EXTREME DEPRIVATION IN REMOTE AREAS IN INDIA: SOCIAL EXCLUSION AS EXPLANATORY CONCEPT

Draft paper for Manchester conference on Chronic Poverty, April 2003, session 'Social Exclusion, Rights and Chronic Poverty'

Arjan de Haan and Amaresh Dubey

First draft, not for quotation

INTRODUCTION

As indicated in writings of a couple of years back,[1] the concept of social exclusion provided two promises. First, it would emphasise the multi-dimensionality of poverty, something that in the international debate anyway has become generally recognised. Second, it would focus on the processes that contribute to deprivation;[2] this may be more crucial as much poverty research still does not bridge the gap between describing and explaining poverty. This paper elaborates on these two issues, arguing that it is a helpful concept to further our understanding of poverty, and proposes to apply the relatively new concept of social exclusion to provide better insight into the dimensions and causes of poverty in one of India's poorest regions. It looks in particular at the inter-relation and overlap of economic factors, human development and social identity as elements of deprivation, and the institutional and cultural factors that have caused and maintain this complexity of deprivation.

Orissa has gradually become the poorest state in India. Within the state, western/southern Orissa has for much longer been associated with backwardness and poverty. This paper will analyse data (mainly from NSS, between 1983/84 and 1999/2000) that shows how Orissa – or probably more accurately – parts of Orissa, have gradually fallen behind India's trend of poverty reduction. It will describe the characteristics of poor people in those areas, emphasising the overlapping aspects of deprivation: remoteness, rural location, possibly immobility (despite large-scale distress migration), identity, education and health. Statistical analysis will try to attribute the strength of various factors in contributing to poverty.

With such a description, and even correlates of poverty, the question that still remains is: why? Such outcomes are the result of – in Giddens' terms – both structure and agency. It is the result of lack of economic growth, no doubt, but this in itself is not just the result of market failure but also of policies. The relative failure of government response, in turn, is the result of lack of accountability: as citizens are unable to effectively voice concerns and priorities, the state has been able to 'get away' with continued extreme deprivation (and possibly increased inequality). And finally, the

[1] De Haan (1998), O'Brien and de Haan (1998), de Haan and Nayak (1994).
[2] Though often ignored, e.g. in the recent work by Franco et al. at QEH (2002), and under-emphasised in Hulme (2003).

relative lack of policy response (or effectiveness) is driven by social-cultural segmentation, the political dominance of coastal Orissa over other parts, and the cultural domination of higher castes over lower castes and tribal groups (unchallenged like in other parts of India).

The concept of social exclusion as applied here thus regards (income) poverty as a key element of exclusion, and not a separate category. This is not merely a definitional and academic issue, as it suggests also that policy responses are inter-linked, that it is unlikely, for example, for poverty programmes to be successful if these do not at the same time address issues of accountability and representativeness and of social-cultural hierarchy.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section one goes over some of the familiar ground regarding NSS data, but emphasises differences across regions (comparing this at times with other sources of data). It then focuses on the differences within Orissa, using NSS region data and information for Orissa's districts. The second section describes the deprivation of social groups in India and in Orissa, and looks into the question about the extent to which various dimensions overlap. Section three presents a preliminary analysis of the effectiveness of government policies, particularly those targeted to the poorest and tribal groups, while the last section will – similarly exploratory – analyse the link between citizens voice, the state's accountability, and continued deprivation.

SECTION 1: INDIAN POVERTY TRENDS - REGIONAL DIVERSITY

Much debate has been generated, partly driven by the increased access to data, regarding poverty trends in India. Up till the early-1990s, there was a great deal of agreement that poverty reduction had increased since the 1970s. But many questions came up during the 1990s, and the NSS data during the mid 1990s generated suspicion that during the period of liberalisation economic growth may have increased, but poverty reduction might not have gone up at the same rate, and inequality may have increased. However, the 1999/2000 NSS data have restored faith that poverty has continued to go down.[3]

In this paper we will not concern us with those overall trends. India is a big country, and at least as significant as the question of the average is the performance of regions within the country (and as we shall discuss later, of groups). De Haan and Lipton (1998) pointed out that in India in 1992 rural poverty varied from 15 percent in Punjab to 60 per cent or more in Maharashtra and Bihar; or, if one uses NSS regions as described in Drèze and Srinivasan (1996), from 9 percent in Himalayan Uttar Pradesh, to 77 per cent in Southern Orissa. Calculation of coefficients of variations of poverty incidences suggested increased disparities during the 1980s across the 16 major states.

[3] See the summary in *Economic and Political Weekly* of 25-31 January 2003, including the articles by Deaton, and Sundaram and Tendulkar, regarding NSS data.

1999/2000 NSS data, reproduced in Annex Table 1a, show state-wise differences between 6 per cent in Punjab and 47 per cent in Orissa, or at NSS region level (Annex Table 2) from 5 per cent in the northern part of Punjab, to over 80 per cent in southern Orissa. According to our current calculation until 1999/2000 (Annex Table 3), the coefficient of variation has sharply increased, with Orissa - and MP and Assam - falling far behind the national trend of poverty reduction. Orissa was and has continued to be one of the poorest states in India (see Annex Table). While most states witnessed significant reduction in poverty during 1973/74 to 1999/00 period, Orissa continued to be the state with the highest poverty incidence (except for in 1993/94 when Bihar recorded highest poverty incidence) States that have done remarkably well in reducing the rural poverty incidence during this period include Kerala and Tamil Nadu that had poverty ratios close to Orissa's in 1957/58.

According to NCAER (1999) data also, Orissa in 1994 had the highest percentage population below the poverty line: 55 compared to the all-India average of 39 per cent, with – perhaps even more striking - a poverty gap of 0.30 compared to the national of 0.18, and the lowest average per capita income per year: Rs.3,028 compared to the India average of Rs.4,485 (poverty line for Orissa was set at Rs.2,330; mean income of the poor was Rs.1,319).

What causes poverty reduction?

Though not the main theme of this paper, it may be helpful to reflect on the possible reasons for those staggering differences. Analysis of trends in poverty across Indian states has indicated that poverty reduction is closely linked to economic growth (Ravallion and Datt 1996).[4] Obviously Orissa's lack of economic growth must be closely linked to its continued high rates of poverty (though the analysis below will stress differences within the state with respect to poverty reduction).

