Deprivation of Basic Amenities in Andhra Pradesh

Motkuri, Venkatanarayana

Centre for Economics and Social Studies, Hyderabad

May 2008

Deprivation of Basic Amenities in Andhra Pradesh*

Motkuri Venkatanarayana

Centre for Economic and Social Studies
N. O. Campus, Begumpet, Hyderabad-16

Email Id: venkatanarayan@gmail.com;
venkat_motukuri@yahoo.com

Abstract

Despite the noble concept of equity wherein every citizen has equal right to live a decent life irrespective of their socio-economic and regional/geographic characteristics, the phenomenon of inequality is persistent in everyday life of people especially those living in developing countries such as India. Especially the people living in rural areas have been constantly encountering the locational disadvantage: being located in rural areas the access to basic amenities is denied or inadequate. In this respect the President of India advocated that provision of urban amenities in rural areas is an essential component of rural development. The present paper is prepared in this context and it follows the framework of Sen's Capability Approach to development wherein it examines the levels of deprivation of rural people in terms of their access to basic amenities like, housing, drinking water, sanitation etc. It also evaluates the degree of relative disadvantage of rural people when compared with their urban counterparts.

Key Words: (*India, Andhra Pradesh, Rural, Poverty, Deprivation, Capability, Basic Amenities, and Basic Deprivations*)

Deprivation of Basic Amenities in Andhra Pradesh

Motkuri Venkatanarayana
Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Hyderabad

I. Introduction

In recent times the President of India has advocated on the provision of urban amenities in rural areas as an essential component of rural development and the global community's concern on the same has been expressed in terms of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This reminds the importance of the goal universal access to basic amenities which is yet to be achieved, especially in rural areas. In the MDGs, the seventh one in the order says about the Environment and Sustainability in which target 10 indicates that proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water should be halved by 2015 and the indicator 31 of target 11 indicates access to improved sanitation for improved living conditions.

From the equity perspective every citizen of a country/nation has equal right to live a decent life, irrespective of his/her location, caste, gender, religion, occupation etc. But in reality inequality is a persistent phenomenon in everyday life of people especially those living in developing countries such as India. Particularly in case of location, the standards of living of people living in rural and urban location differ widely. Rural people constantly face locational disadvantage due to their being in rural area where the access to basic amenities is difficult. As a matter of fact, in the Gandhian perspective, the real India lives in villages. But policy makers have constantly undermined the above fact and neglected rural areas in the development effort. Theoretically it is argued that the urban bias in policy and allocation of resources is the reason behind the locational disadvantage of the rural people (Lipton, 1968 & 1977).

Rural life is characterised by hardship and great insecurity especially for labouring poor. Their day-to-day search for livelihood keeps nothing in reserve to tide over a crisis. There are odds against taking a long-term view of life and planning for the future. Given the income vulnerabilities, the long-run welfare is forgone for short-run securities. Interruption, reduction or loss of earnings from the contingencies such as unemployment, underemployment, low wages, low prices and failure to find the market for the produce, old age, ill-health, sickness, disability etc. are the situations which call for social security. Importantly, the deprivation of

basic amenities causes the rural life most vulnerable to insecurities. Lack of proper institutional measures for social security provisions ensures the continuation of deprivation of the people in the countryside.

It was assumed that in the development process growth itself ensures the social security for wide spectrum of people when fruits of growth trickle down. This type of strategy is called growth-led strategy for social security (Sen and Dreze, 1999). Nonetheless, in many developing countries such as in India, growth alone could not ensure social security. Therefore, the need for state-led (support-led) strategy for social security becomes imperative (Sen and Dreze, 1999). However, the state-supported social security arrangements are mostly concentrated around labour in the organised sector which forms only 10 per cent of the total workforce. About 90 per cent of the workforce has no access to such well-defined arrangements. It indicates the exclusion of a large set of households and the populations living in those households from state-supported social security.

