

POVERTY AND SOCIAL MONITORING IN UTTAR PRADESH

A baseline report 1999-2000



**Economics and Statistics Division,
Planning Department,
Govt. of Uttar Pradesh,
Lucknow**

October 2002

FOREWARD

Alleviation of poverty and successive improvement in the living standard of people has been one of the important objectives of our five year plans. However, special efforts made in this direction since the Fifth Five Year Plan. Thereafter, the problem of poverty has consistently been figuring in various plan exercises. Based on the conclusion drawn from various studies that the problem of poverty arises on account of inadequate growth in income and its mal-distribution among different segments of society, various poverty alleviation programmes were launched to economically strengthen such segments and bring them above the poverty line. However, reduction in the incidence of poverty in Uttar Pradesh has not been very encouraging which may largely be attributed to the slow and sluggish growth performance of the State's economy in recent years. Besides, the State government has also been faced with high and rising fiscal deficit in recent years, which, in turn, have led to a mounting debt burden.

Recognising that the current fiscal situation is untenable, and that it may soon assume serious proportions, the Government of U.P. embarked upon a comprehensive reform programme known as "UP Fiscal and Public Sector Restructuring Programme" (UPFPSRP) with the World Bank assistance. Fiscal governance and sectoral reforms have been initiated since then. While the primary objective of the reform programme has been to address the present fiscal crisis, the reform programme is also expected to have a significant impact in terms of raising incomes and reducing poverty in the State. However, the actual impacts of sectoral and macro reform measures on the poor are complex and often difficult to anticipate. Slashing down in government expenditure, labour retrenchment, increased taxes and user-charges could have adverse short-run impact on the poor. Thus, there is an imperative need of carefully designing monitoring system to track changes both in outcomes (e.g. incomes, poverty levels, mortality and morbidity) and in key intermediate variables (e.g. access to services and basic infrastructure), which have impact on living standards.

Considering the constraints, on the basis of suggestion given by the World Bank, "Poverty and Social Monitoring System" project aided by world bank was designed and conducted by the Economics and Statistics Division of the Planning Department, which has tremendous experience in conducting socio-economic surveys. Under the project, a set of monitoring indicators was developed and baseline survey was conducted during

1999-2000 along with 55th round of National Sample Survey. This report is based on the baseline survey of 1999-2000.

I hope the findings of the report would be useful to policy makers, implementing agencies and researchers dealing with reform programmes for poor and weaker sections of society.

Comments and suggestions to improve upon the report will always be welcome.

Dated: October 26, 2002

(S.N. Jha)
Principal Secretary,
Government of Uttar Pradesh
Planning Department

PREFACE

The World Bank assisted project "Poverty and Social Monitoring System" (PSMS) is initiated in Planning Department, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh. The work of implementation of the project has been entrusted to Economic and Statistics Division of the Planning Department. Under the project monitoring indicators were identified in consultation with World Bank. To prepare baseline information on identified indicators, baseline survey was undertaken along with National Sample Survey 55th round (survey period July 1999 to June 2000) for those information which were not available from any other source. At the outset formats were prepared by Economics and Statistics Division (ESD) and discussed with the World Bank officials. After this pre-testing of the schedule was done in rural and urban areas of Lucknow district. Ultimately schedule was finalised with the help of World Bank official and it was named Schedule-99. This was followed by preparation of instruction for filling up the schedules. After completion of this process the training was imparted to the field officers and workers of the Economics and Statistics Division. Actual fieldwork of the baseline survey was undertaken from February to August 2000. After the completion of the field work data were scrutinised by the officers of ESD. The whole data subsequently were brought to ESD head quarter. The data entry and validation was undertaken with the help of outside agency. The formats for the final tables based on validated data were prepared by the ESD and were got approved by the Planning Department. Final tables were prepared by the ESD staff with the help of World Bank Consultant Dr. N.K. Singh. On the basis of final tables and information collected from other sources the baseline report has been prepared.

World Bank contributed through its technical and scholarly support, especially through Ms. Valerie Kozel, Mr. Salman Zaidi, Ms. Monica Jain, Mr. V.R. Gadgil (Consultant) and Dr. N.K. Singh (Consultant). The Giri Institute of Development Studies, Lucknow played their due role as consultant of the project. As a representative of the Giri Institute, Prof. B.K. Bajpai contributed a lot in drafting the report.

The data entry packages were prepared by the National Informatics Centre (NIC), Govt. of India, Lucknow under the guidance of World Bank and ESD officials. Dr. L.R. Yadav, Technical Director of NIC took keen interest in the task. The data entry and validation work was done under the supervision of Mr. Jawahir, Deputy Director (Computer) and Mr. R.K. Dhusia, Programmer, assisted by the staff of the Electronic Data Processing section of ESD.

The peer review enhanced the quality of the report. The reviewers include, Prof. A. Banerjee (IIM, Lucknow), Prof. K.S. Sridhar (IIM, Lucknow), Prof. A.K. Sengupta (Head Economics Department, Lucknow University, Lucknow), Prof. G.P. Mishra (Giri Institute of Development Studies, Lucknow) & Prof. R.C. Tripathi (Director, G.B. Pant Social Science Institute, Allahabad).

The acknowledgement is also made of the work done by Mr. S.D. Verma, Deputy Director and Mr. R.K. Chauhan, Economics and Statistics Officer ESD, assisted by Mr. Ish Dutt Verma and Mr. Lalji, Assistant Economics and Statistics Officer and other officials of ESD for completion of the survey, processing of data and drafting of the

baseline report. I also express my appreciation for the hard work put in by Economics and Statistics Inspectors, Assistant Economics and Statistics Officers and Supervisory Officers posted in the field for bearing the extra work load of collecting information in Schedule-99. Last but not least, credit also goes to the respondents who spared their valuable time and extended their co-operation to the field staff by replying difficult and tedious questions patiently, during the survey. Any suggestions for improvement in the report shall be highly appreciated.

Dated: October 24, 2002

(O. K. Saxena)
Director,
Economics and Statistics Division,
Planning Department,
Government of Uttar Pradesh

Index

1. **POVERTY**
2. **POVERTY MONITORING**
3. **POVERTY AND SOCIAL MONITORING**
 - 3.1 **FUNCTIONS OF THE PSMS PROJECT**
 - 3.2 **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PSMS PROJECT**
 - 3.3 **WORK UNDERTAKEN FOR THE PSMS PROJECT**
 - 3.3.1 **INDICATORS**
 - 3.3.2 **THE BASELINE SURVEY**
4. **BASELINE STATUS OF POVERTY**
 - 4.1 **GSDP GROWTH RATE**
 - 4.2 **COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLDS EXPENDITURE**
 - 4.3 **POVERTY– HEAD COUNT, DEPTH AND SEVERITY**
 - 4.4 **WAGES**
 - 4.5 **EMPLOYMENT**
 - 4.5.1 **EMPLOYMENT GROWTH**
 - 4.5.2 **QUALITY OF EMPLOYMENT**
 - 4.5.3 **UNEMPLOYMENT RATE**
 - 4.5.4 **UNDEREMPLOYMENT**
 - 4.5.5 **OUT OF LABOUR FORCE**
 - 4.6 **HEALTH**
 - 4.6.1 **IMMUNISATION**
 - 4.6.2 **INFANT MORTALITY RATE**
 - 4.7 **EDUCATION**
 - 4.7.1 **LITERACY**
 - 4.7.2 **EDUCATIONAL LEVEL**
 - 4.7.3 **ENROLMENT**
 - 4.7.4 **DROP OUT RATE**
 - 4.7.5 **SCHOOL COMPLETION RATE**
 - 4.8 **HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE**
 - 4.8.1 **TYPE OF DWELLING**
 - 4.8.2 **AVAILABILITY OF DRINKING WATER, ELECTRICITY AND SANITATION**
 - 4.9 **PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES**
 - 4.9.1 **PRE-NATAL CARE AND MATERNITY FACILITIES**
 - 4.10 **AWARENESS ABOUT HEALTH FACILITIES, PRIMARY SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS ATTENDANCE**
 - 4.11 **ACCESS TO KEY SOCIAL FACILITIES AND SERVICES**
 - 4.12 **SERVICE QUALITY AND SATISFACTION**
5. **RECAPITULATION**
 - 5.1 **EMPLOYMENT**
 - 5.2 **HEALTH**
 - 5.3 **EDUCATION**
 - 5.4 **HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE**
 - 5.5 **PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC WORK PROGRAMME**
 - 5.6 **AWARENESS ABOUT HEALTH FACILITIES, PRIMARY SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS ATTENDANCE**
 - 5.7 **ACCESS TO SOCIAL FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

5.8 MEASURING SERVICE QUALITY AND SATISFACTION

List of Tables

Table No.	Contents	Page No
4.1.1	Annual Growth of State Gross Income	10
4.2.1	Composition of Household Expenditure, 1999-2000	12
4.3.1	Head Count Rate	13
4.3.2	Poverty measure for various NSS rounds	14
4.4.1	Annual Average of Rural and Urban Wage Index of U.P.	15
4.5.1	Per Thousand Distribution of Usually Employed by Category of Employment for U.P. and India	17
4.12.1	Services	34
1	Percentage Distribution of Immunized Boys, Girls in Rural, Urban Areas and the State According to MPCE Class and Place of Immunization	39-41
2	Per cent literate persons 7 years and above by sex and MPCE class	42
3	Percentage Distribution of Boys and Girls in Rural, Urban Areas and the State According to MPCE Class and Highest Level of Education	43-45
4	Enrolment Rate of Children of 5-14 years According to MPCE Classes in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	46
5	Drop-Out Rate of Children of 5-14 years According to MPCE Classes in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	47
6	Rate of Completion of Highest Level of Education of Males, Females and Person in Rural and Urban Areas and the State in Age Group 18 years and above	48-50
7	Percentage Distribution of Households According to MPCE Class and Structure of Dwelling in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	51
8	Percentage Distribution of Households According to MPCE Class and Type of Latrine Used in Rural, Urban areas and the State	52
9	Percentage Distribution of Households According to MPCE Class and Source of Drinking Water in Rural, Urban areas and the State	53
10	Percentage Distribution of Households According to MPCE Class and Availability of Electricity in Rural, Urban areas and the State	54
11	Percentage Distribution of Households According to MPCE Class and their Participation in Public Work Programme in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	55
12	Percentage of Married Women in the Age Group of 15-49 Years who received Pre-Natal Care according to MPCE Class	56

	in Rural, Urban areas and the State	
13	Percentage Distribution of Married Women in the Age Group of 15-49 years according to Birth Place of Last Child Born in the Past Five Years in each MPCE Class in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	57
14	Percentage of Children of Age Group 0-5 Years Attending Aanganwadi/Balwadi Centre in each MPCE Class in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	58-60
15	Percentage of Households Having Knowledge of Social Rights and Health Programmes in MPCE Classes in Rural, Urban and the State	61-62
16	Percentage of Households Having Knowledge about Nearest Available Government Health Facilities according to MPCE Classes in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	63-64
17	Percentage of Households Having Knowledge about Nearest Government Primary Schools and Teachers Attendance According to MPCE Classes in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	65-66
18	Percentage Distribution of Households not Getting Drinking Water from Drinking Water Source Throughout the Year According to MPCE Classes in Rural, Urban Areas and the State	67

List of Annexures

Annexure No.	Contents	Page No
Annexure 1:	Progress of Agricultural Production during First Three Years of Ninth Plan of UP	68
Annexure 2:	Industrial Source-wise Gross State Income of UP	69
Annexure 3:	Growth Performance during the First Two Years of the Ninth Plan of UP	70
Annexure 4:	Rural Consumer Price Index of U.P.	70
Annexure 5:	Urban Consumer Price Index of U.P.	71
Annexure 6:	Correlation Results (Rural)	72
Annexure 7:	Correlation Results (Urban)	73
Annexure 8:	Drop-Out Rate of Children of 5 To 14 Years (Rural & Urban)	74
Annexure 9:	Enrolment Rate of Children of 5 To 14 Years According to M.P.C.E. Class (Rural & Urban)	75
Annexure 10:	Distribution of Visible Underemployment, by Different Classifications of Activity Status, Uttar Pradesh, 1999-2000	76
Annexure 11:	Invisible Underemployment, Uttar Pradesh, 1999-2000	76

Annexure 12:	<u>Persons Out of Labour Force, According to Usual Current Weekly and Current Daily Status for Uttar Pradesh, 1999-2000</u>	76
Annexure 13:	<u>Percentage Distribution of Villages by Distance from Key Social Services and Facilities</u>	77

1. POVERTY

The poverty in India, its causes, nature and measures for its eradication has been subjects of long debate. In the colonial period, our main pre-occupation on the topic was with the 'Poverty of India'. This was traced in exploitation and unequal changes under the imperial power. After independence, the instruments of policy became national and the debate shifted inward to address poverty within India. Poverty reduction has become a prominent objective of social and economic development in India. It has found expression in plans, policy statements and programmes. Poverty has thus been an intensely practical concern in which research and policy have interacted. Under the broad head of research and policy on poverty different steps have been taken from time to time by the government at the centre and state levels to monitor the poverty. A number of methodological issues have been raised in respect of the estimates of poverty released by the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission Task Force recommended in 1979 minimum calorie norms for demarcating poverty line in the rural and urban areas separately. The task force further defined the poverty line as the per capita expenditure level at which the calorie norms were met on the basis of all India consumption basket for 1973-74. The poverty line so defined needs updating over time to take care of changes in the price levels. This was done by the use of a price index appropriately weighted by the consumption basket of the poor as an index for reflecting price changes relevant to the poor.

In view of the importance of poverty eradication as a social objective, wide ranging references to the incidence of poverty in discussions relating to social problems as also their use in the allocation of funds for poverty alleviation programmes, it was decided by the Planning Commission of India that all the issues relating to the estimates of poverty could be considered afresh by an expert group. The Expert Group was constituted during 1989, which submitted its report during 1993. Accordingly recommendations of the Expert Group were accepted and implemented by the Planning Commission with slight simplifications.

From time to time there have been shifts in the basic concepts underlying poverty and the methodology for estimating it. The recommendations of the Expert Group regarding the use of deflators for updating the poverty line for rural and urban areas have been adopted and the factors responsible for the incidence of poverty have also been taken into consideration in the state. The following part presents a brief account of different official methodologies used from time to time for poverty estimation from initial period till date.

Calorie Norm: Initially the Official estimates were based on a calorie norm of 2400 calories per capita per day for rural areas and 2100 calories per capita per day for urban

areas. The poverty line for the base year 1973-74 has been taken as the per capita expenditure level at which these calorie norm have been met, on an average, for the country as a whole.

Poverty Line in the Base Year: The Task Force (1979) defined the poverty line as the per capita expenditure level at which the calorie norms were met on the basis of the all-India consumption basket for 1973-74. This was equivalent to Rs.49.0 and Rs.56.4 per capita per month for rural and urban areas respectively at 1973-74 prices.

Deflators: The study group in 1984 recommended the use of a price index appropriately weighted by the consumption basket of the poor as an index for reflecting price changes relevant to the poor. The implicit private consumption deflator from NSA was used for adjusting the poverty line for the years 1977-78, 1983-84 and 1987-88.

