CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION
India is one of the least urbanized countries in the world because between 1951 and 2001, the level of urbanization increased by 13 percentage points only. The urban population in India at the beginning of 20th century was only 25.85 million constituting 10.84 per cent of India's population in 1901, which increased to 285.35 million comprising 27.78 per cent of total population in 2001. Though urbanisation in India is 27% its urban population exceeds the total population of USA and Brazil. Today India has the second largest urban population in the world and more than two thirds of it lives in the 393 cities that have a population of more than a lakh. During the last 50 years, the rate of growth of urban population of India has been double that of the rate of growth of population. It took nearly 40 years between 1971 and 2008 for India's urban population to rise by 230 million and it could take only half that time to add the next 250 million. According to Mckinsey Report Indian cities are likely to house 40% of the urban population by 2030. India has seen a phenomenal increase in the number of its metropolitan towns. More than half of the total urban population of India lives in small and medium towns. In the beginning, the country had only one metropolitan city, which had increased to 35 in 1991. These 35 million plus cities account for 107.9 million urban population in the country. The concentration of population in million plus cities increased significantly in the last two decades to almost two-fifth of the urban population. The four mega cities viz. Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai, Kolkata with a population of more than 6 million each in 2001 account for almost one fourth of the population living in the cities. Another three Chennai, Bangalore and Hyderabad, have populations ranging between 5 and 10 million. As per the projections of Government of India, the urban population of the country in
2011 will be 405.26 million and 553.04 million in 2021. Thus around one third of population is expected to live in urban areas. Another striking feature of India’s urbanization has been the concentration of urban population in Class I cities. The number of Class I cities has grown from 24 in 1901 to 423 in 2001. There has been more than fivefold increase in the number of Class I cities since 1951. The startling fact is that the proportion of population living in smaller towns has shown declining trend over the period while there is massive growth in population of larger towns. The least-developed states such as, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh have urbanized faster than national average.

The 2001 Census of India reveals that the urban population of the country stood at 286 million or 27.8 per cent of the total population. This is estimated to have increased to 350 million by 2010, which is about 30 per cent of the total population. It is projected that the urban population of India would grow to about 470 million in 2021 and 700 million in 2041. The level of urbanization is expected to reach 50 per cent mark in the next 3-4 decades.

Urbanisation and economic growth are closely inter-linked. Cities are the engines of economic growth. They are the reservoirs of skill and capital. They are the sources of diverse formal and informal sector employment opportunities. They are the hopes for millions in urban areas and the countryside. While Urban India accommodates less than one-third of the country’s population at present, its contribution to GDP is far larger. Central Statistical Organisation (CSO) estimates indicate that this share increased from 38 per cent in 1970-71 to 52 per cent in 1999-00. The Mid-Term
Appraisal of the Eleventh Five Year Plan estimates the urban share of GDP at 62-63 per cent in 2009-10. The 11th Plan document projects it to increase to 75 per cent in 2021. Since 2005-06 the country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth has gone up - above 9% with some fluctuations. In 2008-09 it was 6.8%. It is 8.6% in 2010-11. As India moves ahead to a double digit growth, obviously a key policy issue is emerging as to how to rejuvenate and strengthen Urban India, which will significantly contribute and sustain the economic growth momentum through economies of agglomeration and other productivity-enhancing factors.

Cities and Slums

While cities are the generators of the nation’s wealth and income, there are large sections of the poor in cities, especially slum-dwellers, who are bypassed by the process of growth. An urban-urban divide is emerging as revealed by the trends in Gini co-efficient of urban income distribution encompassing various monthly expenditure classes. A critical issue of public policy is thus how to make cities ‘inclusive’ in accordance with the 11th Plan strategy of ‘inclusive growth’, and provide basic services and access to affordable shelter and employment to the urban poor, including the dwellers of slums which manifest the worst form of poverty. The backlog and current needs of the poor, including slum-dwellers will have to be addressed along with those from future urban growth so as to prevent the conditions that led to mushrooming of slums and haphazardly grown cities and towns in the past. A strategy of guided urbanization will recognize that the urban poor, including slum-dwellers, numbering millions at the bottom of the pyramid, have a key
role in the development of cities. Their number is so large that even a small increase in their productivity through intervention by governments will mean that the contribution to GDP will be huge. The urban poverty issue needs to be tackled from efficiency considerations apart from equity.