Many of the major states in northern India have experiences remarkable agricultural growth, and this tends to be associated with poverty reduction; Orissa's poor performance in agriculture (with irrigation as a key constraint, among others) seems an important cause of the lack in poverty reduction;[5] though even the poorest districts like Kalahandi and Koraput seem to have been net exporters of paddy (Currie 2000: 85). According to NCAER (1999: 37) data regarding employment in agriculture, workers find on average only 85 days of employment (95 for men, 64 for women) in agriculture, against an Indian average of 137 (with only Rajasthan lower with 53 days). Average daily wage came to Rs.18 (18.3 for men, 15.0 for women[6]) against an Indian average of 21. In Orissa, however, particular because of high concentration of

[4] Datt and Ravallion (2002) emphasise that economic growth during the 1990s has occurred in the states where it has little impact on poverty nationally.

[5] GSDP growth was about 3.5 per cent during 1980s and 1990s, while agriculture growth was less than 1 per cent. The lack of industrial growth, despite the upsurge of investment in the early 1990s, has added to this.

[6] NCAER (1999: 78-80). The differences between men and women are relatively small in Orissa; they appear to be higher in southern than in northern India.

poverty in non-coastal areas, the development of the forest sector must have been key to poverty trends. Also, land alienation, including among tribal groups, is often quoted as a key determinant of poverty.[7]

Further, public policies that have also proven to be essential for both economic growth and poverty reduction: higher public spending in basic health and education bring gains to the poor in terms of their ability to participate in economic growth (Ravallion and Datt 1999). Datt and Ravallion (2002) emphasise the importance of 'initial conditions' – including education, health and landlessness – for the effectiveness of non-agricultural growth in reducing poverty. In the case of Orissa, again, this seems relevant given the poor performance of health and education indicators *as well as* income poverty.[8] Similarly, provision of infrastructure is a key to poverty reduction, and a key constraint in Orissa (with relatively dispersed population).

Other indicators of well-being

This brings us to a discussion of those other indicators of well-being, and the question whether in this respect Orissa's performance has been equally poor. With respect to health, during the 1990s, progress was made in Orissa. Infant mortality rates declined from 112 in 1992/3 to 81 in 1998/9 (NFHS-2), though child mortality increased during that period. Child nutritional status changed little during the period, and immunisation coverage improved substantially.

NCAER data (which, recall, showed very high levels of income poverty) for 1994 showed below-average levels of stunting (height for age) and wasting (weight for height) in Orissa. Infant mortality (105 vs 84), under-five mortality (135 vs 117) rates were well above the national average, though with clearly declining trends (source; Deaton 2002?). Maternal mortality rates are high but below national average (source?). Rates of antenatal care in Orissa are similar to the national average (well above Rajasthan's and MP; NCAER 1999: 168), though a higher percentage of women than the national average are attended by untrained personnel (79% vs 60%; NCAER 1999: 172). Morbidity in Orissa is above the national average, and no less than 94 per cent of the population has an unprotected source of water.

Literacy increased markedly during the 1990s: from 49 in 1994 to 64 per cent in 1999; now almost at the national average. The rate of female literacy increased as fast as men's, but is still well behind that of men (51% vs national average of 64%). Enrollment rates increased and are close to the national average.

Finally, NSS data provides information on 'calorie poverty' as well as income/expenditure poverty. As discussed in detail in Dubey (2002), average normative calorie requirements (which form the basis for the Indian poverty norm), have undergone changes since it was derived. The norm appears to have declined over

[7] PRAXIS 2001, for Bolangir; Currie 2000 for Kalahandi, from an historical perspective.
[8] Further to explore, the role of the demographic transition – though fertility levels in Orissa have been relatively low.

the 1980s and 1990s. Hence, poverty may be over-estimated, and the ranking of states may differ. The is the case for Orissa. Orissa is a) not the poorest state in India in terms of calorie deficiency, and b) there was a significant decline in poverty between 1993 and 1999 (Annex Table 4 and 5).

The story that emerges from this is that regional differences how been increasing in (income) poverty, and that Orissa is falling behind India's average. But this is not the case for all kinds of human development indicators (questioning thus a simplified picture of social exclusion and overlapping forms of deprivation): Orissa is not falling behind in terms of education or in health, and some of the indicators (even caloric poverty according to NSS data) show better performance. It seems that public policies have played a positive role, though this appears not to have be translated into economic growth or reductions in income poverty.

Regional differences within Orissa

Orissa is now among the poorest states, but what about differences within Orissa? Here we present the poverty trends in Orissa over the last twenty years, at two levels, 'NSS regions' and districts. For purpose of its surveys, the National Sample Survey Organization has divided entire country into 78 agro-climatic zones. Orissa has been divided into three such zones – coastal, southern and northern. Further, we are able to report NSS data for the 13 old districts (which is the lowest level of disaggregation possible). As per 2001 census, Orissa has 30 districts after sub-division of districts (how the 17 districts were carved out is shown in the Annex, and problems of comparability discussed there). It is possible to merge the newly created districts back to earlier districts and attempt estimating poverty and other characteristics at the level of the old districts.[9]

Both the NSS region data and the district-level data suggest that differences within Orissa, of levels as well as trends, matter at least as much as the state-level averages. The divergence is dramatically illustrated in the graph (and of Annex), which compares trends in poverty since 1983 for average India, Orissa, and the three NSS regions. The first remarkable thing is that in coastal Orissa, poverty has continued to decline at a similar pace as the average for India (and is a few percentage points higher). This is despite the cyclone that hit costal Orissa, during the time of the 1999/2000 survey. As is well know, the decline in poverty in Orissa has stagnated during the 1990s. But the great outlier is southern Orissa: not only are levels much higher (*over 80 per cent*), poverty would have *increased* markedly towards the end of the century. Poverty increased after 1993 in the northern region of the state as well.[10]

[9] While the estimates at the NSS regional level for the rural sector are acceptable, one has to be careful in interpreting the regional level poverty estimates for the urban sector and district level poverty estimates. One way out of this problem could be merging some districts in a region, but here we have just merged the rural and urban samples at the district level to calculate the (old) district level poverty.

[10] In recent investigation of poverty in India based on 55th round survey, several researchers have argued that the consumption expenditure data in this round has actually over estimated expenditure on food items. Therefore, poverty reduction is exaggerated. Even in that kind of supposed over estimation, the rise in poverty in two regions of the state is large irrespective of poverty line being used.

District level estimates support these findings. In fact, six district recorded increase in poverty between 19993/94 and 1999/00. The southern region appear to be fairly homogeneous, with the old districts Phulbani, Kalahandi and Koraput having extreme high poverty incidences, while Kendhujar and Mayurbhanj in the north appear to be the poorest districts (but the north is more heterogeneous).

