

## Chapter 5

### Deprivation Distances

#### 5.1 The Approach

1. This Chapter views regional imbalances from the deprivation end. It is a sequel to all other chapters - preceding and succeeding – dealing with regional imbalances in development / backwardness. While they assess regional imbalances by using some select development-facilitating and development-manifesting indicators and indices, this chapter makes a similar attempt by using some of the select deprivation-causing and development-retarding, and deprivation- manifesting indicators. In this chapter we are trying to tackle the problem of regional imbalances in development from the deprivation end. We believe that by assessing regional imbalances in capability-related deprivations and by redressing them through conscious public policy intervention, the government would be in a position to reduce regional imbalances in development substantially. This exercise would widen our understanding of regional imbalances and make redressal measures more effective in weakening and arresting the forces of divergence and in strengthening and accelerating the forces of convergence. With such an end in view, an attempt is made in this Chapter to assess regional imbalances in deprivation with reference to income deprivation, health deprivation, and education deprivation, and based on such assessment, districts are identified for remedial action in phases.

#### 5.2 Rationale for Deprivation Study

2. By passage of time, there has been considerable evolution in our understanding of the twin notions of ‘development’ and ‘deprivation’. In the case of development, we have been gradually moving away from the narrower notion of income-centered ‘economic development’ towards the broader notion of life- centered ‘sustainable human development’. We have been moving away from the pure economic approach in which growth matters to the one in which people and nature matter. The notion of development has been acquiring wider connotation, which goes beyond income growth and the economy to embrace non-income factors and the society as a whole. Mahbub Ul Huq, in his foreword to “ Human Development in South Asia – 1997” says, "There is widespread consensus today that the purpose of development is not just to enlarge incomes, but to enlarge people's choices, and these choices extend to a decent education, good health, political freedom, cultural identity, personal security, community participation, environmental security, and many other areas of human well- being. Development must deal with the entire society, not just with the economy, and people must be put at the centre of the stage". Similarly, our notion of deprivation has been slowly but steadily moving away from its narrower notion of income poverty or income deprivation, to human poverty and from there to capability deprivation, a fore- runner to the latest notion of poverty of opportunity.

3. The evolution is based on the development-deprivation experiences of several countries spanning both the hemispheres- North and South. A number of myths woven around economic development and income poverty, and on the functional relationship between the two have been blown up by the Human Development Reports (HDRs) of UNDP,

and of the Human Development Centre of Pakistan, and by some of the theoretical and empirical works of Mahbub Ul Huq, Amartya Sen, Jean Dreze et al.

- \* Notwithstanding the decisive role of income in promoting well-being and causing deprivation, neither income adequacy gives a comprehensive picture of well-being nor its inadequacy a comprehensive picture of deprivation or poverty.
- \* Economic development or growth in income, per se, does not and cannot liquidate poverty or deprivation, however we define them. Experience does not show one to one inverse relationship between economic development and deprivation.
- \* Growth in income does not translate itself into the lives of people automatically; it ought to be consciously mediated through public policy intervention. This is more so in the case of geographically and demographically vast, socially plural, culturally diverse, hierarchical, andro-centric society, economy and polity like India; here, growth cannot easily flow down into the lives of people across regions, castes, classes, and gender.
- \* Another related aspect is that growth is necessary but not sufficient to promote human development and eradicate deprivation. Even with lower levels of per capita income, a region can achieve higher levels of human development with reference to matters pertaining to life and death, even though higher growth is necessary to sustain higher levels of human development.
- \* Amartya Sen in his work “Inequality Reexamined” (1992) discusses some empirical examples pertaining to this phenomenon.
  - In terms of per capita GNP, South Africa, Brazil, Gabon, and Oman have six or more times the per capita GNP of China and Sri Lanka. But these relatively richer countries give their people significantly lower ability to survive premature mortality than do the two lower- income countries.
  - Costa Rica, which is considerably poorer than the first four countries, offers not only a much higher life expectancy than those four but a life expectancy that is not significantly below that obtaining in the richest countries of Europe and North America.
  - Among Indian States, Kerala presents a case of lower income and higher levels of human development. It has higher life expectancy at birth, lower infant mortality rate, higher level of general literacy (particularly female literacy), and higher sex ratio.
  - Mysore and Bellary districts in Karnataka present a case of relatively higher levels of per capita income and lower levels of human development.

4. Thus growth, in income, per se, cannot take care of deprivations like lack of toilets, unsafe deliveries, etc,. Apart from growth in income, their redressal needs effective public policies regarding community health services, medical care, and basic education.

5. It is in the aforesaid background, we have taken up this exercise of assessing regional imbalances in deprivation as a part of our wider study of regional imbalances.

### **5.3 Methodology**

6. Originally when this chapter was conceived, it was intended to assess regional imbalances in deprivation among the 175 taluks with reference to 9 indicators of deprivation: (1) the percentage of population below poverty line; (2) percentage of population not surviving to age 40; (3) percentage of deliveries not attended by trained health personnel; (4) percentage of underweight children below 5; (5) percentage of households not having access to safe drinking water; (6) percentage of households not having access to toilets; (7) percentage of illiterate adults in the total adult population; (8) percentage of female adults in the total adult population; and (9) percentage of out of school children in the school going age. The first was chosen to measure income- deprivation, the next five (from 2<sup>nd</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup>) were chosen to measure health deprivation, and the last three to measure education deprivation or knowledge deprivation.

7. But, we could not do so, for, we could not obtain such data for all the taluks of Karnataka. So, we have restricted our analysis of deprivation distances to 27 districts and six indicators of deprivation: (1) percentage of families below poverty line; (2) percentage of unsafe deliveries; (3) percentage of severely malnourished children; (4) percentage of habitations not fully covered with drinking water facility; (5) percentage of children out of school in the age group of 6- 14; and (6) gender gap in literacy. The first one is chosen to measure income deprivation, the next three to measure health deprivation, and the last two to measure education deprivation with specific focus on children and women.

8. We have made some departure in nomenclature and bases of classification of districts although we have used 'State Average' as the benchmark. Here we have categorised the districts into 'Least Deprived', 'Less Deprived' and 'More Deprived' districts depending upon how far (above or below) they are from the state average deprivation. The districts whose deprivation levels are equal to or less than the state average are regarded as 'Least Deprived', those whose deprivation levels are higher than the state average by 25 or less than 25 per cent are regarded as 'Less Deprived', and those whose deprivation levels are higher than the state average by more than 25 per cent are regarded as 'More Deprived'.

### **5.4 Income Deprivation**

9. Income deprivation or income poverty is an important measure of economic deprivation, which has significant bearing on the capabilities and choices of people to live the life they value most. It has implications for some basic capabilities such as ability to live healthier lives for long by escaping avoidable morbidity and mortality, ability to read and write by eliminating illiteracy, and ability to lead a decent standard of living by making people central to the process of development as 'subjects' as well as 'objects' of the process and by ensuring adequate entitlement to the poor and the marginalized. So, income deprivation, if not the sole determinant of the quality of life or well-being of the people, it is decidedly one of the important determinants in the causation of deprivation in health and education indirectly and economic deprivation directly. As such, an assessment of regional variations in the incomes of the poor would be of immense use in making policy prescription to reduce not only deprivational distances, but also development distances. Here we have

chosen 'percentage of families (rural) below the poverty line' as the indicator of income deprivation to assess regional imbalances. Here also 'State average (deprivation)' is used as the bench mark for classifying the districts into Least Deprived, Less Deprived and More Deprived categories.

10. The data related to income deprivation are presented in three tables. Table 5.1 ranks the districts based on their deprivation levels. It gives the relative positions of 27 districts in the deprivation scale based on the degree of deprivation. An overall picture of deprivation with reference to the proportion of districts each division has in the three categories into which the districts are classified, is provided by Table 5.2. And Table 5.3 gives the division-wise classification of districts by names across the three categories.

**Table 5.1**

**Families (Rural) Below Poverty Line in Karnataka by Districts**

Sl. No.	Districts	Percentage of Families Below Poverty Line	Divisions	Rank in respective	
				Regions	State
1	Dhakshina Kannada	15.40	1	1	1
2	Bangalore Urban	15.67	1	2	2
3	Kodagu	19.00	2	3	3
4	Dhavanagere	20.00	2	4	4
5	Bagalkot	23.50	1	1	5
6	Belgaum	23.70	2	2	6
7	Udupi	24.67	3	5	7
8	Chickmagalur	27.00	4	6	8
9	Hassan	27.13	5	7	9
10	Mysore	28.14	6	8	10
11	Mandya	29.86	7	9	11
12	Uttara Kannada	30.45	3	3	12
13	Tumkur	31.40	3	10	13
14	<u>Haveri</u>	32.00	4	4	14
15	Gulbarga	33.70	1	5	15
16	Bangalore Rural	35.75	4	11	16
17	Chamarajanagar	36.00	8	12	17
18	Shimoga	36.00	5	13	18

...Contd

Sl. No.	Districts	Percentage of Families Below Poverty Line	Divisions	Rank in respective	
				Regions	State
19	Dharwad	39.00	5	6	19
20	Bidar	39.60	2	7	20
21	Kolar	40.27	6	14	21
22	Chitradurga	41.50	7	15	22
23	Bijapur	42.00	6	8	23
24	Koppal	42.50	3	9	24
25	Raichur	43.20	4	10	25
26	Bellary	44.57	5	11	26
27	Gadag	46.40	7	12	27
	<b>Bangalore Division</b>	31.51	-	2	2
	<b>Mysore Division</b>	25.90	-	1	1
	<b>Belgaum Division</b>	33.86	-	1	3
	<b>Gulbarga Division</b>	40.71	-	2	4
	<b>South Karnataka</b>	28.71	-	-	1
	<b>North Karnataka</b>	37.29	-	-	2
	<b>Karnataka State</b>	33.00	-	-	-

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.1

**Note:** The districts are arranged in the ascending order of deprivation and descending order of ranks.

Table 5.2

## Families (Rural) Below Poverty Line in Karnataka: Classification of districts by Divisions and Regions

Sl.No	Divisions Regions	Least Deprived Districts			Less Deprived Districts			More Deprived Districts			Total Districts	
		No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the Division/ Region	Percentage share in the total Least Deprived districts of the State	No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the Division/ Region	Percentage share in the total Less Deprived districts of the State	No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the Division/ Region	Percentage share in the total More Deprived districts of the State	No.	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Bangalore	03	42.86	21.43	03	42.86	42.86	01	14.28	16.67	07	100.00
2	Mysore	07	87.50	50.00	01	12.50	14.28	-	-	-	08	100.00
3	South Karnataka Region (SKR)	10	66.67	71.43	04	26.66	57.14	01	6.67	16.67	15	100.00
4	Belgaum	04	57.14	28.57	01	14.29	14.29	02	28.57	33.33	07	100.00
	Gulbarga	-	-	-	02	40.00	28.57	03	60.00	50.00	05	100.00
	North Karnataka Region (NKR)	04	33.33	28.57	03	25.00	42.86	05	41.67	83.33	12	100.00
	Karnataka	14	51.85 **	100.00	07	25.93 **	100.00	06	22.22 **	100.00	27	100.00

**Source :** Derived from Annexure 5.1

**Note :** \*\* These figures indicate the proportion of Least Deprived, Less Deprived, and More Deprived Districts (Column 4,7, and 10 respectively) in the total districts of the State.

