



CHANGING PATTERN OF STATE-WISE HOUSEHOLD SIZE IN INDIA – MACRO TO MICRO LEVEL

Dr. Ponnada Annaji Rao

Lecturer in Economics, Government Degree College,
Narasannapeta-Srikakulam

Abstract : At the national level the average household size in 1991 was 5.5 persons. By 2001 it has come down to 5.3 persons which further declined to 4.8 persons. It is a continuous decline in size from one census to another. In terms of percentages, decline in the first decade (1991-2001) was 3.6, and the second decade (2001-11) was 9.4 while during 1991-2011 the decline was 12.7. It clearly depicts a rather rapid decline in the size of the household at the national level. This same phenomenon is found in the rural as well as urban scenarios in all the successive censuses. However, there is an interesting observation which clearly brings out that the decline in the urban areas is slightly faster in spite of relatively smaller household size to start with in 1991 in most of the states. Another interesting observation is that the total and rural areas are practically very similar in their magnitude, and sometimes the rural average household size is slightly higher than the total, which supports the argument that India lives more in the villages. By virtue of its weight-age, the rural areas influence the overall size.

Index Terms: Household size, Rural, Urban

Introduction: India has been experiencing a slower population growth rate over the last four decades. Slower population growth rates normally tends to reflect changes in the age distribution. The present slower growth rate is also a result of lower fertility rate, given the medical, social and technological developments the country is experiencing. Along with that, the rate of urbanization has been on the rise during the last four decades (Indian Census 1981-2011)¹ as has been presented by the Census of India. The rapid urbanization resulted in fragmentation of the age old joint family system in India. New employment opportunities and the uneconomical rural agrarian sector driving people away from agriculture and increasing stress on education has also resulted in nuclearisation of families, which is growing very rapidly in the country.

Review of Literature :

Shubhagata Roy, Anjali Pandey and K.K.Singh (2016) found that a large number of the Indian women are still forced to give unwanted births; consequently unwanted fertility rate is very high in India as per the reports of National Family Health Survey -1, NFHS-2 & NFHS-3. Out of the five most populous states, Uttar Pradesh stands second in terms of high total fertility rate, Bihar being the first. The fertility differentials exist by residence, education, religion, and caste/tribe in Uttar Pradesh. The total wanted fertility rate has declined from 3.69 in 1992-93 to 2.38 in 2005-06, bringing in a reduction of almost 35 per cent which is a good indication in order to achieve the replacement level fertility. The females who are educated upto secondary level have contributed more in fertility decline (reduced fertility by 33 per cent), compared to others.

Firdous Ansari (2015)² observed that total fertility rate is found 57.14 per cent more in illiterate women as compared to literate women. When illiterate women were compared with women having education of level graduate and above, this rate was found around 106 per cent more in illiterate women in India. Age specific fertility rate of women aged 20-24 years, an increment of 41.38 per cent was observed in illiterate women over literate women. Total fertility rate is figured around 48 per cent and 39 per cent more in illiterate women as compared to literate women of rural and urban India respectively.

¹ Bhagat R.B (2011): "Emerging pattern of Urbanization in India, Commentary", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.46(34), pp 10-12.

² Firdous Ansari (2015): "The Impact of Female Education on Fertility: A Comparative Study of India and Rajasthan", *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, Vol.5(9), pp193-194

Ravi K.Verma (2000)³ in his paper "Contraceptive-use Pattern and Sterilization care in Andhra Pradesh" explained that the contraceptive programme in Andhra Pradesh is characterized by heavy emphasis on female sterilization with little or no information on other methods.

Objectives: The main focus of the study is to compare the household size in state wise urban and rural areas. assess the relationship between household size and economic life, evaluate the link between household size and social life

Methodology : The study used only secondary data. Secondary data was collected from the Census of India, Directorate of Health and Family Welfare publications, State Statistical Abstracts for successive years published by Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Ministry of Rural Development, District Hand book of Statistics and also from internet. The study mainly uses the secondary data from India, Household Survey and Census of India, As far as possible, the data has been segregated to study the newly bifurcated state wise in India.

Household Size at State level - All India

In 1991, Tamil Nadu (4.5) and Andhra Pradesh (4.6) were the two states recording the smallest household size, while among the Union Territories it was Chandigarh (4.4). In the states of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh household size in rural areas were also smallest. Haryana (6.3), Bihar and Uttar Pradesh (6.2 each) were the largest average household size recorded. The hill regions, Island regions and North East states have been omitted from this analysis.

Household size has declined marginally all over the country by 2001. Tamil Nadu (4.3) and Andhra Pradesh (4.3) were still standing at first and second positions while UP (6.5), Jammu & Kashmir (6.5), Rajasthan (6.1) and Bihar (6) states recorded still above the national average household size and considerably larger household sizes in the country.