Regional Poverty Incidence in Orissa (1983 to 1999/00)

	Official Poverty Line				International ($1 a day) Poverty Line			
Years	Coastal (191)	Southern (192)	Northern (193)	Orissa	Coastal (191)	Southern (192)	Northern (193)	Orissa
	Rural							
1983	57.97	80.76	75.22	68.43	47.57	75.93	68.64	60.46
1987/88	48.37	82.98	61.01	58.62	55.33	85.61	65.49	63.98
1993/94	45.33	68.84	45.82	49.80	66.71	83.85	62.51	68.40
1999/00	29.30	86.16	50.98	48.13	47.85	92.70	66.98	63.44
	Urban							
1983	46.15	45.48	54.35	49.66	24.84	27.84	33.55	28.84
1987/88	42.11	52.93	39.90	42.58	22.64	29.71	25.59	24.74
1993/94	47.24	41.94	32.54	40.68	29.44	35.84	16.08	25.09
1999/00	41.65	43.97	45.81	43.51	25.26	30.01	24.65	25.64
	Total							
1983	56.49	79.08	72.28	66.24	44.74	73.65	63.70	56.77
1987/88	47.67	80.29	58.16	56.75	51.67	80.62	60.10	59.42
1993/94	45.57	66.07	43.92	48.64	62.06	78.91	55.86	62.88
1999/00	31.51	81.28	50.10	47.37	43.81	85.46	59.81	57.24

Coastal: Baleshwar, Cuttack, Puri, Ganjam; Southern: Phulbani, Koraput, Kalahandi.
Northern: Balangir, Sambalpur, Dhenkanal, Sundargarh, Kendujhar, Mayurbhanj. 1991 districts

District-wise Poverty in Orissa (1983 to 1999/00)

District code, name & Region code as per 1993/94 dist coding	Official (Planning Com.) Poverty Line				International ($1 a day) Poverty Line			
	1983	1987/88	1993/94	1999/00	1983	1987/88	1993/94	1999/00
5. Baleshwar (191)	72.15	50.88	33.37	41.39	61.58	56.65	58.04	55.36
6. Cuttak (191)	56.71	43.74	48.96	27.98	45.01	49.81	66.72	40.32
12. Ganjam (191)	49.47	54.99	67.66	45.21	39.93	56.87	75.79	53.31
13. Puri (191)	56.34	45.22	29.57	18.18	47.42	47.11	44.97	32.61
8. Phulbani (192)	74.57	71.92	75.59	75.42	67.16	73.55	86.68	90.29
10. Koraput (192)	78.20	76.54	57.82	78.65	72.59	77.51	77.44	85.11
11. Kalahandi (192)	85.90	84.99	68.19	83.76	83.04	84.55	77.85	84.68
1. Sambalpur (193)	58.43	54.5	37.78	42.02	52.04	55.99	50.27	51.21
2. Sundergarh (193)	78.31	53.56	45.15	36.48	65.34	51.73	52.72	48.35
3. Kendujhar (193)	78.27	65.66	62.99	61.92	72.65	64.17	73.51	70.32
4.Mayurbhanj (193)	83.45	64.44	48.19	68.42	76.00	66.14	60.16	73.56
7. Dhenkenal (193)	81.45	54.39	34.68	47.53	75.86	61.69	49.24	54.85
9. Balangir (193)	79.83	57.91	42.43	48.79	76.17	61.50	55.69	66.11
Orissa	68.43	56.74	48.64	47.37	60.46	59.41	62.88	57.24

Note: poverty ratios in 1983 at the district level are reported based on the rural sample only.

Compare to Panda (2003), who comes to similar figures (except for Koraput, with HCR of 92.2).

These stark regional differences are worth further exploration. The next Table compares different indicators of well-being, keeping in mind the earlier observation that different kinds of indicators do not show the same trends. With respect to infant mortality, the deprivation in the southern districts appears in line with the poverty data. So do the data for female literacy (moreover, literacy gender disparities are highest in these poorest districts). But there are remarkable differences as well, including in ranking. For example Bolangir's human development indicators are low compared to income poverty, while for Ganjam it is the reverse.

The complexity of patterns also comes out of district data (Annex Table 14). For child immunisation, an unweighted average for the three NSS region shows no large differences across the regions. Better-off districts like Cuttack and Puri do have the highest rates of immunisation, but not much higher than many of the other, much poorer districts. Literacy figures however seem to be more closely related to income poverty figures: Koraput has very low literacy figures, with slightly less than average improvement over the 1990s. The picture on safe drinking water shows a similar complex pattern.

Well-being indicators at regional level compared

	IMR (1993)	Rank	HCI (1993/94)		Female Literacy	
Bolangir	119	13	42.4	5	18.3	10
Phulbani	112	12	75.6	13	16.6	11
Koraput	110	11	68.2	12	10.6	13
Kalahandi	107	10	57.8	9	12.1	12
Cuttack	98	9	49.0	8	42.5	1
Mayurbhanj	96	8	48.2	7	19.2	9
Keonjhar	90	7	63.0	10	24.6	7
Baleshore	86	6	33.4	2	36.7	3
Ganjam	81	5	67.7	11	23.3	8
Sundergarh	78	4	45.2	6	32.9	4
Puri	74	3	29.6	1	42.2	2
Dhenkanal	69	2	34.7	3	31.0	5
Sambalpur	64	1	37.8	4	28.2	6

Sources: IMR …. , HCI: NSS, ….. Female literacy (% of total pop.): Census 1991 (note: to use Census 1991 data for health)

As noted, there seem to be substantial differences between the income/consumption measures and calorie poverty measures, both from NSS data.[11] The data for the NSS regions are presented in the following Table. This shows a remarkably different picture from the one presented in the Table above. According the calorie poverty measure, poverty in Orissa as a whole declined between 1993 and 1999. The trend for coastal Orissa is similar for the two measures (decline by about 15 percentage points). But for both the southern and northern region, the calorie measure shows important differences, with a) a decline in the 2nd half of the 1990s, and b) much smaller differences between coastal and other parts of Orissa.[12]

Table: Proportion of Calorie Deficient Households in Orissa
(1993/94 and 1999/00)

NSS	**50th**			**55th**		
Regions	**Rural**	**Urban**	**Total**	**Rural**	**Urban**	**Total**
Coastal 191	56.78	43.71	55.15	40.34	37.29	39.81
Southern 192	75.72	27.86	70.79	66.53	36.62	62.92
Northern 193	57.65	32.29	54.01	48.94	43.30	47.98

[11] Usually, in India the calorie poverty has been significantly higher than the consumption expenditure based poverty incidence. In Orissa the two ratios coincide, but there are substantial differences between the ratios within Orissa.

[12] An explanation of the reasons for this needs further explanation, but one of the possibilities relates to the role of PDS (to which 70-80 per cent of the population in Orissa had access in 1993-94). For the 1993-94 NSS data, the value of total purchases is obtained by adding the quantities purchased from the market at market prices and value of the purchases from the PDS if the household bought any item from the PDS. Since PDS prices have been kept below market prices for all commodities supplied through it, any purchase from PDS will depress the expenditure of the household as recorded in the survey.

