



UN
DP

*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*



How Inclusive has Growth Been During 1993/94-2009/10?

Part-II: State-Level Analysis

By Sukhadeo Thorat and Amaresh Dubey

Disclaimer

The views in the publication are those of the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations Development Programme

Copyright © UNDP 2013. All rights reserved. Published in India.

Cover Photo © Niklas Halle'n/UNDP India

How Inclusive has Growth Been During 1993/94-2009/10?

Part-II: State-Level Analysis

Sukhadeo Thorat and Amaresh Dubey

Acknowledgements

We are thankful to Seeta Prabhu for her patience and encouragement to carry out this analysis and to Veronica Pala and Shivakar Tiwari for their help in calculations.

Version: March 2013

Contents

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Note on data and methodological issues**
- 3. Poverty, Inequality and Growth at the State-Level: Aggregate**
- 4. Poverty and Growth at the State-Level: Social Group**
- 5. Poverty and Growth at the State-Level: Religious Groups**
- 6. Summary and Policy Implications**
- 7. References**
- 8. Statistical Tables**
- 9. Appendix Tables**

How Inclusive has Growth Been During 1993/94-2009/10?

Part-II: State-Level Analysis

Sukhadeo Thorat and Amaresh Dubey

1. Introduction

In this study, we examine the changes in the incidence of poverty and its relationship with consumption expenditure growth at the state-level during nearly two decades, since the initiation of large-scale economic reforms in 1991. In Part I of the paper, **How Inclusive has Growth Been During 1993/94-2009/10?**¹, the analysis has been at the aggregate all-India level with disaggregation by place of residence (rural and urban), economic group of the households, and social as well as religious group of the households in the two sectors. In this second part of the paper, we extend the analysis to the level of Indian states and examine the changes in poverty in relation to growth between 1993/94 and 2009/10.

At the aggregate level, we noted that economic growth has brought about substantial decline in poverty that could be attributed to sustained higher average growth in income during 1993/94 and 2009/10. However, we also pointed out that there is evidence of rise in inequalities that has eroded the potential of growth to reduce poverty to some extent. More significantly, we observed that there are substantial differences across socio-religious groups with regard to participation in the growth process and the consequent reduction in poverty.

While at the aggregate level (all-India level), the growth has been on an average higher during the 1990s and 2000s than during the 1950s through 1980s, these figures are only the 'average' for a geographically very large country comprising about thirty-five smaller administrative units called the states and the union territories (UTs).² These states are characterized by their unique socio-cultural, ethnic, linguistic, demographic and agro-climatic conditions as well as natural resources. In addition, although in a limited sense, these states also pursue different policies, that affect the states' growth performance in different ways.³

It has been pointed out in part I of the paper that socio-cultural and religious characteristics do affect consumption and poverty incidence at the aggregate level mediated via

¹ First part of this study supported by UNDP has already been published (see Thorat and Dubey, 2012).

² The reference to smaller administrative units is used in relative sense here. The administrative structure of these states also varies significantly.

³ The issue of governance of the states and union territories is a complex one in India. In terms of subjects dealt by the states, there are concurrent subjects where both state and central governments have common objectives while there are some subjects that are exclusively under the purview of states, e.g. land revenue etc.

occupational and/or location segregation. In this second part of the paper, we examine the spatial variation in growth and poverty reduction at the state level that is hypothesized to be varying as much by states' socio-cultural and religious structure as by its agro-climatic conditions and resource availability.

There are a number of studies that have reported significant variation in growth among the states. Variation in economic performance that has become more pronounced in the post-reform period has also been observed among the states. On the other hand, there has been relatively lower variation in poverty levels among the states during the early 1970s (among the 15 major states, the coefficient of variation of HCR has been 19.8% in 1973-74 that increased consistently over the years and it was over 33.3% in 1993-94). It would, therefore, be interesting to see how this variation in growth during the 1990s and 2000s affected changes in poverty in each one of the states.

Like at the aggregate level, the analysis in this part of the paper is carried out for rural and urban households, classified by the socio-religious affiliation of these households as well as for the economic categories of the households classified by the sources of income of the households. However, at the state level, in most cases, the cross classification (e.g. cross tabulation of socio-religious groups by economic categories) is not feasible to carry out for the reasons explained below.

The rest of the paper is organized in the following way. In section 2, we discuss the data and methodology related issues. In section 3, we look into the inter-state disparities in poverty incidence and growth in the aggregate and by place of residence, rural and urban along with economic group of the households in both rural and urban areas. In section 4, we analyze disparities among major social groups at the state level. Section 5 deals with poverty and growth at the state level among religious groups. In section 6, we have examined the relationship between growth, inequality and poverty. Section 7 summarizes the findings and brings out policy implications of the study. In addition, the paper has statistical tables with calculations of different characteristics at three points of time as well as one statistical appendix comprising detailed background tables.

2. Data and Methodological Issues

In this section, we provide a brief description of the data used in the analysis as well as the limitations that this data imposes for conducting disaggregated analysis. The description of data and other methodological issues have been discussed in detail in part one of the paper (all-India paper). However, we reproduce the section on data and methodology here again.

2.1 Data and Poverty Lines

For measuring growth and incidence of poverty, unit record data was collected from three quinquennial rounds of consumption expenditure surveys (CES), conducted by the National

Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), Government of India. These surveys were conducted during the agricultural years 1993-94 (July 1993 to June 1994), 2004-05 (July 2004 to June 2005) and 2009-10 (July 2009 to June 2010) respectively. The NSSO in these surveys follows a stratified sampling design and weights or multipliers for the surveyed households are used in the calculations.

For calculating the incidence of poverty, we use poverty lines (PLs) published by the Planning Commission. These PLs were originally given by the 1979 Task Force (Gol, 1979) and modified by the 1993 Expert Group (Gol, 1993) for calculating state-level PLs by adjusting for price variation across states. For the years 1993-94 and 2004-05, the state-wise PLs have been taken from Gol (1997, 2007). However, since the submission of the *Report of the Expert Group to Review the Methodology for Estimation of Poverty* (Gol, 2009), the Planning Commission has not specified a set of poverty lines for India and the states for 2009-10 so far.⁴ Consequently, we have updated the poverty line of 2009-10 as reported in Gol (2007) using the methodology similar to the 1993 Expert Group. Thus, the incidence of poverty reported in this paper has been calculated using the ‘old official poverty line’.

As outlined in Part-I of the paper, the incidence of poverty is measured as the percentage of population below the poverty line, the Head Count Ratio (HCR). In addition, the NSS CES data report consumption expenditure of the households in nominal rupees. We have converted the nominal expenditure at constant (1999-2000) prices as mentioned in the all-India paper. The price deflator that we used to convert the household expenditure at constant prices is the implicit price deflator derived from the state-wise PLs for rural and urban areas separately.

2.2 Economic, Caste, Ethnic and Religious Groups

In the hierarchical structure of the Indian population, it is well documented that there are certain groups that lag behind on a range of development outcomes – income, poverty incidence, education, health, and so on – and the inclusive approach in the Eleventh and Twelfth Plans focuses on gains from growth for these groups. We have identified economic as well as socio-religious groups in the NSS data and calculated the incidence of poverty and real mean monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE) for the rural and urban areas. The economic groups in the rural sector are the self-employed in agriculture (farmers, SEAG), self-employed in non-agriculture (non-farm production and business, SENA), wage labour engaged in agriculture (AGLA) and wage labour in non-agriculture (OLAH) and households which have more than one income source (Others). For urban areas, the

⁴ Since the submission of the All-India paper, the Planning Commission, Government of India has reported the poverty ratios for all India and states based Gol (2009) along with PLs for 2009-10. However, since our concern in this paper is with changes in poverty levels since the large-scale reforms were initiated, use of a specific poverty line does not affect the pattern of temporal change. Even then, for the sake of completeness, we have reported the poverty levels at the level of states and all India using Gol (2009) PLs. As can be seen, the pattern of change is not affected by use of these PLs.

economic groups are the self-employed (SEMP), wage/salary earners (RWSE), casual labour (CALA) and other households (with multiple sources of income, Others).

Among the social groups, the identifiable groups from the data include STs, SCs and higher castes (non-SC/ST) which are called Others. It may be pointed out that in 2004-05 and 2009-10, the information on Other Backward Castes (OBCs) was available in the data. However, for the sake of comparability with 1993-94, we have clubbed OBCs with Others in these two rounds. Among the religious groups, data reports households religious denomination as Hindus, Muslims and several Other Religious Minorities (ORMs). For purpose of analysis, we combined Christians, Sikhs, Jains and other religious minorities into one group, ORMs (Thorat 2010).

2.3 Indicators of Pro-poor Growth

Within the limitations of the National Sample Survey data on consumption, in this paper, the pro-poor nature of growth is studied using the rate of change in poverty reduction as well as growth of the consumption expenditure across various socio-religious and economic groups in the states of India.

Specifically, the conceptualization of pro-poor growth implies that growth is considered to be pro-poor if poverty incidence in the current period declined at a higher per annum rate compared to the preceding period, and declined at a higher per annum rate for the most poor; the per annum change in income in the current period exceeds that in the previous period and income of the most poor increased at a higher rate. In the context of spatial analysis of growth and poverty that we present in this paper, this relationship needs to be conceptualized somewhat differently. We propose to consider growth to be pro-poor for the states (i) if poverty declines at a faster rate in the current period compared to the earlier period, and (ii) if poverty declines at a faster rate among the states that had higher levels of poverty.

2.4 Sample size in the states

The analysis of disparities among socio-religious and economic groups at the state level depends crucially on the sample size. The number of households surveyed (i.e. the sample size) across states, sectors and social groups in 2009-10 is reported in Table 2.1. Sample size for the other two rounds is similarly distributed, though the number of households surveyed in earlier rounds (50th and 61st) are slightly larger and not reported in this paper.

While in our analysis at the aggregate level of all-India, the sample size used for the social and religious groups is fairly large, it is not so for all the states especially for STs and SCs. To circumvent this problem, we have divided the states and union territories into two groups. The first group consists of the states for which the sample size is reasonable for all three social groups – STs, SCs and Others. There are 12 states, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam

Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal in the first group. For these states, separate estimates of poverty and mean MPCE have been derived for the three population groups. The second group of states comprises Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand. In these eight states, we could carry out meaningful analysis for SCs and Others only.

For the inter-religious group analysis, as pointed out above, the three major religious groups that we have considered are the Hindus, the Muslims and all other religious minorities (ORMs). Like the social groups, the distribution of the religious groups is also not uniform across the states--- the sample size is not adequate for this analysis in all the states. Therefore, we carry out this exercise for those states in which meaningful comparison can be done for all the three religious groups or for those where at least comparison between the Hindus and the Muslims is feasible.

The sample size, i.e., the number of households surveyed by sector, state and religious groups in 2009-10 is given in Table 2.2. Some studies have shown that estimates of standard errors stabilize when the sample size is around 200. Therefore, in choosing the states for which the inter-religious group analysis can be done, we have used this rule of the thumb. We have chosen the states which have the sample size of at least 150 - 200 households for the Muslims. Hence the analysis is carried out for the following states: Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.

Further, the sample size for ORMs is very small in most of the states. Therefore, the estimates have to be interpreted with caution. At the state level, inter-religious group analysis is effectively a comparative analysis of Hindus and Muslims because of this constraint.

3. Poverty, Inequality and Growth at the State-Level: Aggregate

In this section, we deal with the level of poverty and consumption expenditure across states and in the rural and urban sectors of the states. We also highlight the disparities in poverty and consumption expenditure across states, without going into the disparities among the various economic, social or religious groups. This section is divided into three sub-sections - 3.1 deals with poverty, 3.2 with mean consumption expenditure and 3.3 reports poverty and consumption expenditure for economic groups of the households.

3.1. Poverty

The analysis of incidence of poverty for the country as a whole discussed in the all-India paper points to a faster decline in poverty during 1993-94 and 2009-10 compared to the earlier period with variation in the rate of decline across socio-religious groups. This is the

average picture of the thirty five states and union territories that India is divided into. We have also pointed out in the introduction above that varying agro-climatic conditions and policy regimes in different states result in differential growth rates at the state level.

To contextualize the debate at the state-level, it is important to examine the incidence of poverty for a longer period of time. However, this long term analysis of development outcomes like poverty and its relationship with growth at the state level is fraught with one key challenge---- constant reorganization of states. In this sub-section, we first examine the level and variation in the incidence of poverty across states from 1973-44 to 2009-10 for 15 major states that account for over 96% of Indian population. This is followed by a discussion of variation and changes in poverty levels across all 35 states and union territories during 1993-94 to 2009-10.⁵

Table 1: HCR and Coefficient of Variation of HCR in major states

State	Incidence of Poverty (HCR, in %)				Annual Change (in %)	
	1973 -74	1983	1993-94	2009-10	1974-1994	1994-2010
Andhra Pradesh	49.3	29.9	21.9	16.9	-2.8	-1.4
Assam	51.2	40.9	41.4	17.4	-1.0	-3.6
Bihar	61.8	62.5	55.1	34.2	-0.5	-2.4
Gujarat	47.2	33.3	24.2	12.0	-2.4	-3.2
Haryana	35.2	21.2	25.0	11.9	-1.5	-3.3
Karnataka	54.3	38.5	32.8	23.2	-2.0	-1.8
Kerala	59.7	40.9	25.1	4.5	-2.9	-5.1
Madhya Pradesh	61.9	50.1	36.9	35.4	-2.0	-0.3
Maharashtra	52.9	43.5	38.4	17.7	-1.4	-3.4
Odisha	66.2	65.3	48.6	35.3	-1.3	-1.7
Punjab	28.1	16.3	11.3	5.2	-3.0	-3.4
Rajasthan	46.3	35.0	27.4	14.1	-2.0	-3.1
Tamil Nadu	56.5	52.4	35.4	13.6	-1.9	-3.9
Uttar Pradesh	57.0	47.2	40.8	28.5	-1.4	-1.9
West Bengal	63.2	54.7	36.9	17.9	-2.1	-3.2
All India	54.9	44.8	35.8	21.6	-1.7	-2.5
CoV	19.9	33.0	33.5	52.9		

Note: * indicates that these states include Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand for a long term comparison.

Source: Poverty ratios for 1973-74 through 1987-88 have been taken from GoI (1993) and for 1993-94 and 2009-10 have been calculated by the authors.

In table 1, we report incidence of poverty (the head count ratio, HCR) for 15 major states in 2009-10. Among these 15 major states, poverty levels are the highest in Madhya Pradesh at

⁵ This detailed table includes the three newly created states, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand created after 1993-94.

345.4% followed closely by Odisha at 35.3%. In addition, there are five states (undivided), namely Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, Odisha and Uttar Pradesh that have poverty levels higher than the national average of 21.6%.

These five states account for about 45% of the total Indian population but their share of the poor is over 64%. Poverty situation in these states taken together has actually worsened during 1993-94 and 2009-10 as the share of these five states of the poor has increased by about 11 percentage points from 53.5% in 1993-94. In view of this, one can also conclude that the poverty scenario is still grim in many parts of the country despite decline in the magnitude of poverty incidence during the period 1993-94 to 2009-10.

At the all-India level, poverty declined by about 2.5 percent per annum during 1993-94 to 2009-10. However, table 1 shows that the decline in these states has been lower than the all-India average, the lowest rate of decline during 1993-94 to 2009-10 being in Madhya Pradesh at 0.30%, while Bihar is only marginally lower than the all-India rate of decline. The decline in poverty is not uniform across the states. Moreover, the quantum and the direction of change are different. During 1993-94 to 2009-10, the only other state (other than the five reported above) where poverty declined at a rate lower than the all-India rate is Andhra Pradesh (1.4%), though its level at about 17% is lower than the all-India level in 2009-10. During this period, the highest rate of poverty decline is observed in Kerala at 5.1% per annum. Other states that have a higher rate of poverty decline in this period compared to the all-India average are Assam (3.6%), Gujarat (3.2%), Haryana (3.3%), Maharashtra and Punjab (3.4%), Rajasthan (3.1%), Tamil Nadu (3.9%) and West Bengal (3.2%).

However, it is the rate of decline of poverty among the states in the post-reform period compared to the 1970s and 1980s that presents an interesting picture. Out of the fifteen large states shown in Table 1, there are only three states, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Madhya Pradesh where the rate of decline in the post-reform period is lower than the 1970s and 1980s. In the rest of the states, the rate of decline in a later period is higher, and in some cases, substantially higher compared to the 1970s and 1980s period. So at least on this parameter, **the rate of poverty decline has been pro-poor in twelve of the fifteen major states**. One of the consequences of this varying rate of poverty decline has been the rising inequality in poverty incidence as captured by COV reported in the bottom row of table 1. COV has consistently increased since 1973. Between 1973 and 1993, the increase has been over 13 percentage points, however, during 1993 to 2009 period, it has increased by about 19 percentage points.

Turning to the sectoral picture, the level of poverty along with the average annual rate of decline in poverty in the rural sector is reported in table 2. In 2009-10, the highest level of rural poverty incidence was in Madhya Pradesh (37.7%). The other four states where rural poverty levels in 2009-10 were higher than the all-India average were Bihar (33.6%),

Karnataka (25.1%), Odisha (36.3%) and Uttar Pradesh (26.4%). There are three states, Haryana, Kerala and Punjab where the rate of poverty incidence is in single digits, the lowest rural poverty figure being in Kerala at two percent.

As far as the annual average rate of decline of HCR is concerned, the highest rate is reported in Kerala at 5.8% per annum while in Punjab, the rate of decline is 4.5% annually. Among the fifteen major states, only in Andhra Pradesh has rural poverty actually increased by about 0.5%, while Madhya Pradesh reports only a marginal rate of decline at 0.1%.

Table 2: HCR and Coefficient of Variation of HCR in major states in the Rural Sector

State	Incidence of Poverty (HCR, in %)				Annual Change (%)	
	1973 -74	1983	1993-94	2009-10	1974-1994	1994-2010
Andhra Pradesh	48.4	26.5	16.0	17.1	-3.4	0.5
Assam	52.7	42.6	45.2	17.9	-0.7	-3.8
Bihar	63.0	64.4	57.8	33.6	-0.4	-2.6
Gujarat	46.4	29.8	22.2	13.1	-2.6	-2.6
Haryana	34.2	20.6	28.0	9.3	-0.9	-4.2
Karnataka	55.1	36.3	30.0	25.1	-2.3	-1.0
Kerala	59.2	39.0	25.4	2.0	-2.9	-5.8
Madhya Pradesh	62.7	48.9	38.1	37.7	-2.0	-0.1
Maharashtra	57.7	45.2	39.6	17.7	-1.6	-3.5
Orissa	67.3	67.5	49.8	36.3	-1.3	-1.7
Punjab	28.2	13.2	11.5	3.2	-3.0	-4.5
Rajasthan	44.8	33.5	26.4	12.5	-2.1	-3.3
Tamil Nadu	57.4	54.0	33.0	12.7	-2.1	-3.8
Uttar Pradesh	56.5	46.5	42.3	26.4	-1.3	-2.4
West Bengal	73.2	63.1	41.2	15.9	-2.2	-3.8
All India	56.4	45.6	36.9	21.9	-1.7	-2.5
CoV	22.2	38.2	37.7	59.2		

Note: As in Table 1

Source: As in Table 1

Out of the fifteen major states considered in this section, the rate of rural poverty decline has accelerated in eleven states during the 1990s and 2000s compared to the 1970s and 1980s. The highest acceleration is observed in Haryana (from 0.9% to 4.2%) while Kerala (from 2.9% to 5.8%) and Punjab (3% to 4.5%) experienced the sharpest increase in the rate of decline. However, it is the disparity in the poverty levels in the rural sector that has risen consistently since 1973-74. In 1973-74, the COV has been only around 22% that has increased by about 37 percentage points to over 59% indicating that there is divergence as far as the poverty incidence in a large part of the country is concerned.

The levels and rate of decline of poverty among the same fifteen major states in the urban sector is reported in table 3 below. The level and rate of decline in urban poverty is of importance because the thrust of the reforms has primarily been to promote growth of non-farm sector that gets concentrated in the urban settlements. However, the poverty levels reported in table 3 are not that encouraging. The urban poverty level at just below 21% is only about a percentage point lower than the rural poverty level and this gap has consistently narrowed since 1973-74. The highest level of urban poverty incidence is observed in Assam at 38.5% and this figure is even higher than the rural poverty in all major states. Other major states that have a high level of poverty are Uttar Pradesh (36.9%), Odisha (29.1%), Madhya Pradesh (27.5%) and West Bengal (23.9%). All other states have HCR lower than the all-India average, the lowest poverty being in Punjab (8.8%) and Kerala (11.4%) which is significantly higher than rural poverty in these two states. It seems it is not just the poor migrants from Punjab and Kerala that contribute to higher urban poverty in these states but poor migrants from other states could also be located in the urban areas of these two states contributing to higher urban poverty.

Table 3: HCR and Coefficient of Variation of HCR in major states in the Urban Sector

State	Incidence of Poverty (HCR, in %)				Annual Change (%)	
	1973 -74	1983	1993-94	2009-10	1974-1994	1994-2010
Andhra Pradesh	52.6	40.1	38.8	16.5	-1.3	-3.6
Assam	37.2	26.4	7.9	12.3	-3.9	3.4
Bihar	51.8	50.4	34.9	38.5	-1.6	0.7
Gujarat	49.3	40.6	28.3	10.1	-2.1	-4.0
Haryana	39.6	23.5	16.5	18.0	-2.9	0.6
Karnataka	52.0	43.4	39.7	19.7	-1.2	-3.2
Kerala	62.2	48.7	24.3	11.4	-3.0	-3.3
MPR	58.3	54.6	34.9	27.5	-2.0	-1.3
Maharashtra	43.0	40.6	35.9	17.6	-0.8	-3.2
Orissa	56.3	50.6	40.6	29.1	-1.4	-1.8
Punjab	27.7	23.9	10.9	8.8	-3.0	-1.2
Rajasthan	53.2	40.4	31.0	19.0	-2.1	-2.4
Tamil Nadu	54.5	49.2	40.0	14.6	-1.3	-4.0
Uttar Pradesh	59.5	50.3	34.8	36.9	-2.1	0.4
West Bengal	34.5	32.2	22.9	23.9	-1.7	0.3
All India	49.2	42.2	32.8	20.8	-1.7	-2.3
CoV	20.7	25.1	36.4	45.5		

Note: As in Table 1

Source: As in Table 1

Like poverty incidence, the rate of decline of urban poverty has also varied across these states during the 1990s and 2000s. Out of the fifteen major states in the table, urban poverty has declined in only ten states with the highest rate of decline reported in Gujarat and Tamil Nadu at 4.0%. The other states where urban poverty has declined faster than the

all-India average are Andhra Pradesh (3.6%), Karnataka (3.2%), Kerala (3.3%), Maharashtra (3.2%) and Rajasthan (2.4%). There are five states where urban poverty has actually increased, although only at below one percent. Thus, during the last two decades, the rate of decline in poverty has been slower in urban areas than in rural areas. It is possible that MGNREGA and other social sector interventions in the rural sector have had some impact on poverty reduction as well as on the rate of decline.

The comparison of rate of decline in poverty between pre-1990s, 1990s and 2000s present an interesting picture. Though the rate of decline has accelerated during the 1990s and 2000s (from 1.7% to 2.3%), it is among the states that the rates are very different. In seven out of the fifteen major states, the rate of urban poverty decline has decelerated in the later period compared to the pre-1990s, and in five of these seven states, poverty has increased. The disparities in urban poverty incidence have also increased when we look at the COV in table 3. In 1973-74, COV of poverty incidence has been just 20.7% which increased to 45.5% with a sharp increase (by about 9 percentage points) between 1993 and 2009.

In table 4, the incidence and average annual change of poverty is reported for all 35 states and UTs at two points, 1993-94 and 2009-10, and also for the rural and urban sectors of each one of these states and UTs. Note that we have also reported poverty levels for the three states, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand, created in the year 2000. When these smaller states and UTs are included in the analysis, there is some change in the ranking of states as far as the level and rate of decline of poverty is concerned. The only notable change in ranking is because of Chhattisgarh where poverty level is the highest at 44.7%. It should be recalled that Chhattisgarh is carved out of Madhya Pradesh where poverty situation is most alarming.

As pointed out earlier, the remaining 17 smaller states and UTs account for less than four percent of the population, and hence, do not have a major influence on the level or the rate of decline in poverty levels as their combined weight for the poverty levels for the country as a whole is quite low.

As can be seen, in most of these 17 states and UTs, poverty incidence is lower, and in some cases, the rates of decline are much higher than those observed in case of larger states. For example, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Meghalaya, Sikkim, Tripura, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Pondicherry have reduced poverty substantially during the period 1993-94 to 2009-10. These states had high poverty ratios in 1993-94, but by 2009-10, the HCRs dropped significantly as can be seen in Table 4. Among the smaller states, Daman and Diu is an exception where poverty has increased.

**Table 4: Levels and Rate decline of Poverty at the State-Level
(1993-94 to 2009-10)**

State	Poverty Levels						Rate of Decline (in %)		
	1993-94			2009-10			1993/94 - 2009/10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra Pradesh	16.0	38.8	21.9	17.1	16.5	16.9	0.5	-3.6	-1.4
Arunachal Pradesh	41.4	6.1	37.2	8.9	11.9	9.5	-4.9	6.0	-4.7
Assam	45.2	7.9	41.4	17.9	12.3	17.4	-3.8	3.4	-3.6
Bihar	56.5	40.8	55.0	34.4	42.6	35.2	-2.4	0.3	-2.2
Chhattisgarh	44.4	44.2	44.4	48.3	28.2	44.7	0.6	-2.3	0.1
Goa	5.0	28.3	14.8	1.8	5.2	2.8	-4.0	-5.1	-5.1
Gujarat	22.2	28.3	24.2	13.1	10.1	12.0	-2.6	-4.0	-3.2
Haryana	28.0	16.5	25.0	9.4	18.0	11.9	-4.2	0.6	-3.3
Himachal Pradesh	30.3	9.3	28.6	1.6	7.9	2.1	-5.9	-0.9	-5.8
J & K	18.2	5.1	13.3	4.4	7.1	5.0	-4.7	2.4	-3.9
Jharkhand	62.2	26.5	55.3	30.7	31.8	30.9	-3.2	1.3	-2.8
Karnataka	30.0	39.7	32.8	25.1	19.7	23.2	-1.0	-3.2	-1.8
Kerala	25.4	24.3	25.1	2.0	11.4	4.5	-5.8	-3.3	-5.1
Madhya Pradesh	39.2	49.0	41.7	33.7	27.4	32.1	-0.9	-2.8	-1.4
Maharashtra	38.1	34.9	37.0	17.7	17.6	17.7	-3.3	-3.1	-3.3
Manipur	18.9	6.9	15.7	2.6	13.3	5.4	-5.4	5.8	-4.1
Meghalaya	24.3	1.8	21.2	2.9	4.0	3.1	-5.5	7.4	-5.3
Mizoram	6.2	0.0	4.3	3.6	2.1	3.0	-2.6	na	-1.9
Nagaland	2.3	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	-6.3	na	-6.3
Odisha	49.8	40.6	48.6	36.3	29.1	35.3	-1.7	-1.8	-1.7
Punjab	11.5	10.9	11.3	3.2	8.8	5.2	-4.5	-1.2	-3.4
Rajasthan	26.4	31.0	27.5	12.5	19.0	14.1	-3.3	-2.4	-3.1
Sikkim	31.7	1.0	29.3	4.9	0.8	4.4	-5.3	-1.0	-5.3
Tamil Nadu	33.0	40.0	35.4	12.8	14.6	13.6	-3.8	-4.0	-3.9
Tripura	23.6	6.0	21.3	7.9	5.5	7.5	-4.2	-0.5	-4.1
Uttarakhand	24.8	17.9	23.4	4.0	24.7	9.3	-5.2	2.4	-3.8
Uttar Pradesh	43.1	35.6	41.6	27.4	37.7	29.5	-2.3	0.4	-1.8
West Bengal	41.2	23.0	36.9	16.0	23.9	17.9	-3.8	0.3	-3.2
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1.1	5.2	2.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	-5.1	-6.3	-5.9
Chandigarh	11.8	2.1	3.3	0.0	3.6	3.1	-6.3	4.6	-0.5
Dadar & Nagar Haveli	51.7	38.8	50.7	22.0	9.3	18.8	-3.6	-4.7	-3.9
Daman & Diu	4.7	21.7	11.4	1.1	27.8	13.0	-4.8	1.8	0.9
Delhi	2.0	16.1	14.6	7.6	11.9	11.7	17.6	-1.6	-1.2
Lakshadweep	0.0	15.9	8.1	12.6	1.8	7.1	na	-5.6	-0.7

State	Poverty Levels						Rate of Decline (in %)		
	1993-94			2009-10			1993/94 - 2009/10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Pondicherry	20.0	36.5	30.3	0.0	2.3	1.5	-6.3	-5.9	-5.9
Total	36.9	32.8	35.9	21.9	20.8	21.6	-2.5	-2.3	-2.5

Note: na implies poverty figures are negligible or zero. Poverty level is in percent and rate of decline annualized--- percent per annum.

Source: Special tabulation by the authors using NSS CES unit record data for the respective rounds.

To sum up, the overview of poverty incidence in the states shows that the benefits of growth have not been uniformly attained by all the states in so far as poverty reduction is concerned. At the all-India level, the incidence of poverty is higher in the rural areas than in the urban areas. But this is not true for all the states. In 20 states and union territories, the urban HCR was higher than the rural HCR in 2009-10. Is it because of the success of the rural development programmes that rural poverty has declined at a faster rate? Or is it because of the failure of the same? It is equally likely that because of the lack of rural development, the poor migrate to the urban areas in search of livelihood, and thereby, increase the number of the urban poor. This issue needs to be further investigated.

3.2. MPCE Growth

In this section, we discuss the inter-state disparities with regard to the consumption expenditure as measured by the mean monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) at constant 1999-00 prices. The mean per capita expenditure for 1993-94 and 2009-10 is reported in table 5 along with average annual rate of increase below, while the MPCE at three time points, 1993-94, 2004-05 and 2009-10 and its changes are reported in statistical tables, tables 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 respectively.

We observe large variations across the states with regard to the amount of real MPCE from table 5. Chhattisgarh, the state with the highest poverty ratio, had the lowest MPCE of INR 392 in the rural areas in 2009-10. On the other hand, Kerala's real MPCE in the rural areas in 2009-10 has been INR 1,342. Other states that have considerably lower MPCE, lower than the all-India average MPCE, in the rural sector, are Odisha, Bihar, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra. Among the larger states, the highest rural MPCE, after Kerala, is in Punjab with INR 879. This ranking has almost been the same in 1993-94 as well.

The highest real MPCE in the urban sector in 2009-10 is INR 2,211 in Chandigarh but among the larger states, it is Kerala again with INR 1,692. Other large states that have high MPCE

are Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. Among the smaller states, more the INR 1,000 MPCE is observed for Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Delhi, Lakshadweep and Pondicherry. Compared with the MPCE of INR 540 in Bihar, INR 676 in Uttar Pradesh and INR 688 in Jharkhand, the regional inequality in consumption expenditure in the urban areas is stark indeed.

