

Research Paper

# Poverty Situation in Tribal and Non-tribal Area of Gujarat, India

Jignesh Macwan<sup>1\*</sup> and Y.C. Zala<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Associate, IABMI, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India

<sup>2</sup>Principal & Dean, IABMI, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India

\*Corresponding author: macwanjignesh@gmail.com (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6309-9464)

Received: 10-03-2021

Revised: 24-5-2021

Accepted: 17-06-2021

## ABSTRACT

The present investigation undertook to study the extent of poverty in the tribal and non-tribal areas applying the FGT index. Results showed that overall poverty was higher in the tribal area as compared to non-tribal areas. Among farm sectors in the tribal and non-tribal area, the highest poverty in marginal farm households was followed by landless agricultural labors and small farm households. The overall poverty gap index revealed, on average, 11 percent and 4 percent of the poverty line cash transfer needed to lift each poor person out of poverty in tribal and non-tribal areas, respectively. The value of the squared poverty gap index showed poverty was less severe in non-tribal areas. The poverty line's average expenditure gap shows poor of tribal areas were more flawed than the poor of non-tribal regions in Central Gujarat. Overall expenditure of poor households on food items constituted maximum share followed by non-food items, medical and education in the tribal and non-tribal area. In tribal regions, both poor and non-poor people were spending more on intoxicant and tobacco products than non-tribal areas. The government should give regular employment to inadequate household programs like MGNREGA. There is a dire need to make an awareness program to control the use of intoxicants and tobacco in general for both the area and particularly in tribal areas because they were spending more on these items.

## Highlights

- ① Both poor and non-poor people from tribal areas spent more on intoxicant and tobacco products than non-tribal areas. Therefore, there is a dire need to make an awareness programme to control the use of intoxicants and tobacco in general for both the area and particularly in tribal areas.
- ② Poverty was higher in the tribal area as compared to non-tribal areas of Gujarat state. Among farm sectors, observed the highest poverty in marginal farm households followed by landless agricultural labours and small farm households.

**Keywords:** FGT index, minimum consumption expenditure, poverty extent, poverty line

Poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon. Nevertheless, the world has made noteworthy progress in reducing extreme poverty. The percentage of people living in extreme poverty fell to 10 percent in 2015 from 11 percent in 2013 globally (World Bank, 2019). According to the World Bank measure of extreme income poverty, around 1.2 billion people face extreme poverty (Sustainable Development Solutions Network, 2012).

The Planning Commission of India (2014), indicated that more than 363 million (260.5 million of them in

rural and 102.5 million in urban areas) were poor in India. The proportion of the population below the poverty line in India is 29.5 percent in 2014. Such reduction in poverty is primarily governed by economic growth and paying attention to social welfare programs. The states of India like Andhra

**How to cite this article:** Macwan, J. and Zala, Y.C. (2021). Poverty Situation in Tribal and Non-tribal Area of Gujarat, India. *Economic Affairs*, 66(2): 225-233.

**Source of Support:** None; **Conflict of Interest:** None



Pradesh, Bihar, Maharashtra, Odisha, and Tamil Nadu have performed exceedingly well in the number of people moving below the Poverty Line to Above Poverty Line. According to the Planning Commission of India (2014) report of India (2014) report, around 169 lakh people cannot satisfy monthly per capita consumption expenditure of ₹ 1102.83 in rural and ₹ 1507.06 in urban areas of Gujarat state. Around 27.4 percent of people are under the poverty line or cannot spend a minimum amount expenditure to satisfy and deemed insufficient in 2011-12.

According to the Elvin committee of 1960, Scheduled Tribes (ST) the main problem is poverty (Parmar, 2014). More than four in five people in Scheduled Tribes (ST) are multi-dimensionally poor, and approximately two-thirds of people in Other Backward Castes (OBC) and Scheduled Castes (SC) have low incomes. That is because of social and economic discrimination and inequalities between higher and lower castes. Their participation in their community's financial, political, and social life was inhibited due to prejudices in castes of higher standing. The drop-out and failure rates in education are higher for SC and ST students than other general categories, which keeps poverty rates high among the lower castes (Sridhar, 2014). The government plays a vital role for tribal farmers who are illiterate; farms are tiny and having erratic rainfall. The government spends enormous amounts on poverty alleviation programs for providing employment, rural development, livelihood survival *etc.* It assumes that such intervention helps the tribal farmers earn additional income and improves the consumption level. Hence, it helps in reducing poverty. Measuring poverty by using an essential tool for monitoring poverty since the 1960s has been the Household Consumer Expenditure Surveys (Datt and Ravallion, 2002). Accordingly, this study focused on the incidence of poverty and its severity based on household consumption expenditure and allocation of spending on consumption patterns in tribal and non-tribal areas of central Gujarat.

