



## A STUDY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX OF MAHARASHTRA

**Ravi .S.Ahuja<sup>1</sup>, Ph.D & Ravindra K. Nalawade<sup>2</sup>, Ph.D**

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Skill Development Centre, Savitribai Phule Pune University  
(Formerly University of Pune), Pune 411007

<sup>2</sup>Planning & Development, Savitribai Phule Pune University, (Formerly University of Pune),  
Pune 411007

### **Abstract**

*Human development an integral part of economic development is fastly catching of various stakeholders around the world. It is also about people's active engagement in shaping development, equity and sustainability, intrinsic aspects of freedom of people have to lead lives they have reason to value. Human development index is a tool devised by United Nations for ranking countries for measuring levels of social and economic development measuring life expectancy, education, literacy and standard of living. This paper attempts to explore the HDI score for one of most economically progressive state in India, Maharashtra.*

**Key Words:** Human development in Maharashtra, HDI, Economic Development



[Scholarly Research Journal's](http://www.srjis.com) is licensed Based on a work at [www.srjis.com](http://www.srjis.com)

### **Introduction**

Maharashtra, one of the most progressive states in India with around 45% of its total population residing in urban areas has shown impressive progress in various economic growth parameters post reforms. However parameters of economic development need further investigation which reflects the economic growth and improved social conditions of people residing in the state of Maharashtra. Human Development Index in one of such parameter based on four pillars (i.e. Literacy rate, Gross Enrollment Ratio, Infant Mortality Rate and Per Capita District Domestic Product).

## **Human Development**

Human development is a well being concept. It involves studies of human condition with its core being the capability approach.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) estimates the human development in various member countries and publishes the Human Development Index report in terms of three basic parameters:

1. To live a long and healthy life.
2. To be educated and knowledgeable.
3. To enjoy a decent economic standard of living.

According to Human Development Report (HDR) recently published for the year 2013. India with a Human Development Index (HDI), with a score of 0.554 in 2012 has slipped down to 136 in global ranking (amongst 186 countries for whom reports are published) against its rank of 134 in the year 2012. The existing gap in various social indicators of India with comparison to developed and various developing countries highlights the needs of wide spread of social welfare among the masses. Life expectancy at birth in India was 65.8 years in 2012, compared to 81.3 years in Norway, 78.7 years in United States, 73.8 years in Brazil, 75.1 years in Sri Lanka, 73.7 years in China and the global average of 70.1 years.

The performance of India in terms of mean years of schooling is 4.4 years is much more below than countries like China (7.5 years), Brazil (7.2 years), Sri Lanka (9.3 years), Egypt (6.4 years), but also below that of Bangladesh (4.8 years) and Pakistan (4.9 years).

## **Review of Literature**

### **Human Development**

Human development is an integral part of economic development. Growth merely in numbers of national income doesn't reflect the correct scenario. Human development is not just the "end product of growth but it is an input as well and a key ingredient in the development process"(Boozer et.al 2003). "Human Development is not only about health, education and income – it is also about people's active engagement in shaping development, equity and sustainability, intrinsic aspects of freedom of people have to lead lives they have reason to value. There are fewer consensuses about what progress on these fronts entails and measures are also lacking. But lack of quantification is no reason to neglect or ignore them"<sup>1</sup> UNDP (2010) Human Development Index (HDI) is a comprehensive tool devised by the United Nations for measuring the levels of social and economic developments of the different countries and ranking them accordingly. It is a comparative measure of life