From this analysis one thing is very clear : that all of the four Southern states of the country are having smaller than the national average household size in all the three successive censuses, while the Eastern states namely, Bihar, West Bengal, Jharkhand (2001 and 2011), Odisha, only Bihar and Jharkhand found to have larger household sizes than the national average in all the three census and the other two namely West Bengal and Odisha were having smaller than the national average household size. In terms of decadal change in the size of household, sharpest decline was found in the states of Kerala (20.8%), Odisha (18.9%) and Karnataka (18.2%). Slowest decline was found in the states of Uttar Pradesh (3.2%), Maharashtra (9.8%) and Rajasthan (10.0%).

Classifying the states according to their location, like East, North, South West and Central regions, the previously presented table gives the following picture. It is the East, West and North regions which have largest number of States/Union Territories which are found to be above the national average household size. As per the 1991 census these three regions have nine states/UTs, viz. East has 2 (Bihar and Assam), West has 1(Rajasthan); North has 3 (UP, Punjab and Haryana); South has only Lakshadweep while in the Central region it was Madhya Pradesh. In the 2001 census it was found that 4 states/UTs (Assam, Meghalaya, Bihar and Jharkhand) were above the national average size in the East region. In the west, only Rajasthan was in this stage. In the North region, it was found that four states namely, UP, Punjab, Haryana and Jammu & Kashmir were in the above national average category. In the central and Southern regions, once again Madhya Pradesh and Lakshadweep are found here also. In the 2011 census, in the Central region no state/UT was found above the national average while in the South only Lakshadweep is there. In the Eastern region, five states/UTs namely, Bihar, Jharkhand, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam and Meghalaya are above the national average. In the North region, six states/UTs, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana and Delhi are found to be having larger household size than the national average size. In the Western region only two states/UTs namely Rajasthan and Gujarat are in this category. This detailed study brings out the regional variations of the household size and also clearly shows that there are some states/UTs which continue to be above the national average household size. Most of those states are found in the North and East regions.

Table 1
State wise Household Size in India: 1991, 2001 & 2011

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UT	1991			2001			2011		
		Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban
1.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.0	4.0	3.9
2.	Andhra Pradesh	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.5	3.9	3.9	4.0
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	4.9	5.0	4.4	5.1	5.2	4.6	5.0	5.2	4.4
4.	Assam	5.8	5.9	5.2	5.4	5.5	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.4

³ Ravi K.Verma (2000): "**Contraceptive use Pattern and Care in Andhra Pradesh**", Evidence from NFHS, Paper presented at the National Seminar on 'Fertility Decline in Andhra Pradesh', organized by Indian Institute of Health and Family Welfare (IIHFW), during 13-15 March, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh.

5.	Bihar	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.0	6.0	6.5	5.5	5.5	5.7
6.	Chandigarh	4.4	3.6	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.3
7.	Chhattisgarh*	-	-	-	5.1	5.1	5.1	4.5	4.5	4.6
8.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	5.3	5.3	4.7	4.8	5.0	4.3	4.5	5.0	4.0
9.	Daman & Diu	5.3	5.5	5.1	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.0	4.7	3.8
10.	Delhi	5.0	5.3	5.0	5.1	5.3	5.1	4.9	5.3	4.9
11.	Goa	5.0	5.1	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.2
12.	Gujarat	5.5	5.6	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.0	4.9	5.1	4.7
13.	Haryana	6.3	6.6	5.5	5.7	5.9	5.2	5.2	5.4	4.9
14.	Himachal Pradesh	5.3	5.5	4.2	5.0	5.1	4.2	4.6	4.7	3.9
15.	Jammu & Kashmir#	-	-	-	6.5	6.5	6.3	5.8	5.8	5.8
16.	Jharkhand*	-	-	-	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.3	5.3	5.2
17.	Karnataka	5.5	5.6	5.4	5.1	5.2	4.9	4.5	4.7	4.3
18.	Kerala	5.3	5.2	5.4	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.2	4.2	4.3
19.	Lakshadweep	6.2	6.0	6.4	6.1	5.9	6.2	5.5	5.2	5.6
20.	Madhya Pradesh	5.6	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.5	4.8	4.7	5.0
21.	Maharashtra	5.1	5.2	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.5
22.	Manipur	6.2	6.2	6.3	5.8	5.8	5.6	5.1	5.2	4.8
23.	Meghalaya	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.5	5.6	5.3	5.4	5.5	5.0
24.	Mizoram	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.0	5.1	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8
25.	Nagaland	5.6	5.7	4.9	6.1	6.3	5.3	4.9	5.0	4.7
26.	Odisha	5.3	5.3	5.1	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.3	4.3	4.5
27.	Puducherry	5.0	4.8	5.1	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.1
28.	Punjab	5.9	6.1	5.6	5.6	5.8	5.3	5.0	5.2	4.8
29.	Rajasthan	6.0	6.1	5.9	6.1	6.1	5.8	5.4	5.4	5.3
30.	Sikkim	5.3	5.3	5.2	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.2
31.	Tamil Nadu	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.9	3.9
32.	Tripura	5.2	5.3	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.0
33.	Uttar Pradesh	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.5	6.5	6.4	6.0	6.0	5.7
34.	Uttarakhand*	-	-	-	5.3	5.3	5.2	4.9	4.9	4.8
35.	West Bengal	5.4	5.5	5.2	5.1	5.1	4.9	4.5	4.5	4.4
	India	5.5	5.6	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.1	4.8	4.9	4.6

