



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

## **On the Deprivation of Basic Amenities in Rural India: An Analysis of Census 2001**

Motkuri, Venkatanarayana and Joe, William

Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram (Kerala)

August 2005

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/48445/>  
MPRA Paper No. 48445, posted 20 Jul 2013 15:02 UTC

# On the Deprivation of Basic Amenities in Rural India: An Analysis of Census 2001<sup>#</sup>

Motkuri Venkatanarayana and William Joe

---

**Research Scholars**  
**Centre for Development Studies**  
Prasanthnagar, Ulloor  
Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala - 695 011  
Email: [Venkatanarayana@gmail.com](mailto:Venkatanarayana@gmail.com); and [william@cds.ac.in](mailto:william@cds.ac.in).

## Abstract

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. 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 widely differ. Rural people constantly face locational disadvantage, being in rural area where the access to basic amenities is inadequate. As a matter of fact, in the Gandhian perspective, the real India lives in villages. But policy makers have been 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. In this regard, the President of India advocated that provision of urban amenities in rural areas is an essential component of rural development.

In this context the present paper is an attempt to examine the levels of deprivation of rural people in terms of their access to basic amenities like, housing, drinking water, sanitation etc. And also it evaluates the degree of relative disadvantage of rural people when compared with their urban counterparts. Finally, the paper examines the associated factors related to the locational disadvantage of the rural people. The paper follows the framework of Sen's Capability Approach to development.

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

---

<sup>#</sup> We acknowledge the moral support and encouragement given by Prof. Subramanyam (MIDS, Chennai) and Dr. Uday S. Mishra (CDS, Trivandrum) and a few of our friends.

# **On the Deprivation of Basic Amenities in Rural India : An Analysis of Census 2001**

**Motkuri Venkatanarayana and William Joe<sup>#</sup>**

Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram (Kerala)

---

## **I. Introduction**

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. 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 widely differ. 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). In this regard, the President of India advocated that provision of urban amenities in rural areas is an essential component of rural development.

In this context the present paper is an attempt to examine the levels of deprivation of rural people in terms of their access to basic amenities like, housing, drinking water, sanitation etc. And also it evaluates the degree of relative disadvantage of rural people when compared with their urban counterparts. Finally, the paper examines the associated factors related to the locational disadvantage of the rural people.

## **II. Social Insecurity and Deprivation**

Rural life is characterised by hardship and great insecurity especially for labouring poor. 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 for labour in the organised sector forming 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 large share of the households and the populations living in those households are excluded 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 the growth-led strategy could not help in getting access to these basic amenities, it becomes a liability to the state. Therefore, state-led strategy is required in the provision of these basic facilities. In the welfare state context, it is essential to keep access to basic amenities to all the citizens of the any society.

### **III. 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

---

# Both are Research Scholars at Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum (Kerala). For contact Mail ID: [Venkatanarayana@cds.ac.in](mailto:Venkatanarayana@cds.ac.in); [william@cds.ac.in](mailto:william@cds.ac.in).

human functioning – a ‘functioning’ being what 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 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.

$$N_{i.}^0 = \sum_{j=1}^9 N_{i.}^j \quad \dots (1)$$

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

$$N_{i.}^* = \sum N^j \cdot N_{i.} \quad \dots (2)$$

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

If  $N_{i.}^0 \equiv N_{i.}^*$  ; indicates complete deprivation, in other words all the people living in rural areas are deprived of these basic amenities. The Normalised Index of Deprivation can be derived as follows.

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

Details of number of indicators are as follows:

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

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

$N_{i.}^2$  = Number of people living in households without drinking water facility.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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<sup>1</sup>.

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

Where RDI<sub>j</sub> - Relative Disadvantage Index of 'j'th state; C<sub>ij</sub> is contribution of 'i' th (i.e. rural hhs here) group to the total deprived households in the 'j'th state; S<sub>i</sub> - the share of 'i' th group of (i.e. rural) households in the total households of 'j'th state.

$$C_i \text{ Max} = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad S_i > AD$$

$$C_i \text{ Max} = S_i / AD \quad \text{if} \quad S_i < AD$$

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.

#### **IV. The Levels of Deprivation**

Since Independence the Constitution as well as the policy makers have been assuring the people of India, provision of basic amenities. In spite of last 50 years of effort there are still a large number of households having no access to basic facilities like proper housing.

