



ISSN: 0975-833X

Available online at <http://www.journalcra.com>

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF CURRENT RESEARCH

International Journal of Current Research
Vol. 14, Issue, 09, pp.22209-22217, September, 2022
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.43995.09.2022>

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A STUDY OF SOCIAL SECTOR DEVELOPMENT IN EASTERN UTTAR PRADESH: DISTRICTS-WISE DISPARITY

*Dr. Surendra Kumar Gupta

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, D DU Gorakhpur University, Gorakhpur

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 29th June, 2022
Received in revised form
17th July, 2022
Accepted 14th August, 2022
Published online 28th September, 2022

Key words:

Social Development,
Education, Health and Disparity.

*Corresponding Author:
Xiaowei Yuan

ABSTRACT

Education and health is known to have vital and important links with the achievement of income and social development as well as improvements in health and education has important implications for the supply and demand of labour. Uttar Pradesh is more populous state of India and eastern region of Uttar Pradesh is more backward than other region of Uttar Pradesh. In this paper an attempt has been made to analyse inter-district disparity in the eastern UP and inter regional disparity among the economic regions of U.P in development of social sectors, i.e., education and health. The purpose of this study is to focus on the education and health capabilities of the people of eastern Uttar Pradesh because improvements in education and health are strong symbol of development and growth of any country. The present work is mainly based on secondary data. The study seeks to compare regional variation for the two point of time i.e, 2011-12 and 2017-18 as per availability of data. The districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh are suffering with low health outcome and poor health development. The overall performance of the Eastern Uttar Pradesh in terms of health attainment is pitiable. Between 2011-12 and 2017-18, the overall picture of districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh has remained unchanged with some improvement. By the data analysis it is clear that some districts are performing better in health and education while some districts are in worse condition. Eastern Uttar Pradesh can set the rules of policy and governance for rest of the regions.

Copyright©2022, Surendra Kumar Gupta. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Dr. Surendra Kumar Gupta. 2022. "A Study of Social Sector Development in Eastern Uttar Pradesh: Districts-wise Disparity". *International Journal of Current Research*, 14, (09), 22209-22217.

INTRODUCTION

Uttar Pradesh is more populous state of India as well as only four countries such as China, USA, Indonesia and Brazil have population higher than that of UP. In the state, not only population is high, almost 80 per cent of it resides in rural area, spread over 97,942 inhabited villages which are larger than any African country except Nigeria. In this paper an attempt has been made to analyse inter-district disparity in the eastern UP and inter regional disparity among the economic regions of U.P in development of social sectors, i.e., education and health. The purpose of this study is to focus on the education and health capabilities of the people of eastern Uttar Pradesh because improvements in education and health are strong symbol of development and growth of any country. Dréze and Sen (1995) in his book 'India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity' outlined the importance of various dimensions of health and education as well as UNDP includes health and education as a most important dimension for HDI also.

Literature Review: Siddiqui (2012) found in his study that India has been observing inter-state variations in various aspects. Nitin Tanwar et al (2016) in their study attempted to capture the development of districts of western Uttar Pradesh. The secondary data on a number of indicators published by Uttar Pradesh government for the year 2011-12 have been used in the study.

The principal component analysis, factor analysis and techniques adopted. They used 18 developmental indicators in which 6 indicators were directly concerned with agricultural development and the rest of 12 indicators describe the availability of social and industrial facilities for 26 districts of western Uttar Pradesh in their study. The ranking of the districts in respect of performance in agriculture, Social and Industry have been obtained in their study. A study done by Hemant Saikia, (2012) on regional inequality of Social Sector development in India focused on NER. In his study, he attempted to measure the intra and inter-regional disparity in India using various statistical measures especially Data Envelopment analysis and Principal Component analysis. In the last part of the paper, an attempt is made to analyse the main factors influencing the social sector development in NER. His analysis emphasis that Govt. of India has adopted several measures to improve social sector development although there is various imbalances in various aspects. Further he suggests in his study that a balance sectoral development is needed for future development of the Indian regions, especially the North Eastern region of India. Kumar Naresh & Ritu Rani (2019) in their study focused on regional disparities in social development in India by using social development index (SDI). This study used census-based data of 2011 including 28 states and seven union territories (UTs) of India. By using 12 social indicators this study ranks states and UTs. The findings show that Kerala is the best state among all states in India in terms of social progress. The study confirmed that there are huge disparities at district and states/UTs level in India.

Dev and Ravi (2007) in his study found that pace of decline in poverty has not improved significantly during the post-reform period. The reason behind this is slow down of agricultural growth rate. In addition, the post-reform period has seen increase in inequality. Choudhary (2008) in his study examined regional disparities in terms of educational development in India over the decade of 1981, 1991 and 2001. Educational development index (EDI) was calculated for measuring the level of regional disparities in educational development. Results of the study revealed that only Kerala had a high level of educational development. Keeping the above literature in mind I have chosen this problem to show the actual condition of district in Uttar Pradesh especially in eastern region with following research objectives;

Objectives of Study

After reviewing the various articles this study is shows the findings on following objectives;

- To know the status of social development in eastern Uttar Pradesh in context of health and education.
- To analyse inter-regional disparity among the economic regions of U.P in development of social sectors, i.e., education and health.
- To analyse inter-district disparity in the eastern UP in development of social sectors, i.e., education and health.
- To focus on the education and health capabilities of the people of eastern Uttar Pradesh.

Choice of Indicators and Methodology: District level data on the variables have been chosen keeping in view the availability of information. The sources of data for these indicators are varied, making it difficult to use all the indicators jointly to develop a composite index. The study seeks to compare regional variation for the two point of time i.e, 2011-12 and 2017-18 as per availability of data. The year 2011-12 reflects the situation after about a two decade of economic reforms and 2017-18 represents the latest years for which most of the information is available and shows the impact of the second generation of economic reforms on regional disparity. The study considers the specific region of Eastern Uttar Pradesh with 28 districts as per economic classification. The present work is mainly based on secondary data, UP Statistical Abstracts, District-wise Development Indicator of UP, 2018; District Statistical Diaries and other data sources.

