

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN KARNATAKA - AN INTER-DISTRICT ANALYSIS

Dr. B.S.Venkatesh

Associate Professor

Department of Economics

Maharani Women's Arts, Commerce and Management College

Bangalore 560001.

In the 1960s economic growth was declared as the principal objective of the government, and per capita income was considered as a measuring rod of human wellbeing. However, experience in many countries has proved that economic growth is not a proper indicator. The existence of mass poverty has made per capita income, an unsatisfactory measure for economic growth. So, there occurred some changes in the definition of development in the 1970s and 1980s. Many new welfare and development measures were tried out such as – the level of living index, the state of welfare index, the quality of life index and physical quality of life index.

The Human Development Index of the UNDP First advanced in 1990. The report has explained that development is not just growth in income, wealth or consumption but it is also an expansion of Human Capabilities. Human Development Index thus, should include “Enlarging people’s choices”. There are 3 basic Human Concerns :

1. Long and healthy life
2. Access to knowledge and
3. Skills and control over resources to make sure a decent standard of living.

In 1990 the first human development report was prepared. It developed the basic ideas of how to measure human development. It explained the relationship between Economic Growth and Human Development. Human Development Report revealed that there is no automatic relationship between Economic Growth and Human Welfare. Several countries which have the highest GDP growth have also failed to raise the basic well-being of their people. Human Development Report argues that the decrease in the poverty level will increase Human well-being. Human Development Report brought out new ideas related to welfare, empowerment, gender equity, and impoverishment and so on.

The 1991 Human Development Report focused on the perspective of resource use and political dedication. The 1992 Report highlights on development through trade and

commercial activities. The 1993 Report focused on people's participation in shaping their own lives.

The 1994 Report argued in favour of the North-South co-operation and advised North to spend money to South to have an overall Human Development. The 1994 Report introduced the new concepts of universal primary education, health care centres, clean and safe drinking water, sanitary facilities, best nutrition levels and credit for self-employment.

The 1995 Report speaks about the empowerment of women at the world level. The gender disparities have been labelled as developmental problems and Human Rights were given due consideration. For the first time, it prepared a Gender-Related Development Index (GDI) measuring the development between Women and Men within overall HDI. Gender Empowerment measures expanded its idea for Women who have problems in their life for their future well-being.

The 1996 Report focused on the people who were suffering from a lack of basic requirements. It focused on three additional problems like unsafe births, Underweight children below the age of 5 years and Female literacy.

The 1997 Report focused on poverty eradication and suggested the State to promote pro-poor markets. It has introduced the Human Poverty Index. HPI talks about Health Poverty, malnourishment among children below the age of 5 years and Adult literacy. The 1998 Report speaks about the effects of globalisation on consumption patterns.

Thus, by the end of the 1990s, HDI has become more comprehensive and its scope has been greatly enlarged. Now it measures the achievements of nations based on Human Capabilities. It not only focuses on income but also on education and health. It highlights the problems in fulfilling these 3 essentials to the people.

Another aspect included under HDI is Gender Development Index. GDI measures the overall achievements of men and women in 3 different dimensions of HDI. They are life expectancy, educational attainment and adjusted real income,

As far as India is concerned, there is no official HDI prepared at the national level. There are some individual studies and reports at regional levels. They are summarised in the following table.

