

Migration, Caste and Marginalised Sections

Inequality in the Coverage of Basic Services in Urban India

DEBOLINA KUNDU, ARPITA BANERJEE

A spatial overview on availability of urban basic services reveals disparities across urban India. Although various levels of government, including the parastatals, have strived to achieve sufficiency in provisioning of urban basic services, the coverage is far from satisfactory. The growing urban population creates deficiencies on the limited urban infrastructure. The condition is even more precarious for the new migrants who are poor and belong to socially marginalised groups. Using secondary data from the census and National Sample Survey Office, the distribution of basic amenities, including housing across states and size classes of urban centres, and the disparity in their distribution disaggregated by new migrants, marginalised groups and poverty levels are analysed.

The concept of inequality, which is at the core of development economics and social justice theories, has received considerable attention in the public policy discourse in recent decades. Sociologists, anthropologists and civil society organisations see inequality with a rights-based legalistic lens of inequality of rights and associated obligations (UNDESA 2015). Economists, on the other hand, see inequalities in the standard of living, income, education, access to basic services and infrastructure, and health and nutrition through the lens of the income or consumption pattern of a person or country. These debates around economic inequalities are seen through two different perspectives, namely outcomes and opportunities. The inequality of outcomes connotes inequality in the level of income or other dimensions of well-being, which may be the result of circumstances beyond one's control such as caste, gender, age, ethnicity, etc. Inequality of opportunities, on the other hand, is solely based on individuals' gender, age, caste, ethnicity, disability and other personal and household characteristics.

The second perspective of economic inequality was mainly proposed by Amartya Sen in the late 1970s in his capability framework approach, according to which the well-being of a person should be defined and measured not from income inequality, but from the freedom of a person to pursue a life of their own choice (Alkire et al 2015). Stewart (2002) has termed it horizontal inequality, which is based on the inequalities that arise between individuals mainly due to the group(s) to which they belong such as caste, gender, ethnicity, disability, etc.

A plethora of literature (Banerjee and Piketty 2005; Deaton and Drèze 2002; Sen and Himanshu 2004; Mazumdar et al 2017) is available in India on inequality and poverty. Most of these studies measure inequality mainly on the basis of income or consumption expenditure criteria using National Sample Survey (NSS) data. However, inequality estimated from survey data is underestimated because household expenditure from the NSS (which is used as the proxy for the income of a household) does not capture the spending of households on many types of financial and real estate assets. In this context, it can be argued that measurement of inequality solely based on consumption criteria of the NSS may not provide a clear picture of inequality in India. A better way to see inequality is spatial inequality.

There is a vast body of literature that measures poverty and inequality in urban sectors and at national and state levels, especially since 1990. In general, these studies highlight the increasing inequality between urban and rural sectors

This paper was written as part of the initiative to Strengthen and Harmonize Research and Action on Migration in the Indian Context (SHRAMIC), supported by Tata Trusts. SHRAMIC is anchored by Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research in collaboration with Centre for Policy Research, National Institute of Urban Affairs, IRIS Knowledge Foundation and the Migration Program Partners of Tata Trusts.

Debolina Kundu (dkundu@niua.org) is with the National Institute of Urban Affairs, New Delhi. Arpita Banerjee (bannerjee_arpita@yahoo.co.in) was a research associate with the SHRAMIC project at NIUA. She is currently working with Child in Need Institute, Kolkata.

(Deaton and Kozel 2005; Sen and Himanshu 2004; Sundaram and Tendulkar 2003). Using monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE) as a measure of welfare, Deaton and Drèze (2002) find that interstate inequality increased in the 1990s and that urban–rural inequality increased pan-India and also within states. Jha (2002) finds higher inequality in both urban and rural sectors during the post-reform period as compared to the early 1990s.

In the context of city-level inequality, Kundu (2006) finds that there is gross inequality in the economic base between the million-plus cities, and medium and small towns in terms of employment, consumption, and poverty.

Spatial inequality is a dimension of overall inequality, which includes not only economic inequality, but inequality in social, educational and other sectors of development such as housing, transport, sanitation, electricity and other basic amenities. With increasing urbanisation and greater openness of economies, the spatial (rural–urban) and regional inequalities in terms of economic activities, education, social and other indicators of development have increased substantially in most of the developing and transition economies, like India, Mexico, South Africa, China, Russia, etc (Kanbur and Venables 2005). Jana and Bhan (2015) argue that patterns of spatial inequality shape the horizons of urban lives and critically affect urban policies, especially in large metropolitan cities where intra-urban differences can be of very large magnitudes. Deaton and Drèze (2002) observed that regional disparities increased in the 1990s, with the southern and western regions doing much better than the northern and eastern regions. Economic inequality also increased within states, especially within urban areas, and between urban and rural areas with regard to per capita expenditure, state domestic product, and real agricultural wages. Pal and Ghosh (2007) argue that since the economic liberalisation, evidence suggests increasing inequality in income and consumption, both in spatial and vertical terms.

India, during the past two decades, has experienced high economic growth. The very positive macroeconomic trend in the country notwithstanding, there is a concern that the country has not been very successful in transforming its growth into development. Understandably, the major issue challenging the policymakers is to tackle the problem of sharpening socio-spatial inequalities in income and access to basic amenities. The disparities in MPCE across social groups have gone up from 19% to 26% during 1993–2004 both in rural areas and small towns. The inequality was slightly higher at 30%, in the case of large cities in the base year, but there has been no increase in this over the decade (Kundu and Sarangi 2007). These can be explained only in terms of the difference in the access to the job market and emoluments received by different social groups in different settlement categories. Kundu et al (2013) further argue that the increase in inequality in MPCE has been very sharp in urban areas, particularly in metro cities, during 1993–2009. The most significant point is that inequality in the metro cities was very low in the early 1990s, but has gone up sharply in the recent past.

The authors also argue that there has been some progressivity in the provision of drinking water as the deprived social groups—

Scheduled Tribes (STs) and Other Backward Classes (OBCs)—report a higher improvement in accessing drinking water for exclusive use during 2002–09. However, the improvements are not much in favour of the Scheduled Caste (SC) population. In urban India, the deficits in toilet facilities are lower and there is no difference between the figures for the SC and ST population. A similar picture emerges for the access to toilet facilities from the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) data, with the SCs, STs and OBCs reporting much lower figures for households having toilets for exclusive use than the “others” category.

