

CHAPTER-II

POVERTY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN WEST BENGAL

2.0 Introduction :

Defining poverty requires a way of distinguishing the poor from the non-poor. The usual method is to classify an individual as poor, if he or she does not meet a set of consumption norms. The poverty lines used are generally based on the cost of a fixed bundle of goods deemed necessary for subsistence mostly on nutritional grounds. The use of upper poverty line \$370, gives an estimate of 1115 million people in the developing countries in poverty in 1985, which is roughly one-third of the total population of the developing world. The extremely poor were 630 million which is 18 percent of the total population of the developing world, whose annual income was less than \$275.

The first report of the Brandt Commission identified two geographical belts of absolute poverty. These two belts contain the vast majority of the world's absolute poor-defines as those not being able to obtain the minimum amount of food needed to pursue moderately active life. One of these belt runs North-South across the continents of Africa and includes all Sub-Saharan countries ; the other beginning with the two Yemens and Afghanistan, stretches across Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Burma and into Kampuchea, Vietnam, Laos and Indonesia.

During the last five decades, the development efforts have failed to eliminate poverty in the developing countries. The World Development Report 1990 writes" the burden of poverty is unevenly spread among the regions of the developing world, among countries within those region and among localities within those countries. Nearly half of the worlds poor live in South Asia, a region which accounts for 30 percent of the World population. Sub-Saharan Africa accounts for a smaller but still highly disproportionate share of global poverty. The majority of the poor in South Asia are landless agricultural workers and small farmers with large families, limited human

resources and little access to credit. The causes of poverty lies in so many factors interacting with each other such as socio-cultural values, psychological traits, unutilised or under-utilisation of land and human resources, national development strategies, institutional development and international cooperation. The burden of poverty falls most heavily on women, who shoulder the workload in poor households with less access to education, health, nutrition and remunerative activities. Children, especially girl suffer disproportionately with inadequate health, education and nutrition support. The incidence of poverty is often high among ethnic groups such as indigenous people".

Poverty in the above context refers to absolute poverty, defined as being a state in which individuals lack the resources to afford a minimum standard of living. The incidence of poverty show that 66 percent of the World's extremely poor are in developing countries and 72 percent of it's poor are in Asia.

2.1 Poverty Dimensions :

Poverty has many dimensions such as economic, sociological, psychological, cultural and political. Many of them are not easily amenable to qualification and reinforce each other in a variety of complex ways. Poverty is defined differently by different people. The economists define poverty in terms of persons living below the poverty line. The concept of poverty line again based on the income-consumption approach is a relative explanation and differs from place to place, region to region and nation to nation. The sociologists describe the phenomenon mainly because of culture of poverty. The poor are not poor because of the paucity of financial resources or scarcity of physical comforts, but because they hail from the low socio-economic status. Those conditions adversely affect the intellectual, motivational and emotional aspects of its victims. The politician consider poverty as social injustice. The different governments in the world have been speaking always about a war against poverty which has been hardly conquered. Psychologists have defined poverty in terms of deprivation and helplessness. The poor are deprived not only the minimum necessary provision of physical life and also adequate social and emotional stimuli necessary for the development of a normal individual. The poor do not have any control over their

circumstances which are controlled by others. The behaviour observed among the poor is the result of the environment in which they live. Thus poverty dimensions are important in deciding the deprivation and helplessness among the poor people.

2.1.1 Economic Dimensions of Poverty :

Economists explanation of poverty is largely based on economic system and structure. Since time immemorial, they have shown concern about the problems of poverty. Economic inequalities and the economists classification of poverty are in terms of a specified level below which one is considered poor. A central issue in all debates on poverty is whether poverty should be defined in absolute or in relative terms. It is normally assumed that the two definitions are exclusive because of lack of clarity about the units of poverty. An absolute measure typically reflect basic biological needs. A relative measure focuses more on a nation of requirement that very depending on circumstances - such as a country's level of development or the disparities between rich and poor or other social and ethnic groups. Poverty is defined in absolute terms if the content of poverty standard is taken to be fixed across time and space. A historical notion of subsistence reflecting a very minimal list of basic needs, is at the base of this notion. A common approach in delineating the poverty line is to specify a minimum calorie intake. This calorie level is then converted into food stuffs adequate to meet the level, given typical consumption pattern in a society. The cost of this amount of food is then determined to yield a poverty level. It has been the practice to take a constant calorie take for everyone. In the poverty level prescribed by the Indian planning commission in the early 1960s, 2250 calories per day per person in rural areas was specified as the minimum level. A similar figure of 2100 calories has been mentioned for Pakistan and 2122 calories for Bangladesh.

