Margin—The Journal of Applied Economic Research 9 : 3 (2015): 278–305
SAGE Publications Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/Singapore/Washington DC
DOI: 10.1177/0973801015579754

Indian Urban Households' Access to Basic Amenities: Deprivations, Disparities and Determinants

Arjun Kumar

The need for access to basic amenities—drinking water, sanitation, electricity and drainage—to ensure a decent quality of life has been internationally and nationally recognised and acted upon in the form of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and various policies and programmes in India. Deprivation and disparities in access to basic amenities in urban India have been highlighted in this article, using data from Census 2001 and 2011 and National Sample Survey's (NSS) Housing Conditions Rounds unit records data 1993 and 2008–09. Determinants of households having access to basic amenities in the house have been estimated using an econometric exercise on household-level information (NSS, 2008–09). Despite improvement over time, many households in urban India still face deprivations of basic amenities and, hence, low standard of living. Households located in slums and small and medium towns/cities and those belonging to Poor, Scheduled Tribe, Scheduled Caste and Wage Labourers (Casual Labourers) groups were highly deprived of access to basic amenities, and disparities among various socioeconomic groups were observed to be increasing. Findings suggest the need for urgent attention for providing basic amenities, focused on slums, small and medium towns/cities and supplemented with inclusive, group-specific measures in order to raise the overall quality of life and well-being.

Keywords: *Basic Amenities, Urban India, Size Classes of Towns/Cities, Slums, Quality of Life, Poverty, Social Groups, Religious Groups, Livelihood Categories*

Acknowledgements: This article is an abridged version of research studies undertaken at the Indian Institute of Dalit Studies under the Think Tank Initiative programme, International Development Research Centre. The author would like to acknowledge Prof. Sukhadeo Thorat, Prof. Amitabh Kundu, Prof. P.M. Kulkarni, Prof. Amaresh Dubey, Dr Himanshu and the Indian Institute of Dalit Studies' research team for their insightful comments. The article has benefited substantially from constructive comments of the anonymous referees.

The author is a research affiliate and visiting faculty at the Indian Institute of Dalit Studies, New Delhi, email: arjun40_ssf@jnu.ac.in

1. Introduction, Policy, Review of Literature and Motivation

In many developing nations, the infrastructure and provisions ensuring basic amenities to people living in the teeming urban areas, the very heart of development centres of such countries, are overburdened or ill-supplied. This has led to a poor standard of living and widespread poverty in terms of various capabilities. Access to basic amenities like drinking water, sanitation, electricity, drainage and so on is important to well-being and a reasonable standard of living people and it enables households to fruitfully and productively use their time, which would otherwise be spent on arranging the absent amenities. The need for this access has been recognized internationally and nationally, as it forms the dividing line for various other forms of deprivations. In 2000, 189 nations pledged to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to free people from extreme poverty and multiple deprivations by 2015. In recent years, many other international agencies such as the United Nations, World Bank and Asian Development Bank have advocated the need for basic amenities to raise the standard of living of people.

> The process of enlarging people's choices, as well raising their level of well-being or human development, has emerged as the ultimate goal of development of a society. The motivation behind such an exercise relates closely to seeing poverty as a serious deprivation of certain basic capabilities . . . [this] alternative approach leads to a rather different diagnosis of poverty from the ones that a purely income-based analysis can yield. There are at least four different sources of variation: (1) personal heterogeneities, (2) environmental diversities, (3) variations in social climate, and (4) differences in relative deprivation connected with customary patterns of consumption in particular societies. Poverty analysis cannot really be dissociated from pragmatic considerations particularly informational availability. Axioms can indeed be proposed that attempt to capture our distributional concerns in this constructive exercise. (Sen, 1999)

In order to usher in an era of urban governance, the Eleventh Plan (2007–12) reaffirmed the vitality of the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) launched by the Government of India in 2005. The mission aimed at improving and augmenting the economic and social infrastructure of 65 select cities as well as at providing affordable housing and basic services to the urban poor (BSUP) through planned development of these cities. The JNNURM catered to the non-mission towns and cities through two components, namely, the Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns, and the Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme. The schemes of Affordable Housing in Partnership

and Interest Subsidy Scheme for Housing Urban Poor were dovetailed into the Rajiv Awas Yojana in the Twelfth Plan, which focuses on a slum-free India. These efforts are also supplemented with various other schemes, functioning at the sub-national levels, for the provisions of various basic amenities. Also, largely, 'the Twelfth (Five-Year) Plan (2012–17) of the Government of India (GOI) recognizes the inclusive growth approach as the means to an end that would demand outcomes which yield benefits for all and particularly to the marginalized sections of society' (Thorat & Dubey, 2012).

With these efforts, the housing condition and amenities in India have improved substantially over the years in terms of the type of dwelling structures and households' access to drinking water, sanitation, electricity and so on in urban India. However, there are still a large proportion of households that do not have basic amenities and adequate housing, especially in rural areas and small and medium towns/cities, especially those belonging to the weaker sections of society—such as the scheduled tribes (STs), scheduled castes (SCs) and poor (lower strata of consumption expenditure classes [CEC]; Bhagat, 2013; Dreze & Sen, 2013; Kumar, 2013, 2014, 2015; Srinivasan & Mohanty, 2004).

Inequity in the provision of basic services across states and various size categories of urban centres is extremely high. Investments for the development of infrastructure and provision of basic services have not been spatially balanced during the past few decades. More specifically, state governments and para-statal institutions did not exhibit sensitivity towards small and medium towns. Unfortunately, privatization, partnership arrangements and community-based projects that are being projected as alternatives have not been able to fill the vacuum created by the withdrawal of the state, taking place under the new system of governance. Planners and policymakers have in recent years made a strong case for para-statal agencies and local governments to depend increasingly on their internal resources and institutional finance with the objective of 'bringing in efficiency and accountability in their functioning' (Kundu, 2006; Kundu, Bagchi & Kundu, 1999).

The big city bias of the mission (JNNURM) is very evident. India's developed states and big cities have been able to take advantage of the mission and improve their infrastructural requirements of water supply, sewerage and transportation. Spending for the urban poor has declined over the years, and they are partners in the programme in a very cosmetic sense. The small towns and poorer states have taken little advantage of this programme because of their limited capacity to understand and implement reforms and to prepare city development plans and detailed project reports which are contingent for qualifying for funds (Kundu, 2014).

A major failure of city governance has been the inability to meet the needs of the poor, and the apprehension is that this is a manifestation of an exclusionary urbanisation in the country, prohibiting or discouraging in-migration of persons in the low social and economic categories from gaining a foothold in cities and a stifling dynamics of development at the lowest level of the urban hierarchy (Kundu, 2011).

Besides, widely prevalent caste-based discrimination has contributed to the deprivation of India's urban poor of the basic amenities. Achieving the goal of an 'inclusive society' calls for immediate corrective measures having legal sanctity along with other anti-poverty and economic development programmes complementing them (Thorat & Newman, 2007; Thorat & Sabharwal, 2011).