### The objective of the study

1. To measure poverty among the farm sector in the tribal and non-tribal area of central Gujarat.

2. Examine the consumption expenditure pattern in the tribal and non-tribal areas.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Sampling Design

A multistage sampling technique applies for the selection of sample design. The Gujarat state is comprised of 33 districts; Ahmedabad, Anand, Botad, Dahod, Kheda, Panchmahal, Mahisagar, Chota Udaipur, and Vadodara districts cover under Central Gujarat region. In the first stage, out of these nine districts, giving an equal chance for each district, two districts, namely Dahod and Anand, were selected based on having the highest tribal people (43.83%) and non-tribal people (0.69%), respectively.

At the second stage, prepared a list of taluka-wise ST populations from each selected district, *i.e.*, Dahod and Anand. Following with; three talukas from each selected district were selected considering tribal and non-tribal populations. Thus, for the selection of tribal areas, *i.e.*, from Dahod district, three talukas, *i.e.*, Jhalod, Dahod, and Fatepura, were selected based on the highest ST population, 26.98%, 23.51 %, and 14.08 %, respectively; whereas the non-tribal areas are selected from Anand district, three talukas, *i.e.*, Anklav, Tarapur, and Sojitra, were having the lowest ST population, 1.18 %, 1.79, % and 2.57 %, respectively.

At the third stage, prepared a list of villages. Then, a total of three villages from each selected taluka were selected randomly. Nine villages were selected, from the tribal district (Dahod) and nine villages, from the non-tribal district (Anand). Thus, a total of eighteen villages were selected for the study.

### Selection of respondents

To select the group size, arranged the respondents based on their landholdings in ascending order. They were classified into five size groups, *i.e.*, landless agriculture labor, marginal farm households (up to 1.00 hectare), small farm households (> 1.00 to 2.00 hectares), medium farm households (> 2.00 to 4.00 hectares), and large farm households (above 4.00 hectares). Then a sample of twenty respondents' was selected from each selected village, ensuring probability proportion to each stratum. Thus, of 180 respondents from the tribal district (Dahod) and 180

respondents from the non-tribal district (Anand) were selected. Thus, total of 360 respondents were finally chosen for the study.

### Nature and sources of the data

The study used primary data. The data collected for the poverty situation from the selected respondents for the year 2018-19. Personal interviews using an interview schedule used considering the study's nature and obtaining correct and perfect information. Based on experts' suggestions, revised the interview schedule, and before finalizing the interview schedule, it was pre-tested with 10 percent of the total respondents.

### Framework of the data analysis

The principal analytical tools employed for the study were the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) index of poverty and tabular analysis.

### The extent of poverty

Minimum consumption expenditure per person was used as a standard of measurement to examine poverty. Consumption is a better indicator of long-term household welfare as it consists of a minor temporal variation than income (MoFED, 2013). Also, in India, as elsewhere, consumption is likely to be measured more accurately than income. Minimum food consumption is associated with satisfying specific nutrition standards. Considering consumption to be an indicator of household welfare, it has adjusted for different household members due to their calorie requirement differences. It can deflate household consumption expenditure by an adult equivalent scale, which depends on each family member's nutritional requirement.

In this study, based on individual household minimum consumption expenditure per person data, the first step was classifying a given household, whether he is poor or non-poor than the standard poverty line. The poverty line is a Per Capita Consumption expenditure per person or a cut of a standard living level below which an individual is considered flawed (Planning Commission of India, 2014 and MoFED, 2013). According to the Planning Commission of India (2014), monthly per capita consumption expenditure of ₹ 1102.83 in rural areas and ₹ 1507.06 in urban areas treated as the

poverty line at the Gujarat state level. It implies a monthly consumption expenditure of ₹ 5514.15 in rural areas or ₹ 7535.3 in urban areas for a family of five at 2011-12 prices. Any household/individual failing to meet this consumption expenditure level can treat as a poor household. Hence, the abovementioned poverty line was employed as a cut-off value between poor and non-poor families for this study. People are counted as poor when their measured standard of living is below the poverty line, otherwise non-poor (Planning Commission of India, 2014).

