicants, fuel, apparel, footwear, education, medical services (both institutional and non-institutional), entertainment, and personal and hygiene products. The Tendulkar committee set poverty lines for 2004-05 at Rs 33 per day in urban areas and 27 per day in rural areas, adjusted for Purchasing Power Parity (PPP).

Table 1 Number and percentage of population below poverty line by states

Year	Lakdawala committee					
	Poverty ratio (%)			No. of poor (in lakhs)		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
1977-78	59.82	32.71	57.15	97.55	5.83	103.38
1983-84	42.6	21.73	40.47	73.43	4.26	77.69
1987-88	39.35	9.94	36.21	73.53	2.22	75.75
1993-94	45.01	7.73	40.86	94.33	2.03	96.36
1999-2000	40.4	7.47	36.09	92.17	2.38	94.55

2004-05	22.3	3.3	19.7	54.5	1.28	55.7
	Tendulkar Methodology					
	Poverty ratio (%)			**No. of poor (in lakhs)**		
	Rural	**Urban**	**Total**	**Rural**	**Urban**	**Total**
2004-05	36.4	21.8	34.4	88.8	8.4	97.3
2009-10	39.9	26.1	37.9	105.3	11.2	116.4
2011-12	33.9	20.5	32	92.1	9.2	101.3

Source: Planning Commission Government of India, (June, 2014), Report of the Expert Group to Review the Methodology for Measurement of Poverty

Table 1, which displays the quantity and percentage of the population residing below the poverty line by state, employing the Tendulkar methodology and the Lakdawala committee. Table 4.8 demonstrates that between 1977 and 2005 (Lakdawala committee), the poverty ratio declined in both rural and urban regions, as well as overall; however, the absolute number of individuals living in poverty, measured in lakhs, increased during this period. The table indicates a significant disparity between rural and urban poverty. Between 1977 and 2005, the population of impoverished individuals in urban areas declined, while the rural impoverished population increased. Utilising the Tendulkar methodology, it was observed that from 2004 to 2012, the rural poverty ratio escalated, and the absolute number of impoverished individuals rose in 2012 relative to 2004-05. In Assam, the population of impoverished individuals increased from 2004 to 2012. The incidence of poverty in Assam has decreased over time, from 59.82 percent in 1973-74 to 33.9 percent in 2011-12. Recent trends indicate a deterioration of rural poverty, despite a reduction in urban poverty in Assam. The concentration of poverty in urban regions is significantly lower than in rural regions. Considering these trends and the fact that most of the population resides in rural areas,

it can be asserted that poverty in Assam is primarily a rural phenomenon. Table 2 and table 3 depicts the multidimensional poverty index of Assam in comparison to India. An elevated MPI signifies an increased degree of multidimensional poverty. Multidimensional poverty refers to poverty that goes beyond a lack of income and considers various deprivations that people face in their daily lives. It reflects limited access of education, healthcare and standard of living.

NITI Aayog, as the primary agency for the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), is responsible for creating a localised index to evaluate the effectiveness of States and Union Territories in addressing multidimensional poverty. NITI Aayog formed an inter-ministerial Multi-Dimensional Poverty Index Coordination Committee (MPICC) to institutionalise this project, including ministries and departments associated with health, education, nutrition, rural development, drinking water, sanitation, power, and urban development. It also included experts from the Ministry of Statistics and Programmes Implementation (MoSPI) and technical partners - OPHI and UNDP. The composition of the MPICC was influenced by the varied attributes of the indicators and sub-indicators comprising the index.

