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Poverty is oneof the main problems which have attracted enough attention of sociologists andeconomists. It indicates a condition in which a person fails to maintain aliving standard adequate for his physical and mental efficiency.

It is asituation people want to escape. It gives rise to a feeling of a discrepancybetween what one has and what one should have. The term poverty is a relativeconcept. It is very difficult to draw a demarcation line between affluence andpoverty. Poverty is one of the most critical issues being faced by any economy. It has been defined variously by the scholars.

“ Poverty is conventionally measured by theincome or expenditure level that can sustain a bare minimum standard of living”(Bardhan, 1973). But measuring standard of living is a tricky issue. Income/consumption levels though are taken officially to depict poverty butsuch a measure of poverty needs to be supplemented by other factors that wouldreflect access to minimum level of social amenities.

Longevity, infantmortality rate, health, nutrition, literacy, and access to primary schools, anddrinking water, etc. are the other factors that provide supplementaryinformation on poverty (Vani, 2004). Poverty isdefined as the inability to obtain the minimum requirements of life, health andefficiency due to very low income or insufficient assets. World Bank definespoor person as “ a person who earns less than 1. 25 dollar per day”. It has to bedefined in relation to average living standards in a society and the socialnorms and the customs acceptable to it at a point of time. Poverty is a statewhere a person finds it unable to maintain a minimum socially accepted level ofstandard of living. It is pointed as the root cause for low levels of healthand educational outcomes, poor access to clean drinking water and sanitation, inadequate physical security, lack of voice, and insufficient capacity andopportunity for mobility.

Poverty has been described as a situation of” pronounced deprivation in well being” and being poor as “ to be hungry, to lackshelter and clothing, to be sick and not cared for, to be illiterate and notschooled. Poor people are particularly vulnerable to adverse events outsidetheir control. They are often treated badly by institutions of the state andsociety and excluded from voice and power in those institutions.” Poverty hasbeen described as a situation of “ pronounced deprivation in well being” andbeing poor as “ to be hungry, to lack shelter and clothing, to be sick and notcared for, to be illiterate and not schooled.

Poor people are particularlyvulnerable to adverse events outside their control. They are often treatedbadly by institutions of the state and society and excluded from voice andpower in those institutions.” According to ICMR, the minimum calories intake ofa person has been put at 2400 kilo calories per capita per day in rural areasand 2100 kilo calories per capita per day in urban areas. The minimum calorieintake for rural areas has been kept higher than that in the urban areas, asrural people have to put in more physical effort than those living and workingin urban areas. Those who fail to secure the prescribed calorie intake levelsfall below poverty line and are defined as poor.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY.  The present study is carriedout with the following objectives Ø To analyze the state wise Specific Poverty Lines for the year of2011-2012.   Ø    To identify the determinantsof poverty at macro and micro levels Ø To analyze the trends in incidence of poverty Karnataka and all –India .  Methodology of The Study.  The present study is based on Secondary data, secondary data has been collected from Books , journals, Annual reports , andinternet sources. Review Literature. Murgal etal., (2003) conducted study on measuring poverty in Karnataka as a regionaldimensional.

Under this study they reported that Indian Planning Commission(IPC) estimated poverty at national level by using detailed householdconsumption and expenditure data from the NSSO, but IPC was unable to measurepoverty at regional levels due to inadequate sample size. In order to measurepoverty at regional level they made attempt that pooling of central and statesample data to overcome the problems of limitation of sample size. They usedsecondary information like HCR and PGI of state and central data to measurepoverty.

They compared cumulative distribution and Lorenz curve of MPCEseparately for the rural and urban area of Karnataka. Their study concludedthat Gulbarga and Belagaum division had highest poverty ratio compare to anyother district of Karnataka. Rath (2003) noted that poverty line by Dandekarand Rath (1971) was calculated on the basis of household consumer expendituresurvey of 1961-62 by NSSO. But from 1972 onwards, though NSSO carried out alarge sample consumer expenditure survey but the tabulated calorie data was notpublished. Rather, in poverty determination, focus has shifted from caloriebased approach to income based approach. He examined a method of estimatingpoverty on the basis of price indices.