Table 1 presents the percentage of households and population living in those households in deprived conditions of different basic amenities. There are stark differences between the rural households and their urban counterparts. The absence of any of the basic amenities hampers the development of the individual and in this respect the rural households are more vulnerable. As regards possession of any asset, more than forty percent of the rural households do not possess any asset whereas in urban households twenty percent of them do not possess any asset. The figures on banking services suggest very poor banking habits among rural and urban households. In rural India 70% of the households do not avail of

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance see Jayaraj and Subramanian (2002).

banking services. The figure is also very high for the urban areas (around 50%) 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.

**Table 1: Percentage of Households and Population Deprived of Different Basic Amenities in India : Census 2001**

Indicators		Rural and Urban		Rural		Urban	
		%HH	% Pop	%HH	% Pop	%HH	% Pop
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	No Assets	34.48	34.75	40.49	40.72	19.02	18.91
2	No Banking Services	64.46	64.96	69.89	70.28	50.48	50.20
3	No Electricity	44.15	44.49	56.48	56.79	12.41	12.34
4	No Toilet	63.59	64.09	78.08	78.52	26.28	26.14
5	No Bathroom	63.86	64.36	77.17	77.60	29.60	29.43
6	Fuel-Traditional	74.38	74.96	91.07	91.58	31.42	31.25
7	No Tap Water	63.30	63.79	75.71	76.14	31.34	31.17
8	One or none DW	41.59	41.91	43.20	43.44	37.44	37.23
9	Dilapidated house	5.50	5.54	6.23	6.27	3.60	3.58

**Note:** *DW* - Dwelling Rooms excluding Kitchen.

**Source:** Census of India, 2001.

In economics 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.

There is significant difference between the proportion of non -electrified houses in rural and urban areas. More than half of the rural India does not have electricity in comparison to a tenth of the urban households. Electricity not only serves the basic purpose of lighting but also is very important in the development of agriculture and industry. The poor asset holding position among the rural households reflects the extent of poverty among rural households. Lack of electricity and infrastructure widens information gap, which is detrimental to progress. Sanitary conditions are prerequisite for a healthy life and in this respect the rural households are at a greater disadvantage. Around three fourths of the rural households do not possess bathroom or toilet. Another factor, which can affect health, is the type of cooking fuel being used by the households. 90 % of rural household use traditional cooking fuel such as

firewood, charcoal etc., that are more polluting and harmful. Safe drinking water is another important determinant of health and access to it is very important to avoid water borne diseases. Here also data suggests that the rural households are more vulnerable to water related health problems in comparison to the urban dwellers. The rural and the urban population do show similar proportion of deprivation on the lines of number of dwelling rooms possessed. The reasons for this in urban area could be the space constraint. 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 and the level of deprivation is worse.

## **V. Locational Disparities**

There are widespread locational disparities in India in multiple dimensions wherein one among them is access to basic amenities. These locational disparities can be seen across political administrative divisions (i.e. States) and geographical location of the people especially rural and urban locations.

Table 2 shows the headcount ratio of basic amenities deprivation across major Indian states by location. It is obvious from the table that about half of the rural population/households are deprived of one or other basic amenity. 50% of the rural households show some kind of capability failure in comparison to about 30% in urban India. Bihar shows the maximum instances of capability failure in rural areas, followed by Jharkhand, Orissa, Assam, West Bengal, Chattisgarh, and Madhya Pradesh. These states also show a higher-level deprivation in urban areas. These states are the least developed among the Indian states and the reason is quite clear that such high levels of deprivation are responsible for the poor performance of these states. Rural Himachal Pradesh is the least deprived followed by Punjab and Kerala. In urban India again Himachal Pradesh is the least deprived followed by Jammu and Kashmir, Uttaranchal and Punjab. These states possess very high levels of literacy in comparison to other Indian states, which is a major contributor to economic prosperity.

Overall the proportion of the deprived households in rural area is almost double to that of urban ones. And our relative disadvantage index (RDI) confirms the relative disadvantage of rural household in comparison with their urban counterparts where the positive sign of the index is an indication of the relative disadvantage (See Table 2). It is to be read in terms of the proportion of rural households to the total households (i.e. rural urban combined) and the contribution in terms of the share (i.e. proportion) of the rural households to the total deprived



households. This is a grave scenario especially when we take into account the large number of population residing in rural areas.

**Table 2 : The Head Count Ratio of Basic Amenities Deprivation Across Major Indian State by Location: Census 2001**

Sno	States	Rural and Urban	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
<b>All India</b>		<b>0.506</b>	<b>0.598</b>	<b>0.268</b>	<b>0.187</b>
<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>	Mean	0.490	0.565	0.268	0.150
	SD	0.111	0.108	0.073	0.055
	<b>CV</b>	<b>22.7</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>36.8</b>
	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

This shows the urban bias in provision of amenities. 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.