HDI AND GDI FOR MAJOR STATES

TABLE - 01

STATE	HDI				GDI			
	As per A.K SHIVKUMAR (1991-1992)		As per 1997 HDR of South Asia		As per 1997 UNFPA (1992-1993)		As per A.K SHIVKUMAR (1991-1992)	
	VALUE	RANKING	VALUE	RANKING	VALUE	RANKING	VALUE	RANKING
Andhra Pradesh	0.400	09	0.393	09	0.413	09	0.371	08
Assam	03.79	10	0.374	10	0.395	10	0.347	10
Bihar	0.354	13	0.350	12	0.340	15	0.306	14
Gujarat	0.467	05	0.458	05	0.478	06	0.437	03
Haryana	0.489	04	0.476	04	0.506	05	0.370	09
Karnataka	0.448	07	0.442	07	0.468	07	0.417	05
Kerala	0.603	01	0.597	01	0.628	01	0.565	01
Madhya Pradesh	0.349	14	0.341	15	0.367	13	0.312	12
Orissa	0.373	11	0.368	11	0.372	11	0.329	11
Punjab	0.529	02	0.516	02	0.549	03	0.424	04
Rajasthan	0.356	12	0.354	13	0.371	12	0.309	13
Tamil Nadu	0.438	08	0.432	08	0.511	04	0.402	06
Uttar Pradesh	0.348	15	0.343	14	0.355	14	0.293	15
West Bengal	0.459	06	0.452	06	0.454	08	0.399	7
INDIA	0.423	-	0.436	-	0.428	-	0.388	-

Source:- Human Development in Karnataka – 1999 From chapter-2 Page number-12

The first state in India to bring out HDR was Madhya Pradesh in 1995. In 1997 Karnataka government has set-up an internal group to form a similar document. This has been prepared with two objectives, first to determine the position of the state at the national level and second, to measure different levels of development within the state. With the help of this document and by various human development reports, it has been attempted to analyse human development position with the following issues.

There is a basic shift in thinking from growth-oriented development to human-oriented development in the last half a century or so. Development with a human face and inclusive growth are the discussion points at present. This paper is an attempt to understand the human development process at the state level.

The first and starting point of this paper is an attempt to make an overall glance of various attempts to evolve a proper idea about human development and changes involved in the process.

Secondly, one should arrive at different indicators of human development to trace trends and to make comparisons.

Thirdly, one should understand different dimensions of human development to arrive at a proper perspective.

The final issue relates to different efforts by the authorities to improve human development conditions and achievements.

OBJECTIVES

Based on the above issues, the following list of objectives has been prepared.

1. To survey different attempts to evolve a systematic study of human development.
2. To study different indicators of Human development in Karnataka to bring out their trends and to compare at the district level.
3. To examine different dimensions of human development in Karnataka.

METHODOLOGY

This is a study of the Human development issues at the state level and as such secondary data has been relied upon extensively. For this how indicators of HD have been evolved is presented. Further, gender aspects have also been included. All these issues at the international, national, and state level are depicted with relevant tables.

Three main components of HDI viz, health, education and income have been studied and indices prepared, percentages and ratios have been used to give an idea about trends and comparisons. The multi-dimensional natures of human development covering poverty and gender issues at the district level have been examined. They are presented with relevant indices and tables.

SCOPE

This study covers the entire Karnataka state. It examines the said issues since 1999. It is a district-level comparative analysis.

Karnataka has a comparatively satisfactory level of Human Development in all three sets of indices at the all India level. Karnataka is in the 7th position in all studies. Karnataka has moved by two ranks in GDI. According to SHIV KUMAR'S study of HDI, Kerala has an

index value of 0.603, Uttar Pradesh 0.348 and Karnataka has 0.448. According to Mehaboob Ul Hak's study, Kerala has the best position of 0.597 and the worst performance 0.341 is in Madhya Pradesh with Karnataka at 0.442. According to United Nations Population Fund, the indices in Kerala is 0.623 and 0.340 in Bihar and in Karnataka, which is 0.468. The GDI level is 0.565 in Kerala, 0.293 in Uttar Pradesh and 0.417 in Karnataka. The gender disparities are less in Karnataka when compared to other states like West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu.

The HDI of India is 0.439 and the international rank is 134 among 174 countries. The HDI of Karnataka is better than India with 0.470 and the rank is 131. The GDI of the state is 0.450 and the GDI of India is 0.401. It ranks 93 whereas India is at 99th place. Within the state, the districts have achieved different levels of Human Development. They are ranked according to their HDI performance on the basis of UNDP methods. The real per capita income, Education-school enrolment and adult literacy, Life expectancy at birth were put together with equal value. Similarly, GDI is also added along with HDI to measure regional development.