In the social security framework there are three kinds of securities: Protective, Promotive and Preventive securities (see Sen and Dreze, 1999). The provision of basic amenities such as housing, sanitation, education and health fall in the category of promotive securities. These are the most important basic securities required by most of the rural people. As we have mentioned above that growth-led strategy could not help in getting access to these basic amenities, hence it becomes a liability to the state. Therefore, state-led strategy is only alternative in the provision of these basic facilities. In the welfare state context too, it is essential to keep access to basic amenities to all the citizens of any society.

In this context, the present paper examines, while focusing on rural Andhra Pradesh, the deprivation of rural people in terms of their access to basic amenities like, housing, drinking water, sanitation etc., wherein the paper constructs a composite index for deprivation by using a method, observed in recent literature (see Jayaraj and Subramanian, 2002), an alternative conventional method. The degree of relative disadvantage of rural people vis-à-vis urban counterparts is also analyzed.

Having said, the paper is organized in the following manner. While passing through the introduction, the second section delineates the methodology of the analysis along with the data source used. The core analysis presented in the III section which presented the levels in terms of the percentage of deprived households in the specified and selected basic household

amenities and the IV section which presents the analysis of head count ratio (HCR) which is derived using the alternative methodology, of the deprivation in terms of basic amenities. Policy implications and conclusions are placed in fifth and last section.

II. Methodology

The paper follows the framework of Sen's Capability Approach to development. In this paper, the deprivation is defined with respect to lack of access to a set of fairly basic requirements (amenities) that might be expected to contribute to the capability for achieving satisfactory human functioning – a 'functioning' Amartya Sen (1985) has called 'a state of being or doing'. In other words the 'capability failure' in the different dimension of basic amenities required for standardizing the capability and thereby it's functioning. To examine the level of deprivation in terms of basic household amenities we first construct aggregate head count measure of deprivation, which is used in Jayaraj and Subramanian (2002).

To get the aggregate index of deprivation with respect to capability and functioning in terms basic household amenities, first we have to find the number of individual instances of failure in capability that is presented by the following equation.

$$N^0_{i.} = \sum_{j=1}^9 N^j_{i.} \qquad \ldots \text{ (1)}$$

Where, i= (1,2,3…. n) number of states; j = (1,2,3….9) number of indicators.

$$N_{i.}^* = \sum N^j . N_{i.} \qquad \ldots \text{ (2)}$$

Where, $\sum N^j$ indicates the **total number of indicators** considered for the index.

Details of number of indicators are as follows:

$N_{i.}$ = Size of the population of the ith state.

$N^1_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households with one or none dwelling rooms.

$N^2_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households without drinking water facility[1].

$N^3_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households without electricity connection.

$N^4_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households without lavatory.

$N^5_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households without any specified assets

$N^6_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households using traditional fuel.

$N^7_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households with dilapidated house.

$N^8_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households which do not have banking transactions.

---

[1] Near premises has been considered if the source availed is within 100 meters for urban areas and 500 meters for rural areas.

$N^9_{i.}$ = Number of people living in households without bathroom.

The Normalised Index of Deprivation can be derived as follows.

$$HD_{i.} = N^0_{i.} / N^*_{i.} \qquad \dots \quad (3)$$

If $N^0_{i.} \equiv N^*_{i.}$; indicates complete deprivation, in other words all the people living in rural areas are deprived of these basic amenities. Otherwise it gives the head count ratio of deprivation, which measures the number of instances people are deprived of the selected basic amenities.

And finally we compute the relative disadvantage index. It is to be read as the status of relative disadvantage of rural household in terms of access to basic amenities vis-à-vis urban households. The sign of the index denotes the status, where positive sign indicates the presence of relative disadvantage and the negative sign on the other hand indicates the absence of relative disadvantage[2].

$$RDI_j = \frac{C_{ij} - S_{ij}}{(C_{ij\ Max}) - S_{ij}} \qquad (4)$$

Where RDI_j - Relative Disadvantage Index of 'j'th state/district; C_{ij} is contribution of 'i' th (i.e. rural hhs here) group to the total deprived households in the 'j'th state/district; S_i - the share of 'i' th group of (i.e. rural) households in the total households of 'j'th state/district.

$$C_i\ Max = 1 \qquad\qquad if \qquad S_i > AD$$
$$C_i\ Max = S_i / AD \qquad\quad if \qquad S_i < AD$$

Where AD is the average level of deprivation across all the groups (i.e. rural and urban combined since here we have take two sets of population group - rural and urban).

