Bundelkhand Journal of Academic Research

From Directive Principles to Socioeconomic Outcomes for Inclusive Development in India

Shivam Gupta[1], Khushi Gupta[2], Dr. Shambhu Nath Singh[3]

1. **Research Scholar,** Department of Banking, Economics and Finance, Bundelkhand University Jhansi.
2. **Reseach Scholar,** Department of Banking, Economics and Finance, Bundelkhand University Jhansi.
3. **Associate Professor & Research Supervisor,** Department of Banking, Economics and Finance, Bundelkhand University Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh.

(**Corresponding Author:** guptashivam8550@gmail.com)

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23005325

Abstract

Achieving meaningful inclusive development in India necessitates moving past conventional macroeconomic indicators toward an evaluation of how opportunities, productive assets, and welfare outcomes are distributed across societal strata. The Directive Principles of State Policy (DPSPs), contained in Part IV of the Constitution of India, provide a distinctive normative foundation for such an approach by articulating objectives related to social and economic justice, livelihood, equitable distribution of resources, education, health, nutrition and protection of disadvantaged groups. This study translates these constitutional imperatives into a unified framework spanning six interdependent dimensions: (i) economic justice and reduction of inequality, (ii) employment, livelihood and economic participation, (iii) education and human capability, (iv) Social justice and inclusion, (v) health, nutrition and basic wellbeing, and (vi) equitable distribution of resources and economic power. Each dimension is linked with illustrative socioeconomic indicators that can potentially be measured through established official statistical systems of the Government of India, including the National Statistical Office, Periodic Labour Force Survey, UDISE+, National Family Health Survey, Sample Registration System and other official sources. Drawing upon established multidimensional paradigms and indicator design methodologies, this paper eschews comparative state ranking to provide a systematic constitutional-to-empirical translation. The framework provides an analytical apparatus that directly correlates India's normative socioeconomic dimensions.

Article Info			
	Received: 08 Sept, 2026	**Accepted:** 21 Sept, 2026	**Published:** 30 Sept, 2026
	Table: 01	**Figures & Graphs:** 00	**Sources & Ref.:** 20
	Keywords:	Directive Principles; Inclusive Development; Constitutional, Social Justice; Inequality; Socioeconomic Indicators.	

1. Introduction:

Economic development is increasingly understood as a multidimensional process rather than simply an expansion of aggregate output. While economic growth remains important for generating resources and employment, development also concerns the distribution of opportunities, access to essential services, human capabilities, participation in economic activity and the extent to which disadvantaged groups share in socioeconomic progress. The World Bank's inclusive-growth approach emphasises sustained growth that creates opportunities for people to contribute to and benefit from economic expansion, while the OECD places emphasis on broad

participation, distribution of benefits and opportunities, inclusive labour markets and addressing the circumstances of people and places that may be left behind. (8, 18)

The capability approach provides an additional theoretical basis for this broader understanding of development. Amartya Kumar Sen (20) argues that development should be understood in terms of the expansion of substantive freedoms and capabilities available to individuals. From this perspective, income is an important means of development but does not by itself capture people's actual opportunities to live lives they value. Education, health, employment, social participation and access to resources consequently become central components of development. (20)

The Indian Constitution provides a distinctive normative foundation for considering these dimensions. Part IV of the Indian Constitution contains the Directive Principles of State Policy, which establish important socioeconomic objectives for the State. Article 38 calls for the promotion of a social order informed by justice and the reduction of inequalities; Article 39 addresses adequate livelihood and equitable distribution of material resources; Article 41 concerns work and education; Article 43 refers to living wages and decent conditions of work; Article 45 concerns early childhood care and education; Article 46 addresses the educational and economic interests of weaker sections; and Article 47 concerns nutrition, living standards and public health.(7)

The constitutional significance of these provisions is not dependent on their direct judicial enforceability. Article 37 states that the provisions contained in Part IV are not enforceable by any court but are nevertheless fundamental in the governance of the country and impose a duty upon the State to apply them in making laws (1). The Directives Principles thus function as an authoritative normative framework that systematically directs the socioeconomic priorities of state policy. Constitutional jurisprudence has long underscored the foundational role that socioeconomic rights and the Directive Principles occupy within India's structural design. Abeyratne and Jain (1) examine the relationship between socioeconomic rights and constitutional legitimacy in India and demonstrate the significance of the constitutional commitment to socioeconomic improvement. The DPSPs therefore provide an appropriate starting point for examining how constitutional objectives concerning justice, opportunity and welfare may be connected with contemporary approaches to development.