In this study Principal Component Analysis (PCA) has been used which measures and also represents the explanation of various indicators and their variance proportion. This study analyses inter-regional and inter-district disparity in eastern Uttar Pradesh in two-cross section period 2011-2012 and 2017-18. It uses two sectors for measuring disparity, i.e., health and education and 10 sub-indicators which explain social development in the Uttar Pradesh at regional level and in Eastern Uttar Pradesh at district level. On the basis of composite index, it has identified the backward or disadvantaged regions across the state as well as districts in Eastern Uttar Pradesh.

Data Analysis

Health Sector

Inter-Regional Disparity: There exists a large inter-regional disparity in overall attainment in Health indicators in the state of Uttar Pradesh. The value of the coefficient of variation (CV) shows that during the period 2011-12 to 2017-2018, regional disparity at the state level has increased. This means that there exists some evidence of divergence rather than convergence. The value of CV increased from 91.63 in 2011-12 to 95.79 in 2017-18. The eastern region whose position was second in 2011-12 has retained their position in 2017-18. With the above analysis it is interesting to note here that region-wise disparity as well district-wise disparity has increased. It is very clear that there is not much effect of reform on the districts over the five years in health sector.

Inter-District Disparity: There exists a large inter-district disparity in overall attainment in Health indicators in the districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh. There is a notable difference in the districts in terms of Health Indicators. The best performing district was Ballia, while the most backward district was Amethi and Varanasi in 2011-12. Ballia is top performer district of Eastern Uttar Pradesh in context of health development indicators because in this district, No. of Allopathic Hospitals/ Dispenseries per lakh of Population (Including P.H.Cs.) and No. of Ayurvedic/Homeopathic/Yunani Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population is more than others districts. On the other hand in 2011-12 Amethi district was not made that's why value of index is zero while Varanasi has less Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population (Including P.H.Cs.) and No. of Ayurvedic/Homeopathic/Yunani Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population in comparison to other district. During the period 2011-12, there were many factors for huge disparity in the districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh. These included lack of proper health facilities, lack of no. of allopathic hospitals and lack of other health related convenience etc. The top ten performer districts in this sector belonged to the Eastern Uttar Pradesh are Ballia, Sultanpur, Pratapgarh, Siddharthnagar, Basti, Mirzapur, Mau, Kausambi, Deoria and Balrampur. During 2017-18, Ballia was the top performer, while Varanasi was the bottom performer. It is low not only in this year, but also its position was the same in 2011-12. The districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh are suffering with low health outcome and poor health development. The overall performance of the Eastern Uttar Pradesh in terms of health attainment is pitiable. Between 2011-12 and 2017-18, the overall picture of districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh has remained unchanged with some improvement (disparity has been unchanged in terms of coefficient of variation where CV was 47.62 in 2011-12 and same in 2017-18 respectively) while no major improvement has been seen in the backward districts.

Tables, 3, 4 & 5 present the level of development on the basis of composite index. In this analysis composite index value has been categorized into three parts. If composite index value is equal & more than 0.7 then districts are in high development status, more than 0.4 and less than 0.7 districts are in medium development status and if C I is less 0.4 then districts are in low development status respectively. Regarding health development only four districts Ballia, Sultanpur, Pratapgarh and Siddharthnagar were high developed in 2011-12 while in 2017-18 only five districts are high developed districts in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. It means there is no major change in high developed districts but in the context of some districts major change has been seen namely Sharavasti and Amethi. Where both the districts were in the category of less developed district in 2011-12, they came under the category of highly developed districts in 2017-18. Where ten districts in Eastern Uttar Pradesh are medium developed districts regarding health development in 2011-12 while eleven districts are in medium developed districts in 2017-18 respectively. There is no change in number of districts regarding low developed districts. Twelve districts are in category of low developed districts in 2011-12 and in 2017-18 in case of health development. After observing highly developed districts and medium developed districts in above table, some surprising results are seen. Where Siddharthnagar district was a high-developed district in the context of health development in the year 2011-12, it became a district of medium development in 2017-18. On the other hand, in 2011-12, Shrivasti and Amethi districts were in the category of low-developed district in terms of health development, but in 2017-18, they were came under high developed category districts. It is also clear from the table that some districts were in the category of medium development district in terms of health development in 2011-12, they came under the category of low development in 2017-18 such as; Balrampur, Sonbhadra and Kushinagar.

Education Sector

Disparities in Social Development of Eastern Uttar Pradesh in terms of Education Sector: This portion of the chapter analyses inter-regional and inter-district disparity in Eastern Uttar Pradesh in two-cross section period 2011-2012 and 2017-18.

Table 1. Region-wise Composite Index and Ranking in Context to Health Indicators

Region	2011-12			2017-18		
	Composite Index	Level of Development	Rank	Composite Index	Level of Development	Rank
Bundelkhand Region	1.00	HD	1	1.00	HD	1
Eastern Region	0.41	MD	2	0.40	MD	2
Central Region	0.16	LD	3	0.15	LD	3
Western Region	0.04	LD	4	0.02	LD	4
MEAN	0.40			0.39		
SD	0.370			0.376		
CV	91.63			95.79		