expectancy, education, literacy and standard of living. It was developed and launched by Pakistani economist Mahbub-ul-Haq, followed by Amartya Sen, an Indian economist, in 1990.<sup>2</sup> The global Human development report (2010) published by UNDP stresses the need for human development to be, *first*, sustainable; *second*, equitable and *third*, empowering, such that it enables individuals to exercise their choices and helps them to participate in processes at the household, community and national levels. It also emphasizes the need to look at human development as an evolving concept and not as a fixed or static dictum. The global HDR 2010 points to the fact that progress in health and education alone can also drive improvements in human development. **“Human development is different from economic growth and substantial achievements are possible even without fast growth”** (UNDP 2010).<sup>3</sup> The conceptual and practical relevance of human development has been acknowledged by the development economics. New ideas were facilitated post publication of annual Human Development Reports (HDRS) in 90s by the United Nations Development Programme. Human development comes to be accepted as enhancement of capabilities, widening of choices and expansion of freedom.<sup>4</sup> The social sector improvement is the prime task of government in all the countries. Social sector expenditure by government on various schemes and programmes has been continued over the years. The central governments expenditure on social services as a percentage of total expenditure on social services as a percentage of total expenditure fell from 12.61 percent in 2010-11 to 11.43 percent and 11.93 percent in 2011-12 and 2012-13 (revised estimate), it was picked up to 12.83 percent in 2013-14 (budgetary estimate). HDR measures inequality in terms of two indicators the first is the income Gini coefficient which measures the deviation of distribution of income (or consumption) from a perfectly equal distribution among the individuals in the country. For India the Gini coefficient was 33.4 during 2011-12 indicating lower inequality in the country compared to other countries South Africa(63.1), Brazil(54.7), Malaysia(46.2), China(42.5) etc. Inequality in India has shown a declining trend from the figures of 36.8 in 2010-11 to 33.4 in 2011-12. The second indicator of quintile income ratio, which is a ratio of the average income of the richest 20 percent of the population to that of poorest 20 percent. The ratio for India stood at 4.9 in 2011-12 for other countries like United States it was 8.4, Switzerland - 5.5, Brazil - 20.6, China - 9.6 which implies that inequality in India is less compared to other countries.

## **Interstate analysis of states of India**

### **1. Population**

Kerala is the best performing state in terms of two indicators - Decadal growth of population (4.9 percent) and Sex Ratio (1084). Andhra Pradesh ranks second in population growth and third in sex ratio. Bihar has highest decadal growth of population (25.4) and Haryana has the lowest sex ratio of 879.

### **2. Growth**

Bihar is the best performing state in terms of growth rate of gross state domestic product at 15.1 percent growth from 2012-13 to 2013-14, and per capita growth of 9.9 percent during the same period. However Maharashtra and Haryana Tops in terms of absolute values of gross state domestic product. However Tamil Nadu has lowest growth in gross state domestic product and Rajasthan has lowest per capita income in 2012-13.

### **3. Poverty**

Poverty estimates indicate that Bihar which had the second highest poverty headcount ratio (HCR) in 2004-05 moved to first place in 2011-12 with the HCR at 33.7 per cent relegating Odisha to second place. While the all India poverty HCR was 21.9 per cent, states like Madhya Pradesh, Assam, and Uttar Pradesh, besides Bihar and Odisha had above all India poverty levels in 2011-12. However, in terms of rural poverty, both Odisha and Madhya Pradesh were at the top followed by Bihar and Assam. Kerala had the lowest poverty (7.1 per cent) followed by Himachal Pradesh (8.1 per cent) and Punjab (8.3 per cent).

### **4. Rural-Urban Disparity**

Odisha followed by Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, and Uttar Pradesh had the lowest MPCE (Monthly per capita expenditure) in rural areas and Bihar followed by Odisha, Uttar Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh the lowest MPCE in urban areas in 2011-12. The highest MPCE could be seen in Kerala and Haryana in rural and urban areas respectively with least expenditure on food share in Kerala compared to other states. MPCE for rural areas stood at Rs. 816 and Rs. 1000 for urban areas in 2011-12.

### **5. Health**

Infant mortality rate (IMR) in 2012 was the lowest in Kerala (12) and highest in Madhya Pradesh (56) followed by Assam (55), Odisha, and Uttar Pradesh (53 each) against a national IMR of 42. Birth rate was also lowest in Kerala (14.9) and highest in Bihar (27.7) against a national average of 21.6. Death rate was lowest in Maharashtra and West Bengal (6.3) and highest in Odisha (8.5) against a national average of 7.0.<sup>5</sup>

## **6. Education**

Madhya Pradesh (135.2) followed by Bihar (127.7) had the highest GER (Gross Enrollment Ratio) in the age group 6-10 years during 2010-11 while Punjab (84.3) had the lowest. GER in the age group 11-13 years was highest in Himachal Pradesh (113.8) followed by Tamil Nadu (112.3) and lowest in Bihar (64.6) followed by Assam (67.9). The relatively lower 11-13 years GER compared to 6-10 years GER indicates that the transition of students from primary to upper primary classes is relatively lower than the entry to primary classes. Pupil-teacher ratios at all India levels of education -primary, middle, and high schools - are very high in states like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar affecting the quality of education.