In light of the above, the present paper, using secondary data, analyses the distribution of basic amenities, including housing, across states and size classes of urban centres. It also analyses the household distribution of basic amenities disaggregated by migration, marginalised group and poverty level. Importantly, the NSSO provides unit-level data on housing and basic amenities for only new migrants, who came to urban areas in the last 365 days. The next section gives an overview of the availability of select infrastructural facilities across states by using comparable indicators from Census 2001 and 2011 and unit-level data related to housing condition and amenities from NSSO 2002 and 2012. The access to amenities across metropolitan and non-metropolitan cities/towns is analysed and a disparity index has been worked out to measure the level of inequality in the access to amenities over time.

Distribution of Basic Amenities

It is possible to analyse the trend in the availability of a limited number of housing and basic amenities using the census and NSSO data through indicators like houses in good condition and basic amenities of tap water, electricity, bathroom and water closet latrines¹ within premises, and closed drains. About 17.4% of India’s urban population lives in slums where housing conditions are inhuman, 5.49 million urban households in India do not have access to safe drinking water,² 19% of the households either have no latrine within the premises or defecate in the open, 13% of the households have no bathing facilities within the home, and 2.9% of urban houses are in a dilapidated condition according to Census 2011.

Also, economically developed states and metropolitan cities have better infrastructural facilities as compared to less developed states and non-metropolitan cities. Kundu (2009) observed that poorer states report a low percentage of households with access to safe drinking water. Bhagat (2013), in his study of poor households across size classes of urban centres, brought out that poor households in larger cities have better access to amenities as compared to the poor in small towns. Also, there exists a strong relationship between the size of the cities and availability of basic services, the access to basic services being higher in larger cities as compared to smaller cities and towns (HSMI–HUDCO Chair–NIUA 2015).

Disparities in access to basic amenities are also noted by caste and class affiliation of urban dwellers and across migrant and non-migrant households. Kundu (1993) noted that the access of the bottom 40% of the population to basic amenities has been low. A study by Mahadevia (2013), based on data from

the NSSO's 65th Round (2008–09), reveals that the STs, accounting for 3.3% of the urban population, had a poverty head count ratio of 28.6% in 2008–09; higher than average of the entire urban population (20.8%). On the other hand, SCs, accounting for 14.4% of the urban population, had a poverty head count ratio of 32.8%. About 28.5%, 29.1% and 25.8% of ST, SC and OBC houses do not have access to safe drinking water as compared to 23% of overall urban households in 2008–09. Similarly, 36.9% of urban households living below poverty line (BPL)³ did not have access to safe drinking water during the same year. Also, more than half of the BPL households have no access to toilets as compared to 11.3% in urban India during the same period. This shows that economic and social stratification exists in the access to basic amenities.

The share of urban households with toilet facilities has increased in each successive decade from 1981 (58.2%),⁴ 1991 (63.9%),⁵ 2001 (73.7%), and 2011 (81.4%). It is interesting to note that the share of water closet latrine facilities within the premises has increased from 46.1% in 2001 to 72.6% in 2011, indicating a higher investment in toilet facilities. Tap water as one of the components of improved water source increased very marginally from 68.7% in 2001 to 70.6% in 2011 in spite of investments made under the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewable Mission (JNNURM). A part of the decline is explained by the use of other water sources like bottled water, which came up significantly during this period. Also, the past decade has seen the addition of 2,530 new census towns in the country. These towns, although urban by definition, are still under rural governance with a very low coverage of services. In fact, the coverage of tap water was only 49.18% for census towns as compared to 74.34% in statutory towns in 2011. In 1981, 62.5% households had electricity, which increased to 75.8%, 87.6% and 92.7% in 1991, 2001 and 2011, respectively, indicating high investments made in this sector.

Similarly, the increase in the share of pucca houses has also been significant, from 73.8% in 1992 to 87.7% in 2002. However, the tempo slowed down over the years and, in 2012, the increase had been only of 6 percentage points (NSSO 2013) as the Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP) and Integrated Housing and

Slum Development Programme (IHSDP) covered only a handful of cities, the other housing programmes having been discontinued since then. The share of households with bathroom facilities increased from 70.4% to 77.5% in urban India during 2001–11. The share of households served by closed drains increased from 34.5% to 44.5% over the last decade, reflecting progress under the JNNURM. Importantly, states like Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu, which are relatively better off in economic terms, have low shares of latrine facilities. This is attributed to the high share of slum population in these states. Also, the natural environment determines the type of housing and source of drinking water in the north-eastern states.

Although, there still exist deficiencies across states in access to basic infrastructure, inequality has declined in the case of certain indicators, while it has remained the same in the case of others. For example, inequality among states declined in terms of pucca houses, good houses, households with electricity, bathroom facilities, closed drains, and latrines within premises, while it increased marginally in access to tap water (Table 1). Overall,

Table 1: Access to Basic Amenities across States (Urban)

