

## **India's Basic Social Development in Global Perspectives (With Special Reference to Haryana)**

**Dr. Sarita Rana\***

“Nothing is more expensive than a missed opportunity,” says H. Jackson Brown Jr.

In the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it is important to evaluate opportunities and challenges for India along with special reference to Haryana. In order to initiate the process of self evaluation, one must know where our country and the State stands in the global world keeping in view some pertinent social indicators of development. India certainly needs to develop in order to take rightful place in the comity of nations. With only 2.4 per cent of the world's land area, India has to support as much as 17.7 per cent of the world's population. After more than seven decades of planned development, India have been lagging behind in comparison with other such countries those who got their independence almost at the same time or such other countries who started their planned economic development in the mid of the twentieth century. For example, Japan started its race of development in 1945 after dropping of atom bombs on its two famous cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. China also got its independence in 1949 and started its development path. In these circumstances, there is a dire need of self introspection for the nation as a whole and Haryana in particular.

### **Objectives of the Study –**

Keeping in view the aforesaid scenario of opportunities and challenges, the followings are the specific objectives of the study –

- 1) To take stock and analysis the present status of India in the global economy.
- 2) To examine and compare the social indicators of development for the whole of the world with India and Haryana in particular.
- 3) To provide pabulum for decision makers and planners for providing opportunities and facing challenges.

### **Sources of Data and Methodology –**

The study is purely based on secondary data collected from the following sources:

- i) World Development Indicators, World Bank, 2015, Washington D.C.
- ii) Statistical Abstract of Haryana, Department of Economic and Statistical Analysis, Government of Haryana, Panchkula, 2015-16.
- iii) Survey for Assessment of Dropout rates at Elementary Level in 21 States, Final Report submitted by TNS India Pvt. Ltd. to EDCIL, January, 2013.
- iv) An Analysis of Levels and Trends in Infant and Child Mortality Rates in India, National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development, New Delhi.

The present study uses a research methodology of Exegesis of the Content Analysis which is quite an appropriate research technique for the systematic, objective and quantitative description of the data procured through various secondary sources. The relevant data have been collected, brought into a comparable form, condensed, organized and presented into two-dimensional tables. Then these tables are analysed and interpreted for further planning and decision-making for the state of Haryana and the whole of the nation, that is Indian union.

---

**\* Associate Professor (Commerce), University College, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.**

## **Results and Discussion –**

Table-1 shows the comparable variables of population density and Gross National Income per capita. The highest density is for Macao that is a city State and special and administrative region of China. Leaving all these city states a side, others being Singapore and Hong Kong; the highest density in the world is for Bahrain, that is, 1753 person per square kilometer. In comparison, India has its population density of 421 persons per square kilometer. Haryana has more density of 573 persons per square kilometer in comparison with the national average. Likewise, the other variable in the table, i.e., per capita Gross National Income is the highest in the world for Norway which stands for US \$ 1,02,700 followed by Switzerland and Qatar for the US \$ 90, 680 and 86, 790 respectively. The world's average of per capita Gross National Income is US \$ 10, 683 that is very higher in comparison with India US \$ 1, 570. The per capita GNI for Haryana is more, i.e., US \$ 2055 in comparison with national average of India.

Table – 2 shows education and health as the basic social indicators of development. On health, two indicators of Under-5 Mortality Rate and Maternal Mortality Rate have been taken as proxy. Under-5 Mortality Rate is highest among African countries like Angola, Sierra Leone and Somalia, that is 167, 161 and 146 respectively against per 1,000 live births. The average for the whole of the world is 46 against 1,000 live births. In comparison, the figure is 53 for India and 45 for Haryana. Likewise, another health indicator, i.e., Maternal Mortality Rate per 1,00,000 live births has been highest for Sierra Leone, Somalia and South Sudan which is 1100, 850 and 730 respectively. Its world average is 210 per 1,00,000 live births that is very high in comparison of India, i.e., 190 and Haryana 146.

