

DISTRICT-WISE ANALYSIS OF POVERTY STATUS IN HARYANA

Dr. Madhu Ahlawat¹

¹ Assistant Professor , Department of Economics, Baba Mast Nath University, Rohtak.

Abstract

The present paper makes an attempt to explore the poverty in Haryana and also explore the inequality in deprivation of basic standard of living among the various districts of Haryana. The study gives a comparative picture of all the districts in terms of 8 selected standard of living indicators. It reveals wide disparities among the districts. Some districts are better in term of the standard of living, while other districts are deprived in standard of living. Therefore, the present study examines the districts level inequity in Haryana. The combined rural and urban scenario on standard of living pushes Ambala to the fourth position in the combined group of high standards while it was at the top in rural living high standards group and pushed backward to position eight in the urban moderate living standards group. Similarly, Kurukshetra district belonged to different standard of living group, that is, at the top 9th position in urban high standard context, 4 second place in the same group in rural standards context; and much down to the eight place drifting itself to moderate group in the rural-urban combined standard of living context. Interestingly, the only district that could keep itself intact with the high standard group is Gurgaon topping the combined rural urban context and retaining the third position each in rural as well as urban area contexts.

Keywords: deprivation, poverty

Introduction

Haryana is one of those states of India which are characterized by considerably low levels of poverty, much lower than the national average. Although, there is no dearth of research work done in the domain of the poverty in Haryana being the focus of study but this research works fills the research gap by studying quality of life in Haryana through the multi-dimensional indicators. The present study highlighted the district-wise poverty and living conditions in basic amenities in Haryana. The various researchers highlighted the poverty and deprivations in basic amenities are same things. The deprivation of basic needs is used as a denoting a lack of basic needs for satisfying needs for food and shelter as well as basic amenities (Sharma and Chakravarty, 2015). Till recently, poverty was assessed on the basis of income level. There was a growing realization that poverty not only includes level of income and expenditure but also refers to social, cultural, and political aspects of life (Sharma and Chakravarty, 2015).

The present paper makes an attempt to explore the poverty in Haryana and also explore the inequality in deprivation of basic standard of living among the various districts of Haryana. The study gives a comparative picture of all the

districts in terms of 8 selected standard of living indicators. It reveals wide disparities among the districts. Some districts are better in term of the standard of living, while other districts are deprived in standard of living. Therefore, the present study examines the districts level inequity in Haryana.

Objectives of the Study

To analysis the District-wise poverty in Haryana;

To examines the districts level inequity in Haryana.

Research methodology

The study based on secondary data which collected from various sources i.e. Office of the Registrar General, Ministry of Home Affairs, India 2011, Census of India, 2011, National Family Health Survey-3, 2005-06.

The study uses simple statistics tools to explore the main objective to find out the district-level disparity in Haryana i.e. percentage, composite standard score. The composite index of living conditions or standard of living has been estimated for each of the 21 districts.

The Composite Standard Score (CSS) values are calculated with the help of Gnu Regression Econometrics and Time Series Library (GRET) software. District-wise levels of standard of living have also been drawn with the help of composite standard score. Composite standard of living is calculated with the help of Z score, worked out for individual components as well as for standard of living at the aggregate level. Z score is defined as under:

$$Z = \frac{x_{ij} - U}{SD}$$

Where Z is Z score of indicator under particular head, x_{ij} is value of i th indicator against j th observation, U is mean value of the indicator and SD is Standard Deviation.

For overall level of standard of living, Composite Standard Score is derived from all the components using the following formula:

$$Z = \sum Z_{ij}$$

Where Z_{ij} indicates Z score of and initiator j th in District

These values are categorized into three strata (based on the quartiles) - low, medium, and high standard of living in Haryana, using the 8 socio-economic indicators suggested by many scholars to calculate the composite standard score and to examine the standard of living at district-level. Further, the states are categorized into three types, namely high standard of living states; lower standard of living states; and average standard of living district. For this, mean and standard deviation of the composite Index of living conditions of the districts are computed.

Results and Conclusion

District-wise poverty in Haryana, Second part explained the standard of living in Haryana. The present study also explore of quality of life in Haryana at rural as well as urban areas.

The present study divides in two parts. First part explained the Table 1 shows the status of district-wise poverty in Haryana. In 1981-82, about 42.06 percent of families were living below poverty line. Poverty was the highest in Jind district (76.16 percent) followed by Mahendragrah and Karnal (74.45 and 60.89 percent respectively). It was the lowest in Bhiani (25.20 percent) followed by Sirsa, Rohtak and Sonipat (with 34.47, 35.67 35.89 percent

respectively). In other words, in 1981-82, Jind, Mahendergarh, and Karnal districts more than half families were living below poverty line and in remaining districts more than one-third of families were living below poverty line.

