

International Journal of Scientific Research and Reviews

Spatial and Determinants of Household Poverty: Empirical Evidence from Karnataka

Shivakumar

Guest Faculty, Dept of Studies in Economics, Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University, P.G Centre, Koppal-583231, Karnataka
Email id: shivactg1988@gmail.com. Cell No: 09036789235

ABSTRACT:

The study analysis of spatial and determinants of household poverty among socio-religious groups in Karnataka by using unit level Household consumption Expenditure data of 61st (2004-05) and 68th (2011-12) rounds of NSSO regions. The spatial poverty covered four administrative divisions i.e., Kalaburagi division (is also known as Hyderabad-Karnataka (HK) region), Bangalore division, Mysuru division and Belagavi division. The poverty ratio is measure by making use of Head-count Ratio (HCR) by makes use of state specific poverty line defined by Tendulkar Methodology which is Rs.418 and Rs.588 of 61st round (2004-05) and Rs.902 and Rs.1089 for 68th round (2011-12) for both rural & urban sectors. The study finds much higher levels household poverty in entire districts of Kalaburagi division. The incidence of poverty among social group were reduced by 20.66% in Scheduled Caste, 19.67% in Scheduled Tribes, 15.9% in OBC & 4.5% other (GM) category and in religion groups were reduced by 13.45% in Hindu and 11.46% in Muslims communities.

KEY WORDS: Measurement of Poverty, Spatial Poverty, Determinants, Social & Religious Groups.

JEL Classification: 'I31', 'I32', 'I39'

***Corresponding author:**

Dr. Shivakumar

Guest Faculty, Dept of Studies in Economics,
Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University,
P.G Centre, Koppal-583231, Karnataka

Email id: shivactg1988@gmail.com. Cell No: 09036789235

INTRODUCTION:

Poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon and it is a greatest challenge to the mankind. Poverty is defined as deprivation in well-being, and comprises many dimensions. Poverty it includes low level of education, attainment, sanitation, poor to clean water and sanitation and inadequate ability and opportunity to better one's life. It implies a severe lack of material and immaterial goods which impedes the normal development of the individuals. In absolute terms, it reflects the inability of an individual to satisfy certain basic minimum needs for a sustained, healthy and reasonably productive living. Generally the concept of poverty associated to socially perceived deprivation of financial well-being with respect to minimum basic needs. It emphasized the basic needs of the bottom section of the population. Pro-poor policies on health, education, sanitation and demographics were deemed important. Attempts were made to identify redistributive mechanisms for explaining aiding poverty reduction without hampering growth. Several studies emphasized on non income measures of poverty

In India context, poverty is measured in terms of a specified normative poverty line reflecting the minimum living standard of people. The official approach has laid emphasis on ensuring a subsistence minimum and hence, on eradicating absolute poverty (Surryanarayana, 2009). The measurement of poverty is a complex exercise and the estimates are broadly based on per capita consumption expenditure of household consumption expenditure surveys of NSSO. As per the estimates of Tendulkar committee in 2011-12 is 21.9 percentage of population are poor that is 269.9 millions of population is living below the poverty line Rangarajan¹. Globally two-third of world population is living below the international poverty line which is measured in terms of Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) of \$ 1.90 per day.

The World Bank set a new goal to end extreme poverty in a generation and its target is to have no more than 3 percent of the world's population living on just \$1.90 a day by 2030 and there has been marked progress in reducing poverty over the past decades. Recently in 2013, estimates to the word bank 10.7 percent of the population lived or below \$1.90 a day. The hypothetical discussion about the measurement of poverty has been on poverty measures rather than on poverty line. The primary issue is which measure of poverty is to be used for poverty estimation, most usually the Headcount Ratio, Poverty Gap Index, and Squared Poverty Gap Index.

Karnataka is the seventh largest State in terms of geographical area (191791 sq.km) & it is home to 6.11 crore population (2011 Census) accounting for 5.05% of India's Population and 133.57 lakh households as per 2011 census as against 104.02 lakh households in 2001 census. According to 2011 census, 84 percent of population is Hindu, 12.9% are Muslim, 1.9% are Christian, 07% are Jain, 0.2% are Buddhist, <0.1% are Sikhs and remaining belong to other religions. The state's

population is grown by 15.7% during the last decade, while its population density has risen from 276 in 2001 to 319 in 2011, indicating an increase of about 15.6% and 61 percent of population lives in rural area the decline in the proportion of rural population is 4.58 percent between in 2001 to 2011. In Karnataka, as in other parts of the country, the Scheduled Castes are largely concentrated in the rural parts in the state. Almost 75 per cent populations are live in villages and depend upon agricultural labour or agriculture related activities for subsistence. Karnataka accounts for about 6% of India's national income, the growth has been lopsided and concentrated in only a few locations.