**Research Methodology:** The study is descriptive in nature. The first hand data is collected from various secondary sources. Data is culled from Economic Survey's of Maharashtra for several years for data on per capita district domestic product, Census of India reports for Literacy rate and infant mortality rates and Human development reports published by UNDP, World Bank, Indian government and Government of Maharashtra.

**Human Development Reports for Maharashtra:** Maharashtra published its first Human development report in 2002; it highlighted the socio-economic conditions of various parts of Maharashtra and need for policy measures to tackle the problems of poverty, education, health, nutrition etc. Maharashtra has been the state with high levels of growth in terms of per capita income and state domestic product; however this growth has been not inclusive. It is mostly urban-centric and with non-agriculture development with higher regional disparities. The high levels of per capita income have failed to report high level of human development index for the state. Human development index for the state of Maharashtra was reported as 0.580; however there are wide disparities in district HDI reported. Very few districts showed good improvement in literacy levels from 1991-2001 figures, districts of Vidharba region (except Nagpur) lagged behind in health achievements as captured by IMR.<sup>6</sup>

The second report on human development in the state was published in 2014 highlighting the progress of Maharashtra in terms of Human development. The following table highlights the various district level human development index scores.

**Table 1: HDI for Districts in Maharashtra**

HDI			HDI		
Districts	2001	2011	Districts	2001	2011
Ahmednagar	0.626	0.72	Nagpur	0.691	0.786
Akola	0.631	0.722	Nanded	0.558	0.657
Amravati	0.633	0.701	Nandurbar	0.513	0.604
Aurangabad	0.65	0.727	Nashik	0.652	0.746
Bhandara	0.623	0.718	Osmanabad	0.588	0.649
Beed	0.606	0.678	Parbhani	0.578	0.683
Buldhana	0.567	0.684	Pune	0.722	0.814
Chandrapur	0.637	0.718	Raigarh	0.717	0.759
Dhule	0.579	0.671	Ratnagiri	0.629	0.732
Gadchiroli	0.538	0.608	Sangli	0.67	0.742
Gondiya	0.617	0.701	Satara	0.661	0.742
Hingoli	0.561	0.648	Sindhudurg	0.667	0.753
Jalgaon	0.624	0.723	Solapur	0.624	0.728
Jalna	0.554	0.663	Thane	0.721	0.8
Kolhapur	0.678	0.77	Wardha	0.634	0.723
Latur	0.595	0.663	Washim	0.554	0.646
Mumbai	0.756	0.841	Yavatmal	0.592	0.7
<b>Maharashtra</b>			<b>0.666 0.752</b>		

Source: Maharashtra Human Development Report, 2012, pp 14

**Table 2: District Wise Human development Indicators: 2001 and 2011**

	Total Literacy Rate		GER		IMR		Per Capita DDP	
	2001	2011	2001	2011-12	2001	2007-08	2000-01	2008-09
<b>Maharashtra</b>	<b>76.88</b>	<b>82.91</b>	<b>72.8</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>21892</b>	<b>35033</b>
Ahmednagar	75.3	80.22	71.8	87.9	44	41	16311	27392
Akola	81.42	87.55	67	85.6	44	28	15822	24055
Amravati	82.54	88.23	69.7	86	61	59	16211	21804
Aurangabad	72.91	80.4	80.1	82.2	51	44	19539	30690
Bhandara	78.47	85.14	71	89.3	68	60	16110	25735
Beed	67.99	73.53	82.2	90.4	43	33	14398	21013
Buldhana	75.78	82.09	65.4	87.6	49	34	10729	19487
Chandrapur	73.17	81.35	73.6	88.9	67	74	19408	28730
Dhule	71.65	74.61	64.2	83.7	56	44	13166	21442
Gadchiroli	60.1	70.55	69.1	80.7	75	63	11745	14913
Gondiya	78.52	85.41	73.8	87.2	73	67	15211	23091
Hingoli	66.25	76.04	76.4	78.7	54	50	11203	18286
Jalgaon	75.43	79.73	69.7	88.2	50	48	16580	28939
Jalna	64.42	73.61	71.9	83.7	56	48	11458	20565