Table 2 Multidimensional poverty index of assam (in per cent)

	Year	Head count ratio	Intensity	MPI
India	2019-21	14.96	44.39	0.066
	2015-16	24.85	47.14	0.177
Assam	2019-21	19.35	44.41	8.60
		32.65	47.88	0.156

Source: India National Multidimensional poverty index report 2023

Table 3 Multidimensional poverty index of assam's rural and assam's urban area (in per cent)

		Rural			Urban		
		Head count ratio	Intensity	MPI	Head count ratio	Intensity	MPI
India	2019-21	19.28	44.55	0.086	5.27	43.1	0.023
	2015-16	32.59	47.38	0.154	8.65	45.27	0.039
Assam	2019-21	21.41	44.5	0.095	6.88	42.61	0.029
	2015-16	36.14	48.06	0.174	9.94	43.57	0.043

Source: India National Multidimensional poverty index report 2023

The discourse surrounding the notion and quantification of poverty persists today. There is no consensus on the methodology for estimating poverty, nor is there agreement regarding the indicators of deprivation within the framework of multidimensional poverty. The table 2 reflects that head count ratio of Assam is higher than the all India average in both 2019-21 and 2015-16 report. It is also observed that the intensity of poverty in Assam is higher than that in India. On the other hand table 3 reflects that rural poverty in Assam is more vulnerable than the urban poverty in Assam. In rural Assam, both the head count ratio and intensity of poverty are higher than in urban Assam.

District wise poverty status of Assam

Assam consists of 35 administrative districts. The districts are defined by geographical features including rivers, hills, and forests. The newly established districts predominantly consist of subdivisions derived from the former districts. On 15 August 2015, three additional districts were created, increasing the total from 27 to 30: Charaideo, South Salmara-Mankachar, and West Karbi Anglong. Assam is a state marked by a diverse population exhibiting significant socio-cultural and ethnic variation. According to the 2011 Census of India, Assam's population was 31.205 million, comprising 15.939 million males and 15.266 million females. According to the Census of India, is 353.78 lakh, consisting of 180.06 lakh males and 173.71 lakh females. From 2001 to 2011, the state's population growth rate was 17.07%, whereas the national growth rate was 17.68%. In the state, 86% of the population lives in rural areas, while 14% resides in urban areas. The rural population proportion in the state surpassed the national average of 69%.

The Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (MPI) offers critical insights into multi-dimensional deprivations, detailing both their magnitude and extent. The Multidimensional Progress Index (MPI) comprises ten indicators, reflecting the three critical dimensions of human development: health, education, and living standards. A person is classified as poor when they lack one-third of the indicators, which are equally weighted across three dimensions, based on a joint distribution analysis. This provides data on poverty head-count ratios and the proportion of the population at risk of becoming multi-dimensionally poor.

Table 4 Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (MPI) for districts of assam

District	Headcount ratio of vulnerable	Headcount ratio of Multidimensional Poor	MPI
Baksa	17.36	34.01	13.61
Barpeta	17.97	27.54	11.08
Bongaigaon	14.54	30.79	12.71
Cachar	21.47	37.27	17.1
Chirang	14.32	30.04	11.12

Darrang	14.33	53.16	21.79
Dhemaji	21.14	23.29	9.25
Dhubri	18.88	47.26	20.1
Dibrugarh	12.82	18.79	7.3
DimaHasao	24.31	27.29	12.45
Goalpara	16.89	35.44	14.5
Golaghat	13.04	23.85	9.08
Hailakandi	35.51	39.49	17.68
Jorhat	10.46	12.43	4.69
Kamrup	15.16	28.43	11.7
Kamrup(M)	5.64	6.26	2.63
KarbiAnglong	18.33	31.29	12.52
Karimganj	23.04	41.06	18.73
Kokrajhar	17.68	25.05	9.97
Lakhimpur	14.86	23.12	9.01
Marigaon	17.55	31.46	12.8
Nagaon	13.74	30.73	12.18
Nalbari	13.98	19.35	7.89
Sibsagar	14.77	11.66	4.69
Sonitpur	21.97	35.25	15.05
Tinsukia	10.98	31.08	13.13
Udalguri	14.98	42.36	17.45
Assam	16.54	30.1	12.49