The study using MPCE of Mixed Reference Period¹ (MRP) to measures incidence of mean poverty i.e. Head Count Ratio (Hp): which is defined as the "Percentage of. population which is below the poverty line" by makes use of specific poverty line for Karnataka based on Tendulkar Methodology i.e. Rs.418 and Rs.588 for rural & urban area of 61st round (2004-05) and Rs.902 and Rs.1089 for rural & urban area 68th round (2011-12) of NSSO data. The study 27 districts into four administrative divisions based on Government of Karnataka classification i.e. Kalaburagi division (Districts are Bidar, Kalaburagi, Raichur, Ballari and Koppal), Belagavi division (Districts are Belagavi, Bagalkot, Dharwad, Gadag, Haveri, Uttar Kannada and Vijayapura), Bengaluru division (Districts are Bengaluru rural, Bengaluru urban, Chitradurga, Davangere, Kolar, Shivamogga and Tumkur), and Mysuru division (Districts are Chamrajnagara, Chikkamagaluru, Dakshin Kannada, Hassan, Kodagu, Mandya, Mysuru and Udupi). The is an important value addition to the existing list of literature on poverty in Karnataka the study is significance value addition because it examines the extent, intensity of poverty covering two quinquennial rounds for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, OBC and two major religions of the state, Hindus and Muslims. The section following presents of Poverty estimates at regional level of both rural and urban along with brief description. Section III estimates the incidence of poverty across social groups and religious groups for both rural and urban areas. Finally, section IV focuses on findings and conclusion.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

The empirical study on measuring poverty and inequality by using different methodology to define the official poverty line on social religious groups in rural and urban areas by **Panagariya A and Mukim M**² brings out that, during 1993-94 and 2009-10 poverty is declining in various social and religious groups in all the states, secondly growing in growth rate and reduction of larger poverty scheduled caste and scheduled tribes than the upper cast groups has conical overt the time between 2004-05 and 2009-10 and finally they found in case of India there is no strong relationship between poverty and inequality. **Angus D & Alessandro T**³ measures poverty in India on the basis of prices of food and non-food through Consumer Prices indexes of urban and rural areas separately by using

43rd, 50th & 55th rounds of NSSO consumption data for two periods 1987-88 and 1993-94 and also estimated the rate of inflation over the six years for 17 largest states. After couple of years, estimated poverty line and calculated cost of living indices by Himanshu⁴ measures the all India poverty line based on Planning Commission food and non-food expenditure, later estimate state-wise poverty line by used Fisher Index of state prices and using consumer price index and set up new poverty line for consumption expenditure survey of 2004-05 and also based on Mixed Recall Period using NSSO data. The study finds that estimating of incidence of rural poverty shows a head count ratio of 41.8% for 2004-05 as against the official estimate of 28.3%. Further, comprehensive analysis of division wise with across social group by Arora A & Singh P S⁵ regional as well as disaggregated of district wise pattern of poverty prevailing among social groups of oh rural and urban areas in Uttar Pradesh by using 61st and 68th rounds of NSSO Consumption Expenditure Survey. It identifies the critical regions in UP, there poverty among social groups and particularly in the central, southern and eastern region is unfairly distributed.

There exist several studies on assessments and determinants of poverty both a macro and micro level-Interstate and Intrastate studies focus on spatial divergence in poverty. However the empirical analyses on poverty focusing at district level on socio-religious groups are scanty. The study in respect to Karnataka, since this gap by analyzing the status of district wise and division wise poverty across socio-religious groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Incidence of Poverty by NSS Rounds & Sector in Karnataka

Round	Rural	Urban	Total
61 st Round (2004-05)	37.50	25.88	33.92
68 th Round (2011-12)	24.53	15.28	21.18
Total	30.83	19.79	27.11

Source: Authors estimate based on 61st and 68th round of NSS data.

Above the table 01, shows that the study attempt to identify where the incidence of poverty in rural and urban area was improperly distributed in Karnataka during 2004-05 (61st NSS round) and 2011-12 (68th NSS round) rural poverty declining by 12.97% and urban poverty was 10.06% during 2004-05 to 2011-12. In 61st round the total poverty is 33.92% which is come down by 21.18% in 68th round so around 12.74% declining in the study period.