Kolhapur	76.93	82.9	75.4	88.4	38	13	23052	36178
Latur	71.54	79.03	89.4	91.1	50	53	11811	17674
Mumbai	86.4	88.48	74.4	85.5	40	18	36883	58818
Nagpur	84.03	89.52	76.5	92.6	54	40	23323	37995
Nanded	67.77	76.94	73	80.3	57	30	11022	18155
Nandurbar	55.78	63.04	55.8	67.7	61	75	11248	19156
Nashik	74.36	80.96	66.6	82.2	51	46	21927	35545
Osmanabad	69.02	76.33	75.7	81.9	47	50	13011	17847
Parbhani	66.07	75.22	74.8	86.3	50	51	12934	23146
Pune	80.45	87.19	71.3	88.2	32	28	31624	50158
Raigarh	77.03	83.89	72.7	88.9	42	35	32651	34377
Ratnagiri	75.05	82.43	72.4	89	37	25	16388	27685
Sangli	76.62	82.62	76.2	87.9	32	33	21147	30713
Satara	78.22	84.2	73.5	85.7	32	27	19610	29916
Sindhudurg	80.3	86.54	74.6	87.5	35	35	19794	31563
Solapur	71.25	77.72	74.1	89.5	43	23	16891	28828
Thane	80.66	86.18	73.7	78.5	39	34	31061	50408
Wardha	80.06	87.22	67.3	87.9	51	62	16955	26130
Washim	73.36	81.7	66.3	88	52	46	10152	14885
Yavatmal	73.62	80.7	70.3	84.9	61	47	13562	24118

Source: Maharashtra Human Development Report 2012, pp 12

Note: GER: Gross Enrollment Ratio, IMR: Infant Mortality Rate, DDP: District Domestic Product

The findings from above two tables are

1. Human development in Maharashtra has improved from 2001 to 2011 from 0.666 to 0.752.
2. The disparities among the various districts persist.
3. Progress in districts in with lower HDI values in 2001 have shown greater improvements than with higher HDI value in 2001.
4. The districts of Nandurbar, Gadchiroli, Jalna, Hingoli and Washim shows greater improvement in HDI values than Pune, Mumbai, Thane and Kolhapur.
5. Nandurbar and Gadchiroli are with lowest HDI values at 0.604 and 0.608 respectively.
6. Nashik district have improved its HDI Value from 0.652 in 2001 to 0.746 in 2012.
7. Solapur, Jalgaon, Buldhana and Parbhani also have registered good improvement over previous HDR values.
8. There is positive association between districts with high per capita income and high HDI Values.

9. Pune, Mumbai, Nagpur and Sindhudurg are the only districts are the only districts which have very high human development in terms of all its three dimensions as well as at the aggregate level in 2001 and 2011.
10. Districts with high human development like Thane, Pune, Raigarh and Kolhapur have showed better performance than state in all four indicators.
11. Washim, Gondiya, Parbhani, Jalna, Yavatmal and Latur though doesn't reflect good improvements in income indicators, have shown higher junction with the state average on the Gross Enrollment Ratio.
12. Ahmednagar, Hingoli, Jalna and Yavatmal have showed better performance in infant survival rates (IMR) though comparatively lower performances registered income wise.

**Literacy Status:** As per Census 2011, in Maharashtra there are 8,25,12,225 literates, of them 4,62,94,041 are males and 3,62,18,184 are females. In other words, excluding the children in the age below 7 years of age, this shows that there are 1,70,12,372 illiterates in the state out of them 52,45,094 are males and 1,17,67,278 are females. As per provisional figures 82.91 percent of the state population is literate in 2011. Census figures on literacy rate, male population is more literate than average literate population for the state. The gap between the literacy rate among male and females is shrinking down at every census figures.

