

Population Growth, Poverty and Unemployment in India: A Contemporary State Level Analysis

HIRA SINGH

Department of Economics
H. P. University, Shimla-171005
India

SANDEEP KUMAR

Department of Geography
H. P. University, Shimla-171005
India

Abstract:

Human resources play an immense role to determine the level of development in all economies of the world. Low level of human resource development can be attributed to several factors like high growth rate of population, poverty, unemployment inequality, illiteracy and mortality etc. These factors mostly prevail in developing countries like ours. It is necessary to know in quantitative terms the number of people living in a country at a particular time and the rate at which they are growing i.e. the growth of population. Growing population has forward and backward linkages with the other economic dynamics particularly poverty and unemployment. Rising population is accompanied by a rise in the labor force of the community which leads the substantial chunk of population to unemployment. The rising population has serious implications on poverty also. Poverty can be defined as a social phenomenon in which a section of the society is unable to fulfill even its basic necessities of life. The present paper is an attempt to unveil the present status of population growth, poverty and unemployment in India. The statistical analysis of the data of population growth demonstrates that during the decade of 2001-2011, the urban population has increased more rapidly as compare to rural population. More or less, increase in urban population has been found more than twice as compare to rural population. Further during the

study period it has been found that despite performing well on the front of poverty and unemployment reduction, still there is a high concentration of poor and unemployed across the union of India. So endeavor is entailed on the part of government to arrest the problem of population growth, poverty and unemployment.

Key words: Population Growth, Poverty, Unemployment, Interlinkage, India.

Introduction:

Human resources play an immense role to determine the level of development in all economies of the world. Low level of human resource development can be attributed to several factors like high growth rate of population, poverty, unemployment inequality, illiteracy mortality and morbidity, low level of income and low level of consumption etc. These factors mostly prevail in developing countries like ours and they are responsible for slow growth of their socio-economic development (Kim and Singh 2002).

The study of human resources is vital with the perspective of economic welfare. It is particularly important because human beings are not only instruments of production but also ends in themselves. When in right numbers, they are an asset, but not so if there number is beyond the carrying capacity of the economy- they infect become a liability. It is necessary to know in quantitative terms the number of people living in a country at a particular time and the rate at which they are growing i.e. the growth of population (Sirivastava 1987).

There was a time when population was characterised by high fertility and equally high mortality, low life expectancy and a young age structure. These factors had a significant role in stabilizing a population. However, with steadily decreasing mortality as a result of availability of a sophisticated health

delivery system, high fertility has become a bane of countries like India which are besieged with what demographers and policy makers alike call population explosion (Khader 2000).

As a population grows larger, the ability to restore resources for development may grow progressively smaller. This is true for individual nation just as it is true for entire world. Too few people may retard economic development as surely as too many people might. With a limited Gross national Product (GNP) in less developed countries like India, larger the size of population, the smaller will be the per capita income and the lower the level of living standard. It is hard to increase per capita income quickly, it is necessary either to achieve rapid economic growth or to restrict additional population growth (Tiware 2000).

India's population is growing rapidly. This has posed many difficulties in the way of economic development. Growing population has forward and backward linkages with the other economic dynamics particularly poverty and unemployment. Rising population is accompanied by a rise in the labor force of the community which leads the substantial chunk of population to unemployment (Pethe 1982).

As a matter of fact, unemployment is that situation, when people are willing to work at the prevailing wage rate but they didn't get work. Hence, it makes the solution of the problem of unemployment more intricate. Obviously, a significant proportion of the national resources will have to be used to expand employment opportunities to absorb the increasing labor force and the backlog of unemployed left over due to the continuous pressure of a rapidly growing population (Dev 2000).

The rising population has serious implications on poverty also. Poverty can be defined as a social phenomenon in which a section of the society is unable to fulfill even its basic necessities of life. When a substantial segment of society is deprived of the minimum level of living and continues at a bare

subsistence level, that society is said to be plagued with mass poverty. Due to poverty, rapid industrialization, haphazard urbanization, destructive exploitation, overuse of natural resources, and environmental stress is inevitable. Ecological degradation is being manifested in the poor air and water quality, deforestation, inadequate urban services and sanitation, indoor population in rural areas, water scarcity and over extraction of ground water to irrigation to ensure food security for rapidly growing population (Dandekar and Rath 1971).