Table 2: Incidence of Poverty by Social Groups in Karnataka

Sector	Round	Social Groups				Religious groups	
		ST	SC	OBC	Others	Hindu	Muslim
Rural	61 st	50.53	57.37	35.87	23.72	38.28	35.82
	68 th	30.81	37.06	20.75	21.62	24.15	29.92
Urban	61 st	55.70	41.22	32.14	14.31	23.01	40.30
	68 th	33.69	24.96	15.09	08.77	13.23	24.51

Source: Authors estimate based on 61st and 68th round of NSS data.

Above table 02, its reveals higher the poverty ration scheduled Tribes and Scheduled caste in rural & urban sector. In 61st round study found more than 50% of the household poverty in SCs (57.37%), and STs (50.53%), is theater than Other Backward Classes (OBC) is 35.87% and Others only 23.72% in rural areas. Whereas, in 68th round there is declining the total percentages of poverty ration in all categories but the higher the poverty ratio seen in SCs (37.06%) and STs (30.81%) are rest of other categories.

Table 3: District Net Domestic Product in Karnataka 2011-12 (At Con 2004-05 Prices)

Sl. No	Districts	NDDP Distribution (%)				Population share (%)	Poverty (HCR)	Per Capita (NDDP)	Categories
		Primary	Secondary	Tertiary	Total				
1	Yadgiri	19.79	22.21	58	100	1.92	-	38097	Poorest Quarter
2	Chamarajanagar	89.6	2.55	7.85	100	1.67	1.6	40275	
3	Haveri	11.79	6.18	82.04	100	2.62	33.7	42581	
4	Chikkaballapura	35.3	20.45	44.25	100	2.05	10.03	44183	
5	Bidar	24.93	20.87	54.2	100	2.79	35.1	45282	
6	Vijayapura	28.97	22.49	48.54	100	3.56	23.1	45912	
7	Mandya	35.32	20.78	43.9	100	2.96	16.4	46049	
8	Chitradurga	28.89	15.93	55.19	100	2.72	46.7	47534	Lower Middle Quarter
9	Raichur	22.91	23.91	53.18	100	3.16	37.7	47752	
10	Kalaburagi	21.04	20.83	58.14	100	4.2	37.2	48329	
11	Bagalkot	6.58	4.28	89.14	100	3.09	35.8	50765	
12	Tumakuru	27.29	28.91	43.8	100	4.38	13	50906	
13	Gadag	19.57	20.36	60.07	100	1.74	21.8	51054	
14	Belagavi	26.22	24.03	49.74	100	7.82	28.8	52250	
15	Hassan	31.48	24.12	44.4	100	2.91	11.6	53000	Upper Middle Quarter
16	Davangere	27.46	18.47	54.07	100	3.18	23.3	56788	
17	Kolar	35.22	24.66	40.13	100	2.51	4.2	59614	
18	Uttara Kannada	16.09	24.15	59.76	100	2.35	19.6	61015	
19	Shivamogga	23.37	23.7	52.93	100	2.87	29.3	61271	
20	Chikkamagaluru	32.75	14.72	52.53	100	1.86	14.7	66366	
21	Mysuru	17.75	25.34	56.91	100	4.91	15.5	69759	
22	Ramanagara	24.12	23.09	52.79	100	1.77	10.52	70095	Upper Quarter
23	Dharwad	9.1	24.82	66.07	100	3.02	34	71865	
24	Ballari	19.54	28.65	51.82	100	4.01	40.8	74554	
25	Koppal	32.27	25.64	42.09	100	2.28	40.7	82954	
26	Udupi	15.36	26.72	57.92	100	1.93	22.4	83679	
27	Dakshina Kan	9.59	22.38	68.03	100	3.42	1.6	98572	
28	Bengaluru (R)	16.47	32.58	50.96	100	1.62	13	109380	
29	Kodagu	36.33	10.12	53.55	100	0.91	1.5	116533	
30	Bengaluru (U)	9.5	27.17	63.33	100	15.75	1.5	202340	
State		16.34	25.19	58.47	100	100	21.18	77168	

Source: Based on Karnataka Economic Survey Report 2014-15.