Data Source

Data used to construct such index of deprivation is the state level data on various dimensions of basic capabilities, which are a function of access to and availability of basic household amenities. This paper uses data on household amenities provided by Census of India for the year 2001.

III. Levels of Basic Amenities Deprivation

Since independence the Constitution as well as the policy makers have been assuring the people of India, of provision of basic amenities. Despite the last 50 years of effort, there exist a large number of households not having access to number of basic facilities. Moreover there

exist stark differences between the rural and urban households. There is continuum of locational disadvantage of rural population. Inadequacy/absence of the basic amenities hampers the development of the individual wherein the rural households are the most vulnerable section of the society.

Composition

According to the recent Census (2001) enumeration there are about 192 million households giving space to 1.1 billion people in India, of which 138 million (about 72.0 per cent of the total households) households with 742 million people (about 72.2 per cent of total population) reside in the countryside. Rest of the households and population live in urban India. The average size of household is around 5.4 for the country and rural India. In Andhra Pradesh for the same Census, there are 16.8 million households with 76.1 million population, on average 4.5 persons per household (i.e. household size). The percentage of rural households and population is 72.7 per cent of the total in the state; it is little above the all-India average. The percentage share of the state in all-India in terms of households and population is 8.8 and 7.4 respectively. Obviously the average size of the households (4.5) in Andhra Pradesh is lower than the (5.4) all-India average.

Levels of Deprivation

Figures presented in Table 1 reveals facts of the deprivation of basic amenities in India as well as in Andhra Pradesh. It is very much explicit that the level of deprivation of each of basic amenities is higher among the rural households than in their urban counterparts. Hence the focus of the analysis is on rural households and the figures of urban households used for the comparative perspective.

More than half of the (78 million out of 138 million) households in rural India do not have the electricity connection. Though the situation in Andhra Pradesh (henceforth AP) appears better it is not negligible, there are about 45 per cent of the (5.1 million out of 12.6 million in rural AP) households experiencing such a deprivation. Under the rural electrification programme it is claimed that there is cent percent electrification of villages/habitation/settlements (all they are electrified) a decade ago but it could not ensure that all the households had have electricity connection. Electricity, in fact, serves the basic purpose of lighting on the one hand and plays an important role in the development of agriculture and industry, on the other. Lack of

---

[2] For instance see Jayaraj and Subramanian (2002).

electricity widens the gap with respect to access/right to information (especially in age electronic media age), which is detrimental to development/progress.

Sanitary conditions are prerequisite for a healthy life and in this respect the rural households are at a greater disadvantage. Of 138 and 12.6 million rural household in India and AP, three fourths of the rural households (around 579 and 573 million in India and 10.2 and 9.2 million AP respectively) are deprived of each basic amenity of toilet and bathroom. Similarly, the type of cooking fuel being used by the households, is another aspect that affects the health of a person especially the women. About 90 per cent of the rural households (about 676 and 11 million households respectively of India and AP) use traditional cooking fuel such as firewood, charcoal etc. that is more polluting and harmful.

Table 1: Percentage of Population Living in Households Deprived of Different Basic Amenities according to Census 2001: Comparison of AP and all-India Average

	Indicators	Rural and Urban		Rural		Urban	
		AP	India	AP	India	AP	India
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	No Electricity	32.8	44.49	39.3	56.79	10.0	12.34
2	No Toilet	67.0	64.09	82.0	78.52	21.9	26.14
3	No Bathroom	60.2	64.36	73.6	77.60	21.5	29.43
4	Tradl. Fuel for Cooking	73.1	74.96	87.2	91.58	30.2	31.25
5	No Tap Water	51.9	63.79	59.4	76.14	28.1	31.17
6	One or none DW	49.1	41.91	56.1	43.44	31.5	37.23
7	Dilapidated house	3.9	5.54	4.5	6.27	2.2	3.58
8	No Specified Assets	45.9	34.75	53.2	40.72	24.0	18.91
9	No Banking Services	69.0	64.96	70.0	70.28	66.9	50.20

Note: *DW* - Dwelling Rooms excluding Kitchen.

