



“शिक्षा मानव को बन्धनों से मुक्त करती है और आज के युग में तो यह लोकतन्त्र की भावना का आधार भी है। जन्म तथा अन्य कारणों से उत्पन्न जाति एवं वर्गगत विषमताओं को दूर करते हुए मनुष्य को इन सबसे ऊपर उठाती है।”

— इन्दिरा गाँधी



ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

“Education is a liberating force, and in our age it is also a democratising force, cutting across the barriers of caste and class, smoothing out inequalities imposed by birth and other circumstances.”

— Indira Gandhi

Block

3

URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA

UNIT 1

Urbanization in India – An Overview **5**

UNIT 2

Migration and Urban Problems **23**

UNIT 3

Urban Poverty Unemployment and Development
Interventions **42**

ORIGINAL PROGRAMME DESIGN COMMITTEE

Prof. Amita Shah Gujarat Institute of Development Research Ahmedabad	Prof. P. Radhakrishnan Madras Institute of Development Studies, Chennai
Prof. S. K. Bhati Jamia Millia Islamia University, New Delhi	Prof. Ramashray Roy (Rtd) Centre for Study of Developing Societies New Delhi
Prof. J. S. Gandhi (Rtd) Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi	Prof. R. P. Singh (Rtd) Ex-Vice-Chancellor, MPUAT, Udaipur
Prof. Gopal Krishnan (Rtd) Punjab University, Chandigarh	Prof. K. Vijayaraghavan Indian Agriculture Research Institute, New Delhi
Prof. S. Janakrajan (Rtd) Madras Institute of Development Studies Chennai.	Dr. Nilima Shrivastava, IGONU, New Delhi
Prof. Kumar B. Das Utkal University, Bhubaneswar	Prof. B. K. Pattanaik, IGNOU, New Delhi
Prof. Nadeem Mohsin (Rtd) A.N.Sinha Institute of Social Sciences, Patna	Dr. Nehal A. Farooquee, IGNOU, New Delhi
	Dr. P. V. K. Sasidhar, IGNOU, New Delhi

REVISED PROGRAMME DESIGN COMMITTEE

Late Prof. T S Papola(Rtd) Institute of Studies in Industrial Development New Delhi	Dr, S, Rubina Naqvi Hindu College, University of Delhi, Delhi
Prof. S. Janakrajan (Rtd) Madras Institute of Development Studies Chennai.	Prof. Nadeem Mohsin (Rtd) A.N.Sinha Institute of Social Sciences, Patna
Prof. S. K. Bhati Jamia Millia Islamia University, New Delhi	Prof. Rajesh, Delhi University, New Delhi
Prof. Preet Rustagi Institute of Human Development, New Delhi	Prof. B. K. Pattanaik, IGNOU, New Delhi
Prof. Gopal Iyer (Rtd) Punjab University, Chandigarh	Prof. Nehal A. Farooquee, IGNOU, New Delhi
Dr. S Srinivasa Rao Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi	Prof. P. V. K. Sasidhar, IGNOU, New Delhi
	Dr. Pradeep Kumar, IGNOU, New Delhi
	Dr. Grace Don Nemching, IGNOU, New Delhi
	Dr. Nisha Varghese, IGNOU, New Delhi

COURSE PREPARATION TEAM

Units Writers:

Dr. Vasudha Chattopadhyaya (Unit 1 and 2)
IGNOU, New Delhi

Dr. Debolina Kundun (Unit 3)
NIUA, New Delhi

Editors:

Prof. T. S. Papola (Content Editor)
Institute for Studies in Industrial Development

Prof. B.K. Pattanaik
IGNOU, New Delhi

Prof. Nehal A.Farooquee
IGNOU, New Delhi

Prof. P.V.K.Sasidhar
IGNOU, New Delhi

Programme Coordinators: Prof. P.V.K. Sasidhar, Prof. B.K. Pattanaik, Prof. Nehal A. Farooquee

Course Coordinator : Prof. Nehal A. Farooquee

PRODUCTION TEAM

Mr. S. Burman Dy. Registrar (Publication) MPDD, IGNOU, New Delhi	Mr. K.N. Mohanan Asst. Registrar (Publication) MPDD, IGNOU, New Delhi	Mr. Babu Lal Rewadia Section Officer (Publication) MPDD, IGNOU, New Delhi
--	---	---

December, 2018

© Indira Gandhi National Open University, 2018

ISBN: 978-93-88498-16-6

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Indira Gandhi National Open University.

Further information on the Indira Gandhi National Open University courses may be obtained from the University's office at Maidan Garhi, New Delhi.

Printed and published on behalf of the Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi by the Registrar, MPDD, IGNOU, New Delhi.

Laser Typeset by Tessa Media & Computers, C-206, A.F.E.-II, Okhla, New Delhi.

Printed at : Raj Printers, A-9, Sector B-2, Tronica City, Loni (Gzb.)

BLOCK 3 URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA

Urbanisation is a process of transformation of traditional rural economy in modern urban economy. It is a long-term process and signifies progressive concentration of population in urban unit. As per the 2001 Census, India had a total population of 1028 million, which makes India the second largest country in terms of population after China. India's urban population was 286 million in 2001. This means 27.82 per cent of the total population were living in urban areas in 2001. As a discipline, it is multidisciplinary in nature representing an intersection of architectural social, behavioral, engineering, and financial and management sciences. Urban development may mean any one of these, depending upon our focus. Urban development can also be defined as a process of developing and utilizing natural and human resources, technologies, infrastructural facilities, institutions and organizations, and government policies and programme to encourage and speed up economic growth in urban areas, to provide more employment opportunities, infrastructure and governance to improve the quality of urban life

Unit 1, **Urbanization in India – An Overview**, focuses on urban areas in India, the level and trend of urbanization in India, the distribution of urban population by size class of towns in India. Urban population of India is larger than the total population of many countries. Despite this important fact, one has to accept that India with about 27 per cent of its population living in its urban areas is less urbanised. Also the spread of its urban population is not even. It also discusses the distribution of slums in urban India and in million-plus cities in India.

Unit 2, **Migration and Urban Problems**, describes various reasons for the rural-urban migration, like the push and pull factors. The major push factors are natural disasters, poor living conditions, agricultural change, unemployment, war and conflict etc. Some of the major pull factors are employment, higher incomes, better healthcare and education, attraction to urban facilities and way of life and protection from conflict etc.

Unit 3, **Urban Poverty, Unemployment and Development Interventions**, unit discusses about the urban poverty, unemployment and development initiatives taken by the government for tackling these problems in urban areas.

UNIT 1 URBANISATION IN INDIA: AN OVERVIEW

Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Urbanization: Meaning and Concept
- 1.3 Level and Trend of Urbanisation in India
- 1.4 Level of Urbanisation in India by States and Union Territories
- 1.5 Distribution of Population in Different Size Classes of Towns in India
- 1.6 Problems of Basic Amenities in Urban India
- 1.7 Challenges of Urbanization
- 1.8 Let Us Sum Up
- 1.9 Key Words
- 1.10 References and Selected Readings
- 1.11 Check Your Progress – Possible Answers

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Urbanization is an index of transformation from traditional rural economies to modern industrial one. It is a long term process. India's urbanization is often termed as over-urbanization, pseudo-urbanization. The big cities attained inordinately large population size leading to virtual collapse in the urban services and followed by basic problems in the field of housing, slum, water, infrastructure, quality of life etc. Urbanization is a product of demographic explosion and poverty induced rural-urban migration. Urbanization is occurring not due to urban pull but due to rural push. Globalization, liberalization, privatization are addressing negative process for urbanization in India.

After studying this unit, you should be able to

- Define *urban* area in India;
- Analyse the level and trend of urbanization in India;
- Discuss the distribution of urban population by size class of towns in India;
- Discuss the distribution of slums in urban India and in million-plus cities in India;
- Discuss the state of basic amenities in urban India; and
- Explain the problems of urbanization in India.

1.2 URBANIZATION: MEANING AND CONCEPT

Generally we see urban centres i.e. cities and towns of India are getting crowded day by day. We shall study how the urban centres are getting crowded, i.e. the nature of urbanisation in India in this Unit. But for that first you should be familiar with the basic concepts relating to urbanisation. The definition of *urban* differs from country to country. Any urban area constitutes of towns. Before going to the concept of *urban* it is necessary to know who provides the data about total

population in India. In India, the Census of India enumerates the total population of the country. The Census Act, 1948 forms the basis for the conduct of population Census in independent India. The Census of India enumerates the total population of the country every ten years. The first census after independence was in 1951 and the latest one was in 2001. The final population data are presented separately for rural and urban areas. The unit of classification is *town* for urban areas and *village* for rural areas. The Census of India, 2001 adopted the following definition for urban areas:

- 1) All statutory places with a municipality, corporation, cantonment board or notified area committee, etc. - are called *statutory* towns and are so declared by the state.
- 2) A place satisfying the following three criteria simultaneously are called *census* towns. The criteria are:
 - a minimum population of 5,000;
 - at least 75 per cent of male working population engaged in non-agricultural pursuits;
 - a density of population of at least 400 per sq. km. (1,000 per sq. mile)

Cities are urban areas with more than 100,000 population. Urban areas below 100,000 are called *towns* in India. We shall learn more about size class of towns later.

Another important concept is that of *Urban Agglomerations*. Urban Agglomeration is a continuous urban spread constituting a town and its adjoining urban growths or two or more physical contiguous towns together and any adjoining urban outgrowths of such towns. Examples of outgrowths are railway colonies, university campus, military area and so on that may come up near a city or statutory town outside its statutory limits but within the revenue limits of a village contiguous to the town or city. Each such individual area by itself may not itself satisfy the minimum population limit to qualify it to be treated as an independent urban unit but may deserve to be clubbed with the town as a contiguous urban spread. In 2001 it was decided that one of the constituent towns should be a statutory town and the total population of the urban agglomeration should not be less than 20000 as per 1991 census. With these two criteria, an urban agglomeration can be constituted under the following circumstances:

- A city or town with a continuous outgrowth,
- Two or more adjoining towns with or without outgrowths,
- A city or one or more adjoining towns with their outgrowths all of which together form a continuous spread.

In the first census of independent India in 1951, uniform criteria were not applied by the states to identify the urban centres. As such this census might have overestimated the urban population. Thus 1961 Census tried to standardize the concept of urban centre. This resulted in declassification of a large number of towns that were identified by 1951 Census. Thus urban growth rate reduced during 1951-61 due to this definitional problem. The types of civic status have also undergone change, e.g. publications of 1971 Census excludes *town committee*, which was included in the 1961 Census. Also all the states did not follow the definition of census towns strictly enough. As a result there lies a problem of comparability of data across time and space (Sivaramakrishnan, Kundu and Singh, 2005).

We have learnt here:

- The definition of urban area, cities and towns in India.
- The definition of Urban Agglomeration in India.

Activity 1

Find out the city, town and Urban Agglomeration nearest to your place.

1.3 LEVEL AND TREND OF URBANISATION IN INDIA

Urbanisation is a process of transformation of traditional rural economy in modern urban economy. It is a long-term process and signifies progressive concentration of population in urban unit. As per the 2001 Census, India had a total population of 1028 million, which makes India the second largest country in terms of population after China. India's urban population was 286 million in 2001. This means 27.82 per cent of the total population were living in urban areas in 2001. The percentage of urban population to total population is called the *level of urbanisation* or *degree of urbanisation*. It may be denoted as,

$$UN = UP / TP \times 100,$$

Where UN is the degree of urbanization,

UP is the total urban population of the country and

TP is total population of the country

India's urban population in 2001 was 286 million and total population was 1028 million, thus in 2001, the level of urbanization was,

$$UN = 286/1028 \times 100 = 27.82$$

India's level of urbanisation 27.82 is quite low compared to that of developed countries which varies between 57 and 100 per cent. India is relatively less urbanised than even some of the developing countries. Developing countries like Pakistan with 35 per cent, Nigeria with 48 per cent; the Philippines with 63 per cent, Egypt with 43 per cent and Indonesia with 48 per cent have a higher level of urbanisation than India (UN, 2005). However, in terms of absolute numbers, India's urban population of 286 million in 2001 is more than the total population of many countries.

The annual gain in percentage of urban population shows the increase in level of urbanisation per year and is shown in Table 1.1. Further the annual rate of gain in percentage of urban population shows the rate of increase of level of urbanization per year and is shown in Table 1.1.

Now you know what is the level of urbanization of India. But how do you know how it is growing? Urban growth is measured by the increase in total urban population over the initial population. When calculated between two decades, it is called *decadal urban growth* and can be denoted as follows:

Decadal urban growth rate between P1 and P2 = (Urban population in P2 - Urban population in P1 / Urban population in P1) $\times$ 100,

Where, P1 is the initial year

P2 is the final year

For example, the decadal urban growth rate between 1999 and 2001 can be shown as follows:

Decadal urban growth rate between 1999 and 2001 = $(\text{Urban population in 2001} - \text{Urban population in 1991} / \text{Urban population in 1991}) \times 100 = (286.12 - 217.61 / 217.61) / 100 = 31.48$

The decadal rate of growth of urban population in India has been above 25 per cent in all the census years since 1941 (Table 1.1). But how do we know what is the pace at which urban population is growing? The percentage of annual exponential growth rate of urban population shows at what pace is the urban population growing. From Table 1.1 we find that the growth increased from 0.03 per cent per year in 1911 to 3.47 per cent per year in 1951. After that the pace decreased to 2.34 per cent per year in 1961. This decrease is attributed to strict adherence of definitions as is given in Footnote 1 below. The next two decades of 1971, 1981 saw the population growing at faster rates of 3.21 and 3.81 per cent per year respectively. Thereafter the pace of growth has started declining and was 2.77 per cent per year in 2001.

