



Socio Economic Implications of Urban Poverty in Tamil Nadu: A Field Survey Study

Dr.R.Karthikeyan¹, Dr.M.Sulthana Barvin² and Mrs.V.Nalini³

¹Associate Professor & Head, Department of Economics, A.V.C.College (Autonomous), Mayiladuthurai,

²Associate Professor & Head, Dept of Economics, Sadakathullah Appa College (Autonomous),

Tirunelveli,

³Asst. Prof. of Economics, SIVET College, Chennai-73

Tamil Nadu

India

ABSTRACT

Though Poverty has been a serious issue in the development process across the world for quite a long period of time and alleviation of poverty has been one of the major challenges faced by most of the countries of the world, the issue of urban poverty is not new, but it is often narrowly viewed as an economic issue that is best addressed by economic policies and interventions. The SDG 1, also known as the “No Poverty” goal, is a global effort to eradicate extreme poverty and reduce income inequality by 2030. This goal is of utmost importance because poverty is a pervasive and complex issue that affects billions of people around the world. It can have serious consequences for individuals, communities, and economies, including poor health, limited access to education and other essential services, and reduced economic opportunity. Poverty is currently a serious socio economic concern in India. In spite of a number urban poverty alleviation measures taken by the government still the incidence of poverty exists and further there are social, economic and regional variations observed both at macro level as well as micro level. Hence, the present study tries to study the socio economic implications of urban poverty in one of the recently incepted Corporations of Tamil Nadu, Thanjavur through field survey. This analysis attempts to study the Socio Demographic background of the sample respondents; to analyse the Income and Expenditure Pattern of the selected sample respondents; and to suggest possible policy measures to reduce the incidence of urban poverty to improve the standard of living of the respondents of the study area. Urban poverty today, as driven by globalization and rapid uncontrolled urbanization, also needs to be recognized as a social, political, and cultural process that has profound impacts on overall economic progress.

Keywords: Consumption Pattern, Poverty Line, Poverty Ratio, SDGs, SHGs, Urban Poverty, Urbanization.

1. INTRODUCTION

During the last seven decades India has made tremendous progress in almost all sectors of the economy. Its economy has expanded and diversified, society has become cohesive and Polity has democratized in one side and being the second highest populous country of world India, it has been facing a number of problems, some of which have been successfully been solved, but many others still remain unsolved on the other side. Poverty is one of the biggest challenges of India which has been facing till today since long. Not only in India at global level, the incidence of poverty, today, around 700 million people accounts to nearly 8.5 percent of the global population live in extreme poverty - on less than \$2.15 per day; and around 3.5 billion people accounts to 44 percent of the global population remain poor by a standard that is more relevant for upper middle-income countries, \$6.85 per day. Two thirds of the world's population in extreme poverty lives in Sub-Saharan Africa, rising to three quarters when including all fragile

and conflict-affected countries. Based on the current trajectory, 622 million people, about 7.3 percent of the global population, are projected to live in extreme poverty in 2030. In addition, 3.4 billion people (nearly 40 percent of the world's population) will likely live on less than \$6.85 per day. Almost 129 million Indians are living in extreme poverty in 2024, on less than \$2.15 (about Rs 181) a day, down from 431 million in 1990 (The World Bank). However, with a higher poverty standard of \$6.85 (about Rs 576) per day, the poverty threshold for middle-income countries, more Indians are living below the poverty line in 2024 than in 1990, primarily driven by 'population growth'. Based on the findings of a study in India, it is found that, applying the estimated head count ratio of 27.4% in rural areas and 23.7% in urban areas to the population, there were 246.7 million poor persons in rural India and 114.4 million poor persons in urban India. Altogether, there are 361 million persons that cannot even afford the minimum expenditure norm set by the Rangarajan-led Expert Group. India has more poor people than the entire population of the United States of America. By GDP or national income, India is ranked fifth globally, but in terms of the absolute number of people in poverty, India ranks first in the world. Though the anti-poverty strategy comprising of a wide range of poverty alleviation and employment generating programmes has been implemented but results show that the situation is grim. Importantly, poverty in urban India gets exacerbated by substantial rate of population growth, high rate of migration from the rural areas and mushrooming of slum pockets. Migration alone accounts for about 40 per cent of the growth in urban population, converting the rural poverty into urban one. It is measured by using the method proposed by Rangarajan Committee to calculate the poverty line in 2022–23 for rural areas (Rs 2,515) and (Rs 3,630) for urban areas. This resulted in an overall poverty head-count ratio of 26.4%. Using a low poverty line threshold, that too in data that possibly contains an upward bias we still found that more than one in four Indians lives in poverty.