This article centres on highlighting deprivation and disparities in access to basic amenities by urban households in India in aggregate as well as by slums, size classes of towns/cities, poor–non-poor, social groups, religious groups and livelihood categories,

2. Database and Methodology

This study uses data from two sources—the Census of India (Data on Houses, Housing Amenities and Assets, House listing and Housing Census) for 2001 and 2011 and the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO; Housing Conditions Round[1] unit record data) for 1993 and 2008–09. The indicators for access to basic amenities in the study are deprivation measures including parameters for unavailability of drinking water, sanitation, electricity and drainage arrangement to households (Annexure 1).

For the analysis, the levels of deprivations in urban India and the changes in the levels of deprivation have been calculated using the compounded annual growth rate. The disparities in deprivation of basic amenities among various groups have been measured by the Modified Sopher's Disparity Index[2] for Groups 1 and 2. The ideal value for the index if there is no disparity is 0;

[1] Data on the indicators was extracted and tabulated from the National Sample Survey (NSS) Household unit record data by applying the weights provided by the NSS. It should be noted here that the reference time for arriving at the year differences between two surveys is the mid-point of the NSS Housing Conditions surveys. The NSS 49th (January to June 1993) round survey was completed in six months while the 65th round (July 2008 to June 2009) was completed in a year. The overall period under study is 15.75 years, from 1993 to 2008–09.

[2] The Modified Sopher's Disparity Index = Log (X2/X1) + Log [(200-X1)/(200-X2)], where X1 and X2 are the respective percentages of the values of variables (deprivation of basic amenities).

the higher the value of the index, the greater the extent of disparity and vice-versa; a positive value suggests that the situation is in favour of Group 1 (less deprived of basic amenities) and vice versa. Changes in the index values over time were also captured and analyzed.

The classification of stratum (used for classifying different size classes of towns and cities in urban areas) has changed in each NSS round, pertaining to the respective housing conditions during those rounds. Thus, there arises an issue of comparability between NSS rounds, for various size classes of towns and cities, which has been taken care of and has been discussed in detail.

To tackle the issue of sufficient sample sizes for the analysis from NSS, while going for very minute enquiry, the sample sizes have been checked for every unit of the analysis, and only the minute enquiries with sufficient and appropriate sample sizes have been reported in this article. To overcome the limitations of the NSS surveys, which are based on sampling, the Census for household information has also been referred to.

Determinants of households with access to basic amenities in the house have been estimated with the Probit model using household unit record data (NSS Housing Conditions round 2008–09) to identify factors that affect households' likelihood of having access to basic amenities in the house.

3. Summary of Findings on Deprivation and Disparities

3.1 Deprivation—Aggregate

There was an improvement in access to basic amenities by the urban households during 2001–11 (Table 1). However, when we analyse the absolute number of households deprived of these amenities, despite the decline in the proportion of deprived households, we found that there has been marginal increase in the number of households deprived of the availability of drinking water and latrine facility within their premises and closed drainage connectivity to a waste-water outlet and a decline in the number of households deprived of electricity in their premises.

The compounded annual rate of decline in the proportions of deprived households was highest for the households not having electricity in the house, which in turn can be seen in the better performance of this indicator in terms of fall in the absolute number of households deprived of electricity in the house. An improvement in the access to basic amenities was observed between 1993 and 2008–09 by NSS data (Table 2). This is imminent from an accelerated rate of decline in the deprivation of basic amenities by the households during 2002–2008/2009 (Kumar, 2014).

Table 1 Levels and Changes of Deprivation in Access to Important Basic Amenities by the Household in Urban India during 2001 and 2011 Census *(numbers are in millions)*

	Levels		*2001–11 (Changes)*		
	2011	*2001*	*Numbers (millions)*	*As Proportion of Total Households During 2001 (in %)*	*Annual Compounded (in %)*
Total Number of households (in millions) ***in %***	78.9	53.7	25.2	*46.9*	
Number of households not having availability of drinking water within the premise (near the premise and away)	22.7	18.6	4.1		
As proportion of total households (%)	*28.8*	*34.6*		*22.3*	*–1.82*
Number of households not having latrine facility within the premise (public and open latrine use)	14.7	14.1	0.5		
As proportion of total households **(%)**	*18.6*	*26.3*		*3.9*	*–3.40*
Number of households not having electricity in the house (kerosene, other sources and no lighting)	5.8	6.7	–0.9		
As proportion of total households **(%)**	*7.3*	*12.4*		*–13.5*	*–5.16*
Number of households not having closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet (open drainage and no drainage)	43.8	35.2	8.6		
As proportion of total households **(%)**	*55.5*	*65.5*		*24.4*	*–1.64*

Source: Author's calculation using Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets, Houselisting and Housing Data, Census of India, 2001 and 2011.
Note: Annual compounded growth rate is calculated based on percentage in 2011 over percentage in 2001 of levels of deprivation in respective years.

Table 2 Changes in Deprivation of Important Basic Amenities by Households by Size of Town in Urban India during 1993 and 2008–09
(Levels are in Percent and Changes in Annual Compound Growth Rate)

	Small Towns	*Medium Towns*	*Large Towns*	*Urban Areas*
No facility of drinking water in the house				
Levels in 1993	*44.6*	*41.0*	*28.4*	*39.2*
Levels in 2008–09	*31.6*	*22.5*	*15.6*	*22.9*
Annual change, 1993 to 2008–09	*–2.2*	*–3.7*	*–3.7*	*–3.3*
No latrine facility in the house				
Levels in 1993	*42.7*	*36.0*	*29.9*	*36.6*
Levels in 2008–09	*26.5*	*14.7*	*15.3*	*17.7*
Annual change, 1993 to 2008–09	*–3.0*	*–5.5*	*–4.2*	*–4.5*
No electricity use for domestic purposes in the house				
Levels in 1993	*25.2*	*18.7*	*8.9*	*18.4*
Levels in 2008–09	*7.0*	*3.6*	*1.4*	*3.9*
Annual change, 1993 to 2008–09	*–7.8*	*–9.9*	*–11.3*	*–9.4*
Open, *katcha* and no drainage arrangement in the house				
Levels in 1993	*51.7*	*40.5*	*18.5*	*38.8*
Levels in 2008–09	*34.1*	*22.0*	*5.2*	*20.6*
Annual change, 1993 to 2008–09	*–2.6*	*–3.8*	*–7.7*	*–3.9*

Source: Author's calculation using NSS, Household Conditions Rounds unit record data for the respective years.

3.2 Deprivation and Disparities—Size Classes of Towns/Cities

The classifications used here for the analysis of different size classes of towns and cities (upon recoding the stratum) from NSS data during 1993 and 2008–09 are as follows:

- Small towns: population less than 50,000
- Medium towns: population more than 50,000 and less than 1 million
- Large towns: population more than 1 million

In urban India, between 1993 and 2008–09, the growth in small towns have been slower than in the medium and large towns, and, as a result, there has been decline in the share of small towns and an increase in the share of medium- and large-town households in this period. This phenomenon has also been highlighted in earlier literature as 'dualism in urbanization' or 'top heavy structure urbanization' (Kundu, 2006).