Note: * These states came into existence after 1991,

Census could not be conducted

Source: Registrar General, Census of India -2011

Interestingly, in all the three decadal censuses the same two regions were found to be there. Assam, Bihar, Meghalaya and Jharkhand were there in 2001 and 2011 also in the Eastern region. In the North, Jammu & Kashmir, UP, Punjab and Haryana were found in both 2001 and 2011 censuses.

To understand the movement of states/UTs from one category to another i.e. from the below average to above average household size or vice versa separate turnover tables were presented for total, urban and rural areas in the following all tables respectively. These tables are analysed in such a way that the movement of states/UTs from one census year, say 1991 to successive censuses like 2001 and 2011 are mapped. Here, the movement of states from the starting position in 1991 is mapped in 2001 and 2011 so that better understanding can be drawn about the changing household size across the states/UTs in total as well as in rural urban dichotomy.



Table 2
Turnover Table of Total Household Size in India 1991, 2001 & 2011

Year	States Below National Average	States Above National Average
1991 (5.5)	Gujarat, Karnataka, Chandigarh, Tamil Nadu, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Pondicherry, Goa, Delhi, Maharashtra, Tripura, Ordisa, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Kerala, Daman & Diu, Himachal Pradesh, Meghalaya and West Bengal--(20)	Nagaland, Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Assam, Punjab, Rajasthan, Bihar, Manipur, Uttar Pradesh, Lakshadweep and Haryana ----(11)
2001 (5.3)	Uttarakhand, Tamil Nadu, Chandigarh, Daman & Diu, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Pondicherry, Andaman & Nicobar islands, Goa, Kerala, Sikkim, Odisha, Tripura, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Mizoram, West Bengal, Karnataka, Chhattisgarh, Arunachal Pradesh and Gujarat--(22)	Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Punjab, Jharkhand, Haryana, Manipur, Bihar, Rajasthan, Nagaland, Lakshadweep, Uttar Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir---(13)
2011 (4.8)	Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Daman & Diu, Andhra Pradesh, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Puducherry(Pondicherry), Goa, Kerala, Chandigarh, Tripura, Odisha, West Bengal, Chhattisgarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Karnataka, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim and Maharashtra----(18)	Uttarakhand, Delhi, Nagaland, Mizoram, Assam, Gujarat, Punjab, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Haryana, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Meghalaya, Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir, Lakshadweep and Uttar Pradesh----(17)

Source: Registrar General, Census of India -2011

Table 2 shows that there are 11 States/UTs in the above national average household size in 1991. By 2001 from these 13, only Mizoram moved to below the National average household size category and by 2011 Mizoram moved again moved to the above national average household size. In the same census year 1991 there were 20 States/UTs in the below national average household size category. However, by 2011, five states (Uttarakhand, Delhi, Mizoram, Gujarat and Arunachal Pradesh) shifted to the above national average household size category from the below average household size category in 2001 and the state of Madhya Pradesh moved from above national average household size category in 2001 to below national average household size category in 2011. In the year 2001, in the above national average household size category there was 13 States/UTs. All these states are found again except Madhya Pradesh in the 2011 census in the same category, i.e., above national average household size category.

Table 3
Turnover Table of Urban Household Size in India: 1991, 2001 & 2011

Year	States Below National Average	States Above National Average
1991 (5.3)	Gujarat, Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Chandigarh, Assam, Andaman & Nicobar islands, Tamil Nadu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Goa, Tripura, Nagaland, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Maharashtra, Daman & Diu, Pondicherry, Odisha, West Bengal and Sikkim--(20)	Karnataka, Kerala, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Punjab, Rajasthan, Bihar, Manipur, Uttar Pradesh and Lakshadweep----(11)
2001 (5.1)	Delhi, Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Tripura, Chandigarh, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Goa, Pondicherry, Daman & Diu, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Assam, West Bengal, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Odissa, Mizoram and Gujarat---(22)	Uttaranchal, Haryana, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Manipur, Rajasthan, Lakshadweep, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar----(13)
2011 (4.6)	Chhattisgarh, Daman & Diu, Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Tripura, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Andhra Pradesh, Pondicherry, Sikkim, Goa, Chandigarh, Karnataka, Kerala, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, West Bengal, Odisha and Maharashtra-(19)	Nagaland, Gujarat, Punjab, Uttarakhand, Manipur, Mizoram, Haryana, Delhi, Meghalaya, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Lakshadweep, Bihar and Jammu & Kashmir----(16)