Above table 03 exhibit that, inter-district disparity in distribution of net district domestic product (NDDP) in Karnataka of 2011-12 (at constant 2004-05 prices), district wise per capita income in 2012-13 and poverty for 2011-12 (Authors estimated based on NSSO data). The table divided by four quarter based on NDDP of per capita income. First (poorest) Quarter based on per capita income. Yadgir, with per capita NDDP of Rs. 38097, is poorest district. With population share of 1.92%, it account poverty is not showing because of the district is not bifurcated of Gulbarga district. Mandya is the highest NDDP in first quarter based on par capita income of Rs.46049, share of population is 2.96 it accounted 16.4% of poverty followed by Chamarajanagar, Haveri, Chikkaballapura and Bidar districts. Second (Lower Middle) Quarter of Chitradurga, with per capita NDDP of Rs. 47534, with population share of 2.73% and it accounted 46.7% of poverty and higher the NDDP in Hassan district of Rs. 53000, with population share of 2.91% and it accounted 11.6% of poverty, followed by Kalaburagi, Bagalkot, Tumakuru, Gadag and Belagavi districts. Third (Upper Middle) Quarter of Davangere, with per capita NDDP of Rs.56788, with population share of 3.18%, and it accounted 23.3% of poverty and higher the NDDP in Ballari district of Rs.74554, with population share of 4.01% and it accounted 40.8% of poverty, followed by Kolar, Uttara Kannada, Shivamogga, Chikkamagaluru, Mysuru, Ramanagara and Dharwad. Last Fourth (Upper) Quarter, consist six districts with NDDP are very high and low poverty in the state. Bengaluru urban, the richest district had a per capita NDDP of Rs.202340, which is more than five times that in Bidar and it accounted for only 1.5% of poverty, which is very low in the state.

Table 4: Incidence of Poverty by Divisions

Division	Rural			Urban			Total		
	61 st	68 th	Change	61 st	68 th	Change	61 st	68 th	Change
HK Region	56.9	37.1	-(2.82)	58.6	41.5	-(2.44)	57.4	38.2	-(2.73)
Belagavi	42.7	29.5	-(1.88)	47.1	28.2	-(2.70)	44.2	29.1	-(2.15)
Bengaluru	36.6	18.8	-(2.54)	9.1	5.5	-(0.51)	24.3	11.8	-(1.79)
Mysuru	18.5	12.6	-(0.84)	23.4	8.9	-(2.07)	19.5	11.7	-(1.11)
Total	37.5	24.5	-(1.85)	25.9	15.3	-(1.51)	33.94	21.2	-(1.83)

Source: Authors estimate based on 61st and 68th round of NSS data.

Above table 04 analysis incidence of headcount ratio by administrative divisions reveals that extent and depth of poverty in Karnataka are greatest in HK region, in both rural and urban sector. Because of there is found low level of Monthly Per Capita Consumption Expenditure (MPCE) of Rs.467.3 of 61st (2004-05) NSS round and Rs.1218 of 68th (2011-12) of NSS round. This mean MPCE is very low comparing to other divisions. Higher the poverty shows in HK region and its decline by every year of -2.73%. In Belagavi division there showing second highest poverty ration and there declining by every year of -2.15% respectively in Bengaluru division is -1.79%, the region is consuming very high MPCE because of the all districts have high per capita income and achieve the economic

growth. Especially the Bengaluru city is capital city of state and it has fifth most populous city in country and second fastest growing major metropolis in India with economic growth of 10.3%. In Mysuru division is -1.11 of both rural and urban area this is the mean negative values and of two periods from 2004-05 to 2011-12. periods.

The division wise poverty along with district level has been illustrated by 61st (2004-05) round and 68th (2011-12) round. The following tables and line graph separately (refer tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 & line graph refer figures 1, 2, 3 & 4). Table & figure 05, is represent as Kalaburagi division is also know an Hyderabad-Karnataka (HK) region, table & figure 06, is represent as Belagavi division, table & figure 07, is represent as Bengaluru division and table & figure 08, is represent as Mysuru division.

Table 5: Poverty in HK Region

Districts	61 st Round	68 th Round
Bidar	51.74	35.11
Gulbarga	61.18	37.24
Raichur	68.61	37.73
Koppal	29.42	40.71
Ballari	61.34	40.81
Total	57.36	38.20




Figure 1: Poverty in HK Region

Table 6: Poverty in Belagavi Division

Districts	61 st Round	68 th Round
Belgaum	36.63	28.80
Bagalkot	47.00	35.76
Bijapur	35.37	23.12
Gadag	52.51	21.78
Dharwad	23.76	34.03
Uttar Kannada	60.48	19.55
Haveri	72.96	33.71
Total	44.22	29.14




Figure 2: Poverty in Belagavi Division

Districts	61 st Round	68 th Round
Bengaluru (U)	4.53	1.48
Bengaluru (R)	33.02	13.02
Chitradurga	56.12	46.74
Davangere	69.05	23.30
Shivamogga	19.12	29.33
Tumkur	25.85	13.04
Kolar	28.42	4.17
Total	24.32	11.76




