Poverty Intensive Curve: A New Form of Pro-Poor Growth Index

Opinion

The term ‘Pro-poor growth’ was coined in the early 1970s by Ahluwalia & Cauas [1], subsequently move forward in Ahuluwalia, et al. [2,3]. All of these studies mostly gyrated under the growth, inequality and poverty trajectory, which was further carry on by Wheeler & Adams [4-7]. In 1990s, pro-poor growth agenda become the more volatile figure in the academic literature and every one become contribute to recommend the basket of policy recommendations for the poor, especially, McCulloch & Baulch [8-11]. In 2000s, Kakwani & Pernia [12] proposed an index of pro-poor growth by relative component of growth elasticity of poverty by total poverty elasticity, while [13] measured pro-poor growth rate for China by Watts’s index of poverty. Son [14] proposed a new index for measuring pro-poor growth i.e., ‘poverty growth curve’ that is based on Atkinson’s theorem. Klasen [15] in the similar line emphasized the importance of pro-poor growth and discussed policy issues for sectoral pro-poor growth. Lopez [16] unveiled the reality of pro-poor growth and suggested successful poverty reduction strategies across the countries. Kraay [17] defined pro-poor growth i.e., “Growth is pro-poor if the poverty measure of interest falls” and argued that pro-poor growth policies should required institutional coverage to trickledown its impact on poor. Son & Kakwani [18] estimated the global pro-poor growth estimates by the measure of ‘poverty equivalent growth rate’. Kakwani & Neri [19] linked labor market with social expenditures related to poverty that would provide more social adjustments for achieving the pro-poor growth framework. Finally, the series of residual for poverty, growth, inequality and social expenditures should be used as a regressor to examine the policy lags for the countries.

The study perceived that ‘Poverty intensive curve’ would be the better measure for pro-poor growth rather than conventional pro-poor growth index available in the previous literatures. The study opens the debate on ‘poverty intensive curve’ for measuring pro-poor growth for poverty-associated countries and advice for long-term sustained policy framework for poor to live better and prosperous against the unwanted war of hunger and thrust. This debate is open for discussion.
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