A striking feature of the trends in urbanization in India, as elsewhere in the developing world, is the shift in the locus of poverty to cities and towns. The NSSO 61st Round data and estimation by the Planning Commission using Lakdawala methodology reveal that about 81 million people lived below the poverty line in 2004-05. As per this data, the number of poor in urban areas increased by 44 lakhs between 1993-94 and 2004-05. A large part of the increase in urban population occurred in slums due to natural increase factor and inability of migrants to find space in cities other than slums. The slum population in the country is estimated at 75 million in 2001, projected to increase to 93 million by 2011 (Report of the Committee on Slum Statistics/Census under Dr. Pranob Sen, the then Chief Statistician & Secretary, Statistics & Programme Implementation, 2010). The partial Slum Census conducted by the Registrar General of India in 640 towns in 2001 revealed that about 23.5 per cent of the urban population lived in these cities in slums. Further, there existed several cities with more than 25 per cent of population residing in slums. Mumbai topped the list with 54%, followed by Faridabad (46%), Aligarh (45%), Meerut (44%), Warangal (43%), Amravati (43%), Raipur (37%), Nagpur (36%), Guntur (33%) and other cities. This is in spite of the restrictive definition of slum adopted by the Census of India 2001. The Committee on Slum Statistics, referred to above, estimated the slum
Slums manifest the worst form of deprivation that transcends income poverty. They are characterized by acute over-crowding, insanitary, unhealthy and dehumanizing living conditions. They are subject to precarious land tenure, lack of access to basic minimum civic services such as safe drinking water, sanitation, storm drainage, solid waste management, internal and approach roads, street lighting, education and health care, and poor quality of shelter. Many of these habitations are located in environmentally fragile and dangerous zones prone to landslides, floods and other disasters that make the poor residents highly vulnerable. A significant proportion of the slum dwellers also face social burdens and health problems worse than their non-slum and rural counterparts. Many civic bodies do not provide the required municipal services in slums on the plea that these are located on 'illegal' space. Moreover, the scale of the problem is so colossal that it is beyond the means of Urban Local Bodies most of whom lack a buoyant fiscal base and is subject to severe fiscal stress.

Definition of Slum

Etymology
The origin of the word slum is thought to be the Irish phrase 'S lom é (pron. s' lum ae) meaning "it is a bleak or destitute place." An 1812 English dictionary defined slum to mean "a room". By the 1920s it had become a common slang expression in England, meaning either various taverns and
eating houses, "loose talk" or gypsy language, or a room with "low going-ons". In *Life in London* Pierce Egan used the word in the context of the "back slums" of Holy Lane or St Giles. A footnote defined slum to mean "low, unfrequent parts of the town". Charles Dickens used the word slum in a similar way in 1840, writing "I mean to take a great, London, back-slum kind walk tonight". Slum began to be used to describe bad housing soon after and was used as alternative expression for rookeries.

The word ‘slum’ could be crudely defined as a compact settlement with a collection of poorly-built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together usually with inadequate basic services and subject to unhygienic conditions. Various agencies including international organizations like UN-HABITAT have defined ‘slum’ in different ways, depending on the purpose and issues under consideration. However, there are certain broad similarities in definitions adopted by countries across the world.

The Encyclopedia Britannica defines slum as residential areas that are physically and socially deteriorated and in which satisfactory family life is impossible. Bad housing is a major index of slum conditions. By bad housing is meant dwellings that have inadequate light, air, toilet and bathing facilities; that are in bad repair, dump and improperly heated; that do not afford opportunity for family privacy; that are subject to fire hazard and that overcrowd the land, leaving no space for recreational use".
RGI & NSSO: Definition of Slum

Registrar General of India has adopted the following definition of slum in Census of India, 2001:

- All specified areas in a town or city notified as ‘Slum’ by State/Local Government and UT Administration under any Act including a ‘Slum Act’.
- All areas recognized as ‘Slum’ by State/Local Government and UT Administration. Housing and Slum Boards, which may have not been formally notified as slum under any Act.
- A compact area of at least 300 populations 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.