Figure 3: Poverty in Bengaluru Division

Districts	61 st Round	68 th Round
Chamarajagara	24.43	1.64
Chikkamagalur	14.08	14.69
Dakshin Kannada	13.66	1.63
Hasana	22.93	11.59
Kodagu	10.99	1.51
Mandya	31.68	16.44
Mysuru	19.96	15.47
Udupi	5.77	22.44
Total	19.47	11.69




Figure 4: Poverty in Mysuru Division

Table 9: Incidence of Poverty by Division wise & Social Groups wise

Sector	Social Groups	H-K Region			Belagavi Division			Mysuru Division			Bengaluru Division		
		61	68	Change	61	68	Change	61	68	Change	61	68	Change
Rural	ST	73.73	28.2	-(6.5)	53.86	34.95	-(2.70)	14.7	25.82	(1.58)	46.22	34.49	-(1.67)
	SC	66.94	57.55	-(1.34)	65.06	41.47	-(3.37)	51.8	18.04	-(4.82)	48.91	29.9	-(2.71)
	OBC	62.32	35.72	-(3.8)	49.32	25.86	-(3.35)	18.75	13.4	-(0.76)	32.25	11.43	-(2.97)
	Others	37.41	28.68	-(1.24)	24.02	27.62	(0.51)	5.01	0	-(0.71)	27.57	21.22	-(0.90)
	TOTAL	57.00	37.09	-(2.84)	43.18	29.52	-(1.95)	18.5	12.61	-(0.84)	36.56	18.83	-(2.53)
Urban	ST	89.1	55.46	-(4.80)	80.25	46.48	-(4.82)	45.19	0	-(6.45)	22.12	4.97	-(24.5)
	SC	66.97	54.00	-(1.85)	46.97	34.9	-(1.72)	38.27	23.47	-(2.11)	27.14	16.76	-(1.48)
	OBC	68.39	40.21	-(4.02)	62.65	30.33	-(4.61)	28.84	9.55	-(2.75)	9.3	4.5	-(0.68)
	Others	42.73	31.02	-(1.67)	29.15	20.36	-(1.25)	6.04	3.37	-(0.38)	4.65	0.83	-(0.54)
	TOTAL	58.64	41.5	-(2.44)	47.05	28.19	-(2.69)	23.39	8.9	-(2.07)	9.1	5.49	-(0.51)

Source: Authors estimate based on 61st and 68th round of NSS data.

This study brings out that, during 2004-05 and 2011-12 poverty is declining in various social and religious groups in the states shows in table 09, growing in growth rate and reduction of larger poverty scheduled cast and scheduled tribes than the upper cast groups has conical overt the time in

all four region. Higher the poverty ration in HK region across social groups of 57% poverty in rural area and 58.64% of poverty in urban area followed by rest of divisions. In HK region where STs Poverty is very high of 73.73% (2004-05), is fastest declining by 28.20% in (2011-12) it was around -6.5 points reduced by every year of study period and respectively reduced by SCs 1.34, OBC -38 and Others -1.24 in rural area and also higher the poverty ratio seen in urban areas. But the highest points of poverty ratio are declining by every year in Belagavi division rural area both round, followed by Bengaluru and Mysuru divisions of the study period.

Table 10: Incidence of Poverty by Divisions & Religion wise

Sector	Religion Groups	H-K Region			Belagavi Division			Mysuru Division			Bengaluru Division		
		61 st	68 th	Change	61 st	68 th	Change	61 st	68 th	Change	61 st	68 th	Change
Rural	Hindu	56.37	36.34	-(2.86)	43.18	29.82	-(1.91)	19.76	13.27	-(0.93)	37.51	18.43	-(2.73)
	Muslim	62.65	41.5	-(3.02)	46.5	22.59	-(3.42)	8.07	8.69	(0.09)	25.37	25.92	(0.08)
	TOTAL	56.94	37.1	-(2.83)	43.43	29.12	-(2.04)	18.92	13.1	-(0.83)	36.75	18.84	-(2.56)
Urban	Hindu	53.85	38.25	-(2.23)	40.39	25.24	-(2.16)	21.23	7.96	-(1.90)	9.14	4.48	-(0.67)
	Muslim	68.3	53.95	-(2.05)	69.79	35.6	-(4.88)	34.17	14.91	-(2.75)	11.37	7.84	-(0.50)
	TOTAL	58.47	41.81	-(2.38)	47.54	28.39	-(2.74)	23.69	9.29	-(2.06)	9.56	5.01	-(0.65)

Source: Authors estimate based on 61st and 68th round of NSS data.