A noticeable feature of MPCE is rural-urban differences indicating the rural-urban disparities in consumption. Among the larger states, the highest rural-urban difference in 2009-10 is observed in Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal and Karnataka. Kerala, with a high level of MPCE in both rural and urban sectors, has relatively lower disparities. The states where rural-urban disparities have widened in 2009-10 over 1993 are the same states that have higher rural-urban differences in 2009-10. Among the states where the disparity has narrowed over this period are Odisha, Rajasthan, Bihar, Haryana and Maharashtra.

Table 5 also reports the average annual change in MPCE. The growth in real MPCE has not been shared equally by all the states. At the all-India level, real MPCE (at constant 1999-00 prices) was INR 521 in 1993-94; it increased to INR 683 in 2009-10. The rate of increase has been 2.5 percent per annum in this period. Among the larger states, Kerala has the highest MPCE growth at 7.3% annually. Other large states that have experienced high annual MPCE growth are Maharashtra (2.9%), Gujarat (2.7%) and Tamil Nadu (2.6%). Uttar Pradesh (0.9%), Madhya Pradesh (1.1%), Rajasthan (1.3%) are on the other extreme with very low annual MPCE increase. Bihar, West Bengal, Odisha and Andhra Pradesh have identical annual MPCE growth at 1.5%.

Table 5: Level and Annual Change in Real MPCE during 1993-94 to 2009-10

States and UTs	1993-94 (Rs.)			2009-10 (Rs.)			1993/94 - 2009-10 (in %)		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra Pradesh	465	673	519	466	1097	644	0.0	3.9	1.5
Arunachal Pradesh	498	799	534	894	861	887	5.0	0.5	4.1
Assam	406	743	441	582	803	605	2.7	0.5	2.3
Bihar	345	498	360	435	541	446	1.6	0.5	1.5
Chhattisgarh	366	623	411	392	817	468	0.5	1.9	0.9
Goa	796	853	820	866	1675	1096	0.5	6.0	2.1
Gujarat	477	725	558	566	1183	800	1.2	3.9	2.7
Haryana	595	771	641	825	978	871	2.4	1.7	2.2
Himachal Pradesh	551	1238	609	1059	1338	1083	5.8	0.5	4.9
J & K	571	896	692	771	953	814	2.2	0.4	1.1
Jharkhand	337	653	398	468	688	512	2.4	0.3	1.8
Karnataka	446	716	523	448	1065	664	0.0	3.1	1.7
Kerala	600	840	659	1342	1692	1433	7.7	6.3	7.3

States and UTs	1993-94 (Rs.)			2009-10 (Rs.)			1993/94 - 2009-10 (in %)		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Madhya Pradesh	423	620	474	453	888	559	0.4	2.7	1.1
Maharashtra	445	871	604	550	1359	887	1.5	3.5	2.9
Manipur	473	518	485	626	550	606	2.0	0.4	1.6
Meghalaya	562	859	603	652	760	670	1.0	-0.7	0.7
Mizoram	613	890	701	750	891	815	1.4	0.0	1.0
Nagaland	691	824	726	923	893	915	2.1	0.5	1.6
Odisha	367	639	402	429	926	500	1.0	2.8	1.5
Punjab	674	782	705	879	1061	943	1.9	2.2	2.1
Rajasthan	514	705	558	579	974	675	0.8	2.4	1.3
Sikkim	469	840	499	774	979	803	4.1	1.0	3.8
Tamil Nadu	459	703	545	557	1035	770	1.3	3.0	2.6
Tripura	540	793	574	625	836	659	1.0	0.3	0.9
Uttarakhand	484	735	536	822	779	811	4.4	0.4	3.2
Uttar Pradesh	431	627	469	501	676	536	1.0	0.5	0.9
West Bengal	442	784	522	571	871	643	1.8	0.7	1.5
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	776	1454	968	986	1540	1193	1.7	0.4	1.5
Chandigarh	709	1573	1461	1082	2211	2041	3.3	2.5	2.5
Dadar & Nagar Haveli	383	729	408	438	887	549	0.9	1.4	2.2
Daman & Diu	741	781	757	833	952	886	0.8	1.4	1.1
Delhi	939	1298	1259	920	1230	1214	-0.1	-0.3	-0.2
Lakshadweep	812	864	838	1063	1412	1240	1.9	4.0	3.0
Pondicherry	557	673	629	869	1292	1144	3.5	5.7	5.1
All India	448	744	521	555	1030	683	1.5	2.4	1.9

Source: As in table 4

It is the rate and the disparities in the sectoral MPCE growth rate that present a puzzling situation. In some states, e.g. Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, the real MPCE in the rural sector remained stagnant over 1990s and 2000s but increased at a significantly higher rate in the urban sector. In the rural as well as in the urban areas, the highest annual growth is recorded in Kerala at 7.7% and 6.3% respectively. Other large states that have significantly higher annual growth are Assam (2.7%) and Haryana (2.4%) in the rural sector. Among three newly created states, it is Uttarakhand and Jharkhand that experienced higher than the all-India average growth.

The situation of urban MPCE growth appears to be somewhat peculiar. Among the larger states, other than Kerala, the urban MPCE growth rates are- Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat (3.9%), Maharashtra (3.5%), Karnataka (3.1%), Tamil Nadu (3.0%), Odisha (2.8%) and Madhya Pradesh (2.7%). The larger states that have performed badly in MPCE growth in the

urban sector are Jharkhand (0.3%), Uttar Pradesh (0.5%), Bihar (0.5%) and West Bengal (0.7%).

It is clear from the analysis of MPCE growth that there is a huge variation in the level of MPCE as well as its annual change. The other feature of level of MPCE is that the inter-state disparities are on the rise, COV in the rural sector has increased by six percentage points whereas in the urban sector, it increased by four percentage points in 2009-10 compared to 1993-94 level for all the states and UTs combined. However, we get a different direction of change when we look at COV for only larger states--- in rural areas, the COV in MPCE has been around 20% in 1993-94 which increased to 40%, whereas in the urban areas, it increased less than the rural areas, from 13% in 1993-94 to 28% in 2009-10. In sum, there has been considerable increase in the inter-state disparities as far as the level and growth of MPCE is concerned during post-reform period.

3.3. Economic Groups

In this section, we look at the level and changes in poverty as well as in the real MPCE based on the main source of income. Households in the rural areas are classified into self-employed in non-agriculture (SENA), agricultural labour (AGLA), other labour households (OLAH), self-employed in agriculture, i.e., farmers (SEAG) and mixed income households are classified as Others. In the urban areas, the household types are self-employed (SEMP), regular wage/salary earning (RWSE), casual labour (CALA) and OTHER or mixed income households. The analysis of poverty and consumption expenditure by economic groups is done for 17 major states only as the smaller states and UTs have sample size issues for cross classification of the households.

3.3.1 Poverty

Tables 3.3.1 to 3.3.3 in statistical tables' section report incidence of poverty for rural and urban areas by means of livelihood as defined above at three time points, 1993-94, 2004-05 and 2009-10. In 2009-10, we observe that the incidence of poverty is the highest in case of AGLA in the rural areas, followed by OLAH. OTHER households have the lowest HCR. It is clearly seen that in states where the incidence of poverty was substantial, as discussed in section 3.1 above, the most vulnerable sections are those from AGLA and OLAH households. For instance, in Chhattisgarh, the HCR was 63 percent and 54 percent in case of AGLA and OLAH respectively in 2009-10. In contrast, the HCR of OTHER households was only 14 percent. Similarly, in Bihar, the HCRs of AGLA and OLAH was 48 percent; in Madhya Pradesh, 55 percent and 46 percent of people from AGLA and OLAH were poor. In the rural sector of Odisha, the HCR was 53 percent and 41 percent respectively in case of these two most vulnerable categories of households.

Poverty had declined across all economic groups in the rural areas in most of the states during the period under consideration, but the quantum of decline varies across economic

groups and states in both the sectors as reported in table 6 below. In the rural sector, at the aggregate level, AGLA and OLAH households experienced the highest decline whereas OTHER households have the least decline. Both self-employed households (SENA and SEAG) had poverty decline by 15.5 and 13.1 percentage points respectively. Among the states, the highest reduction in HCR for AGLA households is observed in Jharkhand (51.8 percentage points). In Assam and Kerala, the decline has been 30.8 and 30.3 percentage points respectively. The lowest decline by 4.7 percentage points is reported in Madhya Pradesh whereas in Andhra Pradesh and Chhattisgarh, poverty has actually increased for AGLA households. In case of OLAH, the highest decline is observed in Kerala and Rajasthan, while the poverty level has been stagnant in Madhya Pradesh. In case of SENA and SEAG households, in all the states except Andhra Pradesh, the poverty levels declined but at varying rates.

In case of the urban sector, CALA households have benefited the most with large inter-state variation. Unlike in the rural sector, in Andhra Pradesh, all groups of households have done extremely well as far as poverty reduction is concerned with CALA households reducing their poverty by about 27 percentage points. The other two states where CALA households have benefited the most are Tamil Nadu (38 percentage points) and Maharashtra (32.2 percentage points). The lowest reduction in poverty among the CALA households is observed in Haryana, whereas in Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh, poverty level among these households has actually increased.

Table 6: Decline in Poverty Levels across Major States among Economic Groups during 1993-94 to 2009-10

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra Pradesh	1.5	2.4	-8.8	4.4	0.9	-24.1	-16.9	-27.0	-17.4
Assam	-23.1	-30.8	-29.2	-26.1	-18.0	7.0	-2.4	9.6	6.4
Bihar	-25.2	-27.4	-16.9	-23.3	-17.5	-4.2	-1.2	3.0	12.3
Chhattisgarh	-12.5	2.5	12.5	-7.3	-2.8	-21.8	-15.5	-13.1	2.3
Gujarat	-10.1	-15.4	-11.9	-1.2	-5.9	-16.3	-14.3	-20.3	-15.8
Haryana	-15.0	-17.7	-28.3	-17.9	-10.7	-5.1	7.3	-0.1	5.8
Jharkhand	-35.3	-51.8	-25.8	-23.3	-28.5	5.8	-1.1	10.9	-7.2
Karnataka	-10.0	-7.1	-2.1	-9.0	1.2	-25.5	-14.9	-25.8	-22.5
Kerala	-22.9	-31.7	-30.3	-10.5	-11.5	-14.9	-12.1	-12.9	-3.9
Madhya Pradesh	-15.2	-4.7	0.1	-8.7	2.3	-25.1	-23.1	-22.0	-21.9
Maharashtra	-16.4	-30.2	-16.4	-11.1	-4.6	-21.9	-13.8	-32.3	-14.6
Odisha	-15.7	-14.1	-16.8	-8.1	-13.5	-20.5	-10.3	-18.3	-13.2

Punjab	-7.0	-18.8	-14.6	-2.1	-3.2	-3.2	-3.6	0.5	-5.1
Rajasthan	-12.8	-27.6	-29.8	-9.4	-10.7	-15.6	-14.0	-11.3	-20.9
Tamil Nadu	-14.2	-29.5	-12.8	-15.9	-11.9	-24.7	-21.2	-38.0	-35.7
Uttar Pradesh	-19.2	-24.4	-10.6	-15.1	-10.0	0.1	1.1	11.4	-10.1
West Bengal	-23.0	-37.5	-43.3	-20.0	-4.9	-2.1	0.7	4.0	-4.7
All India	-15.5	-19.7	-16.7	-13.1	-9.4	-13.3	-10.6	-18.2	-13.2

Source: As in table 4

Among other economic groups in the urban areas, generally, RWSE households have had lowest poverty levels along with OTHER households. But between 1993-94 and 2009-10, poverty levels among RWSE households increased in Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, while for OTHER households, it increased in Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Haryana.

In table 7, the average annual rate of decline in headcount poverty is reported. It is essentially conversion of table 6 into annualised rate. Therefore, the direction of change and variation across states and economic groups, mirrors the discussion based on table 6 reported above.

Table 7: Average annual rates of decline of HCRs in major states across economic groups during 1993-94 to 2009-10

(in %)

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra Pradesh	1.0	0.7	-2.9	2.5	0.9	-3.6	-4.2	-2.5	-4.1
Assam	-3.9	-3.0	-2.7	-4.1	-5.0	6.2	-2.6	1.8	12.9
Bihar	-2.8	-2.3	-1.6	-3.4	-2.7	-0.6	-0.3	0.2	3.4
Chhattisgarh	-2.1	0.3	1.9	-1.2	-1.0	-2.7	-2.9	-1.2	0.5
Gujarat	-3.2	-2.9	-3.0	-0.6	-4.2	-4.1	-4.5	-2.3	-5.2
Haryana	-3.8	-1.9	-4.2	-5.9	-5.3	-1.8	3.9	0.0	9.3
Jharkhand	-4.4	-3.9	-2.3	-2.7	-4.1	1.3	-0.4	1.2	-1.4
Karnataka	-2.1	-1.0	-0.5	-2.7	0.9	-3.6	-3.7	-2.3	-4.8
Kerala	-6.2	-5.3	-5.9	-4.8	-5.9	-4.5	-4.2	-2.2	-2.5
Madhya Pradesh	-2.8	-0.5	0.0	-1.8	1.0	-2.9	-3.9	-1.7	-3.3
Maharashtra	-4.0	-3.2	-3.0	-2.7	-4.1	-3.5	-3.5	-2.4	-3.2
Odisha	-2.1	-1.3	-1.8	-1.3	-3.2	-2.4	-2.5	-1.5	-2.5
Punjab	-5.1	-4.1	-4.9	-5.3	-5.8	-1.9	-3.0	0.1	-3.4
Rajasthan	-3.6	-4.0	-3.8	-3.0	-3.1	-2.9	-3.7	-1.2	-4.6
Tamil Nadu	-4.4	-3.7	-3.2	-4.3	-4.8	-4.2	-4.8	-3.5	-4.8
Uttar Pradesh	-2.7	-2.4	-1.2	-2.5	-2.3	0.0	0.4	1.1	-2.2

West Bengal	-3.9	-3.9	-4.6	-4.4	-2.5	-0.5	0.4	0.5	-1.9
All India	-2.9	-2.3	-2.5	-2.8	-3.2	-2.4	-3.0	-1.8	-3.2

Source: As in table 4

To sum up, no specific pattern has emerged from this analysis so as to enable us to single out groups that have benefited more than the others. Each state has its own pattern and distribution.

3.3.2 MPCE Growth

The variations in the real MPCE have a direct correspondence with the variations in the incidence of poverty. AGLA have the least MPCE in the rural areas followed by OLAH. With the exception of Kerala where MPCE is an outlier, we note that in 2009-10 in the rural areas, SEAG, i.e., farmers in Haryana and Punjab were the only groups with real MPCE above INR 1,000. The rest of the economic groups in the rural areas had MPCE in the range of INR 300 to INR 650.

Among the economic groups in rural areas of states, the highest rate of MPCE growth is observed for the OTHER group (multiple sources of income) at 2.3 percent annually. This is followed by 1.7 percent per annum among SENA households while the other three groups, AGLA, OLAH and SEAG have similar rate of growth at 1.3 percent annually. But it is the inter-state variation that is of interest. Leaving out Kerala where the growth for all household groups has been an outlier, it is Jharkhand (3.5%) and Assam (3.2%) where the growth has been the highest.

As the engine of growth and poverty reduction in the rural areas has to be SENA and OLAH, the states where growth has been the highest are again Assam (2.3%), Jharkhand (2.3%) and Punjab (2.7%). Also, Bihar, Haryana and West Bengal have higher growth among the SENA households compared to the all-India average during 1993-94 and 2009-10. Among the OLAH households, the states that report higher growth of MPCE are Assam, Haryana, Jharkhand and West Bengal whereas Andhra Pradesh has experienced a decline in MPCE of AGLA as well as SEAG households. SEAG households in Assam, Bihar, Haryana, Jharkhand, Punjab and West Bengal benefited the most.

Table 8: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real MPCE in major states across economic groups during 1993-94 to 2009-10

(in %)

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra Pradesh	0.0	-0.1	0.7	-0.8	0.8	2.8	4.6	2.2	4.4
Assam	2.3	1.9	2.0	2.8	3.2	0.9	0.4	-1.2	2.6
Bihar	1.9	1.7	1.0	1.9	2.1	0.9	0.6	0.9	1.3

Chhattisgarh	0.9	0.3	0.1	1.3	0.7	1.8	2.0	2.0	3.3
Gujarat	1.4	1.2	0.4	1.1	1.9	2.9	4.3	4.7	6.5
Haryana	2.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.6	2.1	1.5	-0.2	1.9
Jharkhand	2.3	3.4	2.0	1.9	3.5	0.7	0.9	-0.7	-1.0
Karnataka	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.8	3.5	3.0	2.7	3.7
Kerala	8.5	5.4	7.6	7.4	7.1	6.4	9.4	2.5	5.0
Madhya Pradesh	1.4	0.2	-0.1	0.6	0.9	2.5	3.4	1.9	4.5
Maharashtra	1.5	1.8	0.6	1.2	0.6	4.3	3.2	2.7	3.5
Odisha	1.4	0.7	0.9	0.6	1.4	3.5	3.2	1.0	4.8
Punjab	2.7	1.3	0.2	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.6	-0.3	4.3
Rajasthan	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.6	1.5	1.7	4.4	0.5	3.7
Tamil Nadu	1.4	2.3	0.5	1.2	0.9	3.0	3.3	3.0	4.1
Uttar Pradesh	1.5	1.5	0.7	0.9	1.2	-0.1	1.1	-0.6	3.5
West Bengal	2.0	2.6	2.6	1.9	1.4	0.2	1.3	0.0	2.3
All India	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.3	2.2	2.8	1.8	3.5

Source: As in table 4

In the urban sector, the highest growth during 1993-94 was experienced by OTHER households (3.5%) followed by RWSE (2.8%). The most vulnerable group was CALA households in the urban areas and the annual change in their MPCE is 1.8%. Like the rural sector, there are variations across the states in annual growth in each one of the households groups. For OTHER households, there are nine states, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu where growth has been more than the average 3.5% whereas Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh have around 3.5% growth. Other states have lower rates except Jharkhand where there is a decline in MPCE of OTHER households in the urban areas.

The bulk of households in urban areas fall into SEMP category. There is a variation in the growth of MPCE across states. SEMP households in a large number of states such as Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Punjab and Tamil Nadu have done well while those in Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal have not benefited much with growth being low. In Uttar Pradesh, the situation of SEMP households has actually worsened. RWSE households in general have benefited from the growth though at varying rates.

4. Poverty and Growth at the State-Level: Social Group

The analysis of disparities among social groups at the state level depends crucially on the sample size. While at the aggregate level, the sample size for all social groups is fairly large, it is not so for all the states especially for STs and SCs. To circumvent this problem, we have divided the states and Union Territories into two groups. The first group consists of those states for which the sample size is reasonable for all three social groups – STs, SCs and Others. There are 12 states, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam Chhattisgarh, Gujarat,

Jharkhand, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal in the first group. For these states, separate estimates of poverty and mean MPCE have been derived for the three population groups. The second group of states comprise Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand. In these eight states, we can have meaningful analysis for SCs and Others only. In this section, we report the levels and changes in poverty incidence and real MPCE among social groups in the states.

4.1. Poverty

We first discuss the scenario in the rural areas. At the all-India level, there is a clear hierarchy in the ranking of social groups. STs have the highest poverty incidence followed by SCs. Others have the least incidence of poverty. This ranking remains the same in all the three rounds of survey that we use in this study. Tables 4.1.1 to 4.1.3 have poverty ratios for STs, SCs and Others at following time points- 1993-94 and 2009-10.

In 2009-10, the poverty incidence of STs was still alarming with one-third of the ST population in the whole of rural India living below the poverty line (table 4.1.1). The situation is particularly grim in Odisha (62 percent), Chhattisgarh (57 percent) and Madhya Pradesh (53 percent). The disparity between the HCR of STs and that of Others is huge in many states. For example, in Andhra Pradesh, the HCR of STs was 31.5 percent and that of Others was 15 percent. In Gujarat, the figures were 26 percent and 8 percent respectively. In Odisha, the figures were 62 percent and 23 percent respectively. There are certain states in which the disparity is less. For instance, in West Bengal, the HCR of STs was 19 percent and that of Others 14 percent. In Assam and Karnataka, the HCR of Others was higher than that of STs.

Table 9: Average Annual Decline in Poverty Incidence among Social Groups across States (1993-94 to 2009-10)

(in %)

State	Rural			Urban			Total		
	ST	SC	OTH	ST	SC	OTH	ST	SC	OTH
Andhra Pradesh	1.1	-1.3	1.7	-3.2	-3.9	-3.6	0.3	-1.9	-1.4
Assam	-4.1	-3.9	-3.7	7.8	-1.4	3.8	-4.0	-3.9	-3.5
Chhattisgarh	0.4	3.2	0.1	-2.2	-2.7	-2.2	0.3	1.7	-0.5
Gujarat	-1.0	-4.0	-3.3	-4.4	-3.2	-4.1	-1.3	-3.6	-3.7
Jharkhand	-3.0	-3.3	-3.4	2.5	-0.5	2.1	-2.7	-2.9	-2.8
Karnataka	-3.0	-1.6	-0.4	-2.7	-3.7	-3.1	-2.7	-2.1	-1.6
Madhya Pradesh	-0.7	-2.1	-0.4	-2.4	-1.9	-2.9	-0.9	-2.2	-1.5
Maharashtra	-2.9	-3.1	-3.6	-3.0	-2.8	-3.2	-2.9	-3.0	-3.4
Odisha	-0.8	-0.8	-2.6	-1.4	-0.4	-2.7	-0.9	-0.8	-2.7
Rajasthan	-3.9	-2.5	-3.7	11.9	-2.5	-2.6	-3.7	-2.5	-3.3

Tripura	-4.5	-4.8	-4.3		2.9	-3.8	-4.4	-4.3	-4.4
West Bengal	-4.3	-3.7	-3.7	1.2	0.2	-0.1	-4.1	-3.1	-3.1
Bihar	na	-1.9	-2.7	na	-0.7	0.4	na	-1.8	-2.4
Haryana	na	-3.4	-4.9	na	3.4	-2.2	na	-2.4	-4.3
Himachal Pradesh	na	-5.7	-6.2	na	-1.6	-1.7	na	-5.5	-6.1
Kerala	na	-5.3	-5.8	na	-2.1	-3.4	na	-4.8	-5.2
Punjab	na	-4.4	-5.5	na	-2.5	-0.5	na	-3.8	-3.0
Tamil Nadu	na	-3.7	-3.8	na	-3.5	-4.1	na	-3.5	-3.9
Uttar Pradesh	na	-2.2	-2.5	na	-0.2	0.5	na	-2.0	-1.9
Uttarakhand	na	-5.1	-5.2	na	-2.4	4.5	na	-4.5	-3.2

Note: na denotes that the calculation for STs is not feasible in these states.

Source: As in table 4.

The SCs are also very vulnerable to poverty. **In some states like Assam, Chhattisgarh, Karnataka and Rajasthan, SCs were worse off than STs in 2009-10 in the sense that the poverty ratios were higher for SCs than for STs.** In Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha and Tripura, STs were worse off than SCs. In West Bengal, the HCRs were at similar levels for these two groups.

The disparity between SCs and Others is 10 percentage points or more in case of many states like Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Odisha, Rajasthan, Bihar, Haryana and Uttar Pradesh. Haryana reported relatively low HCRs for the entire rural sector in 2009-10 but reported high HCR for SCs.

Poverty has declined at different rates for different social groups. At the all-India level, the highest rate of decline was for Others (2.6 percent per annum), followed by SCs (2.4 percent per annum) and STs (2.1 percent per annum) during 1993-94 to 2009-10. For the rural sector, the rates of decline for the same period are 2.7% for Others, and 2.4% for SCs and 2.1% for STs. These rates are 2.4%, 2.1% and 2.1% respectively for the urban sector.

Among states where the level of poverty can be compared for all three groups, STs, SCs and Others, the rate of decline of poverty among Others is observed in Tripura and West Bengal. The rate of decline in poverty for Others is at 3.7% annually. It has been the same (3.7%) for SCs but in the case of STs, it has reduced at the fastest rate at 4.3% annually.

Other than Tripura and West Bengal, Assam, Jharkhand, Karnataka and Rajasthan are the four states which have reduced poverty at significant rates for STs in the rural sector. In case of SCs, the HCR fell at a rate of more than three percent per annum in Assam, Gujarat, Jharkhand, and Maharashtra. The rate of decline of poverty for SCs has been the lowest

(0.8%) in Odisha, while in Chhattisgarh poverty among SCs has actually increased at the rate 3.2% annually over this period.

Among the eight states where only SC and Others comparison is possible, **SCs appear to be doing much better as their poverty declined at the rate of more than five percent per annum in Himachal Pradesh, Kerala and Uttarakhand.** It declined by 4.4% percent annually in Punjab, 3.7% in Tamil Nadu and 3.4% in Haryana. The lowest decline in this group has been in Bihar (1.9%) and in Uttar Pradesh (2.2%).

Let us now discuss the disparities and change in poverty incidence among social groups in the urban areas. In the urban sector, SCs are generally the worst off followed by STs and Others. In 2009-10, this ranking is observed in Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal. In Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Odisha, STs had the highest incidence of poverty followed by SCs. In Madhya Pradesh, the HCRs of STs and SCs were at similar levels. The disparities among social groups are substantial. It may be noted that the gap between the HCRs of STs and SCs is not that large compared with the glaring disparity between STs and Others or between SCs and Others. For instance, the HCRs of STs, SCs and Others were around 11 percent, 13 percent and 2 percent respectively in Tripura. The figures were 49 percent, 43 percent and 20 percent respectively in Odisha. In Madhya Pradesh, STs and SCs had HCRs of around 45 percent, but the HCR of Others was only 23 percent.

The disparity between SCs and Others is also acute in West Bengal (40 percent against 20 percent), Bihar (58 percent against 40 percent), Haryana (39 percent against 10 percent), Himachal Pradesh (the first sub-period percent against five percent), Kerala (22 percent against 11 percent), Punjab (16 percent against six percent) and Tamil Nadu (27 percent against 12.5 percent). Thus, inequalities among social groups are more pronounced in the urban sector.

In urban areas where comparison can be made among all three groups, the maximum decline in poverty is for Gujarat. The rate of decline is 4.4% for STs followed by 4.1% for Others and 3.2% for SCs, whereas for Andhra Pradesh, a different trend is observed. The maximum decline in the state is for SCs at the rate of 3.9% followed by Others and STs at 3.6% and 3.2% respectively.

In Assam, poverty has actually increased for the two groups namely STs and Others at the rate of 7.8% and 3.8% respectively and declined for SCs at the rate of 1.4% per annum. **In Rajasthan, STs witnessed increase in poverty at the rate of 11.9% per annum** and for the other two groups, i.e. SCs and Others, poverty has declined at the rate of 2.5% and 2.6% percent per annum respectively. In West Bengal, poverty has increased for STs and SCs at

the rate of 1.2% and 0.2% percentage points, whereas for Others it has declined at the rate of 0.1% per annum.

Among states where comparison can be made between SC and Others, Tripura and Haryana are the states where poverty for SCs has increased by 2.9% and 3.4% percent respectively. On the other hand, poverty for OTHER group has increased in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand at the rate of 0.4%, 0.5% and 4.5% respectively.

In this comparison category, Tamil Nadu is the state where poverty has declined for both the groups, namely SCs and Others at the rate of 3.5% and 4.1% percent. In Kerala, Himachal Pradesh and Punjab too, poverty has declined among both the groups. For Kerala, the decline in SC group is 2.1% and in Others, it is 3.4% percent. In Himachal Pradesh, the decline is comparatively less i.e. 1.6% and 1.7% for SCs and Others respectively.

When we look at the picture at an aggregate level combining the rural and urban areas, poverty seems to decline in all the states for the OTHER group. The maximum decline is for Himachal Pradesh at the rate of 6.1% per annum followed by Kerala, Tripura and Haryana at the rates of 5.2, 4.4 and 4.3 percent per annum respectively.

In SC category, poverty has declined in all the states except Chhattisgarh, where it has increased at the rate of 1.7% per annum. In this group, like for Others, **the maximum decline is observed for Himachal Pradesh, i.e. 5.5% followed by Kerala, Uttarakhand and Tripura at the rate of 4.8, 4.5 and 4.3 percent respectively.** For ST group, poverty has **declined at the maximum rate of 4.4% in Tripura followed by 4.1% in West Bengal and 4.0% in Assam,** whereas, it has increased in Andhra Pradesh and Chhattisgarh at the rate of 0.3% per annum. Summing up, it may be said that poverty scenario has changed in different directions and magnitudes for STs, SCs and Others in different states.

4.2. MPCE Growth

In this sub-section, we discuss the current status of disparities in consumption expenditure among social groups and the changes therein during the period under consideration in this study.

We start with the rural sector. At the all-India level, the disparity in consumption expenditure among the three social groups has more or less remained the same. STs had the lowest MPCE followed by SCs. In 1993-94, the difference between the average real MPCE (at constant 1999-00 prices) of STs and that of SCs was only INR 4 and between SCs and Others, it was INR 100. In 2009-10, the difference between the real MPCE of STs and SCs increased to INR 15 and between SCs and Others it was INR 129. The disparities among social groups in rural areas in the states have also remained more or less the same throughout the period under consideration.

Although at the all-India level, STs have the lowest MPCE, at the state-level, the picture is not the same. For six states out of twelve for which we had carried out the analysis for all the three groups in 1993-94, MPCE is greater among STs as compared to SCs. In Rajasthan, MPCE among STs is INR 22 more than SCs. The maximum difference between MPCE among STs and SCs is observed in Andhra Pradesh which is of INR 50.

In 2009-10, with the exception of Assam, MPCE of STs was lower than that of SCs in all the states. The difference was INR 24. For Assam, MPCE is the maximum for both the social groups. It was reported to be INR 594 among STs compared to INR 570 among SCs.

Invariably, MPCE of Others has been higher among social groups. The level of disparities between STs and SCs ranges between INR 2 in Rajasthan to INR 95 in Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat. The level of disparity between STs and Others is in the range of INR 76 in Karnataka to INR 184 in Gujarat. The range of disparity between SCs and Others is narrower among the 12 states. Among the second group of states, the disparity between SCs and Others is acute in Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Punjab and Uttarakhand.

MPCE in urban areas is the highest among Others followed by STs and SCs respectively. Among the 12 states where comparison can be made in all the three social groups, in 1993-94, the only exception was Odisha where MPCE is greater for SCs than STs. The difference is INR 55, whereas, in 2009-10, Assam being the exception repeating the same pattern and the difference is reported to be of INR 74.

For the second set of states where comparison can only be made between two social groups, in 1993-94, the difference of MPCE between SCs and Others ranges from the maximum of INR 618 for Himachal Pradesh to the lowest of INR 146 for Bihar. At the all-India level, the difference for the two social groups also increased over the years, from INR 222 in 1993-94 to INR 366 in 2009-10.