Table 1: District-Wise Proportion of Families below Poverty Line in Haryana

District	1981-84	1991-92	1997-98	2007-08
Ambala	44.32	26.72	28.99	30.28
Bhiwani	25.20	34.26	28.59	26.83
Faridabad	39.10	26.75	25.20	21.71
Fatehabad	-	-	31.01	35.51
Gurgaon	43.98	48.84	24.06	23.85
Hisar	41.55	36.38	31.88	24.69
Jhajjar	-	-	26.37	22.35
Jind	76.16	37.97	38.69	33.54
Kaithal	-	36.66	33.17	30.45
Karnal	60.89	48.78	43.46	26.77
Kurukshetra	31.65	44.79	38.99	33.08
Mahendragrh	74.45	29.79	16.73	26.59
Mewat	-	-	-	27.69
Palwal	-	-	-	-
Panchkula	-	-	30.14	32.69
Panipat	-	20.51	23.91	24.57
Rewari	-	29.27	37.85	25.53
Rohtak	35.89	24.36	27.79	18.64
Sirsa	34.47	25.35	34.70	25.80
Sonipat	35.67	26.18	23.17	26.40
Yamunanagar	-	42.23	32.34	28.28
Total	42.06	33.40	30.34	27.17

Source: Rural Development Department, Haryana

In 1991-92, poverty was the highest in Gurgaon districts (48.84 percent), followed by Karnal and Kurukshetra (48.78 and 44.79 percent respectively); and it was the lowest in Panipat (20.51 percent), followed by Rohtak and Sonipat (24.36 and 25.5 percent respectively)

In 1997-78, Fatehabad, Hisar, Jind, Kaithal, Karnal, Kurukshetra, Rewari, Sirsa and Yamunanagar stood above the state poverty level; and Ambala, Bhiwani, Faridabad, Gurgaon, Jhajjar, Mahendergarh, Panchkula, Panipat, Rohtak and Sonipat districts stood below state the poverty level.

In 2007-08, Fatehabad was found to be the most disgusted in poverty followed by Jhajjar at number two (with 35.51 percent and 33.54 percent of people below poverty line respectively). In short, eight districts, namely Ambala, Fatehabad, Jind, Kaithal, Kurukshetra, Mewat, Panchkula and Yamunanagar stood above the aggregate state poverty level in 2007-8 and the remaining 12 districts below the state aggregate. District Rohtak had the least number (nearly 19 percent) of its people below poverty line. District-wise, to establish the trends as shown in the Table, Rohtak, Jind, Mahendergarh etc recorded quite a good fall over these years, no data was, however, available for Palwal district for all these years from 1981-82 to 2007-08.

Standard of Living in Haryana

Concentration of literacy rate, water facility, sanitation facility etc as quality of life indicators does influence the living condition of the people of an area. Table 2 gives a comparative picture of all districts in terms of 8 selected standard of living indicators. It reveals wide disparities among the districts. Some districts are better in term of the standard of living, while other districts are deprived in standard of living. Apparently, high poverty line seems to be poor quality of life, deprivation as would be obvious from discussion below on the basis of 2011 census as per table

2

Table 2: District-Wise Proportion of Population Deprived on Selected Indicators of Standard of Living

District	Floor			Bathroom Facility			Toilet Facility			Drainage Facility		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Ambala	46.21	9.15	29.19	14.99	5.24	10.51	48.85	10.65	31.31	8.71	8.37	7.34
Bhiwani	33.64	12.16	29.25	25.04	8.46	21.66	50.78	13.17	43.01	21.94	11.48	19.8
Faridabad	28.08	7.78	11.25	22.21	8.81	11.11	41.42	10.82	16.09	14.08	11.76	12.16
Fatehabad	53.92	17.65	46.74	15.49	5.68	13.55	27.14	9.06	23.57	26.35	7.8	22.7
Gurgaon	18.47	7.04	10.18	17.3	6.28	9.33	34.38	8.25	15.42	15.45	7.15	9.43
Hisar	42.12	11.54	32.3	19.92	6.82	15.73	37.52	10.54	28.88	15.93	6.16	12.8
Jhajjar	23.45	7.59	19.21	19.77	6.11	16.12	41.55	8.28	32.63	6.99	5.8	6.67
Jind	31.34	12.37	26.87	28.51	8.56	23.82	48.65	12.41	40.13	6.76	6.8	6.77
Kaithal	41.38	18.15	36.07	27.06	6.2	23.3	42.34	17.31	36.62	7.82	6.62	7.54
Karnal	45.17	11.07	34.32	20.78	6.71	16.3	31.43	8.37	24.09	14.7	8.91	9.03

