

## CHAPTER - 20

# HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIO ECONOMIC WELL-BEING IN KERALA

Human Development is a process of enlarging people's choices to lead healthy life, to acquire knowledge and be educated, and to have access to resources needed for a decent level of living as well as raising the level of well being. The notion of well being includes consumption of goods and services, cultural liberty, accessibility of all sections of society especially the deprived and those who are living below the normative minimum poverty line to the basic necessities of productive and socially meaningful life. Human development results in economic growth.

20.2 Development can be measured using a set of composite Indices – Human Development Index (HDI), Human Poverty Index (HPI) and Gender Equality Index (GEI) estimated from selected human development indicators such as per capita consumption expenditure, incidence of poverty (as head count ratio), access to safe drinking water, proportion of households with pucca houses, literacy rate for the age group of 7 years and above, intensity of formal education, life expectation and infant mortality rate.

### Human Development Index (HDI)

20.3 Human Development Index is a summary measure of three critical dimensions of well being such as longevity – the ability to live long and healthy, education-the ability to read, write and acquire knowledge and command over resources-the ability to enjoy decent standards of living and have a socially meaningful life.

#### BOX-20.1

#### Cultural Liberty

Cultural liberty is a vital part of human development “because being able to choose one's identity without losing the respect of others or being excluded from other choices is important in leading a full life.

People want the freedom to practice their religion openly, to speak their language, to celebrate their ethnic or religious heritage without fear of ridicule or punishment or diminished opportunity. These struggles over cultural identity, if left unmanaged or managed poorly, can quickly become one of the greatest sources of instability within states or between them and, in so doing, trigger conflicts that take development backward”.

*Source : Human Development Report, 2004, UNDP*

20.4 The global position on human and gender development of certain countries are given in Table 20.1.

Table - 20.1

India's global position on human and gender development

| Country    | Human development index (HDI) |       |       | Gender development index (GDI) |       |       | Gender empowerment measures (GEM) |            |       |
|------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|
|            | 2002                          | 2001  | 1990  | 2002                           | 2001  | 1992  | 2002                              | 2001       | 1992  |
|            | Norway                        | 0.956 | 0.944 | 0.911                          | 0.955 | 0.941 | 0.911                             | 0.908      | 0.837 |
| Australia  | 0.946                         | 0.939 | 0.886 | 0.945                          | 0.938 | 0.901 | 0.806                             | 0.754      | 0.568 |
| Sri Lanka  | 0.740                         | 0.73  | 0.692 | 0.738                          | 0.726 | 0.660 | 0.276                             | 0.272      | 0.288 |
| China      | 0.745                         | 0.721 | 0.624 | 0.741                          | 0.718 | 0.578 | NA                                | 0.483<br>@ | 0.474 |
| Indonesia  | 0.692                         | 0.682 | 0.619 | 0.685                          | 0.677 | 0.591 | NA                                | 0.362<br>@ | 0.362 |
| India      | 0.595                         | 0.59  | 0.519 | 0.572                          | 0.574 | 0.401 | NA                                | 0.240<br>@ | 0.226 |
| Pakistan   | 0.497                         | 0.499 | 0.444 | 0.471                          | 0.469 | 0.360 | 0.416                             | 0.414      | 0.153 |
| Bangladesh | 0.509                         | 0.502 | 0.414 | 0.499                          | 0.495 | 0.334 | 0.218                             | 0.218      | 0.287 |
| Nepal      | 0.504                         | 0.499 | 0.413 | 0.484                          | 0.479 | 0.310 | NA                                | N.A        | 0.315 |

Source: 1) Human Development Report, 2004, UNDP

2) Economic Survey, Government of India.

20.5 India's position in human development is 127<sup>th</sup> which is below even that of countries like Cuba, Libya, Bosnia, Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan (Table 20.2)

**Table 20.2**

**Ranked Position of Human Development**

| Country  | Rank | Country    | Rank |
|----------|------|------------|------|
| Cuba     | 52   | Kazakhstan | 78   |
| Libya    | 58   | Azerbaijan | 91   |
| Malaysia | 59   | China      | 94   |
| Bosnia   | 66   | Srilanka   | 96   |
| Brazil   | 72   | Namibia    | 126  |
| Thailand | 76   | India      | 127  |

Source: Human Development Report, 2004, UNDP.

20.6 The changes in Human Development Index from 1975 to 2002 with respect to certain comparable countries are shown in Table 20.3. The growth of human development index of China and Vietnam are quiet impressive, compared to that of India.

**KERALA**

20.7 Kerala is at the top in the country in human development index (0.638). This position is consistent since 1981. This is because of the physical quality of the life of the people. Punjab (0.537) stood next to Kerala followed by Tamil Nadu (0.531). HDI is the lowest for Bihar. Poor States show relatively poor performance on HDI. Similarly the economically better off States are the ones with relatively better performance on HDI. But the relation between HDI and the level of development does not show any correspondence in the case of middle income States. For example, some States like Kerala have high attainments of HDI, at the same time, there are States like Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal where HDI values are not as high. The details are given in the Table - 20.4.