As liberalization and globalization of the economy gain currency in a fast changing world economic order, it is being realized in the policy circles that stabilizing population is an essential component of sustainable development with more equitable distribution, unemployment and poverty alleviation (Premi 1991). In this present study we have made an attempt to surface the recent status of population growth, poverty and unemployment in India on account of considerable interlinkage among them, which in turn have far reaching consequences on the economic development of the country.

Objective of the study

The objective of the present study is to bring out forth the present situation of population growth, poverty and unemployment in India.

Data Base

The present study is entirely based on analytical nature and makes use of secondary data and information. The secondary data have been collected from Primary Census Abstract 2001 and 2011, Census of India, National Sample Survey 68th Round and Planning Commission.

Methodology

The relevant data pertaining to our study have been analysed with the help of simple statistics like decadal growth rate and simple percentage method. Population growth rate have been analysed with decadal growth rate. Beside this, simple percentage method has been also used for the analysis of poverty and unemployment rates.

Decadal Growth Rate is defined as:

$$DGR = \frac{Y_t - Y_{t-1}}{Y_t} \times 100$$

Where DGR= Decadal Growth Rate

Y_t = population of current year

Y_{t-1} = population of base year

Result and Discussion:

Decadal Population Growth in India

Data cited in the **Table-1** exhibits the decadal growth of population in India during the period of 2001 and 2011. It is clear from the data in table that during the decade of 2001 and 2011 the population of India grew at the rate of 17.69 per cent (rural + urban population). Where the rural population grew at the rate of 12.25 per cent what we can call as moderate growth. As against this, the urban population increased with high tempo of 31.80 per cent during the same decade. Table clearly reveals that there are some states and union territories which have evinced negative growth rate in their rural population growth. Among these are Chandigarh with (-69.53 per cent) followed by Lakshadweep (-58.02 per cent), Delhi (-55.64 per cent), Daman and Diu (-40.12 per cent), Kerala (-25.89 per cent), Goa (-18.51 per cent), Nagaland (-14.55 per cent) and Sikkim (-4.99 per cent). Conversely, in the case of urban population all the states and union territories have recorded positive growth rate with huge differentials. During the decade

(2001-2011) one stunning finding came to light that except all states and union territories, Nagaland has registered negative growth rate of (-0.58 per cent) in its total population growth. Further it has been found that Bihar stood at top in terms of rural population growth rate with (24.25 per cent) whereas Andhra Pradesh remained at bottom with (1.73 per cent). In the case of urban population growth Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu recorded top berth with more than (218 per cent) followed by some states like Sikkim (156.52 per cent), Kerala (92.76 per cent) and Tripura (76.17 per cent). In overall growth rate of population union territories of Dadra and Nagar Haveli with (55.83) remained at top followed by states of Meghalaya (27.95 per cent) Arunachal Pradesh (26.03 per cent) and Bihar (25.42 per cent). The upshot of above analysis is that urban population has increased unprecedentedly during this decade as compare to the rural population which has propped up the total population growth in India.

Hira Singh, Sandeep Kumar- *Population Growth, Poverty and Unemployment in India: A Contemporary State Level Analysis*

States/Union Territories	Rural	Urban	Total
States			
Andhra Pradesh	1.73	35.61	10.98
Arunachal Pradesh	22.56	39.27	26.03
Assam	15.47	27.89	17.07
Bihar	24.25	35.43	25.42
Chhattisgarh	17.78	41.84	22.61
Goa	-18.51	35.23	8.23
Gujarat	9.31	36.00	19.28
Haryana	9.85	44.59	19.90
Himachal Pradesh	12.65	15.61	12.94
Jammu and Kashmir	19.42	36.42	23.64
Jharkhand	19.58	32.36	22.42
Karnataka	7.40	31.54	15.60
Kerala	-25.89	92.76	4.91
Madhya Pradesh	18.42	25.69	20.35
Maharashtra	10.36	23.64	15.99
Manipur	9.14	44.83	18.63
Meghalaya	27.17	31.12	27.95
Mizoram	17.40	29.65	23.48
Nagaland	-14.55	66.57	-0.58
Odisha	11.77	26.94	14.05
Punjab	7.75	25.86	13.89
Rajasthan	18.96	29.01	21.31
Sikkim	-4.99	156.52	12.89
Tamil Nadu	6.61	27.05	15.61
Tripura	2.22	76.17	14.84
Uttarakhand	17.97	28.82	20.23
Uttar Pradesh	11.52	39.94	18.81
West Bengal	7.68	29.72	13.84
Union Territories			
Andaman and Nicobar	-1.19	23.49	6.86
Chandigarh	-68.53	26.96	17.19
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	7.70	218.24	55.88
Daman and Diu	-40.12	218.84	53.76
Delhi	-55.64	26.83	21.21
Lakshadweep	-58.02	86.64	6.30
Puducherry	21.33	31.47	28.08
INDIA	12.25	31,80	17.69