Source: 1. Census of India, 2001; 2. Venkatanarayana and Joe (2006)

Drinking water itself is another important determinant of health in terms of fulfilling the body requirements absolving the food. Nevertheless all the water that is available may not be safe in terms of health prospects. There is no dearth of instances wherein the water body/flow carries large number of diseases and thereby their spread. The components of water available also matters the health of the users; for instance the flourosis problem causing physical impediment of people using such water. Rural households are more vulnerable to water related health problems than their urban counterparts. Therefore, access to safe drinking water is very important to avoid water borne diseases. Despite such importance, there are millions of households especially those located in rural (562 and 7.5 million households in India and

AP respectively) are deprived of the facility: safe drinking water. Moreover, the non-availability of water for household daily use and drinking water, taxing on the labour time use of the household members; as they have to spend considerable amount of time on fetching water. The adverse effect of such deprivation is that the school going age children especially girls are substituted for adults in this task, hence causing the schooling deprivation of children (Venkatanarayana, 2005).

One of the three most important basic requirements of living human beings is the 'shelter' (the other two are: food and clothes). Lack of or inadequate housing facility is an important indication of poverty and deprivation (see Mahadeva, 2004). In India (AP), there are about 321 (7) million rural households having only one or none dwelling rooms in their shelter. In terms of the proportion, the rural and urban population, in fact, show similar proportion of deprivation on the lines of number of dwelling rooms. The reasons for this in urban area could be the space constraint and impact of in-migration to urban spaces. There are about 46.3 million rural households living in those houses whose condition is reportedly dilapidated. The proportion of dilapidated houses in rural areas is double in comparison to the urban areas; but in absolute terms, the number is larger in rural areas.

Enumeration of household's asset possession is the uniqueness of the 2001 Census. Such enumeration was absent in the earlier Census. In fact the asset possession is an important factor which reflects the economic condition of the households. The poor asset holding position among the rural households reflects the extent of poverty among rural households. Though there are various types of assets, the Census 2001 did the enumeration of specific selected assets. As regards the possession of such specified assets, above forty percent of the rural households possessed none of such assets whereas in urban households it is twenty percent. The state of Andhra Pradesh stands above the all-India average in terms of having no specified assets.

Another specificity of 2001 Census is the enumeration of the household's status in availing the banking services. In economic literature it is well accepted that imperfections in the credit market can keep the economy at the low-level equilibrium by discouraging investment activities especially in human capital accumulation. Such low spread of banking habits among rural households suggests that there is a long way to go before people start borrowing to invest in human capital. Similarly for the urban households, the absence of banking habits can affect their potential to acquire higher levels of human capital. The figures on banking

services suggest very poor banking habits among rural and urban households. In rural India about 70 per cent of the households do not avail of banking services. The figure is also very high for the urban areas (around 50 per cent) but comparatively lower to the rural India. There is need to develop banking habits among rural as well as urban people. This also hints at the extent to which the imperfect credit operations are prevalent in India. In case of Andhra Pradesh, the percentage of households in such condition is vis-à-vis all-India average.

IV. Head Count Ratio of Deprivation and Regional Disparity

Finally it boils down to get the average levels of deprivation i.e. composite index of specified indicators. As mentioned above, there are different ways to obtain such an average. In one method by following conventional procedures, the average of deprivation levels in each of selected indicators is considered. But it has certain limitations in the sense that it cannot reflect the percentage of population deprived of at least one of the specified number of basic amenities: out of selected number of indicators. The proposition of an alternative is the novelty of the paper as mentioned above. The particular methods the paper proposed is analogous to head count ratio in the poverty literature. Hence, the figures arrived at and presented in the following Tables (i.e. Table 2 and 3) are the head count ratio (henceforth HCR) in terms of percentage of households deprived of specified basic amenities. It takes into account the number of times each household deprived of such amenities, hence the method accounts the degree of deprivation.

