

An Analysis of Multidimensional Poverty in District Karak at Household Level

Irshad Ahmad¹
Nadeem Iqbal²
Aisha Rehman³

Abstract

The aim of research is to find multidimensional poverty and its determinants at micro level and to magnify those determinants which increase the chance of falling in poverty for a household with reference to district Karak. PSLM 2019-20 survey data is used in the study. The households, whose deprivation score is more than the set threshold of 33% scores is considered to be multidimensional poor. The selected demographic and socio-economic characteristics of household are used as explanatory variables and multidimensional poverty status was used as binary dependent variable having outcome to be poor or non-poor. The binary logistic regression model has been fitted to estimate the probability of a household poverty status as affected by its determinants. The finding of the study is that gender, age, marital status, education and monthly income were impacting poverty status of households.

Keywords: Household, Poverty, logistic regression, socio-economic and Karak

¹MPhil Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar,
Corresponding Author's Email: iahmedk@uop.edu.pk,

²Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar,
Email: nadeemiqbal@uop.edu.pk

³Phd Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar, Email: aisharehman726@gmail.com

Introduction

Poverty can be defined as shortfall of income or other means that supply the primary prerequisites of human life, like shelter, medical care, food, security, sanitation, clean water, and education. Poverty has been a significant ill discussed throughout the literature of underdeveloped countries, and observed as the major obstacle to economic growth and development. Townsend (1970) defined poverty is an income phenomenon having shortage of resources to fulfill the basic needs of life. World Bank (2000) defined poverty is the lacking of command over commodities or shortage of income to accommodate the basic necessities of wellbeing. However, Sharma (2012) defined poverty in other aspects of life like an individual may be health poor, house poor or food poor. The traditional definition of poverty and its measurement has been criticized due to measurement of single dimension of poverty. Therefore, poverty debate in researchers and policy makers progressed to the inclusion of few non-monetary aspects like education and health. Bourguignon & Chakravarty (2003) explains that for the attainment of deeper understanding of the poverty issue, the analysis of poverty through various socioeconomic aspects of wellbeing is compulsory. Thus, wellbeing of the people is related to the fulfillment of foods and non-foods items to capable them for participation in the economic

activity. CPRC (2004) highlighted that poverty is not related to only the shortage of income but it is the multidimensional impoverishment of malnutrition, contaminated water for drinking, poor health facilities, illiteracy and social exclusion. The current literature emphasized on the multidimensionality of the poverty.

According to Alkire (2013) poverty is the aggregation of various deprivations, to deeper understanding of poverty it is important to include other aspects of poverty in the estimation methodology. Bourguignon & Chakravarty (2003) suggested that by considering various deprivations of poverty it is necessary to estimate the poverty in multidimensional context. As the poverty estimation has been advanced and considered as the multidimensional concept by economists. Now from researchers the issue of poverty requires advance techniques to be adopted for multidimensional poverty measurement (Ameer et al. 2024). This study apply multidimensional approach for District Karak, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa using PSLM 2019-20 data set. Pakistan is facing the problem of poverty from its independence and still it is a biggest challenge and problem. Studies conducted by UNDP (2010a), Naveed & Islam (2010) are carried out for the estimation of multidimensional poverty at provincial level. District Karak deprived from educational, health and living standard facilities. This study will estimate the determinants of multidimensional poverty at household level at District Karak.

Where in Pakistan specifically and in developing economies generally poverty is a challenging issue in the past literature and showing variations over decades. Alkire, et al. (2019) highlighted in the findings that, among 1.3 billion in the world and across 101 countries about 23.1 percent people are multidimensional poor. About Two-thirds of poor people are living in middle income countries. World Bank (2002) highlighted that one-third of total population of Pakistan as poor and the number of poor people are higher in rural areas in comparison to urban areas. However, most of the studies have estimated single dimension of poverty for Pakistan (Ullah & Chishti, 2023)

However, unidimensional poverty measurement approach is unable to highlight the other factors contributing to poverty. Alkire & Santos (2010) argued that poverty measure based on income cannot be reliable measure for determining the wellbeing of household and it is inadequate measure of poverty as compared to multidimensional Poverty. Therefore, it is indispensable to lengthen the concept of poverty to embody the scale with inclusion of various provision of basic health facilities, access to technical and vocational educational facilities, housing services, safe and clean drinking water and other facilities of life. To fill out the deficiency of traditional poverty estimation methods, this study will apply the multidimensional poverty estimation technique by applying on the primary data.