Contemporary inclusive-development literature reinforces the need for such a multidimensional perspective. Dörffel and Schuhmann (6) conceptualise inclusive development as a multidimensional phenomenon involving both the distribution of development achievements and the distribution of opportunities. Similarly, the OECD's framework for inclusive growth emphasises investment in people and places, inclusive labour markets, business dynamism and effective government.(18) This analytical orientation aligns directly with India's normative constitutional architecture; the DPSP's directing policy focus toward the structural distribution of social, economic and human-development concerns rather than focusing exclusively on national income.

India has also witnessed the development of multidimensional approaches to measuring inclusive development. Aggarwal(2) developed an Inclusive Development Index framework for Indian states using multiple dimensions and indicators, while subsequent work further examined the inclusiveness of Indian states through multidimensional measurement.(3) Although state-level multidimensional evaluations are well-established in empirical literature, these approaches typically overlook the preliminary step of translating foundational constitutional provisions into dimensions of inclusive development.

This study develops a DPSP-based conceptual framework for inclusive development in India. The study attempts to establish a systematic relationship between selected constitutional provisions, six dimensions of inclusive development and illustrative socioeconomic indicators.

This study argues that the DPSP's provide a coherent constitutional foundation for structuring socioeconomic dimensions of inclusive development. By connecting normative policy imperatives with official data sources, the resulting framework equips researchers with measurable indicators-establishing an analytical bridge between India's normative socioeconomic commitments and the measurable outcomes through which inclusive development can be examined.

2. Literature Review:

2.1. Inclusive Development as Multidimensional Concept: The concept of inclusive development has evolved beyond the traditional emphasis on aggregate economic growth. The World Bank's inclusive-growth framework links inclusiveness with sustained growth that creates opportunities for participation and ensures that people can benefit from economic expansion.(8) This framework treats distribution, opportunity and participation alongside growth, suggesting that the quality of development cannot be evaluated solely through aggregate output.

The OECD (18) similarly presents inclusive growth as a multidimensional policy objective. Its framework emphasises opportunities for people and regions that may be left behind, inclusive labour markets, investment in human capabilities and responsive institutions. This perspective underpins the present research, as the foundational imperatives of inclusive development principally employment, education, social opportunity and public welfare-are also reflected in the DPSPs of the Indian Constitution.

Dörffel and Schuhmann (6) further demonstrate that inclusiveness cannot be reduced to a single socioeconomic variable. Their multidimensional inclusiveness framework considers both the distribution of development achievements and the distribution of opportunities. This underscores the imperative to evaluate developmental outcomes across interconnected dimensions, demonstrating the clear limitations of treating income or consumption expenditure as exhaustive measures of structural inclusion.

Sen's (20) capability approach provides a complementary theoretical foundation. Development, from this perspective, involves expansion of the substantive freedoms and capabilities through which individuals can pursue lives they value. Education, health, economic participation and access to resources therefore have intrinsic and instrumental importance. The present framework incorporates this capability perspective particularly through its education, employment, health and resource dimensions.

2.2. Constitutional Foundations of Socioeconomic Development: The Directive Principles represent a distinctive component of India's constitutional architecture because they articulate socioeconomic objectives that should guide State policy. Article 38 establishes the broad objective of social and economic justice and reduction of inequalities. Article 39 expands this orientation through provisions concerning livelihood, resource distribution and prevention of concentration of wealth. Articles 41, 43, 45, 46 and 47 further extend the constitutional vision to work, education, weaker sections, nutrition and public health.(7)

Abeyratne and Jain (1) demonstrate the wider significance of socioeconomic commitments in the Indian constitutional framework. Their analysis supports the view that socioeconomic development is not external to constitutional legitimacy but forms an important part of the constitutional vision.

The constitutional provisions should not, however, be interpreted as a ready-made statistical framework. The Constitution does not prescribe a particular set of indicators for measuring the achievement of its socioeconomic objectives. Instead, the provisions establish broad normative principles. Translating those principles into empirical dimensions therefore requires conceptual interpretation and careful operationalisation.

2.3. From Normative Principles to Measurable Indicators: The movement from normative principles to measurable indicators requires a clear conceptual framework. The OECD/European

Union/EC-JRC (15) emphasises that indicator construction should begin with a sound theoretical framework that defines the phenomenon and its relevant sub-components. Indicator selection should then be guided by analytical soundness, relevance, measurability and other clearly specified criteria rather than by data availability alone. This methodological principle is important for the present study.

