

## Disparities in Access to Basic Amenities across Caste, Ethnicity and Classes in Rural and Urban India

Arjun Kumar\*

### Abstract

*This paper examines the changes in access to basic amenities like drinking water, sanitation, electricity and drainage arrangement in Rural and Urban India using datasets from Census of India, 2001 and 2011 and National Sample Survey Housing Condition Round for 1993 and 2008/9; there is a special focus on disparities in access to basic amenities across caste and ethnic groups and consumption expenditure classes. With respect to all the indicators of basic amenities, an improvement in access by households was observed in proportion terms between 2001 and 2011 as per Census data and between 1993 and 2008/9 by NSS data, with acceleration during 2002 and 2008/9. However, Census data also showed an increase in the absolute number of deprived households in case of drinking water, latrine facility, and closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet in the premise in both Rural and Urban India. Results highlight the need to take immediate action towards providing the access to basic amenities, giving special attention to rural India and bringing in inclusive policy measures (to reduce the increasing disparities in access to basic amenities) taking care of weaker sections (socio-economic) of society to raise the overall standard of life and well-being of the people.*

---

\* Arjun Kumar (arjun40\_ssf@jnu.ac.in) is a Research Affiliate and Visiting Faculty with the Indian Institute of Dalit Studies (IIDS), New Delhi.

This paper is an abridged version of research studies undertaken by Indian Institute of Dalit Studies under the Think Tank Initiative Programme, International Development Research Centre.

The author would like to acknowledge Dr. Montek Singh Ahluwalia, Prof. Sukhdeo Thorat, Prof. Amitabh Kundu, Prof. P. M. Kulkarni, Prof. Amaresh Dubey, Dr. Himanshu and IIDS Research team for their helpful comments on earlier version of this paper.

Earlier versions of this paper were presented in International Conference on India's Development Strategy: Discourses on Past, Present and Future, 5-6 March, 2013, organized by Centre for Jawaharlal Nehru Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi and Annual Conference of Indian Association for Research in National Income & Wealth, 6-7 March, 2014, Mahatma Gandhi Labour Institute, Ahmedabad, and has benefitted substantially from the suggestions received.

The paper has benefitted substantially from constructive comments of an anonymous referee on the earlier draft of this paper.

## I. Introduction

Access to basic amenities like drinking water, sanitation, electricity, housing, drainage and others are crucial for the overall well-being of a household. India, like many other developing nations, has also suffered from wide-spread deprivation in access to basic amenities and services. Its importance for human development has been highlighted in the international arena ever since it was included in the Millennium Development Goals.

“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 (effecting capabilities besides income availability): (1) personal heterogeneities, (2) environmental diversities, (3) variations in social climate, (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 (related to these sources of variations). Axioms can indeed be proposed that attempt to capture our distributional concerns in this constructive exercise” (Sen, 1999).

Accepting such a broad perspective on the human development scenario, various policies and actions have positively stimulated improvements in housing conditions and amenities in India over the last few years, evidenced in terms of the type of dwelling structures, access to drinking water, sanitation, electricity and other amenities enjoyed by households. However, there is still a large proportion of households that fail to have basic amenities and adequate housing, especially in rural areas and including households belonging to Scheduled Tribes (STs), Scheduled Castes (SCs) and lower strata of consumption expenditure classes (Srinivasan and Mohanty, 2004; Mohanan and Chakraborty, 2008; Kumar, 2013; Dreze and Sen, 2013; Kumar, 2014a; Kumar, 2014b; Kumar, 2014c).

The disparities in delivery of basic amenities leading to a stunted growth of the nation indicate a preponderance of inequitable policies and administrative efforts, supplemented by a cavalier attitude and tolerance for market-led provisions of basic amenities. They also indicate that the government and para-statal institutions have not exhibited sensitivity towards backward states, small and medium towns and the poor (Kundu et al, 1999). Presently, privatisation, partnership arrangements and promotion of community-based projects have emerged as the only options for undertaking investments in basic amenities due to resource crunch in the government. This changed perspective and a consequent decline in public investment, however, is likely to accentuate the disparity in the levels of amenities across the size class of urban settlements (Kumar, 2013).

Studies have now recognised and echoed the need to promote the interest of economically and socially weaker sections in India. 'The insights from the experience of poverty and consumption expenditure changes during the periods 1994-2005 – 2005-10, particularly during the latter period...(also) imply that a broad-based pro-poor policy needs to be supplemented by group specific policy (social, religious and economic groups), and this must be made an integral part of the overall planning strategy' (Thorat and Dubey: 2012).

To gauge the magnitude of prevalent deprivation and disparities in the access to basic amenities this paper highlights the changes at an aggregate level, with further enquiry into disparities across social groups and economic groups (consumption expenditure classes).

## **II. Policies on Basic Amenities**

There have been several initiatives, plans and programmes in India to improve access to basic amenities. Since rural and urban areas have different sets of administrative arrangements and needs, separate plans and programmes are designed for them. Two important programs launched in the year 2005 by the Government of India that have contributed to development in rural and urban areas are the Bharat Nirman and the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JnNURM) respectively. There are also various other schemes functioning at the sub-national levels for the provision of various basic amenities.