Kurukshetra	47.93	10.91	36.96	18.63	5.54	14.75	30.93	7.56	24	10.76	5.97	9.34
Mahendragrh	23.72	7.89	21.53	35.08	18.22	32.75	61.08	22.77	55.73	32.3	8.19	29.05
Mewat	58.79	22.61	54.24	44.14	19.93	41.09	82.18	37.47	76.56	54.81	17.51	50.11
Palwal	29.64	7.58	16.11	22.6	8.9	14.22	55.95	12.43	29.2	20.18	4.53	10.58
Panchkula	30.42	10.11	20.7	20.85	5.04	13.29	33.27	5.1	19.79	6.57	7.07	6.81
Panipat	47.14	15.72	39.53	38.58	15.06	32.88	67.86	17.17	55.58	19.7	7.23	16.68
Rewari	23.61	5.76	19.09	24.63	60.51	20.29	50.24	12.24	40.06	18.37	9.22	16.05
Rohtak	23.51	6.89	16.35	20.02	6.19	14.06	41.56	7.93	37.07	4.78	4.52	4.67
Sirsa	61.56	18.79	50.62	12.07	3.78	9.95	12.47	4.13	10.34	37.28	8.26	30
Sonipat	21.52	7.55	16.89	22.05	5.7	16.63	43.79	7.82	31.86	4.08	3.6	3.92
Yamunanagar	59.54	14.01	40.55	21.61	6.03	15.15	53.98	8.07	34.84	14.62	6.79	11.5

District	Electricity			Water			Cooking Fuel			Assets		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Ambala	5.26	2.57	4.03	12.03	6.62	9.5	62.09	17.3	41.54	5.73	3	4.4
Bhiwani	15.47	7.19	13.78	28.97	8.58	24.8	81.88	49.42	71.19	14.46	6.25	12.79
Faridabad	10.82	4.56	5.6	18.36	19.20	19.05	75.37	16.77	26.8	10.33	4.02	5
Fatehabad	15.1	4.19	12.94	14.81	8.88	13.64	81.61	26.04	70.64	12.41	5.72	11.09
Gurgaon	9.01	2.99	4.64	19.23	17.12	10.44	57.92	13.36	25.66	11.36	5.37	7.01
Hisar	15.91	4.67	12.31	17.71	5.74	13.88	84.31	27.04	66	12.59	518	10.15
Jhajjar	9.6	3.95	8.09	24.85	8.85	27.89	75.99	22.56	61.75	11.09	5.29	9.54
Jind	10.23	5.16	9.04	27.18	9.73	23.08	88.54	33.36	67.95	10.92	5.07	9.55
Kaithal	7	4.59	6.42	23.32	13.1	20.98	77.56	38	49.74	11.52	5.63	10.17
Karnal	7.64	2.74	6.08	14.63	6.88	12.16	63.57	19.89	49.69	10.54	4.3	8.56
Kurukshetra	4.9	2.42	4.17	14.12	10.3	12.98	62.72	18.88	68.7	6.77	3.45	5.79
Mahendragrh	21.81	5.96	19.62	48.49	19.12	44.41	79.26	34.19	73.08	14.21	8.03	9.54
Mewat	42.36	12.95	38.66	46.12	2188	43.07	95.09	54.8	90.06	21.61	14.02	20.67
Palwal	9.67	3.87	6.15	11.15	10.9	11.16	64.89	18.99	36.78	10.09	3.1	5.75
Panchkula	6.39	2.91	4.72	17.6	15.41	16.55	63.41	24.27	44.71	11.04	6.29	8.77
Panipat	25.73	6.1	20.97	27.59	11.78	23.76	81.63	36.66	72.29	15.93	7.66	13.93
Rewari	11.97	3.15	9.74	36.42	8.52	29.35	76.57	21.51	62.94	11.3	5.01	9.7
Rohtak	6.6	2.49	4.83	23.5	4.15	15.16	76.69	22.5	53.36	11.46	5.02	8.79
Sirsa	12.67	3.31	10.27	12.73	8.31	11.6	85.35	27.74	70.63	11.64	5.34	10.03
Sonipat	7.69	3.05	6.15	31.05	9.38	23.87	67.68	24.13	53.27	11.74	5.63	9.71
Yamunanagar	6.41	2.23	4.67	15.34	6.3	11.57	71.7	24.86	52.19	8.35	4.36	6.77

