

# Impact of Government Schemes on Poverty Alleviation in Urban Area U.P.

**Yatindra Kumar Jha**

Assistant Professor

Department Of Sociology Dr Rajendra Prasad Memorial Degree College, Lucknow

Affiliated to University of Lucknow, Lucknow , India

Email - yatindrajha@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *Urban poverty is a major challenge before the urban managers and administrators of the present time. Though the anti-poverty strategy comprising of a wide range of poverty alleviation and employment generating programmes has been implemented but results show that the situation is grim. Importantly, poverty in urban India gets exacerbated by substantial rate of population growth, high rate of migration from the rural areas and mushrooming of slum pockets. Migration alone accounts for about 40 per cent of the growth in urban population, converting the rural poverty into urban one. Moreover, poverty has become synonymous with slums. The relationship is bilateral i.e. slums also breed poverty. This vicious circle never ends. Most of the world's poor reside in India and majority of the poor live in rural areas and about one-fourth urban population in India lives below poverty line. If we count those who are deprived of safe drinking water, adequate clothing, or shelter, the number is considerably higher. Moreover, the vulnerable groups such as Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, minorities, pavement dwellers etc., are living in acute poverty. Housing conditions in large cities and towns are depicting sub human lives of slum dwellers. With the reconstruction of poverty alleviation programmes in urban India, it is expected that social and economic benefits will percolate to the population below the poverty line. However, eradication of poverty and improving the quality of life of the poor remain one of the daunting tasks. Government of India has introduced numerous centrally sponsored schemes from time to time. Rajiv Awas Yojana, Rajiv Rin Yojana and National Urban Livelihood Mission are the new addition for poverty alleviation in urban area.*

**Key Words:** *Government, Schemes, Poverty, Allivation, Urban Area.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

Urban poverty is the most challenging task before the urban planners. Urban poverty is different from the rural poverty and thus demands for innovative and multipronged approaches and strategies for its alleviation. Cities are engines of growth and therefore serve as pull factor for the poor. Due to better economic opportunities, socio-economic infrastructure and facilities, the poor from rural areas and semi-urban areas migrate to urban centres. Thus, the poverty is shifting from urban to rural areas. There has been increase in the number of urban poor though the proportion of urban poor against the total urban population has declined over the period. On the other hand, the number of poor and ratio of poverty in rural areas has significantly declined over the period. In view of empowering the urban poor and improving their living conditions in urban centres, Government of India has introduced numerous centrally sponsored schemes from time to time. Rajiv Awas Yojana, Rajiv Rin Yojana and National Urban Livelihood Mission are the new addition. Urban poverty is the most challenging task before the urban planners. Urban poverty is different from the rural poverty and thus demands for innovative and multipronged approaches and strategies for its alleviation. Cities are engines of growth and therefore serve as pull factor for the poor. Due to better economic opportunities, socio-economic infrastructure and facilities, the poor from rural areas and semi-urban areas migrate to urban centres. Thus, the poverty is shifting from urban to rural areas. There has been increase in the number of urban poor though the proportion of urban poor against the total urban population has declined over the period. On the other hand, the number of poor and ratio of poverty in rural areas has significantly declined over the period. In view of empowering the urban poor and improving their living conditions in urban centres, Government of India has introduced numerous centrally sponsored schemes from time to time. Rajiv Awas Yojana, Rajiv Rin Yojana and National Urban Livelihood Mission are the new addition.

## 2. Concept of Urban Poverty:

The word 'poverty' and its adjectival 'poor' denote an ancient concept, expressing social difference between man and man. Poverty is a very vague concept with varied connotations and facets. As a socio-economic issue, it is defined by various international and national agencies, social scientists and sociologists. The World Bank (1990) defines poverty as "the inability to attain a minimal standard of living". In an article, 'Poverty Reduction and Equity,' the World Bank defines poverty in a comprehensive manner, saying, "Poverty is hunger. Poverty is lack of shelter.

Poverty is being sick and not being able to see a doctor. Poverty is not having access to school and not knowing how to read. Poverty is not having a job, is a kind of insecurity for the future. Poverty is losing a child to illness brought about by unclean water. It is a state of powerlessness, lack of representation and freedom.”