Secondly, in many dimensions/aspect, there exist widespread disparities across locations and regions in India wherein the point is the access to basic amenities. Regional disparities across politico-administrative divisions (i.e. States in Indian and districts in Andhra Pradesh) location of the people (i.e. rural and urban sectors) are presented in the following Tables (see Table 2 and 3). It is noteworthy to mention before delving into such regional disparities that the figures presented in the Table 2 are the headcount ratio of deprivation in terms of basic amenities.

The deprivation (of selected basic amenities) level in India and AP stands at 50 per cent (rural urban combined). In the rural areas it stands at 60 and 58 per cent in India and AP respectively. The deprivation levels of urban population (in India and AP) is lower, though not negligible, than their rural counterparts. The HCR of rural area is almost double to that of the urban ones. This shows the urban bias in provision of amenities against rural areas where

majority population resides. There is a distortion in development planning against rural areas and this requires priorities to be set right. Government must make efforts to provide safe drinking water, electricity and sanitary facilities to the rural people. This will help to improve the health status and living standards of the rural people. This also shows that in general there is a lack of awareness among the rural people regarding the availability of various public schemes providing for these amenities.

Table 2: The Head Count Ratio of Basic Amenities Deprivation Across Major Indian States: Census 2001

Sno	States	All	Rural	Urban	RDI
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*
1	**Andhra Pradesh**	**0.506**	**0.583**	**0.270**	**0.157**
2	Assam	0.598	0.645	0.323	0.116
3	Bihar	0.703	0.732	0.426	0.098
4	Chhattisgarh	0.594	0.653	0.341	0.146
5	Gujarat	0.413	0.542	0.212	0.219
6	Haryana	0.387	0.460	0.221	0.119
7	Himachal Pradesh	0.352	0.378	0.157	0.039
8	Jammu & Kashmir	0.397	0.475	0.164	0.130
9	Jharkhand	0.630	0.709	0.346	0.214
10	Karnataka	0.424	0.521	0.240	0.170
11	Kerala	0.377	0.412	0.272	0.056
12	Madhya Pradesh	0.550	0.645	0.275	0.210
13	Maharashtra	0.402	0.534	0.223	0.220
14	Orissa	0.659	0.706	0.362	0.139
15	Punjab	0.330	0.404	0.191	0.111
16	Rajasthan	0.531	0.619	0.244	0.187
17	Tamil Nadu	0.461	0.562	0.319	0.188
18	Uttar Pradesh	0.538	0.599	0.294	0.132
19	Uttaranchal	0.386	0.455	0.174	0.113
20	West Bengal	0.563	0.666	0.310	0.236
	All India	**0.506**	**0.598**	**0.268**	0.187
Descriptive Statistics	Mean	0.490	0.565	0.268	0.150
	SD	0.111	0.108	0.073	0.055
	CV	**22.7**	**19.2**	**27.1**	**36.8**
	Maximum	0.703	0.732	0.426	0.236
	Minimum	0.330	0.378	0.157	0.039
	Range	0.374	0.355	0.269	0.197

Note: 1. RDI - **Relative Disadvantage Index**: it takes into account the relative disadvantage of rural households vis-à-vis urban households.

Source: Census, 2001: Household Amenities; Venkatanarayana and Joe (2006)

There are widespread disparities across states in terms of the incidence of basic amenity deprivation, as shown by co-efficient of variation. The variation across states in rural areas is lesser than that of the urban areas. This indicates more heterogeneity in urban areas and the homogeneity in rural areas across states in terms of the deprivation of basic amenities. This deprivation is all-pervasive phenomenon in rural areas across states irrespective of the level of

economic development. The relative disadvantage index (RDI) stands by the locational disadvantage of the rural population in terms of having access to basic amenities. It, in fact, sustains the argument of urban bias in India's development effort (see Lipton, 1968).