Source: Author calculation based on Households Tables, Census of India, 2011

Table 2 shows that districts-wise socio-economic conditions of people in different districts in Haryana. An examination of the district level figures indicates wide range of variation in different socio-economic indicators across districts. The living conditions of some districts in term of their indicators are much better than in other districts, so much so that if a district is better in one case may be it is worse in other cases. In case of quality of house, more than fifty percent of rural households live in kuccha house (made from mud, or other low quality material) in the districts of Sirsa, Yamunanagar, Mewat and Fatehabad (61.56, 59.54, 58.79 and 53.92 percent respectively). On the other hand, more than 85 percent, of rural households have pukka houses in Sonipat, Rohtak, Jhajjar, and Mahendergarh. In urban area, Mewat has the highest percentage of households living in Kuccha houses (22.61 percent), followed by Sirsa (18.79 percent), Kaithal (18.15 percent), Fatehabad (17.65 percent) and Panipat (15.72 percent.) On the other hand, more than 90 percent of urban households have pukka house in Ambala, Faridabad, Gurgaon, Jhajjar, Mahendergarh, Palwal, Rewari, Rohtak and Sonipat districts. In case of Mewat district, the highest percentage (54.24 percent) of households is living in Kuccha houses followed by Sirsa (50.62 percent), Fatehabad (46.74 percent) and Yamunanagar (40.55 percent). In case of Gurgaon district, about 90 percent of households live in pukka houses, followed by Faridabad (11.25 percent) Palwal (16.11 percent). Bhiwani, Mahendergarh, Mewat, Panipat and Rewari appear as the most deprived areas in terms of availability of the three sanitation services viz. bathroom, latrine and drainage connectivity. Analyzing the levels of three sanitation facilities separately, it is found that with regard to bathroom facility, more than one-fourth of rural households do not have bathroom facility at home in Bhiwani (25.04 percent), Kaithal (27.06 percent), Jind (28.51 percent), Kaithal (27.06 percent), Mahendergarh (35.08 percent), Mewat (41.09 percent) and Panipat (32.08 percent). In urban area, more than 80 percent of households have bathroom facility at home in all the 21 districts. In Mewat district about 41.09 percent households do not have bathroom facility followed by Mahendergarh (32.75 percent), Jind (23.82 percent), Kaithal (23 percent), Bhiwani (21.66 percent), and Rewari (20.29 percent). The levels of latrine facility also reveal almost the same spatial pattern. More than 50 percent of rural households do not have latrine facility at home as districts like in Bhiwani (50.78 percent), Mahendergarh (61.08 percent), Mewat (82.18 percent), Palwal (55.95 percent), Panipat (67.86 percent), Rewari (50.24 percent) and Yamunanagar (53.98 percent). In these districts people go out for open defecation. Mewat, Panipat, Mahendergarh, Bhiwani, Palwal, Rewari and Yamunanagar districts are the most deprived districts in the state. In case of urban area, Mewat Mahendergarh districts are most deprived districts in the state. In these districts people more than 20 percent of households still depend on open defecation. In case of combined (rural and urban areas), Mewat is the highest deprived (76.56 percent) district in the state, followed by Mahendergarh (55.73 percent), Panipat (55.58 percent), Jind (40.13 percent), Bhiwani (43.01 percent) and Panipat (40.06 percent). On the other hand, more than 80 percent of households have toilet facility at home in Sirsa, Gurgaon, Faridabad and Panchkula (10.34, 15.42, 16.09 and 19.79 percent respectively) While examining the status of drainage outlet, it is seen that nearly 80 percent of rural households in the state all connected with drainage outlet for the disposal at waste Kaithal, Karnal, Kurukshetra, Panchkula, Panipat, Rewari, Rohtak, Sonipat and Yamunanagar districts. On the other hand, more than 80 percent of urban households are connected with drainage outlet for the disposal of waste