Under Bharat Nirman, various schemes (for improving the access to basic amenities in rural areas with special provisions for poor, excluded and marginalised groups), such as rural housing (Indira Awaas Yojana), rural drinking water supply (National Rural Drinking Water Programme under Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission), Total Sanitation Campaign (which has been renamed Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan in May 2012 by the Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation), rural electrification (Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyutikaran Yojana) among others, are functioning. A landmark initiative was the launch of Provision of Urban Amenities to Rural Areas (PURA) in 2004.

The JnNURM aims at improving and augmenting the economic and social infrastructure of 65 select cities as well as providing affordable housing and Basic Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP) through planned development of the identified cities. The JnNURM caters to the non-mission towns and cities under the two components - 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 dovetailed into Rajiv Awas Yojana, which focuses on slum free India, in the 12th Plan.

All these policies have special provisions for the weaker and marginalised sections, but the efforts have lost momentum in some aspects, leading to the current disparities in access to basic services among rural and urban sector and different socio-economic sections of society. It has also been recognised by various official sources that one of the problems in the policies adopted is that the schemes are designed in New Delhi and states are asked to implement them in a top-down approach. This is not desirable, and has resulted in design flaws and implementation issues leading to sub-optimal performance.

The Twelfth Five Year Plan recognised the inclusive growth approach as the means to an end that would demand outcomes which yield benefits for all and particularly for the marginalised sections of society (Thorat and Dubey, 2012). “Inclusive growth should result in lower incidence of poverty, improvement in health outcomes, universal access to school education, increased access to higher education, including skill and education, better opportunities for both wage employment and livelihoods and improvement in provision of basic amenities like water, electricity, roads, sanitation and housing. Particular attention needs to be paid to the needs of the SC, ST and OBC population, women and children as also minorities and other excluded group” (Planning commission, 2011).

### III. Database and Methodology

Data for basic amenities for household level enquiry from two major sources— Census of India (Data on Houses, Housing Amenities and Assets, Hoselisting and Housing Census), 2001 and 2011 and National Sample Survey (NSS) Housing Conditions Rounds unit record data 1993 and 2008/9 have been used in this paper.

#### Indicators of Basic Amenities

For the analysis, we have selected, as deprivation measures, a few indicators which highlight households not having access to the corresponding basic amenities. The focus here is to include those indicators which significantly capture the unavailability and lack of access to the corresponding basic amenities.

##### *Census of India*

1. *Households not having availability of drinking water within the premises:* 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 premises.
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.

Changes in these indicators of basic amenities, during 2001–2011, for rural and urban areas, at an aggregate level and then by further disaggregation into Caste and Ethnic groups (Scheduled Tribe, Scheduled Caste and Other), have been analysed.

#### ***NSS Housing Conditions Rounds<sup>1</sup>:***

1. *No facility of drinking water in the house:* It refers to the community use - by all households - of the drinking water facility.
2. *No latrine facility in the house:* It refers to public or community use of latrine facilities, and non-availability of such facilities 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.

Changes in these indicators of basic amenities during 1993 and 2008/9 for rural and urban areas at an aggregate level, and then by further disaggregation into Caste and Ethnic groups, Consumption Expenditure Classes (CEC) (Poor – Non-Poor and Monthly Per Capita Expenditure Quintiles) and their interface have been analysed.

Disparities among various Caste and Ethnic groups for Census 2001–2011, and among Caste and Ethnic groups and Class (Poor – Non-Poor), and among Caste and Ethnic groups and Consumption expenditure classes for NSS 1993–2008/09 have been measured by Modified Sopher's Disparity Index (Modified Sopher's Disparity Index =  $\text{Log} (X_2/X_1) + \text{Log} [(200-X_1)/(200-X_2)]$ ), where,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are the respective percentages of value of variables (deprivation of basic amenities) for group 1 and 2. The ideal value for the Index for having no disparity is 0; higher value of the Index shows that the extent of disparity is higher, and vice-versa; a positive value suggest that the situations are in favour of group 1 (less deprived of basic amenities), and vice-versa). The changes in the index values, over time, have also been captured and analysed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data on the indicators was extracted and tabulated from NSS Household unit record data by applying the weights provided by the NSS. It should be noted here that the reference time is considered to be the mid-point of the NSS Housing Conditions surveys for arriving at the year differences between two surveys. 49th (January to June, 1993) round survey, NSS was completed in six months duration whereas the 65th (July, 2008 to June, 2009) Round was completed in a year. Overall Period 1993–2008/9 - 16 years.

#### **IV. Findings on Disparities in Access to Basic Amenities in Rural India: By Aggregate, Caste, Ethnicity and Class**

There was an improvement in access to basic amenities in rural India during 2001–2011 as indicated by Census data. The data show fall in percentages of deprived households—from 71.3% to 65% for drinking water, 78.1% to 69.3% for latrine facility, 56.5% to 44.7% for electricity and 96.09% to 94.2% for closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet in the premise (Table 1.1). The rate of decline (annual compounded) of the deprived households were 0.92%, 1.19%, 2.32% and 0.19% for drinking water, latrine facility, electricity and closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet in the premise respectively during 2001–2011. Similar improvements were also observed during 1993–2008/9 from NSS data (Table 3.1), with acceleration in the rate of decline during 2002–2008/9 (Kumar, 2014 a).

However, despite improvement in percentage terms of the households during 2001–2011 shown by the Census, there was an increase in the absolute number of deprived households in case of drinking water, latrine facility, and closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet in the premise, and decline in case of electricity in the premises. In 2011, rural households reported very high deprivation in the attainment of level of basic amenities.