Further it is observed that at the national level, rural poverty is higher than poverty in urban areas but the gap between the two has decreased over the last couple of decades. The incidence of decline of urban poverty has not accelerated with GDP growth. As the urban population in the country is growing, so is urban poverty. Urban poverty poses the problems of housing and shelter, water, sanitation, health, education, social security and livelihoods along with special needs of vulnerable groups like women, children and aged people. 11.2 million of the total slum population of the country is in Maharashtra followed by Andhra Pradesh (5.2 million), and Uttar Pradesh (4.4 million). Although the slum population has increased, the number of slums is lower, which makes them more dense. There is higher concentration of slum population in the large urban centres (Census, 2011). Poor people live in slums which are overcrowded, often polluted and lack basic civic amenities like clean drinking water, sanitation and health facilities. Most of them are involved in informal sector activities where there is constant threat of eviction, removal, confiscation of goods and almost non-existent social security cover. A substantial portion of the benefits provided by public agencies are cornered by middle and upper income households. 54.71 percent of urban slums have no toilet facility. Most free community toilets built by state Government or local bodies are rendered unusable because of the lack of maintenance. The pace of poverty reduction was relatively rapid in Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Punjab and West Bengal. The decline in poverty ratio, however, was not enough to reduce the number of poor in eight major states. These are Assam, Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh. The SDG 1, also known as the "No Poverty" goal, is a global effort to eradicate extreme poverty and reduce income inequality by 2030. This goal is of utmost importance because poverty is a pervasive and complex issue that affects billions of people around the world. It can have serious consequences for individuals, communities, and economies, including poor health, limited access to education and other essential services, and reduced economic opportunity. Poverty is currently a serious socio economic concern in India. Poverty may create and contribute to corruption, bribery, illnesses, a lack of education, spousal abuse, parental troubles, unemployment, drug usage, and other negative behaviours. In spite of a number urban poverty alleviation measures taken by the government still the incidence of poverty exists. Hence, the present study tries to study the socio economic implications of urban poverty in one of the recently incepted Corporations of Tamil Nadu, Thanjavour through field survey.

2. OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The specific objectives of the present paper are to study the Socio Demographic background of the sample respondents; to analyse the Income and Expenditure Pattern of the selected sample respondents; and to suggest

possible policy measures to reduce the incidence of urban poverty to improve the standard of living of the respondents of the study area.

The present paper tries to answer the questions that What are the social and economic variables affecting the urban poverty at micro level in the study area?; and Whether the incidence of poverty is associated with the social variables such as Gender, Community, Religion, Literacy, Marital Status, etc and the Economic variables such as Income, Expenditure, Debt, Savings, Assets, etc. or not?

Based on the objectives the hypothesis that the incidence of poverty is varied with community, religion, family size, nature of house, level of education, nature of occupation, income, level of consumption and so on has been formulated.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study has adopted the Multi Stage Random Sampling Technique. In the First Stage the Study Area, Thanjavour district of the state Tamil Nadu has been purposively chosen as it is one of fast growing and recently incepted Corporations of the state. Followed by Thanjavour Block has been purposively chosen since it has the maximum population among the 14 blocks of the corporation, then, Two representative Wards from the Block have been chosen based on the average size of population, viz, Ward 10 and 31. Further, a total sample of 160 households has been chosen based on proportionate random sampling strategy from the selected wards, Ward 10 and 31; 10% of households from each ward have been chosen as the sample respondents which accounts to 160 households have been chosen as the final respondents for the primary data collection. To facilitate the analysis both primary data and secondary have been used which have been collected from the selected respondents through a well structured and pre tested interview schedule.