Human Development Report (2020) highlighted that Pakistan has the largest group of multidimensional poor people, and Pakistan is ranked 154th among 189 countries. From the

empirical evidence stated above, there is intense need of measurement of multidimensional poverty at micro level and also to explore the socioeconomic and demographic factors which causes variations at household level (Taqi et al. 2021; Sibte-Ali et al. 2018). Alkire & Santos (2010) highlights the socio economic aspects of poverty and include various dimensions like education, health and living standards facilities in poverty estimation technique which helps in formulation and implementation of poverty reduction strategies and policies targeting the socioeconomic deprivations of the population to achieve the threshold set by UNDP.

An understanding and analysis of poverty from gross root level and contribution to the literature of poverty is requirement of debate about the determinants of poverty. This study has been designed to investigate socio-economic and demographic factors contributing to multidimensional poverty among households at district Karak. That is to analyze the determinants i.e. household head education, employment status, gender of household head, household size, age of household head and income impact on multidimensional poverty and to analyze the extent of multidimensional poverty.

Theoretical Framework

Theoretically, the study is based on the Capability approach presented Amartya Sen's which described multidimensional deprivation in term of capabilities (Sen, 1999). According to (Ravallion, 2011b) poverty cannot be measured in monetary terms and in term of single dimension as found in empirical literature. However, poverty is multi-faceted, narrow dimensional and diverse concept (Misturelli and Heffernan 2010; and Shakoore, Shah & Ullah 2024). According to De Haan and Lipton (1997) the economic deprivation in terms of minimum level of consumption and basic necessities are the main aspects of poverty and according to previous poverty literature basic necessities of life are needed for survival.

According to World Bank (2011) USD \$ 1.90 a day is a threshold for poverty, which relates to the consumption and income level of the people. multidimensional poverty concept was more precisely explained by Alkire & Santos (2010) and it admitted by emerging literature of poverty and its determinants, according to UN Millennium project 2002 women and children are facing deprivation in health and education about 114 million and 584 million have no basic facilities of life and have no access to basic education at all and The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS) Report 2021 outlines that global extreme poverty rate rose for the first time in over 20 years, and 119 to 124 million people were pushed back into extreme poverty in 2020. There is a risk of a generational catastrophe regarding schooling, where an additional 101 million children have fallen below the minimum reading proficiency level, potentially wiping out two decades of education gains.

Most of south Asian countries are facing problem of toilet and clean drinking water and many deficiencies in basic necessities of life. the pillar which provides strong theoretical foundation are SDGs, which are mainly targeting poverty dimensions and its determinants in broader spectrum and also focused on poverty reduction and development policies. Since advancement in methodology and inclusion of various non-monetary dimensions and availability of data UNDP and OPHI are encouraging those techniques.

Research Area and Data Source

Population of this study is the households of District Karak and sample was taken from 73,144 households for different areas in Karak. District Karak is divided into three tehsils named Karak, Banda Daud Shah and Takht-e-Nasrati and 21 union councils.

Data for sample households are extracted from Pakistan Social and Living Standards Measurement (PSLM) survey for the year 2019-20. PSLM survey was designed to provide Social & Economic indicators at provincial and district levels. PSLM District level survey collected information on key demographic and socio-economic indicators which are the main source of estimation of multi-Dimensional Poverty.

Econometric Model

The Pearson Chi-Square test employed to evaluate the association between categorical variables. This study aims to investigate the relationship between multidimensional poverty and various socioeconomic and demographic factors. By applying the Chi-Square test, we will analyze both qualitative and quantitative variables, with household multidimensional poverty status serving as the dependent variable. This variable is dichotomous, categorizing households as either Poor (1) or Non-Poor (0).