There are widespread disparities across states in terms of the incidence of basic amenity deprivation, as shown by co-efficient of variation (CV). Interestingly, the variation across states in rural areas is lesser than that of the urban areas. This indicates more heterogeneity in terms of the incidence of basic amenity deprivation across states in urban areas. In the same order, there is homogeneity across states in rural areas in terms of basic amenity deprivation. This deprivation is all-pervasive phenomenon in rural areas across states irrespective of the level of economic development. It, in fact sustains the argument of urban bias in India's development effort (see Lipton, 1968)

## **VI. Conclusion and Policy Implications**

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 is the reason behind the locational disadvantage of the rural people is true till the date. In this regard, the President of India advocacy that provision of urban amenities in rural areas is an essential component of rural development.

\* \* \*

## Appendix

**Table 1 : The Level of Basic Amenities Deprivation in India**

Amenities	1971			1981		
	All India	rural	Urban	All India	rural	Urban
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
Household	97.06mn	77.94mn	19.12mn	119446891	90578061	28868830
no tap	86.6	97.4	42.8	77	89.8	36.8
no electricity	93.7	99	72.1			
no bathroom	87.1	92.1	66.9			
no toilet	86.3	96.2	46			
kutcha houses				34.04		
pucca houses				32.67		
semi pucca houses				33.29		
no/one room				45.1	44.8	45.8
	1991			2001		
Household	151032898	111539448	39493450			
no tap	67.72	79.35	34.89	63.30	75.71	31.34
no electricity	57.6	69.44	24.16	44.15	56.48	12.41
no bathroom				63.86	77.17	29.6
no toilet	76.28	90.51	36.09	63.59	78.08	26.28
kutcha houses	27.44	32.4	9.5			
pucca houses	41.61	29.6	70.4			
semi pucca houses	30.95	37.9	20			
no/one room	40.51	40.84	39.59	41.59	43.2	37.44

**Note:**

**Source:** Census of India

**Table 2: The Levels of selected Basic Amenities Deprivation in India  
: Rural and Urban Combined, Census 2001**

Sno	State	No Asset	No Bank'g	No Elec.	No Toilet	No Bathr'm	Fuel-Trad	No Tap Water	One or none DW	Dilapidate d house
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>
1	Andhra Pradesh	0.46	0.69	0.33	0.67	0.60	0.73	0.52	0.51	0.04
2	Assam	0.41	0.79	0.75	0.35	0.86	0.84	0.91	0.37	0.10
3	Bihar	0.50	0.79	0.90	0.81	0.90	0.93	0.96	0.44	0.11
4	Chhattisgarh	0.32	0.76	0.47	0.86	0.88	0.89	0.85	0.29	0.03
5	Gujarat	0.37	0.62	0.20	0.55	0.49	0.57	0.38	0.50	0.03
6	Haryana	0.24	0.55	0.17	0.55	0.48	0.65	0.52	0.27	0.05
7	Himachal Pradesh	0.29	0.40	0.05	0.67	0.65	0.66	0.16	0.27	0.03
8	Jammu & Kashmir	0.26	0.64	0.19	0.47	0.54	0.71	0.48	0.26	0.03
9	Jharkhand	0.40	0.70	0.76	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.87	0.33	0.05
10	Karnataka	0.35	0.60	0.21	0.63	0.41	0.70	0.41	0.45	0.05
11	Kerala	0.27	0.49	0.30	0.16	0.38	0.79	0.80	0.13	0.08
12	Madhya Pradesh	0.42	0.72	0.30	0.76	0.76	0.81	0.75	0.39	0.04
13	Maharashtra	0.37	0.52	0.23	0.65	0.39	0.54	0.36	0.52	0.05
14	Orissa	0.41	0.76	0.73	0.85	0.89	0.89	0.91	0.38	0.10
15	Punjab	0.11	0.52	0.08	0.43	0.30	0.57	0.66	0.24	0.04
16	Rajasthan	0.40	0.71	0.45	0.71	0.68	0.80	0.65	0.35	0.03
17	Tamil Nadu	0.32	0.77	0.22	0.65	0.60	0.67	0.37	0.53	0.01
18	Uttar Pradesh	0.20	0.56	0.68	0.69	0.71	0.86	0.76	0.32	0.06
19	Uttaranchal	0.26	0.40	0.40	0.55	0.61	0.61	0.34	0.28	0.03
20	West Bengal	0.30	0.63	0.63	0.56	0.76	0.77	0.79	0.54	0.09
	<b>All INDIA</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.05</b>
<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>										
	<b>Mean</b>	0.333	0.631	0.402	0.618	0.638	0.745	0.622	0.369	0.052
	<b>SD</b>	0.093	0.123	0.254	0.174	0.188	0.122	0.236	0.116	0.029
	<b>CV</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>63.3</b>	<b>28.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>31.4</b>	<b>55.7</b>
	<b>Minimum</b>	0.114	0.402	0.052	0.160	0.305	0.539	0.159	0.125	0.008
	<b>Maximum</b>	0.495	0.795	0.897	0.858	0.904	0.931	0.963	0.537	0.109
	<b>Range</b>	0.381	0.393	0.846	0.698	0.599	0.393	0.804	0.412	0.100