Based on the above poverty line and data from households, this study has used three poverty dimension instruments that were identified by (Foster *et al.* 1984) to attain our objective to examine the extent of poverty in the State. These include the headcount index, poverty gap index and severity index, or Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) index of poverty. These three poverty dimension instruments also help us to see the poverty situations. By using these three poverty measures, we identified the percentage of the poor (headcount index), the aggregate poverty gap (poverty gap index), and the distribution of income among the poor (poverty severity index) in central Gujarat to achieve our second objective.

The model's mathematical expression in Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT, 1984) for poverty measurement was explained by considering,  $P_\alpha$  as a poverty measurement class. By leveling real per-adult (per capita) household consumption expenditure per person,  $Y_i$ , as:

$$Y_1 \leq Y_2 \leq \dots Y_q \leq Z < Y_{q+1} \dots \leq Y_n \quad \dots(1)$$

Where

$Z$  = Poverty line,  $n$  = Total population,  $q$  = Number of poor

Then,  $P_\alpha$  is given by,

$$P_\alpha = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \left( \frac{Z - Y_i}{Z} \right)^\alpha \quad \dots(2)$$

Where:

$P_\alpha$  = Poverty measure,  $Z$  = Poverty line,  $N$  = Sample size;  $q$  = Number of persons/household below the poverty line;  $Y_i$  = Per capita consumption

expenditure,  $\alpha =$  is the weight attached to the severity of the poor, which takes the value 0, 1, 2 depending on the degree of concern about poverty, In the equation,  $Z - Y_i = 0$  if  $Y_i > Z$ .

**Headcount index:** Share of the population whose monthly per capita consumption expenditure is below the poverty line, that is, the population's share that cannot afford to buy a basic basket of goods. However, this index does not capture differences among the poor.

$$P_0 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \left( \frac{Z - Y_i}{Z} \right)^0 \quad \dots(3)$$

**Poverty gap index:** This index indicates the depth of poverty or provides information regarding how far households are from the poverty line. This measure captures the mean aggregate monthly per capita consumption expenditure shortfall relative to the poverty line across the whole population. In other words, it estimates the total resources needed to bring all the poor to the level of the poverty line (divided by the number of individuals in the population).

$$P_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \left( \frac{Z - Y_i}{Z} \right)^1 \quad \dots(4)$$

**Poverty severity index(squared poverty gap):** This takes into account not only the distance separating the poor from the poverty line (the poverty gap), but also the inequality among the poor; that is, a higher weight is placed on those households further away from the poverty line.

$$P_2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \left( \frac{Z - Y_i}{Z} \right)^2 \quad \dots(5)$$

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Extent of poverty

Through different poverty measuring approaches, poverty indices measure in the tribal and non-tribal areas of Central Gujarat and depicted in Table 1. The headcount index (the poverty incidence) was 0.139 and 0.056 for landless agricultural labor, 0.233 and 0.178 for marginal farm households, and 0.028 and 0.011 for small farm households in tribal and non-tribal areas. It shows the population proportion for which consumption expenditure is less than the

poverty line, *i.e.*, ₹ 1102.83 per month per person. It means 13.9 percent and 5.6 percent for landless agricultural labor, 23.3 percent and 17.8 percent for marginal farm households, 2.8 percent and 1.1 percent in small farm households were under the defined poverty line in the tribal and non-tribal area, respectively. It observed the highest poverty in marginal farm households followed by landless agricultural labors and small farm households in both selected regions. Thus, an overall tribal area (40.55%) had more poverty than non-tribal (24.44%).

Further, it observed no poverty among medium and large farm households of the non-tribal area and large farm households of the tribal areas. Only 1 percent medium farm household was poor in a tribal area. Thus, it may conclude that because of the large landholdings and greater access to other income-generating assets, poverty incidence did not observe among medium and large farmers in both study areas except 1.00 percent of a medium farmers in tribal areas.