His study based on the NSSO data hascreated a detailed price index structure for each state of India. It usedmaximum individual commodities and subsequently he found deep disconnectionbetween income poverty and food consumption. Complexity of monetary poverty andnutritional status has been observed. Increasing income and declining caloriesintake among poor in many states has shown declining poverty incidence ofmonetary poverty.

The results of the studies based on price indices and thoseof the expert group are noticeably different. Sharma(2004) using the planning commission poverty line, computed poverty andinequality indices from the large sample surveys of NSS consumer expendituredata. Rural and urban poverty estimates were presented in the study for theperiod 1973/74-1999/2000. The author observed that the inter-temporal changesin the poverty ratio were more influenced by the changes in per capitaconsumption rather than class distribution. Inter-personal inequality in theconsumption distribution, measured by the Lorenz ratio, remained fairly stablefor a long period but showed signs of decline recently. The study dwells on thequality of data on private consumption obtained from the National SampleSurveys’ consumer expenditure vis-à-vis the private consumption expenditure inNational Accounts Statistics, particularly the recent changes in the method ofdata collection in the former. The study also concluded that importance ofnon-income indicators such as infant mortality rate and school enrolment in theassessment of living standards and also reduction of poverty.

Anonymous(2013) reported that Planning Commission has periodically estimated povertylines and poverty ratios for each of the years for which Large Sample Surveyson Household Consumer Expenditure had been conducted by the National SampleSurvey Office (NSSO) of the Ministry of Statistics and ProgrammeImplementation. These surveys are normally conducted on quinquennial basis. Thepercentage of persons below the Poverty Line in 2011-12 has been estimated at25. 7 in rural areas, 13. 7 in urban areas and 21. 9 for the country as a whole. The respective figures for the rural and urban areas were 41. 8, 25.

7 and 37. 2for the country as a whole in 2004-05. It was 50. 1 per cent in rural areas, 31. 8 per cent in urban areas and 45. 3 per cent for the country as a whole in1993-94.

In 2011-12, India had 270 million persons below the Tendulkar PovertyLine as compared to 407 million in 2004-05, that is a reduction of 137 millionpersons over the seven year period. During the 11-year period 1993-94 to2004-05, the average decline in the poverty ratio was 0. 74 percentage pointsper year.

It accelerated to 2. 18 percentage points per year during the 7-yearperiod 2004-05 to 2011-12. Therefore, it was concluded that the rate of declinein the poverty ratio during the 7-year period 2004-05 to 2011-12 was aboutthree times of that experienced in the 11-year period 1993-94 to 2004-05. Vijaya etal., (2013) conducted a multidimensional poverty analysis, using data collectedfrom the Karnataka Household Asset Survey (KHAS) to assess gender, intra-household disparities in asset ownership and to construct an individuallevel of multidimensional poverty measure for Karnataka.

To measuremultidimensional poverty, they included four dimensions – education, livingstandards, ownership of productive assets and empowerment. The study concludedthat, in Karnataka 25 per cent of the households were classified as multi-dimensionallypoor. The poverty rate among women was (71%) more than double the poverty rateamong men (30%).

Nature  Of  Poverty in Karnataka. Percentage of people belowpoverty line is 20. 91%. Nutritional deficiency among children in Karnataka isacute. It has failed in spreading the facilities of Bangalore’s development torest of the state. It remains one of the few states to have just one city, Bangalore, with more than 1 million people.

North Karnataka has remaineduntouched by development. These are the 10 pooreststates in India where poverty is in dominance. The Indian Government is tryingits level best to bring these states and their people to bring above thepoverty line. Determinantsof Poverty at Macro and Micro levels Poverty is regarded as a vicious circle.

It is the product of different causes. Poverty is a multi dimensional problemand multiple factors are responsible for it. There are several factors whichcauses poverty at micro and macro levels. Determinants of poverty are broadlyclassified into 6 major categories which include (1) Personal factors: (a)Sickness, (b) Mental disease, (c) Accident, (d) Idleness and extravagance and(e) Demoralization. (2) Biological factors: Rapid growth of population is oneof the most important macro determinants of poverty.