The conversion of the calorie intake into a commodity basket must be culture specific, no matter how absolute the standard. The specification of typical foodstuffs require a survey of prevailing consumption practice. Whether it is impossible to specify a separate level for each individual, it is possible to specify a required choice level as a function of age, gender, type of activity and health status. In pricing the consumption basket to arrive at a level of expenditure for the poverty level, non food items necessary

for subsistence need to be considered. The absolute approach though popular, is not free of conceptual problems. But, its narrow economic and physiological basis made it criticised to the assumption of a common, constant calorie intake related to individual personal characteristics.

The relative approach defines requirements not merely for existence but for leading a full life as members of a social community. The living standard can be defined by conducting a survey of actual consumption practice or by surveying a sample of households for what they consider adequate consumption practices. The problems of relative poverty is to consider poverty a type of inequality. By definition, such a measure does not take into account needs of different households. But, it is an objective economic measure relying on income rather than commodities. According to this approach, specific groups of population are treated as poor depending upon the location of their community. The other economic dimensions of poverty called inequality is described in a number of ways such as health, class differentiation etc. The European and western countries claim to have eliminated social inequality from their society. The socialist countries hold that they have brought equality by reducing the disparity of income and status. Some of the countries like U.S.A. and European nations have the problem of poverty confined to minorities where as the developing nations including India have problem of majority.

2.1.2 Sociological Dimensions :

Poverty as a culture is one of the most widely professed approaches towards the phenomenon. Individual poverty is distinguished by certain sociologists from the culture of poverty. They view culture of poverty not primarily as a matter of deprivation or disorganization which terms signify some or other maladaptation of a given culture leading to a loss of decent living. One of the main proponents of this view, Oscar Lewis argued that, there is a distinct culture (or sub culture) of poverty which is sustained not only by external, objective circumstances like poverty, but also by value systems, preferences and internal personal relationships. Lewis holds that such a culture of poverty becomes hereditary by passing through familial lines from one generation to another and then to a third and so on. The culture of poverty have been

criticised by different scholars. The culture of poverty necessitates conceding of various sub cultures of the same within any given society like "Culture of middle class", "Culture of crime", "Culture of beggary" and so on. In a society like India, where so many layers exist, this view may pose severe difficulties in approaching the phenomenon of poverty. But, this is also true that adoption of income alone as a criterion and determining poverty line on its basis does not solve the purpose as it ignore various socio-cultural dimensions of poverty.

2.1.3 Psychological Dimensions :

Where as economists and sociologists have made several attempts to understand and tackle the problem of poverty. Psychologists have been investigating all through and the main concentration what they call it "Psychological Concomitants "which detrimentally influence the general functioning of the individual. Such psychological concomitants include among others, inadequate cognitive skills, inadequate coping mechanism, lower sensory motor skills and physical capacities and deficient motivations. Due to impact of these factors, one becomes, less and less capable of taking educational, occupational and other initiatives to get rid of the poverty. In other words, poverty generates its own psychological correlates which render an individual less competent to come with the problems. In most cases, poverty in a self perpetuating phenomenon and puts into action a vicious circle of its own. As yet, it has not become clear as to whether these behavioural factors are causes or consequences of a person's poverty.

Psychologists have not been as the economists and sociologists were to tackle the problem of poverty both theoretically and practically. However, they have come to an common conclusion that the mischiefs which poverty plays upon in the form of deep sense of dependence, deprivation and inferiority complex, which immerse them in hopelessness, despair and further incapability and even unwillingness.

2.1.4 Poverty : A Phenomenon of Many Dimensions :

As already discussed, economic and sociological dimension too has its own

limitations. Taken into consideration, neither an economic nor a sociological dimension turns to be much convincing and the direction of psychological dimension is no better along. Hence, all these approaches can be combined into a synthesis by giving due consideration to food, education, living conditions etc. In this way, low socio-economic status, for instance households having durable assets can be taken to be a synonym of poverty. Socio-economic conditions or quality of life can be a determining criterion of poverty to study it from different dimensions.