MPCE at 1999-00 prices of Others in the urban sector is more than INR 1,000 in many states like Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Odisha, Rajasthan, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Punjab and Tamil Nadu. With the exception of STs in Gujarat, the real MPCE of STs and SCs has not crossed the INR 1,000 barrier.

The inequalities are more in the urban sector compared to the rural sector and the variations in growth rate are also larger. The growth rate in the second sub-period is higher than the first sub-period at the all-India level for all social groups. SCs had the lowest growth rate in both the periods. Among the 12 states under consideration, there was near stagnation in the real MPCE of STs in the first sub-period. However, STs were the biggest gainers in the second sub-period as far as growth rate of real MPCE is concerned.

Turning to the rate of growth of MPCE between 1993-94 and 2009-10, the highest annual growth is observed for STs in Assam at 3% annually followed by West Bengal (2.4%) and Jharkhand (2.3%). The lowest annual growth is observed for Karnataka (0.2%) while in Andhra Pradesh, MPCE for STs actually declined by 1.1% annually. In case of SCs, the highest annual growth over this period is observed in Jharkhand (3.5%), Assam (2.8%) and West Bengal (2.3%). In the case of Chhattisgarh, the situation of SCs actually worsened as MPCE fell at the rate of 0.5% annually while in Odisha (0.5%), Karnataka (0.7%) and Madhya Pradesh (0.7%), the MPCE growth has been nominal. The states where growth among STs has been better than SCs are Assam, Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal whereas SCs in the remaining states have experienced higher growth than the STs. In the case of Others, MPCE has declined in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka in the rural areas.

The states where only SC-OTHER comparison is possible, SCs on the whole seem to have been doing better with the highest MPCE growth observed in Himachal Pradesh (5.3%) followed by Kerala (4.8%). In the rest of the states, the average annual increase for SCs is positive, however, in the case of Bihar, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh, the annual increase is lower than the Others.

Table 10: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real MPCE by major states and Social Groups during 1993-94 to 2009-10

(in %)

States	Rural			Urban		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra Pradesh	-1.1	1.2	-0.2	4.2	3.7	4.1
Assam	3.0	2.8	2.6	-1.4	0.9	0.8
Chhattisgarh	0.5	-0.5	0.6	1.5	3.8	1.8
Gujarat	0.4	1.7	1.4	5.9	2.8	3.9
Jharkhand	2.3	3.5	2.4	0.0	0.5	0.3
Karnataka	0.2	0.7	-0.1	3.0	4.2	2.9
Madhya Pradesh	1.3	0.7	0.2	4.7	0.9	2.8
Maharashtra	1.3	1.7	1.5	4.3	3.4	3.5
Odisha	0.4	0.5	1.4	2.1	1.0	3.6
Rajasthan	0.7	1.1	0.8	1.5	1.0	2.8
Tripura	1.3	1.6	1.1	-0.4	1.1	0.4
West Bengal	2.4	2.3	1.5	0.2	-0.6	1.1
Bihar	na	1.7	1.6	na	0.4	0.6
Haryana	na	2.2	2.5	na	-0.3	2.6
Himachal Pradesh	na	5.3	6.0	na	2.1	0.5
Kerala	na	4.8	8.0	na	1.9	6.6
Punjab	na	1.0	2.7	na	0.6	2.8
Tamil Nadu	na	1.9	0.9	na	3.9	2.8

Uttar Pradesh	na	1.2	1.1	na	1.3	0.2
Uttarakhand	na	2.4	5.0	na	2.0	0.2
All India	1.3	1.5	1.5	3.1	1.9	2.5

Note: As in table 9.

Source: As in table 4.

In the urban sector, the situation is quite different. At the aggregate level, the annual MPCE growth among STs at 3.1% is the highest, also higher than the Others (2.5%) and the SCs (1.9%). The other feature of MPCE growth in the urban sector is that STs have done better in areas where their number is substantial. In five out of 12 states where comparison among all the three social groups is feasible, MPCE growth among STs is the highest, higher than the Others too (table 10). In two states, Assam and Tripura, MPCE has declined for STs, whereas in West Bengal, growth has only been marginal at 0.2% per annum.

Compared to STs and Others, SCs have a higher per annum growth in only two states, namely, Chhattisgarh and Karnataka and lower than the growth of STs in five states. Compared to Others, MPCE growth for SCs has been higher in five states and negative growth in West Bengal. In eight states where comparison is possible between SCs and Others, SCs have a higher per annum increase in MPCE in four states that includes Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand.

In sum, we find that there are large inter-state disparities across states within each of the social groups besides inter-social group disparities. Despite STs and SCs doing better than Others in some states, the inter-group disparities still persist. We may, therefore, reiterate that inequalities are higher in the urban sector compared to the rural sector and the variations in the growth rate are also larger across states in the urban areas.

5. Poverty and Growth at the State Level: Religious Groups

In this section we look into the disparities in the incidence of poverty and mean consumption expenditure among major religious groups across the states. The three major religious groups that we have considered are the Hindus, the Muslims and all other religious minorities (ORMs). Because the distribution of the religious groups is not uniform across the country, the sample size is not adequate for this analysis in all the states. Therefore, we carry out this exercise for those states in which meaningful comparison can be done for all the three religious groups or where at least comparison between Hindus and Muslims is possible.

Some studies have shown that estimates of standard errors stabilise when the sample size is around 200. Therefore, in choosing the states for which this inter-religious group analysis can be done, we have used this rule of the thumb. We have chosen the states which have

sample size of at least 150 - 200 households for Muslims. Hence the analysis is carried out for the following states: Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. Further, the sample size for ORMs is very small in most states, and therefore, the estimates have to be interpreted with caution.

The level of poverty incidence and its annual rate of decline as well as levels and average annual growth of MPCE are reported at three time points for the Hindus, Muslims and ORMs (where ever the sample size is in the permissible range) in tables 5.1.1 to 5.2.7 in the Statistical Tables. As can be seen from Table 2.2, the only states (out of the 13 listed here) that have a sample size of over 100 households for ORMs separately for rural and urban areas are Andhra Pradesh, rural Jharkhand, Kerala, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu. Thus, at the state level, inter-religious group analysis is effectively a comparative analysis of Hindus and Muslims because of this constraint.

5.1 Poverty

At the all-India level, Muslims have traditionally been a disadvantaged group as far as the incidence of poverty is concerned. However, substantial improvement has taken place in their condition over the years. Between 1993-94 and 2009-10, rural poverty in the entire country declined at a per annum rate of 2.5 percent, which is equivalent to 15 percentage points decline as discussed in section 3.1 above. With regard to the religious groups, rural poverty declined at a slightly higher rate for Muslims and other religious minorities compared with Hindus---the per annum decline being 2.4 percent for Hindus, 3.4 percent for Muslims and 3.6 percent for ORM. In absolute terms also, the decline has been much higher for Muslims (24.46 percentage points), followed by ORM (15.43 percentage points) and Hindus (13.82 percentage points). Thus, Muslims have done better compared to Hindus and ORMs.

The situation of Muslims changed in 2009-10. Poverty incidence of the Muslims was lower than that of the Hindus in 2009-10 in the rural areas. The Muslims with 20.5 percent HCR were poorer than ORMs but less poor than SCs, STs and Hindus in 2009-10.

Table 11: Average Annual Decline in Poverty Incidence in major states by Religion Group during 1993-94 to 2009-10

(in %)

State	Rural			Urban		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra Pradesh	0.6	0.5	-2.1	-3.7	-3.4	-2.8
Assam	-4.0	-3.4	na	1.6	4.6	na
Bihar	-2.2	-3.4	na	0.5	1.0	na
Gujarat	-2.4	-4.4	na	-4.3	-3.0	na

Jharkhand	-3.2	-2.9	-3.4	1.4	2.1	na
Karnataka	-0.8	-3.0	na	-2.8	-3.6	na
Kerala	-5.7	-5.7	-6.2	-3.3	-2.3	-5.1
Madhya Pradesh	-0.8	-3.7	na	-2.7	-3.1	na
Maharashtra	-3.5	-3.9	-1.5	-3.5	-2.2	-2.4
Rajasthan	-3.5	-1.0	na	-2.3	-3.3	na
Tamil Nadu	-3.8	-4.3	-4.9	-4.0	-4.8	-2.6
Uttar Pradesh	-2.3	-2.5	na	-0.1	1.2	na
West Bengal	-4.1	-3.6	na	0.7	-0.9	na
All India	-2.4	-3.4	-3.6	-2.4	-1.8	-3.1

Note: "na" implies that separate calculation for ORM is not feasible.

Source: As in table 4.

Among the states in 2009-10, HCR of Muslims was higher than that of Hindus in four states out of thirteen states where the Hindu - Muslim comparison is feasible. These states are Assam, Jharkhand, Rajasthan and West Bengal. In 1993-94, it was higher in eight states out of 13. In Uttar Pradesh, there was no difference in the HCRs of the two religious groups in 1993-94 and it remained so in 2009-10 although poverty has declined for both Muslims and Hindus. In Kerala and Maharashtra, the disparity in poverty incidence between the two groups was eliminated in 2009-10.

The average annual rate of decline of HCR for Muslims in rural areas is lower compared to Hindus only in five states, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Pradesh and West Bengal. HCR has remained at the same level in Kerala from 1993-94 to 2009-10.

In urban areas, Muslims have not been doing well. At the all-India level in 2009-10, the urban HCR was 19 percent for Hindus and 34 percent for Muslims respectively. The figures in 1993-94 were 31 percent and 48 percent respectively. Thus, poverty has declined at a slower rate for both Hindus and Muslims. The per annum rate of change has been 2.5 percent for Hindus and 2.1 percent for Muslims during 1993-94 and 2009-10.

With the exception of Tamil Nadu, Muslims had higher HCRs than Hindus in the urban areas of all the states in 2009-10. The quantum of disparity is also quite high. For instance, in Assam, the HCR of Hindus was eight percent and that of Muslims was 39 percent; in Bihar, the figures were 39 percent and 59 percent; in Gujarat, it was eight percent and 25 percent; in Maharashtra 14 percent and 32 percent; and in Uttar Pradesh, it was 30 percent and 56 percent. In states where there is an increase in urban poverty (Assam and Bihar), the increase is for both Hindus and Muslims. Therefore, disparities between the two religious groups have more or less remained at the same level.

5.2 MPCE Growth

In Table 5.2.1, real (at 1999-2000 prices) MPCE is reported for rural areas while table 5.2.2 has the figures for urban areas. MPCE at 1999-00 prices in rural areas at the all-India level has been marginally higher for the Muslims in 2009-10. However, during 1993-94, the Muslims have been worse off than the Hindus, with MPCE of Hindus higher by about INR 21. But at the state's level (for 13 states where comparison is possible) we find a large variation in the MPCE. Out of the thirteen states, MPCE of Hindus is higher than that of the Muslims only in six states with largest difference being in Kerala by over INR 300. Between 1993-94 and 2009-10, there has been an improvement in the living standard of the Muslims in almost all the states.

The difference in the urban sector, though, is favouring Hindus in a significant way. In 1993-94, MPCE of Muslims is about INR 193 lower than the Hindus. In fact, MPCE of the Hindus has been higher in all the states except Kerala. However, by 2009-10, the Hindu-Muslim gap in MPCE increased significantly to over INR 300 with all the states having significantly higher MPCE for Hindus than Muslims, with the highest difference observed for Kerala at INR 678. Table 12 shows the differences of the MPCE between Hindus and Muslims for all the 15 states.

Table 12: Differences Muslim-Hindu real MPCE among the States

States	Rural (Rs.)		Urban (Rs.)	
	1993-94	2009-10	1993-94	2009-10
Andhra Pradesh	41	-48	-118	-87
Assam	-43	-167	-183	-134
Bihar	-24	22	-100	-170
Gujarat	2	34	-181	-348
Jharkhand	-20	-12	-112	-156
Karnataka	52	24	-168	-185
Kerala	-65	-304	30	-678
Madhya Pradesh	18	39	-151	-260
Maharashtra	-18	-5	-220	-401
Rajasthan	-64	68	-216	-405
Tamil Nadu	12	15	-83	-114
Uttar Pradesh	-5	-58	-193	-284
West Bengal	-21	-42	-315	-328
All India	-21	6	-193	-304

Source: As in table 4.

The average annual growth of real MPCE during 1993-94 to 2009-10 is reported in table 13. For the Hindus and Muslims, MPCE growth at the aggregate level has been modest at 1.3

percent per annum for Hindus and 1.8 percent per annum for Muslims in the rural areas. There is a large variation in the MPCE growth across states for both Hindus and Muslims as apparent from table 13. Out of the 13 states, MPCE grew at a faster rate for the Muslims in eight states. In Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, MPCE declined during this period for the Muslims and MPCE stagnated for the Hindus. In Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, MPCE growth of Hindus has only been marginally higher.

The per annum growth rate in the urban areas has a very different picture for the Hindus and Muslims. First, at the aggregate level, the average annual growth of real MPCE has been higher for the Hindus (2.5%) compared to the Muslims (2.1%) as seen from table 13. In eight out of thirteen states, the MPCE growth has been higher for the Hindus compared to Muslims. The highest growth for the Muslims is observed in Andhra Pradesh (5.1%) and lowest in West Bengal (0.8%). There are three states, Bihar (-0.4%), Jharkhand (-0.2%) and Uttar Pradesh (-0.2%) where the living standard of the Muslims worsened in the urban areas. In Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, MPCE growth for the Muslims has been better than the Hindus while in Tamil Nadu, both groups experienced similar increase in the real MPCE.

Table 13: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real MPCE for major states by Religion Group during 1993-94 to 2009-10

(in %)

State	Rural			Urban		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra Pradesh	0.0	-1.1	1.7	3.9	5.1	1.4
Assam	3.3	1.6	na	0.4	1.1	na
Bihar	1.5	2.5	na	0.5	-0.4	na
Gujarat	1.1	1.5	na	4.1	3.5	na
Jharkhand	2.3	2.6	2.4	0.3	-0.2	na
Karnataka	0.1	-0.3	na	2.8	3.5	na
Kerala	7.6	5.7	10.8	8.0	2.5	6.3
Madhya Pradesh	0.4	0.7	na	2.9	2.4	na
Maharashtra	1.5	1.7	1.0	3.5	2.9	4.6
Rajasthan	0.7	2.6	na	2.8	1.6	na
Tamil Nadu	1.3	1.3	2.5	2.9	3.0	2.5
Uttar Pradesh	1.1	0.4	na	0.7	-0.2	na
West Bengal	1.9	1.7	na	0.6	0.8	na
All India	1.3	1.8	3.2	2.5	2.1	2.5

Note: As in Table 11.

Source: As in table 4.

Thus, as far as the comparison in the level of two major religious groups, Hindus and Muslims is concerned, there are diverse trends in the rural and urban sectors. While Hindus have been doing on an average better in the urban areas, the Muslims in the rural areas are better off. It would be interesting to examine the correlates that place Muslims at a better position than the Hindus in the rural areas while Hindus at a better position in the urban areas.

6. Growth, Inequality and Poverty: Role of Inequality in Poverty Reduction

In the analysis in sections 3, 4 and 5, we observe large disparities in incidence and change in poverty and levels of living and income growth. These differences persist across social groups as well as religious groups. There are some groups that could be doing better in one region or states than the others. We also observed that MPCE growth varies across regions or states, by place of residence, by social as well as religion groups.

There has been speculation that differences in growth rates and its impact on poverty is affected by the level of inequality. In this section, we first examine the level and changes in inequality using summary measure of inequality, Gini coefficient. This is followed by the investigation of impact of growth on poverty reduction by decomposing changes in the poverty incidence, HCR into growth and distribution components.

Gini coefficients for rural and urban sectors for 1993-94 and 2009-10 have been calculated for all the states and reported in Statistical table 6.1.1. We report in table 14 below the Gini coefficient for only 13 states (since decomposition of poverty into growth and distribution components could be carried out for these 13 states only. It is to be noted that the Gini coefficient has been calculated on the real (1999-2000 prices) MPCE and multipliers available in the NSS CES data.

Table 14: Level of Inequality among Major States in 1993-94 and 2009-10

States	1993-94			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra Pradesh	0.290	0.323	0.314	0.286	0.395	0.392
Assam	0.179	0.290	0.219	0.251	0.330	0.268
Bihar	0.222	0.282	0.236	0.230	0.344	0.246
Gujarat	0.239	0.291	0.280	0.261	0.338	0.360
Haryana	0.311	0.284	0.311	0.310	0.368	0.332
Karnataka	0.269	0.319	0.311	0.240	0.341	0.369
Kerala	0.301	0.343	0.322	0.439	0.527	0.467
Madhya Pradesh	0.301	0.337	0.324	0.300	0.374	0.362
Maharashtra	0.307	0.358	0.377	0.276	0.423	0.427
Odisha	0.246	0.307	0.278	0.268	0.401	0.330
Punjab	0.282	0.281	0.285	0.297	0.382	0.333

Rajasthan	0.265	0.293	0.283	0.230	0.396	0.301
Tamil Nadu	0.312	0.348	0.346	0.271	0.340	0.351
Uttar Pradesh	0.283	0.327	0.304	0.270	0.369	0.301
West Bengal	0.254	0.339	0.313	0.245	0.393	0.306
All India	0.300	0.360	0.350	0.310	0.400	0.370

Source: As in table 4.

It is apparent from the table that there is a rise in inequalities in both the rural as well as the urban sectors at the aggregate level of all India. However, the state level picture is different. Out of the 13 states for which the data are reported in table 14, in the rural sector, nine states report decline in inequality. **The highest decline in inequality is about 13% in the case of Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu and the lowest is in rural sectors of Andhra Pradesh. The states where inequality increased substantially in the rural areas are Kerala (45.8%) and Assam (40.2%).** The other three states experienced a moderate rise in inequality--- Bihar (3.6%), Gujarat (9.2%), Odisha (8.9%) and Punjab (5.3%).

It is in the urban sector where inequality has risen at a much higher level. At the all-India level, the Gini coefficient rose from 0.36 in 1993-94 to 0.40 in 2009-10, or by over 11 percent. Among the states, the Gini coefficient of Kerala is the highest at 0.527 in 2009-10 that increased from 0.343 in 1993-94, recording an increase of about 54%. Kerala seems to be an outlier as the second highest level of Gini is observed in Maharashtra at 0.423, increasing by over 18% from the 1993-94 level (0.358). It is to be noted that these are consumption expenditure-based Gini coefficients and indicate high level of inequality.

The level of inequality in all the states has increased except in the case of Tamil Nadu where it has actually declined marginally. The states where Gini coefficient has risen significantly are Haryana (29.6%), Odisha (30.6%), Punjab (35.9%) and Rajasthan (35.2%). Thus, **unlike in rural areas where there has only been a moderate rise in inequality, in the urban sector, inequality has risen significantly, and in some of the states, inequality levels are as high as Latin American countries.**

How has the rise in inequality affected the effectiveness of growth in reducing poverty in different states? To examine this issue, we carry out a decomposition analysis of reduction in poverty by dividing the change into growth and re-distribution components. A detailed note on the methodology that we have used is reported in Thorat and Dubey (2012).

In panel 1 of table 15, the results of the decomposition for rural sector are reported. Column 3 of table 15 shows the potential of growth to reduce poverty in different states, also known as the mean effect, i.e. how the rise in mean income (in our case MPCE) would affect change in poverty. For example, MPCE in Andhra Pradesh has been stagnant (real MPCE increased by a rupee only between 1993-94 and 2009-10). Consequently, because of this stagnation in

real MPCE, poverty level, HCR could have declined by 0.1 percentage point. But because of redistribution effect, as indicated by a marginal decline in inequality (Gini coefficient, table 14), HCR declined further by 0.6 percentage points resulting in 0.7 percentage points of rural poverty in Andhra Pradesh. Similarly, in case of Assam, the increase in MPCE has the potential of reducing poverty by more than 35 percentage points, but actually, the estimated decline in poverty is only 25 percentage points. Thus, over 10 percentage points has been the loss of poverty reducing potential of MPCE growth in case of Assam.

The other states where rural poverty decline could have been about 35 percentage points is Kerala, however, because of the rise in inequality, the loss has been over 11 percentage points. The states where stagnation or small decline in poverty has helped reducing poverty more than the potential of MPCE are Karnataka, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal.

**Table 15: Contribution of Growth and Distribution in Total Change in HCR
(Between 50th and 66th NSS Rounds)**

States	Rural			Urban		
	ΔH	Growth Effect	Redistribution Effect	ΔH	Growth Effect	Redistribution Effect
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Andhra Pradesh	-0.7	-0.1	-0.6	-20.5	-29.0	8.5
Assam	-25.0	-35.2	10.3	5.8	-3.8	9.7
Bihar	-25.7	-26.6	0.9	2.4	-4.1	6.5
Gujarat	-9.0	-10.9	1.9	-18.5	-24.3	5.7
Haryana	-16.9	-16.9	0.0	0.3	-11.9	12.2
Karnataka	-4.6	-0.3	-4.3	-20.1	-22.5	2.4
Kerala	-23.4	-34.7	11.3	-13.7	-32.6	18.9
Madhya Pradesh	-3.0	-6.1	3.1	-19.7	-23.5	3.9
Maharashtra	-19.3	-15.4	-3.9	-16.5	-22.8	6.3
Odisha	-13.6	-15.1	1.5	-11.8	-23.7	11.9
Punjab	-10.6	-12.4	1.9	-2.6	-13.7	11.1
Rajasthan	-13.5	-8.1	-5.3	-10.0	-20.8	10.8
Tamil Nadu	-19.0	-13.4	-5.6	-23.0	-23.4	0.4
Uttar Pradesh	-15.1	-15.2	0.1	1.3	-5.6	6.9
West Bengal	-24.0	-22.4	-1.6	1.4	-5.8	7.2
All India	-13.9	-15.7	1.8	-10.9	-17.1	6.2

Source: As in table 4.

We reported above that there has been a significant rise in inequality in the urban sector. Since MPCE has also risen faster in urban areas, the potential of MPCE for reducing poverty is much higher (column 6 in table 15) compared to the actual reduction estimated (column 5 of the table). **The two extreme cases are Kerala where MPCE has risen considerably with a**

significant increase in the Gini coefficient. While MPCE growth in Kerala has the potential to reduce urban poverty in the state by 32.6 percentage points, however, the actual reduction has only been by 13.7 percentage points. The loss of 18.9 percentage points has been due to an increase in the Gini coefficient. Similarly in Tamil Nadu, the only state where Gini coefficient has declined marginally in the urban areas, almost the entire potential of MPCE growth (23.4 percentage points) in reducing poverty has got translated into reduction of urban poverty by 23 percentage points. In sum, while growth is effective in reducing poverty, the rising inequality in the urban sector has eroded this effectiveness to some extent.

7. Summary and Policy Implications

The Approach paper to the 12th Plan emphasizes on high growth path regime and pledges that the growth would be inclusive which results in reducing incidence of poverty, particularly of the traditionally deprived groups, the SCs, STs, OBCs, minorities and other excluded groups. Given the pro-poor focus of inclusive growth, this paper assesses the changes in the rural and urban poverty during 1993/10 and the two sub-periods, 1993/05 and 2004/10--- the latter covering three years of the 11th Plan. In this paper, we examine the changes in poverty at aggregate level and for SCs, STs, higher castes, Muslim and economic groups in the different states and see whether there has been a positive income growth, particularly for the most poor, and whether the most poor benefited more than others from income gains and in poverty reduction during 2004/10 (11th plan period) compared with 1993/05. We now summarize the main findings and indicate its implications for the 12th Plan strategy.

Because of the constraint of the sample size, the estimates of poverty ratios and mean MPCE could not be reported for all groups in all states. The analysis for economic groups, for example, could be done only for major states. Similarly, disparities among social groups could be studied only in states where sample size of STs and SCs was reasonable. Estimates for religious groups could be reported only in states where sample size of Muslims was adequate and the results for Other Religious Minorities are meaningful for a very few states only.

We observe large disparities across the states as far as poverty incidence is concerned.

Almost 60 percent of India's poor were in the states of Chhattisgarh, Bihar, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh in 2009-10. The poverty scenario is still grim in many parts of the country although the magnitude has been declining. The decline in poverty is not uniform across the states. Moreover, the quantum and the direction of change are different in the two sub-periods for many states. At the all India level, the incidence of poverty is higher in the rural areas than in the urban areas. But this is not true for all the states. In 20 states and Union Territories, the urban HCR was higher than the rural HCR in 2009-10.

We also note that regional inequality in consumption expenditure as can be seen from the variations in real MPCE across the states has been increasing during the period considered in this study. The growth of real MPCE has not been shared equally by all the states.

Among economic groups, the incidence of poverty is the highest in case of AGLA in the rural areas, followed by OLAH. OTHER households had the lowest HCR. Poverty had declined across all economic groups in the rural areas during the period under consideration, but the rate of decline shows large variations. It emerged that in states, the poor are concentrated in AGLA and OLAH households and these households have witnessed very little change in poverty during the first sub-period. In the urban areas, RWSE is undoubtedly better off than any other household type since people belonging to this category are least likely to be poor. On the other hand, CALA are the worst off group and the difference is high between these two groups.

The variations in the real MPCE have a direct correspondence with the variations in the incidence of poverty. AGLA have the least MPCE in the rural areas followed by OLAH. With the exception of Kerala, farmers in Haryana and Punjab were the only groups with real MPCE above INR 1,000. The rest of the economic groups in the rural areas had MPCE in the range of INR 300 to INR 650. In the first sub-period, the per annum growth rate of real MPCE was very little in almost all groups in all states except Kerala.

Among social groups, STs have the highest poverty incidence followed by SCs. In 2009-10 the poverty incidence of STs was still alarming with one-third of the ST population in rural India living below the poverty line. The situation is particularly grim in Odisha, Chhattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh where more than 50 percent of STs are still poor. The disparity between the HCR of STs and that of Others is huge in many states. SCs are also very vulnerable to poverty. In some states like Assam, Chhattisgarh, Karnataka and Rajasthan, SCs were worse off than STs in 2009-10. The difference between the HCR of SCs and that of Others is 10 percentage points or more in case of many states. Poverty has declined at different rates for different social groups. At the all-India level, the highest rate of decline was for Others (2.5 percent per annum), followed by SCs (2.1 percent per annum) and STs (1 percent per annum) in the first sub-period. In Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Odisha, STs had become worse off in the first sub-period. Assam and Karnataka are the two states where poverty reduced at significant rates for STs in the rural sector in the first sub-period. The worst performing states were Madhya Pradesh, Odisha and Bihar in which there was little or no reduction of poverty for STs and SCs in the rural sector.

In the urban areas, SCs are generally the worst off group followed by STs and Others. The disparities among social groups are substantial. It may be noted that the gap between the

HCRs of STs and SCs is not that large compared with the glaring disparity between STs and Others or between SCs and Others. Inequalities among social groups are more pronounced in the urban sector. The differences in performance with regards to poverty reduction increased in the second sub-period. The gains in poverty reduction in the first sub period were nullified in the second sub-period in some cases. Different groups have fared differently in different states. Thus, disparities have persisted.

The disparities in consumption expenditure among social groups in rural areas in the states have remained more or less the same throughout the period under consideration.

The disparities were not much in rural areas and the annual growth rate of real MPCE was very modest. In the second sub-period, the growth rate of real MPCE improved for STs. The inequalities are more in the urban sector compared to the rural sector and the variations in the growth rate also are larger. The growth rate in the second sub-period is higher than in the first sub-period at the all-India level for all social groups. SCs had the lowest growth rate in both the periods. Among the 12 states under consideration, there was near stagnation in the real MPCE of STs in the first sub-period. However, STs were the biggest gainers in the second sub-period as far as growth rate of real MPCE is concerned.

Among religious groups, at the all-India level, Muslims have traditionally been a disadvantaged group as far as the incidence of poverty is concerned. However, in rural areas, Muslims have done better compared to Hindus and ORMs. The situation of Muslims has changed and their HCR was lower than that of the Hindus in 2009-10. Among the states in 2009-10, the HCR of Muslims was higher than that of Hindus in Assam, Jharkhand, Rajasthan and West Bengal. In Uttar Pradesh, Kerala and Maharashtra, the disparity in poverty incidence between the two groups was eliminated in 2009-10. In urban areas, Muslims have not done so well. With the exception of Tamil Nadu, Muslims had higher HCRs than Hindus in the urban areas of all the states in 2009-10. The quantum of disparity is also quite high. With regard to the rate of change of HCR, we observe little variation between Hindus and Muslims in both the sub-periods although the rate had increased in the second sub-period. In states where there is an increase in urban poverty in the second sub-period, the increase is for both Hindus and Muslims. Therefore, disparities between the two religious groups have more or less remained at the same level.

Mean MPCE at 1999-00 prices in the rural areas shows little variation across states and between Hindus and Muslims. Kerala is an exception. The growth rate of real MPCE was very modest for both Hindus and Muslims in the first sub-period at the all-India level. The rates improved marginally in the second sub-period. With very little growth, the level of disparities also did not change much.

We also show that for the states, growth has the potential to reduce poverty and where inequality is stagnant, MPCE growth has contributed in reducing poverty. Effectiveness of the MPCE growth is eroded somewhat in the urban sector where inequalities have risen.

7. Bibliography

Adelman I and C. T. Morris (1973), *Economic Growth and Social Equity in Developing Countries*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Ahluwalia, Montek S. (1974), *Income Inequality, Some dimensions of the problem*, in *Redistribution and Growth* (Edit) H. Chenery et al Oxford University Press, New York

Ahluwalia, Montek S. (1976a), *Income Distribution and Development: Some Stylized Facts*, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 66, May, Pp. 128-35.

Ahluwalia, Montek S. (1976b), *Inequality, poverty and development*, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 3, Pp. 307-342.

Ahluwalia, Montek S. (1978), *Rural Poverty and Agriculture Performance in India*, *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 14(3), pp 298-323.

Ahluwalia, Montek S., N. Carter and H. B. Chenery (1979), *Growth and Poverty in Developing Countries*, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 6, 299-341.

Bhanamurthy, N. R. and A. Mitra (2004), *Economic Growth, Poverty and Inequality in Indian States in the Pre-Reform and Reform Periods*, *Asian Development Review*, Vol. 21 (2), pp 79-99.

Datt, Gaurav and Martin Ravallion (2000), *Why has Economic Growth been More Pro-poor in some states of India than others?*, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 68(2), pp 381-400

Datt, Gaurav and Martin Ravallion (1992): "Growth and Redistribution Component of Changes in Poverty Measures: A Decomposition With Application to Brazil and India in 1980s", *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 38 (2), pp 275-295.

de Haan, A. and A. Dubey (2005), *Orissa: Poverty, Disparities, or the Development of Under-Development?*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 40 No. 18 (May 28), pp. 2321-29.

Dubey, A. and S. Gangopadhyay (1998), "Counting the Poor: Where are the Poor in India?", *Central Statistical Organization, Ministry of Statistics and PI*, New Delhi.