Table 1.1. Trend Of Urbanisation In India

Census year	Total population	Urban population	No. of towns/UAs	% of urban population to total population	Decadal urban growth rate(%)	Annual exponential	Tempo of urbanisation (Per cent per year)	
							Annual gain in percentage of urban population	Annual rate of gain in percentage of urban population
1901	238396327	25851873	1827	10.84	—	—	—	—
1911	252093390	25941633	1815	10.29	0.35	0.03	-0.06	-0.51
1921	251321213	28086167	1949	11.18	8.27	0.79	0.09	0.86
1931	278977238	33455989	2072	11.99	19.12	1.75	0.08	0.72
1941	318660580	44153297	2250	13.86	31.97	2.77	0.19	1.56
1951	361088090	62443709	2843	17.29	41.42	3.47	0.34	2.47
1961	439234771	78936603	2365	17.97	26.41	2.34	0.07	0.41
1971	548159652	109113977	2590	19.91	38.23	3.21	0.19	1.08
1981	683329097	159462547	3378	23.34	46.14	3.83	0.34	1.72
1991	846302688	217611012	3768	25.71	36.47	3.09	0.24	1.02
2001	1,028,610,328	286119689	5161	27.82	31.48	2.77	0.21	0.82

Source: Census of India, 1991, Paper I of 1992, vol.II, Final population Totals 2001

Note: 1. Including Projected Population of Assam in 1981.
2. Including Projected Population of Jammu and Kashmir in 1991.
3. Excludes population of Mao-Maram, Paomata and Purul sub-divisions of Senapati district of Manipur in 2001.

In 1901, the total urban population of India was only 25.85 million and by 2001, it increased to 286.12 million registering an increase of more than ten times. But the increase was not even throughout the period. The years from 1901 to 1921 were marked by natural disasters and as such were characterised by decline or slow growth in the proportion of urban population to total population. The country experienced much political disturbance in the following two decades from 1921 to 1941. During this period the population in urban areas increased owing to the influx of refugees to the cities. This influx of refugees continued up to 1951.

Just after Independence, the 1951 Census recorded a decadal growth rate of 41.42 per cent in the urban population for the period 1941-51. In 1951, 62.44 million people were living in towns and this increased to 78.93 million in 1961. The percentage of urban to total population was only 10.84 in 1901; it became 17.29 in 1951. However the decadal growth rate came down to 26.41 during 1951-61.¹ With the onset of Five Year Plans, the next two decades saw an increase in the decadal growth rate of urban population, as it became 38.23 during 1961-71 and 46.14 during 1971-81. However, it has come down to 36.47 during 1981-91 and further to 31.48 during 1991-2001. From 109.11 million in 1971 the total urban population grew to 217.61 million in 1991; thus almost doubling in two decades. It doubled between 1961 and 1981 also.

The annual rate of gain in percentage of urban population was found to be 1.08, 1.72, 1.02 and 0.82 during 1961-71, 1971-81 and 1981-91 and 1991-2001 respectively (Table 1.1). The decline in rate of urbanisation can be explained in terms of the components of population growth like natural increase, net migration from rural to urban areas, increase due to new towns and changes in the jurisdiction of urban areas. It can be written as follows:

Urban growth rate = natural growth rate + migration rate + rate of increase due to new towns + rate of increase due to changes in jurisdiction.

Some scholars attribute the decline to under-enumeration of urban population while others present different plausible explanations. One of the important explanations is decline in rural-urban migration, identification of relatively fewer new towns and increasing concentration of population in the rural areas adjacent to large urban centres (Premi, 1991).

We have learnt here about the level and trend of urbanization in India. Now try and answer the questions in *Check Your Progress 1*.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: a) Answer the following questions in about 50 words.

b) Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

1) What are the definition of urban areas according to Census of India, 2001?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) What was India's level of urbanization and decadal urban growth rate of India in 2001?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.4 LEVEL OF URBANISATION IN INDIA BY STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES

One distinct characteristic of urbanisation of India is its lopsided nature. The spread of urban population is not homogenous; rather it shows an imbalance. Some states are more urbanised than others (Table 1.2). Goa (49.76%) and Mizoram (49.63%) were the most urbanised states. But these are small states. Among the major states in India Tamil Nadu with 44.04 per cent urban population was the most urbanised state in 2001 followed by Maharashtra (42.43%), Gujarat (37.56%), Karnataka (33.99%) and Punjab (33.92%). The states of Andhra Pradesh (27.30%), Madhya Pradesh (26.46%), Uttaranchal (25.67%), Rajasthan (23.39%), Chattishgarh (20.09%) Uttar Pradesh (20.78%), Orissa (14.99%), Assam (12.90%), Bihar (10.46%) had urbanisation level less than the average for urban India. Harayana (28.92%) and West Bengal (27.97%) were marginally above the national average.

Table 1.2: Level of Urbanisation in India, States and Union Territories, 2001, 1991

Sl No. State	State/Union Territory	Level of urbanisation in	
		2001	1991
	India*	27.82	25.71
1.	Andhra Pradesh	27.30	26.78
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	20.75	12.80
3.	Assam	12.90	11.10
4.	Bihar	10.46	12.47
5.	Chattishgarh	20.09	N.A
6.	Goa	49.76	41.01
7.	Gujarat	37.36	34.49
8.	Harayana	28.92	24.63
9.	Himachal Pradesh	9.80	8.69
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	24.81	23.83
11.	Jharkhand	22.24	N.A
12.	Karnataka	33.99	30.92

13.	Kerala	25.96	26.39
14.	Madhya Pradesh	26.46	23.18
15.	Maharashtra	42.43	38.69
16.	Manipur	26.58	27.52
17.	Meghalaya	19.58	18.60
18.	Mizoram	49.63	46.10
19.	Nagaland	17.23	17.21
20.	Orissa	14.99	13.38
21.	Punjab	33.92	29.55
22.	Rajasthan	23.39	22.88
23.	Sikkim	11.07	9.10
24.	Tamil Nadu	44.04	34.15
25.	Tripura	17.06	15.29
26.	Uttar Pradesh	20.78	19.84
27.	Uttaranchal	25.67	N.A.
28.	West Bengal	27.97	27.48

Union Territory

1.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	32.63	26.71
2.	Chandigarh	89.77	89.69
3.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	22.89	8.47
4.	Daman & Diu	36.25	46.80
5.	Delhi	93.18	89.93
6.	Lakshadweep	44.46	56.31
7.	Pondicherry	66.57	64.00

Source: *Census of India 2001, 1991, Final Population Totals*

Note : * India excludes the estimated population of Mao Maram, Paomata & Purul subdivision of Senapati district of Manipur

1.5 DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION IN DIFFERENT SIZE CLASSES OF TOWNS IN INDIA

The Census of India classifies towns and urban agglomerations in six size classes according to their population size. The classes are: Class I – 100,000 and above, termed as city; Class II- 50,000-99,999; Class III-20, 000-49,999; Class IV-10, 000-19,999; Class V- 5,000-9,999; Class VI-Less than 5,000.

Table1. 3. Distribution of Population in Different size Classes of Towns in India in 2001

Size Class	Population Range for Size-Class	Number of Towns	%age	Population	%age
All Classes	All Population	5161	100.00	286,119,689	100.00
Class I	1,00000 & above	441	8.54	178,224,290	62.29
Class II	50,000-99,999	496	9.61	34,451,500	12.04
Class III	20,000- 49,999	1388	26.89	42,119,280	14.72
Class IV	10,000- 19999	1561	30.25	22,593,015	7.90
Class V	5,000-9,999	1041	20.17	7,889,668	2.76
Class VI	Below 5000	234	4.53	841,936	0.29

Source: *Urban Statistics Handbook, 2008, National Institute of Urban Affairs*

Concentration of urban population is much more evident in the distribution of urban population among the cities. A large percentage of the total urban population lives in big cities. Around 62 per cent of the urban population was found concentrated in the 441 class I² cities while 38 percent of the urban population were residing in 4720 class II, III, IV, V, and VI towns in 2001. This means that 62 per cent of the urban population were staying in 8.5 per cent of the urban areas in 2001.

1.5.1 Population in Million–Plus Cities in India

Table 1.4: Cities Having More than one Million Population (Within Municipal Limits) in 2001

S.No.	Name of the city	Civic Status	State/ Union Territory	Total Population
1	Greater Mumbai	M.Corp	Maharashtra	11,914,398
2.	Delhi	M.Corp	Delhi	9,817,439
3.	Kolkata	M.Corp	West Bengal	4,580,544
4.	Bangalore	M.Corp	Karnataka	4,292,223
5.	Chennai	M.Corp	Tamil Nadu	4,216,268
6.	Ahmedabad	M.Corp	Gujarat	3,515,361
7.	Hyderabad	M.Corp	Andhra Pradesh	3,449,878
8.	Pune	M.Corp	Maharashtra	2,540,069
9.	Kanpur	M.Corp	Uttar Pradesh	2,532,138
10.	Surat	M.Corp	Gujarat	2,433,787
11.	Jaipur	M.Corp	Rajasthan	2,324,319
12.	Lucknow	M.Corp	Uttar Pradesh	2,207,340
13.	Nagpur	M.Corp	Maharashtra	2,051,320
14.	Indore	M.Corp	Madhya Pradesh	1,597,441

15.	Bhopal	M.Corp	Madhya Pradesh	1,433,875
16.	Ludhiana	M.Corp	Punjab	1,395,053
17.	Patna	M.Corp	Bihar	1,376,950
18.	Vadodara	M.Corp	Gujarat	1,306,035
19.	Thane	M.Corp	Maharashtra	1,261,517
20.	Agra	M.Corp	Uttar Pradesh	1,259,979
21.	Kalyan-Dombivili	M.Corp	Maharashtra	1,193,266
22.	Varanasi	M.Corp	Uttar Pradesh	1,100,748
23.	Nashik	M.Corp	Maharashtra	1,076,967
24.	Meerut	M.Corp	Uttar Pradesh	1,074,229
25.	Faridabad	M.Corp	Haryana	1,054,981
26.	Haora	M.Corp	West Bengal	1,008,704
27.	Pimpri-chinchwad	M.Corp	Maharashtra	1,006,417
	Total			73,021,246

Source: *Census of India, Primary Census Abstract, 2001*

Note: M. Corp stands for Municipal Corporation.

The number of million-plus cities has increased from 12 in 1981 to 23 in 1991 and to 27 in 2001. The number of million plus Urban Agglomerations has increased to 35 in 2001. Not only has the number of million plus cities doubled from 1981 to 1991, the percentage share of urban population staying in the million plus cities has increased from 26.7 per cent in 1981 to 33 percent in 1991; however, the percentage decreased to 25.5 per cent in 2001. The five metropolitan cities of Delhi, Bombay, Kolkata, Chennai and Bangalore had around 12 per cent of the total urban population among them in 2001, which shows that they are the main centres of survival for large numbers of the urban population. Massive migration of landless agricultural labourers and marginal farmers from the rural areas to the large cities has continued over the decades. These unskilled and untrained migrants skip the smaller towns and arrive at the large metropolises in search of a livelihood leading to urban over-congestion (Mukherji, 1996).

One thing needs to be mentioned here that modest urbanisation of India has not been accompanied with a shift in the occupational structure. The proportion of urban population to total population has increased over the decades since Independence. But the percentages of total workers engaged in the primary sector have remained far above those engaged in secondary and tertiary sectors.³ Thus large cities, especially the metropolitan cities with the tertiary sector as economic base have become the centres of concentration of urban population. These large urban centres are based on tertiary sector and cannot provide adequate employment to these migrants in the organised sector and as such they get absorbed in the urban informal sector (Mukherji, 1996). The peripheral areas around the large metropolitan cities have shown a high growth rate in the last decade confirming the fact that the poor urban population is living in the less costly peripheral rural areas from where they commute to the city to work. This is clearly visible in the growth rate of rural areas around Delhi, which have shown around 100 per cent higher growth rate than that of the metropolis of

Delhi during 1981-91. Cities such as Hyderabad, Jaipur, Chandigarh, Bhopal, Pune have also seen large in-migration in their peripheral areas. The smaller urban centres do not provide the migrants the opportunity to get absorbed even in the informal sector; as such the migrants approach the large cities in search of a livelihood. The continuous neglect of small and medium towns has made them economically unattractive to job seekers. Scholars have found that “probability of a person being poor works out as low in a large city compared to any other urban centre” (Kundu and Sarangi, 2007). Thus in effect the rural-urban migrants flock to the large urban centres in India. It must be emphasised here that rural-urban migration in India is not associated with any vertical shift in the labour force from the agricultural sector to the urbanised industrial sector as in western countries. Poverty stricken rural-urban migrants, both men and women migrate to join the urban informal sector as porters, hawkers, domestic servants, construction workers and so on (Mukherji, 1981). Some of them add to urban poverty. The next section will discuss the distribution of slums in urban India and in its million plus cities.

We have learnt here:

- Number of million-plus cities in India has increased over the decades.
- Million-plus cities attract migrants.

1.6 PROBLEMS OF BASIC AMENITIES IN URBAN INDIA

The provision of basic amenities to urban population in general and to the urban poor in particular has always remained a problem. A few important basic amenities are drinking water, sanitation and electricity facilities. In urban India in 2001, 69⁴ per cent of the households had taps as source of drinking water, 61⁵ per cent of the households had their latrine facilities within their houses and only 35 per cent of the households had closed drainage facilities (Census 2001).⁶ Eighty-eight per cent (88%) of the urban households had electricity.

Table 1.7 Availability Of Basic Amenities in Urban India in 2001

Basic Amenities	% of Households having the facility in 2001
Tap as source of drinking water	69
Latrine facility within the house	61
Closed drainage facility	35
Electricity	88

Source: *Census of India 2001, Series-1 India, Analytical Reports on Housing Amenities.*

1.6.1 Safe Drinking Water

The coverage of drinking water supply in India is found to be more in the economically developed states of Maharashtra, Punjab, Haryana, Gujarat, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. Notable exceptions are poorer states of Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh, which have increased the coverage. The coverage of drinking water supply is higher in metropolitan cities (more than 1million population), than in Class I cities (more than 100,000 population) and Class II towns

(population between 50,000- 99999). The average coverage was found to be 98, 91 and 89 per cent respectively in the metropolitan cities, Class I cities and Class II towns in 1999 (NIUA, 2005). The per capita domestic water supply also decreases with the size class of the cities. Class I cities recorded an average of 106 lpcd while the Class II cities recorded an average of 69 lpcd of water per head in 1999. The average per capita gap increased from 23 lpcd for metropolitan cities to 29 lpcd and 33 lpcd for Class I cities and Class II towns respectively (NIUA, 2005). The finding that coverage of water supply declines with decrease in city size finds confirmation from other scholars (Kundu and Thakur, 2006) as well. Also, it is well known that there are inequalities in accessibility of water supply between poorer localities and richer localities within a city. Locality level data from census 2001 and from other micro studies for some large cities confirm that there is high intra-city variation in the quantity and quality of drinking water supply within metropolitan cities in India (Kundu and Thakur, 2006). Thus there emerges a picture of deficiency and inequality in accessibility of water supply among the states, cities and localities in urban India.