Indian research demonstrates that multidimensional socioeconomic frameworks can be operationalised using multiple indicators. Aggarwal (2) developed a multidimensional Inclusive Development Index for Indian states, while Aggarwal (3) examined inclusiveness across states through a broader indicator framework. These studies provide an empirical precedent for multidimensional analysis while also highlighting the importance of theoretical selection and statistical methodology.

2.4. Research Gap: Existing scholarship remains fragmented across three distinct domains: theoretical work on inclusive growth and inclusive development, capability and human-development approaches; and jurisprudence on Indian constitutional welfare mandates. Although quantitative frameworks have established methods for capturing multidimensional well-being, the specific methodological link between constitutional principles and measurable indicators has yet to be systematically established.

The primary contribution of this paper therefore addresses a conceptual rather than empirical deficit: the lack of an analytical model that maps DPSP provisions to rigorous socioeconomic dimensions and representative indicators. By constructing this constitutional-toempirical bridge prior to—and independent of—composite index aggregation, the paper establishes a coherent theoretical basis for evaluating inclusive progress through India's administrative statistical architecture.

3. Research Methodology:

3.1. Selection of Constitutional Provisions: Methodologically, this study adopts a conceptual framework design protocol, beginning with the purposive identification of DPSP provisions with direct socioeconomic significance. Articles 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46 and 47 are selected because they explicitly address social and economic justice, livelihood, work, education, weaker sections, nutrition and public health. (7)

This selection strategy is intentionally purposively rather than exhaustive. Constructing a framework focused specifically on inclusive development does not necessitate cataloging every directive within Part IV; rather, the chosen articles represent those constitutional objectives that bear the most direct analytical link to the distribution of economic opportunities, human capabilities, social inclusion and basic well-being.

3.2. Formation of Development Dimensions: The framework's second phase organizes these constitutional directives into six core dimensions. Rather than applying a mechanical, one-to-one classification, this conceptual grouping is deliberately interpretive: individual provisions frequently inform multiple dimensions, while several articles coalesce to support a unified developmental domain.

The six dimensions are: (1) Economic Justice and Reduction of Inequality; (2) Employment, Livelihood and Economic Participation; (3) Education and Human Capability; (4) Social Justice and Inclusion; (5) Health, Nutrition and Basic Well-being; and (6) Equitable Distribution of Resources and Economic Power. The six dimensions reflect the multidimensional character of inclusive development identified in the literature. (6, 18, 20) They combine economic outcomes, economic participation, human capabilities, social inclusion, basic well-being and structural access to resources. This combination allows inclusive development to be understood as a process involving both outcomes and opportunities.

3.3. Selection of Illustrative Indicators: The third stage involves selecting illustrative indicators for each dimension. Four criteria guide this process: conceptual relevance, measurability, official

data availability and potential comparability. These criteria are consistent with the methodological principles identified by OECD/European Union/EC-JRC (15), which emphasise the importance of establishing the theoretical basis before selecting indicators. This indicator set is designed as an illustrative baseline rather than a closed inventory. It demonstrates the empirical viability of constitutional directives while leaving room for subsequent empirical studies to modify, expand or prune specific variables based on formal sensitivity analyses and rigorous data-quality evaluations.

3.4. Official Data-Source Strategy: Preference is given to established Government of India statistical systems because they provide standardised socioeconomic information suitable for future empirical research. The PLFS provides key labour market indicators including LFPR, WPR and unemployment rate.(13) UDISE+ provides education-system indicators including enrolment and dropout measures.(5,10) The HCES provides state-level information on consumption expenditure and Gini coefficients(12), while NITI Aayog's National MPI provides multidimensional poverty estimates. (14)

Health and demographic indicators can be obtained from official sources such as the Sample Registration System and National Family Health Survey. The SRS provides estimates including infant mortality and other demographic indicators, while the SRS maternal mortality bulletins provide estimates of maternal mortality.(16,17) NFHS provides state-level indicators related to child nutritional status, including stunting.(9) These sources demonstrate the potential feasibility of connecting the conceptual dimensions with official socioeconomic data.