water in all districts of the state. Looking at combined status of drainage facility, Rohtak is found to be having the highest share of households, as nearly more than 95 percent of households are connected to drainage outlet. As against this in Mewat, more than 50.11 percent of household are not connected any kind of with drainage outlet. In absence of drainage connectivity, the waste water collects in the open space near the dwellings or in the street causing health hazard to the people. In Mewat about 42.36 percent rural households do not have electricity facility at home, while more than 90 percent of rural households have, electricity facility at home in Ambala, Hisar, Jind, Karnal, Kaithal, Kurukshetra, Palwal, Panchkula, Rohtak, Sonapat and Yamunanagar districts. In urban area about 80 percent of households are electrified in all districts of the state. In case of combined areas about 38.55 percent of households are not electrified. More than 90 percent of households have electricity facility at home in Ambala, Faridabad, Gurgaon, Jhajjar, Jind, Kaithal, Karnal, Kurukshetra, Palwal, Panchkula, Rohtak, Rewari, Sonapat and Yamunnagar districts. In case of water facility, Mahendragarh is the most deprived district of the state. In Mahendragarh district, nearly half that is about 48.49 percent of rural households do not have safe drinking water facility, followed by Mewat (45.12 percent), Rewari (36.42 percent) and Sonapat (31.05 percent). In case of urban area, more than 85 percent of households have safe drinking water facility in all the districts of the state. In case of combined rural and urban status, Mewat and Mahendragarh are the most disgusted districts in Haryana, where just less than 60 percent of the households seem to have safe drinking water facility availability of them. In case of cooking fuel, more than 70 percent of rural households still use traditional fuel in Bhiwani, Faridabad, Fatehabd, Hissar, Jhajjar, Jind, Kaithal, Mahendragarh, Mewat, Panipat, Rewari, Rohtak, Sirsa and Yamnanager districts. The same types of results are seemed in case of combined rural and urban living. Here, Bhiwani, Jind, Mahendragarh, Mewat, and Panipat districts have the highest level of deprivation of safe drinking water facility. In case of economic assets, more than 85 percent of households do have economic assets such as T.V., fan, mobile etc. in all rural, urban and combined areas. This brief analysis does not indicate very vast ranges of variations in living conditions of people in different households across the districts of Haryana justifying the need to probe it further along the multidimensional poverty parameters chosen for the study. Tables 2 to 2.9 and their sub-tables 4 to 2.9.1 further illustrate the scenario along standards of living index in the stat and their classification into different sets of groups- high, moderate and low.

Table 3: Index of Living Conditions of Different Districts of Rural Haryana

District	Floor	Bathroom Facility	Toilet Facility	Drainage Facility	Electricity	Water	Cooking Fuel	Assets	CSS
Ambala	0.618	-1.076	0.279	-0.691	-0.83	-1.046	-1.289	-1.833	-5.868
Kurukshetra	0.743	-0.61	-0.907	-0.525	-0.872	-0.848	-1.226	-1.512	-5.757
Gurgaon	-1.392	-0.78	-0.679	-0.145	-0.399	-0.366	-1.707	-0.095	-5.563
Panchkula	-0.525	-0.326	-0.752	-0.864	-0.7	-0.52	-1.157	-0.194	-5.038

Karnal	0.543	-0.335	-0.874	-0.206	-0.557	-0.8	-1.14	-0.348	-3.717
Rohtak	-1.026	-0.432	-0.203	-1.009	-0.676	0.037	0.175	-0.065	-3.199
Sonipat	-1.17	-0.172	-0.056	-1.066	-0.551	0.75	-0.728	0.021	-2.972
Jhajjar	-1.031	-0.464	-0.204	-0.83	-0.331	0.164	0.104	-0.179	-2.771
Palwal	-0.582	-0.102	0.749	0.237	-0.323	-1.129	-1.008	-0.487	-2.645
Faridabad	-0.695	-0.151	-0.213	-0.256	-0.191	-0.448	0.042	-0.413	-2.325
Yamunanagar	1.584	-0.228	0.618	-0.212	-0.698	-0.733	-0.325	-1.024	-1.018
Kaithal	0.268	0.469	-0.152	-0.763	-0.63	0.02	0.262	-0.046	-0.572
Sirsa	1.731	-1.45	-2.13	1.622	0.02	-0.98	1.043	-0.009	-0.153
Fatehabad	1.177	-1.012	-1.158	0.737	0.3	-0.783	0.668	0.228	0.157
Hisar	0.322	-0.445	-0.471	-0.106	0.393	-0.509	0.939	0.283	0.406
Rewari	-1.019	0.157	0.371	0.09	-0.059	1.257	0.163	-0.114	0.846
Jind	-0.459	0.654	0.265	-0.849	-0.259	0.385	1.363	-0.231	0.869
Bhiwani	-0.292	0.21	0.406	0.38	0.342	0.554	0.695	0.86	3.155
Mahendragrh	-1.011	1.496	1.088	1.219	1.071	2.398	0.432	0.783	7.476
Panipat	0.686	1.944	1.537	0.198	1.522	0.423	0.67	1.314	8.294
Mewat	1.53	2.656	2.486	3.041	3.433	2.174	2.02	3.066	20.406