Taking the changes of levels into consideration, it was found that special and immediate attention towards access of households to drinking water facility, sanitation facilities and drainage arrangement in the house is needed in rural areas.

Across caste and ethnic groups, ST and SC households lag behind Other in terms of levels and changes (rate of improvement) in access to basic amenities as per both Census and NSS data (Table 2.1 and Table 4.1.1 to 4.1.4). The disparities in the deprivation in access to basic amenities (as measured by Modified Sopher's Disparity Index) were also observed to be increasing between ST and SC households and between SC and Other households in rural India as suggested by the increasing values of the index from 2001 to 2011 as per Census and from 1993 to 2008/09 as per NSS.

Poor households were found to have very low annual rate of decline of deprivation in access to basic amenities as compared to non-poor households, from 1993 to 2008/9, resulting in their high levels of deprivation in 2008/9 (Table 3.1). Disparities in deprivation in access to basic amenities among Poor – Non-Poor were observed to have increased, as suggested by the increased values of the index from 1993 to 2008/9. Across CEC quintiles, as we move from top to bottom MPCE quintiles households, the non-availability of the amenities keeps on increasing and the rate of improvement keeps declining for all the amenities during 1993–2008/9 by NSS data. Households belonging to lower strata of the CEC (bottom MPCE quintiles) lag behind upper CEC (top MPCE quintiles) in terms of levels and changes (rate of improvement) in access to basic amenities. During 2002–2008/9, there was acceleration in the annual rate of change; contributing to improvement across all quintiles among drinking water and

sanitation, and for bottom three quintiles among electricity and drainage. (Kumar, 2014 a)

Across every CEC quintile, the STs and SCs lagged behind Other households in their levels and changes (rate of improvement) in access to basic amenities during 1993–2008/9 by NSS data, which indicates that even if same economic condition prevails there is variation in attainment by different caste and ethnic groups (Tables 4.1.1 to 4.1.4). As we move from bottom to top MPCE quintile classes, the rate of annual decline in deprivation of basic amenities improves among all the groups, with the same-as-in-aggregate pattern across caste and ethnic groups. The results suggest that disparities in deprivation in access to basic amenities exist across caste and ethnic groups in every quintile class category and these have increased during 1993–2008/9 among all the amenities.

Further, it was evident that policies are needed to focus immediately on high levels of unavailability of basic amenities such as drinking water, sanitation, electricity and drainage facilities in rural India, and also to address the severe inherent caste, ethnic and class disparities.

#### **V. Findings on Disparities in Access to Basic Amenities in Urban India: By Aggregate, Caste, Ethnicity and Class**

There was an improvement in access to basic amenities in urban India during 2001–2011 according to Census data, with a fall in percentage of deprived households — from 34.6% to 28.8% for drinking water, 26.3% to 18.6% for latrine facility, 12.4% to 7.3% for electricity, and 65.5% to 55.5% for closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet in the premises (Table 1.2). The rate of decline (annual compounded) of the deprived households was 1.82%, 3.4%, 5.16% and 1.64% for drinking water, latrine facility, electricity and closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet in the premise respectively, during 2001-2011. Similar improvements were also observed during 1993-2008/9 from NSS data (Table 3.2), with acceleration in the rate of decline during 2002-2008/9. (Kumar, 2013 and Kumar, 2014 a)

However, despite improvement in percentage terms of the households, during 2001–2011, by Census, there was an increase in the absolute number of deprived households in case of drinking water, latrine facility, and closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet in the premises, and decline in case of electricity in the premises. In 2011, urban households also reported deprivation in the attainment of level of basic amenities especially in drinking water facility, sanitation facilities and drainage arrangement (though, far better than in rural India).

Across caste and ethnic groups, ST and SC households lag behind Other in terms of levels and changes (rate of improvement) in access to basic amenities as per both Census and NSS data (Table 2.2 and Table 4.2.1 to 4.2.4). Also, the disparities in the deprivation in access to basic amenities were observed to be increasing between ST



and SC households and between SC and Other households in urban India as suggested by the increasing values of the index from 2001 to 2011 as per Census and from 1993–2008/09 as per NSS.

Poor households were found to have high levels of deprivation and very lower annual rate of decline for the deprivation in access to basic amenities as compared to Non-Poor households during 1993 to 2008/9 by NSS data, resulting in high levels of deprivation in 2008/9 (Table 3.2). Disparities in the deprivation in access to basic amenities among Poor - Non-Poor were observed to be substantially increasing as suggested from the values of the index which increased during 1993 and 2008/9. Across CEC quintiles, as we move from top to bottom MPCE quintiles households, the non-availability of the amenities keeps on increasing and the rate of improvement keeps declining for all the amenities, during 1993-2008/9, by NSS data (Tables 4.2.1 to 4.2.4). Households belonging to lower strata of the CEC (bottom MPCE quintiles) lag behind upper CEC (top MPCE quintiles) in terms of levels and changes (rate of improvement) in access to basic amenities. Disparities were found to be high across quintile classes in levels and annual rate of change. However, the overall endowment in urban areas is better than rural. During 2002-2008/9, there was acceleration in the annual rate of change; contributing to improvement for bottom three quintiles in all the indicators, while there was slowdown for top two quintiles after attaining higher levels of access to basic amenities. (Kumar, 2014 a)

Across every MPCE quintile, the STs and SCs lagged behind Other households in their levels and changes (rate of improvement) in access to basic amenities, during 1993–2008/9, by NSS data, which indicates that even if the same economic conditions prevail there is variation in attainment by different caste and ethnic groups (Tables 4.2.1 to 4.2.4). As we move from bottom to top MPCE quintile classes, the rate of annual decline in deprivation of basic amenities improves among all the groups, with the same-as-in-aggregate pattern across caste and ethnic groups. Results suggest that disparities in deprivation in access to basic amenities exist across caste and ethnic groups in every quintile class categories which have increased during 1993–2008/9 among all the amenities.