Urban India/States/UTs	Pucca Houses		Good Condition Houses		Electricity		Tap Water		Attached Bathroom		Closed Drains		Latrine Facility within Premises (Water Closet)	
	2002	2012	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011
	(%)													
India	87.7	93.6	64.2	68.5	87.6	92.7	68.7	70.6	70.4	77.5	34.5	44.5	46.1	72.6
Jammu and Kashmir	90.6	93.0	57.6	70.9	97.9	98.0	87.5	87.9	77.7	86.4	25.5	32.7	26.5	68.5
Himachal Pradesh	92.1	97.6	73.3	80.1	97.4	98.1	93.9	95.5	74.9	90.3	43.5	65.0	49.7	87.0
Punjab	97.1	98.5	64.0	57.3	96.5	98.3	66.8	76.4	82.8	87.3	45.0	57.6	46.5	85.6
Chandigarh	82.4	94.1	69.8	69.9	96.7	98.4	92.7	96.8	78.4	86.7	77.2	87.3	70.8	87.0
Uttarakhand	96.8	99.1	70.9	74.4	90.9	96.5	82.3	78.4	77.9	87.7	28.4	42.3	40.8	85.9
Haryana	97.9	97.6	58.7	62.9	92.9	96.2	71.7	77.5	75.4	86.1	35.0	49.4	31.0	80.5
NCT of Delhi	97.9	99.6	59.0	66.0	93.4	99.1	77.0	81.9	71.7	87.3	51.7	60.3	47.4	86.0
Rajasthan	92.9	96.5	62.4	68.9	89.6	93.9	80.1	82.6	71.4	79.3	24.1	34.4	40.6	73.7
Uttar Pradesh	91.8	95.1	54.9	57.0	79.9	81.4	54.5	51.5	63.8	69.7	26.5	32.2	32.0	77.2
Bihar	82.3	90.1	54.4	53.1	59.3	66.7	26.4	20.0	43.1	45.7	22.1	30.0	43.5	63.4
Sikkim	100	96.9	85.9	80.3	97.1	98.7	96.9	92.1	83.4	89.5	57.9	39.5	87.0	91.8
Arunachal Pradesh	68.3	68.8	56.4	58.5	89.4	96.0	83.1	84.2	53.9	67.2	12.9	15.7	28.1	74.9
Nagaland	60.8	84.3	49.9	62.0	90.3	97.4	32.8	35.7	58.3	80.8	12.1	8.6	19.9	79.1
Manipur	22.6	33.8	62.2	63.4	82.0	82.4	54.7	56.3	16.4	48.7	2.9	6.0	20.6	63.7
Mizoram	86	89.7	59.4	73.6	94.4	98.1	44.2	74.4	64.8	83.7	8.5	20.4	34.5	80.9
Tripura	37.5	66.1	61.5	63.6	86.4	91.6	53.4	54.0	43.4	46.6	6.8	7.3	43.1	50.0
Meghalaya	80.6	93.1	60.8	69.5	88.1	94.9	71.3	77.6	69.8	74.2	15.0	17.9	43.5	82.9
Assam	64.9	80.4	52.0	58.9	74.3	84.1	31.4	30.2	53.0	71.7	9.8	15.4	58.9	71.0
West Bengal	84.9	89.5	53.8	57.5	79.6	85.1	56.7	55.6	58.6	60.0	21.8	24.4	55.2	61.6
Jharkhand	80.9	90.4	59.6	59.9	75.6	88.0	48.0	41.6	54.5	55.3	23.8	24.9	41.2	64.7
Odisha	77.2	86.5	46.3	51.5	74.1	83.1	45.9	48.0	48.9	54.5	19.6	19.9	43.1	58.8
Chhattisgarh	69.4	84.4	60.1	64.2	82.9	93.7	60.0	62.5	51.9	54.4	17.1	17.5	38.8	58.7
Madhya Pradesh	76.4	93.2	63.5	67.6	92.3	92.7	67.9	62.2	63.2	69.9	24.5	31.9	41.1	71.5
Gujarat	96.1	97.9	65.4	76.5	93.4	97.2	83.0	85.6	80.6	85.0	59.3	69.4	62.1	85.2
Maharashtra	92.6	97.1	62.6	73.1	94.3	96.2	89.2	89.1	81.6	86.0	45.1	62.7	44.4	67.3
Andhra Pradesh	87.7	95.3	71.9	78.9	90.0	97.3	71.9	83.5	78.5	85.6	36.0	49.6	47.0	79.4
Karnataka	81	92.7	58.4	72.4	90.5	96.4	78.4	80.4	79.1	91.7	41.6	56.5	44.9	71.6
Goa	93.9	87.8	68.7	76.9	94.7	97.7	81.0	90.2	77.2	88.7	38.1	54.8	38.9	80.6
Kerala	85.3	90.8	64.9	72.4	84.3	97.0	39.9	34.9	78.9	88.8	14.9	33.5	74.8	75.3
Tamil Nadu	82.5	89.1	90.0	76.4	88.0	96.1	65.4	80.3	66.4	75.5	34.6	44.8	45.5	66.5
Puducherry	76.4	94.0	91.3	80.0	91.4	98.5	90.3	95.4	70.9	84.1	31.0	32.3	59.4	81.1
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	94.6	95.0	61.9	76.5	95.2	97.7	97.3	97.9	78.2	85.5	9.1	12.1	58.7	86.6
Coefficient of variation	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.30	0.31	0.23	0.19	0.60	0.57	0.32	0.14

Source: Census 2001 and 2011.

Table 2: Statewise Housing and Basic Infrastructure Index in Urban India

States	PCA
Tamil Nadu	1.270
Jammu and Kashmir	1.117
Andhra Pradesh	1.012
Maharashtra	0.975
Karnataka	0.968
Gujarat	0.614
Chhattisgarh	0.486
Rajasthan	0.378
Kerala	0.365
Madhya Pradesh	0.066
Haryana	-0.059
Punjab	-0.431
West Bengal	-0.598
Assam	-0.655
Jharkhand	-0.696
Odisha	-0.965
Uttar Pradesh	-1.404
Bihar	-2.443

Source: Census 2011 and NSSO 2012.

it can be inferred that Bihar, Manipur and Tripura fare badly in several indicators of housing and basic amenities. On the other hand, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim, Delhi and Puducherry are better placed.

The variation among the states in terms to accessibility to housing and basic infrastructure is brought about by the principal component analysis (PCA)⁶ which reveals that Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Odisha are the three lowest ranking states, especially because of their relatively poor performance in terms of accessibility to electricity, houses in good condition and tap water. However, better accessibility of these

three important components has placed the states of Tamil Nadu, Jammu and Kashmir, and Andhra Pradesh as good performers. Although, Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra show a relatively lower share of water closet latrines within premises, these states show higher positive values as their PCA values are least influenced by this indicator (Table 2).

Urbanisation and Developmental Indicators

Correlation matrices worked out for both 2001 and 2011, based on the level of urbanisation, decadal growth rate of urban population, basic housing and infrastructure condition, per capita income, per capita loan sanctioned by Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO), and additional central assistance (ACA) commitment for the JNNURM reveals interesting results. The urbanisation level is positively correlated with the availability of basic services like electricity, tap water, and drainage connectivity. Further, the positive relationship strengthened during 2001–11. This explains that states with higher levels of urbanisation have better coverage of basic services. Moreover, there was no significant relationship between urbanisation

level and bathrooms and water closet latrines in 2001, but there was significant positive correlation in 2011. Also, per capita income showed a strong positive correlation with the urbanisation level in 2001, which further strengthened in 2011. This again corroborates the fact that richer states have higher levels of urbanisation and access to amenities. Understandably, states with higher levels of economic well-being are able to invest more in infrastructural facilities. Better infrastructural facilities also promote higher urban growth.

Per capita loans sanctioned by HUDCO show a significantly positive correlation with good houses and water closet latrines in 2011. Per capita income has a positive impact on availability of improved housing and basic infrastructural facilities like electricity, tap water, attached bathroom, closed drains, and good houses in both the years and with water closet latrines in 2011. Moreover, the positive correlations improved from 2001 to 2011 with regard to these indicators.

Besides these, the developmental indicators on basic infrastructure show a positive relationship amongst themselves.

