

Prevalence of Absolute Poverty among Rural and Urban Households in Kanyakumari District

Rojin Jeba E

Research Scholar (Reg. No. 12221)

Post Graduate and Research Centre, Department of Economics,
Scott Christian College (Autonomous) Nagercoil-629003, Tamil Nadu
Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli – 627012, Tamil Nadu

Dr. D. Hylin Reba

Research Guide & Assistant Professor

Post Graduate and Research Centre, Department of Economics,
Scott Christian College (Autonomous) Nagercoil-629003, Tamil Nadu
Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli – 627012, Tamil Nadu

Abstract

The study focusses on absolute poverty among rural and urban households by using multidimensional poverty index (MPI). Head count ratio for rural households is 56.92 per cent and intensity of poverty is 47.19 per cent. MPI for rural households is 0.27. Head count ratio for urban households is 39.72 per cent and intensity of poverty is 61.11 per cent. MPI for urban households is 0.24 per cent. The study reveals that rural households are higher per cent of head count ratio than urban and it indicates that below poverty rural households are higher than urban households. In the case of uncensored head count ratio, nutrition and cooking fuel are big problem to rural households and cooking fuel, assets and housing are big problem to urban households. Absolute poverty is a big concern nowadays. The government schemes should reach really needed households and remove them from out of poverty.

Keywords: Head count ratio, Intensity of poverty, Absolute poverty, Urban and rural households.

Introduction

The rural population and labour force continue to rise, and rural-urban migration decreases. Despite a rising labour productivity differential between non-agriculture and agriculture, limited rural-urban migration and slow agricultural growth, urban-rural consumption, income, and poverty differentials have not been rising. Urban-rural spill overs have become important drivers of the rapidly growing rural non-farm sector, which now generates the largest number of jobs in India. Rural non-farm self-employment is especially dynamic with farm households diversifying into the sector to increase income. The bottling up of labour in rural areas means that farm sizes will continue to decline, agriculture will continue its trend to feminisation, and part-time farming will become the dominant farm model (Hans P Binswanger-Mkhize, 2013). If the defining characteristics of these kinds of people are unmeasured, and if they also are related to poverty, then some of the presumed effect of rural residence may be spurious. Alternately, positively selected individuals may be in a better position to out-migrate from rural areas, leaving behind a population more vulnerable to poverty. The higher prevalence of poverty in rural areas have pursued ecological approaches, in which the units of analysis are politically bounded geographic areas—frequently counties. Their characteristics are related to their poverty rates. These community studies frequently include as predictor

variables measures of economic organization (e.g., industrial structure), human capital characteristics (e.g., percentage college graduates in a population), and demographic variables (e.g., percentage elderly), as well as measures of rurality (Bruce Weber, Leif Jensen, Kathleen Miller, Jane Mosley and Monica Fisher, 2016). Globalization can not only cause many hardships for the rural poor, but it can also open up some opportunities which some countries can utilize and others do not, largely depending on their domestic political and economic institutions, and the net outcome is often quite complex and almost always context dependent, belying the glib pronouncements for or against globalization made in the opposing camps (Pranab Bardhan, 2006).

Statement of the Problem

Chronic poverty at the district level by using multidimensional indicators that reflect persistent deprivation, such as illiteracy, infant mortality, low levels of agricultural productivity and poor infrastructure (Aasha Kapur Mehta, 2011). The study focusses on absolute poverty among rural and urban households by using multidimensional poverty index (MPI).

Methodology

The study is based on primary data, 50 rural and urban households are collected randomly and the data have collected through interview schedule. In this study, multidimensional poverty index method is used to measure absolute poverty among rural households in Kanyakumari District. It consists headcount ratio, intensity ratio and MPI.

Multidimensional Poverty Index

This study focuses on multidimensional poverty of rural and urban population of Kanyakumari District. It consists head count ratio, intensity of poverty and Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI).

Table 1
Multidimensional Poverty Index for Rural and Urban Population

Ratios	Head Count	Intensity	MPI
Rural	56.92	47.19	0.27
Urban	39.72	61.11	0.24

Source: Calculated Data

Table 1 explains multidimensional poverty index for rural and urban households. Head count ratio for rural households is 56.92 per cent and intensity of poverty is 47.19 per cent. MPI for rural households is 0.27. Head count ratio for urban households is 39.72 per cent and intensity of poverty is 61.11 per cent. MPI for urban households is 0.24 per cent. It infers that 56.92 per cent of the households are BPL in rural area and 61.12 per cent of the households are living with intensity poverty in urban. Head count ratio is higher to rural households than urban households.

Uncensored Headcount Ratio for Rural and Urban Households

Percentage of total population of Kanyakumari District who are multidimensional poor and deprived in each indicator.

