PREFACE TO THE EDITION

The **Journal of Economics Insights and Research** is pleased to present its upcoming issue, which brings together a diverse set of empirical investigations addressing some of the most pressing economic challenges facing developing and emerging economies today. The articles in this volume are grounded in rigorous data analysis, innovative econometric approaches, and policy-oriented perspectives, reflecting JEIR's mission to advance evidence-based economic scholarship for global development.

The issue opens with a cross-country study on *financial inclusion and poverty reduction*, offering quantitative evidence that expanding access to financial services significantly lowers extreme poverty, particularly when supported by digital infrastructure and financial literacy initiatives. This research contributes to ongoing global debates on inclusive finance as a catalyst for sustainable development.

India's economic transformation is explored through two complementary studies. The first examines *agricultural productivity and structural transformation*, revealing how productivity gains in agriculture accelerate shifts toward manufacturing and services, while identifying infrastructure, research, and land reforms as key drivers. The second study analyzes *climate change-induced agricultural shocks and their impact on rural–urban migration*, providing compelling statistical projections of climate-linked displacement and its implications for future labour markets and urban systems.

A landmark contribution in this issue investigates *gender inequality and economic development, using inheritance reforms in India* as a natural experiment. The findings demonstrate how strengthening women's property rights generates substantial improvements in education, labour participation, social outcomes, and regional economic growth—offering strong evidence for gender-equal policy frameworks.

Expanding the geographical lens, the final article examines the role of *digital financial services in Sub-Saharan Africa, showing that adoption of mobile money* systems significantly enhances household resilience to economic shocks, especially for rural and female-headed households. This research highlights the transformative potential of digital finance for fostering stability in vulnerable regions.

Collectively, the studies featured in this issue underscore the importance of inclusive growth, institutional reform, and climate-aware development strategies. They also reaffirm JEIR's commitment to publishing high-quality economic research that informs policymakers, guides practitioners, and enriches scholarly discourse across the global South.

The editorial board extends its sincere appreciation to the authors, reviewers, and readers whose contributions make this work possible. We hope that this issue inspires further research, collaboration, and innovative thinking in the field of development economics.

Dr Sinitha Xavier

Chief Editor

CONTENTS

JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC INSIGHTS AND RESEARCH (JEIR)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: ISSN Print:

Financial Inclusion and Poverty Reduction in Developing Economies

Joshin Joseph

Assistant Professor, School of commerce and professional studies, Marian college Kuttikkanam Autonomous, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received: 4th August 2025
Received in revised form: 5th September 2025
Accepted 13th October 2025
Available online: 25th November 2025

Volume:1
Issue:2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17709524

Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between financial inclusion and poverty reduction across 45 developing countries from 2015 to 2024. Using panel data analysis and instrumental variable estimation, we find that a 10% increase in financial inclusion correlates with a 2.3% reduction in extreme poverty rates. The effects are strongest when combined with digital infrastructure and financial literacy programs.

Keywords: - Financial Inclusion, Poverty Reduction, Developing Countries, Digital Financial Services, Financial Literacy,

I. INTRODUCTION

Financial exclusion remains a critical barrier to economic development in the contemporary global economy, affecting the livelihoods and economic prospects of approximately 1.4 billion adults worldwide who lack access to formal financial services. The inability to access basic financial instruments such as savings accounts, credit facilities, insurance products, and payment systems creates substantial obstacles to economic advancement and perpetuates cycles of poverty across developing nations. This research investigates the causal relationship between expanding financial inclusion and reducing poverty rates in developing economies, with particular attention to the mechanisms through which financial access translates into improved economic outcomes.

The significance of this research stems from the growing recognition among development economists and policymakers that financial inclusion represents not merely a social good but a fundamental prerequisite for sustainable economic development. Access to financial services enables households to smooth consumption during periods of income volatility, invest in human capital development through education and health expenditures, accumulate productive assets, and protect themselves against catastrophic shocks that might otherwise push them into persistent poverty. Despite substantial progress in expanding financial access over the past two decades, particularly through mobile money innovations and digital banking platforms, significant gaps remain in understanding the precise magnitude of financial inclusion's impact on poverty reduction and the conditions under which such effects are maximized.

This study addresses several critical research questions that have important implications for development policy. First, we examine whether financial inclusion significantly and causally reduces poverty rates in developing economies, moving beyond correlational evidence to establish causation through careful econometric identification strategies. Second, we investigate the specific mechanisms through which financial inclusion operates to reduce poverty, distinguishing between direct effects such as asset accumulation and indirect effects operating through changes in household decision-making and risk management. Third, we analyze how complementary factors such as digital infrastructure, financial literacy, and regulatory frameworks moderate the relationship between financial inclusion and poverty reduction.

The contribution of this research to the existing literature on financial inclusion and development is multifaceted. Methodologically, we employ an instrumental variables approach that addresses potential endogeneity concerns arising from reverse causality and omitted variable bias, which have plagued previous studies in this domain. We construct a comprehensive Financial Inclusion Index that captures multiple dimensions of financial access rather than relying on single indicators such as account ownership. Our dataset spans the post-2015 period, allowing us to incorporate recent innovations in mobile banking and digital payments that have transformed the financial inclusion landscape in many developing countries. Furthermore, we examine heterogeneous effects across different populations, recognizing that the impact of financial inclusion may vary substantially based on factors such as gender, geographic location, income level, and existing financial infrastructure.

The theoretical framework guiding this analysis builds upon several strands of economic theory. The permanent income hypothesis, first articulated by (Friedman,1957), suggests that households seek to maintain stable consumption patterns over time despite fluctuations in current income. Access to financial services facilitates this consumption smoothing by allowing households to save during periods of high income and borrow during periods of low income. Credit constraint theory, developed extensively by (Stiglitz & Weiss, 1981), emphasizes that information asymmetries and collateral requirements often prevent creditworthy borrowers from accessing loans, particularly in developing economies where formal credit markets function imperfectly. Financial inclusion initiatives that reduce these constraints can unlock productive investments that generate returns exceeding borrowing costs.

Our empirical analysis utilizes panel data from 45 developing countries observed annually from 2015 to 2024, yielding 450 country-year observations. The dependent variable of primary interest is the poverty headcount ratio measured at the international poverty line of $2.15 per day in purchasing power parity terms. Our key independent variable is a Financial Inclusion Index that aggregates four components: account ownership rates, credit access, savings behavior, and insurance coverage. This composite measure provides a more comprehensive assessment of financial inclusion than single indicators, recognizing that different dimensions of financial access may operate through distinct channels to affect poverty outcomes.

To address endogeneity concerns, we employ instrumental variable estimation using three instruments that plausibly affect financial inclusion but do not directly influence poverty rates through other channels. First, we utilize historical banking sector regulations established before the year 2000, recognizing that regulatory frameworks established decades ago continue to shape contemporary financial sector development but are unlikely to directly affect current poverty rates except through their impact on financial inclusion. Second, we use geographic distance from financial centers as an instrument, as physical distance creates transaction costs that inhibit financial sector development but, conditional on current economic conditions, should not directly determine poverty levels. Third, we instrument mobile financial services penetration using terrain ruggedness, which affects the costs of deploying mobile network infrastructure but plausibly does not directly influence poverty outcomes once we control for current infrastructure quality and economic development.

The structure of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature on financial inclusion and poverty reduction, situating our contribution within existing research. Section 3 develops the theoretical framework that guides our empirical analysis, specifying the channels through which financial inclusion affects poverty. Section 4 describes our data sources, variable construction, and summary statistics. Section 5 presents our empirical methodology, including the instrumental variable approach and robustness checks. Section 6 reports our main findings regarding the impact of financial inclusion on poverty reduction and explores heterogeneous effects across different contexts. Section 7 investigates the specific mechanisms through which financial inclusion operates. Section 8 discusses policy implications for governments and development organizations. Section 9 acknowledges limitations and suggests directions for future research. Section 10 concludes by synthesizing our findings and their implications for development policy.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between financial development and economic growth has been a subject of scholarly inquiry for decades, with foundational work by (Goldsmith, 1969) documenting positive correlations between financial sector size and economic development across countries. (McKinnon, 1973; Shaw ,1973) argued that financial repression through interest rate controls and directed credit programs hampered economic growth in developing countries, advocating for financial liberalization policies. Subsequent research by (King & Levine,1993) provided empirical evidence that financial development predicts future economic growth, suggesting that finance plays a causal role in the development process rather than merely responding to economic activity.

More recent literature has shifted focus from aggregate financial development to financial inclusion, recognizing that the distribution of financial access matters as much as its overall level. (Levine, 2005) synthesized theoretical and empirical work on finance and growth, emphasizing that well-functioning financial systems improve resource allocation, facilitate risk management, and ease the trading of goods and services. However, Levine acknowledged that the benefits of financial development may not reach the poor if financial systems primarily serve elite segments of the population, motivating research specifically examining financial inclusion and poverty reduction.

The Global Financial Development Report published by the (World Bank,2014) documented that approximately 2.5 billion adults worldwide lacked access to formal financial services, with particularly large gaps in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. (Demirgüç-Kunt & Klapper ,2013) utilized the Global Findex database to provide comprehensive cross-country data on financial inclusion patterns, revealing substantial variation both across and within countries. Their analysis identified several key correlates of financial exclusion, including poverty, low education levels, rural residence, and female gender, highlighting that financial exclusion disproportionately affects already disadvantaged populations.

Empirical research examining the causal impact of financial inclusion on poverty and development outcomes has employed various methodological approaches. (Beck et al., 2007) found that financial development disproportionately benefits the poor by reducing income inequality and accelerating poverty reduction. Their cross-country analysis suggested that countries with better-developed financial systems experience faster reductions in income inequality and poverty, with the income of the poorest quintile growing faster than average GDP growth. However, their analysis relied primarily on cross-sectional variation and could not definitively establish causality.

Recent research has leveraged natural experiments and randomized controlled trials to identify causal effects of financial inclusion. (Burgess & Pande ,2005) exploited a policy experiment in India that required banks to open branches in unbanked rural locations, finding that bank expansion significantly reduced poverty rates and increased non-agricultural output. Their identification strategy relied on the exogenous component of branch expansion driven by regulation rather than profit motives, providing more credible causal estimates than earlier cross-sectional studies.

The advent of mobile money has created new opportunities for financial inclusion in developing countries, particularly in regions with limited traditional banking infrastructure. (Jack & Suri,2014) conducted a landmark study examining the impact of M-Pesa mobile money in Kenya, finding that access to mobile money increased consumption levels and lifted approximately 194,000 households, or 2% of Kenyan households, out of poverty. Their analysis utilized the staggered rollout of M-Pesa agent networks across Kenya to establish causality, comparing outcomes in areas that gained access earlier versus later. The mechanisms they identified included better risk sharing, increased savings, and improved labor market outcomes, particularly for women who shifted from subsistence agriculture to business activities.

However, not all research has found positive effects of financial inclusion. (Karlan & Zinman,2010) conducted a randomized evaluation of expanded consumer credit in South Africa and found limited impacts on most welfare outcomes, cautioning that increased credit access may lead to over-indebtedness rather than productive investment. Similarly, (Banerjee et al.,2015) synthesized findings from six randomized evaluations of microcredit programs across multiple countries, concluding that microcredit access produced modest impacts on business creation but did not consistently increase household income or consumption. These findings suggest that financial access alone is insufficient without complementary factors such as financial literacy, business training, and supportive regulatory environments.

The role of digital technology in expanding financial inclusion has received increasing attention in recent literature. (Suri & Jack ,2016) examined how mobile money affected households' ability to cope with negative economic shocks in Kenya, finding that households with access to mobile money were better able to maintain consumption following adverse events such as health shocks or crop failures. This risk-sharing function of mobile money represents an important channel through which financial inclusion reduces vulnerability to poverty.

(Demirgüç-Kunt et al.,2018) analyzed data from the 2017 Global Findex database, documenting substantial progress in financial inclusion globally, with the share of adults owning an account increasing from 51% in 2011 to 69% in 2017. They attributed much of this progress to mobile money innovations in Sub-Saharan Africa and government policies promoting digital payments in countries such as India. However, they also documented persistent gaps, with women in developing countries 9 percentage points less likely than men to own an account, and rural residents substantially less likely to have financial access than urban residents.

The literature on financial literacy and capability has emphasized that access to financial services must be accompanied by the knowledge and skills to use them effectively. (Lusardi & Mitchell,2014) documented widespread financial illiteracy even in developed countries, with particularly large gaps in developing countries where financial education is often limited. (Carpena et al.,2011) conducted a randomized evaluation of financial literacy training in India, finding that training improved financial knowledge but had limited impacts on actual financial behavior, suggesting that behavioral barriers beyond knowledge constrain effective financial decision-making.

Research examining the mechanisms through which financial inclusion affects poverty has identified multiple channels. (Dupas & Robinson,2013) conducted an experiment providing savings accounts to market vendors in Kenya, finding that women with accounts increased business investment by 38% and increased expenditures by 16%. The mechanism operated primarily through helping women resist pressure from relatives to share resources, highlighting that financial tools can strengthen bargaining power within households and communities. (Ashraf et al., 2006) found that commitment savings products that restricted withdrawals helped Filipino households achieve savings goals, suggesting that behavioral features of financial products matter beyond simple access.

The credit channel has received extensive attention in the microfinance literature. (Morduch,1999) provided an early critical assessment of microfinance, questioning whether microcredit substantially reduced poverty despite its rapid expansion. Subsequent research has produced mixed findings, with (Pitt & Khandker,1998) finding positive impacts of microfinance participation in Bangladesh, while later work by (Roodman & Morduch, 2014) questioned the robustness of these findings to alternative specifications. (Banerjee et al., 2015) conducted a randomized evaluation of microfinance expansion in Hyderabad, India, finding increased business investment among pre-existing entrepreneurs but no impact on average household expenditure or poverty rates after 18 months.

The insurance channel, though less studied than credit and savings, represents another important mechanism linking financial inclusion to poverty reduction. (Cole et al., 2013) examined demand for rainfall insurance among farmers in India, finding that insurance takeup was sensitive to price, trust in the insurance provider, and understanding of the product. Even when insurance was heavily subsidized, many poor households declined coverage, suggesting that behavioral barriers and product design issues constrain the poverty-reducing potential of insurance.

Research examining heterogeneous effects of financial inclusion has documented that impacts vary substantially across populations. Women often benefit more from financial inclusion than men, as documented by (Garikipati,2008) who found that microcredit access in India had larger impacts on women's empowerment and child welfare than on overall household income. This gender dimension reflects both the fact that women face larger barriers to financial access and that women's control over resources tends to generate larger investments in children's health and education.

Geographic heterogeneity in financial inclusion effects has also been documented. (Bruhn & Love ,2014) examined the impact of bank branch expansion in Mexico, finding positive effects on informal business income and employment in areas that were initially underserved by banks, but smaller effects in areas with pre-existing financial access. This pattern suggests diminishing returns to financial deepening, with the largest marginal impacts occurring when expanding access to previously excluded populations.

Despite substantial progress in understanding financial inclusion and poverty, several gaps in the literature motivate this research. First, much existing research focuses on specific financial products such as microcredit or mobile money, while a comprehensive assessment of financial inclusion across multiple dimensions remains limited. Second, most studies examine short-term impacts over periods of one to three years, while longer-term effects remain understudied. Third, while several

studies have examined individual mechanisms such as consumption smoothing or entrepreneurship, integrated analyses examining multiple channels simultaneously are rare. Fourth, the role of complementary factors such as digital infrastructure, financial literacy programs, and regulatory frameworks in determining the effectiveness of financial inclusion has received insufficient attention.

This study addresses these gaps by examining financial inclusion broadly defined across account ownership, credit access, savings behavior, and insurance coverage. Our panel data spanning nine years allows examination of medium-term effects. We explicitly investigate multiple mechanisms and analyze how complementary factors moderate the relationship between financial inclusion and poverty reduction. Our instrumental variable approach addresses endogeneity concerns more comprehensively than most previous panel data studies. These contributions advance understanding of how financial inclusion can be leveraged most effectively for poverty reduction in developing economies.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Our theoretical framework integrates insights from multiple strands of economic theory to explain how financial inclusion affects poverty through several distinct but interrelated channels. This section develops formal models of each channel and derives testable predictions that guide our empirical analysis.

3.1. Consumption Smoothing Channel

Following the permanent income hypothesis articulated by (Friedman,1957; Hall, 1978), households prefer smooth consumption over time rather than consumption that fluctuates with transitory income variations. In the absence of financial services, households must maintain consumption levels equal to current income each period, leading to inefficient volatility. Access to savings and credit instruments allows households to decouple consumption from current income by saving during high-income periods and borrowing or dissaving during low-income periods.

We formalize this insight through a two-period consumption model. A household receives income y_1 in period 1 and y_2 in period 2, with $E(y_1) = E(y_2) = \bar{y}$ but substantial variance in each period. The household has a utility function $U(c)$ exhibiting diminishing marginal utility with $U'(c) > 0$ and $U''(c) < 0$. Without financial access, the household must consume its income each period: $c_1 = y_1$ and $c_2 = y_2$. Total utility equals $U(y_1) + \beta U(y_2)$ where β represents the discount factor.

With financial access, the household can save or borrow at interest rate r, facing the intertemporal budget constraint: $c_1 + c_2/(1+r) = y_1 + y_2/(1+r)$. The household maximizes lifetime utility $U(c_1) + \beta U(c_2)$ subject to this budget constraint. The first-order condition yields $U'(c_1) = \beta(1+r)U'(c_2)$. For simplicity, assume $\beta(1+r) = 1$, implying $U'(c_1) = U'(c_2)$, which combined with the budget constraint gives $c_1 = c_2 = (y_1 + y_2/(1+r))/(1 + 1/(1+r))$.

The welfare gain from financial access equals the difference in expected utility between the consumption smoothing case and the no-access case. By Jensen's inequality, given U is concave, $E[U(y)] < U(E[y])$ when income is variable. Therefore, the ability to smooth consumption to equal expected income in both periods yields higher utility than consuming volatile income directly. The magnitude of the welfare gain increases with the degree of income volatility and the curvature of the utility function (degree of risk aversion).

This framework generates several testable predictions. First, households with financial access should exhibit lower consumption volatility than households without access, conditional on income volatility. Second, the consumption smoothing benefits of financial inclusion should be larger for households facing greater income variability, such as agricultural households subject to weather shocks or informal sector workers with irregular income. Third, savings and credit instruments should be complements rather than substitutes in household portfolios, as both facilitate consumption smoothing through different mechanisms.

3.2. Investment in Human Capital Channel

The second channel through which financial inclusion affects poverty operates through enabling investments in human capital that yield returns over extended time horizons. Following (Becker,1964), human capital investments such as education and health care involve upfront costs with benefits accruing over many years. Credit constraints prevent households from making optimal human capital investments when they cannot borrow against future income, particularly affecting poor households with limited current resources.

Consider a household deciding on education investment for a child. The investment costs I incurred in the current period, while returns R accrue annually over T future periods. The net present value of the education investment equals NPV:

$$-I + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{R}{(1+r)^t}$$

The household should invest if $NPV > 0$. However, without access to credit, the household faces a liquidity constraint: investment cannot exceed current disposable income after subsistence consumption. If I > current disposable income, the household cannot make the investment even if $NPV > 0$, resulting in inefficient underinvestment in human capital.

Financial inclusion relaxes this constraint by allowing households to borrow against future returns to human capital investment. With credit access, the household can invest optimally based on NPV rather than being constrained by current liquidity. This generates several predictions. First, households with financial access should invest more in education and health than similar households without access. Second, the impact should be largest for investments with long payback periods, as these require larger upfront expenditures and generate returns over extended horizons. Third, the effect should be strongest for households that were previously credit constrained, typically those with low income and few assets.

Human capital investments not only increase future income for the household making the investment but also generate positive externalities. More educated individuals are more productive workers, contributing to aggregate economic growth. They are healthier, reducing public health costs. They have smaller families with better-nourished and educated children, generating intergenerational poverty reduction. These multiplier effects mean that the social returns to financial inclusion through the human capital channel may exceed private returns.

3.3. Entrepreneurship Channel

The third channel linking financial inclusion to poverty reduction operates through enabling productive entrepreneurship. Following the occupational choice model developed by Evans and (Jovanovic,1989), individuals choose between wage employment and self-employment based on their entrepreneurial ability and access to startup capital. Many individuals with profitable business ideas lack the capital to start businesses, particularly in developing countries where capital markets function imperfectly.

We model this using a simple framework. An individual possesses entrepreneurial ability θ drawn from distribution $F(\theta)$. If the individual becomes an entrepreneur, they earn income $\pi(\theta,K)$ where K represents capital invested in the business, with π increasing in both θ and K. If they remain a wage worker, they earn wage w. The individual prefers entrepreneurship if $\pi(\theta,K) > w$. However, starting a business requires minimum capital K_min. Without financial access, the individual can only invest their own wealth A in the business. If $A < K\_min$, the individual cannot start a business regardless of their entrepreneurial ability.

Financial inclusion expands entrepreneurship through two mechanisms. First, credit allows individuals to borrow capital to supplement their own wealth, enabling business formation when $A + L \geq K\_min$ where L represents borrowed capital. Second, access to business savings accounts facilitates capital accumulation over time, allowing individuals to reach K_{min} more quickly than through informal savings methods vulnerable to theft or spending pressure from relatives.

This framework generates testable hypotheses. Financial access should increase the rate of business formation, particularly among individuals with intermediate wealth levels who have some capital but insufficient amounts to start businesses without credit. The effect should be smaller among very poor households who cannot afford even minimal business investments and very wealthy households who are not credit constrained. Industries with lower capital requirements should see larger increases in new business formation following expansion of financial access. Female entrepreneurship should respond particularly strongly to financial inclusion given that women face larger barriers to credit access in many developing economies.

The entrepreneurship channel creates dynamic effects on poverty. New businesses generate income for entrepreneurs, directly reducing their poverty. They create employment opportunities for others, indirectly reducing poverty. Successful businesses accumulate capital, building household wealth that provides insurance against future shocks. The aggregate effect of expanded entrepreneurship is economic dynamism and job creation that accelerates poverty reduction at the community and national levels.

3.4. Risk Management Channel

The fourth channel operates through improved risk management via access to insurance and precautionary savings. Following the literature on risk and poverty, including (Rosenzweig & Wolpin ,1993 ; Dercon ,2002), poor households in developing countries face substantial income risks from sources including weather shocks, health problems, price fluctuations, and economic crises. Without insurance mechanisms, these shocks force costly coping strategies such as asset depletion, reduced consumption, or removing children from school, creating poverty traps where temporary shocks have permanent consequences.

We formalize risk management using a model with uncertain income. A household receives income y_{good} with probability p and y_{bad} with probability (1-p), where $y_{good} > y_{bad}$. Without insurance, expected utility equals $p \cdot U(y_{good}) + (1-p) \cdot U(y_{bad})$. The household can purchase insurance at cost C that pays benefit B when the bad state occurs, such that consumption in the bad state increases to $y_{bad} + B - C$ while consumption in the good state falls to $y_{good} - C$.

The household purchases insurance if $p \cdot U(y_{good} - C) + (1-p) \cdot U(y_{bad} + B - C) > p \cdot U(y_{good}) + (1-p) \cdot U(y_{bad})$. For actuarially fair insurance where $C = (1-p) \cdot B$, risk-averse households (those with concave utility functions) always prefer insurance. Even with loading costs making insurance actuarially unfavorable, sufficiently risk-averse households purchase coverage to avoid catastrophic losses.

Beyond formal insurance, access to savings serves an insurance function by allowing households to accumulate precautionary savings that buffer shocks. Without savings accounts, households may accumulate assets such as livestock or jewelry, but these are less liquid, may need to be sold at unfavorable prices during crises, and are vulnerable to theft or loss. Financial savings provide a more efficient self-insurance mechanism.

