Scholedge International Journal of *Management & Development*
ISSN 2394-3378 Vol. 13, Issue 01 (2026)
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.19085/sijmd130102

Demographic Dividend, Skill Development, and Economic Outcomes in India

Satish Kumar[1] & Parveen Shukla[2]
[1]SKS Consulting & Advisors, India
[2]Delhi-based Independent Management Consultant, India

ABSTRACT

India holds one of the most discussed demographic positions in the world right now. With more than 900 million people projected to be of working age by the mid-2040s, the country has what economists call a demographic dividend, meaning a window in time when the proportion of working-age people relative to dependents reaches its peak. In theory, this window should translate into higher savings, greater investment, and faster economic growth. In practice, the translation has proven far more complicated.

This paper examines how India's demographic structure, its skill development programs, and actual economic outcomes are connected, including where the connections break down. Drawing on demographic and human capital theory, government policy documents, and published empirical research, it argues that India's demographic dividend remains only partially realized. The main reason is that skill development programs, despite their scale and ambition, have not consistently produced workers with skills that match what the labor market actually demands. Training quality, industry alignment, and geographic reach are all areas where the current system falls short.

The paper also examines the structural barriers that compound this problem: low female labor force participation, the dominance of informal employment, and wide regional disparities in education and training access. Without changes that go beyond enrollment numbers and headline targets, the dividend that India's population structure makes possible will remain more statistical than real.

Keywords: Demographic dividend, skill development, human capital, India, labor market, economic growth

INTRODUCTION

There is a recurring observation in development economics that population structure matters as much as population size. A country with a large working-age population and relatively few dependents has a structural advantage in wealth creation, provided it uses that advantage well. East Asia demonstrated this during the 1970s through the 1990s, when rapid demographic shifts coincided with deliberate investment in education and economic openness to produce growth rates that surprised the world. Bloom and Williamson (1998) estimated that demographic change accounted for nearly one-third of the East Asian economic miracle during that period.

India is now sitting in a structurally similar position, though the economic context and the institutional environment are quite different. With a median age of around 24 years at the time of the 2011 census, India entered the new decade as one of the world's youngest large economies (Census of India, 2011). NITI Aayog (2018) projected that this youthful demographic structure would persist well into the 2040s, giving India an extended window to benefit from favorable age ratios. The working-age population, defined as those between 15 and 64 years, was projected to exceed 65% of the total population through the 2020s and 2030s.

But the demographic dividend, as Bloom, Canning, and Sevilla (2003) made clear in their foundational RAND study, is not automatic. Countries capture the dividend when they invest in the right things: education, health, and institutional frameworks that allow labor markets to absorb productive workers efficiently. Countries that fail on these fronts see the arithmetic of favorable age ratios translate into mass unemployment, social unrest, and economic stagnation rather than growth.

India's record on these fronts is uneven. Drèze and Sen (2013) drew attention to the persistent gap between India's economic growth story and the actual human development outcomes for its population. Despite decades of respectable GDP growth, investments in education quality, health infrastructure, and skill training have often been insufficient in scale, inconsistent in quality, or poorly aligned with what the labor market actually requires.

The government has recognized this problem and tried to address it. The Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship (2015) launched the National Policy for Skill Development and Entrepreneurship with targets that were ambitious by any measure, including training 400 million people by 2022 across a range of vocational and technical domains. The Planning Commission (2013) had already identified skill development as a strategic national priority in the Twelfth Five Year Plan. But setting targets and hitting them are different things, and the quality of the training delivered has remained a serious concern.