Urban areas witnessed improvement in the access to basic amenities (better than rural areas), but with rise in absolute number of deprived households.

## VI. Conclusions and Policy Implications

Access to basic amenities, ensuring well-being of people, is a cornerstone to the development efforts of a country. In India, as the results of this study imply, worrisome levels of deprivation prevail in access to basic amenities in rural and urban India, with rural households lagging much behind the urban households, especially in access to drinking water, sanitation and drainage facilities, as highlighted by Census and NSS data.



Both rural and urban households experienced improvement in access to all the basic amenities (with highest improvement in access to electricity within the premises) during the overall periods, as per both Census, 2001–2011 and NSS, 1993–2008/9, with an acceleration during 2002–2008/9. However, rates of improvement in rural areas were far lower than those in urban areas.

The findings of this paper suggest that special and immediate action towards access to drinking water facility, sanitation facilities and drainage arrangement is needed, with more focus on rural areas, addressing the systematic weaknesses of the top-down approach followed by the main policies.

Across socio-economic groups, households belonging to Scheduled Tribe, Scheduled Caste and lower strata of CEC (poor) were found lagging in their level of access and rate of improvement in access to basic amenities in both the areas. Even for identical CEC quintiles, the Scheduled Tribe and Scheduled Caste households lagged behind Otherhouseholds, which indicates that even if the same economic conditions prevail, there is variation in attainment by different caste and ethnic groups. To reduce the gap, the rate of change should be greater for those who are lagging behind, but the opposite picture was found in the case of basic amenities. Disparities in the deprivation in access to basic amenities were observed to be increasing between Poor– Non-Poor, between ST and SC households and between SC and Other households in both rural and urban India. Results suggest that disparities exist across caste and ethnic groups in every CEC quintile categories, which have increased between all the amenities during the last few decades.

The improvement can be attributed to various policies adopted by the government for rural and urban areas namely Bharat Nirman and JnNURM (as discussed earlier) which accentuated the rate of improvement and also focussed on the inclusion of weaker sections of society. Nonetheless, the existing levels of deprivation and disparities as discussed in this paper call for taking further steps which accelerate the pace of improvement in providing basic amenities to households for raising the overall standard of life and well-being. Additional and complementary policy measures such as incorporating focus on rural areas, pro-poor and group-specific (economic and social) targeted approach are required to tackle exclusion (also pointed out in the Inclusive Growth agenda in the Twelfth Five Year Plan) and to ensure safeguards towards equal access to services (as suggested by the World Bank (2013) and the United Nations (2013)).

## References

- Dreze Jean, Amartya Sen (2013) *An Uncertain Glory: India and Its Contradictions*, Penguin Books, New Delhi
- Kumar A (2013) “Access to Basic Amenities in Urban India – An Analysis across Size Class of Towns/Cities”, *Urban India*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 127-140, July – Dec 2013, National Institute of Urban Affairs

Kumar A (2014 a) "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*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 127-148

Kumar A (2014 b) "Devalaya and Shauchalaya: Addressing Socio-Economic Inclusions", *Journal of Studies in Dynamics and Change*, 80-87

Kumar A (2014 c) "Estimating Rural Housing Shortage", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XLIX No. 26-27, pp. 74-70, June 28, 2014

Kundu A, S Bagchi, Debolina Kundu (1999) "Regional Distribution of Infrastructure and Basic Amenities in Urban India: Issues Concerning Empowerment of Local Bodies", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXIV No. 28, July 10, 1999

Mohanan P C, S Chakraborty (2008) "Inter-state comparisons of housing conditions-a study based on NSS 58th round", *Sarvekshana*, Journal of National Sample Survey Organization, 94th issue, Volume XXVIII, No. 3&4, December 2008

Planning Commission (2011) "Faster, Sustainable and More Inclusive Growth: An Approach to the Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-17)", Planning Commission, Government of India

Sen Amartya (1999) "The Possibility of Social Change", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 89(3), Pages 349-378

Srinivasan K, S K Mohanty (2004) "Deprivation of Basic Amenities by Caste and Religion: Empirical Study Using NFHS Data", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXIX No. 07, February 14, 2004

Thorat S, A Dubey (2012) "Has Growth Been Socially Inclusive during 1993-94 – 2009-10?", *Economics and Political Weekly*, Vol. XLVII No. 10, March 10, 2012

United Nations (2013) "Inequality Matters: Report of the World Social Situation 2013", Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, New York

World Bank (2013) "Inclusion Matters: The Foundation for Shared Prosperity", New Frontiers of Social Policy, World Bank, Washington, D.C

## Tables:

**Table 1.1. Levels and Changes of Deprivation in Access to important Basic Amenities by the Household during 2001 and 2011 in Rural India, (Numbers are in Millions)**