Sailbala (2005) observed similar findings that poverty incidence was high among the marginal farmers, scheduled tribes, and lower-income categories. Radhakrishna and Panda (2006) also observed that poor households were generally landless laborers or farmers with marginal landholdings, and poverty prevails among the scheduled tribe and scheduled caste population. Pattanaik (2007) also concluded that poverty was high among low landholding farmers relative to higher landholding farmers.

The poverty gap index indicates the extent to which the poor's per capita expenditure falls below the poverty line in the study area. The overall poverty gap index was 0.11 and 0.04 in the tribal and non-tribal regions, respectively. It concluded that, on average, 11 percent and 4 percent of poverty line cash transfers needed to lift each poor person out of poverty in the tribal and non-tribal areas, respectively. The poverty gap for different farm classes in both the areas was found maximum for landless agricultural labour, followed by marginal, small and medium farm households. The poverty depth varied from 32 percent and 11 percent for landless agriculture labor to 1 percent for medium farm households and 1 percent for small farm households in tribal and non-tribal areas. It indicates that poverty depth was more for landless households and marginal farm households of the

**Table 1:** Poverty extent in Tribal and Non-tribal area of Central Gujarat

Group of respondents	Tribal area			Non-tribal area		
	Headcount Index	Poverty Gap Index	Poverty Severity Index	Headcount Index	Poverty Gap Index	Poverty Severity Index
Landless agri. Labour	0.139 (25)	0.32 (25)	0.12 (25)	0.056 (18)	0.11 (18)	0.04 (18)
Marginal	0.233 (106)	0.10 (106)	0.03 (106)	0.178 (117)	0.04 (117)	0.01 (117)
Small	0.028 (34)	0.03 (34)	0.01 (34)	0.011 (30)	0.01 (30)	0.001 (30)
Medium	0.01 (12)	0.01 (12)	0.001 (12)	0.00 (12)	0.00 (12)	0.00 (12)
Large	0.00 (3)	0.00 (3)	0.00 (3)	0.00 (3)	0.00 (3)	0.00 (3)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0.40 (180)</b>	<b>0.11 (180)</b>	<b>0.04 (180)</b>	<b>0.24 (180)</b>	<b>0.04 (180)</b>	<b>0.01 (180)</b>

Figures in the parentheses are the actual number of respondents.

**Table 2:** Monthly per adult equivalent expenditure status in the selected area

Group of respondents	Monthly per adult equivalent expenditure (₹)			
	Tribal area		Non-tribal area	
	Poor (n=73)	Non-poor (n=107)	Poor (n=44)	Non-poor (n=136)
Landless agri. labour	748	—	919	1530
Marginal	819	1255	946	1594
Small	866	1252	1019	1918
Medium	985	1232	—	2132
Large	—	1649	—	3723
<b>Overall</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>1263</b>	<b>943</b>	<b>1744</b>

tribal region. The squared poverty gap index shows the degree of inequality among the inadequate means higher income distribution inequality among the poor; higher is the squared poverty gap index. The squared poverty gap index was calculated by squaring the poverty gap index, which weighted below poverty line observations, showing the poorest among the poor. The squared poverty gap index data shows poverty was less severe in the non-tribal area compared to tribal areas. The squared poverty gap index value was 0.04 and 0.01 in the tribal and non-tribal areas in Central Gujarat.

### Expenditure status of respondents

#### Monthly per adult equivalent expenditure status

Table 2 shows the overall expenditure of poor people in all the five categories of both areas was lesser than the poverty line of ₹ 1102.83 per person per month. In the tribal and the non-tribal regions, poor person's overall monthly average expenditure was ₹ 800 and ₹ 43 per month, respectively. This average monthly expenditure was low in landless

agricultural labor in both areas. This average expenditure gap from recommended expenditure (poverty line) specifies poverty among the poor in the study area. It shows poor of the tribal area was more flawed than the poor of central Gujarat's non-tribal area.

Table 2 shows the monthly per adult equivalent expenditure. In the case of non-poor, all selected categories of non-tribal people, the overall monthly average expenditure was more than the tribal people. This is because large category farm households in the non-tribal areas generally expend more than the minimum spending (Poverty Line) per person per month.