Above table 10 reveals poverty across religious groups where Muslims are found to be comparatively poorer in all the region of Karnataka, more than 60% of Muslim poor against Hindu religion in HK region and Belagavi division because of high percentage of Muslim population approximately 12.91% of Karnataka and it can similarly found in all districts but Muslims have a stronger presence in Gulbarga, Bidar, Raichur, Bijapur, Ballari, Belagavi and Dharwad districts these districts are comes under HK region and Belagavi division but the Hindu populations are equally distributed in all the divisions. The higher MPCE is in Bengaluru division of Rs.1384 in 61st round (2004-05) and Rs.3690 in 68th round (2011) of rural area followed by other division. In rural area higher the MPCE in Mysuru division of Rs.638.6 in 61st round (2004-05) and Rs.1696 in 68th round (2011) followed by other divisions. But the lower MPCE is in HK region of both rural and urban areas of both NSS round.

Table 11: Poverty Incidences by General Education Level of the Household Head

Level of Education	Social Groups								Religion Groups			
	ST		SC		OBC		Others		Hindu		Muslim	
	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th
Rural Household												
NL	57.04	38.55	63.72	51.29	47.49	27.91	30.24	30.55	49.09	35.03	49.63	32.55
LWFS	(* *)	(* *)	47.06	(* *)	3.29	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	2.26	(* *)	55.70	(* *)
LBBP	38.26	(* *)	49.43	(* *)	23.89	(* *)	44.01	(* *)	36.46	(* *)	27.58	(* *)
Primary	26.77	(* *)	51.57	(* *)	28.72	(* *)	24.30	13.94	32.80	5.83	15.45	(* *)
Middle	38.54	23.78	43.62	37.59	15.32	22.81	15.78	27.17	20.42	19.57	3.64	54.02
Secondary	(* *)	(* *)	35.22	4.58	14.08	7.70	7.92	26.17	14.14	10.96	9.95	(* *)
HS	(* *)	28.61	35.28	15.70	19.12	16.88	13.27	13.09	21.98	17.85	(* *)	8.01
DC/C	(* *)	45.65	0.00	1.81	14.34	22.34	0	1.31	8.11	15.47	(* *)	11.39
Graduate	(* *)	(* *)	23.27	52.29	27.78	5.84	6.03	10.57	15.18	17.31	(* *)	(* *)
PG&A	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	7.87	(* *)	2.49	(* *)	2.45	(* *)	(* *)
Urban Household												
NL	76.91	59.16	58.60	43.23	51.99	34.05	43.38	42.64	50.55	38.44	57.77	46.97
LWFS	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	0.9	(* *)	(* *)	43.96	(* *)	(* *)
LBBP	56.81	(* *)	57.77	(* *)	53.64	(* *)	46.44	(* *)	50.16	(* *)	59.34	(* *)
Primary	70.22	(* *)	47.75	(* *)	54.45	(* *)	25.66	(* *)	35.45	(* *)	59.20	(* *)
Middle	39.79	31.60	40.06	55.60	16.15	30.33	10.20	19.09	17.40	30.21	23.34	29.71
Secondary	24.96	22.68	19.56	35.49	23.78	19.95	5.42	12.72	14.11	17.43	17.52	27.87
HS	6.28	22.47	28.48	11.20	7.81	12.06	13.20	17.41	15.06	12.57	11.92	18.82
D/CC	(* *)	12.63	(* *)	12.63	2.48	8.77	0.55	7.12	1.75	9.20	(* *)	10.38
Graduate	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	1.15	6.43	8.14	0.63	8.03	1.87	4.76	(* *)	19.69
PG&A	(* *)	38.40	(* *)	(* *)	(* *)	2.99	(* *)	0.41	(* *)	0.29	(* *)	15.9
Source: Authors estimate based on 61 st and 68 th round of NSS data. Note: NL= Not Literate, LWFS=Literate without formal schooling, LBBP=Literate but below primary, HS=Higher secondary & PG&A= Post Graduate & Above. (* *) are excluded because of small sample size.												

The State has embarked on significant reforms in the education sector with increased public investment to ensure access, equity and quality in education, with community involvement and growth of literacy during the 2001–2011 decade shows that Karnataka has achieved significant progress from 66.64 per cent in 2001 to 75.60 per cent in 2011 (Karnataka, 2013-14). Above the table 11 shows that, Poverty Incidence by General Education Level of the Household Head during 2004-05 to 2011-12 in Karnataka, in religious group OBC and Others are better educated except SCs and STs in rural and urban areas, poor household head by level of education was higher in the 61st round it has been reduced in 68th round across social and religious groups in a rural and urban area.