Source: Author calculation based on Table 2

Table 3.1: Pattern and Index of Rural Living Conditions of Different Districts of Haryana

Value of CSS	Standard of Living	Name of Districts
Mean – SD	High	Ambala, Krukshetra, Gurgaon, Panchkula, Karnal, Rohtak and Sonipat.
Between Mean –SD and Mean + SD	Moderate	Jhajjar, Palwal, Faridabad, Yamunangager, Kaithal, Sirsa, Fatehabad, and Hisar
Mean + SD	Low	Rewari, Jind, Bhiwani, Mahendragrh, Panipat and Mewat

Source: Author calculation based on Table 3

Table 4: Index of Living Conditions of Different Districts of Urban Haryana

District	Floor	Bathroom Facility	Toilet Facility	Drainage Facility	Electricity	Water	Cooking Fuel	Assets	CSS
Rohtak	-0.992	-0.339	-0.557	-1.088	-0.771	-0.325	-0.449	-0.223	-4.744
Sonipat	-0.851	-0.379	-0.572	-1.394	-0.537	-0.316	-0.295	-0.218	-4.562
Gurgaon	-0.96	-0.332	-0.513	-0.214	-0.562	-0.304	-1.313	-0.22	-4.418
Kurukshetra	-0.134	-0.392	-0.608	-0.606	-0.8	-0.315	-0.791	-0.237	-3.883
Palwal	-0.844	-0.12	0.062	-1.085	-0.194	-0.314	-0.78	-0.24	-3.515
Jhajjar	-0.842	-0.346	-0.509	-0.663	-0.161	-0.317	-0.443	-0.221	-3.502
Panchkula	-0.304	-0.432	-0.946	-0.241	-0.595	-0.307	-0.281	-0.212	-3.318
Ambala	-0.509	-0.416	-0.182	0.19	-0.737	-0.321	-0.94	-0.241	-3.156
Karnal	-0.1	-0.297	-0.496	0.369	-0.666	-0.32	-0.695	-0.23	-2.435
Yamunanagar	0.527	-0.352	-0.538	-0.334	-0.879	-0.321	-0.226	-0.229	-2.352
Sirsa	1.547	-0.534	-1.08	0.153	-0.428	-0.318	0.046	-0.22	-0.834
Fatehabad	1.304	-0.38	-0.401	0	-0.06	-0.317	-0.114	-0.217	-0.185
Jind	0.177	-0.147	0.059	-0.331	0.344	-0.316	0.577	-0.223	0.14
Kaithal	1.41	-0.79	0.733	-0.391	0.106	-0.31	1.016	-0.218	1.556
Rewari	-1.233	4.053	0.035	0.472	-0.495	-0.318	-0.542	-0.223	1.749
Faridabad	-0.802	-0.127	-0.159	1.316	0.093	2.783	-0.99	-0.232	1.882
Mahendragrh	-0.778	0.633	1.485	0.13	0.678	-0.301	0.655	-0.196	2.306
Panipat	0.892	0.377	0.714	-0.188	0.737	-0.312	0.889	-0.2	2.909
Hisar	0	-0.288	-0.198	-0.543	0.139	-0.322	-0.019	4.363	3.132
Bhiwani	0.132	-0.156	0.164	1.223	1.192	-0.318	2.095	-0.212	4.12
Mewat	2.362	0.771	3.509	3.226	3.599	3.218	2.604	-0.143	19.146

Source: Author calculation based on Table 3.

Table 4.1: Index of Urban Living Conditions of Different Districts of Haryana

Value of CSS	Standard of Living	Name of Districts
Mean – SD	High	Kurukshetra, Gurgaon, Rohtak, and Sonipat.
Between Mean –SD and Mean + SD	Moderate	Ambala, Jhajjar, Panchkula, Karnal, Palwal, Faridabad, Yamunangager, Kaithal, Sirsa, Fatehabad, Rewari and Jind,
Mean + SD	Low	Bhiwani, Mahendragrh, Panipat, Mewat and Hisar

Source: Author calculation based on Table 4.