The revised definition of poverty by World Bank suggests that it is a state of deprivation in well-being, and comprises many dimensions. It includes low incomes and the inability to acquire the basic goods and services necessary for survival with dignity. Poverty also encompasses low levels of health and education, poor access to clean water and sanitation, inadequate physical security, lack of voice, and insufficient capacity and opportunity to better one's life (World Bank 2005). However, in order to estimate the number of poor, the World Bank has derived the international poverty line, based on purchasing power parity. On this basis, currency fluctuations and nominal numbers become less important, the definition is based on the local costs of a basket of essential goods and services that people can purchase. In May 2014, the World Bank has revised the poverty line and has set it at \$1.78 per day on 2011 PPP basis. On the basis of the new poverty line, India had 179.6 million people living below this new poverty line which is nearly 17.5 percent of world's poor population (Wikipedia).

In 1993, the Planning Commission, under the chairmanship of Suresh Tendulkar, criticised the previous norms of poverty line determination and derived the new poverty line on the basis of Monthly Per Capita Expenditure (MPCE). For the year 1993-94, the poverty line was fixed at Rs. 235.5 and Rs. 295.2 per capita per month in rural and urban areas respectively; and it was estimated that 51.1 percent poor lived in rural areas, 31.8 percent in the urban areas and 45.3 percent poor were present on the country level (Annexure-5). However, the expert group argues that the poverty line has certain limitations. Though it provides a quantitative measure for estimating the number of poor, it does not capture the different aspects of poverty and inequality (Planning Commission 1993).

In July 2013, the Rangrajan committee report has also defined poverty on the basis of MPCE and the revised poverty line has been fixed at Rs. 816 Per Capita per Month for rural areas and Rs. 1000 for urban areas (Planning Commission 2013). The official definition of poverty defines it on the basis of the poverty line. Those who fall below the fixed poverty line are considered as poor. For Sen (1992), poverty is a kind of inequality, where the poor suffer a lack of opportunities to choose their life style, and covers a wide range of dimensions like low-level income and education, insufficient capacity and opportunity in society, inability to acquire the basic goods and services necessary to survive in society with dignity. He argues that apart from income, standard of living is a suitable indicator to identify the situation of poverty. Standard of living is considered as quality of life by sociologists. R. Chambers (1995) explains the state of poverty on the basis of several domains of life. According to him, poverty is not only the deficiency of income but also the deficiency of several basic and social human needs.

Among sociologists Gillin and Gillin (1965), Valentine (1968), and Townsend's (1979), have also tried to define poverty. Harrington (1958) defines it with reference to 'deprivation'. According to him, poverty is the deprivation of those minimal levels of food, health, housing, education, and recreation which are compatible with the contemporary technology, beliefs and values of a particular society. Gillin and Gillin (1965) define poverty as "... that condition in which a person either because of inadequate income or unwise expenditure does not maintain a scale of living high enough to provide for his physical and mental efficiency and enable to provide resources to his natural dependents to function usefully according to the standards of the society of which he is a member" (c.f. Sharma 1997).

The Planning Commission has defined poverty in terms of level of per capita consumer expenditure sufficient to provide an average daily intake of 2400 calories per person in rural areas and 2100 calories per person in urban areas, besides a minimal allocation for basic non-food items. As per Planning Commission, Government of India, the poverty lines based on per capita per month income vary state to state both in rural and urban areas. The cut-off point for measuring poverty in urban areas at the national level in 2004-05 was Rs. 538.60 per capita per month income. It varies from Rs. 665.90 in Goa to Rs. 378.64 in Assam. While in India, poverty has been measured in terms of per capita income adjusted on the basis of consumer expenditure, the donor agencies such as World Bank focuses more on human poverty based on per capita daily expenditure. Poverty is found everywhere, but it is traditionally being seen as a typically rural problem. The rural poor lack adequate income and land to cultivate; they are removed from such services as education and health care and their voices rarely heard. Compared with the rural poor, the urban poor are seen as people who are much better off; they are generally employed and they earned an income that is higher than that of the rural poor; they live near basic infrastructure and services, and their sheer numbers and closeness to the centres of power enable them to influence local political decision making. However, urban poverty requires the urgent attention of policy makers. There is evidence that it is becoming an urban rather than a rural problem. Unless urban poverty addressed, continued urbanization will result in increases in urban poverty and inequality. This may have profound consequences for the city as a whole, as growing inequalities can strain its ability to prosper. Thus, urban poverty reduction requires different kinds of approaches, because it is different from rural poverty in many aspects; the rural poor are affected by the highly monetized nature of urban living, which forces them to spent far more on accommodation, food, transport and other services than the rural poor; unlike rural poverty, urban poverty is characterized by the regulatory exclusion of the poor from benefits of urban development.