**Table 5.3****Families (Rural) Below Poverty Line in Karnataka: Classification of districts by Divisions**

Sl.No.	Divisions	Least Deprived Districts		Less Deprived Districts		More Deprived Districts	
1	2	3		4		5	
1	Bangalore	1	Bangalore (Urban).....(2)	1	Bangalore (Rural).....(16)	1	Chitradurga.....(22)
		2	Davanagere.....(4)	2	Shimoga.....(18)		
		3	Tumkur.....(13)	3	Kolar.....(21)		
2	Mysore	4	Dhakshina Kannada...(1)	4	Chamarajanagar.....(17)		-Nil-
		5	Kodagu.....(3)				
		6	Udupi.....(7)				
		7	Chickmagalur .....(8)				
		8	Hassan.....(9)				
		9	Mysore.....(10)				
		10	Mandya.....(11)				
3	Belgaum	11	Bagalkot.....(5)	5	Dharwad.....(19)	2	Bijapur.....(23)
		12	Belgaum.....(6)			3	Gadag.....(27)
		13	Uttara Kannada.....(12)				
		14	Haveri.....(14)				
4	Gulbarga		Nil	6	Gulbarga.....(15)	4	Koppal.....(24)
				7	Bidar.....(20)	5	Raichur.....(25)
						6	Bellary.....(26)

**Source :** Derived from Annexure 5.1

**Note :** The figures in brackets indicate the ranks of the districts in the state

11. From the data referred to above, we may draw the following inferences regarding deprivational distances in Karnataka: -

- (i) Of the 27 districts, 14 districts have their deprivation levels lower than the state average of 33%, and the remaining 13 districts have their levels higher than the state average.
  - As to their distribution among the three categories in the State, 22.22% of them are found in the More Deprived category, 25.93% are found in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining 51.85% are found in the Least Deprived category. (Table 5.2)
- (ii) Wide variations exist across the regions, divisions, and districts in terms of the degree of deprivation.
  - Among the districts, the values of deprivation vary from a low of 15.40% in Dhakshina Kannada to a high of 46.40% in Gadag.
  - Among the divisions, the values vary from a low of 25.90% in Mysore to a high of 40.71% in Gulbarga.
  - Among the regions, the values vary from a low of 28.71% in SKR, to a high of 37.29% in NKR. (Table 5.1)
- (iii) Wide variations also emerge, when we view income deprivation with reference to the proportion of districts the regions and divisions have in each of the last two categories which are relevant for policy prescription. Among the regions, NKR with 41.67% of its districts in the More Deprived and 25% in the Less Deprived category, emerges as the more deprived region in Karnataka.
  - Among the divisions, Gulbarga with 60% of its districts in the More Deprived and the remaining 40% in the Less Deprived category emerges as the more deprived division in Karnataka (Table 5.2).
- (iv) The data do not lend conclusive evidence to the emotionally surcharged view that income deprivation is found only in NKR and not in SKR. However, they do lend conclusive evidence to the view that the deprivation is more pronounced in NKR than in SKR, both in terms of its extent and intensity.
  - Both the divisions of NKR have higher levels of deprivation than the State average and also than those of the two divisions of SKR.

12. From the aforesaid assessment of income deprivation, we may say that NKR by claiming the second rank among the regions, Gulbarga, by claiming the 4<sup>th</sup> rank among the divisions, and Gadag, by claiming the 27<sup>th</sup> rank among the districts, emerge as the more deprived spatial units in Karnataka.

13. In all, 13 districts in the state require remedial action. Gadag, Bellary, Raichur, Koppal, Bijapur, and Chitradurga (6 districts) deserve remedial action in the first phase, and



Kolar, Bidar, Dharwad, Shimoga, Chamarajanagar, Bangalore (R), and Gulbarga (7 districts) merit redressal measures in the second phase (Table 5.3).

### 5.5. Unsafe Deliveries

14. The Task Force on Health and Family Welfare, while writing on the strengths and weaknesses of Karnataka's health system, points out that Karnataka has done well in many aspects of health, but there have been areas where it has not performed as well as it might have. One such area which we have considered in our study of regional imbalances in deprivation under 'health deprivation' is percentage of unsafe deliveries in the 27 districts of Karnataka. In view of its implications for matters pertaining to life and death such as TFR, MMR, IMR, CDR, CBR etc., it turns out to be a major indicator of health deprivation. It affects not only the lives of women who are exposed to unsafe deliveries, but also of the children who are delivered. With all the commendable achievements that Karnataka has made on this front, quite a few women in the reproductive age are deprived of access to safe delivery facilities. Further, this deprivation is not uniformly found in all the districts. There are wide variations among the districts.

15. The data pertaining to unsafe deliveries are presented in three tables. Table 5.4 gives the relative deprivation levels of all the 27 districts. It is a rank list. It tells us the position of each district in its own division and region, and in the State. Table: 5.5 presents an overview of this deprivation by regions and divisions. It shows the proportion of districts that each division has in each of the three categories - Least Deprived, Less Deprived and More Deprived - and it indicates the relative positions of divisions and regions. It also tells us what proportion of these three categories of districts are found in different divisions and regions (from the total of 27 districts in the state). A classified picture of districts by names against each division is presented in Table 5.6.

**Table: 5.4 Unsafe Deliveries in Karnataka by districts**

Sl.No.	Districts	Percentage of deliveries not attended by trained health personnel (unsafe deliveries)	Rank in the Respective		Rank in the State
			Divisions	Regions	
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Dakshina Kannada	8.50	1	1	1
2.	Udupi	8.50	2	2	2
3.	Bangalore Urban	9.40	1	3	3
4.	Uttara Kannada	13.90	1	1	4
5.	Shimoga	17.00	2	4	5
6.	Kodagu	20.60	3	5	6
7.	Bangalore (Rural)	20.90	3	6	7
8.	Chickmagalur	22.00	4	7	8
9	Hassan	30.30	5	8	9
10.	Mysore	30.30	6	9	10
11.	Chamarajanagar	30.30	7	10	11
12.	Belgaum	31.40	2	2	12
13.	Dharwad	34.70	3	3	13
14.	Gadag	34.70	4	4	14

...Contd

Sl.No.	Districts	Percentage of deliveries not attended by trained health personnel (unsafe deliveries)	Rank in the Respective		Rank in the State
			Divisions	Regions	
15.	Haveri	34.70	5	5	15
16.	Tumkur	36.50	4	11	16
17.	Mandya	38.10	8	12	17
18.	Kolar	40.80	5	13	18
19.	Bellary	46.00	1	6	19
20.	Chitradurga	46.20	6	14	20
21.	Davanagere	46.20	7	15	21
22.	Bidar	47.50	2	7	22
23.	Bijapur	49.90	6	8	23
24.	Bagalkot	49.90	7	9	24
25.	Koppal	52.00	3	10	25
26.	Raichur	52.00	4	11	26
27.	Gulbarga	52.30	5	12	27
	Bangalore Division	31.00	-	2	2
	Mysore Division	23.58	-	1	1
	Belgaum Division	35.60	-	1	3
	Gulbarga Division	49.96	-	2	4
	<b>South-Karnataka region</b>	<b>27.29</b>	-	-	<b>1</b>
	<b>North-Karnataka region</b>	<b>42.78</b>	-	-	<b>2</b>
	<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>35.04</b>	-	-	-

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.2

**Note :** The districts are arranged in the ascending order of deprivation and descending order of ranks.

**Table 5.5: Unsafe deliveries in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions and Regions**

Sl.No.	Divisions/Regions	Least Deprived Districts			Less Deprived Districts			More Deprived Districts			Total Districts	
		Nos	Percentage share in the total districts of the divisions/region	Percentage share in the total Least Deprived Districts in the State	Nos	Percentage share in the total districts of the divisions/region	Percentage share in the total Less Deprived Districts in the State	Nos	Percentage share in the total districts of the divisions/region	Percentage share in the total More Deprived Districts in the State	Nos	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Bangalore	3	42.86	20.00	2	28.57	66.67	2	28.57	22.22	7	100.00
2	Mysore	7	87.50	46.67	1	12.50	33.33	-	-	-	8	100.00
	South Karnataka Region (SKR)	10	66.67	66.67	3	20.00	100.00	2	13.33	22.22	15	100.00
3	Belgaum	5	71.43	33.33	-	-	-	2	28.57	22.22	7	100.00
4	Gulbarga	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	100.00	55.56	5	100.00
	North Karnataka Region(NKR)	05	41.67	33.33	-	-	-	7	58.33	77.78	12	100.00
	<b>Karnataka State</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>55.56**</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11.11**</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>33.33**</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>27</b>	100.00

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.2

\*\* The figures indicate the proportion of the Least Deprived, Less Deprived and More Deprived Districts (columns 4,7,and 10 respectively) in the state.

**Table: 5.6 Unsafe Deliveries in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions**

Sl.No.	Divisions	Least Deprived Districts	Less Deprived Districts	More Deprived Districts
1	2	3	4	5
1	Bangalore	1. Bangalore Urban (3) 2. Shimoga (5) 3. Bangalore Rural (7)	1. Tumkur (16) 2. Kolar (18)	1. Chitradurga (20) 2. Davanagere (21)
2	Mysore	4. Dakshina Kannada (1) 5. Udupi (2) 6. Kodagu (6) 7. Chickmagalur (8) 8. Hassan (9) 9. Mysore (10) 10. Chamarajanagar (11)	3. Mandya (17)	Nil
3	Belgaum	11. Uttara Kannada (4) 12. Belgaum (12) 13. Dharwad (13) 14. Gadag (14) 15. Haveri (15)	Nil	3. Bijapur (23) 4. Bagalkot (24)
4	Gulbarga	Nil	Nil	5. Bellary (19) 6. Bidar (22) 7. Koppal (25) 8. Raichur (26) 9. Gulbarga (27)

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.2

**Note :** 1. The figures in brackets indicate the ranks of the districts in the state.

16. The points that emerge out of the data presented in the three tables are listed below: -

- (i) There are significant variations in the incidence of this deprivation among the districts. The percentage of unsafe deliveries ranges from a low of 8.50% in Dakshina Kannada and Udupi to a high of 52.30% in Gulbarga.
  - Among the divisions, it varies from a low of 23.58% in Mysore division to a high of 49.96% in Gulbarga division. In between we have Bangalroe with 31% and Belgaum with 35.60%.
  - Among the regions, as against SKR (27.29%), NKR with 42.78% of unsafe deliveries emerges as the most deprived region in Karnataka.
  - That means Gulbarga among the districts, again Gulbarga among the divisions, and NKR among the regions, emerge as the most deprived parts in Karnataka. (Table 5.4)
- (ii) Based on the bench mark used for the classification of districts, at the state level, 55.56% of the districts find their place in the Least Deprived category, 11.11% in the Less Deprived category and 33.33% in the More Deprived category of districts.
- (iii) Among the regions, NKR suffers a higher rate of deprivation than SKR. The latter has higher proportion of its districts in the Least Deprived category (66.67%) and lower proportions in the Less Deprived (20%) and More Deprived (13.33%) categories. On the contrary, the former has higher proportion of its districts in the More Deprived category (58.33%) and none in the Less Deprived category, and 41.67% in the Least Deprived category of districts.
- (iv) Among the divisions, Mysore emerges as the least deprived division and Gulbarga as the most deprived division. Mysore has 87.50% of its districts in the Least Deprived category, 12.50% in the Less Deprived category and none in the More Deprived category. On the contrary, Gulbarga emerges as the most deprived division with all its districts (100%) in the More Deprived category and none in the other two categories. And of the remaining two divisions, Bangalore suffers a higher degree of deprivation than Belgaum division. (Table 5.5)
- (v) When we consider only the last two categories which are relevant for remedial action, the following facts merit attention:-
  - Gulbarga is the only division which has all its five districts (Gulbarga, Raichur, Koppal, Bidar and Bellary) in the More Deprived category and none in the other two categories.
  - Mysore is the only division, which has none of its districts in the More Deprived category and only one district (Mandya) in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining seven in the Least Deprived category.
  - Belgaum has none of its districts in the Less Deprived category. It has two districts (Bijapur and Bagalkot) in the More Deprived category, and the remaining five in the Least Deprived category.

- Bangalore has two each of its districts in the Less Deprived category (Tumkur and Kolar) and More Deprived category (Chitradurga and Davangere), and the remaining three in the Least Deprived category. (Table 5.6)

17. As far as redressal measures are concerned, in all, 12 districts become eligible - nine in the More Deprived category and three in the Less Deprived category. The nine districts which attract remedial action in the first phase begin at Gulbarga (27<sup>th</sup> rank) and end at Bellary (19<sup>th</sup> rank), and the three districts which attract remedial action in the second phase begin at Kolar (18<sup>th</sup> rank) and end at Tumkur (16<sup>th</sup> rank). For further details see Table 5.6.

## **5.6 Malnourished Children Below 5**

18. Children below 5 are highly vulnerable to nutritional deficiencies. Quite a few children in that age group particularly those belonging to BPL families, are said to be underweight children, among other things, owing to malnourishment. And malnourishment has negative bearing on the physical and mental development of children. As such, malnourishment of children in that age group turns out to be an important human deprivation to be redressed on priority basis. The report of the Task Force on Health and Family Welfare (2001) observes, "There is rampant malnutrition in Karnataka, in spite of average availability of food being relatively adequate". As far as malnourishment of children below 5 is concerned, Karnataka is said to be suffering from regional disparities. In Karnataka, of the 21,25,751 children (below 5) weighed (2001) from among the Anganawadi children covered under ICDS, only 8,84,468 are normal, and the remaining 12,41,283 are malnourished (12,30,644 are moderately malnourished and 10,639 are severely malnourished). Here, we are confining our assessment of regional imbalances to the category of severely malnourished children.

19. The data pertaining to severely malnourished children are presented in three tables. Table 5.7 gives an account of the relative positions of 27 districts in respect of severely malnourished children. It is a rank list. Table 5.8 presents the details of the proportion of districts of each division under three categories of districts - Least Deprived, Less Deprived, and More Deprived. The division-wise distribution of districts by names is presented in Table 5.9.