Source: See Annexure 1

Table 2. District-wise Index and Ranking in Context to Health Indicators

District	2011-12			2017-18		
	Composite Index	Level of Development	Rank	Composite Index	Level of Development	Rank
Balia	0.83	HD	1	0.87	HD	1
Sultanpur	0.79	HD	2	0.86	HD	2
Pratapgarh	0.74	HD	3	0.80	HD	3
Siddharthnagar	0.72	HD	4	0.67	MD	6
Basti	0.68	MD	5	0.63	MD	7
Mirzapur	0.56	MD	6	0.61	MD	8
Mau	0.52	MD	7	0.47	MD	12
Kausambi	0.5	MD	8	0.41	MD	16
Deoria	0.46	MD	9	0.55	MD	10
Balrampur	0.45	MD	10	0.24	LD	24
Chandauli	0.44	MD	11	0.57	MD	9
Azamgarh	0.44	MD	12	0.52	MD	11
Sonbhadra	0.4	MD	13	0.39	LD	18
Kushinagar	0.4	MD	14	0.35	LD	20
Ghazipur	0.39	LD	15	0.41	MD	14
Ambedkarnagar	0.39	LD	16	0.41	MD	15
SantRavidas Nagar	0.39	LD	17	0.33	LD	21
Gorakhpur	0.37	LD	18	0.39	LD	17
Jaunpur	0.37	LD	19	0.42	MD	13
Shravasti	0.33	LD	20	0.77	HD	5
Maharajganj	0.32	LD	21	0.31	LD	22
Ayodhya	0.29	LD	22	0.35	LD	19
Bahraich	0.29	LD	23	0.06	LD	27
Gonda	0.21	LD	24	0.22	LD	26
SantKabir Nagar	0.16	LD	25	0.29	LD	23
Prayagraj	0.12	LD	26	0.23	LD	25
Varansi	0.1	LD	27	0.04	LD	28
Amethi	0		28	0.78	HD	4
CV	48.52			47.78		-----

Source: See Annexure 2

Table 3. High Development (Composite Index >0.7)

Year 2011-12	Year 2017-18
1.Balia	1.Balia
2.Sultanpur	2.Sultanpur
3.Pratapgarh	3.Pratapgarh
4.Siddharthnagar	4.Amethi
	5.Shravasti

Table 4. Medium Development (Composite Index <0.4)

Year 2011-12	Year 2017-18
1.Basti	1.Siddharthnagar
2.Mirzapur	2.Basti
3.Mau	3.Mirzapur
4.Kausambi	4.Chandauli
5.Deoria	5.Deoria
6.Balrampur	6.Azamgarh
7.Chandauli	7.Mau
8.Azamgarh	8.Jaunpur
9.Sonbhadra	9.Ghazipur
10.Kushinagar	10.Ambedkarnagar
	11.Kausambi

Table 5: Low Development (Composite Index >0.4)

Year 2011-12	Year 2017-18
1.Sant Ravidas Nagar	1.Gorakhpur
2.Gorakhpur	2.Sonbhadra
3.Jaunpur	3.Ayodhya
4.Shravasti	4.Kushinagar
5.Maharajganj	5.SantRavidas Nagar
6.Ayodhya	6.Maharajganj
7.Bahraich	7.SantKabir Nagar
8.Gonda	8.Balrampur
9.SantKabir Nagar	9.Prayagraj
10.Prayagraj	10.Gonda
11.Varansi	11.Bahraich
12.Amethi	12.Varansi

Table 6: Region-wise Composite Index and Ranking in Context to Education Indicators

Regions	2011-12		2017-18	
	Composite Index	Rank	Composite Index	Rank
Bundelkh and Region	1.00	1	0.96	1
Eastern Region	0.18	3	0.12	4
Central Region	0.16	4	0.39	2
Western Region	0.22	2	0.25	3
Mean	0.39	-----	0.43	-----
SD	0.354	-----	0.322	-----
CV	91.48	-----	74.82	-----

Source: See Annexure 3

Table 7. District-wise Index and Ranking in Context to Education Indicators

District	2011-12			2017-18		
	Composite Index	Level of Development	Rank	Composite Index	Level of Development	Rank
Ambedkarnagar	0.72	HD	1	0.7	HD	7
Jaunpur	0.70	HD	2	0.75	HD	3
Ayodhya	0.67	MD	3	0.7	HD	6
Sultanpur	0.66	MD	4	0.74	HD	4
Ghazipur	0.65	MD	5	0.75	HD	2
Varansi	0.62	MD	6	0.52	MD	23
Sonbhadra	0.62	MD	7	0.68	MD	11
Mirzapur	0.60	MD	8	0.69	MD	9
Pratapgarh	0.59	MD	9	0.52	MD	22
Prayagraj	0.59	MD	10	0.46	MD	26
SantRavidas Nagar	0.58	MD	11	0.72	HD	5
Chandauli	0.57	MD	12	0.64	MD	16
Balia	0.55	MD	13	0.64	MD	15
SantKabir Nagar	0.53	MD	14	0.69	MD	10
Mau	0.53	MD	15	0.61	MD	18
Azamgarh	0.52	MD	16	0.6	MD	19
Deoria	0.51	MD	17	0.79	HD	1
Basti	0.49	MD	18	0.69	MD	8
Bahraich	0.48	MD	19	0.29	LD	28
Gorakhpur	0.46	MD	20	0.65	MD	14
Kausambi	0.44	MD	21	0.65	MD	13
Siddharthnagar	0.42	MD	22	0.54	MD	21
Maharajganj	0.39	LD	23	0.66	MD	12
Gonda	0.38	LD	24	0.51	MD	24
Shravasti	0.32	LD	25	0.48	MD	25
Balrampur	0.32	LD	26	0.34	LD	27
Kushinagar	0.32	LD	27	0.62	MD	17
Amethi	0	LD	28	0.56	MD	20
CV	26.39			19.31		-----

Source: See Annexure 4 & 5

Table 8. High Development (Composite Index >0.7)

Year 2011-12	Year 2017-18
5.Ambedkarnagar 6.Jaunpur	1.Ambedkarnagar, 2.Jaunpur, 3.Ayodhya, 4.Sultanpur , 5.Ghazipur, 6.Deoria 7.SantRavidas Nagar.