Table-1 State-Wise Decadal Growth Rate (%) of Population, 2001-2011

Source: Computed by Authors from *Census of India data, 2001 and 2011*

Population below the Poverty Line in India

Table-2 provides the data pertaining to the poverty across the different states of India during the period of 2004-05 and 2011-12. The perusal of the table exhibits that during the period of 2004-05 and 2011-12, there was a decline in poverty at the all India level from 37.2 per cent to 21.9 per cent. The state level data demonstrates a mixed picture and in a sense, a very disturbing picture. Between 2004-05 and 2011-12, among the states and union territories Tripura has recorded highest reduction in its poverty ratio of 26.6 per cent followed by Odisha (24.6 per cent), Sikkim (22.9 per cent), Maharashtra (20.8 per cent) and Bihar (20.7 per cent). A number of states exhibited an increase in the poverty ratios during the period of 2004-05 and 2011-12. This is a matter of grave concern. Obviously, this underlines the need for promoting growth in these states. Among these states was Nagaland where the incidence of poverty increased with 9.9 per cent followed by Mizoram (5.1 per cent) and Arunachal Pradesh (3.6 per cent). With the exception of these states whole states and union territories experienced reduction in their respective poverty ratios. Unequivocally, we have succeeded in reduce poverty to a great extent in our country but the fact remains that still there is a large proportion of population below the poverty line. It is evident from table that in 2011-12, high incidence of poverty i. e more than 30 per cent has been found in the states of Chhattisgarh (39.9 per cent), Jharkhand (37 per cent), Manipur (36.9 per cent), Arunachal Pradesh (34.7 per cent), Bihar (33.7 per cent), Odisha (32.6 per cent) and Assam (32.0 per cent). The states, where the incidence of poverty was observed very low i.e. less than 10 per cent, were Goa (5.1 per cent) followed by Kerala (7.1 per cent), Himachal Pradesh (8.1 per cent), Sikkim (8.2 per cent), Punjab (8.3 percent) and Andhra Pradesh (9.2 per cent). It is evident from the data that despite making reduction in the poverty ratios across the states and union territories still there is a high concentration of poor in many

states.

States/UTs	Years		Decrease
	2004-05	2011-12	
States			
Andhra Pradesh	29.9	9.2	20.7
Arunachal Pradesh	31.1	34.7	-3.6
Assam	34.4	32.0	2.4
Bihar	54.4	33.7	20.7
Chhattisgarh	49.4	39.9	9.5
Goa	25.0	5.1	19.9
Gujarat	31.8	16.6	15.2
Haryana	24.1	11.2	12.9
Himachal Pradesh	22.9	8.1	14.8
Jammu and Kashmir	13.2	10.4	2.9
Jharkhand	45.3	37.0	8.3
Karnataka	33.4	20.9	12.5
Kerala	19.7	7.1	12.7
Madhya Pradesh	48.6	31.7	17.0
Maharashtra	38.1	17.4	20.8
Manipur	38.0	36.9	1.1
Meghalaya	16.1	11.9	9.2
Mizoram	15.3	20.4	-5.1
Nagaland	9.0	18.9	-9.9
Odisha	57.2	32.6	24.6
Punjab	20.9	8.3	12.6
Rajasthan	34.4	14.7	19.7
Sikkim	31.1	8.2	22.9
Tamil Nadu	28.9	11.3	17.6
Tripura	40.6	14.1	26.6
Uttarakhand	32.7	11.3	21.4
Uttar Pradesh	40.9	29.4	11.5
West Bengal	34.3	20.0	14.3
Union Territories			
Delhi	13.1	9.9	3.2
Puducherry	14.1	9.7	4.4
All India	37.2	21.9	15.3

Table-2 State-wise poverty estimates (% below poverty line) 2004-05 and 2011-12

Source: *Review of Expert Group to Review the Methodology for Estimation of Poverty (2009)*

Planning Commission, Government of India; Press Note on Poverty Estimates, 2011 – 12

(2013) Planning Commission, Government of India

Note: A negative sign before the number in column four (decrease) indicates an increase in percentage of population below the poverty line.