Like health, another basic indicator of development is education that constitutes two variants, i.e., Primary Completion Rate and Literacy Rate. The Primary Completion Rate is highest for Korea Republic (111 per cent), Argentina (110 per cent), Indonesia (105 per cent) and Japan (102 per cent) in the World. However, the world's average is 92 per cent in comparison of the Union of India (96 per cent) and the State of Haryana (76 per cent). It is also very important to mention here that there are various reasons why the primary completion rate may exceed 100 per cent. The numerator may include late entrants and average children who have repeated one or more grades of primary education as well as children who entered school early, while the denominator is the number of children at the entrance age for the last grade of primary education. Similarly another variant of Youth Literacy Rate is either hundred per cent or

**Table – 1**  
**Global Population, Income and Poverty Line**

Sr. No.	Country	Population Density (People per sq. km.) 2013	GNI Per Capital \$ 2013	International Poverty Line in Local Currency	
				\$ 1.25 a day 2005	\$ 2 a day 2005
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1.	Bahrain	1,753	19,700	N.A.	N.A.
2.	Bangladesh	1,203	1,010	31.9	51.0
3.	France	120	43,520	N.A.	N.A.
4.	Germany	231	47,250	N.A.	N.A.
5.	Ghana	114	1,770	5,594.8	8,951.6
6.	Hong Kong SAR, China	6,845	38,420	N.A.	N.A.
<b>7.</b>	<b>India</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>1,570</b>	<b>19.5<sup>j</sup></b>	<b>31.2<sup>j</sup></b>
8.	Indonesia	138	3,580	5,241.0 <sup>j</sup>	8,385.7 <sup>j</sup>
9.	Japan	349	46,330	N.A.	N.A.
10.	Korea Republic	516	25,920	N.A.	N.A.
11.	Luxembourg	210	69,880	N.A.	N.A.
12.	Macao SAR, China	18,942	64,050	N.A.	N.A.
13.	Maldives	1,150	5,600	12.2	19.5
14.	Malta	1,323	20,980	N.A.	N.A.
15.	Mozambique	33	610	14,532.1	23,251.4
16.	Netherlands	498	51,060	N.A.	N.A.
17.	Norway	14	1,02,700	N.A.	N.A.
18.	Pakistan	236	1,360	25.9	41.4
19.	Qatar	187	86,790	N.A.	N.A.
20.	Russian Federation	9	13,850	16.7	26.8
21.	Singapore	7,713	54,040	N.A.	N.A.
22.	Switzerland	205	90,680	N.A.	N.A.
23.	United Kingdom	265	41,680	N.A.	N.A.
24.	United States	35	53,470	N.A.	N.A.
25.	Vietnam	289	1,740	7,389.9	11,839.8
<b>26.</b>	<b>World</b>	<b>55<sup>w</sup></b>	<b>10,683<sup>w</sup></b>	<b>N.A.</b>	<b>N.A.</b>
<b>27.</b>	<b>Haryana</b>	<b>573<sup>TT.1</sup></b>	<b>2,055<sup>TT.2</sup></b>	<b>N.A.</b>	<b>N.A.</b>

Source: World Bank (2015), World Development Indicators, Washington DC: World Bank.

For Haryana: Government of Haryana (2015-16), Statistical Abstract of Haryana, Department of Economic and Statistical Analysis, Panchkula, 2017.

Notes: j - Based on benchmark national PPP estimate rescaled to account for cost-of-living differences in urban and rural areas.

T 1.1 - Figure as per Population Census, Government of India, 2011.

T 1.2 - Per-capita Income at constant prices of 2011-12 converted into US dollar as per the exchange rate of INR into dollars of Rs. 54.33 for a US dollar on 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2013.

N.A. - Not Available

w - The Aggregates are totals by weighted averages.