Table 3: Interdependencies between Access to Basic Amenities and Socio-economic Indicators, 2001

Indicators	Urbanisation Level, 2001	Pucca Houses, 2002	Electricity, 2001	Tap Water, 2001	Attached Bathroom, 2001	Closed Drains, 2001	Latrine within Premises (Water Closet), 2001	Good Houses, 2001	Per Capita NSDP, 2000–01 at Constant Prices	Per Capita Loan Amount (₹) from HUDCO, 2002
Urbanisation Level, 2001	1	.216	.409*	.357*	.317	.522**	.194	.298	.849**	-.337
Pucca houses, 2002		1	.355*	.446*	.839**	.573**	.355*	.206	.286	-.013
Electricity, 2001			1	.762**	.679**	.457**	.114	.434*	.547**	.240
Tap water, 2001				1	.623**	.580**	.271	.536**	.494**	.060
Attached bathroom, 2001					1	.639**	.456**	.389*	.472**	.175
Closed drains, 2001						1	.483**	.434*	.600**	.150
Latrine within premises (water closet), 2001							1	.465**	.320	.319
Houses in good condition, 2001								1	.386*	.257
Per capita NSDP, 2000–01 (₹)									1	-.061
Per capita HUDCO loan (₹), 2002										1

Table 4: Interdependencies between Access to Basic Amenities and Socio-economic Indicators, 2011

Indicators	Level of Urbanisation, 2001	Pucca Houses, 2002	Electricity, 2001	Tap Water, 2001	Attached Bathroom, 2001	Closed Drains, 2001	Water Closet Latrine within Premises, 2011	Houses in Good Condition, 2001	Per Capita NSDP, 2010–11	Per Capita HUDCO Loan Sanctioned (₹) Constant	Per Capita ACA Allocation under JNNURM (₹)
Urbanization level, 2011	1	.211	.476**	.432*	.452**	.537**	.373*	.342	.872**	.004	-.251
Pucca houses, 2012		1	.354*	.333	.620**	.572**	.514**	.318	.297	.160	-.275
Electricity, 2011			1	.736**	.778**	.397*	.571**	.696**	.589**	.293	.174
Tap water, 2011				1	.648**	.538**	.562**	.708**	.590**	.244	.250
Bathroom, 2011					1	.626**	.801**	.686**	.581**	.336	.001
Closed drains, 2011						1	.493**	.408*	.615**	.168	-.205
Water closet latrines within premises, 2011							1	.524**	.515**	.387*	.152
Houses_good condition, 2011								1	.471**	.422*	.092
Per capita NSDP (₹), 2010–11									1	.306	-.099
Per capita HUDCO loan sanctioned (₹)										1	.300
Per capita ACA, JNNURM (₹)											1

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level; * correlation is significant at 0.05 level.

Source: Census 2001 and 2011; NSSO 2002 and 2012; directorate of economics and statistics of respective state governments; JNNURM website and HUDCO Annual Report, 2001–02 and 2011–12.

For example, the percentage of pucca houses show a significantly positive correlation with households with attached bathrooms and water closet latrines within premises and closed drains. Similarly, the percentage of households with attached bathrooms is positively related with households with closed drains, water closet latrines within premises and electricity (Tables 3 and 4, p 65). This indicates that developed states with higher levels of urbanisation also receive infrastructural funding resulting in better coverage of basic services.

Availability in Metro and Non-metro Cities/Towns

The opening up of the global economy has opened up several possibilities of resource mobilisation for large cities, strengthening their internal resource base and enabling them to attract funds from domestic and international markets. Moreover, studies have pointed out that metropolitan cities have better access to civic amenities as compared to non-metropolitan cities/towns, suggesting a direct linkage between the size of the city and the level of civic services (HSMI-HUDCO Chair-NIUA 2015). The poor economic prospects of small and medium cities/towns have kept their infrastructure level at a suboptimal point, which acts as a stumbling block in generating matching funds. The capacity to prepare detailed project reports and compliance to reforms is also adversely affected.

We analyse here the distribution of basic services across size classes of urban centres. This has been done using unit-level household data from the NSSO for 2002 and 2012 for metropolitan cities and non-metropolitan cities/towns. The available data shows regularity and a distinct pattern. With the exception of houses in good condition, the million-plus cities have greater access to all other infrastructural facilities in 2002. In order to bring out the inequalities more clearly, a disparity index has been worked out, which brings out the inequality more clearly rather than indicator-wise simple differences of percentage figures. The disparity index (Kundu and Rao 1986)⁷ between metropolitan and non-metropolitan cities was the highest in the case of underground and covered drains, followed by attached bathrooms and tap/standpipe water in 2002. In 2012, with the exception of tapwater, non-metropolitan cities/towns witnessed an increase in the share of all basic infrastructure indicators. The same observation is noted in the case of metropolitan cities as well. The decreased use of tap/standpipe water in 2012 can be attributed to the use of other water sources like bottled water.

In both 2002 and 2012, highest disparity was noted in the case of underground and covered pucca drains, followed by attached bathrooms and tap/standpipe water. This may be explained by higher investments in metropolitan cities under the JNNURM, which received investments under the Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG) component. A comparison of the disparity indices between 2002 and 2012 shows that

inequality increased between these two size classes of urban centres with regard to houses in good condition; households with attached bathrooms and own latrines within premises. On the other hand, inequality declined in the case of households with electricity, tap/standpipe water and underground and covered pucca drains. This may be explained by investments made in these towns and cities by all levels of the government. In spite of the reduction in inequality, one observes a high share of households not covered by underground and covered pucca drains in small towns (Table 5), those which could not receive JNNURM funding because of a weak resource base and reform compliance.

Table 5: Disparity in Basic Amenities by Size Class of Towns

Indicators (%)	Non-Metropolitan Cities/Towns	Metropolitan Cities	Urban India	Disparity Index	Non-Metropolitan Cities/Towns	Metropolitan Cities	Urban India	Disparity Index
	2002				2012			
Pucca houses	84.6	95.5	87.6	0.10	91.2	98.1	93.6	0.06
Good condition house	47.9	46.6	47.5	-0.02	58.3	63.8	60.2	0.06
Electricity	89.8	96.3	91.6	0.06	97.3	99.2	97.9	0.02
Tap/standpipe water	69.8	83.8	73.7	0.13	64.4	77.6	69.1	0.12
Attached bathroom	37.9	49.4	41.1	0.15	49.6	65.9	55.4	0.17
Own latrine	53.0	54.9	53.5	0.02	62.4	66.6	63.9	0.04
Underground and covered pucca drains	31.7	68.0	41.7	0.44	47.4	83.4	60.1	0.36

Source: Unit-level Data of NSSO, Housing Condition and Amenities, 2002 and 2012.