Across major Indian states which account about 95 per cent of the India's population, Bihar followed by Jharkand, Orissa, West Bengal, Chattisgarh are having, in order, the highest head count ratio (HCR) in terms of the deprivation of rural population. It is very interesting to see West Bengal falling in the group of states having the highest in terms of the HCR of deprivation. The so-called BIMARU (Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajastan and Uttar Pradesh) states except Bihar, are having lower levels of head count of deprivation than West Bengal. The group of BIMARU states except Bihar seems improving their position, as they are moving ahead in terms of the most deprived states to moderately deprived ones.

The least HCR (of rural population) is observed for the state of Himachal Pradesh, and it is followed by Punjab, Kerala, Uttaranchal and Haryana in the order. It is interesting that the state of Kerala which is highly elevated for its achievement in social sector development especially education and health, slides down to third position in the order of the states having least HCR of deprivation in terms of basic amenities.

In case of Andhra Pradesh also widespread disparities are observed in the HCR of deprivation in terms basic amenities, across its politico-administrative sub-regions (i.e. district). The variation (as it is measured by coefficient of variation-CV) in the levels of HCR across district is lower in rural areas when compared to the urban area. It indicates the rural-homogeneity and urban-heterogeneity across district, in the HCR of deprivation. However, the relative disadvantage index (RDI) of rural population shows that there is monotonous trend across districts in terms of rural population being relatively the most disadvantaged in terms of basic amenities. Some district are showing negative sign before the value of the index indicating that the rural population is no longer the most disadvantage in relative terms when compared to their urban counterparts.

Across the districts of Andhra Pradesh the highest HCR of deprivation is observed for Srikakulam (0.667) from north coastal Andhra region (henceforth the north coast), followed by Mahabubnagar of south-Telangana region and Vizianagaram (0.657) and Visakhapatnam (0.644) of the north coast and Nellore (0.644) of the south coastal Andhra region (south coast) and Chittor and Anantapur of Rayalaseema region. On the other hand, the lowest HCR of

deprivation is observed for Nizamabad followed by Rangareddy of Telangana region and the few more districts in the order are: Krishna, West Godavari and Guntur of south coast.

Table 3: The Head Count Ratio of Basic Amenities Deprivation across Districts of Andhra Pradesh by Location: Census 2001

Sno	States	All	Rural	Urban	RDI
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*
1	Srikakulam	0.702	0.667	0.472	-0.405
2	Vizianagaram	0.674	0.657	0.465	-0.111
3	Visakhapatnam	0.578	0.644	0.367	0.169
4	East Godavari	0.602	0.588	0.411	-0.079
5	West Godavari	0.589	0.562	0.411	-0.190
6	Krishna	0.531	0.557	0.361	0.106
7	Guntur	0.562	0.578	0.409	0.071
8	Prakasam	0.621	0.625	0.454	0.038
9	Nellore	0.613	0.644	0.411	0.174
10	Chittoor	0.602	0.630	0.280	0.168
11	Cuddapah	0.582	0.611	0.398	0.171
12	Anantapur	0.596	0.628	0.415	0.158
13	Kurnool	0.578	0.599	0.420	0.124
14	Mahabubnagar	0.673	0.662	0.381	-0.144
15	Rangareddy	0.443	0.554	0.305	0.209
16	Hyderabad	0.272	-	0.272	-
17	Medak	0.599	0.584	0.364	-0.154
18	Nizamabad	0.554	0.540	0.362	-0.121
19	Adilabad	0.570	0.593	0.341	0.167
20	Karimnagar	0.625	0.628	0.401	0.010
21	Warangal	0.622	0.621	0.359	-0.008
22	Khammam	0.625	0.603	0.392	-0.147
23	Nalgonda	0.629	0.605	0.374	-0.242
Andhra Pradesh		0.583	0.607	0.366	-0.034
Descriptive Statistics	Mean	0.585	0.608	0.384	-
	SD	0.086	0.036	0.052	-
	CV	**14.7**	**6.0**	**13.4**	**-**
	Maximum	0.702	0.667	0.472	-
	Minimum	0.272	0.540	0.272	-
	Range	0.430	0.127	0.199	-

Note: 1. RDI - ***Relative Disadvantage Index***: it takes into account the relative disadvantage of rural households vis-à-vis urban households.