This description of differences within India reinforces the earlier message. First, there appears to be a trends towards increasing differentiation within India, as within Orissa. But a simple comparison of different kinds of data, apart from showing that even from within the same source measurement of poverty need to be closely scrutinised, indicates that there are no simple patterns of deprivation.

SECTION 2: SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION

Section 1 showed that location and poverty overlap to a great extent; this sections look at the link between social differentiation and poverty. A recent paper for DFID (Bahuguna and de Haan 2002) summarised some of the main trends and changes in the 'caste system' in India, which argues that caste had undergone radical transformation, but that this is not reflected in a clear trend toward more equality. We described the following remarkable differences across social groups:

- Scheduled Tribes (ST) and Scheduled Castes (SC) are predominatly located in rural areas, and tend to be employed in agriculture - the sector that employs 2/3 of the population while producing only 1/3 of national product. SC are more than two times more likely as the category 'other castes' (i.e. higher castes) to be rural rather than urban based; and ST 5 times more.[13]
- Within rural areas SC/ST tend to belong to the proletariat. In 1999/2000, ST were twice as likely to be agricultural labourer as the non-SC/ST category; SC even more. Socially deprived groups cultivate less land. SC's on average own one-third of the amount owned by other castes. This difference seems higher in the higher income decile groups. ST do not have less land than the average, and relatively more ST are categorised as self-employed in agriculture, but one suspects this tends to be on more marginal lands (displacement also tends to affect ST more than others).
- As wage labour is such an important part of particularly SC livelihoods, what about wages? Rural Labour Enquiries generally do not show significant differences in wages for different caste categories within agricultural unskilled labour, and insignificant differences in non-farm labour. However, poverty data show that even within the same sector, deprived groups are more likely to be poor - as data on landlessness and unemployment also suggest.[14]
- There are large gaps in education indicators between SC/ST and other groups - though there are many recent instances where these gaps have narrowed at the state level. SCs and ST are two to three times more likely to be illiterate than the better-off groups. Average school attendance is about 10 percentage points lower among Dalit boys than other boys, while the difference is about 15 per cent among girls. Lower enrolment appear to exist among all income (quintile) groups.

[13] Probably, more refined data would show further marginalisation, in terms of marginalised rural areas, and because displacement disproportionally affects tribals.

[14] SC and ST are worse off no matter in which sector they work. This does not mean that they are paid less for the same jobs, as within the sectors there are of course large employment differences, and as suggested above wage rates for agricultural labourers appear to be the same for SC as others.

- According to recent NFHS data, child mortality among the ST category is twice as large as among higher castes, and almost as high among SC. Differences in other indicators like IMR and neonatal mortality are smaller - and the differences across social groups are much smaller than across income groups - though still appear significant.
- Data on private expenditure and poverty headcount show substantial differences across groups. Average expenditure of SC on average is less than two-thirds of that of the category other, and even lower for ST. The difference is larger in urban than for rural areas (in urban areas the SC-ST order is reversed). In terms of poverty headcount, the differences are striking: 16% of the non-deprived groups, 27% of OBC, 36% of SC and 44% of ST are in poverty.[15] To put it differently, in Thorat's (2002a) words, ST are about 25 years behind higher castes in the reduction of poverty.

Thus, in most respects, and despite the many policies to reduce differentials as discussed below, SC and ST (and OBC to a lesser extent) suffer from multiple and probably overlapping forms of deprivation. It is clear that the social aspects of caste stratification are closely interlinked with its economics; caste and class are intensely intertwined. However, this is not a uniform or unchanging picture. There are large numbers of people of higher castes that are poor. And the categories SC and ST themselves imply very high levels of aggregation (SC for example consisting of 400 jatis; and many of the OBCs are, for example, influential landlords, but many also are poor. Also, in areas like education, at least in some states differences have become smaller; regional differences in health and education have not grown, at least not as much as the income differences. Finally, among the deprived groups, upward mobility has occurred.

Social differentiation in Orissa

It is common knowledge that western Orissa's deprivation is related to the large tribal population that inhibit the more remote areas. 23 per cent of Orissa population is classified as 'scheduled tribes' (and 16 per cent as 'scheduled castes', which is around the all-India average), and they live mostly in remote rural areas (they tend to live in rural areas, and are concentrated in the poorest districts). This section focuses on the deprivation and poverty incidence among these social groups in Orissa, compare the poverty of socially deprived groups in Orissa with their counter parts in the rest of the country. First, we discuss the trend of poverty incidence by three social groups, STs, SCs and Others covering the period 1983 to 1999/00, followed by analysis of various aspects of deprivation for four social groups (this is limited to only one year, as detailed data for social groups is available only for 1999/00).

[15] According to NCAER (1999: 44), while average headcount of poverty in 1994 was 39%, that among STs was 51%, SCs 50%, and Muslims 43%.

Distribution of Population by Social Groups

Social Groups	India			Orissa		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
ST	10.51	3.41	8.72	27.04	10.92	24.40
SC	20.46	14.38	18.93	20.98	17.59	20.42
OBC	37.59	30.42	35.78	31.62	22.86	30.18
OTHERS	31.45	51.79	36.56	20.37	48.62	25.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

The following table reports the incidence of poverty by social groups. The long-term trend shows the decline in poverty incidence as reported above. At all-India level, among the social groups SCs appear to have fared marginally better off as they have experienced reduction in poverty by over 22 percentage points (with a faster decline in rural areas); STs and Others recorded a decline in poverty incidence by about 19 percentage points each.

Poverty Ratios by Social Group 19883 to 1999/00

Social Group	Rural				Urban				Total			
	1983	1987/88	1993/94	1999/00	1983	1987/88	1993/94	1999/00	1983	1987/88	1993/94	1999/00
Orissa												
ST	87.08	83.82	71.31	73.08	73.73	61.37	62.81	59.38	86.22	82.34	70.76	72.08
SC	75.99	65.75	49.79	52.30	69.53	59.52	45.46	72.03	75.38	65.35	49.39	55.08
OTHERS	58.52	47.31	40.18	33.29	41.86	37.87	36.32	34.18	56.16	45.92	39.55	33.48
ALL	68.43	58.62	49.79	48.04	49.66	42.58	40.68	43.59	66.24	56.75	48.63	47.31
All India												
ST	63.89	56.31	47.05	44.35	55.30	52.26	35.67	37.42	63.27	55.93	46.29	43.67
SC	58.96	50.79	48.27	35.44	56.12	54.65	49.08	39.13	58.50	51.38	48.42	36.14
OTHERS	40.90	33.80	31.20	21.14	39.94	36.44	28.67	20.78	40.66	34.48	30.46	21.04
ALL	46.51	39.36	37.28	26.50	42.32	39.16	31.70	23.98	45.57	39.31	35.95	25.87

Trends in Orissa differ from the all-India pattern. In Orissa, the group Others progressed somewhat more (23 percentage points), followed by SCs (20 percentage points), and STs experienced least reduction in poverty (14 percentage points, with a staggering high level of 72 per cent in 1999/2000). In urban areas the patterns seems to differ, but sample size there is small.