**District wise Literacy Rates:**

**Table 3: Literacy Rate in Districts of Maharashtra**

Districts	Persons			
	Census 2001 (In percentage)	Rank as per Census 2001	Census 2011(In percentage)	Rank as per Census 2011
Amravati	82.54	4	88.23	4
Buldhana	75.78	16	82.09	17
Akola	81.42	5	87.55	5
Washim	73.36	22	81.7	18
Yavatmal	73.62	21	80.7	21
Nanded	67.77	30	76.94	27
Hingoli	66.25	31	76.04	29
Parbhani	66.07	32	75.22	30
Jalna	64.42	33	73.61	32
Aurangabad	72.91	24	80.4	22
Beed	67.99	29	73.53	33
Latur	71.54	26	79.03	25
Osmanabad	69.02	28	76.33	28
Thane	80.66	6	86.18	9

Mumbai	86.4	2	88.48	3
Mumbai(Suburban)	89.89	1	90.9	1
Raigarh	77.03	13	83.89	13
Ratnagiri	75.05	19	82.43	16
Sindhudurg	80.3	8	86.54	8
Nashik	74.36	20	80.96	20
Nandurbar	55.78	35	63.04	35
Dhule	71.65	25	74.61	31
Jalgaon	75.43	17	79.73	24
Ahmednagar	75.3	18	80.22	23
Nagpur	84.03	3	89.52	2
Wardha	80.06	9	87.22	6
Bhandara	78.47	11	85.14	11
Chandrapur	73.17	23	81.35	19
Gondiya	78.52	10	85.41	10
Gadchiroli	60.1	34	70.55	34
Pune	80.45	7	87.19	7
Solapur	71.25	27	77.72	26
Satara	78.22	12	84.2	12
Kolhapur	76.93	14	82.9	14
Sangli	76.62	15	82.62	15

Source: Government of Maharashtra, Economic Survey of Maharashtra, 2013-14

There are 13 districts that are above the state literacy rate of 82.91 percent. And there are 10 districts having literacy rate below state level but above 80 percent. Further in 11 districts literacy rate is below 80 percent and above 70 percent. Nandurbar is the only district with lowest literacy rate in the state with 63.04 percent literacy rate. As far as ranking goes, Mumbai (Sub-urban) has the highest literacy rate of 90.9 percent, followed by Nagpur at 89.52 percent. Gadchiroli and Nandurbar are still at bottom with same rank at 34<sup>th</sup> and 35<sup>th</sup> respectively.

**Education:** Education plays a key role in transforming the socio-economic, health and various other development-related outcomes. Literacy among females have shown far-reaching effects in narrowing the gender gap, increasing literacy levels as important human development indicators. Besides increased economic benefits education facilitates individual's ability to access and utilize various facilities and resources.<sup>7</sup>

**Access to education and rising enrollments:** Although the state has witnessed overall improvements in literacy at district level literacy rates, inter-district variations persist. There

has been a good increase in provisioning for schools in Maharashtra, especially at primary and secondary levels. The numbers of primary schools during 1970 to 2011 have increased by more than 10 percent in each decade. Numbers of primary schools teachers have increased by an average of 22 percent, and the number of children in primary schools by 27 percent from 1990 to 2011. Enrolment in primary classes has increased by 43 percent between 2005-06 and 2011-12. While for upper primary enrolment the rise is 16.3 percent. <sup>8</sup>

The following table highlights the growth of schools, teachers and students ratio

**Table 4: School Statistics in Maharashtra (in numbers)**

		1970	1980	1990	2000	2011-12
<b>Schools imparting elementary education</b>						
Total	No. of	44535	51045	57744	65586	10084
Schools						
Total	No. of School	177946	222070	268322	313656	542070
Teachers						
Total	School	6199235	8392356	10421602	12694398	16185891
Enrollment						
<b>Secondary Schools (Std VIII to Std X)</b>						
Total	No. of	5313	6119	9978	14767	21579
Schools						
Total	No. of School	74685	114065	181842	235490	174708
Teachers						
Total	School	2077127	3309333	5794120	8274750	7038294
Enrollment						
<b>Primary School Ratios</b>						
Total	number of	4	4	5	5	5
teachers per schools						
Total	number of	139	164	180	194	161
students per school						
Total	number of	35	38	39	40	30
students per teacher						
<b>Secondary School Ratios</b>						
Total	number of	14	19	18	16	8

---

teachers per school					
Total number of	392	541	581	560	326
students per school					
Total number of	28	29	32	35	49
students per teacher					

---

Source: Government of Maharashtra, Human Development Report 2012 , pp 212

Primary education in Maharashtra is largely done by government schools. The number of secondary schools increased by 63 percent during 1980-90 and 48 percent during the period 1990-2000, with the number of secondary school teachers increasing by average of 47 percent in each decade during 1970-2000. The number of school children enrolled in secondary schools increased in large number by almost average 60 percent each decade across 1970-2000. There has been increased female participation in primary and secondary schools.