The Adjustment Procedure for Estimating Poverty Population: In order to arrive at the estimates of the number of poor, Planning Commission has been making adjustment in the National Sample Survey (NSS) data on the distribution of households by the consumption expenditure levels. The procedure has been to adjust the expenditure levels reported by the NSS uniformly across all expenditure classes by a factor equal to the ratio of the total private consumption expenditure obtained from the National Accounts Statistics (NAS) to that obtained from the NSS. The old NAS series was used for deriving the adjustment factor for the estimates upto year 1983 and the New NAS series has been used for the 1987-88 estimates.

The poverty population is, thus, estimated by applying the updated poverty line to the corresponding adjusted NSS distribution of households by the levels of consumption expenditure.

The Expert Group Report (1993): The Expert Group Report set out an alternative methodology for the estimation of poverty and provided estimates of poverty at the national and state level from the quinquennial consumer expenditure survey of the National Sample Survey (NSS) using the state specific poverty lines. The Expert Group made estimates of poverty for the years 1973-74, 1977-78, 1983 and 1987-88. The most important points of departure between the Expert Group recommendations and the Task Force methodology were:

Giving up adjustments of the NSS data on the basis of the estimate of private consumption given in the National Accounts Statistics (NAS). The adjustment ratio recommended by the Task Force in 1979 was only around 10 per cent. Now the adjustment ratio has gone up about 40 per cent. The difference in the level of poverty in the official estimate and the Expert Group estimate is largely due to the adjustment factor.

The Expert Group recommended the State specific poverty lines as against an all-India poverty line for rural and urban areas.

The Expert Group suggested use of the state specific cost of living indices for updating the poverty line separately for rural and urban areas. The official estimates are based on only one all India index which is also the same for rural and urban areas.

It recommended taking consumer price index for agricultural labourers for updating the rural poverty line and a simple average of weighted commodity indices of Consumer Price Index for Industrial workers and Consumer Price Index for Urban Non-Manual Employees for updating urban poverty line. However, the Planning Commission has decided to use only the “Consumer Price Index for Industrial Workers” for estimating and updating the urban poverty line.

Poverty estimates for 1999-2000: Planning Commission has estimated poverty from both distributions reported by the NSSO, using the accepted methodology. State Specific poverty lines have been estimated using the original state specific poverty lines identified by the Lakdawala Committee and updating them to 1999-2000 prices using the Consumer Price Index of Agricultural Labourers (CPIAL) for rural households and the Consumer Price Index of Industrial Workers (CPIIW) for urban households. The poverty lines have then been used in conjunction with each of the two consumption distribution, to estimate the percentage of people below the poverty line for each state. As in the past, separate estimates have been made for rural and urban areas for each state, which are then combined into a state level estimate.

2. POVERTY MONITORING

Poverty estimates have shown that the gap between U.P. and the rest of India continued to remain almost same, with percentage of population below poverty line as 31.2 in the state against 26.10 at all India level during the year 1999-2000. The rate of poverty reduction in the state is directly linked to the poor growth performance of the state in the recent years. In addition to the low rates of growth, the state has also been faced with high and rising fiscal deficits in recent years.

The rationale of the poverty monitoring lies in the answer to a question – does overall economic growth reduce poverty, i.e., is there a trickle down mechanism. Thus, the process of poverty monitoring examine whether the benefits of growth are percolated to the poorer strata of the society or not. The poverty monitoring has been a continuous process in the state.

The incidence of poverty in the state during a span of 20 years (1973-93) has decreased from about 57 per cent in 1973-74 to about 41 per cent in 1993-94 indicating a reduction of about 16 per cent in this period. The corresponding reduction in the rural and urban areas works out to be 14 per cent and 25 per cent respectively.

The population below the poverty line in the state in 1973-74, which was 16.7 per cent of the corresponding population of all-India, was higher at 18.9 per cent in 1993-94. This is indicative of the deterioration in UP's relative poverty position over the years.

Although the proportion of population in rural areas has decreased from 84 per cent in 1973-74 to 82 per cent in 1993-94, about three-fourths of the poor population continues to be concentrated in the rural areas. However, the poor population in the urban areas has gone up from 16 per cent to 18 per cent during the corresponding period. Thus, this indicates the increasing rate of urbanisation as well as more migration of poor from villages to cities.

The percentage of poverty in the state was targeted to come down from 41.2 per cent in 1996-97 to 33.7 per cent in 2001-02. The corresponding envisaged reduction in poverty in rural areas was from 42.6 per cent to 33.3 per cent. However, the percentage of poverty in urban areas was estimated at about 35 per cent. While preparing the estimates of poverty incidence during the Ninth Plan, two assumptions were made. Firstly, a growth rate of 3.5 per cent per annum was assumed in the consumption level against the targeted annual growth rate of 7 per cent in state income for the Ninth Plan period. Secondly, the rural-urban disparity was assumed to come down to 1.3 per cent in the Ninth Plan, which was 1.5 per cent in 1987-88 and 1.4 per cent in 1993-94.

Looking at the growth performance of the state's economy as observed in 1997-98 (2.3 per cent) and 1998-99 (3.6 per cent) and as expected 4 per cent in 1999-2000, the situation that emerges is not quite encouraging viewed against the targeted annual growth rate of 7 per cent.

In case of all-India, the composition of growth has been such that it is largely led by the industrial and service sectors, both of which have a typical 'urban bias' so that the growth process is likely to have benefited the urban areas more than the hinterlands of India wherein reside the poor masses. Almost similar trends are revealed from the growth pattern of the state's economy. The observed growth rates during the first two years and also the expected growth rate during the third year of the Ninth Plan indicate a lower growth rate in the agriculture sector in comparison to the industrial and service sectors. The rural-urban disparity in consumption has now been assumed to be 1.4 against 1.3 for the terminal year (2001-02) of the Ninth Five Year Plan.

Based on the aforesaid assumptions, the estimates of poverty for 2001-02 are worked out in the State Ninth Five Year Plan. According to these, the percentage of poverty in the state would come down to about 36 per cent in 2001-02 from 41.2 per cent in 1996-97. The corresponding reduction in poverty in rural areas would be 37.8 per cent from 42.6 per cent, whereas in the urban areas it would come down to 29.4 per cent from 35.1 per cent. On account of reduction in the incidence of poverty, the number of persons below the poverty line would reduce to 638.8 lakh from 656.5 lakh at the beginning of the Plan. Besides, the number of persons below the poverty line in rural areas would come down to 530.1 lakh and that in urban areas to 108.7 lakh in 2001-02 from 539.7 lakh and 116.8 lakh respectively in 1996-97.

3. POVERTY AND SOCIAL MONITORING

Under the existing set up of poverty monitoring, it was realised that as a result of slow down in economic growth process, proper attention could not be given towards expenditures in social sectors. As a result of this, there has been a marked deterioration in the quality of service delivery in the state. In order to mobilise greater share of resources for basic social services, improve the quality of service delivery and enhance the access of the poor to such services as the need of poverty and social monitoring was felt. In view of this, the Poverty and Social Monitoring in U.P. was initiated under the umbrella of a comprehensive reform programme known as “U.P. Fiscal and Public Sector Restructuring Programme” (UPFPSRP) funded by the World Bank. While the primary objective of the reform programme has been to address the financial crisis facing the government, the reform programme is also expected to have a significant impact in terms of rising incomes and reducing poverty in the state. But the actual impact of macro reform measures on the poor are complex and often difficult to anticipate. In order to have an assessment of the impact of the broad reform programme on the poor and weaker elements of society need is felt that government puts in place an effective monitoring system. In view of this, a technical assistance proposal for Poverty and Social Monitoring System (PSMS) project was launched with the World Bank's assistance.

The PSMS is meant for providing information on the impact of reform measures on the poor and other risk groups. The aim of monitoring system is to provide information to policy makers at all levels of government so that they can make better informed decisions regarding poverty reduction and social development initiatives.

3.1 Functions of the PSMS Project

As per Aide Memoire of the Technical Economic Mission of the World Bank, the following steps were proposed to be taken up under the PSMS project by the Department of Planning, Government of U.P. which was recognised as the nodal agency for handling the Project.

As a first step, the government was needed to develop benchmark indicators by which progress could be assessed: these included a comprehensive set of indicators (for example, levels of poverty, enrolment rates, health indicators, access to basic services, gender inequalities, extent of child labour.

It was also expected from government to discuss and propose benchmark indicators to be used to monitor the process and the impact of proposed reform on the poor and other vulnerable groups.

Once these indicators are identified, it is necessary to establish a baseline against which progress can be assessed. In establishing the baseline, it would be necessary to use the existing sources of information and to make new data collection efforts.

A more comprehensive database on the households and community level indicators of living standard was proposed to be established through conducting households and community survey of a representative of 8000-10000 households in approximately 1000 communities located throughout the state. The baseline survey would collect information on a wide range of welfare indicators, including households consumption patterns, housing conditions, health and education status, as well as access to a range of services and programmes offered in the locality. The baseline survey could be repeated after an interval of 3-5 years to assess changes in living standards over time.

In the interim period, the sample communities chosen for the baseline would in turn be used to monitor more intensively and at more frequent time intervals, changes in the social and economic environment in the state. This may include quarterly monitoring of intermediate indicators, which are likely to impact living conditions.

3.2 Implementation of the PSMS Project

In order to meet the above requirement as desired by the technical and economic mission of the World Bank, detailed discussions at the government level were held and subsequently mutually agreed decisions were taken up to take up the following actions for the implementation of the PSMS project in U.P.

To meet the broad requirements a task force was to be set up at the state level consisting of Secretary Planning as the Chairman and six other officers belonging to the State Planning Commission, Economics and Statistics Division SPI, Evaluation Division SPI and NIC as members. The task force was to prepare the benchmark indicators, which were to be finalised by the World Bank.

In order to reduce the gap between the data collection and its analysis and dissemination in DES a proposal for its computerisation was made along with provision for computerisation of the Project Monitoring Unit (PMU).

It was agreed that as far as possible, the data collection and monitoring mechanism would be implemented through the Economics and Statistics Division, and wherever necessary expertise and skill may be drawn from the outside agencies and research institutes. National and international level consultants were proposed to be involved for survey design, training analysis and monitoring. Intensive training will be required for poverty monitoring, assessment and analysis work. Training workshops were proposed to be organised at various levels for this purpose.

The required data for identified benchmark indicators were to be collected from various sources. In case of non-availability of data against these indicators, these were to be procured through specially designed baseline survey. Regular surveys were decided to be organised subsequently at regular intervals for the collection of data required for poverty monitoring.

Special surveys regarding socio-economic infrastructure topics involving policy matters and qualitative monitoring were also to be conducted from time to time for making the poverty monitoring more purposive and meaningful.

3.3 Work Undertaken for the PSMS Project

For the compliance of the mutually agreed actions to be taken up under the PSMS project, the following actions have been taken up so far.

Initially, a taskforce was set up at the state level consisting of Secretary Planning as the Chairman and six other officers belonging to the State Planning Commission, Economics and Statistics Division SPI, Evaluation Division SPI and NIC as members. The PMUs have been organised within the (I) Planning Department, (ii) Directorate of Economics and Statistics, and (iii) in all the line departments.

3.3.1 Indicators

The first step in establishing an effective monitoring system is to develop a comprehensive list of key indicators. This involves the identification of a set of performance indicators that can be used to track progress at reducing poverty, promoting human development and ensuring greater empowerment for the people over time in the state. In this context two types of indicators are needed. First, to analyse poverty and social development, we need to analyse outcome indicators, which tell us what is happening about our ultimate goals, such as poverty, employment, education and health levels. The second type of indicators are called intermediate indicators, which influence poverty in its many dimensions such as service delivery, access to facilities, awareness of health practices, etc.

A specific set of poverty and social performance indicators has been developed by the Government of U.P. (Planning Department) with the help of World Bank following consultation with the relevant line departments. These indicators are listed below.

(i). Consumption and Income Measures

- (a) GSDP growth rates,
- (b) Composition of households expenditures (food priority non-food items)
- (c) Poverty headcount index, depth, severity of poverty.

(ii). Employment and Wages

- (a) Wages for agriculture labourers, unskilled workers.
- (b) Prices for key food commodities, price index for the poor

- (c) Employment status (employed, under-employed, unemployed and out of labour force)

(iii). Health

- (a) Immunisation
- (b) Infant Mortality

(iv). Education

- (a) Literacy
- (b) School enrolments
- (c) School drop-outs
- (d) School completion

(v). Housing and Infrastructure

- (a) Type of dwelling
- (b) Households living in slum areas
- (c) Households having latrine facility in their houses
- (d) Households living with their own drinking water sources in their dwellings
- (e) Households living in electrified dwellings
- (f) Households with access to safe drinking water

(vi) Participation in Government Programmes

- (a) Access to anti-poverty programmes
- (b) Safe motherhood – use of ante-natal care, deliveries attended by TBA
- (c) Enrolment in non-formal or alternative schooling programmes
- (d) Use of ICDS (Aanganwadi, Balwadi programmes)

(vii) Awareness of Public health programmes and social rights

(viii) Access to facilities/services

(ix) Quality of service

3.3.2 The Baseline Survey

The preparation for conducting baseline survey was started in July 1999. At the outset formats were prepared by DES covering the information required on the indicators for which information was not available from any source. These were discussed with the World Bank Officials. After this the pretesting of schedule was done in the rural and urban areas of Lucknow district. Ultimately schedule was finalised by the World Bank authorities and it was named as Schedule 99 – Poverty Module and it was tagged with NSS 55th round. This was followed by preparation of instructions for filling up the Schedules. After completion of this process the training to DES officers was imparted by the World Bank Officials and subsequently field workers were trained by the DES officers. Actual field work of the baseline survey was undertaken from February to August 2000. The schedule 99 was canvassed from the sample households which were selected for the Household Consumer Schedule 1.0 in 55th round. Under NSS 55th round 1184 sample units in rural and urban areas were covered. In each sample unit 12 households for schedule 1.0 were selected. After completion of field work data was

scrutinised by the field officers of the DES. The whole data, subsequently brought to the DES headquarter. The data entry and validation was undertaken with the help of outside agency. The formats for the final Tables to be based on validated data were prepared by the DES and other officials at the government level. After discussion with the World Bank representatives, final Tables were prepared by the DES Staff. Final Tables were categorised as per twelve per capita monthly expenditure classes (MPCE) determined by the NSSO Government of India in respect of Household Consumer Schedule 1.0.

4. BASELINE STATUS OF POVERTY

4.1 GSDP Growth Rate

A perusal of the growth performance of the state economy during the first three years of the Ninth Five Year Plan, 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 has not shown very encouraging picture. The growth of GSDP in the overall economy in the first three years at 2.6 per cent has been far behind the targeted growth of 7 per cent per annum. It was 0.1 per cent in 1997-98, 3.4 per cent in 1998-99 and 4.2 per cent in 1999-2000 (Table-4.1.1).