TABLE- 02

HDI RANKING OF TOP 5 AND BOTTOM 5 DISTRICTS OF KARNATAKA AT GLOBAL LEVEL		
DISTRICT	HDI RANKING	
	WITHIN STATE	GLOBAL LEVEL
Kodagu	1 (0.630)	104
Bangalore Urban	2(0.601)	110
Dakshina Kannada	3(0.592)	111
Uttara Kannada	4(0.533)	123
Chikmagalur	5(0.524)	124
Mysore	16(0.440)	133
Bellary	17(0.429)	135
Bidar	18(0.419)	138
Gulbarga	19(0.412)	139
Raichur	20(0.399)	142
STATE	(0.470)	131
INDIA	(0.439)	134

SOURCE:- Human Development in Karnataka-1999

From chapter 2 Page Number 13

The ranking of different districts indicates that the value is as high as 0.630 in Kodagu and as low as 0.399 in Raichur. This brings out a huge gap between the levels of development across regions. Three districts i.e., Dakshina Kannada, Kodagu, Bangalore Urban have changed their rankings and moved up in their levels of development. Uttara Kannada, Chikmagalur and Shimoga districts have also recorded good progress. Thus districts of the Coastal and Malnad Karnataka have done well in quality of life. The districts of Hyderabad Karnataka are slightly better than Mysore, Mandya and Kolar. The performance of some districts in social development is better than those districts of other states. Kodagu, Dakshina-Kannada and Mysore are rated higher even by international standards, of course, the opposite picture is witnessed in Raichur which figures quite low.

TABLE - 03

DISTRICTS OF KARNATAKA HAVING FEMALE AND MALE LITERACY RATES BELOW THOSE OF SUB – SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES		
	LITERACY RATE	
	FEMALE	MALE
SUB – SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES	40	63
DISTRICTS		
Raichur	22	50
Gulbarga	24	52
Bidar	31	59
Bellary	32	59
Mandya	37	59
Mysore	38	56
Kolar	38	63
Bangalore Rural	38	62

SOURCE:-Human Development in Karnataka – 1999

From Chapter 2 Page Number 14

Kodagu is said to be the highest in HDI level when compared to other districts. it has an 0.630 but when the two variables like Education and Health are added to it, its HDI rank is below Dakshina-Kannada it has 0.769 but Kodagu has 0.727 thus it is clear that Dakshina – Kannada is far better than Kodagu in Health and Education field. Dakshina-Kannada's HDI rank is 3 and its rank on income scale is 4. Income and Social indicators of some districts do not have a vast difference in ranking. Every district is different from the others in income, health and education. This is seen across the districts like Belgaum, Bijapur, Bangalore

Urban, Chikmagalur, Chitradurga, Mandya, Raichur, Shimoga and Uttara Kannada. The districts like Bellary, Mysore, and Gulbarga have a very high rank in income when compared to the health and Education fields. The districts like Dharwad, Hassan, Kolar and Tumkur have a higher rank in Education when compared to Health and Income. Based on these data one should focus on each district's HDI level.

As far as the development disparities based on gender are concerned, the following picture emerges. In 1991 the GDI's for Karnataka districts were calculated. The GDI value of Kodagu is 0.615 and that of Raichur is 0.376. The GDI ranks follow the HDI rank which is not a common procedure at the international level. The top highest districts are Kodagu, Bengaluru Urban and Dakshina-Kannada. The districts which follow these are Uttara Kannada, Chikmagalur, Shimoga. The lowest level districts are from Hyderabad Karnataka, they are Bellary, Bidar, Gulbarga and Raichur. When compared to Bombay Karnataka districts Mysore, Mandya and Kolar are behind them.

TABLE - 04

GDI RANKING OF TOP 5 AND BOTTOM 5 DISTRICTS OF KARNATAKA AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL		
DISTRICT	GDI RANKING WITHIN STATE	GLOBAL LEVEL
Kodagu	1(0.615)	65
Dakshina – Kannada	2(0.588)	69
Bangalore Urban	3(0.546)	73
Uttara Kannada	4(0.511)	82
Chikmagalur	5(0.505)	84
Mysore	16(0.414)	95
Bellary	17(0.409)	96
Bidar	18(0.403)	97
Gulbarga	19(0.388)	99
Raichur	20(0.376)	101
STATE	0.451	93
INDIA	0.401	99

SOURCE:- Human Development in Karnataka – 1999

From Chapter 2 Page Number 15

We can see from table 4 the Gender Disparity in development across different districts. Kodagu's GDI is the highest. It is at 65th rank globally, whereas Karnataka, stands at 93rd rank and India at 99th place. However, Raichur district is at the bottom -101 rank.

