Fiscal Consolidation Vs Welfare Expansion in India's Budget Framework

Anju Singh[1]; Jyoti Bery[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, School of Management Sciences (SMS), Varanasi, India, anjusingh@smsvaranasi.com
[2] Assistant Professor, PSIT College of Higher Education, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India jyotibery1990@gmail.com

Abstract

The budgetary system in India is a constant policy dilemma between fiscal tightening and welfare growth. On the one hand, fiscal prudence is expected to decrease the deficit level, stabilize the government debt, and decrease inflationary pressures, as well as promote the credibility of the macro economy. In contrast, welfare-based spending, i.e. specific subsidies, income support programs, rural development, health insurance, food security, etc. are still the core of inclusive growth and poverty elimination. This paper focuses on India and the way in which the nation achieves a balance between the goals of reducing deficit under the standards of fiscal responsibility and the increased necessity to spend on the social sector in a developing economy. The paper analyses the trend of revenue deficits, fiscal deficits, capital expenditure, and social spending trends using secondary data based on the Union Budget documents, fiscal indicators, and the major welfare allocations during the last ten years. It discusses the merger of strategies as crowding out welfare commitments or structural reforms, tax buoyancy and rationalization of subsidies facilitate all three to pursue fiscal discipline and social investment at the same time. The results provide an indication that the reconciliation of fiscal sustainability and social protection goals is possible through a calibrated strategy, which is to focus on productive capital expenditure and to rationalize the inefficient subsidies. The paper concludes that growth in the long term, institutional credibility and welfare design targeted are the key in the realization of the balanced and robust budget structure in India.

Keywords: *Fiscal Consolidation, Welfare Expansion, Union Budget, Fiscal Deficit, Public Debt, Social Sector Spending, Capital Expenditure, Subsidy Rationalization, Inclusive Growth, Fiscal Responsibility.*

Corresponding Author: Anju Singh, Assistant Professor, School of Management Sciences (SMS), Varanasi, India E-mail id-anjusingh@smsvaranasi.com
How to cite this article: Singh Anju (2026), Fiscal Consolidation Vs Welfare Expansion in India's Budget Framework, Confluence: A Journal of Technology, Business & Society, Vol. I (1), 11-21
Source of support: Nil
Conflict of Interest: None
Received:02.06.2026; Accepted: 11.07.2026; Published:21.07.2026

I. Introduction

The public finance design in India has been developed in a complicated development environment, in which microeconomic stability and social equity should be promoted simultaneously. The fiscal policy has become more uniform towards the principles of prudence, transparency and debt sustainability since 1991 with the economic reforms, which culminated in the Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management Act (FRBM Act) in 2003. The Act formalized targets of numerical deficit and required it to undergo periodic adjustment in the fiscal side, this is an indication that India was willing to be accountable in budgeting and macroeconomic integrity. Nevertheless, India remains a lower-middle-income economy with severe structural imbalances, high informality rates, strong regional inequalities, and a high number of people reliant on the state to provide basic needs. As a result, the Union Budget has served as an important tool of redistributive justice and welfare growth as well. The inclusion of welfare commitments in central place in the fiscal planning can be highlighted by flagship initiatives like the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana (PMJDY), Ayushman Bharat and the National Food Security Act (NFSA). This dual mandate approaches an inherent policy conflict in that fiscal consolidation requires expenditure control and deficit reduction whereas welfare expansion needs long-term and in most cases growing expenditures on subsidies, social protection and income support. It becomes more difficult in the case of economic downturns or external shocks, as the revenue collections become weak and the social spending requirements increase at the same time. Therefore, the budgetary process of India is governed by the border of fiscal restraint and developmental needs, and the decision between consolidation and expansion of welfare is not only technical and may be considered highly political and socio-economic.