Epaulard, A. (2003), 'Macroeconomic Performance and Poverty Reduction, ' *IMF Working Paper N° 03/72*.

Foster, James, Joel Greer and Erick Thorbecke (1984), *A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures*", *Econometrica*, Vol. 52 (3), pp 761-766.

Jain, L. and S. Tendulkar (1990), The Role of Growth and Distribution in the Observed Change in Head-Count-Ration Measure of Poverty: A Decomposition Exercise for India, *Indian Economic Review*, Vol. 25 (2), pp 165-205.

Kakwani, N. (2000), On Measuring Growth and Inequality Components of Poverty with Application to Thailand", *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, Vol. 16 (1), pp 67-79.

Kalsen, Stephan (2010), Measuring and Monitoring Inclusive Growth: Multiple Definitions, Open, Questions and Some Constructive Proposals, Asian Development Bank, Working Paper Series No 12 June 2010

Government of India (2009), Eleventh Five Year Plan -2007-2012, Volume I, Inclusive Growth, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi.

Government of India (2011), Faster, Sustainable and More Inclusive Growth :An Approach to 12th Five Year Plan Planning Commission,

Hull, K. (2009), Understanding the Relationship between Economic Growth, employment and Poverty Reduction, OECD, Paris.

Kolenikov, S., and A. Shorrocks (2005), 'A Decomposition Analysis of Regional Poverty in Russia, ' *Review of Development Economics* 9, 25-46.

Kraay, A. (2004), 'When is Growth Pro-poor? Cross-country Evidence, ' World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, WPS 3225.

Mahendra Dev, S. (2005), Pro-poor Growth in India: What do we know about the Employment Effects of Growth 1980-2000?, Working Paper No. 161, Overseas Development Institute.

Palmer-Jones, R. and K. Sen (2003), 'What Has Luck Got To Do With It? A Regional Analysis of Poverty and Agricultural Growth in Rural India, ' *Journal of Development Studies* 40, 1-31.

Papanek, G. (1978) Economic Growth, income distribution and political processes in LDCs, in *Income distribution and in economic inequality*, (Edit) Griliches, Z. et al Campus Verlag – Halstead Press Frankfurt –New York

Paukert, F. (1973) Income distribution at different levels of development, *International Labour Review*, Vol. 108, Pp. 97-125.

Pernia, Ernesto (2003) Pro-poor growth: What is it and How is it Important Asian Development Bank, ERD Policy Brief No.17

Ravallion, M. (1997), 'Can High-Inequality Countries Escape Absolute Poverty?' *Economics Letters*, 56, 51-57.

- Ravallion, M. (2001), 'Growth, Inequality and Poverty: Looking Beyond Averages,' *World Development* 29, 1803-1815.
- Ravallion, M. and G. Datt (2002), 'Why Has Economic Growth Been More Pro-poor in Some States of India than Others?', *Journal of Development Economics* 68, 381-400.
- Ravallion, M. and S. Chen (2003), 'Measuring Pro-poor Growth,' *Economics Letters* 78, 93-99.
- Ravallion, M. (2009), Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction: Do Poor Countries Need to Worry about Inequality?, in Joachim Barun, Ruth Varvas Hill and Rajul Pmadya-Lorch (ed) *The Poorest and Hungary- Assessment, Analysis and Action*, IFPRI, Washington DC, Pp. 179-86.
- Rauniyar, Ganesh and Ravi Kanbur (2010), *Inclusive Development: Two Papers on Conceptualization, Applications, and the ADB Perspective*. January draft Independent Evaluation Department, ADB.
- Sen, Abhijit (1997), Agricultural Growth and rural poverty, in *Growth, Eemployment and poverty –Changes and continuity in rural India*, (Edit) Chadha, G. K. and Sharma, A. K., Indian Society of Labour Economics.
- Shorrocks, A. (1999), 'Decomposition Procedures for Distributional Analysis: A Unified Framework Based on the Shapley Value,' *mimeo*, University of Essex.
- Thorat, Amit (2010), Ethnicity, Caste, and Religion –Implications for Poverty Outcomes, *Economic and Politically Weekly*, Vol XLV No 52, December 18-24, 2010.
- Thorat, S. K. and Amaresh Dubey (2012), Has Growth Been Socially Inclusive during 1993-94 – 2009-10?, *Economic and Politically Weekly*, Vol 47(10), pp. 43-54.
- Thorat, Sukhadeo and Narandra Kumar (2008), B. R. Ambedkar - Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policies –Perspective on Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Thorat, Sukhadeo and Narandra Kumar (2008), *In search of Inclusive Society – Addressing the Graded Inequality*, Rawat Publication, New Delhi.
- Thorat, Sukhadeo (2008), *Dalits in India - Search for Common Destiny*, Sage Publication, New Delhi.
- Thorat, Sukhadeo, Peter Hazell and Shangeen Fan (2000), Government Spending, Growth and Poverty in Rural India, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 82(4), 1038-1051, November.
- Thorat, Sukhadeo (with Shenggen Fan and Ashok Gulati) (2006) *Investment, Subsidies and Pro-poor Growth in Rural India Discussion Paper*, IFPRI, Washington D. C.

Thorat, Sukhadeo (with M Mahamallick) (2006), "Chronic Poverty and Socially Disadvantage Groups :Analysis of Causes and Remedies, Working Paper 33, Chronic Poverty Centre London and Indian Institute of Public Administration.

Thorat, Sukhadeo (with S. Vanketsan and M Mahamallick) (2005) Human Poverty, Social Exclusion and Marginalized Groups, Working Paper, UNDP.

Thorat, Sukhadeo and Katherine Newman (2010) Block By Caste :Economic Discrimination Modern India, Oxford

Tsakloglou, Panos ((1988), Development and Inequality Revisited, Applied Economics, Vol. 20, 509-531.

Tsui, K. (1996), 'Growth-equity Decomposition of a Change in Poverty: An Axiomatic Approach, ' *Economics Letters* 50, 417-423.

Villasenor, J. and B. C. Arnold (1989): "Elliptical Lorenz Curves", *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 40 (2), pp. 327-338.

White (XXXX)..

Zheng, B. (1993), 'An Axiomatic Characterization of the Watts Index, ' *Economics Letters* 42, 81-86.

Statistical Tables

**Table 2.1: Sample size (number of households surveyed) in 2009-10
(by sector, state and social groups)**

State	Rural			Urban			Total		
	ST	SC	OTH	ST	SC	OTH	ST	SC	OTH
Andhra Pradesh	312	767	2849	76	393	2495	388	1160	5344
Arunachal Pradesh	797	24	220	298	18	284	1095	42	504
Assam	488	287	1838	84	170	577	572	457	2415
Bihar	66	662	2567	21	149	1099	87	811	3666
Chhattishgarh	520	225	751	98	106	532	618	331	1283
Goa	21	4	134	3	8	274	24	12	408
Gujarat	467	176	1076	81	166	1458	548	342	2534
Haryana	13	444	983	9	275	896	22	719	1879
Himachal Pradesh	178	411	1071	14	80	287	192	491	1358
J & K	36	167	1241	10	101	1156	46	268	2397
Jharkhand	610	274	874	136	110	743	746	384	1617
Karnataka	153	325	1558	107	213	1714	260	538	3272
Kerala	31	222	2353	13	125	1708	44	347	4061
Madhya Pradesh	569	454	1708	127	324	1514	696	778	3222
Maharashtra	468	587	2960	150	572	3258	618	1159	6218
Manipur	615	29	731	41	56	1084	656	85	1815
Meghalaya	816	2	46	335	8	65	1151	10	111
Mizoram	620	9	3	874	8	14	1494	17	17
Nagaland	689	3	12	292	3	25	981	6	37
Odisha	669	552	1753	149	174	732	818	726	2485
Punjab	7	635	918	12	397	1146	19	1032	2064
Rajasthan	407	561	1615	75	271	1207	482	832	2822
Sikkim	230	40	338	39	19	102	269	59	440
Tamil Nadu	38	692	2590	33	442	2843	71	1134	5433
Tripura	424	283	605	43	133	368	467	416	973
Uttarakhand	50	204	794	10	113	608	60	317	1402
Uttar Pradesh	46	1597	4263	30	462	2595	76	2059	6858
West Bengal	230	1007	2339	74	532	2144	304	1539	4483
A & N Islands	41		231	2		286	43		517
Chandigarh		6	26	2	46	225	2	52	251
D & N Haveli	81	5	10	22	10	64	103	15	74
Daman & Diu	15	6	43	3	4	57	18	10	100
Delhi	1	17	41	14	139	689	15	156	730
Lakshadweep	51		4	113	5	10	164	5	14
Pondicherry		42	86	1	37	410	1	79	496
Total	9759	10719	38631	3391	5669	32669	13150	16388	71300

Source: Special tabulation by the authors using NSS CES unit record data

**Table 2.2: Sample size (number of households surveyed) in 2009-10
(by sector, state and religious groups)**

State	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	3540	254	134	2380	468	116	5920	722	250
Arunachal P	255	12	774	279	22	299	534	34	1073
Assam	1749	779	88	719	97	16	2468	876	104
Bihar	2789	498	12	1098	164	10	3887	662	22
Chhattishgarh	1458	6	32	659	45	32	2117	51	64
Goa	117		42	177	32	76	294	32	118
Gujarat	1584	130	5	1406	251	48	2990	381	53
Haryana	1311	51	78	1105	35	40	2416	86	118
Himachal P	1564	10	86	360	10	11	1924	20	97
J & K	495	920	30	448	725	95	943	1645	125
Jharkhand	1388	165	205	799	94	96	2187	259	301
Karnataka	1825	189	22	1648	304	82	3473	493	104
Kerala	1389	614	603	1078	423	345	2467	1037	948
Madhya P	2611	92	28	1662	248	56	4273	340	84
Maharashtra	3599	188	228	2971	600	409	6570	788	637
Manipur	619	112	645	949	99	134	1568	211	779
Meghalaya	47	25	792	84	7	317	131	32	1109
Mizoram	7		625	17	4	875	24	4	1500
Nagaland	15	5	684	22	7	291	37	12	975
Odisha	2880	39	56	991	44	20	3871	83	76
Punjab	360	30	1170	951	36	568	1311	66	1738
Rajasthan	2395	129	59	1205	267	81	3600	396	140
Sikkim	365	4	239	110	10	40	475	14	279
Tamil Nadu	3068	83	169	2817	271	230	5885	354	399
Tripura	1152	101	59	520	21	3	1672	122	62
Uttarakhand	944	73	31	580	137	14	1524	210	45
Uttar Pradesh	5079	812	15	2155	894	38	7234	1706	53
West Bengal	2425	1102	49	2405	322	23	4830	1424	72
A & N Islands	171	17	84	215	37	36	386	54	120
Chandigarh	19		13	229	4	40	248	4	53
D & N Haveli	95	1		88	7	1	183	8	1
Daman & Diu	64			58	4	2	122	4	2
Delhi	58	1		701	103	38	759	104	38
Lakshadweep	4	51		12	116		16	167	
Pondicherry	114	9	5	370	35	43	484	44	48
Total	45555	6502	7062	31268	5943	4525	76823	12445	11587

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.1.1: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by Sector and State

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra P	15.96	38.80	21.92	10.47	27.36	14.79	17.13	16.46	16.94
Arunachal P	41.41	6.05	37.22	10.86	2.58	9.91	8.92	11.85	9.51
Assam	45.21	7.93	41.41	22.11	3.65	20.41	17.93	12.29	17.35
Bihar	56.49	40.75	54.98	42.54	36.26	41.96	34.38	42.64	35.22
Chhattishgarh	44.40	44.24	44.37	40.77	42.18	40.99	48.32	28.19	44.74
Goa	4.98	28.26	14.81	5.64	19.71	10.92	1.82	5.24	2.79
Gujarat	22.23	28.28	24.20	18.89	13.31	16.96	13.14	10.13	11.99
Haryana	27.99	16.47	25.02	13.25	14.48	13.57	9.35	18.02	11.94
Himachal P	30.33	9.26	28.55	10.53	3.19	9.83	1.56	7.88	2.10
J & K	18.22	5.12	13.32	4.27	7.40	5.06	4.40	7.12	5.04
Jharkhand	62.17	26.51	55.29	46.15	20.25	41.98	30.67	31.84	30.91
Karnataka	30.04	39.72	32.80	20.67	32.61	24.34	25.07	19.66	23.18
Kerala	25.38	24.31	25.12	13.20	19.99	14.80	2.02	11.43	4.47
Madhya P	39.24	48.97	41.74	36.79	42.72	38.18	33.67	27.36	32.13
Maharashtra	38.14	34.93	36.95	29.57	32.10	30.59	17.74	17.63	17.69
Manipur	18.94	6.89	15.65	4.23	0.67	3.36	2.56	13.34	5.35
Meghalaya	24.33	1.81	21.23	3.57	0.06	3.11	2.93	3.96	3.10
Mizoram	6.22	0.00	4.26	2.79	0.00	1.69	3.64	2.14	2.96
Nagaland	2.30	0.00	1.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Odisha	49.78	40.64	48.62	46.93	44.72	46.63	36.34	29.10	35.30
Punjab	11.48	10.89	11.31	9.02	6.29	8.14	3.21	8.77	5.16
Rajasthan	26.38	31.03	27.45	18.32	32.31	21.44	12.46	19.03	14.05
Sikkim	31.70	0.96	29.25	16.02	1.14	14.34	4.92	0.81	4.36
Tamil Nadu	32.97	39.96	35.43	22.99	22.46	22.79	12.75	14.60	13.57
Tripura	23.64	6.04	21.29	34.49	5.53	30.43	7.87	5.51	7.49
Uttarakhand	24.83	17.85	23.40	40.65	36.50	39.68	4.03	24.69	9.31
Uttar Pradesh	43.09	35.64	41.63	33.30	30.13	32.68	27.44	37.69	29.50
West Bengal	41.18	22.95	36.94	28.36	13.50	24.73	15.95	23.90	17.87
A & N Islands	1.06	5.22	2.24	0.35	1.04	0.59	0.19	0.00	0.12
Chandigarh	11.79	2.08	3.34	14.08	3.81	4.86	0.00	3.62	3.07
D & N Haveli	51.67	38.83	50.74	39.64	19.17	37.22	21.95	9.32	18.82
Daman & Diu	4.71	21.66	11.42	0.00	16.67	5.86	1.07	27.84	13.02
Delhi	2.00	16.11	14.58	6.89	16.34	15.70	7.62	11.91	11.69
Lakshadweep	0.00	15.93	8.06	0.34	11.96	6.10	12.62	1.78	7.13
Pondicherry	19.99	36.47	30.26	25.80	21.24	22.85	0.00	2.29	1.50
Total	36.87	32.77	35.85	28.03	25.81	27.47	21.89	20.76	21.58

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.1.2: Average Annual Rate of Decline of HCR by Sector and State

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009/10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra P	-3.1	-2.7	-3.0	12.7	-8.0	2.9	0.5	-3.6	-1.4
Arunachal P	-6.7	-5.2	-6.7	-3.6	72.0	-0.8	-4.9	6.0	-4.7
Assam	-4.6	-4.9	-4.6	-3.8	47.4	-3.0	-3.8	3.4	-3.6
Bihar	-2.2	-1.0	-2.2	-3.8	3.5	-3.2	-2.4	0.3	-2.2
Chhattishgarh	-0.7	-0.4	-0.7	3.7	-6.6	1.8	0.6	-2.3	0.1
Goa	1.2	-2.7	-2.4	-13.5	-14.7	-14.9	-4.0	-5.1	-5.1
Gujarat	-1.4	-4.8	-2.7	-6.1	-4.8	-5.9	-2.6	-4.0	-3.2
Haryana	-4.8	-1.1	-4.2	-5.9	4.9	-2.4	-4.2	0.6	-3.3
Himachal P	-5.9	-6.0	-6.0	-17.0	29.5	-15.7	-5.9	-0.9	-5.8
J & K	-7.0	4.0	-5.6	0.6	-0.7	-0.1	-4.7	2.4	-3.9
Jharkhand	-2.3	-2.1	-2.2	-6.7	11.4	-5.3	-3.2	1.3	-2.8
Karnataka	-2.8	-1.6	-2.3	4.3	-7.9	-1.0	-1.0	-3.2	-1.8
Kerala	-4.4	-1.6	-3.7	-16.9	-8.6	-14.0	-5.8	-3.3	-5.1
Madhya P	-0.6	-1.2	-0.8	-1.7	-7.2	-3.2	-0.9	-2.8	-1.4
Maharashtra	-2.0	-0.7	-1.6	-8.0	-9.0	-8.4	-3.3	-3.1	-3.3
Manipur	-7.1	-8.2	-7.1	-7.9		11.8	-5.4	5.8	-4.1
Meghalaya	-7.8	-8.8	-7.8	-3.6		0.0	-5.5	7.4	-5.3
Mizoram	-5.0		-5.5	6.1		14.9	-2.6		-1.9
Nagaland	-9.1		-9.1				-6.3		-6.3
Odisha	-0.5	0.9	-0.4	-4.5	-7.0	-4.9	-1.7	-1.8	-1.7
Punjab	-1.9	-3.8	-2.5	-12.9	7.9	-7.3	-4.5	-1.2	-3.4
Rajasthan	-2.8	0.4	-2.0	-6.4	-8.2	-6.9	-3.3	-2.4	-3.1
Sikkim	-4.5	1.7	-4.6	-13.9	-5.8	-13.9	-5.3	-1.0	-5.3
Tamil Nadu	-2.8	-4.0	-3.2	-8.9	-7.0	-8.1	-3.8	-4.0	-3.9
Tripura	4.2	-0.8	3.9	-15.4	-0.1	-15.1	-4.2	-0.5	-4.1
Uttarakhand	5.8	9.5	6.3	-18.0	-6.5	-15.3	-5.2	2.4	-3.8
Uttar Pradesh	-2.1	-1.4	-2.0	-3.5	5.0	-1.9	-2.3	0.4	-1.8
West Bengal	-2.8	-3.7	-3.0	-8.8	15.4	-5.5	-3.8	0.3	-3.2
A & N Islands	-6.1	-7.3	-6.7	-9.1	-20.0	-15.9	-5.1	-6.3	-5.9
Chandigarh	1.8	7.6	4.1	-20.0	-1.0	-7.4	-6.3	4.6	-0.5
D & N Haveli	-2.1	-4.6	-2.4	-8.9	-10.3	-9.9	-3.6	-4.7	-3.9
Daman & Diu	-9.1	-2.1	-4.4		13.4	24.5	-4.8	1.8	0.9
Delhi	22.2	0.1	0.7	2.1	-5.4	-5.1	17.6	-1.6	-1.2
Lakshadweep		-2.3	-2.2		-17.0	3.4		-5.6	-0.7
Pondicherry	2.6	-3.8	-2.2	-20.0	-17.8	-18.7	-6.3	-5.9	-5.9
Total	-2.2	-1.9	-2.1	-4.4	-3.9	-4.3	-2.5	-2.3	-2.5

Source: As in table 2.1

**Table 3.2.1: Average Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by Sector and State
(at constant, 1999-00, prices)**

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra P	465.1	672.5	519.2	525.7	858.2	610.7	466.3	1097.0	643.5
Arunachal P	498.2	798.8	533.8	727.3	800.0	735.6	893.9	860.8	887.2
Assam	406.4	742.6	440.7	512.0	961.7	553.6	582.3	803.1	604.9
Bihar	345.0	497.8	359.7	392.2	605.2	411.8	435.4	540.5	446.1
Chhattisgarh	366.1	623.1	411.4	403.8	836.3	470.0	392.4	816.7	468.1
Goa	796.4	853.1	820.3	866.8	1160.6	977.1	865.9	1674.7	1096.2
Gujarat	477.4	725.0	557.9	537.2	977.6	689.1	565.8	1182.6	800.4
Haryana	595.2	771.2	640.6	754.8	951.5	807.2	825.0	977.9	870.8
Himachal P	551.2	1237.5	609.1	743.8	1157.8	783.0	1058.7	1338.0	1082.8
J & K	571.0	895.7	692.4	744.9	812.0	761.8	770.9	953.3	813.5
Jharkhand	337.2	653.1	398.2	399.8	860.3	474.0	468.0	687.9	512.2
Karnataka	446.3	716.0	523.3	485.6	881.2	607.4	448.3	1065.4	663.7
Kerala	600.0	839.7	658.7	882.8	1100.9	934.0	1341.8	1692.2	1432.9
Madhya P	423.0	619.9	473.8	417.0	763.4	498.1	453.1	887.6	558.8
Maharashtra	444.6	871.1	603.5	499.5	930.7	673.3	549.9	1359.3	887.1
Manipur	472.5	517.7	484.9	579.3	659.6	599.0	625.7	549.8	606.1
Meghalaya	561.9	859.0	602.7	617.8	1080.6	679.3	651.9	759.9	670.3
Mizoram	613.4	890.1	700.9	733.7	1090.1	874.4	750.4	890.9	814.8
Nagaland	690.8	823.7	726.2	952.9	1360.6	1072.7	923.2	892.5	914.9
Odisha	367.0	638.7	401.6	396.6	678.0	435.1	428.6	926.2	499.8
Punjab	673.7	782.4	705.1	748.3	1104.2	862.8	879.1	1061.1	943.0
Rajasthan	513.9	704.5	557.7	542.7	802.6	600.6	578.7	974.0	674.7
Sikkim	469.2	839.7	498.7	649.1	1005.0	689.3	774.4	979.3	802.5
Tamil Nadu	458.8	702.5	544.7	526.5	938.0	684.8	556.8	1034.9	769.7
Tripura	539.9	793.3	573.7	460.0	909.8	523.1	624.8	836.3	658.7
Uttarakhand	484.4	734.8	535.9	595.9	842.7	653.6	821.5	778.6	810.6
Uttar Pradesh	430.8	626.8	469.2	490.5	738.3	539.2	500.5	675.7	535.7
West Bengal	442.2	783.9	521.7	514.2	1023.4	638.8	570.6	870.9	643.3
A & N Islands	776.2	1453.9	967.6	934.7	1565.9	1149.3	985.7	1540.3	1193.2
Chandigarh	708.7	1573.3	1460.7	718.4	1473.4	1396.3	1082.2	2211.4	2041.0
D & N Haveli	383.0	728.5	408.3	501.2	1140.8	576.6	438.1	887.3	549.4
Daman & Diu	741.2	780.6	756.8	1020.7	875.0	969.5	833.1	952.1	886.2
Delhi	938.9	1298.0	1259.1	811.7	1088.0	1069.3	920.4	1230.0	1213.9
Lakshadweep	811.7	864.1	838.2	1143.7	1212.0	1177.5	1063.4	1412.4	1240.1
Pondicherry	556.6	673.2	629.2	642.9	888.4	801.6	868.7	1291.6	1144.4
Total	447.7	743.6	521.3	511.2	895.6	608.6	554.6	1029.9	683.2

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.2.2: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by Sector and State

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra P	1.2	2.5	1.6	-2.3	5.6	1.1	0.0	3.9	1.5
Arunachal P	4.2	0.0	3.4	4.6	1.5	4.1	5.0	0.5	4.1
Assam	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.7	-3.3	1.9	2.7	0.5	2.3
Bihar	1.2	2.0	1.3	2.2	-2.1	1.7	1.6	0.5	1.5
Chhattisgarh	0.9	3.1	1.3	-0.6	-0.5	-0.1	0.5	1.9	0.9
Goa	0.8	3.3	1.7	0.0	8.9	2.4	0.5	6.0	2.1
Gujarat	1.1	3.2	2.1	1.1	4.2	3.2	1.2	3.9	2.7
Haryana	2.4	2.1	2.4	1.9	0.6	1.6	2.4	1.7	2.2
Himachal P	3.2	-0.6	2.6	8.5	3.1	7.7	5.8	0.5	4.9
J & K	2.8	-0.8	0.9	0.7	3.5	1.4	2.2	0.4	1.1
Jharkhand	1.7	2.9	1.7	3.4	-4.0	1.6	2.4	0.3	1.8
Karnataka	0.8	2.1	1.5	-1.5	4.2	1.9	0.0	3.1	1.7
Kerala	4.3	2.8	3.8	10.4	10.7	10.7	7.7	6.3	7.3
Madhya P	-0.1	2.1	0.5	1.7	3.3	2.4	0.4	2.7	1.1
Maharashtra	1.1	0.6	1.1	2.0	9.2	6.4	1.5	3.5	2.9
Manipur	2.1	2.5	2.1	1.6	-3.3	0.2	2.0	0.4	1.6
Meghalaya	0.9	2.3	1.2	1.1	-5.9	-0.3	1.0	-0.7	0.7
Mizoram	1.8	2.0	2.3	0.5	-3.7	-1.4	1.4	0.0	1.0
Nagaland	3.4	5.9	4.3	-0.6	-6.9	-2.9	2.1	0.5	1.6
Odisha	0.7	0.6	0.8	1.6	7.3	3.0	1.0	2.8	1.5
Punjab	1.0	3.7	2.0	3.5	-0.8	1.9	1.9	2.2	2.1
Rajasthan	0.5	1.3	0.7	1.3	4.3	2.5	0.8	2.4	1.3
Sikkim	3.5	1.8	3.5	3.9	-0.5	3.3	4.1	1.0	3.8
Tamil Nadu	1.3	3.0	2.3	1.2	2.1	2.5	1.3	3.0	2.6
Tripura	-1.3	1.3	-0.8	7.2	-1.6	5.2	1.0	0.3	0.9
Uttarakhand	2.1	1.3	2.0	7.6	-1.5	4.8	4.4	0.4	3.2
Uttar Pradesh	1.3	1.6	1.4	0.4	-1.7	-0.1	1.0	0.5	0.9
West Bengal	1.5	2.8	2.0	2.2	-3.0	0.1	1.8	0.7	1.5
A & N Islands	1.9	0.7	1.7	1.1	-0.3	0.8	1.7	0.4	1.5
Chandigarh	0.1	-0.6	-0.4	10.1	10.0	9.2	3.3	2.5	2.5
D & N Haveli	2.8	5.1	3.7	-2.5	-4.4	-0.9	0.9	1.4	2.2
Daman & Diu	3.4	1.1	2.6	-3.7	1.8	-1.7	0.8	1.4	1.1
Delhi	-1.2	-1.5	-1.4	2.7	2.6	2.7	-0.1	-0.3	-0.2
Lakshadweep	3.7	3.7	3.7	-1.4	3.3	1.1	1.9	4.0	3.0
Pondicherry	1.4	2.9	2.5	7.0	9.1	8.6	3.5	5.7	5.1
Total	1.3	1.9	1.5	1.7	3.0	2.5	1.5	2.4	1.9

Table 3.3.1: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major states and economic groups in 1993-94

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	9.69	22.85	19.22	11.18	6.36	41.70	25.09	66.85	26.53
Assam	36.82	64.97	68.79	39.49	22.65	7.03	5.73	33.65	3.11
Bihar	56.29	75.61	64.96	42.44	40.70	47.06	23.90	78.09	22.63
Chhattisgarh	36.98	60.21	41.53	38.68	16.90	50.10	33.54	70.83	27.63
Gujarat	19.46	33.43	24.51	13.75	8.80	24.60	19.91	55.23	18.86
Haryana	24.67	57.80	42.66	18.80	12.57	17.09	11.67	37.57	3.92
Jharkhand	49.78	83.00	68.89	54.50	43.60	28.58	18.45	55.96	32.41
Karnataka	29.41	46.51	24.01	20.60	7.95	43.88	25.27	71.60	28.97
Kerala	22.97	37.05	32.38	13.59	12.20	20.80	17.83	36.74	9.78
Madhya P	33.31	59.55	45.64	29.94	14.60	53.30	37.26	82.46	41.08
Maharashtra	25.45	58.86	33.95	25.28	7.02	39.32	24.87	82.74	28.51
Odisha	47.55	67.38	57.63	39.55	26.46	54.45	25.93	75.09	33.23
Punjab	8.67	28.53	18.51	2.45	3.48	10.28	7.59	29.73	9.53
Rajasthan	22.34	43.01	48.89	19.40	21.86	33.67	23.81	59.09	28.62
Tamil Nadu	20.00	49.74	24.80	22.93	15.69	37.10	27.56	67.40	46.45
Uttar Pradesh	44.73	63.82	53.24	36.91	27.57	41.58	18.58	64.42	28.24
West Bengal	36.79	60.32	58.38	28.24	12.06	29.62	11.57	54.54	15.90
All India	32.88	54.42	42.15	29.69	18.11	35.39	21.72	64.19	26.15

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.3.2: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major states and economic groups in 2004-05

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	4.71	15.93	6.32	8.78	8.74	31.95	17.05	49.84	13.09
Assam	26.99	36.64	39.26	15.60	9.68	3.66	1.00	23.21	3.98
Bihar	37.00	67.48	58.69	25.52	41.62	36.03	25.19	80.74	23.40
Chhattisgarh	43.96	55.45	24.04	32.01	16.65	43.23	24.12	92.02	18.70
Gujarat	10.35	29.59	22.12	13.32	5.60	13.93	7.18	47.39	5.16
Haryana	11.68	27.97	31.71	5.32	8.16	11.59	11.90	50.27	5.81
Jharkhand	41.59	75.13	60.16	43.97	16.28	19.37	8.92	61.58	8.25
Karnataka	13.15	32.40	10.67	14.08	9.10	32.23	20.25	64.69	27.69
Kerala	7.65	23.91	17.16	5.74	9.41	15.14	14.55	31.74	18.03
Madhya P	32.67	56.52	49.56	27.13	11.80	48.36	25.33	78.57	30.72
Maharashtra	21.37	47.32	30.88	18.18	7.96	32.79	23.04	76.73	13.72
Odisha	32.78	64.54	51.95	46.11	19.78	50.16	20.90	89.25	26.38
Punjab	6.44	25.78	9.54	0.94	1.86	4.74	4.63	25.48	8.90
Rajasthan	12.61	37.03	34.72	14.09	7.49	37.75	18.27	63.41	12.58
Tamil Nadu	12.72	33.64	20.86	15.65	10.60	21.09	15.35	53.01	10.35
Uttar Pradesh	34.36	55.30	48.87	26.37	19.25	32.27	20.84	52.96	21.41
West Bengal	23.18	45.58	30.12	17.59	13.19	15.97	3.91	39.01	5.48
All India	23.78	44.14	32.71	21.45	14.35	27.09	16.32	58.01	14.97

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.3.3: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major states and economic groups in 2009-10