Source: Assam Human Development report 2014

The MPI integrates both headcount and average deprivation intensity of the impoverished. The table 4 illustrates that among the districts of Assam, Darrang district has the highest headcount ratio of multidimensional poverty at 53.16 percent, while Kamrup (M) has the lowest at 6.26 percent. It illustrates the diversity among the districts of Assam. The table also indicates that Baksha, Bongaigaon, Cachar, Darrang, Dhubri, Goalpara, Hailakandi, Karbi Anglong, Karimganj, Morigaon, Nagaon, Sonitpur, Tinsukia, and Udalguri exhibit a higher headcount ratio of multidimensionally poor individuals compared to the average headcount ratio of 30.10 percent for Assam. Researchers have also analysed that the headcount ratio of vulnerable populations varies across districts in Assam, and the overall situation is unfavourable for the state. The average headcount ratio of the vulnerable population in Assam is 16.54. The Hailakandi district exhibits the highest headcount ratio of vulnerable individuals at 35.51, while the Kamrup (M) district has the lowest headcount ratio of vulnerable individuals at 5.64. Districts such as Baksha, Barpeta, Cachar, Dhemaji, Dhubri, Goalpara, Dima Hasao, Karbi Anglong, Karimganj, Kokrajhar, Morigaon, and Sonitpur exhibit a higher headcount ratio of vulnerability compared to the average in Assam. The third column indicates the overall MPI of the districts. A higher MPI indicates that more individuals are experiencing multidimensional poverty. The average Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) in Assam is 12.49, although there is considerable variation among districts. Districts such as Barpeta, Chirang, Dhemaji, Dibrugarh, Golaghat, Jorhat, Kamrup (M), Kokrajhar, Lakhimpur, Nagaon, Nalbari, and Sibsagar exhibit a lower Multidimensional Poverty

Index (MPI) than the average MPI of Assam. The highest MPI is found in Darrang district at 21.79, while Kamrup (M) has the lowest MPI at 2.63.

Researchers have indicated that there are varied poverty situations across the districts of Assam.

Table 5 Rural urban poverty gap in Assam

Diatrict	Rural	Urban	Rural -Urban poverty gap
Baksa	41.5	19.5	22
Barpeta	41	17.5	23.5
Bongaigaon	36	8	28
Cachar	35.5	15	20.5
Chirang	42	34.5	7.5
Darrang	47	26.5	20.5
Dhemaji	37.5	26	11.5
Dhubri	43.5	24	19.5
Dibrugarh	34	20	14
DimaHasao	44.5	32	12.5
Goalpara	42	30.5	11.5
Golaghat	46	20.5	25.5
Hailakandi	35	13.5	21.5
Jorhat	38.5	15	23.5
Kamrup	39.5	25	14.5
Kamrup(M)	36.5	3.5	33
Karbi Anglong	45	28.5	16.5
Karimganj	38	28	10
Kokrajhar	39	29	10
Lakhimpur	38	29	9
Marigaon	45.5	36	9.5
Nagaon	41.5	21.5	20
Nalbari	35	17.5	17.5
Sibsagar	34	13.5	20.5
Sonitpur	43	14.5	28.5
Tinsukia	41.5	14	27.5
Udalguri	43.5	40.5	3
Assam	40.5	17	23.5

Source: Assam Human Development Report 2014, Rural Urban Poverty gap is calculated by researcher

Table 5 demonstrates that there is a poverty gap between rural and urban areas in each and every district in the state of Assam. On average, the poverty rate in rural Assam is 40.5 percent, which is higher than not only the poverty rate in urban areas, which is 17 percent, but also the average poverty rate in Assam, which is 37 percent. This is a reflection of rural poverty, which is more vulnerable than urban depression. Baksha, Barpeta, Chirang, Darang, Dhubri, Dima Hasao, Goalpara, Golaghat, Karbi Anglong, Morigaon, Nagaon, Sonitpur, Tinsukia, and Udalguri are among the districts in Assam that are experiencing a higher level of rural poverty than the overall rural poverty in the state. There is a significant