**Note:** 1. Deprivation is defined as lack of access/non-availability of selected facilities; 2. Figure given in col. 3 to 11 are presented in proportion i.e. proportion of the total households which do not having selected facility; 3. DW - Dwelling rooms excluding kitchen; 4. Tradition Fuel includes firewood, crop residue, cowdung cake, coal/lignite/charcoal.

**Source:** Census, 2001: Household Amenities.

**Table 3: The Levels of selected Basic Amenities Deprivation in India  
: Rural, Census 2001**

Sno	State	No Asset	No Bank'g	No Elec.	No Toilet	No Bathr'm	Fuel-Trad	No Tap Water	One or none DW	Dilapidated house
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>
1	Andhra Pradesh	0.53	0.70	0.40	0.82	0.73	0.87	0.60	0.56	0.04
2	Assam	0.43	0.85	0.83	0.40	0.92	0.92	0.95	0.38	0.11
3	Bihar	0.51	0.81	0.95	0.86	0.94	0.97	0.99	0.45	0.11
4	Chhattisgarh	0.36	0.81	0.54	0.95	0.97	0.98	0.95	0.30	0.03
5	Gujarat	0.50	0.70	0.28	0.78	0.69	0.83	0.51	0.56	0.03
6	Haryana	0.29	0.58	0.21	0.71	0.59	0.83	0.62	0.26	0.05
7	Himachal Pradesh	0.31	0.43	0.06	0.72	0.70	0.74	0.17	0.26	0.03
8	Jammu & Kashmir	0.31	0.70	0.25	0.58	0.65	0.88	0.59	0.27	0.02
9	Jharkhand	0.44	0.79	0.90	0.93	0.96	0.98	0.97	0.35	0.06
10	Karnataka	0.43	0.65	0.28	0.83	0.52	0.92	0.52	0.50	0.06
11	Kerala	0.30	0.50	0.34	0.19	0.43	0.86	0.86	0.13	0.09
12	Madhya Pradesh	0.50	0.79	0.38	0.91	0.89	0.96	0.89	0.44	0.04
13	Maharashtra	0.50	0.61	0.35	0.82	0.54	0.85	0.54	0.54	0.06
14	Orissa	0.44	0.80	0.81	0.92	0.96	0.95	0.97	0.39	0.10
15	Punjab	0.13	0.54	0.11	0.59	0.38	0.77	0.84	0.23	0.05
16	Rajasthan	0.47	0.76	0.56	0.85	0.80	0.94	0.78	0.37	0.03
17	Tamil Nadu	0.40	0.82	0.29	0.86	0.79	0.89	0.40	0.61	0.01
18	Uttar Pradesh	0.21	0.58	0.80	0.81	0.80	0.96	0.84	0.32	0.06
19	Uttaranchal	0.30	0.44	0.50	0.68	0.74	0.75	0.39	0.26	0.04
20	West Bengal	0.34	0.72	0.80	0.73	0.91	0.90	0.93	0.57	0.10
	<b>All INDIA</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>0.06</b>
<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>										
	<b>Mean</b>	0.386	0.679	0.482	0.748	0.745	0.888	0.716	0.386	0.056
	<b>SD</b>	0.109	0.133	0.277	0.189	0.182	0.076	0.241	0.134	0.031
	<b>CV</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>57.5</b>	<b>25.3</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>54.8</b>
	<b>Minimum</b>	0.133	0.425	0.055	0.187	0.376	0.735	0.171	0.133	0.009
	<b>Maximum</b>	0.532	0.850	0.949	0.948	0.969	0.976	0.986	0.606	0.112
	<b>Range</b>	0.399	0.425	0.894	0.762	0.593	0.241	0.815	0.473	0.103

**Note:** 1. Deprivation is defined as lack of access/non-availability of selected facilities; 2. Figure given in col. 3 to 11 are presented in proportion i.e. proportion of the total households which do not having selected facility; 3. DW - Dwelling rooms excluding kitchen; 4. Tradition Fuel includes firewood, crop residue, cowdung cake, coal/lignite/charcoal.