TABLE – 05

COMPARATIVE RANK OF HDI AND GDI FOR DISTRICTS OF KARNATAKA 1991					
DISTRICT	HDI 1991	GDI 1991	HDI RANK	GDI RANK	HDI RANK MINUS GDI RANK
Kodagu	0.630	0.615	1		0
Bangalore Urban	0.601	0.546	2		-1
Dakshina Kannada	0.592	0.588	3		+1
Uttara Kannada	0.533	0.511	4		0
Chikmagalur	0.524	0.505	5		0
Shimoga	0.483	0.468	6		0
Hassan	0.473	0.460	7		0
Bangalore Rural	0.472	0.454	8		0
Belgaum	0.471	0.447	9		-1
Chitradurga	0.466	0.448	10		+1
Dharawad	0.459	0.442	11		0
Tumkur	0.447	0.435	12		0
Mandya	0.444	0.423	13		-1
Bijapur	0.443	0.420	14		-1
Kolar	0.443	0.426	15		+2
Mysore	0.440	0.414	16		0
Bellary	0.429	0.409	17		0
Bidar	0.419	0.403	18		0
Gulbarga	0.412	0.388	19		0
Raichur	0.399	0.376	20		0
STATE	0.470	0.451			

SOURCE:- Human Development in Karnataka – 1999 From Chapter 2 Page Number 15

In 1991 HDI was calculated for 10 districts of Karnataka. They are Bangalore Urban and Rural, Belgaum, Chikmagalur, Chitradurga, Dakshina Kannada, Hassan, Kodagu, Shimoga and Uttara Kannada. Excluding Chitradurga, all the districts have scored higher HDI values, above the state average. If we compare districts with both HDI and GDI values, there is no difference in the ranks of 15 districts. Belgaum, Bijapur, and Kolar districts moved up slightly and Chitradurga and Mandya districts have moved down.

Conclusion

Human Development and Gender-related Development should be studied carefully. The representative indicators which are used to find human well being have not covered all the aspects of Human Development. The same is with GDI. Some of the dimensions of Gender Inequality like community life and decision making, consumption of resources within family, dignity and personal security are important but not considered. Hence, both approaches should be studied with a broader perspective to get a general picture.

References:

1. United Nations Development Programme 1999, Human Development Report 1999, Report Number.9, Oxford University Press Inc, U.S.A,
2. Anand, Sudhir & Amartya Sen (1993): "Human Development Index: Methodology & Measurement", UNDP Occasional Papers No. 8, New York.
3. Anand, Sudhir & Amartya Sen (1994): "Human Development in Poor Countries: on the role of private incomes and Public Services", Journal of Economic Perspectives, 7 (1), pp 133-50.
4. Bharadwaj and Bharadwaj (1998): "Gender Related Development Index for major states of India: An Economic Analysis", The Indian Journal of Economics, Vol. 312 (59), pp. 9-19.
5. Chaubey P.K., (2002): "The Human Development Index: A contribution to its Construction", The Indian Journal of Economics, Vol.83, No 328, pp 95-100.
6. Desai M. J. (1991): "Human Development: Concepts & Measurement", European Economic Review, Vol. 35, pp. 350-357.
7. Haq, Mahbub ul (1996): "Human Development Paradigm for South Asia, "Institute of Social Sciences, New Delhi.
8. Government of Karnataka (2002): "High Power Committee on Regional Imbalances Redressel", Planning Commission, Bangalore.
9. Government of Karnataka, Planning Commission (1999): "Human Development in Karnataka", UBS Publishers Distributors Limited, Bangalore.