This paper takes a close look at how India's demographic dividend, its skill development efforts, and the economic outcomes visible in employment and productivity data are connected. Section 2 sets out the conceptual framework. Section 3 examines India's demographic profile in more detail. Section 4 reviews the skill development ecosystem. Section 5 analyzes the relationship between skill training and economic outcomes. Section 6 addresses the structural challenges that limit the dividend. Section 7 concludes.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The Demographic Dividend

The demographic dividend concept describes the economic windfall that can accompany a particular phase of the demographic transition. During this transition, birth and death rates both fall, but not at the same speed. Death rates typically fall first, producing a period of rapid population growth. As birth rates then decline, the large cohorts born during the high-growth period move into working age, creating a situation where the labor force is large relative to both the young and the elderly.

Bloom, Canning, and Sevilla (2003) argued that this favorable ratio supports economic growth through several channels. Households with fewer children save more, increasing the pool of capital available for investment. Governments can direct resources away from child-focused spending toward infrastructure and productive public investment. Workers entering the labor force during this period can accumulate more experience and earn higher wages than would be possible in a more age-balanced population. The net effect, when labor markets and institutions are functioning well, is a sustained period of above-average growth.

Bloom and Williamson (1998) tested this argument empirically using data from East Asian economies and found strong support. Their analysis attributed approximately a third of East Asia's growth premium during the miracle decades to demographic change. But they also found that the dividend was conditional: economies with flexible labor markets, open trade regimes, and strong human capital investment captured the dividend most effectively. Those without these conditions did not.

Human Capital and Skill Formation

The connection between demographic structure and economic outcomes runs through human capital. Schultz (1961) argued, in what remains one of the foundational papers in development economics, that education and skill acquisition are forms of investment in people. They raise the productive capacity of the individual and, in aggregate, of the economy. This reframing, which treated education as investment rather than mere consumption, changed how economists and policymakers thought about returns to training.

Becker (1964) extended this framework into a theory of human capital that distinguished between general training, which raises worker productivity across all employers, and specific training, which only raises productivity in particular contexts. This distinction matters for skill development policy because general training has positive externalities and tends to be underprovided by the private sector alone. Without public support, firms underinvest in it because they cannot capture all the returns when workers move between employers.

Mincer (1974) added an empirical dimension to the human capital framework by estimating the returns to education and experience in earnings data. His work established that schooling and experience are the two primary determinants of earnings and that their combined effect is large and statistically robust. This gave policymakers a concrete argument for investing in education and training: the returns show up in wages, which reflect productivity.

Together, these theoretical frameworks suggest that a country sitting on a large working-age population has a structural opportunity, but one that it must actively convert into productive outcomes through human capital investment. The demographic arithmetic creates the opportunity; skill formation is the mechanism through which it becomes a realized economic gain.

Labor Supply and Gender

Any serious analysis of India's demographic dividend has to confront the gender dimension of labor supply. Goldin (2006) documented the sweeping transformation of women's labor force participation in the United States and showed that it was among the most consequential economic shifts of the twentieth century. The expansion of women's participation increased aggregate labor supply, changed the composition of human capital in the economy, and had measurable effects on household income, family structure, and economic growth.

India faces this problem from the opposite direction. Female labor force participation in India is among the lowest in the world for a country at its level of development, and the gap between male and female participation has been widening in some states. This means that projections of India's working-age population significantly overstate the actual labor supply available to the economy. The dividend looks smaller once female participation rates are factored in, and the economic cost of continuing exclusion grows larger each year.

India's Demographic Profile

India's population crossed 1.2 billion at the time of the 2011 census, and projections suggest it crossed 1.4 billion around 2023, making it the most populous country in the world. But the size of the population, while striking, is less important for economic purposes than its structure.

The 2011 census showed that about 63% of India's population was in the 15–59 age bracket, which represents the core working-age group, with particularly large cohorts in the 15–29 range (Census of India, 2011). The median age of approximately 24 years placed India well below China, the United States, and most of Western Europe. Chandrasekhar, Ghosh, and Roychowdhury (2006) had argued in the Economic

and Political Weekly that this demographic structure created a window of opportunity that India needed to exploit before the age distribution shifted toward an older profile.