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	11.18	25.25	10.40	15.60	7.24	17.61	8.20	39.84	9.09
Assam	13.76	34.22	39.59	13.43	4.68	14.02	3.35	43.28	9.53
Bihar	31.06	48.22	48.08	19.14	23.24	42.90	22.74	81.13	34.88
Chhattisgarh	24.46	62.74	54.03	31.39	14.07	28.34	18.04	57.75	29.90
Gujarat	9.40	18.02	12.59	12.52	2.88	8.29	5.60	34.92	3.08
Haryana	9.66	40.13	14.33	0.94	1.85	12.04	19.01	37.50	9.75
Jharkhand	14.46	31.19	43.11	31.25	15.09	34.39	17.31	66.88	25.22
Karnataka	19.46	39.39	21.95	11.60	9.14	18.35	10.33	45.77	6.51
Kerala	0.12	5.38	2.06	3.13	0.71	5.88	5.72	23.84	5.91
Madhya P	18.16	54.84	45.79	21.28	16.92	28.16	14.13	60.45	19.14
Maharashtra	9.04	28.65	17.55	14.21	2.41	17.42	11.08	50.47	13.96
Odisha	31.85	53.29	40.84	31.42	12.92	33.94	15.67	56.77	19.99
Punjab	1.63	9.72	3.91	0.39	0.28	7.08	4.00	30.25	4.39
Rajasthan	9.57	15.43	19.06	9.98	11.15	18.07	9.85	47.79	7.70
Tamil Nadu	5.80	20.28	11.99	7.07	3.76	12.37	6.36	29.36	10.79
Uttar Pradesh	25.52	39.43	42.65	21.86	17.58	41.70	19.63	75.86	18.19
West Bengal	13.82	22.87	15.08	8.22	7.16	27.48	12.30	58.56	11.17
All India	17.39	34.71	25.50	16.60	8.75	22.07	11.13	46.03	12.97

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.3.4: Average annual rates of decline of HCRs by major states and economic groups during 1993-94 to 2004-05

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	-4.7	-2.8	-6.1	-2.0	3.4	-2.1	-2.9	-2.3	-4.6
Assam	-2.4	-4.0	-3.9	-5.5	-5.2	-4.4	-7.5	-2.8	2.6
Bihar	-3.1	-1.0	-0.9	-3.6	0.2	-2.1	0.5	0.3	0.3
Chhattisgarh	1.7	-0.7	-3.8	-1.6	-0.1	-1.2	-2.6	2.7	-2.9
Gujarat	-4.3	-1.0	-0.9	-0.3	-3.3	-3.9	-5.8	-1.3	-6.6
Haryana	-4.8	-4.7	-2.3	-6.5	-3.2	-2.9	0.2	3.1	4.4
Jharkhand	-1.5	-0.9	-1.2	-1.8	-5.7	-2.9	-4.7	0.9	-6.8
Karnataka	-5.0	-2.8	-5.1	-2.9	1.3	-2.4	-1.8	-0.9	-0.4
Kerala	-6.1	-3.2	-4.3	-5.2	-2.1	-2.5	-1.7	-1.2	7.7
Madhya P	-0.2	-0.5	0.8	-0.9	-1.7	-0.8	-2.9	-0.4	-2.3
Maharashtra	-1.5	-1.8	-0.8	-2.6	1.2	-1.5	-0.7	-0.7	-4.7
Odisha	-2.8	-0.4	-0.9	1.5	-2.3	-0.7	-1.8	1.7	-1.9
Punjab	-2.3	-0.9	-4.4	-5.6	-4.2	-4.9	-3.6	-1.3	-0.6
Rajasthan	-4.0	-1.3	-2.6	-2.5	-6.0	1.1	-2.1	0.7	-5.1
Tamil Nadu	-3.3	-2.9	-1.4	-2.9	-2.9	-3.9	-4.0	-1.9	-7.1
Uttar Pradesh	-2.1	-1.2	-0.7	-2.6	-2.7	-2.0	1.1	-1.6	-2.2
West Bengal	-3.4	-2.2	-4.4	-3.4	0.9	-4.2	-6.0	-2.6	-6.0
All India	-2.5	-1.7	-2.0	-2.5	-1.9	-2.1	-2.3	-0.9	-3.9

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.3.5: Average annual rates of decline of HCRs by major states and economic groups during 2004-05 to 2009-10

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	27.4	11.7	12.9	15.5	-3.4	-9.0	-10.4	-4.0	-6.1
Assam	-9.8	-1.3	0.2	-2.8	-10.3	56.6	46.9	17.3	27.9
Bihar	-3.2	-5.7	-3.6	-5.0	-8.8	3.8	-1.9	0.1	9.8
Chhattisgarh	-8.9	2.6	24.9	-0.4	-3.1	-6.9	-5.0	-7.4	12.0
Gujarat	-1.8	-7.8	-8.6	-1.2	-9.7	-8.1	-4.4	-5.3	-8.1
Haryana	-3.5	8.7	-11.0	-16.4	-15.5	0.8	11.9	-5.1	13.6
Jharkhand	-13.0	-11.7	-5.7	-5.8	-1.5	15.5	18.8	1.7	41.2
Karnataka	9.6	4.3	21.2	-3.5	0.1	-8.6	-9.8	-5.8	-15.3
Kerala	-19.7	-15.5	-17.6	-9.1	-18.5	-12.2	-12.1	-5.0	-13.4
Madhya P	-8.9	-0.6	-1.5	-4.3	8.7	-8.4	-8.8	-4.6	-7.5
Maharashtra	-11.5	-7.9	-8.6	-4.4	-13.9	-9.4	-10.4	-6.8	0.3
Odisha	-0.6	-3.5	-4.3	-6.4	-6.9	-6.5	-5.0	-7.3	-4.8
Punjab	-14.9	-12.5	-11.8	-11.7	-17.0	9.9	-2.7	3.7	-10.1
Rajasthan	-4.8	-11.7	-9.0	-5.8	9.8	-10.4	-9.2	-4.9	-7.8
Tamil Nadu	-10.9	-7.9	-8.5	-11.0	-12.9	-8.3	-11.7	-8.9	0.9
Uttar Pradesh	-5.1	-5.7	-2.5	-3.4	-1.7	5.8	-1.2	8.6	-3.0
West Bengal	-8.1	-10.0	-10.0	-10.7	-9.1	14.4	42.9	10.0	20.8
All India	-5.4	-4.3	-4.4	-4.5	-7.8	-3.7	-6.4	-4.1	-2.7

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.3.6: Average annual rates of decline of HCRs by major states and economic groups during 1993-94 to 2009-10

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	1.0	0.7	-2.9	2.5	0.9	-3.6	-4.2	-2.5	-4.1
Assam	-3.9	-3.0	-2.7	-4.1	-5.0	6.2	-2.6	1.8	12.9
Bihar	-2.8	-2.3	-1.6	-3.4	-2.7	-0.6	-0.3	0.2	3.4
Chhattisgarh	-2.1	0.3	1.9	-1.2	-1.0	-2.7	-2.9	-1.2	0.5
Gujarat	-3.2	-2.9	-3.0	-0.6	-4.2	-4.1	-4.5	-2.3	-5.2
Haryana	-3.8	-1.9	-4.2	-5.9	-5.3	-1.8	3.9	0.0	9.3
Jharkhand	-4.4	-3.9	-2.3	-2.7	-4.1	1.3	-0.4	1.2	-1.4
Karnataka	-2.1	-1.0	-0.5	-2.7	0.9	-3.6	-3.7	-2.3	-4.8
Kerala	-6.2	-5.3	-5.9	-4.8	-5.9	-4.5	-4.2	-2.2	-2.5
Madhya P	-2.8	-0.5	0.0	-1.8	1.0	-2.9	-3.9	-1.7	-3.3
Maharashtra	-4.0	-3.2	-3.0	-2.7	-4.1	-3.5	-3.5	-2.4	-3.2
Odisha	-2.1	-1.3	-1.8	-1.3	-3.2	-2.4	-2.5	-1.5	-2.5
Punjab	-5.1	-4.1	-4.9	-5.3	-5.8	-1.9	-3.0	0.1	-3.4
Rajasthan	-3.6	-4.0	-3.8	-3.0	-3.1	-2.9	-3.7	-1.2	-4.6
Tamil Nadu	-4.4	-3.7	-3.2	-4.3	-4.8	-4.2	-4.8	-3.5	-4.8
Uttar Pradesh	-2.7	-2.4	-1.2	-2.5	-2.3	0.0	0.4	1.1	-2.2
West Bengal	-3.9	-3.9	-4.6	-4.4	-2.5	-0.5	0.4	0.5	-1.9
All India	-2.9	-2.3	-2.5	-2.8	-3.2	-2.4	-3.0	-1.8	-3.2

Source: As in table 2.1

**Table 3.3.7: Average MPCE by major states and economic groups in 1993-94
(at constant, 1999-00, prices)**

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	488.4	391.8	420.2	524.8	705.4	626.2	799.9	426.2	836.9
Assam	436.1	346.8	332.2	415.3	507.1	630.6	876.0	434.2	804.9
Bihar	344.4	283.1	313.0	389.9	402.8	433.8	602.8	331.2	635.8
Chhattisgarh	433.3	315.0	402.3	370.8	519.8	581.0	713.1	414.4	634.4
Gujarat	520.4	396.3	460.8	509.1	590.6	752.9	795.0	489.5	839.9
Haryana	568.0	406.1	450.4	680.6	716.0	694.6	872.4	558.9	1059.9
Jharkhand	387.6	272.2	303.2	353.2	417.6	598.4	713.8	417.6	886.1
Karnataka	476.5	359.2	442.1	481.7	618.9	658.1	845.4	446.7	906.8
Kerala	672.6	461.8	504.0	705.6	774.2	869.0	1034.9	587.1	1072.4
Madhya P	447.2	321.6	367.3	472.0	550.8	551.3	727.9	380.1	726.1
Maharashtra	535.6	335.8	490.7	478.1	711.9	842.9	953.0	420.4	1038.3
Odisha	374.8	301.0	349.8	388.9	525.3	535.4	749.9	392.6	674.4
Punjab	595.8	488.2	610.0	809.1	781.9	765.5	839.3	591.5	852.7
Rajasthan	501.2	426.4	436.0	539.7	591.5	635.4	804.6	484.5	773.3
Tamil Nadu	525.0	351.8	471.6	506.2	679.1	717.6	804.1	450.0	787.2
Uttar Pradesh	415.7	327.7	361.7	460.3	548.2	576.1	770.2	393.4	688.8
West Bengal	448.4	346.5	372.0	501.2	629.6	699.5	915.5	440.7	878.7
All India	468.5	346.8	422.6	480.6	609.2	694.3	862.0	452.3	853.9

Source: As in table 2.1

**Table 3.3.8: Average MPCE by major states and economic groups in 2004-05
(at constant, 1999-00, prices)**

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	583.8	422.5	529.0	567.3	708.1	745.2	997.7	531.2	1415.7
Assam	498.7	419.7	418.1	528.3	689.9	862.2	1092.4	433.2	1049.0
Bihar	400.5	311.4	340.8	446.3	421.6	532.9	815.0	346.8	801.0
Chhattisgarh	418.2	329.6	427.7	431.9	673.6	727.7	1119.1	345.0	1067.2
Gujarat	636.5	413.8	494.7	589.0	755.2	943.2	1062.4	547.4	1371.3
Haryana	631.9	459.8	508.9	782.2	1286.4	952.8	1004.7	458.0	1434.0
Jharkhand	434.2	303.9	345.4	391.8	549.7	735.4	1104.7	444.7	919.6
Karnataka	537.3	382.5	494.3	518.1	908.6	816.1	1037.7	491.2	1364.1
Kerala	988.4	601.9	690.8	1129.8	1139.5	1241.7	1290.9	708.6	1219.7
Madhya P	439.1	323.9	357.3	454.0	612.6	727.4	872.8	406.4	1168.0
Maharashtra	577.0	364.7	500.1	542.5	810.1	918.5	1004.5	449.3	1405.9
Odisha	457.2	311.7	349.8	387.9	612.2	593.7	891.2	363.5	902.8
Punjab	772.2	491.0	583.0	933.0	960.3	1048.2	1243.7	538.7	1510.2
Rajasthan	565.7	433.9	449.6	560.5	667.2	687.4	1023.6	449.4	1089.7
Tamil Nadu	659.3	391.0	493.0	598.3	836.2	915.2	1029.2	500.9	1442.5
Uttar Pradesh	495.4	371.7	397.1	516.7	634.0	699.2	877.8	438.9	812.9
West Bengal	565.6	400.4	463.7	544.7	754.7	890.2	1225.5	562.5	1646.6
All India	552.4	380.0	471.5	536.1	744.5	836.3	1030.8	494.4	1233.6

Source: As in table 2.1

**Table 3.3.9: Average MPCE by major states and economic groups in 2009-10
(at constant, 1999-00, prices)**

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	486.9	386.6	468.9	460.6	799.3	908.7	1390.5	573.0	1426.4
Assam	594.3	452.9	436.9	603.8	770.1	720.3	932.6	349.2	1138.8
Bihar	451.6	359.6	365.0	510.3	540.4	494.3	660.1	380.1	766.6
Chhattisgarh	497.7	328.8	406.7	448.9	576.8	747.3	943.5	549.3	971.8
Gujarat	637.3	471.0	488.1	602.5	768.3	1108.1	1342.6	855.5	1711.7
Haryana	753.3	471.2	591.7	1005.8	1008.3	929.2	1075.2	543.1	1378.3
Jharkhand	532.0	421.4	401.0	462.4	649.8	665.6	820.0	371.7	740.0
Karnataka	492.1	365.5	469.9	492.6	697.5	1029.9	1254.7	638.5	1446.2
Kerala	1585.0	860.5	1120.3	1541.0	1647.5	1761.4	2597.9	824.1	1929.8
Madhya P	548.6	331.9	363.0	520.8	630.5	775.3	1126.9	493.2	1245.1
Maharashtra	665.7	433.2	540.9	566.7	782.5	1427.9	1443.7	604.7	1625.5
Odisha	461.4	337.1	400.2	427.9	644.6	837.8	1134.8	457.4	1195.8
Punjab	854.2	586.7	634.3	1154.7	1087.8	1058.5	1191.1	559.4	1434.3
Rajasthan	593.1	496.8	504.3	595.2	735.9	810.3	1375.9	523.4	1225.8
Tamil Nadu	641.9	482.7	512.8	606.8	772.4	1067.1	1227.5	666.8	1298.7
Uttar Pradesh	518.6	406.6	399.9	526.4	649.4	570.2	900.0	354.7	1079.4
West Bengal	590.2	493.2	524.7	652.2	775.0	716.9	1103.0	442.5	1207.9
All India	598.4	418.9	513.7	579.1	835.8	942.2	1243.9	583.5	1334.8

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.3.10: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real MPCE by major states and economic groups during 1993-94 to 2004-05

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	1.8	0.7	2.4	0.7	0.0	1.7	2.2	2.2	6.3
Assam	1.3	1.9	2.4	2.5	3.3	3.3	2.2	0.0	2.8
Bihar	1.5	0.9	0.8	1.3	0.4	2.1	3.2	0.4	2.4
Chhattisgarh	-0.3	0.4	0.6	1.5	2.7	2.3	5.2	-1.5	6.2
Gujarat	2.0	0.4	0.7	1.4	2.5	2.3	3.1	1.1	5.8
Haryana	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.4	7.2	3.4	1.4	-1.6	3.2
Jharkhand	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.0	2.9	2.1	5.0	0.6	0.3
Karnataka	1.2	0.6	1.1	0.7	4.3	2.2	2.1	0.9	4.6
Kerala	4.3	2.8	3.4	5.5	4.3	3.9	2.2	1.9	1.2
Madhya P	-0.2	0.1	-0.2	-0.3	1.0	2.9	1.8	0.6	5.5
Maharashtra	0.7	0.8	0.2	1.2	1.3	0.8	0.5	0.6	3.2
Odisha	2.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.0	1.7	-0.7	3.1
Punjab	2.7	0.1	-0.4	1.4	2.1	3.4	4.4	-0.8	7.0
Rajasthan	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	1.2	0.7	2.5	-0.7	3.7
Tamil Nadu	2.3	1.0	0.4	1.7	2.1	2.5	2.5	1.0	7.6
Uttar Pradesh	1.7	1.2	0.9	1.1	1.4	1.9	1.3	1.1	1.6
West Bengal	2.4	1.4	2.2	0.8	1.8	2.5	3.1	2.5	7.9

All India	1.6	0.9	1.1	1.0	2.0	1.9	1.8	0.8	4.0
-----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.3.11: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real MPCE by major states and economic groups during 2004-05 to 2009-10

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	-3.3	-1.7	-2.3	-3.8	2.6	4.4	7.9	1.6	0.2
Assam	3.8	1.6	0.9	2.9	2.3	-3.3	-2.9	-3.9	1.7
Bihar	2.6	3.1	1.4	2.9	5.6	-1.4	-3.8	1.9	-0.9
Chhattisgarh	3.8	0.0	-1.0	0.8	-2.9	0.5	-3.1	11.8	-1.8
Gujarat	0.0	2.8	-0.3	0.5	0.3	3.5	5.3	11.3	5.0
Haryana	3.8	0.5	3.3	5.7	-4.3	-0.5	1.4	3.7	-0.8
Jharkhand	4.5	7.7	3.2	3.6	3.6	-1.9	-5.2	-3.3	-3.9
Karnataka	-1.7	-0.9	-1.0	-1.0	-4.6	5.2	4.2	6.0	1.2
Kerala	12.1	8.6	12.4	7.3	8.9	8.4	20.2	3.3	11.6
Madhya P	5.0	0.5	0.3	2.9	0.6	1.3	5.8	4.3	1.3
Maharashtra	3.1	3.8	1.6	0.9	-0.7	11.1	8.7	6.9	3.1
Odisha	0.2	1.6	2.9	2.1	1.1	8.2	5.5	5.2	6.5
Punjab	2.1	3.9	1.8	4.8	2.7	0.2	-0.8	0.8	-1.0
Rajasthan	1.0	2.9	2.4	1.2	2.1	3.6	6.9	3.3	2.5
Tamil Nadu	-0.5	4.7	0.8	0.3	-1.5	3.3	3.9	6.6	-2.0
Uttar Pradesh	0.9	1.9	0.1	0.4	0.5	-3.7	0.5	-3.8	6.6
West Bengal	0.9	4.6	2.6	3.9	0.5	-3.9	-2.0	-4.3	-5.3
All India	1.7	2.1	1.8	1.6	2.5	2.5	4.1	3.6	1.6

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 3.3.12: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real MPCE by major states and economic groups during 1993-94 to 2009-10

State	Rural					Urban			
	SENA	AGLA	OLAH	SEAG	OTHER	SEMP	RWSE	CALA	OTHER
Andhra P	0.0	-0.1	0.7	-0.8	0.8	2.8	4.6	2.2	4.4
Assam	2.3	1.9	2.0	2.8	3.2	0.9	0.4	-1.2	2.6
Bihar	1.9	1.7	1.0	1.9	2.1	0.9	0.6	0.9	1.3
Chhattisgarh	0.9	0.3	0.1	1.3	0.7	1.8	2.0	2.0	3.3
Gujarat	1.4	1.2	0.4	1.1	1.9	2.9	4.3	4.7	6.5
Haryana	2.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.6	2.1	1.5	-0.2	1.9
Jharkhand	2.3	3.4	2.0	1.9	3.5	0.7	0.9	-0.7	-1.0
Karnataka	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.8	3.5	3.0	2.7	3.7
Kerala	8.5	5.4	7.6	7.4	7.1	6.4	9.4	2.5	5.0
Madhya P	1.4	0.2	-0.1	0.6	0.9	2.5	3.4	1.9	4.5
Maharashtra	1.5	1.8	0.6	1.2	0.6	4.3	3.2	2.7	3.5
Odisha	1.4	0.7	0.9	0.6	1.4	3.5	3.2	1.0	4.8
Punjab	2.7	1.3	0.2	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.6	-0.3	4.3
Rajasthan	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.6	1.5	1.7	4.4	0.5	3.7
Tamil Nadu	1.4	2.3	0.5	1.2	0.9	3.0	3.3	3.0	4.1
Uttar Pradesh	1.5	1.5	0.7	0.9	1.2	-0.1	1.1	-0.6	3.5
West Bengal	2.0	2.6	2.6	1.9	1.4	0.2	1.3	0.0	2.3
All India	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.3	2.2	2.8	1.8	3.5

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.1.1: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major state and social groups in the rural areas

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	26.90	25.95	11.83	28.29	15.52	6.99	31.47	20.36	15.00
Assam	41.97	45.73	45.76	12.62	25.71	24.15	14.31	17.09	18.89
Chhattisgarh	53.50	38.56	38.53	54.82	31.99	33.46	57.14	58.00	39.39
Gujarat	30.83	32.85	17.26	34.28	22.82	13.63	25.76	12.01	8.11
Jharkhand	70.87	72.84	54.23	54.12	57.55	39.39	37.13	34.29	24.72
Karnataka	38.08	45.73	24.44	21.39	31.33	17.56	20.10	34.07	22.84
Madhya P	59.62	47.93	27.39	58.38	43.28	24.73	52.81	31.45	25.53
Maharashtra	51.72	51.49	32.52	56.25	44.77	21.35	27.77	26.28	13.87
Odisha	71.31	49.79	40.18	75.84	49.93	32.93	61.72	43.45	23.25
Rajasthan	45.51	38.19	18.17	32.54	28.26	11.39	17.22	23.11	7.40
Tripura	39.30	26.80	18.92	41.37	33.20	31.89	11.27	6.38	5.85
West Bengal	62.09	46.30	35.55	42.74	28.85	26.27	19.29	18.91	14.24
Bihar		69.94	52.15		64.17	35.91		49.14	29.47
Haryana		46.40	20.68		26.00	8.32		21.28	4.34
Himachal P		37.33	26.09		19.89	6.42		3.11	0.24
Kerala		37.63	23.79		21.63	11.52		5.95	1.55
Punjab		21.93	4.80		14.45	5.23		6.48	0.58
Tamil Nadu		44.58	28.49		30.37	20.20		18.29	11.01
Uttar Pradesh		60.36	37.61		44.73	29.39		38.91	22.82
Uttarakhand		35.82	21.26		53.28	36.25		6.73	3.55
All India	50.22	48.32	31.21	44.69	37.13	22.68	32.99	29.63	17.53

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.1.2: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major state and social groups in the urban areas

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	45.63	45.74	37.92	51.90	37.37	24.80	22.20	17.56	16.11
Assam	8.35	16.48	7.26	2.93	5.09	3.47	18.78	12.67	11.67
Chhattisgarh	43.84	61.60	41.20	42.12	52.73	40.35	28.75	35.16	26.57
Gujarat	35.64	45.91	25.59	21.04	17.83	12.49	10.55	22.05	8.78
Jharkhand	34.45	49.21	19.87	42.49	48.78	13.05	48.34	45.56	26.58
Karnataka	62.40	62.76	35.49	61.87	50.32	29.01	35.37	25.64	18.01
Madhya P	72.98	64.28	43.10	44.69	68.38	37.75	44.57	45.11	22.86
Maharashtra	60.58	53.84	30.44	40.93	42.77	29.45	31.70	29.52	14.86
Odisha	62.81	45.46	36.26	64.62	74.53	37.13	49.21	42.83	20.34
Rajasthan	8.40	49.69	27.89	24.95	55.07	26.37	24.40	29.51	16.16
Tripura	0.00	8.84	5.72	0.18	16.11	3.11	10.69	12.97	2.23
West Bengal	23.49	38.74	19.70	22.19	25.46	10.28	27.83	39.98	19.46
Bihar		66.23	37.88		66.85	32.31		58.35	40.44
Haryana		25.29	14.64		33.25	10.25		39.16	9.55
Himachal P		20.06	6.86		5.02	2.77		15.01	5.01
Kerala		33.44	23.92		33.40	18.76		22.16	10.84
Punjab		26.89	6.29		14.29	3.32		16.14	5.83
Tamil Nadu		61.45	36.63		41.22	19.17		26.99	12.54
Uttar Pradesh		50.74	33.45		43.46	27.97		49.22	35.95
Uttarakhand		37.34	14.69		70.11	29.35		23.03	25.30
All India	42.89	49.72	29.57	34.24	40.86	22.62	28.61	32.82	18.20

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.1.3: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major state and social groups

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	28.72	28.61	19.78	30.48	20.06	12.03	30.16	19.81	15.35
Assam	40.94	43.49	41.25	12.26	23.18	22.04	14.49	16.41	18.12
Chhattisgarh	53.11	42.17	39.26	53.81	34.75	34.86	55.84	53.52	36.25
Gujarat	31.25	36.79	20.46	33.06	21.32	13.17	24.87	15.43	8.42
Jharkhand	67.76	67.96	45.98	53.44	56.21	33.90	38.02	36.16	25.24
Karnataka	41.23	49.00	28.02	26.47	35.48	21.51	23.14	32.42	20.88
Madhya P	60.73	52.15	32.34	57.46	48.30	28.65	52.39	34.11	24.66
Maharashtra	53.03	52.29	31.67	54.20	43.89	24.83	28.41	27.57	14.32
Odisha	70.76	49.39	39.54	75.25	52.63	33.68	60.41	43.37	22.77
Rajasthan	44.31	40.56	20.83	32.21	34.21	15.26	17.80	24.48	9.90
Tripura	38.05	25.03	16.75	39.08	31.27	26.47	11.25	7.61	5.03
West Bengal	59.79	45.27	30.91	41.66	28.23	21.66	20.18	22.76	15.69
Bihar		69.78	50.54		64.29	35.53		49.69	30.74
Haryana		42.43	18.96		27.40	8.88		26.37	5.93
Himachal P		36.13	24.33		18.88	6.03		4.07	0.69
Kerala		36.96	23.82		23.81	13.29		8.71	4.06
Punjab		22.92	5.30		14.42	4.53		8.88	2.75
Tamil Nadu		48.48	31.64		33.09	19.77		21.01	11.74
Uttar Pradesh		59.25	36.70		44.58	29.08		40.11	25.82
Uttarakhand		36.04	19.74		56.29	34.45		9.81	9.69
All India	49.57	48.57	30.73	43.79	37.88	22.66	32.53	30.27	17.74

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.1.4: Average Annual Rates of Decline of HCRs by major state and social groups in the rural areas

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	0.5	-3.7	-3.7	2.2	6.2	22.9	1.1	-1.3	1.7
Assam	-6.4	-4.0	-4.3	2.7	-6.7	-4.4	-4.1	-3.9	-3.7
Chhattisgarh	0.2	-1.5	-1.2	0.8	16.3	3.5	0.4	3.2	0.1
Gujarat	1.0	-2.8	-1.9	-5.0	-9.5	-8.1	-1.0	-4.0	-3.3
Jharkhand	-2.1	-1.9	-2.5	-6.3	-8.1	-7.4	-3.0	-3.3	-3.4
Karnataka	-4.0	-2.9	-2.6	-1.2	1.7	6.0	-3.0	-1.6	-0.4
Madhya P	-0.2	-0.9	-0.9	-1.9	-5.5	0.6	-0.7	-2.1	-0.4
Maharashtra	0.8	-1.2	-3.1	-10.1	-8.3	-7.0	-2.9	-3.1	-3.6
Odisha	0.6	0.0	-1.6	-3.7	-2.6	-5.9	-0.8	-0.8	-2.6
Rajasthan	-2.6	-2.4	-3.4	-9.4	-3.6	-7.0	-3.9	-2.5	-3.7
Tripura	0.5	2.2	6.2	-14.6	-16.2	-16.3	-4.5	-4.8	-4.3
West Bengal	-2.8	-3.4	-2.4	-11.0	-6.9	-9.2	-4.3	-3.7	-3.7
Bihar		-0.7	-2.8		-4.7	-3.6		-1.9	-2.7
Haryana		-4.0	-5.4		-3.6	-9.6		-3.4	-4.9
Himachal P		-4.2	-6.9		-16.9	-19.2		-5.7	-6.2
Kerala		-3.9	-4.7		-14.5	-17.3		-5.3	-5.8
Punjab		-3.1	0.8		-11.0	-17.8		-4.4	-5.5
Tamil Nadu		-2.9	-2.6		-8.0	-9.1		-3.7	-3.8
Uttar Pradesh		-2.4	-2.0		-2.6	-4.5		-2.2	-2.5
Uttarakhand		4.4	6.4		-17.5	-18.0		-5.1	-5.2
All India	-1.0	-2.1	-2.5	-5.2	-4.0	-4.5	-2.1	-2.4	-2.7

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.1.5: Average Annual Rates of Decline of HCRs by major state and social groups in the urban areas

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	1.2	-1.7	-3.1	-11.4	-10.6	-7.0	-3.2	-3.9	-3.6
Assam	-5.9	-6.3	-4.7	108.3	29.8	47.2	7.8	-1.4	3.8
Chhattisgarh	-0.4	-1.3	-0.2	-6.4	-6.7	-6.8	-2.2	-2.7	-2.2
Gujarat	-3.7	-5.6	-4.7	-10.0	4.7	-5.9	-4.4	-3.2	-4.1
Jharkhand	2.1	-0.1	-3.1	2.8	-1.3	20.7	2.5	-0.5	2.1
Karnataka	-0.1	-1.8	-1.7	-8.6	-9.8	-7.6	-2.7	-3.7	-3.1
Madhya P	-3.5	0.6	-1.1	-0.1	-6.8	-7.9	-2.4	-1.9	-2.9
Maharashtra	-2.9	-1.9	-0.3	-4.5	-6.2	-9.9	-3.0	-2.8	-3.2
Odisha	0.3	5.8	0.2	-4.8	-8.5	-9.0	-1.4	-0.4	-2.7
Rajasthan	17.9	1.0	-0.5	-0.4	-9.3	-7.7	11.9	-2.5	-2.6
Tripura		7.5	-4.2		-3.9	-5.6		2.9	-3.8
West Bengal	-0.5	-3.1	-4.3	5.1	11.4	17.9	1.2	0.2	-0.1
Bihar		0.1	-1.3		-2.5	5.0		-0.7	0.4
Haryana		2.9	-2.7		3.6	-1.4		3.4	-2.2
Himachal P		-6.8	-5.4		39.8	16.1		-1.6	-1.7
Kerala		0.0	-2.0		-6.7	-8.4		-2.1	-3.4
Punjab		-4.3	-4.3		2.6	15.2		-2.5	-0.5
Tamil Nadu		-3.0	-4.3		-6.9	-6.9		-3.5	-4.1
Uttar Pradesh		-1.3	-1.5		2.6	5.7		-0.2	0.5
Uttarakhand		8.0	9.1		-13.4	-2.8		-2.4	4.5
All India	-1.8	-1.6	-2.1	-3.3	-3.9	-3.9	-2.1	-2.1	-2.4

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.1.6: Average Annual Rates of Decline of HCRs by major state and social groups