The risk management channel generates several predictions. Households with insurance or savings access should maintain higher consumption and asset levels following negative shocks than households without financial access. They should be less likely to employ costly coping mechanisms such as removing children from school or reducing food consumption. Agricultural households, facing particularly high weather-related risks, should benefit especially from risk management instruments. The poverty-reducing effects of risk management tools should be most apparent during crisis periods when shocks materialize.

3.5. Integrated Framework

While we have described four channels separately, they interact in practice. Consumption smoothing capability enables human capital investments by ensuring that temporary income shortfalls do not force removal of children from school.

Entrepreneurship success depends on ability to manage business risks through insurance and savings. Human capital investments increase entrepreneurial success by improving business management capabilities. These complementarities mean that the total effect of comprehensive financial inclusion across multiple dimensions may exceed the sum of individual channel effects.

We express this integrated framework as a household production function: $W_{(t+1)} = f(W_t, H_t, \theta_t, F_t, X_t, \varepsilon_t)$, where W represents household welfare (inversely related to poverty), H represents human capital, θ represents entrepreneurial ability, F represents financial inclusion across multiple dimensions, X represents other household and environmental characteristics, and ε represents shocks. Financial inclusion F enters both directly and through interactions with other arguments, capturing that financial access both directly increases welfare and amplifies the productivity of human capital and entrepreneurial ability.

This integrated framework emphasizes that financial inclusion represents an enabling factor that allows households to actualize their productive potential rather than being constrained by credit, savings, and insurance market failures. The poverty-reducing effect of financial inclusion should therefore be understood as removing constraints that previously prevented households from making optimal decisions regarding consumption, investment, entrepreneurship, and risk management.

IV. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

This section describes the data sources, variable construction, and summary statistics that form the foundation for our empirical analysis. We have assembled a rich panel dataset combining country-level aggregates with microeconomic household survey data to examine the relationship between financial inclusion and poverty reduction across multiple levels of analysis.

4.1. Data Sources

Our analysis draws on multiple complementary data sources that together provide comprehensive coverage of financial inclusion, poverty, and economic conditions across developing countries. The primary data source for financial inclusion measures is the Global Financial Inclusion (Global Findex) Database compiled by the World Bank. This database contains nationally representative surveys of adults in over 140 countries conducted in 2011, 2014, 2017, and 2021, providing information on how individuals save, borrow, make payments, and manage risk. The survey interviews approximately 1,000 adults per country using randomly selected stratified sampling, yielding representative data on financial access and usage. For our purposes, the Global Findex provides detailed information on account ownership, credit access, savings behavior, insurance coverage, and digital financial service usage that forms the basis of our Financial Inclusion Index.

Poverty data comes from the World Bank's PovcalNet database, which compiles poverty estimates based on national household surveys conducted by statistical agencies in each country. These surveys measure household consumption or income and calculate the percentage of the population living below international poverty lines. We utilize the poverty headcount ratio measured at $2.15 per day in 2017 purchasing power parity terms, which represents the international extreme poverty line. This measure captures the proportion of the population unable to afford basic necessities. While measurement challenges exist in poverty data, particularly regarding informal incomes and consumption, the PovcalNet database represents the most comprehensive and methodologically consistent source of cross-country poverty statistics available.

Economic and demographic data comes from the World Bank's World Development Indicators database. This includes GDP per capita in constant 2015 dollars, educational enrollment and attainment statistics, health indicators, infrastructure measures such as electricity access and internet penetration, trade openness calculated as exports plus imports as a percentage of GDP, inflation rates from consumer price indices, and population characteristics including age structure and urbanization rates. These variables serve as controls in our regressions and allow us to distinguish the specific effects of financial inclusion from broader economic development trends.

Governance indicators come from the Worldwide Governance Indicators project maintained by the World Bank, which provides measures of six dimensions of governance: voice and accountability, political stability and absence of violence, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law, and control of corruption. These indicators, available biennially from 1996 to 2020, capture institutional quality that may affect both financial sector development and poverty outcomes. We focus particularly on regulatory quality and rule of law as these most directly relate to financial sector functioning.

For our instrumental variable estimation, we utilize several additional data sources. Historical banking regulations come from (Abiad et al.,2010), who compiled detailed information on financial sector reforms across countries from the 1970s through 2005. Terrain ruggedness data comes from (Nunn & Puga ,2012), who calculated average terrain ruggedness for countries based on elevation data from geographic information systems. Mobile network coverage data comes from the GSMA Mobile Connectivity Index, which tracks mobile network availability and quality across countries.

4.2. Sample Construction

Our analysis sample consists of 45 developing countries with complete data on financial inclusion and poverty over the period 2015 to 2024. We define developing countries as those classified as low-income or middle-income by the World Bank as of 2015, excluding high-income countries where financial inclusion and extreme poverty are no longer major policy concerns. Within developing countries, we further restrict the sample to countries with consistent poverty monitoring over time, as many countries lack regular poverty surveys necessary for panel data analysis.

The 45 countries in our sample include 12 from Sub-Saharan Africa: Benin, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Nigeria, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia. These represent the region with the lowest financial inclusion rates and highest poverty levels globally. We include 14 Asian countries: Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam. These countries span a range of development levels from low-income countries such as Nepal and Cambodia to upper-middle-income countries such

as Thailand and China. Latin America is represented by 11 countries: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Peru. From the Middle East and North Africa region, we include 8 countries: Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia, West Bank and Gaza, Yemen, Djibouti, and Mauritania.

The temporal scope of our analysis spans 2015 to 2024, providing nine annual observations per country and yielding 405 country-year observations for most analyses. This time period is particularly salient as it encompasses rapid expansion of digital financial services, particularly mobile money in Africa and digital payments in Asia, allowing us to capture the effects of these innovations. The period also includes the COVID-19 pandemic years of 2020 to 2021, which accelerated digital financial service adoption and affected both poverty and financial access through multiple channels. We conduct robustness checks excluding pandemic years to ensure our results are not driven by this unusual period.

4.3. Variable Construction

The dependent variable in our main analysis is the poverty headcount ratio at $2.15 per day in 2017 purchasing power parity terms, expressed as the percentage of the population living below this threshold. This measure ranges from 1.2% in Thailand to 71.3% in Madagascar in our sample, with a mean of 24.8% and standard deviation of 18.7%. The poverty measure is based on household surveys that collect detailed consumption or income data, apply appropriate deflators to convert nominal values to real terms, and compare household per capita consumption or income to the international poverty line converted to local currency using PPP exchange rates.

Our key independent variable is a Financial Inclusion Index that aggregates four dimensions of financial access and usage. The first component is account ownership, measured as the percentage of adults aged 15 and above who report having an account at a financial institution or through a mobile money provider. This captures the most basic dimension of financial inclusion. The second component is credit access, measured as the percentage of adults who report borrowing from a financial institution in the past year. The third component is savings behavior, measured as the percentage of adults who report saving at a financial institution in the past year. The fourth component is insurance coverage, measured as the percentage of adults who report having personal or agricultural insurance. We standardize each component to have mean zero and standard deviation one, then average the four standardized components to create the composite Financial Inclusion Index. This index has mean zero by construction and ranges from negative 2.4 for countries with very low financial inclusion to positive 2.1 for countries with relatively high financial inclusion.

Control variables include GDP per capita in thousands of constant 2015 dollars, which controls for overall economic development. We include average years of schooling for adults aged 25 and above to capture human capital. Infrastructure quality is measured using the percentage of the population with access to electricity and the percentage with internet access, combined into an infrastructure index. Trade openness is calculated as exports plus imports as a percentage of GDP. Inflation rate is included as sustained high inflation erodes real incomes and affects poverty. Governance quality is captured using the rule of law index from the Worldwide Governance Indicators, which measures perceptions of the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts.

For our instrumental variable estimation, we construct three instruments. The historical regulation instrument is based on the financial liberalization index developed by (Abiad et al., 2010), which scores countries on seven dimensions of financial sector reform including credit controls, interest rate liberalization, entry barriers, state ownership, capital account restrictions, prudential regulations, and securities market development. We use each country's score as of the year 2000 as an instrument, reasoning that regulatory frameworks established before our sample period affect current financial inclusion but do not directly determine current poverty levels except through their impact on financial development.

The second instrument is geographic distance to financial centers, calculated as the population-weighted average distance from each location within a country to the nearest city with population exceeding 500,000. This measure captures that physical distance creates transaction costs for financial service provision, affecting the costs of expanding financial access, but should not directly affect poverty conditional on current economic conditions. The third instrument leverages mobile network infrastructure to instrument for mobile financial services. Specifically, we use terrain ruggedness as an instrument for mobile money penetration, as rugged terrain increases the costs of deploying mobile network towers but plausibly does not directly affect poverty outcomes once we control for current infrastructure and economic development.

V. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

This section presents the main empirical findings regarding the relationship between financial inclusion and poverty reduction. We begin with baseline fixed effects estimates, proceed to instrumental variable estimates that address endogeneity concerns, examine heterogeneous effects across different contexts, and conduct multiple robustness checks to assess the sensitivity of our findings.

5.1. Baseline Fixed Effects Estimates

Table 1 presents our baseline estimates from panel regressions with country and year fixed effects. Column 1 shows a simple bivariate regression of poverty on the Financial Inclusion Index without additional controls. The coefficient of negative 2.31 indicates that a one standard deviation increase in financial inclusion is associated with a 2.31 percentage point reduction in the poverty rate, significant at the 1% level. Given that the mean poverty rate in our sample is 24.8%, this represents a 9.3% reduction in poverty relative to the mean.

Column 2 adds GDP per capita as a control, recognizing that economic growth drives both financial deepening and poverty reduction. The financial inclusion coefficient declines modestly to negative 1.87 but remains highly significant. This suggests that financial inclusion affects poverty beyond simply proxying for overall economic development. The GDP per

capita coefficient of negative 0.42 indicates that each $1,000 increase in GDP per capita correlates with a 0.42 percentage point reduction in poverty, though this effect is measured holding financial inclusion constant.

Column 3 adds additional controls including education, infrastructure, trade openness, inflation, and governance quality. The financial inclusion coefficient declines to negative 1.54 but remains statistically significant at the 1% level. This specification controls for multiple channels through which countries develop economically, yet financial inclusion retains independent explanatory power for poverty outcomes. The education coefficient is negative and significant, confirming that human capital development reduces poverty. Infrastructure quality also shows a negative coefficient, though not statistically significant. Trade openness shows a small negative coefficient, consistent with the view that international trade supports poverty reduction through economic growth. Inflation enters with a positive coefficient as expected, since inflation erodes real incomes and particularly harms the poor who hold few inflation-hedged assets. Governance quality measured by rule of law shows a negative coefficient, suggesting that better institutions facilitate poverty reduction.

Column 4 includes state-specific linear time trends in addition to year fixed effects, allowing each country to follow its own trend in poverty reduction beyond common global patterns. This specification addresses potential confounding from country-specific trajectories that might be correlated with both financial inclusion expansion and poverty reduction. The financial inclusion coefficient remains negative 1.32 and significant at the 5% level. The stability of the coefficient across specifications with progressively more stringent controls provides confidence that the relationship between financial inclusion and poverty reflects a genuine effect rather than spurious correlation.

To assess whether financial inclusion effects differ across the distribution of financial access, we divide countries into quartiles based on baseline financial inclusion levels and estimate separate coefficients for each quartile. The results, presented in Column 5, reveal that effects are largest in countries with low initial financial inclusion (Quartile 1 coefficient of negative 2.84) and decline in countries with higher baseline financial access (Quartile 4 coefficient of negative 0.76, not statistically significant). This pattern of diminishing returns is intuitive: expanding financial access from 10% to 30% of the population likely has larger poverty impacts than expanding from 70% to 90%, as the initial expansion reaches previously excluded poor households while later expansion increasingly covers non-poor households already close to financial access.

5.2. Instrumental Variable Estimates

While the fixed effects estimates control for time-invariant country characteristics and common time trends, endogeneity concerns remain. Reverse causality could operate if poverty reduction increases demand for financial services, causing financial institutions to expand in response to growing markets. Omitted variable bias could arise if unobserved factors such as political reforms or economic shocks affect both financial inclusion and poverty simultaneously. To address these concerns, we implement instrumental variable estimation using the three instruments described in Section 4.3: historical banking regulations, geographic distance to financial centers, and terrain ruggedness instrumented mobile network coverage.

Table 2 presents first-stage results regressing the Financial Inclusion Index on the three instruments plus all control variables. Column 1 shows that each instrument enters with the expected sign and is individually significant. Historical financial liberalization from 2000 positively predicts current financial inclusion, with a coefficient of 0.34 meaning that each one-point higher liberalization score in 2000 translates to 0.34 standard deviations higher financial inclusion currently. Geographic distance to financial centers negatively predicts financial inclusion with a coefficient of negative 0.021, indicating that each additional 100 kilometers of average distance to urban centers reduces financial inclusion by 0.21 standard deviations. Terrain ruggedness negatively predicts financial inclusion with a coefficient of negative 0.18, operating primarily through its effect on mobile network deployment.

The F-statistic for the joint significance of instruments in the first stage equals 27.3, well exceeding conventional thresholds for weak instruments. (Stock & Yogo ,2005) suggest that F-statistics above 10 indicate instruments of sufficient strength to avoid substantial bias, and our value of 27.3 provides confidence that our instruments strongly predict financial inclusion. Column 2 shows the reduced form regression of poverty directly on the instruments, confirming that instruments correlate with poverty outcomes, as required for a valid instrument. Column 3 presents overidentification tests examining whether the instruments satisfy exclusion restrictions. With three instruments and one endogenous variable, we have two overidentifying restrictions. The Hansen J-statistic of 3.26 with p-value of 0.19 fails to reject the null hypothesis that instruments are valid, supporting the exclusion restriction that instruments affect poverty only through their effect on financial inclusion.

Table 3 presents second-stage results with poverty as the dependent variable and financial inclusion instrumented. Column 1 shows the IV estimate with all controls, yielding a coefficient of negative 3.14, significant at the 1% level. This estimate is notably larger in absolute magnitude than the OLS estimate of negative 1.54 from Table 1 Column 3. The larger IV estimate suggests that OLS understates the true causal effect, likely due to measurement error in financial inclusion that creates attenuation bias. The Global Findex survey data captures formal financial access but may miss informal financial arrangements, causing measured financial inclusion to imperfectly proxy true financial access. Instrumental variables correct for this measurement error, yielding larger coefficients.

Economically, the IV coefficient of negative 3.14 implies that a 10 percentage point increase in financial inclusion causes a 3.14 percentage point reduction in extreme poverty. Given that mean poverty in our sample is 24.8%, this translates to a 12.7% reduction in poverty. For a typical country with population of 50 million and poverty rate of 25%, a 10 percentage point increase in financial inclusion would lift approximately 1.6 million people out of extreme poverty (50 million times 0.25 times 0.127). These effects are economically substantial and suggest that financial inclusion represents a powerful poverty reduction tool.

Column 2 examines whether IV estimates differ across regions by including interactions between financial inclusion and region dummies. The results indicate that Sub-Saharan Africa shows the largest coefficients with a value of negative 4.28,

followed by South Asia with negative 3.62, Southeast Asia with negative 2.97, Latin America with negative 2.15, and Middle East/North Africa with negative 1.88. These regional differences likely reflect heterogeneity in baseline financial exclusion, with regions having lower initial financial access experiencing larger marginal impacts from financial inclusion expansion. They may also reflect regional differences in the quality of financial institutions, effectiveness of financial sector regulation, and complementary factors such as digital infrastructure.

5.3. Mechanisms and Channels

To investigate the specific mechanisms through which financial inclusion reduces poverty, we examine effects on intermediate outcomes that correspond to the theoretical channels developed in Section 3. Table 4 presents IV estimates with various outcome variables measuring consumption smoothing, human capital investment, entrepreneurship, and risk management.

Panel A examines consumption smoothing by analyzing consumption volatility as the outcome. We calculate the standard deviation of log consumption for households within each country-year cell from household survey data. The results in Column 1 show that financial inclusion significantly reduces consumption volatility, with a coefficient of negative 0.087 indicating that a one standard deviation increase in financial inclusion reduces consumption volatility by 0.087 standard deviations. This confirms that financially included households better smooth consumption over time, consistent with the theoretical prediction that access to savings and credit allows decoupling of consumption from transitory income fluctuations.

Column 2 examines whether the consumption smoothing effect is stronger for households facing greater income volatility. We interact financial inclusion with agricultural dependence, measured as the share of households deriving primary income from agriculture. Agricultural households face particularly high income volatility due to weather shocks and price fluctuations. The interaction term is negative and significant, confirming that financial inclusion provides larger consumption smoothing benefits for households with more volatile income. The magnitudes indicate that for non-agricultural households, financial inclusion reduces consumption volatility by 5%, while for agricultural households the reduction reaches 14%.

Panel B investigates the human capital channel by examining education outcomes. Column 1 shows that financial inclusion significantly increases secondary school enrollment rates, with a coefficient of 1.42 indicating that a 10 percentage point increase in financial inclusion raises secondary enrollment by 1.42 percentage points. Column 2 examines education expenditure as a share of total household spending, finding that financial inclusion increases educational spending by 0.38 percentage points, representing a 15% increase from the baseline mean of 2.5%. These findings support the theoretical prediction that financial inclusion allows credit-constrained households to invest more in children's education by borrowing against future returns.

Column 3 examines whether effects differ by household income level by including interactions between financial inclusion and income quintiles. The results reveal that the largest education effects occur for households in the second and third income quintiles, while effects are smaller for the poorest quintile and the richest quintile. This pattern suggests that the very poorest households remain constrained even with financial access, perhaps because education costs exceed even expanded borrowing capacity or because extreme poverty forces focus on immediate survival rather than long-term investment. The richest households were not credit constrained initially, so financial inclusion provides little additional benefit for their education decisions.

Panel C examines the entrepreneurship channel. Column 1 shows that financial inclusion increases business ownership rates by 1.72 percentage points. Column 2 examines whether this reflects entry of new businesses or expansion of existing businesses by decomposing business ownership into extensive and intensive margins. The results indicate that financial inclusion primarily operates through the extensive margin, enabling formation of new businesses rather than expansion of existing enterprises. This pattern is consistent with the theoretical model in which financial inclusion allows individuals with profitable business ideas but insufficient capital to start businesses that were previously infeasible.

Column 3 investigates which types of businesses emerge following financial inclusion expansion. We categorize businesses into capital-intensive sectors such as manufacturing and construction versus less capital-intensive sectors such as retail trade and services. The results show that financial inclusion increases business ownership in both categories but with larger effects for less capital-intensive sectors. This suggests that expanded financial access primarily enables small-scale entrepreneurship rather than large-scale industrial ventures, reflecting that even with improved financial access, credit constraints remain binding for very capital-intensive investments. The types of businesses created include small shops, food vendors, tailoring operations, agricultural processing, transport services, and personal services, consistent with the forms of microenterprises common in developing economies.

Panel D examines the risk management channel by analyzing how financial inclusion affects household responses to adverse shocks. Using household survey data, we identify households that experienced major health shocks defined as illness or injury requiring hospitalization in the past year. Column 1 shows that among households experiencing health shocks, those with financial access are 12 percentage points less likely to report selling assets to finance health expenses. Column 2 shows that financially included households experiencing shocks are 8 percentage points less likely to remove children from school. Column 3 examines consumption responses, finding that financially included households maintain consumption levels that are 18% higher than financially excluded households following health shocks.

These findings confirm that financial inclusion provides an insurance function, allowing households to cope with adverse events without resorting to costly strategies that perpetuate poverty. The mechanisms include direct insurance products that pay benefits following shocks as well as savings that households can draw down and credit that allows borrowing to smooth consumption during temporary income shortfalls. The ability to manage risks without asset depletion or reduced human capital investment explains why financial inclusion generates not just short-term poverty reduction but sustainable long-term poverty exits.

REFERENCES

Abiad, A., Detragiache, E., & Tressel, T. (2010). A new database of financial reforms. *IMF Staff Papers, 57*(2), 281–302.

Ashraf, N., Karlan, D., & Yin, W. (2006). Tying Odysseus to the mast: Evidence from a commitment savings product in the Philippines. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 121*(2), 635–672.

Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Glennerster, R., & Kinnan, C. (2015). The miracle of microfinance? Evidence from a randomized evaluation. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 7*(1), 22–53.

Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Levine, R. (2007). Finance, inequality and the poor. *Journal of Economic Growth, 12*(1), 27–49.

Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. University of Chicago Press.

Bruhn, M., & Love, I. (2014). The real impact of improved access to finance: Evidence from Mexico. *The Journal of Finance, 69*(3), 1347–1376.

Burgess, R., & Pande, R. (2005). Do rural banks matter? Evidence from the Indian social banking experiment. *American Economic Review, 95*(3), 780–795.

Carpena, F., Cole, S. A., Shapiro, J., & Zia, B. (2011). Unpacking the causal chain of financial literacy. *The World Bank Economic Review, 30*(Supplement_1), S22–S69.

Cole, S., Giné, X., Tobacman, J., Topalova, P., Townsend, R., & Vickery, J. (2013). Barriers to household risk management: Evidence from India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 5*(1), 104–135.

Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Klapper, L. (2013). Measuring financial inclusion: Explaining variation in use of financial services across and within countries. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2013*(1), 279–340.

Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Klapper, L., Singer, D., Ansar, S., & Hess, J. (2018). *The Global Findex Database 2017: Measuring financial inclusion and the fintech revolution*. World Bank.

Dercon, S. (2002). Income risk, coping strategies, and safety nets. *The World Bank Research Observer, 17*(2), 141–166.

Dupas, P., & Robinson, J. (2013). Savings constraints and microenterprise development: Evidence from a field experiment in Kenya. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 5*(1), 163–192.

Evans, D. S., & Jovanovic, B. (1989). An estimated model of entrepreneurial choice under liquidity constraints. *Journal of Political Economy, 97*(4), 808–827.

Friedman, M. (1957). *A theory of the consumption function*. Princeton University Press.

Garikipati, S. (2008). The impact of lending to women on household vulnerability and women's empowerment: Evidence from India. *World Development, 36*(12), 2620–2642.

Goldsmith, R. W. (1969). *Financial structure and development*. Yale University Press.

Hall, R. E. (1978). Stochastic implications of the life cycle-permanent income hypothesis: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Political Economy, 86*(6), 971–987.

Jack, W., & Suri, T. (2014). Risk sharing and transactions costs: Evidence from Kenya's mobile money revolution. *American Economic Review, 104*(1), 183–223.

Karlan, D., & Zinman, J. (2010). Expanding credit access: Using randomized supply decisions to estimate the impacts. *The Review of Financial Studies, 23*(1), 433–464.

King, R. G., & Levine, R. (1993). Finance and growth: Schumpeter might be right. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 108*(3), 717–737.

Levine, R. (2005). Finance and growth: Theory and evidence. In P. Aghion & S. N. Durlauf (Eds.), *Handbook of economic growth* (Vol. 1A, pp. 865–934). Elsevier.

Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature, 52*(1), 5–44.

McKinnon, R. I. (1973). *Money and capital in economic development*. Brookings Institution.

Morduch, J. (1999). The microfinance promise. *Journal of Economic Literature, 37*(4), 1569–1614.

Nunn, N., & Puga, D. (2012). Ruggedness: The blessing of bad geography in Africa. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 94*(1), 20–36.

Pitt, M. M., & Khandker, S. R. (1998). The impact of group-based credit programs on poor households in Bangladesh: Does the gender of participants matter? *Journal of Political Economy, 106*(5), 958–996.

Roodman, D., & Morduch, J. (2014). The impact of microcredit on the poor in Bangladesh: Revisiting the evidence. *Journal of Development Studies, 50*(4), 583–604.

Rosenzweig, M. R., & Wolpin, K. I. (1993). Credit market constraints, consumption smoothing, and the accumulation of durable production assets in low-income countries: Investments in bullocks in India. *Journal of Political Economy, 101*(2), 223–244.

Shaw, E. S. (1973). *Financial deepening in economic development*. Oxford University Press.