	Levels		2001 – 2011 (Changes)		
	2011	2001	Numbers as (millions)	proportion of total households during 2001 (in %)	Annual compounded (in %)
<b>Number of Households (in millions)</b>	167.83	138.27			
			29.56		21.37
<b>Number of Households Not having Availability of Drinking Water within the premise (Near the premise and Away) (in millions)</b>	109.09	98.59	10.50		
<i>as proportion of total HHs (in %)</i>	65.00	71.30		10.65	-0.92
<b>Number of Households Not having Latrine Facility within the premise (Public and Open latrine use) (in millions)</b>	116.30	107.99	8.31		
<i>as proportion of total HHs (in %)</i>	69.30	78.10		7.70	-1.19
<b>Number of Households Not having Electricity in the house (Kerosene, Other sources and no lighting) (in millions)</b>	75.02	78.12	-3.10		
<i>as proportion of total HHs (in %)</i>	44.70	56.50		-3.97	-2.32
<b>Number of Households Not having Closed Drainage Connectivity for Waste Water Outlet (Open drainage and No drainage) (in millions)</b>	158.18	132.87	25.31		
<i>as proportion of total HHs (in %)</i>	94.25	96.09		19.05	-0.19

Note: Annual compounded growth rate is calculated based upon proportion of Households in 2011 over proportion of Households in 2001 of levels of deprivation. Source: Author's Calculation using Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets, House listing and Housing Data, Census of India, 2001 and 2011.

**Table 1.2. Levels and Changes of Deprivation in Access to important Basic Amenities by the Household during 2001 and 2011 in Urban India, Census (Numbers are in Millions)**

	Levels		2001 – 2011 (Changes)		
	2011	2001	Numbers as (millions)	proportion of total households during 2001 (in %)	Annual compounded (in %)
<b>Number of Households (in millions)</b>	78.9	53.7	25.2		
<i>in %</i>				46.9	
<b>Number of Households Not having Availability of Drinking Water within the premise (Near the premise and Away) (in millions)</b>	22.7	18.6	4.1		
<i>as proportion of total HHs (in %)</i>	28.8	34.6		22.3	-1.82
<b>Number of Households Not having Latrine Facility within the premise (Public and Open latrine use) (in millions)</b>	14.7	14.1	0.5		
<i>as proportion of total HHs (in %)</i>	18.6	26.3		3.9	-3.40
<b>Number of Households Not having Electricity in the house (Kerosene, Other sources and no lighting) (in millions)</b>	5.8	6.7	-0.9		
<i>as proportion of total HHs (in %)</i>	7.3	12.4		-13.5	-5.16
<b>Number of Households Not having Closed Drainage Connectivity for Waste Water Outlet (Open drainage and No drainage) (in millions)</b>	43.8	35.2	8.6		
<i>as proportion of total HHs (in %)</i>	55.5	65.5		24.4	-1.64

As in Table 1.1.

**Table 2.1. Deprivation of Few Important Basic Amenities in the House by Social Groups Households in Rural India, 2001 and 2011**

	ST	SC	Other	Total	Modified Disparity Sopher's Index (SC,ST) (SC,Other)	
<b>Households</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	20.1	32.9	114.8	167.8		
Share of households in %	12.0	19.6	68.4	100.0		
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	15.9	27.9	94.4	138.3		
Share of households in %	11.5	20.2	68.3	100.0		
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
decadal growth in %	26.8	17.8	21.5	21.4		
annual exponential in %	2.4	1.6	1.9	1.9		
<b>Households Not having Availability of Drinking Water within the premise</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	17.30	23.70	68.08	109.07		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	85.9	72.0	59.3	65.0	0.13	-0.13
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	14.21	22.09	62.27	98.57		
as proportion of total HHs (in %) 89.4	79.1	65.9	71.3		0.09	-0.12
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
Number (in million)	3.09	1.61	5.80	10.50	Changes in Index Value	0.03 0.00
decadal growth in %	21.7	7.3	9.3	10.7		
compounded annual in %	-0.4	-0.9	-1.1	-0.9		
<b>Households Not having Latrine Facility within the premise</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	16.96	25.40	73.89	116.25		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	84.2	77.2	64.4	69.3	0.06	-0.12
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	14.13	23.72	70.12	107.97		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	88.9	84.9	74.2	78.1	0.04	-0.10
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
Number (in million)	2.84	1.67	3.77	8.28	Changes in Index Value	0.03 -0.02
decadal growth in %	20.1	7.1	5.4	7.7		
compounded annual in %	-0.5	-1.0	-1.4	-1.2		
<b>Households Not having Electricity in the house</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	10.84	16.64	47.54	75.02		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	53.8	50.5	41.4	44.7	0.04	-0.11

	ST	SC	Other	Total		Modified Disparity Sopher's Index (SC,ST) (SC,Other)
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	11.1	18.1	48.9	78.1		
as proportion of total HHs (in %) 69.6	64.9	51.8	56.5	0.05		-0.14
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
Number (in million)	-0.22	-1.50	-1.35	-3.07	Changes in	-0.01 0.03
decadal growth in %	-2.0	-8.3	-2.8	-3.9	Index Value	
compounded annual in %	-2.5	-2.5	-2.2	-2.3		
<b>Households not having closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	19.80	31.73	106.66	158.18		
as proportion of total HHs (in %) 98.3	96.4	92.9	94.3			0.02 -0.03
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	15.66	27.28	89.93	132.87		
as proportion of total HHs (in %) 98.6	97.6	95.2	96.1			0.01 -0.02
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
Number (in million)	4.14	4.45	16.73	25.31	Changes in	
decadal growth in %	26.4	16.3	18.6	19.1	Index Value	0.01 -0.01
compounded annual in %	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2		

Note: ST- Scheduled Tribe, SC- Scheduled Caste, Other- Other than ST and SC.