1.6.2 Household Sanitation

In urban India, 14.6 percent households had pit latrines, 46.1 percent households had water closets⁷ within the premises in 2001. Thus around 39 per cent of the urban households did not have any proper latrine facilities within the premises in 2001. However, the percentage of households not having the facility has declined over the decades. The states with no latrine facility in the house were very high in Chattisgarh (47.4%), Maharashtra (41.9%) and Orissa (40.3%). Urban households in the northeastern region mostly use pit latrines, the percentage being more than the national average. Access to water closet facilities is between 47 percent and 87 percent in the states of Himachal Pradesh (49.7%), Punjab (46.5%), Delhi (47.4%), Sikkim (87.0%), Assam (58.9%), West Bengal (55.2%), Gujarat (62.1%), Andhra Pradesh (47.0%) and Kerala (74.8%).⁸ Thus we find that even in the urban areas a large number of people do not have latrine facilities inside the house. This is a potential for hazard to public health.

1.6.3 Solid and Liquid Waste Disposal

Similarly, waste water flowing into open drainage system and flowing into water bodies creates problems for public health. According to census 2001, the percentage of households connected to closed drainage and open drainage was 34.5 and 43.4 respectively at national level in urban India.⁹ The rest 22.1 percent households did not have any drainage facility at all. Delhi (51.7%), Gujarat (59.3%), Maharashtra (45.1%) and Karnataka (41.6%) had closed drainage facilities between 41 percent and 59 percent. Chandigarh at 77.2 percent had the highest percentage of households having closed drainage facilities in 2001. Thus much needs to be done to create the facility for all to sustain urban development and maintain public health.

Many urban centers do not have sewerage system and if they have it is partial. Many towns and cities do not have sewage treatment plants as such untreated sewage flows in land and water bodies creating pollution. It is to be noted that the facility of sewerage system declines with city size as also the percentage of wastewater treated. A survey conducted by National Institute of Urban Affairs found that all the metropolitan cities surveyed had sewerage system. But only 57 (35%) out of the 164 Class I cities and 21 (18%) out of 115 sampled Class II

towns had a functioning sewerage system in 1999 (NIUA, 2005). Urban centers in India should have proper and functional sewerage systems.

Another major problem in cities is the management of solid waste. According to estimates by the Eleventh Five Year Plan, about 115000 MT of municipal solid waste is generated in India.¹⁰ According to a survey by National Institute of Urban Affairs, the per capita waste generation was highest in metropolitan cities with 500 gm per day, 377 gm in Class I cities and 297 gm in Class II towns in 1999 (NIUA, 2005). The waste collection efficiency declines with city size. The NIUA survey further found that Metropolitan cities collect an average of 91 percent of waste generated while the collection efficiency is 85 per cent for Class I cities and 75 per cent for Class II towns. It is to be remembered that with growth of urban population, the amount of waste generated is increasing and it needs urgent attention.

1.6.4 Electricity

Regarding consumption and accessibility of electricity, it is found that 87.6 per cent of the households in urban India used electricity, 11.6 percent used kerosene and only 0.2 per cent used solar energy as source of lighting in 2001. More than 90 per cent households in Himachal Pradesh (97.4%), Uttaranchal (90.9 %), Jammu and Kashmir (97.9%), Haryana (92.9 %), Delhi (93.4%), Sikkim (97.1%), Mizoram (94.4%), Nagaland (90.3%), Gujarat (93.4%), Maharashtra (94.3%), Andhra Pradesh (90.9%), Madhya Pradesh (92.3%), Karnataka (90.5%) and Goa (94.7%) used electricity as the source of lighting in 2001. On the other hand, only 59.3 percent urban households in Bihar had accessibility to electricity.¹¹ However, the percentage of households using solar energy is almost negligible which needs attention. Use of renewable sources of energy as source of lighting should be popularized for sustainable urban development.

1.7 CHALLENGES OF URBANIZATION

Most of the counties including India is experiencing rapid urbanization. The unplanned urbanization particularly in developing countries has culminated several problems. This rapid urbanization envisages that within the next two to three decades, there will be need for increased demand for basic infrastructure, housing and living facilities in major urban centres. The demand for clean water sanitation, solid waste disposal, sewage for liquid waste, health and transport facilities will enhance manifold. Therefore, the urbanization process and growth will face many challenges. Let us discuss a few challenges of urban development in India.

- i) **Housing** – Housing provision for the growing urban population will be the biggest challenge before the government. The growing cost of houses comparison to the income of the urban middle class, has made it impossible for majority of lower income groups are residing in congested accommodation and many of those are devoid of proper ventilation, lighting, water supply, sewage system, etc. for instance in Delhi, the current estimate is of a shortage of 3,00,000 dwelling units the coming decades. The United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) introduced the concept of “Housing Poverty” which includes “Individuals and households who lack safe, secure and healthy shelter, with basic infrastructure such as piped water

and adequate provision for sanitation, drainage and the removal of household waste”.

- ii) **Safe Drinking Water-** Ensuring safe drinking water to urban population is a problem in most of metropolitan cities of India. The 2001 census figure shows that still many households in urban areas consume water from unsafe sources such as tanks, pond and lake, river and canal and spring, the percentages are 7.7, 03.02 and 0.2 respectively. The safe drinking water sources are also found to be contaminated because of water in the cities are inadequate and in the future the expected populations cannot be accommodated without a drastic improvement in the availability of water. The expenses on water treatment and reuse will grow manifold.
- iii) **Sanitation-** The poor sanitation condition is another gloomy feature in urban areas and particularly in slums and unauthorized colonies of urban areas. The drainage system in many unorganized colonies and slums are either not existing and if existing are in a bad shape and in bits resulting in blockage of waste water. This unsanitary conditions lead to many sanitation related diseases such as diarrhoea and malaria.

Unsafe garbage disposal is one of the critical problem in urban areas and garbage management always remained a major challenge

Table 1.8: Distribution of Urban Households by Means of Sanitation

	Categories	Percentage
1.	No bathroom facility within the house	29.5
2.	Pit Latrine	14.6
3.	Water closet	46.1
4.	Other latrine	13.0
5.	No latrine	26.3
6.	Closed drain	34.5
7.	Open drain	43.4
8.	No drainage	22.1

Source: Census, 2001

In all, the environmental deterioration will be the worst curse that will be inflicted by the future urbanization in India. Moreover, in the metropolitan and large cities, the noise pollution would become a challenging problem and protectors may become a precaution from the medical point of view.

- iv) **Poverty-** Roughly a third of the urban population today lives below the poverty line. There are glaring disparities between haves and have-nots in urban areas. The most demanding of the urban challenges, unquestionably is the challenge posed by poverty; the challenge of reducing exploitation, relieving misery and creating more human condition for urban poor. Dandekar and Rath has remarked that “The urban poor are only an overflow of rural poor into the urban area”. They had further opined that “While the character

of rural poverty has remained the same as before the character of urban poverty has deepened further”. S.R.Hasim remarked that cities have been and still are the engines of growth and yet, they harbour a significant number of people who are poor and whose living conditions can only be described as miserable.

A recent estimate shows that around 50 million poor people are residing in urban India.

Table 1.9: Estimates of Incidence of Urban Poverty in India

Year	Poverty Ratio	Number of Poor (Million)
1977-78	45.2	64.6
1983	40.8	70.9
1987-88	38.2	75.2
1993-94	32.4	76.3
1999-2000	23.6	67.1
2007	15.1	49.6

Source: Economic Survey 2003-04, GOI

- v) **Health conditions-** The important indicators of human development are education and health. The health condition of urban poor in some areas are even more adverse compared to rural areas. As many as 20 million children in the developing countries consequent to drinking water which is badly about 6,00,000 persons are loosing their lives on account of indoor air pollution (Jagmohan,2005). The National Family Health Survey, 2006-07 has envisaged that a lot of women and children are suffering from nutritional anaemia and diseases like tuberculosis and asthma are occurring in good number. Providing health care services to the growing urban population is major challenge before the government health care delivery system.
- vi) **Provision of Employment-** Providing gainful employment to the growing urban population is a major challenge before the government. It is generally observed that the literate and semi-literate migrants are absorbed with minimal works carrying lower wage and more hour of work the Un Habitat Report(2003) has rightly remarked “The cities have become a dumping ground for surplus population working in unskilled, unprotected and low-wage informal service industries and trade”. The urban workers are increasingly being pushed into the informal sector and without any adequate space provided by the cities to this sector. As a result most of the informal activities in the cities were carried on in public places like footpaths, open empty spaces, parks or just in the streets. The plight of rickshaw pullers and street vendors is widely noted and commented upon. As the rural agriculture sectors is shrinking day by day the challenges before the urban sector to provide viable employment to migrating population will be a daunting task in the coming year.
- vii) **Urban Transport and traffic management-** One of the most challenging problem facing the urban areas is urban transport. The challenge is to provide a well integrated and environmental friendly traffic congestion and

environmental pollution has reached unprecedented level in many metropolitan cities. The sustainable urban transport system should ensure safe and pollution free transport system. The increasing urban population has made the transport system like public bus facilities and metros extremely crowded and unpleasant. The traffic management need not only to control traffic but also check accidents occurring in urban areas. Some of the other challenges are road pricing, licensing system, user taxes on fuel, parking of vehicles, etc.

- ix) Urban Crime-** prevention of urban crime is another challenge before the government of states having more number of urban areas and particularly metropolitan cities. The mega cities are facing increased criminal activities on account of unchecked migration, illegal settlements and diverse socio-cultural disparities, organized groups, gangsters, professional criminals for wishing a lavish life in metropolitan. According to IPC (Indian Penal Code) data, a total of 3,23,363 cognizable crimes under the IPC were reported in 35 mega cities during 2006 as compared to 3,14,708 crimes during 2005, thereby reporting an increase of 3.70 percent. The cities of Delhi, Mumbai and Bengaluru have accounted for 16.2 percent, 9.5 percent and 8.1 percent respectively of the total crime reported from 35 mega cities. Prevention of crime in mega cities is a challenge before the city government in India.
- x) Urban slum-** It is estimated that the metropolitan cities in the year 2000 AD would have a large number of population living in the slum and squatter settlements. According to Jagmohan at least 33 percent of the Indian urban population lives in slums which are dreary and deadly as the old Jewish “Ghettos”. Life in the slum is quite miserable devoid of sanitation, poor quality of housing, unsafe drinking water and deficiencies of the other infrastructure. The living conditions of slum dwellers become deplorable during excessive cold, summer, and rainy season.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: a) Answer the following questions in about 50 words.

b) Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

- 1) What are the condition of availability of safe drinking water across various states in India?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) How have urban slums become a major challenge in urbanization?

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.8 LET US SUM UP

Urban population of India is larger than the total population of many countries. Despite this important fact, one has to accept that India with about 27 per cent of its population living in its urban areas is less urbanised. Also the spread of its urban population is not even. The large cities especially the metropolitan cities have most of the total urban population. Small and medium towns have not flourished. Poor migrants from rural areas bypass these towns and arrive at large cities in search of employment.

About 15 per cent of the total urban population of the states of India lives in slums. The actual picture is grimmer. Around 23 per cent of the urban population of the towns reporting slums was living in slums in 2001. The cities with more than one million populations have high percentage of population living in slums. Urban basic services are poor in urban India and are less than the requirement.

Urbanisation is happening in India. But it has its problems. Major problems of urban areas of India are overcrowding, congestion, inadequate basic services and urban infrastructure, lack of efficient transport facilities, air pollution, environmental pollution and existence of slums.

1.9 KEY WORDS

Urban: Census of India, 2001 adopted the following definition for urban areas in India.

- 1) All statutory places with a municipality, corporation, cantonment board or notified area committee, etc.- are called *statutory* towns and are so declared by the state.
- 2) A place satisfying the following three criteria simultaneously are called *census* towns. The criteria are:
 - a minimum population of 5,000;
 - at least 75 per cent of male working population engaged in non-agricultural pursuits;
 - a density of population of at least 400 per sq. km. (1,000 per sq. mile)

City: Cities are urban areas with more than 100,000 population in India.

Towns: Towns are urban areas below 100,000 population in India.

Urban Agglomeration: Urban Agglomeration is a continuous urban spread constituting a town and its adjoining urban growths or two or more physical contiguous towns together and any adjoining urban outgrowths of such towns. Examples of outgrowths are railway colonies, university campus, military area.

Level of urbanisation/degree of urbanisation: The percentage of urban population to total population is called the level of urbanisation or degree of urbanisation.

Decadal Urban Growth: Increase in total urban population over the initial population, calculated between two decades, is called decadal urban growth.

Slums: The slums are usually characterised by inadequate housing, congestion,

overcrowding and lack of services. Section 3 of the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956 defines *slums* as areas where buildings:

- are in any respect unfit for human habitation,
- are by reason of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangement and design of such buildings, narrowness or faulty arrangement of street, lack of ventilation, light or sanitation facilities, or any combination of these factors, are detrimental to safety, health or moral.

Size class of towns: The Census of India classifies towns and urban agglomerations in six size classes according to their population size. The classes are: Class I – 100,000 and above, termed as city; Class II- 50,000-99,999; Class III-20, 000-49,999; Class IV-10, 000-19,999; Class V- 5,000-9,999; Class VI- Less than 5,000.

1.10 REFERENCES AND SELECTED READINGS

Kundu and Sarangi (2007). Migration, employment status and poverty: An analysis across urban centres. *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 27, 299-306.

Kundu and Thakur (2006). Access to drinking water in urban India: An analysis of emerging spatial pattern in the context of new system of governance. In V.Ratna Reddy and S. Mahendra Dev (Eds.) *Managing Water Resources: Policies, Institutions and Technologies*, New Delhi: Oxford.

Mukherji, Shekhar (1991). The nature of migration and urbanisation in India: The search for alternative planning strategies. In *Dynamics of Population and Family Welfare*, Srinivasan and Pathak eds. Bombay, Himalaya Publishing House.

Mukherji, Shekhar (1996). Poverty-induced migration and urban involution in India: Alternative planning strategies In S.P. Mohanty and A. R. Momin (Eds.) *Census as Social Document*, New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

National Institute of Urban Affairs (2005). *Status of Water Supply, Sanitation and Solid Waste Management in Urban Areas*, New Delhi: National Institute of Urban Affairs

Premi, M.K. (1991). India's urban scene and its future implications, *Demography*, (India), vol. 20, No. 1, pp 41-52.