In 1999/00, the NSS expanded the scope of its household consumption survey by identifying one more caste group called OBCs, Other Backward Castes (this classification is not comparable with earlier rounds). The social groupings fit into a poverty ranking the way one would predict, and this is the same for Orissa as the India average. The differences between STs and others is larger in rural than urban areas, and slightly larger in Orissa than India's average.

Head Count Index by Social Group
(India and Orissa-1999-00)

Social Group	India			ORISSA		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
ST	44.31	37.87	43.69	73.08	59.38	72.08
SC	35.43	39.12	36.13	52.30	72.03	55.08
OBC	25.55	30.18	26.54	39.70	41.14	39.88
OTH	15.89	15.24	15.66	23.33	30.90	25.75
Total	26.50	23.98	25.87	48.04	43.59	47.31

The number of sampled households from STs and SCs is critically low for obtaining reliable estimates of poverty incidence by social group at NSS region level. With that health warning, the data would suggest that even in the poorest areas, the hierarchy of ST, SC and Others exist: in 1999/2000 92 per cent of STs would be in poverty, though 78 per cent of Others also live in poverty in the southern region (and the differences between STs and others, in terms of headcount, are larger in the better-off areas).

Head Count Index in Regions of Orissa by Social Group
(Calculated using Official Poverty Line)

	Rural				Urban			
Region	ST	SC	OTHERS	ALL	ST	SC	OTHERS	ALL
				1999/00				
Coastal	66.63	42.18	24.32	31.74	63.47	75.74	34.26	41.84
Southern	92.42	88.90	77.65	87.05	72.28	85.02	24.59	43.85
Northern	61.69	57.22	34.67	49.81	54.44	63.11	37.77	46.06
Orissa	73.08	52.30	33.29	48.04	59.38	72.03	34.18	43.59

On average land held by STs in Orissa is less than the national average. Within of Orissa STs in the Southern region hold most land; however, this land tends to be in secluded areas, the land market is distorted, and whether the land held by these groups is irrigated and what the productivity differences are is not known. In terms of landholding, it is the SCs that are most deprived.

Average Cultivable land holding 1999/00 (in hectares)

Social Groups	India	Orissa	Coastal	Southern	Northern
ST	0.80	0.60	0.52	0.71	0.55
SC	0.31	0.32	0.29	0.44	0.32
OBC	0.72	0.58	0.46	0.63	0.70
OTHERS	0.98	0.55	0.51	0.54	0.71

The following Table shows levels of education: while differences between India and Orissa are small (indicated earlier), the differences across regions and social groups are very large – though even 27 per cent of the not-deprived groups in rural coastal areas is illiterate (and 17 per cent in urban areas), 82 per cent of the ST population in the southern areas is illiterate. According to NFHS-2 (2001: 38), 87.7 per cent of the

female tribal population, 72.6 of the scheduled caste women, 55.9 per cent of other backward caste women and 33.9 per cent of 'other women' were illiterate.[16]

Education Levels in the Working Age Group (15-59 Years) in Orissa (1999/00)

	Coastal	Southern	Northern	Coastal	Southern	Northern	Coastal	Southern	Northern	Coastal	Southern	Northern
	Illiterate			Primary			HS			Graduate		
	Rural											
ST	69.95	82.46	69.06	18.38	13.08	17.99	10.61	4.37	12.55	1.06	0.08	0.40
SC	49.05	66.87	57.94	25.09	20.39	24.91	24.29	12.71	15.67	1.40	0.03	1.47
OBC	36.08	67.45	41.01	31.12	23.04	26.93	29.92	9.34	29.97	2.76	0.17	2.09
OTHERS	27.06	43.74	27.06	30.73	30.77	26.38	38.84	25.48	39.48	3.32	0.01	7.07
	Urban											
ST	14.98	48.10	48.44	3.80	22.70	16.41	36.18	19.75	32.65	45.04	9.44	2.49
SC	70.19	56.47	45.37	10.33	17.68	23.93	19.29	24.64	28.58	0.20	1.21	2.12
OBC	18.76	28.72	17.39	27.38	26.49	29.50	46.43	37.80	47.72	7.44	6.99	5.39
OTHERS	17.21	13.17	6.65	19.42	15.48	16.60	48.69	56.20	54.44	14.68	15.15	22.13

Above we noted the importance of agriculture, and the lack of employment in terms of days of work. NSS data suggest that wages for agricultural labourers are lower in Orissa than anywhere else. The following Table shows the differences within Orissa, showing the expected differences across regions. But within regions, the pattern is not so straightforward: in coastal areas remarkable differences exist between ST and SC; in the south this differences does not exist while both categories earn less than the category Others; and in the northern parts ST actually earn more than ST and OBC.

Average Weekly Wages of Agriculture Laborers in Regions of Orissa and by Social Group (1999/00)

NSS region	Average	ST	SC	OBC	OTHERS
Coastal	162.74	138.48	163.39	166.89	164.66
Southern	104.79	104.11	103.15	103.43	125.42
Northern	130.09	134.32	120.42	125.65	144.16

The key message from this section is the large differences across social groups, which reinforces and is closely interlinked with the differences across regions. It is important, for policy purposes, that even within the most deprived regions, on most indicators a (complex) hierarchy of social groups exists.

[16] Surprisingly, infant mortality and neo-natal mortality appear to be relatively high not among ST and SC population, but particularly among the 'other backward classes' (NFH 2001: 122).

Why are deprived groups poorer?

In discussions and policy papers, it is common to find an almost unquestioned association between region, social group (particularly Scheduled Tribe), and poverty. But it is not evident why such social groups are poorer. It may be due to location, lack of education, lack of land, etc, but it may also be due to differences in returns to assets, or lower wages for the same jobs. Similarly, health outcomes differences may be 'explained' by income differentials, or may be caused by environmental factors, location of services and health seeking behaviour as well as discrimination within health services. In the final version of this paper we will try to answer this question using 1999/2000 data NSS; in this paper we refer to other studies that indicate that such 'additional' deprivation does exist.