In a tribal area, a poor person needed an average ₹ 303 per month to reach the poverty line. It was highest in the landless agricultural labor category (₹ 355) and lowest in medium category farm households (₹ 118). In non-tribal areas, a poor person needed fewer amounts (₹ 159) to reach the poverty line than the tribal areas. It was highest in the landless agricultural labor category (₹ 184) and lowest in small category farm households (₹ 84). This result shows that targeting poor people

**Table 3:** Monthly per adult equivalent expenditure gap from the poverty line in tribal and non-tribal area

Group of respondents	Average monthly expenditure gap (₹)			
	Tribal area		Non-tribal area	
	Average expenditure gap (₹)	Gap (%) (from poverty line)	Average expenditure gap (₹)	Gap (%) (from poverty line)
Landless agri. Labour	355	32.19	184	16.68
Marginal	284	25.75	157	14.24
Small	237	21.49	84	7.62
Medium	118	10.70	—	—
Large	—	—	—	—
<b>Overall</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>27.47</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>14.42</b>

**Table 4:** Monthly total consumption expenditure on food, non-food, education, and medical (₹/month)

Groups	Expenditure	Tribal area		Non-tribal area	
		Poor (n=73)	Non-poor (n=107)	Poor (n=44)	Non-poor (n=136)
Landless agri. Labour	Food expenditure	2349	—	2306	3180
	Non-food expenditure	1254	—	1414	1695
	Education	33	—	25	63
	Medical	102	—	171	146
	Total expenditure	3738	—	3916	5084
Marginal	Food expenditure	2844	3355	3310	4335
	Non-food expenditure	1735	2081	1714	2108
	Education	46	79	60	178
	Medical	162	237	228	354
	Total expenditure	4787	5752	5312	6975
Small	Food expenditure	3059	3482	3292	4901
	Non-food expenditure	1528	2316	1717	2386
	Education	108	40	0	207
	Medical	167	267	271	432
	Total expenditure	4862	6105	5280	7926
Medium	Food expenditure	3339	3794	—	6115
	Non-food expenditure	3216	2506	—	2917
	Education	42	136	—	563
	Medical	417	231	—	462
	Total expenditure	7014	6667	—	10057
Large	Food expenditure	—	4447	—	7448
	Non-food expenditure	—	2966	—	4719
	Education	—	111	—	1014
	Medical	—	222	—	4653
	Total expenditure	—	7746	—	17834
<b>Overall</b>	Food expenditure	2696	3465	3081	4632
	Non-food expenditure	1577	2213	1646	2271
	Education	46	75	49	257
	Medical	145	244	217	462
	Total expenditure	4464	5997	4993	7622

appropriately and assisting those through efficient poverty reduction programs would help to reduce poverty.

### Consumption expenditure of households in the tribal and non-tribal area

Consumption expenditure of households' used to measure poverty in this study as it assumes the

best indicator for living standard measurement than income. However, the income of the poor often varies over time, and consumption expenditure may reflect households' purchasing power. Therefore, an attempt to know the contribution of spending on food, non-food, education, and the households' health in this section is depicted in Table 4.

Poor households had expended overall ₹ 4464 and

₹ 4993 per month in the tribal and non-tribal areas. Among this total expenditure, poor people had spent the maximum on food items followed by non-food items, medical, and education in both the selected regions.

Table 5 indicates the expenditure of respondents in percentage. Overall expenditure of poor households on food items constituted maximum share (60.40% and 61.71 %) followed by non-food items (35.32% and 32.96 %), medical (3.25 % and 4.35 %), and education (1.03 % and 0.98 %) in tribal and non-tribal area, respectively.

In the tribal area, it saw that most of the people were spending on intoxicants and tobacco products. This could be the reason for their less expenditure on food items. Thus, sampled households assessed how much of their total non-food expenditure was spent on intoxicants and tobacco products, as shown in Table 6.

In the tribal and non-tribal areas, 34.12 percent and 13.61 percent of the total non-food expenditure of the poor households while 31.04 percent and 11.05 percent for the non-poor families spent on the intoxicants and tobacco products, respectively.