Note: Rest of the UTs has not been embraced on account of data unavailability.

Incidence of Unemployment in India

Table-3 demonstrates the data of unemployment rates (Usual Status Basis) during the period of 2004-05 and 2009-2010. The table reveals that unemployment rates are traditionally higher in urban areas than in rural areas. At the all India level in 2004-05 the unemployment rate in rural areas was 1.7 per cent whereas in urban areas it was 4.5 per cent. There was a slight fall in the rural unemployment rate in 2009-10 to 1.6 per cent, but the urban unemployment rate was of the order of 3.4 percent, significantly higher. It is evident from the table that during 2009-10, maximum incidence of unemployment (rural + urban) i.e. more than 10 per cent, has been found in Chandigarh (27.7 per cent) followed by Tripura (26.3 per cent), Nagaland (19 per cent), Andaman and Nicobar (16.4 per cent) Kerala (14.8 per cent) and Jharkhand (10.2 per cent) which is twofold more than the all India level. As against them, lowest incidence of total unemployment i.e. 4 per cent, has been found in Gujarat and Rajasthan (2.6 per cent) in each, Karnataka (3.2 per cent), Chhattisgarh (3.5 per cent), Madhya Pradesh (3.6 per cent), Maharashtra (3.8 per cent) and Uttar Pradesh (3.9 per cent). The data in the table exhibits that during 2004-05 and 2009-10, the states and union territories which have shown better record in total unemployment reduction were Lakshadweep with (17.1 per cent), followed by Tripura (15 per cent), Kerala (11.5 per cent), Odisha (11.2 per cent) and Goa (10.9 per cent). Conversely, the states and union territories which have shown increase in total unemployment during the same period were Chandigarh with (21.1 per cent), Nagaland (12.5 per cent), Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, and Dadra and Nagar Haveli. Further it is inferred from the data cited in the table that the overall scenario of unemployment across the

states and union territories is not up to the mark. So endeavor should be made on the part of government to eliminate the differentials in unemployment rates across the union of India.

States/Union Territories	Years					
	2004-05			2009-10		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
States						
Andhra Pradesh	0.7	3.6	4.3	1.2	3.1	4.3
Arunachal Pradesh	0.9	1.2	2.1	1.3	3.4	4.7
Assam	2.6	7.2	9.8	3.9	5.2	9.1
Bihar	1.5	6.4	7.9	2.0	7.3	9.3
Chhattisgarh	0.6	3.5	4.1	0.6	2.9	3.5
Goa	11.1	8.7	19.7	4.7	4.1	8.8
Gujarat	0.5	2.4	2.9	0.8	1.8	2.6
Haryana	2.2	4.0	6.0	1.8	2.5	4.3
Himachal Pradesh	1.8	3.8	5.6	1.6	4.9	6.5
Jammu and Kashmir	1.5	4.9	6.4	2.5	6.0	8.5
Jharkhand	1.4	6.5	7.9	3.9	6.3	10.2
Karnataka	0.7	2.8	3.5	0.5	2.7	3.2
Kerala	10.7	15.6	26.3	7.5	7.3	14.8
Madhya Pradesh	0.5	2.8	3.5	0.7	2.9	3.6
Maharashtra	1.0	3.6	4.6	0.6	3.2	3.8
Manipur	1.1	5.5	6.6	3.8	4.8	8.6
Meghalaya	0.3	3.5	3.8	0.4	5.1	5.5
Mizoram	0.3	1.9	2.2	1.3	2.8	4.1
Nagaland	1.8	5.5	7.3	10.6	9.2	19.8
Odisha	5.0	13.4	18.4	3.0	4.2	7.2
Punjab	3.8	5.0	8.8	2.6	4.8	7.4
Rajasthan	0.7	2.9	3.6	0.4	2.2	2.6
Sikkim	2.4	3.7	6.1	4.3	0	4.3
Tamil Nadu	1.2	3.5	4.7	1.5	3.2	4.7
Tripura	13.3	28.0	41.3	9.2	17.1	26.3
Uttarakhand	1.3	5.4	6.7	1.6	2.9	4.5
Uttar Pradesh	0.6	3.3	3.9	1.0	2.9	3.9
West Bengal	2.5	6.2	8.7	1.9	4.0	5.9
Union Territories						
Andaman and Nicobar	6.2	8.8	15.0	8.0	8.4	16.4
Chandigarh	2.6	4.0	6.6	24.7	3.0	27.7
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	3.3	3.0	6.3	4.8	5.3	10.1
Daman and Diu	0.3	3.0	3.3	4.0	2.4	6.4
Delhi	1.9	4.8	6.7	1.7	2.6	4.3
Lakshadweep	7.5	25.0	32.5	9.7	5.7	15.4
Puducherry	7.0	8.1	15.1	3.0	3.1	6.1
All India	1.7	4.5	6.2	1.6	3.4	5.0