In Alkire and Foster methodology, total deprivation score is 100 and it is equally divided into three dimensions health, education, and standard of living. Health dimension consist of 4 indicators and education dimension consist of two indicators each, and each indicator have weightage of 16.65 while standard of living dimension have six indicators and each indicator has a weightage of 5.55. if a household is deprived in an indicator then we allot value '1' and allot value '0' for non-deprived. If a household aggregate deprivation score is 33.3 percent or above then it is multi-dimensionally poor.

Table 1: Multi-dimensional poverty dimensions and indicator with weightages

Dimension (weight)	Indicator	Weight
Health (33.33)	(1) Access to nearest health facility clinics/BHUs	16.65
	(2) Child immunization	5.56
	(3) Antenatal care	5.56
	(4) Assisted delivery	5.56
Education (33.33)	(1) Zero members have completed/attended five years of schooling in a family	16.65
	(2) At least one school-aged child not enrolled in school in a family	16.65
Standard of living condition (33.33)	(1) No electricity connection in the Household	5.56
	(2) No access to safe drinking water in the Household	5.56
	(3) No access to improved sanitation in the Household	5.56
	(4) House has dirt wall/floor in the family	5.56
	(5) Household uses dirty cooking fuel (dung, firewood or charcoal)	5.56
	(6) Household has no car and does not own at least one of the items like bicycle ,motorcycle, radio, refrigerator, cell phone, television	5.56
Total weight=100		Total weight =100

Incidence (E) and intensity (M) of multidimensional poverty can be computed as follow:
Incidence of Multidimensional poverty can be computed as follow

$$E = hi/n \quad (1)$$

Where E stands for incidence of multidimensional poverty which shows the percentage of poor households, *hi* shows the total number of deprived households and *n* is the total number of household. Multi-dimensional Poverty intensity (M) can be found as follow

$$M = \sum di/h \quad (2)$$

Where *d* is the deprivation score *d* and can computed by adding of all deprivation scores in each dimension thus, $di=d1 +d2 +d3$ and ‘h’ is total the number of deprived households. The multi-dimensional poverty index can be found by multiplying incidence (E) with intensity (M)

$$MPI = E \times M \quad (3)$$

Total households and multidimensional Poor Households

Table 2 shows the number of multidimensional poor households to number of total households according to the poverty cut-off suggested by Alkire and Foster (2012). The table depicts that 303 households out of 400 households are non- multidimensional poor which 75.75% and 97 households are multidimensional poor which is 24.25% of the total households at district Karak. Awan and Iqbal(2010) estimated multidimensional poverty using Alkire and Foster methodology for district Sargodha and found 18.6 percent population is multidimensional poor. The results show that the number of multidimensional poor persons in district Karak is comparatively high.

Table 2: Total households and Multi-dimensional poor households

MDP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Non-Poor	303	75.75	75.75
Poor	97	24.25	100
Total	400	100	

Extent of multidimensional poverty

Table 3 depicts that 47% people in district Karak are Non-poor, 28.75% are vulnerable, 23.5% are marginal poor and 1% are extremely multidimensional poor. Padda & Hameed (2018) estimated multidimensional poverty for 21 districts across Pakistan and he found that 27% peoples are Non-poor ,31% people are vulnerable ,14% are poor and 1% are extreme poor in district Nowshehra, KPK and findings for Raheem Yar khan are 28.5 people are Non-poor, 23% people are vulnerable , 14%people are poor and 8% people are extreme poor. The reason behind multidimensional poverty is that the households have deprived in the dimensions of education, health and living standard. Most of the areas in which these households live have no proper access educational institutes, basic health facilities, no access to clean drinking water, no proper drainage system and no living standard facilities at all.