**Table: 5.7****Moderately and Severely Malnourished Children in Karnataka by Districts**

Rank	Name of the District	% of Moderately Malnourished Children	Rank	Name of the District	% of Severely Malnourished Children	Rank in the Respective	
						Division	Region
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Udupi	43.27	1.	Mandya	0.04	1	1
2.	Kodagu	43.37	2.	Tumkur	0.05	1	2
3.	Dakshina Kannada	47.55	3.	Chamarajnar	0.07	2	3
4.	Mandya	47.69	4.	Mysore	0.08	3	4
5.	Tumkur	49.86	5.	Udupi	0.08	4	5
6.	Chickmagalur	50.60	6.	Dakshina Kannada	0.10	5	6
7.	Uttara Kannada	51.37	7.	Hassan	0.11	6	7
8.	Hassan	51.56	8.	Chickmagalur	0.11	7	8
9.	Bangalore Rural	52.61	9.	Kodagu	0.11	8	9
10.	Bangalore Urban	54.12	10.	Kolar	0.14	2	10
11.	Dharwad	54.23	11.	Bangalore Urban	0.18	3	11
12.	Belgaum	54.82	12.	Bangalore Rural	0.21	4	12
13.	Kolar	55.86	13.	Belgaum	0.25	1	1
14.	Chamarajnar	56.22	14.	Haveri	0.26	2	2
15.	Mysore	56.95	15.	Uttara Kannada	0.29	3	3
16.	Shimoga	59.71	16.	Shimoga	0.31	5	13
17.	Chitradurga	59.78	17.	Chitradurga	0.38	6	14
18.	Bijapur	61.99	18.	Gadag	0.46	4	4
19.	Raichur	63.31	19.	Bagalkot	0.46	5	5
20.	Davanagere	63.53	20.	Bidar	0.48	1	6
21.	Bagalkot	63.53	21.	Dharwad	0.53	6	7
22.	Haveri	63.88	22.	Bijapur	0.54	7	8
23.	Gulbarga	64.06	23.	Davanagere	0.62	7	15
24.	Gadag	66.62	24.	Gulbarga	1.27	2	9
25.	Koppal	69.07	25.	Raichur	1.77	3	10
26.	Bidar	69.36	26.	Koppal	1.92	4	11
27.	Bellary	70.61	27.	Bellary	2.32	5	12
1.	<b>Myore Division</b>	<b>50.71</b>	1.	<b>Mysore Division</b>	<b>0.08</b>	-	<b>1</b>
2.	<b>Bangalore Division</b>	<b>56.02</b>	2.	<b>Bangalore Division</b>	<b>0.25</b>	-	<b>2</b>
3.	<b>Belgaum Divison</b>	<b>58.70</b>	3.	<b>Belgaum Division</b>	<b>0.37</b>	-	<b>1</b>
4.	<b>Gulbarga Division</b>	<b>66.88</b>	4.	<b>Gulbarga Division</b>	<b>1.48</b>	-	<b>2</b>
1.	<b>South Karnataka</b>	<b>53.64</b>	1.	<b>South Karnataka</b>	<b>0.17</b>		<b>1</b>
2.	<b>North Karnataka</b>	<b>61.96</b>	2.	<b>North Karnataka</b>	<b>0.81</b>		<b>2</b>
	<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>57.89</b>		<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>0.50</b>		

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.3

**Note :** The districts are arranged in the ascending order of deprivation and descending order of ranks.

**Table 5.8: Severely Malnourished Children in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions and Regions**

Sl. No.	Division/ Region	Least Deprived Districts			Less Deprived Districts			More Deprived Districts			Total districts	
		No	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the total Least Deprived Districts in the State	No	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the Less Deprived Districts in the State	No	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the total More Deprived Districts in the State	No	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Bangalore	06	85.71	30.00	01	14.29	33.33	Nil	Nil	Nil	07	100.00
2	Mysore	08	100.00	40.00	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	08	100.00
	South Karnataka Region (SKR)	14	93.33	70.00	01	6.67	33.33	Nil	Nil	Nil	15	100.00
3	Belgaum	05	71.43	25.00	02	28.57	66.67	Nil	Nil	Nil	07	100.00
4	Gulbarga	01	20.00	05.00	Nil	Nil	Nil	04	80.00	100.00	05	100.00
	North Karnataka Region (NKR)	06	50.00	30.00	02	16.67	66.67	04	33.33	100.00	12	100.00
	<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>74.07 *</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>03</b>	<b>11.11 *</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>04</b>	<b>14.82 *</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.3

**Note :** 1. \* These figures indicate the proportion of the Least Deprived, Less Deprived and More Deprived districts (columns 4,7 and 10 respectively) in the State.



**Table: 5.9 Severely Malnourished Children in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions**

Sl. No.	Division	Least Deprived Districts	Less Deprived Districts	More Deprived Districts
1	2	3	4	5
1	Bangalore	1. Tumkur (2) 2. Kolar (10) 3. Bangalore Urban (11) 4. Bangalore Rural (12) 5. Shimoga (16) 6. Chitradurga (17)	1. Davanagere (23)	-Nil-
2	Mysore	7. Mandya (1) 8. Chamarajnagar (3) 9. Mysore (4) 10. Udupi (5) 11. Dakshina Kannada (6) 12. Hassan (7) 13. Chickmagalur (8) 14. Kodagu (9)	-Nil-	-Nil-
3	Belgaum	15. Belgaum (13) 16. Haveri (14) 17. Uttara Kannada (15) 18. Gadag (18) 19. Bagalkot (19)	2. Dharwad (21) 3. Bijapur (22)	-Nil-
4	Gulbarga	20. Bidar (20)	-Nil-	1. Gulbarga (24) 2. Raichur (25) 3. Koppal (26) 4. Bellary (27)

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.3

**Note :** 1. The figures in brackets indicate the ranks of the districts in the State

20. From the data, the following facts emerge:-

- (i) It is heartening to note that only a very small proportion of the children below 5 (0.50%) are severely malnourished. But it is disheartening to note that a substantial proportion of them (57.89%) are moderately malnourished. It is a matter of concern. The remaining 41.61% of them are said to be normal.
- (ii) Wide variations in the degree of this deprivation are found across the regions, divisions and districts.
  - Among the regions, the proportion of the severely malnourished varies from a low of 0.17% in SKR to a high of 0.81% in NKR. The incidence is higher than the state average of 0.50% in NKR. (Table 5.7)
  - A similar situation exists in the case of moderately malnourished children. The deprivation ranges from a low of 53.64% in SKR to a high of 61.96% in NKR. And the incidence is higher than the state average of 57.89% in NKR. (Table 5.7)
  - Among the divisions, the spread is very high. Gulbarga has a higher rate of incidence (1.48% in the case of severely malnourished and 66.88% in the case of moderately malnourished) than the other three divisions. The lowest rate of incidence is found in Mysore division (0.08% and 50.71%). (Table 5.7)
  - Among the districts, it varies from a low of 0.04% in Mandya to a high of 2.32% in Bellary in respect of the severely malnourished, and from a low of 43.27% in Udupi to a high of 70.61% in respect of the moderately malnourished in Bellary. The spread in both the cases is alarming.
- (iii) Wide variations are also found in the proportion of districts under each category in respect of the severely malnourished children below 5.
  - Among the regions, NKR carries a higher burden than SKR. The former has 50% of its districts in the last two categories (33.33% in the More Deprived Category and 16.67% in the Less Deprived Category). On the contrary, the latter has none of its districts in the More Deprived Category, and has only 6.67% of its districts in the Less Deprived Category. (Table 5.7)
  - Among the divisions, Gulbarga carries the highest burden and Mysore carries the least burden. Gulbarga has 80% of its districts in the More Deprived Category and none in the Less Deprived Category. Whereas Mysore has none of its districts in these two categories; all its districts are in the Least Deprived Category.
    - Between Belgaum and Bangalore, the former carries a higher burden than the latter, even though both of them do not have any of their districts in the More Deprived category. The former has 28.57% of its districts as against the latter's figure of 14.29% in the Less Deprived category. (Table 5.8)

- (iv) In the entire State, only four districts figure in the More Deprived category, and peculiarly enough, all of them belong to the Gulbarga division of NKR. They are Bellary, Koppal, Racihur, and Gulbarga.
- And of the three districts that figure in the Less Deprived category, two are in the Belgaum division of NKR (Bijapur and Dharwad), and one is in the Bangalore division of SKR (Davanagere). (Table 5.9)

21. As far as redressal measures are concerned, the government has to initiate remedial action in the four districts of Gulbarga division in the first phase, and in the three districts (two in Belgaum division and one in Bangalore division) in the second phase. For details see Table 5.9.

### **5.7 Unsafe Drinking Water: Habitations Not Fully Covered by Safe Drinking Water Facility**

22. Effective access to adequate quantity of safe drinking water is one of the key variables in determining the ability of people to live healthier lives by escaping avoidable waterborne diseases and also by facilitating the food absorption capacity of the people. A recent study by M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation and UN World Food Programme has considered safe drinking water one of the principal constituents of food security through its bearing on the absorption of the food consumed. As such, inaccessibility or inadequate accessibility to safe drinking water cannot but adversely affect the health-based capabilities of the people concerned. Karnataka government has made commendable progress on this front when compared to its achievements on other kinds of health deprivations such as non-availability of toilets. Even then, it is a matter of serious concern. Another dimension of this deprivation is that it varies widely across the districts, divisions, and regions of the State. We have chosen 'Habitations not fully covered by safe drinking water facility' as one of the indicators of health deprivation. We have done so because, we could not get the latest data on house-holds /habitations not having access to safe drinking water. As such, we are using 'Habitations not fully covered by safe drinking water facility' as proxy to habitations not having access to safe drinking water'. At the state level, as at 2000, over 42% of the habitations are not fully covered by safe drinking water facility. That means quite a sizeable proportion of the population has been exposed to the harmful effects of unsafe drinking water.

23. The data pertaining to 'percentage of habitations not fully covered by safe drinking water facility' are presented in three tables. Table 5.10 ranks the 27 districts in the deprivation scale. It shows not only the relative positions of the districts in the State, but also the degree of deprivation and the deprivation-spread between the State average and that of each of the 27 districts. Apart from that it throws light on interregional and inter-divisional variations in this deprivation. Table 5.11 provides another dimension of deprivation-distances. It presents the division-wise and region-wise extent of deprivation measured in terms of the proportion of the districts that different divisions and regions have in each the three categories - Least Deprived, Less Deprived, and More Deprived. And the actual names of the districts which figure in each of the three categories are listed with their respective ranks in the State in Table 5.12.

**Table 5.10 Drinking Water in Karnataka by Districts**

Sl. No.	Districts	Percentage of Habitations Not Fully covered by Safe Drinking Water Facility	Rank in the Respective		Rank in the State
			Divisions	Regions	
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Kolar	26.00	1	1	1
2	Chitradurga	27.38	2	2	2
3	Davanegere	27.38	3	3	3
4	Bangalore Rural	28.70	4	4	4
5	Bellary	30.59	1	1	5
6	Mysore	31.84	1	5	6
7	Chamarajnar	31.84	2	6	7
8	Bangalore Urban	32.44	5	7	8
9	Dharwad	32.82	1	2	9
10	Gadag	32.82	2	3	10
11	Haveri	32.82	3	4	11
12	Tumkur	33.41	6	8	12
13	Hassan	34.45	3	9	13
14	Bijapur	39.58	4	5	14
15	Bagalkot	39.58	5	6	15
16	Mandya	41.35	4	10	16
17	Chickmagalur	42.75	5	11	17
18	Shimoga	45.40	7	12	18
19	Koppal	46.09	2	7	19
20	Raichur	46.09	3	8	20
21	Belgaum	47.06	6	9	21
22	Gulbarga	48.08	4	10	22
23	Bidar	50.16	5	11	23
24	Kodagu	63.05	6	13	24
25	Uttara Kannada	75.11	7	12	25
26	Dakshina Kannada	83.51	7	14	26
27	Udupi	83.51	8	15	27
	Bangalore Divison	31.53		1	1
	Mysore Division	51.54		2	4
	Belgaum Division	42.83		1	2
	Gulbarga Divison	44.20		2	3
	South Karnataka Region	41.54			1
	North Karnataka Region	43.52			2
	<b>Karnataka State</b>	<b>42.53</b>			

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.2

**Note :** The districts are arranged in the ascending order of deprivation and descending order of Ranks.

**Table 5.11: Unsafe drinking water in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions and Regions**

Sl. No.	Division/Region	Least Deprived Districts			Less Deprived Districts			More Deprived Districts			Total districts	
		No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the total Least Deprived Districts in the State	No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the Less Deprived Districts in the State	No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the total More Deprived Districts in the State	No.	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Bangalore	06	85.71	37.50	01	14.29	14.29	Nil	Nil	Nil	07	100.00
2	Mysore	04	50.00	25.00	01	12.50	14.28	3	37.50	75.00	08	100.00
	South Karnataka Region (SKR)	10	66.67	62.50	02	13.33	28.57	3	20.00	75.00	15	100.00
3	Belgaum	05	71.42	31.25	01	14.29	14.29	1	14.29	25.00	07	100.00
4	Gulbarga	01	20.00	6.25	04	80.00	57.14	Nil	Nil	Nil	05	100.00
	North Karnataka Region (NKR)	06	50.00	37.50	05	41.67	71.43	01	08.33	25.00	12	100.00
	<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>59.26 **</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>07</b>	<b>25.93 **</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>04</b>	<b>14.81 *</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.2

**Note :** 1.\* \* These figures indicate the proportion of the Least Deprived, Less Deprived and More Deprived districts (columns 4,7 and 10 respectively) in the State.