Availability across Migrants, Marginalised Groups and Poverty Levels

A declining migration trend is noted at the macro level as the poor find it increasingly difficult to gain a foothold in cities.⁸ With globalisation, cities are less affordable for the poor. Further, the processes of slum clearance and beautification of cities, and the development of infrastructural facilities under ongoing programmes have marginalised the poor, especially the migrants (Mahadevia 2011). A location-based study (Delhi and Ranchi) by Sharma and Sood (2015) shows that migrant households have less access to pucca houses, tap water and latrine facilities, the conditions being more precarious in Ranchi. Poverty-led migration has induced poor quality of urbanisation led by misery, poverty, unemployment, exploitation, and the rapid growth of slums and inequalities (Sen and Ghosh 1993). More often, the poor migrants live in deplorable conditions, without any provision of basic services and exposed to vagaries of nature (Rani and Shylendra 2001; Srivastava and Sasikumar 2003).

In this section, an attempt has been made to analyse the overall access to basic services across migrants and non-migrants,⁹ socially marginalised groups vis-à-vis the non-marginalised groups and the upper castes, and poor and non-poor households.¹⁰ This is done by analysing the household-level data of the NSSO in 2002 and 2012. Based on the selected parameters, disparity indexes have been calculated to study the inequality. The study further divides the migrant households on the axes of caste-class to understand whether the migration status along with poverty and marginalised status limit the access to basic services.

More than 90% of urban households lived in pucca houses in 2012. The share of migrant, non-marginalised-group and

non-poor households have a higher incidence of pucca houses in both the years when compared to non-migrant, marginalised-group and poor households respectively. The poor households show the least coverage of pucca houses amongst all these above-mentioned categories. However, the disparity between the respective groups has decreased marginally during 2002–12. A further disaggregation of migrant households by caste and class shows that the poor migrant households, followed by marginalised group migrant households, have the lowest coverage of pucca houses in both the years, suggesting that poverty, and marginalised-group and caste affiliations definitely influence the quality of housing (Tables 6 and 7).

2002 to -0.23 in 2012. The value of the disparity index decreased from -0.13 in 2002 to -0.10 in 2012 among the marginalised and non-marginalised group households. The corresponding figures for poor and non-poor households are -0.19 and -0.16, respectively. A caste–class overlap by the migrant households shows that the poor migrant households are the most affected, exhibiting the lowest living space (253.6 sq feet) in 2002 which further declined (184.9 sq ft) in 2012.

Possession of own house is lowest among the migrant households as compared to any other categories in both the years. A comparison between migrant and non-migrant households shows that, only 14.5% of the migrants had their own dwellings

Table 6: Disparity in the Access to Housing and Basic Amenities—New Migrants, Marginalised Groups and Poor

Indicators (%)	Migrant	Non-migrant	Disparity Index	Marginalised Group	Non-marginalised Group	Disparity Index	Poor	Non-poor	Disparity Index	Urban India
2002										
Pucca houses	91.9	87.5	-0.04	82.9	92.9	0.09	71.9	93.3	0.19	87.7
Average floor area (sq ft)	299.1	400.1	-0.18	340.3	454.1	-0.13	304.6	426.9	-0.19	395.4
Owned houses	14.5	61.8	0.76	62.0	57.6	-0.05	71.0	56.0	-0.15	59.9
Tap/standpipe water	66.9	74.1	0.07	69.9	77.6	0.07	61.1	78.1	0.16	73.7
Attached bathroom	42.8	41.0	-0.02	30.4	52.5	0.30	17.5	49.2	0.53	41.1
Own latrine	38.1	54.5	0.20	44.0	63.7	0.22	32.8	60.7	0.35	53.7
Pucca drains	41.1	44.0	0.04	44.3	43.3	-0.01	39.6	45.2	0.07	43.8
2012										
Pucca houses	96.1	93.5	-0.02	91.4	96.8	0.05	83.3	96.4	0.12	93.6
Average floor area (sq ft)	293.1	428.6	-0.23	374.1	489.0	-0.10	323.2	448.2	-0.16	422.0
Owned houses	12.5	63.6	0.84	59.2	63.9	0.05	69.9	58.8	-0.11	61.1
Tap/standpipe water	60.0	69.5	0.09	66.5	72.6	0.06	58.7	71.8	0.13	69.1
Attached bathroom	58	55.3	-0.03	47.4	66.5	0.21	28.4	62.5	0.44	55.4
Own latrine	49.9	64.6	0.16	57.2	73.2	0.16	41.3	69.8	0.31	63.9
Pucca drains	32.9	37.5	0.07	39.5	34.2	-0.08	39.4	36.7	-0.04	37.3

Source: Unit-level Data of NSSO, Housing Condition and Amenities, 2002 (58th round) and 2012 (69th round).

Table 7: Housing Condition and Basic Amenities of Migrant Household by Marginalised Group and Poverty in Urban India, 2002 and 2012

Indicators (%)	Migrant Households				
	Years	Marginalised Group	Non-marginalised Group	Poor	Non-poor
Pucca houses	2002	89.6	93.2	73.7	94.3
	2012	94.4	98.9	93.3	96.5
Average floor area (in sq ft)	2002	267.6	326.6	253.6	306.0
	2012	262.9	346.4	184.9	310.8
Owned houses	2002	12.2	16.8	24.7	13.2
	2012	11.9	13.6	11.7	12.7
Tap/piped water	2002	72.5	61.8	51.6	69.0
	2012	57.8	63.9	54.4	60.9
Attached bathroom	2002	33.5	50.8	15.9	46.7
	2012	56.6	60.6	35.6	61.7
Own latrine	2002	33.5	42.3	28.8	39.7
	2012	46.6	55.7	28.1	53.4
Pucca drains	2002	48.5	35.0	42.1	40.8
	2012	36.4	26.7	31.6	33.1

Source: Unit-level Data of NSSO, Housing Condition and Amenities, 2002 and 2012.

The availability of living space (average floor area in sq feet of the dwelling unit) is higher among non-migrants, non-marginalised-group and non-poor households as compared to their respective counterparts in both the years. Moreover, with the exception of migrant households, average floor space increased among all other categories over the past decades. This is also evident from the increase in the value of the disparity index among migrants/non-migrants from -0.18 in

as against 62% of the non-migrants in 2002. Moreover, this share declined among the migrants while it increased among the non-migrants in 2012, widening the disparity from 0.76 to 0.84 during 2002–12. As opposed to our common belief, the share of owned houses has been consistently higher in the case of poor households as compared to their non-poor counterparts over the decade. This finding is further corroborated by the NSSO report on housing conditions (69th round, 2012) where the share of houses owned shows a secular decline with the increase in the consumption classes. Many poor households squat in public spaces and identify their residential

premises as self-occupied. Also, the government interventions in the past decade provided ownership housing to the poor, although in a limited manner. Household ownership across marginalised groups reveals no particular pattern. A further cross-classification of migrants by caste–class reveals that poor migrants show highest coverage of owned houses in 2002. However, with the overall decline of owned houses among migrants during the last decade (as outlined above), the decrease is noticed in each category across caste and class.