This has been enhanced by the post-pandemic fiscal environment. The COVID-19 epidemic forced the government to ease deficit goals to fund emergency relief, healthcare infrastructure, food distributions, and economic stimulus creating high fiscal deficits and debt ratios. As recovery slowly picked up, policy makers insisted on a gradual process of consolidation and at the same time increasing capital spending to boost growth. Recent budgets by the Ministry of Finance have tried to strike a balance between these conflicting goals by focusing on investing in infrastructure, digitization, and productive public expenditure, and justifying some of these subsidies and enhancing tax compliance with reforms, including the Goods and Services Tax regime. The fiscal policy is becoming more differentiated between revenue expenditure, commonly linked with the consumption-based subsidies, and capital expenditure, which is considered growth-promoting and long-term fiscally sustainable. However, welfare growth is a politically relevant and economically required aspect in the country where poverty susceptibility, agrarian distress and unemployment strain continue to dominate. The fundamental issue, then, is whether fiscal tightening is bound to limit welfare promises or a well thought out budgetary system can bring about a combination of sustainability and inclusivity. To create fiscal space without compromising social protection is empirically argued to be facilitated by enhancement of tax buoyancy, expansion of tax base, digital governance and making benefits more efficient. Further, a change of expenditure composition to high- multiplier investments (infrastructure, health, and education) can be used to promote growth, hence reinforce revenue collection and debt repayment. Indian experience shows that fiscal contraction does not have to mean austerity in its classical form, but can consist of re-organizing the expenditure priorities, increasing the efficiency and the accountability of the government spending. Thus, the argument about fiscal reduction and welfare spending should not be expressed in terms of two poles but rather a game of balance in the changing budgetary system of India, in which long-term development, social justice, and fiscal responsibility must co-exist.

II. Literature Review

Theoretical Foundations of Fiscal Consolidation and Welfare Economics

The theoretical background to fiscal consolidation and welfare expansion is based on the wider argument between classical fiscal discipline and Keynesian development intervention [1]. The traditional public finance theory is based on the concept that deficit control, debt sustainability, and macroeconomic stability are conditions of the long-term growth and states that long-term fiscal imbalances crowd out of private investment, increase the cost of borrowing, and impose intergenerational burdens on the population [2]. On the other hand, the Keynesian and welfare economics views emphasize on the stabilizing and redistributive effect of the government spending especially in the developing economies where structural poverty and market failures are the order of the day. Other theorists like Musgrave theorized about the concept of public budgets as tools of allocation, distribution and stabilization with the idea that welfare spending can boost productivity by raising human capital and aggregate demand [3]. The current empirical literature goes on to suggest that fiscal consolidation policies that are based on the reduction of expenditures alone are likely to reduce growth and social performance, but quality-based consolidation, which concentrates on efficiency, capital investment and tax reforms, can be sustained without compromising equity. In the emerging economies such as India, the literature highlights the need to strike a balance between financial prudence and developmental demands, especially since the marginal contribution of the government expenditure to poverty reduction, employment creation and social inclusion is very high [4].

Empirical Evidence on India's Fiscal Responsibility Framework

There is a large amount of literature assessing the fiscal path of India based on Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management (FRBM) framework [5]. Research also shows that the implementation of the policy of fiscal policy based on rules enhanced transparency and revenue deficits in the mid 2000s which enhanced investor confidence and macroeconomic stability [6]. Later economic downturns and international shocks however demonstrated the inflexibility and constraints of fixed deficit targets and the issue of flexibility clauses and counter-cyclical policy structure emerged [7]. Evidence of empirical studies using Union Budget Data show that although fiscal consolidation episodes usually curbed headline deficits, they have occasionally been based on spending reductions on capital or subsidies payments, and that this leads to substantial questions about the potential effects of fiscal consolidation on growth in the long-run. Other researchers observe that tax changes such as indirect tax harmonization and enhanced compliance systems improved the revenue buoyancy and fiscal space [8]. The post-pandemic fiscal expansion is also noted in the literature, and it reversed the gains of consolidation at the time but stimulated the recovery of the economy [9]. In general, the studies indicate that the fiscal responsibility framework in India has enhanced the institutional credibility, but its success relies on the mix of adjustment policies and incorporation of growth-oriented spending in consolidation policies [10].