Resource-related indicators require different sources. The All India Debt and Investment Survey provides information on household assets and liabilities.(11) Landholding distribution can be examined through the Agriculture Census(4), while formal financial access can be represented using appropriate official banking and financial-inclusion statistics. The Reserve Bank of India maintains financial-inclusion statistics and its Financial Inclusion Index incorporates dimensions of access, usage and quality. (19)

3.5. Analytical Scope and Limitations: By design, the scope of this paper is confined to conceptual taxonomy and indicator mapping. It deliberately avoids empirical aggregation techniques—such as normalization, variable weighting, composite scoring, and state-level rankings—ensuring that the model serves as an analytical apparatus rather than an exhaustive index of constitutional adherence. This delimitation stems from the recognition that normative constitutional principles are conceptually broader than any single empirical metric. A conventional unemployment indicator reflects labour-market frictions but falls short of measuring the substantive realization of constitutional livelihood rights; likewise, asset-distribution data tracks material ownership without fully capturing structural economic power.

Accordingly, translating this framework into an empirical instrument will require systematic validation in subsequent studies. Methodological priorities for future research include expert review, dimensionality testing, sensitivity analyses, and assessments of administrative data consistency across subnational jurisdictions.

4. Framework Development

4.1. Economic Justice and Reduction of Inequality: The first dimension is Economic Justice and Reduction of Inequality, primarily grounded in Article 38. Article 38 establishes the objective of promoting a social order informed by social, economic and political justice and reducing inequalities in income, status, facilities and opportunities.(7) This provides a direct constitutional basis for considering both economic wellbeing and distributional outcomes.

Three illustrative indicators are proposed: Per Capita Net State Domestic Product (PCNSDP), Multidimensional Poverty Headcount Ratio and Gini Coefficient of consumption expenditure. PCNSDP represents the average economic resource base of a state, while multidimensional poverty captures deprivation across several dimensions and the Gini coefficient captures the distribution of consumption expenditure. (12,14)

4.2. Employment, Livelihood and Economic Participation: The second dimension is Employment, Livelihood and Economic Participation, based primarily on Articles 39(a), 41 and 43. Article 39(a) concerns adequate means of livelihood, Article 41 concerns work, and Article 43 refers to living wages and decent conditions of work. (7)

The proposed indicators are Labour Force Participation Rate, Worker Population Ratio and Unemployment Rate. These indicators are available through the PLFS, which is the principal official source for labour-market indicators in India.(13) LFPR captures labour-market participation, WPR captures actual employment and unemployment rate identifies the proportion of the labour force without employment.

4.3. Education and Human Capability: The third dimension is Education and Human Capability, grounded in Articles 41, 45 and 46. These provisions establish constitutional concern for education and for the educational interests of weaker sections.(7) Education also has a central role in the capability approach because it expands individuals' ability to participate in economic and social life.(20)

The proposed indicators are Gross Enrolment Ratio, school dropout rate and literacy rate. GER provides information about educational participation, dropout rate captures retention and literacy provides a broad measure of basic educational attainment. UDISE+ is an important official source for school-level indicators and publishes state-level dropout statistics.(5,10)

4.4. Social Justice and Inclusion: The fourth dimension is Social Justice and Inclusion, primarily associated with Articles 38 and 46. Article 38 emphasises equality of opportunity, while Article 46 specifically concerns the educational and economic interests of weaker sections and their protection from social injustice. (7) Unlike the first three dimensions, this dimension focuses primarily on gaps between social groups. The proposed indicators are SC/ST educational participation gap, SC/ST employment participation gap and gender gap in economic participation. Relevant information can be drawn from official education and labour-market datasets, particularly UDISE+ and PLFS. (5,10,13)

4.5. Health, Nutrition and Basic Well-being: The fifth dimension is Health, Nutrition and Basic Well-being, based on Articles 39(e) and 47. Article 39(e) concerns protection of the health and strength of workers, while Article 47 directs the State toward improving nutrition, living standards and public health.(7) The proposed indicators are Infant Mortality Rate, Maternal Mortality Ratio and child stunting rate. The SRS provides official estimates of infant mortality and other demographic indicators, while the SRS maternal mortality bulletins provide maternal mortality estimates. (16,17) NFHS provides nationally comparable state-level information on nutritional outcomes, including child stunting. (9)

4.6. Equitable Distribution of Resources and Economic Power: The sixth dimension is Equitable Distribution of Resources and Economic Power, grounded primarily in Articles 39(b) and 39(c). These provisions concern the distribution of material resources and prevention of concentration of wealth and means of production. (7)