Source: See Annexure 4 & 5

Table 9. Medium Development (Composite Index <0.4)

Year 2011-12	Year 2017-18
1.Ayodhya 2.Sultanpur 3.Ghazipur 4.Varansi 5.Sonbhadra 6.Mirzapur 7.Pratapgarh 8.Prayagraj 9.SantRavidas Nagar 10.Chandauli 11.Balia 12.SantKabir Nagar 13.Mau 14.Azamgarh 15.Deoria 16.Basti 17.Bahraich 18.Gorakhpur 19.Kausambi Siddharthnagar	1.Varansi 2.Sonbhadra 3.Mirzapur 4.Pratapgarh 5.Prayagraj 6.Chandauli 7.Balia 8.SantKabir Nagar 9.Mau 10.Azamgarh 11.Basti 12.Gorakhpur 13.Amethi 14.Siddharthnagar 15.Maharajganj 16.Gonda 17.Shravasti 18.Kushinagar 19.Kausambi

Source: See Annexure 4 & 5

Table 10. Low Development (Composite Index >0.4)

Year 2011-12	Year 2017-18
1.Maharajganj	1.Balrampur
2.Gonda	2.Bahraich
3.Shravasti	
4.Amethi	
5.Kushinagar	
6.Balrampur	

Source: See Annexure 4 & 5

It uses two sectors for measuring disparity, i.e., education and health and 10 sub-indicators which explain social development in the Uttar Pradesh at regional level and in Eastern Uttar Pradesh at district level. On the basis of composite index, it has identified the backward or disadvantaged regions across the state as well as districts in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. In this section an attempt has been made to analyse inter-regional disparity in Uttar Pradesh and inter-district disparity in the districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh in social sector, i.e., education.

Inter-Regional Disparity: There exists a large inter-regional disparity in overall attainment in education indicators in the state of Uttar Pradesh. The value of the coefficient of variation (CV) shows that during the period 2011-12 to 2017-2018, regional disparity at the state level has decreased. This means that there exists some evidence of convergence rather than divergence. The value of CV decreased from 91.48 in 2011-12 to 74.82 in 2017-18. The eastern region whose position was third in 2011-12 has slipped their position at fourth in 2017-18. With the above analysis it is interesting to note here that region-wise disparity as well district-wise disparity has decreased. It is very clear that there is much effect of reform on the districts over the five years in education sector.

Inter-District Disparity: There exists a large inter-district disparity in overall attainment in education indicators in the districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh. There is a notable difference in the districts in terms of Education Indicators. The best performing district was Ambedkarnagar in 2011-12 and Deoria is best performing district in 2017-18, while the most backward district was Amethi in 2011-12 and Bahraich in 2017-18. Ambedkarnagar is top performer district of Eastern Uttar Pradesh in context of education development indicators because in this district, Drop Out Rate in Junior Basic School (J.B.S.), Drop Out Rate in Senior Basic School (S.B.S.) and Literacy Gap between Male-Female is less and Total Literacy Rate, Male Literacy Rate, Number of I.T.Is Per Lakh Population, Number of School Per Lakh Population in Junior Basic School(J.B.S.)and Number of School Per Lakh Population in Senior Basic School(S.B.S.) are high in comparison to other districts. On the other hand in 2011-12 Amethi district has no data that's why value of index is zero while Kushinagar has high Drop Out Rate in Junior Basic School (J.B.S.), Drop Out Rate in Senior Basic School (S.B.S.) and Literacy Gap between Male-Female and less in Total Literacy Rate, Male Literacy Rate, Number of I.T.Is Per Lakh Population, Number of School Per Lakh Population in Junior Basic School(J.B.S.)and Number of School Per Lakh Population in Senior Basic School(S.B.S.) in comparison to other district.

During the period 2011-12, there were many factors for huge disparity in the districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh. These included lack of proper education facilities, lack of awareness about education and lack of other education related convenience etc. The top ten performer districts in this sector belonged to the Eastern Uttar Pradesh are Ambedkarnagar, Jaunpur, Ayodhya, Sultanpur, Ghazipur, Varansi, Sonbhadra, Mirzapur, Pratapgarh and Prayagraj. During 2017-18, Deoria was the top performer, while Bahraich was the bottom performer. The districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh are suffering with low educational outcome and poor education development. The overall performance of the Eastern Uttar Pradesh in terms of Education attainment is pitiable. Between 2011-12 and 2017-18, the overall picture of districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh has improved with some improvement (disparity has been decreased in terms of coefficient of variation where CV was 26.39 in 2011-12 and 19.31 in 2017-18 respectively) and major improvement has been seen in the

backward districts. Tables, 8, 9 & 10 presents the level of development on the basis of composite index. In this analysis composite index value has been categorized into three parts. If composite index value is equal & more than 0.7 then districts are in high development status, more than 0.4 and less than 0.7 districts are in medium development status and if C I is less 0.4 then districts are in low development status respectively. Regarding Education development only two districts Ambedkarnagr and Jaunpur were high developed in 2011-12 while in 2017-18 seven districts are high developed districts in Eastern Uttar Pradesh such as Ambedkarnagar, Jaunpur, Ayodhya, Sultanpur, Ghazipur, Deoria and SantRavidas Nagar. It means there is major change in high developed districts but in the context of some districts no major change has been seen namely Balrampur, Shrivasti and Gonda. These districts were in the category of less developed district in 2011-12, and also in 2017-18. Where twenty districts in Eastern Uttar Pradesh are medium developed districts regarding education development in 2011-12 while nineteen districts are in medium developed districts in 2017-18 respectively. There is major change in number of districts regarding low developed districts. Six districts are in category of low developed districts in 2011-12 and only two districts in 2017-18 in case of education development. After observing highly developed districts and medium developed districts in above table, some surprising results are seen. Where Ayodhya, Sultanpur, Ghazipur, Deoria and SantRavidas Nagar districts were medium-developed district in the context of education development in the year 2011-12, it became a district of highly developed in 2017-18. On the other hand, in 2011-12, Bahraich district was in the category of medium-developed district in terms of education development, but in 2017-18, that was came under low developed category district. It is also clear from the table that Balrampur district was in the category of low development district in terms of education development in 2011-12, same position in 2017-18.