Sivaramakrishnan, K.C, Kundu,A. and Singh,B.N.(2005). *Handbook of Urbanisation in India*. New Delhi: Oxford.

United Nations Population Divisions, (2005) World Urbanisation Prospects: 2005 Revision.

1.11 CHECK YOUR PROGRESS – POSSIBLE ANSWERS

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) What are the definition of urban areas according to Census of India, 2001?

- Answer:** i) All statutory places with a municipality, corporation, cantonment board or notified area committee, etc.- are called *statutory* towns and are so declared by the state.
- ii) A place satisfying the following three criteria simultaneously are called *census* towns.
- a minimum population of 5,000;
 - at least 75 per cent of male working population engaged in non-agricultural pursuits;
 - a density of population of at least 400 per sq. km. (1,000 per sq. mile)

2) What was India's level of urbanization and decadal urban growth rate of India in 2001?

Answer: India's level of urbanisation in 2001 was 27.82 percent and the decadal urban growth rate of India in 2001 was 31.48 percent.

Check Your Progress-2

1) What are the condition of availability of safe drinking water across various states in India?

Answer: The coverage of drinking water supply in India is found to be more in the economically developed states of Maharashtra, Punjab, Haryana, Gujarat, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. Notable exceptions are poorer states of Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh, which have increased the coverage. The coverage of drinking water supply is higher in metropolitan cities (more than 1million population), than in Class I cities (more than 100,000 population) and Class II towns (population between 50,000- 99999).

2) How have urban slums become a major challenge in urbanization?

Answer: It is estimated that the metropolitan cities in the year 2000 AD would have a large number of population living in the slum and squatter settlements. According to Jagmohan at least 33 percent of the Indian urban population lives in slums which are dreary and deadly as the old Jemish "Ghettos". Life in the slum is quite miserable devoid of sanitation, poor quality of housing, unsafe drinking water and deficiencies of the other infrastructure. The living conditions of slum dwellers become deplorable during excessive cold, summer and rainy season.

UNIT 2 MIGRATION AND URBAN PROBLEMS

Structure

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Migration: Concept and Meaning
- 2.3 Status of Migration
- 2.4 Rural-urban Migration: Causes and Effects
- 2.5 Migration and Urban Slums
- 2.6 Conditions of Urban Slums
- 2.7 Migration and Urban Problems
- 2.8 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.9 Key Words
- 2.10 References and Selected Readings
- 2.11 Check Your Progress – Possible Answers

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Urbanization is taking place at a rapid pace in the cities of developing countries mainly due to rural-urban migration. Rural-urban migration is the movement of people from the countryside to the cities. This has resulted in rapid urban growth and the proportion of people living in towns and cities has been increasing. The rural-urban migration is caused as a result of push and pull factors. The major push factors are natural disasters, poor living conditions, agricultural change, unemployment, war and conflict etc. Some of the major pull factors are employment, higher incomes, better healthcare and education, attraction to urban facilities and way of life and protection from conflict etc. This rapid urbanization results in problems like pollution, lack of clean drinking water, employment opportunities, traffic problems, poverty, substance abuse, garbage disposal and sewage problems.

After studying this unit you should be able to:

- Discuss the meaning of migration and define who migrants are.
- Discuss what the broad flows of migration are.
- Analyse effects and consequences of rural-urban migration.
- Explain the reasons of migration of rural-urban migrants.
- Explain the effect of rural-urban migration on urban basic amenities.
- Discuss the characteristics of slums dwellers.
- Discuss the conditions of basic amenities prevailing in slums.
- Identify the problems occurring in urban areas due to migration.

2.2 MIGRATION: CONCEPT AND MEANING

Migration means movement of people from one place to another. Any place can gain population by births and by in-migration of people from outside the area of

the place. Similarly, any place can lose population by deaths and by out-migration of people from the area of the place. Thus migration is an important factor, which affects the structure of the population. For example, if young adults of working age migrate, the population of the place receiving the migrants become younger and the number of workers in the population increase. Thus the Census of India notes that the migration process affects the place where migrants move in and the areas from which the migrants move out.

Migration to urban areas is not always bad. Urban areas have higher productivity than the rural areas. The income level is also higher in the urban areas than rural areas of India. Kundu and Sarangi (2007) inferred that migration is a “definite instrument of improving economic wellbeing and escaping poverty for the adult population in large, medium and small towns”. Thus migration from rural to urban areas may actually reduce the poverty level of India. Scholars and economists have advocated that migration to cities will actually develop an economy and thus should be encouraged (Billsborrow, 1998; World Development Report, 2009). The World Development Report (2009) cites examples of densely populated city like Tokyo, highly mobile country like U.S.A. to put forth its view that migration of people is associated with growth. But the problem remains that too much migration creates problems for the governance of the city. It is particularly relevant for already dense cities of India. In this unit we shall learn about migration and urban problems in India.

2.2.1 Indian Census and Concept of Migration

Before going to the discussion on migration in India, we should know who gives the data on migration and what is the definition of migrants. In Unit 1, we have seen that the Census of India enumerates total population of India. The Census of India also enumerates the total migrants in India. It should be noted here that National Sample Survey Organisation also collects data on migration in India in various rounds but that is on the basis of samples. Here, we shall learn about migration in India following census definitions, concepts and data. At present the migration data is given by Census of India by place of birth and by place of last residence. But till 1961, migration data were being given only by place of birth (POB). This means if one was found residing at a place other than one's place of birth, the person was enumerated as migrant. In 1971, for the first time the migration data were collected by place of last residence (POLR) in addition to place of birth. This means that if one's place of enumeration is different from one's place of last residence, one is enumerated as migrant by POLR. This enabled one to get the recent movements of the migrants, which is not captured by data on place of birth. For example, say, Sunil was born in 1976 at Patna and in 2001 was found at Delhi, then, he has been enumerated as migrant from Patna to Delhi by POB in 2001 census. But in between Sunil went to Kolkata in 1993 and stayed there up to 1998 and migrated to Delhi in 1999. Enumeration as migrant by POB does not capture this recent movement of Sunil. This is captured by migration by POLR. Sunil has been enumerated as migrant by POLR from Kolkata to Delhi in 2001 Census. So, the definition of migrant by POB is that a person is enumerated at a place other than his place of birth. The definition of migrant by POLR is that a person is enumerated at a place other than his place of last residence.

2.3.1 In-migration in India

Migration data is given by space, time, reason and gender. Space means the place, area (village/town/district/state), urban and rural origin or destination. The lowest unit for enumerating migrants' place of last residence is village or town. Any change of residence within the village or town or city is not considered migration. Migration data is presented as change of residence within the district (intra-district movement), change of residence from one district to another (inter-district movement) and change of residence between one state and another (inter-state movement). Time is given by duration of stay at any place. If all the divisions are taken together, it is called 'all durations'. Reasons of migrations are classified in different categories, which we shall study in 2.6. Some of the migration data is given by gender i.e. by male and female. In India, the total in-migrants by place of last residence in 2001 were 314,541,350 persons by all durations of residence.

Table 2.1: Total In-migrants in India by Place of Last Residence, 2001
(All durations of residence)

Place of last residence	Total	Rural	Urban
Last residence elsewhere in India	309,385,525	207,773,661	101,611,864
Last residence outside India	4,946,860	2,508,775	2,438,085
Unclassifiable	208,965	94,956	114009
Total	314,541,350	210,377,392	104,16,958

Source: *Census of India, 2001*

Out of them 309,385,525 persons were internal migrants i.e. these people migrated from some place within India. A total number of 4,946,860 persons migrated from some place outside India whereas 208965 persons could not be classified. Here, we are concerned with the internal migrants of India, i.e. people who migrated from some place within India. The total internal migrants of India were 30.07 per cent of the total population of India in 2001. It was 29.2 per cent in 1971, 30.3 per cent in 1981 and 27 per cent in 1991. Thus internal migration in India has increased from 1971 and 1981 while it fell in 1991 but has increased again to 30.3 per cent in 2001. Out of the total internal migrants in India, 101,611,864 persons migrated to urban areas, which is a huge number in itself. In terms of percentage the total urban migrants were 32.8 percent of the total internal migrants in India in 2001.

2.3.2 Flow of Migration in India

Collected data about migration is usually classified by streams, distance, duration, reason and gender and presented for clear understanding of the flow and reasons of migration. The data on streams of migration is classified by movements from rural to rural areas, from rural to urban areas, from urban to rural areas and from urban to urban areas. The data on distance is usually given by within the district movement, by inter-district movement, by within the state movements and by interstate movements. The data on duration is classified by number of years.

When all the durations are clubbed together, we get the data by all durations as has been given in Table 2.1 and 2.2.

In India rural-rural migration was around 63 per cent and rural-urban migration was about 19 per cent in 2001 (by all durations). Similarly, urban-urban and urban-rural migration was around 13 per cent and 5 per cent respectively in 2001. Thus we find that rural-rural migration is the largest in volume in India, which is followed by rural-urban migration. But rural-urban migration is very important for its effects on urban areas. We also learn another important thing about migration by gender. Women are more mobile than men in India. The percentages of female migrants in all the streams of migration are more than male migrants (Table 2.2). Rural-rural migration in India is overwhelmingly dominated by women and was 84.81 per cent in 2001. The percentages of women migrants in urban-rural (65.01%), urban-urban (54.87%) and even in rural-urban (52.59%) flows were more than men in 2001. Most of the women

Table 2.2: Distribution of Internal In-migration in India by Place of Last Residence, Stream and Gender, 2001(All Durations of Residence)

Stream	Total Migrants (,000)			Percentage		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Rural-Rural	171,735	26,080	145,655	100.00	15.19	84.81
Rural-Urban	51,686	24,505	27,180	100.00	47.41	52.59
Urban- Rural	12,999	4,547	8,451	100.00	34.98	65.01
Urban-Urban	36,562	16,500	20,061	100.00	45.13	54.87

Source: *Census of India, 2001 Migration Tables*

in India migrate at least once after marriage in India and this is one reason for which women are found to be more migratory than men India. The other reasons are that women have started moving more with the family and also on their own for employment than before.

Now, let us look at the distribution and growth of internal migrants in India by streams and by 0-9 years duration. This will show us the growth of the migrants in different census periods. This is given in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Distribution and Growth of Migrants by Streams (0-9 Years Duration) In India, 1971-2001

Migration streams	Growth Rate(%)		
	1971-81	1981-91	1991-2001
Intra-state			
Rural-rural	14.8	0.2	12.2
Rural-Urban	47.8	6.7	7.3
Urban –Rural	29.4	-4.8	1.0
Urban-Urban	50.0	-11.2	23.6

Interstate			
Rural-Rural	12.1	3.4	54.0
Rural-Urban	22.8	20.1	76.5
Urban- Rural	14.1	9.6	11.2
Urban –Urban	18.0	6.0	24.3

Source: Bhagat, B.R.

From Table 2.3 we find that, migration in all the streams declined in 1981-91 compared to 1971-81 but it picked up again in 1991-2001. Rural-urban intra-state migration increased by 7.3 percent during 1991-2001 but rural-urban interstate migration grew by 76.5 per cent during 1991-2001. Similarly, urban – urban intrastate migration grew by 23.6 per cent and urban-urban interstate migration grew by 24.3 per cent during 1991-2001. Thus we find that migration to urban areas has grown considerably during 1991-2001. However the most remarkable growth is seen in interstate rural-urban migration.

So we have learnt here:

- Rural-Rural migration is highest by volume in India.
- Rural-Urban migration is second highest by volume in India.
- Rural-urban interstate migration has grown rapidly during 1991-2001.
- Women are more migratory than men in all the streams of migration in India.

Activity 2

Find out a friend who is intra-state rural-urban migrant and find another friend who is inter-state rural-urban migrant.

2.4 RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION: CAUSES AND EFFECTS

Migrations usually happen due to reasons of social change and economic development. People move from less developed areas to more developed areas. It may also happen due to natural disasters like drought or flood. People may move from rural to rural areas, from urban to rural areas, from urban to urban areas and from rural to urban areas. Here we shall talk of migration to urban areas. Migration towards urban areas can be from both urban and rural areas. However, rural to urban migration has important connotations for urbanization. Though there are other flows of migration as has been mentioned above, rural to urban migration is considered very important for urbanization and development because of its consequences on the migrants and on urban areas and urbanization. We have already learnt in Unit 1 that rural-urban migration is an important component of urbanisation (see Unit 1).

2.4.1 Causes of Rural-Urban Migration

The migrants usually have high work participation rate compared to the non-migrants. Some of them have better educational qualification than non-migrants.

However a substantial portion of the rural-urban migrants is less educated, poor and come from agricultural background and belongs to scheduled caste and scheduled tribe community. Some of them move alone while majority of them move with family. In 1981, Census of India widened the scope of enquiry on migration and started collecting 'reasons of migration from place of last residence'. In 2001 census, reasons of migration were given by place of last residence and were seven in number as has been shown below in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Reasons of Migration of Rural-urban and Urban-urban Migrants, 2001

Reasons	Rural-Urban			Urban-Urban		
	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female
Work/Employment	26.19	51.06	3.77	17.50	34.93	3.16
Business	2.13	4.13	0.33	2.00	3.91	0.42
Education	2.40	3.72	1.22	2.03	3.06	1.18
Marriage	28.20	1.03	52.70	25.51	0.88	45.77
Moved afterbirth	4.98	6.18	3.90	8.14	10.35	6.33
Moved with Household	24.87	20.59	28.74	27.89	26.31	29.20
Others	11.22	13.29	9.35	16.93	20.55	13.95
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: *Census of India, 2001 Migration Tables*

Work or employment was the most important reason for migration of rural-urban male migrants. More than fifty per cent of the rural-urban male migrants migrated for employment and about 21 per cent of them moved with household. Also about 35 per cent of the male urban-urban male migrants migrated for employment while 26 per cent migrated with family. More than fifty per cent of the rural-urban female migrants migrated due to marriage while around 29 per cent of the rural-urban female migrants migrated moved with the household. Among the women who have moved from urban to urban areas around 45 per cent moved for marriage and 29 per cent moved with household. So we find that majority of the migrants to urban areas migrate for employment and majority of the female migrants to urban areas moved due to marriage or move with household.