During 2004-05 and 2009-2010

Table -3 State-wise Unemployment Rates (rural and urban) on Usual Status Basis

Source: *Compiled and Computed from NSS 68th Round (July 2011-June 2012) Data on Employment and Unemployment.*

Conclusions:

Human resources play an immense role to determine the level of development in all economies of the world. Low level of human resource development can be attributed to several factors like high growth rate of population, poverty and unemployment. These factors mostly prevail in developing countries like ours. The upshot of foregoing analysis is that population is growing rapidly with the decadal growth rate of 17.69 per cent. Particularly, urban population has grown with 31.80 per cent as against the rural population of 12.25 per cent. States and Union Territories where the rural population grew with negative rate were Chandigarh with (-69.53 per cent) followed by Lakshadweep (-58.02 per cent), Delhi (-55.64 per cent), Daman and Diu (-40.12 per cent), Kerala (-25.89 per cent), Goa (-18.51 per cent), Nagaland (-14.55 per cent) and Sikkim (-4.99 per cent). Except all states and union territories, Nagaland has registered negative growth rate of (-0.58 per cent) in its total population growth. During the period of 2004-05 and 2011-12, there was a decline in poverty at the all India level from 37.2 per cent to 21.9 per cent. Between 2004-05 and 2011-12, among the states and union territories Tripura has recorded highest reduction in its poverty ratio of 26.6 per cent followed by Odisha (24.6 per cent), Sikkim (22.9 per cent), Maharashtra (20.8 per cent) and Bihar (20.7 per cent). Nagaland recorded an increase in its incidence of poverty with 9.9 per cent followed by Mizoram (5.1 per cent) and Arunachal Pradesh (3.6 per cent). Unemployment rates are traditionally higher in urban areas than in rural areas. At the all India level in 2004-05 the unemployment rate in rural areas was 1.7 per cent whereas in urban areas it was 4.5 per cent. There was a slight fall in the rural unemployment rate in 2009-10 to 1.6 per cent, but the urban unemployment rate was of the order of 3.4 percent, significantly higher. During 2009-10, maximum incidence of unemployment (rural + urban) i.e. more than 10

per cent, has been found in Chandigarh (27.7 per cent) followed by Tripura (26.3 per cent), Nagaland (19 per cent), Andaman and Nicobar (16.4 per cent) Kerala (14.8 per cent) and Jharkhand (10.2 per cent) As against them, lowest incidence of total unemployment i.e. 4 per cent, has been found in Gujarat and Rajasthan (2.6 per cent) in each, Karnataka (3.2 per cent), Chhattisgarh (3.5 per cent), Madhya Pradesh (3.6 per cent), Maharashtra (3.8 per cent) and Uttar Pradesh (3.9 per cent). Further it can be inferred that despite performing well on the front of poverty and unemployment reduction, still there is a high concentration of poor and unemployed across the union of India. So endeavor is entailed on the part of government to arrest the problem of population growth, poverty and unemployment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Dandekar, V. M. and N. Rath. 1971. "Poverty in India: Dimension and Trends." *Economic and Political Weekly* 26(5): 78 -85.
- Dev, S. Mahendra. 2000. "Economic Reforms: Poverty, Income Disparities and Employment." *Economic and Political Weekly* 48(25): 2325 -30.
- Khader, S.A. 2000. "Population and Manpower Development." *Yojana* 44: 34-37.
- Pethe, V.P. 1982. *Changes in size and growth of population*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Premi, Mahender, K. 1991. *India's population: Heading towards a billion*. Delhi: B.R. Publishing House.
- Srivastava, S.C. 1987. *Demographic profile of north-eastern India*. Delhi: Mittal Publication.
- Kim, S.U. and Ranjeet Singh. 2000. *Population and development*. Delhi: Sunrise Publication.
- Tiwari D.N. 2000. Population and Sustainable Development. *Yojana* 44: 53-57.