disparity between the occurrence of poverty in rural areas and urban areas in each district. The disparity between rural and urban poverty can be found in every district of Assam. Among the districts, Baksha, Barpeta ,cachar, Chirang, Darrang,Dhubri, Dhemaji, Dibrugarh, dima hasao, Goalpara, Hailakandi, Jorhat , Kamrup, Karbi Anglong, Karimganj, Kokrajhar, Lakhimpur, Morigaon, Nagaon, Nalbari, Sibsagar and udalguri have lower or equal the gap of rural and urban poverty than the average gap of rural and urban Area of Assam. The district with the greatest gap is Kamrup (M), while the district with the smallest gap is Udalguri for the districts. Therefore, not only is there a diversity of poverty on a district-by-district basis in the district of Assam, but there is also a rural-urban diversity both between the districts and within the districts themselves. When compared to the urban areas of these districts, the rural areas of these districts are more susceptible to danger.

In India, the official poverty line is derived indirectly from the Monthly Per Capita Consumption Expenditure (MPCE) according to a predetermined calorie standard. Poverty in India is fundamentally consumption poverty, linked to deprivation in essential functions, specifically the ability to live and be nourished. The motivations for consumption are diverse, encompassing nourishment, amusement, longevity, quality of life, solitary self-fulfillment, and interactive socialization. While consumption is not an ultimate objective, it is a significant and fundamental aspect of human existence. Any deficiency in consumption will inevitably lead to a series of functional deprivations.

Table 6 District wise average MPCE on food and average MPCE total

District	Average MPCE on food(Rs.)			Average MPCE total (Rs.)		
	Rural	Urban	Urban- Rural Gap	Rural	Urban	Urban- Rural Gap
Baksa	590.31	968.97	378.66	949.7	2703.89	1754.19
Barpeta	557.41	972.75	415.34	915.32	1778.56	863.24
Bongaigaon	750.29	1608.76	858.47	1328.25	2758.73	1430.48
Cachar	858.24	1234.18	375.94	1275.53	2187.3	911.77
Chirang	483.2	518.18	34.98	899.46	1106.38	206.92
Darrang	508.09	1005.33	497.24	782.68	1607.02	824.34
Dhemaji	570.09	849.71	279.62	1066.02	1757.73	691.71
Dhubri	583.51	972.82	389.31	854.85	1660.47	805.62
Dibrugarh	625.75	1007.34	381.59	1093.25	1859.55	766.3
DimaHasao	573.87	721.84	147.97	761.34	1277.33	515.99
Goalpara	612.4	933.71	321.31	921.29	1310.99	389.7
Golaghat	430.06	1077.43	647.37	790.84	1974.21	1183.37
Hailakandi	740.57	1170.85	430.28	1295.44	2030.3	734.86
Jorhat	588.42	1428.59	840.17	1080.6	2782.83	1702.23
Kamrup	543.2	851	307.8	987.44	1864.07	876.63
Kamrup(M)	591.71	1565.77	974.06	1049.05	3945.31	2896.26
KarbiAnglong	465.95	1049.78	583.83	951.48	1647.52	696.04
Karimganj	816.99	1142.82	325.83	1138.02	1720.2	582.18
Kokrajhar	507.76	523.22	15.46	946.64	1362.53	415.89
Lakhimpur	582.3	699.21	116.91	1138.25	1727.25	589
Marigaon	524.94	841.49	316.55	789.53	1235.04	445.51

Nagaon	521.82	895.52	373.7	904.81	1686.73	781.92
Nalbari	579.62	1068.76	489.14	1081.37	2070.34	988.97
Sibsagar	568.47	865.23	296.76	1357.05	2428.93	1071.88
Sonitpur	1041.47	1180.95	139.48	1830.92	2657.53	826.61
Tinsukia	586.35	1323.4	737.05	1057.8	2735.54	1677.74
Udalguri	596.52	775.69	179.17	812.18	1112.58	300.4
Assam	622.12	1185.71	563.59	1060.74	2491.15	1430.41

Source: Assam Human Development Report 2014, Average Urban- Rural gap of MPCE on food and MPCE in total is calculated by researcher