People move from rural to urban areas for various reasons like, worsening in economic situation, employment, higher wages, better amenities, change in social environment, education and so on. It is widely documented that male migrants from rural to urban areas in India migrate for reasons related to worsening in economic situation, employment and better employment (Census, 2001, Banerjee, 1986).

Though macro data like that from census finds women moving mainly with family and marriage, many micro studies have shown that many of the rural-urban women migrants migrate for employment (Singh, 1984, Chattopadhyay, 2005, Neetha 2004). Traditionally women have been categorised as passive movers, moving with family or for marriage. This is primarily because in macro data like in census they are not found moving on their own for work. However,

micro studies have found women migrating on their own for work in many kinds of work like nursing, domestic service etc. Some of them who migrate alone are usually unmarried, widowed or divorced and belong to scheduled castes or scheduled tribes community. They migrate to work to support themselves and their families at origin. This type of women migrants is found mostly in the lower income group. Even when these women migrate with family the underlying cause of migration mostly happen to be work, earn and support the family.

So we find that majority of the male migrants and possibly a substantial portion of the women migrants to urban areas migrate to work and earn livelihood. Those who are educated and trained get work in the formal sector but the uneducated ones keep working in the informal sector or unorganised sector. Next we shall learn what are the effects of migration of rural-urban migration on urban slums.

We have learnt here:

- The most important reason of migration of rural-urban male migrants is work or employment.
- The most important reason of migration of rural-urban female migrants is marriage according to census data.
- However, rural-urban female migration is not all passive, many women from rural area migrate to urban area for work.

2.4.2 Effects of Rural Urban Migration

In-migration to any area increases its population. This affects the structure and profile of the population of the area of destination as well as that of origin. If young people of working age group migrate to a place, then the age composition of the people at destination changes and become younger. This means when young people out-migrate from an area, the older people and children are left behind. Thus, the age composition of people of the area of origin of the migrants tilts to the higher side. This is what happens when a substantial number of people of working age group from rural areas migrate to urban areas. If substantial numbers of men out-migrate from the rural area to work in the urban area, then the numbers of women become more in the area of origin at rural area. Similarly, if substantial numbers of men in-migrate to any urban area, then the numbers of men become more in the population of the area of the destination. Thus rural-urban migration affects the demographic profile of the people at origin and destination both.

Rural-urban migration results in change in income and work status of the concerned rural-urban migrants. Most of the rural-urban migrants migrate to work and earn higher income. Thus the incomes of the rural-urban migrants generally increase after migration. Migration may also affect the work-status of the migrants. If the migrant was not working before migration, then he/she has become worker from non-worker. The migrant may have been doing agricultural work in rural area but have started doing some non-agricultural work in urban area after migration. The rural-urban migrant may have also turned from casual worker to regular worker. Thus, rural-urban migration has the potential to change the migrant's income and work profile.

Rural-urban migration also has social impacts. The rural-urban migrants try to imbibe different aspects of urban society. The urban society is different from

rural society in different aspects. Restrictions are less in an urban society. The rural-urban migrants, especially women find the urban areas less restrictive and more open. As a result, the migrants find more freedom and can perform many things in urban areas, which they could not do in rural areas. Also the rural-urban migrants are found to work in many activities in urban areas, which they could not have done in the rural areas. Caste, religion and ethnic background is not important for work in most urban areas.

But, most importantly in-migration to urban areas puts pressure on the urban basic amenities, like water supply, drainage, sewerage, housing, transport facilities and so on, which are already constrained in Indian cities. The financial resources of urban local bodies are limited and increase in migration to urban areas creates problems for urban governance. We have discussed the condition of basic amenities in urban areas in Unit 1 and shall also discuss the effects of rural-urban migration on basic urban amenities later in this Unit.

So, we have learnt here:

- Rural-urban migration may change the demographic and economic profile of the population concerned and have social impacts on the migrants.
- While rural-urban migration reduces poverty it strains the urban basic amenities.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: a) Answer the following questions in about 50 words.

b) Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

- 1) What is the most important reason of migration of rural-urban migrant men and women?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) How does rural-urban migration affect the demographic profile of the people at origin and destination?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2.5.1 Urban Slum and Education

A high percentage of the residents of urban slums are less educated and belong to scheduled caste and scheduled tribe population. Most of them are rural-urban migrants. Some of them are better educated but a substantial portion of them is not educated. They move to urban areas to earn their living, pay up their debt and help the families financially. Thus they inevitably move from rural areas to some areas where housing is cheap.

To understand the magnitude of problems of urban slums we should first know what is the percentage of urban population living in slum areas. We have learnt some of it in Unit 1. However I shall mention those here in short for reference. We get data about population in slums from census 2001. All the cities and towns have not reported slums. Only 640 cities/towns reported slums in 2001 (Table 2.4). A total of 15 per cent of the total urban population were found to live in slums in urban India whereas 23.1 per cent of the urban population of the towns reporting slums were living in slum areas in 2001 (Table 2.4). The percentage of slum population of million-plus cities was found to be higher at 24.1 per cent.

Table 2.4: Percentage of Slum Population in India and Million Plus Cities in 2001

Indicators	No./Percentage
No. of cities/towns reporting slum population	640
% of slum population to total urban population	15.0
% of slum population to total population of cities/ towns reporting slum population	23.1
% of slum population in million –plus cities	24.1

Source: *Census of India, 2001*

Thus understandably million plus cities where employment opportunities are more have the largest percentage of slums.

Next I shall refer to some characteristics of urban slum dwellers. Approximately, literacy of a person shows the kind of work that can be done by him.

Table 2.5 Literacy Rate in Urban India, Urban Slums and in Slums of Million Plus Cities In 2001

Persons/Male/Female	Literacy Rate		
	Urban India	Urban Slums	Urban Slums in Million plus cities
Persons	80.3	73.1	76
Male	86.7	80.7	82
Female	73.2	64.4	68

Source: *Census of India, 2001*

From Table 2.5 we find that literacy rate in urban slums are lower than that of urban India. In 2001, total literacy rate in urban India was 80.30 whereas it was only 73.1 in urban slums. Comparing literacy rate of men we find that it was 86.7 and 80.7 for urban India and urban slums of India respectively in 2001. However, the literacy rate of people in urban slums of million plus cities is more than that of urban slums in urban India but it is less than that of the general population in urban India. This explains the fact that in slums like Dharavi of Mumbai various kinds of skilled and educated persons are found.

2.5.2 Urban Slum and Ethnicity

Another major characteristics of slums in urban India is its ethnic characteristics. A majority of slum population is found to be coming from scheduled caste and scheduled tribe population. On an average 22 per cent and 15 per cent of the population in slums in urban India were from scheduled castes and scheduled tribes respectively (Table 2.6). However, the slums of million-plus cities were found to have larger percentage of scheduled caste population. About 74 per cent of the million plus cities had percentage of scheduled caste population more than 22.01, which was the average of urban India in 2001. Mumbai had a remarkably high (65.91) percentage of scheduled caste population followed by Meerut (63.95) and Faridabad (59.92). Scheduled tribe population was found to be 14.56 percent in slums of urban India. Mumbai again had the highest percentage (62.08%) of scheduled tribe population in the slums followed by Nagpur (59.31%) and Kanpur (55.47%).

Table 2.6: Percentage of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Population in Slums in India and Million-plus Cities, 2001

Sl. No.	Name of the state/city	% of scheduled caste population in slums	% of scheduled tribe population in slums	% of slum population to total population
	India	22.01	14.56	15.0
1.	Greater Mumbai	65.91	62.08	54.1
2.	Delhi	31.04	0.00	18.7
3.	Kolkata	33.77	25.56	32.5
4.	Bangalore	29.28	15.26	10.0
5.	Chennai	45.03	27.20	18.9
6.	Ahmedabad	22.41	19.61	13.5
7.	Hyderabad	33.46	27.74	17.2
8.	Pune	41.87	21.54	19.4
9.	Kanpur	29.84	55.47	14.4
10.	Surat	34.78	41.94	20.9
11.	Jaipur	30.90	22.98	15.9
12.	Lucknow	11.34	4.61	8.2
13.	Nagpur	44.05	59.31	35.9

14.	Indore	30.35	11.82	17.7
15.	Bhopal	20.27	13.57	8.7
16.	Ludhiana	26.18	0.00	22.5
17.	Patna	0.81	0.00	0.3
18.	Vadodara	24.06	27.41	14.2
19.	Thane	41.20	35.19	27.8
20.	Agra	14.23	8.91	9.5
21.	Kalyan-Dombivili	10.31	1.30	2.9
22.	Varanasi	21.19	0.00	12.6
23.	Nashik	32.87	23.01	12.9
24.	Meerut	63.95	36.23	44.1
25.	Faridabad	59.92	0.00	46.5
26.	Haora	19.34	9.97	11.7
27.	Pimprichinchwad	36.00	12.14	12.2

Source: *Census of India, 2001, Slum Population, Series-1*

Thus we have learnt that a major part of the urban slum dwellers are rural-urban migrants, are not educated and belong to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. One more thing that characterises slum population is its high work participation rate. Slum dwellers come to work in cities and towns and that is why they get engaged in any work that they get and that is why work participation rate is generally higher in the slums than the general urban population. We present work participation rate of slum workers in Table 2.7.

Table 2.7: Work Participation Rate in Urban India and in Urban Slums of India

Place	Work participation rate		
	Persons	Male	Female
Urban India	29.3	47.2	9.4
Urban slums of India	32.9	51.3	11.9

Source: *Census of India, 2001, Slum Population, Series-1*

We have learnt here:

- The percentage of slum population in urban India, in cities and in million plus-cities of India.
- The characteristics of slum dwellers in India.

2.6 CONDITIONS OF URBAN SLUMS

2.6.1 Character of Urban Slum

What kind of living conditions do the slum dwellers have in the slums? National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), conducted a survey in 2002 on the conditions of urban slums, which covered all the urban areas (recognised by

1991 census) of whole of Indian Union except Leh and Kargil districts of Jammu and Kashmir. We shall discuss the conditions in urban slums following the data of this survey. According to NSSO, “slum is a compact settlement with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities in unhygienic conditions”. Such an area, for the purpose of survey by NSSO, is considered as “non-notified slum” if at least 20 households lived in that area. The slums, which are notified by the local- bodies like municipality, Municipal Corporation etc. are called “notified slums”.

Table 2.8: Percentage Distribution, Ownership of Land and Density of Household in the Notified and Non-notified Slums in India, 2002

Description	Notified slums	Non-notified slums
Percentage distribution of slums by notified/ non-notified	51	49
Percentage of total surveyed households living in notified /non-notified slums	65	35
Percentage of slums located on public land	63	63
Percentage of slums located on private land	35	35
Average number of household per slum	205	112

Source: National Sample Survey Organisation, Sarvekshana, Report No. 486, Condition of Urban Slums, 2002, 58th round (July2002-Dec 2002)

According to the National Sample Survey (NSS) data (2002), around 51 per cent of the slums were notified while 49 per cent were non-notified slums in 2002 (Table2.8). Around 65 Per cent of the households were living in notified slums and 35 per cent of the households were living in non-notified slums. Majority of the slums are situated on public lands. However, some of them are situated on private lands too. According to NSS data (2002) around 63 per cent of the notified as well as non-notified slums were found on public land while 35 per cent of them were on private land while the location of the rest were not known. Notified slums are in somewhat better condition than the rest as we shall find later and possibly because of that, those slums were much dense than the non-notified slums. On an average 205 households were found in notified slums compared to 112 (average) households in non-notified slums. Thus we find that the majority of the slums are located on public land and notified slums are denser than the non-notified slums. Let us see what kind of environment, structures and basic services the slums have.

2.6.2 Conditions of Road in Urban Slum

Table 2.9 Percentage Distribution of Slums by Conditions of Road, 2002

Type of road	Notified Slums	Non-notified slums
Pucca approach road	86	67
Pucca inner road	71	37
Water logging on approach road/ inner road	36	54

Source: National Sample Survey Organisation, Sarvekshana, Report No. 486, Condition of Urban Slums, 2002, 58th round (July2002-Dec 2002)

Around 86 per cent of the notified slums and 67 per cent of the non-notified slums had pucca approach road (Table 2.9). Around 71 per cent of the roads within the notified slums and 37 per cent of the non-notified slums were pucca. Waterlogging on the roads create health hazards in the slums. Around 36 per cent of the notified slums and 54 per cent of the non-notified slums were affected by water logging either on the approach road or on the roads within the slums.

2.9.3 Conditions of Housing in Urban Slum

One of the basic requirements of survival of human being is a place to stay or a house. The structure of the houses of the slum-dwellers was divided as 'pucca', 'semi-pucca' and 'katcha' in the NSS survey. A pucca structure is one, which is having roof and wall made of pucca materials whereas a katcha structure is one, which is having roof and wall made of katcha material. A structure, which does not fall in these two categories were categorised as semi-pucca. Table 2.10 gives the information about type of structure of the majority of houses in the slums. About 64 per cent of the notified slums had majority of houses pucca, 30 per cent had majority of houses semi-pucca and in 6 per cent of them had majority of houses katcha in 2002. In contrast, only 30 per cent of the non-notified slums had majority of the houses pucca, 40 per cent of them had majority of the houses semi-pucca and 30 per cent of them had majority of the houses katcha in 2002. Thus, though all the notified slums did not have majority of the houses pucca but still they were better than non-notified slums.

Table 2.10: Percentage Distributions of Slums by Type of Structure of the Majority of the Houses, 2002

Type of structure of the majority of the houses	Notified slums	Non-notified Slums
Pucca	64	30
Semi-pucca	30	40
Katcha	6	30
Total	100	100

Source: National Sample Survey Organisation, Sarvekshana, Report No. 486, Condition of Urban Slums, 2002, 58th round (July2002-Dec 2002)

Table 2.11 Percentage Distribution of Slums by Major Source of Drinking Water, 2002

Type of major source	Notified slums	Non-notified slums
Tap	84	71
Tube well	10	22
Well	2	2
Others	4	5
Total	100	100

Source: National Sample Survey Organisation, Sarvekshana, Report No. 486, Condition of Urban Slums, 2002, 58th round (July2002-Dec 2002)

Another basic requirement for living is drinking water. Supply of safe drinking water to all is an accepted goal of government of India. Table 2.11 presents the percentage distribution of slums by major source of drinking water. Major source of drinking water in 84 per cent of the notified slums and 71 per cent of the non-notified slums was tap in 2002. In another 10 per cent of the notified slums and 22 per cent of the non-notified slums major source of drinking water was tube-well in 2002. Thus in 94 per cent of the notified slums and 93 per cent of the non-notified slums major source of drinking water was tap or tube-well. This is not a very bad situation. But the actual situation depends on duration of availability of water and quality of the water available, which may not be ideal and satisfactory.