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

**Table 2.2. Deprivation of Few Important Basic Amenities in the House by Social Groups in Urban India, 2001 and 2011**

	ST	SC	Other	Total	Modified Disparity Sopher's Index (SC,ST) (SC,Other)	
<b>Households</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	3.2	11.3	64.4	78.9		
Share of households in %	4.0	14.3	81.6	100.0		
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	2.3	7.8	43.6	53.7		
Share of households in %	4.3	14.5	81.1	100.0		
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
decadal growth in %	36.9	44.8	47.8	46.9		
annual exponential in %	3.1	3.7	3.9	3.8		
<b>Households Not having Availability of Drinking Water within the premise</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	1.43	4.86	16.40	22.70		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	44.9	43.0	25.5	28.8	0.02	-0.27
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	1.24	4.02	13.33	18.59		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	53.1	51.5	30.6	34.6	0.02	-0.28
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
Number (in million)	0.19	0.84	3.08	4.11	Changes in	0.01
decadal growth in %	15.7	20.9	23.1	22.1	Index Value	0.01
compounded annual in %	-1.7	-1.8	-1.8	-1.8		
<b>Households Not having Latrine Facility within the premise</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	1.08	3.85	9.77	14.70		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	34.0	34.1	15.2	18.6	0.00	-0.40
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	0.98	3.56	9.57	14.11		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	42.3	45.5	22.0	26.3	-0.04	-0.38
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
Number (in million)	0.10	0.30	0.20	0.59	Changes in	0.04
decadal growth in %	10.2	8.3	2.0	4.2	Index Value	-0.02
compounded annual in %	-2.1	-2.9	-3.6	-3.4		
<b>Households Not having Electricity in the house</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	0.43	1.48	3.86	5.78		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	13.5	13.1	6.0	7.3	0.01	-0.36



	ST	SC	Other	Total		Modified Disparity Sopher's Index (SC,ST) (SC,Other)
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	0.5	1.8	4.4	6.7		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	21.9	22.6	10.1	12.4		-0.02 -0.38
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
Number (in million)	-0.08	-0.28	-0.53	-0.89	Changes in	0.03 0.02
decadal growth in %	-15.3	-15.8	-12.1	-13.3	Index Value	
compounded annual in %	-4.7	-5.3	-5.1	-5.1		
<b>Households not having closed drainage connectivity for waste water outlet</b>						
<b>2011</b>						
Number (in million)	2.11	7.48	34.18	43.77		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	66.1	66.2	53.1	55.5		0.00 -0.14
<b>2001</b>						
Number (in million)	1.73	5.95	27.49	35.17		
as proportion of total HHs (in %)	74.4	76.2	63.1	65.5		-0.02 -0.13
<b>2001 - 2011 (Changes)</b>						
Number (in million)	0.37	1.53	6.69	8.60	Changes in	0.02 -0.01
decadal growth in %	21.6	25.8	24.3	24.4	Index Value	
compounded annual in %	-1.2	-1.4	-1.7	-1.6		

As in Table 2.1.

**Table 3.1. Changes in Levels of Deprivation of few important Basic Amenities by Poor–Non-Poor Households in Rural India, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

	Non-Poor	Poor	Total	Modified Sopher's Disparity Index (Poor, Non-Poor)	
<b>No Facility of Drinking Water in the House</b>					
Levels in 1993	69.83	78.00	73.48		-0.08
Levels in 2008-09	52.17	68.98	56.90		-0.17
Changes during 1993-2008-09 (annual compounded)	-1.83	-0.78	-1.61	Changes in Index Value	-0.10
<b>No Latrine Facility in the House</b>					
Levels in 1993	84.01	91.65	87.83		-0.07
Levels in 2008-09	59.83	83.80	66.46		-0.23
Changes during 1993-2008-09 (annual compounded)	-2.13	-0.57	-1.75	Changes in Index Value	-0.16
<b>No Electricity Use for domestic Purposes</b>					
Levels in 1993	56.71	71.08	63.04		-0.14
Levels in 2008-09	27.57	50.93	33.99		-0.33
Changes during 1993-2008-09 (annual compounded)	-4.48	-2.09	-3.85	Changes in Index Value	-0.19
<b>Open, Katcha and No Drainage Arrangement in the House</b>					
Levels in 1993	88.39	92.67	90.43		-0.04
Levels in 2008-09	72.09	84.03	75.32		-0.11
Changes during 1993-2008-09 (annual compounded)	-1.29	-0.62	-1.15	Changes in Index Value	-0.07

Note: Poverty line has been calculated based on old official poverty line method used by Planning commission. Poverty line has been updated from 1993 and 2004-5 poverty estimates of Planning Commission using Consumer Price Index for Agricultural Labourers (Base year 1986-7 = 100) for rural areas and using Consumer Price Index of Industrial Workers (Base year 1982 = 100) for urban areas. Source: Author's Calculation using National Sample Survey, Housing Conditions Round unit record data for the respective years, Planning Commission and Ministry of Labour, GOI.