World Bank has long used a complicated statistical standard—income of \$1 per day per person measured at purchasing power parity—to determine the numbers of extreme poor around the world. Another World Bank category, income between \$1 per day and \$2 per day, can be used to measure moderate poverty. These measures feature prominently in public policy circles. The number of poor estimated on that basis was 1.1 billion people living in extreme poverty in 2001. The overwhelming share of world's extreme poor, 93 per cent in 2001, lived in three regions viz. East Asia, South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. In the period of modern economic growth, the global population rose more than 6-folds in just two centuries whereas world's average per capita income rose even faster. The gulf between today's rich and poor countries is a new phenomenon. As of 1820, the biggest gap between rich and poor—especially between world's leading economy of the day, United Kingdom and the world's poorest region, Africa – was ratio of four to one in per capita income. By 1998, the gap between the richest economy, the United States, and the poorest region, Africa had widened to 20 to one. Thus, all regions experienced economic progress but today's rich regions experienced by far the greatest economic progress.

There has been gradual increase in the number of urban poor over the period of 1973-74 to 2004-05. During 1973-74, there were 60.05 million urban poor in India while during 2004-05, the number of urban poor was reported to be 80.79 million. About 81 million persons in urban areas were reported living below poverty line during 2004-2005. Importantly, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Bihar account for larger share in urban poor. The percentage of urban poor was recorded highest in Orissa (44.3 per cent), Madhya Pradesh (42.1 per cent), Uttar Pradesh (30.6 per cent), Bihar (34.6 per cent) and Maharashtra (32.2 per cent). Indian poverty is predominant in the rural areas where more than three quarters of all poor people reside, though there is wide variation in poverty across different states. Moreover, progress in reducing poverty is also very uneven across different states of the country. Largest numbers of urban poor were reported in Maharashtra followed by Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan. As per McKinsey Report (2010), about 75 per cent of urban population is in the bottom income segments, earning an average of Rs.80. About 30 per cent population was reported to be deprived while about 45 per cent urban population was reported to be as aspires. Thus out of about 341 million urban populations, about 254 million urban population was concentrated in the bottom income brackets. In sum, urban poverty has a cumulative impact. It leads to problems like poor health and education, unemployment, low wages, unhygienic living conditions, sense of insecurity, disempowerment etc. As per information available from Planning Commission, Government of India, about 21 per cent population was reported living below poverty line in urban areas. The total numbers of urban poor were reported to be 76.47 million. The proportion of urban poor against the total urban population was reported high in Manipur (46.4 per cent) followed by Bihar (39.4 per cent), Uttar Pradesh (31.7 per cent) and Jharkhand (31.1 per cent) (Table 5.1).

**Table: 5.1****Number and percentage of Population below Poverty Line in Urban India**

State	Percentage of Population	Number of Persons (Lakh)
Andhra Pradesh	17.7	48.7
Assam	26.1	11.2
Bihar	39.4	44.8
Chhattisgarh	23.8	13.6
Gujarat	17.9	44.6
Haryana	23.0	19.6
Himachal Pradesh	12.6	0.9
Jammu and Kashmir	12.8	4.2
Jharkhand	31.1	24.0
Karnataka	19.6	44.9
Kerala	12.1	18.0
Madhya Pradesh	22.9	44.9
Maharashtra	18.3	90.9
Orissa	25.9	17.7
Punjab	18.1	18.4
Rajasthan	19.9	33.2
Tamil Nadu	12.8	43.5
Uttar Pradesh	31.7	137.3
Uttarakhand	25.2	7.5
West Bengal	22.0	62.5
<b>All India</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>764.7</b>

Source: Planning Commission, Government of India, 2010.