Households in smaller towns had the lowest annual rate of decline in deprivation in access to basic amenities, followed by the rates in medium towns and then larger towns and cities, between 1993 and 2008–09, resulting in high levels of deprivation in smaller towns followed by medium towns and then larger towns and cities (Table 2).

Decisions on the funding of 65 mission cities under JNNURM were based on the Census 2001. This resulted in disparities in the creation of urban infrastructures across India, as smaller towns were at a disadvantage vis-à-vis large cities in access to the funds. Thus, the funding for the well-off cities (like the state capitals and million-plus cities) needs to be scaled down as they have the capacity to generate resources of their own. The extra available funds could be directed towards making special provisions for addressing the infrastructure needs of the economically backward states and smaller towns (Kundu, 2014).

Thus, a reinvigorated focus on smaller towns and cities while making provisions of basic amenities in urban India would go a long way in ensuring an inclusive urban growth.

3.3 Deprivation—Slums

The 2011 Primary Census Abstract for Slums reveals that the slum population in India has increased during 2001–11, with urban slum[3] households constituting 17.43 per cent of a total of 78.87 million households in urban India (Table 3). Households in urban slums reported higher level of deprivation in access to basic amenities as compared to the levels of deprivation in urban India as a whole in 2011.

While public spending on slum improvement has increased on a modest scale, exclusionary practices such as evictions have increased, partly to 'cleanse' the cities and enhance their image among prospective investors (UN-Habitat, 2014).

[3] A Slum, for the purpose of the Census, has been defined as a residential area where dwellings are unfit for human habitation by reasons of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangements and design of such buildings, narrowness or faulty arrangement of street, lack of ventilation, light or sanitation facilities or any combination of these factors which are detrimental to safety and health. For the purpose of the Census, slums have been categorised and defined as of the following three types: Notified (all notified areas in a town or city notified as a 'Slum' by state, union territory administration or local government under any Act, including a 'Slum Act'), Recognised (all areas recognised as a 'Slum' by state, union territory administration or local government, Housing and Slum Boards, which may have not been formally notified as a slum under any act), and Identified (a compact area of at least 300 population or about 60–70 households of poorly built congested tenements, in unhygienic environment usually with inadequate infrastructure and lacking in proper sanitary and drinking water facilities).

Table 3 Levels of Deprivation in Access to Important Basic Amenities by Households in Urban Slums and Urban India during 2011 *(in Percent)*

	Urban Slums	*Urban India*
Number of households (in millions)	13.75	78.87
Households not having availability of drinking water within the premise	*43.3*	*28.8*
Households not having latrine facility within the premise	*34.0*	*18.6*
Households not having electricity in the house	*9.5*	*7.3*
Households not having closed drainage connectivity for waste-water outlet	*63.1*	*55.5*

Source: Author's calculation using Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets, Houselisting and Housing Data, Census of India, 2001 and 2011.

3.4 Deprivation and Disparities—Poor–Non-poor

The share of poor households out of total urban households declined drastically between 1993 (36.47 per cent) and 2008–09 (18.98 per cent).[4] High levels of deprivation in access to basic amenities and very lower annual rate of decline in this deprivation was found among the poor households, as compared to that of non-poor households, between 1993 and 2008–09, by NSS data, resulting in high levels of deprivation of poor in 2008–09 (Table 4). Also, disparities in deprivation of access to basic amenities among poor and non-poor (as measured by Modified Sopher's Disparity Index) have substantially increased in case of all the indicators of basic amenities considered in this study, as suggested by the increasing values of the index for the period between 1993 and 2008–09.

3.5 Deprivation and Disparities—Social Groups

According to the Census 2011, ST, SC and Other Households constituted 4.04 per cent, 14.34 per cent and 81.62 per cent, respectively, of the total urban households in India (Table 5.1). A close degree of similarity is also observed in the NSS 2008–09 data, where the ST, SC, OBC and Others

[4] The poverty line used to demarcate poor and non-poor households, between 1993 and 2008–09, has been calculated by updating the poverty line (as per old official Planning Commission methodology) using the 1993 and 2004–05 poverty estimates of the Planning Commission and the Consumer Price Index for Industrial Workers data (base year 1982 = 100) from the Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

Table 4 Changes in Levels of Deprivation of Few Important Basic Amenities in Urban Areas by Poor– Non-poor, between 1993 and 2008–09
(in Percentage Points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)

	Non-poor	*Poor*	*Total*		*Modified Sopher's Disparity Index (poor, non-poor)*
No facility of drinking water in the house					
Levels in 1993	*32.38*	*50.96*	*39.22*		–0.25
Levels in 2008–09	*17.89*	*44.39*	*22.86*		–0.46
Changes during the period between 1993 and 2008–09 (annual compounded)	*–3.70*	*–0.87*	*–3.37*	Changes in index value	–0.22
No latrine facility in the house					
Levels in 1993	*30.17*	*47.83*	*36.52*		–0.25
Levels in 2008–09	*12.36*	*40.78*	*17.74*		–0.59
Changes between 1993 and 2008–09 (annual compounded)	*–5.51*	*–1.01*	*–4.48*	Changes in index value	–0.34
No electricity use for domestic purposes					
Levels in 1993	*13.11*	*27.49*	*18.36*		–0.36
Levels in 2008–09	*1.80*	*12.69*	*3.86*		–0.87
Changes between 1993 and 2008–09 (annual compounded)	*–11.85*	*–4.79*	*–9.43*	Changes in index value	–0.52
Open, *katcha* and no drainage arrangement in the house					
Levels in 1993	*32.30*	*50.14*	*38.73*		–0.24
Levels in 2008–09	*16.13*	*39.78*	*20.60*		–0.45
Changes between 1993 and 2008–09 (annual compounded)	*–4.31*	*–1.46*	*–3.93*	Changes in index value	–0.21

Source: Author's calculation using NSS, Household Conditions Rounds, unit record data for the respective years, Planning Commission and Ministry of Labour, Government of India.
Notes: Poverty line has been calculated based on old official poverty line method used by Planning Commission. Poverty line has been updated from 1993 and 2004–05 poverty estimates of Planning Commission using Consumer Price Index of Industrial Workers, base year 1982 = 100, for urban areas.

households formed 3.28 per cent, 14.43 per cent, 37.83 per cent and 44.46 per cent, respectively, in 2008–09, as per NSS data.

ST and SC households were found to have remarkably higher levels of deprivation and lower annual rate of decline in deprivation in access to basic amenities, as compared to Other households (during 2001–11, as per Census data, and between 1993 and 2008–09, as per NSS data; Tables 5.1 and 5.2). Disparities in deprivation of access to basic amenities were observed to have marginally increased between ST and SC households and between SC and Other households, as suggested by the changes in the values of the Modified Sopher's Disparity Index, which increased marginally from 2001 to 2011 (Census data) and from 1993 to 2008–09 (NSS data).

3.6 Deprivation and Disparities—Interface of Poor–Non-poor (MPCE Quintiles) and Social Groups

The shares of ST and SC households were found to be more across Poor households (bottom monthly per capita expenditure [MPCE] quintiles), as compared to Others, in the years 1993 and 2008–09.