Source: Registrar General, Census of India -2011

Now looking at the urban scenario as presented in the Table 3 in all 11 States/UTs were found in the above national average household size category in the census 1991. By 2001, three states, namely Karnataka, Kerala and Mizoram moved out of this category and into the “below national average household size category” by 2001 and Karnataka and Kerala continued to be in the same “below national average household size category” in 2011 also. The only state Mizoram again fell back into the “above national average household size category” by 2011. On the whole most of the states which were in this category of “above national average household size” are with a few exceptions, found in the 2001 and 2011 censuses also. The increase in number from 11 in 1991 to 13 in 2001 and 16 in 2011 is due to formation of new states during that time and only Mizoram moving in and out of the categories twice.

The picture in the rural setting is presented in Table 4. There are 11 States/UTs in the “above national average household size” in 1991 and 13 in 2001 censuses. Of these, the state of Mizoram moved out of that category and moved into “below national average household size” category in 2001. Of the 20 States/UTs found in the “below national average household size” category in 1991, almost all of them are found to be in the same category in 2001 and 2011 also. The few exceptions are: Gujarat, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Delhi and Arunachal Pradesh came into ‘below’ category in 1991 and 2001, but these states are moved into the ‘above’ category in 2011.

This analysis brings out that the states moving across the “Below” to “above” national average household size is not very frequent. The positioning of the states/UTs are more or less stable and the movement is fairly low. The increase in number of states in these two groups is mostly because of formation of new states after 1991 due to administrative decisions but not to a change in the demography of the states or in the size of the household.

Table 4
Turnover Table of Rural Household Size in India: 1991, 2001 & 2011

Year	States Below National Average	States Above National Average
1991 (5.6)	Karnataka, Gujarat, Chandigarh, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Sikkim, Pondicherry, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Kerala, Maharashtra, Tripura, Odisha, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh, Daman & Diu and West Bengal--(20)	Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland, Mizoram, Assam, Lakshadweep, Punjab, Rajasthan, Bihar, Manipur, Uttar Pradesh and Haryana---(11)
2001 (5.4)	Chandigarh, Tamil Nadu, Daman & Diu, Andhra Pradesh, Pondicherry, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Goa, Kerala, Odisha, Sikkim, Tripura, Maharashtra, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Himachal Pradesh, Delhi, Mizoram, Gujarat, Chhattisgarh, West Bengal, Karnataka, Arunachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand ----(22)	Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Meghalaya, Jharkhand, Punjab, Manipur, Haryana, Lakshadweep, Rajasthan, Nagaland, Uttar Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir--(13)

2011 (5.9)	Uttarakhand, Mizoram, Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Pondicherry, Kerala, Odisha, Goa, Tripura, West Bengal, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Madhya Pradesh, Daman & Diu and Karnataka---(20)	Nagaland, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Gujarat, Punjab, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Lakshadweep, Delhi, Jharkhand, Haryana, Rajasthan, Bihar, Meghalaya, Jammu & Kashmir and Uttar Pradesh----(15)
---------------	---	---

Source: Registrar General, Census of India -2011

Conclusion : The study will help to identify various factors that determine or help determine the choice of household size in an urban and rural setting in India. Household size has declined marginally all over the country by 2001. From this analysis one thing is very clear that all of the four Southern states of the country are having smaller than the national average household size in all the three successive censuses, This analysis brings out that the states moving across the “Below” to “Above” national average household size is not very frequent. The positioning of the States/UTs is more or less stable and the movement is fairly low.

References:

- [1] Bhagat R.B (2011): “Emerging pattern of Urbanization in India, Commentary”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.46(34), pp 10-12.
- [2] Firdous Ansari (2015): “The Impact of Female Education on Fertility: A Comparative Study of India and Rajasthan”, *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, Vol.5(9), pp193-194
- [3] Ravi K.Verma (2000): "Contraceptive use Pattern and Care in Andhra Pradesh", Evidence from NFHS, Paper presented at the National Seminar on ‘Fertility Decline in Andhra Pradesh’, organized by Indian Institute of Health and Family Welfare (IIHFW), during 13-15 March, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh.
- [4] Shubhagata Roy, Anjali Pandey and K.K.Singh (2016): “Levels and Trends of Wanted and Unwanted Fertility in Uttar Pradesh”, *Elixir International Journal*, pp39923-39929