**Table - 20.3**

**Changes in Human Development Index**

| Countries | 1975  | 1980  | 1985  | 1990  | 1995  | 2000  | 2002  |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| China     | 0.523 | 0.557 | 0.593 | 0.627 | 0.683 | 0.721 | 0.745 |
| India     | 0.411 | 0.437 | 0.476 | 0.514 | 0.548 | 0.579 | 0.595 |
| Vietnam   |       |       |       | 0.610 | 0.649 | 0.686 | 0.691 |

Source : Business Line-The Hindu-26.7.2004

**BOX-20.2**

**China and India -impressive growth, important differences.**

China and India together containing a third of the world's population, have enjoyed tremendous economic growth over the past decade. Their successes in advancing average well-being imply major improvements for a large portion of humanity. But their experience also point to the importance of looking beyond national averages to understanding differences within countries.

Though both countries have achieved rapid, sustained economic growth, their rates of progress have been quiet different. China has enjoyed the fastest sustained economic advance in human history, averaging real per capita growth of 8% a year over the past decade. Its per capita income is now \$ 3,976 in purchasing power parity (PPP) terms. Meanwhile, real per capita income in India grew at a robust though more modest average rate of 4.4%, reaching \$2,358 in 2001. Reflecting their successful economic growth, both countries have been significant reductions in poverty. According to World Bank estimates based on consumption surveys, the proportion of people living on less than \$1 day declined in China from 33% in 1990 to 16% in 2000, and in India from 42% in 1993/94 to 35% in 2001 (World Bank 2003). While highly contested because of differences in methodology, survey design, and samples, these calculations nonetheless provide a rough indication of poverty trends in these countries.

**Market Reforms**

China's exceptional growth is partly explained by its market-based reforms that started in 1978, well before India's similar reforms began in 1991. These reforms have enabled China to integrate with the global economy at a phenomenal pace. Today it is the largest recipient of foreign direct investment among developing countries, with annual investment rising from almost zero in 1978 to about \$2 billion in 2002 (nearly 5% of GDP). Foreign direct investment in India has also increased significantly, though at much lower levels, growing from \$129 million in 1991 to \$4 billion in 2002 (less than 1% of GDP)

Robust export growth has contributed to the economic performance of both countries, with a growing dominance of manufactured exports- though again, China has had much more success in this realm. Its exports reached \$320 billion in 2001, compared with \$35 billion for India. Manufactured

exports accounted for 53% of China's total exports in 1981 and for 90% in 2001; in India that share rose from 60% to 77%. China has had particular success in moving from labour-intensive to technology-intensive exports: telecommunications equipment and computer now account for a quarter of its exports.

#### Social investments

Social investments are required for a sustained economic growth. In China public spending on education is 2.3% of GDP while that on health is 2.1% of GDP. The outcomes for human development are clear. Literacy stands at 84%, infant mortality rates at 32 per 1,000 live births and under five mortality rates at 40 per 1,000 live births.

India, in contrast, has traditionally had lower spending levels. Health spending stands at 1.3% of GDP (Central and State Governments combined). Spending on education has increased significantly, from 0.8% of GDP in 1950 to 3.2% today, though it still falls short of the government target of 6% of GDP. Human development indicators for India remain much lower than for China. Literacy stands at 65%, infant mortality at 68 per 1,000 live births, and under-five mortality rates at 96 per 1,000 live births.

#### Regional variations and other challenges

It would be misleading to talk solely in terms of national averages for two countries so large in population and area. In China the highest economic growth has occurred in the coastal provinces-while the geographically isolated north-western provinces have experienced much lower growth. India also harbours stark regional variations. In 1992-97 per capita economic growth ranged from -0.2% in Bihar to 7.8% in Gujarat. Similar variations appear in other human development indicators, such as those for education and health.

Both countries still face challenges, such as the spread of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases accompanying increased labour migration and international trade. And both face the challenge of fostering a knowledge-based economy to maintain consistently high economic growth as average skill levels increase. Both also need to focus on spreading the gains of growth to regions, communities and ethnic groups that have seen so little benefit from the new prosperity. Inclusive public policies should focus on investments in health, education and infrastructure for future development.

Source : Human Development Report, 2003, UNDP

Table - 20.4  
Human Development Index of Major States.

| States            | 1981         |          | 1991         |          | 2001         |          |
|-------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|
|                   | Index        | Rank     | Index        | Rank     | Index        | Rank     |
| 1. Andhra Pradesh | 0.298        | 9        | 0.377        | 9        | 0.416        | 10       |
| 2. Assam          | 0.272        | 10       | 0.348        | 10       | 0.386        | 14       |
| 3. Bihar          | 0.237        | 15       | 0.308        | 15       | 0.367        | 15       |
| 4. Gujarat        | 0.360        | 4        | 0.431        | 6        | 0.479        | 6        |
| 5. Haryana        | 0.360        | 5        | 0.443        | 5        | 0.509        | 5        |
| 6. Karnataka      | 0.346        | 6        | 0.412        | 7        | 0.478        | 7        |
| <b>7. Kerala</b>  | <b>0.500</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>0.591</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>0.638</b> | <b>1</b> |
| 8. Madhya Pradesh | 0.245        | 14       | 0.328        | 13       | 0.394        | 12       |
| 9. Maharashtra    | 0.363        | 3        | 0.452        | 4        | 0.523        | 4        |
| 10. Orissa        | 0.267        | 11       | 0.345        | 12       | 0.404        | 11       |
| 11. Punjab        | 0.411        | 2        | 0.475        | 2        | 0.537        | 2        |
| 12. Rajasthan     | 0.256        | 12       | 0.347        | 11       | 0.424        | 9        |
| 13. Tamil Nadu    | 0.343        | 7        | 0.466        | 3        | 0.531        | 3        |
| 14. Uttar Pradesh | 0.255        | 13       | 0.314        | 14       | 0.388        | 13       |
| 15. West Bengal   | 0.305        | 8        | 0.404        | 8        | 0.472        | 8        |
| <b>All India</b>  | <b>0.302</b> | -        | <b>0.381</b> | -        | <b>0.472</b> | -        |