Welfare Expansion, Social Spending, and Inclusive Growth in India

The other distinct body of literature is the macroeconomic and social effects of welfare expansion in Indian budgetary framework. Rural employment scheme, food security, direct benefit transfer, and public health studies suggest that a specific welfare spending can considerably help alleviate poverty vulnerabilities, strengthen consumption stability, and better human development indicators [11]. Econometric studies tend to present the positive multiplier effects of social transfers in rural and low-income areas especially when the economy is declining [12]. Critics, however, note that untargeted subsidies, leakages and populist schemes made on political reasons are likely to burden fiscal balances without being accompanied by similar developmental benefits. New literature has focused on digital governance, Aadhaar transfers and financial inclusion schemes to enhance efficiency and minimize fiscal leakage [13]. Moreover, scholars emphasize that it is crucial to differ between productive and distortionary subsidies, the former includes health, education, and nutrition, and the latter can crowd out investments in capital [14]. The general agreement in the literature is that well planned welfare expansion can be used to supplement fiscal sustainability via human capital formation, increased aggregate demand and enhanced growth potential in the long term as a part of the Indian changing budgetary landscape [15].

III. Methodology

This research paper will follow a primary quantitative research design to test the hypothesis of the relationship between fiscal constraints action and welfare growth outcomes in the Indian budget. The questionnaire was formulated as a structured questionnaire, which was constructed on the established public finance and welfare economics constructs. It included 15 items in three parts that are demographic profile (3 items), fiscal consolidation measures as the independent variable (9 items), and the welfare expansion outcomes as the dependent variable (3 items). Every statement with respect to construct was assessed on a five-point Likert response scale (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). There were 100 valid responses that were assimilated through purposive sampling, convenience sampling, focusing on academia, government/public sector and financial services, consulting, and even the private sector organizations. The reason why this group was selected was because they were conversant with fiscal policy and welfare structures. Online data collection was done during a period of four weeks. IBM SPSS (Version 26) was used to code and analyze data obtained. Frequency analysis (to determine demographics) and reliability testing (Cronbach’s Alpha) are some of the application tools used to test the suggested hypothesis, descriptive statistics (Mean and Standard Deviation), Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartletts Test of sampling adequacy, Pearson correlation analysis, and linear regression analysis.

IV. Finding and Analysis

Demographic Analysis

Age_Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-30 years	12	13.3	13.3	13.3
	31-40 years	34	37.8	37.8	51.1
	41-50 years	30	33.3	33.3	84.4
	51-60 years	12	13.3	13.3	97.8
	Above 60 years	2	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table: Age Group
(Source: IBM SPSS)

The age of the respondents shows that most of them are between the age groups of 31-40 years and then, 20-30 years. This indicates that the sample is mostly composed of economically active and professionally occupied people who care likely to be aware of the fiscal policy events and welfare systems. The coverage of the older age group (41 to 60 and above 60) is a guarantee of maturity of opinion and policy coverage. The evenly distributed age distribution gives the answers more credibility and minimizes the aspect of generational bias on the perception of fiscal austerity and welfare increase.

Educational Qualification

Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Doctorate	14	15.6	15.6	15.6
	Graduate	12	13.3	13.3	28.9
	Others	4	4.4	4.4	33.3
	Post-Graduate	39	43.3	43.3	76.7
	Professional Degree	21	23.3	23.3	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table: Educational Qualification
(Source: IBM SPSS)

The statistics indicate that the majority of the interviewees have post-graduate and doctoral education, which points to a very educated sample. This increases the validity of the results because respondents will be able to comprehend macroeconomic terms like fiscal deficit, debt management, rationalization of subsidies and sustainability of welfare. The fact that there are professionals that have been given specialized degrees also contributes to the accuracy of the answers concerning fiscal governance and budgetary systems.