National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), for the purpose of survey in 1976-77, categorized slums as including ‘declared’ and ‘undeclared’ slums. The declared slums were areas, which had been formally declared as slum by the respective municipalities, corporations, local bodies or the development authorities. The undeclared slums were defined as “an aerial unit having twenty five or more katcha structures mostly of temporary nature, or inhabited by persons with practically no private latrine and inadequate public latrine and water”. For the purpose of survey in 1993 and 2002, NSSO adopted the definition of slum as “a compact area with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities in unhygienic conditions”.
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The undeclared slums were defined as “if 20 households lived in that area”. In addition, certain areas, declared as slums by local municipalities, corporations, local bodies and development authorities, were taken as ‘declared slums’.

**International Definitions**

Internationally, the term ‘slum’, has been defined variedly in different countries. However, it is generally identified as a densely populated urban area characterized by substandard housing and squalor. The essential characteristics of slums thus include high densities, low standards of housing (structure and services), and squalor. Dwellings in such settlements vary from simple shacks to more permanent structures; access to basic services and infrastructure tends to be deficient. First appearing during the 1820s in London, the term ‘slum’ was used to identify the poorest quality housing areas and living in the most unsanitary conditions. Since then the term has undergone many transformations leading to many connotations and meanings. Terms such as slum, shanty, squatter settlement, informal housing and low-income community are now used somewhat interchangeably by agencies and authorities in countries. The term used in India include *chawls*(Ahmedabad, Mumbai), *katras/jhuggi-jhompdi colonies* (Delhi), *bustee* (Kolkata), *yopadpattis* (Maharashtra, Gujarat), *murikiwadas* (*Andhra Pradesh*) etc.

A UN-HABIT AT review of the definitions used by national and local governments, offices, institutions involved in slum issues and public
perceptions reveals the following attributes of slums (see Global Report on Human Settlements 2003).

**Slum Definition: UN-HABITAT**

Following the Expert Group recommendation, UN-HABITAT has adopted a generic definition of slum as “a contiguous settlement where the inhabitants are characterized as having inadequate housing and basic services. A slum is often not recognised and addressed by the public authorities as an integral or equal part of the city”. For operational purposes, UN-HABITAT has defined a slum household as a group of individuals living under the same roof that lack one or more of the conditions listed below:

- Insecure residential status;
- Inadequate access to safe water;
- Inadequate access to sanitation and other infrastructure;
- Poor structural quality of housing; and
- Overcrowding.

**Operational Definition of Slum**

The operational definition of a slum, originally based on recommendations of a United Nations Expert Group meeting held in 2002 and subsequently revised by UN-HABITAT in 2008, defines a slum household as a household lacking one or more of the following:

- Improved water;
- Improved sanitation;
- Sufficient living area;
- Durable housing;
- Secure tenure.
Slum Characteristics

The economic disparity between the rural and urban population is a key factor pulling/inducing the rural poor population towards cities in search of economic betterment. Cities grow by migration, natural increase and reclassification of rural areas as urban. The migration and urbanisation process, with city authorities not being able to provide space to the increasing number of poor that cities need, has led to the mushrooming of slums. These poor quality human settlements extend to public lands or wherever else space can be found without being subjected to deterrent action by various agencies, even on road margins and vulnerable locations like river banks, drains, swamps, garbage dumping yards, etc. It would be appropriate to be familiar with the various definitions used by data providers before going in depth into the details of slum statistics in India.

Lack of Basic Services

Lack of basic services-lack of access to improved sanitation facilities and improved water source, supplemented sometimes, by the absence of waste collection systems, electricity supply, surfaced roads and footpaths, street lighting and storm water drainage.

Sub-standard Dwelling

High number of substandard housing structures often built with non-permanent materials unsuitable for housing, given local conditions of location and climate, e.g. earthen floors, mud-and-wattle walls, thatched roofs, etc. - often in violation of housing norms and standards locally applicable.
Over-crowding and High Density

Very low space per person, high occupancy rate, co-habitation by different families and a large number of single-room units. Often five and more persons share a one-room unit for cooking, sleeping and living.