CONCLUSION

Eastern Uttar Pradesh seems to have great potential for overall development through the development of agriculture sector, manufacturing sector, service sector and social development as well as the abundance of natural wealth in a suitable climatic condition, in addition to the huge human resources bestowed upon it that can definitely be translated into the riches of the region but due to lack health and education facilities this region seems to backward region because healthy and skilled manpower can be improve the production and productivity in any sector of economy.

The districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh are suffering with low health outcome and poor health development. The overall performance of the Eastern Uttar Pradesh in terms of health attainment is pitiable. Between 2011-12 and 2017-18, the overall picture of districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh has remained unchanged with some improvement. By the data analysis it is clear that some districts are performing better in health and education while some districts are in worse condition. Eastern Uttar Pradesh can set the rules of policy and governance for rest of the regions in the country regarding health and education but taking steps by the government must be focus on improvement of infrastructure development.

REFERENCES

- District-wise Development Indicator, Planning Department of Uttar Pradesh 2018
- Dreze, Jean and Amartya Sen 1995. India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, pp. 13-15.
- Siddiqui, S. 2012. Regional analysis of socio-economic development in Uttar Pradesh. African Jour. of Social Science. 2 : 120-130.
- Nitin Tanwar et al. 2016. Evaluation of Socio-economic Development in Western Uttar Pradesh. Indian Journal of Economics and Development 12(3):521-528.

Hemant Saikia 2012. Regional inequality of Social Sector development in India. *Journal of Regional Science* 6(2):73-90
https://niti.gov.in/planningcommission.gov.in/docs/plans/stateplan/up_sdr/vol-2/Chap_b12.pdf
 Kumar Naresh & Ritu Rani 2019. Regional Disparities in Social Development: Evidence from States and Union Territories of India. *South Asian Survey* 26(1) 1–27, 2019

Dev, S. M., & Ravi, C. 2007. Poverty and inequality: All-India and states, 1983–2005. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(6), 509–521.
 Choudhary, A. P. 2008. Regional disparities in educational development in India-patterns and policy issues. The Indian Economic Association Conference, 27–29 December, M.S. University, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

Annexure 1: Health Sector (Region Wise)

Regions	No. of Allopathic Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population (Including P.H.Cs.)		No. of Ayurvedic/Homeopathic/Yunani Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population		Composit		Regions	No. of Allopathic Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population (Including P.H.Cs.)		No. of Ayurvedic/Homeopathic/Yunani Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population		Composit	
	2011-12	Index	2011-12	Index	Index	Rank		2017-18	Index	2017-18	Index	Index	Rank
Bundelkhand Region	3.4	1.00	3.11	1.00	1.00	1	Bundelkhand Region	3.15	1.00	2.87	1.00	1.00	1
Eastern Region	2.66	0.44	2.15	0.39	0.41	2	Eastern Region	2.44	0.40	1.99	0.40	0.40	2
Central Region	2.09	0.00	2.03	0.32	0.16	4	Central Region	1.97	0.00	1.84	0.30	0.15	4
Western Region	2.2	0.08	1.53	0.00	0.04	5	Western Region	2.02	0.04	1.4	0.00	0.02	5
Mean		0.38		MEAN	0.40		Mean				MEAN	0.39	
				SD	0.370						SD	0.376	
				CV	91.63						CV	95.79	

Annexure 2: Health Sector (District Wise)

District	No. of Allopathic Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population (Including P.H.Cs.)			No. of Ayurvedic/ Homeopathic/Yunani Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population			No. of Allopathic Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population (Including P.H.Cs.)			No. of Ayurvedic/ Homeopathic/Yunani Hospitals/Dispenseries per lakh of Population		
	2011-12	Index	2011-12	Index	Composite Index	Rank	2017-18	Index	2017-18	Index	Composite Index	Rank
Pratapgarh	3.35	0.74	3.28	0.74	0.74	3	3.13	0.85	3.07	0.74	0.80	3
Kausambi	3.94	1.00	0.79	0.00	0.50	8	3.06	0.81	0.89	0.00	0.41	16
Prayagraj	1.9	0.10	1.24	0.13	0.12	26	1.82	0.14	1.82	0.32	0.23	25
Ayodhya	2.34	0.30	1.78	0.29	0.29	22	2.34	0.42	1.74	0.29	0.35	19
Ambedkarnagar	2.3	0.28	2.46	0.49	0.39	16	2.18	0.33	2.33	0.49	0.41	15
Sultanpur	3.94	1.00	2.72	0.57	0.79	2	3.64	1.13	2.61	0.58	0.86	2
Amethi	NA		NA		0.00	28	3.3	0.95	2.73	0.62	0.78	4
Bahraich	2.3	0.28	1.83	0.31	0.29	23	1.57	0.00	1.26	0.13	0.06	27
Shravasti	2.27	0.26	2.14	0.40	0.33	20	3.13	0.85	2.94	0.69	0.77	5
Balrampur	2.79	0.49	2.19	0.41	0.45	10	1.91	0.19	1.78	0.30	0.24	24
Gonda	2.08	0.18	1.58	0.23	0.21	24	2.07	0.27	1.37	0.16	0.22	26
Siddharthnagar	3.82	0.95	2.45	0.49	0.72	4	3.27	0.93	2.1	0.41	0.67	6
Basti	3.33	0.73	2.93	0.63	0.68	5	3.09	0.83	2.16	0.43	0.63	7
Sant Kabir Nagar	2.19	0.23	1.12	0.10	0.16	25	1.95	0.21	2	0.38	0.29	23
Maharajganj	2.54	0.38	1.69	0.27	0.32	21	2.29	0.39	1.53	0.22	0.31	22
Gorakhpur	2.61	0.41	1.9	0.33	0.37	18	2.48	0.50	1.74	0.29	0.39	17
Kushinagar	2.37	0.31	2.42	0.48	0.40	14	2.15	0.32	2.02	0.38	0.35	20
Deoria	2.84	0.52	2.17	0.41	0.46	9	2.81	0.68	2.15	0.43	0.55	10
Azamgarh	2.94	0.56	1.88	0.32	0.44	12	2.88	0.72	1.82	0.32	0.52	11
Mau	2.84	0.52	2.53	0.51	0.52	7	2.36	0.43	2.4	0.51	0.47	12
Balia	3.18	0.67	4.17	1.00	0.83	1	2.93	0.74	3.84	1.00	0.87	1
Jaunpur	2.67	0.44	1.8	0.30	0.37	19	2.56	0.54	1.77	0.30	0.42	13
Ghazipur	2.47	0.35	2.23	0.43	0.39	15	2.32	0.41	2.12	0.42	0.41	14
Chandauli	2.83	0.51	2.05	0.37	0.44	11	2.71	0.62	2.43	0.52	0.57	9
Varansi	1.67	0.00	1.46	0.20	0.10	27	1.61	0.02	1.05	0.05	0.04	28
Sant Ravidas Nagar	2.68	0.44	1.89	0.33	0.39	17	2.11	0.30	1.99	0.37	0.33	21
Mirzapur	2.67	0.44	3.06	0.67	0.56	6	2.57	0.55	2.9	0.68	0.61	8
Sonbhadra	2.27	0.26	2.58	0.53	0.40	13	2.06	0.27	2.39	0.51	0.39	18
Mean		0.46		0.41				0.51		0.41		