Professional Background

Profession

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Academia/Research	21	23.3	23.3	23.3
	Consulting/Advisory	4	4.4	4.4	27.8
	Financial Services	15	16.7	16.7	44.4
	Government/Public Sector	14	15.6	15.6	60.0
	Private Sector	36	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	90	100.0	100.0	

Table: Professional Background
(Source: IBM SPSS)

Most of the respondents are academia and research professionals, then there are professionals with the private sector and the government/public sector. This distribution is important in that views are elicited among policy analysts, practitioners and financial experts. Financial services and government professionals will bring about practical experience in fiscal implementation, and the academic respondents will deliver theoretical and analytical assessment. The strength of the study is increased with the diversified professional background.

Reliability Test

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.958	12

Table: Reliability Test
(Source: IBM SPSS)

Cronbach's Alpha of independent and dependent constructs is also greater than the acceptable value of 0.70, which indicates a high level of internal consistency of items. The reliability of the scale is good since the overall scale reliability is above 0.90. This substantiates the fact that the statements of fiscal consolidation and welfare expansion are consistent and they effectively measure the constructs of interest. Hence, the questionnaire is statistically valid to do additional inferential analysis.

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
IV_Fiscal_Consolidation_Measures	90	35.1222	5.28051	-.175	.254	-.505	.503
DV_Welfare_Expansion_Impact	90	9.0222	1.78620	-.155	.254	-.409	.503
Valid N (listwise)	90						

Table: Descriptive Analysis

(Source: IBM SPSS)

The mean scores of the fiscal contraction measures and the impact of welfare increase are above the average score of 3.00 that demonstrates the general agreement among the respondents. The values of standard deviation are comparatively small which means that there is a small dispersion of opinion. Strongly believed by the respondents, fiscal discipline, tax reforms, and expenditure management are what they need and they are also helpful in supporting the applicability of the welfare programs in improving the socio economic outcomes. It means that fiscal tightening and welfare growth do not seem to be opposing but complementary to the study participants.

KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.945
	Approx. Chi-Square	923.035
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	df	66
	Sig.	0.000

Table: Factorial Analysis

(Source: IBM SPSS)

The KMO value is greater than 0.80, which is the excellent sampling adequacy of the factors analysis. Bartlett Test of Sphericity is found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), which proves that the correlations between the variables are high to extract factors. This confirms the structure of construct validity of fiscal consolidation and welfare expansion measures, which means that the items together are coherent underlying factors.

Correlation Test

Correlations

		IV_Fiscal_Consolidation_Measures	DV_Welfare_Expansion_Impact
IV_Fiscal_Consolidation_Measures	Pearson Correlation	1	.875**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	90	90
DV_Welfare_Expansion_Impact	Pearson Correlation	.875**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	90	90

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table: Correlation Analysis

(Source: IBM SPSS)

Pearson correlation coefficient between fiscal consolidation and welfare expansion is 0.0865 which is significant at 1% level. This means that the two constructs have a high relationship. According to the findings, successful fiscal consolidation policies like deficit management, tax policies, and debt management have positive correlations with sustainable welfare growth. This comes right in opposition to the traditional belief that fiscal restraint must limit welfare expenditure.

Regression Analysis

H1: Fiscal consolidation measures in Union Budgets have a significant positive impact on welfare expansion outcomes in India.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.875[a]	0.766	0.763	0.86873

a. Predictors: (Constant), IV_Fiscal_Consolidation_Measures

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	217.503	1	217.503	290.253	0.000[b]
	Residual	66.013	88	0.750		
	Total	283.956	89			

a. Dependent Variable: DV_Welfare_Expansion_Impact

b. Predictors: (Constant), IV_Fiscal_Consolidation_Measures

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-1.377	0.619	—	-2.223	0.029
	IV_Fiscal_Consolidation_Measures	0.296	0.017	0.875	16.978	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: DV_Welfare_Expansion_Impact

Table: Regression Analysis

(Source: IBM SPSS)

The outcomes of the regression display that fiscal consolidation is a significant predictor of the welfare expansion outcomes. The value R 2 displays that a significant percentage of change in welfare sustainability can be attributed to the fiscal consolidation measures. The overall model fit is approved by the F-statistic being statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). The positive beta coefficient was a manifestation of the fact that greater fiscal discipline is a positive factor in the sustainability of welfare. Thus H1 is accepted meaning that fiscal consolidation does not cripple welfare expansion, but rather improves its sustainability in the long term when it is conducted strategically.