2.6.4 Urban Sanitation

Sewerage and drainage facility is one of the most important basic services needed in urban areas. In the absence of proper sewerage and drainage facility, the environment of any area becomes filthy and unhealthy. Data about these facilities are presented in Table 2.11. There were no sewerage facility in an overwhelming 70 per cent of the notified slums and 85 per cent of the non-notified slums in 2002 (Table 2.12). Underground or covered drains were found in only 25 per cent of the notified slums and in 13 per cent of the non-notified slums. Most of the notified slums (60 %) had open drains. Forty three per cent of non-notified slums had open drains while there was no drainage facility in 44 per cent of the non-notified slums.

Table 2.12: Percentage Distribution of Slums Having Underground Sewerage and Drainage Facility, 2002

Availability of underground sewerage / drainage facility	Notified slums	Non-notified slums
Underground sewerage	30	15
No sewerage	70	85
Underground /covered drains	25	13
Open drains	60	43
No drainage	15	44

Source: National Sample Survey Organisation, Sarvekshana, Report No. 486, Condition of Urban Slums, 2002, 58th round (July2002-Dec 2002)

Next, let us see, how garbage is disposed in urban slums. The data regarding this is presented in Table 2.13. Arrangement of garbage disposal was made by local bodies like panchayat or municipality or corporation in 79 per cent of the notified slums and only 42 per cent of the non-notified slums. The residents or some others make arrangement of garbage disposal in 5 per cent of the notified slums and 12 per cent of the non-notified slums whereas there were no arrangements for disposal of garbage in 16 per cent of the notified slums and 46 per cent of the non-notified slums in 2002. However, availability of arrangement of garbage disposal is not sufficient, one has to see how frequently is the service available. The survey reports that only 52 per cent of the notified slums and 46 per cent of the non-notified slums get the service at least once in two days while 34 per cent of the notified slums and 35 per cent of the non-notified slums get the service at least once in 3-7 days and in the rest of them the service is even worse (NSS Report No. 486).

Table 2.13 Percentage Distribution Of Slums Having Arrangement Of Garbage Disposal Facility In, 2002

Arrangement of garbage disposal made by	Notified slums	Non-notified slums
Panchayat/municipality/Corporation	79	42
Residents/others	5	12
No arrangement	16	46
Total	100	100

Source: National Sample Survey Organisation, Sarvekshana, Report No. 486, Condition of Urban Slums, 2002, 58th round (July2002-Dec 2002)

Table 2.14 gives the percentage slums having facility of septic tank or flush latrine and the percentage of slums having no latrine facility. We find that 66 per cent of the notified slums had septic tank or flush latrine facility. However, this facility was available to only 35 per cent non-notified slums in 2002. More than fifty per cent (51%) of the non-notified slums did not have any latrine facility. However, only 17 per cent of the notified slums were found not having any facility in 2002.

Table 2.14: Percentage Of Slums Having Septik Tank/Flush Latrine And Percentage Of Slums Having No Latrine Facility In Urban Slums, 2002

Type of latrine facility	Notified slums	Non-notified slums
Septik tank/flush latrine	66	35
No latrine	17	51

Source: National Sample Survey Organisation, Sarvekshana, Report No. 486, Condition of Urban Slums, 2002, 58th round (July2002-Dec 2002)

Table 2.15: Percentage Distribution of Slums Having Electricity Connection, 2002

Availability of underground sewerage/drainage facility	Notified slums	Non-notified slums
Household and street light	84	53
Household only	11	25
Street light only	4	6
Not reported	1	16
Total	100	100

Source: National Sample Survey Organisation, Sarvekshana, Report No. 486, Condition of Urban Slums, 2002, 58th round (July2002-Dec 2002)

2.6.4 Electricity in Urban Slum

Table 2.15 presents the data regarding availability of electricity in the slums. Electricity can be available in the houses and in the streets. 84 per cent of the notified slums and only 53 per cent of the non-notified slums had electricity in

both the households and streets. 11 per cent of the notified slums and 25 per cent of the non-notified slums had electricity only in the household. However, 4 per cent of the notified slums and 6 per cent of the non-notified slums had only streetlight.

Thus we find that environment and availability of basic services are not adequate in the urban slums. This leads to problems of health and hygiene. The other problems of slums relate to crime and theft. Though work participation rate of slum workers are higher than the general urban population of India, it is a fact that everyone does not get employment. This leads to different kinds of theft and crime and slums are thought to be the breeding ground of these activities, which is a big problem of slums.

We have learnt here:

- The conditions of housing, roads and basic services prevailing in urban slums are poor.

Activity 4

Find out the conditions of housing, roads and basic services in any urban slum.

2.7 MIGRATION AND URBAN PROBLEMS

Migration to urban areas further aggravates urban problems. Thus in short, urban problems due to migration can be summed up as follows:

- Migration to urban areas, especially rural-urban migration puts pressure on the already strained urban basic services like water supply, sewerage, drainage, garbage disposal and electricity.
- Migration to urban areas puts pressure on urban housing.
- Migration to urban areas makes the cities congested.
- Migration to urban areas creates problems for transport in the city by putting pressure on the transport system.
- Migration to urban areas aggravates problems of environmental pollution.
- Rural-urban migration increases slums in urban areas.
- Increase in slums increases anti-social activities.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: a) Answer the following questions in about 50 words.

b) Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

1) What is the condition of roads in urban slums?

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) Write any three migration induced urban problems.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2.8 LET US SUM UP

Migration means movement of people from one place to another. Migration is an important factor, which affects the structure of the population. The definition of migrant by POB is that a person is enumerated at a place other than his place of birth. The definition of migrant by POLR is that a person is enumerated at a place other than his place of last residence. In terms of percentage the total urban migrants were 32.8 percent of the total internal migrants in India in 2001.

Migration to urban areas, especially rural-urban migration puts pressure on the already strained urban basic services like water supply, sewerage, drainage, garbage disposal and electricity and housing. It also makes cities congested and puts pressure on the transport system. Further, it aggravates problems of air and environmental pollution and increases anti-social activities.

2.9 KEY WORDS

Migration: Migration means movement of people from one place to another.

Migrant by POB: The definition of migrant by POB is that a person is enumerated at a place other than his place of birth.

Migrant by POLR: The definition of migrant by POLR is that a person is enumerated at a place other than his place of last residence.

Work Participation Rate: Percentage of total workers to total population

2.10 REFERENCES AND SELECTED READINGS

Banerjee, B. (1986). *Rural to Urban Migration and the Urban Labour Market*. Delhi:Himalaya Publishing House

Bhagat, B.R. (2009). Internal migration in India: Are the underclass more mobile? Paper presented in the 26th IUSSP General Population Conference held in Marrakech, Morocco, 27 September to 2 October 2009.

Billsborrow, R.E. (1998). The state of the art and overview of the chapters, in Richard E. Billsborrow (Ed.), *Migration, Urbanisation and Development: New Directions and Issues, Proceedings of the Symposium on Internal Migration and Urbanisation in Developing Countries*, 22-24 January 1996, New York, (Massachusetts, United Population Fund and Kluwer Academic Publishers) 1-56.

Census of India (2001). *Final Population Totals, 2001*, Office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner, GOI, New Delhi.

Chattopadhyay, B. (2005). Why do women workers migrate? Some answers by rural-urban female migrants, *Urban India*, 23(2), 69-91.

Kundu A. and N. Sarangi (2007). Migration, employment status and poverty: An analysis across urban centres. *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 27, 299-306.

National Institute of Urban Affairs (2005). *Status of Water Supply, Sanitation and Solid Waste Management in Urban Areas*, New Delhi: National Institute of Urban Affairs

Neetha. N. (2004). Making of female bread winners, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34(17), 1681-1688

Singh, A. M. (1984). Rural to urban migration of women in India: Patterns and implications. In *Women in the Cities of Asia: Migration and Urban Adaptation*, James T. Fawcett, Siew-Ean Khoo and Peter C. Smith, eds. Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press.

The World Bank (2009). World Development Report 2009: Reshaping Economic Geography. Washington D.C. The World Bank

2.11 CHECK YOUR PROGRESS – POSSIBLE ANSWERS

Check Your Progress-1

- 1) What is the most important reason of migration of rural-urban migrant men and women?

Answer: Male migrants from rural to urban areas in India migrate for reasons related to worsening in economic situation, employment and better employment opportunities. The macro data like that from census finds women moving mainly with family and marriage, many micro studies have shown that many of the rural-urban women migrants migrate for employment.

- 2) What is the most important reason of migration of rural-urban migrant men and women?

Answer: If young people of working age group migrate to a place, then the age composition of the people at destination changes and become younger. This means when young people out-migrate from an area, the older people and children are left behind. Thus, the age composition of people of the area of origin of the migrants tilts to the higher side. If substantial numbers of men out-migrate from the rural area to work in the urban area, then the numbers of women become more in the area of origin at rural area and the numbers of men become more in the population of the area of the destination.

Check Your Progress-2

- 1) What is the condition of roads in urban slums?

Answer: During 2002, around 86 per cent of the notified slums and 67 per cent of the non-notified slums had pucca approach road. Around 71 per cent of the roads within the notified slums and 37 per cent of the non-notified slums were pucca. Waterlogging on the roads create health hazards in the slums. Around 36 per cent of the notified slums and 54 per cent of the non-notified slums were affected by water logging either on the approach road or on the roads within the slums.

2) Write any three migration induced urban problems.

Answer: Migration to urban areas further aggravates urban problems. Thus in short, urban problems due to migration can be summed up as follows:

- Migration to urban areas, especially rural-urban migration puts pressure on the already strained urban basic services like water supply, sewerage, drainage, garbage disposal and electricity.
- Migration to urban areas puts pressure on urban housing.
- Migration to urban areas makes the cities congested.



UNIT 3 URBAN POVERTY, UNEMPLOYMENT AND DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS

Structure

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Urban Poverty: Types and Dimensions
- 3.3 Urban Unemployment: Types and Dimensions
- 3.4 Urban Development Programmes Initiated Since Independence
- 3.5 Public Private Partnership in Urban Development
- 3.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 3.7 Key Words
- 3.8 References and Selected Readings
- 3.9 Check Your Progress – Possible Answers

3.1 INTRODUCTION

To a common man, poverty means hunger. Poverty has been defined as a multifaceted and dynamic concept. The official estimate of poverty is based on normative level of consumption expenditure. Poverty is estimated on the minimum food intake by an individual expressed in monetary terms. This would cover the minimum nutritional diet and possibly allow for certain essential non-food expenditure. However, poverty calculated solely on individual's income does not cover the other parameters of deprivation like access to safe drinking water, sanitation, health, literacy etc. Therefore, it is important to define poverty in broader terms taking deprivation and vulnerability into consideration. In fact, poverty line is a measure of absolute poverty and is widely used to assess the extent of poverty within and across countries.

According to the latest round of the National Sample Survey Organisation (61st round) data, there existed more than 80 million poor people in cities and towns of the country in 2004-05, with the percentage of urban population below poverty line at 25.7 per cent. The absolute number of urban poor in the country has increased by more than 4 million between 1993-94 and 2004-05. The urban poverty ratio is much higher in several large urbanizing states compared to the rural poverty ratio. According to a recent Indian government committee constituted to estimate poverty, nearly 38% of India's population (380 million) is poor. The committee headed by Dr. Tendulkar has used a different methodology to reach at the current figure. It has taken into consideration indicators for health, education, sanitation, nutrition and income as per National Sample Survey Organization survey of 2004-05. This new methodology is a complex scientific basis aimed at addressing the concern raised over the current poverty estimation.

In the presently prevailing period, unemployment has become a challenge to Indian economy. All strategies and plans formulated to tackle the unemployment problem are not providing satisfactory outcomes whereby the desired level of unemployment mitigation is leading towards becoming a myth in India.

After studying this unit you should be able to:

- Define the concept of poverty and discuss the role of MDGs in alleviating poverty
- Discuss the causes and consequences of urban poverty and unemployment
- Describe various urban development programmes initiated by GOI since independence
- Public private partnership in urban development

3.2 URBAN POVERTY: TYPES AND DIMENSIONS

Poverty is one of the main problems, which have attracted attention of sociologists and economists. It indicates a condition in which a person fails to maintain a living standard adequate for his physical and mental efficiency. The term poverty is a relative concept. It is very difficult to draw a demarcation line between affluence and poverty. According to Adam Smith - Man is rich or poor according to the degree in which he can afford to enjoy the necessities, the conveniences and the amusements of human life.

An analysis of the 50th and 55th rounds of the NSSO shows that the percentage of people below poverty line to be less in metro cities, compared to small towns (Kundu, 2006). The figures for the small towns are marginally below that of rural areas. Similar observation was also made by Dubey and Gangopadhyay (2001) using the same data.

The analysis of the data brought out by the 50th and 55th rounds of NSS further shows that per capita calorie intake for the bottom three deciles of population in the small and medium cities/mediums work out to be much below that of large cities but equal to or slightly below the corresponding rural figure. Moreover, the fat intake in the small towns is significantly below than in large cities. All these indicate the lack of affordability in the small towns, and therefore higher incidence of poverty.

According to S.R. Harim, the poverty levels in small size towns with less than 50,000 population are high, in the middle size towns, the poverty levels are lower and they are lowest for large towns. Similar results on the relationship between town size and poverty were observed by Kundu and Sarangi (2005) as given in Table-1. According to the data, the large cities exhibit distinctly higher demographic growth, better infrastructural facilities and higher levels of education and lower poverty ratios. According to Kundu and Sarangi, the quality of employment, productivity and returns to education are likely to be better in large cities than in small towns.

Table 1: Percentage of Poor in Different Size Classes of Cities/Town

City/Town Size	1993-94	1999-2000
Large Towns/Cities	18.4	14.2
Medium Towns/Cities	27.6	20.4
Small Towns	33.2	24.2
All Urban Areas	27.4	19.9

Source: Kundu A and Sarangi N (2005), "Employment Guarantee – The Issue of Urban Exclusion", *Economic and Political Weekly* 40(30), 3642-6

As per the 57th round of the NSSO, the proportion of chronically hungry households (not getting enough to eat during any month of the year) has declined to 0.1 per cent in urban areas. Further, 3 per thousand households in urban areas reported getting enough food only in some months of the year.