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	0.6	-2.7	-3.6	-0.2	-0.3	5.5	0.3	-1.9	-1.4
Assam	-6.4	-4.2	-4.2	3.6	-5.8	-3.6	-4.0	-3.9	-3.5
Chhattisgarh	0.1	-1.6	-1.0	0.8	10.8	0.8	0.3	1.7	-0.5
Gujarat	0.5	-3.8	-3.2	-5.0	-5.5	-7.2	-1.3	-3.6	-3.7
Jharkhand	-1.9	-1.6	-2.4	-5.8	-7.1	-5.1	-2.7	-2.9	-2.8
Karnataka	-3.3	-2.5	-2.1	-2.5	-1.7	-0.6	-2.7	-2.1	-1.6
Madhya P	-0.5	-0.7	-1.0	-1.8	-5.9	-2.8	-0.9	-2.2	-1.5
Maharashtra	0.2	-1.5	-2.0	-9.5	-7.4	-8.5	-2.9	-3.0	-3.4
Odisha	0.6	0.6	-1.3	-3.9	-3.5	-6.5	-0.9	-0.8	-2.7
Rajasthan	-2.5	-1.4	-2.4	-8.9	-5.7	-7.0	-3.7	-2.5	-3.3
Tripura	0.2	2.3	5.3	-14.2	-15.1	-16.2	-4.4	-4.3	-4.4
West Bengal	-2.8	-3.4	-2.7	-10.3	-3.9	-5.5	-4.1	-3.1	-3.1
Bihar		-0.7	-2.7		-4.5	-2.7		-1.8	-2.4
Haryana		-3.2	-4.8		-0.8	-6.6		-2.4	-4.3
Himachal P		-4.3	-6.8		-15.7	-17.7		-5.5	-6.1
Kerala		-3.2	-4.0		-12.7	-13.9		-4.8	-5.2
Punjab		-3.4	-1.3		-7.7	-7.9		-3.8	-3.0
Tamil Nadu		-2.9	-3.4		-7.3	-8.1		-3.5	-3.9
Uttar Pradesh		-2.3	-1.9		-2.0	-2.2		-2.0	-1.9
Uttarakhand		5.1	6.8		-16.5	-14.4		-4.5	-3.2
All India	-1.1	-2.0	-2.4	-5.1	-4.0	-4.3	-2.1	-2.4	-2.6

Source: As in table 2.1

**Table 4.2.1: Average MPCE by major states and social groups in the rural areas
(at constant, 1999-00, prices)**

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	420.3	370.7	496.5	386.9	444.3	564.2	344.3	439.7	484.1
Assam	403.3	393.4	408.6	528.2	481.8	511.8	594.3	570.4	581.4
Chhattisgarh	323.8	382.6	397.1	343.5	465.1	428.3	349.4	352.7	433.8
Gujarat	410.8	421.4	510.9	435.8	470.0	578.6	439.9	534.9	623.8
Jharkhand	309.3	288.7	366.8	365.8	359.8	426.6	424.0	451.8	505.3
Karnataka	380.5	368.3	477.6	407.6	399.0	519.3	394.9	407.4	470.7
Madhya P	316.4	363.1	489.7	325.5	364.5	476.3	383.8	403.6	505.6
Maharashtra	372.4	365.4	476.4	368.2	402.2	544.5	451.5	463.1	588.4
Odisha	292.3	354.0	404.6	282.3	360.9	459.3	311.9	382.5	493.9
Rajasthan	468.5	446.1	544.6	426.4	484.3	591.7	518.8	521.1	615.1
Tripura	467.0	504.1	569.3	410.7	453.0	487.3	563.8	634.1	668.9
West Bengal	368.5	395.0	477.8	404.4	484.4	542.2	508.9	540.5	590.9
Bihar		299.2	359.5		324.0	412.9		378.3	454.4
Haryana		452.2	653.9		501.2	853.5		608.8	918.7
Himachal P		487.7	580.3		592.4	804.7		901.6	1137.8
Kerala		446.0	618.9		656.2	921.5		789.2	1415.4
Punjab		553.9	748.5		576.1	865.4		643.9	1072.1
Tamil Nadu		372.6	491.2		416.4	568.3		488.5	563.2
Uttar Pradesh		352.6	455.6		418.6	515.5		421.0	532.4
Uttarakhand		402.1	506.4		510.1	629.6		557.7	912.2
All India	375.7	379.6	480.1	396.3	434.5	552.4	455.4	470.0	598.7

Source: As in table 2.1

**Table 4.2.2: Average MPCE by major state and social groups in the urban areas
(at constant, 1999-00, prices)**

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	588.6	572.5	684.8	587.8	698.8	895.2	982.7	911.3	1129.9
Assam	759.1	584.6	753.8	753.3	736.5	1018.2	590.7	665.2	852.8
Chhattisgarh	714.2	451.6	644.6	692.2	588.5	913.7	882.4	725.1	830.7
Gujarat	611.0	574.6	750.6	806.6	826.6	1001.2	1191.6	830.8	1221.8
Jharkhand	499.4	459.1	724.2	570.7	627.3	932.5	499.8	496.1	754.7
Karnataka	543.2	481.4	756.7	544.4	580.5	937.2	806.3	803.7	1112.3
Madhya P	444.8	543.9	653.9	606.2	494.3	826.2	781.3	621.6	946.8
Maharashtra	576.7	603.0	931.5	713.7	702.4	988.5	975.7	932.7	1453.0
Odisha	487.8	544.1	679.2	491.2	448.1	740.4	654.2	632.5	1074.8
Rajasthan	733.6	559.9	732.1	716.9	615.4	856.4	907.5	648.2	1057.5
Tripura	948.8	628.0	819.8	1037.6	636.0	973.9	881.1	742.8	865.8
West Bengal	736.5	618.6	818.8	790.4	698.5	1110.8	764.1	558.0	958.2
Bihar		366.2	512.9		558.0	609.5		389.7	559.7
Haryana		619.2	802.8		583.4	1034.0		587.6	1130.5
Himachal P		742.1	1360.5		851.5	1234.5		991.6	1466.5
Kerala		625.3	849.8		644.9	1141.3		813.8	1751.1
Punjab		620.7	827.4		674.3	1268.9		678.0	1198.5
Tamil Nadu		509.7	732.5		650.4	988.1		824.3	1065.2
Uttar Pradesh		475.6	649.8		549.1	767.9		572.8	675.3
Uttarakhand		500.5	773.7		615.6	889.7		657.5	794.7
All India	615.6	557.4	779.3	736.9	643.7	949.7	919.8	724.8	1091.0

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.2.3: Average monthly per capita expenditure by major state and social groups
(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	436.7	397.9	553.9	405.5	497.3	657.9	434.4	533.4	684.9
Assam	414.2	408.0	449.0	536.7	513.0	563.4	594.1	584.9	610.5
Chhattisgarh	339.6	393.4	464.5	371.2	481.5	527.0	373.8	425.7	531.1
Gujarat	428.4	467.6	603.0	469.8	576.8	748.1	483.8	635.8	900.4
Jharkhand	325.5	323.9	452.5	377.7	400.7	532.0	430.0	459.2	575.2
Karnataka	401.5	390.0	568.0	424.8	438.6	663.6	476.8	485.0	730.8
Madhya P	327.1	409.8	541.4	344.5	390.5	581.8	404.3	445.9	648.6
Maharashtra	402.6	446.5	662.1	414.4	534.1	735.0	536.4	650.0	979.9
Odisha	305.0	371.8	449.3	293.3	370.4	509.2	348.0	413.7	589.3
Rajasthan	477.1	469.6	595.9	439.1	513.3	660.2	550.3	548.4	741.3
Tripura	482.3	516.4	610.5	445.6	473.6	578.9	575.7	654.5	713.5
West Bengal	390.4	425.5	577.7	424.7	523.8	706.0	535.6	543.7	692.8
Bihar		302.1	376.8		334.8	433.6		379.0	466.6
Haryana		483.6	696.4		517.1	906.0		602.7	983.6
Himachal P		505.3	651.8		610.1	851.0		908.9	1168.6
Kerala		474.9	677.7		654.1	975.1		793.4	1506.2
Punjab		567.2	775.1		600.0	1012.8		652.4	1124.3
Tamil Nadu		404.3	584.8		475.2	745.8		593.5	803.3
Uttar Pradesh		366.8	498.1		433.7	571.3		438.7	565.1
Uttarakhand		416.6	568.0		528.9	697.5		576.5	879.0
All India	397.1	411.2	566.2	425.5	476.8	666.6	504.6	521.2	751.7

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.2.10: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real MPCE by major state and social groups in the rural areas

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	-0.7	1.8	1.2	-2.2	-0.2	-2.8	-1.1	1.2	-0.2
Assam	2.8	2.0	2.3	2.5	3.7	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.6
Chhattisgarh	0.6	2.0	0.7	0.3	-4.8	0.3	0.5	-0.5	0.6
Gujarat	0.6	1.0	1.2	0.2	2.8	1.6	0.4	1.7	1.4
Jharkhand	1.7	2.2	1.5	3.2	5.1	3.7	2.3	3.5	2.4
Karnataka	0.6	0.8	0.8	-0.6	0.4	-1.9	0.2	0.7	-0.1
Madhya P	0.3	0.0	-0.2	3.6	2.1	1.2	1.3	0.7	0.2
Maharashtra	-0.1	0.9	1.3	4.5	3.0	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.5
Odisha	-0.3	0.2	1.2	2.1	1.2	1.5	0.4	0.5	1.4
Rajasthan	-0.8	0.8	0.8	4.3	1.5	0.8	0.7	1.1	0.8
Tripura	-1.1	-0.9	-1.3	7.5	8.0	7.5	1.3	1.6	1.1
West Bengal	0.9	2.1	1.2	5.2	2.3	1.8	2.4	2.3	1.5
Bihar		0.8	1.4		3.4	2.0		1.7	1.6
Haryana		1.0	2.8		4.3	1.5		2.2	2.5
Himachal P		2.0	3.5		10.4	8.3		5.3	6.0
Kerala		4.3	4.4		4.1	10.7		4.8	8.0
Punjab		0.4	1.4		2.4	4.8		1.0	2.7
Tamil Nadu		1.1	1.4		3.5	-0.2		1.9	0.9
Uttar Pradesh		1.7	1.2		0.1	0.7		1.2	1.1
Uttarakhand		2.4	2.2		1.9	9.0		2.4	5.0
All India	0.5	1.3	1.4	3.0	1.6	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.5

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.2.11: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real MPCE by major state and social groups in the urban areas

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	0.0	2.0	2.8	13.4	6.1	5.2	4.2	3.7	4.1
Assam	-0.1	2.4	3.2	-4.3	-1.9	-3.2	-1.4	0.9	0.8
Chhattisgarh	-0.3	2.8	3.8	5.5	4.6	-1.8	1.5	3.8	1.8
Gujarat	2.9	4.0	3.0	9.5	0.1	4.4	5.9	2.8	3.9
Jharkhand	1.3	3.3	2.6	-2.5	-4.2	-3.8	0.0	0.5	0.3
Karnataka	0.0	1.9	2.2	9.6	7.7	3.7	3.0	4.2	2.9
Madhya P	3.3	-0.8	2.4	5.8	5.2	2.9	4.7	0.9	2.8
Maharashtra	2.2	1.5	0.6	7.3	6.6	9.4	4.3	3.4	3.5
Odisha	0.1	-1.6	0.8	6.6	8.2	9.0	2.1	1.0	3.6
Rajasthan	-0.2	0.9	1.5	5.3	1.1	4.7	1.5	1.0	2.8
Tripura	0.9	0.1	1.7	-3.0	3.4	-2.2	-0.4	1.1	0.4
West Bengal	0.7	1.2	3.2	-0.7	-4.0	-2.7	0.2	-0.6	1.1
Bihar		4.8	1.7		-6.0	-1.6		0.4	0.6
Haryana		-0.5	2.6		0.1	1.9		-0.3	2.6
Himachal P		1.3	-0.8		3.3	3.8		2.1	0.5
Kerala		0.3	3.1		5.2	10.7		1.9	6.6
Punjab		0.8	4.9		0.1	-1.1		0.6	2.8
Tamil Nadu		2.5	3.2		5.3	1.6		3.9	2.8
Uttar Pradesh		1.4	1.7		0.9	-2.4		1.3	0.2
Uttarakhand		2.1	1.4		1.4	-2.1		2.0	0.2
All India	1.8	1.4	2.0	5.0	2.5	3.0	3.1	1.9	2.5

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 4.2.12 Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by major state and social groups

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	-0.6	2.3	1.7	1.4	1.5	0.8	0.0	2.1	1.5
Assam	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.8	1.7	2.7	2.7	2.2
Chhattisgarh	0.8	2.0	1.2	0.1	-2.3	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.9
Gujarat	0.9	2.1	2.2	0.6	2.0	4.1	0.8	2.2	3.1
Jharkhand	1.5	2.2	1.6	2.8	2.9	1.6	2.0	2.6	1.7
Karnataka	0.5	1.1	1.5	2.5	2.1	2.0	1.2	1.5	1.8
Madhya P	0.5	-0.4	0.7	3.5	2.8	2.3	1.5	0.6	1.2
Maharashtra	0.3	1.8	1.0	5.9	4.3	6.7	2.1	2.8	3.0
Odisha	-0.3	0.0	1.2	3.7	2.3	3.1	0.9	0.7	1.9
Rajasthan	-0.7	0.8	1.0	5.1	1.4	2.5	1.0	1.0	1.5
Tripura	-0.7	-0.8	-0.5	5.8	7.6	4.7	1.2	1.7	1.1
West Bengal	0.8	2.1	2.0	5.2	0.8	-0.4	2.3	1.7	1.2
Bihar		1.0	1.4		2.6	1.5		1.6	1.5
Haryana		0.6	2.7		3.3	1.7		1.5	2.6
Himachal P		1.9	2.8		9.8	7.5		5.0	5.0
Kerala		3.4	4.0		4.3	10.9		4.2	7.6
Punjab		0.5	2.8		1.7	2.2		0.9	2.8
Tamil Nadu		1.6	2.5		5.0	1.5		2.9	2.3
Uttar Pradesh		1.7	1.3		0.2	-0.2		1.2	0.8
Uttarakhand		2.5	2.1		1.8	5.2		2.4	3.4
All India	0.6	1.4	1.6	3.7	1.9	2.6	1.7	1.7	2.0

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.1.1: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major state and religious groups--- rural areas

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	15.9	12.5	23.8	10.5	10.2	10.2	17.5	13.5	15.9
Assam	40.7	55.1		15.0	35.3		14.5	25.2	
Bihar	54.7	66.8		41.0	52.1		35.3	30.3	
Gujarat	22.3	17.0		19.5	12.5		13.8	5.0	
Jharkhand	61.4	65.6	65.7	44.9	46.4	54.2	30.3	35.3	29.9
Karnataka	29.8	34.6		20.7	25.0		25.8	18.2	
Kerala	24.5	32.0	20.7	13.6	17.1	7.3	2.2	3.0	0.3
Madhya P	39.5	30.2		37.0	35.0		34.5	12.2	
Maharashtra	36.7	43.4	50.8	28.8	26.4	42.3	16.3	16.5	38.9
Rajasthan	26.3	31.7		18.5	16.1		11.6	26.4	
Tamil Nadu	32.8	25.0	40.5	23.4	10.0	21.0	13.1	7.9	8.7
UP	43.3	43.2		32.7	36.5		27.7	26.1	
West Bengal	38.4	48.5		24.4	36.9		13.4	20.4	
All India	36.5	45.0	27.1	27.9	33.0	18.2	22.7	20.5	11.7

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.1.2: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major state and religious groups-- urban areas

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	37.1	49.6	26.2	25.9	39.5	13.8	15.0	22.9	14.3
Assam	6.2	22.2		3.1	6.1		7.8	38.5	
Bihar	36.6	51.1		33.0	50.6		39.5	59.3	
Gujarat	25.4	46.8		11.6	29.4		7.8	24.7	
Jharkhand	25.8	33.7		18.4	40.1		31.7	45.1	
Karnataka	35.8	57.6		29.1	48.5		19.5	24.2	
Kerala	24.6	26.8	21.3	20.0	28.2	9.5	11.8	17.0	3.8
Madhya P	47.6	63.0		40.1	61.3		27.4	31.7	
Maharashtra	32.4	49.4	31.9	27.0	54.7	30.5	14.4	32.0	19.5
Rajasthan	27.7	55.7		31.2	44.2		17.6	26.6	
Tamil Nadu	39.6	46.0	34.5	23.0	21.7	16.8	14.5	10.9	20.0
UP	31.0	47.0		25.6	40.5		30.4	56.2	
West Bengal	19.9	42.5		11.1	28.8		22.1	36.3	
All India	30.6	47.7	22.4	23.6	40.6	13.7	18.8	34.3	11.2

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.1.3: Poverty Incidence (HCRs) by major state and religious groups

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	21.0	32.0	24.4	14.2	23.3	11.2	16.8	18.3	15.4
Assam	36.3	53.6		13.6	33.9		13.6	25.8	
Bihar	53.3	64.1		40.3	52.0		35.7	33.9	
Gujarat	23.2	35.9		16.9	20.7		11.7	16.2	
Jharkhand	54.1	60.9	59.5	39.9	45.9	51.9	30.6	37.9	27.5
Karnataka	31.3	46.5		22.9	38.2		23.8	21.4	
Kerala	24.5	30.9	20.8	15.2	19.6	7.8	4.7	6.3	1.3
Madhya P	41.4	49.5		37.6	51.3		33.0	23.5	
Maharashtra	35.2	47.3	42.3	28.1	46.5	36.4	15.6	27.2	28.6
Rajasthan	26.6	41.2		21.0	30.2		12.9	26.5	
Tamil Nadu	35.0	39.0	38.2	23.2	18.6	19.0	13.7	9.9	13.8
UP	41.3	44.6		31.6	37.9		28.2	36.3	
West Bengal	33.5	47.7		20.6	35.8		16.0	22.2	
All India	35.1	45.9	25.7	26.9	35.5	16.9	21.7	25.1	11.5

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.1.4: Average annual rates of decline of HCRs by major state and religious groups in the rural areas

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	-3.1	-1.7	-5.2	13.3	6.5	11.2	0.6	0.5	-2.1
Assam	-5.7	-3.3		-0.7	-5.7		-4.0	-3.4	
Bihar	-2.3	-2.0		-2.8	-8.4		-2.2	-3.4	
Gujarat	-1.1	-2.4		-5.8	-12.0		-2.4	-4.4	
Jharkhand	-2.4	-2.7	-1.6	-6.5	-4.8	-9.0	-3.2	-2.9	-3.4
Karnataka	-2.8	-2.5		4.9	-5.4		-0.8	-3.0	
Kerala	-4.0	-4.2	-5.9	-16.8	-16.5	-19.2	-5.7	-5.7	-6.2
Madhya P	-0.6	1.4		-1.4	-13.0		-0.8	-3.7	
Maharashtra	-2.0	-3.6	-1.5	-8.7	-7.5	-1.6	-3.5	-3.9	-1.5
Rajasthan	-2.7	-4.5		-7.5	12.8		-3.5	-1.0	
Tamil Nadu	-2.6	-5.5	-4.4	-8.8	-4.2	-11.7	-3.8	-4.3	-4.9
UP	-2.2	-1.4		-3.1	-5.7		-2.3	-2.5	
West Bengal	-3.3	-2.2		-9.0	-8.9		-4.1	-3.6	
All India	-2.1	-2.4	-3.0	-3.8	-7.6	-7.2	-2.4	-3.4	-3.6

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.1.5: Average annual rates of decline of HCRs by major state and religious groups in the urban areas

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	-2.7	-1.9	-4.3	-8.4	-8.4	0.7	-3.7	-3.4	-2.8
Assam	-4.5	-6.6		30.3	106.2		1.6	4.6	
Bihar	-0.9	-0.1		3.9	3.4		0.5	1.0	
Gujarat	-4.9	-3.4		-6.6	-3.2		-4.3	-3.0	
Jharkhand	-2.6	1.7		14.5	2.5		1.4	2.1	
Karnataka	-1.7	-1.4		-6.6	-10.0		-2.8	-3.6	
Kerala	-1.7	0.5	-5.0	-8.2	-7.9	-12.0	-3.3	-2.3	-5.1
Madhya P	-1.4	-0.2		-6.3	-9.7		-2.7	-3.1	
Maharashtra	-1.5	1.0	-0.4	-9.3	-8.3	-7.2	-3.5	-2.2	-2.4
Rajasthan	1.1	-1.9		-8.7	-8.0		-2.3	-3.3	
Tamil Nadu	-3.8	-4.8	-4.7	-7.4	-10.0	3.8	-4.0	-4.8	-2.6
Uttar Pradesh	-1.6	-1.3		3.8	7.8		-0.1	1.2	
West Bengal	-4.0	-2.9		19.8	5.2		0.7	-0.9	
All India	-2.1	-1.4	-3.5	-4.1	-3.1	-3.6	-2.4	-1.8	-3.1

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.1.6: Average annual rates of decline of HCRs by major state and religious groups

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	-2.9	-2.5	-4.9	3.7	-4.3	7.5	-1.3	-2.7	-2.3
Assam	-5.7	-3.3		0.0	-4.8		-3.9	-3.2	
Bihar	-2.2	-1.7		-2.3	-7.0		-2.1	-2.9	
Gujarat	-2.5	-3.8		-6.2	-4.3		-3.1	-3.4	
Jharkhand	-2.4	-2.2	-1.2	-4.7	-3.5	-9.4	-2.7	-2.4	-3.4
Karnataka	-2.4	-1.6		0.8	-8.8		-1.5	-3.4	
Kerala	-3.5	-3.3	-5.7	-13.8	-13.6	-16.7	-5.1	-5.0	-5.9
Madhya P	-0.8	0.3		-2.4	-10.8		-1.3	-3.3	
Maharashtra	-1.8	-0.2	-1.3	-8.9	-8.3	-4.3	-3.5	-2.7	-2.0
Rajasthan	-1.9	-2.4		-7.7	-2.5		-3.2	-2.2	
Tamil Nadu	-3.1	-4.8	-4.6	-8.2	-9.4	-5.5	-3.8	-4.7	-4.0
Uttar Pradesh	-2.1	-1.4		-2.2	-0.8		-2.0	-1.2	
West Bengal	-3.5	-2.3		-4.5	-7.6		-3.3	-3.3	
All India	-2.1	-2.1	-3.1	-3.9	-5.8	-6.3	-2.4	-2.8	-3.4

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.2.1: Average monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and religious groups in the rural areas

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	463.7	504.5	443.0	525.1	545.4	498.2	466.4	418.9	564.9
Assam	420.3	377.4		546.0	453.4		642.3	475.2	
Bihar	348.6	324.4		395.9	367.8		432.0	453.6	
Gujarat	477.6	479.2		536.8	548.8		563.3	597.3	
Jharkhand	338.4	318.7	360.1	406.1	399.6	358.7	465.3	453.4	495.8
Karnataka	439.5	491.5		472.3	484.1		444.1	467.9	
Kerala	596.6	531.8	687.0	837.8	834.4	1073.2	1320.2	1016.3	1868.7
Madhya P	421.4	439.2		412.7	453.5		451.7	490.3	
Maharashtra	452.0	434.4	373.4	508.2	454.1	415.4	558.2	553.4	431.4
Rajasthan	516.0	452.0		537.0	553.3		574.2	642.2	
Tamil Nadu	461.0	472.8	414.7	522.7	635.9	557.4	555.1	570.3	578.1
UP	429.8	424.4		491.7	482.8		508.2	450.7	
West Bengal	448.4	427.0		537.3	464.9		585.9	544.3	
All India	443.7	423.0	560.7	501.8	500.3	695.8	539.0	545.1	848.0

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.2.2: Average monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and religious groups in the urban areas

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	686.3	568.2	866.1	891.3	625.3	977.4	1115.6	1028.4	1064.4
Assam	760.1	577.2		961.5	942.7		811.5	677.6	
Bihar	525.0	425.5		645.0	444.0		569.7	399.5	
Gujarat	744.1	563.5		993.5	724.8		1229.5	881.9	
Jharkhand	661.8	549.8		880.6	622.6		688.9	532.7	
Karnataka	742.2	574.1		925.1	664.8		1077.3	892.3	
Kerala	813.5	843.1	922.1	1165.6	849.9	1211.3	1858.5	1180.5	1853.3
Madhya P	631.8	481.3		759.9	572.9		922.6	662.9	
Maharashtra	902.2	682.4	924.7	960.5	713.8	1091.2	1400.6	999.6	1609.7
Rajasthan	729.3	512.9		839.8	549.4		1051.2	646.4	
Tamil Nadu	707.8	625.2	768.7	931.3	837.4	1148.0	1040.6	927.1	1075.0
UP	677.6	484.3		809.9	574.3		755.7	472.1	
West Bengal	825.9	510.7		1070.6	676.4		907.7	579.9	
All India	761.0	568.1	957.9	923.1	658.9	1187.9	1061.1	757.1	1336.9

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.2.3: Average monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and religious groups

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	517.0	537.9	537.6	612.6	581.0	637.0	629.6	732.7	720.2
Assam	462.9	386.3		594.3	477.1		664.5	484.6	
Bihar	362.7	342.0		417.9	376.7		445.4	446.9	
Gujarat	555.8	532.7		684.9	634.9		798.5	759.1	
Jharkhand	404.0	352.9	412.4	495.3	415.3	396.0	510.1	474.5	557.2
Karnataka	514.6	534.5		593.5	585.3		646.2	692.5	
Kerala	652.5	596.7	744.1	916.9	838.0	1104.0	1464.6	1055.0	1864.5
Madhya P	470.8	464.1		481.7	527.4		554.7	589.9	
Maharashtra	602.1	596.8	621.8	670.0	639.4	749.2	873.6	860.7	1058.5
Rajasthan	561.4	476.0		597.2	551.3		673.0	644.6	
Tamil Nadu	542.1	574.5	553.3	670.2	784.3	842.8	765.4	811.7	804.3
UP	469.7	446.0		542.5	514.6		550.5	458.0	
West Bengal	547.4	438.4		690.2	492.8		681.0	548.2	
All India	517.8	472.6	676.3	602.6	552.4	839.4	673.2	616.2	1005.5

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.2.7: Average annual rate of increase of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and religious groups in the rural areas

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	1.2	0.7	1.1	-2.2	-4.6	2.7	0.0	-1.1	1.7
Assam	2.7	1.8		3.5	1.0		3.3	1.6	
Bihar	1.2	1.2		1.8	4.7		1.5	2.5	
Gujarat	1.1	1.3		1.0	1.8		1.1	1.5	
Jharkhand	1.8	2.3	0.0	2.9	2.7	7.6	2.3	2.6	2.4
Karnataka	0.7	-0.1		-1.2	-0.7		0.1	-0.3	
Kerala	3.7	5.2	5.1	11.5	4.4	14.8	7.6	5.7	10.8
Madhya P	-0.2	0.3		1.9	1.6		0.4	0.7	
Maharashtra	1.1	0.4	1.0	2.0	4.4	0.8	1.5	1.7	1.0
Rajasthan	0.4	2.0		1.4	3.2		0.7	2.6	
Tamil Nadu	1.2	3.1	3.1	1.2	-2.1	0.7	1.3	1.3	2.5
UP	1.3	1.3		0.7	-1.3		1.1	0.4	
West Bengal	1.8	0.8		1.8	3.4		1.9	1.7	
All India	1.2	1.7	2.2	1.5	1.8	4.4	1.3	1.8	3.2

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.2.8: Average annual rate of increase of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and religious groups in the urban areas

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	2.7	0.9	1.2	5.0	12.9	1.8	3.9	5.1	1.4
Assam	2.4	5.8		-3.1	-5.6		0.4	1.1	
Bihar	2.1	0.4		-2.3	-2.0		0.5	-0.4	
Gujarat	3.0	2.6		4.8	4.3		4.1	3.5	
Jharkhand	3.0	1.2		-4.4	-2.9		0.3	-0.2	
Karnataka	2.2	1.4		3.3	6.8		2.8	3.5	
Kerala	3.9	0.1	2.9	11.9	7.8	10.6	8.0	2.5	6.3
Madhya P	1.8	1.7		4.3	3.1		2.9	2.4	
Maharashtra	0.6	0.4	1.6	9.2	8.0	9.5	3.5	2.9	4.6
Rajasthan	1.4	0.6		5.0	3.5		2.8	1.6	
Tamil Nadu	2.9	3.1	4.5	2.3	2.1	-1.3	2.9	3.0	2.5
UP	1.8	1.7		-1.3	-3.6		0.7	-0.2	
West Bengal	2.7	2.9		-3.0	-2.9		0.6	0.8	
All India	1.9	1.5	2.2	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.5

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 5.2.9: Average annual rate of increase of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and religious groups

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.6	5.2	2.6	1.4	2.3	2.1
Assam	2.6	2.1		2.4	0.3		2.7	1.6	
Bihar	1.4	0.9		1.3	3.7		1.4	1.9	
Gujarat	2.1	1.7		3.3	3.9		2.7	2.7	
Jharkhand	2.1	1.6	-0.4	0.6	2.9	8.1	1.6	2.2	2.2
Karnataka	1.4	0.9		1.8	3.7		1.6	1.8	
Kerala	3.7	3.7	4.4	11.9	5.2	13.8	7.8	4.8	9.4
Madhya P	0.2	1.2		3.0	2.4		1.1	1.7	
Maharashtra	1.0	0.6	1.9	6.1	6.9	8.3	2.8	2.8	4.4
Rajasthan	0.6	1.4		2.5	3.4		1.2	2.2	
Tamil Nadu	2.1	3.3	4.8	2.8	0.7	-0.9	2.6	2.6	2.8
UP	1.4	1.4		0.3	-2.2		1.1	0.2	
West Bengal	2.4	1.1		-0.3	2.2		1.5	1.6	
All India	1.5	1.5	2.2	2.3	2.3	4.0	1.9	1.9	3.0

Source: As in table 2.1

Table 6.1: Gini from NSS CES data (MPCE at constant 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra Pradesh	0.290	0.323	0.314	0.286	0.395	0.392
Arunachal Pradesh	0.306	0.279	0.318	0.341	0.332	0.339
Assam	0.179	0.290	0.219	0.251	0.330	0.268
Bihar	0.222	0.282	0.236	0.230	0.344	0.246
Chhattisgarh	0.217	0.306	0.262	0.282	0.336	0.339
Goa	0.313	0.278	0.299	0.220	0.431	0.331
Gujarat	0.239	0.291	0.280	0.261	0.338	0.360
Haryana	0.311	0.284	0.311	0.310	0.368	0.332
Himachal Pradesh	0.284	0.462	0.329	0.314	0.415	0.326
Jammu & Kashmir	0.241	0.286	0.287	0.240	0.315	0.263
Jharkhand	0.234	0.325	0.296	0.245	0.360	0.287
Karnataka	0.269	0.319	0.311	0.240	0.341	0.369
Kerala	0.301	0.343	0.322	0.439	0.527	0.467
Madhya Pradesh	0.301	0.337	0.324	0.300	0.374	0.362
Maharashtra	0.307	0.358	0.377	0.276	0.423	0.427
Manipur	0.154	0.157	0.156	0.178	0.219	0.191
Meghalaya	0.281	0.245	0.296	0.206	0.260	0.220
Mizoram	0.173	0.182	0.201	0.242	0.234	0.245
Nagaland	0.165	0.201	0.181	0.191	0.241	0.205
Odisha	0.246	0.307	0.278	0.268	0.401	0.330
Punjab	0.282	0.281	0.285	0.297	0.382	0.333
Rajasthan	0.265	0.293	0.283	0.230	0.396	0.301
Sikkim	0.212	0.255	0.236	0.281	0.201	0.277
Tamil Nadu	0.312	0.348	0.346	0.271	0.340	0.351
Tripura	0.243	0.283	0.259	0.209	0.299	0.235
Uttaranchal	0.244	0.277	0.273	0.368	0.338	0.362
Uttar Pradesh	0.283	0.327	0.304	0.270	0.369	0.301
West Bengal	0.254	0.339	0.313	0.245	0.393	0.306
A & N Islands	0.254	0.404	0.341	0.252	0.278	0.293
Chandigarh	0.246	0.468	0.465	0.190	0.459	0.453
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0.259	0.325	0.284	0.208	0.209	0.276
Daman & Diu	0.261	0.212	0.243	0.306	0.284	0.299
Delhi	0.277	0.406	0.397	0.255	0.352	0.349
Lakshadweep	0.257	0.306	0.283	0.331	0.346	0.347
Pondicherry	0.304	0.301	0.307	0.322	0.315	0.341

Appendix Tables

Notes on Appendix tables

Source of Appendix Tables

Unless other-wise specified, the tables reported in this appendix have been generated/calculated using NSS CES unit record data from 50th (1993/94), 61st (2004/05) and 66th (2009/10) rounds of surveys.