Unhealthy/Hazardous Conditions

Unhealthy living conditions due to lack of basic services - open sewers, lack of pathways, uncontrolled dumping of waste, polluted environment, etc. Houses may be built on hazardous lands, unsuitable for settlement, such as floodplains, drains, river beds, garbage dumps, and on areas prone to landslide.

Insecure Tenure/Informal Settlements

Lack of formal document entitling the occupant to inhabit the land or structure - illegality of living; informal or unplanned settlements cropping up on public lands or lands reserved for non-residential purposes, especially for conservation.

Poverty and Exclusion

Income poverty is sometimes considered a characteristic of slum-dwellers, but not always. Slum conditions are physical and due to statutory and regulatory factors that create barriers to human and social development.

Minimum Settlement Size

Many slum definitions also require some minimum settlement size. The municipal slum definition of Kolkata requires a minimum of 700 square
metres to be occupied by huts. Census of India 2001 requires at least 300 people or 60-70 households living in a settlement cluster.

**Access to Improved Drinking Water Sources**

A household has access to improved drinking water supply if it uses water from sources that include: piped water into dwelling, plot or yard; public tap/stand pipe; tube well/borehole; protected dug well; protected spring; or rain water collection.

**Access to Improved Sanitation Facilities**

A household is considered to have access to improved sanitation if it uses flush or pour flush to piped sewer system, septic tank or pit latrine; pit latrine with slab; composting toilet; or ventilated improved pit latrine. The excreta disposal system is considered improved if it is private or shared by a reasonable number of households.

**Sufficient Living Area**

A house has sufficient living area for the household members if not more than three members share the same room. Otherwise, it will mean overcrowding.

**Durable Housing**

A house is considered durable if it is built on a non-hazardous location and is of permanent materials. Hazardous sites include: geologically unstable areas (landslide/earthquakes and flood-prone areas); garbage dump sites; high industrial pollution areas; unprotected high risk zones (e.g. railroads, airports, power transmission lines), etc. Permanency of a housing structure is
determined by: quality of construction (materials used for wall, floor and roof) and compliance with local building codes, standards and byelaws.

**Security of Tenure**

Households have secure tenure when they have effective protection against forced evictions through: evidence of proper documentation (formal title deed to either land or residence or both) or *de facto* or perceived protection against eviction.

The absence of each of these components is categorized as shelter deprivations. A slum household is classified based on the presence of one (or more) of the above five shelter-related deprivations. Four of these five deprivation indicators (lack of improved water, lack of improved sanitation, overcrowded conditions and non-durable housing structures) measure the physical manifestation of slum conditions. They focus attention on the circumstances that surround slum life, depicting deficiencies and casting poverty as an attribute of the environments in which slum dwellers live. The fifth indicator - security of tenure - has to do with legality, which is not easy to measure or to monitor, as the tenure status of slum dwellers often depends.

**Growth and countermeasures**

Recent years have seen a dramatic growth in the number of slums as urban populations have increased in the Third World. In April 2005, the director of UN-HABITAT stated that the global community was falling short of the Millennium Development Goals which targeted significant improvements for slum dwellers and an additional 50 million people have been added to the
slums of the world in the past two years. According to a 2006 UN-HABITAT report, 327 million people live in slums in Commonwealth countries - almost one in six Commonwealth citizens. In a quarter of Commonwealth countries (11 African, 2 Asian and 1 Pacific), more than two out of three urban dwellers live in slums and many of these countries are urbanising rapidly. Recent years have seen a dramatic growth in the number of slums as urban populations have increased in the Third World.

In April 2005, the director of UN-HABITAT stated that the global community was falling short of the Millennium Development Goals which targeted significant improvements for slum dwellers and an additional 50 million people have been added to the slums of the world in the past two years. According to a 2006 UN-HABITAT report, 327 million people live in slums in Commonwealth countries - almost one in six Commonwealth citizens. In a quarter of Commonwealth countries (11 African, 2 Asian and 1 Pacific), more than two out of three urban dwellers live in slums and urbanising rapidly.

The number of people living in slums in India has more than doubled in the past two decades and now exceeds the entire population of Britain, the Indian Government has announced. The number of people living in slums is projected to rise to 93 million in 2011 or 7.75 percent of the total population almost double the population of Britain.