Table 2
Uncensored Headcount Ratio for Rural and Urban Households

Indicators	Rural	Urban
Nutrition	41.84	30.49
Child & Adolescent Mortality	1.24	2.94
Maternal Health	1.47	1.58
Years of Schooling	17.76	19.72
School Attendance	17.76	19.72
Cooking Fuel	46.58	30.77
Sanitation	00	00
Drinking Water	00	00
Electricity	00	00
Housing	31.89	33.94
Assets	17.63	26.85
Bank Account	00	00

Source: Calculated Data

Table 2 explains Percentage of total population of Kanyakumari District who are multidimensional poor and deprived in each indicator. As far as indicator of nutrition concern, 41.84 per cent of population are deprived intake of nutrition in rural and 30.49 per cent of population are deprived intake of nutrition in urban. As far as child and adolescent mortality concern, 1.24 and 2.94 per cent of population are deprived in child and adolescent mortality in rural and urban. As far as maternal health concern, 1.47 and 1.58 per cent of population are deprived in maternal health. As far as years of schooling concern, 17.76 and 19.72 per cent of population are deprived in years of schooling in rural and urban. As far as school attendance concern, 17.76 and 19.72 per cent population are deprived in school attendance in rural and urban. As far as cooking fuel concern, 46.58 and 30.77 per cent population are deprived in cooking fuel in rural and urban. As far as sanitation concern, and zero per cent of population are deprived in sanitation in rural and urban. As far as drinking water concern, zero per cent population are deprived in drinking water. As far as electricity concern, zero per cent population are deprived in electricity in rural and urban. As far as housing concern, 31.89 and 33.94 per cent population are deprived in rural and urban. As far as assets concern, 17.63 and 26.85 per cent population are deprived in assets. As far as bank account concern, zero per cent population are deprived in bank account in rural and urban.

Censored Headcount Ratio for Rural and Urban Population

Percentage of total population of Kanyakumari District who are multidimensional poor and deprived in each indicator

Table 3
Censored Headcount Ratio for Rural and Urban Population

Indicators	Rural	Urban
Nutrition	23.66	15.32
Child & Adolescent Mortality	0.64	0.19
Maternal Health	1.09	0.76
Years of Schooling	10.76	10.72
School Attendance	8.32	12.72
Cooking Fuel	26.58	17.77
Sanitation	00	00

Drinking Water	00	00
Electricity	00	00
Housing	24.78	21.23
Assets	13.22	11.10
Bank Account	00	00

Source: Calculated Data

Table 3 indicates Percentage of total population of Kanyakumari District who are multidimensionally poor and deprived in each indicator as per censused method. As far as indicator of nutrition concern, 23.66 per cent of population are deprived intake of nutrition in rural and 15.32 per cent of population are deprived intake of nutrition in urban. As far as child and adolescent mortality concern, 0.64 and 0.19 per cent of population are deprived in child and adolescent mortality in rural and urban. As far as maternal health concern, 1.09 and 0.76 per cent of population are deprived in maternal health. As far as years of schooling concern, 10.76 and 10.72 per cent of population are deprived in years of schooling in rural and urban. As far as school attendance concern, 8.32 and 12.72 per cent population are deprived in school attendance in rural and urban. As far as cooking fuel concern, 26.58 and 17.77 per cent population are deprived in cooking fuel in rural and urban. As far as sanitation concern, zero per cent of population are deprived in rural and urban. As far as drinking water concern, zero per cent population are deprived in drinking water. As far as electricity concern, zero per cent population are deprived in electricity in rural and urban. As far as housing concern, 24.78 and 21.23 per cent population are deprived in rural and urban. As far as assets concern, 13.22 and 11.10 per cent population are deprived in assets. As far as bank account concern, zero per cent population are deprived in bank account in rural and urban.

Conclusion

The study reveals that rural households are higher per cent of head count ratio than urban and it indicates that below poverty rural households are higher than urban households. In the case of uncensored head count ratio, nutrition and cooking fuel are big problem to rural households and cooking fuel, assets and housing are big problem to urban households. Absolute poverty is a big concern nowadays. The government schemes should reach really needed households and remove them from out of poverty.

References

1. Bruce Weber, Leif Jensen, Kathleen Miller, Jane Mosley and Monica Fisher 2016, 'A critical review of rural poverty literature: is there truly a rural effect?', International Regional Science Review, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 381–414.
2. Pranab Bardhan 2006, 'Globalisation and rural poverty', World Development, vol. 34, no. 8, pp. 1393-1404.
3. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1756883
4. Hans P Binswanger-Mkhize, 'The Stunted Structural Transformation of the Indian Economy', Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 48, No. 26/27, pp. 5-13.