**Table: 5.12 Unsafe Drinking Water in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions**

Sl. No.	Divisions	Least Deprived Districts	Less Deprived Districts	More Deprived Districts
1	2	3	4	5
1	Bangalore	1. Kolar (1) 2. Chitradurga (2) 3. Davanagere (3) 4. Bangalore Rural (4) 5. Bangalaoe Urban (8) 6. Tumkur (12)	1. Shimoga (18)	-Nil-
2	Mysore	7. Mysore (6) 8. Chamarajnagar (7) 9. Hassan (13) 10. Mandya (16)	2. Chickmagalur (17)	1. Kodagu (24) 2. Dakshina Kannada (26) 3. Udupi (27)
3	Belgaum	11. Dharwad (9) 12. Gadag (10) 13. Haveri (11) 14. Bijapur (14) 15. Bagalkot (15)	3. Belgaum (21)	4. Uttara Kannada (25)
4	Gulbarga	16. Bellary (5)	4. Koppal (19) 5. Raichur (20) 6. Gulbarga (22) 7. Bidar (23)	-Nil-

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.2

**Note :** 1. The figures in brackets indicate the ranks of the districts in the State

24. Some of the important dimensions of deprivation-disparities that emerge from the data are summarized below: -

- (i) It is heartening to note that 59.26% of the districts in the State are found in the Least Deprived Category with their deprivation levels lower than the State average of 42.53%. Whereas only 25.93% of the districts appear in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining 14.81% of the districts in the More Deprived category. Yet it is a matter of concern. (Table 5.11)
- (ii) Wide variations exist across the regions, divisions and districts in terms of the degree of deprivation.
  - Inter-district disparities range from a low of 26% in Kolar to a high of 83.51% in Udupi and Dakshina Kannada.
  - Inter-divisional disparities range from a low of 31.53% in Bangalore to a high of 51.54% in Mysore.
  - Among the regions, the range of disparities is negligible. It is 41.54% in SKR and 43.52% in NKR. Of course, the deprivation of NKR is slightly higher than the State average. (Table 5.10)
- (iii) Wide variations in disparities also emerge when we view the deprivation with reference to the proportion of districts that the divisions and regions have in each of the last two categories which are relevant for policy prescription.
  - Interregionally, NKR with 8.33% of its districts in the More Deprived category, and 41.67% in the Less Deprived category, emerges as the more deprived region in Karnataka.
  - Among the divisions, two divisions deserve attention. Gulbarga, with 80% of its districts in the Less Deprived category and none in the More Deprived category, and Mysore with 37.50% of its districts in the latter and 12.50% in the former, together emerge as the more deprived divisions in Karnataka.
  - Intraregionally, among the divisions of NKR, the incidence of deprivation is higher in Gulbarga than in Belgaum. And in respect of SKR, the incidence of deprivation is more in Mysore than in Bangalore. (Table 5.11)

25. From the aforesaid discussion, we may say that among the divisions, Mysore and Gulbarga, among the regions, NKR, and among the districts, Udupi, Dakshina Kannada, Uttara Kannada and Kodagu emerge as the more deprived areas in Karnataka.

26. In all, 11 districts deserve redressal measures. Udupi, Dakshina Kannada, Uttara Kannada and Kodagu (4 districts) attract remedial action in the first phase, and Bidar, Gulbarga, Belgaum, Raichur, Koppal, Shimoga, and Chickmagalur (7 districts) merit remedial action in the second phase (Table 5.12).

## 5.8 Children out of School in the Age group of 6-14 Years

27. The Human Development Centre of Pakistan begins the 5<sup>th</sup> Chapter of its 1998 issue of "Human Development in South Asia" with the words, "Enabling all children to obtain a complete primary education of high quality is the key challenge faced by governments in South Asia". It is also a challenge to us in India. Despite the sincere efforts of the government to achieve 'universalisation of primary education', quite a few children in the primary school going age continue to remain outside schools for diverse socio-economic reasons. 'Children out of school' and 'school dropouts' do pose a challenge on our way to reach the goal of universalisation of primary education. Of the two, 'children out of school' is a major challenge. It is indeed a challenge to the Government of Karnataka also. As at 2001, of the 81,09,494 children in the age group of 6-14 years, 8,13,563 children are out of schools. That means 10.03% of the Children in 6-14 age group in the state are out of school. This is indeed a cause for concern. Further, for Karnataka, regional variations in this deprivation is also a cause for concern. We have chosen "Percentage of Children out of school in the age group of 6-14 years" as one of the indicators to measure capability-deprivation with reference to education. Here, it is of significance to note that from the point of view of such children, it seems to represent present deprivation, but as they grow, it turns out to be a major capability-deprivation for life. Further, it goes beyond such individuals to affect adversely the aggregate capability of the society of which they are an integral part. It is more so when we recognize the necessity of minimum schooling to take advantage of the opportunities that the ongoing process of liberalization, marketisation, privatization, transnationalisation, and globalisation has been throwing up. Education, apart from being instrumental, has intrinsic value from the point of view of the individual. The children who are exposed to this kind of deprivation, cannot but lead a choiceless or a least-choice life when they grow into adults.

28. It is in this background, we have chosen 'children out of school' as an indicator to assess the extent of deprivation in education across the regions, divisions and districts of Karnataka. The data in respect of "Percentage of Children out of school in the age group of 6-14 years" are presented in three tables. Table 5.13 ranks the 27 districts based on the degree of their deprivation. It gives us the relative positions of the districts in the deprivation scale. It also gives the exact distance of each district from the state average level of deprivation on either side - above or below. Table 5.14 gives the division-wise and region-wise picture as to the proportion of districts that figure in each of the three categories - Least Deprived, Less Deprived and More Deprived. The actual names of the districts that figure in each of the three categories by divisions are given in table 5.15.



**Table 5.13 Children out of School (in the age group of 6-14 years)  
in Karnataka by Districts**

Rank	Districts	Percentage of out of School Children in the 6 - 14 age group	Rank in the Respective	
			Divisions	Regions
1	2	3	4	5
1	Udupi	1.10	1	1
2	Dakshina Kannada	1.76	2	2
3	Bangalore Urban	2.72	1	3
4	Mandya	4.27	3	4
5	Bangalore Rural	4.40	2	5
6	Tumkur	4.50	3	6
7	Hassan	5.11	4	7
8	Shimoga	6.10	4	8
9	Chickmagalur	6.78	5	9
10	Uttara Kannada	6.89	1	1
11	Chitradurga	7.50	5	10
12	Davanagere	7.70	6	11
13	Haveri	8.40	2	2
14	Belgaum	8.46	3	3
15	Kodagu	8.52	6	12
16	Dharwad	8.54	4	4
17	Mysore	9.01	7	13
18	Chamarajanagar	9.14	8	14
19	Kolar	9.81	7	15
20	Gadag	10.11	5	5
21	Bidar	12.41	1	6
22	Bagalkot	13.22	6	7
23	Bellary	16.75	2	8
24	Bijapur	17.32	7	9
25	Koppal	20.95	3	10
26	Gulbarga	24.37	4	11
27	Raichur	26.73	5	12
	Bangalore Divison	5.58		2
	Mysore Division	5.45		1
	Belgaum Division	10.56		3
	Gulbarga Divison	20.82		4
	South Karnataka Region	5.53 15.21	- -	1 2
	<b>Karnataka State</b>	<b>10.03</b>	-	

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.4

**Note :** The districts are arranged in the ascending order of deprivation and descending order of ranks

**Table 5.14: Children out of School (in the Age group of 6-14 years) in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions and Regions**

Sl. No.	Division/ Regions	Least Deprived Districts			Less Deprived Districts			More Deprived Districts			Total districts	
		No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/ region	Percentage share in the total Least Deprived Districts in the State	No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division /region	Percentage share in the Less Deprived Districts in the State	No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/ region	Percentage Share in the total More Deprived Districts in the State	No.	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Bangalore	07	100.00	36.84	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	07	100.00
2	Mysore	08	100.00	42.11	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	08	100.00
	South Karnataka Region (SKR)	15	100.00	78.95	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	15	100.00
3	Belgaum	04	57.14	21.05	01	14.29	50.00	02	28.57	33.33	07	100.00
4	Gulbarga	Nil	Nil	Nil	01	20.00	50.00	04	80.00	66.67	05	100.00
	North Karnataka Region (NKR)	04	33.33	21.05	02	16.67	100.00	06	50.00	100.00	12	100.00
	Karnataka	19	70.37**	100.00	02	7.41 **	100.00	06	22.22* *	100.00	27	100.00

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.4

**Note :** 1.\*\* These figures indicate the proportion of the Least Deprived, Less Deprived and More Deprived districts (columns 4,7 and 10 respectively) in the State.

**Table: 5.15 Children out of School (in the Age group of 6-14 years) in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions**

Sl. No.	Divisions	Least Deprived Districts	Less Deprived Districts	More Deprived Districts
1	2	3	4	5
1	Bangalore	1. Bangalore Urban (3) 2. Bangalore Rural (5) 3 Tumkur (6) 4. Shimoga (8) 5 Chitradurga (11) 6 Davanagere (12) 7 Kolar (19)	Nil	-Nil-
2	Mysore	8. Udupi (1) 9. D. Kannada (2) 10. Mandya (4) 11. Hassan (7) 12. Chickmagalur (9) 13. Kodagu (15) 14. Mysore (17) 15. Chamarajanagar (18)	Nil	-Nil-
3	Belgaum	16. Uttarak Kannada (10) 17. Haveri (13) 18. Belgaum (14) 19. Dharwad (16)	1. Gadag (20)	1. Bagalkot (22) 2. Bijapur (24)
4	Gulbarga	Nil	2 Bidar (21)	3. Bellary (23) 4. Koppal (25) 5. Gulbarga (26) 6. Raichur (27)

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.4.

**Note :** 1. The figures in brackets indicate the ranks of the districts in the State.

29. We may interpret the data as under: -

- (i) There is no district in the State which has done away with this deprivation. Every district suffers from deprivation, of course, the deprivations vary in degree. But the variations are significant.
- Among the districts, it varies from a low of 1.10% in Udupi to a high of 26.73% in Raichur. The spread is alarming.
  - Among the divisions, it varies from a low of 5.45% in Mysore to a high of 20.82% in Gulbarga.
  - A similar situation also exists at the regional level. As against the state average of 10.03%, it is 5.53% in SKR and 15.21% in NKR
  - From this we may infer that the intensity of this deprivation is high in Raichur among the districts, in Gulbarga among the divisions, and in NKR among the regions. (Table 5.13)
- (ii) As to the nature and extent of deprivation in terms of the proportion of districts of each division and region, we come to know the following facts: -
- At the state level, 22.22% of its districts are in the More Deprived category, 7.41% in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining 70.37% in the Least Deprived category. But the same is not the case with divisions and regions.
  - Among the regions, at the one end there is NKR with 50% of its districts in the More Deprived category, 16.67% in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining 33.33% in the Least Deprived category. At the other end there is SKR which has all its districts in the Least Deprived category.
  - Among the divisions, we have two extreme cases. Gulbarga has 80% of its districts in the More Deprived category, and 20% in the Less Deprived category, and none in the Least Deprived category. On the contrary, Bangalore and Mysore have all their districts (100%) in the Least Deprived category and none in the other two categories.
  - From these facts again we may infer that the extent of deprivation in terms of the proportion of districts, the deprivation is high in NKR among the regions, and in Gulbarga among the divisions (Table 5.14).
- (iii) If we restrict our focus to the last two categories, the districts which are relevant for policy prescription, we come to know that, of the 6 districts that figure in the More Deprived category, 4 are in Gulbarga division (Raichur, Gulbarga, Koppal and Bellary), and 2 are in Belgaum division (Bijapur and Bagalkot).
- Of the 2 districts that appear in the Less Deprived category, one each is found in Gulbarga (Bidar) and Belgaum (Gadag) divisions. (Table 5.15)

30. As far as redressal measures are concerned, Raichur (27<sup>th</sup> Rank), Gulbarga (26<sup>th</sup> Rank), Koppal (25<sup>th</sup> Rank), Bijapur (24<sup>th</sup> Rank), Bellary (23<sup>rd</sup> Rank), and Bagalkot (22<sup>nd</sup> Rank) deserve remedial action in the first phase. And Bidar (21<sup>st</sup> Rank), and Gadag (20<sup>th</sup> Rank), merit remedial action in the second phase. (Table 5.15)

## 5.9 Gender Gaps in Literacy

31. In a hierarchical andro-centric society, economy and polity, gender gaps in many aspects of life are quite common and they reflect the disadvantage which women suffer in relation to men. Literacy is one such area where women suffer disadvantage when compared to men. Gender gap in literacy is one of the most significant deprivations that women suffer in India. Literacy has both instrumental and intrinsic value. It is instrumental in augmenting people's capabilities, and besides, it is a goal to be achieved for its own sake. Despite the recent focus on female literacy and the resultant increase in female literacy, gender gaps in literacy which are unfavourable to women continue to persist in India. These gaps, inter alia, have implications for gender empowerment, fertility rates, CBR, IMR, MMR etc. Gender gaps are to be reduced consciously through effective public policy related to literacy and basic education. As far as Karnataka is concerned, the gender gaps in literacy are more pronounced in certain parts of the state than in others. In assessing regional imbalances in gender gaps in literacy, state average is reckoned as the bench mark.