2.2. State Variations in Poverty :

Between 1973-74 and 1993-94, the southern states have been more successfully able to reduce rural poverty than eastern or central states. The share of southern states in the country's total rural poor declined from about 24 per cent to less than 16 per cent between the above mentioned two points in time. The share of eastern-central states went up from 61 per cent to 71 per cent, largely contributed by Bihar, UP and Orissa. In these states, the rural poverty ratio is still around 40-50 per cent. Not all southern states that were able to reduce poverty did so because of any spectacular economic growth. While Andhra Pradesh brought down its poverty through its public distribution system. Kerala's success is largely the result of investment in human development. Low levels of poverty in Punjab and Haryana are largely attributed to their agricultural growth although in terms of human development indicators - especially gender related - these states do not compare well with Kerala. This is not to discount the importance of growth but to highlight the fact that it is not just the pace of growth but also its pattern that matters when it comes to poverty reduction.

Specific targeted anti-poverty programmes started in right earnest were taken up in the Sixth Plan. Simultaneously, investment in human development was considered to be crucial to improve the quality of life so as to equip the poor to participate in the growth process. It is well known that in respect of institutional reforms, spread of agricultural technology, implementation of anti-poverty programmes and availability of economic and social infrastructure, the experience differs across states.

The India Rural Development Report 1999 examines the factors that lead to disparate outcomes in terms of poverty reduction. It has made an attempt to correlate poverty levels with some other variables, social and economic, to explain regional variations in poverty. The Report encompasses several measures of social and infrastructure development as explanatory variables.

The Report rightly recognises that as there are vast intra-state differences in the levels of poverty.

TABLE 2.1 : STATE-WISE PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION BELOW THE POVERTY LINE (MODIFIED EXPERT GROUP)

Sl.No.	State	1973-74	1977-78	1983	1987-88	1993-94
1.	Andhra Pradesh	48.41	38.11	26.53	20.92	15.92
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	52.67	59.82	42.60	39.35	45.01
3.	Assam	52.67	59.82	42.60	39.35	45.01
4.	Bihar	62.99	63.25	64.37	52.63	58.21
5.	Goa	46.85	37.64	14.81	17.64	5.34
6.	Gujarat	46.35	41.76	29.80	28.67	22.18
7.	Haryana	34.23	27.73	20.56	16.22	28.02
8.	Himachal Pradesh	27.42	33.49	17.00	16.28	30.34
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	45.51	42.86	26.04	25.70	30.34
10.	Karnataka	55.14	48.18	36.33	32.82	29.88
11.	Kerala	59.19	51.48	39.03	29.10	25.76
12.	Madhya Pradesh	62.66	62.52	48.90	41.92	40.64
13.	Maharashtra	57.71	63.97	45.23	40.78	37.93
14.	Manipur	52.67	59.82	42.60	39.35	45.01
15.	Meghalaya	52.67	59.82	42.60	39.35	45.01
16.	Mizoram	52.67	59.82	42.60	39.35	45.01
17.	Nagaland	52.67	59.82	42.60	39.35	45.01
18.	Orissa	67.28	72.38	67.53	57.64	49.72
Sl.No.	State	1973-74	1977-78	1983	1987-88	1993-94
19.	Punjab	28.21	16.37	13.20	12.60	11.95
20.	Rajasthan	44.76	35.89	33.50	33.21	26.46
21.	Sikkim	52.67	59.82	42.60	39.35	45.01

22.	Tamil Nadu	57.43	57.68	53.99	45.80	32.48
23.	Tripura	52.67	59.82	42.60	39.35	45.01
24.	Uttar Pradesh	56.53	47.60	46.45	41.10	42.28
25.	West Bengal	73.16	68.34	63.05	48.30	40.80
26.	A & N Islands	57.43	57.68	53.99	1.29	32.48
27.	Chandigarh	27.96	27.32	23.79	45.80	11.35
28.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	46.85	37.64	14.81	14.67	51.95
29.	Daman & Diu					5.34
30.	Delhi	24.44	30.19	7.66	67.11	1.90
31.	Lakshadweep	59.19	51.48	39.03	29.10	25.76
32.	Pondicherry	57.43	57.68	53.99	45.80	32.48
	All India	56.44	53.07	45.65	39.09	37.27

Source : Planning Commission estimates as quoted in
India Rural Development Report, 1999

* Most of these states were historically a part of the Permanent Settlement Act and land reforms have been less than satisfactory in all these states ;

* Almost all these regions (except perhaps much of western Rajasthan and parts of western Madhya Pradesh (MP) and southern UP) have the agro-climatic potential to yield high returns in agriculture because of reasonable to high rainfall and availability of perennial river waters. Much of the reason for poverty in these states is thus a human failure rather than it being a result of natural factors.