**Budget for Education:** Expenditures under the SSA (Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan) are on a centre-state sharing basis in the ratio of 65:35 (RTE Act). Over the years, SSA expenditures for the state of Maharashtra has rised by 12 percent from 2006-07 to 2009-10 in comparison to Bihar and Rajasthan whose budgets increased by 78 and 79 percent respectively during the same period. The state spent 1.3 percent of the state domestic product on education in 2007-08. State levels trends in education expenditures can be examined on per child basis. The Government of India releases Rs.950 per elementary school going child under the SSA and there exist interstate variations in expenditures on the same. Rajasthan and Chattisgarh spend Rs.1300 per child, while Maharashtra spends Rs.875 on an average. However when computed by taking the state budgetary allocations for elementary education into account, the per-child expenditure in Maharashtra raised substantially to Rs. 9635, which is much higher than that in West Bengal (Rs.3604) , Madhya Pradesh (Rs.4023) and Rajasthan(Rs.7025).<sup>9</sup>

**Health and Nutrition:** The Eleventh Five Year plan marked out several measurable health targets to be achieved by the end of plan period, namely

1. Increase in child sex ratio for 0-6 years age group
2. Reduction of the IMR, MMR and total fertility rate.
3. Under nutrition among children
4. Reduction of anemia among women and girls.
5. Provision of safe and clean drinking water for all.

The CBR for Maharashtra in 2011 (16.7) was lower than the national figure of 21.8. Sector-wise comparisons show the birth rate to be slightly higher in rural areas (17.3) vis-à-vis urban areas (15.8) Inter-district variations exist in rural CBR, ranging from as low as 11.1 in Sindhudurg to as high as 20.1 in Nandurbar. It is reported to be less than 15 in Chandrapur, Gondia, Raigarh, Ratnagiri, Sindhudurg and Wardha, while it is more than 20 in Nandurbar (State Bureau of Health Intelligence and Vital Statistics 2010). The CDR, which is measured as the number of deaths per 1,000 persons, has also shown a decline from 7.1 in 2001 to 6.3 in 2011 and is lower than the national average of 7.1. The CDR is higher in rural areas (7.3) as compared to urban areas (5.3) (Office of the Registrar General 2012). The TFR of the state has shown a decline from 4.9 in 1971 to 1.9 in 2010. The TFR in both rural and urban areas of the state has seen a steady decrease, reaching near-replacement levels in the former (2.0) and well below replacement levels in the latter (1.7) in 2010. There is a slight disparity in TFRs of rural and urban areas, with the former reporting higher fertility rates than the later (2.0 and 1.7 respectively). What is alarming is the drop in the child sex ratio (0–6 years) from 913 in 2001 to 883 in 2011 not only reflecting of preference for a male child but also reflect the poor quality of care given to a girl child. Beed district reported the lowest child sex ratio (801) and Gadchiroli the highest (956). While in 2001, not a single district had reported a child sex ratio below 830, in 2011 two districts reported a child sex ratio below 830: Jalgaon (829) and Beed (801). The life expectancy of any individual, which is a component of the HDI and reflects the number of years a person can be expected to survive, given the current age-specific mortality rate of the age group to which he/she belongs. Life expectancy for Maharashtra's population was only 53.8 years during 1970–75, but has increased to 67.2 years during 2002–06 which is also higher than the national average (63.5 years). Females reported an advantage of over two years in life expectancy over males in both the rural and the urban areas of the state. The life expectancy of the urban population is also significantly higher (by six years) in urban areas compared to rural areas (Registrar General, India [2009: Table 11]). The IMR captures the number of deaths in the first year of life per 1,000 live births. The causes of infant mortality could vary from poor maternal or child health to the non-availability of health-care facilities. The state has shown considerable progress in terms of reduction in the IMR experiencing a marked drop of 22 points over the decade 2001–11 (47 in 2001 to 25 in 2011). In both 2001 and 2011, the IMR was reported to be higher in rural areas, although the rural–urban gap has narrowed from 27 points in 2001 to 13 points in 2011. The IMR remains higher for female children with the gender gap reducing from five