Three illustrative indicators are proposed: household asset distribution, distribution of operational landholdings and access to formal financial resources. The AIDIS provides official information concerning household assets and liabilities. (11) Landholding distribution can be examined using Agriculture Census data(4), while formal financial access can be examined using official banking and financial-inclusion statistics.(19)

4.7. Integrated Constitutional Framework: The six dimensions collectively establish the study's integrated framework, progressing from Directive Principles of State Policy→Constitutional socioeconomic principles→ Six dimensions of inclusive development→Illustrative socioeconomic indicators→ Future empirical analysis. This sequence serves as an analytical bridge rather than a rigid causal chain: constitutional provisions supply the normative baseline, the dimensions provide categorical structure, and the indicators offer measurable proxies. Accordingly, the six dimensions

are conceived as intrinsically interdependent, capturing the multifaceted and indivisible nature of constitutional welfare.

Table-1: DPSP Based Integrated Framework for Inclusive Development

DPSP Provisons	Constitutional Principle	Dimensions	Indicators	Primary Official Data
Article-38	Social and Economic Justice; reduction of inequalities	D1. Economic Justice and Reduction of Inequality	PCNSDP; Multidimensional Poverty Headcount Ratio; Gini Coefficient	MoSPI; NITI Aayog; RBI
Article 39(a), 41 & 43	Adequate livelihood, work, living wage and decent conditions	D2. Employment, Livelihood and Economic Participation	LFPR; WPR; Unemployment Rate	PLFS; MoSPI
Article 41, 45 & 46	Education and promotion of educational interests of weaker sections	D3. Education and Human Capability	GER; Dropout Rate; Literacy Rate	UDISE+; Ministry of Education; official statistics UDISE+; PLFS
Article 38 & 46	Equality of opportunity; protection and advancement of weaker sections	D4. Social Justice and Inclusion	GER; SC/ST Economic and Employment Gap; Gender Participation Gap	UDISE+; PLFS
Article 39(e) & 47	Protection of health; nutrition and public health	D5. Health, Nutrition and Basic Well-Being	IMR; MMR; Child Stunting	SRS/ORGI; NFHS
Article 39(b) & 39(c)	Equitable distribution of material resources	D6.Equitable Distribution of Resources and Economic Power	Operational Landholding Distribution; Formal Financial Access	AIDIS/NSO; Agriculture Census; RBI

Source: Author's conceptual framework based on the Constitution of India and established Government of India statistical systems.

5. Operationalisation through Official Socioeconomic Indicators:

5.1. Economic Justice and Reduction of Inequality: The first dimension combines economic resources, deprivation and distribution. PCNSDP provides an indication of average economic production, multidimensional poverty identifies broader deprivation and the Gini coefficient provides a distribution-sensitive measure of consumption inequality. India's HCES provides official Gini estimates at the state level, while NITI Aayog's National MPI provides multidimensional poverty estimates. (12,14)

5.2. Employment, Livelihood and Economic Participation: The second dimension can be operationalised through LFPR, WPR and unemployment rate. The PLFS officially reports these labour-market indicators and is therefore the principal data source for future applications of this dimension.(13)

5.3. Education and Human Capability: The third dimension can be operationalised through GER, dropout rate and literacy. UDISE+ provides official school-education statistics, including state-level dropout rates. The Ministry of Education's recent UDISE+ material also cautions that changes in data systems and population projections can affect comparability across years, making methodological harmonisation necessary for future empirical research.(5,10)

5.4. Social Justice and Inclusion: Assessing the fourth dimension involves measuring inter-group divides in socioeconomic access. Tracking educational and labour-force gaps across gender and caste identities (notably SC/ST groups) operationalizes how structural barriers limit economic participation. The underlying framework assumes that reduced disparities reflect greater social inclusion, contingent upon rigorous gap specification.

This dimension deliberately departs from aggregate indicators. Favourable state-level averages in employment or education frequently mask pronounced disparities among marginalized groups.

The inclusion dimension thus supplements conventional indicators by embedding an explicit horizontal, equity-focused perspective into the evaluation of development outcomes.