In every MPCE quintile class category, during this time period, ST and SC households experienced higher levels of deprivation and lower annual rate of decline in deprivation in access to basic amenities in the house vis-à-vis Other households (Tables 6.1–6.4). As we move from bottom quintiles to the higher ones, while the levels of deprivation appear to decrease, with the rates of decline per annum improving for all social groups, yet the pattern among social groups remains the same.

Disparities in deprivation of access to basic amenities across various social groups in every MPCE quintile class were also observed to have increased, as suggested by the increase in the values of the Modified Sopher's Disparity Index. It indicates that even if same economic conditions prevail, there is variation in access to amenities by different social groups. The data also suggest that the disparities among social groups, especially among SC and Other households, have tended to be higher among higher quintiles, in 2008–09. This shows that social identity and backgrounds act as constraining factors that lead to lesser access to basic amenities by weaker sections.

Households in urban areas experienced acceleration in the access to basic amenities for bottom three MPCE quintile categories, from 2002 to 2008–09, whereas top-quintile-class categories witnessed deceleration after attaining higher levels of access (Kumar, 2014). However, the pattern among social groups in all the MPCE quintile categories remained the same.

Table 5.1 Household Deprivation of Important Basic Amenities in Urban India by Social Groups, 2001 and 2011

						Modified Sopher's Disparity Index	
	ST	*SC*	*Others*	*Total*		*(SC, ST)*	*(SC, Other)*
Households 2011							
Number (million)	3.2	11.3	64.4	78.9			
Share of households in %	*4.0*	*14.3*	*81.6*	*100.0*			
2001							
Number (million)	2.3	7.8	43.6	53.7			
Share of households in %	*4.3*	*14.5*	*81.1*	*100.0*			
2001–11 (changes)							
Decadal growth in %	*36.9*	*44.8*	*47.8*	*46.9*			
Annual exponential in %	*3.1*	*3.7*	*3.9*	*3.8*			
Households not having drinking water within the premise							
2011							
Number (million)	1.43	4.86	16.40	22.70			
as proportion of total households (in %)	*44.9*	*43.0*	*25.5*	*28.8*		0.02	–0.27
2001							
Number (million)	1.24	4.02	13.33	18.59			
as proportion of total households (in %)	*53.1*	*51.5*	*30.6*	*34.6*		0.02	–0.28
2001–11 (changes)							
Number (million)	0.19	0.84	3.08	4.11	Changes in index value	0.01	0.01
Decadal growth in %	*15.7*	*20.9*	*23.1*	*22.1*			
Compounded annual growth in %	*–1.7*	*–1.8*	*–1.8*	*–1.8*			

(Table 5.1 continued)

(Table 5.1 continued)

	ST	SC	Others	Total		Modified Sopher's Disparity Index (SC, ST)	Modified Sopher's Disparity Index (SC, Other)
Households not having latrine facility within the premise							
2011							
Number (million)	1.08	3.85	9.77	14.70			
As proportion of total households (in %)	*34.0*	*34.1*	*15.2*	*18.6*		0.00	–0.40
2001							
Number (million)	0.98	3.56	9.57	14.11			
As proportion of total households (in %)	*42.3*	*45.5*	*22.0*	*26.3*		–0.04	–0.38
2001–11 (changes)							
Number (million)	0.10	0.30	0.20	0.59	Changes in index value	0.04	–0.02
Decadal growth in %	*10.2*	*8.3*	*2.0*	*4.2*			
Compounded annual growth in %	*–2.1*	*–2.9*	*–3.6*	*–3.4*			
Households not having electricity in the house							
2011							
Number (million)	0.43	1.48	3.86	5.78			
As proportion of total households (in %)	*13.5*	*13.1*	*6.0*	*7.3*		0.01	–0.36
2001							
Number (million)	0.5	1.8	4.4	6.7			
As proportion of total households (in %)	*21.9*	*22.6*	*10.1*	*12.4*		–0.02	–0.38
2001–11 (changes)							
Number (million)	–0.08	–0.28	–0.53	–0.89	Changes in index value	0.03	0.02
Decadal growth in %	*–15.3*	*–15.8*	*–12.1*	*–13.3*			

Compounded annual growth in %	*–4.7*	*–5.3*	*–5.1*	*–5.1*			
Households not having closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet 2011							
Number (million)	2.11	7.48	34.18	43.77			
As proportion of total households (in %)	*66.1*	*66.2*	*53.1*	*55.5*		0.00	–0.14
2001							
Number (million)	1.73	5.95	27.49	35.17			
As proportion of total households (in per cent)	*74.4*	*76.2*	*63.1*	*65.5*		–0.02	–0.13
2001–11 (changes)							
Number (million)	0.37	1.53	6.69	8.60	Changes in Index Value	0.02	–0.01
Decadal growth in %	*21.6*	*25.8*	*24.3*	*24.4*			
Compounded annual growth in %	*–1.2*	*–1.4*	*–1.7*	*–1.6*			

Source: Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets, Houselisting and Housing Data, Census of India, 2001 and 2011.

Notes: ST = Scheduled Tribe, SC = Scheduled Caste, Other = Other than ST and SC.

Table 5.2 Changes in Levels of Deprivation of Important Basic Amenities in Urban Areas by Social Groups, 1993 and 2008–09
(in Percentage Points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)

						Modified Sopher's Disparity Index	
	ST	*SC*	*Others*	*All*		*(SC, ST)*	*(SC, Others)*
No facility of drinking water in the house							
Levels in 1993	*54.40*	*49.97*	*36.62*	*39.15*		0.05	–0.17
Levels in 2008–09	*31.32*	*37.89*	*19.93*	*22.89*		–0.10	–0.32
Changes between 1993 and 2008–09 (annual compounded)	*–3.44*	*–1.74*	*–3.79*	*–3.35*	Changes in index value	–0.15	–0.15
No latrine facility in the house							
Levels in 1993	*50.74*	*50.49*	*33.58*	*36.60*		0.00	–0.22
Levels in 2008–09	*25.59*	*33.50*	*14.66*	*17.74*		–0.14	–0.41
Changes between 1993 and 2008–09	*–4.25*	*–2.57*	*–5.13*	*–4.49*	Changes in index value	–0.14	–0.18
No electricity use for domestic purposes							
Levels in 1993	*28.18*	*28.25*	*16.21*	*18.35*		0.00	–0.27
Levels in 2008–09	*8.45*	*7.50*	*3.04*	*3.86*		0.05	–0.40
Changes between 1993 and 2008–09	*–7.36*	*–8.08*	*–10.08*	*–9.42*	Changes in index value	0.06	–0.13
Open, *katcha* and no drainage arrangement in the house							
Levels in 1993	*54.40*	*44.63*	*37.13*	*38.80*		0.11	–0.10
Levels in 2008–09	*30.99*	*31.31*	*18.30*	*20.60*		–0.01	–0.27
Changes between 1993 and 2008–09	*–3.51*	*–2.23*	*–4.39*	*–3.94*	Changes in index value	–0.12	–0.17

Source: Author's calculation using NSS, Household Conditions Rounds, unit record data for the respective years.