Census data released in December 2011 by the IBGE (Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics) shows that in 2010, about 6% of the
population lived in slums in Brazil. It means that 11.4 million of the 190 million people lived in the country areas of irregular occupation and lack of public services or urbanization - called by the IBGE of "subnormal agglomerations".

Many governments around the world have attempted to solve the problems of slums by clearing away old decrepit housing and replacing it with modern housing with much better sanitation. The displacement of slums is aided by the fact that many are squatter settlements whose property rights are not recognized by the state. This process is especially common in the Third World. Slum clearance often takes the form of eminent domain and urban renewal projects, and often the former residents are not welcome in the renewed housing. For example, in the Philippine slums of Smokey Mountain, located in Tondo, Manila, projects have been enforced by the Government and non-government organizations to allow urban resettlement sites for the slum dwellers. According to a UN-HABITAT report, over 20 million people in the Philippines live in slums, and in the city of Manila alone, 50% of the over 11 million inhabitants live in slum areas.

Moreover new projects are often on the semi-rural peripheries of cities far from opportunities for generating livelihoods as well as schools, clinics etc. At times this has resulted in large movements of inner city slum dwellers militantly opposing relocation to formal housing on the outskirts of cities. See, for example, Abahlali baseMjondolo in Durban, South Africa.

Critics argue that slum clearances tend to ignore the social problems that cause slums and simply redistribute poverty to less valuable real estate.
Where communities have been moved out of slum areas to newer housing, social cohesion may be lost. If the original community is moved back into newer housing after it has been built in the same location, residents of the new housing face the same problems of poverty and powerlessness. There is a growing movement to demand a global ban of 'slum clearance programmes' and other forms of mass evictions.

The generic “slum” definition adopted by UN-HABITAT till recently has been very broad and differs from the definition adopted in India. One can see the vast difference in the slum population for India estimated by the UN agencies for the country along with world regions in the past as shown in a dated UN Report 2001 (Table 1.1). According to this estimates, the Indian slum population (estimated by UN at more than 50% of the urban population in 2001) is far more than what is revealed by the NSSO and RGI estimates. The recent State of World Cities 2010/11 Report of the UN-HABITAT, however, has reported a much smaller percentage of slum population in India. According to this latest report, India has lifted 59.7 million people out of slums conditions since 2000 and slum prevalence has fallen from 41.5 percent in 1990 to 28.1 percent in 2010.
### Table 1.1

**Estimated Population of Urban and Slum Areas in the World and different Regions-2001 (at Mid-Year), by UN-HABITAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions/ Countries</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Urban Population</th>
<th>% of Urban Population in Total</th>
<th>Urban Slum Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>6134.000</td>
<td>2926.000</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>924.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Regions</td>
<td>1194.000</td>
<td>902.000</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>54.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Regions</td>
<td>4940.000</td>
<td>2022.000</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>870.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Developed Countries</td>
<td>685.000</td>
<td>179.000</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>140.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1025.096</td>
<td>285.608</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>158.418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban and Slum Population Estimates by UN-HABITAT-2001

### Review of Literature

A number of sociological studies had been undertaken on slums in Indian cities. The poor in slums were observed as migrants from the countryside (De Souza 1980), Joshi (1989), Rao (1990), Ram (1991) and Desai (1994). Oscar Lewis found the problem of slums in the ‘Culture of Poverty’ which consisted of distractive traits such as lack of saving, a high rate of illegitimacy, family disorganization, authoritarianism and a pervasive sense of marginality and fatalism.

According to Charles Stokes the poor were motivated to migrate because of the wage differential between the city and the countryside. According to Stokes, poor in slum lack ability.

De Souza in his study pointed out that the problem of poverty was an aspect of social inequality and stratification and a large number of slum dwellers belonged to the disadvantaged section of the society.
According to Paul Wiebe, the impoverished condition of slum dwellers was a product of economic system. Thus the growths of slums have been viewed in socio-economic and cultural angles.

The studies concerned with the living conditions of the poor in a given slum or slums in a city, focused attention on aspects like employment, earning, housing, sanitation, drinking water and drainage facilities. A brief sketch of individual studies shows that a majority of slum-dwellers were employed in unorganized sector or informal sector.