Two World Bank studies have focused on the returns to assets for different social groups. In UP (Kozel and Parker 2003), analysis of 1993/94 NSS data showed that half the difference in per capita consumption between SC/ST households and others could be explained by differences in assets, while the other half was due to differences in returns to those assets. SC/ST households also suffered from lower returns to education. A similar pattern was found in AP (Lanjouw and Zaidi 2002). The policy conclusion from this is that policies to enhance the assets of deprived groups will not suffice to close the gaps between the groups.

A recent paper by Kunal Sen (2003) uses 1993-94 NSS data for Orissa and India, and through regression analysis shows that in Orissa ST (though not SC) are more likely to be in poverty holding other factors constant. An earlier joint paper (Gang, Sen and Yu 2002) tried to decompose the differences between the poverty rates of Indian SC, ST and non SC/ST households. For both (though groups profiles differ) around half of the difference is caused by the difference in characteristics of groups (education, occupation, demographic, location), the other half by the effect that these characteristics have on the probability of being poor.

These results, which we will explore further in a later version of this paper suggest that to a large extent different dimensions of poverty are overlapping, eg social identity, education and poverty. But not all of it: as seen earlier some indicators may move in different directions or at different speeds, and with respect to poverty of specific social groups that are indicators that social identity form an independent factors for the probability to be in poverty. Studies also suggest that these correlates are different for different groups and in different areas in India.

SECTION 3: GOVERNMENT POLICIES: RESERVATION AND SPECIAL AREA PROGRAMMES

In Orissa, as in India, policy debates do not show a lack of attention to poverty. Government papers like Plan documents show that poverty is key to policy making. The government implements a wide range of targeted schemes, as well as the in India

common reservation for social deprived groups. Why have these had little apparent effect, at least going by the income poverty data? This section discusses – in exploratory fashion - some recent studies and concurrent evaluations.

Impacts of reservation policies have not been studied specifically for Orissa. However, general findings for India are likely to apply here as well. According to Alam (1999), the political process in India has undergone massive transformation, and deprived groups have increasingly participated and changed Indian politics (though less so in Orissa than elsewhere, as discussed in the next section). However, the rise of the oppressed castes has not been about 'substantive equality' (like land reform), but about the participation in the politics of the former rulers.[17] The fact that social identity often has been more important than class similarly may help to explain why differences between social groups have not reduced significantly.

Positive discrimination for SCs and STs in government services, state run and sponsored educational institutions and legislative bodies has become a key feature of Indian social policy. Amendments to the constitution have enabled representation of SC men and women in local governance structures. The reservation policies were intended to be temporary, but there are few signs that they will be abolished. There is some evidence that ST groups have benefited even less than SC groups, for example in the uptake of reservation (Xaxa 2001).[18]

A key feature affecting particularly tribals relates to forest access and policies. This is a subject that warrants a paper on its own (at least). But it is clear that the colonial and post-colonial forest policies have done little to protect the livelihoods of the groups that have traditionally occupied forests: a focus on revenue generation and state control, the role and power of (outside) traders, forest protection, the lack of recognition of communal rights, displacement due to irrigation of mining projects, all have over a long period of time marginalised these groups.[19] The impacts of relatively recent policy initiatives relating to devolution of control over forest produce to local governance bodies, and increase of wages for kendu leaf pluckers (the product that remains under state control) will show over time.

One might expect decentralisation to contribute to poverty reduction, and – as reservation brings deprived groups to the political spectrum at local level – the reduction of differences across groups. However, though the long-term impacts of decentralisation cannot be underestimated, the pro-poor potential seems to have remained limited.[20] The power of local bodies in Orissa has remained limited,

[17] A question by Weiner (2001: 211) is relevant here, whether the emphasis on political representation and the limited affirmative action have crowded-out attention to broad-based education and health.
[18] Acharya et al. (NCDS, 2001) describe a range of administrative (coordination) and implementation problems in welfare schemes for SC and ST.
[19] A historical review in Currie (2000: pp.64 ff) suggest that these trends have existed over a long period of time; e.g. tribal land alienation was very common before 1900. Similarly legislation to ban land transfers from tribal persons date back to the early 20th century.
[20] Mathew 2003 emphasises that the local elections during the 1990s have been followed by violence, often caste-based (though it still has potential).

knowledge of elected representatives regarding roles and functions often restricted., and decentralised planning needs strengthening. Moreover, decentralisation does not guarantee the representation of deprived groups. The PRAXIS (2002) study on poor's perceptions of government services noted that the Panchayat was for many people the most important local institution, as it coordinates and sanctions development schemes, but it is also perceived to be the most corrupt institution. A pilot social audit held in Bolangir in November 2001 showed substantial and relatively open corruption at panchayat level.

Human development policies have already been referred to above. Despite progress in the health sector, NFHS data indicate that 87% of tribal and 83% of illiterate women deliver at home. A recent CYSD study also noted very low access by poor people. PRAXIS (2002) noted relatively positive perceptions regarding attitudes and accessibility, but large distances (also PRAXIS 2001, for Bolangir). In the education sector, as indicated above improvements are made though a long way remains to be gone particularly in poorest areas. Progress has been made with transferring of school management (particularly appointment of teachers) to local committees, but much remains to be done to strengthen local control and planning and improvements along lines of other states.

Among the targeted programmes, the Public Food Distribution System has received most attention. NCAER data (1993) shows only 5 per cent of Orissa households using PDS, compared to an all-India average of 33 per cent. However, NSS survey data show much higher access to PDS: in 1993/94 80% of population benefited, with the poorest having slightly less access than better-off (World Bank 1998). A CSDS study (CSDS 2000, Kumar 2001) showed that almost 50% of poor have access to fair price food grains. Apart from access, issues of timing of PDS outlets (CYSD 2002), long distances, the small differences between the PDS prices and the market prices, and in the past the need to buy in bulk (PRAXIS 2001) have been discussed as reasons why this has had limited impact on poverty (and inequality).

There is limited evidence regarding effectiveness of other targeted schemes. A CYSD study (2002) notes only 18 percent of below poverty line (BPL) households avail benefits of Antodaya Anna Yojana and Annapurna Yojna, while 28 percent avail old age and widow pension. PRAXIS (2001) emphasised that the housing scheme Indira Awas Yojana tended to be very popular but that the outreach was very low.[21] Employment generation similarly seems to have brought some but limited benefits to poor people, and have created only a small number of days. NSS data indicates that IRDP has not done well in targeting the poor.[22] The ICDS scheme seems to have performed relatively well in Orissa.

[21] Meher (2000) reports problems in (gender) targeting in IAY.