**Table – 2**  
**Basic Social Indicators of Development**

Sr. No.	Country	Health		Education	
		Under-5 Mortality Rate (Per 1,000 live births) 2013	Maternal Mortality Rate (Modeled Estimate per 1,00,000 live births) 2013	Primary Completion Rate (% of Relevant Age Group) 2009-13 <sup>a</sup>	Youth Literacy Rate (% of Population) Ages 15-24 2005-13 <sup>a</sup>
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1.	Afghanistan	97	400	-	47
2.	Angola	167	460	54	73
3.	Argentina	13	69	110	99
4.	Australia	4	6	-	-
5.	Bahrain	6	22	-	98
6.	Bangladesh	41	170	75	80
7.	Brazil	14	69	-	99
8.	China	13	32	-	100
9.	Ethiopia	64	420	-	55
10.	France	4	12	-	-
11.	Germany	4	7	98	-
12.	Guinea	101	650	61	31
<b>13.</b>	<b>India</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>81</b>
14.	Indonesia	29	190	105	99
15.	Japan	3	6	102	-
16.	Korea Republic	4	27	111	-
17.	Malaysia	9	29	-	98
18.	Pakistan	86	170	73	71
19.	Sierra Leone	161	1,100	71	63
20.	Somalia	146	850	-	-
21.	South Sudan	99	730	37	-
22.	U.K.	5	8	-	-
23.	U.S.	7	28	-	-
24.	Vietnam	24	49	97	97
<b>25.</b>	<b>World</b>	<b>46w</b>	<b>210w</b>	<b>92w</b>	<b>89w</b>
<b>26.</b>	<b>Haryana</b>	<b>45<sup>12.1</sup></b>	<b>146<sup>12.2</sup></b>	<b>76.0<sup>12.3</sup></b>	<b>75.6<sup>12.4</sup></b>

Source: *Ibid.*, Table 1.

Notes: a -Data are for the most recent year available.

T 2.1 - National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development, 2014, An Analysis of Levels and Trends in Infant and Child Mortality Rates in India, New Delhi.

T 2.2 - Figure as per World Health Organisation Bulletin, 2016, 94: 370-375. Available at <https://dx.doi.org/10-2471/BLT.15>.

T 2.3 - Figure as per EDCIL, Final Report submitted by TNS India. Pvt. Ltd., Survey for Assessment of Dropout Rates at Elementary Level in 21 States, January, 2013.

T 2.4 - Figure as per National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi. Available at <https://www.dise.in>

w - The Aggregates are totals by weighted averages.

**Table – 3**  
**Global Quantum of Poverty**

Sr. No.	Country	Reference Year	Population below \$ 1.25 a day (%)	Population below \$ 2.00 a day (%)	Reference Year	Population below \$ 1.25 a day (%)	Population below \$ 2.00 a day (%)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Argentina	2010 <sup>e,f</sup>	< 2	4.0	2011 <sup>e,f</sup>	< 2	2.9
2.	Bangladesh	2005	50.5	80.3	2010	43.3	76.5
3.	Bhutan	2007	10.2	29.8	2012	2.4	15.2
4.	Brazil	2011 <sup>f</sup>	4.5	8.2	2012 <sup>f</sup>	3.8	6.8
5.	Bulgaria	2010 <sup>f</sup>	< 2	3.3	2011 <sup>f</sup>	< 2	3.9
6.	Cambodia	2010	11.3	40.9	2011	10.1	41.3
7.	China	2010 <sup>h</sup>	9.2	23.2	2011 <sup>h</sup>	6.3	18.6
8.	Colombia	2011	5.0	11.3	2012	5.6	12.0
9.	Czech Republic	2002	29.7	56.9	2008	35.0	59.1
10.	Ecuador	2011 <sup>f</sup>	4.0	9.0	2012 <sup>f</sup>	4.0	8.4
11.	Ethiopia	2005	39.0	77.6	2010	36.8	72.2
12.	Ghana	1998	39.1	63.3	2005	28.6	51.8
<b>13.</b>	<b>India</b>	<b>2009<sup>h</sup></b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>2011<sup>h</sup></b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>59.2</b>
14.	Indonesia	2010 <sup>h</sup>	18.0	46.3	2011 <sup>h</sup>	16.2	43.3
15.	Malaysia	2007 <sup>i</sup>	< 2	2.9	2009 <sup>i</sup>	< 2	2.3
16.	Maldives	1998	25.6	37.0	2004	< 2	12.2
17.	Mauritius	2006	< 2	< 2	2012	< 2	< 2
18.	Mexico	2010	4.0	8.3	2012	3.3	7.5
19.	Pakistan	2007	17.2	55.8	2010	12.7	50.7
20.	Philippines	2009	18.1	41.1	2012	19.0	41.7
21.	Thailand	2008 <sup>c</sup>	<2	4.6	2010 <sup>c</sup>	< 2	3.5
22.	Turkey	2010	< 2	3.1	2011	< 2	2.6
23.	Uganda	2009	37.9	64.7	2012	37.8	62.9
24.	Vietnam	2010	3.9	16.8	2012	2.4	12.5
<b>25.</b>	<b>Haryana<sup>T3.1</sup></b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>24.10<sup>T3.2</sup></b>	<b>N.A.</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>11.16<sup>T3.3</sup></b>	<b>N.A.</b>