NITI Aayog (2018), in its Strategy for New India @ 75, projected that India would retain a relatively young age structure until around 2055–2060, when the country would begin aging more rapidly. This gives India a longer demographic window than East Asia had, but it also means the pressure on skill development and employment generation is sustained over a longer period.

The regional variation in India's demographic profile is significant. States like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh still have high fertility rates and younger populations, while states like Kerala, Tamil Nadu, and Himachal Pradesh have already moved through the demographic transition and have older, slower-growing populations. This variation means the national picture obscures important sub-national differences. Many of the states that are youngest and have the most to gain from the dividend are also the states with the weakest educational infrastructure and the lowest per capita incomes.

The scale of India's annual addition to the working-age population has been estimated at roughly 12 to 15 million per year. This is the number of young people the economy needs to absorb productively each year just to keep unemployment stable. Against that backdrop, the question of skill development becomes less about policy design in the abstract and more about operational capacity at extraordinary scale.

Skill Development in India: Architecture and Programs

The formal structure of skill development in India is spread across multiple ministries and agencies, which creates coordination challenges that have been noted repeatedly in policy reviews. The Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, created in 2014, brought greater focus and institutional attention to the sector. Its flagship program, Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana (PMKVY), became the largest skills initiative in the country by coverage, though its quality outcomes have been widely debated.

The National Policy for Skill Development and Entrepreneurship (Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, 2015) set out the government's vision for building a skilled workforce at national scale. The policy recognized that India's workforce was overwhelmingly informal and that the vocational education and training system needed substantial restructuring to meet the demands of a modernizing economy. The stated aspiration was to skill, reskill, and upskill 400 million people by 2022, an ambitious target that reflected both the scale of the challenge and the urgency of the moment.

The Twelfth Five Year Plan (Planning Commission, 2013) had already flagged skill development as one of the critical themes for India's development. The plan noted that less than 5% of India's workforce had received formal vocational training at that time, compared with more than 80% in developed economies. This gap was not merely a statistical point; it reflected a structural weakness in productivity and earnings potential for the overwhelming majority of Indian workers.

The institutional ecosystem that has grown around skill development includes the National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC), sector skill councils for different industry segments, and a network of Industrial Training Institutes (ITIs) that have been in operation since the 1950s. The ITI network has been expanded substantially, but the quality of training in many institutes remains inconsistent. Infrastructure is often outdated, instructors are sometimes undertrained, and the curricula have not always kept up with changes in industry requirements.

The National Skill Qualification Framework (NSQF), introduced to create a standardized system for recognizing and certifying skills across different levels, was a significant structural reform. It attempted to create pathways from informal training to formal certification and from vocational qualifications to higher education, addressing a long-standing problem where vocational credentials were treated as terminal rather than as steps on a longer learning progression.

The World Bank (2019) noted in its World Development Report that the nature of work is changing rapidly in ways that make traditional approaches to skills training insufficient. Automation and digitization are reshaping demand for skills across sectors, with routine cognitive and manual tasks being replaced by automation while demand for social, creative, and technical skills grows. India's skill development system, which was designed primarily around the needs of manufacturing and traditional services, faces the additional pressure of preparing workers for a labor market being restructured by technology faster than training systems can typically adapt.

SKILL DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC OUTCOMES

Returns to Education and Training

The relationship between skill development and economic outcomes is not straightforward in the Indian context, and the data available to assess it are imperfect. But several patterns are visible. The basic human capital prediction, that more education and training produces higher earnings, is broadly confirmed in Indian labor market data. Workers with secondary or higher education consistently earn more than those without, and workers with certified vocational training tend to earn more than those with comparable general education but no vocational credentials. These wage premiums are consistent with the theoretical predictions of Schultz (1961), Becker (1964), and Mincer (1974).