Source : NHDR 2001

**Score and Rank: State-wise**

20.8 According to a study conducted by the 'India Today' in 2004, Score is an indicator of a State's performance where Score is determined on the basis of eight select parameters such as sex ratio, poverty ratio, hunger, literacy, female to male literacy ratio, gross enrolment, infant mortality and immunisation. Table 20.5 shows the Scores and Ranks of major States in India. Score of Kerala improved from 2.23 in 2003 to 2.34 in 2004; however, the rank two remained unchanged.

Punjab is at the top in performance with score 2.46 and ranked first.

20.9 According to the survey, among socially developed States, Kerala ranks first followed by Tamil Nadu, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh (Box - 20.3). Among socially most developed 10 districts, eight are in Kerala with Kollam occupying the first place. Punjab and Kerala are the best two States to live in (Box No. 20.4). The other findings of the survey are given in Appendices 20.1, 20.2 and 20.3.

**Table - 20.5**  
**Score and Rank of Major States in India**

| States            | Score       |             |             | Rank     |          |          |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
|                   | 2004        | 2003        | Change      | 2004     | 2003     | Change   |
| 1. Andhra Pradesh | 1.46        | 1.32        | 0.14        | 11       | 10       | -1       |
| 2. Assam          | 0.87        | 0.68        | 0.19        | 15       | 14       | -1       |
| 3. Bihar          | 0.41        | 0.24        | 0.17        | 20       | 17       | -3       |
| 4. Gujarat        | 1.79        | 1.83        | -0.04       | 7        | 6        | -1       |
| 5. Haryana        | 1.93        | 1.84        | 0.09        | 5        | 5        | 0        |
| 6. Karnataka      | 1.69        | 1.57        | 0.12        | 8        | 8        | 0        |
| <b>7. Kerala</b>  | <b>2.34</b> | <b>2.23</b> | <b>0.11</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>0</b> |
| 8. Madhya Pradesh | 1.17        | 0.77        | 0.39        | 12       | 13       | 1        |
| 9. Maharashtra    | 1.86        | 1.69        | 0.17        | 6        | 7        | 1        |
| 10. Orissa        | 0.71        | 0.46        | 0.24        | 18       | 16       | -2       |
| 11. Punjab        | 2.46        | 2.52        | -0.06       | 1        | 1        | 0        |
| 12. Rajasthan     | 1.14        | 1.00        | 0.14        | 13       | 11       | -2       |
| 13. Tamil Nadu    | 2.07        | 1.95        | 0.13        | 4        | 4        | 0        |
| 14. Uttar Pradesh | 0.80        | 0.57        | 0.23        | 17       | 15       | -2       |
| 15. West Bengal   | 1.08        | 0.87        | 0.21        | 14       | 12       | -2       |

Source : India Today, Special issue August, 2004.

**BOX-20.3**

**Socially Developed States**

- 1 Kerala
- 2 Tamil Nadu
- 3 Himachal Pradesh
- 4 Karnataka
- 5 Andhra Pradesh

**Socially Most Equal States**

- 1 Haryana
- 2 Rajasthan
- 3 Himachal Pradesh
- 4 Uttar Pradesh
- 5 Bihar

Box Continued

**Socially Most Developed Districts**

|    |                    |            |
|----|--------------------|------------|
| 1  | Kollam             | Kerala     |
| 2  | Pathanamthihha     | Kerala     |
| 3  | Kottayam           | Kerala     |
| 4  | Idukki             | Kerala     |
| 5  | Alappuzha          | Kerala     |
| 6  | Ernakulam          | Kerala     |
| 7  | Mahe               | Pondichery |
| 8  | Thiruvananthapuram | Kerala     |
| 9  | Trichur            | Kerala     |
| 10 | Karaikal           | Pondichery |

**Socially Least Developed Districts**

|    |              |                   |
|----|--------------|-------------------|
| 1  | Sahibganj    | Jharkhand         |
| 2  | Tirap        | Arunachal Pradesh |
| 3  | Sitamarhi    | Bihar             |
| 4  | Giridith     | Jharkhand         |
| 5  | Rayagada     | Orissa            |
| 6  | Palamju      | Jharkhand         |
| 7  | Garhwa       | Jharkhand         |
| 8  | Nabarangapur | Orissa            |
| 9  | Shoehar      | Bihar             |
| 10 | Pakaur       | Jharkhand         |

Source: India Today, Special Issue, August 2004

**BOX-20.4**

Pathanamthitta is around 2500 km south of Patiala. People in the two places speak entirely different languages, eat totally different food, wear completely different dresses and are as similar as chalk and cheese. Yet the States the two districts belong to - Kerala and Punjab have one abiding commonality. They are the two best states in India to live in. That is if one counts only the large states. The north-south uniformity replicates itself when it comes to smaller states. Delhi and Pondicherry were India's best two small states. That throws water on the long held notion of the north-south divide!