The Town and Country Planning Organization, Delhi reported that a majority of workers (65 per cent) in low-income settlements were engaged in construction activities. A study on Squatter Settlements in Delhi by Majumdar shows that a majority (54 per cent) of households in slums were employed as casual labourers.

A study of slum dwellers in Madras also reported that most of the slum dwellers were daily-wage earners as was found in Delhi. 34 per cent of males and 68 per cent of females had occupations such as office attendants, domestic servants and coolies.

In Calcutta, West Bengal Statistical Bureau found that 31 per cent of the workers were engaged in casual labour, 23 per cent in handicrafts and 22 per cent in trade and other services.

A majority of slum dwellers in metropolitan cities of India in 1971 earned less than Rs.300 per month, which was well below the poverty line income.
The data published by the Bureau of Economics and Statistics, Government of Andhra Pradesh on the socio-economic conditions of slum-dwellers (1976-77) in the 13 cities of Andhra Pradesh showed that 38.8 per cent of households were living in the structures considered as bad. There were no drinking water facilities in 19.9 per cent of the households in the slums, 40.2 per cent had no sanitation facilities. Nearly 38 per cent of the households relied on community facilities for their sanitary needs.

Yatin O. Parikh conducted a field survey of Baroda slums during 1979-80 and measured the incidence of poverty among slum households using three alternative criteria: calorie, income and expenditure. The planning Commissions’ poverty line of 2100 calories per person per day for urban areas was used. The income needed to meet this nutritional requirement was estimated to be Rs.88 per capita per day at 1979-80 prices. According to calorie norm the incidence is as high as 62.81 per cent and it ranged from the lowest figure of 60.61 per cent (among SC population) to the highest figure of 68.77 per cent (among the castes identified by Baxi Commission). However considering the incidence of poverty with respect to expenditure per capita and income per capita, the deviations were quite marked and significant from the calorie criteria. The incidence of poverty with respect to expenditure criteria was lower than that with respect to per capita income criteria among the slum dwellers, as many of them incurred debts to pull on their lives. Through multiple regression analysis he showed that there was highly significant negative relationship between per capita income of the family and calorie deficiency per consumer unit. While the migratory status had no
relationship with calorie intake, proportion of literates in a family had a significant positive relationship with calorie intake.

Thakur has estimated poverty among rural households in Himachal Pradesh in 1980-81 by collecting primary data from 109 households. He estimated poverty using nutrition approach and nutrition plus approach by making due allowances for the food and non-food components for marginal, small, medium and all farmers with inclusion of non-food expenditure. When the food poverty line of Rs.52.93 per capita per month (in 1980-81 prices) was moved up to Rs.77.61 per capita per month, the poverty estimate had increased from 47.14 per cent to 51.37 per cent for all households.

Vishwa Mittar has studied the extent and severity of poverty among poor households in Patiala city in 1984, by selecting a random sample of 300 households; 103 from the formal sector, 157 from the informal sector and 40 from the mixed sector. By using the poverty line of Rs. 107.63 per person per month at 1982-83 prices corresponding to 2383 calories per person per day he calculated the incidence of poverty (Head Count Ratio) as 34.52 per cent and poverty gap index as 0.0642. He had also showed that the incidence of poverty was positively correlated with the size of household, but negatively associated with number of earners per household, the level of education and age of household head. The intensity of poverty was comparatively large among migrant households, households with heads below 30 years of age and had no formal education. The intensity was found to be high among nuclear type families when compared with that among the joint families.
Prem S. Vashishtha analysed the incidence and correlates of urban poverty by collecting data in the districts of Ludhiana (Punjab), Vadodara (Gujarat), Uttar Kannad (Karnataka) and Gaya (Bihar) in 1988-89. He had made a comparative analysis of inequality and poverty in the four districts by selecting 225 sample households in each district. Using food poverty lines of Rs.2100 per capita annual income for Ludhiana, Rs.2002 for Vadodara, Rs.2016 for Uttar Kannad and Rs.1918 for Gaya at 1988-89 prices, he calculated Head Count Ratio, Poverty Gap index, Sen Index, Fishlow Index, FGT index and Gini Coefficient of income inequality. To understand the correlates of poverty, he examined the incidence of poverty in terms of various socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the households. His finding were: household size and dependency ratio were positively correlated to incidence of poverty, the former having a much stronger effect than the latter; incidence of poverty were higher among households headed by young persons (25-34 years); poverty gap was a small fraction of household income in the developed districts compared to that in the less developed districts; incidence of poverty was high among illiterates in both developed and less developed districts, but it was much higher in the latter than in the former. Incidence of poverty was higher in the informal sector than that in the formal sector. The informal sector contributed a major share to poverty; there was no clear evidence of poverty being associated with caste status. To understand the influence of the factors namely, age of head, household size, dependency ratio, caste and activity status a logit model had been estimated. He concluded that in addition to caste, other factors such as occupation, education and per
capita income level should be considered as criteria for selecting target
groups for identification of beneficiaries for the poverty alleviation
programmes.