Table 3: Total households and Extentof Multi-dimensional

Extent of Multi-Dimensional Poverty	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Non-Poor ($0 < WDS \leq 20$)	188	47	47
Vulnerable/Medium ($0.20 < WDS \leq 0.33$)	115	28.75	75.7
Marginal/poor ($0.33 < WDS \leq 0.50$)	93	23.25	99
Severe/Extreme ($0.50 < WDS \leq 1.00$)	4	1	100
Total	400	100	

Household head Gender and multidimensional poverty

Table 4 express the relationship between number of households head gender and multidimensional poverty. 94 households are multidimensional poor whose heads are male while in percentage it is 24.23% percent.it means that 24.32% multidimensional poor households are headed by male. On the other hand 25% multidimensional poor households are headed by female which are 3 out of total 9 households. The results of P-value is 0.95 in the table depicts that household head gender have insignificant impact on multidimensional poverty for district Karak. Most of the Household head are male while households headed by female are less in number than that of headed by male due the fact that they are unmarried, divorced or widowed.in the said district both genders have equal opportunities of getting education ,health and employment .gender discrimination regarding health ,education ,employment are unable to explain from the sample data.

Table 4: Household head Gender and multidimensional poverty

Gender	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Male	294 75.7%	94 24.2%	388
Female	9 75%	3 25%	12
Total	303 75.7%	97 24.2%	400 100
Pearson chi2(1) = 0.0038 Pr=0.951			

Household size and multidimensional poverty

Table 5 depicts significant relationship between household size and multidimensional poverty .it shows that MDP for small sized households is 26.75% while for medium size household multidimensional poverty is 24.77% and for large size households it is 6.9%. Results for district Karak depicts that household size and families with large number of children play an important role and increases the likelihood of being multidimensional poor.

Table 5 Household size and multidimensional poverty

MDP	Small size (≤4 members)	Medium size (5-6 members)	Large size (≥7members)	Total
Non-poor	115 73.25	161 75.23	27 93.1	303 75.75
Poor	42 26.75	53 24.77	2 6.9	97 24.25
Total	157	214	29	400

100	100	100	100
Pearson chi2(2) = 5.3201 Pr = 0.070			

Household head age and multi-dimensional poverty

Table 6 shows the relationship between household age and multidimensional poverty. Age of household head is considered an important factor for explaining the multidimensional poverty and the table also depicts that as household age increase the chance of the likelihood of being multidimensional poverty decreases. Results of the table show that multidimensional poverty for age of household is less than 50 years is high in comparison to age of the household higher than 50 years. According to their findings household head age and poverty varies in opposite direction and poverty for age 14 to 40 years is 22.4%, for 41 to 60 years is 61.3% and for greater than 61 years is 16.3%.since in district Karak the reason behind less chance of falling in MDP is that as the age of household increases the skills and experience also increases, which leads to higher wages and salaries to be paid in the market. Aged and retired household head from government departments and armed forces also receive pensions and medical treatment which minimizes the chances of falling into multidimensional poverty.

Table 6 Household Head Age and Multi-dimensional poverty

Household head age	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Less than or equal to 20 years	7 77.78	2 22.22	9
21-35 years	112 78.87	30 21.13	142
36-50 years	148 71.84	58 28.16	206
51-65 years	29 80.56	7 19.44	36
Greater than or equal to 66 years	7 100	0 0	7
Total	303 75.75	97 24.25	400 100
Pearson chi2(4) = 5.1781 Pr 0.027			

Household head employment status and multidimensional poverty

The results of table 7 shows the results and importance of relationship between household employment status and multidimensional poverty because employment play an important role in achieving of livelihood income .The results shows that multidimensional poverty for

unemployed household head is 29.46%, for paid employees 24.29%, for self-employed 10.71% and for own cultivator is 23.03%, for share cropper is 50% and for livestock grazer is 66.67%. The results for district Karak coincides with the findings of Awan and Iqbal (2010) for district Sargodha. The reason behind high MDP for households and its heads whose were paid employees, unemployed, share cropper and livestock grazer is that they their wages and salaries are low and not enough to fulfill their basic needs of life therefore their chances of falling into poverty is high. It was also found that multidimensional poverty was lower among government sector employees and higher among the construction sector labors on daily wages. Findings of Awan et al. (2019) for Pakistan also shows that those households whose heads are employed are much likely to be non-poor than households with unemployed heads. Employment status household heads is sharecropper, paid employee and livestock grazer are more vulnerable the poverty poor than employed household head. The results are consistent with (Cheema & Sial, 2012; Sheikh et al. 2020; Shah et al. 2021).