While poverty reduced by nearly 20 percentage points on the aggregate during 1973-74 and 1993-94, individual states have exhibited very different positions. Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Kerala, MP, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Tamil Nadu (TN) and WB show a visible fall in poverty proportions, while others like Bihar and HP and a number of smaller states, most of them in the north-east, have either shown little change or an actual rise in poverty proportions. In this regards it is of importance to note that the Northeast, which has not received significant attention in the literature on poverty, harbours large proportions in poverty and has not experienced any significant change over this period. In contrast, other small states/union territories like Goa, Andaman and Nicobar Island (ANI), Delhi, Lakshwadeep and Pondicherry,

witnessed a significant fall in the poverty proportions. Most of the latter experienced heavy urbanisation during this period, and in any case did not historically carry the burden of an oppressive agrarian structure.¹⁴ Lastly, the state level data show that states/union territories like Arunachal Pradesh, HP, Assam, Bihar, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir (J&K), Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tripura and UP have shown a rise in poverty proportions between 1987-88 and 1993-94.

Poverty among Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) is an issue of concern since these groups have been identified as ones without much access to land, the principal productive resource in rural areas, and also that they suffer from social and educational handicaps. The latest estimates on poverty among SCs and STs, based on the 50th round of the NSS for 1993-94 have been worked out by Dubey (1998) according to which the poverty proportion among SCs was about 17 percentage points above the general category and the among STs and 19 per cent. Similar figures for 1987-88 were, 19 per cent and 22 per cent respectively. It is seen that both SCs and STs, (more STs than SCs), are significantly poorer compared to the general category people, though the gaps have narrowed somewhat in the recent years.

There are no gender specific estimates of poverty since economy level data on this aspect are not collected. The only proposition presently available is that women headed households are poorer than others. This attributed to lack of resources with women after the demise of/desertion by male members. Several micro studies reveal that food distribution is not equal within households ; there is intra household inequity. This is true across all classes, but in lower income groups such an inequality can create perpetual malnutrition. This long-term deterioration in sex ratios is a supporting indicator of this.

A more dis-aggregated, NSS region-wise picture of poverty in West Bengal (head count ratio) can be seen in Table 2.2. (To a significant extent, there are heterogeneity in each state except perhaps Bihar, which is uniformly poor. Sharp contrasts are witnessed in Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra, though variations can be seen in smaller states like Haryana and Punjab as well. The regions have been segregated by low (up to 20 per cent), medium (21-40 per cent), high (41-60 per

cent) and very high (more than 60 per cent) levels of poverty, southern Bihar, southern Orissa, south western MP and southern UP fall in the very high poverty bracket. These regions are composed of the districts in Chotanagpur and Santhal Parganas in Bihar, Koraput and Phulbani district in Orissa, the Jhansi region in UP and its adjacent regions in MP, including Betul, Khandwa and Houshangabad. Two peculiar features of these regions are, that either they are mainly tribal (except Jhansi) or rocky and dry, yet densely populated because of their agro-climatic features. The one major inference drawn here is, that tribal areas are predominantly and distinctly poor.)

2.3 Poverty Variations in West Bengal

While it may be useful to identify states with high low incidence of poverty, there are states, which have high variations within them, but owing to historical/ economic antecedents and agro-climatic factors. This is typically true of the large states though such variation exists in smaller states as well.

Table 2.2 : Classification of NSS regions by rural poverty ratio (1993-94)

Medium Poverty Region (21-40 percent)	Poverty Ratio	High Poverty Region (41-60 percent)	Poverty Ratio
WB Central Plains	31.0	WB Himalayan	58.7
WB Western Plains	40.3	WB Eastern	47.1

Source : Calculations made by NIRD and Haque as reported in India Rural Development Report 1999.