Source: *Ibid.*, Table 1.

Notes : c - Estimated nonparametrically from nominal consumption per capita distributions based on unit-record household survey data.

e Covers urban areas only.

f Estimated nonparametrically from nominal income per capita distributions based on unit-record household survey data.

h Population-weighted average of urban and rural estimates.

i Based on per-capita income averages and distribution data estimated parametrically from grouped household survey data.

T 3.1 The source of data for Haryana is different and not comparable. The data is collected from the website of the Reserve Bank of India, Available at [m.rbi.org.in](http://m.rbi.org.in) The data is based on the basis of the MRP consumption of the respective reference year.

T 3.2 The data is based on MRP consumption calculated by the RBI and not comparable for the rest of the data in the column No. 4 of the table.

T 3.3 The data is based on MRP consumption calculated by the RBI and not comparable for the rest of the data in the column No. 7 of the table.

**Table – 4**  
**Global Shared Prosperity**

Sr. No.	Country	Shared Prosperity Period		Annual Growth of Survey Mean Income or consumption per capita	
		Baseline Year	Most Recent Year	Bottom 40% of the Population	Total Population
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Argentina	2006	2011	6.5	3.4
2.	Bangladesh	2005	2010	1.8	1.4
3.	Bhutan	2007	2012	6.5	6.4
4.	Bolivia	2006	2011	12.8	4.0
5.	Brazil	2006	2011	5.8	3.6
6.	Cambodia	2007	2011	9.2	3.0
7.	China	2005	2010	7.2	7.9
8.	Colombia	2008	2011	8.8	5.6
9.	Czech Republic	2006	2011	1.8	1.8
10.	Ecuador	2006	2011	4.4	0.5
11.	Ethiopia	2005	2010	- 0.4	1.4
<b>12.</b>	<b>India</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.8</b>
13.	Madagascar	2005	2010	- 4.5	- 3.5
14.	Mauritius	2007	2012	0.0	0.0
15.	Mexico	2006	2010	0.4	- 0.3
16.	Nepal	2003	2010	7.3	3.7
17.	Pakistan	2005	2010	3.0	1.8
18.	Philippines	2006	2012	1.4	0.7
19.	Russian Federation	2004	2009	9.6	8.2
20.	Serbia	2007	2010	- 1.7	-1.3
21.	Thailand	2006	2010	4.3	2.2
22.	Turkey	2006	2011	5.4	5.1
23.	Vietnam	2004	2010	6.2	7.8
24.	West Bank and Gaza	2004	2009	2.3	2.3
<b>25.</b>	<b>Haryana<sup>T4.1</sup></b>	<b>N.A.</b>	<b>N.A.</b>	<b>N.A.</b>	<b>N.A.</b>

Source: *Ibid.*, Table 1.