**Table 5:** Percentage share of monthly expenditure on food, non-food, education, and medical (in %)

Groups	Expenditure	Tribal area		Non-tribal area	
		Poor (n=73)	Non-poor (n=107)	Poor (n=44)	Non-poor (n=136)
Landless agri. Labour	Food expenditure	62.84	—	58.89	62.55
	Non-food expenditure	33.54	—	36.10	33.35
	Education	0.89	—	0.64	1.23
	Medical	2.72	—	4.36	2.87
	Total expenditure	100	—	100	100
Marginal	Food expenditure	59.41	58.30	62.32	62.15
	Non-food expenditure	36.24	36.20	32.26	30.22
	Education	0.96	1.40	1.12	2.55
	Medical	3.39	4.10	4.29	5.08
	Total expenditure	100	100	100	10
Small	Food expenditure	62.92	57.04	62.35	61.84
	Non-food expenditure	31.43	37.93	32.51	30.11
	Education	2.22	0.65	0	2.61
	Medical	3.43	4.38	5.14	5.44
	Total expenditure	100	100	100	100
Medium	Food expenditure	47.61	56.90	—	60.81
	Non-food expenditure	45.85	37.58	—	29.01
	Education	0.59	2.05	—	5.59
	Medical	5.94	3.47	—	4.59
	Total expenditure	100	100	—	100
Large	Food expenditure	—	57.41	—	41.76
	Non-food expenditure	—	38.28	—	26.46
	Education	—	1.43	—	5.69
	Medical	—	2.87	—	26.09
	Total expenditure	—	100	—	100
Overall	Food expenditure	60.40	57.77	61.71	60.77
	Non-food expenditure	35.32	36.90	32.96	29.80
	Education	1.03	1.26	0.98	3.37
	Medical	3.25	4.07	4.35	6.06
	Total expenditure	100	100	100	100

**Table 6:** Monthly expenditure on intoxicants and tobacco products (in ₹)

Groups	Expenditure	Tribal area		Non-tribal area	
		Poor (n=73)	Non-poor (n=107)	Poor (n=44)	Non-poor (n=136)
Landless agri. Labour	1 Intoxicants	230(18.34)	—	0 (0.00)	38(2.24)
	2 Tobacco products	246 (19.62)	—	210 (14.85)	300 (17.70)
	3 Total (1+2)	476 (37.96)	—	210(14.85)	338(19.94)
	4 Total non-food cost	1254 (100)	—	1414 (100)	1695 (100)
Marginal	1 Intoxicants	204 (11.76)	311(14.94)	25 (1.46)	7 (0.33)
	2 Tobacco products	304 (17.52)	393 (18.89)	198 (11.55)	215 (10.20)
	3 Total (1+2)	508 (29.28)	704(33.83)	223(13.01)	222(10.53)
	4 Total non-food cost	1735 (100)	2081 (100)	1714 (100)	2108 (100)
Small	1 Intoxicants	190 (12.43)	226 (9.76)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
	2 Tobacco products	160 (10.47)	369 (15.93)	400 (23.30)	261 (10.94)
	3 Total (1+2)	350 (22.91)	595(25.69)	400(23.30)	261(10.94)
	4 Total non-food cost	1528 (100)	2316 (100)	1717 (100)	2386 (100)
Medium	1 Intoxicants	600 (18.66)	326(13.01)	—	0 (0.00)
	2 Tobacco products	600 (18.66)	468 (18.68)	—	308 (10.56)
	3 Total (1+2)	1200 (37.31)	794(31.68)	—	308(10.56)
	4 Total non-food cost	3216 (100)	2506 (100)	—	2917 (100)
Large	1 Intoxicants	—	400(13.49)	—	0 (0.00)
	2 Tobacco products	—	300 (10.11)	—	400 (8.48)
	3 Total (1+2)	—	700(23.60)	—	400 (8.48)
	4 Total non-food cost	—	2966 (100)	—	4719 (100)
Overall	1 Intoxicants	256 (16.23)	295(13.33)	18 (1.09)	7 (0.31)
	2 Tobacco products	282 (17.88)	392 (17.71)	206 (12.52)	244 (10.74)
	3 Total (1+2)	538 (34.12)	687 (31.04)	224 (13.61)	251 (11.05)
	4 Total non-food cost	1577 (100)	2213 (100)	1646 (100)	2271 (100)

Note: Figures within the parentheses indicate percentage to respective total.