Table 7: Household Head Employment Status and Multidimensional poverty

Employment Status	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Unemployed	79 70.54%	33 29.46%	112
Paid employee	134 75.71%	43 24.29	177
Self employed	75 89.29	9 10.71	84
Own cult	10 76.92	3 23.08	13
Share crop	1 50	1 50	2
Live stock	4 33.33	8 66.67	12
Total	303 75.94	97 24.06	399 100
Pearson chi2(5) = 22.2301 Pr = 0.000			

Household head education and Multi-dimensional poverty

Table 8 shows the inverse relationship between household head education and multidimensional poverty in district Karak. The table 8 depicts that multidimensional poverty is higher for those households whose head have never attended school and it is about 44.95% and 20.4 % for those households whose head attended matric and multidimensional poverty is going to decrease as the

education of the household head increases and multidimensional poverty is for least for those who have higher education. The reason behind the decrease in the chance of falling in MDP is that as the level of education of household head increases the opportunities of getting employment and high salaries and wages also increases which lower the chances of falling into poverty. PIDE report (2021) highlighted correlates of poverty show that education can be considered a major and most significant factor in the determining the poverty level across the country. developing countries specifically Pakistan have low investment in human capital in the form of education Spending .Acquiring education and skill helps individuals to overcome their state of destitute and improve their wellbeing ,to support and other members of family in a better way to improve their wellbeing and poverty state. Highly educated households are highly paid in the job market and the Education is a process of training, Learning and imparting of knowledge which polish the human capital for the job market in the economy .educated, empowered and improved human capital increases the productivity and earning of the worker in the economy and it play its role in mitigating the multidimensional poverty and its severity as found by Ahmad & (2013) ,they estimated and analyzed the relationship between education and poverty across 34 districts in Punjab .their main findings are that improved Education and health services are found to have negative association with poverty and positive impact on the growth of the economy .

Table 8: Household head education and Multi-dimensional poverty Education of household head

MDP	Never enrolled	Matric	FA/FSc/D.A.E	BA/B.S.c	MA./MS.c/BS/or higher	Total
0	60 55.05	174 79.82	22 95.65	27 90	20 100	303 75.63
1	49 44.95	44 20.18	1 4.35	3 10	0 0	97 24.37
Total	109 100	218 100	23 100	30 100	20 100	400 100
Pearson chi2(4) = 41.2925 Pr = 0.000						

Relation between MDP and monthly income of the household

Table 9 depicts negative association between household income and MDP. the table shows that as household monthly income at the district Karak increases multidimensional poverty goes on diminishing .Multi-dimensional poverty is 28.74% for households whose income is Rs.3000 or less than. As income increases the MDP shows a declines for income bracket Rs.60000 ,Rs.90000 7.14 %and greater than 90000.the reason behind that is as income of household head increases he accommodate all the basic needs and all household expanses on education and

health which ultimately decreases the chance of falling into MDP. The findings are consistent with the findings of Wang (2022), who estimated impact of income on multidimensional poverty. He found that Income and incidence of poverty are inversely impact each other and as income goes on to increase can significantly reduce the incidence of multidimensional poverty across each dimension impact is in limited manner.

Table 9: Relation between MDP and monthly income of the household Monthly Income

MDP	≤30000	31001-60000	60001-90000	>90000	Total
0	181 71.26	73 78.49	13 92.86	36 92.31	303 75.75
1	73 28.74	20 21.51	1 7.14	3 7.69	97 24.25
Total	254 100	93 100	14 100	39 100	400 100
Pearson chi2(3) = 11.2202 Pr = 0.011					