One would notice high deprivation of calorie intake in rural areas compared to urban areas based on the analysis of the NSS quinquennial data on consumption expenditure for the bottom 30 per cent of the population. Average per capita calorie intake worked out to be 1673 and 1634 for rural and urban areas respectively in 1993-94. In urban areas there has been some improvement in calorie intake during 1994-2000, while for the rural areas, it has remained more or less the same (Kundu, 2005).

Urban poverty manifests itself in various forms, viz, (a) proliferation of slums and squatters; (b) fast growth of the informal sector; (c) increasing casualisation of labour; (d) increasing pressure on civic services; (e) increasing educational deprivation and health contingencies. The Working Group on Urban Poverty appointed by the National Commission on Urbanization (1988) observed that the most pressing of the urban challenges is that posed by urban poverty. The problem of urban poverty is a manifestation of the higher incidence of marginal and low income employment in the informal sector; therefore, it is essential to upgrade informal sector occupations.

The vulnerability of a household to be poor may be of the following types. One or multiple type of vulnerability may be found to occur in any poor household.

Housing Vulnerability: Lack of tenure, poor quality shelter without ownership rights, no access to individual water connection/toilets, unhealthy and insanitary living conditions. The fact that household size affects the poverty status of a household is well known. Larger households tend to have a higher probability of being poor.

Economic Vulnerability: Irregular/casual employment, low paid work, lack of access to credit on reasonable terms, lack of access to formal safety net programmes, low ownership of productive assets, poor net worth, legal constraints to self-employment.

Social Vulnerability: Low education, lack of skills, low social capital/caste status, inadequate access to food security programmes, lack of access to health services, exclusion from local institutions.

Personal Vulnerability: Proneness to violence or intimidation, especially women, children, the elderly, disabled and destitute, belonging to low castes and minority groups, lack of information, lack of access to justice.

In addition to the generic aspects of poverty there are certain characteristics of poverty, which are particular to circumstances within which poor people live. At the city level the urban poor live unhygienic and overcrowded condition. Some occupy precarious sites vulnerable to fire in the dry season and flooding during monsoon. The risk of outbreak of disease and epidemics is also high in these areas. Further, poor urban households are heavily dependent on informal labor market. Their vulnerability is related to insecurity of highly segmented labor market. Access to jobs and training is determined to a high degree by gender,

caste and neighborhood. Vulnerability relates to type of work, regularity of wage labour and availability of capital among the self employed. A study has shown that 53 percent of household dependent on unprotected and irregular employment are below the poverty line. The increasing casualisation of labor markets for both men and women is an important feature of urban poverty. High percentage of male migrants making their entry in the informal labor market is common in India.

In the context of limited asset base where livelihood security is dependent on income and employment, the issue of tenure is very important. Most of the vulnerable households live in slums or squat on public land and their fear of eviction is a constant source of insecurity. Further the urban poor are highly dependent on public agencies for their daily basic needs.

Support from family and community based network is limited among the urban poor. Although slum residents live in clearly defined occupational or caste based grouping, they necessarily do not trust each other. Many studies had shown that the threat of violent is a constant feature of urban life. This is exacerbated by youth under-employment, alcoholism and drug abuse, especially among men.

Finally vulnerability is more pronounced for the women folk. 'Feminisation of poverty' is a term used to describe the overwhelming representation of women among the poor. Women tend to be disproportionately represented among the poor (World Bank 1989). Poverty studies from both developed and developing countries show that women are more subjected to poverty and vulnerability than men. Beyond these structural features, there are specific groups of the urban poor who face the additional vulnerability, like the elderly, disabled, young children and women. Individuals disassociated from household are also prone to increased vulnerability, as for example, street children beggars, sex workers and abandoned women.

Vulnerability as discussed in the previous section is a chronic set of structural condition which maintains people in a constant precarious state. It is not necessarily equated with shocks as for example, a disaster but rather with the structure at household level and within communities around where people live. It is deeply embedded within the structure of the state and society which reproduce inequality, exclusion and exploitation and therefore limit the poor people choices.

3.3 URBAN UNEMPLOYMENT: TYPES AND DIMENSIONS

Unemployment data show that the overall unemployment rates are not high, though they are higher in urban areas than in rural areas. The unemployed person-day rates are higher than the rates obtained for persons, thereby indicating a high degree of intermittent unemployment. This is mainly due to the absence of regular employment for many workers. Studies have shown that casualisation of labour is the main, and increasing, source of urban poverty. The dynamics of development in urban areas of many states during the past two decades has been such that rapid economic growth has not led to a corresponding decline in poverty. While income levels are rising to meet the basic nutritional needs, other equally basic needs of shelter, civic amenities, health care, educational and social needs, etc. are not being met in an adequate fashion. Urban poverty, thus, emerges as a more complex phenomenon than rural poverty.

The disaggregative data on employment in three different size class of urban centers and rural areas as brought out by the 50th and 55th rounds (of Employment and Unemployment) reveal that rates of unemployment do not show much variation, although the million plus cities report slightly higher figures. It has been argued that it would be erroneous to take unemployment as an index of deprivation since studies based on NSS as well as other survey data reveal that it is generally high in households that are economically better off and can afford to wait and choose in the labour market (Kundu, 2005). Indeed the poor in the country are too poor to afford to remain unemployed. As a consequence, the unemployment in small towns works out to be less than in bigger towns/cities. Interestingly, the percentage of unemployed is higher among the non-poor even in small and medium towns.

According to the 61st round of NSSO survey on employment and unemployment for July 2004-05, the number of unemployed per 1000 persons in the labour force was 17 in the rural areas and 45 in the urban areas. As far as the employment pattern in the urban areas is concerned, the NSSO (2004-05) has envisaged that out of the total employment, 45.4 percent are self employed, 39.5 percent are regular employees and 15 percent are casual laborers. The self employed are the small petty shop owners, vendors, hand rickshaw pullers and auto rickshaw etc. Most of them are in a subsistence living condition. The percentage of poverty among the self employed, salaried and casual labourers are 32.1, 16.3 and 55.0 percent respectively.

Table 2: Percentage of Workers (15-64 Years) in Poverty in Urban Areas, 1983-2000

Categories	1983	1987-89	1993-34	1999-2000
Self-employed	43.8	40.7	33.5	32.1
Salaried	26.3	24.0	17.8	16.3
Casual Labour	63.6	64.1	57.2	55.0
Total	40.1	37.8	31.5	29.7

Source: *India Urban Poverty Report, 2009, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India*

The NSSO has following findings with regard to the urban unemployment rate in different states:

- i) State having lower casual wage rates have lower unemployment rates- Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh;
- ii) Some of the developed states such as Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu found to have low unemployment rate;
- iii) Unemployment rates are significantly higher than overall employment for educated and youth.

Unemployment at any given point of time may be either due to one of the factors mentioned above or a combination of several factors (mentioned above). It has also been observed that if the labour market in the economy does not work in an optimum manner, it leads to unemployment. Factors like rapid changes in technology; recessions; inflation; disability; undulating business cycles; changes

in tastes as well as alterations in the climatic conditions; discriminating factors in the place of work also result in unemployment.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: a) Answer the following questions in about 50 words.

b) Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

1) What do you understand by feminization of poverty?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What is the employment pattern in the urban areas?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.4 URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES INITIATED SINCE INDEPENDENCE

Urban development programmes with a focus on reduction and alleviation of poverty, has been one of the objectives of five-year plans in the country since the beginning of the planned era. This was, however, brought into the core of planning exercise only during the Fifth year plan. The consumption levels of different commodities were projected in this plan by taking higher growth rates for people in lower consumption brackets. Extensive research has since then been carried out to study the dimensions of poverty, its temporal trend, spatial pattern etc. This led to identification of theoretical solutions for reduction of poverty and launching of programmes during the past five year plans.

An analysis of the government policies and programmes and investment pattern during the fifties, sixties and seventies reveals a distinct bias for urban areas. Public sector investment in infrastructure and basic services improved the level of services in urban centers, which accentuated the rural urban disparity. These investments were concentrated mostly in the large cities that attracted private investments as well as subsidized institutional funds. This resulted in creation of employment opportunities at a higher level of productivity earnings than in rural areas, widening the gap between their income levels. This period also witnessed the creation of a number of Boards and Corporations at the state level and development authorities at the city level. Considerable funds were routed through these agencies that improved the level of services for at least a section of the urban population.

Removal of poverty received attention initially in the Fifth Five Year Plan. The earlier plans did not emphasize on proper analysis of the dimension of poverty. The Fifth Plan noted that the consumption levels of the bottom 30 per cent of the country's population remained below the minimum of Rs.40.6 per capita per month at 1972-73 prices. No distinction was, however, made between rural and urban poverty. The plan stressed poverty could be removed by promoting economic growth and through proper implementation of the national level programmes like Minimum Needs Programme. The Sixth Plan addressed the problem of poverty in a more focused manner and recognized that economic growth process by itself was not enough to tackle poverty. It noted that about 51 per cent of the rural population and 41 per cent of the urban population were living below the poverty line in 1979-80. Specific programmes like Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns, Minimum Needs Programme, Urban Basic Services, Integrated Rural Development Programme, National Rural Development Programme (NRDP) etc. were recommended for urban and rural areas. The Sixth Plan showed a distinct bias in favour of rural poverty by implementing specific programmes. The programmes that have been launched since independence have been briefly discussed in the following section.

Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT)

The programme was launched in 1979-80 basically for developing small and medium towns partly by providing basic services to poor and also by improving their economic conditions so that the growth of metro cities could be arrested. Initially, the scope of the programme was restricted to towns with populations below one hundred thousand as per the 1971 Census. It had been decided in the Eighth Plan to include cities having population of five hundred thousand as per the Census of 1991.

Low Cost Sanitation Programme (LCS)

The goal of providing sanitation facilities to eighty per cent of urban population was fixed in the early eighties with the announcement of the UN Decadal Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation. Accordingly, a centrally sponsored scheme was launched in 1980-81, with the objective of eliminating manual scavenging through conversion of dry latrines. It covered all the households, which have dry latrines and those having no latrines including slum and squatter settlements. Under this scheme, loan¹ and Central subsidy were both channeled through HUDCO.

Shelter and Sanitation for Pavement Dwellers (SSPD)

This programme was launched in large urban areas including metropolitan cities, having sizable shelter-less population. The Tenth Plan has pointed out that the provision of subsidy under the scheme has to be adequate to make it feasible for the NGOs to take up shelter construction. The grants per bed should also be revised to achieve the objective of providing a sufficient number of night-shelters for the homeless women and children. The Pay and Use component of this scheme is being merged with the Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan of VAMBAY.

Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme (AUWSP)

This is another centrally sponsored scheme launched during the Eighth Plan for providing water to the towns having less than 20,000 population as per the Census of 1991, operationally under the State PHED to be funded by the Central

Government, State Government and concerned ULBs on 50:45:5 ratio. The Centre met the entire cost in Union Territories.

National Slum Development Programme (NSDP)

The NSDP initiated in 1996 as a scheme of Special Central Assistance for slum improvement, has been providing additional central assistance to state governments to provide water supply and sanitation among other facilities to the slums.

VAMBAY (Valmiki-Ambedkar Awas Yojana)

This scheme has been launched in 2001-02 to provide shelter or upgrade the existing shelter of the people living below poverty line in urban slums implemented in partnership with state governments who will set up the implementation machinery, arrange for land where required and for the credit component for housing. The state funds under the scheme will be in proportion to their slum population.

Nehru Rozgar Yojana (NRY)

In order to alleviate the conditions of urban poor, a Centrally Sponsored programme - Nehru Rozgar Yojana - was launched at the end of the Seventh Five Year Plan (October 1989) with the objective of providing of employment to the urban unemployed and underemployed poor. The Central Government indicated its overall contribution while the essential task of identifying, earmarking and coordinating the relevant sectoral inputs was undertaken by the State Governments. The NRY consisted of three schemes namely (i) the Scheme of Urban Micro Enterprises (SUME); (ii) the Scheme of Urban Wage Employment (SUWE); and (iii) the Scheme of Housing and Shelter Upgradation (SHASU). During the Eighth Plan, 92% of the available funds were utilised and but for the shortfall in the number of dwelling units upgraded/in progress under SHASU, the targets have been achieved under all the other schemes.

Urban Basic Services for the Poor (UBSP)

The UBSP Programme was implemented as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme during the Eighth Five Year Plan with the specific objectives of effective achievement of the social sector goals; community organization, mobilization and empowerment; and convergence through sustainable support system. The expenditure on the Programme was being shared on a 60:40 basis between the Central and the State Governments and UTs (with legislatures). Further, the per capita expenditure on any slum pocket is Rs.75/- in the first year and Rs.50/- from the second year onwards after the basic infrastructure is developed.

Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Programme (PM IUPEP)

Recognizing the seriousness and complexity of urban poverty problems, especially in the small towns, the PMI UPEP was launched in November, 1995 applicable to all Class II urban agglomerations with a population ranging between 50,000 and one lakh subject to the condition that elections to local bodies have been held.

The Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY)

The Nehru Rozgar Yojna (NRY) and Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Programme (PMI UPEP) were two important direct poverty alleviation programmes in urban areas. Although their thrust was on employment and income generation for urban poor, these had components for provision of basic services as well. PMI UPEP was launched in the year 1995-96 with the objectives of employment generation, shelter upgradation, social development and community empowerment. It may, however, be noted that during 1997, the three programmes of UBSP, NRY and PMIUPEP have been merged into a single employment generation programme called Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY).

The SJSRY is a Centrally Sponsored Scheme applicable to all the urban areas with expenditure to be shared in ratio 75:25 between the Centre and States/UTs. The programme has two sub-schemes namely, (a) Urban Self –Employment Programme and (b) Urban Wage Employment Programme. The self-employment and wage employment components of the NRY and PMIUPEP have been re-organised under this single programme. The shelter upgradation components of both NRY and PMIUPEP have been merged with the National Slum Development Programme.