Uttar Pradesh occupies the central position in the northern India. It is the most populous state in the country. The state witnessed a tremendous growth in its urban population during the last three decades. During 1971-81 the decadal growth was about 60.62 per cent, the highest in the country. In 1981-91 the growth had been about 38.97 per cent, second after Orissa. As per 2001 census, every fifth person in the state is residing in urban centres. The total urban population of the state has been raised to 347 million showing an increase of about 33 per cent over the decade of 1991-2001. Uttar Pradesh is the most populous state in the country which accounts for 16.4 per cent of the country's population. It is also the fourth largest state in geographical area, covering 9 per cent of the country's geographical area. The pace of urbanization has been lower in the state. The level of urbanization has been reported lower than most of the other states. In 2001, 20.78 per cent population of the state was found living in urban areas. During 1991-2001, urban population grew by 2.84 per cent per annum. The urban population of the state in 2011 was reported to be 4.44 crore, constituting 20.78 percent of the total p[population of the state (Table 3.1).

Table: 3.1  
Trends of Urbanization in Uttar Pradesh

Census year	No. of UA's and Towns	Total Urban Population	Percentage of Urban Population	Decadal Growth	Annual Growth
1901	349	0.52	11.20	-	-
1911	350	0.47	10.26	-9.61	-1.01
1921	367	0.47	10.61	0.16	0.02
1931	375	0.53	11.28	13.24	1.24
1941	385	0.67	12.52	26.06	2.31
1951	410	0.82	13.65	21.86	2.31
1961	215	0.90	12.81	9.23	0.88
1971	256	1.16	13.90	29.72	2.60
1981	598	1.87	17.83	60.89	4.76
1991	631	2.60	19.68	38.52	3.26
2001	670	3.45	20.78	32.88	2.84
2011	915	4.44	22.28	28.70	2.87

Source: Census of India, 2001, Uttar Pradesh

Chart: 3.1  
Growth Urban Population in Uttar Pradesh



As per 2001 census, there were 670 towns and cities in the state. Most of the towns and cities are categorized as class IV<sup>th</sup> and Class III<sup>rd</sup> having population in between 10,000 to 50,000. However, urban population is concentrated in large towns and cities. During 2011, 267 census towns and 648 statutory towns were reported in the state. During 2002, there were 3641 urban local bodies. Out of total urban local bodies in India, 107 ULB, were

Municipal Corporations, 1443 Municipal Councils, and 2091 Nagar Panchayats. The highest number of local bodies were reported in Tamil Nadu (719) followed by Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. In the state of Uttar Pradesh, there are 630 urban local bodies. Out of these there are 13 Municipal Corporations, 194 Nagar Palika Parishads and 423 Nagar Panchayats. About 40 per cent population lives in Nagar Palika Parishads while about 37 per cent population lives in Municipal Corporations.

### 3. LITERATURE REVIEW:

In India Several studies have been conducted on urban poor and poverty alleviation programme various universities and research organization. Institutions have also studied on governance also, but we need more studies on the issues. There is increasing focus on Reforming Public Services in India through urban good governance.

In urban sociology, the study of city and the progress of urbanization are the centre point of attention. Various sociologists like Burgess and Park (1925), Writh (1938), Devis (1965, 1969), Frank (1971) and Wallerstein (1974) etc. have focused their attention on the process of urbanization and its impact on changing society in general and on urban society in particular.

In Indian society the process of urbanization and its impact has attracted the attention of several sociologists like Dube (1955), Ghurye (1961), Gore (1968), D' Souza (1968), M. S. A. Rao (1970) and Srinivas (1976). However, their perspective has been different from that of poverty and growth aspects. Considering the problem urban poverty and growth of slums in big and metropolitan cities of the country.

Several sociologists like Desai and Pillai (1972), Venkatrayappa (1972), Wiebe (1975), T. K. Majumdar (1977, 83), K. R. Rao and M. S. A. Rao (1984) and Dhadeva (1989) have studied the urban society in the perspective of the aggravated situation of slums and urban poor. Though these sociologists have stressed that slums are the hutment locality of urban poor where people live in a sub-standard manner, yet they have not explained how the dynamics of several elements related to their social, economic and cultural situations sustain and perpetuate the phenomenon of the urban poverty at the macro level.