Table A3.1: Average Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by Sector and State of the Poor
(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra P	214.7	348.2	276.4	214.1	361.4	283.8	215.9	372.6	258.7
Arunachal P	285.0	266.6	284.7	303.4	301.1	303.3	286.9	289.7	287.6
Assam	298.4	304.3	298.5	305.0	301.1	305.0	316.4	279.3	313.7
Bihar	249.7	288.8	252.5	269.4	301.7	272.0	267.8	278.2	269.1
Chhattisgarh	251.2	356.2	269.7	236.8	335.1	252.3	240.5	351.0	252.9
Goa	258.9	445.8	409.5	299.2	412.6	376.0	317.3	461.6	394.4
Gujarat	259.5	370.1	301.5	262.4	389.9	296.9	275.6	405.4	317.3
Haryana	290.7	342.5	299.5	298.9	325.5	306.4	306.4	364.6	332.7
Himachal P	300.1	363.7	301.8	311.8	307.1	311.6	307.9	343.9	319.5
J & K	302.6	337.5	307.6	312.5	323.0	316.4	309.6	366.6	328.4
Jharkhand	246.7	304.8	252.1	270.8	310.5	273.9	272.2	287.5	275.4
Karnataka	245.0	366.2	286.9	266.7	374.5	311.1	256.0	396.7	297.6
Kerala	291.9	368.5	310.0	296.6	368.5	319.4	292.0	394.1	360.0
Madhya P	233.0	345.3	266.9	243.6	345.5	270.3	240.7	354.5	264.3
Maharashtra	240.5	383.1	290.8	250.7	386.2	308.0	267.6	421.7	331.6
Manipur	320.9	314.7	320.1	332.2	318.7	331.5	339.7	291.9	308.8
Meghalaya	315.3	308.6	315.2	338.2	340.5	338.2	312.5	316.5	313.3
Mizoram	315.2		315.2	315.7		315.7	348.1	301.4	332.6
Nagaland	332.0		332.0						
Odisha	246.1	340.2	256.1	240.3	331.3	252.2	245.3	372.7	260.3
Punjab	303.2	328.2	310.2	314.9	346.8	322.9	330.2	326.8	328.2
Rajasthan	276.4	360.7	298.2	288.5	362.5	313.3	300.9	373.8	324.9
Sikkim	302.4	327.7	302.5	320.2	285.3	319.8	322.3	320.8	322.3
Tamil Nadu	239.4	353.3	284.7	256.8	376.1	302.1	258.0	389.8	321.1
Tripura	283.3	277.2	283.0	293.8	311.2	294.3	333.4	293.1	328.7
Uttarakhand	277.7	323.7	284.9	356.1	421.8	370.2	272.2	327.6	309.8
Uttar Pradesh	253.7	313.4	263.7	273.0	318.9	281.3	278.4	307.6	285.9
West Bengal	279.6	328.2	286.7	284.7	334.1	291.3	294.3	318.7	302.2
A & N Islands	286.8	396.9	359.4	301.3	452.5	392.8	267.9		267.9
Chandigarh	345.3	304.5	323.2	321.0	323.4	322.7		345.9	345.9
D & N Haveli	252.4	344.7	257.6	250.3	364.1	257.2	263.0	485.8	290.3
Daman & Diu	258.4	456.1	406.8		454.4	454.4	212.9	492.8	480.0
Delhi	334.2	382.5	381.7	346.6	424.4	422.1	360.2	410.1	408.4
Lakshadweep		383.9	383.9	314.1	318.9	318.8	366.8	404.8	371.6
Pondicherry	258.5	357.7	332.9	258.2	400.9	344.0		430.0	430.0
Total	255.2	349.1	276.6	266.4	357.6	288.1	266.0	353.2	288.7

Table A3.2: Average Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by Sector and State of the Non-Poor
(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra P	512.6	878.1	587.4	562.1	1045.3	667.5	518.0	1239.7	722.0
Arunachal P	648.8	833.0	681.5	778.9	813.2	783.2	953.4	937.5	950.3
Assam	495.6	780.3	541.2	570.8	986.7	617.4	640.4	876.5	666.0
Bihar	468.7	641.5	490.5	483.1	778.0	513.0	523.1	735.5	542.2
Chhattisgarh	457.8	834.8	524.4	518.7	1201.9	621.3	534.5	999.6	642.2
Goa	824.5	1013.6	891.7	900.7	1344.2	1050.7	876.1	1741.8	1116.3
Gujarat	539.7	864.8	639.7	601.2	1067.9	769.2	609.7	1270.1	866.2
Haryana	713.5	855.7	754.4	824.4	1057.4	885.8	878.5	1112.7	943.8
Himachal P	660.5	1326.7	731.9	794.6	1185.8	834.4	1070.6	1422.9	1099.2
J & K	630.7	925.9	751.5	764.2	851.1	785.5	792.2	998.3	839.2
Jharkhand	486.0	778.7	578.9	510.3	1000.0	618.8	554.6	874.9	618.2
Karnataka	532.8	946.4	638.7	542.6	1126.4	702.7	512.6	1229.0	774.2
Kerala	704.8	991.1	775.6	972.0	1283.9	1040.8	1363.4	1859.7	1483.1
Madhya P	545.8	883.4	622.0	518.0	1075.1	638.9	560.9	1088.4	698.3
Maharashtra	570.5	1133.1	786.7	603.9	1188.1	834.3	610.8	1559.9	1006.5
Manipur	507.9	532.7	515.4	590.2	662.0	608.3	633.3	589.5	622.9
Meghalaya	641.1	869.2	680.2	628.1	1081.0	690.3	662.2	778.2	681.7
Mizoram	633.2	890.1	718.0	745.8	1090.1	884.0	765.6	903.8	829.5
Nagaland	699.2	823.7	733.0	952.9	1360.6	1072.7	923.2	892.5	914.9
Odisha	486.8	842.9	539.2	534.8	958.4	594.8	533.2	1153.4	630.4
Punjab	721.8	837.9	755.5	791.3	1155.0	910.7	897.3	1131.6	976.4
Rajasthan	599.0	859.2	655.8	599.7	1012.7	679.0	618.2	1115.1	731.9
Sikkim	546.6	844.7	579.8	711.8	1013.3	751.1	797.8	984.6	824.4
Tamil Nadu	566.8	934.8	687.4	607.0	1100.8	797.7	600.5	1145.2	840.2
Tripura	619.4	826.5	652.3	547.5	944.8	623.2	649.7	868.0	685.4
Uttarakhand	552.7	824.1	612.5	760.2	1084.6	840.0	844.6	926.4	862.0
Uttar Pradesh	564.8	800.4	615.7	599.1	919.2	664.4	584.5	898.4	640.3
West Bengal	556.1	919.7	659.4	605.1	1130.9	753.0	623.1	1044.3	717.5
A & N Islands	781.4	1512.2	981.6	936.9	1577.7	1153.8	987.0	1540.3	1194.3
Chandigarh	757.3	1600.3	1500.1	783.5	1519.0	1451.2	1082.2	2281.4	2094.7
D & N Haveli	522.7	972.2	563.5	665.9	1325.0	766.0	487.3	928.5	609.4
Daman & Diu	765.0	870.3	801.9	1020.7	959.1	1001.5	839.8	1129.4	947.0
Delhi	951.2	1473.9	1408.8	846.2	1217.6	1189.8	966.7	1340.9	1320.5
Lakshadweep	811.7	955.1	878.0	1146.5	1333.3	1233.3	1164.0	1430.7	1306.8
Pondicherry	631.1	854.4	757.7	776.7	1019.9	937.2	868.7	1311.8	1155.2
Total	560.0	935.8	658.0	606.6	1082.8	729.9	635.5	1207.2	791.7

Table A3.3: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure of the Poor by Sector and State

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra P	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.6	-1.8	0.0	0.4	-0.4
Arunachal P	0.6	1.2	0.6	-1.1	-0.8	-1.0	0.0	0.5	0.1
Assam	0.2	-0.1	0.2	0.7	-1.4	0.6	0.4	-0.5	0.3
Bihar	0.7	0.4	0.7	-0.1	-1.6	-0.2	0.5	-0.2	0.4
Chhattisgarh	-0.5	-0.5	-0.6	0.3	0.9	0.0	-0.3	-0.1	-0.4
Goa	1.4	-0.7	-0.7	1.2	2.4	1.0	1.4	0.2	-0.2
Gujarat	0.1	0.5	-0.1	1.0	0.8	1.4	0.4	0.6	0.3
Haryana	0.3	-0.5	0.2	0.5	2.4	1.7	0.3	0.4	0.7
Himachal P	0.4	-1.4	0.3	-0.3	2.4	0.5	0.2	-0.3	0.4
J & K	0.3	-0.4	0.3	-0.2	2.7	0.8	0.1	0.5	0.4
Jharkhand	0.9	0.2	0.8	0.1	-1.5	0.1	0.6	-0.4	0.6
Karnataka	0.8	0.2	0.8	-0.8	1.2	-0.9	0.3	0.5	0.2
Kerala	0.1	0.0	0.3	-0.3	1.4	2.5	0.0	0.4	1.0
Madhya P	0.4	0.0	0.1	-0.2	0.5	-0.4	0.2	0.2	-0.1
Maharashtra	0.4	0.1	0.5	1.3	1.8	1.5	0.7	0.6	0.9
Manipur	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.5	-1.7	-1.4	0.4	-0.5	-0.2
Meghalaya	0.7	0.9	0.7	-1.5	-1.4	-1.5	-0.1	0.2	0.0
Mizoram	0.0		0.0	2.0		1.1	0.7		0.3
Nagaland	-9.1		-9.1				-6.3		-6.3
Odisha	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	0.4	2.5	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.1
Punjab	0.4	0.5	0.4	1.0	-1.2	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.4
Rajasthan	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.6
Sikkim	0.5	-1.2	0.5	0.1	2.5	0.2	0.4	-0.1	0.4
Tamil Nadu	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.7	1.3	0.5	0.6	0.8
Tripura	0.3	1.1	0.4	2.7	-1.2	2.3	1.1	0.4	1.0
Uttarakhand	2.6	2.8	2.7	-4.7	-4.5	-3.3	-0.1	0.1	0.5
Uttar Pradesh	0.7	0.2	0.6	0.4	-0.7	0.3	0.6	-0.1	0.5
West Bengal	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.7	-0.9	0.8	0.3	-0.2	0.3
A & N Islands	0.5	1.3	0.8	-2.2	-20.0	-6.4	-0.4	-6.3	-1.6
Chandigarh	-0.6	0.6	0.0	-20.0	1.4	1.4	-6.3	0.9	0.4
D & N Haveli	-0.1	0.5	0.0	1.0	6.7	2.6	0.3	2.6	0.8
Daman & Diu	-9.1	0.0	1.1		1.7	1.1	-1.1	0.5	1.1
Delhi	0.3	1.0	1.0	0.8	-0.7	-0.7	0.5	0.5	0.4
Lakshadweep		-1.5	-1.5	3.4	5.4	3.3		0.3	-0.2
Pondicherry	0.0	1.1	0.3	-20.0	1.4	5.0	-6.3	1.3	1.8
Total	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.3

Table A3.4: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure of the Non-Poor by Sector and State

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra P	0.9	1.7	1.2	-1.6	3.7	1.6	0.1	2.6	1.4
Arunachal P	1.8	-0.2	1.4	4.5	3.1	4.3	2.9	0.8	2.5
Assam	1.4	2.4	1.3	2.4	-2.2	1.6	1.8	0.8	1.4
Bihar	0.3	1.9	0.4	1.7	-1.1	1.1	0.7	0.9	0.7
Chhattisgarh	1.2	4.0	1.7	0.6	-3.4	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.4
Goa	0.8	3.0	1.6	-0.5	5.9	1.2	0.4	4.5	1.6
Gujarat	1.0	2.1	1.8	0.3	3.8	2.5	0.8	2.9	2.2
Haryana	1.4	2.1	1.6	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.4	1.9	1.6
Himachal P	1.8	-1.0	1.3	6.9	4.0	6.3	3.9	0.5	3.1
J & K	1.9	-0.7	0.4	0.7	3.5	1.4	1.6	0.5	0.7
Jharkhand	0.5	2.6	0.6	1.7	-2.5	0.0	0.9	0.8	0.4
Karnataka	0.2	1.7	0.9	-1.1	1.8	2.0	-0.2	1.9	1.3
Kerala	3.4	2.7	3.1	8.1	9.0	8.5	5.8	5.5	5.7
Madhya P	-0.5	2.0	0.2	1.7	0.2	1.9	0.2	1.5	0.8
Maharashtra	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.2	6.3	4.1	0.4	2.4	1.7
Manipur	1.5	2.2	1.6	1.5	-2.2	0.5	1.5	0.7	1.3
Meghalaya	-0.2	2.2	0.1	1.1	-5.6	-0.2	0.2	-0.7	0.0
Mizoram	1.6	2.0	2.1	0.5	-3.4	-1.2	1.3	0.1	1.0
Nagaland	3.3	5.9	4.2	-0.6	-6.9	-2.9	2.0	0.5	1.6
Orissa	0.9	1.2	0.9	-0.1	4.1	1.2	0.6	2.3	1.1
Punjab	0.9	3.4	1.9	2.7	-0.4	1.4	1.5	2.2	1.8
Rajasthan	0.0	1.6	0.3	0.6	2.0	1.6	0.2	1.9	0.7
Sikkim	2.7	1.8	2.7	2.4	-0.6	2.0	2.9	1.0	2.6
Tamil Nadu	0.6	1.6	1.5	-0.2	0.8	1.1	0.4	1.4	1.4
Tripura	-1.1	1.3	-0.4	3.7	-1.6	2.0	0.3	0.3	0.3
Uttarakhand	3.4	2.9	3.4	2.2	-2.9	0.5	3.3	0.8	2.5
Uttar Pradesh	0.6	1.3	0.7	-0.5	-0.5	-0.7	0.2	0.8	0.2
West Bengal	0.8	2.1	1.3	0.6	-1.5	-0.9	0.8	0.8	0.6
A & N Islands	1.8	0.4	1.6	1.1	-0.5	0.7	1.6	0.1	1.4
Chandigarh	0.3	-0.5	-0.3	7.6	10.0	8.9	2.7	2.7	2.5
D & N Haveli	2.5	3.3	3.3	-5.4	-6.0	-4.1	-0.4	-0.3	0.5
Daman & Diu	3.0	0.9	2.3	-3.5	3.5	-1.1	0.6	1.9	1.1
Delhi	-1.0	-1.6	-1.4	2.8	2.0	2.2	0.1	-0.6	-0.4
Lakshadweep	3.7	3.6	3.7	0.3	1.5	1.2	2.7	3.1	3.1
Pondicherry	2.1	1.8	2.2	2.4	5.7	4.7	2.4	3.3	3.3
Total	0.8	1.4	1.0	1.0	2.3	1.7	0.8	1.8	1.3

Table A4.1: Average monthly per capita expenditure by major state and social groups in the rural areas of the Poor

(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	210.7	211.9	217.6	198.8	214.5	221.2	195.3	218.9	218.4
Assam	313.2	302.6	295.3	315.1	302.6	304.0	328.4	311.4	315.0
Chhattisgarh	247.6	248.1	256.7	230.9	243.6	241.8	238.7	237.7	243.6
Gujarat	251.3	253.5	266.6	248.0	274.7	269.8	268.3	277.8	284.5
Jharkhand	239.8	234.2	256.5	264.1	262.5	278.3	264.0	291.2	270.9
Karnataka	238.9	234.5	252.0	277.3	263.8	266.7	247.7	262.7	253.8
Madhya P	217.9	240.9	242.9	239.2	236.9	252.1	236.6	242.0	244.1
Maharashtra	244.1	235.0	241.5	233.5	245.4	261.6	258.7	261.9	273.5
Odisha	231.2	247.2	257.5	223.7	237.5	258.9	223.0	255.4	262.1
Rajasthan	271.3	268.8	284.1	291.5	281.1	292.3	297.4	293.3	311.6
Tripura	277.5	297.3	279.0	292.5	289.4	297.2	333.8	344.1	327.5
West Bengal	283.6	277.2	280.5	279.9	289.1	283.4	295.7	302.5	289.1
Bihar		239.9	254.3		262.0	273.1		254.8	274.5
Haryana		281.4	303.2		292.3	306.8		301.7	315.5
Himachal P		296.3	303.7		310.2	319.7		320.3	339.0
Kerala		294.5	292.4		306.3	300.7		338.3	276.2
Punjab		303.1	306.6		315.8	312.9		329.1	340.6
Tamil Nadu		238.3	239.8		254.9	257.5		261.8	256.3
Uttar Pradesh		244.9	258.5		268.6	275.0		271.8	282.7
Uttarakhand		267.9	282.2		350.2	357.4		276.8	269.7
All India	245.7	250.1	260.1	246.4	265.3	273.0	249.4	266.5	270.8

Table A4.2: Average monthly per capita expenditure by major state and social groups in the urban areas of the Poor

(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	308.6	339.1	350.8	340.2	362.2	362.6	369.4	360.6	374.8
Assam	286.4	297.4	306.4	327.2	247.9	311.9	269.0	289.6	278.1
Chhattisgarh	370.4	326.4	362.6	282.6	310.1	353.8	346.6	357.8	349.5
Gujarat	371.8	356.8	373.1	334.3	376.0	396.3	375.6	384.5	412.4
Jharkhand	300.6	297.1	310.5	289.0	326.7	309.7	284.7	275.5	292.2
Karnataka	349.3	345.0	372.8	345.9	350.5	382.7	407.2	378.2	398.6
Madhya P	334.7	330.0	352.5	301.5	328.5	355.4	345.7	335.4	362.9
Maharashtra	367.7	359.8	391.7	362.3	366.7	393.6	397.3	415.0	426.4
Odisha	311.6	333.9	349.5	312.1	315.2	341.0	372.9	343.4	389.8
Rajasthan	350.6	360.4	360.8	329.2	349.9	370.7	381.9	371.1	374.3
Tripura		260.2	282.3	341.4	312.2	309.5	265.8	307.1	277.2
West Bengal	350.9	316.5	332.3	361.2	339.3	329.9	295.7	314.4	322.1
Bihar		273.8	292.1		280.5	306.5		259.6	282.6
Haryana		346.7	340.9		313.6	334.3		369.3	359.4
Himachal P		360.9	365.7		313.5	303.3		335.7	352.7
Kerala		360.3	369.3		384.2	365.7		384.2	395.3
Punjab		322.3	335.7		346.9	346.7		321.3	330.6
Tamil Nadu		331.2	359.3		368.3	379.8		389.8	391.3
Uttar Pradesh		307.4	314.6		312.8	320.4		303.9	308.5
Uttarakhand		315.2	327.5		416.4	421.6		343.6	325.2
All India	343.2	337.2	352.7	326.8	350.5	361.7	356.0	349.3	354.3

Table A4.3: Average monthly per capita expenditure by major state and social groups of the Poor
(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	225.8	239.2	295.4	221.1	271.7	303.7	213.3	243.9	269.4
Assam	313.1	302.4	295.6	315.2	301.1	304.1	325.3	308.8	312.4
Chhattisgarh	251.7	266.0	287.0	234.1	257.0	268.2	241.2	253.2	262.6
Gujarat	263.3	292.4	317.8	253.0	300.0	317.9	271.0	329.8	346.2
Jharkhand	242.5	243.6	262.1	265.3	271.0	280.8	266.1	287.9	277.2
Karnataka	260.5	261.7	301.6	297.5	290.6	320.7	296.2	280.6	304.4
Madhya P	229.6	269.3	288.9	242.5	262.9	293.1	241.4	266.0	279.8
Maharashtra	265.0	278.9	300.4	246.5	297.4	328.8	283.8	327.1	345.3
Odisha	235.8	254.7	271.2	227.7	249.5	275.0	235.8	266.2	280.9
Rajasthan	271.8	292.0	312.2	292.8	305.6	327.3	306.8	313.5	340.8
Tripura	277.5	296.0	279.1	292.5	290.7	297.4	331.4	332.3	322.4
West Bengal	285.1	281.7	290.1	282.2	297.4	289.8	295.7	306.3	300.5
Bihar		241.2	257.5		262.9	276.3		255.2	275.8
Haryana		288.7	311.5		297.3	316.1		330.3	337.2
Himachal P		298.8	305.3		310.2	318.9		324.9	348.3
Kerala		304.1	312.1		326.6	323.0		358.1	362.2
Punjab		307.5	318.2		323.3	321.9		325.6	331.8
Tamil Nadu		265.5	293.5		290.4	307.7		313.2	325.3
Uttar Pradesh		251.1	269.7		273.6	284.7		276.4	290.9
Uttarakhand		275.1	290.0		364.9	371.7		306.4	310.6
All India	253.3	266.0	285.7	251.7	283.9	298.4	259.4	284.5	297.4

Table A4.4: Average monthly per capita expenditure by major state and social groups in the rural areas of the Non-Poor

(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	497.5	426.4	533.9	461.1	486.6	590.0	412.7	496.2	531.0
Assam	468.5	469.9	504.2	559.0	543.8	577.9	638.6	623.7	643.4
Chhattisgarh	411.4	467.0	485.1	480.3	569.2	522.1	497.0	511.4	557.4
Gujarat	481.8	503.6	561.9	533.7	527.8	627.3	499.5	570.0	653.7
Jharkhand	478.3	434.9	497.4	485.6	491.7	523.0	518.6	535.7	582.3
Karnataka	467.6	481.0	550.5	443.1	460.7	573.1	432.0	482.2	534.9
Madhya P	461.8	475.6	582.8	446.6	461.9	550.0	548.6	477.8	595.2
Maharashtra	509.7	503.8	589.7	541.7	529.2	621.3	525.7	534.9	639.2
Odisha	444.2	459.8	503.4	466.3	483.9	557.7	455.3	480.2	564.2
Rajasthan	633.3	555.7	602.5	491.4	564.3	630.2	564.9	589.6	639.4
Tripura	589.6	579.9	637.1	494.2	534.3	576.3	593.1	653.9	690.1
West Bengal	507.5	496.7	586.7	497.3	563.6	634.4	559.8	596.0	641.0
Bihar		437.3	474.2		434.9	491.3		497.5	529.6
Haryana		600.0	745.3		574.5	903.1		691.8	946.0
Himachal P		601.7	677.9		662.5	838.0		920.3	1139.7
Kerala		537.4	720.9		752.8	1002.4		817.7	1433.3
Punjab		624.4	770.8		620.1	895.9		665.8	1076.3
Tamil Nadu		480.7	591.4		486.9	647.0		539.2	601.2
Uttar Pradesh		516.4	574.4		539.9	615.6		516.0	606.3
Uttarakhand		477.0	566.9		692.5	784.4		578.0	935.8
All India	506.8	500.7	579.9	517.4	534.4	634.4	556.8	555.7	668.4

Table A4.5: Average monthly per capita expenditure by major state and social groups in the urban areas of the Non-Poor

(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	823.5	769.3	888.8	854.9	899.6	1070.9	1157.7	1028.6	1275.0
Assam	802.2	641.2	788.9	766.2	762.8	1043.7	665.1	719.7	928.8
Chhattisgarh	982.7	652.5	842.1	990.3	899.1	1292.4	1098.5	924.3	1004.8
Gujarat	743.5	759.4	880.4	932.5	924.4	1087.5	1287.8	957.0	1299.6
Jharkhand	603.9	616.0	826.7	778.8	913.5	1026.0	701.0	680.7	922.1
Karnataka	865.1	711.3	967.8	866.4	813.4	1163.8	1024.7	950.3	1269.0
Madhya P	742.2	929.0	882.2	852.5	852.6	1111.7	1131.5	856.8	1119.9
Maharashtra	897.9	886.7	1167.7	957.2	953.2	1236.9	1244.2	1149.5	1632.2
Odisha	785.4	719.2	866.8	818.3	836.9	976.3	926.8	849.0	1249.8
Rajasthan	768.7	757.0	875.7	845.7	940.9	1030.3	1077.1	764.2	1189.1
Tripura	948.8	663.7	852.4	1038.9	698.1	995.2	954.7	807.8	879.3
West Bengal	854.9	809.6	938.2	912.8	821.1	1200.3	944.6	720.4	1112.0
Bihar		547.4	647.5		1117.5	754.1		571.9	747.9
Haryana		711.5	882.0		717.8	1113.9		728.1	1212.0
Himachal P		837.8	1433.9		880.0	1261.0		1107.5	1525.2
Kerala		758.4	1000.8		775.6	1320.4		936.0	1915.9
Punjab		730.4	860.4		728.9	1300.6		746.6	1252.2
Tamil Nadu		794.3	948.2		848.2	1132.4		984.9	1161.8
Uttar Pradesh		648.9	818.3		730.8	941.7		833.4	881.1
Uttarakhand		611.0	850.5		1083.0	1084.1		751.5	953.7
All India	820.1	775.1	958.4	950.3	846.2	1121.6	1145.8	908.3	1254.9

Table A4.6: Average monthly per capita expenditure by major state and social groups of the Non-Poor

(Rs. at 1999-00 prices)

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	521.6	461.5	617.6	486.3	553.9	706.3	529.8	604.9	760.2
Assam	484.3	489.3	556.8	567.6	577.0	636.7	639.7	639.1	676.4
Chhattisgarh	439.1	486.3	579.2	531.0	601.1	665.5	541.4	624.4	683.7
Gujarat	503.4	569.6	676.4	576.9	651.8	813.4	554.3	691.6	951.4
Jharkhand	500.1	494.1	614.7	506.8	567.1	660.8	530.6	556.2	675.8
Karnataka	500.5	513.3	671.7	470.6	519.9	757.5	531.2	583.0	843.3
Madhya P	477.9	562.9	662.2	482.2	509.8	697.7	583.6	539.1	769.4
Maharashtra	557.9	630.3	829.8	613.5	719.3	869.2	636.7	772.9	1085.9
Odisha	472.3	486.1	565.7	492.8	504.7	628.1	519.0	526.6	680.3
Rajasthan	640.5	590.8	670.5	508.6	621.3	720.1	603.1	624.6	785.3
Tripura	608.1	589.9	677.2	543.8	556.8	680.2	606.7	681.1	734.2
West Bengal	546.9	544.4	706.3	526.4	612.8	821.1	596.2	613.7	765.8
Bihar		442.6	498.8		464.1	520.3		501.2	551.2
Haryana		627.2	786.4		600.0	963.5		700.3	1024.3
Himachal P		622.2	763.2		679.8	885.1		933.6	1174.3
Kerala		575.1	792.0		756.5	1075.0		834.9	1554.6
Punjab		644.4	800.7		646.6	1045.6		684.3	1146.7
Tamil Nadu		534.8	719.7		566.6	853.7		668.0	866.8
Uttar Pradesh		535.0	630.5		562.5	688.8		547.4	660.5
Uttarakhand		496.3	636.4		740.1	868.7		605.9	940.0
All India	538.5	548.4	690.6	560.9	594.4	774.4	622.8	623.9	849.7

Table A4.7: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by major state and social groups in the rural areas of the Poor

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	-0.5	0.1	0.1	-0.4	0.4	-0.3	-0.5	0.2	0.0
Assam	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.4
Chhattisgarh	-0.6	-0.2	-0.5	0.7	-0.5	0.1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.3
Gujarat	-0.1	0.8	0.1	1.6	0.2	1.1	0.4	0.6	0.4
Jharkhand	0.9	1.1	0.8	0.0	2.2	-0.5	0.6	1.5	0.4
Karnataka	1.5	1.1	0.5	-2.1	-0.1	-1.0	0.2	0.8	0.0
Madhya P	0.9	-0.2	0.3	-0.2	0.4	-0.6	0.5	0.0	0.0
Maharashtra	-0.4	0.4	0.8	2.2	1.3	0.9	0.4	0.7	0.8
Odisha	-0.3	-0.4	0.1	-0.1	1.5	0.3	-0.2	0.2	0.1
Rajasthan	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.9	1.3	0.6	0.6	0.6
Tripura	0.5	-0.2	0.6	2.8	3.8	2.0	1.3	1.0	1.1
West Bengal	-0.1	0.4	0.1	1.1	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.2
Bihar		0.8	0.7		-0.5	0.1		0.4	0.5
Haryana		0.4	0.1		0.6	0.6		0.5	0.3
Himachal P		0.4	0.5		0.7	1.2		0.5	0.7
Kerala		0.4	0.3		2.1	-1.6		0.9	-0.3
Punjab		0.4	0.2		0.8	1.8		0.5	0.7
Tamil Nadu		0.6	0.7		0.5	-0.1		0.6	0.4
Uttar Pradesh		0.9	0.6		0.2	0.6		0.7	0.6
Uttarakhand		2.8	2.4		-4.2	-4.9		0.2	-0.3
All India	0.0	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.4	0.3

Table A4.8: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by major state and social groups in the urban areas of the Poor