Source: India Today, Special Issue, August, 2004.

Table - 20.6

**Education – Rank position of States**

**Gender Equality Index (GEI)**

20.10 Gender Equality Index is a composite variable derived for measuring the inequality in the attainments of human development indicators between females and males. During the eighties, attainment of women improved only marginally. At national level GEI increased from 62 % in the early eighties to 67.6% in the early nineties. At the state level Gender equality was the highest for Kerala followed by Manipur, Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh and Nagaland in eighties.

**Education**

20.11 Education is one of the basic components of human development which is a pre condition for economic growth and it is the foundation of a vibrant democracy. The indicators of education are literacy level, enrolment rate and dropout rate.

20.12 Lack of education robs an individual of a full life. It also robs society of a foundation for sustainable development. Educated people are likely to be more productive and hence better off. State wise ranking position is given in Table 20.6

| State            | 2004 | 2003 | Variation |
|------------------|------|------|-----------|
| Kerala           | 1    | 2    | 1         |
| Himachal Pradesh | 2    | 1    | -1        |
| Tamil Nadu       | 3    | 3    | 0         |
| Maharashtra      | 4    | 4    | 0         |
| Uttaranchal      | 5    | NR   | NA        |
| Punjab           | 6    | 5    | -1        |
| Jammu&Kashmir    | 7    | 7    | 0         |
| Karnataka        | 8    | 6    | -2        |
| Haryana          | 9    | 10   | 1         |
| Assam            | 10   | 8    | -2        |
| Gujarat          | 11   | 9    | -2        |
| Andhra Pradesh   | 12   | 11   | -1        |
| West Bengal      | 13   | 12   | -1        |
| Orissa           | 14   | 13   | -1        |
| Madhya Pradesh   | 15   | 14   | -1        |
| Chhattisgarh     | 16   | NR   | NA        |
| Rajasthan        | 17   | 15   | -2        |
| Uttar Pradesh    | 18   | 16   | -2        |
| Jharkand         | 19   | NR   | NA        |
| Bihar            | 20   | 17   | -3        |

Source : India Today Agu, 2004

has a high enrolment for both male and female children. School enrolment of male and female children is given in Table 20.9.

**Literacy rate**

20.13 Literacy is one of the most important outcomes of primary education and it is the first step in learning and knowledge building of a person. Kerala has a literacy rate of 90.9 per cent followed by Mizoram (88.5 %) and Goa (82.3 %). The details are given in Table 20.7

**Literacy rates of 10 top States in India (2001)**

| Rank | States           | Literacy Rate |
|------|------------------|---------------|
| 1    | Kerala           | 90.9          |
| 2    | Mizoram          | 88.5          |
| 3    | Goa              | 82.3          |
| 4    | Delhi            | 81.8          |
| 5    | Pondicherry      | 81.5          |
| 6    | Maharashtra      | 77.3          |
| 7    | Himachal Pradesh | 75.9          |
| 8    | Tripura          | 73.7          |
| 9    | Tamil Nadu       | 73.5          |
| 10   | Punjab           | 70.0          |

Source : Census figures

20.14 Kerala is far above other states in women literacy. The gap between men and women literacy rates is decreasing. Women literacy rate in Kerala and India is depicted in Table 20.8.

**Table - 20.8  
Women Literacy Rates in Kerala and India**

| Year | Kerala (%) |       | All India (%) |
|------|------------|-------|---------------|
|      | Men        | Women | Women         |
| 1961 | 64.89      | 45.66 | 15.35         |
| 1971 | 77.13      | 62.53 | 21.97         |
| 1981 | 84.56      | 73.36 | 29.76         |
| 1991 | 93.62      | 86.17 | 39.29         |
| 2001 | 94.20      | 87.86 | 54.16         |

Source: Census figures

**Enrolment rate**

20.15 Enrolment of children in schools depicts the current flow or the spread of education. Kerala

**Table - 20.9**

**School enrolment of male-female students Std.1-10**

| Year    | Total   | Boys    | Girls   | Girls % |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1960-61 | 3270301 | 1778010 | 1492291 | 45.63   |
| 1970-71 | 4795532 | 2551644 | 2243888 | 46.83   |
| 1980-81 | 5602953 | 2896774 | 2706179 | 48.30   |
| 1990-91 | 5901101 | 3012308 | 2888793 | 48.95   |
| 2000-01 | 5219052 | 2660898 | 2558154 | 49.02   |
| 2003-04 | 4881585 | 2489214 | 2392371 | 49.00   |

Source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics

20.16 Though there is a decreasing trend in the enrolment of total students, the percentage of girls' enrolment is on increasing trend. The gross enrolment ratio is given in Appendix-20.4. It can be seen from Table 20.10 that enrolment of girls is more in HSS and VHSC courses.