Though these scholars have not conducted any micro scoping study of urban society in the context of the Indian society, but the subject has attracted the attention of several Indian social scientists in general and sociologists in particular. Among social scientists, Mishra (1978), Kundu (1980), Rao (1983), Joshi (1989), Mehar (1998) and Mohan (2009) etc. have explored the study of urbanization and its effects on Indian cities in different perspectives.

Mishra (1978) has examined the process of urbanization in several big and million-plus cities of India. According to him, urbanization is a process which reveals itself through temporal, spatial and sectoral changes in the demographic, social, economic and technological and environmental aspects of life in a given society. These changes manifest themselves in the increasing concentration of population in human settlements larger than villages, in the increasing involvement of the people in secondary and tertiary production, and in the progressive adoption of certain social traits which are typical of traditional rural societies.

Kundu (1980) assumes that both urbanization and urban population growth are a simultaneous process. He states that urban poverty is a by-product of rapid urbanization. However, at the micro level he did not conduct any study of the urban poor that explains their problems in detail. Singh (2006) in his paper on "Restructuring of Municipal Services in India" maintained that there has been considerable debate in India about the indifferent quality of public service delivery which remains poor on a whole. Though, decentralization initiatives have brought about institutional changes in municipal services, yet urbanization, unplanned urban development and inadequate infrastructure of resources have stressed urban services. These services have not been able to keep pace with the fast growing population.

Dhar (2006) in his paper on "Good Governance, Civil Service Reforms and Decentralization" said that in developing countries like India, full transition to market systems has to be very wisely and continuously brought about or ill the impacts of change can be inequitable and even catastrophic. He highlighted the need of a bold, effective and credible state which trusts people, which governs through policy and bold, open, people's friendly action.

Singh (2007) in his paper on "Fostering Excellence in Public Services in India" remarked that independence India has been constantly endeavoring to bring efficiency, particularly in public service delivery through more accountability, transparency and responsiveness. Singh (2008) in his report on "Decentralized Urban Governance in India" highlighted the need for introducing municipal reforms and strengthening the urban local governments for delivering public services to urban poor.

World Bank (2004) in its report on "Challenges of Poverty in Uttar Pradesh" highlighted the incidence and dimensions of poverty in the state of Uttar Pradesh. The report maintained that about 8 per cent of world's poor live in Uttar Pradesh alone. Planning Commission (2007) in its Uttar Pradesh Development report elaborated the governance framework and social development. Krueger (1993) maintained that accelerated growth and social welfare improvements have a lot to do with strong leadership and a well functioning bureaucracy.

Mauro (1995) said that bureaucratic inefficiency could affect growth indirectly or directly by leading to a misallocation of investment among sectors. Hart, Shleifer and Vishny (1997) have maintained that private provision is

likely to work well for some public goods but not at all well for some others. Oates (1972) said that decentralization is the transfer of decision making from the highest level of the government to quasi autonomous units of the local government. The strong merit of decentralization is that it enables the government to be more responsive to local needs, tastes and financial viability.

Mohan (2009) in 1990s analyzed the decadal growth of urban population and the growth of employment structure since 1951 to 1991 and discussed the pattern of urbanization in the recent past. According to him, urban population growth can be seen in every decade, but rapid urbanization took place in 1991 as it was associated with economic growth and industrialization. The high concentration of population in cities has also resulted in an increased demand of urban infrastructure, basic services and employment while the cities are unable to fulfill the demand of this large population, resulting in the problems associated with urbanization.

In a recent study, Mukherji (2006) outlines the negative impact of the migration of socially underprivileged group from less developed regions to developed ones. He states that cities are unable to provide jobs for the unskilled and semi-skilled migrants in the urban organized sector. Therefore, they are absorbed by the urban informal sector, is dominated by low paid jobs. In this sector people get income which is hardly sufficient for their survival in the city.

Ramchandran (1989), in his book 'urbanization and social system' outlines that apart from rural-urban migration, sometimes physical expansion of cities into peripheral villages in an unplanned and haphazard manner creates a rural-urban fringe, where a mix of rural and urban characteristic societies is found. In this area, people demand all the basic services of urban life but in the absence of basic facilities they live on illegally occupied land and slums emerge. Besides the physical changes in these areas, certain socio-economic, cultural and demographic changes also occur in cities which make the urban society ruralised. This transitional area, lying at the interface of the urban and rural vicinity and is identified as peri-urban area or rurban. Growth of peri-urban area is also one of the negative impacts of urbanization.