[22] Mishra and Behera (2000) report for Mayurbhanj that employment generation schemes did little to increase total employment, assets created were of low quality, implementation was top-down, and contractors did not always pay the prescribed wage or provide employment for the specified period. Samal (1998) also notes the limited number of days of employment generated: 17 compared to stipulated 100 days. Kumar (2001) concludes that less than 3% of poor benefit from employment schemes (average also 3%), and about 6% receive subsidised housing. A VIKALPA study in Bolangir

Access to targeted schemes is dependent on a Below the Poverty Line (BPL) card. These are distributed based on a Census carried out by Panchayati Raj Department. One of the key issues has been that levels of poverty according to this Census have been very high in coastal districts as well; with the revision during the 2003 Census this may be rectified. But so far, targeting seems to have been little successful. According to Kumar (2001), 51 % of the total sampled population had a BPL card, 64% of the very poor, and 57% of the poor (social categories show similar slight progressiveness/targeting). Thus, the poor do not get more (or less) access to food grains at fair price shops than the average.

For the KBK districts (the old Kalahandi, Bolangir, Koraput; the poorest districts though excluding some of the poorest new districts) the government has formulated a special plan. A long term plan has been formulated, now with 100% grant central assistance. Drought proofing is a key activity, and many targeted interventions are coordinated under the scheme.

The limited information available (at least to us) does not allow for very substantial conclusions about the reasons for the high poverty in (parts of) Orissa. Though much press reports suggest that public policies have been less effective in Orissa than elsewhere – for example in the context of regular reporting of 'starvation deaths' – there is limited evidence that allows comparisons across states. Also, in some sectors substantial progress has been made, and more and better comparisons between sectors may be helpful. For our understanding of the most deprived groups, particularly STs in remote areas, we may hypothesise, first, that reservation policies have done little to improve the well-being of the large majority of the population (and whether current policy approaches contribute to continued social marginalisation and stigmatisation). Second, targeted schemes, though little evidence is available, seem to have had limited success – and the next section discusses some possible reasons for this. Third, and of relevant for our understanding of the nature of exclusion of those groups, the poverty is as much related to the policies – which have a long history - that have impacted their traditional livelihoods, as with isolation.

SECTION 4: SOCIAL MOBILISATION

This last section deals with exploring key paradoxes of poverty in remote areas in Orissa. These relate to why poverty has continued to persist despite significant mineral wealth, despite the fact that there is probably no absolute food shortage, and despite the political interest that has been taken in the region (and despite that this occurs within a democracy with a free press). The hypothesis is that the nature of social mobilisation and articulation of citizens' voice, or rather the lack thereof, has played a key role in sustaining the contradictions.

1996/97 narrates problems with drought employment schemes: lack of full payment, lack of consultation, domination contractors, etc.

The analysis regarding 'voice' of poor people can usefully start from the comparison of political regimes across Indian states by John Harris. This emphasises the unchallenged nature of politics in Orissa. Orissa may be the only state where the landowning classes have not captured state politics, let alone that this dominance was challenged by other castes. Orissa is marked by continued Brahmin dominance at the top, and this dominance is based in the coastal areas. Biju Patnaik's Congress' government power built on the numerical dominance of Khandaits (middle peasants, declared OBC in the early 1990s), who haven't challenged power relations like middle peasants elsewhere in India.[23] Politics and governments have very weak roots in society, and public action by marginalised groups has remained limited.[24]

Second, a CDS survey (CDS 2000, Kumar 2001) provides important background information regarding knowledge of the political system. As other studies, this one shows that the poor do take a great interest in the political system, as indicated by high voter turnouts. But at the same time, their knowledge is very limited. Though many could during the survey name the sarpanch, only 22 per cent of the 'very poor' could name the country's Prime Minister (against 78 per cent of the upper class), and 39 per cent their MLA. According to this survey, exposure to media is extremely limited: only 6 per cent of the very poor read newspapers, and only 17 per cent listen to radio. This is confirmed by NFHS data showing that 84 per cent of Scheduled Tribes is not regularly exposed to any media. The point is not merely lack of knowledge, but unequal access to knowledge.

Third, decentralisation has remained limited. As already described, the local governance structures have not been as well developed as in other places in India. This is not only the process of devolution to the panchayats; similarly it appears that district functions of planning and monitoring have remained limited. Orissa's power thus has remained extremely centralised, due to a range of factors which need further exploration (eg why decentralisation is resisted by the administration as well as political leaders, and the reasons why the interests of remote areas have not been better articulated through the political system).

It is generally recognised that civil society is weak in Orissa – though the generalisation has many important exceptions, and many organisations work among the poorest groups and in most remote regions. It appears that there a few cases of strong (joint) advocacy, and where such advocacy has occurred policy debates have become polarised and a common perceptions regarding NGOs being anti-development has developed (though this may be wrong, the perception still hinders the debate, and therefore effective articulation of voice). Press reporting in Orissa also tends to be weak on reporting on social issues, and the regular reporting on hunger deaths may

[23] Sengupta 2001 emphasises Orissa's history of limited Oriya unity (and the elite's perception of marginality even in the late-colonial period), and the fact that the appeal for Oriya nationalism did not percolate to the lower levels of society.

[24] Key exceptions to this have been the resistance to displacement in western Orissa, and the opposition to investment plans in Chilka lake.

not substantially contribute to accountability as a) this tends to be the national press more than the Orissa-based, and b) does not seems to be of extremely high quality and address key issue of causes of poverty.

The hypothesis, to be developed in much more detail in a later version of this paper, is that the paradox of plenty and poverty in western Orissa is related to the lack of representation of interest of poor groups in remote areas. This lack, as within the poverty profile, seems to derive from a cumulation of disadvantages: location (coast vs inland), infrastructure (access to information), and social (high caste vs others). The relative lack of policy response – or rather, the effectiveness thereof – seems driven by social-cultural segmentation, the political dominance of coastal Orissa over other parts, and the cultural domination of higher castes over lower castes and tribal groups (unchallenged like in other parts of India). As citizens are unable to effectively voice concerns and priorities, the state seems to have has been able to 'get away' with continued extreme deprivation and possibly increased inequality.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS: CHRONIC POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION

The concept of social exclusion, applied here to western (ie non-Coastal) Orissa which contains many of the poorest districts in India, would describe or emphasise both the multi-dimensionality of poverty, and help understand processes and causes of poverty. This paper has emphasised poverty trends in Orissa, showing increasing inequality in income poverty, the extent to which various dimensions of poverty overlap (to some extent, but not uniformly), policy approaches to reducing poverty, and the extent to which citizens voice contributes to making such policies work.

Given the trends in poverty, it is plausible that chronic poverty characterises a large part of the deprivation in western Orissa. A key concern is whether the poor in parts of Orissa and India are falling behind general development patterns; there is certainly evidence to substantiate this. There is further evidence that the reasons for this has not been due to a lack of attention by policy makers, but that the mainstream responses, in parts of Orissa have had limited success. The hypothesis, to be developed further, is that the lack of effective citizens' voice has been a key determinant of those patterns. The description so far suggest that deprivation in terms of lack of access to education, income, markets etc., is compounded by deprivation on the basis of social identity, and that social mobilisation to address these inequalities has remained limited.