Annexure 3: Education Sector (Region Wise)

Region	Drop Out Rate in Junior Basic School (J.B.S.)		Drop Out Rate in Senior Basic School (S.B.S.)		Literacy Gap Between Male-Female		Total Literacy Rate		Male Literacy Rate		Number of I.T.Is Per Lakh Population		Number of School Per Lakh Population in Junior Basic School(J.B.S.)		Number of School Per Lakh Population in Senior Basic School(S.B.S.)		Composite Index	Rank	Index	2017-18	Index	Composite Index	Rank
	2011-12	Index	2011-12	Index	2001	Index	2001	Index	2001	Index	2011-12	Index	2011-12	Index	2011-12	Index							
Bundelkhand Region	7.94	0.00	34.05	0.00	30.2	1.00	59.3	1.00	73.13	1.00	0.26	1.00	93.23	1.00	54.59	1.00	0.75	1	1.00	39.04	1.00	0.91	1
Uttar Pradesh	16.74	0.79	49.04	0.93	26.6	0.53	56.27	0.40	68.82	0.15	0.13	0.07	76.72	0.11	37.67	0.16	0.39	4	0.15	29.08	0.15	0.31	2
Western Region	18.86	0.98	50.23	1.00	24.87	0.30	57.36	0.61	68.84	0.15	0.14	0.14	74.67	0.00	38.08	0.18	0.42	2	0.00	27.49	0.02	0.29	3
Eastern Region	19.05	1.00	49.41	0.95	29.47	0.90	54.27	0.00	68.6	0.11	0.12	0.00	76.1	0.08	36.7	0.11	0.39	3	0.15	30.19	0.25	0.29	4
Central Region	9.2	0.11	49.94	0.98	22.54	0.00	57.58	0.66	68.06	0.00	0.12	0.00	77.91	0.17	34.5	0.00	0.24	5	0.22	27.28	0.00	0.21	5
Mean		0.58		0.77		0.55		0.53		0.28		0.24		0.27		Mean	0.44				Mean	0.41	
																SD	0.153				SD	0.234	
																CV	34.80				CV	57.83	

Drop Out Rate in Junior Basic School (J.B.S.)	Index	Drop Out Rate in Senior Basic School (S.B.S.)		Literacy Gap Between Male-Female		Total Literacy Rate		Male Literacy Rate		Number of I.T.Is Per Lakh Population		Index	Number of School Per Lakh Population in Junior Basic School(J.B.S.)
		2017-18	Index	2011	Index	2011	Index	2011	Index	2017-18	Index		
2017-18	Index	2017-18	Index	2011	Index	2011	Index	2011	Index	2017-18	Index	2017-18	
4.71	0.31	8.48	1.00	22.81	1.00	69.26	1.00	79.9	1.00	0.29	1.00	90.89	
5.65	0.65	6.72	0.49	20.1	0.53	67.68	0.15	77.28	0.27	0.15	0.13	74.41	
6.6	1.00	7.48	0.71	19.34	0.40	67.47	0.04	76.55	0.06	0.15	0.13	71.54	
5.51	0.60	5.04	0.00	21.88	0.84	67.4	0.00	78.11	0.50	0.13	0.00	74.47	
3.88	0.00	7.94	0.84	16.99	0.00	68.31	0.49	76.32	0.00	0.15	0.13	75.87	

Source: Various Issues of District wise Development Indicators Uttar Pradesh, Economics and Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, Planning Department, Uttar Pradesh, [Http://Updes.Up.Nic.In](http://Updes.Up.Nic.In)

Annexure 4: Education Sector (District Wise)