#### **4. MATERIALS:**

Poverty is broadly defined in terms of material deprivation, human deprivation and a range of other deprivations such as lack of voice, vulnerability, violence, destitution, social and political exclusions, and lack of dignity and basic rights. Prof. Amartya Sen has defined poverty as the deprivation of basic capabilities that provide a person with the freedom to choose the life he/she has reason to value. These capabilities include good health, education, social networks, and command over economic resources, and influence on decision making that affects one's life. In India, and indeed throughout the world, the conventional approach equates poverty with material deprivation and defines the poor in terms of incomes or levels of consumption.

We will select about 300 urban poor including manual scavengers, street vendors and slum dwellers in the city. The field survey will be conducted with the help of structured interview schedules. Two sets of interview schedules for urban poor including scavengers, street vendors, and slum dwellers, and municipal officials and people's representatives of ULBs, NGOs and other stake holding agencies will be developed. The interview schedules will contain the relevant questions, research points and scales of view perception related to awareness, sensitization, participation, impact etc. of programmes, schemes and projects. The secondary data will be compiled from the municipal records, reports and documents. Besides, previous surveys, reports, studies and other relevant research work will also be consulted. The filled-in interview schedules will be thoroughly checked and processed with the help of relevant statistical tools and techniques including appropriate software and tabulation.

#### **5. METHOD:**

The present study will be empirical in nature and based mainly on primary data collected through field survey. Besides survey and analysis of primary data, secondary data and pertinent literature will be compiled from published and documented sources for getting insights on the to of the research. The study will focus on national perspective however; the field survey will be confined to the state of Uttar Pradesh. We will select Lucknowcity for in-depth study. The study will cover urban slum dwellers, street vendors, manual scavengers and other urban poor who have been benefited under various inclusive programmes and schemes. Besides the survey of urban poor and slum dwellers, the people's representatives and officials of ULBs, NGOs and other stakeholder agencies engaged in implementation of urban poverty alleviation programmes, schemes, and delivery of basic services to urban poor will also be contacted. The primary and secondary data will be interpreted, discussed and analyzed. The central tendencies, results, conclusions and trends and patterns will be drawn out from the analysis of data. Besides, the pertinent literature will be critically reviewed for insight stimulation on the topic of research. The policy measures and action plan will be based on the analysis of research findings and critical appreciation of pertinent literature

#### **6. ANALYSIS & FINDINGS:**

Skills are essential to improve productivity, incomes, and access to employment opportunities. Thus, poverty reduction strategy should focus on vocational education and training since vast majority people living in poverty

cannot afford and have access to training opportunities, which are commercially managed. International Labour Organization has invested in the field of employment intensive infrastructure programmes. It has now widely recognized that these programmes are effective in bringing much needed income to poor families and their communities. Financial investment in jobs and employment may create additional opportunities to poor youth. The labour intensive projects should respect standards, promote gender equality and encourage enterprise development through contracting systems. The entrepreneurship development may promote income generating enterprises and livelihood development. This will also promote self-employment among educated unemployed youth. Interestingly, it is impossible to build an enterprise without access to credit. Micro-finance activities should be promoted, strengthened and encouraged along with entrepreneurship for enabling poor to borrow for productive purposes.

Participation and inclusion are central to new approach to poverty reduction. Cooperatives and people's associations including Self Help Groups are ideal instruments in such a strategy. Cooperatives have proved to be a key organized form in building new models to combat social exclusion and poverty. Similarly, SHG's are proving crucial instrument for availability of micro-finance and social empowerment of poor. Significantly, discrimination is a basis for social exclusion and poverty. Promoting gender equality and eliminating all forms of Discrimination at work are essential to defeating poverty. Child labour is both a cause and a system of poverty. In order to ensure effective functioning of SJSRY, formation and strengthening of community development societies is imperative. The community development structure may be formed and strengthened effectively only through community organizers and active role of nongovernment organizations including civil societies. Similarly, training and entrepreneurship development among the urban poor may be ensured through public private partnership involving non-government organizations.