32. The data pertaining to gender gaps in literacy are presented in three tables. Table 5.16 presents a comparative picture of the gender gaps in literacy of all the 27 districts in Karnataka; the districts are ranked depending upon the gender gaps. Table 5.17 gives a division-wise and region-wise picture of the proportion of districts in each of the three categories. And the division-wise classification of districts by names is given in Table 5.18.

**Table: 5.16 Gender Gaps in Literacy in Karnataka by Districts, Divisions and Regions, (2001)**

Rank	Name of the District	Literacy Rate		Gender gap in points (3-4)	Rank in Respective	
		Male	Female		Division	Region
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Bangalore Urban	88.36	78.98	9.38	1	1
2	Kodagu	83.80	72.53	11.27	1	2
3	Dakshina Kannada	89.74	77.39	12.35	2	3
4	Udupi	86.59	74.02	12.57	3	4
5	Shimoga	82.32	67.24	15.08	2	5
6	Mysore	71.30	55.81	15.49	4	6
7	Uttara Kannada	84.48	68.48	16.00	1	1
8	Chickmagalur	80.68	64.47	16.21	5	7
9	Chamarajanagar	59.25	43.02	16.23	6	8
10	Davangere	76.44	58.45	17.99	3	9
11	Dharwad	81.04	62.20	18.84	2	2
12	Hassan	78.29	59.32	18.97	7	10
13	Mandya	70.71	51.62	19.09	8	11
14	Bangalore Rural	74.43	55.12	19.31	4	12
15	Tumkur	76.88	57.18	19.70	5	13

...Contd

Rank	Name of the District	Literacy Rate		Gender gap in points (3-4)	Rank in Respective	
		Male	Female		Division	Region
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	Chitradurga	74.69	54.62	20.07	6	14
17	Kolar	73.14	52.81	20.33	7	15
18	Haveri	77.94	57.60	20.34	3	3
19	Bijapur	68.10	46.19	21.91	4	4
20	Bidar	73.29	50.01	23.28	1	5
21	Belgaum	75.89	52.53	23.36	5	6
22	Bellary	69.59	46.16	23.43	2	7
23	Gulbarga	62.52	38.40	24.12	3	8
24	Raichur	62.02	36.84	25.18	4	9
25	Gadag	79.55	52.58	26.97	6	10
26	Bagalkot	71.31	44.10	27.21	7	11
27	Koppal	69.15	40.76	28.39	5	12
1	Mysore Division	77.02	61.64	15.38		1
2	Bangalore Division	80.56	64.78	15.78		2
3	Belgaum Division	76.30	54.06	22.24		1
4	Gulbarga Division	66.51	41.92	24.59		2
<b>1</b>	<b>South Karnataka</b>	<b>79.20</b>	<b>63.53</b>	<b>15.67</b>		<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>North Karnataka</b>	<b>72.24</b>	<b>48.99</b>	<b>23.25</b>		<b>2</b>
	<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>76.29</b>	<b>57.45</b>	<b>18.84</b>		

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.5

**Note:** The districts are arranged in the ascending order of gender gap, and descending order of ranks.

**Table 5.17: Gender Gaps in Literacy in Karnataka :Classification of Districts by Divisions and Regions**

Sl. No	Divisions/ Regions	Least Deprived Districts			Less Deprived Districts			More Deprived Districts			Total Districts	
		No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the total Least Deprived Districts in the state	No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the total Less Deprived Districts in the state	No.	Percentage share in the total districts of the division/region	Percentage share in the total More Deprived Districts in the state	No.	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	Bangalore	03	42.86	27.27	04	57.14	36.37	-	-	-	07	100.00
2.	Mysore	06	75.00	54.55	02	25.00	18.18	-	-	-	08	100.00
	South Karnataka Region (SKR)	09	60.00	81.82	06	40.00	54.55	-	-	-	15	100.00
3.	Belgaum	02	28.57	18.18	03	42.86	27.27	02	28.57	40.00	07	100.00
4	Gulbarga	-	-	-	02	40.00	18.18	03	60.00	60.00	05	100.00
	North Karnataka Region (NKR)	02	16.66	18.18	05	41.67	45.45	05	41.67	100.00	12	100.00
	<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>40.74 *</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>40.74 *</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>05</b>	<b>18.52*</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Source:** Derived from Annexure 5.5

**Note :** \* These figures indicate the proportion of Least Deprived, Less Deprived and More Deprived Districts (columns 4,7 and 10 respectively) in the state.

**Table: 5.18 Gender Gaps in Literacy in Karnataka: Classification of Districts by Divisions**

Sl.No.	Divisions	Least Deprived Districts	Less Deprived District	More Deprived Districts
1	2	3	4	5
1	Bangalore	1. Bangalore Urban (1) 2. Shimoga (5) 3. Davanagere (10)	1. Bangalore Rural (14) 2. Tumkur (15) 3. Chitradurga (16) 4. Kolar (17)	Nil
2	Mysore	4. Kodagu (2) 5. Dakshina Kannada (3) 6. Udupi (4) 7. Mysore (6) 8. Chickmagalur (8) 9. Chamarajanagar (9)	5. Hassan (12) 6. Mandya (13)	Nil
3	Belgaum	10. Uttar Kannada (7) 11. Dharwad (11)	7. Haveri (18) 8. Bijapur (19) 9. Belgaum (21)	1. Gadag (25) 2. Bagalkot (26)
4	Gulbarga	Nil	10. Bidar (20) 11. Bellary (22)	3. Gulbarga (23) 4. Raichur (24) 5. Koppal (27)

**Source :** Derived from Annexure 5.5

**Note :** 1. The figures in brackets indicate the ranks of the districts in the state.

33. The following facts about regional imbalances emerge out of the data:

- (i) There is no single district which does not have gender gaps in literacy; gaps are present in all the districts. That means female disadvantage in literacy is found in all the districts in Karnataka.
- (ii) There are wide variations in gaps. Among the districts, it varies from a high of 28.39 percentage points in Koppal to a low of 9.38 percentage points in Bangalore(U). Among the divisions, it varies from a high of 24.59 in Gulbarga to a low of 15.38 in Mysore. And among the regions, it varies from a high of 23.25 in NKR to a low of 15.67 in SKR. (Table 5.16)
- (iii) Based on the benchmark, of the 27 districts in the state, 40.74% of them are in the Least Deprived category, 40.74% of them are in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining 18.52% of them are in the more Deprived category. (Table 5.17)
- (iv) Among the regions, NKR suffers greater deprivation than SKR. The former has 41.67% of its districts in the More Deprived category, 41.67% in the Less Deprived category, and only 16.66% in the Least Deprived category. On the contrary, the latter has none in the More Deprived category, 40% in the Less Deprived category, and 60% in the Least Deprived category. (Table 5.17)



- (v) Gulbarga division stands out by having none of its districts in the Least Deprived category, and by having two of its districts (Bidar and Bellary) in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining three districts (Gulbarga, Raichur and Koppal) in the More Deprived category, it emerges as the most deprived division in Karnataka.
- Mysore and Bangalore divisions do not have any of their districts in the More Deprived category. Of them, Mysore has only two of its districts (Hassan and Mandya) in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining six districts in the Least Deprived category, and Bangalore has four of its districts (Bangalore (R) , Tumkur, Chitradurga and Kolar) in the Less Deprived category, and the remaining three districts in the Least Deprived category. For details see Table 5.18.

34. As far as redressal measures are concerned, five districts(Koppal, Raichur, Gulbarga, Bagalkot and Gadag) figuring in the More Deprived category attract remedial action in the first phase, and eleven districts commencing with Bellary (22<sup>nd</sup> rank) and ending at Hassan (12<sup>th</sup> rank) attract remedial action in the second phase. For further details, see Table 5.18.

## 5.10 A Resume

35. In brief we may say that:-

- Capability - deprivations are found in all the districts irrespective of the divisions and regions to which they belong. Of course, the severity of deprivations is more pronounced in NKR than in SKR. Most of the parameters of deprivation point at Gulbarga as the most deprived division.
- However, no such division / region - specific pattern is seen at the district level. Gadag in respect of 'income deprivation', Gulbarga in respect of 'unsafe deliveries', Bellary in respect of 'severely malnourished children', Udupi in respect of 'unsafe drinking water', Raichur in respect of 'children out of school', and Koppal in respect of 'gender gaps in literacy', emerge as the most deprived districts in Karnataka.
- The districts of NKR are found to be experiencing greater degree of female disadvantage and child disadvantage than those of SKR.

36. Table 5.19 presents an overview of the relative positions of the districts which figure under “Less Deprived” and “More Deprived” categories with reference to each of the six parameters of deprivation considered in the study.

- Given the severity of the deprivations and their crippling impact on people’s basic capabilities, the government ought to intervene through public policy into matters pertaining to primary education and primary health care facilities with special focus on gender and child-sensitive parameters of deprivation. We cannot leave these matters entirely to market forces and private sector.
- Quite often regional imbalances in development may conceal some of the deprivations. So, deprivation-combating measures need be carefully integrated with those of development facilitating measures so that regional imbalances get tackled from both the ends – development end and deprivation end.

- (vi) Spatially, the deprivation study – assessment and redressal – ought to go beyond the districts vertically down to reach the taluks, and assessment-wise, it has to go beyond the six parameters used in the present inquiry to include all the parameters referred to in the methodology section of this Chapter. That means efforts are to be made to develop deprivation data-base at the taluk level.
- (vii) Further, the deprivation study, to be comprehensive and useful for policy prescription, it has to go beyond the physical aspects of infrastructure facilities to cover their functional aspects. We have used the secondary sources of data to assess the physical aspects of infrastructure facilities. Considering the massive task of gathering field work-based primary data required for assessing the functional aspects, the Committee commissioned a sample survey to capture the functional, non-functional and dysfunctional aspects of infrastructure with reference to Drinking Water, ANM Sub Centres and PHCs, Rural electrification, and Primary and Higher Primary Schools. The highlights of the survey findings are presented in Annexure 5.6. However, a birds-eye-view is captured in Table 5.20.