District	Drop Out Rate in Junior Basic School (J.B.S.)		Drop Out Rate in Senior Basic School (S.B.S.)		Literacy Gap Between Male-Female		Total Literacy Rate		Male Literacy Rate		Number of I.T.Is Per Lakh Population		Number of School Per Lakh Population in Junior Basic School(J.B.S.)		Number of School Per Lakh Population in Senior Basic School(S.B.S.)		Composite Index	Rank
	2017-18	Index	2017-18	Index	2011	Index	2011	Index	2011	Index	2017-18	Index	2017-18	Index	2017-18	Index		
Pratapgarh	18.07	1.00	41.31	1.00	23.43	0.64	70.09	0.81	81.88	0.93	0.14	0.31	89.42	0.72	35.16	0.74	0.77	1
Kausambi	1.62	0.09	0	0.00	24.22	0.72	61.28	0.50	72.78	0.59	0.11	0.21	68.3	0.43	37.99	0.85	0.42	22
Prayagraj	13.97	0.77	14.58	0.35	21.58	0.46	72.32	0.89	82.55	0.95	0.08	0.10	50.68	0.18	20.77	0.23	0.49	11
Ayodhya	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.09	0.20	68.73	0.76	78.12	0.79	0.15	0.34	85.07	0.66	38.38	0.86	0.45	19
Ambedkarnagar	4.5	0.25	6.32	0.15	19	0.19	72.23	0.88	81.66	0.92	0.15	0.34	91.93	0.76	38.59	0.87	0.55	2
Sultanpur	0	0.00	0.62	0.02	21.9	0.49	69.27	0.78	80.19	0.86	0.15	0.34	86.93	0.69	34.88	0.73	0.49	12
Amethi	1.44	0.08	0	0.00	NA		NA				0.34	1.00	98.59	0.85	34.97	0.74	0.33	26
Bahraich	15.4	0.85	12.63	0.31	19.16	0.21	49.36	0.09	58.34	0.04	0.14	0.31	68.04	0.43	25.17	0.38	0.33	27
Shravasti	13.36	0.74	17.18	0.42	22.38	0.54	46.74	0.00	57.16	0.00	0.19	0.48	109.15	1.00	42.26	1.00	0.52	7

Continue...

Balrampur	17.41	0.96	7.38	0.18	21.31	0.43	49.51	0.10	59.73	0.10	0.12	0.24	76.51	0.54	28.22	0.49	0.38	25
Gonda	8.77	0.49	8.83	0.21	22.32	0.53	58.71	0.41	69.41	0.46	0.13	0.28	79.86	0.59	29.1	0.53	0.44	21
Siddharthnagar	10.18	0.56	9.54	0.23	23.51	0.65	59.25	0.43	70.92	0.52	0.14	0.31	79.32	0.58	30.55	0.58	0.48	14
Basti	0.83	0.05	2.48	0.06	21.65	0.46	67.22	0.71	77.88	0.78	0.15	0.34	85.07	0.66	34.07	0.70	0.47	16
Sant Kabir Nagar	0.69	0.04	0	0.00	23.59	0.66	66.72	0.69	78.39	0.80	0.16	0.38	74.57	0.52	29.19	0.53	0.45	20
Maharajganj	3.61	0.20	8.17	0.20	26.93	1.00	62.76	0.56	75.85	0.70	0.13	0.28	73.38	0.50	31.38	0.61	0.50	9
Gorakhpur	5.73	0.32	0	0.00	22.44	0.54	70.83	0.83	81.8	0.92	0.19	0.48	59.35	0.30	25.28	0.39	0.47	15
Kushinagar	12.69	0.70	0	0.00	25.35	0.84	65.25	0.64	77.71	0.77	0.15	0.34	82.96	0.63	25.45	0.39	0.54	4
Deoria	0	0.00	0	0.00	23.89	0.69	71.13	0.85	83.27	0.98	0.18	0.45	79.72	0.59	36.57	0.80	0.54	3
Azamgarh	11.67	0.65	0	0.00	20.43	0.34	70.93	0.84	81.34	0.91	0.1	0.17	72.81	0.49	33.73	0.69	0.51	8
Mau	0	0.00	3.35	0.08	18.82	0.18	70.94	0.84	82.45	0.95	0.08	0.10	70.59	0.46	26.97	0.45	0.38	24
Balia	6.82	0.38	0	0.00	21.74	0.47	71.55	0.86	81.49	0.91	0.17	0.41	70.24	0.46	25.22	0.39	0.48	13
Jaunpur	0	0.00	0	0.00	24	0.70	71.78	0.87	83.8	1.00	0.08	0.10	78.83	0.58	34.63	0.73	0.50	10
Ghazipur	1.95	0.11	0	0.00	22.51	0.55	71.48	0.86	82.8	0.96	0.08	0.10	88.2	0.71	40.88	0.95	0.53	5
Chandauli	1.12	0.06	0	0.00	21.37	0.43	75.6	1.00	81.72	0.92	0.05	0.00	59.04	0.30	28.49	0.50	0.40	23
Varansi	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.09	0.00	75.6	1.00	83.78	1.00	0.1	0.17	37.5	0.00	14.05	-0.02	0.27	28
Sant Ravidas Nagar	0	0.00	0	0.00	25.44	0.85	68.97	0.77	81.47	0.91	0.12	0.24	62.66	0.35	31.13	0.60	0.47	17
Mirzapur	0	0.00	1.99	0.05	22.11	0.51	68.48	0.75	78.97	0.82	0.15	0.34	83.95	0.65	28.96	0.52	0.46	18
Sonbhadra	4.4	0.24	6.68	0.16	22.79	0.58	64.03	0.60	74.92	0.67	0.19	0.48	95.92	0.82	33.1	0.67	0.53	6
Mean		0.30		0.12		0.51		0.68		0.75		0.31		0.55			Mean	0.47
																	SD	#NAME?
																	CV	#NAME?