The SJSRY seeks to provide gainful employment to the urban unemployed or underemployed poor by encouraging the setting up of self-employment ventures or provision of wage employment. This programme is based on the creation of suitable community structures on the UBSP pattern and delivery of inputs under this programme was devised through urban local bodies and similar community institutional structures and rests on the foundation of community empowerment. Community organisations like Neighbourhood Groups (NHGs), Neighbourhood Committees (NHCs) and Community Development Societies (CDSs) have been set up in the target areas based on the UBSP pattern. The CDSs is the focal point for purposes of identification of beneficiaries, preparation of applications, monitoring of recovery and generally providing whatever other support is necessary to the programme. The CDSs identifies viable projects suitable for that particular area.

Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM)

Urban Renewal, with a focus on inclusive development of urban centers, is one of the thrust areas in the National Common Minimum Programme of the Government and accordingly Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) was launched on 3rd December 2005 with an investment of Rs.50,000.00 crores in the Mission period of seven years beginning 2005-06. The Mission aims to encourage reforms and fast-track infrastructure development with a focus on efficiency in urban infrastructure and services delivery mechanism, community participation, accountability of ULBs towards citizens. The primary objective of the JNNURM is to create economically productive, efficient, equitable and responsive cities. To achieve this objective, the Mission focuses on integrated development of infrastructure services; securing linkages between asset creation and maintenance for long-run project sustainability; accelerating the flow of investment into urban infrastructure services; planned urban development; renewal of inner-city areas and universalisation of urban services to ensure balanced urban development.

The Mission has also succeeded in getting the state and city governments to commit themselves to structural reforms which the Central government had failed to achieve despite adopting several measures and incentive schemes proposed since early nineties through other programmes and legislations (Kundu, et.al 2007). In fact, a set of 23 mandatory reforms have to be introduced by the respective state governments and cities as per the commitments made by them in the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) at the beginning of the mission period. The JNNURM is thus a mission of macro economic growth wherein ground conditions have been created through reform measures and infrastructural investment in 65 select cities for attracting domestic and foreign investment. The JNNURM has two sub-missions for the mission cities, viz, (1) Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG) and (2) Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP).

The JNNURM is expected to cater to the non-mission towns and cities under the two components, namely, the (1) Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG) of UIDSSMT and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP). The programme is expected to cover all other Census towns under Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT). The existing programme of IDSMT, AUWSP has been subsumed under UIDSSMT. Likewise, the existing VAMBAY and the discontinued NSDP have been subsumed in the IHSDP.

Activity 2

Visit your Municipality/Municipal Corporation. Find out the details of the current urban development programmes in your city/state.

3.5 PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The nineties have witnessed a dramatic change in the perspective of urban governance, wherein the responsibility of provision of basic services has shifted from the central government to the state and local governments, private agencies and community-based organisations. Cities and towns have been given clear directives to make capital investment in water supply and sanitation facilities, besides covering their operational costs. These are to be undertaken mostly through institutional and private finance rather than budgetary support. The allocations for government departments and parastatal agencies allowing them to undertake capital projects have been cut down drastically. The high cost of borrowing has discouraged them from taking up any financially non remunerative but socially desirable projects, like those for providing water and sanitation facilities in low-income areas. This has seriously affected the access of the urban poor to basic amenities.

Recent years have witnessed increased private sector participation in the provision of basic services. Water supply and solid waste management are the two sectors wherein private sector has shown the maximum interest in the nineties. The core of the argument here is that the urban local bodies can through this achieve substantial cost saving while making it possible for the companies to conduct their business with profit. The issue whether such sub-contracting arrangements leads to dilution of social responsibility and exclusion of the poor and vulnerable

sections from the formal delivery system, would be the key area of concern in this context.

The scheme of Affordable Housing in Partnership aims at operationalising the strategy envisaged in the National Urban Housing & Habitat Policy (NUHHP) 2007, of promoting various types of public-private partnerships – of the government sector with the private sector, the cooperative sector, the financial services sector, the state parastatals, ULBs, etc. – for realizing the goal of affordable housing for all. It intends to provide a major stimulus to economic activities through affordable housing for the creation of employment, especially for the construction workers and other urban poor who were the most vulnerable groups during recession. It also targets the creation of demand for a large variety of industrial goods through the multiplier effect of housing on other economic activities.

This Scheme is a part of the JNNURM and takes into account the experience of implementing BSUP and IHSDP, and the assessment that shortfall in response from BSUP towns is a factor of the lack of urban land availability for expansion of cities. The scheme is also an acknowledgement of the strain of BSUP and IHSDP on state budgetary resources, and the need to draw in institutional finance for construction of affordable housing on a mass scale. The scheme seeks to encourage State Governments to make provision for land to meet the acute shortage of affordable housing and to work in the partnership model envisaged in the NUHHP 2007. Land costs would be intermediated by States/UTs and ULBs, by providing land at nominal, predetermined or institutional rates for specified housing or integrated housing projects which would be the prerequisite for the scheme. Costs of land could also be intermediated by attracting private developers to build on their land, by granting zoning-related incentives such as land use conversion, extra floor area space for the construction of affordable houses to be allotted by the State/UT government, etc. It has also been suggested that the cost of construction could also be driven down by planning layouts which mix EWS/LIG/MIG with HIG houses and commercial layouts, and cross subsidizing through the premium earned on the sale of HIG and commercial spaces. While these innovative instruments might help in catering to the housing needs of a section of the population, which may not be the poor, the easier way for undertaking this task by entrusting the state housing boards and parastatals, set up for this purpose seems to be lost sight off.

Under the 'provision of household level basic services' reforms under JNNURM, housing does figure. Under this scheme, private agencies are being encouraged to take up slum redevelopment where existing slums are being rebuilt with multi-storey structures. However, substantial land thus acquired in the name of housing for the poor is being earmarked for commercial and residential uses of the non-poor. The subsidies directed to the poor are thus cornered by the private agencies either for themselves or for the section of the population who can afford market prices at prime locations in cities.

Earmarking 20-25 per cent of developed land by private developers for the EWS and LIG category is another promising area under the central reform. It is difficult to understand why the private sector would earmark 25 per cent of their developed land for the urban poor when the public sector including public institutions like HUDCO have given up their social responsibility of providing housing for the poor.

The increased participation sought from the private sector in providing municipal services by making it mandatory to frame state level regulatory and policy initiatives for the purpose is another reform which calls for attention. If municipal services are provided and managed by the private sector, determined by market, there would be chances of the poor being priced out.

Activity 3

Visit your Municipality/Municipal Corporation. Find out the details of the current urban development programmes in your city/state undertaken on PPP.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: a) Answer the following questions in about 50 words.

b) Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

1) Write about the National Slum Development Programme?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What is the idea behind the Public Private Partnership in Urban Development?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.6 LET US SUM UP

To a common man, poverty means hunger. Poverty has been defined as a multifaceted and dynamic concept. The official estimate of poverty is based on normative level of consumption expenditure. Poverty is estimated on the minimum food intake by an individual expressed in monetary terms. According to the latest round of the National Sample Survey Organization (61st round) data, there existed more than 80 million poor people in cities and towns of the country in 2004-05, with the percentage of urban population below poverty line at 25.7 per cent.

Urban poverty manifests itself in various forms, viz, (a) proliferation of slums and squatters; (b) fast growth of the informal sector; (c) increasing casualisation of labour; (d) increasing pressure on civic services; (e) increasing educational deprivation and health contingencies. The Working Group on Urban Poverty appointed by the National Commission on Urbanisation (1988) observed that the most pressing of the urban challenges is that posed by urban poverty. The

problem of urban poverty is a manifestation of the higher incidence of marginal and low income employment in the informal sector; therefore, it is essential to upgrade informal sector occupations. Hence there is a need for emphasis on generation of self-employment in processing and services sector, improving the access to technology and credit and above all improving the general legal and physical environment which governs the working of the informal sector.

Urban development programmes with a focus on reduction and alleviation of poverty, has been one of the objectives of five-year plans in the country since the beginning of the planned era. This was, however, brought into the core of planning exercise only during the Fifth year plan. The consumption levels of different commodities were projected in this plan by taking higher growth rates for people in lower consumption brackets. Extensive research has since then been carried out to study the dimensions of poverty, its temporal trend, spatial pattern etc. This led to identification of theoretical solutions for reduction of poverty and launching of programmes during the past five year plans.

The nineties have witnessed increased private sector participation in the provision of basic services. Water supply and solid waste management are the two sectors wherein private sector has shown the maximum interest in the nineties. The core of the argument here is that the urban local bodies can through this achieve substantial cost saving while making it possible for the companies to conduct their business with profit. The issue whether such sub-contracting arrangements leads to dilution of social responsibility and exclusion of the poor and vulnerable sections from the formal delivery system, would be the key area of concern in this context.

3.7 KEY WORDS

Poverty: Poverty has been defined as a multifaceted and dynamic concept. The official estimate of poverty is based on normative level of consumption expenditure. Poverty is estimated on the minimum food intake by an individual expressed in monetary terms.

Millennium Development Goals: The MDGs are certain time bound and quantified targets for reducing extreme poverty and extending universal rights across the globe by 2015 adopted in the year 2000 through the Millennium Declaration.

Structural poverty: Structural poverty may be defined as a situation in which the poor are unable to accumulate resources or earn enough to move out of the vicious cycle of poverty.

Slum: A slum is a compact settlement with a collection of poorly built tenements mostly of temporary nature, crowded together usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities in unhygienic conditions. Such an area, for the purpose of this survey, was considered as “non-notified slum” if at least 20 households lived in that areas. Areas notified as slums by the respective municipalities, corporations, local bodies or development authorities are treated as “notified slums”. For survey, slums in urban areas only were considered. The slum dwellings are commonly known as “Jhopad Pati”, in Bombay and “Jhuggi Jhopri” in Delhi.

Squatter Slum: Sometimes an area develops into an unauthorised settlement with unauthorised structures put up by “Squatters”. Squatter settlements were the slum like settlements, which did not have the stipulated number of 20 households to be classified as a slum.

JNNURM: Launched in 2005, Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) is a central government reform linked programme of urban renewal wherein adoption of reforms in urban governance is mandatory for all the states and 65 Mission cities (all State capitals, all million plus cities and cities of historical interest).

3.8 REFERENCES AND SELECTD READINGS

Asthana, M.D. and Sabir Ali (2004), “ Urban Poverty in India “, New Delhi, Council for Social Development and Uppal Publishing House.

Council for Social Development (2006), “India: Social Development Report”, Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Jha, Ramanath, and Nasrin Siddiqui, (2000),” People-friendly cities: Explorations in India Urban Governance”, Mumbai, UNICEF.

Kadekodi, G.K. and G.V.S.N. Murty, (1992), “ Poverty in India: Data Base Issues”, New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd.

Kundu, A. Bagchi, S. and Kundu, D. (1999), “Regional Distribution of Infrastructure and Basic Amenities in Urban India”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34/28/1999.

Kundu, Amitabh (2001), “ Institutional Innovations for Urban Infrastructure Development-The India Scenario”, in *Good Urban Governance Campaign-India Launch Learning from one another*, UNCHS (Habitat), New Delhi, September 4 to 6.

Kundu, Amitabh and Darshini MaAhadevia (2002), “Poverty and Vulnerability in a Globalising Metropolis :Ahmedabad”, New Delhi, Manak Publications Pvt Ltd.

Kundu, Amitabh and Niranjana Sarangi (2005), “Issue of Urban Exclusion”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 13.

Kundu, Amitabh, (1993), “In the Name of the Urban Poor: Access to Basic Amenities”, New Delhi, Sage Publications India.

Sen, Amartya, (1981), “Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation”, Delhi, Oxford University Press.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2006), “Human Development Report 2005”, New Delhi.

3.9 CHECK YOUR PROGRESS – POSSIBLE ANSWERS

Check Your Progress-1

- 1) What do you understand by feminization of poverty?

‘Feminisation of poverty’ is a term used to describe the overwhelming representation of women among the poor. Women tend to be disproportionately represented among the poor. Poverty studies from both developed and developing countries show that women are more subjected to poverty and vulnerability than men.

- 2) What is the employment pattern in the urban areas?

As far as the employment pattern in the urban areas is concerned, the NSSO (2004-05) has envisaged that out of the total employment, 45.4 percent are self employed, 39.5 percent are regular employees and 15 percent are casual labourers. The self employed are the small petty shop owners, vendors, hand rickshaw pullers and auto rickshaw etc. Most of them are in a subsistence living condition. The percentage of poverty among the self employed, salaried and casual labourers are 32.1, 16.3 and 55.0 percent respectively.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Write about the National Slum Development Programme?

The NSDP initiated in 1996 as a scheme of Special Central Assistance for slum improvement, has been providing additional central assistance to state governments to provide water supply and sanitation among other facilities to the slums.

- 2) What is the idea behind the Public Private Partnership in Urban Development?

Recent years have witnessed increased private sector participation in the provision of basic services. Water supply and solid waste management are the two sectors wherein private sector has shown the maximum interest in the nineties. The core of the argument here is that the urban local bodies can through this achieve substantial cost saving while making it possible for the companies to conduct their business with profit.

MDV-109: Development in India – An Overview

BLOCK 1 DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES AND PLANNING	
UNIT 1	Pre-Independent Development Initiatives
UNIT 2	Planning and Development Initiatives: Pre Liberalization Period
UNIT 3	Planning and Development Initiatives: Post Liberalization Period
UNIT 4	Globalization and Development in India
BLOCK 2 RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA	
UNIT 1	Rural Development : An Overview
UNIT 2	Agriculture and Rural Economy
UNIT 3	Rural Industrialization
UNIT 4	Rural Cooperatives and Banking
UNIT 5	Rural Poverty Unemployment and Development Interventions
BLOCK 3 URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA	
UNIT 1	Urbanization in India – An Overview
UNIT 2	Migration and Urban Problems
UNIT 3	Urban Poverty Unemployment and Development Interventions
BLOCK 4 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT	
UNIT 1	Development of Scheduled Castes
UNIT 2	Development of Scheduled Tribes
UNIT 3	Youth Development
BLOCK 5 ROLE OF PUBLIC, PRIVATE AND SERVICE SECTORS IN DEVELOPMENT	
UNIT 1	Role of Public Sector in Development
UNIT 2	Role of Private/Corporate Sector in Development
UNIT 3	Development of Service Sector
UNIT 4	Role of Unorganised Sector in Development

MPDD/IGNOU/P.O. 1K/December, 2018



ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

ISBN : 978-93-88498-16-6