The returns are not uniform, though. In the Indian context, the returns to education depend heavily on the quality of that education, the sector of employment, and the geographic location of the worker. A worker with a vocational certificate from a well-resourced ITI in an urban setting with strong employer linkages can expect meaningfully different outcomes than a worker with a similar certificate from a poorly equipped institute in a rural district. The average figures obscure this variation, which is large.

Productivity and Informal Employment

Perhaps the most persistent economic cost of inadequate skill development in India is visible in the productivity of the informal sector. The informal economy accounts for roughly 90% of employment in India and a large share of output, but productivity in the informal sector is a fraction of what it is in the formal sector. Many workers in the informal economy are not poorly skilled because they chose not to train; they are poorly skilled because good training was not available to them, or because the credentials they obtained did not give them access to formal employment.

This creates a self-reinforcing trap. Workers in the informal sector are less productive, earn less, save less, and are less able to invest in their own human capital or that of their children. The demographic dividend works through savings and investment as well as labor supply; if the large working-age cohort is predominantly engaged in low-productivity informal work, the savings and investment effects that drive the dividend are muted.

Employment Generation and Sectoral Shifts

India's economic growth in recent decades has been unusual in a development economics context because it has been driven primarily by services rather than manufacturing. Most countries that have successfully converted a demographic dividend into sustained growth did so through a phase of labor-intensive manufacturing that absorbed large numbers of workers and gradually upgraded their capabilities. India largely bypassed this phase; more precisely, the manufacturing sector did not grow fast enough to absorb the numbers entering the labor market.

Services, particularly IT and financial services, have generated high-value employment, but for a relatively narrow segment of the workforce. The skills required for these sectors, including strong English proficiency, digital literacy, and advanced technical training, are not widely distributed. As a result, the

sectors that have grown most in recent decades have not been the sectors most accessible to the bulk of India's working-age population.

The World Bank (2019) flagged this tension in its analysis of developing economies: high-productivity sectors are growing, but they are not absorbing labor at scale. This means that the demographic dividend's expected mechanism, namely a large and productive labor force generating higher output and savings, is operating well below its potential.

CHALLENGES AND STRUCTURAL GAPS

Quality Versus Quantity in Training

The most consistently identified problem in India's skill development system is the gap between the number of people trained and the quality of training they receive. Government programs have historically been evaluated against enrollment and completion numbers rather than employment outcomes and earnings gains. This creates incentive problems at every level of the system. Training providers optimize for throughput; participants complete courses that may not lead to employment; and the official data shows impressive numbers that do not translate into measurable economic improvement.

Chandrasekhar, Ghosh, and Roychowdhury (2006) were already raising concerns about the quality of human capital formation in India in the mid-2000s. The problem has not been resolved in the years since. Employer surveys consistently find that graduates of vocational programs are not job-ready, and a significant share of PMKVY participants report difficulty finding employment in the trade they were trained for.

Industry Linkage and Curriculum Relevance

Training systems work best when they are closely linked to industry, meaning employers are involved in designing curricula, providing practical training, and hiring graduates. India's sector skill councils were intended to bring this kind of industry involvement into the system, but the linkage between councils, training providers, and actual employers has been inconsistent.

The gap between what training programs teach and what employers actually need shows up in high unemployment rates among trained graduates. The country is simultaneously short of skilled workers in certain sectors and producing trained graduates who cannot find work in their area of training. This mismatch represents a resource waste that the demographic situation makes particularly costly.

Regional and Social Disparities

The geography of skill development in India maps closely onto the geography of poverty and underdevelopment. States with the youngest populations and the most to gain from the dividend, namely Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand, and Madhya Pradesh, are also the states with the fewest training institutions, the worst-resourced ITIs, and the lowest rates of formal employment. This reflects the cumulative effect of decades of unequal public investment.

Social barriers compound geographic ones. Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Other Backward Classes face discrimination in hiring even when they hold comparable credentials. Women face restrictions on mobility, family pressure against certain occupations, and workplace environments that can be unwelcoming. These barriers mean that even well-designed training programs produce worse outcomes for marginalized groups than aggregate figures suggest.