Source: Census, 2001: Household Amenities.

It is, in fact, indicating the shift over of historically deprived regions, as they are moving up towards better access to basic amenities. For instance, a few districts from historically back region i.e. Telangana are found to be in the order of the districts with relatively the least HCR of deprivation. On the other, districts from historically developed region i.e. coastal Andhra especially so of the north coast district found to be in the order of the districts with relatively the highest HCR of deprivation.

V. Policy Implications

In the words of Sen the deprivation causes or leads to the capability failure. If one defines the deprivation with respect to lack of access to a set of fairly basic requirements (herein, household amenities) which are expected to contribute to the capability for achieving satisfactory human functioning – a 'functioning' being that is called as 'a state of being or doing'. In other words lack of access to basic amenities, which are required for standardizing the capability and thereby functioning, leads to the 'capability failure' which in turn causes the disturbances in functioning.

Deprivation of basic amenities could be due to either lack of access to facility or under utilization of facility provided. In the case of the former one it owes to lack of or inadequate provision of facility itself and the latter one could be due to lack of initiative in other spheres that could have enabled the people to utilize the provision. In this respect both require the intervention of the state in the provision of facility as well as enabling the people to utilize the facility that is provided. Both the provision of facility and enabling initiatives are necessary while eliminating the deprivation in terms of the access to basic amenities. Consistency in the location disadvantage of the rural population across sub-region is indicating the biasedness in terms of allocation of resources and thereby provision of facilities, against rural locations. Therefore, rural areas need multiple policy initiative towards provision of basic amenities as well as those initiatives which provide a mechanism to enable the rural people utilize the facilities provided.

In terms of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the target of halving the deprived population in terms of basic amenities (for instances sanitation, drinking water and electricity provision) by 2015 raises the doubt over the achievement. Despite the consistent efforts in the last 55 years, about half of the (55 per cent) population is being deprived of these amenities. The MDGs target year is 2015, left 15-year period to reduce the deprivation level to 27 percent (half of the 55 percent); at moment only 9 years left for the target to be achieved. However, it is not impossible to reach such targets given the plenty of resource mobilization and planning and management devices. The need of the hour is *the political will and bureaucratic commitment*.

VI. Conclusions

The noble notions of equality and equity are far from being realized especially in developing countries such as India. In the equity perspective every citizen of any country/nation has equal right to live a decent life irrespective of his/her location, caste, gender, religion, occupation etc. Reality shows the persistent phenomenon of inequality in everyday life of people. Inequalities are wide spread across geographical locations. Particularly the standards of living of people living in rural and urban location widely differ. Rural people constantly face locational disadvantage of their being in the countryside where the access to basic amenities is difficult. The argument of urban bias in policy and in the allocation of resources as the reason behind the locational disadvantage of the rural people is true till date. In the light of the President's advocacy with respect to provision of urban amenities in rural areas, an essential component of rural development and Millennium Development Goals, the process has to be accelerated.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

Reference

Chambers, R (1982) "Health, Agriculture and Rural Poverty: Why Seasons Matter", *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 18(2).

Jayaraj, D and Subramanian, S (2002) "Child Labour in Tamil Nadu in the 1980's: A Preliminary Account of its Nature, Extent and Distribution", *Economic and Political Weekly*, March 9.

Lipton, Michael (1968) "Strategies for Agriculture: Urban Bias and Rural Planning", in Streeten, Paul and Lipton, M (eds.) **The Crisis of Indian Planning: Economic Planning in the 1960's**, O U P, London.