Analysis and Discussion

BPL, a benchmark set by the government of India to identify individuals and households in need of government assistance and aid. The BPL line is a monetary threshold, and families whose income falls below this level are classified as being below the poverty line. The BPL line is determined using various methods. One of the most prominent is the Tendulkar Methodology, named after the late economist Suresh Tendulkar. This approach considers spending on food, education, and health, apart from the bare calorie intake that was used earlier. It was estimated that as of 2009-2010, a family earning less than Rs. 27.20 per day in rural areas or less than Rs. 33.33 per day in urban areas was considered below the poverty line according to the Tendulkar Methodology. Currently, the below poverty line in urban areas is fixed at Rs.1, 286 and in rural areas it is Rs. 1059.42 per month. However, it is important to note that the poverty line can vary widely from state to state due to differences in cost of living and other factors. The BPL line helps to target social benefits and welfare programs more effectively, but it has also been criticized for being too low and not accurately reflecting the real cost of living in many parts of India.

The state-wise poverty ratios have witnessed a secular decline continuously over the period of time. Though poverty has declined at the macro-level, rural urban and inter-state disparities are visible. The rural poverty ratio is still relatively high in Orissa, Bihar and the North Eastern States. In Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, the urban poverty ratios were in the range of 30.89 to 42.83 per cent in 1999-2000. The combined rural and urban poor make up 47.15 per cent of Orissa and 42.60 per cent of Bihar. For the states of Madhya Pradesh, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh and Assam the combined poverty ratios in 1999-2000 were in the range of 33.47 to 37.43 per cent. There has been a significant reduction in poverty during the period in Kerala, Jammu & Kashmir, Goa, Lakshdweep, Delhi, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, West Bengal and Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

Table 1. State-wise Poverty Lines Distribution in Rupees Per Capita Per Month Earning

Sl.No	State/ UTs	1983-84		1993-94		2011-12		2022-23	
		Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
1	A &N Islands (TN)	96.15	120.30	196.53	296.63	1229	1845	3848	4992
2	Andhra Pradesh	72.66	106.43	163.02	278.14	1036	1475	2609	3541
3	Arunachal Pradesh	98.32	97.51	232.05	212.42	1132	1517	3247	4248
4	Assam	98.32	97.51	232.05	212.42	1023	1548	2849	3933
5	Bihar	97.48	111.80	212.16	238.49	976	1340	2616	3539
6	Chandigarh (HP)	88.57	101.03	233.79	253.61	1209	1577	2939	3999
7	Chhattisgarh (MP)	83.59	122.82	193.10	317.16	897	1314	2382	3312
8	Dadra& Naga Haveli	88.24	115.61	194.94	126.47	1005	1669	2603	3290
9	Daman & Diu (Goa)	88.24	126.47	194.94	328.56	1206	1552	3181	3964
10	Delhi	88.57	123.24	233.79	309.48	1353	1647	3104	4100
11	Goa	88.24	126.47	194.94	328.56	1166	1560	2654	3913
12	Gujarat	83.29	123.22	202.11	297.22	1134	1667	2799	3935
13	Haryana	88.57	103.48	233.79	258.23	1137	1637	2575	3681
14	Himachal Pradesh	88.57	102.26	233.79	253.61	985	1472	2457	3397
15	Jammu & Kashmir	91.75	99.62	233.79	253.61	982	1432	2263	3391
16	Jharkhand (Bihar)	97.48	111.80	212.16	238.49	940	1393	2627	3656
17	Karnataka	83.31	120.19	186.63	302.89	921	1491	2694	3650
18	Kerala	99.35	122.64	243.84	280.54	1031	1435	2812	3910
19	Lakshadweep(KL)	99.35	122.64	243.84	280.54	1166	1467	3107	4078
20	Madhya Pradesh	83.59	122.82	193.10	317.16	946	1455	2295	3425
21	Maharashtra	88.24	126.47	194.94	328.56	1084	1707	2665	3932
22	Manipur	98.32	97.51	232.05	212.42	1285	1732	3098	4067
23	Meghalaya	98.32	97.51	232.05	212.42	1124	1624	2756	3807
24	Mizoram	98.32	97.51	232.05	212.42	1159	1735	3225	4245
25	Nagaland	98.32	97.51	232.05	212.42	1279	1768	2980	4238
26	Odisha	106.28	124.81	194.03	298.22	878	1327	2288	3324
27	Pondicherry (TN)	96.15	120.30	196.53	296.63	1070	1421	2962	3655
28	Punjab	88.57	101.03	233.79	253.61	1148	1604	2763	3653
29	Rajasthan	80.24	113.55	215.89	280.85	1059	1532	2614	3577
30	Sikkim	98.32	97.51	232.05	212.42	1090	1595	3244	4506
31	Tamil Nadu	96.15	120.30	196.53	296.63	989	1391	2815	3759
32	Tripura	98.32	97.51	232.05	212.42	912	1441	2833	3823
33	Uttar Pradesh	83.85	110.23	213.01	258.65	918	1446	2893	3923
34	Uttarakhand (UP)	83.85	110.23	213.01	258.65	984	1520	2443	3701
35	West Bengal	105.55	105.91	220.74	247.53	971	1501	2735	3707
	All India	89.50	115.65	205.84	281.35	972	1502	2511	3576