points in 2000 to two points in 2010. There are marked inter- district variations in the IMR, with variations in the IMR between districts found to be associated with district economic development. Special attention needs to be given to five districts, namely, Nandurbar, Washim, Yavatmal, Wardha and Bhandara, where the IMR in rural areas exceeds 35. MMR, which is the number of women who die during pregnancy and childbirth, per 100,000 live births .The MMR has always remained below the all- India average in Maharashtra. It has shown a decline from 166 in 1997–98 to 149 in the years 2001–03 and 130 in 2004–06, eventually reducing substantially to 104 during the years 2007–09 and standing at less than half of the national MMR of 212. Causes of maternal mortality reveal marginal success by the state in reducing deaths due to postpartum hemorrhage, toxemia of pregnancy and puerperal sepsis. Along with these causes, anemia is found to contribute to maternal deaths amongst pregnant women in rural areas.

**State Health Expenditure:** Provisioning of healthcare in India is the shared responsibility between Centre, State and Local bodies. However Healthcare being a state subject, the primary responsibility of financing and provisioning of public health services rests with State governments. The expenditure of the government on health care is seen have increased from Rs.13,278.8 million in 2006–07 to Rs.28,044.6 million in 2011–12 in absolute terms The percentage of the total expenditure (Plan and Non-Plan) also seems to be increasing, from 92 per cent in 2006–07 to 98 per cent in 2011–12. Public expenditure on health and family welfare was 0.6 per cent of GSDP for Maharashtra. As a proportion of total budgetary expenditure, the state spent 3.7 per cent on health and family welfare, which is lower than the target of 7–8 per cent mandated by the National Health Policy, 2002. Maharashtra has made progress in the area of health and related services, reflected in the various health-related vital statistics, with input as well as process indicators also showing improved inclusion in terms of gender, sectors and socio-economic groups. However, many gaps have to be breached, especially for the socially and economically backward groups, to enable them to reach the state level averages. What emerges is that for the health system in Maharashtra to be successful in fulfilling public health goals, some of the imperative policy action areas are addressing regional disparities in infrastructure availability in primary, secondary and tertiary health care services; strengthening rural infrastructure along with making it accessible to highly disadvantaged groups; stepping up state allocations to the health sector coupled with better utilization of available resources; improved drug availability in hospitals as well as increased transparency in the procurement systems; enhancing manpower especially in rural

and tribal areas through financial and non-financial incentives and focus on primary health care in urban areas of the state.

**Per Capita Income District Wise:** Maharashtra is big state comprising of 35 districts, having different socio-economic, cultural, population parameters, source of livelihood and climatic conditions. Each district in the state of Maharashtra is different from other and offers different strengths to the economy of the State. It would be incorrect to form a opinion of growth of the state without considering the growth at district levels which highlights the widening or reducing inter-district disparities which would facilitate formation and implementation of policies catering to local levels.

The 35 districts in the state are grouped into six divisions for ease of understanding the growth pattern in divisions. The divisions are as follows:

1. Amravati Division comprises of Amravati, Buldhana, Akola, Washim and Yavatmal
2. Aurangabad Division comprises of Aurangabad, Nanded, Hingoli, Parbhani, Jalna, Beed, Latur and Osmanabad
3. Konkan Division comprises of Thane, Mumbai, Mumbai (sub-urban), Raigarh, Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg.
4. Nasik Division comprises of Nasik, Nandurbar, Dhule, Jalgaon and Ahmednagar.
5. Nagpur Division comprises of Nagpur, Wardha , Bhandara, Chandrapur , Gondiya and Gadchiroli
6. Pune Division comprises of Pune, Solapur , Satara , Kolhapur and Sangli

The following table highlights the Per Capita District Domestic Product at current prices for various divisions

**Table 5: Per Capita District Domestic Product at Current Prices for Divisions (In-Rupees)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Amravati Division</b>	<b>Aurangabad Division</b>	<b>Konkan Division</b>	<b>Nashik Division</b>	<b>Nagpur Division</b>	<b>Pune Division</b>
2000-01	75587	111092	133885	75804	100945	107914
2001-02	85929	119320	141377	87529	113414	117072
2002-03	90247	130713	153334	96060	120672	126635
2004-05	95087	150069	199878	118157	147322	161100
2005-06	107482	172698	217939	132991	167910	182937

---

2006-07	120944	199678	236222	167766	190264	211052
2007-08	146567	240569	269623	189258	217872	238242
2008-09	185371	304690	383705	234558	290410	304136
2009-10	214984	347654	421828	256482	313215	344540
2010-11	262657	428231	496744	306963	352927	408146
2011-12	297716	484551	577565	340819	407172	457061
2012-13	338194	511030	637305	371217	461191	497463

---

Source: Economic Survey of Maharashtra, various issues.