Conclusion

Poverty is and considered a multidimensional phenomenon in the present literature and is correlated with economic and social variables such as gender, age, household size, marital status, education level, and income and employment status of household head. The multidimensional poverty among the different households in district Karak is determined by different socio-economic and demographic factors, and found a significant association between multidimensional poverty at household level and household head's socio-economic and demographic characteristics such as education level of household head, income of the household, marital status of the household head, and age of the household head are found to be significant in determining the multidimensional poverty in Karak while employment status and household size was found to be insignificant association with multidimensional poverty. The more a household head and its members are is educated the minimum the probability of the household being in multidimensional poverty. The households' head with highest level of education such as M.A/M.Sc. and BS honors was found have no chance of being fall in multidimensional poverty according to the findings. The households' head employment status were found no significant relationship with multidimensional poverty in Karak. on the other side, the households' head age was found to be inversely associated with multidimensional poverty and it was found that household headed by higher aged head are found to have little risk of being in multidimensional poverty. The marital status of the household head have also has negative impact on the determination of poverty as compared to the household head who is single. The other characteristics of the household such as household dwelling type and household size shows insignificant impact on household multidimensional poverty.

Policy Recommendations

To effectively reduce multidimensional poverty in district Karak, several targeted interventions to be implemented. First, enhancing educational opportunities for household heads, particularly in technical and formal education, is essential, as education is inversely related to poverty levels. Initiatives should also focus on leveraging online business platforms like Amazon and Alibaba, as well as freelancing sites such as Fiverr and Upwork, by providing training and skill development for unemployed graduates at local colleges and universities. Furthermore, since household income is negatively correlated with multidimensional poverty, macroeconomic policies must prioritize government intervention in health, education, and living standards. Increased public and private investment in infrastructure and natural resources is crucial, especially given the district's mineral wealth. Proper extraction and management of resources like oil and gas can significantly boost household incomes at various levels. Additionally, investments in infrastructure development, health services, sanitation, clean drinking water programs, agriculture, and small to medium-sized enterprises are vital for improving the living standards of impoverished communities. Overall, a comprehensive policy intervention strategy that targets multiple dimensions of poverty is necessary to promote sustainable development in the district.

References

1. Ali, S., & Ahmad, N. (2013). Human capital and poverty in Pakistan: Evidence from the Punjab province. *European Journal of Science and Public Policy*, 11, 36-41.
2. Alkire, S. (2013). Choosing dimensions: The capability approach and multidimensional poverty. In *The many dimensions of poverty* (pp. 89-119). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
3. Alkire, S., & Santos, M. E. (2010). Acute multidimensional poverty: A new index for developing countries. *United Nations development program human development report office background paper*, (2010/11).
4. Alkire, S., Kanagaratnam, U., & Suppa, N. (2019). The global multidimensional poverty index (MPI) 2019.
5. Ameer, N., Bhutta, M. A., Nawaz, D., Asghar, M. M., & Jawad, F. (2024). Navigating the Role of Remittances in Attaining Sustainable Development Goals in Developing Countries: New Insights from Panel ARDL Model. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, 2(2), 384-396.
6. Awan, M. S., & Aslam, M. A. (2011). Multidimensional poverty in Pakistan: case of Punjab province. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 3(2), 133-144.
7. Awan, M. S., & Iqbal, N. (2010). Determinants of urban poverty: The case of medium sized city in Pakistan.