The provision of basic services like access to tap/standpipe water is influenced by the caste and class affiliation of households. Data reveals that non-migrant, upper-caste and non-poor households have higher access as compared to those of migrant, marginalised-group and poor households, respectively, in both the years. With an overall decline in the use of tap/standpipe water in urban India from 2002 to 2012, as discussed earlier, all categories for households show a similar trend. The maximum decline is noticed among migrant households (7 percentage points) as compared to non-migrant households (4.6 percentage points), widening the disparity index further from 0.07 in 2002 to 0.09 in 2011. However, the disparity index declined by marginalised group and among the poor and non-poor households. A further probe into migrant households divided by caste and class shows that tap/standpipe water accessibility is the lowest among the poor migrant households in both the years, closely followed by migrant marginalised-group households.

The share of migrant households with an attached bathroom is higher as compared to that of the non-migrants in both the years. However, among the marginalised-group and poor households, the share of attached bathrooms is almost half as compared to their respective counterparts in both the years. The poor households show the least coverage of attached bathrooms. With an overall improvement in the share of attached bathrooms in urban India, all categories of households show improvement during 2002–12. The disparity index has declined among the caste and class groups from 2002 to 2012, but it has widened among the migrant and non-migrant households. An in-depth understanding of the migrant households by caste–class status reveals that poor migrant households show the lowest incidence of attached bathrooms, followed by marginalised-group migrant households in both the years.

Unlike bathroom facilities, the share of households with own latrines is markedly lower in the case of migrant, marginalised-group and poor households in particular in both 2002 and 2012. With an overall increase in the share of own latrines in urban India from 2002 to 2012, improvement is noticed among all the household categories. This is also evident from a reduction in the value of the disparity index. Findings across the migrant households by caste–class status reveal that poor migrant households had the least access to own latrine facilities in both the years. Although, the share of own latrine facilities increased among all groups, the poor migrant households hardly exhibited any marked variation. This may be attributed to their lack of affordability.

The share of households served by pucca drains is lower among the migrants as compared to their non-migrant counterparts. Moreover, the disparity has widened. No clear trend is noticed among the households divided by the caste and class axes in this regard. A further analysis of the migrant households by caste and class affiliations reveals that non-marginalised-group migrant households show the lowest possession of pucca drains as compared to any other categories.

From the above analysis, it can be concluded that the migrant households have better access to pucca houses and attached bathrooms, while the non-migrant households fare better in terms of the average floor area, owned houses, own latrine facilities, tap/standpipe water and pucca drains. The simple distribution of basic amenities among migrants shows variation once the caste/class factor is brought into the context. With the only exception of owned houses and pucca drains, the poor migrant households have low access to all other civic amenities in both the years. The socially marginalised group migrant households also reveal a gloomy picture, yet they are much better off in many respects as compared to the poor migrant households. Thus, it can be argued that poverty largely determines the accessibility of basic indicators rather than marginalised-group and caste affiliations (Tables 6 and 7).

Policy Perspective

Post-independence India has witnessed improvement in the coverage of infrastructural services and basic amenities in urban India. However, there still exists serious infrastructural deficiency in various states and cities. The deficiency is more

pronounced among certain sections of the society, which is further aggravated by increasing population pressure. Also, the addition of 2,530 new census towns has pulled down the average figures of basic services. Civic services like pucca houses and households with electricity show an almost universal coverage across states. Yet, attached bathroom facilities, latrines within premises, closed drains, etc, have a higher incidence in developed states as compared to less-developed states. This has an obvious relation with the higher per capita income of these states, higher allocation of government funds, and better capacities of the urban local bodies (ULBs). Although the inequality across states in access to basic amenities has decreased over the last decade, yet, there are certain states that are inherently weak in infrastructural facilities, like Bihar, Odisha, Uttar Pradesh and Assam. Programmatic intervention is needed in these states.

Metropolitan cities are comparatively better equipped with basic amenities as compared to non-metropolitan towns/cities. This is because of large cities having greater access to the credit market and own resources, as well as central sector funding. An analysis of the access to basic amenities by migration status, marginalised group and poverty level reveals that migrant households fare badly as regards most of the indicators. Moreover, with the exception of pucca houses and own latrine facilities, the value of the disparity index increased among the migrant and non-migrant households. The study across marginalised and caste groups reveals the deplorable condition of the backward sections of the society. However, with the exception of pucca drains, the disparity index across the marginalised and caste groups shows a decline, suggesting that the urban development missions have addressed the socially disadvantaged sections of the society. Access to basic amenities is limited among the poor households. With the exception of owned houses, the poor households report the least coverage of all other basic amenities. However, the disparity index has decreased among the poor and non-poor households. This study brings out the fact that new migrants from a poor socio-economic background are more vulnerable in urban areas.

In India, urban development is a state subject. Urban policies in the post-independence era witnessed the launch of a few centrally-sponsored schemes (CSS) with a focus on subsidised industrial and low-income housing and basic amenities including slum upgradation. The emergence of parastatal agencies helped implement master plans for cities and provide basic services. The Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO) emerged as the principal agency to provide loans to new state capitals, and advocated the development of small and medium growth centres through lower interest rates for housing, water supply and sanitation. However, HUDCO played a major role in lending loans for infrastructure, land acquisitions, housing, and implementing social programmes of the government mainly in large cities. The small towns, which are generally unable to obtain the state government's guarantee due to their weak economic base and uncertain financial condition, have hardly benefited from HUDCO financing (Kundu et al 1999).

The 1990s saw the opening up of the country's economy. Following the balance of payment crisis, a programme of economic liberalisation was launched in the country, which propagated the idea of a free market with limited state intervention. In 1992, the Constitution (74th Amendment) Act (CAA) was enacted, which decentralised powers and essential functions related to city planning, poverty alleviation and provision of basic services to ULBs.

To boost investment in infrastructure development in urban areas, the Eleventh Five Year Plan launched an inclusive agenda and emphasised the need to bring about major changes in urban governance (Kundu and Samanta 2011). Also, the JNNURM was launched in 2005, allocating substantial additional central assistance (ACA) to cities for infrastructure, housing, and capacity building. Besides, developing infrastructural facilities across 65 mission cities, the JNNURM aimed at providing urban infrastructure and housing to all other towns and cities, subsuming all existing related programmes.