Source: Authors' Calculations based on NSSO 1985; NSSO 1995; NSSO (2013b) ; NSSO, 2024

Table 2 State Wise Incidence of Urban Poverty in India

Sl.No	State/UT	1993-94		1999-2000		2004-05		2011-12	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Andhra Pradesh	74.47	38.33	60.88	26.63	55	23.4	16.98	5.81
2	Arunachal Pradesh	0.11	7.73	0.18	7.47	0.6	23.5	0.66	20.33
3	Assam	2.03	7.73	2.38	7.47	8.3	21.8	9.21	20.49
4	Bihar	42.49	34.50	49.13	32.91	42.8	43.7	37.75	31.23
5	Goa	1.53	27.03	0.59	7.52	1.7	22.2	0.38	4.09
6	Gujarat	43.02	27.89	28.09	15.59	42.9	20.1	26.88	10.14
7	Haryana	7.31	16.38	5.39	9.99	15.9	22.4	9.41	10.28
8	Himachal Pradesh	0.46	9.18	0.20	4.63	0.3	4.6	0.30	4.33
9	Jammu&Kashmir	1.86	9.18	4.49	1.98	2.9	10.4	2.53	7.20
10	Karnataka	60.46	40.14	44.49	25.25	51.8	25.9	36.96	15.25
11	Kerala	20.46	24.55	20.27	20.27	19.8	18.4	8.46	4.97
12	Madhya Pradesh	82.33	48.38	81.22	38.44	21.3	35.1	43.10	21.00
13	Maharashtra	111.90	35.15	102.87	26.81	114.6	25.6	47.36	9.12
14	Manipur	0.47	7.73	0.66	7.47	2.3	34.5	2.78	32.59
15	Meghalaya	0.29	7.73	0.34	7.47	1.2	24.7	0.57	9.26
16	Mizoram	0.30	7.73	0.45	7.47	0.4	7.9	0.37	6.36
17	Nagaland	0.20	7.73	0.28	7.47	0.2	4.3	1.00	16.48
18	Orissa	19.70	41.64	25.40	42.83	22.8	37.6	12.39	17.29
19	Punjab	7.35	11.35	4.29	5.75	16.9	18.7	9.82	9.24
20	Rajasthan	33.82	30.49	26.78	19.85	43.5	29.7	18.73	10.69
21	Sikkim	0.03	7.73	0.04	7.47	0.2	25.9	0.06	3.66
22	TamilNadu	80.40	39.77	49.97	22.11	59.7	19.7	23.40	6.54
23	Tripura	0.38	7.73	0.49	7.47	1.5	22.5	0.75	7.42
24	Uttar Praadesh	108.28	35.39	117.88	30.89	130.1	34.1	118.84	26.06
25	West Bengal	44.66	22.41	33.38	14.86	60.8	24.4	43.83	14.66
26	A & Nicobar Island	0.33	39.77	0.24	22.11	0.01	0.8	.	.
27	Chandigarh	0.73	11.35	0.45	5.75	0.9	10.1	2.34	22.31
28	Dadra&NagarHaveli	0.06	39.93	0.03	13.52	0.14	17.8	0.28	15.38
29	Daman&Diu	0.15	27.03	0.05	7.52	0.13	14.4	0.26	12.62
30	Delhi	15.32	16.03	11.42	9.42	18.3	12.9	16.46	9.84
31	Lakshadweep	0.08	24.55	0.08	20.27	0.04	10.5	0.02	3.44
32	Puducherry	2.38	39.77	1.77	22.11	0.7	9.9	0.55	6.30
33	All India	763.37	32.36	670.07	23.62	814.1	25.5	531.25	13.70

Source: Reports of Various Planning Commission, GOI.