Drèze and Sen (2013) were direct about the consequences of neglecting human development for these groups. The economic cost of exclusion is not borne only by excluded individuals; it reduces aggregate

productivity and constrains the growth of domestic demand that could sustain a broader industrial expansion.

The Gender Participation Gap

India's female labor force participation rate is anomalously low even by developing-country standards, and it has been declining in some states. Goldin (2006) showed that women's labor force participation tends to follow a U-shaped curve across development: declining initially as rising incomes allow women to leave low-wage agricultural work, then rising as education and urban employment create new opportunities for skilled women. India appears to be stuck in the declining phase of this curve for a disproportionate share of its female population.

The demographic dividend that economists calculate for India is based on working-age population shares. But if only 20–25% of working-age women are actually participating in the labor force, the dividend is being calculated against a figure that significantly overstates the actual labor supply. Closing the gender participation gap would, by itself, substantially increase the realized economic benefit of India's demographic position.

CONCLUSION

India's demographic dividend is real, but it is not inevitable. The country has a structural advantage in its age distribution that will persist for another two to three decades, which gives it both the opportunity and the time to build the human capital that can convert that advantage into sustained economic growth. But the window is not infinite, and the cost of wasted years compounds over time.

The evidence reviewed in this paper suggests that India's current trajectory falls short of what is needed. The skill development system is large and has expanded significantly in recent years, but it continues to produce outputs that do not match the labor market's actual demands. Training quality varies widely. Employer linkage is inconsistent. Regional and social disparities limit access for those who would benefit most. And the persistent underutilization of women's labor potential is a major structural drag on the dividend's realization.

The conceptual frameworks developed by Bloom, Canning, and Sevilla (2003), Schultz (1961), and Becker (1964) all point in the same direction: the demographic dividend is captured through human capital investment, not through population numbers alone. India's policymakers have understood this in principle. The challenge has been translating principle into effective, large-scale, quality-conscious implementation.

What is needed is a shift in how skill development outcomes are measured and rewarded. Moving from enrollment and certification numbers to employment rates, wage premiums, and productivity gains would realign the incentives of training providers and government programs toward results that actually matter. Closer integration between industry and training institutions would improve curriculum relevance. And deliberate attention to the geographic and social dimensions of access would ensure that the states and communities with the most at stake receive the investment they need.

India's demographic window is a genuine opportunity. But recognizing an opportunity and seizing it are two different things.

REFERENCES

Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. Columbia University Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bloom, D. E., & Williamson, J. G. (1998). Demographic transitions and economic miracles in emerging Asia. *The World Bank Economic Review, 12*(3), 419–455.

Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., & Sevilla, J. (2003). *The demographic dividend: A new perspective on the economic consequences of population change*. RAND Corporation.

Census of India. (2011). *Primary census abstract*. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India.

Chandrasekhar, C. P., Ghosh, J., & Roychowdhury, A. (2006). The "demographic dividend" and young India's economic future. *Economic and Political Weekly, 41*(49), 5055–5064.

Drèze, J., & Sen, A. (2013). *An uncertain glory: India and its contradictions*. Princeton University Press.

Goldin, C. (2006). The quiet revolution that transformed women's employment, education, and family. *American Economic Review, 96*(2), 1–21.

Mincer, J. (1974). *Schooling, experience, and earnings*. Columbia University Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, Government of India. (2015). *National policy for skill development and entrepreneurship 2015*. Government of India.

NITI Aayog. (2018). *Strategy for new India @ 75*. Government of India.

Planning Commission, Government of India. (2013). *Twelfth five year plan (2012–2017): Economic sectors* (Vol. 2). Government of India.

Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review, 51*(1), 1–17.

World Bank. (2019). *World development report 2019: The changing nature of work*. World Bank.