Note: T 4.1 The data on shared prosperity is not available on the state of Haryana.

N.A. Not Available.

near hundred per cent for many countries in the world. However, the average for the whole world is 89 per cent in the age group of 15 to 24 years of the population. It is 81 and 75.6 per cents for India and Haryana respectively. It seems that in the area of education, India and Haryana both have been lagging behind than the average value of the indicators for the global world.

Table – 3 shows the quantum of poverty in the global world. The highest poverty is among African and Asian countries, for example, Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Uganda. For India, it is 32.7 and 68.8 per cents below poverty line measured at two scales, one is less than US \$ 1.25 a day and US \$ 2.00 a day respectively for 2009. The scenario is comfortable for Haryana in comparison with the national scenario. It is 24.1 per cent in 2004-05 and 11.16 per cent in 2011-12. For Haryana, the data is collected from different source with different parameters. Therefore, it may be less comparable but it definitely gives an idea about the status of poverty in the State.

Table - 4 shows the Shared Prosperity for the whole world. It is defined as fostering income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the welfare distribution in every country and is measured by calculating the annualized growth of mean per capita real income or consumption of this bottom segment. Improvements in shared prosperity require a growing economy and a consideration for equity. The figures in the table show that the scenario for many countries has been improving. However, in India the annualized growth of Survey mean income per capita has been 3.8 per cent for the total population and 3.3 per cent for bottom 40 per cent of the population. Such data could not be produced for Haryana. There is an urgent need for the Government of India to take an aspect of equity along with growth of Indian economy.

### **Conclusion and Suggestions –**

The study revealed that the status of India, keeping in view the variables under consideration, has been near the global average. In turn, Haryana is more comfortable than India's national average. However, the comparison of India with other economies which got their independence with India's contemporary period, have been dismal. The progress for India has not been so impressive keeping in view that India being a big country with huge natural resources. In this manner, India has been lagging behind. In case of India, it seems that there is a story of missed opportunities. As rightly mentioned by H. Jackson Brown Junior in the beginning that missed opportunities may proved very costly for every individual and every country. In these circumstances, there is a dire need to build up a mass and strong political will that may proceed ahead quite aggressively like Japan, South Korea and of course China as well. In India, there is no scarcity of natural resources. Everyone will also agree that there is rampant corruption and parallel economy of black money in India. It means that there are leakages of public funds earned through rich natural resources. In such a scenario, India must break the vicious circle of poverty with strong national character along with political will. India must learn a lesson from Japan and proceed ahead on the path of economic and social development. There is an ever need of devoting on the human capital formation instead of physical capital formation. Such a developmental path will be instrumental for overall development in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **References:**

- Desai, Nitin (2010), "Sustaining High Growth," in Sameer Kochhar (ed.), *India on the Growth Turnpike (Essays in the Honour of Vijay L. Kelkar)*, Academic Foundation, New Delhi.
- Mishra, Prachi (2013), "Has India's Growth Story Withered?", *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII (15), April 13.
- Nagaraj, R. (2008), "India's Recent Economic Growth: A Closer Look," *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLIII (15), April 12-18.
- Panda, Manoj (2013), "Macroeconomic Overview: The Growth Story," in Mahendra Dev (ed.), *India Development Report 2012-13*, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Panagariya, Arvind (2008), *India: The Emerging Giant*, Oxford University Press, New York.



- Planning Commission (2011), *Faster, Sustainable and More Inclusive Growth: An Approach to the 12<sup>th</sup> FYP*, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Radhakrishna, R. (ed.) (2008), *India Development Report 2008*, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Subramaniam, Arvind (2012), "Growth Experience" in Kaushik Basu and Annemie Macrtens (ed.), *The Concise Oxford Companion to Economics in India*, Oxford University, University Press, New Delhi.
- UNDP (2009), *Global Economic Crises: Impact on the Poor in India: A Synthesis of Sector Studies*, Available at <https://www.undp.org>