Mohapatra and Susmita Das have studied the quality of life of the
poor in Shillong. Using census data collected by Shillong Municipal Board for
UBSP in 1991 on 1780 households in four out of 11 localities (notified
poverty pockets under UBSP by the Shillong Municipal Board) had been
used for the study. A composite index of quality of life was constructed using
variables, which characterize the urban poor, namely, physical environment,
employment, earnings, health and education. The study converted the
variables to scores (0-3) by giving the lowest score to the highest quality. The
composite index was calculated by simple addition of scores for the 10
indicators selected. The households were grouped into five classes based on
the value of quality of life index. The study revealed that nearly 13 per cent of
the households in the slum localities had a low to very low quality of life; A
majority of the households (75 per cent) had a moderate quality of life;
Approximately 12 per cent of the households in the poverty pockets had a
high to very high quality of life indicating the existence of non-poor within the
poor pockets.

Biswa roop Das studied the living conditions of the urban poor in the
He gives a descriptive analysis of the work force in the slums, their
occupations and income. He found that the slum dwellers were engaged in a
variety of jobs numbering 478. His findings were: Nearly 40 per cent of the
migrants were self-employed and 37 per cent were textile workers. 35 per cent of the households were giving below the poverty line.

Dubey and Ranjay Vardhan studied the socio economic conditions of slum dwellers in Chandigarh from the CRRID survey (1998), which was conducted on the basis of 100 per cent coverage of slum households. There were totally 45 slums, out of which 19 were authorized and 26 were unauthorized. There were totally 55,670 households with a population of 2,26,230. Deprivation Index had been calculated for each slum by taking into account the access to basic amenities of the slum dwellers, namely, shelter, safe drinking water, toilet facilities and lighting facilities. Then, he classified the slums as having low, medium and high deprivation based on the value of the deprivation index. 46.26 per cent of the slums belonged to ‘high deprivation’.

The above review of studies on poverty reveals that urban poverty studies in India are very much limited. Factors underlying regional and temporal variations in urban poverty have not been explored. Moreover, there are only isolated location-specific studies of the informal sector workers, slum and pavement dwellers. Studies related to the characteristics of the urban poor are only a very few. Hence the present study on urban poverty trends in Tamil Nadu and socio-economic and poverty profiles of slum-dwellers will fill this gap in the literature on urban poverty.
Scope of the study

The Karnataka Slum Clearance Board reveals that there are 2722 slums in the urban part of the state. Out of which 2251 are officially declared slums and 471 are undeclared slums. However, all slums have not come under the purview of the slums Act. It is important to note that slums in 52 towns have not even brought to the books of the Slum Clearance Board even after the completion of 34 years of their existence. The Board has identified and listed only 40 percent of the slums and the remaining have to be documented.

Slums as elsewhere even in Karnataka are suffering from basic amenities such as supply of drinking water, latrine facilities, drainage, internal roads, dilapidated huts or houses, undisposal garbage, street lights and other health and hygienic conditions.

Bangalore, Capital city of Karnataka, is Silicon Valley of India and the fifth largest metropolis in the country. Its population is likely to cross 7.2 million by 2011. Considerable proportion of migrated population burned the already over strained the socio-economic overheads.