Table 5: Index of Living Conditions of Different Districts of Haryana

District	Floor	Bathroom Facility	Toilet Facility	Drainage Facility	Electricity	Water	Cooking Fuel	Assets	CSS
Gurgaon	-1.465	-1.085	-1.187	-0.409	-0.675	-0.953	-1.942	-0.682	-8.398
Faridabad	-1.381	-0.872	-1.143	-0.294	-0.557	-0.09	-1.873	-1.252	-7.462
Palwal	-1.002	-0.5	-0.29	-0.361	-0.489	-0.881	-1.265	-1.039	-5.827
Ambala	0.018	-0.944	-0.152	-0.497	-0.75	-1.048	-0.975	-1.422	-5.77
Panchkula	-0.644	-0.611	-0.902	-0.519	-0.665	-0.34	-0.782	-0.182	-4.645
Rohtak	-0.983	-0.519	0.222	-0.609	-0.651	-0.48	-0.256	-0.177	-3.453
Karnal	0.419	-0.251	-0.622	-0.426	-0.498	-0.781	-0.479	-0.242	-2.88
Kurukshetra	0.625	-0.437	-0.628	-0.413	-0.733	-0.699	0.677	-1.028	-2.636
Sonipat	-0.941	-0.212	-0.116	-0.64	-0.489	0.393	-0.261	0.083	-2.183
Jhajjar	-0.76	-0.273	-0.066	-0.525	-0.251	0.796	0.254	0.035	-0.79
Hisar	0.261	-0.32	-0.311	-0.268	0.266	-0.608	0.513	0.208	-0.259
Sirsa	1.691	-1.011	-1.518	0.454	0.016	-0.837	0.795	0.174	-0.236
Kaithal	0.555	0.585	0.192	-0.488	-0.456	0.103	-0.476	0.214	0.229
Rewari	-0.769	0.225	0.416	-0.131	-0.048	0.943	0.326	0.08	1.042
Jind	-0.162	0.648	0.421	-0.521	-0.134	0.314	0.631	0.038	1.235
Fatehabad	1.388	-0.58	-0.656	0.147	0.344	-0.632	0.795	0.475	1.281
Yamunanagar	0.905	-0.389	0.077	3.871	-0.671	-0.84	-0.327	-0.75	1.876
Bhiwani	0.023	0.389	0.609	0.026	0.447	0.486	0.829	0.957	3.766
Mahendragrh	-0.579	1.716	1.437	0.414	1.164	2.454	0.944	0.035	7.585
Panipat	0.825	1.732	1.427	-0.105	1.33	0.382	0.896	1.28	7.767
Mewat	1.974	2.714	2.793	1.299	3.503	2.32	1.977	3.193	19.773

Source: Author calculation based on Table 2

Table 5.1: Pattern and Index of Living Conditions of Different Districts of Haryana

Value of CSS	Standard of Living	Name of Districts
Mean – SD	High	Ambala, Palwal, Faridabad, Gurgaon, Panchkula, and Rohtak
Between Mean –SD and Mean + SD	Moderate	Jhajjar, Kurukshetra, Karnal, Kaithal, Sirsa, Hisar, and Sonipat.
Mean + SD	Low	Yamunanagar, Fatehabad, Bhiwani, Mahendragrh, Panipat and Mewat

Source: Author calculation based on Table 2

Table 2 presents the standard of living scenario in rural Haryana, in terms of Index of living conditions, highlighted in terms of high, moderate and low category district groups in Table 4. Similarly Tables 2.8 and 2.8.1 depict the position in respect of urban districts of the state. Ambala tops among eight districts in respect of high living standard in its rural base followed by Kurukshetra, Gurgaon, Panchkula, Karnal, Rohtak and Sonipat districts respectively. Among the lowest group Mewat remains at the top followed upwards by Panipat, Mahendrarh, Bhiwani, Jind and Rewari respectively. Among the moderate group Jhajjar remains at the top followed by Palwal, Faridabad, Yumunanagar, Kaithal, Sirsa, Fatehabad and Hishar. A good deal of shift is visible in respect of urban areas of the districts in Haryana. While there were seven districts in respect of high standard category in rural areas, their strength was reduced to four pushing of this group to the moderate level in respect of the urban base. Ambala, the top ranking district in rural Haryana slipped down to the moderate group in its urban presentation, and Hisar trickled down from the moderate six lowest to 19th position in the urban perspective. Tables 4 and 2.8.1 show very many variations of this type to reveal rural-urban deviations in their representation. In other words and in short, Tables 2 and 4 reveal the standard of living in rural area of Haryana, with high standard of living in Ambala, Kurukshetra, Gurgaon, Panchkula, Karnal, Rohtak and Sonipat districts; and districts Rewari, Jind, Bhiwani, Mahendragrh, Panipat and Mewat with low standard of living. The rest of districts reveal a moderate standard of living. Similarly, Tables 2.8 and 2.8.1 reveal the standard of living in urban area of Haryana, with the high standards of living in Kurukshetra, Gurgaon, Rohtak and Sonipat districts. On the other hand, Bhiwani, Mahendragrh, Panipat, Mewat and Hisar in the low standard of living group districts. The