1. The state government should setup Urban Poverty and Slum Improvement Task Force. This task force may be allowed to give direction and control of the functioning of Urban Poverty Alleviation . programme including JnURM and IHSDP. City-wide master plans for slum upgradation should be drawn up with the objective of removing the slum characteristics of the selected settlements. Slum mapping along with biometric survey is imperative for the inclusive development of the cities.

2. Capacity building is essential for developing communication and interpersonal skills among the people responsible for providing for the needs of the urban poor, for improving the level of services and satisfaction of the beneficiaries, and for providing coordinated services from a number of line agencies.

3. The wage employment component under SJSRY should be used only for building assets and infrastructure relating to the urban poor, and not for general municipal works. The requirement should be selected by the beneficiaries themselves and implementation should be from such lists of works identified by the beneficiaries. Poverty elimination is impossible unless the economy generates opportunities for investment, entrepreneurship, job creation and sustainable livelihoods. People living below poverty need voice to obtain recognition of rights and demand respect. They need representation and participation in urban planning and implementation of urban poverty alleviation programmes.

4. Training systems need to become more flexible and responsive to rapidly changing skill requirements. Reform should focus on how learning can be facilitated, not just on training for specific occupational categories. There is also imperative need of increasing the investment in training and skill development for sustainable livelihoods.

5. Small and micro enterprises constitute a large and growing share of employment and are generally more labour intensive. However, small business development requires management skills to survive and grow. Self help group based micro financing may be an effective instrument for empowering urban poor and promoting micro and small enterprises for livelihood development.

Eradicating poverty calls for the coordination of policies that focus on different dimensions of life of people living in poverty. Coordination and cooperation among various stake holding agencies is imperative to effectively implement the urban poverty alleviation programmes. The Civil Societies and Public Sector Participation is imperative and it should be strengthened through community mobilization, participation and entrusting NGOs by government agencies Public-private partnership is to be further strengthened through state level policy environment and support.

## 7. RESULT:

Examining the problem of urban poverty in urbanization perspective, the study reveals that, urbanization, rural-urban migration – resulting from several push and pull factors, expansion of urban areas, limited economic opportunity, and exploitation in urban labour market and inadequate implementation of development initiatives play a significant role in causing poverty in the urban areas. It causes the growth of slums and similar places like poor hutment clusters in the city. The study shows that during the phase of urbanization the city has attracted a large segment of population from the distant rural areas. Thus, a bulk of people belonging to the socially and economically underprivileged group of rural society moved from villages to the city in search of employment, income and better quality of life. However, being unskilled, semi-skilled, and illiterate or have low level of education they are unable to get job in urban organized sector and hence, depend upon urban informal sector for their livelihood. The informal

sector of the city also absorbs them as they make their massive contribution in providing cheap labour force for the development of the city. In addition, most of them work as low-paid workers in different areas of urban informal sector and help the rich in many ways. These low-paid poor workers are functionally integrated with the large system of urban society. The city also accepts them as functional members of the urban society. Yet, in the city, they have to face several problems and challenges in their daily life including poor housing, inaccessibility of basic services, limited access to employment opportunities, lack of social and personal security, limited access to health and educational opportunities, labour exploitation etc. On the negative side, urbanization has resulted in deterioration of urban society due to overcrowding, congestion, shortage of infrastructure and basic services unemployment, underemployment, labour exploitation and growth of slums and informal sector, urban poverty and structural inequality in the urban society. It is found that the locality of slum dwellers where urban poor live is an unhealthy environment which is likely to increase the risk of disease and infections. The open drainage and garbage disposal system and their lack of civic sense makes their living environment filthy and unhygienic which likely increase the spreading of diseases and infections.

JNNURM, IHSDP, UIDSSMT, AMRUT, Smart City Mission, Swachh Bharat Mission, Rajiv Awas Yojna, NULM, Prime Minister Housing for All were launched by Government of India for the provision of massive investment for infrastructure development, strengthening of urban local governments and delivery of civic services. The reforms introduced under the Mission aimed at decentralization, transparency, efficiency and accountability in urban administration. The reforms also aimed at creating opportunities for the empowerment of urban poor and improving basic services for them.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Social security measures must be expanded, and strengthened through legal provisions, enhanced budgetary support and launching of new programmes.