**Table 3.2. Changes in Levels of Deprivation of few important Basic Amenities in Urban Areas by Poor – Non-Poor, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

	Non Poor	Poor	Total	Modified Sopher's Disparity Index (Poor, Non Poor)
<b>No Facility of Drinking Water in the House</b>				
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 1993-2008-09 (annual compounded)	-3.70	-0.87	-3.37	Changes in Index Value -0.22
<b>No Latrine Facility in the House</b>				
Levels in 1993	30.17	47.83	36.52	-0.25
Levels in 2008-09	12.36	40.78	17.74	-0.59
Changes during 1993-2008-09 (annual compounded)	-5.51	-1.01	-4.48	Changes in Index Value -0.34
<b>No Electricity Use for domestic Purposes</b>				
Levels in 1993	13.11	27.49	18.36	-0.36
Levels in 2008-09	1.80	12.69	3.86	-0.87
Changes during 1993-2008-09 (annual compounded)	-11.85	-4.79	-9.43	Changes in Index Value -0.52
<b>Open, Katcha and No Drainage Arrangement in the House</b>				
Levels in 1993	32.30	50.14	38.73	-0.24
Levels in 2008-09	16.13	39.78	20.60	-0.45
Changes during 1993-2008-09 (annual compounded)	-4.31	-1.46	-3.93	Changes in Index Value -0.21

As in Table 3.1.

**Table 4.1.1. Changes in Levels of No Facility of Drinking Water in the House by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories Households in Rural India, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

CEC	ST	SC	Others	All	Modified Sopher's (SC, ST)	Disparity Index (SC, Others)
<b>Levels in 1993</b>					<b>1993</b>	
0-20	87.62	81.32	75.83	79.10	0.06	-0.05
20-40	83.79	78.73	73.15	75.71	0.05	-0.05
40-60	83.29	74.45	72.32	73.79	0.08	-0.02
60-80	81.86	76.23	66.05	69.40	0.05	-0.10
80-100	82.59	68.02	58.92	61.64	0.14	-0.09
Total	84.66	77.89	69.84	73.25	0.06	-0.08
<b>Levels in 2008-09</b>					<b>2008-09</b>	
0-20	84.94	74.98	62.38	70.02	0.09	-0.12
20-40	79.28	72.16	56.90	63.52	0.07	-0.15
40-60	75.09	68.27	52.50	58.42	0.06	-0.16
60-80	71.34	60.51	47.53	52.30	0.11	-0.14
80-100	60.35	53.42	32.90	37.64	0.07	-0.27
Total	77.26	67.83	49.58	56.82	0.09	-0.19
<b>Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded</b>					<b>Changes in Index Value</b>	
0-20	-0.20	-0.51	-1.23	-0.77	0.03	-0.07
20-40	-0.35	-0.55	-1.58	-1.11	0.02	-0.10
40-60	-0.66	-0.55	-2.01	-1.47	-0.02	-0.14
60-80	-0.87	-1.46	-2.07	-1.78	0.06	-0.05
80-100	-1.97	-1.52	-3.63	-3.08	-0.06	-0.18
Total	-0.58	-0.87	-2.15	-1.60	0.03	-0.12

Note: ST- Scheduled Tribe, SC- Scheduled Caste, Others- Forward Castes and also Other Backward Castes. MPCE- Monthly Per Capita Expenditure. Consumption Expenditure Classes (CEC) (Quintiles) is in percentages. Annual compounded growth rate is calculated based on the percentage of levels of un-attainment in respective years. Source: Author's Calculation using National Sample Survey, Household Conditions Rounds, unit record data for the respective years.

**Table 4.1.2. Changes in Levels of No Latrine Facility in the House by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories Households in Rural India, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

CEC	ST	SC	Others	All	Modified Sopher's (SC, ST)	Disparity Index (SC, Others)
<b>Levels in 1993</b>					<b>1993</b>	
0-20	94.65	93.63	90.99	92.26	0.01	-0.02
20-40	91.73	92.03	88.68	89.82	0.00	-0.03
40-60	88.32	90.13	86.93	87.73	-0.02	-0.03
60-80	87.31	88.92	83.18	84.62	-0.01	-0.05
80-100	80.79	82.47	73.57	75.20	-0.02	-0.08
Total	90.83	91.09	85.37	87.24	0.00	-0.05
<b>Levels in 2008-09</b>					<b>2008-09</b>	
0-20	91.07	89.12	80.09	84.63	0.02	-0.08
20-40	79.14	82.79	73.93	76.85	-0.03	-0.08
40-60	71.36	76.62	65.78	68.86	-0.05	-0.10
60-80	66.07	70.97	56.40	60.19	-0.05	-0.15
80-100	47.82	52.17	35.05	38.38	-0.05	-0.22
Total	76.52	77.43	60.92	66.41	-0.01	-0.16
<b>Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded</b>					<b>Changes in Index Value</b>	
0-20-0.24	-0.31	-0.81	-0.55		0.01	-0.06
20-40	-0.93	-0.67	-1.15	-0.99	-0.03	-0.05
40-60	-1.34	-1.03	-1.75	-1.53	-0.03	-0.07
60-80	-1.75	-1.42	-2.44	-2.14	-0.03	-0.10
80-100	-3.27	-2.87	-4.60	-4.18	-0.04	-0.14
Total	-1.08	-1.03	-2.12	-1.72	-0.01	-0.11

As in Table 4.1.1.