Further it was observed that Jharkhand ranks as the second poorest state in India. The poverty level in Jharkhand is around 42.16%, surpassing the national average which may be closely attributed to the state's social indicators, including literacy, enrollment rates, infant mortality, and child nutrition, lag behind the rest of the country. Manipur, the third poorest state, exhibits a poverty rate of approximately 36.89%. The state's economic backwardness stems from challenges such as inadequate infrastructure, including electricity, transportation, and communication networks. These factors contribute to the state's struggle for economic development, resulting in high poverty rates. Despite its rich cultural heritage and natural resources, Manipur's development has been hampered by a lack of investment and infrastructure development. Arunachal Pradesh, the largest state among the northeastern states, ranks

as the fourth poorest state in India. Approximately 34.67% of its population lives below the poverty line which is attributed to remote location and limited access to major production centers and lack of infrastructure and investment hinder economic progress and contribute to its high poverty levels. Bihar, with approximately 33.74% of its population living below the poverty line, ranks as the fifth poorest state in India. The high poverty levels in Bihar can be attributed to factors such as institutional and technical deficiencies, illiteracy, lack of access to quality education and healthcare, and structural challenges in the agricultural sector. Chhattisgarh, another impoverished state, witnesses around one-third of its population living below the poverty line. The poverty level in Chhattisgarh stands at 39.93%, highlighting the pressing need for development interventions. Although the state contributes only 15% of the total steel production in India, it grapples with significant poverty due to limited economic opportunities, a lack of access to basic amenities and services in rural areas.

Odisha, with a poverty rate of 29.04%, faces challenges related to educational backwardness and inadequate female literacy rates. Half of the state's population is educationally disadvantaged, and the lack of educational opportunities hampers overall development. Efforts to improve access to education and enhance female literacy are crucial for reducing poverty in Odisha. Approximately 32.07% of Assam's population lives below the poverty line, which may be due to the state's location, distant from major production centers, unfavorable climate conditions and lack of infrastructure and investment act as a barrier to economic progress. Addressing these challenges is essential for uplifting the state and improving the living standards of its population. Madhya Pradesh often referred to as the tribal state of India, exhibits a poverty rate of approximately 36.07%. The state is home to the largest number of Scheduled Tribes in the country. Forest-dependent rural communities, particularly tribal populations, heavily rely on forest resources for subsistence, income, and employment. Measures to diversify livelihood options, promote sustainable development, and provide better access to basic amenities are essential for poverty alleviation in Madhya Pradesh. Karnataka, despite being a state with rapid urbanization, records a poverty rate of 13.2%. While urban areas like Bangalore have experienced significant development, disparities exist in other regions, such as North Karnataka. Tackling urban-rural disparities, improving infrastructure, and promoting inclusive growth are key strategies for reducing poverty and ensuring balanced development in Karnataka. Despite its economic progress, Karnataka's development has been uneven, leading to high levels of poverty in many parts of the state.

Urban Poor - Social Profile

The present paper primarily tries to study the socio economic implications of urban poverty based on the primary data collected through field survey. With regard to Social profile of the respondents, out of 160 respondents, 139 (87%) respondents are male and 21 (13%) respondents are female, with regard to the age distribution, majority 68% respondents are under the age group 25-45 years and only 8% respondents are above 65 years old. Further, 84 Percent are Hindu 12 Percent are Christian and only 4% belong to Muslim community; Majority of the respondents i.e. 54% are BC while 20 % are SC community and 26% MBC community.. Further, 70 percent of the respondents reside at nuclear family. With regard to the family size distribution Majority of households have the family members in between 5 and 8 i.e 84% and 70 Percent of the respondents are married. It is found that the educational status of the sample respondents which infers that among the respondents majority i.e. 42% are secondary level educated and only 2% are higher level educated and it is appreciable that no one is illiterate. Further it is found that about 84 Percent are residing at owned house in the study area. Most of the house value lies less than Rs.3 Lakhs (41 Houses) and only 5 households are living at the high valued house. Further, majority is daily wage earners, 32 % are industries workers and 12 % of the respondents are doing small businesses.