- Effective implementation of governance reforms is imperative to ensure inclusive growth and development. The governance of public services needs further improvement in delivery mechanism.
- Capacity of socially excluded communities need be improved through training, capacity building and by providing opportunities to acquire hands-on-skills. The issues of capacity building may be well addressed under National Skill Development Mission.
- The state government should setup Urban Poverty and Slum Improvement Task Force. This task force may be allowed to give direction and control of the functioning of Urban Poverty Alleviation programme including JnNURM, AMRUT, Prime Minister Housing for All, Swachh Bharat Mission and IHSDP.
- Policies to reduce eradicate poverty need to address both the demand and supply sides of the labour market. Urban poverty reduction cannot be possible without integrating the rural poverty. Thus, there is equally need of addressing poverty reduction and employment generation in rural areas to check the migration of rural poor to urban centres.
- Building capacity of vendors' organizations, community based organizations, NGOs, and other associations are essential for organizing, strengthening and protection of street vendors and hawkers.

## 8. CONCLUSION:

The study is an attempt to explore the incidence of poverty in urban area as not only an economic phenomenon, but as a complex social phenomenon too that renders any single norm inadequate to understand the problems and situation of the poor in the urban area. Being a multi-faceted social issue, urban poverty needs to be studied the problem in sociological perspective that effectively explains the real situation, problems and quality of life of the urban poor in holistic way. It will help to understand the holistic phenomenon of urban poverty. The study assumes that the dynamic interaction of several socio-economic and cultural factors involved in the creation and perpetuation of poverty. The problem of urban poverty cannot be understood by traditional and bureaucratically-accepted poverty line approach. It further assumes that poverty alleviation requires a multi-dimensional approach and therefore a detailed study of urban poverty is essential to comprehend the dynamics and factors determining urban poverty.

## REFERENCES:

1. World Bank (2006), *Reforming Public Services in India*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
2. Burgess, E. W. and Park, R. E. et al., (1925). *The Growth of the City*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
3. Desai, A. R. and Pillai, S. D., (1972). *Profile of an Indian Slum*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan

4. Mishra, K.(1995) Issues in Devolution of Functions and Fiscal Powers to Municipalities, Paper Prepared for the Second National Meet of the State Finance Commission, March 6-7, NIPFP, New Delhi.
5. Rao, K. N. (2005). *Poverty in India-Global and Regional Dimensions*, New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications
6. Kundu, A., (2004). *Urban Poverty in India: issue and Perspectives in Development*, New Delhi: Uppal Publication
7. Indian Council of Social Science Research, (2013). *Inclusive Urban Development in India: A Study of Pro-Poor Initiatives in Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal* by A. K. Singh, Lucknow Law College, Lucknow
8. Mohan, R., (2009). *Urbanization in India: Pattern and Emerging Policy Issues* in Sujata P. and Deb, K., (eds.), *Urban Studies: Oxford in India Reading in Sociology and Social Anthropology*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press
9. Mukherji, S., (2006). *Migration and Urban Decay, Asian Experience*, New Delhi: Rawat publications
10. Singh, A.K. (2006), Restructuring of Municipal Services in India, *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. LII (3), July-September.
11. Dhar, T.N. (2006), Good Governance, Civil Service Reform & Decentralization, *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. LII (3), July-September.
12. Singh, A.K. (2008), Urban Poverty Alleviation Programmes in India, Working Paper, Regional Centre for Urban Environmental Studies, Lucknow.
13. Pinto, M.R. (2006), People Centred Development and Participatory Urban Governance: The
14. Mumbai Experience, IN *Local Governance in India: Decentralization & Beyond*, Edited by Jayal, N.G. et.al., Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
15. Singh, A.K. (2007), Urban Poverty in India, IN *India in Global Economy*, Edited by G.R. Krishnamoorthy & A.K. Singh, Serials Publications, New Delhi.
16. World Bank (2002), *Poverty in India: Challenge of Uttar Pradesh*, World Bank, Delhi.
17. Planning Commission(2007), *Uttar Pradesh Development Report*, Academic foundation, New Delhi.
18. Singh, U.B. et.al. (2014), *Challenges of Urban Governance in India in New Millennium*, Global Research Publications, New Delhi.