Table 12: Poverty Incidence by Type of Ration card of Household Head

Type of Ration Card	Social Groups								Religious Group			
	ST		SC		OBC		Others		Hindu		Muslim	
	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th
Rural												
Antyodaya	35.91	21.41	68.82	31.73	54.30	27.84	30.55	28.92	53.11	24.73	43.89	68.08
BPL	56.90	37.21	64.34	37.88	44.87	21.95	38.71	31.38	50.80	27.29	45.85	36.11
Others	51.84	17.55	48.66	16.66	25.44	15.75	12.37	9.85	24.23	14.94	21.42	5.02
Urban												
Antyodaya	1	86.55	12.89	64.65	63.74	67.15	20.88	36.08	32.20	62.91	61.41	49.15
BPL	85.25	51.69	67.77	30.31	61.02	25.70	56.11	39.63	60.58	25.21	81.69	40.33
Others	40.97	4.67	23.93	11.10	21.09	7.12	8.08	4.45	13.60	6.95	22.65	7.69

Source: Authors estimate based on 61st and 68th round of NSS data.

Above table 12, shows that, Poverty Incidence by Type of Ration card of Household Head during 2004-05 to 2011-12 in Karnataka, the incidence of poverty among the different type of ration cards in urban and rural area for both rounds irrespective of castes and religion is extensive. The ration cards of all types observed to be more in urban areas compare to rural areas and proportion of BPL card holders among social and religious groups found more than other type of cards. Among different religious groups Muslim beneficiaries hold more BPL and Antyodaya cards during the period of 2004-05 to 2011-12 in Karnataka.

Table 13: Poverty Incidences by Uses of Lighting of Household

Sl.No	Lighting Type	Social Groups								Religious Group			
		ST		SC		OBC		Others		Hindu		Muslim	
		61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th
1	Kerosene	55.67	81.28	59.14	34.14	49.57	51.37	48.86	33.34	52.61	50.82	55.06	63.09
2	Electricity	50.85	28.59	53.57	33.12	32.83	18.14	18.49	15.46	32.06	20	37.14	26.25
3	Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		51.17	31.5	54.37	33.19	34.73	18.81	20.13	15.63	34.2	20.63	38.33	26.87

Source: Authors estimate based on 61st and 68th round of NSS data.

Note: Others: consist of Gas, Candle, Other Oil and No Lighting Arrangement

Above the table 13 show that, poverty incidences of households of lighting arrangements are Kerosene, Electricity, Gas, Candle and others arrangements in rural and urban areas of both 61st and 68th round in the state. Higher the proportion of household is using kerosene in both 61st and 68th round across socio-religious groups. Among them, SCs, Others and Hindus households are decline the proportion uses of kerosene between period of 2004-05 to 2011-12. Second higher the proportion of households is using Electricity, but it is declining of across socio-religious groups between the study periods and others.

Table 14: Poverty Incidences by Uses of Cooking Type of Household

Sl.No	Cooking Type	Social Groups								Religious Group			
		ST		SC		OBC		Others		Hindu		Muslim	
		61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th	61 st	68 th
1	Firewood	53.49	37.41	61.61	40.3	43.03	27.45	31.42	28.64	43.49	29.56	53.97	43.62
2	LPG	25.67	1.4	7.64	7.64	10.22	5.56	3.43	4.27	6.09	4.7	9.26	9.46
3	Gobar Gas	-	-	-	-	-	8.58	4.02	-	2.48	5.4	-	-
4	Kerosene	16.59	47.21	14.76	43.41	18.76	5.7	6.12	10.88	11.82	18.55	22.85	8.89
5	NCA	81.75	54.09	48.84	15.17	17.47	5.99	14.07	0.96	25.06	6.57	17.86	-
6	Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		51.17	31.5	54.37	33.19	34.73	18.81	20.13	15.63	34.2	20.63	38.33	26.87

Source: Authors estimate based on 61st and 68th round of NSS data.
Note: NCA= No Cooking Arrangement, Others: consist of Electricity, Coal, Dung Cake and Charcoal

Above the table 14 exhibit that, poverty incidence of households are uses of Cooking type is Firewood, LPG, Gobar Gas, Kerosene, NCA, Electricity, Coal, Dung Cake and Charcoal. Among these categories higher the proportion of households are uses of Firewood across social and religious groups between periods of 2004-05 to 2011-12. Is there higher the households of SCs in among social groups and Muslims in religious groups are uses of firewood and respectively as uses of LPG and Kerosene. Among socio-religious groups is there OBC, Others and Hindu households are uses of Gobar gas and other cooking type of Electricity, Coal, Dung Cake and Charcoal are cannot uses even single households of both rural and urban areas between the study periods of 2004-05 and 2011-12.