Urban Poor – Economic Profile

Since Poverty is closely related to the economic status of the respondents the major economic variables such as income, expenditure, savings position, Asset Position, indebtedness of the respondents have been taken for analysis. It is also found that only 8 % of the respondents have earned less than Rs.5000/- monthly and it is to be appreciated that 22 % belong to the income group of above Rs.15000. The same trend is attributed in the case of expenditure and savings also. Further, 8% the respondents have spent on food items less than Rs.4000/- per month and 8% of the respondents spent above Rs.12000 per month on food items. Similarly, more than half of the respondents i.e. 52 % spent less than Rs.1000 on non-food items and only one respondent spent above Rs.4000 per month on non-food items. With regard to saving 22 % of the respondents have not saved any amount and half of the respondents i.e. 50%

have saved less than Rs.10000 and on the other side only 06 respondents have saved more than Rs.20000 so far in the study area. Similarly, all the respondents are indebted to some extent, 64 % have borrowed less than Rs.25000 and only 4 % have borrowed above Rs.1 Lakh. Among the sample respondents 32% have owned assets worth less than Rs.2 Lakhs and 16% of the respondents have owned assets worth of above Rs. 6 Lakhs

Table 3. Social and Economic Profile of Urban Poor

Social Profile				Economic Profile		
Description		Respondents		Description	Respondents	
		Nos	Per cent		Nos	Per cent
Sex	Total	1600	100	Monthly Income		
	Male	139	87	Below 5000	13	08
	Female	21	13	5001 to 10000	48	30
Religion				10001 to 15000	64	40
	Hindu	135	84	Above 15000	35	22
	Christian	19	12	Asset Position		
Community	Muslim	06	04	Below 2 Lakhs	51	32
				2 to 4 Lakhs	45	28
	SC/ST	72	45	4 to 6 Lakhs	38	24
	MBC	35	22	Above 6 Lakhs	26	16
	BC	53	33	Consumption -Food Items		
Age	Total	160	100	Below 4000	13	08
				4001 to 8000	57	36
	Below 25	13	08	8001 to 12000	77	48
	25- 45	108	68	12001 and Above	13	08
	45-65	26	16	Consumption-Non Food Items		
Family Type	65& Above	13	08	Below 1000	83	52
	Total	160	100	1001 to 2000	38	24
				2001 to 3000	35	22
	Nuclear	112	70	3001 &Above	04	02
	Joint Family	48	30	Indebtedness		
Family Size				Below 25000	103	64
	Less than 4	19	12	25001 to 50000	26	16
	5-8	135	84	50001 to 75000	16	10
	More than 08	06	04	75001 to 1 Lakh	09	06
				Above 1 Lakh	06	04
Marital Status	Married	112	70	Savings		
	Un-Married	25	16	No Savings	35	22
	Widow	23	14	Below 5000	42	26
Occupation				5001 to 10000	38	24
	Business	20	12	10001 to 15000	26	16
	Daily Wage Labour	94	56	15001 to 20000	13	08
	Industry Worker	46	32	20001& Above	06	04

Source: Primary Data

It is also known from the regression model that there are host of factors, such as, religion, educational status, family size, income, consumption pattern, occupation etc. are closely related with the income of the respondents.

It is calculated that the value of R^2 is 0.79 which implies that 79 % of influencing variables on poverty is influenced by these variables which are included in the model. From this model, it is found that among these variables, the Consumption Expenditure is primarily and closely related to income since the calculated regression coefficient for consumption expenditure is 0.26 followed by occupation, (0.19), Asset Position (0.14), Level of Education (0.16) and Community (0.04); from this model it could be inferred that there are host of factors, such as, religion, educational status, family size, income, consumption pattern, occupation etc. are closely related with the income of the respondents. Hence, the hypothesis that there are host of factors influencing the incidence of poverty, such as, religion, educational status, family size, income, consumption pattern, occupation etc. among these factors, the economic factors are influencing more than that of others is proved.

From the analysis it is noted that with regard to income distribution only 8 % of the respondents have earned less than Rs.5000/- monthly followed by 30% belong to the income group of Rs.5001- 10000; 40 % belong to the income group of Rs.10001 – 15000 and it is to be appreciated that 22 % belong to the income group of above Rs.15000. The same trend is attributed in the case of expenditure and savings also.