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	0.9	0.6	0.3	1.7	-0.1	0.7	1.2	0.4	0.4
Assam	1.3	-1.5	0.2	-3.6	3.4	-2.2	-0.4	-0.2	-0.6
Chhattisgarh	-2.2	-0.5	-0.2	4.5	3.1	-0.2	-0.4	0.6	-0.2
Gujarat	-0.9	0.5	0.6	2.5	0.5	0.8	0.1	0.5	0.7
Jharkhand	-0.4	0.9	0.0	-0.3	-3.1	-1.1	-0.3	-0.5	-0.4
Karnataka	-0.1	0.1	0.2	3.5	1.6	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.4
Madhya P	-0.9	0.0	0.1	2.9	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.2
Maharashtra	-0.1	0.2	0.0	1.9	2.6	1.7	0.5	1.0	0.6
Odisha	0.0	-0.5	-0.2	3.9	1.8	2.9	1.2	0.2	0.7
Rajasthan	-0.6	-0.3	0.2	3.2	1.2	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.2
Tripura		1.8	0.9	-4.4	-0.3	-2.1		1.1	-0.1
West Bengal	0.3	0.7	-0.1	-3.6	-1.5	-0.5	-1.0	0.0	-0.2
Bihar		0.2	0.5		-1.5	-1.6		-0.3	-0.2
Haryana		-0.9	-0.2		3.5	1.5		0.4	0.3
Himachal P		-1.2	-1.5		1.4	3.3		-0.4	-0.2
Kerala		0.6	-0.1		0.0	1.6		0.4	0.4
Punjab		0.7	0.3		-1.5	-0.9		0.0	-0.1
Tamil Nadu		1.0	0.5		1.2	0.6		1.1	0.6
Uttar Pradesh		0.2	0.2		-0.6	-0.7		-0.1	-0.1
Uttarakhand		2.9	2.6		-3.5	-4.6		0.6	0.0
All India	-0.4	0.4	0.2	1.8	-0.1	-0.4	0.2	0.2	0.0

Table A4.9: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by major state and social groups of the Poor

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	-0.2	1.2	0.3	-0.7	-2.0	-2.3	-0.3	0.1	-0.5
Assam	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.4
Chhattisgarh	-0.6	-0.3	-0.6	0.6	-0.3	-0.4	-0.3	-0.3	-0.5
Gujarat	-0.4	0.2	0.0	1.4	2.0	1.8	0.2	0.8	0.6
Jharkhand	0.9	1.0	0.6	0.1	1.2	-0.3	0.6	1.1	0.4
Karnataka	1.3	1.0	0.6	-0.1	-0.7	-1.0	0.9	0.5	0.1
Madhya P	0.5	-0.2	0.1	-0.1	0.2	-0.9	0.3	-0.1	-0.2
Maharashtra	-0.6	0.6	0.9	3.0	2.0	1.0	0.4	1.1	0.9
Odisha	-0.3	-0.2	0.1	0.7	1.3	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.2
Rajasthan	0.7	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.6
Tripura	0.5	-0.2	0.6	2.7	2.9	1.7	1.2	0.8	1.0
West Bengal	-0.1	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.5	0.2
Bihar		0.8	0.7		-0.6	0.0		0.4	0.4
Haryana		0.3	0.1		2.2	1.3		0.9	0.5
Himachal P		0.3	0.4		0.9	1.8		0.5	0.9
Kerala		0.7	0.3		1.9	2.4		1.1	1.0
Punjab		0.5	0.1		0.1	0.6		0.4	0.3
Tamil Nadu		0.9	0.4		1.6	1.1		1.1	0.7
Uttar Pradesh		0.8	0.5		0.2	0.4		0.6	0.5
Uttarakhand		3.0	2.6		-3.2	-3.3		0.7	0.4
All India	-0.1	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.0	-0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3

Table A4.10: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by major state and social groups in the rural areas of the Non-Poor

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	-0.7	1.3	1.0	-2.1	0.4	-2.0	-1.1	1.0	0.0
Assam	1.8	1.4	1.3	2.9	2.9	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.7
Chhattisgarh	1.5	2.0	0.7	0.7	-2.0	1.4	1.3	0.6	0.9
Gujarat	1.0	0.4	1.1	-1.3	1.6	0.8	0.2	0.8	1.0
Jharkhand	0.1	1.2	0.5	1.4	1.8	2.3	0.5	1.4	1.1
Karnataka	-0.5	-0.4	0.4	-0.5	0.9	-1.3	-0.5	0.0	-0.2
Madhya P	-0.3	-0.3	-0.5	4.6	0.7	1.6	1.2	0.0	0.1
Maharashtra	0.6	0.5	0.5	-0.6	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.5
Odisha	0.5	0.5	1.0	-0.5	-0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.8
Rajasthan	-2.0	0.1	0.4	3.0	0.9	0.3	-0.7	0.4	0.4
Tripura	-1.5	-0.7	-0.9	4.0	4.5	3.9	0.0	0.8	0.5
West Bengal	-0.2	1.2	0.7	2.5	1.2	0.2	0.6	1.3	0.6
Bihar		0.0	0.3		2.9	1.6		0.9	0.7
Haryana		-0.4	1.9		4.1	1.0		1.0	1.7
Himachal P		0.9	2.1		7.8	7.2		3.3	4.3
Kerala		3.6	3.6		1.7	8.6		3.3	6.2
Punjab		-0.1	1.5		1.5	4.0		0.4	2.5
Tamil Nadu		0.1	0.9		2.2	-1.4		0.8	0.1
Uttar Pradesh		0.4	0.7		-0.9	-0.3		0.0	0.3
Uttarakhand		4.1	3.5		-3.3	3.9		1.3	4.1
All India	0.2	0.6	0.9	1.5	0.8	1.1	0.6	0.7	1.0

Table A4.11: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by major state and social groups in the urban areas of the Non-Poor

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	0.3	1.5	1.9	7.1	2.9	3.8	2.5	2.1	2.7
Assam	-0.4	1.7	2.9	-2.6	-1.1	-2.2	-1.1	0.8	1.1
Chhattisgarh	0.1	3.4	4.9	2.2	0.6	-4.5	0.7	2.6	1.2
Gujarat	2.3	2.0	2.1	7.6	0.7	3.9	4.6	1.6	3.0
Jharkhand	2.6	4.4	2.2	-2.0	-5.1	-2.0	1.0	0.7	0.7
Karnataka	0.0	1.3	1.8	3.7	3.4	1.8	1.2	2.1	1.9
Madhya P	1.4	-0.7	2.4	6.5	0.1	0.1	3.3	-0.5	1.7
Maharashtra	0.6	0.7	0.5	6.0	4.1	6.4	2.4	1.9	2.5
Odisha	0.4	1.5	1.1	2.7	0.3	5.6	1.1	1.1	2.8
Rajasthan	0.9	2.2	1.6	5.5	-3.8	3.1	2.5	0.1	2.2
Tripura	0.9	0.5	1.5	-1.6	3.1	-2.3	0.0	1.4	0.2
West Bengal	0.6	0.1	2.5	0.7	-2.5	-1.5	0.7	-0.7	1.2
Bihar		9.5	1.5		-9.8	-0.2		0.3	1.0
Haryana		0.1	2.4		0.3	1.8		0.1	2.3
Himachal P		0.5	-1.1		5.2	4.2		2.0	0.4
Kerala		0.2	2.9		4.1	9.0		1.5	5.7
Punjab		0.0	4.7		0.5	-0.7		0.1	2.8
Tamil Nadu		0.6	1.8		3.2	0.5		1.5	1.4
Uttar Pradesh		1.1	1.4		2.8	-1.3		1.8	0.5
Uttarakhand		7.0	2.5		-6.1	-2.4		1.4	0.8
All India	1.4	0.8	1.5	4.1	1.5	2.4	2.5	1.1	1.9

Table A4.12: Average Annual Rates of Increase of Real Monthly Per Capita Expenditure by major state and social groups of the Non-Poor

State	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	-0.6	1.8	1.3	1.8	1.8	1.5	0.1	1.9	1.4
Assam	1.6	1.6	1.3	2.5	2.2	1.2	2.0	1.9	1.3
Chhattisgarh	1.9	2.1	1.4	0.4	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.8	1.1
Gujarat	1.3	1.3	1.8	-0.8	1.2	3.4	0.6	1.3	2.5
Jharkhand	0.1	1.3	0.7	0.9	-0.4	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.6
Karnataka	-0.5	0.1	1.2	2.6	2.4	2.3	0.4	0.8	1.6
Madhya P	0.1	-0.9	0.5	4.2	1.2	2.1	1.4	-0.3	1.0
Maharashtra	0.9	1.3	0.4	0.8	1.5	5.0	0.9	1.4	1.9
Odisha	0.4	0.3	1.0	1.1	0.9	1.7	0.6	0.5	1.3
Rajasthan	-1.9	0.5	0.7	3.7	0.1	1.8	-0.4	0.4	1.1
Tripura	-1.0	-0.5	0.0	2.3	4.5	1.6	0.0	1.0	0.5
West Bengal	-0.3	1.1	1.5	2.7	0.0	-1.3	0.6	0.8	0.5
Bihar		0.4	0.4		1.6	1.2		0.8	0.7
Haryana		-0.4	2.0		3.3	1.3		0.7	1.9
Himachal P		0.8	1.5		7.5	6.5		3.1	3.4
Kerala		2.9	3.2		2.1	8.9		2.8	6.0
Punjab		0.0	2.8		1.2	1.9		0.4	2.7
Tamil Nadu		0.5	1.7		3.6	0.3		1.6	1.3
Uttar Pradesh		0.5	0.8		-0.5	-0.8		0.1	0.3
Uttarakhand		4.5	3.3		-3.6	1.6		1.4	3.0
All India	0.4	0.8	1.1	2.2	1.0	1.9	1.0	0.9	1.4

Table A5.1: Average monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state, religious and economic groups in the rural areas

State	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Poor									
Andhra P	216.5	203.5	190.7	212.8	227.9	234.2	216.5	206.8	217.0
Assam	304.3	288.0		306.9	303.5		319.1	313.9	
Bihar	250.2	247.6		268.3	274.5		267.3	274.0	
Gujarat	258.6	281.7		261.7	291.1		275.3	286.8	
Jharkhand	246.0	253.1	242.1	270.8	281.5	258.2	274.4	266.2	263.2
Karnataka	243.8	260.7		266.2	272.5		255.6	264.7	
Kerala	299.1	274.2	297.2	292.2	303.9	299.4	319.7	249.9	350.0
Madhya P	232.7	238.3		243.0	261.0		240.3	273.6	
Maharashtra	241.4	230.7	238.6	251.4	253.8	243.0	269.3	258.9	260.6
Rajasthan	276.3	277.2		288.2	305.3		298.4	309.9	
Tamil Nadu	239.0	251.3	241.1	257.3	260.6	245.4	258.1	242.1	261.3
UP	252.7	260.3		273.2	271.0		277.2	286.2	
West Bengal	281.5	274.6		286.6	282.4		302.2	284.5	
Non Poor									
Andhra P	510.4	547.6	522.0	561.7	581.6	528.0	519.2	451.9	630.8
Assam	499.8	486.9		588.2	535.2		697.1	529.5	
Bihar	467.7	478.8		484.6	469.5		521.6	531.7	
Gujarat	540.5	519.5		603.2	585.5		609.4	613.7	
Jharkhand	485.2	443.7	586.4	516.2	501.7	477.6	548.2	555.6	595.0
Karnataka	522.6	613.3		526.1	554.7		509.6	513.2	
Kerala	692.9	653.3	788.6	923.7	943.7	1133.9	1342.2	1039.7	1873.2
Madhya P	544.8	526.3		512.5	557.1		563.2	520.5	
Maharashtra	573.7	590.3	512.7	612.0	525.9	541.6	614.4	611.8	540.1
Rajasthan	601.5	533.3		593.5	600.7		610.5	761.6	
Tamil Nadu	569.3	546.7	533.0	603.6	677.8	640.5	600.0	598.6	608.1
UP	565.0	549.5		597.8	604.6		596.9	508.7	
West Bengal	552.3	570.7		618.5	571.7		629.8	611.1	

Table A5.2: Average monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state, religious and economic groups in the urban areas

	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
State	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Poor									
Andhra P	347.0	350.3	377.7	363.6	354.6	327.2	372.9	370.5	383.6
Assam	306.5	299.3		298.5	305.6		279.7	279.2	
Bihar	288.8	287.8		303.1	297.6		280.8	271.9	
Gujarat	370.4	370.8		391.2	386.1		404.9	406.6	
Jharkhand	304.9	305.7		313.7	310.3		290.4	277.9	
Karnataka	367.9	358.3		372.4	375.6		388.4	427.3	
Kerala	370.8	361.7	367.8	370.8	359.2	387.7	398.0	386.1	403.5
Madhya P	344.4	350.5		343.0	352.1		356.7	343.6	
Maharashtra	390.2	371.8	360.2	395.3	371.8	370.9	421.7	430.2	400.1
Rajasthan	360.8	359.9		363.0	359.2		375.8	371.5	
Tamil Nadu	352.7	361.0	344.6	376.4	371.8	378.1	394.1	377.1	353.0
UP	312.3	315.1		324.1	312.0		312.1	301.3	
West Bengal	331.6	319.9		339.4	322.1		322.4	304.4	
Non Poor									
Andhra P	886.7	782.3	1039.8	1075.4	801.9	1081.9	1246.3	1224.2	1177.9
Assam	790.3	656.4		982.9	984.1		856.8	926.6	
Bihar	661.7	569.1		813.6	593.8		758.2	585.1	
Gujarat	871.4	732.8		1072.4	865.7		1299.5	1038.2	
Jharkhand	785.8	674.0		1008.7	831.9		874.2	742.2	
Karnataka	950.6	866.9		1152.3	937.1		1243.7	1040.6	
Kerala	957.5	1019.3	1071.7	1364.6	1042.4	1297.9	2054.2	1342.9	1911.2
Madhya P	892.7	703.7		1039.4	923.2		1136.2	811.3	
Maharashtra	1147.2	986.1	1189.7	1169.7	1126.0	1406.8	1564.7	1267.1	1903.0
Rajasthan	870.7	705.1		1055.9	700.2		1195.0	746.1	
Tamil Nadu	940.2	850.5	992.4	1097.0	966.7	1303.4	1150.4	994.1	1255.1
UP	842.1	634.6		976.7	752.5		949.1	691.0	
West Bengal	948.3	652.0		1161.8	819.6		1073.4	737.2	

Table A5.3: Average monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state, religious and economic groups

	1993-94			2004-05			2009-10		
State	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Poor									
Andhra P	271.8	323.0	235.7	278.6	323.7	267.4	251.4	312.2	265.0
Assam	304.3	288.2		306.6	303.5		316.2	311.5	
Bihar	252.3	253.2		270.8	277.2		268.8	273.6	
Gujarat	294.5	355.4		290.5	357.0		306.0	390.6	
Jharkhand	251.7	257.4	246.0	274.6	283.3	259.1	277.7	269.9	263.8
Karnataka	279.0	323.6		302.3	345.9		290.3	362.0	
Kerala	317.6	290.0	314.7	317.3	322.1	323.5	372.0	336.8	394.4
Madhya P	262.8	322.4		264.2	328.4		261.5	328.2	
Maharashtra	287.0	327.2	280.0	300.8	352.7	295.9	321.9	397.7	311.3
Rajasthan	295.0	321.2		310.2	344.9		320.3	345.6	
Tamil Nadu	281.2	337.6	277.8	299.9	356.0	302.1	320.3	342.1	321.6
UP	259.9	281.1		279.8	286.2		283.6	294.1	
West Bengal	289.3	280.0		294.7	286.6		310.4	288.1	
Non Poor									
Andhra P	582.0	639.0	634.9	667.7	659.1	683.8	706.1	827.1	803.2
Assam	553.4	499.6		639.6	566.1		719.5	544.9	
Bihar	488.7	500.3		517.2	484.3		543.4	535.8	
Gujarat	634.8	631.8		765.1	707.6		863.6	830.5	
Jharkhand	583.9	501.5	657.2	641.8	527.4	544.0	612.5	599.6	668.4
Karnataka	621.8	718.1		680.1	733.1		757.2	782.3	
Kerala	761.1	734.1	857.0	1023.9	963.9	1169.8	1519.1	1102.9	1883.3
Madhya P	617.8	603.0		612.9	736.9		698.9	670.3	
Maharashtra	773.4	839.2	872.6	814.7	889.0	1009.1	975.3	1033.3	1357.5
Rajasthan	657.9	584.3		673.6	640.5		725.0	752.7	
Tamil Nadu	682.6	726.2	723.5	782.2	882.5	969.6	836.2	863.4	881.7
UP	617.4	578.8		663.6	653.9		655.2	551.4	
West Bengal	677.4	582.8		792.9	608.0		751.4	622.5	

Table A5.4: Average annual rate of increase of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state, religious and economic groups in the rural areas

	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
State	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Poor									
Andhra P	-0.2	1.1	2.1	0.3	-1.9	-1.5	0.0	0.1	0.9
Assam	0.1	0.5		0.8	0.7		0.3	0.6	
Bihar	0.7	1.0		-0.1	0.0		0.4	0.7	
Gujarat	0.1	0.3		1.0	-0.3		0.4	0.1	
Jharkhand	0.9	1.0	0.6	0.3	-1.1	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.5
Karnataka	0.8	0.4		-0.8	-0.6		0.3	0.1	
Kerala	-0.2	1.0	0.1	1.9	-3.6	3.4	0.4	-0.6	1.1
Madhya P	0.4	0.9		-0.2	1.0		0.2	0.9	
Maharashtra	0.4	0.9	0.2	1.4	0.4	1.4	0.7	0.8	0.6
Rajasthan	0.4	0.9		0.7	0.3		0.5	0.7	
Tamil Nadu	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.1	-1.4	1.3	0.5	-0.2	0.5
UP	0.7	0.4		0.3	1.1		0.6	0.6	
West Bengal	0.2	0.3		1.1	0.1		0.5	0.2	
Non Poor									
Andhra P	0.9	0.6	0.1	-1.5	-4.5	3.9	0.1	-1.1	1.3
Assam	1.6	0.9		3.7	-0.2		2.5	0.5	
Bihar	0.3	-0.2		1.5	2.6		0.7	0.7	
Gujarat	1.1	1.2		0.2	1.0		0.8	1.1	
Jharkhand	0.6	1.2	-1.7	1.2	2.1	4.9	0.8	1.6	0.1
Karnataka	0.1	-0.9		-0.6	-1.5		-0.2	-1.0	
Kerala	3.0	4.0	4.0	9.1	2.0	13.0	5.9	3.7	8.6
Madhya P	-0.5	0.5		2.0	-1.3		0.2	-0.1	
Maharashtra	0.6	-1.0	0.5	0.1	3.3	-0.1	0.4	0.2	0.3
Rajasthan	-0.1	1.1		0.6	5.4		0.1	2.7	
Tamil Nadu	0.5	2.2	1.8	-0.1	-2.3	-1.0	0.3	0.6	0.9
UP	0.5	0.9		0.0	-3.2		0.4	-0.5	
West Bengal	1.1	0.0		0.4	1.4		0.9	0.4	

Table A5.5: Average annual rate of increase of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state, religious and economic groups in the urban areas

	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
State	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Poor									
Andhra P	0.4	0.1	-1.2	0.5	0.9	3.4	0.5	0.4	0.1
Assam	-0.2	0.2		-1.3	-1.7		-0.5	-0.4	
Bihar	0.5	0.3		-1.5	-1.7		-0.2	-0.3	
Gujarat	0.5	0.4		0.7	1.1		0.6	0.6	
Jharkhand	0.3	0.1		-1.5	-2.1		-0.3	-0.6	
Karnataka	0.1	0.4		0.9	2.8		0.3	1.2	
Kerala	0.0	-0.1	0.5	1.5	1.5	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.6
Madhya P	0.0	0.0		0.8	-0.5		0.2	-0.1	
Maharashtra	0.1	0.0	0.3	1.3	3.1	1.6	0.5	1.0	0.7
Rajasthan	0.1	0.0		0.7	0.7		0.3	0.2	
Tamil Nadu	0.6	0.3	0.9	0.9	0.3	-1.3	0.7	0.3	0.2
UP	0.3	-0.1		-0.7	-0.7		0.0	-0.3	
West Bengal	0.2	0.1		-1.0	-1.1		-0.2	-0.3	
Non Poor									
Andhra P	1.9	0.2	0.4	3.2	10.5	1.8	2.5	3.5	0.8
Assam	2.2	4.5		-2.6	-1.2		0.5	2.6	
Bihar	2.1	0.4		-1.4	-0.3		0.9	0.2	
Gujarat	2.1	1.6		4.2	4.0		3.1	2.6	
Jharkhand	2.6	2.1		-2.7	-2.2		0.7	0.6	
Karnataka	1.9	0.7		1.6	2.2		1.9	1.3	
Kerala	3.9	0.2	1.9	10.1	5.8	9.5	7.2	2.0	4.9
Madhya P	1.5	2.8		1.9	-2.4		1.7	1.0	
Maharashtra	0.2	1.3	1.7	6.8	2.5	7.1	2.3	1.8	3.7
Rajasthan	1.9	-0.1		2.6	1.3		2.3	0.4	
Tamil Nadu	1.5	1.2	2.8	1.0	0.6	-0.7	1.4	1.1	1.7
UP	1.5	1.7		-0.6	-1.6		0.8	0.6	
West Bengal	2.0	2.3		-1.5	-2.0		0.8	0.8	

Table A5.6: Average annual rate of increase of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state, religious and economic groups

	1993/94 - 2004-05			2004/05 - 2009/10			1993/94 - 2009-10		
State	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Poor									
Andhra P	0.2	0.0	1.2	-2.0	-0.7	-0.2	-0.5	-0.2	0.8
Assam	0.1	0.5		0.6	0.5		0.2	0.5	
Bihar	0.7	0.9		-0.1	-0.3		0.4	0.5	
Gujarat	-0.1	0.0		1.1	1.9		0.2	0.6	
Jharkhand	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.2	-0.9	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.5
Karnataka	0.8	0.6		-0.8	0.9		0.3	0.7	
Kerala	0.0	1.0	0.3	3.4	0.9	4.4	1.1	1.0	1.6
Madhya P	0.0	0.2		-0.2	0.0		0.0	0.1	
Maharashtra	0.4	0.7	0.5	1.4	2.6	1.0	0.8	1.3	0.7
Rajasthan	0.5	0.7		0.7	0.0		0.5	0.5	
Tamil Nadu	0.6	0.5	0.8	1.4	-0.8	1.3	0.9	0.1	1.0
UP	0.7	0.2		0.3	0.6		0.6	0.3	
West Bengal	0.2	0.2		1.1	0.1		0.5	0.2	
Non Poor									
Andhra P	1.3	0.3	0.7	1.2	5.1	3.5	1.3	1.8	1.7
Assam	1.4	1.2		2.5	-0.7		1.9	0.6	
Bihar	0.5	-0.3		1.0	2.1		0.7	0.4	
Gujarat	1.9	1.1		2.6	3.5		2.3	2.0	
Jharkhand	0.9	0.5	-1.6	-0.9	2.7	4.6	0.3	1.2	0.1
Karnataka	0.9	0.2		2.3	1.3		1.4	0.6	
Kerala	3.1	2.8	3.3	9.7	2.9	12.2	6.2	3.1	7.5
Madhya P	-0.1	2.0		2.8	-1.8		0.8	0.7	
Maharashtra	0.5	0.5	1.4	3.9	3.2	6.9	1.6	1.4	3.5
Rajasthan	0.2	0.9		1.5	3.5		0.6	1.8	
Tamil Nadu	1.3	2.0	3.1	1.4	-0.4	-1.8	1.4	1.2	1.4
UP	0.7	1.2		-0.3	-3.1		0.4	-0.3	
West Bengal	1.6	0.4		-1.0	0.5		0.7	0.4	

**Table A6.1: Gini coefficients of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices
by major state and social groups in 1993-94**

State	Rural			Urban			Total		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	0.30	0.24	0.29	0.34	0.29	0.32	0.31	0.26	0.31
Assam	0.14	0.16	0.19	0.26	0.27	0.29	0.16	0.18	0.23
Chhattisgarh	0.18	0.23	0.23	0.37	0.24	0.30	0.21	0.23	0.28
Gujarat	0.21	0.23	0.24	0.26	0.27	0.29	0.22	0.26	0.26
Jharkhand	0.23	0.21	0.23	0.24	0.27	0.33	0.24	0.25	0.31
Karnataka	0.23	0.25	0.27	0.32	0.25	0.31	0.25	0.26	0.31
Madhya P	0.26	0.24	0.30	0.26	0.36	0.33	0.27	0.29	0.32
Maharashtra	0.27	0.27	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.35	0.29	0.32	0.38
Odisha	0.22	0.22	0.24	0.31	0.27	0.30	0.24	0.24	0.28
Rajasthan	0.33	0.26	0.24	0.22	0.27	0.29	0.33	0.26	0.27
Tripura	0.27	0.22	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.28	0.28	0.22	0.26
West Bengal	0.21	0.21	0.27	0.26	0.33	0.34	0.23	0.24	0.33
Bihar	NA	0.21	0.22	NA	0.23	0.28	NA	0.21	0.24
Haryana	NA	0.28	0.30	NA	0.23	0.29	NA	0.28	0.30
Himachal P	NA	0.25	0.29	NA	0.28	0.48	NA	0.26	0.34
Kerala	NA	0.20	0.30	NA	0.23	0.35	NA	0.22	0.33
Punjab	NA	0.27	0.26	NA	0.29	0.27	NA	0.28	0.27
Tamil Nadu	NA	0.25	0.32	NA	0.31	0.35	NA	0.28	0.35
Uttar Pradesh	NA	0.26	0.28	NA	0.26	0.33	NA	0.27	0.30
Uttarakhand	NA	0.20	0.25	NA	0.22	0.27	NA	0.21	0.28
All India	0. 28	0. 26	0. 30	0.34	0.34	0.36	0. 30	0. 30	0. 35

Source: Special tabulation by the authors using unit record data from the 50th round of NSS CES.

Table A6.2: Gini coefficients of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and social groups in 2009-10

State	Rural			Urban			Total		
	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS	ST	SC	OTHERS
Andhra P	0.25	0.27	0.29	0.40	0.33	0.40	0.35	0.33	0.40
Assam	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.26	0.29	0.33	0.22	0.25	0.28
Chhattisgarh	0.26	0.26	0.29	0.36	0.31	0.34	0.29	0.32	0.35
Gujarat	0.21	0.21	0.27	0.42	0.32	0.33	0.27	0.27	0.36
Jharkhand	0.24	0.22	0.25	0.30	0.32	0.36	0.25	0.24	0.30
Karnataka	0.17	0.23	0.25	0.29	0.28	0.34	0.26	0.29	0.38
Madhya P	0.30	0.22	0.31	0.40	0.31	0.37	0.32	0.26	0.37
Maharashtra	0.24	0.23	0.28	0.35	0.35	0.43	0.31	0.34	0.44
Odisha	0.25	0.23	0.25	0.33	0.32	0.41	0.29	0.26	0.33
Rajasthan	0.21	0.24	0.22	0.30	0.25	0.41	0.24	0.25	0.31
Tripura	0.18	0.20	0.22	0.27	0.30	0.30	0.20	0.22	0.25
West Bengal	0.20	0.22	0.26	0.38	0.30	0.39	0.23	0.23	0.33
Bihar	NA	0.24	0.22	NA	0.27	0.35	NA	0.24	0.24
Haryana	NA	0.28	0.30	NA	0.26	0.35	NA	0.28	0.32
Himachal P	NA	0.30	0.31	NA	0.43	0.40	NA	0.31	0.32
Kerala	NA	0.26	0.45	NA	0.28	0.53	NA	0.26	0.47
Punjab	NA	0.22	0.29	NA	0.29	0.38	NA	0.24	0.33
Tamil Nadu	NA	0.25	0.26	NA	0.31	0.34	NA	0.30	0.35
Uttar Pradesh	NA	0.23	0.28	NA	0.35	0.36	NA	0.25	0.30
Uttarakhand	NA	0.18	0.40	NA	0.29	0.34	NA	0.21	0.39
All India	0.28	0.26	0.32	0.39	0.33	0.40	0.32	0.29	0.38

Source: Special tabulation by the authors using unit record data from the 66th round of NSS CES.

Table A6.3: Gini coefficients of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and religious groups in 1993-94

State	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	0.29	0.32	0.36	0.32	0.29	0.35	0.31	0.31	0.39
Assam	0.18	0.18	NA	0.29	0.29	NA	0.22	0.19	NA
Bihar	0.22	0.23	NA	0.28	0.25	NA	0.24	0.24	NA
Gujarat	0.24	0.20	NA	0.29	0.25	NA	0.28	0.24	NA
Jharkhand	0.23	0.19	0.30	0.33	0.28	0.35	0.30	0.23	0.34
Karnataka	0.26	0.31	NA	0.31	0.31	NA	0.31	0.32	NA
Kerala	0.29	0.29	0.32	0.33	0.38	0.36	0.31	0.33	0.33
Madhya P	0.30	0.26	NA	0.34	0.24	NA	0.33	0.25	NA
Maharashtra	0.31	0.33	0.27	0.35	0.34	0.36	0.38	0.36	0.40
Rajasthan	0.27	0.22	NA	0.29	0.24	NA	0.29	0.23	NA
Tamil Nadu	0.31	0.27	0.30	0.35	0.30	0.36	0.35	0.30	0.37
UP	0.28	0.27	0.26	0.33	0.25	0.46	0.31	0.26	0.38
West Bengal	0.24	0.28	NA	0.34	0.26	NA	0.31	0.28	NA
All India	0.29	0.29	0.33	0.36	0.32	0.39	0.35	0.32	0.38

Source: Special tabulation by the authors using unit record data from the 50th round of NSS CES.

Table 6.4: Gini coefficients of mean monthly per capita expenditure at 1999-2000 prices by major state and religious groups in 2009-10

State	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs	Hindus	Muslims	ORMs
Andhra P	0.29	0.23	0.35	0.38	0.46	0.31	0.39	0.44	0.38
Assam	0.27	0.18	NA	0.31	0.40	NA	0.28	0.20	NA
Bihar	0.23	0.22	NA	0.35	0.27	NA	0.25	0.23	NA
Gujarat	0.26	0.27	NA	0.33	0.37	NA	0.36	0.35	NA
Jharkhand	0.24	0.24	0.28	0.36	0.32	0.31	0.28	0.27	0.32
Karnataka	0.24	0.24	NA	0.34	0.30	NA	0.37	0.33	NA
Kerala	0.44	0.30	0.53	0.58	0.41	0.45	0.49	0.33	0.51
Madhya P	0.30	0.22	NA	0.38	0.28	NA	0.37	0.28	NA
Maharashtra	0.28	0.26	0.24	0.41	0.39	0.50	0.42	0.38	0.53
Rajasthan	0.22	0.32	NA	0.41	0.24	NA	0.30	0.28	NA
Tamil Nadu	0.27	0.24	0.26	0.34	0.28	0.37	0.35	0.30	0.37
UP	0.28	0.21	0.30	0.37	0.30	0.34	0.31	0.24	0.35
West Bengal	0.23	0.26	NA	0.39	0.30	NA	0.31	0.27	NA
All India	0.30	0.28	0.40	0.40	0.38	0.41	0.37	0.33	0.42

Source: Special tabulation by the authors using unit record data from the 66th round of NSS CES.



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

United Nations Development Programme
55 Lodhi Estate, Post Box No. 3059
New Delhi 110003, India
Tel: +91 11 46532333 Fax: +91 11 24627612
Email: info.in@undp.org
For more information:
www.in.undp.org