**Table-20.10  
Male and Female students in HSS, VHSC, ICSE and CBSE schools**

| Enrollment in students in    | Total  | Boys   | Girls  | % of girls |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|------------|
| HSS (2002-03)                | 339353 | 144961 | 194382 | 57.3       |
| VHSC (2002-03)               | 55893  | 26076  | 29821  | 53.3       |
| Kendriya Vidyalaya (2001-02) | 31575  | 17104  | 14471  | 45.8       |
| Navodaya Schools (2001-02)   | 5962   | 3477   | 2483   | 41.6       |
| CBSE Schools (2001-02)       | 224585 | 125406 | 99179  | 44.2       |
| ICSE Schools (2001-02)       | 46087  | 26927  | 19160  | 41.6       |

Source: Directorate of Economic and Statistics

**Teacher-pupil Ratio**

20.17 Teacher-pupil ratio is one of the indicators which reflects the quality of education. During 2002-03, the overall Teacher-pupil ratio was 1:28.5 and in 2003-04, it became 1:28.3,

registering a marginal increase. At the lower primary, upper primary and at high school levels the ratios are 1:45, 1:33 and 1:18 respectively.

**Drop out**

20.18 It is the percentage of students dropping out of a class/classes in a year. Kerala has the lowest drop out rate among all States in India. In 2002, the drop out rate in Kerala was 1.36 per cent as against 1.45 per cent in 2001. Total drop out rate which was 1.69 per cent in 2001 among SC students decreased to 1.57 per cent during 2002. Drop out rate among ST students which was 4.13 per cent during 2001 also decreased to 3.47 per cent in 2002.

**Health**

20.19 Like Economic growth, the Health of a nation is a product of many factors and forces that combine and interact with each other. Economic growth, per capita income, employment, levels of literacy and education – especially among females – age of marriage, birth rates, availability of information on health care and nutrition, access to safe drinking water, public and private health care infrastructure, access to preventive health care and medical care, pucca homes with sanitation facilities, access to electricity, public hygiene, road safety and environmental pollution are among the factors that directly contribute health of a nation.

20.20 The health status of population can be measured by indicators such as life expectancy, infant and child mortality rates along with the incidence of communicable and non communicable diseases. The ranked positions of the 20 major states are given in the Table 20.11. Kerala stands in the first position followed by Himachal Pradesh and Tamil Nadu.

**Table - 20.11**  
**Health Rank Positions of 20 Major States.**

| Sl No | Name of States   | 2004 (Rank) | 2003 | change |
|-------|------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| 1     | Kerala           | 1           | 3    | 2      |
| 2     | Himachal Pradesh | 2           | 2    | 0      |
| 3     | Tamil Nadu       | 3           | 5    | 2      |
| 4     | Jammu & Kashmir  | 4           | 1    | -3     |
| 5     | Karnataka        | 5           | 6    | 1      |
| 6     | Punjab           | 6           | 4    | -2     |
| 7     | Maharashtra      | 7           | 8    | 1      |
| 8     | Uttaranchal      | 8           | NR   | NA     |
| 9     | Gujarat          | 9           | 7    | -2     |
| 10    | Andhra Pradesh   | 10          | 9    | -1     |
| 11    | West Bengal      | 11          | 10   | -1     |
| 12    | Rajasthan        | 12          | 12   | 0      |
| 13    | Haryana          | 13          | 11   | -2     |
| 14    | Assam            | 14          | 15   | 1      |
| 15    | Chattisgarh      | 15          | NR   | NA     |
| 16    | Orissa           | 16          | 16   | -      |
| 17    | Madhya Pradesh   | 17          | 13   | -4     |
| 18    | Uttar Pradesh    | 18          | 17   | -1     |
| 19    | Jharkhand        | 19          | NR   | NA     |
| 20    | Bihar            | 20          | 14   | -6     |

Source: India Today, Special Issue, August, 2004.

**BOX-20.5**

**Kerala**

Kerala’s birth, death, infant mortality and literacy rates compare favourably even with countries having much higher income levels. It is all the more creditable that these have been achieved in a democratic set up without any coercive measures. There are several factors that explain Kerala’s performance but most of these are not easily replicable in other states. Historically, the benevolent rulers of Travancore and Cochin had enlightened policy towards health and education that paved the way for a human development strategy for the State. Several mass movements led by social reformers and visionaries helped mobilise the masses and empowered them to fight for their rights. This led to a high degree of political consciousness and social awareness. Christian Missionaries have played a pioneering role in promoting health and education. They continue to manage accessible and affordable hospitals, schools and colleges in the State.