Since the income has its influence on the level of consumption and savings, 8% the respondents have spent on food items less than Rs.4000/- per month, 36 % have spent in between Rs.4000 and Rs.8000, 48% of the households spent in between Rs.8000 and Rs.12000 and 8% of the respondents spent above Rs.12000 per month on food items. Similarly, more than half of the respondents i.e 52 % spent less than Rs.1000 on non-food items and only one respondent spent above Rs.4000 per month on non-food items. With regard to saving 22 % of the respondents have not saved any amount and half of the respondents i.e. 50% have saved less than Rs.10000 and on the other side only 13 respondents have saved more than Rs.20000 so far in the study area. Similarly, all the respondents are indebted to some extent, 64 % have borrowed less than Rs.25000 and only 4 % have borrowed above Rs.1 Lakh. Among the sample respondents 32% have owned assets worth less than Rs.2 Lakhs and 16% of the respondents have owned assets worth of above Rs. 6 Lakhs.

The incidence of poverty is closely attributed with community, religion, family size, nature of house, level of education, nature of occupation, income, level of consumption and so on; to measure the variables which are closely related to income the regression model has also been applied.

$$Y = b_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + b_4 x_4 + b_5 x_5 \dots U$$

Y = Monthly Income ; X_1 = Consumption Expenditure; X_2 = Asset Position

X_3 = Level of Education; X_4 = Community; X_5 = Occupation.

b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5 , are parameters to be estimated. U = Error term

It is calculated that the value of R^2 is 0.79 which implies that 79 % of influencing variables on poverty is influenced by these variables which are included in the model. From this model, it is found that among these variables, the Consumption Expenditure is primarily and closely related to income since the calculated regression coefficient for consumption expenditure is 0.26 followed by occupation, (0.19), Asset Position (0.14), Level of Education (0.16) and Community (0.04); from this model it could be inferred that there are host of factors, such as, religion, educational status, family size, income, consumption pattern, occupation etc. are closely related with the income of the respondents.

Policy Implications and Conclusion

It is fact that observed that rapid economic growth has not led to a corresponding decline in poverty. Urban poverty thus, emerges as a more complex phenomenon than rural poverty. The urban poor faces more problems related with housing amenities, urban infrastructure, size of town or city, and vulnerabilities, housing, economic, social and personal. It is observed from the analysis that there are more variations found in the incidence of poverty among states and among districts of states and hence proper measures may be taken to bridge the interstate and inter district variations in the poverty; it is suggested that all states of the nation and all districts of the state should design a common and uniform policy measure to mitigate the urban poverty; it is also noted that poverty reduction strategy

enunciated by the Central and state governments should focus on vocational education and training since vast majority people living in poverty cannot afford and have access to training opportunities, which are commercially managed; it has now widely recognized that the poverty alleviation programmes are effective in bringing much needed income to poor families and their communities. Thus, financial investment in jobs and employment may create addition opportunities to poor youth. Proper measures may be taken to strengthen the programmes like Skill India; Moreover, participation and inclusion are central to new approach to poverty reduction. Cooperatives and people's associations including Self Help Groups are an ideal instrument in such a strategy and hence measures may be taken to encourage forming not only women SHGs but also Men SHGs in the study district; It is also suggested that special field level training must be provided to the local level authorities who are directly involving with the vulnerable people like municipal managers, administrators and personnel is required on sustainable basis. Academic institutions, local NGO's, private organizations etc. should be enhanced to cater to the needs of training of municipal personnel. Awareness programmes may also be inculcated among the people of the study area relating to the availability of various opportunities and government programmes on employment generations, poverty alleviations through Local Media. In the study area there are a number of educational institutions including Medical, Engineering, Agricultural and general, it is suggested that all higher educational institutions may adopt each one ward of this corporation and device programmes for the upliftment of the vulnerable group of the people.

To conclude, though Poverty has been a serious issue in the development process across the world for quite a long period of time and alleviation of poverty has been one of the major challenges faced by most of the countries of the world, the issue of urban poverty is not new, but it is often narrowly viewed as an economic issue that is best addressed by economic policies and interventions. Urban poverty today, as driven by globalization and rapid uncontrolled urbanization, also needs to be recognized as a social, political, and cultural process that has profound impacts on overall economic progress. It is a complex phenomenon of many dimensions but not merely the economic dimension. So, the government should provide better and comprehensive development programme facilities, so that people living below poverty line can improve their livelihood. It is also suggested that Poverty alleviation programmes should also take up the issue of poverty not only from the Socio- Cultural and Economic perspectives; but also Political and Institutional perspectives; Technological and environmental perspectives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors kindly acknowledge Dr.D.Vettriselvi, Principal, Agaram Matriculation School, Karuppampulam, Vedaranyam, Tamil Nadu for her academic assistance and discussion while drafting this paper.