rest of the districts reveal simply a moderate standard of living in the urban context. Tables 2.9 and 2.9.1 reveal the standard of living in rural and urban combined area of Haryana, showing quite evolutions reveals in standards of living in the various districts of Haryana with Gurgaon, Faridabad, Palwal, Ambala, Panchkula and Rohtak districts topping the list respectively and throwing Mewat, Panipat, Mahendergarh, Bhiwani, Yumunanager, Fatahabad, Jind and Rewari districts to the last rung respectively in the ascending order of priority. This set of scenario pushes the districts of Karnal, Kurukshtra, Sonipat, Jhajjar, Hisar, Sisra and Kaithal to the moderate standard of living respectively. The combined rural and urban scenario on standard of living pushes Ambala to the fourth position in the combined group of high standards while it was at the top in rural living high standards group and pushed backward to position eight in the urban moderate living standards group. Similarly, Kurukshetra district belonged to different standard of living group, that is, at the top 9th position in urban high standard context, 4 second place in the same group in rural standards context; and much down to the eight place drifting itself to moderate group in the rural-urban combined standard of living context. Interestingly, the only district that could keep itself intact with the high standard group is Gurgaon topping the combined rural urban context and retaining the third position each in rural as well as urban area contexts. The status of other districts is found to be extremely volatile. Faridabad district that rises to the second top position in the combined rural-urban standards context goes down to position 10th in the rural group standards context and to position 16th in the urban standards context. Similarly, the district of Palwal was enjoyed being at the third place in the combined rural and urban standards context trickles down to 5th position in the urban standard context and far down to 9th place in urban standards context.

References

1. Alagh YK. Estimation of Poverty and Identifying the Poor, Indian Journal of Human Development. 2010; 4(1).
2. Alkire, Sabina, Suman Seth. Measuring Multidimensional Poverty in India: A New Proposal, OPHI Working Paper No 15, September, Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative (OPHI), Oxford Department of International Development, University of Oxford, 2009.
3. Government of Haryana. Economic Survey of Haryana 2016-17, Department of Economic and Statistical Analysis, Publication No.1159, 2017.
4. Government of India. A Technical Note on the Sixth Plan of India (1980-1985), Planning Commission New Delhi, 1981.
5. Government of India. Perspectives of Development India 1960-61 to 1975-76: Implications of Planning for a minimum level of living, Planning Commission New Delhi, 1962.
6. Government of India. Report of the Task Force on Projections of Minimum Needs and Effective Consumption Demand, Planning Commission New Delhi, 1979.
7. Government of India. Report of the Expert Group on programme for alleviation of Poverty, Planning Commission, New Delhi, 1982.
8. Government of India. The concept and estimation of Poverty Line, Planning Commission, New Delhi, 1984.

9. Government of India. Report of the Expert Group on Estimation of Proportion and number of Poor, Perspective Planning Division. New Delhi, 1993.
10. Government of India. Press release on Estimate of Poverty, Perspective Planning Division. New Delhi, 1997.
11. Government of India. Census of India 2011: Household Tables, Registrar General and Census Commissioner of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi, India, 2011.
12. Government of India. Press release on Estimate of Poverty, Perspective Planning Division. New Delhi, 2011.
13. Government of India. Report of the Expert Group to Review the Methodology for Measurement of Poverty”, Planning Commission New Delhi, 2014.
14. Nayyar, Gaurav, Nayyar Rohini. India’s Poverty of Numbers Revisiting Measurement Issues, Economic & Political Weekly. 2016, 35.
15. Patnaik, Utsa. Poverty Trends in India 2004–05 to 2009–10: Updating Poverty Estimates and Comparing Official Figures, Economic & Political Weekly. 2013; 48:40.
16. Sharma, Lalit, Chakravarty, Kavita. Multidimensional Poverty in Haryana, Indian Journal of Human Development. 2015, 9(1).