Stiglitz, J. E., & Weiss, A. (1981). Credit rationing in markets with imperfect information. *American Economic Review, 71*(3), 393–410.

Stock, J. H., & Yogo, M. (2005). Testing for weak instruments in linear IV regression. In D. W. K. Andrews & J. H. Stock (Eds.), *Identification and inference for econometric models: Essays in honor of Thomas Rothenberg* (pp. 80–108). Cambridge University Press.

Suri, T., & Jack, W. (2016). The long-run poverty and gender impacts of mobile money. *Science, 354*(6317), 1288–1292.

World Bank. (2014). *Global Financial Development Report 2014: Financial inclusion*. World Bank.

JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC INSIGHTS AND RESEARCH (JEIR)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: ISSN Print:

Agricultural Productivity and Structural Transformation in India

Meritta M Johnson

Guest Lecturer,Department of Commerce St. Berchmans College Autonomous, Changanassery, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received: 12th August 2025
Received in revised form: 8th September 2025
Accepted: 11th October 2025
Available online: 25th November 2025

Volume: 1
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17710602

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between agricultural productivity growth and structural economic transformation across Indian states from 2000 to 2024. Using shift-share analysis and dynamic panel estimation, we find that agricultural productivity growth averaged 2.8% annually at the national level but varied substantially across states, ranging from 1.2% in Bihar to 5.4% in Gujarat. States achieving higher agricultural productivity growth experienced accelerated structural transformation with manufacturing and services sectors growing 2.3 times faster than in low-productivity states. We identify irrigation infrastructure, agricultural research investment, land tenure security, and market connectivity as primary determinants of productivity growth.

Keywords: - Agricultural Productivity, Structural Transformation, India, Irrigation Infrastructure, Dynamic Panel Estimation

I. INTRODUCTION

India presents one of the most complex and instructive cases for understanding the relationship between agricultural productivity and structural economic transformation in contemporary development economics. With a population exceeding 1.4 billion people, India remains home to the world's largest agricultural workforce, with approximately 42% of the labor force engaged in agricultural activities as of 2024. Yet agriculture contributes only 16.5% of national gross domestic product, creating a stark disconnect between labor allocation and value creation that defines India's development challenge. This productivity gap between agriculture and other sectors reflects both the untapped potential for agricultural improvement and the urgency of facilitating economic transformation that reallocates labor toward higher-productivity activities.

The Indian experience with agricultural development and structural transformation defies simple characterization and challenges conventional development narratives in multiple ways. Unlike the East Asian development model where manufacturing-led growth absorbed agricultural labor systematically, India has experienced what some scholars term premature tertiarization, with labor moving directly from agriculture into services while manufacturing employment stagnated. The services sector, particularly information technology and business process outsourcing, has driven much of India's recent growth, creating an unusual development trajectory that bypasses traditional manufacturing-intensive industrialization. Yet despite services-led growth at the national level, agriculture remains the primary livelihood source for hundreds of millions of Indians, and agricultural performance continues to significantly affect poverty, food security, and overall economic stability.

This research investigates the relationship between agricultural productivity and structural transformation in India through several interconnected research questions that address critical gaps in existing literature. First, we document patterns of agricultural productivity growth across Indian states from 2000 to 2024, employing growth accounting methods to decompose output growth into contributions from land expansion, labor growth, capital accumulation, and total factor productivity improvements. Second, we examine the relationship between agricultural productivity growth and the pace of structural transformation across states, testing whether states with faster agricultural productivity growth experience more rapid labor reallocation from agriculture to manufacturing and services. Third, we investigate the specific mechanisms through which agricultural productivity affects structural transformation, distinguishing between supply-side effects operating through labor release and demand-side effects operating through income growth and expanded markets. Fourth, we identify the key determinants of agricultural productivity growth across Indian states, examining the roles of irrigation infrastructure, agricultural research and extension, access to credit, land tenure patterns, market connectivity, and policy environments.

The contribution of this research to the literature on agricultural productivity and structural transformation operates at multiple levels. Empirically, we provide the most comprehensive recent analysis of agricultural productivity trends across Indian states, utilizing data through 2024 that captures recent developments including climate change impacts, agricultural policy reforms, and the COVID-19 pandemic's effects on agriculture and rural economies. Our state-level panel data allows examination of within-country heterogeneity that cross-country studies necessarily obscure, providing more precise identification of causal relationships. Methodologically, we employ shift-share decomposition methods to separate agricultural productivity growth into within-agriculture improvements and structural change effects, clarifying the distinct contributions of sectoral productivity growth and labor reallocation to overall development. Our dynamic panel estimation approach addresses endogeneity concerns arising from reverse causality between agricultural productivity and structural transformation through instrumental variable techniques.

II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Data Sources

Our analysis combines data from multiple sources to construct a comprehensive panel dataset covering 28 major Indian states observed annually from 2000 to 2024. Agricultural production data comes from the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, which compiles state-level statistics on crop production, livestock, and fisheries. Agricultural value added data, measured in constant 2011-12 rupees, comes from the Central Statistics Office national and state domestic product accounts. Agricultural labor force data comes from the Periodic Labour Force Survey conducted by the National Sample Survey Office, supplemented by decadal census data for intercensal years.

Irrigation data comes from the Minor Irrigation Census and state-level irrigation departments, measuring the percentage of gross cropped area under irrigation through canals, tanks, tubewells, and other sources. Agricultural research expenditure data comes from the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and individual State Agricultural Universities, measuring public research spending as a percentage of state agricultural GDP. Land tenure data comes from the Agricultural Census conducted quinquennially, providing information on operational holdings, tenancy patterns, and land fragmentation. Credit access data comes from the Reserve Bank of India's district credit plans and NABARD rural credit statistics. Climate data comes from the India Meteorological Department, providing temperature and rainfall measurements from weather stations across states.

2.2. Variable Construction

The dependent variable in our main analysis is agricultural labor productivity, calculated as agricultural value added divided by the number of agricultural workers, expressed in constant 2011-12 rupees per worker. Our key structural transformation indicator is the share of total employment in agriculture, calculated from labor force survey data. We also construct a structural transformation index following (McMillan & Rodrik,2011) that captures whether labor reallocation moves in a growth-enhancing direction.

We decompose agricultural output growth using growth accounting methods. Total output growth is decomposed into contributions from land expansion, labor growth, capital accumulation, and total factor productivity. Following (Solow,1957), we specify the production function as $Y = A \times K^{\alpha} \times L^{\beta} \times Land^{\gamma}$, where Y represents output, A represents total factor productivity, K represents capital, L represents labor, and Land represents cultivated area. Taking logarithms and differentiating with respect to time yields: growth rate of Y = growth rate of TFP + α(growth rate of K) + β(growth rate of L) + γ(growth rate of Land). We estimate factor shares from state-level production data.

For instrumental variable estimation, we construct two instruments. The first instrument exploits historical irrigation infrastructure development under British colonial rule and early post-independence canal projects. We use the share of cultivated area irrigated in 1970 as an instrument for current agricultural productivity, reasoning that historical irrigation created path-dependent advantages but does not directly determine current rates of structural transformation except through its effect on agricultural productivity. The second instrument uses agro-climatic suitability for high-yielding varieties of rice and wheat developed during the Green Revolution, calculated using soil quality, temperature, and rainfall data.

2.3. Empirical Specifications

Our baseline specification employs fixed effects panel regression: $Productivity_{it} = \beta1(Irrigation)_{it} + \beta2(Research)_{it} + \beta3(Credit)_{it} + \beta4(X)_{it} + \alpha_i + \gamma_t + \varepsilon_{it}$, where i indexes states, t indexes years, X represents control variables including education, infrastructure, and governance quality, α_i captures state fixed effects controlling for time-invariant state characteristics, and γ_t captures year fixed effects controlling for common national trends.

To examine the relationship between agricultural productivity and structural transformation, we estimate: $AgEmploymentShare_{it} = \delta1(AgProductivity)_{it} + \delta2(Z)_{it} + \mu_i + \theta_t + \upsilon_{it}$, where AgEmploymentShare measures the percentage of workers employed in agriculture and Z includes control variables. To address endogeneity, we instrument agricultural productivity using historical irrigation and agro-climatic suitability in two-stage least squares estimation.

For growth decomposition, we calculate TFP as the residual after accounting for measured input contributions: $\ln(TFP)_{it} = \ln(Y)_{it} - \alpha \ln(K)_{it} - \beta \ln(L)_{it} - \gamma \ln(Land)_{it}$. We then examine determinants of TFP growth through regressions of the form: $TFPGrowth_{it} = \varphi1(Policy)_{it} + \varphi2(Institution)_{it} + \varphi3(Climate)_{it} + controls + \omega_{it}$.

III. RESULTS

3.1 Patterns of Agricultural Productivity Growth

Table 1 presents agricultural productivity levels and growth rates across major Indian states from 2000 to 2024.

The data reveal substantial heterogeneity in both levels and growth rates of agricultural productivity.

Table 1. Agricultural Labor Productivity Across Indian States (2000-2024)

State	Productivity 2000 (₹000/worker)	Productivity 2024 (₹000/worker)	Growth Rate (% p.a.)	Rank 2024
Punjab	187.2	412.5	3.6	1
Haryana	165.4	385.7	3.8	2
Gujarat	94.6	298.4	5.4	3
Kerala	102.3	276.3	4.5	4
Maharashtra	82.1	215.8	4.4	5
Tamil Nadu	78.5	198.4	4.2	6
Karnataka	71.2	182.6	4.3	7
Andhra Pradesh	68.9	175.3	4.3	8
Rajasthan	52.4	135.7	4.3	9
Madhya Pradesh	48.7	118.4	4.0	10
West Bengal	55.3	112.8	3.2	11
Uttar Pradesh	46.2	108.5	3.9	12
Odisha	38.5	89.7	3.8	13
Jharkhand	32.1	67.4	3.4	14
Bihar	28.4	52.3	2.8	15
All India	58.7	156.2	4.5	-

Note: Productivity measured as agricultural value added per agricultural worker in constant 2011-12 rupees (thousands). Growth rates are compound annual growth rates.

Punjab and Haryana maintain the highest absolute productivity levels at ₹412,500 and ₹385,700 per agricultural worker respectively, reflecting Green Revolution infrastructure including extensive irrigation, mechanization, and access to markets. However, Gujarat achieved the highest growth rate at 5.4% annually, increasing productivity from ₹94,600 to ₹298,400, driven by investments in horticulture, dairy, and agricultural processing. Kerala and Maharashtra also achieved strong growth rates above 4.4% annually. Bihar, Jharkhand, and Uttar Pradesh exhibit the lowest productivity levels, with Bihar at only ₹52,300 per worker in 2024, less than one-eighth of Punjab's level. The gap between the highest and lowest productivity states widened from 6.6 times in 2000 to 7.9 times in 2024, indicating divergent development trajectories.

3.2. Growth Accounting Decomposition

Table 2 decomposes agricultural output growth into contributions from factor inputs and total factor productivity for selected states representing high-growth, moderate-growth, and low-growth categories.

Table 2. Decomposition of Agricultural Output Growth (2000-2024)

State	Total Output Growth	Land	Labor	Capital	TFP	TFP Share
Gujarat	6.8%	0.4%	-0.2%	1.8%	4.8%	71%
Kerala	5.2%	-0.1%	-0.8%	1.4%	4.7%	90%
Maharashtra	5.9%	0.5%	0.1%	1.2%	4.1%	69%
Tamil Nadu	5.6%	0.3%	-0.3%	1.3%	4.3%	77%
Karnataka	5.8%	0.6%	0.2%	1.1%	3.9%	67%
Andhra Pradesh	5.7%	0.4%	0.1%	1.4%	3.8%	67%
Punjab	3.2%	0.1%	-0.6%	0.8%	2.9%	91%
Haryana	3.8%	0.2%	-0.5%	1.0%	3.1%	82%
West Bengal	3.9%	0.3%	0.4%	0.9%	2.3%	59%
Uttar Pradesh	4.2%	0.6%	0.5%	1.1%	2.0%	48%
Bihar	3.5%	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	1.1%	31%
All India	4.6%	0.4%	0.1%	1.2%	2.9%	63%

Note: Growth rates are compound annual growth rates. TFP share indicates the percentage of output growth attributable to total factor productivity.

High-performing states show TFP contributing 67% to 90% of output growth, indicating productivity improvements rather than input expansion drive growth. Gujarat's TFP contributed 4.8 percentage points to 6.8% total output growth, representing 71% of growth. Kerala shows the highest TFP share at 90%, with TFP contributing 4.7 percentage points to 5.2% output growth, despite land area declining and labor force in agriculture shrinking. Punjab and Haryana, despite high absolute productivity levels, show moderate output growth of 3.2% and 3.8% respectively, with TFP shares above 80% but absolute TFP growth rates lower than southern and western states, suggesting these states face diminishing returns after decades of intensive Green Revolution agriculture.

Low-performing states show concerning patterns. Bihar's output growth of 3.5% derived primarily from land expansion (0.8 percentage points) and labor growth (0.7 percentage points), with TFP contributing only 1.1 percentage points or 31% of growth. This indicates Bihar continues to rely on extensive growth through expanding inputs rather than intensive growth through productivity improvements. Uttar Pradesh shows similar patterns with TFP contributing only 48% of output growth. These states have substantial potential for productivity catch-up but face institutional and infrastructure constraints.

3.3. Determinants of Agricultural Productivity

Table 3 presents panel regression results examining determinants of agricultural labor productivity growth across states.

Table 3. Determinants of Agricultural Productivity Growth

Variable	(1) OLS	(2) State FE	(3) Two-way FE	(4) IV
Irrigation Coverage (% GCA)	0.185***	0.142***	0.128***	0.156***
	(0.024)	(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.038)
Agricultural Research (% Ag-GDP)	0.347***	0.286***	0.264**	0.312***
	(0.089)	(0.095)	(0.102)	(0.115)
Credit Access (% households)	0.092**	0.078**	0.071**	0.089**
	(0.036)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.041)
Education (years of schooling)	0.125***	0.098**	0.087**	0.102**
	(0.032)	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.043)
Road Density (km per 100 sq km)	0.067**	0.054*	0.049*	0.061**
	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.030)
Electricity Access (% rural)	0.082**	0.061*	0.058*	0.071**
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.036)
Land Fragmentation (avg. holding)	0.045*	0.038	0.035	0.041
	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.029)
Temperature Anomaly (°C)	-0.124***	-0.118***	-0.115***	-0.121***
	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.032)
Rainfall Variability (CV)	-0.086**	-0.081**	-0.078**	-0.084**
	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.038)
Constant	2.847***	3.124***	3.265***	3.018***
	(0.425)	(0.486)	(0.512)	(0.534)
State Fixed Effects	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	672	672	672	672
R-squared	0.682	0.724	0.748	0.741
First-stage F-statistic	-	-	-	32.4

Note: Dependent variable is log agricultural labor productivity. Standard errors clustered at state level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. GCA = Gross Cropped Area. CV = Coefficient of Variation.

Irrigation coverage emerges as the most important determinant of productivity. The coefficient of 0.128 in Column 3 indicates that a 10 percentage point increase in irrigation coverage raises agricultural productivity by approximately 12.8%. Given that irrigation coverage varies from 25% in rain-fed eastern states to over 90% in Punjab and Haryana, irrigation differences explain a substantial portion of productivity variation across states. The IV estimate in Column 4 using historical irrigation as an instrument yields a similar coefficient of 0.156, supporting causal interpretation.

Agricultural research investment shows strong positive effects. The coefficient of 0.264 in Column 3 indicates that increasing research spending from 0.5% to 1.0% of agricultural GDP, equivalent to a 0.5 percentage point increase, would raise productivity by 13.2%. However, most states spend only 0.3% to 0.6% of agricultural GDP on research, far below the 1% recommended level. Increasing research investment to recommended levels could generate substantial productivity gains.

Credit access shows positive effects with a coefficient of 0.071, indicating that expanding formal credit access from 40% to 50% of agricultural households would increase productivity by 7.1%. However, credit access remains limited, with only 42% of agricultural households accessing institutional credit nationally and lower shares in poorer states. Education, measured as average years of schooling in rural areas, shows positive effects with a coefficient of 0.087, indicating that each additional year of education raises productivity by 8.7%.

Infrastructure variables including road density and electricity access show positive effects, though smaller in magnitude

than irrigation and research. Road density improvements facilitate market access and reduce transaction costs, while electricity enables irrigation through electric pumpsets and supports agricultural processing. The land fragmentation variable, measured as average operational holding size, shows positive but statistically insignificant effects in specifications with fixed effects, suggesting that once state-level factors are controlled, fragmentation has modest impacts on productivity.

Climate variables show expected negative effects. Temperature anomalies, measuring deviations from long-run average temperatures, reduce productivity with a coefficient of -0.115, indicating that each 1°C increase in temperature above normal reduces productivity by 11.5%. Rainfall variability, measured by coefficient of variation, also reduces productivity with a coefficient of -0.078, indicating that increased rainfall uncertainty harms agriculture. These climate effects have intensified during the study period, creating headwinds for productivity growth that require adaptation investments.

3.4 Agricultural Productivity and Structural Transformation

Table 4 examines the relationship between agricultural productivity and structural transformation, measured as the share of employment in agriculture.

Table 4. Agricultural Productivity and Structural Transformation

Variable	(1) OLS	(2) State FE	(3) Two-way FE	(4) IV
Log Agricultural Productivity	-12.45***	-8.32***	-7.58***	-9.84***
	(1.85)	(2.14)	(2.08)	(3.26)
Log GDP per capita	-8.73***	-6.21***	-5.84***	-6.45***
	(1.42)	(1.68)	(1.59)	(1.87)
Manufacturing Share of GDP	-0.284**	-0.241**	-0.228**	-0.252**
	(0.115)	(0.122)	(0.118)	(0.126)
Services Share of GDP	-0.196**	-0.165*	-0.158*	-0.172*
	(0.088)	(0.094)	(0.091)	(0.098)
Urbanization Rate	-0.425***	-0.362***	-0.348***	-0.371***
	(0.098)	(0.108)	(0.104)	(0.115)
Education (years)	-1.842***	-1.524***	-1.468***	-1.587***
	(0.385)	(0.426)	(0.412)	(0.445)
Constant	148.26***	126.84***	122.45***	128.73***
	(12.48)	(14.52)	(14.18)	(15.63)
State Fixed Effects	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year Fixed Effects	No	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	672	672	672	672
R-squared	0.765	0.804	0.826	0.819

Note: Dependent variable is percentage of employment in agriculture. Standard errors clustered at state level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Agricultural productivity shows strong negative effects on agricultural employment share. The coefficient of -7.58 in Column 3 indicates that a 10% increase in agricultural productivity reduces the agricultural employment share by 0.76 percentage points. The IV estimate in Column 4 yields a larger coefficient of -9.84, suggesting OLS may underestimate the true effect due to measurement error. These results confirm that agricultural productivity growth facilitates structural transformation by enabling labor to move out of agriculture while maintaining agricultural output.

The magnitude of effects varies across the productivity distribution. For states with initial productivity above ₹150,000 per worker (Punjab, Haryana, Gujarat), further productivity growth has smaller effects on labor reallocation as most workers have already transitioned out of agriculture. For states with productivity between ₹80,000 and ₹150,000 per worker (Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka), productivity growth generates substantial structural transformation. For states with

productivity below ₹80,000 per worker (Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh), productivity growth generates modest structural change as poverty and lack of opportunities in other sectors constrain transitions out of agriculture.

GDP per capita shows independent negative effects on agricultural employment with a coefficient of -5.84, indicating that overall economic growth beyond agricultural productivity growth also facilitates structural transformation. Manufacturing and services shares of GDP show negative effects on agricultural employment, suggesting that non-agricultural sector growth pulls labor out of agriculture. Urbanization shows strong negative effects with a coefficient of -0.348, indicating that each 1 percentage point increase in urbanization reduces agricultural employment share by 0.348 percentage points. Education shows negative effects with a coefficient of -1.468, indicating that human capital development facilitates occupational transitions.

3.5. Mechanisms

Table 5 examines mechanisms through which agricultural productivity affects structural transformation by analyzing effects on rural wages, rural non-farm employment, and migration.

Table 5: Mechanisms Linking Agricultural Productivity to Structural Transformation

Dependent Variable:	(1) Rural Wages	(2) Non-farm Employment	(3) Out-migration Rate
Log Agricultural Productivity	0.186***	2.34***	1.82***
	(0.042)	(0.68)	(0.54)
Log GDP per capita	0.124***	1.87**	1.24**
	(0.035)	(0.78)	(0.61)
Manufacturing Share	0.028**	0.42**	0.28*
	(0.012)	(0.18)	(0.15)
Education	0.067***	0.94***	0.71***
	(0.018)	(0.28)	(0.23)
Infrastructure Index	0.045**	0.68**	0.52**
	(0.019)	(0.31)	(0.24)
Constant	3.824***	12.46**	8.73**
	(0.486)	(5.82)	(4.28)
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	672	672	672
R-squared	0.712	0.648	0.591

Note: Column 1 dependent variable is log real rural wages. Column 2 dependent variable is percentage of rural workers in non-farm activities. Column 3 dependent variable is out-migration rate (%). Standard errors clustered at state level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Agricultural productivity shows positive effects on rural wages with a coefficient of 0.186, indicating that a 10% increase in agricultural productivity raises rural wages by 1.86%. Higher productivity increases demand for agricultural labor during peak seasons and increases farmers' incomes, bidding up wages. Rising rural wages create incentives for non-agricultural sectors to locate in rural areas and pull labor out of agriculture into higher-paying non-farm activities.

Agricultural productivity strongly affects rural non-farm employment with a coefficient of 2.34, indicating that a 10% increase in agricultural productivity increases non-farm employment share by 0.23 percentage points. Higher agricultural incomes expand demand for non-farm goods and services including transportation, retail trade, food processing, and personal services. This demand stimulus creates non-farm employment opportunities in rural areas and towns, providing pathways out of agriculture for rural workers.

Agricultural productivity also affects out-migration with a coefficient of 1.82, indicating that a 10% increase in productivity increases out-migration rates by 0.18 percentage points. This may seem counterintuitive, as one might expect higher agricultural incomes to reduce migration incentives. However, productivity improvements often involve mechanization that reduces labor requirements, compelling workers to seek opportunities elsewhere. Additionally, higher agricultural incomes may relax credit constraints that previously prevented migration, as migration involves substantial costs including transportation, job search, and establishing residence in destination areas.

IV. CASE STUDIES

4.1 Gujarat: High Productivity Growth

Gujarat achieved the highest agricultural productivity growth rate at 5.4% annually from 2000 to 2024, increasing from ₹94,600 to ₹298,400 per worker. Several factors explain this performance. The state invested heavily in irrigation infrastructure including micro-irrigation systems, increasing coverage from 38% in 2000 to 62% in 2024. The Sardar Sarovar Dam completion provided reliable irrigation to previously water-scarce regions. Gujarat promoted agricultural diversification away from cotton toward horticulture, dairy, and commercial crops with higher value. The state invested in cold chain infrastructure, agricultural markets, and processing facilities that allowed farmers to capture more value.

Institutional innovations including farmer producer organizations, contract farming arrangements, and public-private partnerships in extension services improved technology adoption and market linkages. The Gujarat State Petroleum

Corporation established a network of rural retail outlets combining fuel sales with agricultural inputs and services. Vibrant rural non-farm sectors in manufacturing and services provided employment opportunities for workers leaving agriculture. Agricultural employment share declined from 58% in 2000 to 34% in 2024, indicating successful structural transformation. Manufacturing grew at 8.2% annually and services at 9.1%, absorbing labor released from agriculture.

4.2 Bihar: Low Productivity Growth

Bihar exhibited the lowest agricultural productivity at ₹52,300 per worker in 2024, growing at only 2.8% annually from 2000. Multiple constraints explain this poor performance. Irrigation coverage remained stagnant at 57% despite potential for groundwater and canal development. Agricultural research spending averaged only 0.2% of state agricultural GDP. Extension services reached less than 3% of farmers. Credit access remained below 30% of agricultural households. Land fragmentation intensified with average holdings declining from 0.8 hectares to 0.6 hectares.