The data also shows that out of all five categories for the poor households in the tribal area, landless agriculture labor spent the highest 37.96 percent on the intoxicants and tobacco products, followed by medium (37.31%), marginal (29.28%), and small (22.91%). Thus, in tribal areas, both poor and non-poor people were spending more on intoxicants and tobacco products than in non-tribal areas. It suggests that government and social organizations make awareness programs to control intoxicants and tobacco in general for both the region and particularly in tribal areas.

## CONCLUSION

The extent of poverty showed that overall tribal areas had more poverty than non-tribal areas. It was observed that the highest poverty in marginal

farm households followed by landless agricultural labors, and small farm households in both selected regions. The poverty depth was more in landless agricultural labor, followed by marginal farm households, small and medium farm households. The squared poverty gap index shows poverty was less severe in the non-tribal area than in the tribal areas. Overall expenditure of poor households on food items constituted maximum share (60.40 % and 61.71 %) followed by non-food items (35.32 % and 32.96 %), medical (3.25 % and 4.35 %), and education (1.03 % and 0.98 %) in tribal and non-tribal area, respectively. It suggested that the extent of poverty was more significant in the tribal area; hence, the government should emphasize the tribal region. It is necessary to give regular employment to landless agriculture labor and marginal farm households



through proper and efficient implementation of working programs such as MGNREGA to increase their income level.

In tribal areas, poor and non-poor people were spending more income on intoxicant and tobacco products than non-tribal areas. Therefore, it suggested that government and social organizations should make awareness programs to control the use of intoxicants and tobacco in general for both the area and particularly in tribal areas because they were spending more on these items.

## REFERENCES

- Datt, G. and Ravallion, M. 2002. Is India's Economic Growth Leaving the Poor Behind? *J. Econ. Perspec.*, **16**(3): 89 –108.
- Foster, J., Greer, J. and Thorbecke, E. 1984. A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measure, *Econometrica*, **52**(3).
- MoFED. 2013. Development and Poverty in Ethiopia (1995/96-2010/11), National Sample Survey Office, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India Household Consumer Expenditure, NSS 68<sup>th</sup> Round.
- Parmar, P.M. 2014. Problem of Poverty among Schedule Tribes, *PARIPEX- Indian J. Res.*, **3**(9): 11-12.
- Pattanaik, B.K. 2007. Rural Poverty and Need for Primary Sector Development, *Kurukshetra*, **55**(7): 38-42.
- Planning Commission of India. 2014. The Expert Group to Review the Methodology for Measurement of Poverty (Planning Commission, Government of India Report): Rangrajan, C., Mahendra Dev, S., Sundaram, K., Vyas, M. and Datt, K. L.
- Prabhavati, P.O. and Naveena, N. 2014. An Analysis of Poverty in Karnataka: A study, *J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, **19**(3): 27-31.
- Radhakrishna, R. and Panda, M. 2006. Macroeconomics of Poverty Reduction: India Case Study, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai.
- Sailabala, D. 2005. Poverty in Rural Orissa and Role of Education, *In: K.N. Rao (Eds.), Poverty in India, Global and Regional Dimensions* (pp. 392-403), Deep and Deep Publications, New Delhi.
- Shridhar, H. 2014. Persistent Levels of Poverty in India: Urgent Action Needed to End Suffering, *ANU Undergrad. Res. J.*, **5**: 201-212.
- Storck, H., Emanu, B. Adnew, B., Borowiecki, A. and Woldehawariate, S. 1991. Farming Systems and Farm Management Practices of Small Holders in the Hararghe Highlands: Farming Systems and Resources Economics in the Tropics, Wssenschaftsver lag Vauk, Kiel, Germany, pp. 41-48.
- Sustainable Development Solutions Network. 2012. A Background Paper on Global Profile of Extreme Poverty, Secretariat of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network, A Global Initiatives for the United Nation.
- World Bank. 2008. The Growth Report: Strategies for Sustained Growth and Inclusive Development, Commission on Growth and Development, World Bank.
- World Bank. 2019. Poverty. Retrieved from <https://www.worldbank.org/en /topic/poverty/overview>, February, 2019.