**Source:** Census, 2001: Household Amenities.

**Table 4: The Levels of selected Basic Amenities Deprivation in India  
: Urban, Census 2001**

Sno	State	No Asset	No Bank'g	No Elec.	No Toilet	No Bathr'm	Fuel-Trad	No Tap Water	One or none DW	Dilapidate d house
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>
1	Andhra Pradesh	0.24	0.67	0.10	0.22	0.22	0.31	0.28	0.37	0.02
2	Assam	0.25	0.47	0.26	0.05	0.47	0.35	0.69	0.31	0.07
3	Bihar	0.32	0.53	0.41	0.30	0.57	0.58	0.74	0.31	0.08
4	Chhattisgarh	0.17	0.54	0.17	0.47	0.48	0.55	0.40	0.25	0.03
5	Gujarat	0.18	0.50	0.07	0.19	0.19	0.16	0.17	0.42	0.02
6	Haryana	0.13	0.48	0.07	0.19	0.25	0.26	0.28	0.29	0.04
7	Himachal Pradesh	0.14	0.25	0.03	0.23	0.25	0.07	0.06	0.36	0.03
8	Jammu & Kashmir	0.10	0.43	0.02	0.13	0.22	0.19	0.12	0.22	0.03
9	Jharkhand	0.23	0.38	0.24	0.33	0.45	0.65	0.52	0.27	0.04
10	Karnataka	0.20	0.51	0.09	0.25	0.21	0.30	0.22	0.35	0.03
11	Kerala	0.19	0.46	0.16	0.08	0.21	0.59	0.60	0.10	0.06
12	Madhya Pradesh	0.18	0.52	0.08	0.32	0.37	0.38	0.32	0.27	0.03
13	Maharashtra	0.19	0.40	0.06	0.42	0.18	0.12	0.11	0.51	0.03
14	Orissa	0.20	0.48	0.26	0.40	0.51	0.48	0.54	0.31	0.08
15	Punjab	0.08	0.46	0.04	0.13	0.17	0.19	0.33	0.27	0.04
16	Rajasthan	0.18	0.55	0.10	0.24	0.29	0.33	0.20	0.28	0.02
17	Tamil Nadu	0.22	0.70	0.12	0.36	0.34	0.36	0.35	0.43	0.01
18	Uttar Pradesh	0.16	0.47	0.20	0.20	0.36	0.43	0.45	0.32	0.05
19	Uttaranchal	0.12	0.29	0.09	0.13	0.22	0.17	0.18	0.33	0.03
20	West Bengal	0.20	0.41	0.20	0.15	0.41	0.44	0.43	0.47	0.06
	<b>All INDIA</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.04</b>
Descriptive Statistics	<b>Mean</b>	0.183	0.475	0.138	0.241	0.319	0.346	0.350	0.323	0.040
	<b>SD</b>	0.056	0.106	0.099	0.116	0.126	0.167	0.194	0.090	0.020
	<b>CV</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>71.7</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>55.6</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>50.0</b>
	<b>Minimum</b>	0.080	0.248	0.021	0.054	0.172	0.072	0.061	0.102	0.007
	<b>Maximum</b>	0.322	0.700	0.407	0.474	0.569	0.645	0.736	0.506	0.080
	<b>Range</b>	0.242	0.452	0.387	0.420	0.396	0.574	0.675	0.404	0.073

**Note:** 1. Deprivation is defined as lack of access/non-availability of selected facilities; 2. Figure given in col. 3 to 11 are presented in proportion i.e. proportion of the total households which do not having selected facility; 3. DW - Dwelling rooms excluding kitchen; 4. Tradition Fuel includes firewood, crop residue, cowdung cake, coal/lignite/charcoal.

**Source:** Census, 2001: Household Amenities.

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

Venkatanarayana, M (2005) "On the Non-Random Distribution of Educational Distribution of Children in India", *Working Paper No. 372*, Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum.

World Bank (1995) **Economic Development in India: Achievement and Challenges**, The World Bank's Country Study, Washington D C.