Effective implementation of land reforms under the Communist Governments created a high degree of motivation for education, which has yielded long-term social dividends to Kerala. As a result of the land reforms, those who lost land and those who got small parcels of land realised the need for alternate source of income and , hence, turned to education in a big way. Matrilineal system, though confined to certain higher castes, created a helpful social environment and a higher status of women compared to other States in India. The marriage age of girls and boys increased continuously and this made a significant impact on birth rate. Late marriages and educated mothers resulted in lower rates of maternal, infant and child mortality and higher practice of contraception. Massive investment in health and education combined with good administration, private and civil society participation helped in enriching the human resource development strategy, yielding better health standards and adoption of small family norms. Effective management of Government’s family planning programme and contribution of private doctors and charitable hospitals have played a significant role in reducing mortality and fertility rates. The widespread coverage of print and electronic media along with cinema in the State helped improve communication and publicity for the spread of family planning concerns and practices. A rural-urban continuum in human habitations and well developed transportation network by road and water- improved accessibility to health services and education. Finally, migration in large number has always been a feature of Kerala’s development. Apart from easing population pressure and unemployment, migration has brought in considerable monetary remittances to families in Kerala, which has improved the living standards.

Source: NHRD 2001

**Infant Mortality**

20.21 Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) is the number of deaths per thousand live births in the first year of child’s life. The IMR in Kerala during 2001 was 11 per cent. The infant mortality rate of 10 states during 2001 is given in the Table 20.12.

**Table - 20.12  
Infant Mortality Rate (2001)**

| Rank             | States      | IMR                |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1                | Kerala      | 11                 |
| 2                | Tamil Nadu  | 44                 |
| 3                | Gujarat     | 45                 |
| 4                | Maharashtra | 46                 |
| 5                | Punjab      | 48                 |
| 6                | Bihar       | 55                 |
| 7                | West Bengal | 55                 |
| 8                | Haryana     | 56                 |
| 9                | Andhra      | 61                 |
| 10               | Pradesh     | 63                 |
| <b>All India</b> |             | <b>64 (provl.)</b> |

Source : India Today, Special Issue, August 2004

**BOX-20.6**

**Infant mortality rates**

Wide disparities between the rich and poor in many countries indicate the persistence of deprivation among poor people. They have less access to basic health services, safe drinking water, adequate nutrition and safe motherhood and child initiatives. All this is reflected in higher infant mortality among the poor.

Source : World Development Indicators-2003.

**Poverty**

20.22 The interstate disparity in human poverty is quiet striking. It was in the range of 55-60% in the early eighties for the worse off states, and between 32-35% in the better off states like Kerala, Punjab and Himachal Pradesh. It has declined since then. The state wise rank of Population Below Poverty Line -!999-2000 (%) is given in Table 20.13.

**Table - 20.13**  
**Population below**  
**poverty line 1999-2000**

| Rank | Name of state  | %     |
|------|----------------|-------|
| 1    | Punjab         | 5.84  |
| 2    | Haryana        | 7.94  |
| 3    | Kerala         | 12.05 |
| 4    | Gujarat        | 13.13 |
| 5    | Rajasthan      | 14.78 |
| 6    | Andhra Pradesh | 15.36 |
| 7    | Karnataka      | 19    |
| 8    | Tamil Nadu     | 20.95 |
| 9    | Maharashtra    | 24.58 |
| 10   | West Bengal    | 28.01 |

Source: India Today August, 2004

**Microfinance**

20.23 Kerala's achievements in rural development through participatory planning and Kudumbashree is another model in the development front. Kudumbashree envisages mobilising microfinance through thrift and credit operation and set up micro enterprises for the unemployed for additional income generation. Kudumbashree is an attack on poverty. Achievements under Kudumbashree Programmes are given in Table-20.14

**Table - 20.14**  
**Major achievements under Kudumbashree Mission, 2004**

| Sl No | Particulars   | Achievements (Nos) |
|-------|---|--------------------|
| 1     | Number of members/families                                  | 3098011            |
| 2     | Neighborhood groups (NHGs) at Grass root level              | 151406             |
| 3     | Area Development Society (ADS) at ward level                | 13924              |
| 4     | Community Development Society CDS at local Government level | 1050               |

Source : Kudumbashree Mission, Kerala.

20.24 The thrift amount (cumulative) collected is Rs.432.35 crore and internal lending (cumulative) to NHGs is Rs.874.78 crore. The cumulative disbursement of bank loans to NHGs amounted to Rs.153.70 crore as on December 31, 2004 around 44325 NHGs. This translates to an average loan per NHG at Rs.34,676.

**Crime**

20.25 The year-wise total number of crimes under Indian Penal Code (IPC) and Special Local Laws (SLL) is given in Table-20.15. Nearly three-fourth of all crimes are Indian Penal Code crimes. The Special and Local laws crimes constituted nearly 25% during 2002.

**Table-20.15**  
**Details of Cases Under IPC and SLL in Kerala.**

| Year | IPC    | SLL   | Total  | Ratio (IPC:SLL) |
|------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| 1996 | 86141  | 14675 | 100816 | 100:17          |
| 1997 | 92523  | 13507 | 106030 | 100:15          |
| 1998 | 93020  | 15782 | 108802 | 100:17          |
| 1999 | 94448  | 17825 | 112273 | 100:19          |
| 2000 | 99033  | 23529 | 122562 | 100:24          |
| 2001 | 103847 | 31598 | 135445 | 100:30          |
| 2002 | 104200 | 34954 | 139154 | 100:34          |

Source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics

**Crime rate:**

20.26 The rate of crime defined as the number of crimes per one-lakh inhabitants is universally accepted as an indicator since it balances the effect of growth in population. The crime rate in respect of IPC decreased marginally by 0.6% while SLL increased 9.1% and total crime rate increased of 1.7% during 2002 over 2001 (Table-20.16).