**Table 4.1.3. Changes in Levels of No Electricity Use for domestic Purposes by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories Households in Rural India, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

CEC	ST	SC	Others	All	Modified Sopher's (SC, ST)	Disparity Index (SC, Others)
<b>Levels in 1993</b>					<b>1993</b>	
0-20	74.83	73.35	71.46	72.48	0.01	-0.02
20-40	71.26	70.58	64.88	66.97	0.01	-0.06
40-60	74.31	63.95	62.01	63.56	0.10	-0.02
60-80	60.83	59.41	55.01	56.36	0.01	-0.05
80-100	56.56	50.68	41.37	43.57	0.07	-0.11
Total	69.86	67.42	60.11	62.80	0.02	-0.07
<b>Levels in 2008-09</b>					<b>2008-09</b>	
0-20	52.76	56.05	49.95	52.20	-0.04	-0.07
20-40	43.18	45.02	41.55	42.64	-0.02	-0.04
40-60	37.83	36.73	31.12	33.09	0.02	-0.09
60-80	37.75	29.72	22.67	25.46	0.12	-0.14
80-100	24.14	19.44	11.51	13.46	0.11	-0.25
Total	42.67	40.54	30.21	33.95	0.03	-0.15
<b>Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded</b>					<b>Changes in Index Value</b>	
0-20	-2.19	-1.69	-2.25	-2.06	-0.05	-0.05
20-40	-3.13	-2.81	-2.79	-2.83	-0.03	0.01
40-60	-4.20	-3.46	-4.28	-4.06	-0.08	-0.07
60-80	-2.98	-4.30	-5.47	-4.92	0.11	-0.09
80-100	-5.26	-5.90	-7.80	-7.19	0.04	-0.13
Total	-3.08	-3.18	-4.27	-3.83	0.00	-0.08

As in Table 4.1.1.

**Table 4.1.4. Changes in Levels of Open, Katcha and No Drainage Arrangement in the House by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories Households in Rural India, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

CEC	ST	SC	Others	All	Modified Sopher's (SC, ST)	Disparity Index (SC, Others)
<b>Levels in 1993</b>					<b>1993</b>	
0-20	95.63	93.35	93.34	93.68	0.02	0.00
20-40	95.53	92.98	89.04	90.73	0.02	-0.03
40-60	95.46	91.80	89.78	90.73	0.03	-0.02
60-80	94.57	91.58	87.91	89.21	0.03	-0.03
80-100	93.48	83.08	82.68	83.44	0.09	0.00
Total	95.23	91.96	88.81	90.21	0.03	-0.03
<b>Levels in 2008-09</b>					<b>2008-09</b>	
0-20	93.75	85.21	81.69	84.85	0.08	-0.03
20-40	86.95	80.74	78.23	79.92	0.06	-0.02
40-60	89.29	79.98	73.86	76.82	0.08	-0.06
60-80	89.59	75.09	68.47	71.72	0.13	-0.06
80-100	77.37	68.89	59.60	62.07	0.08	-0.09
Total	89.09	79.35	71.71	75.39	0.09	-0.07
<b>Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded</b>					<b>Changes in Index Value</b>	
0-20	-0.13	-0.58	-0.84	-0.63	0.06	-0.03
20-40	-0.60	-0.89	-0.82	-0.80	0.03	0.01
40-60	-0.42	-0.87	-1.23	-1.05	0.05	-0.04
60-80	-0.34	-1.25	-1.57	-1.38	0.10	-0.03
80-100	-1.19	-1.18	-2.06	-1.86	-0.01	-0.09
Total	-0.42	-0.93	-1.35	-1.13	0.06	-0.04

As in Table 4.1.1.



**Table 4.2.1. Changes in Levels of No Facility of Drinking Water in the House by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories Households in Urban Areas, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

ST CEC	SC	Others	All		Modified Sopher's (SC, ST)	Disparity Index (SC, Others)
<b>Levels in 1993</b>				<b>1993</b>		
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
<b>Levels in 2008-09</b>				<b>2008-09</b>		
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
<b>Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded</b>				<b>Changes in Index Value</b>		
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

As in Table 4.1.1.

**Table 4.2.2. Changes in Levels of No Latrine Facility in the House by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories Households in Urban Areas, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

ST CEC	SC	Others	All		Modified Sopher's (SC, ST)	Disparity Index (SC, Others)
<b>Levels in 1993</b>				<b>1993</b>		
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
<b>Levels in 2008-09</b>				<b>2008-09</b>		
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
<b>Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded</b>				<b>Changes in Index Value</b>		
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

As in Table 4.1.1.

**Table 4.2.3. Changes in Levels of No Electricity Use for domestic Purposes by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories Households in Urban Areas, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

ST CEC	SC	Others	All		Modified Sopher's (SC, ST)	Disparity Index (SC, Others)
<b>Levels in 1993</b>				<b>1993</b>		
0-20	41.80	39.81	27.44	30.92	0.03	-0.19
20-40	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
<b>Levels in 2008-09</b>				<b>2008-09</b>		
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
<b>Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded</b>				<b>Changes in Index Value</b>		
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

As in Table 4.1.1.

**Table 4.2.4. Changes in Levels of Open, Katcha and No Drainage Arrangement in the House by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories Households in Urban Areas, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)**

ST CEC	SC	Others	All		Modified Sopher's (SC, ST)	Disparity Index (SC, Others)
<b>Levels in 1993</b>				<b>1993</b>		
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
<b>Levels in 2008-09</b>				<b>2008-09</b>		
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
<b>Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded</b>				<b>Changes in Index Value</b>		
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

As in Table 4.1.1.