**Table: 5.19 Consolidated statement of Deprivations: Classification of Districts into More Deprived and Less Deprived Districts by Deprivation Parameters**

<b>Income Deprivation</b>	<b>Health Deprivation</b>			<b>Education Deprivation</b>	
<b>B.P.L Families</b>	<b>Unsafe Deliveries</b>	<b>Severely Malnourished Children</b>	<b>Unsafe Drinking Water</b>	<b>Children out of School</b>	<b>Gender Gaps in Literacy</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
		<b>More Deprived Districts</b>			
1. Gadag (27) 2. Bellary (26) 3. Raichur (25) 4. Koppal (24) 5. Bijapur (23) 6. Chitradurga (22)	1. Gulbarga (27) 2. Raichur (26) 3. Koppal (25) 4. Bagalkot (24) 5. Bijapur (23) 6. Bidar (22) 7. Davanagere (21) 8. Chitradurga (20) 9. Bellary (19)	1. Bellary (27) 2. Koppal (26) 3. Raichur (25) 4. Gulbarga (24)	1. Udupi (27) 2. Dakshina Kannada (26) 3. Uttara Kannada (25) 4. Kodagu (24)	1. Raichur (27) 2. Gulbarga (26) 3. Koppal (25) 4. Bijapur (24) 5. Bellary (23) 6. Bagalkot (22)	1. Koppal (27) 2. Bagalkot (26) 3. Gadag (25) 4. Raichur (24) 5. Gulbarga (23)
		<b>Less Deprived Districts</b>			
1. Kolar (21) 2. Bidar (20) 3. Dharwad (19) 4. Shimoga (18) 5. Chamarajanagar (17) 6. Bangalore (R) (16) 7. Gulbarga (15)	1. Kolar (18) 2. Mandya (17) 3. Tumkur (16)	1. Davangere (23) 2. Bijapur (22) 3. Dharwad (21)	1. Bidar (23) 2. Gulbarga (22) 3. Belgaum (21) 4. Raichur (20) 5. Koppal (19) 6. Shimoga (18) 7. Chickmagalur (17)	1. Bidar (21) 2. Gadag (20)	1. Bellary (22) 2. Belgaum (21) 3. Bidar (20) 4. Bijapur (19) 5. Haveri (18) 6. Kolar (17) 7. Chitradurga (16) 8. Tumkur (15) 9. Bangalore(R) (14) 10.Mandya (13) 11.Hassan (12)

**Source :** Derived from Table Nos: 5.3, 5.6, 5.9, 5.12, 5.15 and 5.18.

**Note :** Figures in brackets indicate the ranks of the districts concerned in the state.

Table 5.20

**Bird's-Eye-View of the Study on Functionality of Infrastructure Facilities in 5 important Sectors.**

Sl.No.	Sector/item	South Karnataka	North Karnataka	State
	1	2	3	4
<b>I</b>	<b>Functionality of Primary and Higher Primary Schools</b>			
1(a)	percentage of Primary Schools having less than four class rooms .	86	85	85
(b)	percentage of Higher Primary Schools having less than 7 class rooms	43	46	44
2(a)	percentage of Primary School Teachers' posts vacant.	10	12	11
(b)	percentage of Higher Primary School teachers' posts vacant.	10	12	11
3(a)	percentage of students absent in Primary Schools	5	13	10
(b)	percentage of students absent in Higher Primary Schools.	6	11	9
4(a)	percentage of Primary Schools functioning in government buildings.	88	84	86
(b)	percentage of Higher Primary Schools functioning in government buildings.	83	91	87
5(a)	percentage of Primary Schools not having sufficient accomodation.	39	47	43
(b)	percentage of Higher Primary Schools not having sufficinet accomodation.	40	44	42
6(a)	percentage of Primary Schools lacking basic facilities.			
	I) Drinking Water	65	76	70
	II)Toilet	84	90	87
	III)Electricity	82	84	83
(b)	percentage of Higher Primary Schools lacking basic facilities.			
	I) Drinking Water	40	60	49
	II)Toilet	50	76	62
	III)Electricity	37	51	43

.... Contd

Sl.No.	Sector/item	South Karnataka	North Karnataka	State
	1	2	3	4
<b>II</b>	<b>Functionality of ANM Subcentres and PHCS.</b>			
1	percentage of subcentres not having government buildings.	33	36	34
2	percentage of subcentres each covering more than 5000 population.	22	35	28
3	percentage of subcentres not having regular ANMs.	14	11	12
4	percentage of PHCs not having manpower .			
	I)Doctor	1	8	5
	II)Lab technician	29	26	29
	III)Pharmacist.	49	60	57
	IV)Paramedical staff less than 50 percent.	17	18	17
	V)Administrative staff less than 50 percent.	19	16	18
5	percentage of PHCs each covering more than 30000 population.	24	24	24
6	percentge of PHCs having inadequate facilities			
	I)Accomodation.	46	48	47
	II)Supply of drugs	29	16	23
	III)Medicial equipment	42	38	40
	IV)Water supply	41	45	43
	V)Electricity	18	20	19
	VI)Cold storage	12	24	17
7	percentage of PHCs where Doctors are not staying in headquarters.	44	50	47
<b>III</b>	<b>Functionality of Rural Drinking Water Facilities.</b>			
A	Borewell with hand pumps.			
1	percentage of Villages /hamlets having water supply less than 40 LPCD	65	76	69
2	percentage of Villages /hamlets having inadequate water supply during summer.	31	54	39
3	percentage of Villages reporting contamination in drinking water.	7	7	7

... Contd

Sl.No.	Sector/item	South Karnataka	North Karnataka	State
	1	2	3	4
<b>B</b>	Mini water supply scheme			
1	percentage of Villages /hamlets having water less than 40 LPCD	62	71	66
2	percentage of Villages /hamlets having inadequate water supply during summer.	32	52	40
3	percentage of Villages reporting contamination in drinking water.	7	6	7
<b>C</b>	Piped water supply scheme			
1	percentage of Villages /hamlets having water less than 40 LPCD	47	67	55
2	percentage of Villages /hamlets having inadequate water supply during summer.	38	58	41
3	percentage of Villages having contamination in drinking water.	7	7	7
<b>IV</b>	<b>Functionality of Drinking Water facilities in Urban area-Borewell</b>			
1	percentage of towns having less than 60 LPCD	68	80	74
2	percentage of towns having inadequate water supply during summer.	58	55	57
3	percentage of towns reporting contamination in drinking water.	20	10	16
<b>V</b>	<b>Functionality of rural electrification</b>			
1	percentage of hamlets not having electricity	4	9	7
2(a)	percentage of villages not having street lights.	1	1	1
(b)	percentage of hamlets not having street lights	16	42	29
3(a)	percentage of villages reporting insufficient power supply	80	75	78
(b)	percentage of hamlets reporting insufficient power supply .	88	27	58

**Annexure 5.1**  
**Families (Rural) Below Poverty Line in Karnataka**

Sl. No	District	Percentage of families Below Poverty Line
1	2	3
1	Bangalore Urban	15.67
2	Bangalore Rural	35.75
3	Chitradurga	41.50
4	Davanagere	20.00
5	Kolar	40.27
6	Shimoga	36.00
7	Tumkur	31.40
8	Bagalkot	23.50
9	Belgaum	23.70
10	Bijapur	42.00
11	Dharwad	39.00
12	Gadag	46.60
13	Haveri	32.00
14	Uttara Kannada	30.45
15	Chamarajanagar	36.00
16	Chickmagalur	27.00
17	D. Kannada	15.40
18	Hassan	27.13
19	Kodagu	19.00
20	Mandya	29.86
21	Mysore	28.14
22	Udupi	24.67
23	Bellary	44.57
24	Bidar	39.60
25	Gulbarga	33.70
26	Koppal	42.50
27	Raichur	43.20

**Source :** RDPR, Government of Karnataka: Results of the BPL Census for the IX Plan period (1997-98)

## Annexure5.2

## District-wise Demographic indicators of Karnataka

Sl.No	Districts	Estimated coverage of safe drinking water –2000 (% of habitations)	Percentage of safe deliveries
1	2	3	4
1	Bangalore Urban	67.56	90.60
2	Bangalore Rural	71.30	79.10
3	Chitradurga	72.62	53.80
4	Davanagere	72.62	53.80
5	Kolar	74.00	59.20
6	Shimoga	54.60	83.00
7	Tumkur	66.59	63.50
8	Belgaum	52.94	68.60
9	Bijapur	60.42	50.10
10	Bagalkot	60.42	50.10
11	Dharwad	67.18	65.30
12	Gadag	67.18	65.30
13	Haveri	67.18	65.30
14	Uttara Kannada	24.89	86.10
15	Bellary	69.41	54.00
16	Bidar	49.84	52.50
17	Gulbarga	51.92	47.70
18	Koppal	53.91	48.00
19	Raichur	53.91	48.00
20	Chickmagalur	57.25	78.00
21	Dakshina Kannada	16.49	91.50
22	Udupi	16.49	91.50
23	Hassan	65.55	69.70
24	Kodagu	36.95	79.40
25	Mandya	58.65	61.90
26	Mysore	68.16	69.70
27	Chamarajanagar	68.16	69.70

Source: National population Commission



**Annexure 5.3**  
**Nutritional Aspects of Children Below 5 in Karnataka by Districts and Divisions (2001)**

Sl. No.	Districts	Classification of Nutritional Status					Total No. of Children Weighed
		Normal (Nos)	Grade I (Nos)	Grade II (Nos)	Grade III	Grade IV	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>I.</b>	<b>Bangalore Division</b>	<b>2,51,100</b>	<b>2,33,671</b>	<b>87,968</b>	<b>1,274</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>5,74,155</b>
1	Bangalore (Urban)	25,604	22,353	7,965	95	8	56,025
2	Bangalore (Rural)	37,044	30,573	10,736	150	17	78,520
3	Chitradurga...	30,563	31,620	14,245	257	35	76,720
4	Davanagere...	26,784	32,170	15,283	414	45	74,696
5	Kolar...	54,113	47,446	21,254	158	13	1,22,984
6	Shimoga...	22,803	26,271	7,784	156	18	57,032
7	Tumkur	54,189	43,238	10,701	44	6	1,08,178
<b>II.</b>	<b>Mysore Division</b>	<b>2,29,221</b>	<b>1,87,271</b>	<b>48,960</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4,65,844</b>
1.	Chamarajanagar	23,582	24,351	5,976	36	1	53,946
2.	Chickmagalur	23,791	19,835	4,589	47	6	48,268
3.	Dakshina Kannada	30,341	22,042	5,517	53	7	57,960
4.	Hassan...	34,619	31,428	5,501	66	9	71,623
5.	Kodagu...	15,545	9,698	2,231	27	4	27,505
6.	Mandya...	43,198	30,914	8,507	34	2	82,655
7.	Mysore...	37,821	36,159	13,961	66	7	88,014
8.	Udupi...	20,324	12,844	2,678	24	3	35,873
<b>III</b>	<b>Belgaum Division</b>	<b>2,67,147</b>	<b>2,50,375</b>	<b>1,32,838</b>	<b>2,170</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>6,52,786</b>
1.	Bagalkot...	26,963	29,158	18,421	307	39	74,888
2.	Belgaum...	1,01,085	83,610	39,724	511	62	2,24,992
3.	Bijapur...	38,512	39,213	24,497	508	52	1,02,782
4.	Dharwad...	27,235	22,531	10,111	294	28	60,199
5.	Gadag...	18,400	21,879	15,349	218	38	55,884
6.	Haveri...	28,276	31,970	18,403	186	22	78,857
7.	Uttara Kannada	26,676	22,014	6,333	146	15	55,184
<b>IV</b>	<b>Gulbarga Division</b>	<b>1,37,000</b>	<b>1,59,719</b>	<b>1,29,842</b>	<b>5,956</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>4,32,966</b>
1.	Bellary...	22,996	31,782	28,210	1,802	170	84,960
2.	Bidar...	24,552	31,620	24,854	391	3	81,420
3.	Gulbarga...	52,847	54,464	43,159	1,849	83	1,52,402
4.	Koppal...	16,020	21,447	16,694	967	95	55,223
5.	Raichur...	20,585	20,406	16,925	947	98	58,961
	<b>South Karnataka</b>	<b>4,80,321</b>	<b>4,20,942</b>	<b>1,36,928</b>	<b>1,627</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>10,39,999</b>
	<b>North Karnataka</b>	<b>4,04,147</b>	<b>4,10,094</b>	<b>2,62,680</b>	<b>8,126</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>10,85,752</b>
	<b>Karnataka</b>	<b>8,84,468</b>	<b>8,31,036</b>	<b>3,99,608</b>	<b>9,753</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>21,25,751</b>

**Source:** Government of Karnataka: Abstract from the Government of India, Monthly Progress Report (Format II) for the month of November 2001: Joint Director (ICDS), Ls. No. DWC/FCD/MPR/12/2001-02 dt. 17.01.2002.

**Note :** Grade I and II Children are moderately Malnourished and Grade III and IV Children are Severely Malnourished

### Annexure 5.4

#### The Children out of school in 6-14 age group in Karnataka by Districts, divisions and regions

Sl. No.	Districts	Children in the age group 6-14 years (nos.)	Children out of school in the age group of 6-14 years	Percentage of children out of school
1	2	3	4	5
1	Bangalore Urban	796084	21687	2.72
2	Bangalore Rural	288375	12691	4.40
3	Chitradurga	242594	18205	7.50
4	Davanagere	286006	22023	7.70
5	Kolar	433740	42570	9.81
6	Shimoga	244557	14911	6.10
7	Tumkur	386956	17403	4.50
8	Bagalkot	282710	37385	13.22
9	Belgaum	609823	51567	8.46
10	Bijapur	344549	59685	17.32
11	Dharwad	223547	19081	8.54
12	Gadag	156688	15836	10.11
13	Haveri	244177	20506	8.40
14	Uttara Kannada	201510	13874	6.89
15	Chamarajnagar	143413	13106	9.14
16	Chickmagalur	163087	11061	6.78
17	Dakshina Kannada	251630	4418	1.76
18	Hassan	254148	12981	5.11
19	Kodagu	71150	6062	8.52
20	Mandya	260219	11101	4.27
21	Mysore	328867	29635	9.01
22	Udupi	187053	2059	1.10
23	Bellary	344161	57634	16.75
24	Bidar	284244	35264	12.41
25	Gulbarga	560739	136667	24.37
26	Koppal	219771	46046	20.95
27	Raichur	299696	80105	26.73
	Bangalore Division	2678312	149490	5.58
	Mysore Division	1659567	90423	5.45
	Belgaum Division	2063004	217934	10.56
	Gulbarga Division	1708611	355716	20.82
	<b>North Karnataka</b>	<b>3771615</b>	<b>573650</b>	<b>15.21</b>
	<b>South Karnataka</b>	<b>4337879</b>	<b>239913</b>	<b>5.53</b>
	<b>Karnataka State</b>	<b>8109494</b>	<b>813563</b>	<b>10.03</b>

Source: High Power Committee for Redressal of Regional Imbalances, Government of Karnataka, Bangalore.