The above table reveals that there is wide variations in per capita district domestic products for various districts which are part of the divisions. It would be more precise to understand per capita district domestic product growth of each division to understand the economic growth of the region.

**Amravati Division:** The average annual growth of per capita division domestic product from 2000-2013 is 14.76 percent, in other terms it can be said that it took 4.88 years for Amravati division to double its per capita division domestic product.

**Aurangabad Division:** The average growth of per capita division domestic product from 2000-2013 is 15.04 percent, in other terms it can be said that it took 4.79 years for Aurangabad division to double its per capita division domestic product.

**Konkan Division:** The average growth of per capita division domestic product from 2000-2013 is 15.70 percent, in other terms it can be said that it took 4.59 years for Konkan division to double its per capita division domestic product.

**Nasik Division:** The average growth of per capita division domestic product from 2000-2013 is 15.70 percent, in other terms it can be said that it took 4.59 years for Nasik division to double its per capita division domestic product.

**Nagpur Division:** The average growth of per capita division domestic product from 2000-2013 is 15.01 percent, in other terms it can be said that it took 4.80 years for Nagpur division to double its per capita division domestic product.

**Pune Division:** The average growth of per capita division domestic product from 2000-2013 is 15.08 percent, in other terms it can be said that it took 4.77 years for Pune division to double its per capita division domestic product. Economic growth in the state is highly

polarized and metropolitized, as about two-fifths of the Net State Income comes from Konkan region, also four highly urbanized districts- Mumbai, Thane, Pune and Nagpur account for about one-half of the NSDP, these industrialized districts also contributes higher of the tertiary income. Inclusive development demands providing equal opportunities towards benefits of the growth for all the region and masses of the society. Looking at growth figures though some of the districts growth looks impressive, but they lack in term per capita district domestic product which is small. Being one of the most industrialized states it is observed that growth is centered in only few districts of the state which is biggest irony of the development in Maharashtra. The difference between the lowest (Nandurbar: Rs.50,124) and highest (Mumbai: Rs.1,67,736) per capita district domestic product is more than 3 times highlighting the centralization of growth in certain parts of the state only. These are the districts which receive maximum investments which are fueling growth of these districts; however this growth comes at cost of various social problem of higher population density, massive migration of labor within state to these districts leading to rise in pressure on utilities of these districts leaving villages and other parts of the state barren. As per the Census 2011, Maharashtra ranks first in the number of Slums. To mitigate these issues it is important to facilitate growth of other parts of the state also understanding competence of the districts which will make inclusive and benefits all the masses.

**Conclusions:** The current study is concluded with the finding that human development is an integral part of economic development and is need of the hour. Human development is summarized using a human development index which acts an indicator highlighting the status of in various parameters that form HDI. HDI score for Maharashtra has improved from 0.666 to 0.752 in span of 13 years captured through human development reports published in 2001 and 2014. There is large room of improvements in improving various vital statistics and provisioning of higher budgetary resources for healthcare and education for the state of Maharashtra.

## **References**

Government of Maharashtra, “Human development report 2012” pp.3-4.

Mishra A and Choudhary R, “A Comparative study of human development index of selected Indian states” Abhinav national monthly journal of research in commerce and management” , Vol.3 , Feb-2014, pp. 63-76.

Government of Maharashtra, “Human development report 2012” pp.2-2.

Umajyothi V, Ph.D. Thesis titled “Human development- A human rights based approach”, University of Kerala. pp. 1-2.

Government of Maharashtra, “Economic Survey of Maharashtra 2013-14” pp.110-11

Government of Maharashtra, “Human development report 2012” pp.7-8

Government of Maharashtra, “Human development report 2012” pp.45-47.

Government of Maharashtra, “Human development report 2012” pp.51-52.

Government of Maharashtra, “Human development report 2012” pp.66-67.

Government of Maharashtra, “Human development report 2012” pp.72-76.

Government of Maharashtra, “Human development report 2012” pp.77-87.