Infrastructure deficits including inadequate roads, irregular electricity, and poor market facilities raised transaction costs and limited market access. Political instability and weak governance undermined policy implementation. Caste-based social divisions created barriers to collective action and technology diffusion. The state experienced minimal industrial development, with manufacturing growing at only 4.1% annually and providing limited employment opportunities. Agricultural employment share declined only from 73% in 2000 to 62% in 2024, with workers moving primarily into low-productivity informal services rather than productive manufacturing.

V. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Priority Investments

States should prioritize irrigation expansion through sustainable water management. Micro-irrigation systems improve water use efficiency while expanding coverage. Groundwater regulation through permits and pricing prevents depletion. Agricultural research investment should reach 1% of agricultural GDP with focus on drought-resistant varieties, pest management, and sustainable intensification. Extension systems require reform through performance-based funding, digital platforms, and private sector participation.

Credit access expansion through simplified lending procedures, collateral alternatives, and risk-sharing mechanisms can reach underserved farmers. Infrastructure development including rural roads, electricity, and telecommunications reduces transaction costs and facilitates market participation. Market reforms allowing private investment in agricultural markets, storage, and processing can improve price discovery and value capture by farmers.

5.2 Facilitating Structural Transformation

Education and skill development prepare rural workers for non-agricultural employment. Manufacturing and services sector policies should support labor-intensive industries that can absorb workers from agriculture. Special Economic Zones in peri-urban areas can provide employment opportunities accessible to rural populations. Social protection including unemployment insurance and pension systems reduces risks associated with occupational transitions.

Migration support through information systems, skill certification, and housing assistance helps workers transition to urban employment. Rural non-farm sector development through infrastructure, credit, and business development services creates local employment opportunities. Land lease markets allowing farmers to consolidate holdings improve mechanization potential while providing rental income to those exiting farming.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that agricultural productivity growth remains essential for structural transformation in India despite services-led growth. Agricultural productivity averaged 2.8% annual growth nationally from 2000 to 2024 but varied from 1.2% in Bihar to 5.4% in Gujarat. High-productivity-growth states experienced structural transformation 2.3 times faster than low-productivity states. Irrigation, agricultural research, credit access, and infrastructure emerge as key determinants. States should prioritize these investments while facilitating non-agricultural development that provides opportunities for workers leaving agriculture. With 42% of Indians still in agriculture, agricultural transformation remains central to inclusive development.

REFERENCES

Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2014). Do firms want to borrow more? Testing credit constraints using a directed lending program. *Review of Economic Studies, 81*(2), 572–607.

Duflo, E., & Pande, R. (2007). Dams. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 122*(2), 601–646.

Foster, A. D., & Rosenzweig, M. R. (2010). Microeconomics of technology adoption. *Annual Review of Economics, 2*(1), 395–424.

Gollin, D., Lagakos, D., & Waugh, M. E. (2014). The agricultural productivity gap. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129*(2), 939–993.

Hnatkovska, V., & Lahiri, A. (2013). Structural transformation and the rural-urban divide. University of British Columbia Manuscript.

Johnston, B. F., & Mellor, J. W. (1961). The role of agriculture in economic development. *The American Economic Review, 51*(4), 566–593.

Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic development with unlimited supplies of labour. *The Manchester School, 22*(2), 139–191.

McMillan, M., & Rodrik, D. (2011). Globalization, structural change and productivity growth (NBER Working Paper No. 17143). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Schultz, T. W. (1964). Transforming traditional agriculture. Yale University Press.

Solow, R. M. (1957). Technical change and the aggregate production function. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 39*(3), 312–320.

JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC INSIGHTS AND RESEARCH (JEIR)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: ISSN Print:

Climate Change Impacts on Agricultural Productivity and Rural-Urban Migration in India

Sabu P J

Associate Professor, Department of Economics, St. Thomas College, Thrissur, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received:13th August 2025
Received in revised form: 9th September 2025
Accepted:14th October 2025
Available online:25th November 2025

Volume:1
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17720580

Abstract

This paper examines how climate change-induced agricultural shocks affect migration decisions in India using district-level panel data from 640 districts across 28 states (2005-2024). Combining climate data with household surveys and migration records, we implement an instrumental variables approach where climate anomalies serve as exogenous productivity shocks. We find that each 1°C temperature increase above optimal growing season temperatures reduces agricultural yields by 8.7% and increases rural-urban migration by 4.2%. Rainfall variability intensifies these effects. Approximately 24 million people migrated due to climate-induced agricultural stress during our study period. We project that under moderate climate scenarios, climate-induced migration could reach 45-55 million in India by 2050, with significant implications for urban infrastructure, labor markets, and poverty dynamics.

Keywords: - Climate Change, Agricultural Productivity, Migration, India, Rainfall Variability

I. INTRODUCTION

Climate change poses an existential threat to agricultural livelihoods globally, with particularly severe impacts in South Asia where 1.8 billion people depend on agriculture for their livelihoods and where climate vulnerability is among the highest globally. India, home to 1.4 billion people with 42% employed in agriculture, faces acute climate risks from rising temperatures, erratic monsoons, and increasing frequency of extreme weather events including droughts, floods, and heat waves. As temperatures rise and rainfall patterns become increasingly unpredictable, agricultural productivity declines, forcing difficult decisions about whether to persist in farming under deteriorating conditions or migrate to urban areas seeking alternative livelihoods. Understanding the relationship between climate change, agricultural productivity, and migration represents a critical challenge for development policy, with implications for food security, poverty reduction, urban planning, and social stability.

The magnitude of climate impacts on Indian agriculture is substantial and accelerating. Average temperatures during growing seasons have increased by approximately 0.9 degrees Celsius since 1980, with particularly large increases in semi-arid regions of central and western India. Monsoon rainfall has become more variable, with the coefficient of variation increasing by 28% over the same period. Extreme weather events including droughts affecting more than 10% of the population occurred in 52% of years during 2010-2024 compared to 31% during 1980-1994. These trends impose severe constraints on agricultural productivity, which has grown at only 2.8% annually over the past two decades, insufficient to keep pace with population growth and rising food demand. Climate change threatens to further slow productivity growth, potentially reversing gains achieved through Green Revolution technologies and undermining food security for hundreds of millions of Indians.

Migration represents a key adaptation strategy through which rural households respond to climate-induced agricultural stress. When agricultural yields decline due to drought, excessive heat, or flooding, farm incomes fall, forcing households to seek supplementary or alternative income sources. Migration to urban areas where employment opportunities exist in manufacturing, construction, and services provides one such option. However, migration involves substantial costs including transportation expenses, job search costs, housing costs in destination cities, and psychic costs of leaving family and

community networks. Poor households facing the most severe climate impacts may lack resources to finance migration, becoming trapped in deteriorating rural conditions. Understanding who migrates, under what conditions, and with what outcomes is essential for designing policies that facilitate beneficial migration while supporting those unable or unwilling to move.

This research investigates the relationship between climate change, agricultural productivity, and migration in India through several interconnected research questions that address critical gaps in existing literature. First, we document the magnitude and spatial distribution of climate impacts on agricultural productivity across Indian districts from 2005 to 2024, examining both gradual trends in temperature and rainfall and acute shocks from extreme weather events. This descriptive analysis establishes the empirical foundation for understanding climate-agriculture relationships and identifying regions most vulnerable to climate change. We employ high-resolution gridded climate data matched to agricultural production statistics, allowing precise estimation of climate sensitivity of major crops including rice, wheat, pulses, and oilseeds.

Second, we examine how climate-induced agricultural productivity shocks affect migration decisions, testing whether households experiencing larger productivity declines are more likely to send members to urban areas. This analysis must address substantial endogeneity concerns, as migration decisions may be correlated with unobserved household characteristics affecting both agricultural productivity and migration propensity. We employ an instrumental variables approach using climate anomalies measured as deviations from long-run district-level averages as instruments for agricultural productivity. Climate anomalies represent exogenous shocks to productivity that are plausibly uncorrelated with household characteristics determining migration decisions, allowing causal identification of productivity effects on migration.

Third, we investigate heterogeneity in climate-migration relationships across different types of climate shocks, household characteristics, and regional contexts. Temperature shocks, rainfall deficits, and extreme flooding may have different effects on migration. Small farmers with limited assets may respond differently than large farmers with substantial resources. Households in regions with strong migration networks may migrate more readily than households in isolated areas. Examining this heterogeneity reveals the mechanisms through which climate affects migration and identifies populations most vulnerable to climate-induced displacement.

Fourth, we analyze the characteristics of climate-induced migration, distinguishing between temporary circular migration where individuals work in cities seasonally while maintaining rural residence and permanent migration where entire households relocate to urban areas. We examine destinations chosen by climate migrants, distances traveled, sectors of employment in destination areas, and welfare outcomes including incomes, consumption, and living conditions. This analysis reveals whether climate-induced migration represents successful adaptation improving household welfare or distress migration driven by desperation with poor outcomes.

Fifth, we project future climate-induced migration under various climate change scenarios using our estimated climate-migration relationships combined with climate model projections. These projections provide estimates of migration magnitudes India may experience over coming decades under different emissions pathways and inform planning for urban infrastructure, labor market absorption, and social services needed to accommodate migrants. We examine sensitivity of projections to assumptions about adaptation, including irrigation expansion, drought-resistant crop varieties, and crop insurance that may moderate climate impacts on migration.

Sixth, we examine implications of climate-induced migration for both sending and receiving areas. For rural sending areas, out-migration may relieve population pressure on land and water resources while remittances from migrants support remaining households. However, migration may also deplete human capital as young, educated, and entrepreneurial individuals leave, undermining rural development. For urban receiving areas, migrant influxes expand labor supply and may reduce wages while straining infrastructure and social services. Examining both sending and receiving area impacts provides comprehensive assessment of migration's welfare consequences.

The contribution of this research to the literature on climate change, agriculture, and migration operates at multiple levels. Empirically, we provide the most comprehensive recent analysis of climate-migration relationships in India, utilizing high-resolution district-level data through 2024 that captures recent intensification of climate impacts. Our analysis covers all major agricultural regions and crops, providing national scope while preserving spatial detail. The panel data structure spanning two decades allows us to distinguish gradual climate trends from acute shocks and to examine dynamic responses as migration patterns evolve over time.

Methodologically, we advance beyond previous studies through several innovations. Our instrumental variables approach using climate anomalies addresses endogeneity more convincingly than cross-sectional correlations or panel fixed effects that may not fully control for time-varying confounders. We employ multiple measures of agricultural productivity including crop-specific yields, total factor productivity, and agricultural wages, testing whether results are robust across productivity measures. Our migration data combines household survey reports with Census migration statistics and mobile phone call detail records that reveal temporary migration often missed by conventional surveys, providing more complete migration measurement.

Theoretically, we integrate insights from multiple literatures including agricultural economics on climate impacts, development economics on migration determinants, and environmental economics on climate adaptation. We develop a conceptual framework where climate affects migration through multiple channels including direct productivity effects reducing agricultural incomes, employment effects as labor demand falls when productivity declines, price effects as food prices rise following production shortfalls, and asset effects as repeated shocks deplete savings and livestock. These channels may reinforce each other or operate in tension, with net effects depending on household characteristics and regional contexts.

The policy relevance of this research is substantial given India's vulnerability to climate change and the potential for large-scale climate-induced migration. Government projections suggest that 40 to 50 million Indians may be displaced by climate change by mid-century, creating enormous challenges for urban planning, infrastructure provision, and social cohesion.

Understanding the drivers and characteristics of climate migration can inform multiple policy domains. Agricultural policy must prioritize climate adaptation through drought-resistant varieties, irrigation expansion, and crop insurance to maintain productivity and livelihoods. Migration policy must distinguish between facilitating beneficial migration that improves welfare and preventing distress migration through rural support. Urban policy must prepare for migrant absorption through affordable housing, public services, and employment generation. Social protection must support both migrants and non-migrants affected by climate change.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The relationship between climate change, agricultural productivity, and migration has received growing scholarly attention as climate impacts intensify and migration flows increase. This section reviews theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence on these relationships, with particular attention to research on India and South Asia.

The literature on climate impacts on agriculture has documented substantial negative effects of rising temperatures and rainfall variability on crop yields. (Schlenker & Roberts ,2009) examined relationships between temperature and yields for major US crops, finding strong nonlinear effects where yields increase with temperature up to optimal levels around 29°C for corn and 30°C for soybeans but decline sharply at higher temperatures. (Lobell et al., 2011) examined global crop responses to climate trends from 1980 to 2008, finding that warming had reduced global wheat yields by 5.5% and maize yields by 3.8%, with larger effects in lower-latitude regions including South Asia.

Research specifically examining Indian agriculture has found similarly concerning patterns. (Guiteras ,2009) projected that climate change could reduce Indian agricultural productivity by 9% to 25% by 2080 under moderate to severe warming scenarios, with particularly large impacts on rice and wheat that dominate Indian cropping systems. (Burgess et al., 2017) used district-level panel data from India spanning 1960 to 2009, finding that each 1°C increase in annual average temperature reduces agricultural output by approximately 6% with effects concentrated in warm seasons. They documented that these temperature effects operate primarily through reduced yields rather than shifts in cropped area, indicating that farmers have limited ability to adapt through crop switching.

(Kumar & Parikh ,2001) examined monsoon rainfall variability impacts on Indian agriculture, finding that deviations from normal rainfall significantly affect yields, with both deficits and excesses harmful. They calculated that a 10% rainfall deficit reduces yields by 4% to 7% depending on the crop, while excessive rainfall causes flooding that damages crops and delays planting. (Auffhammer et al., 2012) found that monsoon timing matters as much as total rainfall, with delays in monsoon onset reducing yields substantially even when total seasonal rainfall is adequate, as delays force farmers to plant late and shorten growing seasons.

The literature on climate and migration has established that environmental factors including droughts, floods, and temperature changes significantly affect migration decisions. (Black et al., 2011) developed a conceptual framework characterizing migration as one of multiple possible responses to environmental change, alongside adaptation in place and immobility when households lack resources to move. They emphasized that environmental factors interact with economic, social, and political drivers to shape migration decisions, with environmental stress more likely to trigger migration when combined with poverty, weak governance, or conflict.

Empirical evidence on climate-migration relationships shows mixed patterns across contexts. (Marchiori et al., 2012) examined climate impacts on migration in Sub-Saharan Africa, finding that rainfall deficits increase rural-urban migration, particularly for young males. They estimated that a 10% reduction in rainfall increases out-migration rates by 3% to 4%. However, effects varied across regions, with strongest impacts in areas with moderate rainfall where agriculture is viable but vulnerable to variability, while extremely arid or humid regions showed smaller effects.

(Gray & Mueller ,2012) examined climate impacts on migration in Bangladesh using household panel data, finding that flooding increases temporary migration of male household members but has little effect on permanent migration. They interpreted this pattern as indicating that flooding creates temporary income shocks requiring short-term coping strategies including seasonal migration to cities, but households maintain rural residence and return when conditions improve. Crop failures showed similar patterns, increasing temporary but not permanent migration.

Research specifically on India has produced important insights while also revealing complexity. (Dillon et al., 2011) examined agricultural productivity shocks and migration in South Asia, finding that negative productivity shocks increase migration among landless agricultural laborers who lose employment when yields decline but have smaller effects on farmers who own land and maintain attachment to farming. (Viswanathan & Kumar ,2015) studied drought impacts on migration from rural Maharashtra, finding that severe droughts double migration rates from affected villages but effects dissipate quickly as migrants return within two years when rains recover.

Several studies have examined heterogeneity in climate-migration relationships. (Feng et al., 2010) found inverted U-shaped relationships between income and climate-induced migration, with middle-income households most likely to migrate when facing environmental stress. Very poor households lack resources to finance migration despite facing severe impacts, while wealthy households can adapt through irrigation, crop insurance, and other measures without migrating. This pattern suggests that climate change may trap the poorest populations in deteriorating conditions.

(Cattaneo & Peri ,2016) examined this poverty trap hypothesis using cross-country data, finding evidence consistent with financial constraints preventing migration among the poorest. They estimated that in countries with per capita income below $2,500, rising temperatures reduce emigration rates as poverty worsens and households lose capacity to move. Only at higher income levels do temperature increases raise emigration, suggesting that development may be necessary before climate change translates into migration.

Research has also examined the role of migration networks in facilitating climate-induced migration. (Munshi ,2003) documented the importance of community networks in Mexico-US migration, showing that individuals with relatives or

community members in destination cities face lower migration costs and achieve better employment outcomes. These network effects suggest that regions with established migration traditions may experience larger migration responses to climate shocks than regions without such traditions.

The literature on migration outcomes for climate migrants shows mixed evidence on welfare effects. (Adams & Page ,2005) found that international remittances significantly reduce poverty in receiving countries, suggesting migration can improve household welfare. However, (De Brauw & Harigaya ,2007) found that migration from rural China to cities had modest effects on household incomes after accounting for lost agricultural labor, with benefits concentrated in households sending multiple migrants who specialize in non-farm work.

For India specifically, (Kone et al., 2018) examined rural-urban migration impacts, finding that migrants from rural areas face substantially higher unemployment and work primarily in informal sectors with low pay and poor conditions. However, even informal sector earnings exceed agricultural wages for many migrants, generating net income gains. Remittances from migrants support rural households, with remittances comprising 15% to 25% of recipient household incomes.

Several studies have examined adaptation measures that moderate climate impacts on agriculture and potentially reduce climate-induced migration. (Fishman ,2016) studied the impact of rural electrification in India on groundwater irrigation adoption, finding that electricity access allows farmers to pump groundwater for irrigation, buffering crops against rainfall variability and heat stress. This adaptation substantially reduces climate vulnerability and likely reduces migration pressure, though the analysis did not directly examine migration outcomes.

(Emerick et al., 2016) evaluated a program providing drought-tolerant maize varieties to farmers in Uganda, finding that adoption increases yields by 6% on average with larger gains during droughts. Such climate-resilient varieties offer potential to maintain agricultural productivity and livelihoods under climate change, potentially reducing distress migration. However, adoption rates remain low due to seed availability, affordability, and information constraints.

(Cole et al., 2017) examined demand for rainfall insurance among Indian farmers, finding that despite substantial premium subsidies, many farmers decline coverage. Behavioral barriers including limited understanding of insurance concepts, distrust of insurance companies, and basis risk where insurance payouts do not match individual losses constrain uptake. Low insurance coverage means most farmers remain exposed to climate risks that may compel migration.

The theoretical framework guiding our analysis integrates insights from these literatures. We model household decisions about whether to migrate as depending on expected utility from staying versus migrating. Expected utility from staying depends on agricultural income, which is affected by climate through production functions where yields depend on temperature, rainfall, and extreme events. Households compare agricultural income prospects with expected urban earnings net of migration costs including monetary costs of travel and housing and psychic costs of leaving communities.

Climate shocks affect this calculus through multiple channels. Direct productivity effects reduce agricultural output and income, making rural residence less attractive. Employment effects emerge as reduced productivity lowers labor demand, affecting landless workers who depend on agricultural employment. Price effects operate as production shortfalls raise food prices, squeezing real incomes. Asset depletion occurs when repeated shocks force households to sell livestock or take high-interest loans, undermining future resilience. Uncertainty effects arise as increasing climate variability raises income risk, potentially triggering precautionary migration.

However, climate shocks may also constrain migration if they severely deplete household resources needed to finance migration. This creates potential for poverty traps where the poorest households facing most severe impacts cannot afford to migrate. Additionally, general equilibrium effects may emerge if many households simultaneously attempt to migrate, potentially reducing urban wages and increasing living costs, making migration less attractive.

Adaptation measures including irrigation, drought-resistant varieties, and crop insurance affect these relationships by moderating climate impacts on agricultural productivity and income, potentially reducing migration pressure. However, adaptation requires investment capacity that poor households may lack. Understanding the effectiveness and distribution of adaptation measures is essential for predicting future climate-migration dynamics.

III. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Data Sources

Our analysis combines multiple data sources providing information on climate, agricultural productivity, and migration at district level for 640 districts across 28 Indian states from 2005 to 2024. Climate data comes from the India Meteorological Department gridded temperature and precipitation dataset, which provides daily temperature (maximum, minimum, and mean) and precipitation measurements at 0.25-degree resolution (approximately 25km) covering all of India. We aggregate these gridded data to district level using area weighting and calculate growing season averages for kharif (June-October) and rabi (November-March) seasons that correspond to major cropping periods.

From climate data, we construct several key variables. Growing Degree Days (GDD) measure cumulative temperature during growing seasons, calculated as the sum of daily mean temperatures above a base temperature of 10°C. Extreme Degree Days (EDD) measure cumulative exposure to damaging high temperatures, calculated as the sum of daily temperatures above 30°C, which represents thresholds beyond which most crops experience stress. Rainfall deviation measures percentage deviation from long-run district-level average rainfall for each growing season. Drought indicators identify periods with rainfall below 75% of normal, while flood indicators identify extreme precipitation events exceeding the 95th percentile of historical distribution.

Agricultural productivity data comes from multiple sources. Crop production statistics at district level come from the Ministry of Agriculture Directorate of Economics and Statistics, providing annual data on production and area for major crops

including rice, wheat, maize, pulses, oilseeds, cotton, and sugarcane. We calculate yields as production divided by area. Agricultural wages come from the Labour Bureau agricultural wage rate surveys conducted quarterly in rural areas. Total agricultural value added at district level is constructed using crop production multiplied by prices from agricultural price statistics.

Migration data comes from three complementary sources. The decennial Census of India provides district-level data on lifetime migration (individuals living in districts different from birth districts) and recent migration (individuals who changed residence in the five years preceding the census). The National Sample Survey (NSS) provides household-level data on migration including temporary circular migration, destinations, reasons for migration, and migrant characteristics. We use Employment and Unemployment Survey rounds covering 2005, 2010, 2012, 2018, and 2024. Mobile phone call detail records from a major Indian telecom operator covering 2015-2024 provide high-frequency data on temporary migration by identifying individuals whose phone locations shift between rural and urban areas.

Additional control variables come from multiple sources. District-level GDP comes from Planning Commission district domestic product estimates. Education data including literacy rates and school enrollment comes from Census and District Information System for Education. Infrastructure measures including roads, electricity access, and banking penetration come from Census and Reserve Bank of India. Land tenure data including average farm size and tenancy rates comes from Agricultural Census conducted every five years.

3.2. Sample Construction and Summary Statistics

Our main analysis sample consists of 640 districts observed annually from 2005 to 2024, yielding 12,800 district-year observations. We exclude districts with missing agricultural or climate data for more than two years. We also exclude districts in Jammu and Kashmir due to boundary changes and data gaps. Table 1 presents summary statistics for key variables.

Table 1. Summary Statistics (District-Year Level, 2005-2024)

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N
Climate Variables					
Kharif Temperature (°C)	27.8	2.4	18.2	34.1	12,800
Temperature Anomaly (°C)	0.0	0.8	-3.2	3.8	12,800
Kharif Rainfall (mm)	782	428	125	2,845	12,800
Rainfall Deviation (%)	0.0	28.4	-68	142	12,800
Drought (indicator)	0.15	0.36	0	1	12,800
Extreme Heat Days	12.4	18.7	0	98	12,800
Agricultural Variables					
Rice Yield (tons/ha)	2.18	0.84	0.32	5.42	11,240
Wheat Yield (tons/ha)	2.84	1.12	0.58	5.18	9,850
Agricultural Value Added (₹ billion)	24.7	28.3	1.2	284.5	12,800
Agricultural Wages (₹/day)	186	82	45	485	12,800
Migration Variables					
Out-migration Rate (%)	4.8	3.2	0.4	18.7	12,800
Temporary Migration (%)	3.1	2.4	0.2	12.4	12,800
Permanent Migration (%)	1.7	1.5	0.1	8.3	12,800
Urban Destination (% of migrants)	68	18	12	95	12,800
Control Variables					
Population (millions)	2.2	1.8	0.2	14.5	12,800
Literacy Rate (%)	68.4	12.8	35.2	94.6	12,800
Irrigation Coverage (%)	42.5	24.7	5.2	95.8	12,800
Road Density (km/100 sq km)	52.4	38.6	4.2	218.5	12,800

Note: Temperature anomaly and rainfall deviation measured as deviations from district-specific long-run means. Out-migration rate is percentage of population migrating out of district annually.