## Annexure 5.5

## Gender Gaps in Literacy in Karnataka by Districts

Sl.No.	District	Number of Literates			Literacy rate		
		Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Karnataka	30774988	17817682	12957306	67.04	76.29	57.45
1	Belgaum	2323258	1392932	930326	64.42	75.89	52.53
2	Bagalkot	808069	502308	305761	57.81	71.31	44.10
3	Bijapur	882754	538179	344575	57.46	68.10	46.19
4	Gulbarga	1324905	830658	494247	50.65	62.52	38.40
5	Bidar	785206	477456	307750	61.98	73.29	50.01
6	Raichur	683988	431738	252250	49.54	62.02	36.84
7	Koppal	547345	345457	201888	55.02	69.15	40.76
8	Gadag	556191	338746	217445	66.27	79.55	52.58
9	Dharwad	1003608	580829	422779	71.87	81.04	62.20
10	Uttar Kannada	906640	506799	399841	76.59	84.48	68.48
11	Haveri	846960	499906	347054	68.09	77.94	57.60
12	Bellary	1000602	608165	392437	58.04	69.59	46.16
13	Chitradurga	857099	504478	352621	64.88	74.69	54.62
14	Davanagere	1057525	612240	445285	67.67	76.44	58.45
15	Shimoga	1078573	599168	479405	74.86	82.32	67.24
16	Udupi	799305	403425	395880	79.87	86.59	74.02
17	Chickmagalur	732185	409495	322690	72.63	80.68	64.47
18	Tumkur	1537332	893835	643497	67.19	76.88	57.18
19	Kolar	1392445	819329	573116	63.14	73.14	52.81
20	Bangalore Urban	4862343	2692608	2169735	83.91	88.36	78.98
21	Bangalore rural	1081240	633486	447754	65.00	74.43	55.12
22	Mandya	960948	557435	403513	61.21	70.71	51.62
23	Hassan	1051095	595424	455671	68.75	78.29	59.32
24	Dakshina Kannada	1404928	743445	661483	83.47	89.74	77.39
25	Kodagu	374041	200627	173414	78.17	83.80	72.53
26	Mysore	1477464	841941	635523	63.69	71.30	55.81
27	Chamarajnaragar	438939	257573	181366	51.26	59.25	43.02
	<b>Karnataka</b>	30774988	17817682	12957306	67.04	76.29	57.45

**Source:** Census of India 2001, Series -30, Karnataka provisional population totals, Director of Census Operations, Karnataka.

## ANNEXURE 5.6

### **Highlights of the Survey on Functionality of infrastructure / facilities in the selected sectors:**

The main highlights of the survey on functionality of infrastructure facilities in the selected sectors namely, drinking water (rural and urban), health care through ANM sub-centres and primary health centres, rural electrification and primary and higher primary education are given below:

#### **Drinking water facilities (Rural)**

##### **I Borewell with handpump scheme**

1. The water supply through borewell hand pump scheme was partially covered in 81 or 17% villages/ hamlets in the State, of which 59 or 18% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 22 or 15% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

2. The water supply was less than 40 LPCD in 324 or 69% villages/hamlets surveyed in the state, of which 215 or 65% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 109 or 76% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

3. Inadequate water supply was reported in 182 or 39% villages/hamlets during summer season, of which 104 or 31% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 78 or 54% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka. In other seasons, inadequate water supply was found in 47 or 10% villages/hamlets in the state, of which 30 or 9% villages were in South Karnataka and 17 or 12% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

4. Contamination in drinking water was reported in 32 or 7% villages in the state, of which, 23 or 7% villages were found in South Karnataka and 9 or 7% villages in North Karnataka.

5. Water supply was irregular in 61 or 13% villages surveyed in the State, of which 39 or 11% villages were found in South Karnataka and 22 or 15% villages in North Karnataka.

##### **II Mini Water supply scheme**

1. Out of 646 villages/hamlets surveyed, 140 or 22% villages/hamlets were partially covered under mini water supply scheme, of which 87 or 22% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 53 or 21% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

2. The water supply was less than 40 LPCD in 427 or 66% villages/hamlets, of which 247 or 62% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 180 or 71% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

3. The water supply was reported inadequate in 261 or 40% villages. During summere season, of which 130 or 32% villages/hamlets were found in South Karnataka and 131 or

52% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka. In other seasons, inadequate water supply was found in 51 or 8% villages/hamlets, of which 27 or 6% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 24 or 9% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

4. The drinking water was reported contaminated in 47 or 7% villages, of which 30 or 7% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 17 or 6% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

5. The water supply was reported irregular in 97 or 15% villages, of which 61 or 15% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 36 or 14% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

### **III Piped Water Supply scheme**

1. The water supply through piped water supply scheme was partially covered in 169 or 17% villages/hamlets out of 977 villages/hamlets in the state. It was partially covered in 93 or 15% villages in South Karnataka and 76 or 20% villages in North Karnataka.

2. The water supply was less than 40 LPCD in 539 or 55% villages/hamlets surveyed in the state, of which 283 or 47% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 256 or 67% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

3. The water supply was inadequate in 451 or 41% villages/hamlets during summer in the state, of which 229 or 38% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 222 or 58% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka. During other seasons inadequate water supply was reported in 99 or 10% villages/hamlets in the state, of which 42 or 7% of villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 57 or 15% of villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

4. The water was contaminated in 49 or 5% villages/hamlets in the state, of which 24 or 4% villages/hamlets were found in South Karnataka and 25 or 6% villages / hamlets in North Karnataka.

5. The water supply was reported irregular in 184 or 9% villages/hamlets surveyed in the state, of which 118 or 20% villages/hamlets were found in South Karnataka and 66 or 17% villages in North Karnataka.

### **IV Other sources: (open well, river, tank etc.)**

1. The water supply under other sources (open well, river, tank etc.) was partially covered in 33 or 15% villages/hamlets in the State, of which 17 or 9% villages were covered in South Karnataka and 16 or 42% villages in North Karnataka.

2. The water supply was less than 40 LPCD in 186 or 82% villages/hamlets surveyed in the state, of which 153 or 81% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 33 or 87% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka.

3. The water supply was reported inadequate in 32 or 14% villages/hamlets during summer season, of which 16 or 9% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 16 or 42% villages/hamlets in North Karnataka. During other seasons inadequate water supply was

reported in 7 or 3% villages/hamlets, of which 3 or 2% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 4 or 11% of villages in North Karnataka.

4. The water was reported contaminated in 3 or 1% villages/hamlets in the State of which, in none of the villages water contamination was reported in South Karnataka whereas contamination was found in 3 or 8% villages in North Karnataka.

5. The water supply was reported irregular in 9 or 4% villages/hamlets surveyed in the State, of which 6 or 3% villages/hamlets were in South Karnataka and 3 or 8% villages / hamlets in North Karnataka.

## **1B. Drinking water facilities available in urban area**

### **I Borewell**

- (1) Drinking water supply was less than 60 LPCD in 56 or 74% towns, out of 76 towns surveyed in state. It was less than 60 LPCD in 31 or 68% towns in South Karnataka and 25 or 80% towns in North Karnataka.
- (2) The water was reported contaminated in 12 or 16% towns in the state. Of which 9 or 20% towns were found in South Karnataka and 3 or 10% towns in North Karnataka.
- (3) Inadequate water supply was reported in 43 or 57% towns during summer season in the state, of which 26 or 58% towns were in South Karnataka and 17 or 55% towns in North Karnataka. During other seasons, inadequate water supply was reported in 10 or 13% towns in the state, of which 5 or 11% towns were in South Karnataka and 5 or 16% towns in North Karnataka.
- (4) The water supply was reported once in a week in 9 or 12% towns in the State, of which 6 or 13% towns were in South Karnataka and 3 or 10% towns in North Karnataka during summer season. The water supply was irregular in 3 or 4% towns during summer season, of which all 3 or 10% towns were in North Karnataka. The water supply was twice in a week in 11 or 14% towns in other seasons, of which 6 or 13% towns were in South Karnataka and 5 or 16% towns in North Karnataka.

### **II Tank**

1. Out of 28 towns surveyed under this scheme, 22 or 79% towns had drinking water supply less than 60 LPCD, of which 8 or 67% towns were in South Karnataka and 14 or 88% towns in North Karnataka.

2. The water content was reported as saltish and hard in 4% towns each in the State. Regionwise analysis shows that saltish water was reported in 8% towns in South Karnataka and hardness in water was reported in 6% towns in North Karnataka.

3. Inadequate water supply was reported in 22 or 79% towns during summer season in the State. Of which 10 or 83% towns were in South Karnataka and 12 or 75% towns in

North Karnataka. During the other seasons inadequate water supply was reported in 8 or 29% towns in the state. Of which 3 or 25% towns were in South Karnataka and 5 or 31% in South Karnataka.

4. The water supply was twice in a week in 9 or 32% towns in the state, of which 2 or 17% towns were in South Karnataka and 7 or 44% towns in North Karnataka during summer season. During other seasons water supply was twice in a week in 5 or 18% towns in the state, of which all 5 or 31% towns are in North Karnataka and none of the towns in South Karnataka.

### **III Canal**

1. Out of 9 towns surveyed in the state, 3 or 33% towns had drinking water supply less than 60 LPCD. It was less than 60 LPCD in 2 or 40% towns in South Karnataka and 1 or 25% towns in North Karnataka.

2. Inadequate water supply was reported in 5 or 56% towns during summer season in the state, of which 3 or 60% towns were in South Karnataka and 2 or 50% in North Karnataka. During other seasons, Inadequate water supply was reported in 2 or 22% towns in the state, of which all 2 or 40% towns were in South Karnataka and none of the towns under the said category in North Karnataka.

3. The water supply was twice in a week in 2 or 22% towns in the state, of which all 2 or 40% towns were found in South Karnataka and none of the towns under this category in North Karnataka during summer season. The water supply was twice in a week in 2 or 22% towns during the other seasons, of which all 2 or 40% towns were in South Karnataka and none of the towns under this category in North Karnataka.

### **IV River**

1. Out of 87 towns surveyed in the state, 38 or 44% towns had drinking water supply less than 60 LPCD. It was less than 60 LPCD in 8 or 20% towns in South Karnataka and 30 or 65% towns in North Karnataka.

2. The water was reported contaminated in 2 or 2% towns in state, of which 1 or 2% towns were in South Karnataka and 1 or 2% towns in North Karnataka.

3. Inadequate water supply was reported in 46 or 53% towns during summer season in the state, of which 16 or 39% towns were in South Karnataka and 30 or 65% towns in North Karnataka. During other seasons, inadequated water supply was reported in 10 or 11% towns in state, of which 2 or 5% towns were in South Karnataka and 8 or 17% towns in North Karnataka.

4. The water supply was twice in a week in 9 or 10% towns in the state, of which 3 or 7% towns were in South Karnataka and 6 or 13% towns in North Karnataka during summer season. The water supply was twice in a week in 5 or 6% towns during other seasons in the state, of which none of the towns came under this category in South Karnataka and all the 5 or 11% towns were in North Karnataka.

## **V Other Sources**

1. Out of 20 towns surveyed in the state, 13 or 65% towns had drinking water supply less than 60 LPCD. It was less than 60 LPCD in 10 or 62% towns in South Karnataka and 3 or 75% towns in North Karnataka.

2. Inadequate water supply was reported in 9 or 45% towns during summer season in the state, of which 7 or 37% towns were in South Karnataka and 2 or 50% towns in North Karnataka. During other seasons, inadequate water supply was reported in 2 or 10% towns in the state, of which all 2 or 13% towns were in South Karnataka and none of towns was reported in North Karnataka.

3. The water supply was twice in a week in 4 or 20% towns in the state, of which 3 or 19% towns were in South Karnataka and 1 or 24% towns in North Karnataka during summer season. During the other season the water supply was twice in a week in 4 or 20% towns in the state, of which all 4 towns were in South Karnataka and none of the towns was reported in North Karnataka.