The high poverty (41-60 per cent) areas are in parts of Assam, rest of Bihar, portions of MP, Inland Maharashtra, Northern TN, Eastern and Central Up, parts of WB and most of the North East. The reasons here are similar ; that tribal, thickly populated semi-arid areas, and those, which have been neglected historically, are poor. Parts of WB have made strides in poverty alleviation. Medium level poverty persists in regions of western states. Within the same western states, a few regions

have made more progress than others, compared to the eastern ones where there is uniform poverty. Typical examples are, MP, Maharashtra, TN and UP. Lastly, the western coastal regions, entire AP, Punjab, parts of MP and Rajasthan, which are continuum of a north-south belt having experienced green revolution, are pockets of low poverty.

Table 2.3 : Regional share of poor in West Bengal

State	Region	Share of poor(%)
WB	WB Himalayan	15.21
	Eastern	34.23
	Central Plains	26.52
	Western Plains	24.04
	Total	100.00

Source : Calculations made by the NIRD and Haque (1998) as reported in India Rural Development Report 1999.

An aspect calling for attention is the distribution of the poor between very poor (i.e. those below 75 per cent of consumption levels at the poverty line) and moderately poor (i.e. those between 75 per cent and near the poverty line)¹⁵. While it is seen, as expected, that the proportion of very poor are high (Table 2.4) in areas where the proportion of poor are high (Table 2.3), it is of interest to note that majority of the poor are concentrated near the poverty line.

Table 2.4 : Rural poor by severity of poverty : NSS region in West Bengal

State	Region	Very Poor	Moderately Poor	Poor
WB	Himalayan	16.37	42.36	58.73
	Eastern	78.87	29.27	47.14
	Central Plains	11.96	19.08	31.04
	Western Plains	9.55	30.71	40.26

Source : Calculations made by NIRD and Haque (1998) as reported in India Rural Development Report 1999.

2.4 Alternative Measures of Poverty

There are alternative measures of poverty, typically the Sen Index and the Poverty Gap Index (see Sen, 1980 ; and Foster, Greer and Thorbecke, 1984) which measure the depth and severity of poverty, i.e. how poor are the poor below the poverty line. Two sets of estimates now available for a relatively long period and which also cover the recent periods, are the ones constructed by Dev, Parikh and Suryanarayana (1991) and Ravallion and Dutt (1996). The former presents both the Sen Index and the poverty Gap Index. Both these indices, when drawn on a graph, show very similar trends and patterns to the head counts, implying that the poverty line is defined at such low levels that the variation below it is not effectively reflected in the computations, particularly when applied to aggregated data. Moreover, as Dandekar (1992) has stated, the NSS data are not robust enough to be subjected to very sophisticated techniques, though they are good to judge the broad extent of poverty and deprivation. are the determinants of who are the poor and who are not.

A regional dis-aggregated picture identifying who are the poor can be seen from Table 2.5. This table, by and large, confirms the contention made here, with the difference that region has its own agro-climatic features that somewhat uniquely define the extent of poverty in each occupational category. The fact remains that labouring classes are poor in larger proportions when compared to the self-employed.

Table 2.5 : Region-wise Poverty Ratio by Occupational Groups (as in 1993-94) in West Bengal.

State	Region	Self-employment in non-agriculture	Agricultural labour	Other labour	Self-employment in agriculture	Other households
WB	WB Himalayan	51.7	85.7	82.8	41.7	16.4
	Eastern	41.5	68.8	53.7	33.5	13.2
	Central Plains	27.3	45.3	43.8	22.0	86.9
	Western Plains	35.4	58.8	56.8	28.6	11.3

Source : Calculations made by NIRD and Haque (1998) as reported in India Rural Development

Report 1999.

2.5 Social Development in West Bengal :

Social development is a general term encompassing a whole range of development processes in the field of education, health and living conditions besides the overall growth in infrastructure that would raise the quality of life of the population at large. The nexus between social development and infrastructure facilities, particularly in the rural areas, needs no emphasis. It is well established by now that no form of physical accumulation or technological change is sustainable in the absence of people being able to absorb them to their advantage. For this, human facilities need to grow beyond physical labour.

Social development and infrastructure growth in rural India gained momentum with the launching of the Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) in the Fifth Five year Plan in the 1970s, though several policies were evolved and programmes implemented since the fifties for providing infrastructure services and social facilities in rural settlements. Analyses of experiences up to the Fifth Plan show inadequate priority and lack of integrated effort in this direction. The MNP in the Fifth Plan included elementary education, health, water supply, roads, electrification, housing and nutrition, as a package to be delivered in a phased manner to the whole country. Adult education was added in the Sixth Plan and rural domestic energy, rural sanitation and PDS became parts of the MNP in the Seventh Plan.