(3) Geographical factors:(unfavorable climate weather, absence of natural resources and Naturalcalamities also created poverty at micro and macro levels). (4) Economicalfactors: i. e Backwardness of agriculture and unequal distribution of wealth.(5) Social factors which include religion, caste, family size and type, education levels, occupation, source of income and land holding. 6) Politicalfactors: Political elites are giving various popular slogans like ‘ anti povertyprogramme, ‘ removal of unemployment’ or ‘ Bekari Hatao’, ‘ Garibi Hatao’ etc butthese slogans have not been translated into action. The Concept of Poverty Line.

The Conceptor poverty line has been derived from the definition of poverty, which isdefined in absolute terms. The individual or family income of which isnot adequate to ensure them the minimum requirements of life (e. g. nutrition, clothing and shelter) is stated to be the poverty line or more conservatively, only food, a yardstick for socially decent life being the ultimate goal. It hasalso been observed that the common man must be entitled to a minimum calorieintake to guarantee him bare survival. Poverty line concept ismulti-dimensional (viz., income-poverty and non-income poverty). It gives notonly levels of Income consumption But also health and education, vulnerabilityand risk; and marginalization exclusion of the poor from the mainstream of society.

As pointed out by Tendulkar committee , theconcept of poverty is associated with socially perceived deprivation withrespect to basic human needs. For the year 2009-10, the planning commission hasdefined the poverty line as Rs. 22. 40 per day in rural areas and 28.

60 percapita per day in urban areas. This translates to 672. 8 per capita per month inrural areas and 859. 60 per capita per month in urban areas. In 2004-05 thepercentage of people living below poverty line was 33. 3%. in 2009-10 it was 23.

6%. the percentage of people living below poverty line in Karnataka has come downby 9. 7% in the estimate of poverty for 2009-10, released by the planningcommission. in 2004-05, the percentage of people living below poverty line was33. 3%.

in 2009-10, it was 23. 6%. in Karnataka, there were over 1. 42 crore peopleliving below poverty line in 2009-10, down from over 1. 86 crore in 2004-05. whilethe poverty rate in rural Data Analysis And Discussion Thefollowing tables depicts the state wise Specific Poverty Lines for the year of2011-2012Table-1State Specific Poverty Lines for 2011-2012 Sl. No States   Monthly per capital (RS.)   RURAL URBAN 1 Andhra Pradesh 860 1, 009 2 Arunachal Pradesh 930 1, 060 3 Assam 828 1, 008 4 Bihar 778 923 5 Chhattisgarh 738 849 6 Delhi 1, 145 1, 134 7 Goa 1, 090 1, 134 8 Gujarat 932 1, 152 9 Haryana 1, 015 1, 169 10 Himachal Pradesh 913 1, 064 11 Jammu 891 988 12 Jharkhand 748 974 13 Karnataka 902 1, 089 14 Kerala 1, 018 987 15 Madhya Pradesh 771 897 16 Maharashtra 967 1, 126 17 Manipur 1, 118 1, 170 18 Meghalaya 888 1, 154 19 Mizoram 1, 066 1, 155 20 Nagaland 1, 270 1, 302 21 Odisha 695 861 22 Punjab 1, 054 1, 155 23 Rajasthan 905 1, 002 24 Sikkim 930 1, 226 25 Tamil Nadu 880 937 26 Tripura 798 920 27 Uttarakhand 880 1, 082 28 Uttar Pradesh 768 941 29 West Bengal 783 981 30 Puducherry 1, 301 1, 309 ALL India 816 1.

00  Note : Computed as perTendulkar Method on Mixed Reference Period(MRP) Source: Government of IndiaPlanning Commission 2013.  Theestimates of state wise poverty lines for rural and urban arease for 2011-12are given in table. The all India poverty line is the per capital per monthexpenditure that corresponds to the all india poverty ratio. Poverty in Indiais a hurdle for economic prosperity. It also indicates the monthly per capitaamong rural and urban people in different states of India. The monthly percapita amongst urban people is highest ie 1, 302 Rupees in Nagaland whencompared to other states where as monthly per capita amongst rural people isleast in Odisha when compared to other states. The Government s at the statelevels should initiate measures to improve the income level of the people.  Table: 2: Poor Estimated by Tendulkar Method using Mixed ReferencePeriod(MRP) Year Poverty Ratio % Number of poor’s in million Rural Urban Total Rural  Urban Total 1993-94 50.