REFERENCES

Ahluwalia, M. S. (1978), 'Rural Poverty and Agricultural Performance in India', *Journal of Development Studies*, 14, 298-323.

Alam, J. (1999), 'Is Caste Appeal Casteism? Oppressed Castes in Politics', *Economic and Political Weekly,* March 27.

Bahuguna, S. and A. de Haan (2002), Caste in South Asia: Social and Economic Exclusion, internal DFID paper.

Centre for Development Studies (2000), *Study of Political System and Voting Behaviour of the Poor in Orissa*, commissioned by DFID.

Currie, Bob (2000), *The Politics of Hunger in India. A Study of Democracy, Governance and Kalahandi's Poverty*, MacMillan, Chennai.

Das, S., A. Dubey, V. Pala (2002), 'Poverty, Inequality and Level of Living Among Different Social Groups in India', unpublished manuscript, North-Eastern Hill University.

Datt, G., and M. Ravallion (2002), *Is India's Economic Growth Leaving the Poor Behind?*, World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper.

CYSD, 2002/3,

Das, S., A. Dubey, V. Pala, 'Poverty, Inequality and Level of Living Among Different Social Groups in India', unpublished manuscript, June 2002, North-Eastern Hill University.

Deaton, A. (2003), 'Adjusted Poverty Estimates for 1999-2000', *Economic and Political Weekly,* Vol.38, No.4, pp.322-26.

Dreze, J. and P.V. Srinivasan (1996), *Poverty in India: Regional Estimates, 1987-8*, London School of Economics, DEP No.70.

de Haan, A., Social Exclusion in Policy and Research: Operationalising the Concept, in: Figueiredo, J, and A. de Haan, eds., *Social Exclusion: The ILO Contribution*, ILO, Geneva, 1998.

de Haan, A., Social Exclusion: an Alternative Concept for the Study of Deprivation?, *IDS Bulletin*, Vol.29, No.1, January 1998a.

de Haan, A. and P, Nayak, *Social Exclusion and South Asia. A Regional Bibliographical Review*, International Institute for Labour Studies, Discussion Papers No.77, 1994.

Dubey, A. (2002), Calorie Consumption and Nutritional Deficiency in India: A Disaggregated Analysis (1993-94 and 1999-00), Draft paper.

Franco, S., B. Harriss-White, R. Saith, F. Stewart, (2002), Alternative Realities: Different Concepts of Poverty and Their Empirical Consequences and Policy Implications, DFID Report.

Harriss, J., 'Comparing Political Regimes across Indian States. A Preliminary Essay', *Economic and Political Weekly,* November 27, 1999.

Hulme, D. (2003, forthcoming), 'Conceptualizing Chronic Poverty', *World Development.*

Kozel, V., and B. Parker (2003), 'A Profile and Diagnostic of Poverty in Uttar Pradesh', *Economic and Political Weekly,* Vol.38, No.4, pp.385-403.

Kumar, S. (2001) Study of political systems and voting behaviour of the poor in Orissa, DFID-Delhi.

Lanjouw, P., and S. Zaidi, 2002, 'Andhra Pradesh Poverty Note: A Preliminary Profile and Emerging Issues', unpublished paper, World Bank.

Mallik, R. and Meher (1997) Concurrent Evaluation of IRDP (Vth round), Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneshwar

Mallik, R.M. and S.Padhi, (1995) Irrigation system in Orissa: its impact on agricultural development, Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneshwar

Mathew, George, 'Panchayati Raj Institutions and Human Rights in India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 11, 2003, pp.155-62.

Mearns, R. and S. Sinha (1999), Social Exclusion and Land Administration in Orissa, India, Policy Research Working Paper no.2124, World Bank

Meenakshi, J.V., R. Ray, S. Gupta, 'Estimates of Poverty for SC, ST and Female-Headed Households', *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 29, 2000, pp.2748-54.

Meher, R. (2000) Concurrent Evaluation of India Awaas Yojana in Orissa, Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneshwar.

Mishra, S. and M.Behera, (2000) Evaluation of anti-poverty programmes in Mayurhbanj District, Orissa, Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneshwar.

National Family Health Survey, India, 1998-99, Orissa (2001), IIPS Mumbai.

National Council of Applied Economic Research (1999), India: Human Development Report. A Profile of Indian States in the 199s, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

O'Brien, D., and A. de Haan, Poverty and Social Exclusion on the North and South. An Annotated Bibliography, IDS Development Bibliography 15, 1998.

Panda, M. (2003), 'Poverty in Orissa: A Disaggregated Analysis' (not for quotation)

PRAXIS (2001), *The Politics of Poverty. A Tale of the Living Dead in Bolangir*, Books for Change, Bangalore.

PRAXIS (2002), 'The Accountable State', report prepared for Government of Orissa, supported by DFID.

Public Affairs Centre

Ravallion, M., and G. Datt (1996), 'How Important to India's Poor is the Sectoral Composition of Growth?', *World Bank Economic Review,* Vol.10, No.1, pp.1-25.

Ravallion, M., and G. Datt (1999), When is Growth Pro-Poor? Evidence for the Diverse Experiences of India's States, World Bank.

Samal, K.C. (1998), 'Poverty Alleviation after Post-Liberalisation. Study of Tribal Block in Orissa, Economic and Political Weekly, July 11.

Sengupta, J. (2001), State, Market, and Democracy in the 1990s: Liberalization and the Politics of Oriya Identity', in: N. Gopal and S. Pai, eds., Democratic Governance in India: Challenges of Poverty, Development, and Identity, New Delhi: Sage.

Sundaram, K., and S. Tendulkar (2003), 'Comparability Problem in NSS Data', *Economic and Political Weekly,* Vol.38, No.4, pp.327-37.

Thorat, S., 'Oppression and Denial. Dalit Discrimination in the 1990s', *Economic and Political Weekly*, February, 2002, pp.572-78.

Thorat, S, 2002a, 'Caste System and Economic Inequality. Economic Theory and Evidence', Preliminary Draft.

VIKALPA (1997), 'The Spiral of Poverty. A report based on the survey in Bongomunda and Turekela block of Bolangir', Bolangir.

World Bank, PREM, South Asia Region, 2002, *Poverty in India. The Challenge of Uttar Pradesh*, World Bank, Report 22323-In.

Xaxa, V., 'Protective Discrimination: Why Scheduled Tribes Lag Behind Scheduled Castes', *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 21, 2001.