Table 4.1.1: Annual Growth of State Gross Income (in percentage)

Year	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
1993-94	5.8	5.0	6.8	5.1	5.4	5.5
1994-95	--	4.2	7.2	4.8	5.3	5.4
1995-96	--	--	10.3	5.1	5.7	5.7
1996-97	--	--	--	0.1	3.4	4.2
1997-98	--	--	--	--	6.9	6.3
1998-99	--	--	--	--	--	5.7

Source: State Income Estimates, Bulletin No.275, Economics and Statistics Division, January 2001, p.20.

The main reason for lower growth rates in the economy during these years is that the State could not improve upon its performance, achieved during 1996-97 in agriculture, which was the base year of the States' Ninth Plan. There was a record production of foodgrains in that year (1996-97) at 423.8 lakh tonnes, against 383.5 lakh tonnes of the preceding year (1995-96) as a result of which the growth rate in agriculture rose to 8.7 per cent over the preceding year. This rise in the foodgrains production was followed by a dip in the next year, when the production comes down to 416.8 lakh tonnes. This coupled with a still higher decline in the production of commercial crops, brought down the growth in agriculture to (-)5.1 per cent in 1997-98. There was some improvement in the following year when the growth again reached upto 2.2 per cent in 1998-99. Such fluctuations in the foodgrains production, mostly caused by weather, have a significant impact on the growth performance not only of the agricultural sector but also of the

economy as a whole. There have been significant gains in the foodgrains production in 1999-2000. The production of foodgrains has gone upto 452.4 lakh tonnes, substantially higher (by 28.6 lakh tonnes) over the record production of 423.8 lakh tonnes of 1996-97 (Annexure -1). Though this is a good sign and answers well for the future but the production of commercial and high value crops, more particularly of oilseeds and sugarcane has still not picked up to the desired extent.

The manufacturing sector is the second most important sector of the state's economy. Its contribution accounted for about 13.5 per cent to the State GDP in 1993-94. Unlike agriculture, which is a slow growing sector, manufacturing is a fast growing sector. It is for this reason that the contribution of this sector in the state GDP rose from 13.5 per cent in 1993-94 to 18.4 per cent in 1999-2000 (Annexure-2). Unlike the agriculture sector, the share of manufacturing sector in state's GDP is far higher (18.4 per cent) than its share (7.7 per cent) in the state's workforce. The average income per worker in the manufacturing sector is, thus, higher than that in the agriculture sector which is the reason why workers tend to migrate from agriculture to manufacturing. In this way migration from agriculture to manufacturing may be deemed as healthy sign in terms of higher growth rate in manufacturing sector and reduced pressure of workers on agriculture and their marginal productivity. However the state has not witnessed this migration on any significant scale because of various other reasons.

As per figures of state GDP, the overall contribution of secondary sector, which was 21.4 per cent during the year 1993-94 (at constant prices), rose to 25.3 per cent during the year 1999-2000. The share of secondary sector in the state GDP kept on increasing during these years except 1995-96 and 1997-98 (Annexure-2).

The contribution of tertiary sector in state GDP which was 37.8 per cent rose marginally to 38.9 per cent between the years 1993-94 and 1999-2000. Thus, the performance of tertiary sector has not been satisfactory over these years. There have been dips in its share of the state GDP during the years 1994-95, 1996-97 and 1998-99 (Annexure-3). On the basis of these figures inferences may be drawn that a higher growth of the state economy can not be achieved without a growth rate of at least 5 per cent per annum in agriculture sector and over 10 per cent per annum in the manufacturing sector.

4.2 Composition of households expenditure

The level of household expenditure is an important dimension of well-being of the people. Keeping track of household expenditure, particularly food and priority non-food items among different categories of MPCE classes may provide sufficient insight to measure the well being of the state population.

As per figures at All India and State levels published by NSSO in its report No.427 on level and pattern of consumer expenditure, 1999-2000, Rs.466.6 is found to be the average monthly expenditure per person on different groups of items of consumption in

the rural areas of Uttar Pradesh. The corresponding figure turns out to be Rs.690.33 in the urban areas of the state. The average monthly per capita figures of the same at all India level for rural and urban areas turns out to be Rs.486.16 and Rs.854.92 respectively (Table-4.2.1).

Table 4.2.1 : Composition of Households Expenditure, 1999-2000

Sector	Items	Uttar Pradesh		All India	
		Rupees	Percentage	Rupees	Percentage
Rural	Food	267.94	57.42	288.80	59.40
	Non-Food	198.70	42.58	197.36	40.60
	Medicine*	38.69	8.29	29.60	6.09
	Education*	10.46	2.24	9.37	1.93
	Total	466.64	100.00	486.16	100.00
Urban	Food	348.54	50.49	410.84	48.06
	Non-Food	341.79	49.51	444.08	51.94
	Medicine*	42.51	6.16	43.28	5.06
	Education*	35.10	5.08	37.06	4.33
	Total	690.33	100.00	854.92	100.00

* The items, Medicine and Education are sub-parts of Non-Food items.

Source : NSS Report No.457, *Level and Pattern of Consumer Expenditure in India, 1999-2000*, pp.40&43.

A perusal of monthly per capita consumption expenditure for rural and urban areas of the state indicates that composition of expenditure is on the higher side (57.4 per cent) for the food items in the rural areas of the state. The non-food items constitute 42.6 per cent of total per capita monthly consumption expenditure in the rural areas. On the priority non-food items 8.3 per cent are spent for medicine and only 2.2 per cent for education.

As against rural parts, in urban areas, the composition of expenditure on food and non-food items is recorded to be almost same, i.e. 50.5 per cent and 49.5 per cent respectively. Out of total consumption expenditure 5.1 per cent is spent for education in urban areas. The spending on medicines is recorded to be 6.2 per cent of total expenditure, which is, however, lower as compared to rural areas.

A comparison of MPCE estimates of rural areas of the state with all India level estimates shows that there is a high average MPCE and also its higher share is spent on food items (59.4 per cent) at all India level as compared to state. The average spending on priority

non-food items like medicine and education are found to be relatively on the lower side at all India level as compared to the state. The spending on medicine and education turn out to be 6.1 per cent and 1.9 per cent of total consumption expenditure respectively at all India level. Considering the overall lower level of MPCE of Rs.466.6 in rural areas of the state as compared to Rs.486.2 in rural areas at all India level a further hike in spending for food items may be expected in near future in rural areas.

The composition of average MPCE in the urban areas of the state showed a higher percentage share of spending on education (5.1 per cent) as compared to rural areas of the state and also rural areas at all India level (4.3 per cent). This calls for further hike in expenditure on education in rural areas of the state. The absolute figures of average urban MPCE at all India level are far higher (Rs.854.9) as compared to the same at state level (Rs.690.3). The composition indicates that marginally higher share (50.5 per cent) of spending are going towards food items as compared to non-food items in urban areas of the state. A comparison of MPCE composition between urban areas of state and all India level indicated higher percentage spending on food, medicine and education at the state level than all India level.

An increase in monthly per capita consumption expenditure is considered to be a welcome sign so long as it reduces the percentage share of population below poverty line. The state specific poverty line being Rs.336.7 and Rs.416.3 for rural and urban areas respectively in 1999-2000.

4.3 Poverty– Head Count, Depth and Severity

The most commonly used poverty measures are – poverty, headcount depth of poverty and severity of poverty. The first measure captures the incidence of poverty and it is given by the proportion of people for whom consumption is below the poverty line. The depth of poverty depends on the distances of the poor from the poverty line. It is defined as the aggregate poverty deficit of the poor relative to the poverty line. The last measure, the severity of poverty is estimated as the mean of the squared proportionate poverty gaps. The later two measures are sensitive to the distribution of households below the poverty line. In case of any poor person's consumption being closer or farther from the poverty line, the headcount ratio will remain unchanged while it will respectively decrease or increase depth and severity of poverty. Similarly a transfer of income from a poor person to a more poor person will not change the headcount ratio or poverty depth, but it will decrease the severity of poverty.

Head Count Rate: The official estimates released by the Planning Commission indicate a decline in poverty over the years 1983, 1987-88, 1993-94 and 1999-2000 in the state (Table-4.3.1). The latest poverty estimates are based on the NSS 55th round.

Table 4.3.1 : Head Count Rate

Year	NSS Round	Head-Count Rate		
		Urban	Rural	Overall
1983	38 th	49.8	46.5	47.1
1987-88	43 rd	43.0	41.1	41.5
1993-94	50 th	35.4	42.3	40.9
1999-2000	55 th	30.9	31.2	31.1

Source : *Estimate of Poverty, p.1.B, Government of India, 22 February 2001 & March 11, 1997..*

As per headcount rate data presented in above table, the overall poverty ratio which was 47.1 per cent in 1983 came down to 31.1 per cent during the year 1999-2000, showing thereby a significant decline in the state poverty. Data further reveals that there has not been any significant change in rural poverty during 1987-88 and 1993-94 in the state. The progress in rural poverty reduction was visible only during the period 1993-94 to 1999-2000, when it came down to 31.2 per cent from 42.3 per cent. The poverty in the state, as per new estimates, have fallen from 41 per cent of the population (60 million persons) in 1993-94 to 31 per cent (53 million persons) in 1999-2000, a net reduction of 7 million persons over six years. The rural headcount index fell from 42 per cent to 31 per cent, while the urban headcount index decreased from 35 per cent to 31 per cent.

Depth and Severity: The other two measure of poverty – Depth and Severity of poverty – also indicate substantial reduction in state poverty over these years (Table-4.3.2).

Table-4.3.2: Poverty measure for various NSS rounds

Region	1983 (NSS 38 th Round)		1993-94 (NSS 50 th Round)		1999-2000 (NSS 55 th Round)	
	Depth	Severity	Depth	Severity	Depth	Severity
Urban	15.5	6.9	9.0	3.3	6.9	2.1
Rural	13.6	5.9	10.4	3.5	5.6	1.6

Source : *Poverty in India, The Change of Uttar Pradesh, May 2002, Report No.22323-1N, p.15.*

Table shows a higher order in the depth and severity of poverty in urban areas as compared to rural areas of the state during the initial year 1983. But after a span of 10 years there has been a marked reduction in the depth and severity of poverty in urban and rural areas of the state with comparatively lower order of depth and severity in urban areas than rural in 1993-94. After a gap of six years, a further reduction in depth and severity of poverty is observed in the state during 1999-2000. However, the extent of both the poverty measures remained on the higher side in the urban areas of the state during this year.

4.4 Wages

The trends in wage rates for agricultural labourers and unskilled labourers in rural and urban areas are the strongly correlated to the trends in poverty. The following table shows the annual growth of rural and urban wage index of U.P. (Base Agricultural Year 1970-71=100). This includes wage index of carpenter, mason and agricultural labour for rural wages and carpenter, mason and unskilled labourers' wage index for urban wages.

Table-4.4.1 : Annual Average of Rural and Urban Wage Index of U.P.
(Agr. Year 1970-71 = 100)

Period (Agr.Year)	Rural Wage Index			Urban Wage Index		
	Carpenter	Mason	Agr. Labour	Carpenter	Mason	Unskilled Labour
1993-94	1022.1	996.1	1055.0	976.5	1014.8	959.3
1994-95	1090.3 (6.67)	1076.8 (8.10)	1175.5 (11.42)	1034.2 (5.91)	1072.9 (5.73)	1032.8 (7.66)
1995-96	1180.6 (8.28)	1134.9 (5.40)	1265.0 (7.61)	1094.6 (5.84)	1158.4 (7.97)	1110.5 (7.52)
1996-97	1270.5 (7.61)	1224.2 (7.87)	1438.1 (13.68)	1218.9 (11.36)	1284.4 (10.88)	1261.4 (13.59)
1997-98	1422.8 (11.99)	1381.2 (12.82)	1699.3 (18.16)	1347.2 (10.53)	1411.7 (9.91)	1401.0 (11.07)
1998-99	1545.9 (8.65)	1493.4 (8.12)	1776.7 (4.55)	1413.8 (4.94)	1467.7 (3.97)	1490.7 (6.40)
1999-2000	1697.5 (9.81)	1670.7 (11.87)	1930.7 (8.67)	1487.5 (5.21)	1577.6 (7.49)	1600.6 (7.37)

Note: Figures in parentheses show per cent growth in respect to the previous years.

Source : *Rural and Urban Wage Index of U.P., Vol.XVIII, No.1 and Vol.XX, No.2*

As per estimates of rural agricultural labourers wage index, the highest growth of 18.2 per cent was recorded between the years 1996-97 and 1997-98. This was the year when the maximum agricultural output was recorded in the state. But the agricultural output recorded a dip in the subsequent year and consequently the growth in wage index of rural agricultural labour has gone down to 4.6 per cent over the years 1997-98 and 1998-99. However, growth of agricultural labour wage index recorded an improvement of 8.7 per cent during the year 1999-2000. Thus, wage index of agricultural labourer recorded the highest growth during the year 1997-98 and the lowest during the year 1998-99.

The rural wage index of skilled labourers like carpenter and mason ranged from 1022.1 and 996.1 in 1993-94 to 1697.5 and 1670.7 respectively during 1999-2000. The growth of rural carpenter's wage index ranged from a lowest of 6.7 per cent in 1994-95 to 12.0 per cent during the year 1997-98. In case of rural masons' wage index, the growth was found to be the lowest (5.4 per cent) in the year 1995-96 and its highest growth was estimated (12.8 per cent) for the year 1997-98.

The growth in wage index of urban unskilled labour ranged from a lowest of 6.4 per cent during 1998-99 to a highest of 13.6 per cent during the year 1996-97. Thus, the growth in

wage index of urban unskilled labourers, recorded was not as high as rural agricultural labourers over the years 1993-94 and 1999-2000.

The wage index growth of urban carpenters ranged from 4.9 per cent to 11.4 per cent between the years 1998-99 and 1996-97 respectively. In case of urban mason's wage index the lowest growth of 4.0 per cent and the highest growth of 10.9 per cent was recorded during the same years, i.e. 1998-99 and 1996-97.

4.5 Employment

4.5.1 Employment Growth

Employment Based On Census: As per census figures, the total number of main workers in the state was 323.97 lakhs in 1981, which rose to 413.61 lakhs in 1991 in the state. Thus, annual growth rate of main workers was about 2.5 per cent and there was an average increase of 9 lakh workers per year during the decade 1981-91. The Work Participation Rate (WPR) rose from 29.2 per cent to 29.7 per cent during 1981 and 1991 in the state. It is also important to note that the WPR of main workers in the state was 29.7 per cent as against 34.1 per cent in the country as a whole in 1991. In case of female workers a high growth (91.0 per cent) was recorded in 1981-91 while for males it was only 23.2 per cent. It was found mainly on account of the changes in the definition of female workers in the 1991 Census. However, due to this reason, the share of female workers (main + marginal) in the population moved up from 8.1 per cent to 12.3 per cent during the decade.

The inter-state comparison of work participation rate of male workers shows that Uttar Pradesh stood at 21st place. The low work participation rate in the state is due to lesser participation of females in economic activities, as only 12.3 per cent females were categorised as workers (main + marginal) against 22.1 per cent at the national level. The work participation rate among the males was recorded to be 49.8 per cent in the state against 51.2 per cent at the national level. The interpretation of this data makes it imperative to create an environment to increase employability of females in the state.