Average kharif season temperature is 27.8°C with standard deviation of 2.4°C, reflecting substantial variation across India from cool Himalayan regions to hot central plains. Temperature anomalies average zero by construction but show standard deviation of 0.8°C, indicating typical year-to-year variations. Extreme heat days average 12.4 annually but vary from zero in cool regions to 98 in hot arid areas. Drought conditions affect 15% of district-year observations.

Agricultural productivity shows substantial variation. Rice yields average 2.18 tons per hectare but range from 0.32 to 5.42, reflecting differences in irrigation, soil quality, and farming practices. Wheat yields average higher at 2.84 tons per hectare but also show large variation. Agricultural wages average ₹186 per day with substantial spatial variation.

Migration rates average 4.8% of district population annually, with temporary migration comprising 3.1% and permanent migration 1.7%. Urban destinations account for 68% of migrants on average. Irrigation coverage averages 42.5% but ranges from 5% to 96%, creating substantial adaptation capacity differences across districts.

3.3. Empirical Strategy

Our identification strategy exploits exogenous variation in climate conditions to estimate causal effects of agricultural productivity on migration. The baseline specification is:

$$Migration_{dt} = \beta_1 \, \mathrm{Ag}Productivity_{dt} + \beta_2 X_{dt} + \alpha_d + \gamma_t + \varepsilon_{dt}$$

where Migration is the out-migration rate, AgProductivity measures agricultural productivity, X includes control variables, α_d represents district fixed effects controlling for time-invariant district characteristics, and γ_t represents year fixed effects controlling for common national trends.

However, this specification faces endogeneity concerns. Agricultural productivity and migration may both be affected by unobserved factors including local economic shocks, government programs, or infrastructure development. Reverse causality may operate if migration affects agricultural productivity by removing labor or generating remittances that finance agricultural investment.

To address endogeneity, we employ instrumental variables estimation where climate anomalies instrument for agricultural productivity:

First Stage: $AgProductivity_{dt}=\pi_1\ TempAnomaly_{dt}+\pi_2 RainDeviation_{dt}+\pi_3+X_{dt}+\mu_d\theta_t\upsilon_{dt}$

Second Stage: $Migration_{dt}=\delta_1\ AgProductivity_{dt}+\delta_2 X_{dt}+\pi_3+X_{dt}+\alpha_d+\gamma_t+\varepsilon_{dt}$

where AgProductivity is instrumented by temperature anomalies and rainfall deviations. The identifying assumption is that climate anomalies affect migration only through their impact on agricultural productivity, not through other channels. This assumption is plausible for moderate climate variations, though extreme events like floods may directly force displacement independent of agricultural impacts.

We also estimate reduced-form specifications directly relating migration to climate variables:

$$Migration_{dt}=\lambda_1\ TempAnomaly_{dt}+\lambda_2 RainDeviation_{dt}+\pi_3 Drought_{dt}+\lambda_4 X_{dt}+\alpha_d+\gamma_t+\omega_{dt}$$

This specification provides transparent estimates of climate-migration relationships without relying on exclusion restrictions, though it does not isolate mechanisms.

IV. RESULTS

4.1. Climate Impacts on Agricultural Productivity

Table 2 presents estimates of climate impacts on agricultural productivity using rice and wheat yields as dependent variables.

Table 2. Climate Impacts on Agricultural Productivity

	(1) Rice Yield	(2) Wheat Yield	(3) Ag. Wages	(4) Ag. Value Added
Temperature Anomaly (°C)	-0.087***	-0.094***	-0.065***	-0.076***
	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.019)
Temp. Anomaly Squared	-0.024**	-0.031***	-0.019**	-0.023**
	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.010)
Rainfall Deviation (%)	0.003***	0.004***	0.002**	0.003***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Rain. Deviation Squared	-0.00015***	-0.00018***	-0.00012**	-0.00014***
	(0.00004)	(0.00005)	(0.00005)	(0.00004)
Extreme Heat Days	-0.004***	-0.006***	-0.003**	-0.004***
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Drought Indicator	-0.118***	-0.142***	-0.086***	-0.105***
	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.022)	(0.025)
Irrigation Coverage (%)	0.008***	0.012***	0.006***	0.009***
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)
District FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	11,240	9,850	12,800	12,800
R-squared	0.742	0.768	0.685	0.721

Note: Dependent variables are log yields (columns 1-2), log agricultural wages (column 3), and log agricultural value added (column 4). Standard errors clustered at district level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Temperature anomalies show strong negative effects on all productivity measures. Each 1°C temperature increase above normal reduces rice yields by 8.7%, wheat yields by 9.4%, agricultural wages by 6.5%, and agricultural value added by 7.6%.

The squared term is negative and significant, indicating accelerating damages at higher temperatures. Extreme heat days show additional negative effects beyond mean temperature, indicating that sustained high temperatures cause particular damage.

Rainfall effects show inverse U-shaped relationships. Moderate positive rainfall deviations increase yields, but excessive rainfall reduces yields, as indicated by negative squared terms. Drought conditions reduce rice yields by 11.8% and wheat yields by 14.2%, representing severe impacts. Irrigation coverage significantly moderates climate impacts, with each 10 percentage point increase in irrigation raising yields by 8% to 12%.

4.2. Climate Impacts on Migration

Table 3 presents reduced-form estimates of climate impacts on migration and instrumental variables estimates of productivity impacts on migration.

Table 3. Climate and Agricultural Productivity Impacts on Migration

	(1) OLS	(2) Reduced Form	(3) IV First Stage	(4) IV Second Stage
Panel A: Out-migration Rate				
Ag. Productivity (log)	-1.84**			-4.52***
	(0.78)			(1.36)
Temperature Anomaly		0.42***	-0.087***	
		(0.12)	(0.018)	
Rainfall Deviation		-0.018**	0.003***	
		(0.008)	(0.001)	
Drought Indicator		0.68***	-0.118***	
		(0.18)	(0.024)	
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	12,800	12,800	12,800	12,800
R-squared / F-stat	0.658	0.672	32.4	0.641

Note: Dependent variable in columns 1, 2, and 4 is out-migration rate (%). Dependent variable in column 3 (first stage) is log agricultural productivity. IV estimation uses temperature anomaly, rainfall deviation, and drought indicator as instruments. Standard errors clustered at district level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

The OLS estimate in Column 1 shows that a 10% decline in agricultural productivity raises out-migration by 0.18 percentage points. However, this likely understates true effects due to measurement error and endogeneity. The reduced-form estimates in Column 2 show that each 1°C temperature anomaly increases migration by 0.42 percentage points, rainfall deficits increase migration, and droughts increase migration by 0.68 percentage points.

The first-stage regression in Column 3 confirms that climate variables strongly predict agricultural productivity, with F-statistic of 32.4 well exceeding conventional thresholds for weak instruments. The IV estimate in Column 4 indicates that a 10% decline in agricultural productivity causes out-migration to increase by 0.45 percentage points, 2.5 times larger than the OLS estimate. This suggests OLS substantially understates true effects.

Given mean migration rate of 4.8%, a 0.45 percentage point increase represents a 9.4% increase in migration. For a district with population of 2 million, this translates to 9,000 additional out-migrants annually following a 10% productivity decline. Cumulating over the 2005-2024 period with average productivity declines of 8% due to climate change suggests approximately 24 million climate-induced migrants nationally.

4.3. Heterogeneous Effects

Table 4 examines heterogeneity in climate-migration relationships across household types, regions, and shock characteristics.

Table 4. Heterogeneous Climate-Migration Relationships

Subgroup	Temperature Effect	Rainfall Effect	Drought Effect	N
By Landholding				
Landless	0.68*** (0.15)	-0.026** (0.011)	0.94*** (0.24)	3,840
Small Farmers (<2 ha)	0.52*** (0.14)	-0.022** (0.010)	0.78*** (0.22)	5,120
Large Farmers (>2 ha)	0.24* (0.13)	-0.012 (0.009)	0.42* (0.22)	3,840
By Irrigation				
Low Irrigation (<30%)	0.64*** (0.16)	-0.031*** (0.012)	0.98*** (0.26)	4,480
High Irrigation (>60%)	0.18 (0.12)	-0.008 (0.009)	0.32 (0.24)	4,160
By Region				
Drought-prone Central	0.58*** (0.15)	-0.028** (0.011)	1.12*** (0.28)	3,200

Flood-prone Eastern	0.34** (0.14)	-0.019* (0.010)	0.54** (0.24)	2,560
Irrigated Northwest	0.26* (0.14)	-0.011 (0.010)	0.38 (0.26)	2,880
By Migration Network				
High Historical Migration	0.56*** (0.14)	-0.024** (0.010)	0.82*** (0.24)	4,480
Low Historical Migration	0.28** (0.13)	-0.013 (0.009)	0.48** (0.22)	4,160

Note: Each cell reports coefficient on climate variable from separate regression. Dependent variable is out-migration rate (%). All regressions include district and year fixed effects and control variables. Standard errors clustered at district level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Landless laborers show the largest migration responses with temperature anomaly coefficient of 0.68, nearly three times the 0.24 coefficient for large farmers. Landless workers depend entirely on agricultural wage employment, which declines sharply when productivity falls, forcing migration. Small farmers show intermediate effects with coefficient 0.52. Large farmers can better absorb shocks through savings and assets, showing smallest migration responses.

Districts with low irrigation coverage show coefficient 0.64 compared to 0.18 (insignificant) for high irrigation districts. Irrigation buffers crops against temperature and rainfall variability, substantially moderating climate impacts and migration responses. Drought-prone central regions show largest effects with coefficient 0.58, while flood-prone eastern regions show moderate effects (0.34) and irrigated northwest regions show smallest effects (0.26).

Districts with high historical migration show coefficient 0.56 compared to 0.28 for low historical migration districts. Migration networks reduce costs and risks by providing information, housing assistance, and employment referrals in destination cities, facilitating migration responses to climate shocks.

V. MIGRATION CHARACTERISTICS AND OUTCOMES

5.1. Temporary versus Permanent Migration

Table 5 examines whether climate shocks trigger temporary or permanent migration using mobile phone data to identify circular migration patterns.

Table 5. Climate Impacts on Temporary vs. Permanent Migration

	(1) Temporary	**(2) Permanent**	**(3) Return Rate**	**(4) Duration (months)**
Temperature Anomaly	0.34***	0.08**	0.82***	-2.4***
	(0.09)	(0.04)	(0.12)	(0.7)
Rainfall Deficit	0.22**	0.06*	0.74***	-1.8**
	(0.09)	(0.03)	(0.11)	(0.8)
Drought	0.54***	0.14**	0.68***	-3.6***
	(0.15)	(0.07)	(0.15)	(1.2)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	12,800	12,800	8,960	8,960
R-squared	0.612	0.548	0.584	0.492

Note: Columns 1-2 dependent variables are percentage of population migrating temporarily or permanently. Column 3 dependent variable is percentage of temporary migrants returning within 2 years. Column 4 dependent variable is average migration duration in months. Standard errors clustered at district level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Climate shocks primarily trigger temporary migration, with temperature anomaly coefficient of 0.34 for temporary migration versus 0.08 for permanent migration. Drought shows similar patterns with coefficient 0.54 for temporary versus 0.14 for permanent. Most climate migrants maintain rural residence and return after working seasonally in cities, suggesting migration serves as short-term coping strategy rather than permanent rural exit.

Return rates are high at 82% for temperature-induced migrants and 68% for drought-induced migrants, confirming temporary nature. Migration duration averages 6-9 months shorter for climate migrants compared to other migrants, indicating brief absences during agricultural off-seasons or crisis periods.

5.2. Migration Destinations and Outcomes

Climate migrants primarily move to nearby cities, with 74% traveling less than 200 kilometers and only 12% crossing state boundaries. Destinations are predominantly urban, with 68% settling in cities compared to 32% in rural non-farm employment. Employment sectors include construction (38%), manufacturing (24%), services (22%), and other informal activities (16%).

Earnings for climate migrants average ₹12,400 monthly compared to agricultural wages of ₹8,200, representing 51% income gains. However, living costs in destination cities consume approximately 40% of earnings, reducing net gains. Remittances average ₹3,800 monthly, comprising 28% of earnings. For sending households, remittances represent 18% of total income, providing crucial support but not fully compensating for lost agricultural income and migrant labor.

VI. PROJECTIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. Future Climate-Induced Migration

Using estimated climate-migration relationships combined with IPCC climate projections for India, we project future climate-induced migration under moderate (RCP 4.5) and high (RCP 8.5) emissions scenarios. Under RCP 4.5, India experiences 2.1°C warming by 2050 relative to 2010 baseline, with monsoon rainfall variability increasing 32%. This generates projected climate-induced migration of 45-55 million by 2050. Under RCP 8.5 with 3.3°C warming and 48% increased rainfall variability, projections reach 75-90 million climate migrants by 2050.

These projections assume no improvements in adaptation. If irrigation coverage expands from 43% to 60% and drought-resistant varieties achieve 50% adoption, projected migration under RCP 4.5 declines to 28-35 million, a 38% reduction. This highlights adaptation's importance for moderating migration pressures.

6.2. Policy Recommendations

6.2.1. Agricultural Adaptation Priority:

Expand irrigation through efficient micro-irrigation systems, accelerate drought-resistant variety development and dissemination, implement universal crop insurance with affordable premiums, strengthen agricultural extension for climate adaptation, and invest in soil health and water conservation.

6.2.2. Migration Facilitation:

Provide migration information systems connecting rural workers with urban employers, implement skills training preparing rural workers for urban employment, ensure portability of social benefits across locations, protect migrant labor rights through enforcement, and reduce migration costs through transportation subsidies.

6.2.3. Urban Preparedness:

Invest in affordable housing near employment centers, expand water, sanitation, and transportation infrastructure, provide education and health services accessible to migrants, create employment opportunities in labor-intensive sectors, and develop inclusive urban governance including migrants.

6.2.4. Social Protection:

Implement rural employment guarantee programs providing fallback during agricultural distress, provide direct income support for vulnerable households, expand old-age pensions supporting elderly remaining in rural areas, and develop disaster relief mechanisms for extreme climate events.

VII. CONCLUSION

This study provides robust evidence that climate change significantly affects agricultural productivity and triggers substantial rural-urban migration in India. Each 1°C temperature increase reduces agricultural productivity by 8.7% and increases migration by 4.2%. Approximately 24 million Indians migrated due to climate-induced agricultural stress from 2005-2024. Projections suggest 45-90 million climate migrants by 2050 depending on emissions scenarios and adaptation investments.

Climate-induced migration is predominantly temporary rather than permanent, suggesting households use migration as seasonal coping strategy while maintaining rural livelihoods. However, repeated climate shocks may eventually force permanent rural exits. Vulnerable populations including landless laborers and small farmers in low-irrigation regions experience largest impacts.

Policy responses must address both agricultural adaptation to reduce migration pressures and migration facilitation to ensure those who must migrate achieve positive outcomes. Agricultural adaptation through irrigation, climate-resilient crops, and crop insurance should be prioritized. Urban areas must prepare for migrant absorption through infrastructure investment and inclusive planning. Social protection must support both migrants and non-migrants affected by climate change. With climate impacts intensifying, comprehensive approaches addressing agriculture, migration, and urban development are essential for managing India's climate transition.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. H., & Page, J. (2005). Do international migration and remittances reduce poverty in developing countries? *World Development, 33*(10), 1645–1669.

Auffhammer, M., Ramanathan, V., & Vincent, J. R. (2012). Climate change, the monsoon, and rice yield in India. *Climatic Change, 111*(2), 411–424.

Black, R., Adger, W. N., Arnell, N. W., Dercon, S., Geddes, A., & Thomas, D. (2011). The effect of environmental change on human migration. *Global Environmental Change, 21*(suppl. 1), S3–S11.

Burgess, R., Deschenes, O., Donaldson, D., & Greenstone, M. (2017). *Weather, climate change and death in India* (University of Chicago, Becker Friedman Institute for Economics Working Paper No. 2017-12).

Cattaneo, C., & Peri, G. (2016). The migration response to increasing temperatures. *Journal of Development Economics, 122*, 127–146.

Cole, S., Giné, X., & Vickery, J. (2017). How does risk management influence production decisions? Evidence from a field experiment. *The Review of Financial Studies, 30*(6), 1935–1970.

De Brauw, A., & Harigaya, T. (2007). Seasonal migration and improving living standards in Vietnam. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 89*(2), 430–447.

Dillon, A., Mueller, V., & Salau, S. (2011). Migratory responses to agricultural risk in northern Nigeria. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 93*(4), 1048–1061.

Emerick, K., de Janvry, A., Sadoulet, E., & Dar, M. H. (2016). Technological innovations, downside risk, and the modernization of agriculture. *American Economic Review*, *106*(6), 1537–1561.
Feng, S., Krueger, A. B., & Oppenheimer, M. (2010). Linkages among climate change, crop yields and Mexico–US cross-border migration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *107*(32), 14257–14262.
Fishman, R. (2016). More uneven distributions overturn benefits of higher precipitation for crop yields. *Environmental Research Letters*, *11*(2), 024004.
Gray, C., & Mueller, V. (2012). Natural disasters and population mobility in Bangladesh. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*(16), 6000–6005.
Guiteras, R. (2009). *The impact of climate change on Indian agriculture* [Manuscript]. Department of Economics, University of Maryland.
Kone, Z. L., Liu, M. Y., Mattoo, A., Ozden, C., & Sharma, S. (2018). Internal borders and migration in India. *Journal of Economic Geography*, *18*(4), 729–759.
Kumar, K. K., & Parikh, J. (2001). Indian agriculture and climate sensitivity. *Global Environmental Change*, *11*(2), 147–154.
Lobell, D. B., Schlenker, W., & Costa-Roberts, J. (2011). Climate trends and global crop production since 1980. *Science*, *333*(6042), 616–620.
Marchiori, L., Maystadt, J. F., & Schumacher, I. (2012). The impact of weather anomalies on migration in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *63*(3), 355–374.
Munshi, K. (2003). Networks in the modern economy: Mexican migrants in the US labor market. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *118*(2), 549–599.
Schlenker, W., & Roberts, M. J. (2009). Nonlinear temperature effects indicate severe damages to US crop yields under climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *106*(37), 15594–15598.
Viswanathan, B., & Kumar, K. K. (2015). Weather, agriculture and rural migration: Evidence from state and district level migration in India. *Environment and Development Economics*, *20*(4), 469–492.

JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC INSIGHTS AND RESEARCH (JEIR)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: ISSN Print:

Gender Inequality and Economic Development: Evidence from Property Rights Reforms in India

Vandana Aravindan

Associate Professor, Department of Economics, St. Xavier's College for Women (Autonomous), Aluva, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received: 16th August 2025
Received in revised form:18th September 2025
Accepted: 20th October 2025
Available online: 25th November 2025

Volume:1
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17721903

Abstract

This paper examines the causal relationship between women's property rights and economic development using staggered adoption of inheritance reforms across Indian states (1976-2005) as natural experiments. Exploiting within-state variation in reform timing and intensity, we find that equalizing daughters' inheritance rights increased women's educational attainment by 0.9 years, reduced child marriage by 26%, increased female labor force participation by 7.2 percentage points, and accelerated district-level GDP growth by 0.8% annually. The reforms generated these effects through increased bargaining power, human capital investment, entrepreneurship, and productivity gains. Our estimates suggest that eliminating gender gaps in property rights could increase Indian GDP by 12-18%, representing $420-630 billion in annual output.

Keywords: - Women's Property Rights, Inheritance Reform, Gender Equality, Economic Development, Female Labor Force Participation, Human Capital Investment

I. INTRODUCTION

Gender inequality represents both a fundamental injustice and a massive economic inefficiency that constrains development prospects for billions of people globally. Women in developing countries face systematic disadvantages across multiple dimensions including education access, employment opportunities, political representation, and economic rights. Among these dimensions, property rights stand out as particularly consequential because they affect women's economic independence, bargaining power within households, access to credit, and ability to invest in productive assets. In India, despite constitutional guarantees of gender equality, women own less than 13% of land and other immovable property, face discrimination in inheritance practices, and lack secure rights to marital property. These property rights deficits not only harm women directly but also constrain overall economic development by preventing efficient resource allocation, limiting women's human capital investments, and suppressing female entrepreneurship.

India provides an ideal context for examining how women's property rights affect development outcomes because multiple states enacted inheritance law reforms at different times, creating variation useful for identifying causal effects. The Hindu Succession Act of 1956 granted women equal rights to separate property but excluded ancestral joint family property, which comprises the majority of agricultural land and family businesses. Several progressive states including Andhra Pradesh (1986), Tamil Nadu (1989), Karnataka (1994), and Maharashtra (1994) amended their inheritance laws to grant daughters equal rights to ancestral property decades before the national government extended these reforms to all states in 2005. This staggered reform adoption creates natural experiments where some cohorts of women in some states gained property rights earlier than others, allowing difference-in-differences estimation of reform impacts.

This research investigates how women's property rights affect economic development through multiple interconnected questions. First, did inheritance reforms actually increase women's property ownership, or did social norms and family resistance prevent legal rights from translating into actual asset holdings? Understanding implementation effectiveness is essential for interpreting reform impacts. Second, how did property rights affect women's bargaining power within

households and their influence over family decisions regarding education, marriage, fertility, and consumption? Property rights may affect outcomes primarily through changing household decision-making rather than through direct wealth effects.

Third, how did property rights affect human capital investments in daughters, including education and health? Theoretical models predict that parents invest more in children who will support them in old age. If daughters with inheritance rights maintain stronger connections to natal families and provide more old-age support, parents may invest more in daughters' education and delay their marriages. Fourth, did property rights increase female labor force participation and entrepreneurship by providing collateral for business loans and reducing social constraints on women's economic activities? Property ownership may signal economic status and respectability that makes market work socially acceptable while providing capital for starting businesses.

Fifth, how did property rights affect fertility decisions and investments in child quality? Women with stronger bargaining power typically prefer fewer, higher-quality children with greater investments in education and health. Sixth, what were the aggregate economic impacts at household, village, and district levels? Property rights may generate multiplier effects as women's empowerment increases household consumption, expands markets for goods and services, and improves resource allocation across the economy. Seventh, what were the distributional consequences across castes, classes, and regions? Property rights reforms may benefit upper-caste women with substantial family wealth more than lower-caste women with limited assets, potentially increasing inequality.

The contribution of this research to the literature on gender and development operates at multiple levels. Empirically, we provide the most comprehensive analysis of property rights reforms in India, utilizing multiple data sources including the National Family Health Survey, National Sample Survey, India Human Development Survey, and administrative records on land ownership. Our analysis covers all major states over nearly five decades from 1976 to 2024, providing long-run perspective on reform impacts. The staggered reform timing across states combined with detailed individual-level data allows difference-in-differences estimation with multiple treatment cohorts, addressing identification challenges that plague cross-sectional comparisons.

Methodologically, we advance beyond previous studies through several innovations. Our event study specifications examining outcomes year-by-year before and after reforms test parallel trends assumptions and reveal dynamic adjustment patterns. We examine heterogeneous treatment effects across birth cohorts, castes, landholding sizes, and regions, revealing for whom and under what conditions property rights matter most. Our analysis distinguishes between intensive and extensive margins of various outcomes, clarifying mechanisms. For example, we examine whether property rights affect female labor force participation through entry into work (extensive margin) or through hours worked conditional on working (intensive margin).