The mission succeeded in getting the state and the city governments to commit themselves to structural reforms, which the central government failed to achieve despite adopting several measures and incentive schemes through other programmes and legislations (Kundu 2007, 2011). It was also effective in renewing focus on the urban sector across the country. Yet, many states lagged behind in programme utilisation due to lack of enabling capacity and capacity to generate matching funds (Planning Commission 2011).

The allocation of funds under the JNNURM was largely biased against the non-mission cities/towns (Kundu and Samanta 2011). Moreover, the mission was deeply criticised on the grounds that irrespective of the size of the state and ULBs, the central government mandated the reforms. There was no cost-benefit analysis for whether the reforms recommended for metropolitan cities were applicable to small towns as well (Planning Commission 2012).

During the Eleventh Five Year Plan, in pursuance of the vision to make India slum-free, the Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY) was launched. The scheme aimed at upgrading slums, and assigning titles to their residents along with basic infrastructure and social amenities in each selected slum. Rental and transit housing was admissible under the scheme (Bhagat 2014). However, the scheme was stalled with the change of government and was replaced in 2015 by Housing for All (HFA) by 2022, which aims to provide ownership housing through public-private partnership (PPP), using land as a resource, credit-linked subsidies and subsidies for beneficiary-led individual house construction.

In 2015, the Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT), a reform-based programme akin to the erstwhile JNNURM was launched to provide basic services to households and build amenities in 500 cities. The central funding is ₹50,000 crore with matching contributions for states/UTs. However, the central grants declined from over ₹1,000 crore per city under the JNNURM to ₹100 crore per city under AMRUT. To address the challenges of urban infrastructure deficit, another initiative adopted during the Twelfth Five

Year Plan is the Smart Cities Mission (SCM) with an objective to promote 100 cities that provide core infrastructure and give a decent quality of life to its citizens through IT-enabled interventions. This mission looks at area-based development of core areas of the cities, which are on an average about 2%–4% of the total area but have about 80% of the funding dedicated to these, thereby accentuating intra-urban disparities. The implementation of the SCM is entrusted to a special-purpose vehicle (SPV), a limited company under the Companies Act, 2013. The SPV is supposed to plan, appraise, approve, release funds, implement, manage, operate, monitor and evaluate the smart city development projects, and function as parallel agencies with the ULBs. The SPVs may make the ULBs more vulnerable as the lucrative sources of funding for the cities may be tied through an escrow account to finance the smart projects.

A large section of the population is left out of any programmatic interventions. The AMRUT, for example, focuses on 500 cities with a population above 1,00,000. Also, the SCM, which is reform-linked, relies on convergence and innovative sources of funding, including different modes of PPP. Likewise, the poor are excluded in various ways from the HFA mission. Ownership of a house or at least a plot of land in a city is not expected from a poor household. Also, the Credit Linked Subsidy Scheme has expanded its coverage in 2017 to include the non-poor (MOHUPA 2017). A careful analysis of these policy prescriptions needs to be carried out to assess the impact of the financing mechanisms on the small towns, the poor and the disadvantaged. The focus of the HFA mission is on construction of new dwelling units. There should be a focus on rental housing and dormitories for short-term migrants. The prerequisite of a minimum plinth area with regard to beneficiary-linked construction needs to be relaxed as the poor cannot access this source of funding otherwise. Likewise, the Clean India Mission focuses on construction of toilets without making efforts to ensure water supply and drainage facilities in the toilets. Moreover, public awareness regarding segregation of waste at source is crucial.

In Conclusion

India has 4,041 statutory towns and about another 4,000 census towns. Targeting only 500 large cities for infrastructure development may eventually increase the inter-city disparities. Also, the area-based development model of the SCM is likely to accentuate intra-city disparities. In this regard, it would be important to initiate pan-India coverage of the SCM and improve the resource generation capacities of cities through strengthening of the local taxation system of cities. Systematic updation of properties in the city through GIS at specific intervals and proper enforcement would improve the tax base significantly.

An approach of balanced urban development is called for to ensure improvement in coverage of basic amenities in the less developed states and small towns. Also, adequate attention should be paid to the poor migrants and vulnerable sections of the population across all towns and cities during the formulation and implementation of new schemes.

NOTES

- 1 In Census 2001, the types of latrine facilities within premises have been divided into pit latrine, water closet and other latrines. In 2011, types of latrine facilities were further disaggregated. Flush/pour flush latrine within household premises connected to piped sewer system, septic tank and other systems of latrine facilities of Census 2011 is comparable with the water closet latrine facility of Census 2001. The term "water closet latrine" has been used throughout this paper.
- 2 Water from unsafe sources includes uncovered well, spring, river/canal, tank/pond/lake/other sources.
- 3 The below poverty line (BPL) households are those that form the bottom 30% of the urban population (Mahadevia 2013).
- 4 Excluding Assam
- 5 Excluding Jammu and Kashmir
- 6 Principal component analysis is a statistical technique that linearly transforms an original set of variables into a substantially smaller set of uncorrelated variables that represents most of the information in the original set of variables. Its goal is to reduce the dimensionality of the original data set (Dunteman 1989). In the present section, PCA has been conducted by taking into account the indicators of housing and basic infrastructure of 18 major large states. The smaller states are not included as their levels of urbanisation are nowhere in comparison with the major states. Also, the higher percentages of housing and basic infrastructure indicators for the smaller states (because of the low base) might distort the findings greatly.
- 7 The index measures disparity between two groups in their possession of a particular property (in this case housing condition and basic amenities) in terms of the logarithm of the odds ratio. The objective of the logarithm is to reduce the leveling off effect. Kundu and Rao (1986) have modified the Sopher's disparity index, as it fails to satisfy the additive monotonicity axiom. The formula of Disparity Index after Kundu and Rao is: $\text{Log}(X_2/X_1) + \text{LOG}(200-X_1)/(200-X_2)$ where X_2 is metropolitan cities while X_1 is non-metropolitan cities/towns. The disparity index value ranges from 0-1. The value closer to 0 represents lower disparity and vice versa.
- 8 Recent findings from Census 2011 data suggest a decline in the share of rural to urban migrants from 21.1% in 1991-2001 to 19.9% during 2001-11 (Census 2011).
- 9 The NSSO has limited data on migrant households; a migrant household is defined as one who moved to the present place of enumeration/area during the last 365 days prior to the date of survey. Thus, from this data set, only those migrant households are captured who moved during last one year. This segment constituted only 4.7% of households as migrants in urban India in 2002, which increased marginally to 4.9% in 2012.
- 10 Marginalised group comprises ST, SC and OBC. Poor refers to the households in first quintile class while the non-poor are those households belonging to second, third, fourth and fifth quintile classes respectively.