The average monthly per capita expenditure on food in the state is INR 710.22. Table 4.14 illustrates the disparity in average Monthly Per Capita Expenditure (MPCE) on food between rural and urban areas, as well as the difference in average MPCE on total expenditures in these regions. The urban monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) on food is INR 1,185.71; nearly double that of the rural MPCE on food, which INR 622.12 is. The average total Monthly Per Capita Expenditure (MPCE) in the state is INR 1,284.32, with rural areas averaging INR 1,060.74 and urban areas averaging INR 2,491.15. The table illustrates the disparity between the average monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) on food (in rupees) and the overall average MPCE between rural and urban areas. The highest rural-urban monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) on food is found in Kamrup Metro at 974.06, followed by Bongaigaon district at 858.47, while the lowest rural-urban gap is in Kokrajhar district at 15.46.Conversely, the most significant disparity in MPCE total is observed in Kamrup (M) district, with a rural-urban average MPCE gap of 2896.26, while the smallest gap is recorded in Chirang district, with a rural-urban gap of 206.92. Twenty-one districts exhibit a lower monthly per capita expenditure on food compared to the average monthly per capita expenditure on food in rural Assam. Conversely, 22 districts exhibit a lower per capita expenditure (MPCE) on food in urban areas compared to the urban average MPCE; however, these districts possess a higher MPCE on food than the average MPCE in rural areas of Assam. Six districts, specifically Bongaigaon, Golaghat, Jorhat, Kamrup Metro, Karbi Anglong, and Tinsukia, exhibit a greater disparity between rural average monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) on food and urban MPCE on food than the overall rural-urban average gap in MPCE on food. Additionally, it is observed that 16 districts have a lower Mean Per Capita Expenditure (MPCE) than the average MPCE for rural Assam. Conversely, 20 districts exhibit a lower Monthly Per Capita Expenditure (MPCE) on food in urban areas compared to the overall urban average MPCE; however, these districts possess a higher MPCE than the average MPCE in rural areas of Assam. Five districts, namely Baksha, Bongaigaon, Jorhat, Kamrup Metro, and Tinsukia, exhibit a greater disparity between the average rural MPCE and the total urban MPCE than the overall average rural-urban gap in MPCE.

Findings and Conclusion

From the preceding discussion, the researcher concludes that Assam experiences a higher level of poverty compared to the overall situation in India. While it is evident that poverty in Assam has diminished in recent years, the progress remains less than satisfactory. From this discussion researcher find that there is a trend that poverty in Assam always more severe than the all India average. Multidimensional poverty index shows that position of head count ratio and intensity of poverty no so favorable for Assam in recent years. The districts of Assam exhibit a considerable range of poverty levels. A significant number of districts experience elevated levels of poverty compared to the average poverty rate in Assam. The highest MPI is found in Darrang district at 21.79, while Kamrup (M) has the lowest MPI at 2.63. Researchers indicate that there exists a varied poverty situation across the districts of Assam. On average, the poverty rate in rural Assam is 40.5 percent, which is higher than

not only the poverty rate in urban areas, which is 17 percent, but also the average poverty rate in Assam, which is 37 percent. This is a reflection of rural poverty, which is more vulnerable than urban depression. Thus researcher says that in Assam there is a prevalence of inequality between urban and rural area of Assam. The average total Monthly Per Capita Expenditure (MPCE) in the state is INR 1,284.32, with rural areas averaging INR 1,060.74 and urban areas averaging INR 2,491.15. This also illustrates the disparity between the average monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) on food (in rupees) and the overall average MPCE between rural and urban areas. Thus in Assam not only in district wise poverty disparity exits but also rural- urban poverty gap exits. Rural-Urban poverty gap is not so good sign for future perspectives. Dependence on Low-Productivity Agriculture, lack of Infrastructure and Services, limited Employment Opportunities in rural areas, Migration from rural to urban areas for finding batter life, lower literacy etc. are the main reason of rural-urban poverty gap in Assam. The occurrence of underemployment and hidden unemployment within the workforce, along with inefficient resource utilization, has resulted in reduced production levels in the agricultural sector. This resulted in a deterioration of their quality of life. The continual increase in the unemployed population in Assam is a major contributor to poverty. The quantity of job seekers is increasing at a rate that surpasses the expansion of available employment opportunities. Simply augmenting production or performing a demographic evaluation will not adequately mitigate poverty in Assam. It is imperative to acknowledge that the inequality in income distribution and the concentration of wealth require attention. Therefore, researcher conclude Assam faces poverty situation from the years and years. Its nature is more severe than the India. Also, we seen that from the above discussion that rural poverty is more vulnerable and severe that the urban Assam.