5.5. Health, Nutrition and Basic Well-being: Health indicators can be obtained from established official sources. The SRS is designed to provide demographic and mortality estimates at national and sub-national levels, including infant mortality, while the SRS maternal mortality bulletin provides estimates of maternal mortality (16, 17). NFHS provides comparable information on nutritional outcomes, including child stunting. These data demonstrate the feasibility of connecting the constitutional concern for nutrition and public health with observable socioeconomic outcomes. (9)

5.6. Equitable Distribution of Resources and Economic Power: The sixth dimension requires structural indicators. AIDIS provides official information on household asset ownership and liabilities and therefore offers an important source for examining household resource distribution (11). Landholding distribution and formal financial access provide complementary information. Land ownership represents an important productive resource, while access to formal financial services can affect households' ability to save, borrow, invest and participate in economic activity. RBI financial-inclusion statistics provide an institutional basis for examining access, usage and quality of financial services. (4,19)

5.7. Data Feasibility and Future Empirical Application: The proposed framework is compatible with India's existing statistical infrastructure, but data availability should not determine the conceptual framework by itself. The OECD/European Union/EC-JRC (15) emphasises that indicator selection should be based on a sound theoretical understanding of the phenomenon. Accordingly, an indicator should be retained because it provides a meaningful representation of the dimension, not simply because it is readily available. Differences in frequency, reference periods, definitions and geographic coverage will need to be considered in future empirical applications. For example, UDISE+ has undergone changes in data collection and methodology, while labour-market statistics have their own survey definitions and reference periods. (4,5,9,10,11,12,13,14,16,17,19)

6. Discussion and Theoretical Contribution:

6.1. A Constitutional Indication for Inclusive Development: This paper's central theoretical contribution consists of anchoring inclusive development analysis in the constitutional framework itself. Rather than evaluating pre-existing composite metrics against constitutional norms after the fact, the framework begins with specific DPSP provisions and operationalizes their welfare mandates into structured developmental categories.

Importantly, this model does not treat constitutional directives as a prescriptive statistical model. It recognizes the DPSPs as an overarching normative foundation from which conceptual categories can be developed—clearly distinguishing between constitutional provisions as broad teleological aims and empirical indicators as observable, measurable proxies.

6.2. Multidimensionality: The six dimensions reflect the multidimensional nature of inclusive development identified by OECD (18), Sen (20) and Dörffel and Schuhmann (6). Economic justice, employment, education, social inclusion, health, and resource distribution constitute indivisible aspects of structural progress. Observable interdependencies—such as the impact of education on livelihood security, health on labor productivity, asset ownership on economic resilience, and social marginalization on institutional access—confirm that these dimensions function as complementary analytical pillars rather than independent categories.

6.3. Social Inclusion as a Separate Dimension: The explicit inclusion of social justice as a separate dimension is another theoretical contribution. Aggregate socioeconomic indicators can conceal persistent differences between social groups. Articles 38 and 46 provide a constitutional basis for examining these disparities (7). The proposed gap indicators therefore add a distributional and group-sensitive dimension to the framework. This approach is consistent with the broader

inclusive-development literature, which emphasises the importance of opportunities and participation rather than simply average outcomes.(6,18) It also aligns with the capability perspective, under which individuals' actual opportunities may differ substantially even when average economic conditions are similar.(20)

6.4. Relationship with Existing Development Indices: The proposed framework provides a different conceptual starting point. Existing measures generally begin from development concepts and construct indicators around those concepts, whereas the present framework begins from constitutional socioeconomic principles. India's existing multidimensional research provides evidence that inclusive development can be studied through multiple indicators and dimensions. Aggarwal (2, 3) demonstrates the feasibility of multidimensional state-level assessment.

6.5. Methodological Contribution: Methodologically, the framework maintains a clear distinction among three levels: constitutional principles, analytical dimensions and empirical indicators. This distinction is consistent with the OECD/European Union/EC-JRC (15) emphasis on establishing a theoretical framework before indicator selection. It prevents the indicators from being mistaken for the constitutional principles themselves.

Conclusions: The Directive Principles of State Policy constitute an important constitutional foundation for understanding India's socioeconomic objectives. Articles 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46 and 47 collectively address social and economic justice, livelihood, employment, education, weaker sections, nutrition and public health.(7) Taken together, these provisions offer a foundational architecture that directly aligns with modern theoretical paradigms of inclusive development.

This study has operationalized these constitutional commitments into six structured analytical dimensions: (i) economic justice and inequality reduction, (ii) employment, livelihood, and economic participation, (iii) education and human capability, (iv) Social justice and group inclusion, (v) public health, nutrition, and foundational wellbeing, and (vi) the equitable distribution of resources and economic power.