8. Bourguignon, F. Chakravarty, SR (2003).The measurement of multidimensional poverty. *Journal of Economic inequality*,Netherlands.
9. Cheema, A. R., & Sial, M. H. (2012). Incidence, profile and economic determinants of poverty in Pakistan: HIES 2005-06. *Management Science and Engineering*, 6(2), 120-129.
10. De Haan, A., Lipton, M., & Darbellay, E. (1997). The role of government and public policy in poverty alleviation in sub-Saharan Africa.
11. Misturelli, F., & Heffernan, C. (2010). The concept of poverty: a synchronic perspective. *Progress in Development Studies*, 10(1), 35-58.
12. Ozughalu, U. M., & Ogwumike, F. O. (2012). Impact of employment status and nature of employment of household head on household poverty incidence in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 3(14), 221-233.
13. Padda, I. U. H., & Hameed, A. (2018). Estimating multidimensional poverty levels in rural Pakistan: A contribution to sustainable development policies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 197, 435-442.
14. Poverty, O.,& Human Development Initiative. (2019). Global multidimensional poverty index 2019: illuminating inequalities.
15. Ravallion, M. (2011). On multidimensional indices of poverty. *The Journal of Economic Inequality*, 9(2), 235-248.
16. Sakuhuni, R. C., Chidoko, C., Dhoru, N. L., & Gwaindepi, C. (2011). Economic determinants of poverty in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Economic Research*, 2(6), 1-12.
17. Salahuddin, T., & Zaman, A. (2012). Multidimensional poverty measurement in Pakistan: time series trends and breakdown. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 493-504.
18. Saleem, H., Shabbir, M. S., & Khan, B. (2021). Re-examining multidimensional poverty in Pakistan: A new assessment of regional variations. *Global Business Review*, 22(6), 1441-1458.
19. Santos, M. E., & Villatoro, P. (2018). A multidimensional poverty index for Latin America. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 64(1), 52-82.
20. Sen, A. (1999). Commodities and capabilities. *OUP Catalogue*.
21. Shah, S. Z. A., Farooq, F., Chaudhry, I. S., & Asghar, M. M. (2021). The role of internal and external migration on rural poverty alleviation in Pakistan: a case study of Multan district. *Review of Education, Administration & Law*, 4(2), 495-502.
22. Shakoor, U., Shah, S. A., & Ullah, I. (2024). Investigating spatial patterns and contributing factors of rural poverty and vulnerability to environmental threats in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Journal of Social and Economic Development*, 26(2), 663-682.
23. Sharma, K. (2012). Changing profile of urban poverty: A case study of Jharkhand (India). *Transcience*, 3(2), 2191-1150.

24. Sheikh, M. R., Akhtar, M. H., Asghar, M. M., & Abbas, A. (2020). Demographic and economic aspects of poverty. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 58(1), 131-160.
25. Sial, M. H., Noreen, A., & Awan, R. U. (2015). Measuring multidimensional poverty and inequality in Pakistan. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 685-696.
26. Sibte-e-Ali, M., Chaudhary, I. S., & Farooq, F. (2018). Impact of Human and Social Capital on Economic Development in Pakistan: Empirical Evidence from Primary Data Analysis. *Journal of Accounting and Finance in Emerging Economies*, 4(1), 39-46.
27. Sikander, M. U., & Ahmed, M. (2008). Household determinants of poverty in punjab: a logistic regression analysis of MICS (2003-04) data set. In *8th Global Conference on Business & Economics* (pp. 1-41).
28. Spaho, A. (2014). Determinants of Poverty in Albania. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4 (2), 157-164
29. Taqi, M., e Ali, M. S., Parveen, S., Babar, M., & Khan, I. M. (2021). An analysis of Human Development Index and Economic Growth. A Case Study of Pakistan. *iRASD Journal of Economics*, 3(3), 261-271.
30. Townsend, P. (1970). Concept of poverty. In *International Seminar on Poverty (1967: University of Essex)*. American Elsevier.
31. Ullah Awan, R., Arif, M., Raza Cheema, A., & Rahim, S. (2019). An Empirical Analysis of Employment Status, Nature of Employment and Poverty Incidence in Pakistan. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings*, 8(2 (s)), pp-18.
32. Ullah, K., & Chishti, M. Z. (2023). Spatial distribution of poverty in Pakistan: an asset-based approach. *Future Business Journal*, 9(1), 2.
33. United Nations. (2004). Progress towards the millennium development goals 1990–2005. Statistics Division, The United Nations.
34. United, N. (2021). The sustainable development goals report 2021. *New York*.
35. Wang, X. (2022). On the relationship between income poverty and multidimensional poverty in China. In *Multidimensional Poverty Measurement* (pp. 85-106). Springer, Singapore.
36. World Bank. (1990). The World Bank Report 1990. Poverty. Report Number PUB8507. World development indicators 1990 (1).
37. World Bank. (2000). The World development report 2000. Oxford University Press.