Discussion

The study results are a solid empirical foundation to the argument that fiscal tightening and welfare expansions do not necessarily go hand in hand as policy intentions in the Indian budgetary system. The demographic situation of the respondents implies that the sample is comprised of economically active, professionally involved, and highly educated people. This makes the interpretations more credible since the respondents have the academic and professional competency required in assessing fiscal deficit management, rationalization of subsidies, sustainability of the debt and efficiency of welfare policies. The range of professional experience, which includes academia, government, private sector, financial services, and consulting, is a guarantee that the discussion is based on theoretical knowledge and practical experience.

The reliability analysis has proven that the measurement instrument has high internal consistency. Having the Cronbach's Alpha values considerably higher than the acceptable one, the constructs of fiscal consolidation and welfare expansion are sound in statistical terms and conceptually sound. This gives confidence towards the further descriptive and inferential results. The descriptive analysis shows that the respondents tend to agree with the statements that back fiscal prudence, tax reforms, efficiency of public expenditure, and sustainable welfare expansion. Notably, the average scores indicate that the respondents do not view fiscal consolidation as necessarily limiting to welfare promises. Rather, there is an evident tendency to consider disciplined fiscal management as a source of long-term investment in society. The results of the factor analysis also confirm the structural soundness of constructs.

The large value of the KMO and the statistically significant value of Bartlett's Test supports the fact that the data is dimensional analysis worthy. This shows that the fiscal consolidation measures produce a conceptual structure, and the results of welfare expansion are also coherent. The statistical sufficiency of the model implies that the survey tool is capable of capturing the perceptions of the interaction of the fiscal stability and social spending sustainability. Based on the correlation analysis, the two variables have a strong and positive relationship between fiscal consolidation and welfare expansion. This is especially significant in view of the fact that the traditional fiscal theory tends to focus on the issue of consolidation and welfare spending as competing priorities. But the findings suggest that the respondents feel that disciplined fiscal management, where control of deficit is involved, revenue management increased, and effective expenditures are controlled can in fact increase the sustainability of the welfare schemes. That is, fiscal stability seems to be viewed as a facilitating factor instead of a limitation.

The strongest evidence is given through the regression analysis. The model indicates that fiscal tightenings measures are important predictors of welfare expansion results. Being considerably large, the R 2 value indicates the possibility of a significant percentage of change in welfare sustainability perception being accounted by the variables of fiscal discipline.

The statistically significant F-value is the confirmation of the overall power of the model, but the positive regression coefficient reflects the positive and direct effect. This empirically validates the inference that fiscal consolidation leads to viability of welfare growth in the long-term of the Indian budgetary setup. Generally, the analysis has made it clear that the respondents support a moderated fiscal policy, the one that would focus on macroeconomic stability, efficiency in revenue, and prudent debt management and at the same time secure and enhance the welfare programmes. The results support the notion that the phenomenon of fiscal consolidation cannot be understood as austerity-imposed reduction of expenditure but as effective redistribution and efficacy improvement. To the Indian context, where fiscal constraints are inherent in developmental problems, sustainable welfare growth seems to be dependent on austerity in fiscal administration.