CONCLUSION:

Poverty of India is of great importance today even thought so many measures have been taken by various Governments and International Organization to alleviate the global poverty. Since the Government of Karnataka also has initiated various poverty alleviation programmers in both rural and urban areas have achieved to eradicate extreme poverty in the state. The study examines district wise and division wise status of poverty across socio-religious groups in Karnataka by making use of 61st and 68th round of NSSO Household Consumption Expenditure Data. There is significance between poverty across socio-religious groups in both round of rural and urban areas in Karnataka and poverty to education at district level and division level across socio-religious groups. To find out expose that while poverty in the state reduced by total 12.74%, points between 2004-05 and 2011-12 in Karnataka. Remnants the incidence of poverty in social group wise reduced by 19.67% in Scheduled Tribes, 20.66% in Scheduled Caste, 15.9% in OBC & 4.5% and the estimates poverty in religion wise reduced by 13.45% in Hindu and 11.46% in Muslims religion. Higher the poverty ration in HK region across social groups of 57% poverty in rural area and 58.64% of poverty in urban area followed by rest of divisions. In HK region where STs Poverty is very high of 73.73% (2004-05), is fastest declining by 28.20% in (2011-12) it was around -6.5 points reduced by every

year of study period and respectively reduced by SCs 1.34, OBC -38 and Others -1.24 in rural area and also higher the poverty ratio seen in urban areas.

REFERENCES:

1. Rangarajan, C. "Report of the Expert group to Review the Methodology for Measurement of Poverty" Government of India 2014.
2. Panagariya Arvind & Mukim Megha. "A comprehensive analysis of poverty in India" working paper no. 2013; 01.
3. Deaton Angus and Tarozzi Alessandro "Prices and poverty in India" Research Program in Development Studies Princeton University July 29, 2000; (4),
4. Himanshu. What are These New Poverty Estimates and What Do They Imply? *Economic and Political Weekly: October ; 2008; XLII(43)25-31: 38-43.*
5. Arora Akash & Singh P S "Poverty across Social and Religious Groups in Uttar Pradesh an Interregional Analysis" *Economic & Political Weekly* 2015;52
6. Borooah K. Vani "Caste, Inequality, and Poverty in India" *Review of Development Economics*, 2005; 9(3): 399–414
7. Bradshaw K. Ted "Theories of Poverty and Anti-Poverty Programs in Community Development" RPRC Working Paper No. 06-05 2005.
8. Chandra Hukum and U. C. Sud "Estimation of District Level Poor Households in the State of Uttar Pradesh in India by Combining NSSO Survey and Census Data" 2010.
9. Deaton Angus and Dreze Jean "Poverty and Inequality in India: A Re-Examination" *Economic and Political Weekly* September, 2002.
10. Jha Raghendra "Reducing Poverty and Inequality in India: Has Liberalization Helped?" Working paper no. 204 (UNU/WIDER) 2000.
11. Karnataka, E.S "Economics Survey of Karnataka" Planning, Programmes Monitoring and Statistic Department, Bengaluru 2013-14
12. Methodology for Estimation of Poverty report, Planning Commission Govt. of India 2014.
13. Murgai Rinku et.all "Measuring poverty in Karnataka the Regional Dimension" *Economic and Political Weekly* January 25th, 2003.
14. Meenakshi V J and Ray Ranjan 'Poverty, Household Size and Female Headed Household in India 1999
15. Mutatkar Rohit "Social Group Disparities and Poverty in India" Working Paper (IGIDR) Series No. WP-2005-004-2005.

16. Rani Anita “Poverty in Punjab: A District Level Study” 2011 Ph.D. Thesis
17. Suryanarayana M H “Intra-State Economic Disparities: Karnataka and Maharashtra”
Economic & Political Weekly 2009; xliv (26) & (27).
18. Ranjan Ray and Geoffrey Lancaster “On Setting the Poverty Line Based on Estimated
Nutrient Prices With Application to the Socially Disadvantaged Groups in India During
the Reforms Period” Discussion Paper 2004-(09) ISSN 1443-8593-ISBN 1 86295 216 7.
19. Tilak B. G Jandhyala “Education poverty in Karnataka” National Institute of Education
Planning and Administration”, New-Delhi 2010