A review of the implementation of the MNP up to the end of 1980s revealed that, in general, physical and financial target achievements were at a satisfactory level, except in rural sanitation. However, achievements in relation to the need on the one hand, and quality of services delivered on the other, were far from satisfactory. While access to primary schooling had seen substantial improvement, the literacy rate did not exceed 50 per cent as per the 1991 census. Access to health facility was provided, but the birth rates, death rates, infant mortality and morbidity, could not see any significant improvement. Coverage of villages with drinking water facilities, too, could not ensure sustained water supply at a daily supply rate of 40 litres per

capita, the prescribed minimum.

The Eighth Plan laid emphasis on quality in addition to quantity, and the resource allocation was stepped up with an emphasis on efficient dovetailing of different on-going schemes/programmes towards this end. The MNP was given a new shape in 1996 with the identification of seventh Basic Minimum Services (BMS) as being of high priority. These include, 100 per cent coverage of primary health facilities, safe drinking water to all, universalisation of primary education, housing to all shelterless, nutrition support to children, connectivity (rural roads) to all unconnected villages and revamping and streamlining of the Public Distribution System (PDS) with a focus on backward areas and the poor. These were sought to be achieved within a period of two to five years.

An attempt is being made in this chapter to assess the status and spatial disparities with regard to social and infrastructure development. For the purpose of analysis and discussion, the following working classification has been made. They are not all homogenous, for instance irrigation is oddly placed in the social infrastructure grouping, but it is retained.

Social Indicators :

Child mortality,
rural population
growth (decadal),
total literacy, female
literacy and household size.

Social Infrastructure :

Housing, drinking water,
sanitation, primary school,
medical facility, roads, post
and telegraph, electricity
and irrigation.

In respect to each of the parameters, the NSS regions have been sequenced and composite ranks have been developed . In addition, two composite indices have been evolved : first, the Social Development Index (SDI) composed of parameters like female literacy, education standard, drinking water facility, toilet facility, housing status electrification and access to PDS, and next, the Infrastructure Development Index (IDI) comprising the parameters of irrigation, road density, market density, electrification communication, education, medical facility and drinking water supply.

These two indices provide a fairly comprehensive coverage of social and infrastructure variables, and have been used here for a qualitative judgement of disparities across the regions. The SDI and IDI have been developed with a NSS region as a unit since complete data are available at this level of dis-aggregation.

2.5.1 Social Infrastructure :

The social infrastructure status of the regions varies for each parameter across the state (Table-2.6). No region seems to be uniformly better placed than the other, in respect of all the parameters. However, based on the absolute values of the six parameters considered here, Delhi, Northern Plains of Gujarat, Daman and Diu, Saurashtra, southern Karnataka, Southern Punjab and Lakshadweep come in the top 10 per cent of the ranks for all parameters put together. If one deletes the union territories from this list since many receive substantial grants for their limited geographical area and thus vitiate comparison, the situation cannot be considered to be happy. In the status of bottom 30 per cent regions, Orissa tops the list as a laggard on all parameters except primary schools. This state, despite its overall backwardness, seems to have made some strides in setting up educational infrastructure in the recent years. Another general feature is that almost all regions in the North Eastern states fall at the bottom group in respect to most of the parameters. The predominant deficiencies in the states where 40 per cent or more regions fall in the bottom 30 per cent group.

Table-2.6 : Classification of regions by social infrastructure

Parameter	Top 10 per cent	Bottom 30 per cent
Pucca House	Delhi, Lakshadweep, Northern Punjab, Himalayan (UP), Daman and Diu,	Vidya (MP), Dadra and Nagpur Haveli, Central UP, Plains Eastern Assam, Coastal Orissa, Northern Orissa, Southern WB, Himalayan WB, Saurashtra, Southern Punjab. Southern Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Arunachal Pradesh, Western Plains WB, Meghalaya, Southern Orissa, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Plains