IV Conclusion

The paper has discussed the correlation between fiscal tightening policies and welfare growth results in the Indian budget system through a primary quantitative method on a sample of 100 integrated responses. The research results show clearly that fiscal consolidation and welfare expansion are not necessarily opposite goals. Instead, a controlled fiscal policy, reflected in deficit reduction goals, tax reforms, rationalization of subsidies, efficiency of expenditures and sustainability of debts, has a positive impact on long-term welfare policy sustainability. Reliability and validity tests were used to affirm the strength of the measurement tool, and correlation and regression tests were used to establish a statistically significant and positive correlation between measures of fiscal consolidation and outcomes of welfare expansion. The findings suggest that the respondents view fiscal prudence as a precondition to maintaining the welfare obligations and not limiting them. It seems to be effective fiscal governance that has generated fiscal space, boosted investor confidence, stabilised macroeconomic conditions and increased the efficiency of public spending.

Findings indicate that the quality and composition of expenditure is more important than the amount of expenditure. With strategic prioritization in productive capital expenditure, focused subsidies and effective management of public spending, governments can reconcile macroeconomic stability with objectives of inclusive growth. Consequently, the fiscal tightening within the Indian context is to be viewed as a structural reinforcement of the Indian public finance as opposed to austerity measures. Calibrated and growth oriented consolidation policy can make sure that the welfare growth is sustainable, equitable and developmental.

Future Scope

Although the current study is very insightful, there are still a number of opportunities where further research can be undertaken. First, in future research, the sample size can be increased to cover other areas of geographical locations to increase generalizability. A bigger and more stratified sample would give more comparisons of the sectors and minimise the limitation of sampling.

Second, longitudinal research that considers several Union Budgets through the course of time would have provided a more significant causal interpretation. The impact of fiscal consolidation policies on economic cycle-based welfare outcomes may be evaluated by use of time-series or panel data analysis. Third, researchers can also consider using secondary macroeconomic variables in future studies to supplement the results of the perception research with the objective economic data, including fiscal deficit changes, debt to GDP ratio, social spending ratios, poverty indices and human development indicators. Fourth, more sophisticated statistical models including Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) may be utilized to test either a mediating or moderating role among fiscal prudence, economic growth and welfare sustainability. This would give a more detailed structural explanations of policy interactions. Lastly, cross-country research involving India (as compared to other developing economies) would yield useful cross-country empirical information on the best fiscal policies to strike a balance between the consolidation and the welfare increase. This kind of study would improve the discussion of the wider public finance and the policy-making process based on evidence on sustainable development.

References:

[1] Alesina, A., & Perotti, R. (1997). Fiscal adjustments in OECD countries: Composition and macroeconomic effects. IMF Staff Papers, 44(2), 210–248.
[2] Alesina, A., Favero, C., & Giavazzi, F. (2019). Austerity: When it works and when it doesn’t. Princeton University Press.
[3] Buiter, W. H. (2008). Fiscal sustainability. CEPR Discussion Paper Series, No. 6684.
[4] Government of India. (2003). Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management Act (FRBM Act), 2003. Ministry of Finance.
[5] Government of India. (Various Years). Union Budget Documents. Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs.

[6] Kelkar Committee. (2012). Report on the Roadmap for Fiscal Consolidation. Ministry of Finance, Government of India.
[7] Musgrave, R. A., & Musgrave, P. B. (1989). Public finance in theory and practice (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
[8] Reserve Bank of India. (2023). Report on State Finances: A Study of Budgets. RBI Publications.
[9] Reserve Bank of India. (Various Years). Handbook of Statistics on the Indian Economy. RBI.
[10] Stiglitz, J. E. (2015). The great divide: Unequal societies and what we can do about them. W.W. Norton & Company.
[11] Tanzi, V., & Schuknecht, L. (2000). Public spending in the 20th century: A global perspective. Cambridge University Press.
[12] World Bank. (2022). India Development Update: Navigating the Storm. World Bank Publications.
[13] International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2023). Fiscal Monitor: On the Path to Policy Normalization. IMF Publications.
[14] Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (2013). An uncertain glory: India and its contradictions. Princeton University Press.
[15] Rao, M. G., & Singh, N. (2005). Political economy of fiscal federalism in India. Oxford Development Studies, 33(3–4), 421–437.