### **2A Functionality of ANM Sub-Centres in Karnataka**

1. ANMs are not working on regular basis in 140 or 12% sub centres out of 1126 ANM Sub-Centres surveyed in the state. Of which 83 or 14% sub-centres are in South Karnataka and 57 or 11% sub-centres in North Karnataka.

2. About 388 or 34% ANM Sub-Centres are not having government buildings in the state. Of which 205 or 33% sub-centres in South Karnataka and 183 or 36% centres in North Karnataka.

3. The population coverage was more than 5000 in each of 319 or 28% sub centres, in the state. This pattern was found in 137 or 22% sub-centres in South Karnataka and in 12 or 35% sub-centres in North Karnataka.

4. As per the opinion of villagers, the services rendered by 98 or 9% ANMs have been rated as poor, it was satisfactory in 680 or 60% centres and functioning good in 348 or 31% sub centres. The services rendered by 32 or 5% ANMs in South Karnataka and 13% of ANMs in North Karnataka are reported as poor. It was reported as satisfactory in 373 or 61% of ANMs in South Karnataka and in 307 or 60% of ANMs North Karnataka. About 207 or 34% of ANMs have been rated as functioning good in South Karnataka whereas about 141 or 27% of ANMs have been graded as functioning good in North Karnataka.

### **2B Functionality of Primary Health Centres (PHCs) in Karnataka**

1. Of the 175 PHCs surveyed, 8 or 5% PHCs are working without doctors, of which 1% of PHCs fall in this category in South Karnataka and 8% PHCs in North Karnataka. Out of 175 PHCs surveyed 51 or 29% centers are working without Lab-technicians, of which 28 or 29% of PHCs fall in South Karnataka and 23 or 26% PHCs in North Karnataka. Pharmacists are not working in 101 PHCs. Of which 47 or 49% of PHCs are in South Karnataka and 54 or 60% centres in North Karnataka.



2. 30 or 17% PHCs are functioning with less than 50% of paramedical staff against sanctioned posts. Of which 6 or 17% PHCs fall in South Karnataka and 14 or 18% PHCs in North Karnataka.

3. 31 or 18% PHCs are functioning with less than 50% administrative staff against sanctioned posts. Of which 18 or 19% PHCs fall in South Karnataka and 13 or 16% PHCs in North Karnataka.

4. 42 or 24% PHCs covered each with a total population of more than 30,000, of which 23 or 24% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 19 or 24% PHCs in North Karnataka.

5. Bed facilities are not provided in 36 or 21% PHCs, of which 32 or 34% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 4 or 5% of PHCs in North Karnataka.

6. Out patients treated daily were more than 100 in 10 or 6% PHCs, of which 7 or 7% PHCs fall in South Karnataka and 3 or 4% PHCs in North Karnataka.

7. 19 or 11% PHCs are not having government buildings, of which 7 or 7% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 12 or 15% PHCs in North Karnataka.

8. Out of 175 PHCs surveyed, inadequate infrastructure facilities are observed in several aspects. Accommodation was inadequate in 82 or 47% PHCs, of which 44 or 46% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 38 or 48% PHCS in North Karnataka. Supply of drugs was inadequate in 41 or 23% PHCs, of which 28 or 29% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 13 or 16% PHCs in North Karnataka. Maintenance of accounts was not proper in 83 or 47% PHCs, of which 47 or 49% fall in South Karnataka and 36 or 45% in North Karnataka. Medical equipments were inadequate in 70 or 40% PHCs, of which 40 or 42% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 30 or 38% PHCs in North Karnataka. Water supply was inadequate in 75 or 43% PHCs, of which 39 or 41% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 36 or 45% PHCs in North Karnataka. Electricity was not regular in 33 or 19% PHCs, of which 17 or 18% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 16 or 20% PHCs in North Karnataka. Lab facilities were inadequate in 77 or 44% PHCs, of which 42 or 44% PHCs are in South Karnataka and 35 or 44% PHCs in North Karnataka and Cold storage was not properly maintained in 30 or 17% PHCs, of which 11 or 12% PHCs fall in South Karnataka and 19 or 24% in North Karnataka.

9. About 70 or 40% PHCs are not having government quarters for doctors, of which 41 or 43% PHCs fall in South Karnataka and 29 or 36% in North Karnataka.

10. Doctors are not staying at head quarters in 82 or 47% PHCs, of which 42 or 44% PHCs fall in this category in South Karnataka and 40 or 50% in North Karnataka.

### **3. Functionality of rural electrification in Karnataka 2001**

#### **A. Status of electrification in Villages:**

1. Out of 1050 villages surveyed in the state, 10 or 1% villages are not provided with street lights, of which 6 or 1% villages fall in South Karnataka and 4 or 1% villages in North Karnataka.

2. 814 or 78% villages are not having sufficient power supply, of which 454 or 80% villages are in South Karnataka and 360 or 75% villages in North Karnataka.

3. Among 814 villages reported with insufficient power supply, 289 or 36% villages are having less than or equal to 12 hours of power supply for lighting purpose in a day, of which 179 or 39% villages fall in the category in South Karnataka and 110 or 31% villages in North Karnataka.

4. Among 814 villages reported with insufficient power supply, 762 or 94% villages had less than or equal to 12 hours of power supply for drinking purpose in a day, of which 418 or 92% villages were in South Karnataka and 344 or 96% villages in North Karnataka.

### **B. Status of electrification in hamlets:**

1. Out of 1552 hamlets attached to 1050 main villages surveyed in the state, 101 or 7% hamlets are not having electricity facilities, of which 28 or 4% hamlets were in South Karnataka and 73 or 9% hamlets in North Karnataka.

2. 450 or 29% hamlets are not provided with street lights, of which 120 or 16% hamlets are in South Karnataka and 330 or 42% hamlets in North Karnataka.

3. 846 or 58% hamlets are not having sufficient power supply, of which 655 or 88% hamlets are in South Karnataka and 191 or 27% hamlets in North Karnataka.

4. Out of 846 hamlets reported with insufficient power supply, 357 or 42% are having less than or equal to 12 hours of power supply for lighting purpose in a day, of which 255 or 39% hamlets fall in this category in South Karnataka and 102 or 53% hamlets in North Karnataka.

5. Out of 846 hamlets reported with insufficient power supply, 799 or 94% hamlets are with less than or equal to 12 hours of power supply for drinking purpose in a day, of which 635 or 97% hamlets are in South Karnataka and 164 or 86% hamlets in North Karnataka.

### **Primary and higher primary education**

1. In 1050 selected villages, 2493 schools have been surveyed in the State, comprising 983 primary schools and 1510 higher primary schools. Out of 983 primary schools surveyed, 485 primary schools are in South Karnataka and 498 primary schools in North Karnataka. Out of 1510 higher primary schools surveyed, 832 higher primary schools are in South Karnataka and 678 higher primary schools in North Karnataka.

2. Out of total number of 983 primary schools surveyed as many as 886 or 90% schools are Government, of which 438 or 90% schools are in South Karnataka and 448 or 90% schools in North Karnataka. Out of total number of 983 primary schools surveyed 97 or 10% schools are managed by others, of which 47 or 10% schools are in South Karnataka and 50 or 10% schools in North Karnataka.

3. Out of total number of 1510 higher primary schools surveyed, as many as 1319 or 87% schools are functioning under Government, of which 698 or 84% schools are in South Karnataka and 621 or 92% schools in North Karnataka. Out of 1510 Higher primary schools surveyed, 191 or 13% schools are managed by others, of which 134 or 16% schools are in South Karnataka and 57 or 8% in North Karnataka .

4. Out of 76344 students enrolled, 7920 or 10% students are found absent in primary schools, of which 1373 or 5% students are in South Karnatka and 6547 or 14% @ students in North Karnataka.

5. Out 433472 students enrolled, 37101 or 9% students are found absent in higher primary schools, of which 11086 or 6% students are in South Karnataka and 26015 or 11% students in North Karnataka.

6. Out of 2571 teacher's posts sanctioned, 294 or 11% posts are vacant in primary schools, of which 125 or 10% posts vacant are found in South Karnataka and 169 or 12% in North Karnataka.

7. Out of 11863 teachers' posts sanctioned, 1296 or 11% posts are vacant in higher primary schools, of which 611 or 10% posts are in South Karnataka and 685 or 12% posts in North Karnataka.

8. Out of 983 Primary Schools surveyed, 838 or 85% schools have less than 4 class rooms, of which 416 or 86% Schools fall in South Karnataka and 422 or 85% schools in North Karnataka.

9. Among 1510 higher primary schools surveyed, 666 or 44% schools have less than 7 class rooms, of which 355 or 43% schools are in South Karnataka and 311 or 46% schools in North Karnataka.

10. Out of 983 primary schools surveyed, as many as 842 or 86% schools are functioning in government buildings, of which 425 or 88% schools are in South Karnataka and 417 or 84% schooQs in North Karnataka.

10a. Out of 983 primary schgols surveyed, 141 or 14% schools are in other than government buildings, of which 60 or 12% schools are in South Karnataka and 81 or 16% schools in North Karnataka.

11. Out of 1510 higher primary schools surveyed, as many as 1310 or 87% schools are functioning in government buildings, of which 693 or 83% schools are in South Karnatka and 617 or 91% schools in North Karnataka.

11a. Out of 1510 higher primary schools surveyed, as many as 200 or 13% schools are in other than Government buildings, of which 139 or 17% schools are in South Karnataka and 61 or 9% schools in North Karnataka.

12. Among 842 primary schools functioning in Government buildings, 151 or 18% are not in good condition, of which 82 or 19% schools are in South Karnataka and 69 or 17% schools in North Karnataka.

12a. Among 842 primary schools functioning in Government buildings, 358 or 43% schools are not having sufficient accommodation, of which 164 or 39% schools are in South Karnataka and 194 or 47% schools in North Karnataka.

13. Among 1310 higher primary schools functioning in Government buildings, 362 or 28% buildings are not in good condition, of which 210 or 30% schools are in South Karnataka and 152 or 25% schools in North Karnataka.

13a. Among 1310 higher primary schools functioning in Government buildings 548 or 42% schools have insufficient accommodation, of which 278 or 40% schools are in South Karnataka and 270 or 44% schools in North Karnataka.

14. Among 983 Primary Schools surveyed, non-availability of basic infrastructure facilities are reported as follows: 817 or 83% schools have not provided with electricity, of which 397 or 82% schools are in South Karnataka and 420 or 84% schools in North Karnataka, 692 or 70% schools are not having drinking water, of which 316 or 65% schools are in South Karnataka and 376 or 76% schools in North Karnataka. 857 or 87% schools are not having toilet facilities, of which 409 or 84% schools are in South Karnataka and 448 or 90% schools in North Karnataka and 622 or 63% schools are not having play grounds, of which 321 or 66% of schools are in South Karnataka and 301 or 60% schools in North Karnataka.

15. Among 1510 Higher Primary Schools surveyed, non-availability of the basic infrastructure facilities are reported as follows: 651 or 43% schools are not having electricity, of which 307 or 37% of schools are in South Karnataka and 344 or 51% schools in North Karnataka. 741 or 49% schools are not having drinking water, of which 336 or 40% schools are in South Karnataka and 405 or 60% schools in North Karnataka. 935 or 62% schools are not having toilet facilities, of which 418 or 50% schools are in South Karnataka and 517 or 76% schools in North Karnataka and 591 or 39% schools are not having play grounds, of which 337 or 41% schools are in South Karnataka and 254 or 37% schools in North Karnataka.

16. Out of 983 primary schools surveyed, 317 or 32% schools have insufficient teaching materials, of which 164 or 34% schools are in South Karnataka and 153 or 31% schools in North Karnataka and out of 1510 higher primary schools, 136 or 9% schools have insufficient teaching materials, of which 76 or 9% schools are in South Karnataka and 60 or 9% schools in North Karnataka.

17. In the survey the opinion of the villagers was elicited regarding efficiency of the teaching and functioning of the schools. Accordingly, out of 2493 schools surveyed, 41 or 2% schools require improvements, of which 30 or 2% schools fall in South Karnataka and 11 or 1% schools in North Karnataka. 28 or 1% schools' functioning is irregular, of which 9 or 1% schools fall in South Karnataka and 19 or 2% schools in North Karnataka. 2424 or 97% schools are functioning good, of which 1278 or 97% schools fall in South Karnataka and 1146 or 97% schools in North Karnataka.

18. As per the villagers opinion, the teaching efficiency was good in 1289 or 52% schools, of which 715 or 54% schools fall in South Karnataka and 574 or 49% schools in North Karnataka. The teaching efficiency was average in 1173 or 47% schools, of which 588 or 45% schools fall in South Karnataka and 585 or 50% schools in North Karnataka. The teaching efficiency was poor in 31 or 1% schools, of which 14 or 1% schools fall in South Karnataka and 17 or 1% schools in North Karnataka.