	> 65%	Western Assam, Nagaland, Plains Manipur, Hills Assam, Mizoram, Tripura, Hills Manipur. < 20%
Safe Drinking Water	Chandigarh, Central Plains WB , Southern Punjab, Pondicherry, Northern Punjab Delhi, Eastern Plains WB .	Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Northern MP, North Eastern Rajasthan, Coastal Orissa, Coastal Andhra Pradesh, Southern UP, Hills Assam Central UP, Eastern Maharashtra, Tripura, Goa, Northern Orissa, Coastal Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Southern Bihar, Plains Manipur Vindhya (MP), Coastal & Ghats Karnataka Southern Kerala, Mizoram, Northern Kerala Lakshadweep. < 45%
	< 65%	
Toilets	Lakshadweep, Tripura, Mozoram, Southern Kerala, Plains Manipur, Arunachal Pradesh Plains, Eastern Assam.	Eastern Haryana, Coastal Orissa, Central MP Western Plains WB , South Western Andhra Andhra Pradesh, Northern Bihar, Northern Eastern Rajasthan, South Eastern Rajasthan, Southern UP, Inland Western Karnataka, Southern Bihar, Southern Rajasthan, Southern MP, Central UP, Chhattisgarh MP, Eastern UP, Chandigarh Northern Orissa, Inland Central Maharashtra, Southern Orissa, Northern MP, Vidhya (MP) < 5%
	> 40%	
Parameter	Top 10 per cent	Bottom 30 per cent
Primary School	Daman and Diu, Northern Kerala, Southern Kerala, Plains Northern Gujarat, Inland Western Maharashtra, Island Central Maharashtra, South Western Andhra Pradesh.	Northern MP, Central Bihar, Meghalaya Western UP, Central UP, Southern Rajasthan Vindhya (MP), Western Plains WB , Western Rajasthan, Central MP, South Eastern Rajasthan, Chandigarh, Hills Manipur, Pondicherry, Southern Orissa, Southern Bihar, Himalayan, UP, Eastern UP, A and N Island Hills Assam, Himachal Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh.

	> 40%	< 75%
Medical Facility	Southern UP, Southern Kerala, Northern Kerala, Central UP, Western UP, Saurashtra, Lakshadweep.	Himachal Pradesh Inland Western Karnataka, Coastal Orissa, South Western MP, Plain Western Assam, Plains Eastern Assam, Southern Bihar, South Eastern Rajasthan, Northern Orissa, Hills Manipur, Arunachal Pradesh, Inland Eastern Karnataka, Malwa (MP) Southern MP, Southern Orissa, Chhattisgarh MP, Central MP, Vindhya (MP), Inland Southern Karnataka, Meghayala, Hills Assam.
	> 85%	< 20%
Taps	Daman and Diu, Pondicherry, Sikkim, Western Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Delhi, Himalayan UP.	Central UP, Coastal Andhra Pradesh, Western UP, South Western MP, Southern Rajasthan, Hills Manipur, Northern MP, Eastern Plains WB, Western Plains WB, South Eastern Rajasthan, Malwa MP, Central Plains WB, Vindhya (MP), Central Bihar, Southern Bihar, Northern Orissa, Coastal Orissa, Northern Bihar, Southern Orissa.
	> 80%	< 1%

Source : India Rural Development Report, NIRD, 1999.

TABLE 2.7 : STATUS OF THE REGIONS THAT FALL IN BOTTOM 30 PER CENT

RANK OF SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

States	No. of Regions	No. of Regions under each Parameter							Backwardness Index (%)
		Pucca House	Drinking Water	Electricity	Toilets	Primary School	Medical Facility	Taps	
West Bengal	4	2	-	4	1	1	-	3	40.0

Source : India Rural Development Report, NIRD, 1999.

TABLE-2.8 : STATES THAT LIE IN THE BOTTOM 30 PER CENT GROUPING WITH REGARD TO SPECIFIC SOCIAL PARAMETERS.

Housing	Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur
Drinking Water	Meghalaya, Manipur.
Electricity	Meghalaya, Bihar, Assam, Rajasthan, UP, West Bengal.
Sanitation	Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Manipur, Bihar, Rajasthan, UP
Primary School	Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Manipur, Bihar, Rajasthan, UP
Medical Facilities	Meghalaya, Assam, Bihar
Tap Water	Bihar, MP, Rajasthan, WB

Source : India Rural Development Report, NIRD, 1999.

2.5.2 Social Development :

Social development is measured here through assessing patterns in female literacy, total literacy, household size and child mortality. Data indicate that most of the North Eastern states have performed well in comparison to others. Among the states in other statements TN, Kerala, HP, Karnataka and WB have shown a better standing, as none of the regions in these states fall in the bottom 30 per cent category. Among the worst performing states are the ones from the BIMARU region ; Madhya Pradesh is at the bottom, followed by Rajasthan, Utter Pradesh and Bihar.