Source: Various Issues of District wise Development Indicators Uttar Pradesh, Economics and Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, Planning Department, Uttar Pradesh, Http://Updes.Up.Nic.In

Annexure 5: Education Sector (District Wise)

District	Drop Out Rate in Junior Basic School (J.B.S.)		Drop Out Rate in Senior Basic School (S.B.S.)		Literacy Gap Between Male-Female		Total Literacy Rate		Male Literacy Rate		Number of I.T.I.s Per Lakh Population		Number of School Per Lakh Population in Junior Basic School (J.B.S.)		Number of School Per Lakh Population in Senior Basic School (S.B.S.)		Composite Index	Rank
	2011-12	Index	2011-12	Index	2001	Index	2001	Index	2001	Index	2011-12	Index	2011-12	Index	2011-12	Index		
Pratapgarh	24.42	0.54	47.71	0.48	32.45	0.66	57.6	0.74	73.91	0.88	0.15	0.48	90.54	0.75	39.08	0.61	0.64	2
Kausambi	37.48	0.83	58.93	0.68	32.17	0.65	46.88	0.40	61.96	0.51	0.07	0.10	81.88	0.64	49.69	1.00	0.60	4
Prayagraj	14.95	0.33	23.02	0.05	29.43	0.46	62.11	0.88	75.81	0.94	0.08	0.14	50.63	0.21	33.77	0.41	0.43	22
Ayodhya	6.35	0.14	42.15	0.38	27.16	0.30	56.28	0.70	69.42	0.74	0.12	0.33	86.33	0.70	42.97	0.75	0.51	15
Ambedkarnagar	18.18	0.40	36.61	0.29	26.07	0.23	58.43	0.76	71.37	0.80	0.16	0.52	85.79	0.69	46.63	0.89	0.57	9
Sultanpur	44.91	1.00	54.59	0.60	29.63	0.47	55.75	0.68	70.49	0.77	0.26	1.00	108.59	1.00	47.55	0.92	0.81	1
Amethi	NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		0.00	28
Bahraich	17.63	0.39	62.38	0.74	22.79	0.00	35.16	0.04	45.58	0.00	0.17	0.57	90.83	0.76	39.98	0.64	0.39	25
Shravasti	19.53	0.43	74.71	0.96	28.08	0.36	33.82	0.00	46.67	0.03	0.14	0.43	72.9	0.52	32.93	0.38	0.39	26
Balrampur	33.28	0.74	76.94	1.00	24.05	0.09	34.6	0.02	45.84	0.01	0.05	0.00	87.63	0.72	39.11	0.61	0.40	24
Gonda	35.83	0.80	60.65	0.71	29.22	0.44	42.59	0.27	56.39	0.33	0.09	0.19	77.94	0.58	39.99	0.64	0.50	17
Siddharthnagar	25.09	0.56	60.51	0.71	29.58	0.47	42.3	0.26	56.66	0.34	0.08	0.14	87.41	0.71	40.83	0.67	0.48	18
Basti	22.63	0.50	65.52	0.80	30.18	0.51	52.49	0.58	67.1	0.67	0.12	0.33	82.7	0.65	36.63	0.52	0.57	10
Sant Kabir Nagar	0	0.00	54.8	0.61	31.65	0.61	50.88	0.53	66.57	0.65	0.12	0.33	79.05	0.60	32.78	0.37	0.46	20
Maharajganj	12.8	0.29	67.06	0.83	35.99	0.91	46.61	0.40	63.92	0.57	0.07	0.10	85.93	0.69	32.61	0.37	0.52	13
Gorakhpur	35.75	0.80	59.22	0.69	30.69	0.54	58.49	0.76	73.57	0.87	0.15	0.48	58.23	0.32	29.36	0.25	0.59	7
Kushinagar	43.05	0.96	72.12	0.91	34.01	0.77	46.94	0.41	63.64	0.56	0.11	0.29	72.77	0.51	33.62	0.40	0.60	3
Deoria	22.94	0.51	58.47	0.67	32.51	0.67	58.64	0.77	75.01	0.91	0.12	0.33	71.94	0.50	34.05	0.42	0.60	5
Azamgarh	30.59	0.68	46.1	0.45	27.64	0.33	56.95	0.72	71.04	0.79	0.08	0.14	67.66	0.44	37.2	0.54	0.51	14
Mau	24.5	0.55	69.72	0.87	26.94	0.29	62.16	0.88	75.6	0.93	0.09	0.19	80.83	0.62	30.63	0.29	0.58	8
Balia	28.16	0.63	56.61	0.64	28.76	0.41	57.86	0.74	71.91	0.82	0.19	0.67	74.64	0.54	31.42	0.32	0.60	6
Jaunpur	0	0.00	23.12	0.05	32.11	0.64	59.84	0.81	76.18	0.95	0.09	0.19	84.25	0.67	41.25	0.69	0.50	16
Ghazipur	2.68	0.06	45.19	0.44	30.84	0.55	59.55	0.80	74.87	0.91	0.08	0.14	90.23	0.75	40.02	0.64	0.54	11
Chandauli	12.38	0.28	23.73	0.06	29.9	0.49	59.72	0.80	74.04	0.88	0.05	0.00	58.77	0.32	32.92	0.38	0.40	23
Varansi	5.02	0.11	20.43	0.00	24.83	0.14	66.12	1.00	77.87	1.00	0.1	0.24	34.99	0.00	22.75	0.00	0.31	27
Sant Ravidas Nagar	4.26	0.09	29.49	0.16	37.32	1.00	57.9	0.75	75.76	0.93	0.12	0.33	60.16	0.34	37.04	0.53	0.52	12
Mirzapur	6.56	0.15	33.11	0.22	30.34	0.52	55.31	0.67	69.59	0.74	0.11	0.29	77	0.57	35.25	0.46	0.45	21
Sonbhadra	10.33	0.23	35.07	0.26	29.25	0.44	49.22	0.48	62.95	0.54	0.1	0.24	103.2	0.93	41.96	0.71	0.48	19
Mean		0.44		0.53		0.48		0.59		0.67		0.30		0.58			Mean	0.50
																	SD	#NAME?
																	CV	#NAME?