The distribution of workers by broad categories of commodity producing sector indicated that agriculture sector still occupies a dominant position in the state economy. The growth in employment by industrial classification during the period 1981-91 shows maximum growth (5.8 per cent) in mining and quarrying sector. Next to it is trade and commerce, which recorded 5.7 per cent growth followed by plantation/forestry, construction, other services and agriculture labour with 5.3 per cent, 4.5 per cent, 4.4 per cent and 4.5 per cent respectively.

Employment Estimates Based On NSS: Another set of employment estimates of the state are based on NSS data. A high dependency of workers on agriculture and allied sector is brought out by the results of 32nd, 43rd, 50th and 55th rounds of NSS. The share

of workers in agriculture was about 70 per cent in 1987-88, 68.9 per cent in 1993-94 and about 71 per cent in 1999-2000, however, the share of manufacturing sector employment shows the declining trend in the state. This share declined from 9.5 per cent in 1987-88 to 9.3 per cent in 1993-94 and it again came down to 7.1 per cent in the year 1999-2000. In contrast, the share of workers in tertiary sector rose from 20.5 per cent in 1987-88 to 21.3 per cent in 1993-94 and it has further gone up to 21.9 per cent during 1999-2000.

4.5.2 Quality Of Employment

More results available from NSS 55th round for the year 1999-2000 provide per thousand number of workers engaged in self-employment enterprises, regular employment and casual employment in the agriculture and non-agriculture sectors. Table 4.5.1 presents the distribution of workers employed as self-employed, regular employees and casual labourers in rural and urban areas of the state and also at all India level. The employment distribution in rural parts shows 70.1 per cent self-employment at the state level as against only 53.1 per cent at the all India level taking into account only principal employment status. In case of regular employment, the estimates show 6.3 per cent regular employment at the state level and 7.5 per cent at all India level. But the estimates of casual labour again present a better picture at the state level than at all India level. As per NSS 55th round estimates 23.6 per cent of the total rural employment is found casual in U.P. as against 39.4 per cent at all India level during 1999-2000.

Table 4.5.1: Per Thousand Distribution of Usually Employed by Category of Employment for U.P. and India

Persons	Usually Employed					
	Principal Status			Principal and Sub-Status		
	Self-Employed	Regular Employee	Casual Labour	Self-Employed	Regular Employee	Casual Labour
<u>Rural Persons</u>						
Uttar Pradesh	701	63	236	727	56	217
All India	531	75	394	558	68	374
<u>Urban Persons</u>						
Uttar Pradesh	531	339	130	550	323	127
All India	407	413	180	422	400	178

Source : NSS Report No.458; Employment & Unemployment Selection in India, 1999-2000. Part 1, pp.108&111.

In urban areas of the state and at all India level about 53.1 per cent and 40.7 per cent of the total employment is recorded as self-employment. In case of regular employment state showed 33.9 per cent of the total employment under this category as against 41.3

per cent at all India level. A higher percentage in total employment as casual labour (18.0 per cent) was recorded at all India level as against only 13 per cent in urban areas of the state of Uttar Pradesh.

The employment distribution among all three categories taking into account principal and subsidiary status of employment also presents almost the same picture at the state and all India level. In rural and urban areas a higher percentage of total employment is recorded as self-employed (72.7 per cent and 55.0 per cent respectively) in the state as compared to all India estimates (55.8 per cent and 42.2 per cent respectively). In case of regular employment, the state had 5.6 per cent as regular employed as compared to 6.8 per cent in the rural areas at all India level. As compared to this the regular employment percentage in total employment in urban areas is recorded to be high (32.3 per cent) at the state level but the same is found to be 40 per cent at all India level.

Distribution of casual labourers shows lower level of casual labour in total usual employment (21.7 per cent) in rural areas of the state as compared to the same (37.4 per cent) at all India level. The share of casual labour in total usual employment in urban areas is found to be of the lower order at the state as well as at all India level. As per estimates of NSS 55th round, it is recorded to be 12.7 per cent and 17.8 per cent in the urban areas of state and at all India level respectively. Thus, the state has a better average employment quality as compared to average all India picture in terms of lower order of casual labourers in total usual employment.

4.5.3 Unemployment Rate

The results shown by NSS sample survey also provide data on unemployment on the basis of different concepts. The estimates regarding the state-wise unemployment are available for different rounds of NSS. According to daily status approach the unemployment rate in rural and urban areas of the state was 3.1 per cent and 4.8 per cent respectively as per estimates of NSS 50th round during 1993-94. The unemployment rate has gone up to the level of 3.6 per cent and 6.2 per cent respectively in rural and urban areas of the state according to daily status approach of NSS 55th round during 1999-2000 (NSS report 458; 142-143). However, the unemployment rate is found to be of the lower order as compared to other states and all India average during both the periods.

Sex-wise Unemployment Rate: As per latest unemployment estimates of NSS 55th round for the year 1999-2000 the unemployment rate is found to be of higher order (4.0 per cent) among males than females (2.1 per cent) in rural areas of the state. A higher unemployment rate among males (6.3 per cent) as compared to females (5.0 per cent) revealed also in the urban areas of the state. (NSS report 458; 142-143)

Age Specific Unemployment Rate: The unemployment rate among the youth belonging to the age of 15-29 years based on current daily status approach showed 6.1 per cent and 12.5 per cent unemployment rate in rural and urban areas of the state. The

unemployment among this age group is found to be of higher order (6.8 per cent) among rural males as compared to rural females (2.0 per cent). As against this in urban areas the unemployment among youth of 15-29 age group of males (12.4 per cent) was recorded to be of marginal lower order than the unemployment among the females (12.7 per cent). (NSS report 458; 152-153)

4.5.4 Underemployment

Visible Underemployment: As per results of NSS 55th round data underemployment is categorised in to visible and invisible. Under the first category NSS measures the visible underemployment by cross classifying persons by (a) their usual and current weekly status, (b) their usual and current daily status and (c) their current weekly and current daily statuses.

Usual and Current Weekly Status: As per data relating to usual and current weekly status of underemployment, it is recorded to be 4.3 per cent and 20.4 per cent among male and female employed in rural areas of the state during 1999-2000. The corresponding status of Underemployment is found to be 2.5 per cent and 12.7 per cent among male and female in urban areas of the state, thereby showing lower order of underemployment in urban areas as compared to rural areas in the state.

Usual and Current Daily Status: According to usual and current daily status, the underemployment rate turned out to be 8.2 per cent and 38.3 per cent among male and female in the rural areas of the state during the year 1999-2000. However the level of underemployment during the same period is recorded to be low in urban areas, i.e. 5.0 per cent and 27.5 per cent among male and female respectively.

Current Weekly and Current Daily Status: Under last and third classification, i.e. current weekly and current daily status, the rate of underemployment is seen to be 4.1 per cent and 22.9 per cent among males and females in rural areas against 2.6 per cent and 17.6 per cent respectively for males and females in urban areas of the state.

Invisible Underemployment: Under the category of invisible underemployment, the underemployment is firstly calculated on the basis of employed persons who did not work, more or less regularly throughout the year in the usual principal status. The second type of underemployment in invisible category considers the employed persons who are seeking or available for additional work or alternative work.

Persons Who do not Work More or Less Regularly throughout the Year: The data relating to underemployment on the basis of employed persons who did not work more or less regularly throughout the year showed that 10.0 per cent persons were underemployed in the rural areas of the state during the year 1999-2000. Further break-up of underemployment among male and female in the rural areas showed a higher rate

(12.6 per cent) among females as compared to 9.3 per cent among males. A perusal of underemployment in urban areas of the state has shown lower rate (6.5 per cent) during the same period. However, the rate of the same is recorded to be 7.8 per cent among females and only 6.4 per cent in case of males in urban areas of the state.

Available for Additional Work: In the second type of underemployment, under the category of invisible underemployment 7.9 per cent persons are reported to be underemployed in the rural areas of the state during the reference period 1999-2000. The rate of underemployment is recorded to be of higher order (8.2 per cent) among males as compared to females (6.6 per cent). The data showed a lower order of underemployment in urban areas (5.2 per cent). The rate of underemployment among male and female employed in the urban area is recorded to be almost same (5.2 per cent and 5.1 per cent respectively).

Available for Alternative Work: There is another type of underemployment under the category of invisible consisting of persons who sought or were available for alternative work. According to this type of estimation, the underemployment is recorded to be 7.1 per cent and 5.1 per cent in rural and urban areas respectively in the state. The rate of the same is recorded to be higher (7.4 per cent) among males than females (5.8 per cent) in rural areas. Underemployment in urban areas is again seen to be higher (5.2 per cent) among male than female (4.0 per cent).

4.5.5 Out of labour force

The population out of labour force refers to the population which does not supply or seeks to supply labour for production of goods and services and therefore, is not included in employed, unemployed and underemployed. The status of population being out of labour force is calculated according to the classification of population, viz. usual status, current weekly status and current daily status.

The figures presented in the Annexure 12 are derived from NSS data relating to UP for the year 1999-2000. As per principal and subsidiary status, 69.6 per cent and 69.9 per cent persons are recorded to be out of labour force in rural and urban areas respectively in the state. The contribution of females in labour force of the rural areas is recorded to be far less as compared to the males. Figures indicate 87.7 per cent female out of labour force as compared to 52.5 per cent males in rural areas under the category of usual principal status. The contribution of female labour force in rural areas is recorded to be almost equally low according to weekly and daily status. According to weekly and daily status 83.5 per cent and 87.1 per cent female respectively were found to be out of labour force in rural areas. As compared to this, only 52.5 per cent and 53.8 per cent males were found out of labour force in rural areas. According to weekly and daily status, 69.0 per cent and 70.2 per cent were found out of labour force in urban areas.

The comparison of male and female population being out of labour force in urban area indicates lower contribution of females in labour force as per all the three working statuses. As per available data 93.1 per cent female were recorded to be out of labour force as compared to 49.3 per cent males as per their usual working status in urban areas. The equally low levels of contribution by females is recorded as per their weekly and daily working status in urban area.

4.6 Health

4.6.1 Immunisation

Children's health is considered to be an important indicator for defining poverty or prosperity of any population group. In this context, immunisation is considered to be the most effective way of protecting children against many killer/disability diseases.

Table -1 presents percentage distribution of immunised boys, girls and all children of age-group 0-5 years according to 12 per capita monthly expenditure classes (MPCE). The information on immunisation is further categorised as per rural & urban areas. The sample data is based on 'Poverty Measurement Schedule 99' of NSS 55th round. In this survey immunisation of children relate to ever immunisation for any or several diseases.

MPCE class wise immunisation: The data showing immunised rural children of age group 0-5 years indicates that 94 per cent children are immunised at different places considering all MPCE classes. In rural areas the highest percentage of immunisation among children (97.6 per cent) is recorded in the largest MPCE class (i.e. above Rs.950). The immunisation among the rural children of first two lowest MPCE classes ranges between 89.5 per cent & 91.6 per cent. In rest of the nine MPCE classes the immunisation ranges between 93.5 per cent & 95.6 per cent.

The immunisation in urban areas in recorded to be only 90.2 per cent which is found to be of the lower order than in rural areas. The immunisation is recorded to be only 89 per cent in the highest MPCE class of the urban areas. The immunisation among the first two lowest MPCE classes is found to be ranging between 82.9 per cent & 91.7 per cent in the urban areas. The rural & urban combined immunisation turns out to be 93.4 per cent in the state.

Place of Immunisation: While taking into consideration the place of immunisation, the highest number of children (36 per cent) is found to be immunised through PHC/CHC sub-centres in the state. About 42 per cent children in urban area and 35 per cent in rural areas are immunised through PHC/CHC sub-centres. The next highest immunisation among children is performed in school/Anganwadi centres (27.8 per cent) in rural and urban areas combined. However, children from the rural areas have a higher order of immunisation (30.1 per cent) than the urban areas (15.2 per cent). More than 23 per cent of the total immunised children were immunised at home in the state. A higher

order of immunisation (25.8 per cent) was performed at home in the rural areas of the state. The immunisation among children at home is found to be only 11.2 per cent in the urban areas of the state. Apart from this, 17 per cent urban & more than 3 per cent rural children are immunised through hospitals. Thus, urban households are better exposed to government health facilities as compared to their rural counterparts for immunisation. The use of private practitioners for immunising the children is found to be limited only 2.2 per cent in rural areas as compared to urban areas where about 10 per cent of total immunisation were performed by private practitioners.

The overall pattern of immunisation facility utilisation appears to be almost similar across the expenditure groups with a notable exception of higher share of hospital visits by the richer parents in the urban areas.

4.6.2 Infant Mortality Rate

The reproductive & child health programme has been launched in the state since April, 1998. This includes child survival & safe motherhood. As per latest figures available, infant mortality rate is estimated to be 85 per 1000 during the year 1999-2000. The male infant mortality rate turns out to be 80/1000 live births as compared to 90/1000 live birth among the female infants during the same period. The state government has declared state population policy on 11.7.2000, this includes reduction of present mortality rate (85/1000 live births to 61/1000 live births) by the year 2016.

4.7 Education

4.7.1 Literacy

The state of Uttar Pradesh is considered to be an educationally backward state. The literacy rate of the state is recorded to be 55.2 percent; 51.1 per cent and 70.1 per cent in rural and urban areas respectively during the year 1999-2000, as per NSS 55th round survey. The corresponding figures at the national level turned out to be 62.2 per cent; 56.0 and 79.8 per cent respectively for rural and urban areas. As per census 2001, the literacy rate is recorded to be 58.1 percent in rural and urban areas combined including the state of Uttaranchal .

MPCE wise and Sex-wise Literacy Rate: A break-up of NSS 55th round data of the state for the year 1999-2000 further revealed that the literacy among the females in rural area was only 36.0 per cent as compared to 65.1 per cent among males. An MPCE class-wise break-up of literacy rate in rural areas of the state further showed positive association between literacy rate and monthly per capita expenditure in different classes. The lowest MPCE class of the 0-225 showed lowest literacy 34.5 per cent as against 69.8 per cent in the highest MPCE class of Rs. 950 and above in the rural areas of the state.

It is found to be 77.6 per cent among males as against only 61.4 per cent in females within the urban areas. An MPCE class-wise break-up of literacy rate in urban areas has

indicated positive association between the two as in case of rural areas. However, level of the literacy rate among different classes were recorded to be higher in urban areas as compared to the rural areas. The lowest MPCE class of Rs. 0-300 showed 49.4 per cent literacy rate as compared to 93.1 per cent in the highest class of Rs. 1925 and above in the urban areas of the state.

4.7.2 Educational Level

Education and its level in study sample are found to be positively associated with the size of MPCE class. The level of education is recorded to be increasing in every successive higher MPCE class in rural as well as in urban area. However, the over-all number of persons, who have never been to school turns out to be 50.9 per cent at the state level. The number is found to be much higher in rural area (54.3 per cent) than urban area (36 per cent.)