Table 6.1 Changes in Drinking Water non-availability in Urban Households by Social and Economic Groups—MPCE Quintile Categories, 1993 and 2008–09 *(in Percentage Points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)*

					Modified Sopher's Disparity Index	
CEC	*ST*	*SC*	*Others*	*All*	*(SC, ST)*	*(SC, Others)*
	Levels in 1993				1993	
0–20	*64.87*	*58.45*	*50.42*	*52.97*	0.07	–0.09
20–40	*61.02*	*54.42*	*42.08*	*45.02*	0.07	–0.15
40–60	*47.37*	*42.34*	*36.06*	*37.18*	0.06	–0.09
60–80	*35.44*	*28.35*	*29.45*	*29.50*	0.12	0.02
80–100	*26.01*	*34.20*	*23.10*	*23.72*	–0.14	–0.20
Total	*54.40*	*49.97*	*36.62*	*39.15*	0.05	–0.17
	Levels in 2008–09				2008–09	
0–20	*46.27*	*57.47*	*41.81*	*45.67*	–0.13	–0.18
20–40	*49.23*	*44.00*	*32.51*	*35.59*	0.06	–0.16
40–60	*28.04*	*33.49*	*22.44*	*24.39*	–0.09	–0.20
60–80	*18.76*	*22.92*	*14.93*	*15.93*	–0.10	–0.21
80–100	*5.99*	*12.46*	*5.49*	*5.90*	–0.33	–0.37
Total	*31.32*	*37.89*	*19.93*	*22.89*	–0.10	–0.32
	Changes in levels between 1993 and 2008–09, annual compounded				Changes in index value	
0–20	*–2.12*	*–0.11*	*–1.18*	*–0.94*	–0.19	–0.10
20–40	*–1.35*	*–1.34*	*–1.62*	*–1.48*	–0.01	–0.02
40–60	*–3.27*	*–1.48*	*–2.97*	*–2.64*	–0.15	–0.12
60–80	*–3.96*	*–1.34*	*–4.22*	*–3.84*	–0.21	–0.22
80–100	*–8.90*	*–6.21*	*–8.72*	*–8.46*	–0.19	–0.17
Total	*–3.44*	*–1.74*	*–3.79*	*–3.35*	–0.15	–0.15

Source: Author's calculation using NSS, Household Conditions Rounds, unit record data for the respective years.

Notes: MPCE = monthly per capita expenditure; CEC = consumption expenditure classes; CEC quintiles are in percentages.

Table 6.2 Changes in Latrine non-availability in Urban Households by Social and Economic Groups—MPCE Quintile Categories, 1993 and 2008–09 *(in Percentage Points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)*

					Modified Sopher's Disparity Index	
CEC	*ST*	*SC*	*Others*	*All*	*(SC, ST)*	*(SC, Others)*
	Levels in 1993				1993	
0–20	*67.22*	*57.29*	*46.85*	*50.26*	0.10	–0.12
20–40	*57.72*	*54.64*	*38.50*	*42.14*	0.03	–0.20
40–60	*41.25*	*42.73*	*32.76*	*34.33*	–0.02	–0.14
60–80	*19.70*	*36.01*	*26.85*	*27.55*	–0.30	–0.15
80–100	*14.69*	*35.19*	*21.06*	*21.66*	–0.43	–0.26
Total	*50.74*	*50.49*	*33.58*	*36.60*	0.00	–0.22
	Levels in 2008–09				2008–09	
0–20	*47.48*	*59.09*	*37.88*	*43.33*	–0.13	–0.25
20–40	*32.43*	*40.26*	*24.62*	*28.31*	–0.11	–0.25
40–60	*24.33*	*25.24*	*15.57*	*17.40*	–0.02	–0.23
60–80	*9.73*	*16.04*	*8.40*	*9.29*	–0.23	–0.30
80–100	*2.12*	*6.55*	*3.24*	*3.40*	–0.50	–0.31
Total	*25.59*	*33.50*	*14.66*	*17.74*	–0.14	–0.41
	Changes in levels during 1993 to 2008–09, annual compounded				Changes in index value	
0–20	*–2.18*	*0.20*	*–1.34*	*–0.94*	–0.23	–0.14
20–40	*–3.59*	*–1.92*	*–2.80*	*–2.49*	–0.15	–0.06
40–60	*–3.30*	*–3.29*	*–4.61*	*–4.22*	0.00	–0.09
60–80	*–4.38*	*–5.01*	*–7.11*	*–6.67*	0.07	–0.15
80–100	*–11.57*	*–10.12*	*–11.21*	*–11.09*	–0.07	–0.05
Total	*–4.25*	*–2.57*	*–5.13*	*–4.49*	–0.14	–0.18

Source: As given in Table 6.1.

Note: As given in Table 6.1.

Table 6.3 Changes in Levels of No Electricity Use for Domestic Purposes in Urban Areas by Social and Economic Groups—MPCE Quintile Categories, 1993 and 2008–09 *(in Percentage Points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)*

					Modified Sopher's Disparity Index	
CEC	*ST*	*SC*	*Others*	*All*	*(SC, ST)*	*(SC, Others)*
		Levels in 1993			1993	
0–20	*41.80*	*39.81*	*27.44*	*30.92*	0.03	–0.19
2–40	*27.69*	*28.42*	*18.85*	*20.91*	–0.01	–0.20
40–60	*15.75*	*21.67*	*14.06*	*15.15*	–0.15	–0.21
60–80	*11.03*	*10.88*	*10.68*	*10.71*	0.01	–0.01
80–100	*11.36*	*8.65*	*8.32*	*8.39*	0.12	–0.02
Total	*28.18*	*28.25*	*16.21*	*18.35*	0.00	–0.27
		Levels in 2008–09			2008–09	
0–20	*19.24*	*18.92*	*12.48*	*14.38*	0.01	–0.20
20–40	*9.38*	*7.41*	*5.29*	*5.89*	0.11	–0.15
40–60	*5.25*	*3.89*	*2.10*	*2.48*	0.13	–0.27
60–80	*3.09*	*1.39*	*0.81*	*0.94*	0.35	–0.24
80–100	*0.09*	*0.95*	*0.17*	*0.21*	–1.03	–0.75
Total	*8.45*	*7.50*	*3.04*	*3.86*	0.05	–0.40
	Changes in levels during 1993 to 2008–09, annual compounded				Changes in index value	
0–20	*–4.81*	*–4.61*	*–4.88*	*–4.74*	–0.02	0.00
20–40	*–6.64*	*–8.18*	*–7.75*	*–7.73*	0.12	0.05
40–60	*–6.74*	*–10.33*	*–11.37*	*–10.85*	0.29	–0.07
60–80	*–7.76*	*–12.25*	*–15.10*	*–14.31*	0.34	–0.23
80–100	*–26.45*	*–13.09*	*–21.89*	*–20.87*	–1.15	–0.73
Total	*–7.36*	*–8.08*	*–10.08*	*–9.42*	0.06	–0.13

Source: As in Table 6.1.