Government of Karnataka and Bangalore City Corporation has laid much emphasis on the development of infrastructure, which helped only the elite; Poor masses have been totally neglected. Election promises regarding popular programmes have not been implemented. To prove this point one can check the data of the slums gathered by Authorities. No single government department has the complete data about the number of slums in
Bangalore and Karnataka. Three different departments: are Bruhat Bengaluru MahanagaraPalike (B.B.M.P), the Bangalore Development Authority and Karnataka Slum Clearance Board established under the Slum Act (improvement and clearance) do not seemed to have reliable information about the slums in the Bangalore. These departments have no comprehensive picture about the number of slums, nature and extent of problems faced by slum dwellers which shows the attitude of the authorities towards the development of slums.

This study attempts to examine the growth of slums and the efforts made by Karnataka to the development of slums. To accomplish this, the socio-economic conditions of the slum dwellers in the city need to studied thoroughly as it help to know the gap between promise and performance of the policy implementation.

Objectives of the study

The objectives of the present framework are to analyse socio-economic factor responsible for the growth of slums, in Karnataka and their integrating with the community.

1. To Study the factors responsible for rural Exodus;
2. To Examine the effect of globalization on growth of slums in the city of Bangalore;
3. To assess the role of government policies and programmes in respect of rehabilitation for slum dwellers;
4. To identify the major socio-economic problems of slum dwellers in Bangalore city; and
5. To suggest suitable policy measures for improvement of the socio-economic conditions of slum dwellers in the city.

**Hypotheses**

1. Large scale of rural exodus is the main factor for the growth of urban slums.
2. Slums grew at a faster in during the regime of the New Economic Reforms and has widened the gap between rich and poor.
3. The state Government Policy has been conductive to improve the socio-economic conditions Slum dwellers.

**Methodology and Sample Size**

The city of Bangalore has been conveniently divided into four regions: the East, the West, the North and the South. In all there are 597 slums in the city; out of which 30 slums have been randomly selected based the concentration of Slum dwellers. For the purpose of the intensive socio-economic survey, ten household have been sampled from each slum. Thus, an all 300 samples would be consulted for the collection of primary data.

**Source of Data**

The study predominantly based on empirical investigation. The Primary data would be collected with the help of structured questionnaire for the randomly selected 300 sample households in thirty slums.

The secondary data would be collected from Slum Clearance Board, Karnataka, City Corporation and Urban Development Authority. These are the three government organizations working for the improvement and
rehabilitation of slum areas in the state. The data will also be collected
district wise of physical and financial target and achievements of slum areas
and data will be collected from Bureau of Economic and Statistic and
Population Census reports of state books, journals other un-published
research materials would also be consulted.

Period of the Study
The study covers a period of two decades, from 1990 to 2010.

Techniques of Research
Year wise available on Physical and financial achievements of slums
will be processed with the help of statistical tools such as quantitative,
qualitative and S.P.S.S. statistics, averages percentage simple and
compound growth rate time series analysis The primary data will be worked
to envisage income inequalities among the respondents and will be applied
the poverty line be worked out in slums areas of the state Researcher would
not like to stick to a traditional method of puritan school of research. If it
requires research scholar does not hesitate to borrow statistics, ideas,
research method and techniques from the disciplines like sociology,
anthropology and urban sociology etc.

Limitation of the Study
It is felt that household survey could not be undertaken. On the other
hand, it was attempted only sample survey method consulting only 300
households. Hence, the survey results cannot ensure cent percent accurate
or complete realistic picture of the socioeconomic conditions of the slum
dwellers in Bangalore city or similarly based slums elsewhere in the Indian Metropolitan cities.

Chapter Scheme

The Study on “Growth of Slums in Bangalore city: A Study on the Socio-Economic Conditions of slums dweller’s”, is proposed to present in six chapters:

Chapter-1 : Introduction-Review of literature-Objectives-Hypothesis Methodology-Database-Study period and limitation of the study.

Chapter-2 : Growth of Slums in Bangalore city-their size structure and population growth in slums since 1990.

Chapter-3 : Review of Karnataka Government policies to improve socio-economic conditions of Slum dwellers in Bangalore city.

Chapter-4 : Performance of Slum Clearance Board of Karnataka since 1990 to till date.

Chapter-5 : The Socio-Economic Conditions of Slum dwellers in Bangalore city.

Chapter-6 : Summary of the Findings, Conclusion and Suggestions to improve the Socio-Economic condition of Slum dwellers in the city in particular and in general in Karnataka.
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