Lipton, Michael (1977) **Why Poor People Stay Poor: Urban Bias in World Development**, Temple Smith, London.

Mahadeva, M (2004) "Housing and Amenities in India: An Explanation Towards Development and Deprivation", *Man & Development*, Vol. XXVI (2), June.

Sen, AK and Dreze, Jean (1999) "Poverty and Famine", in **Sen and Dreze Omnibus**, OUP, Oxford.

Sen, A K (1985) **Commodities and Capabilities**, North Holland, Amsterdam.

Venkatanarayana, M (2005) "On the Heterogeneities in Educational Deprivation of Children in Andhra Pradesh", in G K Karanth (ed**.) Dimensions of Social Development: Status, Challenges and Prospects**, *Social and Economic Change Monographs Series 8*, Institute for Social and Economic Change, Banglore.

Venkatanarayana, M and Joe, William (2005) "On the Basic Deprivation of Basic Amenities in Rural India: An Exploration of Census Data", *MPRA Paper No. 48445. Accessible at* http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/48445/1/MPRA_paper_48445.pdf, Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram.

Appendix

Table 1: Relative Disadvantage Index (RDI) for Rural Population in terms of the Basic Amenities: Andhra Pradesh, Census 2001

Sno	District	Population		Number of Instances of Deprivation		Rural Share in Pop (Si)	Rural Sec Contb. (Ci)	Average Dep. (AD)	Ci Max	RDI
		Total	Rural	All	Rural					
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*
1	Srikakulam	2531752	2253473	19555067	16534542	0.890	0.846	0.702	1	-0.405
2	Vizianagaram	2243354	1831196	16630761	13237030	0.816	0.796	0.674	1	-0.111
3	Visakhapatnam	3816820	2285792	24280577	16189960	0.599	0.667	0.578	1	0.169
4	East Godavari	4897777	3746454	32458011	24222923	0.765	0.746	0.602	1	-0.079
5	West Godavari	3799213	3048535	24626184	18834666	0.802	0.765	0.589	1	-0.190
6	Krishna	4181071	2840697	24422088	17418859	0.679	0.713	0.531	1	0.106
7	Guntur	4455445	3169326	27541567	20156559	0.711	0.732	0.562	1	0.071
8	Prakasam	3054921	2588026	20865052	17796579	0.847	0.853	0.621	1	0.038
9	Nellore	2665009	2066193	17968242	14633047	0.775	0.814	0.613	1	0.174
10	Chittoor	3737437	2927215	24762058	20293831	0.783	0.820	0.602	1	0.168
11	Cuddapah	2592048	2006448	16594505	13488032	0.774	0.813	0.582	1	0.171
12	Anantapur	3639304	2719225	23867120	18785774	0.747	0.787	0.596	1	0.158
13	Kurnool	3524073	2708899	22405649	17863626	0.769	0.797	0.578	1	0.124
14	Mahbubnagar	3509182	3137700	25990095	22841379	0.894	0.879	0.673	1	-0.144
15	Rangareddy	3587891	1636492	17497607	9967061	0.456	0.570	0.443	1	0.209
16	Medak	2663783	2280437	17562367	14644560	0.856	0.834	0.599	1	-0.154
17	Nizamabad	2339459	1916674	14267096	11377556	0.819	0.797	0.554	1	-0.121
18	Karimnagar	3500876	2811881	21932052	18337800	0.803	0.836	0.570	1	0.167
19	Adilabad	2489312	1830438	17122580	12634744	0.735	0.738	0.625	1	0.010
20	Warangal	3241864	2619961	22191823	17902275	0.808	0.807	0.622	1	-0.008
21	Khammam	2569158	2059061	17674793	13650031	0.801	0.772	0.625	1	-0.147
22	Nalgonda	3245400	2812752	22438094	18722964	0.867	0.834	0.629	1	-0.242
	Andhra Pradesh	72285149	55296875	487801512	369208248	0.765	0.757	0.613	1	-0.034

Notes:

Source: Census of India 2001- Household Amenities, Andhra Pradesh