Note: As in Table 6.1.

Table 6.4 Changes in Levels of Poor Drainage Arrangements in Urban Households by Social and Economic Groups—MPCE Quintile Categories, 1993 and 2008–09 *(in Percentage Points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)*

					Modified Sopher's Disparity Index	
CEC	*ST*	*SC*	*Others*	*All*	*(SC, ST)*	*(SC, Others)*
		Levels in 1993			1993	
0–20	*66.26*	*54.13*	*50.79*	*52.39*	0.13	–0.04
20–40	*50.62*	*48.38*	*42.19*	*43.63*	0.03	–0.08
40–60	*52.64*	*34.97*	*35.72*	*36.00*	0.23	0.01
60–80	*42.12*	*29.17*	*30.14*	*30.36*	0.19	0.02
80–100	*36.41*	*23.58*	*24.72*	*24.88*	0.22	0.02
Total	*54.40*	*44.63*	*37.13*	*38.80*	0.11	–0.10
		Levels in 2008–09			2008–09	
0–20	*40.25*	*47.42*	*39.57*	*41.41*	–0.09	–0.10
20–40	*43.14*	*40.26*	*30.08*	*32.75*	0.04	–0.15
40–60	*34.86*	*24.64*	*19.92*	*21.14*	0.18	–0.10
60–80	*20.91*	*14.37*	*12.75*	*13.17*	0.18	–0.06
80–100	*9.41*	*14.33*	*5.64*	*6.22*	–0.19	–0.42
Total	*30.99*	*31.31*	*18.30*	*20.60*	–0.01	–0.27
	Changes in levels during 1993 to 2008–09, annual compounded				Changes in index value	
0–20	*–3.12*	*–0.84*	*–1.57*	*–1.48*	–0.22	–0.06
20–40	*–1.01*	*–1.16*	*–2.13*	*–1.80*	0.01	–0.08
40–60	*–2.58*	*–2.20*	*–3.64*	*–3.32*	–0.05	–0.12
60–80	*–4.35*	*–4.40*	*–5.32*	*–5.16*	–0.02	–0.07
80–100	*–8.23*	*–3.11*	*–8.96*	*–8.43*	–0.42	–0.45
Total	*–3.51*	*–2.23*	*–4.39*	*–3.94*	–0.12	–0.17

Source: As in Table 6.1.

Note: As in Table 6.1.

> The insights from the experience of poverty and consumption expenditure changes . . . need to be kept in mind in developing a pro-poor inclusive growth strategy during the Twelfth Plan. Thus, the achievement of pro-poor and inclusive growth objectives of the Twelfth Plan necessitates comprehensive pro-poor policy, supplemented by group specific policy (social, religious and economic groups), as an integral part of the overall planning strategy. (Thorat & Dubey, 2012)

3.7 Deprivation—Livelihood Categories

Casual Labourers' households were found to have high levels of deprivation in access to basic amenities followed by households belonging to Self-employed and then Regular Wage/Salary Earners and Others, in urban India, during 2008–09 (Table 7.2).

3.8 Deprivation—Religious Groups

Among religious groups in urban India, Hindus, Muslims and Other Religious Minorities' households constituted 80.73 per cent, 13.23 per cent and 6.04 per cent of the total urban household, respectively, in 2008–09.

Muslims followed by Hindus' households were found to have high levels of deprivation in access to basic amenities, as compared to Other Religious Minorities' households in urban India, in 2008–09 (Table 7.2).

3.9 Deprivation—Poor–Non-poor, Social Groups, Livelihood Categories and Religious Groups across Class Size of Towns/Cities

As we move from small to large towns/cities in urban India, in 2008–09, the percentage of poor households as well as the percentage of ST, SC and OBC households decreases, while that of Others households keeps is found to be increasing. The shares of Muslims and Other Religious Minorities' households keep decreasing and that of the Hindu households keep increasing. The percentage of Self-employed, Casual Labour and Others' households decreases while that of Regular Wage/Salary Earner households is observed to increase.

Households in smaller towns were found to be the most deprived of access to basic amenities followed by medium towns and then larger towns and cities, and also the Casual Labourers, Poor, SC and ST households were found to have high levels of deprivation. Similar patterns were observed among Poor–Non-poor, Social Groups, Religious Groups and Livelihood Categories in various size classes of towns/cities, in 2008–09, with improvements in the levels of access to basic amenities as we move from small to large towns in urban India (Tables 7.1 and 7.2). Casual Labourers', Poor, SC and ST households in small and medium

Table 7.1 Basic Amenities by Size of Town, Social Group and Poor–Non-poor 2008–09
(in Percentage Points)

	ST	*SC*	*OBC*	*Others*	*Non-poor*	*Poor*	*Total*
No facility of drinking water							
Small towns	*38.95*	*48.57*	*33.21*	*20.31*	*25.68*	*46.77*	*31.46*
Medium towns	*32.48*	*35.25*	*24.25*	*15.70*	*17.23*	*43.56*	*22.49*
Large towns	*14.02*	*32.32*	*16.46*	*11.42*	*13.21*	*40.42*	*15.53*
Urban areas	*31.31*	*37.89*	*25.66*	*15.10*	*17.89*	*44.39*	*22.86*
No latrine facility							
Small towns	*30.15*	*50.53*	*27.51*	*13.47*	*17.53*	*49.57*	*26.39*
Medium towns	*27.26*	*26.52*	*17.69*	*7.07*	*9.40*	*36.18*	*14.75*
Large towns	*12.71*	*30.72*	*12.54*	*13.10*	*13.48*	*33.98*	*15.23*
Urban areas	*25.59*	*33.50*	*19.85*	*10.29*	*12.36*	*40.78*	*17.74*
No electricity use for domestic purposes							
Small towns	*7.30*	*13.22*	*7.39*	*3.59*	*3.37*	*16.41*	*6.99*
Medium towns	*11.80*	*6.74*	*3.68*	*1.90*	*1.76*	*11.12*	*3.63*
Large towns	*1.72*	*3.08*	*1.32*	*0.96*	*0.70*	*8.21*	*1.34*
Urban areas	*8.45*	*7.50*	*4.42*	*1.88*	*1.80*	*12.69*	*3.86*
Open, *katcha* and no drainage arrangement							
Small towns	*41.97*	*47.69*	*33.72*	*27.40*	*29.46*	*46.18*	*34.01*
Medium towns	*32.12*	*31.71*	*24.78*	*15.36*	*17.71*	*39.23*	*22.01*
Large towns	*7.60*	*12.92*	*5.87*	*3.13*	*3.63*	*22.29*	*5.23*
Urban areas	*30.99*	*31.31*	*24.16*	*13.36*	*16.13*	*39.78*	*20.60*

Source: Author's calculation using NSS, Household Amenities Unit Record Data, 2008–09.
Notes: ST = scheduled tribe; SC = scheduled caste; OBC = Other Backward Castes; Others = Other than ST, SC and OBC.

towns and cities were found to have very high levels of deprivation in access to basic amenities in 2008–09.