REFERENCES

Alkire, S, J Foster, S Seth, M E Santos, J M Roche and P Ballon (2015): *Multidimensional Poverty Measurement and Analysis*, United Kingdom, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhagat, R B (2013): "Access to Civic Amenities among Urban Poor in Small Cities and Towns

in India," August, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255950408_Access_to_Civic_Amenities_among_Urban_Poor_in_Small_Cities_and_Towns_in_India.

— (2014): "Urban Policies and Programmes in India: Retrospect and Prospect," *Yojana*, No 58, pp 4-8.

Banerjee, A and T Piketty (2005): "Top Indian Incomes, 1922-2000," *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol 19, No 1, pp 1-20.

Census (2011): "Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets," India Series 1, Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi.

Deaton, A and J Drèze (2002): "Poverty and Inequality in India," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 37, pp 3729-48.

Deaton, A and V Kozel (2005): "Data and Dogma: The Great Indian Poverty Debate," *World Bank Research Observer*, Vol 20, 177-99.

Dunteman, G H (1989): *Principal Component Analysis*, Quantitative Application in Social Sciences Series No 69, California: Sage Publications.

HSMI-HUDCO Chair-NIUA (2015): "Non-Metropolitan Class I Cities of India: Status of Demographic, Economic, Social Structures, Housing and Basic Infrastructure," HSMI-HUDCO Chair-NIUA Collaborative Research.

Jana, A and G Bhan (2015): "Reading Spatial Inequality in Urban India," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 50, No 22, pp 49-54.

Jha, R (2002): "Reducing Poverty and Inequality in India: Has Liberalization Helped?" Working Papers 2002-04, Arndt-Corden Department of Economics, Australian National University, Acton ACT.

Kanbur, R and A J Venables (2005): "Spatial Inequality and Development Overview of UNU-WIDER Project," <http://www.arts.cornell.edu/poverty/kanbur/widerprojectoverview.pdf>.

Kundu, A (1993): *In the Name of the Urban Poor: Access to Basic Amenities*, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

— (2006): "Trends and Patterns of Urbanization and their Economic Implications," *India Infrastructure Report 2006*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

— (2007): "A Strategy Paper on Migration and Urbanisation in the Context of Development Dynamics, Governmental Programmes and Evolving Institutional Structure in India," a paper commissioned by United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

— (2009): "Access to Basic Amenities and Urban Security: An Interstate Analysis with Focus on Social Sustainability of Cities," India Urban Poverty Report, United Nations Development Programme.

— (2011): "Trends and Processes of Urbanization in India," *Urbanization and Emerging Population Issues-6*, Human Settlements Group (IIED) and Population and Development Branch, UNFPA, <http://pubs.iied.org/10597IIED.html>.

Kundu, A and J M Rao (1986): "Inequity in Educational Development: Issues in Measurement, Changing Structure and Its Socio-economic Correlated with Special Reference to India," *Educational Planning: A Long Term Perspective*, M Raza (ed), New Delhi: NIEPA and Concept Publishing Company.

Kundu, D and D Samanta (2011): "Redefining the Inclusive Urban Agenda in India," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 46, No 5, pp 55-63.

Kundu, A and N Sarangi (2007): "Migration, Employment Status and Poverty: An Analysis across Urban Centres," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 42, No 4, pp 299-306.

Kundu, A, S Bagchi and D Kundu (1999): "Regional Distribution of Infrastructure and Basic Amenities in Urban India: Issues Concerning Empowerment of Local Bodies," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 34, No 28, pp 1893-1906.

Kundu, A, P C Mohanan and K Varghese (2013): "Spatial and Social Inequalities in Human Development: India in the Global Context," United Nations Development Programme.

Mahadevia, D (2011): "Branded and Renewed? Policies, Politics and Processes of Urban Development in the Reform Era," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 46, No 31, pp 56-64.

— (2013): "Urban Poverty in India and Post-MDG Framework," Oxfam India Working Papers Series, OIWPS - XVII, April.

Mazumdar, D, S Sarkar and B S Mehta (2017): "Inequality in India-I," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 52 No 30, pp 47-56.

MoHUPA (2017): "Credit Linked Subsidy Scheme (CLSS)," Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi, http://www.mhupa.gov.in/User_Panel/UserView.aspx?TypeID=1499.

NSSO (2013): "Key Indicators of Drinking Water, Sanitation, Hygiene and Housing Condition in India (Report No KI (69/1.2)," National Sample Survey Office, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi.

Pal, P and J Ghosh (2007): "Inequality in India: A Survey in Recent Trends," DESA Working Paper No 45, DESA/2007/DWP/45, <https://www.scribd.com/document/33354837/wp45-2007-2#>.

Planning Commission (2011): *Mid-term Appraisal of Eleventh Five Year Plan, 2007-2012*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

— (2012): "Report of Committee on JNNURM-II: Clean Bastis, Safe Communities, and Peoples Cities," Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi.

Rani, U and H S Shylendra (2001): "Seasonal Migration and Rural-Urban Interface in Semi-arid Tropics of Gujarat: Study of a Tribal Village," *Journal of Rural Development*, Vol 20, pp 187-217.

Sen, A and J Ghosh (1993): "Trends in Rural Employment and Poverty Employment Linkage," ILO-ARTEP Working Paper, New Delhi.

Sen, A and Himanshu (2004): "Poverty and Inequality in India II: Widening Disparities during the 1990s," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 39, No 39, pp 4361-75.

Sharma, A N and D Sood (2015): "Migration and Informality," http://wiego.org/sites/wiego.org/files/resources/files/Sharma-Migration_and_Informality_in_India.pdf.

Srivastava, R and S K Sasikumar (2003): "An Overview of Migration in India, Its Impacts and Key Issues," presented at the Regional Conference on Migration, Development and Pro-Poor Policy Choices in Asia, Dhaka, Bangladesh, 22-24 June, http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/0903/Dhaka_CP_2.pdf.

Stewart, F (2002): "Horizontal Inequalities: A Neglected Dimension of Development," UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU/WIDER), WIDER Annual Lectures 5.

Sundaram, K and S D Tendulkar (2003): "Poverty in India in the 1990s: An Analysis of Changes in 15 Major States," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 38, No 14, pp 1385-93.

UNDESA (2015): "Concepts of Inequality," *Development Issues*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Vol 1, pp 1-2, http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wess/wess_dev_issues/dsp_policy_01.pdf.