**Table-20.16**  
**Crime rate under IPC and SLL –Kerala**

| Year | Estimated Mid-year Population (lakhs) | Crime Rate |     | Total |
|------|---------------------------------------|------------|-----|-------|
|      |                                       | IPC        | SLL |       |
| 1997 | 308.03                                | 300        | 44  | 344   |
| 1998 | 310.82                                | 299        | 51  | 350   |
| 1999 | 313.65                                | 301        | 57  | 358   |
| 2000 | 316.50                                | 313        | 74  | 387   |
| 2001 | 319.38                                | 325        | 99  | 424   |
| 2002 | 322.29                                | 323        | 108 | 431   |

source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics

**Atrocities against women in Kerala**

20.27 The atrocities against women have been increased 300% during the period 1991 to 2001, while the population growth of women increased only by 14.58%. Incidence of total crimes against women reported a decline of 3.7% during 2003 over 2002. Rape cases reported a decline of 24 % and molestation cases reported a decline of 5.5% while torture cases reported an increase of

1.1%. An analysis of the share of various crimes against women indicates that crimes like rape and molestation decreased while cruelty by husband and relatives increased during 2003 over 2002. The details are given in Table 20.17

**Migration**

20.28 Lack of employment opportunities within the State has forced a large chunk of working age population to go else where in search of employment.

20.29 There were 13.62 lakh Kerala emigrants living abroad in 1998. Emigration from Kerala has increased in recent years. Between 1988 - 1992 and 1993 - 1997, the number of emigrants increased by 120 per cent. Large scale emigration from the State began only in the 1970's. Arab Countries and Middle East Countries were the destination of 95 % of emigrants. The district wise details of non-resident Keralites is given in Table 20.18.

**Table 20.17**  
**Atrocities committed against women-Kerala (1991-2003)**

| Offences                                | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003* |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Rape                                    | 211  | 227  | 211  | 197  | 266  | 389  | 588  | 589  | 423  | 552  | 562  | 499  | 377   |
| Molestation                             | 569  | 523  | 468  | 679  | 810  | 1166 | 1561 | 1173 | 1643 | 1695 | 1942 | 2123 | 2007  |
| Kidnapping                              | 99   | 86   | 85   | 120  | 110  | 149  | 160  | 130  | 123  | 89   | 97   | 91   | 121   |
| Eve-teasing                             | 5    | 1    | 5    | 3    | 14   | 40   | 70   | 96   | 50   | 69   | 81   | 102  | 80    |
| Dowry Death                             | 13   | 12   | 8    | 9    | 21   | 25   | 25   | 21   | 31   | 25   | 27   | 17   | 23    |
| 498(A) cruelty by Husband and relatives | 237  | 290  | 380  | 551  | 787  | 1079 | 1675 | 2125 | 2488 | 2418 | 2561 | 2836 | 2866  |
| Others                                  | 733  | 939  | 737  | 986  | 1305 | 2122 | 3227 | 2739 | 2985 | 2773 | 2171 | 1833 | 1748  |
| Total                                   | 1867 | 2078 | 1894 | 2545 | 3313 | 4970 | 7306 | 7473 | 7743 | 7621 | 7441 | 7501 | 7222  |

\*Provisional

Source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics

**Table-20.18**  
**District-wise Migrants -Kerala**

| Districts          | Non-Resident Keralites (NRK) |               |             | NRK per 100 HH |             | % to total |            |
|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------|------------|
|                    | 2004                         | 1999          | % increase  | 2004           | 1999        | 2004       | 1999       |
| Thiruvananthapuram | 271105                       | 249583        | 8.6         | 34.6           | 38.0        | 9.9        | 11.9       |
| Kollam             | 217771                       | 177083        | 23.0        | 35.8           | 31.6        | 8.0        | 8.4        |
| Pathanamthitta     | 217222                       | 152042        | 42.9        | 72.0           | 51.6        | 7.9        | 7.2        |
| Alappuzha          | 118145                       | 97442         | 21.2        | 24.0           | 20.4        | 4.3        | 4.6        |
| Kottayam           | 134937                       | 53658         | 151.5       | 30.4           | 13.7        | 4.9        | 2.6        |
| Idukki             | 11646                        | 12407         | -6.1        | 4.3            | 4.9         | 0.4        | 0.6        |
| Ernakulam          | 195672                       | 148778        | 31.5        | 27.4           | 24.4        | 7.2        | 7.1        |
| Thrissur           | 264896                       | 277890        | -4.7        | 40.3           | 44.2        | 9.7        | 13.2       |
| Palakkad           | 232884                       | 155300        | 50.0        | 42.6           | 29.2        | 8.5        | 7.4        |
| Malappuram         | 413324                       | 420460        | -1.7        | 68.5           | 69.7        | 15.1       | 20.0       |
| Kozhikode          | 276537                       | 176936        | 56.3        | 47.3           | 33.5        | 10.1       | 8.4        |
| Wayanad            | 11556                        | 7879          | 46.7        | 6.6            | 5.0         | 0.4        | 0.4        |
| Kannur             | 247808                       | 116328        | 113.0       | 52.9           | 25.1        | 9.1        | 5.5        |
| Kasaragod          | 118917                       | 55414         | 114.6       | 50.9           | 27.3        | 4.4        | 2.6        |
| <b>Kerala</b>      | <b>2732420</b>               | <b>210200</b> | <b>30.0</b> | <b>39.7</b>    | <b>33.0</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>100</b> |