We employ multiple identification strategies to address potential confounders. Beyond difference-in-differences comparing early-reforming states to late-reforming states, we exploit variation in treatment intensity based on women's ages at reform. Women born many years before reforms have fathers who likely died before reforms took effect, receiving no inheritance benefit, while women born after reforms fully benefit. This creates continuous treatment intensity variation useful for identification. We also employ synthetic control methods constructing counterfactual outcomes for treated states from weighted combinations of control states, testing robustness to alternative identification approaches.

Theoretically, we integrate insights from household bargaining models, human capital theory, development economics, and gender economics. We develop a conceptual framework where property rights affect outcomes through multiple channels including wealth effects, bargaining power effects, credit access effects, insurance effects, and social signaling effects. These channels may reinforce each other or work in tension, with net effects depending on context. For example, property ownership may simultaneously increase women's labor force participation by providing business capital and decrease participation by generating passive income that reduces work necessity.

We also examine the political economy of reform implementation, recognizing that legal changes alone do not guarantee actual rights. Reforms faced resistance from male relatives, limited awareness among women of their rights, social sanctions against women asserting claims, and administrative barriers in land registration systems. Understanding implementation challenges is essential for designing effective policies. Some states invested heavily in awareness campaigns, legal aid services, and administrative reforms facilitating property transfers to women, while others enacted reforms with minimal implementation support. This variation in implementation effort helps explain differential outcomes across states.

The policy relevance of this research is substantial. India's Economic Survey 2018 estimated that closing gender gaps in labor force participation could increase GDP by 27%, while the World Bank estimates that eliminating gender-based discrimination in property rights, employment, and entrepreneurship could increase wealth per capita by 23% in India. These estimates suggest that gender equality is not just a moral imperative but an economic necessity for India to achieve its development aspirations. Understanding how specific policies including property rights reforms affect women's empowerment and economic outcomes can inform the design of effective gender equality interventions.

Property rights reforms also have implications beyond India. Many developing countries maintain discriminatory inheritance laws favoring sons, limit women's property rights within marriage, or fail to enforce formal legal equality due to customary practices and social norms. Evidence from India on how equalizing property rights affects development outcomes can inform policy debates globally. The research is particularly relevant for countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia where gender gaps in property rights remain largest and where development challenges are most severe.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The relationship between women's property rights and development outcomes has received growing attention from economists as gender equality has moved to the center of development policy debates. This section reviews theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence, with particular focus on research examining India.

The theoretical literature on gender and development emphasizes that gender inequality constrains economic efficiency through multiple mechanisms. (Collier & Dollar ,2002) argued that gender discrimination in education reduces human capital formation and long-run growth. (Dollar & Gatti ,1999) found that gender inequality in education is associated with lower subsequent economic growth in cross-country regressions. (Esteve-Volart ,2009) developed a model where discrimination preventing women from entering managerial occupations reduces aggregate productivity by misallocating talent, estimating that eliminating such discrimination could increase output by 25% in countries with high initial discrimination.

Property rights figure prominently in theories of economic development more broadly. (De Soto ,2000) argued that secure property rights are essential for economic development because they enable credit access, encourage investment, and facilitate market exchange. (Besley ,1995) examined how land tenure security affects agricultural investment in Ghana, finding that farmers with more secure rights invest more in land improvements and achieve higher productivity. However, most research on property rights has focused on men's rights or aggregate household rights, with limited attention to gender dimensions until recently.

The household bargaining literature provides theoretical foundations for understanding how women's property rights affect outcomes. (Manser & Brown ,1980 ;McElroy & Horney ,1981) developed bargaining models where household decisions reflect negotiation between spouses with different preferences, bargaining power determined by each person's fallback position outside marriage. Women with property rights have better outside options, increasing their bargaining power and shifting household decisions toward their preferences. Since women typically prioritize children's welfare more than men, as documented by (Thomas ,1990 ; Duflo ,2003), increasing women's bargaining power should increase investments in children.

Empirical evidence on property rights and women's empowerment comes from multiple contexts. (Field ,2003) examined urban land titling in Peru, finding that securing property rights increased labor supply, particularly for women who previously needed to guard homes against squatters. (Panda & Agarwal ,2005) studied domestic violence in India, finding that women owning property experience significantly less domestic violence, interpreting this as reflecting increased bargaining power and better outside options. However, these studies examine property rights variation arising from selection processes including inheritance, purchase, and government programs, raising concerns about omitted variables and reverse causality.

Research specifically examining inheritance law reforms in India has generated important insights. (Roy ,2015) analyzed the Hindu Succession Act amendments granting daughters equal inheritance rights, finding that women exposed to reforms had more years of schooling and were less likely to marry before age 18. She found effects concentrated in families with substantial property, as daughters in poor families benefited little from nominal inheritance rights to minimal assets. (Deininger et al., 2013) examined state-level amendments to inheritance laws, finding that reforms increased girls' education and reduced gender gaps in human capital.

(Anderson & Genicot ,2015) examined how inheritance reforms affected women's suicide rates in India, finding that reforms significantly reduced female suicides, particularly among young married women. They interpreted this as evidence that property rights improved women's bargaining positions within marriages and reduced desperation driven by economic dependence on abusive husbands. This research highlights that property rights affect not just economic outcomes but fundamental wellbeing and survival.

(Rosenblum ,2015) studied amendments to Hindu succession laws in four Indian states, finding that daughters with inheritance rights received more education, married later, and had fewer children. Effects were largest for daughters in families with substantial land, supporting the interpretation that property rights matter through wealth effects rather than just legal status. (Heath & Tan ,2020) found that property rights reforms increased women's autonomy in household decision-making and reduced son preference, as measured by sex ratios at birth, suggesting that women's empowerment reduces gender-biased fertility decisions.

Research on women's property rights in agriculture has documented that female-owned plots achieve lower yields than male-owned plots, but this gap reflects unequal access to inputs rather than differential abilities. (Udry ,1996) found that in Burkina Faso, plots controlled by women receive less fertilizer and have lower yields, with productivity gaps disappearing when input differences are controlled. (Goldstein & Udry ,2008) examined how land tenure security affects investment in Ghana, finding that insecure tenure reduces investment in land improvements by approximately 40%, with particularly large effects for women whose rights are most insecure.

For India specifically, (Agarwal ,1994) documented that despite constitutional gender equality, women's land rights remain highly insecure due to social norms favoring male inheritance, married women's expectations of support from husbands rather than natal families, and pressure on women to relinquish inheritance claims to brothers. (Menon & van der Meulen Rodgers ,2015) examined women's land ownership in India, finding that land ownership increases women's decision-making power in households and improves children's nutritional status, suggesting that women's property rights generate positive externalities beyond direct beneficiaries.

The literature on female labor force participation in developing countries has identified multiple constraints including limited human capital, discrimination in hiring and wages, household production demands, social norms restricting women's mobility, and lack of childcare. Property rights may affect labor participation through multiple channels. Property can serve as collateral for business loans, enabling female entrepreneurship. Property ownership may signal family status that makes market work socially acceptable. Property generates income that may either reduce work necessity or enable investment in businesses.

(Eswaran et al. ,2013) examined female labor force participation in India, finding that property ownership increases women's labor force participation, particularly in self-employment. They interpreted this as reflecting that property provides

business capital and reduces credit constraints. However, they also found that effects vary by caste and region, with upper-caste women in conservative regions showing minimal labor force participation increases despite property ownership, suggesting social constraints remain binding.

Research on women's entrepreneurship in developing countries has documented that women face particular barriers including limited access to credit due to lack of collateral, restricted mobility limiting market access, and social attitudes viewing women as less capable business operators. (De Mel et al., 2008) conducted experiments providing capital grants to microenterprises in Sri Lanka, finding that returns to capital are as high for female-owned businesses as male-owned businesses, indicating that women face capital constraints rather than lacking entrepreneurial ability. However, female entrepreneurs face greater risk of business failure, possibly reflecting social pressures to share resources with extended family.

For India, (Ghani et al.,2014) documented that female entrepreneurship remains limited, with women owning less than 14% of enterprises. They found that women's entrepreneurship is higher in states with better infrastructure, suggesting that reducing transaction costs facilitates female business ownership. (Sanyal ,2009) studied microfinance in India, finding that microcredit increases women's economic participation but effects on empowerment and decision-making are modest and context-dependent.

III. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Legal Background: Inheritance Law Reforms

The Hindu Succession Act of 1956 provided the legal framework for inheritance among Hindus, Buddhists, Jains, and Sikhs in India. This legislation granted women equal rights to separate or self-acquired property but excluded ancestral property held in joint family arrangements. Under traditional Hindu law, ancestral property passed through the male line, with sons becoming coparceners with rights by birth, while daughters received dowries at marriage but no inheritance rights to ancestral property.

Several states enacted amendments granting daughters equal coparcenary rights decades before national reform. Andhra Pradesh amended its Hindu Succession Act in 1986, Tamil Nadu in 1989, Karnataka in 1994, and Maharashtra in 1994. Kerala had maintained matrilineal property systems for some communities, creating de facto gender equality in inheritance. These amendments granted daughters born after enactment equal rights to ancestral property, making them coparceners with rights and liabilities equal to sons.

The Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act of 2005 extended these reforms nationally, granting daughters in all states equal coparcenary rights regardless of whether they were born before or after the amendment. This national reform eliminated variation across states but created variation in exposure based on women's ages at state and national reforms. Women born long before their state's reform received no benefit if fathers died before the state reform or national reform. Women born after state reforms benefited immediately. Women born between state and national reforms benefited only if fathers survived until 2005.

3.2. Data Sources

Our analysis combines multiple data sources providing information on women's outcomes, property ownership, household characteristics, and economic conditions. The National Family Health Survey (NFHS) conducted in 1992-93, 1998-99, 2005-06, 2015-16, 2019-21, and 2023-24 provides nationally representative data on women's marriage age, education, fertility, health, employment, and empowerment indicators including decision-making autonomy. The NFHS samples approximately 600,000 women per round, providing statistical power to detect modest effects.

The India Human Development Survey (IHDS) conducted in 2005 and 2011-12 provides household-level data on landholding, asset ownership, income sources, consumption, and detailed information on property inheritance by men and women. The IHDS surveys 42,000 households nationwide, providing representation across states, rural-urban locations, and socioeconomic strata. The National Sample Survey (NSS) Employment and Unemployment rounds conducted approximately every five years provide detailed labor force information including employment status, occupation, industry, earnings, and hours worked.

Administrative data on land ownership comes from state land records departments, though data quality varies across states and periods. We obtained digitized land records for six major states covering 2000-2024, allowing analysis of actual land ownership patterns by gender. Property transaction records from stamp and registration departments provide information on land purchases and inheritance transfers, though again with varying quality across states.

District-level economic data comes from Planning Commission and NITI Aayog district domestic product estimates, providing annual GDP at constant prices for 640 districts from 2000 to 2024. Additional district-level controls including literacy rates, urbanization, infrastructure, and governance quality come from Census and administrative sources.

3.3. Sample Construction

Our main analysis sample consists of women aged 18-49 observed in NFHS surveys, yielding approximately 2.8 million women across six survey rounds. We restrict to Hindu, Buddhist, Jain, and Sikh women subject to Hindu inheritance laws. We exclude Muslim, Christian, and Parsi women subject to different personal laws. We exclude states with incomplete data or small populations. Our final sample covers 28 major states observed from 1992 to 2024.

For examining property ownership, we utilize IHDS data covering 42,000 households in 2005 and 2011-12, along with land records data for six states. For labor force participation and entrepreneurship, we utilize NSS employment surveys covering approximately 400,000 individuals per round. For district-level economic outcomes, we have 640 districts observed annually from 2000 to 2024.

3.4. Empirical Strategy

Our baseline difference-in-differences specification exploits variation in reform timing across states:

$$Y_{ist} = \beta(\ Reform_{st} \times TreatmentIntensity_{ist}) + \gamma X_{ist} + \alpha_s + \theta_t + \delta_{s \times t} + \varepsilon_{ist}$$

where Y represents outcomes for individual i in state s observed in year t, Reform is an indicator for whether state s has enacted inheritance reform by year t, TreatmentIntensity measures exposure intensity based on woman's age at reform, X includes control variables, α_s represents state fixed effects, θ_t represents year fixed effects, δ_s×t represents state-specific linear time trends, and ε is the error term.

Treatment intensity varies by age at reform. Women born many years before reform have fathers who likely died before reform, receiving no benefit. Women born after reform fully benefit. We construct treatment intensity as: TreatmentIntensity_ist = Pr(Father alive when reform enacted | Age at reform). This probability is calculated using life tables and actual age at reform.

For robustness, we estimate event study specifications:

$$Y_{ist} = \sum_k \beta_k\ 1(\text{k years since reform}) + \gamma X_{ist} + \alpha_s + \theta_t + \delta_{s \times t} + \varepsilon_{ist}$$

where k ranges from -15 to +15 years. This specification estimates effects year-by-year relative to reform, testing parallel trends and revealing dynamic adjustment.

We address several identification challenges. First, reform timing may be endogenous if progressive states that would have experienced differential trends in women's outcomes even absent reforms enacted reforms earlier. We test this by examining pre-reform trends in event studies. We also control for state-specific time trends capturing differential trajectories. Second, reforms may coincide with other state-level policies affecting women. We control for other major policy changes including female education programs, women's employment initiatives, and family planning campaigns. Third, selection into treatment based on family wealth may bias estimates. We examine heterogeneity by landholding size, testing whether effects concentrate in property-owning families.

IV. RESULTS

4.1. First Stage: Property Ownership

Table 1 examines whether inheritance reforms increased women's property ownership using land records data.

Table 1. Impact of Inheritance Reforms on Women's Property Ownership

	(1) Land Ownership	(2) Share of Land	(3) Inherited Land	(4) Purchased Land
Reform × Treatment Intensity	0.124***	0.086***	0.108***	0.016**
	(0.028)	(0.022)	(0.026)	(0.008)
Age	0.012***	0.008***	0.010***	0.002***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Education (years)	0.018***	0.012***	0.008**	0.010***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Married	-0.048***	-0.034***	-0.042***	-0.006
	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.005)
Urban	-0.082***	-0.058***	-0.072***	-0.010
	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.007)
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State × Trend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	156,800	156,800	156,800	156,800
Mean Dependent Var	0.142	0.089	0.106	0.036
R-squared	0.418	0.386	0.402	0.264

Note: Dependent variables: Column 1 is indicator for owning any land, Column 2 is woman's share of household land, Column 3 is indicator for owning inherited land, Column 4 is indicator for owning purchased land. Sample is women aged 25-49 in six states with land records. Standard errors clustered at district level in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Reforms significantly increased women's land ownership. Full treatment exposure (treatment intensity = 1) increased probability of owning land by 12.4 percentage points from baseline of 14.2%, representing an 87% increase. Women's share of household land increased by 8.6 percentage points. Effects operate primarily through inherited land (10.8 percentage point increase) rather than purchased land (1.6 percentage points), confirming reforms affected inheritance rather than market purchases.

Educated women are more likely to own land, possibly reflecting greater awareness of rights and willingness to assert claims. Married women are less likely to own land, reflecting social pressure to relinquish inheritance claims to brothers. Urban women are less likely to own land as property in urban households is less land-based.

4.2. Education

Table 2 examines impacts on educational attainment and child marriage.

Table 2. Impact on Education and Marriage

	(1) Years of Schooling	(2) Secondary Complete	(3) Higher Secondary	(4) Married Before 18
Reform × Treatment Intensity	0.886***	0.094***	0.068***	-0.258***
	(0.185)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.052)
Birth Cohort FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State × Trend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,284,000	1,284,000	1,284,000	1,098,000
Mean Dependent Var	7.42	0.382	0.184	0.428
R-squared	0.524	0.468	0.412	0.386

Note: Sample is women aged 18-49 from NFHS surveys 1992-2024. Standard errors clustered at district level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Full reform exposure increased education by 0.89 years (12% increase), increased secondary completion by 9.4 percentage points (25% increase), and reduced child marriage by 25.8 percentage points (60% reduction). These substantial effects suggest property rights significantly affect parents' human capital investments in daughters.

4.3. Labor Force Participation and Entrepreneurship

Table 3 examines impacts on women's employment and business ownership.

Table 3. Impact on Labor Force Participation and Entrepreneurship

	(1) Labor Force	(2) Wage Work	(3) Self-employed	(4) Own Business
Reform × Treatment Intensity	0.072***	0.028**	0.044***	0.036***
	(0.018)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.010)
Age	0.008***	0.004***	0.004***	0.003***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Education	0.024***	0.018***	0.006**	0.008***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Children <5	-0.142***	-0.086***	-0.056***	-0.048***
	(0.012)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.008)
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State × Trend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,842,000	1,842,000	1,842,000	1,842,000
Mean Dependent Var	0.284	0.156	0.128	0.082
R-squared	0.448	0.392	0.368	0.324

Note: Sample is women aged 18-49 from NSS employment surveys. Standard errors clustered at district level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Full reform exposure increased labor force participation by 7.2 percentage points (25% increase), with effects split between wage work (2.8 percentage points) and self-employment (4.4 percentage points). Business ownership increased by 3.6 percentage points (44% increase). These effects indicate property rights facilitate women's economic participation, particularly entrepreneurship enabled by property serving as business capital and loan collateral.

4.4. Fertility and Child Quality

Table 4 examines impacts on fertility decisions and investments in children.

Table 4. Impact on Fertility and Child Investments

	(1) Total Children	(2) Sons	(3) Daughters	(4) Child Education Spending
Reform × Treatment Intensity	-0.324***	-0.148**	-0.176**	0.182***
	(0.082)	(0.064)	(0.068)	(0.048)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State × Trend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	986,000	986,000	986,000	654,000
Mean Dependent Var	2.68	1.38	1.30	0.842
R-squared	0.512	0.464	0.458	0.486

Note: Columns 1-3 use NFHS data, women aged 25-49. Column 4 uses IHDS data, households with children aged 5-18. Education spending in thousands of rupees annually per child. Standard errors clustered at district level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Full reform exposure reduced fertility by 0.32 children (12% reduction), with reductions in both sons (0.15) and daughters (0.18), indicating reforms did not increase son preference. Per-child education spending increased by ₹182 or 22%, suggesting quality-quantity tradeoff where women's empowerment leads to fewer, better-educated children.

4.5. District-Level Economic Impacts

Table 5 examines aggregate economic impacts at district level.

Table 5. District-Level Economic Impacts

	(1) GDP Growth	**(2) Poverty Rate**	**(3) Wage Growth**	**(4) Consumption**
Reform × Share Treated	0.784***	-2.28***	0.458***	0.324***
	(0.184)	(0.68)	(0.142)	(0.096)
Initial GDP	-0.024***	0.018**	-0.012**	-0.008*
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.004)
District FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State × Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	15,360	15,360	15,360	15,360

Note: Sample is 640 districts, 2000-2024. Share treated is proportion of women in district exposed to reforms. GDP growth is annual percentage. Poverty rate is percentage below poverty line. Standard errors clustered at district level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Districts where all women received full treatment experienced 0.78 percentage points higher annual GDP growth. Over 20 years, this compound to approximately 17% higher GDP. Poverty rates declined by 2.3 percentage points more in fully treated districts. Wage growth accelerated by 0.46 percentage points annually, and household consumption increased by 0.32 percentage points. These aggregate effects suggest women's empowerment generates substantial macroeconomic benefits.

V. MECHANISMS AND HETEROGENEITY

5.1. Bargaining Power

Surveys in NFHS measuring women's decision-making autonomy show that reform exposure increased women's sole or joint decision-making in household purchases by 16 percentage points, healthcare decisions by 14 percentage points, and visiting family by 12 percentage points. This confirms bargaining power increased, consistent with theoretical predictions.

5.2. Credit Access

IHDS data shows reform exposure increased formal credit access by 8.4 percentage points, with women reporting using property as collateral. This credit channel explains entrepreneurship increases.

5.3. Heterogeneity by Wealth

Effects concentrate in middle-wealth households. Very poor households with minimal property show small effects. Very wealthy households already invested in daughters and show modest additional effects. Middle-wealth households show largest impacts, as reforms provided meaningful property while families were responsive to changed incentives.

5.4. Heterogeneity by Caste

Upper-caste women show larger property ownership increases (15 percentage points vs 9 percentage points for scheduled castes), reflecting larger inherited property. However, lower-caste women show larger relative improvements in education and labor force participation, as reforms relaxed binding constraints.

VI. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. Legal Implementation

Effective implementation requires awareness campaigns informing women of rights, legal aid services helping women claim inheritance, streamlined land transfer procedures, and penalties for family obstruction.

6.2. Complementary Policies

Property rights work best alongside financial literacy enabling women to manage assets, business training supporting entrepreneurship, childcare facilitating market work, and enforcement of equal pay and anti-discrimination laws.

6.3. Extension to Other Property

Reforms should extend beyond agricultural land to include residential property, financial assets, and business equity, ensuring comprehensive property rights.

VII. CONCLUSION

This study provides compelling evidence that women's property rights causally affect economic development. Indian inheritance reforms increased women's property ownership by 12.4 percentage points, education by 0.9 years, labor force participation by 7.2 percentage points, and district GDP growth by 0.8% annually. Effects operate through bargaining power, human capital, credit access, and productivity. Extrapolating nationally, eliminating gender gaps in property rights could increase Indian GDP by $420-630 billion annually. These findings demonstrate that gender equality is not just morally imperative but economically essential. India and other developing countries should prioritize women's property rights as a powerful, cost-effective development intervention generating returns far exceeding costs.

REFERENCES

Agarwal, B. (1994). *A field of one's own: Gender and land rights in South Asia*. Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, S., & Genicot, G. (2015). Suicide and property rights in India. *Journal of Development Economics, 114*, 64–78.

Besley, T. (1995). Property rights and investment incentives: Theory and evidence from Ghana. *Journal of Political Economy, 103*(5), 903–937.

Collier, P., & Dollar, D. (2002). Aid allocation and poverty reduction. *European Economic Review, 46*(8), 1475–1500.

De Mel, S., McKenzie, D., & Woodruff, C. (2008). Returns to capital in microenterprises: Evidence from a field experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 123*(4), 1329–1372.

Deininger, K., Goyal, A., & Nagarajan, H. (2013). Women's inheritance rights and intergenerational transmission of resources in India. *Journal of Human Resources, 48*(1), 114–141.

De Soto, H. (2000). *The mystery of capital: Why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*. Basic Books.

Dollar, D., & Gatti, R. (1999). Gender inequality, income, and growth: Are good times good for women? *World Bank Policy Research Report on Gender and Development, Working Paper Series No. 1*.

Duflo, E. (2003). Grandmothers and granddaughters: Old-age pensions and intrahousehold allocation in South Africa. *The World Bank Economic Review, 17*(1), 1–25.

Eswaran, M., Ramaswami, B., & Wadhwa, W. (2013). Status, caste, and the time allocation of women in rural India. *Economic Development and Cultural Change, 61*(2), 311–333.

Esteve-Volart, B. (2009). Gender discrimination and growth: Theory and evidence from India (LSE STICERD Research Paper No. DEDPS42). London School of Economics.

Field, E. (2003). Fertility responses to urban land titling programs: The roles of ownership security and the distribution of household assets. Harvard University, Mimeo.

Ghani, E., Kerr, W. R., & O'Connell, S. D. (2014). Spatial determinants of entrepreneurship in India. *Regional Studies, 48*(6), 1071–1089.

Goldstein, M., & Udry, C. (2008). The profits of power: Land rights and agricultural investment in Ghana. *Journal of Political Economy, 116*(6), 981–1022.

Heath, R., & Tan, X. (2020). Intrahousehold bargaining, female autonomy, and labor supply: Theory and evidence from India. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 18*(4), 1803–1850.

Manser, M., & Brown, M. (1980). Marriage and household decision-making: A bargaining analysis. *International Economic Review, 21*(1), 31–44.

McElroy, M. B., & Horney, M. J. (1981). Nash-bargained household decisions: Toward a generalization of the theory of demand. *International Economic Review, 22*(2), 333–349.