By mapping each dimension to administrative data sources and representative indicators, the study delineates a viable pathway from constitutional norms to empirical observation. Rather than claiming an exhaustive measurement of constitutional fulfilment, the proposed framework positions these statistical variables as empirical proxies that capture observed welfare outcomes and underlying structural conditions. Consequently, the core scholarly contribution does not lie in introducing an additional aggregate development index, but in establishing a rigorous conceptual bridge between constitutional principles and empirical socioeconomic analysis required for organising a multidimensional understanding of inclusive development.

The Directive Principles supply a distinct normative framework for analysing inclusive development in India. By mapping constitutional provisions to observable socioeconomic indicators across six interdependent dimensions, this study establishes a vital analytical bridge between codified state obligations and empirical development research. In doing so, it provides a robust, theoretically grounded foundation to guide future empirical inquiries into the realization of India's socioeconomic constitutional mandate.

References:

1. Abeyratne, R. (2014). Socioeconomic rights in the Indian Constitution: Toward a broader conception of legitimacy. Brooklyn Journal of International Law, 39(1), 1–71.
2. Aggarwal, S. C. (2021). Inclusiveness and the progress of Indian states: Evidence from Inclusive Development Index between 2011 and 2018. Indian Journal of Human Development, 15(2), 200–228. https://doi.org/10.1177/09737030211008688
3. Aggarwal, S. C. (2023). How inclusive are Indian states: Evidence from Inclusive Development Index. Arthaniti: Journal of Economic Theory and Practice, 22(2), 151–180. https://doi.org/10.1177/0976747920985455
4. Agriculture Census 2015–16: All India report on number and area of operational holdings. Government of India. Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Government of India. (2019).

5. Department of School Education & Literacy, UDISE+: Publications & Statistics. Retrieved September 6, 2026, from UDISE+Publications & Statistics. https://udiseplus.gov.in/#/en/page/publications
6. Dörffel, C., & Schuhmann, S. (2022). What is inclusive development? Introducing the Multidimensional Inclusiveness Index. Social Indicators Research, 162, 1117–1148. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-021-02860-y
7. Government of India. (1950). The Constitution of India. Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice.
8. Ianchovichina, E., & Lundström, S. (2009). Inclusive growth analytics: Framework and application (Policy Research Working Paper No. 4851). World Bank.
9. International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), & ICF. (2021). National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5), 2019–21: India. IIPS.
10. UDISE. (2025). UDISE+ report 2024–25: Existing structure. Government of India. https://dashboard.udiseplus.gov.in/report2026/static/media/UDISE+2024_25_Booklet_existing.118ba29d4773e6372f72.pdf
11. National Statistical Office. (2021). All India debt and investment survey, 2019 (NSS 77th Round) (Report No. 588). Government of India. https://www.pib.gov.in/Pressreleaseshare.aspx?PRID=1753935&lang=2&reg=48
12. National Statistical Office. (2025). Household Consumption Expenditure Survey (HCES), 2023–24. Government of India.
13. National Statistical Office. (2026). Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS): Annual report, 2025. https://www.mospi.gov.in/uploads/publications_reports/publications_reports178004041 5321 _0624fb13-fb47-40bc-b470-7c7e9635c3ef_PLFS_2025_F_REV_29052026.pdf
14. NITI Aayog. (2023). National multidimensional poverty index: A progress review 2023. Government of India.
15. OECD/European Union/ EC-JRC (2008). Handbook on constructing composite indicators: Methodology and user guide.OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264043466-en
16. Office of the Registrar General (2026). Sample Registration System (SRS) bulletin 2024 (Vol. 59, Issue 1). Government of India.https://censusindia.gov.in/nada/index.php/catalog/47151
17. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India. (2026). Sample Registration System (SRS): Special bulletin on maternal mortality in India 2022–24. Government of India.
18. OECD (2018). Opportunities for all: A framework for policy action on inclusive growth. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301665-en
19. Reserve Bank of India. (2025). Annual report 2024–25. Reserve Bank of India.
20. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

=====

Cite the article:	Gupta, Shivam, Gupta, Khushi and Singh, Dr. Shambhu Nath (2026). From Directive Principles to Socioeconomic Outcomes for Inclusive Development in India. Bundelkhand Journal of Academic Research (BJAR), Volume-2, Issue-3, July-September 2026, Page 184-193. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23005325