3.10 Determinants of Households Having Access to Basic Amenities in the House

Determinants of households having access to basic amenities in the house has been estimated with Probit model using household unit record data, NSS Housing Conditions round for 2008–09, to identify the factors that affect households' likelihood of having access to basic amenities in the house.

Table 7.2 Basic Amenities by Size of Town, Economic Groups-Livelihood Category and Religious Group 2008–09 *(in Percentage Points)*

	SE	*RWSA*	*CL*	*Others*	*Hindus*	*Muslims*	*ORMs*	*Total*
No facility of drinking water								
Small towns	*28.83*	*25.82*	*55.18*	*18.18*	*32.67*	*28.71*	*24.88*	*31.46*
Medium towns	*23.31*	*17.94*	*46.65*	*10.30*	*22.71*	*24.80*	*14.79*	*22.49*
Large towns	*15.65*	*13.58*	*38.41*	*4.63*	*15.19*	*21.96*	*7.57*	*15.53*
Urban areas	*22.89*	*18.08*	*48.19*	*11.02*	*23.13*	*25.23*	*15.56*	*22.86*
No latrine facility								
Small towns	*25.29*	*15.23*	*55.78*	*13.53*	*28.08*	*24.67*	*10.81*	*26.39*
Medium towns	*13.88*	*10.67*	*38.41*	*5.83*	*14.97*	*16.14*	*9.06*	*14.75*
Large towns	*14.60*	*14.08*	*37.25*	*3.67*	*14.83*	*19.17*	*13.15*	*15.23*
Urban areas	*17.05*	*12.71*	*44.18*	*7.19*	*18.06*	*19.18*	*10.50*	*17.74*
No electricity use for domestic purposes								
Small towns	*7.66*	*1.96*	*15.79*	*4.35*	*6.39*	*12.28*	*2.38*	*6.99*
Medium towns	*3.66*	*1.63*	*10.44*	*2.37*	*3.37*	*5.91*	*2.19*	*3.63*
Large towns	*1.59*	*0.90*	*4.27*	*0.14*	*1.29*	*2.29*	*0.17*	*1.34*
Urban areas	*4.21*	*1.45*	*11.24*	*2.40*	*3.54*	*6.84*	*1.74*	*3.86*
Open, *katcha* and no drainage arrangement								
Small towns	*31.56*	*29.15*	*53.19*	*25.37*	*34.71*	*32.08*	*32.09*	*34.01*
Medium towns	*21.75*	*16.82*	*44.64*	*15.23*	*21.45*	*24.87*	*23.44*	*22.01*
Large towns	*5.38*	*3.78*	*17.21*	*1.34*	*5.51*	*5.28*	*1.04*	*5.23*
Urban areas	*20.33*	*14.97*	*42.97*	*14.89*	*20.34*	*22.39*	*20.12*	*20.60*

Source: Author's calculation using NSS, Household Amenities unit record data for the respective years, Planning Commission and Ministry of Labour, Government of India.
Notes: SE = Self-employed; RWSA = Regular Wage/Salary Earner; CL = Casual Labour; ORM = Other Religious Minorities.

The dependent variable in the model are households having facility of drinking water in the house, households having latrine facility in the house, households having electricity to be used for domestic purposes and households having closed drainage arrangement in the house, and the explanatory variable are households' affiliation to various size classes of towns/cities, area type (slums and squatter settlements), MPCE quintile class categories, livelihood categories, social groups and religious groups (with one subcategory; for example, large towns/cities is a subcategory to size classes of town/cities, referred as the 'reference category' for each variable). The results (estimated marginal effects) of the econometric exercise that was carried out to examine the contribution of different factors to households' access to basic amenities in the house, in urban India, are reported in Table 8.

Table 8 Results of Maximum Likelihood Probit Model for Access to Basic Amenities in Urban India during 2008–09

	Households Having Facility of Drinking Water in the House	*Households Having Latrine Facility in the House*	*Households Having Electricity use for Domestic Purposes*	*Households Having Closed Drainage Arrangement in the House*
Dependent Variable	*dF/dx*	*dF/dx*	*dF/dx*	*dF/dx*
Various size class of towns				
Medium towns*	–0.051	0.008	–0.011	–0.227
Small towns*	–0.129	–0.041	–0.024	–0.387
Area type				
Slums and squatter settlements*	–0.283	–0.307	–0.016	–0.104
CEC MPCE quintile categories				
Quintile 1 (0–20)*	–0.366	–0.344	–0.151	–0.288
Quintile 2 (20–40)*	–0.281	–0.228	–0.077	–0.226
Quintile 3 (40–60)*	–0.190	–0.159	–0.054	–0.165
Quintile 4 (60–80)*	–0.138	–0.093	–0.021	–0.095
Livelihood categories				
Self-employed*	–0.019	–0.014	–0.016	–0.040
Casual labourers*	–0.144	–0.167	–0.047	–0.158
Others*	0.017	0.022	–0.026	–0.058
Social groups				
ST*	–0.163	–0.052	–0.036	–0.207
SC*	–0.129	–0.133	–0.028	–0.088
OBC*	–0.059	–0.057	–0.004	–0.065

Religious groups				
Hindus*	–0.078	–0.116	–0.026	0.028
Muslims*	–0.064	–0.123	–0.069	0.051
Number of observations	56,374	56,374	56,374	56,374
Pseudo R^2	0.1550	0.2212	0.1599	0.1524

Source: Estimated using unit record data from the NSS on Housing Conditions during 65th round (2008–09).

Notes: Reference categories: Various Size Class of Towns and Cities: Large Towns; Area Type: Non-slums and Squatter Settlements; MPCE: Quintile 5 (80–100); Household Types: Regular Wage/Salary Earners; Social groups: Others; Religious Groups: Other Religious Minorities.

Df/dx are marginal effects, that is, the change in probability of having a corresponding basic amenity in the house with a one-unit change in the right-side variable (discrete change of dummy variable from 0 to 1).

*implies the variable is dichotomous

The dprobit option from STATA has been used for estimation using vce(robust) command.

Significant marginal probabilities are in bold (at 1 per cent level of significance).

The results illustrate that households in small towns/cities followed by those in medium towns/cities have lesser probability of having access to basic amenities in the house, relative to large towns/cities' (reference category) households, controlling other factors. Households living in slums and squatter settlements have lesser probability of access to basic amenities than their counterparts. Across MPCE quintiles, as we move towards bottom quintiles, the probability of households having access to basic amenities in the house declines, relative to top quintile (reference category) households. The pattern across livelihood categories shows that Casual Labourers' households were found lagging with lesser probabilities of having access to basic amenities as compared to Self-employed, Others and Regular Wage/Salary Earners' households. The pattern across social groups suggests that ST and SC households were worse, with least probability of access to basic amenities, followed by OBCs relative to households belonging to Other social groups. Across religious groups, Muslim households, followed by Hindu households, were found to have lesser probabilities of access to basic amenities than that of the households belonging to Other Religious Minorities.

Hence, these results on the determinants of households having access to basic amenities in the house in urban India further support the findings discussed in the earlier sections.