TABLE 2.9 : CLASSIFICATION OF REGION BY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Parameter	Top 10 per cent	Bottom 30 per cent
Female Literacy	Southern Kerala, Northern Kerala, Lakshadweep, Mizoram, Goa, Andaman, and Nicobar Islands, Coastal & Ghats (Karnataka). > 60%	Dry Areas (Gujarat), Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Central Bihar, South Western MP, Chhattisgarh (MP), South Western, Andhra Pradesh, Western UP, Central UP, Inland Northern Andhra Pradesh, Southern UP, Southern Bihar, Vindhya (MP) Northern Bihar, Eastern UP, Northern MP, Malwa (MP), North Eastern Southern Rajasthan, Western Rajasthan. < 40%
Total Literacy	Southern Kerala, Northern Kerala, Lakshadweep, Mizoram, Goa, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Coastal and Ghats (Karnataka).	Central MP, Eastern Plains WB , Western Up, Arunachal Pradesh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Northern MP, Southern UP, South Western MP, Eastern UP, Chhattisgarh (MP), North Eastern Rajasthan, Central UP, South Western Andhra Pradesh, Southern Bihar, Vindhya (MP),

		Malwa (MP), Northern Bihar, Inland Northern Andhra Pradesh, South Eastern Rajasthan, Western Rajasthan, Southern Rajasthan, Southern Orissa.
	> 70%	< 40%
Household Size	Chandigarh, Inland TN, Southern TN, Coastal TN, Coastal Andhra Pradesh, Southern Orissa, Coastal Northern TN.	Mizoram, Inland Northern Karnataka, Coastal Orissa, Malwa (MP), Northern Punjab, Southern UP, South Western MP, Northern Bihar, Lakshadweep, Plains Western Assam, Plains Manipur, Western Rajasthan, Southern Punjab, Saurashtra, Hills Manipur, Western UP, Eastern UP, North Eastern Rajasthan, Western Haryana, Northern MP, Eastern Haryana, Central Bihar.
	< 5	< 6
Decadal Growth (1981-91)	Southern Kerala, Southern TN, Coastal TN, Coastal and Ghats Karnataka, Inland Eastern Karnataka, Inland TN, Goa.	Northern MP, Eastern Haryana, Central MP, North Eastern Rajasthan, Vindhya (MP), Inland Central Maharashtra, Maghalaya, South Western Andhra Pradesh, Hills Manipur, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Pondicherry, Tripura, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, Inland Southern Andhra Pradesh, Chandigarh, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Delhi, Nagaland.
	< 15%	> 30%
Child Mortality (1991)	Hills Manipur, Southern Kerala, Northern Kerala, Coastal and Ghats Karnataka, Goa, Plains Manipur, Pondicherry.	Lakshadweep, Arunachal Pradesh, Eastern Maharashtra, Western UP, Eastern UP, South Eastern Rajasthan Chhattisgarh (MP), Northern Orissa, Southern UP, Southern Rajasthan, Central UP, Malwa (MP), Southern Orissa, Coastal Orissa, Southern MP, Northern MP, South Western MP, Central MP, Vindhya (MP).
	< 55	> 105

Source : India Rural Development Report, NIRD, 1999.

Table 1.10 : States with predominant deficiency in social development

Female Literacy	Bihar, MP, Rajasthan, UP, Andhra Pradesh (50%)
Total Literacy	Bihar, MP, Rajasthan, UP, Andhra Pradesh (50%)
Household Size	Bihar, Haryana, Manipur, Mizoram, Punjab, UP, Rajasthan (50%)
Child Mortality	Arunachal Pradesh, MP, Orissa, UP, Rajasthan (50%).

Source : India Rural Development Report, NIRD, 1999.

Table 2.11 : Absolute Values and Ranks

State/Region	Region Code	Female Literacy Value	Literacy Rank	Total Literacy Value	Total Literacy Rank	Household Value	Household Rank	Total Rank	Overall Rank
Himalayan (WB)	75	29.84	42	42.56	45	5.19	19	106	34

Eastern Plains (WB)	76	28.33	47	38.48	54	5.41	32	133	46
Central Plains (WB)	77	43.87	26	56.26	24	5.63	41	91	29
Western	78	44.71	22	59.75	15	5.75	49	86	26

Source : India Rural Development Report, NIRD, 1999.