1  31. 8  45. 3 328. 6  74. 5  403.

7 2004-05 41. 8 25. 7 37. 2 326.

3  80. 8  407. 1 2011-12 25.

7 13. 7  21. 9 216. 5 52. 8 269.

3 Annual Average Decline: 1993-94 to 2004-05 (Percentage points per annum) 0. 75  0. 55  0. 74 – – – Annual Average Decline: 2004-05 to 2011-12 (Percentage points per annum) 2. 32 1. 69  2.

18 – – –               Source : Anon, (2013 a) Tablet. 3: Trends inIncidence of Poverty: Karnataka and All-India Karnataka   Year   Rural Sector   Urban Sector   Combined     %of poor No of poor (million poor No of poor (million %of poor No of poor (million 1973-74 55. 14 12.

84 52. 01 4. 19 54.

34 17. 03 1993-94 29. 88 (56. 60) 9.

60 40. 14 (34. 20) 6. 05 33.

16 (49. 50) 15. 65 2004-05 20. 80 (37. 50) 7.

51 32. 60 (25. 90) 6. 38 25. 00 (33. 40) 13. 89 2009-10 15. 82 (30.

81) 5. 87 23. 54 (18. 34) 5.

09 18. 52 (26. 46) 10. 87 All India   1973-74 56.

44 261. 29 49. 23 60.

31 54. 93 321 . 60 1993-94 37. 27 (50. 10) 244. 03 32. 36 (31.

80) 76. 34 35. 97 (45.

30) 320. 37 2004-05 28. 30 (41. 80) 220. 90 25.

70 (25. 70) 80. 79 27. 50 (37. 20) 301. 72 2009-10 22. 42 (36. 50) 184.

95 19. 27 (19. 80) 67. 33 21.

57 (31. 99) 253. 28 Sorces; Karnataka economic survey  The above table shows that changes in status of poverty during theperiod of 1973-74 to 2009-10 Rural poverty in Karnataka has declined by 39%during 1973-74 to 2009-10, which is higher by 5% as compared to the decline atthe all-India level. The number of rural poor also declined over the period.

The decline in number of rural poor in Karnataka between 1973-74 and 2009-10was 54% which is almost double that of the all-India decline of 29%. Incidenceof poverty has always been less in rural Karnataka than the correspondingestimate for the Country as a whole. Deprivation in the urban sector toodeclined but at a lesser extent (as compared to rural sector) both in Karnataka(28 %) and India as a whole (30 %) between 1973-74 and 2009-10.

The decline inthe poverty ratios was not sufficient to neutralize the growth in urbanpopulation. Hence, the number of urban poor has increased both in Karnataka andall-India between1973-74 and 2004-05. However between 2004-05 and 2009-10, adecline is seen in the number of poor and decline is greater in Karnataka (20%)as compared to All-India (17%). Incidence of urban poverty is much higher inKarnataka than in India as a whole for all the years. The extent of deprivationas measured by headcount ratio in Karnataka is 31% in rural areas, 18% in urbanareas and 26% for the State as a whole. The corresponding figures for all Indiaare 37% in rural, 20%-and 32% for the Country as a whole. Conclusion Karnataka has initiated various poverty alleviation programmers in bothrural and urban areas. While these programmers have resulted in a markeddecline in the number of the state’s poor, much remain to be done to addressregional and social variations in poverty.

Towards ensuring food security toits citizens, the state operates an extensive food distribution system toprovide basic foods with a focus on those who are below the poverty line. Thestate has also recently completed an elaborate exercise to weed out fake rationcards and to enhance the targeting of the public distribution system. The statehas also established institutions to provide affordable housing to the poor.

Promotion of livelihood opportunities through modernizing agriculture, establishingrural industries, and skill up gradation be considered as effective strategies.