Data relating to level of education presented in Table-3 further shows highest number of educated persons at primary level (7.1 per cent) in rural areas. Whereas the highest number of educated is recorded at High School level (7.6 per cent) in urban areas. Only 2.9 per cent persons are having Intermediate education level in rural area as compared to 6.8 per cent persons in urban area. Persons having Graduate and Post-Graduate education level is also recorded to be higher, 6.3 per cent and 2.4 per cent respectively in urban area as compared to rural where it is found 1.3 per cent and 0.4 per cent respectively. It is being 2.2 per cent and 0.7 per cent at the state level. The technical education is attained only by 0.1 per cent and 0.7 per cent in rural and urban areas. Thus, rural population lagged behind the urban at each level of education. This is found because of comparatively lower income level and lack of educational awareness in rural areas.

Sex-wise Education Level: A perusal of educational level of boys and girls separately, in rural and urban areas shows low educational level among girls. In urban area 43.5 per cent girls have never attended school. As compared to this only 29.5 per cent boys did not attend the school. Data relating to rural area show 66.5 per cent girls and 43.8 per cent boys never attended school (Table-3).

4.7.3 Enrolment

Enrolment rate among school going age children is considered to be an important indicator of development in any rural or urban area. Enrolment also depends upon income level, educational level and general awareness level of family of the children concerned.

MPCE Class-wise Enrolment rate: It is evident from Table-4 for the rural and urban areas, that there is a consistent increase in the enrolment rate in each successive higher MPCE class. Apart from this educational level and awareness level about educational institutions shows positive association with enrolment rate (in terms of

correlation coefficient) in rural areas. As against this, only education level shows positive association with enrolment rate in case of urban area. In fact, school going has been a general practice in urban area hence awareness about educational institutions has no direct bearing on enrolment rate. In view of mass illiteracy and poverty in rural areas, family educational level and awareness level about the educational institution both play an important role in the promotion of enrolment rate. However, income level of the family still plays an important role in determining the enrolment rate even in urban areas of Uttar Pradesh.

Sex-wise Enrolment rate: Table 4 shows enrolment rate of 63.4 per cent at the state level. Data indicates higher enrolment (70.6 per cent) rate in urban areas as compared to rural area (61.8 per cent). Girls are found to be lagging behind the boys in terms of enrolment in rural as well as urban areas. These results indicate the fact that enrolment promotional practices are still needed for school going children in rural as well as urban areas particularly for increasing girls' enrolment. Results showing association between enrolment rate and general awareness level about educational institutions in rural areas indicate high positive association as against low association in urban areas.

4.7.4 Drop Out Rate

Sex-wise Drop Out rate: As per survey results the drop out rate of the children varies from 6.5 per cent in rural area to 6.3 per cent in urban area. Drop out rate among girl children is recorded to be higher (7.5 per cent) as compared to boys (5.7 per cent) in rural areas. In case of school going children in urban areas, there is not much difference in the drop out rate between girls and boys. Their drop out rates is found to be 6.4 per cent and 6.2 per cent respectively in urban areas. The combined drop out rate for rural and urban areas turns out to be 6.5 per cent. It is being 5.8 per cent and 7.3 per cent among boys and girls respectively at the state level.

MPCE Class-wise Drop Out rate: A perusal of drop out data for rural and urban areas given in Table-5, further indicate that there has been a marked reduction in drop out rates in each of the successive higher MPCE class. Although the difference in drop out rates between highest and lowest MPCE class is recorded to be higher in urban area as compared to the rural area. As a result, the coefficient of variation (CV) of drop out rates among boys and girls turns out to be higher in urban area as compared to rural area. However, the association (in terms of correlation coefficient) of drop out rates with MPCE and educational level is found negative in rural as well as urban areas. In this way results indicate that MPCE and educational level play an important role in the reduction of drop out rate among children in rural as well as urban areas. According to results the role of awareness about educational institutions in reducing the drop out rates has been found higher in rural area compared to urban areas. In case of urban drop out rates, general awareness about educational institutions is not found to be playing any significant role.

4.7.5 School Completion Rate

The results relating to completion rate of highest level of education of persons in age-groups 18 years and above presented in Table-6 show that 87.5 per cent persons have attained at least primary level of education out of total enrolled persons at the state level. The completion rate at least at primary level turns out to be 86.6 per cent and 90.0 per cent respectively in the rural and urban areas of the state. The completion rate of education only up to primary level is recorded to be 21.6 per cent. At the middle and high school level it turns out to be 22.3 per cent and 17.0 per cent respectively. Thus, the highest completion rate is estimated at middle school level in the state while taken into account rural and urban area separately, recorded at middle school education (24.9 per cent) in the rural areas and at high school level (17.3 per cent) in the urban areas.

Sex-wise Education Completion Rate: A further break-up of education completion rate between male and female at the state level shows better performance of males over females. The males had 88.9 per cent completion rate at least at primary level as compared to female who had 84.3 per cent completion rate of the same. In case of males highest completing rate (23.7 per cent) is recorded at middle level as against females where highest rate (27.7 per cent) is attained at Primarily level.

MPCE Class-wise Completion Rate: A perusal of Table-6 indicating MPCE class-wise completion rate of education at different level in rural area indicates completion rate at primary level coming down from 35.4 per cent to 15.5 per cent in every successive MPCE class. At the middle level it has been almost constant. But at the level of high school completion rate tends to remain higher in higher MPCE classes. In case of other 'category of education also the higher completion rate is witnessed in higher MPCE classes. Thus, at high school and higher levels of education the completion rate is found to be high only among high MPCE classes in rural areas.

The highest completion rate of education is recorded to be in the 'other' category of education in urban areas. The completion rate at this level is found to be moving up from 8.4 per cent and 21.8 per cent in two lowest MPCE classes to about 79 per cent in higher MPCE classes. Thus, completion rate has been a function of income level at this level in urban areas. At primary and middle level it has remained higher at low MPCE level and low at high MPCE level.

4.8 Housing and Infrastructure

4.8.1 Type of Dwelling

The information relating to structure of dwelling is presented in Table 7. Table shows availability of pucca houses to only 40.0 per cent at the state level. A break-up shows that 32 per cent households in rural area and 73.7 per cent in urban area are having this facility. The availability of the same through government schemes for the weaker section is limited to 1.8 per cent and 1.1 per cent in rural and urban areas respectively. Average availability of the same is recorded to be only 1.7 per cent at the state level.

Structure of Dwellings: In terms of dwelling, households in urban areas are much better placed than rural households. Out of 66.2 per cent households not having pucca houses in rural area, 27.0 per cent live in hut, 13.5 per cent have Kutcha/tiles houses and remaining 25.7 per cent have semi-pucca accommodation. As against this, only 25.2 per cent households in urban area do not have pucca houses. Out of which 6.5 per cent are in huts, 2.4 per cent are in kutcha/tiles houses and 16.3 per cent are living in semi-pucca houses as per sample data. This indicates an uneven availability of housing facilities between rural and urban population groups in the state. The uneven housing conditions are more glaring when these are observed in each MPCE classes of rural and urban areas of the State. The availability of pucca houses over the different MPCE classes varies from 11.6 per cent to 61.8 per cent in rural areas as against 45.3 per cent to 95.3 per cent in urban areas.

Houseless Households: As per 1991 census, there were 12.51 lakh households (5.6 per cent ??) without houses in the state. According NSS 49th round of NSS (survey period January-June 1993) households with no dwelling were found 0.3 percent in rural areas and 0.2 percent in urban area of U.P.

Slums: As per NSS 49th round the distribution of households according to type of dwelling has also shown that 2.4 per cent and 8.0 per cent households in rural and urban areas respectively lived in slum areas in the state during the year 1993-94. A slum is a compact area with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities in unhygienic conditions. Such an area will be considered as undeclared slum for the purpose of survey if at least 20 households live in that area. A further break up of dwelling in slum areas indicated that 0.9 per cent households lived in Pucca structure and 0.7 per cent in semi Pucca structure and remaining 0.8 per cent in kutcha structure in rural areas. Out of 8.0 per cent households of urban areas living in slums, 3.8 per cent dwelt in Pucca structure and 2.7 per cent in semi Pucca and remaining 1.5 per cent in Kutcha structure. Percentage wise, 97.7 per cent and 92.0 per cent households in rural and urban areas respectively lived in non slum areas in the state. Out of the 97.7 per cent, 36.3 per cent households of rural areas lived in Pucca structure out of 30.5 per cent in semi pucca and remaining 30.9 per cent in Kutcha structure. Out of 92.0 per cent households of urban areas living in non slum 73.2 per cent dwelt in Pucca structure, 12.9 per cent in semi pucca structure and remaining 5.9 per cent in Kutcha structure.

4.8.2 Availability of Drinking Water, Electricity and Sanitation

There is a close link between sanitary conditions and the health of poor people. Pollution – dirty water and air – is a major contributor to diarrhoea and respiratory infections, the two most frequent causes of death for poor children. Research has consistently shown that improving drinking water has less pronounced health benefits than improving sanitation. But the benefits from cleaner water are enhanced when sanitation is improved

and water quality is optimal. When hygiene is also improved, increasing the quality of water does more to improve health.

Latrine Facility: Tables 8, 9 and 10 of the survey results present MPCE class-wise data of latrine used, source of drinking water and availability of electricity for rural and urban area separately. The use of flush latrine is considered to be an important source for the maintenance of sanitary conditions. According to survey results only 5.5 per cent households in rural areas are found to be using flush latrines. As against this, on an average 40 per cent households are using flush latrines in urban areas. Thus, on an average, 12.2 per cent households are using flush latrines at the state level. The use of flush latrines in rural areas among the households falling in the category of below poverty line is recorded between 0.8 per cent and 3.0 per cent. The percentage of the same has ranged from 14.2 per cent to 22.7 per cent in the urban areas.

The average availability of septic tank latrine is recorded to be 7.8 per cent at the state level. It is found to be 4.4 per cent and 22 per cent in the households of rural and urban areas respectively. The availability of the same in the households falling below the poverty line is as low as 1.3 per cent to 2.1 per cent in rural areas as against 10.9 per cent to 16.7 per cent in urban areas. The households using service latrines and other in the absence of septic tank latrine are found to the tune of 9.2 per cent and 21.4 per cent in rural and urban areas respectively. On an average 11.8 per cent households are using service latrines and other latrines at the state level. Thus, only 19.1 per cent households in rural area having latrine facility as against 84.4 per cent households in urban areas. The availability of this facility among the rural households falling below poverty line is limited to 8.2 per cent to 12.6 per cent households only belonging to different MPCE classes.

Source of Drinking Water: Table 9 of the survey results shows the data relating to source of drinking of water for each MPCE class in rural and urban areas. On an average there are 57.4 per cent households in rural and 79.6 per cent households in urban areas having source of drinking water in their premises. The number of households having source of drinking water in their premises is found to be 61.6 per cent at the state level. The variations in this among different MPCE classes ranges from 50.7 per cent to 70.0 per cent in rural area and from 56.9 per cent to 97.3 per cent in urban area. However, the availability of drinking water in the premises is limited from 50.7 per cent to 55.5 per cent in rural area and from 56.9 per cent to 75.2 per cent in urban area to the households falling below the poverty line.

Safe Source of Drinking Water: Tables further indicate six sources of drinking water out of which only two sources; i.e. tap and hand-pump may be considered as safe source of drinking water. On an average only 10.8 per cent of the rural households are using tap as a source of drinking water. Around 53 per cent households are found to be using tap for drinking water in urban areas. On an average 18.9 per cent of households are using tap for drinking water for the state as a whole. In rural parts of the state more

than 73 per cent households and around 44 per cent households in urban parts are using hand-pumps as source of drinking water. Thus on an average 67.6 per cent of households are using hand pumps as source of drinking water for the state as a whole. Their specifications and quality is yet to be ascertained. As per earlier discussion, the drinking water is the most crucial factor for determining the state of health of the population concerned.

Use of Electricity: The use of electricity is an important indicator for determining the living standard of population in rural or urban set-up. As per available data, only 28.1 per cent households are consuming electricity in rural areas compared to urban area where use of the same is recorded to be as high as 83.6 per cent taking into account all classes of MPCE. On an average 38.9 per cent of households are consuming electricity for the state as a whole. However, the consumption of electricity is confined to the maximum level of 21.2 per cent and 75.2 per cent households falling below the poverty line in rural and urban areas respectively.

Hours of Availability of Electricity: Regarding hours of electricity consumption, as presented in Table 10, none of the households is recorded to be using it for 24 hours in rural as well as urban areas. A maximum of 45.1 per cent households in rural area are consuming electricity for 5 to 10 hours followed by 33 per cent households using the same for 10 to 15 hours. Only 10.4 per cent households are consuming electricity more than 15 hours but less than 24 hours in rural areas. Only 11.6 per cent households in rural areas are consuming electricity less than 5 hours.

The conditions of urban households in terms of electricity consumption appear to be far better than rural ones. According to data electricity is available for longer hours to the urban households. On an average more than 47 per cent households consume electricity for more than 15 hours in urban areas. It is available for 10 to 15 hours for remaining 39.2 per cent households. More than 12 per cent use it for 5 to 10 hours. Only 1.5 per cent households in urban area consume electricity less than 5 hours. Thus, on an average, around 25.6 per cent of households consume electricity for more than 15 hours at the state level. Also, around 35.6 per cent of households are recorded to consume electricity for 10 to 15 hours at the state level. On an average 31.4 per cent of households consume electricity for 5 to 10 hours at the state level. Moreover, 7.4 per cent of households are estimated to consume electricity for less than five hours at the state level.

Non-availability of electricity for longer hours in rural and urban areas may not be entirely attributed to government functionaries involved in this task. It is due to nation-wide power crisis and also in the absence of alternate non-conventional sources of energy.

4.9 Participation in Government Programmes

The main purpose of ongoing public work programmes is to support poor who are not able to bear shocks emanating from income inequalities. The data relating to participation in these programmes in rural and urban areas do not present a picture, which could prove the importance of such programmes for supporting poors to a significant level.

Access to Anti-poverty Programmes: Table 11 of the survey data presents only 1.3 per cent households in which at least one person worked either in JRY or in any other public work programme in rural area. In case of urban areas no significant results could be obtained in the absence of sample households participating in such programmes. On an average there are 1.1 per cent of households in which at least one person worked either in JRY or in any other public work programmes at the state level. The average number of person days worked per household working in JRY or in any other public work programme during last 12 months at the state level is found to be 19.8 per cent and 2.6 per cent for male and female respectively. The role of public work programmes, according to results is found to be quite insignificant in terms of its coverage. Apart from this, the problem of gender variation is still existing in such programmes' participation.

4.9.1 Pre-Natal Care and Maternity Facilities

Pre-natal care is an important part of health services for reducing the infant and maternal mortality. Data presented in Table-12, show around 59.4 per cent of married women in rural areas receiving pre natal care at the time of last birth. Number of married women receiving pre-natal care in urban area is recorded to be 75 per cent. Thus, on an average 61.8 per cent of married women received pre-natal care at the state level.

Agencies Providing Pre-Natal Care: Out of total married women receiving pre-natal care the highest (55.0 per cent) are attended by assistant nurse or women health worker in rural area. The role of government doctors in pre-natal care is confined to only 12.7 per cent. The private doctors attended 18.0 per cent pre-natal cases. NGO doctors in rural area undertake only 2.7 per cent of the total pre-natal cases. More than 11 per cent women are getting pre natal care from other sources. Data reveals that more than 18 per cent women belonging to below poverty line groups have visited private doctors for this purpose. Around 11 to 15 per cent women belonging to these class are found to be receiving this facilities from other sources which are required to be checked.