4. Concluding Observations and Policy Implications

The significance of basic amenities in ensuring physical, psychological, social and economic security to people and recognizing the need for planned urbanization and development of existing urban areas have been underscored by several policy measures at national, sub-national and international levels in the past decades. However, in providing adequate amenities, there are challenges such as disparities among the size class of towns and cities, regional imbalances, exclusionary urbanization and empowerment of local bodies that still remain unaddressed and need to be tackled on a priority basis.

This article highlights the dire situations of access to basic amenities like drinking water, sanitation, electricity and drainage over recent decades in urban India and probes into the aspects of size classes of towns and cities, slums, and various socioeconomic categories.

There was an improvement observed in access to basic amenities in urban India in deprived households between 2001 and 2011 (by Census data) and between 1993 and 2008–09 (NSS data). In 2011, 28.8 per cent, 18.6 per cent, 7.3 per cent and 55.5 per cent of urban households did not have drinking

water, latrine facilities and electricity within their premises and closed drainage connectivity for a waste water outlet, respectively. However, there has been a marginal increase in the absolute number of households deprived of drinking water and latrine facility and closed drainage connectivity for a waste-water outlet and a decline in the number of households deprived of electricity in their premises between 2001 and 2011. The annual rate of decline for the deprivation was very high for electricity, followed by latrine facilities, drinking water and drainage arrangements in urban India.

Households in smaller towns and cities displayed the lowest annual rate of decline in deprivation in access to basic amenities, followed by medium towns and cities, as compared to larger towns and cities between 1993 and 2008–09 resulting in their high levels of deprivation in 2008–09. Households living in slums also reports higher deprivation in access to basic amenities during 2011.

Weaker sections, poor households (compared to non-poor households) and ST and SC households (compared to other households) also witnessed low annual rate of decline in deprivation in access to basic amenities, resulting in their high levels of deprivation in the concluding or the present scenario. Disparities in access to basic amenities were observed to have increased between the poor and non-poor households, between ST and SC households and between SC and other households.

Even for identical MPCE quintiles (poor and non-poor), ST and SC households were found to be lagging behind other households in their levels of deprivation and rates of improvement; furthermore, disparities in deprivation in access to basic amenities across social groups in every MPCE quintile class were seen to have increased. The results suggest that there are factors based on social backgrounds that act as constraints and lead to a denial of access to basic amenities.

Households located in slums and in small and medium towns and cities and those belonging to the poor (lower strata of CEC), SC, ST and wage labourers (casual labourers) were found lagging in access to basic amenities in the house in urban India. The results of the determinants of households with access to basic amenities in the house further support these findings.

Thus, findings suggest that access to basic amenities that are highly crucial to the well-being of the people and ensuring a better quality of life in urban India require immediate attention. For this, recent policies relating to the provision of basic amenities need to be strengthened. Furthermore, inclusive and socio-spatial perspectives on development need to be prioritized (as highlighted in the literature) so that the interests of the haves and the well-represented

do not overshadow those of the poor and weak who are at the risk of falling into further destitution. Also, households in slums and small and medium towns and cities require special attention for the provision of basic amenities. These need to be supplemented with targeted pro-poor and group-specific measures, to provide safeguards to the marginalized.

Annexure

A1 Indicators of Basic Amenities Used

The indicators of access to basic amenities used are deprivation measures including parameters for unavailability of *drinking water, sanitation, electricity and drainage arrangement*:

Census of India (Data on Houses, Housing Amenities and Assets), 2001 and 2011

1. ***Households not having availability of drinking water within the premise***: It refers to households having availability of drinking water *near the premises* and *away from the premises*.
2. ***Households not having latrine facility within the premise***: It refers to households having *public and open latrine use,* meaning no latrine facility within the premise.
3. ***Households not having electricity in the house (as a source of lighting in the house)***: It refers to households having *kerosene, other sources* of lighting in the house and *no electricity*.
4. ***Households not having closed drainage connectivity for waste-water outlet:*** It refers to households having *open drainage and no drainage* connectivity for waste-water outlet.

National Sample Survey Housing Conditions Round Data, 1993 and 2008–09

1. ***No facility of drinking water in the house:*** It refers to the community use of the drinking water facility by the households.
2. ***No latrine facility in the house:*** It refers to public or community use of latrine facilities, and non-availability of such facility in the house.
3. ***No electricity used for domestic purposes***.
4. ***Open katcha and no drainage arrangement:*** Here, underground and *pucca* arrangement for drainage are excluded.

References

Bhagat, R.B. (2013). Conditions of SC/ST households: A story of unequal improvement. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 67(41), 62–66.

Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (2013). *An uncertain glory: India and its contradictions*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.

Dubey, A., Gangopadhyay, S., & Wadhwa, W. (2001). Occupational structure and incidence of poverty in Indian towns of different sizes. *Review of Development Economics*, 5(1), 49–59.

Kumar, A. (2013). Access to basic amenities in urban India—An analysis across size class of towns/cities. *Urban India*, 33(2), 127–140.

———. (2014). Access to basic amenities: Aspects of caste, ethnicity and poverty in rural and urban India—1993 to 2008–2009. *Journal of Land and Rural Studies*, 2(1), 127–148.

———. (2015). Discrepancies in sanitation statistics of rural India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50(2), 13–15.

Kundu, A. (2006). *Trends and patterns of urbanisation and their economic implication* (India Infrastructure Report on Urban Infrastructure 2006 by Infrastructure Development Finance Company). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

———. (2011). Politics and economics of urban growth. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(20), 10–12.

———. (2014). Exclusionary growth, poverty and India's emerging urban structure. *Social Change*, 44(4), 541–566.

Kundu, D. (2014). Urban development programmes in India: A critique of the JNNURM, *Social Change*, 44(4), 615–632.

Kundu, A., Bagchi, S., & Kundu, D. (1999). Regional distribution of infrastructure and basic amenities in urban India: Issues concerning empowerment of local bodies. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34(28), 1893–1906.

Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation. (2010). *Guidelines for slum-free city planning. Rajiv Awas Yojana*. New Delhi: Govt. of India.

Planning Commission. (2011). *Faster, sustainable and more inclusive growth: An approach to the Twelfth Five Year Plan* (2012–17). New Delhi: India Offset Press.

Sen, A. (1999). The possibility of social change. *American Economic Review*, 89(3), 349–378.

Srinivasan, K., & Mohanty, S.K. (2004). Deprivation of basic amenities by caste and religion: Empirical study using NFHS data. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(7), 728–735.

Thorat, S., & Dubey, A. (2012). Has growth been socially inclusive during 1993–94–2009–10? *Economic and Political Weekly*, 57(10), 43–53.

Thorat, S., & Newman, K.S. (2007). Caste and economic discrimination: Causes, consequences and remedies. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 52(41).

Thorat, S., & Sabharwal, N.S. (2011). Social exclusion and commons. In *Vocabulary of Commons* (pp. 359–385). Bangalore, India: Foundation for Ecological Security, WQ Judge Press.

UN-Habitat. (2014). *The evolution of national urban policies: A global overview*. Nairobi, Kenya: UN-Habitat.