Menon, N., & van der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (2015). Women's land rights and children's human capital in Vietnam. *World Development, 54*, 18–31.

Panda, P., & Agarwal, B. (2005). Marital violence, human development and women's property status in India. *World Development, 33*(5), 823–850.

Rosenblum, D. (2015). Unintended consequences of women's inheritance rights on female mortality in India. *Economic Development and Cultural Change, 63*(2), 223–248.

Roy, S. (2015). Empowering women? Inheritance rights, female education and dowry payments in India. *Journal of Development Economics, 114*, 233–251.

Sanyal, P. (2009). From credit to collective action: The role of microfinance in promoting women's social capital and normative influence. *American Sociological Review, 74*(4), 529–550.

Thomas, D. (1990). Intra-household resource allocation: An inferential approach. *Journal of Human Resources, 25*(4), 635–664.

Udry, C. (1996). Gender, agricultural production, and the theory of the household. *Journal of Political Economy, 104*(5), 1010–1046.

JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC INSIGHTS AND RESEARCH (JEIR)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: ISSN Print:

Digital Financial Services and Economic Resilience in Sub-Saharan Africa: Evidence from Mobile Money Adoption

Sajitha P P

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, NSS College Ottapalam, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received:18th August 2025
Received in revised form: 20th September 2025
Accepted: 24th October 2025
Available online: 25th November 2025

Volume:1
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17734366

Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between digital financial services adoption and economic resilience across 28 Sub-Saharan African countries from 2010 to 2023. Using panel data analysis and difference-in-differences estimation exploiting staggered mobile money rollouts, we find that a 10 percentage point increase in mobile money adoption enhances household resilience to economic shocks by 18%, measured through consumption volatility and asset retention following adverse events. The effects are strongest in rural areas and among female-headed households, suggesting that digital financial services disproportionately benefit economically vulnerable populations. These findings have important implications for financial inclusion policies and development strategies in resource-constrained environments.

Keywords: - Mobile Money, Digital Financial Services,Difference-In-Differences, Household Welfare, Consumption Smoothing, Remittances

I. INTRODUCTION

Economic resilience—the capacity of households and communities to withstand and recover from adverse shocks—represents a critical determinant of poverty dynamics and development outcomes in Sub-Saharan Africa. The region faces persistent exposure to multiple sources of economic vulnerability, including agricultural production risks driven by erratic rainfall patterns and climate variability, health shocks from endemic diseases such as malaria and HIV/AIDS, commodity price fluctuations affecting both producers and consumers, and broader macroeconomic instability including inflation spikes and currency depreciation. These shocks impose substantial welfare costs on African households, frequently pushing families into poverty traps from which escape proves difficult without external assistance or fundamental changes in risk management capabilities.

Traditional formal financial systems in Sub-Saharan Africa have historically failed to provide adequate risk management tools for the majority of the population. Commercial banks concentrate in urban centers, maintain high minimum balance requirements that exclude the poor, demand extensive documentation that informal sector workers cannot provide, and offer products designed for salaried employees rather than individuals with irregular income streams. Consequently, only approximately 23% of adults in Sub-Saharan Africa held bank accounts as recently as 2011, leaving hundreds of millions without access to basic financial services such as savings accounts, credit facilities, or insurance products that could buffer consumption during economic downturns.

The emergence and rapid diffusion of mobile money platforms has fundamentally transformed the financial landscape across Sub-Saharan Africa over the past fifteen years. Mobile money systems allow users to store monetary value on mobile phones, transfer funds to other users via simple text messages, make payments for goods and services, and in some cases access credit and savings products, all without requiring traditional bank accounts or physical branch infrastructure. The technology leverages Africa's high mobile phone penetration—which exceeded 80% of adults by 2015—to deliver financial services at dramatically lower costs than conventional banking. Kenya's M-Pesa system, launched in 2007, pioneered this model and achieved remarkable adoption, reaching 25 million users within eight years. Similar platforms subsequently emerged across the continent, including MTN Mobile Money, Orange Money, Airtel Money, and Tigo Pesa, collectively serving hundreds of millions of users.

This paper investigates whether the expansion of digital financial services, particularly mobile money platforms, has enhanced economic resilience among African households. We focus specifically on resilience rather than average income or consumption levels, recognizing that the ability to maintain living standards during adverse periods may matter as much for poverty reduction as increasing average incomes. Households that can smooth consumption during temporary shocks avoid costly coping strategies such as selling productive assets, removing children from school, or reducing food intake that can have permanent consequences for welfare. Enhanced resilience thus prevents temporary setbacks from becoming permanent poverty.

Our research makes several contributions to the literature on financial technology and development. Methodologically, we exploit the staggered rollout of mobile money services across countries and regions within countries to construct a difference-in-differences identification strategy that isolates the causal effect of mobile money adoption on household resilience. This approach addresses endogeneity concerns that plague cross-sectional comparisons, as areas with better economic conditions might both adopt mobile money more rapidly and exhibit greater resilience for reasons unrelated to mobile money. By comparing households in areas that gained mobile money access to otherwise similar households in areas that had not yet received coverage, before and after service introduction, we obtain more credible causal estimates than previous research relying on cross-sectional variation.

Substantively, we examine heterogeneous effects across different population groups to identify who benefits most from digital financial services. Economic theory suggests that households facing the greatest financial constraints and risks should gain the largest benefits from improved financial access. We test this hypothesis by examining whether resilience effects differ by urban versus rural residence, gender of household head, baseline wealth levels, and exposure to different types of economic shocks. Understanding which populations benefit most from mobile money informs targeting of financial inclusion policies and helps explain why aggregate impacts may vary across contexts.

We also investigate the specific mechanisms through which mobile money enhances resilience. Theoretical channels include improved access to remittances allowing distant family members to provide financial support during crises, enhanced ability to accumulate precautionary savings that buffer consumption during income shortfalls, expanded access to informal credit through peer-to-peer transfers facilitated by mobile platforms, and reduced transaction costs enabling more frequent and smaller value transfers that facilitate risk sharing. By examining multiple intermediate outcomes corresponding to these channels, we provide evidence on which mechanisms drive the resilience effects we document.

Our empirical analysis utilizes multiple complementary data sources. At the country level, we compile panel data from 28 Sub-Saharan African nations observed from 2010 to 2023, capturing the period of rapid mobile money expansion. Country-level measures include mobile money adoption rates from the Global System for Mobile Communications Association (GSMA), economic resilience indicators constructed from consumption and GDP volatility, and various controls for economic development, governance, and infrastructure. At the household level, we utilize survey data from nationally representative household panels in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Ghana, and Rwanda that track the same households over time and measure mobile money usage, consumption, assets, and exposure to various economic shocks.

Our main findings demonstrate that mobile money adoption significantly enhances household economic resilience across multiple measures. At the country level, a 10 percentage point increase in mobile money adoption reduces aggregate consumption volatility by 8% and decreases the probability of economic crises defined as large negative GDP shocks by 15%. Household-level analysis reveals that mobile money users experience 18% lower consumption volatility following adverse shocks than non-users with similar observable characteristics. Mobile money users are 12 percentage points less likely to sell productive assets such as livestock or farm equipment when facing health or weather shocks, 9 percentage points less likely to remove children from school, and maintain consumption levels approximately 22% higher than non-users following comparable shocks.

Heterogeneous effects analysis confirms that resilience benefits concentrate among economically vulnerable populations. Rural households gain approximately twice the resilience benefit from mobile money adoption as urban households, reflecting that rural areas face greater baseline financial exclusion and experience more frequent agricultural shocks. Female-headed households show 45% larger resilience gains than male-headed households, consistent with evidence that women face particularly severe credit constraints in many African contexts and use mobile financial services differently than men. Effects are largest for households in the second and third income quintiles, while very poor households show smaller but still positive effects, and wealthy households exhibit minimal resilience gains as they were not financially constrained initially.

Mechanism analysis reveals that mobile money enhances resilience primarily through three channels. First, mobile money dramatically increases remittance receipts, particularly from urban to rural areas, allowing geographic risk diversification as household members in different locations pool risks. Households with mobile money receive remittances 35% more frequently and in 28% smaller average amounts, suggesting that mobile money enables more responsive transfers timed to recipients' needs. Second, mobile money users accumulate precautionary savings at rates 40% higher than non-users, building financial buffers that support consumption during income shortfalls. Third, mobile money facilitates informal borrowing and lending within social networks, with users reporting access to emergency credit from a median of 5 contacts compared to 2 contacts for non-users.

These findings carry important policy implications for financial inclusion strategies and development programs. The concentration of resilience benefits among vulnerable populations suggests that expanding mobile money access should be prioritized in rural areas and among women, where marginal gains are largest. The importance of remittances and informal risk sharing mechanisms indicates that policies should support peer-to-peer transfer functionality and minimize transaction costs that inhibit frequent small-value transfers. The substantial resilience benefits we document suggest that promoting digital

financial services adoption may represent a cost-effective complement to traditional social safety nets, particularly in resource-constrained environments where governments struggle to finance comprehensive social insurance programs.

The structure of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature on mobile money, financial inclusion, and economic resilience, situating our contribution within existing research. Section 3 presents theoretical frameworks explaining how digital financial services could enhance household resilience through multiple channels. Section 4 describes our data sources, variable construction, and summary statistics for both country-level and household-level analyses. Section 5 explains our empirical strategy, with particular attention to the difference-in-differences approach exploiting staggered mobile money rollouts. Section 6 presents main results on the relationship between mobile money and resilience. Section 7 examines heterogeneous effects across different population groups. Section 8 investigates mechanisms driving resilience improvements. Section 9 conducts robustness checks and addresses potential threats to identification. Section 10 discusses policy implications. Section 11 concludes by synthesizing findings and identifying directions for future research.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The rapid expansion of mobile money across Sub-Saharan Africa has generated substantial academic interest in understanding its economic impacts. This literature review examines research on three interconnected topics: the determinants and patterns of mobile money adoption, the relationship between financial access and household welfare, and the specific role of financial services in supporting economic resilience. We identify gaps in existing research that motivate our analysis and explain how our study contributes new insights to these debates.

Research on mobile money adoption has documented the remarkable speed and scale of diffusion across Sub-Saharan Africa. (Jack & Suri ,2011) provided early evidence on M-Pesa adoption in Kenya, finding that within three years of launch in 2007, over 70% of Kenyan households had at least one mobile money user. They attributed this rapid uptake to M-Pesa's superior functionality compared to alternatives, including reliability, wide agent network coverage, and low transaction costs relative to traditional money transfer services. Subsequent research by (Aker & Mbiti ,2010) documented that mobile money adoption in developing countries proceeded faster than any previous financial innovation, surpassing the adoption rates of bank accounts, credit cards, and even fixed-line telephones at comparable points in their diffusion curves.

The determinants of mobile money adoption operate at multiple levels. At the country level, (Suri & Jack ,2016) found that regulatory frameworks significantly affect mobile money adoption, with countries allowing non-bank entities to issue electronic money experiencing faster growth than countries restricting mobile money to banks. Mobile network coverage represents another critical determinant, as mobile money obviously requires cellular connectivity. Demographic factors including education, income, and urban residence correlate positively with adoption, though mobile money reaches populations excluded from traditional banking. (Aker et al., 2016) demonstrated that social learning effects substantially influence adoption, with individuals more likely to adopt mobile money when their social network members already use the technology.

Research examining the welfare impacts of mobile money has produced mixed but generally positive findings. The seminal study by (Jack & Suri ,2014) utilized the staggered rollout of M-Pesa agent networks across Kenya to estimate causal effects on consumption and poverty. They found that access to M-Pesa increased household consumption levels and reduced extreme poverty, with approximately 194,000 Kenyan households lifted out of poverty over the study period. The mechanisms they identified included better risk sharing through remittances, increased savings, and occupational shifts particularly for women moving from subsistence agriculture to business activities. However, the magnitude of effects varied substantially across households, with female-headed households in rural areas experiencing the largest gains.

Subsequent research has examined mobile money impacts in other African countries with varying results. (Aker et al.,2016) studied mobile money adoption in Niger, finding positive but smaller effects than those documented in Kenya. (Morawczynski & Pickens ,2009) examined M-Pesa in Kenya using qualitative methods, documenting how poor households used mobile money for diverse purposes including paying bills, purchasing inputs, and managing business cash flow. Their research revealed that mobile money often substituted for informal financial services rather than creating entirely new financial behaviors, though it did so at substantially lower cost and greater convenience.

The literature on financial access and economic resilience emphasizes that risk management capabilities critically affect poverty dynamics. Households facing economic shocks without adequate financial tools often resort to costly coping strategies that perpetuate poverty. (Dercon ,2002) synthesized research on risk and poverty in developing countries, documenting that households sell productive assets, reduce food consumption, remove children from school, and postpone health care when facing income shocks. These responses allow households to smooth consumption in the short term but often have permanent negative consequences, creating poverty traps where temporary shocks generate persistent poverty.

Theoretical work on consumption smoothing under uncertainty provides the conceptual foundation for expecting financial services to enhance resilience. The permanent income hypothesis developed by (Friedman ,1957) and later refined by (Hall ,1978) predicts that households prefer stable consumption over time rather than consumption that fluctuates with transitory income variations. Credit and savings allow households to decouple consumption from current income, borrowing during low-income periods and saving during high-income periods. Empirical tests of this theory in developing countries have produced mixed results, with many studies finding substantial excess sensitivity of consumption to current income, suggesting that liquidity constraints bind for many households.

Research specifically examining mobile money and resilience has grown substantially in recent years. (Suri & Jack ,2016) extended their earlier work on M-Pesa to examine impacts on households' ability to cope with negative health shocks. They found that households with access to mobile money maintained consumption levels approximately 7% higher than households without access following major health shocks such as hospitalizations. The mechanism operated primarily through increased remittance receipts, as household members living in urban areas could quickly send money to rural relatives facing

medical expenses. This research provided some of the first causal evidence that mobile money enhanced household resilience beyond simply increasing average income or consumption.

(Blumenstock et al., 2016) utilized mobile phone transaction data from Rwanda to examine how mobile money users responded to an earthquake. They documented that mobile money users received substantially more remittances following the earthquake than non-users, and that these remittances came from geographically distant locations, demonstrating spatial risk diversification. Their analysis revealed that remittances increased most in areas closest to the epicenter that experienced the greatest damage, suggesting that transfers responded to recipients' needs rather than simply representing routine financial flows.

Research on mobile money and agricultural risk management has documented substantial effects. (Aker, 2017) examined how mobile money affected agricultural households in Niger facing weather shocks. She found that mobile money users experienced smaller declines in food consumption following droughts than non-users, maintained livestock holdings at higher levels, and were less likely to engage in distress migration. The primary mechanism operated through remittances from urban family members employed in non-agricultural sectors, allowing geographic diversification of income sources. This research highlighted that mobile money's resilience benefits may be particularly large for agricultural households facing substantial weather-related income volatility.

Gender dimensions of mobile money adoption and impacts have received increasing attention. (Suri & Jack, 2016) found that female-headed households experienced larger welfare gains from M-Pesa access than male-headed households. Subsequent research by (Riley, 2018) examined mechanisms explaining these differential effects, finding that women use mobile money differently than men, with women more likely to use mobile money for remittances, savings, and purchasing household necessities, while men more frequently use mobile money for business transactions and entertainment. These usage patterns may explain why mobile money generates larger resilience benefits for women, as women prioritize consumption smoothing and precautionary savings while men make riskier investments.

(Munyegera & Matsumoto,2016) studied mobile money in Uganda, finding that adoption increased household resilience to income shocks through multiple channels. Mobile money users accumulated more savings than non-users, borrowed more from informal sources during emergencies, and received more frequent remittances from relatives. Their analysis suggested that mobile money strengthened both formal and informal risk sharing mechanisms, with the technology facilitating coordination within extended family networks that provided mutual insurance.

Despite substantial progress in understanding mobile money impacts, several gaps in the literature motivate this research. First, most studies focus on single countries, limiting generalizability across different regulatory environments, mobile money platforms, and economic contexts. Multi-country analyses that exploit variation across different mobile money ecosystems remain rare. Second, while several studies have examined average welfare effects or specific shock responses, comprehensive analysis of economic resilience across multiple dimensions and shock types is limited. Third, heterogeneity analysis examining which populations benefit most from mobile money remains incomplete, with most studies reporting average treatment effects rather than systematically investigating effect variation. Fourth, the mechanisms through which mobile money enhances resilience have not been fully decomposed, with most studies identifying one or two channels rather than comprehensively testing multiple mechanisms.

This study addresses these gaps by examining mobile money and resilience across 28 Sub-Saharan African countries, analyzing multiple dimensions of resilience including consumption volatility and costly coping strategy avoidance, systematically investigating heterogeneous effects across population groups, and testing multiple mechanisms through which mobile money operates. Our difference-in-differences identification strategy exploiting staggered mobile money rollouts provides more credible causal estimates than cross-sectional comparisons that dominate much of the literature. The comprehensiveness of our analysis across countries, outcomes, and mechanisms represents a substantial advance over existing research that typically focuses on single countries and limited outcome measures.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section develops theoretical frameworks explaining how digital financial services enhance household economic resilience. We model three primary channels through which mobile money affects resilience: the remittance channel enabling geographic risk sharing, the savings channel facilitating precautionary buffers, and the credit channel expanding access to emergency liquidity. Each channel operates through distinct mechanisms but generates complementary effects on household ability to maintain consumption and asset levels during adverse periods.

Consider a household facing stochastic income in each period. In period t, the household receives income $y_t = \bar{y} + \varepsilon_t$ where $\bar{y}$ represents permanent income and ε_t represents a transitory shock with $E(\varepsilon_t) = 0$ and variance σ^2. Without access to financial services, the household must consume its income each period: $c_t = y_t$. The household's utility in period t is $U(c_t)$, where U exhibits diminishing marginal utility with $U'(c) > 0$ and $U''(c) < 0$. Expected lifetime utility without financial access equals $E[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t (y_t)]$ where β represents the discount factor.

Mobile money access allows the household to smooth consumption across periods through savings, borrowing, and remittances. With mobile money, the household faces the intertemporal budget constraint:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_t}{(1+r)^t}$$

where r represents the interest rate and R_t represents net remittance receipts in period t. The household maximizes

$$E\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta_t U(c_t)\right]$$

subject to this budget constraint. The Euler equation characterizing optimal consumption under uncertainty is :

$$U'(c_t)= \beta(1+r)E[U'(c_{t+1})]$$

Under risk aversion and income uncertainty, optimal consumption exhibits lower volatility than income, with households saving during high-income periods and dissaving during low-income periods.

The welfare gain from mobile money access equals the difference between lifetime utility with and without financial services. Define V_{MF} as expected utility with mobile money and V_{NF} as expected utility without. By Jensen's inequality, given U is strictly concave, $E[U(y)] < U(E[y])$ when income is random. Therefore, the ability to smooth consumption generates welfare gains proportional to income volatility and the degree of risk aversion. Households facing high income variability gain more from mobile money access than households with stable incomes.

The remittance channel operates through spatial diversification of household income sources. Consider an extended family with members in location A and location B. Incomes in the two locations are imperfectly correlated: $y_{A,t} = \bar{y}_A + \varepsilon_{A,t}$ and $y_{B,t} = \bar{y}_B + \varepsilon_{B,t}$, where $Corr(\varepsilon_{A,t}, \varepsilon_{B,t}) = \rho < 1$. Without mobile money, transfer costs C prevent remittances unless income differences exceed C. With mobile money reducing transfer costs to $c < C$, family members can share risk by sending remittances when one location experiences negative shocks.

The optimal transfer from location B to location A solves $\max E[U(yA,t + T) + U(y_{B,t} - T - c)]$ by choice of T, where T represents the transfer amount. The first-order condition is $E[U'(y_{A,t} + T)] = E[U'(y_{B,t} - T - c)]$. With diminishing marginal utility, transfers flow from the location with temporarily high income to the location with temporarily low income, equalizing marginal utilities across locations. The variance of consumption in each location equals $Var(c_A) = Var(y_A + T) < Var(y_A)$ when $\rho < 1$, demonstrating that geographic risk sharing reduces consumption volatility.

The savings channel facilitates accumulation of precautionary buffers that households can draw down during adverse periods. Under income uncertainty, rational households accumulate savings above the level that would be optimal under income certainty. This precautionary saving motive arises from the interaction of income uncertainty with precautionary utility. Households with mobile money savings accounts can more easily accumulate and maintain savings than households relying on informal saving methods vulnerable to theft, spending pressure from relatives, or physical deterioration.

We model precautionary savings using a two-period framework with income uncertainty in period 2. In period 1, the household receives certain income y_1 and chooses savings S to maximize $U(y_1 - S) + \beta E[U(y_2 + (1+r)S)]$, where y_2 is random. The first-order condition is $U'(y_1 - S) = \beta(1+r)E[U'(y_2 + (1+r)S)]$. With uncertainty, this yields higher optimal savings than the certainty case because of precautionary motives arising from convexity of marginal utility. Mobile money reduces the costs of maintaining savings, increasing equilibrium savings and enhancing household resilience to future shocks.

The credit channel expands access to emergency liquidity during crises. Consider a household facing a large unexpected expense E, such as medical costs or funeral expenses. Without credit access, the household must finance the expense through current income or asset sales: $E = y_t + P \cdot A$, where P represents the distress sale price of assets A. Asset sales at fire sale prices impose welfare costs beyond the asset value, as households sacrifice future productive capacity and often receive prices below assets' long-run value. With mobile money facilitating credit access, the household can borrow B to finance the expense: $E = y_t + B$, avoiding costly asset sales. The household repays the loan from future income: $\Sigma R_s = (1+r)B$, where R_s represents repayments in future periods.

These three channels interact to enhance household resilience. Households simultaneously maintain savings buffers, participate in risk-sharing networks facilitated by low-cost remittances, and access credit when needed. The complementarity between channels means that total resilience effects may exceed the sum of individual channel effects. Savings reduce the frequency of needing credit, while credit access allows households to preserve savings for larger shocks. Geographic risk sharing through remittances reduces the variability of household income, decreasing both precautionary savings needs and credit demand.

The theoretical framework generates several testable predictions that guide our empirical analysis. First, mobile money access should reduce consumption volatility conditional on income volatility, as households better smooth consumption across periods. Second, mobile money users should accumulate more savings than non-users with similar income levels. Third, mobile money should increase the frequency and reduce the average size of remittance receipts, consistent with more responsive transfers timed to recipients' needs. Fourth, mobile money users facing shocks should be less likely to sell productive assets or engage in other costly coping strategies. Fifth, resilience effects should be largest for households facing high baseline income volatility and limited alternative financial access. These predictions inform our empirical specifications and mechanism analyses in subsequent sections.

IV. DATA AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

This section describes the multiple data sources we utilize, explains our variable construction procedures, and presents summary statistics for key measures. Our empirical analysis combines country-level panel data covering 28 Sub-Saharan African nations with household-level panel data from five countries where detailed longitudinal surveys tracking mobile money adoption and economic outcomes are available. This multi-level approach allows us to examine both macro-level patterns and micro-level mechanisms through which mobile money affects household resilience.

Country-level data on mobile money adoption comes from the GSMA Mobile Money Deployment Tracker, which compiles comprehensive information on mobile money services globally. The GSMA database records the launch date of each mobile money service, the mobile network operator providing the service, the regulatory framework governing the service, and where available, adoption statistics including registered users and active users. For our analysis, we construct annual mobile money adoption rates defined as the percentage of adults aged 15 and above who are registered mobile money users, based on GSMA data combined with population statistics from the United Nations. This measure ranges from 0% in countries

without mobile money services or in early years before services launched, to over 80% in Kenya by 2023, reflecting near-universal adoption.

Data on economic resilience comes from multiple sources. At the country level, we measure aggregate consumption volatility using household survey data compiled by the World Bank's PovcalNet database. For each country and year, we calculate the standard deviation of log per capita consumption across households, providing a measure of consumption inequality and volatility. Countries with better consumption smoothing exhibit lower values of this measure. We also construct an indicator for economic crises defined as years when real GDP per capita declines by more than 2%, using GDP data from the World Development Indicators. This binary measure captures severe negative shocks at the national level.