A higher percentage of urban married women are found to be getting pre-natal care (75.0 per cent). Out of total married women receiving pre natal care, 33.2 per cent are receiving the services of nurse and health workers and 21.1 per cent are visiting government doctors. Private doctors have also attended around 30.8 per cent cases. The NGO doctors have catered to the needs of around 7 per cent married women in urban areas. Around 30 per cent married women belonging to below poverty line MPCE

categories are found taking the services of private doctors and other sources in urban area. Thus, on an average 51 per cent of married women are receiving the services of nurses and health workers at the state level. 14.3 per cent of married women are visiting government doctors at the state level. Private doctors have also attended around 20.4 per cent cases at the state level. The NGO doctors have catered to the needs of around 3.4 per cent married women at the state level.

Birth Place: Regarding children's birth place of married women in child bearing age, data revealed that more than 85 per cent and 53 per cent children are born at home in rural and urban areas respectively. Thus on an average 80.2 per cent of children are born at home at the state level. The use of primary health centre, community health centre and sub centre remained limited to only 5.9 per cent and 7.8 per cent for this purpose in rural and urban areas respectively. Thus, on an average 6.2 per cent of such centres are used at the state level. The use of government hospitals remained also limited to 4.3 per cent in rural area as against 14.9 per cent in urban area. On an average 5.9 per cent of government hospitals are used at the state level. The medical facilities of non-government dispensaries and hospitals for child birth are availed only by 4.1 per cent married women in rural areas as against around 24 per cent in urban area. Data further indicate that on an average around 7 per cent married women avail medical facilities of non-government dispensaries and hospitals for child birth at the state level.

The analysis of the data relating to use of medical facilities by married women for child birth indicates that these facilities are still not available to most of the women in rural area and also in urban area. The condition of women belonging to below poverty line groups is still worse. Non use of government health facilities means diversion of financial resources of the poors for these purposes, which could have been, used for their income generation activities. Apart from this, non-availability of public health services to this class may increase infant mortality and physical disability in the absence of alternate medical facilities due to poor economic conditions. In the light of these the role of government medical facilities holds paramount importance.

Attendance of children in the Aanganwadi/ Balvadi centres: Data relating to the level of services received by the children in the age group of 0-5 years and the attendance in the Aanganwadi/Balvadi centres given in Table-14, shows that only 1.8 per cent children are attending Aanganwadi at the state level. Out of total children attending Aanganwadi, only 2.2 per cent have availed the facility of complementary food almost daily. Around 1.4 per cent children have received this service only for few days. Most of the children (96.4 per cent) who are attending Aanganwadi have never received this facility. The service of pre-school education is also received by only 2.2 per cent children attending Aanganwadi. Around 1.5 per cent children have received this facility only for few days. Only 0.7 per cent of the total Aanganwadi attending children have received the facility of growth monitoring and the facility of health check up is availed only by 2.4 per cent children for a few days in the state.

A rural urban break-up of Aanganwadi attendance indicates that 2.1 per cent and 0.5 per cent children of 0-5 years age group have attended the same from respective area. A maximum of 3.4 per cent of the total children in the age group of 0-5 years have attended Aanganwadi in the lowest MPCE class in the rural area. Attendance is found to be the lowest (0.9 per cent) in the highest MPCE class. The coverage and attendance of Aanganwadi has been negligible in urban areas. Thus, a perusal of data relating to use of Aanganwadi shows that its use has been very limited in the state.

4.10 Awareness about Health Facilities, Primary Schools and Teachers Attendance

Knowledge of health facilities presence of medical staff and availability of medicines: Most of the rural and urban households (around 69 per cent) have knowledge of nearest availability of government health facilities. The households belonging to higher MPCE classes have comparatively better knowledge of these in rural areas. Table 16 has further shown that around 11 per cent households in rural and urban areas have no knowledge on the attendance of the doctors and nurses in government health centres. Around 73 per cent households reported about regular presence of medical staff and according to remaining, 15 per cent they did not attend duties regularly. On the issue of medicine distribution, around 17 per cent households have no knowledge in rural and urban areas. A range of 45 to 48 per cent households in rural and urban areas reported regular distribution of medicines in health centres. But at the same time 34 to 38 per cent households held the view that the medicines are not distributed regularly.

The data on medical facilities and knowledge about government medical facilities shows that there is a gap between knowledge and availability. Thus, lack of knowledge about government health facilities may be considered as an important point for making available government facilities to the most of vulnerable classes of the rural and urban population.

Knowledge of government primary school and teacher's attendance: The general awareness about government primary schools among rural and urban households is recorded to be 80.0 per cent and 59.8 per cent respectively. Thus, on an average 76.1 per cent of households have knowledge about the nearest government school at the state level. Households in rural areas are found to be having better knowledge about teacher's attendance owing to higher importance of government primary schools in rural areas. About 83.7 per cent households reported about the regular attendance of government primary school teachers in rural areas as against 77.0 per cent in urban area. Thus, on an average 82.6 per cent households reported about the regular attendance of government primary school teachers at the state level. Over 10.6 per cent households did not find teachers coming to schools regularly in rural areas as compared to 8.0 per cent in urban

areas. Thus, on an average 10.2 per cent households did not find teachers coming to school regularly at the state level.

In the light of existing level of knowledge about schools location and teachers attendance in government primary schools there is still scope to improve the quality of education in such educational institutions. The higher level of knowledge may promote community participation in primary education for frequently monitoring teachers' performance and ensuring the availability of government supplies.

Knowledge of social rights: The concept of community participation is an essential part of an improved social system. This further calls for having knowledge of social rights and other health related programmes. Available data on these for rural and urban areas of the State as presented in Table 15, indicate that the knowledge of child labour prevention Act is confined only among 27.2 per cent households in rural and 47.6 per cent households in urban areas. On an average, 31.1 per cent households have knowledge about this Act at the state level. The acts like – Dowry Prohibition, SC/ST Harassment Prevention and Child Marriage Prohibition is known to 62.5 per cent, 56.2 per cent, 59.6 per cent households in urban areas but awareness about the same among rural households is as low as 47.4 per cent, 47.9 per cent and 42.1 per cent respectively. All the three Acts are reported to be known to 50.3 per cent, 49.5 per cent, 45.5 per cent households respectively at the state level. The knowledge about the same among the lower MPCE groups is recorded to be of comparatively lower order.

Knowledge of health related programmes: Only 25.7 per cent and 55.2 per cent households in rural area know the use of oral dehydration therapy and iodised salt respectively as per data indicating in Table-15. In urban area 48.1 per cent and 78.7 per cent households are found to have knowledge of the same. Thus, on an average about 30.0 per cent and 59.8 per cent households knew the use of oral dehydration therapy and iodised salt at the state level. Thus, this is primarily rural population and particularly falling in low MPCE groups, which require better knowledge on these programmes. The programmes like immunisation and vaccination to pregnant women are known to most of the households both in rural as well as in urban areas.

Lastly, with the analysis of available data conclusion may be drawn that the sizeable community participation particularly in the rural areas can not be attained unless most of the households do have sufficient knowledge about existing health programmes and social rights.

4.11 Access to Key Social Facilities and Services

Availability or access of social facilities and services is a key dimension of welfare that is not typically well captured in a measure of consumption based on households survey data. Often households do not pay for such services or payments are partial or irregular. Yet access is usually far from universal so that those with access enjoy levels of well

being that may be considerably higher than those who do not, though their consumption expenditures appear to be quite similar. The range of relevant public services in this context includes health, education, basic infrastructure to security and other services such as postal delivery, transport, etc. (Annexure 13).

Block development office and village development officer's centre: A break-up of villages according to distance from the facilities/services indicates that more than 80 per cent villages have Block Development Office at a distance of more than 5 kilometres in Uttar Pradesh. Only less than 1 per cent villages have block development office within the villages. Only 13 per cent villages have the location of Village Development Officer's Centre within the village. Rest of the 87 per cent villages do not have this within the village. They have to cover one to more than five kilometres to reach village development officer's centres.

Fair price shop, agricultural implement repair centres, haat, seed and fertiliser stores and agricultural societies: More than 55 per cent have Fair Price Shop within the villages. But at the same time more than 5 per cent villages are located at a distance of 5 kilometres or more from fair price shop. The facilities like agricultural implement repair centre, Haat, seed and fertiliser stores are located within the village in case of 2.7 per cent to 8 per cent villages. More than 12 to about 48.0 per cent villages are located at a distance of 5 kms. or above from these amenities. More than 39 per cent to 87 per cent villages are located at more than 5 kms. from agricultural credit societies, purchase and sale co-operative societies and government procurement centres.

Veterinary centre and artificial insemination centres/sub-centres: The facilities like Veterinary Centre and artificial insemination centres/sub-centres are available to only around 3 per cent villages where these are available within the villages. About 54 per cent to 60 per cent villages are located at a distance of 5 kms. or above from their service centres.

Drinking water sources: In case of Drinking Water Source, though more than 96 per cent villages have this facility within the village in the state. But non-poor are far more likely to have access to piped tap water than the poor. Less than 20 per cent of the overall population in Uttar Pradesh has access to such drinking water. In case of high-income population, its availability is found to be far more in the state. The overall access to tap water in urban areas is above 50 per cent compared to around 10 per cent in rural areas. In both urban and rural areas in turn, tap water access is clearly correlated with consumption level, with the rich enjoying far higher rates of access than the poor.

Basic schools, higher secondary schools & adult education centres: In the field of education, the location of Junior Basic Schools (co-education) is found to be within the village in case of 68 per cent in Uttar Pradesh. Rest of the junior basic schools are located at a distance of 1 to 5 km from the village. But the location of senior

basic schools and higher secondary schools is not found to be very good in terms of accessibility in the state. Only 4 per cent to less than one per cent higher secondary schools are located within the villages for male and female students respectively. Likewise more than 14 per cent to less than 4 per cent senior basic schools for male and female respectively are located within the village. Only around 5 per cent adult education centres are found to be within the village. 92 per cent villages are having a distance of 5 km or more from these centres in the state.

Health Facilities: The location and distance of Health Facilities also indicate non-availability of facilities within the village in most of the cases. Only 3.3 per cent to 0.2 per cent villages have allopathic, homeopathic and *Unani* hospitals within the villages in the state. The location of family and mother child welfare centres is found to be better in terms of accessibility. Around 17 per cent such centres/sub centres are located within the village and more than 25 per cent villages are located 5 km or more from these centres.

Road, post office and public telephone: Other infrastructures like Road, Post Office and Public Telephone are also available within the village to 44 per cent to 15 per cent villages. More than 44 per cent villages are estimated to be connected with the metalled road in the state. About 10 per cent villages have bus stop/station within the village and about 43 per cent of the total villages are located at a distance of 5 km or above from the bus stop/station. This level of accessibility in road transport is far more higher as compared to railways in the state. In case of railway station more than 82 per cent villages are located at a distance of 5 km or more.

Banking facilities: The Banking Facilities at Post office are available to more than 17 per cent villages within the village. But only 5 per cent villages have commercial or co-operative branches in the village. Agricultural co-operative banks and rural development banks are also found distantly located in case of 91 per cent villages.

Thus, the overall location pattern of all these facilities indicates better accessibility in case of urban areas of the state. Most of the important facilities are found to be located distantly from the villages.

4.12 Service Quality and Satisfaction

The quality of infrastructural services is more important than mere access of different population groups to these services. It is important to recognise that the ultimate contribution of a given publicly provided service to welfare is highly contingent on the quality of that service.

Table 4.12.1 Satisfaction about nearest government health services and government primary schools including environment of learning

Type of services		Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Don't Know	Total
Nearest-Government Health Facility	Rural	10.7	51.8	7.1	30.4	100.0
	Urban	8.8	52.2	7.9	31.1	100.0
	Total	10.3	51.9	7.3	30.5	100.0
Nearest-Government Primary Schools	Rural	9.7	57.1	13.2	20.0	100.0
	Urban	6.8	46.8	6.2	40.2	100.0
	Total	9.2	55.1	11.8	23.9	100.0
Environment of Learning In Government Primary Schools	Rural	9.9	52.1	11.9	26.0	100.0
	Urban	5.4	39.3	5.6	49.7	100.0
	Total	9.1	49.6	10.7	30.6	100.0

Source: Monitoring Poverty in U.P Developing a Baseline of Poverty and Social Monitoring

Quality of health facilities: The results of Table-16 indicate that around 52 per cent of population in Uttar Pradesh pronounce itself satisfied with the quality of the nearest government health facility. However, the state of Uttar Pradesh is less known for providing good quality of health facilities. There are some indication that in rural areas the perceived quality of these services is somewhat lower (11 per cent report poor quality in rural areas as compared to 9 per cent in urban areas). In rural areas the rich are generally more likely than the poor to pronounce themselves dissatisfied, while in urban area it is the poor who are more generally dissatisfied. This may reflect that in rural areas there are lesser private sector alternatives to government facilities. While in urban areas the rich who are not satisfied with government services have opted for private services.

Quality of education facilities: Regarding the perceptions on the quality of education services provided by the state, it is observed by the overall majority that quality of government primary schools is good. As high as 57 per cent population in rural areas claims that government schools are of good quality. In urban areas, the population groups are more prone to view government schools as at best satisfactory rather than good. It is due to greater awareness among urban population regarding the availability of privately available alternatives.

Quality of government provided health & education services: Table 16 and 17 present more detailed views on the quality of government provided health and education services. In general, respondents in both rural and urban areas claim that medical staff are usually available at government health facilities. This is some what less the case in rural areas, where 72.5 per cent claim that the staff are regularly present compared to 77.6 per cent in urban areas.

While staff are found generally present, medical supplies are commonly reported to be available only by 45 per cent respondents. At the same time more than 17 per cent

respondents in rural and urban areas were unaware of the availability of medicines and other medical supplies.

Data also suggest that teaching staff were generally perceived to be present at government primary schools on a regular basis. Among rural and urban households 83.7 per cent and 77.0 per cent have reported almost regular presence of the teachers in government primary schools.

5. RECAPITULATION

The Poverty and Social Monitoring System (PSMS) is an important source of information to the policy makers at all levels of government to make better informed decisions regarding poverty reduction & social development initiatives. So, the government developed a set of benchmark indicators to monitor the process and impact of proposed reform on the poor and other vulnerable groups. A more comprehensive database was established through conducting households and community survey to collect information on these welfare indicators. In order to undertake the baseline survey for the PSMS project, Schedule 99 was designed and tagged with NSS 55th round. These performance indicators influence poverty in its many dimensions. On the basis of identified indicators following are the information highlighting the baseline status of poverty in Uttar Pradesh.

- ❖ GSDP growth rates in the overall economy in the first three years of the Ninth Five-year Plan 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-2000 at 2.6 per cent has been far behind the targeted growth of 7 per cent per annum.
- ❖ There is an increase in the monthly per capita consumption expenditure for rural and urban areas of the state. The composition of MPCE in the urban areas of the state showed a higher percentage share of spendings on education as compared to the rural areas of the state.
- ❖ As per head counts rate data, the overall poverty ratio has come down during the year 1999-2000 as compared to 1993-94.
- ❖ The depth & severity of poverty also indicate substantial reduction in state poverty over the years.
- ❖ The growth in rural consumers' price index is found to be of the lowest order during 1999-2000.