Source : Working paper I, Gulf Revisited (7/2004 CDS, Tvm)

### Road and Motor Vehicles

20.30 The total road length in Kerala during 2003-04 is 145704 Kms. In relation to per lakh of population and 100 Sq.kms. of area the State's total road length is 462.6 kms and 374.9 kms against the national average of 258.2 kms and 74.9 kms respectively. In the previous year the total length of road in Kerala is 138196.47 kms.

20.31 The growth of Vehicle population in Kerala is growing at the rate of 10% per year. During 2004 the number of motor vehicles registered under Motor vehicle Act is 2792074 as against 2552171 in the previous year showing an increase of 9.4%. Kerala has 7184 vehicles per sq. km. and 8769 vehicles per lakh population.

### Infrastructure Indices

20.32 Kerala occupies the fourth position in Social and Economic Infrastructure Index. The first three places are occupied by Delhi, Punjab and Goa respectively (Table-20.19)

**Table.20.19**  
**Social and Economic Infrastructure Index**

|                   | CMIE Index        |               | CMIE Index  |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Andhra Pradesh    | 104.01 (13)       | Maharashtra   | 106.77 (9)  |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 71.89 (26)        | Manipur       | 83.5 (23)   |
| Assam             | 104.39 (12)       | Meghalaya     | 77.6 (25)   |
| Bihar             | 91.31 (18)        | Mizoram       | 84.49 (22)  |
| Delhi             | 730.62 (1)        | Nagaland      | 89.89 (19)  |
| Goa               | 171.57 (3)        | Orissa        | 101.45 (15) |
| Gujarat           | 105.33 (11)       | Punjab        | 171.92 (2)  |
| Haryana           | 133.12 (6)        | Rajasthan     | 87.27 (20)  |
| Himachal Pradesh  | 113.88 (7)        | Sikkim        | 83.01 (24)  |
| Jammu & Kashmir   | 92.03 (17)        | Tamil Nadu    | 145.62 (5)  |
| Karnataka         | 106.12 (10)       | Tripura       | 92.85 (16)  |
| <b>Kerala</b>     | <b>162.42 (4)</b> | Uttar Pradesh | 112.04 (8)  |
| Madhya Pradesh    | 86.66 (21)        | West Bengal   | 102.09 (14) |

Source : Centre for Development Studies

#### BOX-20.7

#### Tele- Density

The overall tele- density of the country crossed 7% . Six States namely Punjab, Kerala, Andaman and Nicobar, Himachal Pradesh and Gujarat have tele density greater than 10%. The tele- density of Major Cities is Delhi-42%, Mumbai-36%, Chennai-39% and Kolkata 19%.

Source : Department of Tele communication, Annual Report 2003-04

### Growth of Telecom Net work

20.33 The overall Telephone connections in Kerala as on 2004 are 48.76 lakh as against 36.81 Lakh in 2003. All India figures corresponding to this are 765.40 lakh and 546.17 lakh respectively.

### Consumption of Electricity

20.34 In 2002-03, the per capita consumption of electricity in Kerala was 395 Kw h, which was much lower than the all India level of 566.69 Kwh. Among southern States, per capita consumption was the highest in Tamil Nadu (815.26 kwh), followed by Andhra Pradesh( 672.64kwh) and Karnataka (611.16 kwh). In 2003-04, the per capita consumption of Kerala is 392 kwh and in 2004-05 it is 386 kwh.

### Aged in Kerala

20.35 Compared to other States, Kerala has the largest proportion of elderly population. The ageing

and feminisation of the Kerala

population in five decades are shown in Table.20.20. The male population aged 60 years above constitutes about 10 per cent of the total male population, whereas the corresponding proportion of women is 11.62 per cent. The proportion of aged population increased from 5.8 per cent in 1961 to 10.84 per cent in 2001 and is expected to increase further. Serious thought need to be

given in the coming years to the adoption of a variety of policies and action programmes to meet the needs of the growing elderly population.

**Table-20.20**

**Male and Female 60 years and above. (%)**

| Year | Male  | Female | Average |
|------|-------|--------|---------|
| 1961 | 5.65  | 6.02   | 5.84    |
| 1971 | 5.97  | 6.47   | 6.22    |
| 1981 | 7.15  | 7.84   | 7.50    |
| 1991 | 8.33  | 9.29   | 8.82    |
| 2001 | 10.00 | 11.62  | 10.84   |

Source : Kerala Calling. (Aug. 2004)