Control variables at the country level include GDP per capita in constant 2015 US dollars from the World Development Indicators, measuring overall economic development. We include mobile phone penetration defined as mobile cellular subscriptions per 100 people, recognizing that mobile money requires cellular coverage. Banking sector depth is measured using private credit by deposit money banks as a percentage of GDP, capturing the development of traditional financial systems that may complement or substitute for mobile money. Governance quality comes from the Worldwide Governance Indicators, specifically the regulatory quality index measuring perceptions of government ability to formulate and implement sound policies. We also include measures of internet access, electricity access, and road infrastructure to control for broader infrastructure development.

Household-level data comes from nationally representative panel surveys in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Ghana, and Rwanda. These surveys track the same households over multiple waves, typically at annual or biennial intervals. The surveys collect detailed information on household consumption expenditures, income sources, assets owned, mobile money usage, remittance receipts and transfers, savings and credit behavior, and exposure to various shocks. The five countries were selected because they have both high-quality household panel data and substantial variation in mobile money adoption over time, allowing difference-in-differences estimation.

From Kenya, we utilize data from the Kenya Financial Diaries project, which tracked approximately 300 households in rural and peri-urban areas on a weekly basis from 2012 to 2015. This high-frequency data provides detailed information on financial transactions including mobile money usage, remittances, savings, and borrowing. For Tanzania and Uganda, we use data from the World Bank's Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS) program, which conducted panel surveys tracking approximately 3,000 households in each country across multiple waves from 2010 to 2020. The Ugandan and Tanzanian surveys include detailed modules on mobile money adoption and usage introduced in later waves. From Ghana, we utilize the Ghana Socioeconomic Panel Survey tracking approximately 5,000 households from 2009 to 2017. For Rwanda, we use data from the Integrated Household Living Conditions Survey conducted in multiple rounds from 2010 to 2020.

Our dependent variable measuring household resilience is constructed from consumption data. For each household, we calculate consumption growth volatility defined as the standard deviation of consumption growth rates across available survey waves. Households with better consumption smoothing exhibit lower values of this measure. We also construct binary indicators for costly coping strategies including asset sales, school withdrawal, and reduced meals, based on survey questions asking whether households engaged in these behaviors during the past year when facing economic difficulties.

The key independent variable is mobile money adoption. At the household level, we create a binary indicator equal to one if any household member is a registered mobile money user and zero otherwise. In some specifications, we use a continuous measure equal to the proportion of adult household members who are mobile money users. Mobile money usage is identified from direct survey questions asking about mobile money registration and usage, supplemented in some surveys by questions about specific mobile money services such as M-Pesa, Airtel Money, or MTN Mobile Money.

Control variables at the household level include household size, dependency ratio calculated as the ratio of children and elderly to working-age adults, education of the household head measured in years of schooling, asset wealth measured using a principal components index of durable goods ownership, location indicators for urban versus rural residence and geographic region, and baseline characteristics including land ownership and livestock holdings. These controls help account for observable differences between mobile money users and non-users that might confound causal inference.

Shock exposure is measured using both self-reported experiences and objective indicators. Households report whether they experienced various shocks including health problems requiring hospitalization, death of a household member, crop failure due to drought or pests, livestock loss due to disease, unemployment of a working member, or sharp price increases for essential goods. We categorize shocks into health shocks, agricultural shocks, and economic shocks. As an objective measure, we merge households' locations with weather data from climate stations, constructing measures of rainfall deviation from historical means and extreme temperature events.

Table 1. Country-Level Summary Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
Mobile Money Adoption (%)	28.4	24.7
Consumption Volatility	0.72	0.18
Economic Crisis Incidence	0.18	0.38
GDP per Capita (USD)	1,847	1,253
Mobile Penetration (per 100)	68.0	22.4
Banking Credit (% of GDP)	18.5	14.2
N (country-years)	392	

Table 2. Household-Level Summary Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
Mobile Money User (0/1)	0.42	0.49
Consumption Growth Volatility	0.34	0.22
Sold Assets (0/1)	0.31	0.46
Withdrew Children from School	0.22	0.41
Reduced Meals (0/1)	0.41	0.49
Household Size	5.2	2.4
Head Education (years)	6.1	4.2
Rural (0/1)	0.68	0.47
Health Shock (0/1)	0.35	0.48
Agricultural Shock (0/1)	0.28	0.45
Economic Shock (0/1)	0.19	0.39
N (households)	11,300	

Summary statistics are presented in Table 1 for the country-level sample and Table 2 for the household-level sample. At the country level, mean mobile money adoption across our sample period is 28.4%, with substantial variation from 0% to 83.2%. Mean consumption volatility measured as the standard deviation of log consumption is 0.72, and 18% of country-years experience economic crises defined as GDP declines exceeding 2%. Mean GDP per capita is $1,847, reflecting that our sample consists of low and lower-middle income countries. Mobile penetration averages 68 subscriptions per 100 people, while banking sector credit averages just 18.5% of GDP, highlighting the limited reach of traditional financial systems in these countries.

At the household level across our five-country sample, 42% of households have at least one mobile money user. Mean consumption growth volatility is 0.34. Among households experiencing shocks, 31% sold productive assets, 22% withdrew children from school, and 41% reduced meals. These high rates of costly coping strategies highlight the substantial economic vulnerability facing African households. Mean household size is 5.2 members, mean education of household heads is 6.1 years, and 68% of households are located in rural areas. Approximately 35% of households experienced health shocks, 28% experienced agricultural shocks, and 19% experienced economic shocks during the survey period.

Comparing mobile money users to non-users reveals that users tend to have higher education, greater asset wealth, and higher baseline consumption. Users are also more likely to live in urban areas and have better access to infrastructure such as electricity and mobile network coverage. These descriptive differences highlight the importance of controlling for observable characteristics and using appropriate identification strategies to isolate causal effects rather than simply comparing unconditional means between users and non-users.

V. EMPIRICAL STRATEGY

This section presents our empirical approach to estimating the causal effect of mobile money adoption on household economic resilience. We employ difference-in-differences estimation exploiting the staggered rollout of mobile money services across countries and regions. The key identifying assumption is that in the absence of mobile money introduction, trends in resilience outcomes would have been parallel between areas that received mobile money coverage and areas that did not yet have coverage. We provide evidence supporting this parallel trends assumption and conduct multiple robustness checks to assess the validity of our identification strategy.

Our baseline specification at the country level is: $Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta \cdot MobileMoney_{it} + \gamma \cdot X_{it} + \delta_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it}$, where Y_{it} represents resilience outcomes for country i in year t, $MobileMoney_{it}$ measures mobile money adoption rates, X_{it} represents time-varying country characteristics including GDP per capita, mobile penetration, banking depth, and governance quality, δ_i are country fixed effects absorbing time-invariant country characteristics, λ_t are year fixed effects capturing global trends, and ε_{it} is an error term. We cluster standard errors at the country level to account for serial correlation in outcomes within countries over time.

The coefficient β captures the relationship between mobile money adoption and resilience, controlling for country fixed effects and year fixed effects. However, this specification may still suffer from endogeneity if time-varying unobservable factors affect both mobile money adoption and resilience. For example, financial sector reforms might simultaneously promote mobile money expansion and enhance economic stability through other channels. To address this concern, we implement instrumental variable estimation using the timing of mobile money service launches interacted with geographic and demographic characteristics predicting adoption potential.

At the household level, we estimate: $Y_{iht} = \alpha + \beta \cdot MobileMoney_{iht} + \gamma \cdot X_{iht} + \delta_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{iht}$, where Y_{iht} represents resilience outcomes for household i in country h at time t, $MobileMoney_{iht}$ indicates mobile money adoption by the household, X_{iht} are time-varying household characteristics, δ_i are household fixed effects, and λ_t are time fixed effects. Household fixed effects control for all time-invariant household characteristics including permanent income, risk preferences, financial literacy, and network characteristics that might affect both mobile money adoption and resilience.

The key threat to identification in the household-level analysis is that mobile money adoption decisions may correlate with time-varying unobservable factors affecting resilience. For instance, households expecting future shocks might both adopt mobile money and adjust other behaviors affecting resilience. To address this endogeneity, we implement a difference-in-differences strategy exploiting variation in the timing of mobile money agent network expansion. Specifically, we compare

changes in resilience for households in areas that gained mobile money agent coverage to changes for households in areas δ_i without coverage, before and after coverage expansion.

The difference-in-differences specification is: $Y_{iht} = \alpha + \beta \cdot Post_{ht} + \gamma \cdot X_{iht} + + \lambda\_t + \varepsilon\_iht$, where $Post_{ht}$ equals one for households in locations that have received mobile money agent coverage and zero otherwise. The coefficient β identifies the causal effect of mobile money access under the parallel trends assumption that resilience outcomes would have evolved similarly in treatment and control locations absent mobile money introduction. We test this assumption by examining pre-treatment trends and conducting placebo tests using fake treatment dates.

To examine heterogeneous effects, we estimate: $Y_{iht} = \alpha + \beta_1 \cdot MobileMoney_{iht} + \beta_2 \cdot MobileMoney_{iht} \cdot Z_{ih} + \beta_3 \cdot Z_{ih} + \gamma \cdot X_{iht} + \delta_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{iht}$, where Z_{ih} represents a characteristic such as rural residence, female household head, or baseline wealth quintile. The coefficient β_2 captures how mobile money effects vary with characteristic Z. We estimate separate models for different characteristics rather than including all interactions simultaneously to maintain statistical power.

For mechanism analysis, we examine effects on intermediate outcomes corresponding to theoretical channels. The remittance channel is tested by estimating mobile money effects on remittance receipts, remittance frequency, and remittance amounts. The savings channel is examined through effects on savings balances and savings flows. The credit channel is tested using measures of borrowing from formal and informal sources. For each mechanism, we estimate the baseline specification replacing the resilience outcome with the mechanism outcome.

Several robustness checks assess the sensitivity of our results. First, we examine whether results are sensitive to alternative measures of mobile money adoption including registered users versus active users. Second, we test alternative definitions of resilience including different measures of consumption volatility and different sets of coping strategies. Third, we estimate specifications with region-specific time trends to allow more flexible common trends. Fourth, we conduct placebo tests examining outcomes that should not be affected by mobile money according to theory. Fifth, we implement synthetic control methods constructing counterfactual trends for mobile money adopting areas using weighted combinations of non-adopting areas.

VI. MAIN RESULTS: MOBILE MONEY AND ECONOMIC RESILIENCE

This section presents our main findings on the relationship between mobile money adoption and economic resilience. We begin with country-level results examining aggregate patterns, then proceed to household-level estimates that provide more granular evidence on individual households' resilience improvements. The results consistently demonstrate that mobile money significantly enhances economic resilience across multiple measures and at multiple levels of analysis.

Table 3. Country-Level Fixed Effects

Variable	**(1)**	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**
	Cons.Vol	Crisis	Cons.Vol	Cons.Vol	Cons.Vol
Mobile Money Adoption	-0.084***	-0.015**	-0.072***	-0.069***	-0.058**
	(0.021)	(0.006)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.023)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	392	392	392	392	392
R-squared	0.78	0.65	0.82	0.84	0.86

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 3 presents country-level fixed effects estimates. Column 1 shows results with consumption volatility as the dependent variable. The coefficient on mobile money adoption is negative 0.084 and significant at the 1% level, indicating that a 10 percentage point increase in mobile money adoption reduces aggregate consumption volatility by 0.084 standard deviations, equivalent to approximately 8%. This substantial effect suggests that mobile money meaningfully enhances consumption smoothing at the national level. The magnitude is economically significant given that typical year-to-year variation in consumption volatility is on the order of 0.1 standard deviations.

Column 2 examines economic crisis incidence, defined as years with GDP per capita declines exceeding 2%. The coefficient on mobile money adoption is negative 0.015, significant at the 5% level, indicating that a 10 percentage point increase in adoption reduces crisis probability by 1.5 percentage points. Given that the baseline crisis rate in our sample is 18%, this represents approximately a 15% reduction in crisis incidence relative to the mean. This finding suggests that mobile money not only helps individual households cope with idiosyncratic shocks but also contributes to aggregate macroeconomic stability, perhaps by reducing the transmission of localized shocks into broader economic contractions.

Columns 3 through 5 add progressively more controls. Column 3 includes GDP per capita, mobile penetration, and banking depth, addressing concerns that mobile money simply proxies for overall economic and financial development. The mobile money coefficient remains negative 0.072 for consumption volatility and negative 0.013 for crisis incidence, both statistically significant. Column 4 adds governance quality and infrastructure measures, with mobile money coefficients remaining stable at negative 0.069 and negative 0.012 respectively. Column 5 includes country-specific linear time trends allowing each country to follow its own trajectory in resilience outcomes. Mobile money coefficients decline slightly to negative 0.058 and negative 0.010 but remain statistically significant, providing confidence that results are not driven by pre-existing differential trends between high and low mobile money adoption countries

Table 4. Household-Level Fixed Effects

Variable	Cons.Vol	Assets	School	Meals
Mobile Money User	-0.062***	-0.121***	-0.087***	-0.094***
	(0.014)	(0.028)	(0.024)	(0.026)
MM × Shock (Consumption)	0.221***			
	(0.052)			
Household FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	11,300	11,300	11,300	11,300

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 4 presents household-level fixed effects estimates using our five-country panel sample. Panel A shows results for consumption growth volatility. Column 1 presents a simple bivariate regression with household and time fixed effects, yielding a coefficient of negative 0.062 on mobile money adoption, significant at the 1% level. This indicates that mobile money users experience 6.2 percentage points lower consumption volatility than non-users with the same permanent characteristics. Column 2 adds time-varying household controls including size, dependency ratio, education, and assets. The coefficient declines modestly to negative 0.054 but remains highly significant.

Panel B examines effects on costly coping strategies among households experiencing shocks. Column 1 shows that mobile money users are 12.1 percentage points less likely to sell productive assets when facing shocks, a large effect given that 31% of shock-affected households sell assets. Column 2 demonstrates that users are 8.7 percentage points less likely to withdraw children from school following shocks, representing a 40% reduction from the baseline rate of 22%. Column 3 shows that users are 9.4 percentage points less likely to reduce meals, a 23% reduction from the baseline rate of 41%. These findings confirm that mobile money users employ less costly coping strategies, consistent with enhanced resilience through better access to alternative shock response mechanisms.

Panel C presents consumption levels following shocks as an alternative resilience measure. Among households experiencing negative shocks, mobile money users maintain consumption levels approximately 22% higher than non-users with similar characteristics. This substantial effect demonstrates that mobile money enables households to better maintain living standards during adverse periods, reducing the welfare costs of shocks.

Table 5. Difference-in-Differences

Variable	Cons.Vol	Assets	School
Post Agent Coverage	-0.061***	-0.102***	-0.078***
	(0.017)	(0.031)	(0.026)
Observations	11,300	11,300	11,300

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 5 implements the difference-in-differences specification exploiting staggered expansion of mobile money agent networks. This approach addresses endogeneity concerns by comparing households that gained mobile money access to those that did not yet have access, before and after coverage expansion. Column 1 shows that agent network coverage increases consumption smoothing, with the coefficient implying that gaining coverage reduces consumption volatility by 18%. Column 2 demonstrates reduced asset sales following coverage expansion, with treatment areas showing 10.2 percentage points lower asset sale rates than control areas after gaining coverage. Column 3 shows similar patterns for school withdrawal, with treatment effects of negative 7.8 percentage points.

The consistency of results across country-level and household-level analyses, across different resilience measures, and across alternative identification strategies provides confidence that mobile money genuinely enhances economic resilience. The magnitudes we estimate are economically substantial, with consumption volatility reductions of 15-20% and coping strategy reductions of 25-40%. These effects are comparable to or larger than effects of other development interventions such as cash transfer programs or microfinance, suggesting that mobile money represents a powerful tool for enhancing household resilience in Sub-Saharan Africa.

VII. HETEROGENEOUS EFFECTS

This section examines how mobile money's resilience effects vary across different population groups and contexts. Understanding heterogeneity is important for policy design, as identifying which populations benefit most from mobile money can inform targeting of financial inclusion interventions. Theoretically, we expect larger effects for populations facing greater baseline financial constraints and higher exposure to economic risks, as these groups have the most to gain from improved financial access.

Table 6. Urban vs Rural

Outcome	Rural	Urban	Diff	p-val
Cons. Volatility	-0.092***	-0.047**	-0.045	0.032
Asset Sales	-0.153***	-0.078**	-0.075	0.018
School Withdrawal	-0.104***	-0.061**	-0.043	0.089
Observations	7,684	3,616		

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 6 presents results by urban versus rural residence. Panel A shows that rural households experience substantially larger resilience benefits from mobile money than urban households. The consumption volatility reduction is 0.092 for rural households compared to 0.047 for urban households. Reductions in costly coping strategies are also larger in rural areas, with asset sale probabilities declining by 15.3 percentage points for rural users versus 7.8 percentage points for urban users. These differential effects likely reflect that rural areas have lower baseline financial access and face greater exposure to agricultural shocks, making mobile money more valuable. Rural areas also benefit more from the remittance channel, as rural-to-urban migration creates opportunities for geographic risk diversification that mobile money facilitates.

Table 7. Gender Heterogeneity

Outcome	**Female**	**Male**	**Diff**	**p-val**
Cons. Volatility	-0.084***	-0.058***	-0.026	0.041
Asset Sales	-0.147***	-0.102***	-0.045	0.067
School Withdrawal	-0.098***	-0.081***	-0.017	0.213
Observations	3,164	8,136		

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 7 examines heterogeneity by gender of household head. Female-headed households show resilience gains approximately 45% larger than male-headed households across most measures. Female-headed households reduce consumption volatility by 0.084 compared to 0.058 for male-headed households. Asset sales decline by 14.7 percentage points for female-headed households versus 10.2 percentage points for male-headed households. These larger effects for women likely reflect multiple factors. Women face greater baseline financial exclusion, with lower bank account ownership and credit access even controlling for income and education. Women also appear to use mobile money differently than men, with survey evidence indicating that women prioritize savings and remittances for household consumption smoothing while men use mobile money more for business transactions.

Table 8. Wealth Quintiles

Quintile	**Q1**	**Q2**	**Q3**	**Q4**	**Q5**
Cons. Volatility	-0.038*	-0.087***	-0.092***	-0.061***	-0.019
Asset Sales	-0.076**	-0.142***	-0.156***	-0.108***	-0.042
School Withdrawal	-0.062*	-0.095***	-0.101***	-0.089***	-0.038
Observations	2,260	2,260	2,260	2,260	2,260

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 8 presents results by baseline wealth quintile. Effects follow an inverted-U pattern across the wealth distribution. The poorest quintile shows positive but relatively small effects, with consumption volatility declining by 0.038. The second and third quintiles exhibit the largest effects, with volatility reductions of 0.087 and 0.092 respectively. The fourth quintile shows smaller effects of 0.061, while the wealthiest quintile exhibits minimal effects of 0.019 that are not statistically significant. This pattern suggests that very poor households remain constrained even with mobile money access, perhaps because extreme poverty limits ability to save or maintain social networks for risk sharing. Middle-income households benefit most as they have sufficient income to utilize mobile money's savings and credit features but face binding financial constraints without mobile money. Wealthy households show minimal effects because they already had financial access through traditional banking and were not financially constrained initially.

Table 9. Shock Types

Shock Type	**Consumption**	**Assets**	**School**
Health Shocks	0.283***	-0.168***	-0.112***
	(0.061)	(0.043)	(0.035)
Agricultural Shocks	0.194***	-0.114***	-0.089**
	(0.054)	(0.038)	(0.036)
Economic Shocks	0.217***	-0.125***	-0.093***
	(0.058)	(0.041)	(0.034)
Observations	11,300	11,300	11,300

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 9 examines whether effects differ by type of shock experienced. Panel A focuses on health shocks, showing particularly large mobile money effects. Consumption following health shocks is 28% higher for mobile money users than non-users, and asset sales decline by 16.8 percentage points. These large effects likely reflect that health shocks often require immediate cash to pay for medical expenses, and mobile money facilitates rapid receipt of remittances from relatives who can provide emergency assistance. Panel B examines agricultural shocks including droughts and crop failures. Mobile money effects are substantial but somewhat smaller than for health shocks, with consumption maintained 19% higher and asset sales reduced by 11.4 percentage points. Panel C looks at economic shocks such as unemployment and price spikes, finding intermediate effects between health and agricultural shocks.

Table 10. Network Heterogeneity

Network	Has	No	Diff	p-val
Urban Family: Cons.Vol	-0.098***	-0.052***	-0.046	0.019
Urban Family: Assets	-0.145***	-0.089***	-0.056	0.028
Large Family: Cons.Vol	-0.081***	-0.041**	-0.040	0.047
Large Family: Assets	-0.136***	-0.078***	-0.058	0.035
Many Contacts: Cons.Vol	-0.088***	-0.048***	-0.040	0.052

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 10 investigates whether effects vary by baseline social network characteristics measured in initial survey waves. Households with larger extended family networks benefit more from mobile money, consistent with remittances operating through family risk-sharing arrangements. Households with family members living in urban areas show particularly large effects, with consumption volatility declining by 0.098 compared to 0.052 for households without urban family connections. This pattern confirms that geographic diversification represents an important channel through which mobile money enhances resilience, as mobile money reduces the transaction costs of remittances between urban wage earners and rural agricultural households.

The heterogeneity analysis reveals that mobile money's resilience benefits concentrate among economically vulnerable populations including rural residents, women, and middle-income households. These findings have important policy implications, suggesting that efforts to expand mobile money access should prioritize rural areas and female users where marginal benefits are largest. The concentration of benefits among vulnerable populations also indicates that mobile money can serve equity objectives alongside efficiency goals, as those most in need of resilience improvements experience the largest gains.

REFERENCES

Aker, J. C. (2017). Using digital technology to improve agricultural extension: Evidence from Niger. *Agricultural Economics, 48*(S1), 35–48.

Aker, J. C., Boumnijel, R., McClelland, A., & Tierney, N. (2016). Payment mechanisms and anti-poverty programs: Evidence from a mobile money cash transfer experiment in Niger. *Economic Development and Cultural Change, 65*(1), 1–37.

Aker, J. C., & Mbiti, I. M. (2010). Mobile phones and economic development in Africa. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 24*(3), 207–232.

Blumenstock, J., Eagle, N., & Fafchamps, M. (2016). Airtime transfers and mobile communications: Evidence in the aftermath of natural disasters. *Journal of Development Economics, 120*, 157–181.

Dercon, S. (2002). Income risk, coping strategies, and safety nets. *The World Bank Research Observer, 17*(2), 141–166.

Friedman, M. (1957). *A theory of the consumption function.* Princeton University Press.

Hall, R. E. (1978). Stochastic implications of the life cycle–permanent income hypothesis: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Political Economy, 86*(6), 971–987.

Jack, W., & Suri, T. (2011). Mobile money: The economics of M-PESA. *NBER Working Paper No. 16721.* National Bureau of Economic Research.

Jack, W., & Suri, T. (2014). Risk sharing and transactions costs: Evidence from Kenya's mobile money revolution. *American Economic Review, 104*(1), 183–223.

Morawczynski, O., & Pickens, M. (2009). Poor people using mobile financial services: Observations on customer usage and impact from M-PESA. *CGAP Brief*. Washington, DC: Consultative Group to Assist the Poor.

Munyegera, G. K., & Matsumoto, T. (2016). Mobile money, remittances, and household welfare: Panel evidence from rural Uganda. *World Development, 79*, 127–137.

Riley, E. (2018). Mobile money and risk sharing against village shocks. *Journal of Development Economics, 135*, 43–58.

Suri, T., & Jack, W. (2016). The long-run poverty and gender impacts of mobile money. *Science, 354*(6317), 1288–1292.