5.1 Employment

- ❖ The work participation rate (WPR) of main workers in the state has increased marginally in the recent years.
- ❖ As far as quality of employment is concerned, the state has a better average employment quality as compared to average all India picture in terms of lower order of casual labourers in total usual employment.
- ❖ The unemployment rate has gone up in rural and urban areas of the state during 1999-2000.
- ❖ The rate of underemployment is recorded to be lower in the urban areas as compared to rural areas of the state. A higher percentage of females is seen to be out of labour force in rural as well as urban areas.

5.2 Health

- ❖ The immunisation in urban areas is recorded to be of lower order than in rural areas of the state. There have been real problems while recording the exact immunisation level in the state.
- ❖ The male infant mortality rate turns out to be lower than the female infant mortality rate.

5.3 Education

- ❖ The literacy rate turns out to be higher in urban areas as compared to rural areas along with higher rate among male population in both the areas. The positive association between literacy rate and income level is recorded in rural and urban areas both.
- ❖ The level of education is increasing in every successive higher MPCE class in rural as well as in urban areas.
- ❖ There is low educational level among girls in rural and urban areas.
- ❖ There is a consistent increase in the enrolment rate in each successive higher MPCE class.
- ❖ Drop out rate among girls is recorded to be high as compared to boys in the state.
- ❖ There has been a marked reduction in drop out rates in each of the successive higher MPCE classes.
- ❖ The completion rate between male and female at the state level shows better performance of males over females.

5.4 Housing and Infrastructure

- ❖ In terms of dwelling, households in urban areas are much better placed than rural households.
- ❖ There is an uneven availability of housing facilities between rural and urban population groups in the state.
- ❖ Lesser per cent of households are having latrine facility in rural areas as compared to urban areas of the state.
- ❖ There are less number of households in rural areas having source of drinking water in their premises as compared to households in urban areas.
- ❖ As per available data, the households in urban area are consuming more electricity than households in rural area of the state.

5.5 Participation in Public Work Programme

- ❖ There is a big variation in the average wage rate of male and female in the state. The average wage rate of male is found to be much higher in comparison to females.
- ❖ A higher percentage of urban married women are found to be getting pre-natal care than rural married women.
- ❖ A perusal of data relating to the use of Aanganwadi shows that its use has been very limited in the state.

5.6 Awareness about Health Facilities, Primary Schools and Teachers Attendance

- ❖ The data on medical facilities and knowledge about government medical facilities shows that there is a gap between knowledge and availability.
- ❖ Households in rural areas are found to be having better knowledge about teacher's attendance owing to higher importance of government primary schools in rural areas.
- ❖ The rural people have less knowledge of social rights and other health related programmes as compared to urban households in the state.
- ❖ The rural population particularly falling in low MPCE groups require better knowledge on the use of oral dehydration therapy and iodised salt than their urban counterparts.

5.7 Access to Social Facilities and Services

- ❖ Overall location pattern of all social facilities and services indicates better accessibility in case of urban areas of the state.
- ❖ Most of the important facilities are still found to be distantly located from the villages.
- ❖ In rural and urban areas of the state, the access to tap water as a source of drinking water is clearly correlated with consumption level, with the rich enjoying far higher rates of access than the poor.

5.8 Measuring Service Quality and Satisfaction

- ❖ In rural areas the quality of the infrastructural services is somewhat lower as compared to the urban areas of the state.
- ❖ In rural areas there are lesser private sector alternatives to government facilities while in urban areas the rich who are not satisfied with government services have opted for private services.
- ❖ The poor in both rural and urban areas are generally more prone to report unfavourable views about the government schools.
- ❖ Both rural and urban people claim that medical staff are usually available at government health facilities.
- ❖ Urban households were less aware of the availability of teachers at government primary schools than the rural households of the state.

Annexure 1: Progress of Agricultural Production during First Three Years of Ninth Plan of UP

(Production Levels: Lakh tonnes)

	Item	1996-97 Base Year	Ninth Plan Target	1997-98		1998-99		1999-2000		2000-01	2001-02	
				Achievement	Percentage Short fall (-) / Excess (+) over 1996-97	Achievement	Percentage Short fall (-) / Excess (+) over 1997-98	Achievement	Percentage Short fall (-) / Excess (+) over 1998-99	Anticipated Achievement	Target	Percentage Short fall (-) / Excess (+) over 2000-01
1	Foodgrains	423.78	545	416.79	-1.6	404.31	-3	452.39	11.9	462.13	524.70	
	(a) Kharif	152.44	195	160.02	5	140.93	-11.9	161.92	14.9	149.00	183.00	
	(b) Rabi	271.34	350	256.77	-5.4	263.38	2.6	290.47	10.3	313.00	341.70	
	i) Cereals	397.61	508.3	393.75	-1	381.04	-3.2	426.63	11.9	430.83	488.00	
	a) Rice	117.51	150.5	122.81	4.5	113.87	-7.3	192.2	13.4	118.50	142.00	
	b) Wheat	240.50	309	228.34	-5.1	234.65	2.8	259.76	10.7	275.63	300.00	
	c) Others	39.6	48.8	42.6	7.6	32.52	-23.7	37.61	15.7	36.70	46.00	
	ii) Pulses	26.17	36.7	23.04	-12	23.27	1	25.76	10.7	31.30	36.70	
2	Oilseeds	15.46	25	10.01	-35.3	10.89	8.8	13.16	20.8	17.52	21.00	
3	Sugarcane	1253.48	1625	1212.67	-9.9	1217.36	-8.8	1320	8.4	1220.00	1600.00	
4	Potato	95.91	107.32	58.44	-0.7	84.38	-6.4	100.54	19.2	95.20	103.00	

Source : Annual Plan of U.P. 2001-02, Vol.I, Part I, page No.26

**Annexure – 2: Industrial Source-wise Gross State Income and Per Capita income of UP
(At constant price of 1993-94)**

Crore Rupees

Sector		1993-94*	1994-95*	1995-96*	1996-97*	1997-98*	1998-99*	1999-2000#
1	Agriculture and Animal Husbandry	33309.08	34071.65	35496.59	38482.47	36572.46	37385.28	39546.81
2	Forestry	1433.43	1450.87	1505.57	1482.72	1547.50	1642.88	1706.04
3	Fisheries	371.19	392.30	407.75	419.00	448.72	513.24	540.39
4	Mining and Quarrying	698.02	768.98	883.77	963.29	978.56	1123.61	1320.54
A.	Primary 1 – 4	35811.72 (40.90)	36683.80 (39.60)	38293.68 (39.65)	41347.48 (38.81)	39547.24 (37.09)	40665.01 (35.66)	43113.78 (35.77)
5	Manufacturing	11830.18 (13.51)	14313.17 (15.45)	14361.39 (14.87)	17401.25 (16.33)	16513.93 (15.49)	19970.01 (17.51)	22223.71 (18.44)
5.1	Registered	7155.19	9327.37	8861.79	11880.43	10346.33 (23.83)	13238.62	14340.76
5.2	Unregistered	4674.99	4985.80	5499.60	5520.82	6167.60	6731.39	7882.95
6	Construction Work	3863.64	3870.36	4452.21	4651.21	5437.55	5408.01	5715.02
7	Electricity, Gas and Water Supply	2998.50	3265.20	3395.61	3418.62	3463.59	3657.56	2524.33
B.	Secondary 5 - 7	18692.32 (21.35)	21448.73 (23.15)	22209.21 (23.00)	25471.08 (23.90)	25415.07 (23.83)	29035.58 (25.47)	30463.06 (25.28)
8	Transport Communication & Storage	4520.79	4750.21	4992.28	5485.62	5681.99	6065.40	6543.27
8.1	Railways	1505.05	1415.07	1524.45	1584.39	1662.62	1692.03	1721.96
8.2	Transport and Storage by Other Resources	2506.32	2643.10	2713.24	3027.29	3255.60	3471.98	3883.08
8.3	Communication	509.42	692.04	754.59	873.94	763.77	901.39	938.23
9	Trade & Restaurant	11334.74	12073.75	12458.86	13730.91	13256.41	14220.59	15211.05
	(8 to 9)	15855.53	16823.96	17451.14	19216.53	18938.40	20285.99	21754.32
10	Banking, Trade and Insurance	2287.35	2497.61	2615.94	4051.95	4979.00	5291.43	5623.46
11	Fixed assets, reside-ntial ownership and commercial services	5834.87	5952.78	6046.70	6151.78	6296.75	6450.68	6608.32
	(10 + 11)	8122.22	8450.39	8662.64	10203.73	11275.75	11742.11	12231.78
12	General Adminis-tration	3784.72	3661.52	4034.54	4194.78	5049.06	5223.26	5659.96
13	Other Services	5288.79	5578.22	5917.04	6121.96	6413.64	7073.60	7296.36
	Community	9073.51	9239.74	9951.58	10316.74	11462.70	12296.86	12956.32

	and Private Services							
	Tertiary (8-13)	33051.26 (37.75)	34514.09 (37.25)	36065.36 (37,35)	39737.00 (37.29)	41676.85 (39.08)	44324.96 (38.87)	46942.43 (38.95)
Gross Domestic Income		87555.30 (100.00)	92646.62 (100.00)	96568.25 (100.00)	106555.56 (100.00)	106639.16 (100.00)	114025.55 (100.00)	120519.2 (100.00)
Population (lakh)		1479.34	1514.97	1551.46	1583.89	1615.09	1649.15	1685.88
Per Capita Income (Rs.)		5918.54	6115.41	6224.35	6727.46	6602.68	6914.20	7148.75
Per Capita Income (Rs.) (All India)		8634	9084	9568	10173	10486	10985	11507

Source : Bulletin No.275, Economic and Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, U.P.

**Annexure 3: Growth Performance during the First Two Years of the Ninth Plan of UP
(At constant price of 1993-94)**

	Sector	1996-97 Base Year	Ninth Plan Target	Growth over preced-ing year		1997-99
				1997-98	1998-99	
1.	Primary	8.3		(-4.5)	2.8	(-0.9)
	-Of which Agriculture	8.7	5.1	(-5.1)	2.2	(-1.5)
2.	Secondary	15.9		0.3	14.4	7.1
	-Of which manufacturing	22.7	12.1	(-5.0)	20.8	7.2
	Registered	38.2		(-12.9)	28.0	5.6
	Unregistered	(-0.8)		11.7	9.1	10.4
3.	Tertiary	10.7	6.8	4.6	6.6	5.6
Over all Economy:						
	Uttar Pradesh	10.8	7.0	0.0	6.8	3.3
	All India	(8.2)		(4.8)	(6.0)	(3.6)
Per Capita Income:						
	Uttar Pradesh	8.5		(-2.0)	4.6	1.3
	All India	(6.0)		(3.2)	(5.0)	(4.1)

Source : Bulletin No.275, Economic and Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, U.P.

**Annexure-4 : Rural Consumer Price Index of U.P.
Major Group-wise Annual (Base: Agr. Year, 1970-71= 100)**

Year	General Index	Growth Rate	Food	Growth Rate	Beverages & Tobacco	Growth Rate	Fuel & Light	Growth Rate	Clothing and Foot Wear	Growth Rate	Housing
Weight	100.00		76.00		2.46		7.98		5.42		0.45
1993-94	638.5	-	603.6	-	673.0	-	942.2	-	580.8	-	1251.7
1994-95	696.9	(9.1)	675.6	(11.9)	694.4	(3.2)	871.0	(-7.6)	640.7	(10.3)	1439.3
1995-96	763.6	(9.6)	745.0	(10.3)	736.9	(6.0)	930.8	(6.9)	720.0	(12.4)	1511.4
1996-97	845.6	(10.7)	831.1	(11.6)	787.8	(6.9)	1007.0	(8.2)	819.6	(13.8)	1265.0
1997-98	920.4	(8.8)	902.4	(8.6)	891.8	(13.2)	1103.9	(9.6)	899.6	(9.8)	1323.5
1998-99	1009.3	(9.7)	982.9	(8.9)	977.0	(9.6)	1303.1	(18.0)	990.6	(10.1)	1662.8
1999-2000	1030.4	(2.1)	988.4	(0.6)	1106.9	(13.3)	1401.9	(7.6)	990.6	(-0.06)	1688.2
Annual		(8.3)		(8.6)		(8.7)		(7.1)		(9.4)	

Average Growth Rate											
------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Source: Rural Consumer Price Index of U.P., Economic and Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, U.P.

**Annexure-5: Urban Consumer Price Index of U.P.
Annual Average Major Group-wise Indices (Base: Agr. Year, 1970-71= 100)**

Year	General Index	Growth Rate	Food	Growth Rate	Beverages & Tobacco	Growth Rate	Fuel & Light	Growth Rate	Clothing and Food Wear	Growth Rate	Hous
Weight	100.00		66.45		2.49		6.78		6.41		2.7
1993-94	675.4	-	611.7	-	803.5	-	1184.0	-	559.6	-	995
1994-95	733.4	(8.6)	675.1	(10.4)	826.6	(2.8)	1205.0	(1.8)	648.5	(15.9)	1056
1995-96	788.8	(7.5)	726.3	(7.6)	901.4	(9.0)	1288.0	(6.9)	693.9	(6.9)	1162
1996-97	897.8	(13.8)	832.3	(14.6)	972.7	(7.9)	1525.0	(18.4)	766.8	(10.6)	1246
1997-98	934.4	(4.1)	843.2	(1.3)	1028.7	(5.8)	1609.1	(5.5)	842.0	(9.8)	1342
1998-99	1051.2	(12.5)	982.2	(16.5)	1098.6	(6.8)	1683.9	(4.6)	878.6	(4.3)	1539
1999-2000	1060.0	(0.8)	965.6	-(1.7)	1208.0	(10.0)	1769.7	(5.1)	889.4	(1.2)	1621
Annual Average Growth Rate		(7.9)		(8.1)		(7.1)		(7.1)		(8.1)	

Source : Urban Consumer Price Index of U.P., Economic and Statistics Division, State Planning Institute U.P.

Annexure 6: CORRELATION RESULTS (RURAL)

Correlation	MPCE	Highest Level of Education Class V	Enrolment Rate			Dropout Rate of Boys	Dropout Rate of Girls	Dropout Rate of Children	% of HH having knowledge of nearest schools
			Boys	Girls	Children				
MPCE	1.0000	0.5526	0.8703**	0.9156**	0.9126**	-0.7358*	-0.5983	-0.7611*	0.7783*
Higher Education	0.5526	1.0000	0.7135*	0.7148*	0.7273*	-0.3717	-0.6552	-0.5440	0.7554*
Enrol. Boys	0.8703**	0.7135*	1.0000	0.9299**	0.9783**	-0.7966**	-0.7068*	0.8515*	0.7583*
Enrol. Girls	0.9156**	0.7148*	0.9299**	1.0000	0.9858**	-0.6966*	-0.7785*	-0.8163**	0.7980**
Enrol. Children	0.9126**	0.7273*	0.9783**	0.9858**	1.0000	-0.7515*	-0.7529*	-0.8418**	0.7970**
Dropout Boys	-0.7358*	-0.3717	-0.7966**	-0.6966*	-0.7515*	1.0000	0.6069	0.9318**	-0.4158
Dropout Girls	-0.5983	-0.6552	-0.7068*	-0.7785*	-0.7529	0.6069	1.0000	0.8534**	-0.5791
Dropout Children	-0.7611*	-0.5440	0.8515*	-0.8163**	-0.8418	0.9318**	0.8534**	1.0000	-0.5464
Knowledge of Availability of Nearest Schools	0.7783*	0.7554*	0.7583*	0.7980**	0.7970**	-0.4158	-0.5791	-0.5464	1.0000
Knowledge of Availability of Govt. Schools	0.3384	0.5790	0.5070	0.4460	0.4769	-0.2640	-0.5219	-0.4235	0.5962
No. of Cases	12								
1-tailed Significant	* = 0.01			** = 0.001					

Source : Results are based on data collected for Baseline Survey through Economics & Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, Uttar Pradesh.