REFERENCES

- Ahluwalia, Montek S. (1990)**, "*Policies for Poverty Alleviation*", Asian Development Review, Vol. 8, # 1, pp 111-132.
- Amartya K. Sen (1981)** , Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlements and Deprivation, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Ankuran, A.(2020)**., "*Problem of Poverty in India*" , International Journal of Research and Review Vol.7; Issue: 1; E-ISSN: 2349-9788; P-ISSN: 2454-2237
- Babu, R., & Panda, A.N.(2016)**, "*Poverty Alleviation in India: A Study of National Policies and Programmes*", International Journal of Advanced Research and Development , Volume 1; Issue 2,ISSN: 2455-4030,PP-06-11
- Banerjee, Abhijit and Esther Duflo, (2007)**, "*The Economic Lives of the Poor*," Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 21(2), Pp 141-167.
- Bapat, Meera & Nigel Crook (1992)**, "*Struggle and Survival of Poor Metropolitan Households - A Longitudinal Study in Pune: 1979 to 1988*" Economic & Political Weekly Vol. 37, No. 22, May 30, pp. 1141-1147.
- Bhalla, S.S. (2003a)**, '*Recounting the Poor, Poverty in India 1983-1999*', Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 38, No. 4, Jan 25-31), p.338-349.

Bhagwati, Jagdish N. (1988), "*Poverty and Public Policy*", World Development, Vol. 16, No 5, pp 539-555.

Chaudhuri, S. and N. Gupta (2009), "*Level of Living and Poverty Patterns: A District-wise Analysis from India*", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 45, No. 9, February 28, pp. 94-110.

Dandekar, V.M. and N. Rath (1971a), "*Poverty in India – I : Dimensions and Trends*", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.6, No. 1, January 2, pp. 25-48.

Dandekar, V.M. and N. Rath(1971b), "*Poverty in India - II: Policies and Programmes*", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.6, No. 2, January 9, pp. 106-145.

Deaton. A. and V. Kozel (2005), '*Data and Dogma: The Great Indian Poverty Debate*', The World Bank Research Observer, Vol. 20, No. 2.

Gangopadhyay, K and Singh, K,(2013) "*Extent of Poverty in India: A Different Dimension*", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol XVIII, No 6

Jain L R and Suresh D Tendulkar (1995), *Economic Reforms and Poverty*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol - XXX No.23, June 10, 1995.

Karthikeyan R and D.Vettriselvi (2018), *Incidence of Urban Poverty in Tamil Nadu: A Micro Level Socio Economic Analysis*, International Journal of Engineering and Management Research, Vol. 8, Issue.1, ISSN- 2394- 6962, February, 2018

Karthikeyan R and D.Vettriselvi (2018), "*Urbanisation and Economic Development Relations in Tamil Nadu: A Descriptive Analysis*", Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research Vol. 5, Issue-10, ISSN- 2349- 5162, PP.923-931

Karthikeyan R and D.Vettriselvi (2018), "*Inter-State variations in Urban Poverty in India: A Composite Analysis*", Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research Vol. 5, Issue-12, ISSN- 2349-5162, PP.621-632

Madhura Swaminathan (1995) "*Aspects of Urban Poverty in Bombay*", Environment and Urbanization Vol. 7/1, pp.133-143.

Mitra, Arup (1992), "*Urban Poverty: A Rural Spill-Over?*", Indian Economic Review, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 403-419.

Narayanamoorthy A. and Munir A. Hanjra (2010), *What Contributes to Disparity in Rural-Urban Poverty in Tamil Nadu?: A District Level Analysis*, Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics Vol.65, No.2, April-June, pp 228-243

Patnaik Utsa (2010), '*Trends in Urban Poverty under Economic Reforms: 1993-94 to 2004-05*', Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 45, No. 4, January 23

Sundaram and Suresh D Tendulkar (2003), *Poverty among Social and Economic Groups in India in 1990s*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol -XXXVIII No. 50, December 13, 2003.

Tendulkar, Suresh & L.R. Jain (1991), "*Change in Number of Rural & Urban Poor Between 1970-71 & 1983*", Economic & Political Weekly, Vol. 26 # 11& 12, pp. 709-722.