Therefore, effective distribution channel is crucial for inequality and mitigating poverty. The allocation of goods and food grains must priorities the requirements of the destitute population. The existing public distribution system necessitates reorganization and expansion to include rural and semi-urban areas of Assam. Government should implement proper poverty alleviation programmes with fruitful creation of employment opportunities in rural area help to reduce poverty in Assam. As income generation is a major source of poverty reduction it is very important that government should take initiative specific poverty alleviation programme according to nature and characteristics poverty in the particular area. As rural poverty is more vulnerable in Assam, it is beneficial that government give extra effort to proper implementation of poverty alleviation programmes in rural area as well as increase awareness of poverty alleviation programmes among rural people. Government should take imitative upon self-employment programmes in rural Assam which help reduction of inequality between rural and urban area through income generation. Not only government but also people are also increasing their involvement in government poverty alleviation programme to effective implementation of alleviation programmes.

Limitation and Scope of the study: As this paper is based on secondary sources, findings are limited. There is a scope of study through primary survey to understand the ground cause of poverty in Assam. It's help to study how poverty is removed from the society. Also, there is very high scope of study that root cause of rural-urban poverty gap in Assam.

References

Ahluwalia, M. S. (1978). Rural poverty and agricultural performance in India. *The Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 298–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220387808421677

Ahmed, A. (1987). *The anatomy of rural poverty in Assam: A Case Study of Dibrugarh Sub-division*. Mittal Publications.

Amarendra. (1998). *Poverty, Rural Development and Public Policy*. Deep and Deep Publications.

Assam Economic Survey (2020-2024)

Assam Human development report 2014

Das, M., & Saikia,P.(2022). Role of Panchayati Raj Institution in eradication of Poverty: A case study from Kamrup district. *Current World Environment*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 145-153.

Deka, D. (2025). Living on the Edge: A Thematic Review of Socioeconomic Vulnerabilities in

Assam's Char Areas. I*nternational Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 3.

Deka, N. (2018). Multidimensional poverty index for the poor in Guwahati city (Assam, India). *Journal of Social and Economic Development,* vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 43-74. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40847-018-0057-3

Hazarika, M & Talukder, R (2023). Credit access and poverty in rural Assam: A case study. *Space and Culture, India*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 98-108.

Karagiannaki, E. (2017) *The empirical relationship between income poverty and income inequality in rich and middle income countries. CASE Papers* (206). London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK.

Planning Commission (2002). *Report of the special group on targeting ten million employment opportunities per year.* (S.P. Gupta committee).Government of India.

Rabha,D., & Deka, P.(2022). Livelihood diversification and poverty among the Rabha tribe: A case study of Kamrup (R) district of Assam. *Journal of rural Development,* vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 205-218

Sen, A. (1983). *Poor, Relatively Speaking.* Ireland: Economic and Social Research Institute.

Sharma, A. (1990). *Concept and measurement of poverty*. Anmol Publications. https://www.google.co.in/books/edition/Concept_And_Measurement_Of_Poverty/whPv28r1HY8C?hl=en

Sharma, A. N. (Ed.). (2005). *Poverty in North East India,* Mittal Publications.

Townsend, P. (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom: A Survey of Household Resources and Standards of Living*. Univ of California Press.

Author Details:

Goriyashi Mahanta, *Research Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Science & Technology Meghalaya Meghalaya*

Sujata Choudhury, *Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University of Science and Technology Meghalaya Meghalaya*