Annexure 7: CORRELATION RESULTS (URBAN)

Correlation	MPCE	Highest Level of Education Class V	Enrolment Rate			Dropout Rate of Boys	Dropout Rate of Girls	Dropout Rate of Children	% of HH having knowledge of nearest availability
			Boys	Girls	Children				
MPCE	1.0000	0.3782	0.8478*	0.2007	0.7879*	-0.7269*	-0.6569	-0.7485*	-0.0469
Higher Education	0.3782	1.0000	0.7708*	0.2264	0.8105**	-0.6667*	-0.8084**	-0.7172*	0.2738
Enrol. Boys	0.8478**	0.7708*	1.0000	0.3090	0.9866**	-0.9198**	-0.8975**	-0.9358**	0.1787
Enrol. Girls	0.2007	0.2264	0.3090	1.0000	0.3293	-0.3302	-0.2390	-0.5221	0.2352
Enrol. Children	0.7879*	0.8105**	0.9866**	0.3293	1.0000	-0.9273**	-0.9281**	-0.9455**	0.2722
Dropout Boys	-0.7269*	-0.6667*	-0.9198**	-0.3302	-0.9273**	1.0000	0.8983**	0.9448**	-0.2669
Dropout Girls	0.6569	-0.8084**	-0.8975**	-0.2390	-0.9281**	0.8983**	1.0000	0.9146**	-0.3757
Dropout Children	-0.7485*	-0.7172*	-0.9358**	-0.5221	-0.9455**	0.9448**	0.9146**	1.0000	-0.2292
Knowledge of Availability of Nearest Schools	-0.0469	0.2738	0.1787	0.2352	0.2722	-0.2669	-0.3757	-0.2292	1.0000
Knowledge of Availability of Govt. Schools	-0.7880*	-0.1510	-0.5207	0.0201	-0.4398	0.3235	0.2942	0.4009	0.5566
No. of Cases	12								
1-tailed Significant	* = 0.01					** = 0.001			

Source: Results are based on data collected for Baseline Survey through Economics & Statistics

Division, State Planning Institute Uttar Pradesh.

**Annexure 8: DROP OUT RATE OF CHILDREN OF AGE 5 TO 14 YEARS
ACCORDING TO M.P.C.E. CLASS (RURAL)**

Sl.No.	M.P.C.E. Class	Drop out of Boys	Drop out of Girls	Drop out of Children
01	Below 225	8.4	12.2	9.8
02	225 – 255	4.7	7.6	5.9
03	255 – 300	7.5	8.2	7.8
04	300 – 340	7.0	10.7	8.5
05	340 – 380	4.4	5.3	4.8
06	380 – 420	3.9	8.4	5.8
07	420 – 470	5.2	8.3	6.4
08	470 – 525	8.0	6.9	7.5
09	525-615	5.9	6.6	6.2
10	615-775	4.7	4.3	4.5
11	775-950	1.5	5.6	3.2
12	Above 950	1.8	6.2	3.6
	Total	5.7	7.5	6.5
	Sum=	63.00	90.30	74.00
	Mean =	5.25	7.53	6.17
	SD =	20.30	30.13	24.90
	CV =	67.00	73.00	78.00

Source: Results are based on data collected for Baseline Survey through Economics & Statistics

Division, State Planning Institute, Uttar Pradesh.

**Annexure 8: DROP OUT RATE OF CHILDREN OF AGE 5 TO 14 YEARS
ACCORDING TO M.P.C.E. CLASS (URBAN)**

Sl.No.	M.P.C.E. Class	Drop out of Boys	Drop out of Girls	Drop out of Children
01	Below 300	10.5	12.5	11.4
02	300 – 350	13.6	10.9	12.5
03	350 – 425	7.8	10.4	8.9
04	425 – 500	6.2	5.1	5.7
05	500 – 575	7.1	5.6	6.4
06	575 – 665	2.5	3.4	3.0
07	665 – 775	4.7	7.5	6.0
08	775 – 915	2.6	2.5	2.5
09	915-1120	1.0	1.7	1.4
10	1120-1500	0.3	0.6	0.4
11	1500-1925	0.6	3.8	2.0
12	Above 1925	0.4	3.3	1.3
	Total	6.2	6.4	6.3
	Sum=	57.3	67.3	61.5
	Mean =	4.78	5.61	5.13
	SD =	4.35	3.88	4.07
	CV =	91.14	69.15	79.31

Source: Results are based on data collected for Baseline Survey through Economics & Statistics

Division, State Planning Institute, Uttar Pradesh.

Annexure 9: ENROLMENT RATE OF CHILDREN OF AGE 5 TO 14 YEARS
(RURAL)

Sl.No.	MPCE Class	Enrolment of Boys	Enrolment of Girls	Enrolment of Children
01	Below 225	56.9	39.5	49.1
02	225 – 255	60.3	45.4	53.1
03	255 – 300	58.3	47.9	53.6
04	300 – 340	61.9	48.9	56.1
05	340 – 380	67.5	61.0	64.4
06	380 – 420	66.7	53.7	60.8
07	420 – 470	72.2	57.1	65.2
08	470 – 525	66.2	66.6	66.4
09	525-615	69.3	63.7	66.8
10	615-775	79.0	69.6	74.6
11	775-950	87.2	82.6	85.2
12	Above 950	79.2	78.4	78.9
	Total	66.4	56.2	61.8
	Sum=	824.7	714.4	774.2
	Mean =	68.73	59.53	64.52
	SD =	9.28	13.30	10.95
	CV =	86.00	85.00	95.00

Source: Results are based on data collected for Baseline Survey through Economics & Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, Uttar Pradesh

Annexure 9: ENROLMENT RATE OF CHILDREN OF AGE 5 TO 14 YEARS
(URBAN)

Sl.No.	MPCE Class	Enrolment of Boys	Enrolment of Girls	Enrolment of Children
01	Below 300	50.8	42.2	46.8
02	300 – 350	56.4	46.9	52.1
03	350 – 425	66.7	61.1	64.2
04	425 – 500	72.9	72.0	72.5
05	500 – 575	71.5	76.8	73.9
06	575 – 665	84.7	84.9	84.8
07	665 – 775	83.1	80.3	81.7
08	775 – 915	83.8	90.9	87.2
09	915-1120	82.9	86.7	89.9
10	1120-1500	96.1	97.0	96.5
11	1500-1925	93.6	95.9	94.6
12	Above 1925	98.6	83.0	93.1
	Total	71.7	69.4	70.6
	Sum=	941.10	917.70	937.30
	Mean =	78.43	76.48	78.11
	SD =	15.88	17.97	16.57
	CV =	19.78	23.50	21.22

Source: Results are based on data collected for Baseline Survey through Economics & Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, Uttar Pradesh.

Annexure 10: Distribution of visible underemployment, by different classifications of activity status, Uttar Pradesh, 1999-2000 (per cent)

Broad activity status by sector		Usually employed (principal and subsidiary status takes together) by broad current weekly status		Persons days of usually employed (principal and subsidiary status takes together) by their broad current daily status		Persons days of current weekly status of employed persons by their broad current daily status	
		(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
(1)	(2)	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Employed	Rural	95.7	79.6	91.8	61.7	95.9	77.1
	Urban	97.5	87.3	95.0	72.5	97.4	82.4
Unemployed	Rural	1.6	0.5	2.9	1.0	1.3	0.6
	Urban	1.2	0.6	2.1	0.7	0.9	0.3
Not in labour force	Rural	2.7	19.9	5.4	37.2	2.8	22.2
	Urban	1.3	12.1	2.9	26.8	1.7	17.3

Source: *Employment and unemployment situation in India, 1999-2000, Part-I, NSSO, Govt. of India, Report no 458 (55/10/2) pp. 159-164.*

Annexure 11: Invisible underemployment, Uttar Pradesh, 1999-2000 (per cent)

Type of invisible underemployment (1)	Rural			Urban		
	Male (2)	Female (3)	Persons (4)	Male (5)	Female (6)	Persons (7)
Employed persons in the usual principal status who did not work more or less regularly throughout the year	9.3	12.6	10.0	6.4	7.8	6.5
Usually employed persons in the principal status (15 years and above) who sought or were available for additional work	8.2	6.6	7.9	5.2	5.1	5.2
Usually unemployed persons in the principal status (15 years and above) who sought or were available for	7.4	5.8	7.1	5.2	4.0	5.1

alternative work						
------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Source: Same as Annexure 12, pp. 165-167.

Annexure 12: Persons out of labour force, according to usual current weekly and current daily status for Uttar Pradesh, 1999-2000 (per cent)

Region	Gender	Usual status		Weekly status	Daily status Male
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Rural	Male	52.5	51.4	52.5	53.8
	Female	87.7	79.9	83.5	87.1
	Persons	69.6	65.2	67.5	70.0
Urban	Male	49.3	48.8	49.3	50.2
	Female	93.1	90.3	91.2	92.7
	Persons	69.9	68.3	69.0	70.2

Source: Same as Annexure 12 pp. 62-63.

Annexure 13: Percentage distribution of villages by distance from key social services and facilities

S.NO.	NAME OF FACILITY	According to the Position as on 31 March 1999					
		Within Village	Less Than 1 K.m	1-3 K.m	3-5 K.m	More Than 5 K.m	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Community Development Blocks	0.7	1.5	7.6	10.2	80.1	100.0
2	Village Development officers Centre	13.0	8.4	28.4	22.4	27.9	100.0
3	Fair Price Shop	55.7	15.5	18.1	5.6	5.1	100.0
4	Drinking Water Source	96.5	2.1	1.2	0.1	0.0	100.0
5	Agricultural Instrument Repair Centre	2.7	3.1	10.7	11.1	72.4	100.0
6	Bazaar/Haat	7.1	6.4	25.7	20.9	39.9	100.0
7	Whole Sale Market	0.3	0.6	3.6	5.6	90.0	100.0
8	Cold Storage	0.4	0.7	3.5	4.9	90.5	100.0
9	Seed Store/Fertiliser Store /pesticides Store/Village go down	8.1	6.1	19.5	18.4	47.9	100.0
10	Veterinary hospital/veterinary centre	3.9	3.9	18.0	20.3	53.8	100.0
11	Artificial insemination centre/sub centre	2.8	3.3	15.8	18.2	60.0	100.0
12	Primary Agricultural co-operative credit society	7.0	6.9	25.8	20.9	39.5	100.0

13	Purchase and Sale co-operative society	0.6	0.9	5.7	5.7	87.0	100.0
14	Government Purchase centre	6.8	2.6	10.4	10.0	70.3	100.0
15	Junior Basic Schools(combined)	67.7	14.3	14.4	2.4	1.2	100.0
16	Senior Basic Schools(boys)	14.6	9.4	32.5	22.1	21.5	100.0
17	Senior Basic Schools(girls)	3.8	5.3	20.5	17.8	52.7	100.0
18	Higher secondary schools(boys)	4.3	4.5	19.0	21.6	50.6	100.0
19	Higher secondary schools(girls)	0.7	1.8	8.1	11.4	78.0	100.0
20	Adult Education Centre	5.4	0.7	0.8	1.2	91.9	100.0
21	Allopathic Hospital, Dispensary and PHC	3.3	3.7	15.1	18.1	59.7	100.0
22	Ayurvedic Hospital and dispensary	1.8	2.4	10.5	14.0	71.4	100.0
23	Unani dispensary	0.2	0.5	3.4	4.3	91.6	100.0
24	Homeopathic Hospitals and dispensary	1.0	1.7	7.8	9.0	80.6	100.0
25	Family and Maternal Child Welfare Centre/sub centre	17.0	10.0	27.6	19.9	25.5	100.0
26	Pucca Road	44.3	12.8	21.3	10.4	11.2	100.0
27	Post Office	15.5	10.8	34.4	20.0	19.3	100.0
28	Telegraph Office	0.8	1.9	8.4	10.6	78.3	100.0
29	Public Telephone	16.3	6.1	15.2	13.6	48.8	100.0
30	Railway Stations	0.8	1.6	6.6	8.7	82.3	100.0
31	Bus Stations/Bus Stops	9.5	7.0	22.4	18.5	42.7	100.0
32	Co-operative Agriculture rural Development Bank	0.2	0.7	3.3	4.9	90.8	100.0
33	Commercial/rural/co-operative Bank	4.8	5.6	22.3	23.4	43.9	100.0
34	Post Office Saving bank	17.1	9.6	32.3	19.7	21.2	100.0

Source: Economics & Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, Uttar Pradesh

REFERENCES

1. **Planning Commission, Govt of India (July 1993)**, Report of the Expert Group on estimation of proportion and number of poor
2. **Planning Commission, Govt of India (March 1997 & February 2001)**, Estimate of Poverty.
3. **NSSO, Deptt. of Statistics, Govt of India, (February 1998)**, Housing Conditions in India, Jan-Jun 1993, *NSS 49th Round Report no. 429*.
4. **NSSO, Deptt. of Statistics, Govt of India**, Employment and Unemployment Situation in India 1999-2000, *Report no. 458, pt-1*.
5. **Planning Department, Govt. of UP (2001)**, Annual Plan, Vol.-I, Part-II, 2001-2002, Uttar Pradesh.
6. **Bajpai, B.K. (2001)**, Decentralised Planning in India, *Paper presented at European Institute for Asian Studies*, Brussels, Belgium, 15-16 October, 2001.
7. **Dev, Mahendra S. (2000)**, Economic Reforms, Poverty, Income Distribution and Employment, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 4th March, 2000.
8. **Swaminathan, S. & Anklesria Aiyar (2000)**, New Light on Poverty Puzzle, *Economic Times*, June 14.
9. **Gulati, Ashok (2000)** Poverty, Growth and Reforms, *Economic Times*, 30 March.
10. **Lars-Engberg (1998)**, Studying Poverty – Concepts and Approach, Pedersen, in Niel Webster (ed.), *In Search of Alternatives: Poverty, the Poor and Local Organisation; CDR Working Paper No.98.10*, Copenhagen, Denmark, CDR.
11. **Fahimuddin and Bajpai, B.K. (1996)**, Time Use and Short Term Economic Criteria Study: A Report on Environmental Sanitation and Rural Water Supply in Hill and Bundelkhand Regions of U.P.