# CHAPTER-I INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

Nepal is a land locked country situated on the Southern flank of the Himalayan 885 kilometer long and 90 to 230 kilometers wide, covering a total area of 1,47,181 square kilometers. Nepal is sandwiched between India and China, with Tibet an autonomous province of china in the north and Bihar, U.P. of Indian in the South, west and east. Nepal's land forms rise in successive hill and mountain ranges punctuated by fertile alluvial valleys and bisected by major rivers system Koshi, Karnali, Gandaki, and Mahakali. Nepal has extremely diversified land scape, climate, vegetation and culture.

Nepal comprises three main ecological regions, namely the mountain, the Hill and the Terai. Mountain region lies between the attitudes of 8477 to 8848 meters, covers about 35 percent of the land area of the country, accommodates 7.3 percent of the population of the country. The hill region lies between the attitudes of 660 to 4877 meters from the sea level and comprises survival attractive peaks, fertile valleys and cities such as Kathmandu and Pokhara. The region covers three forth of country's total are 42% and shares 44.3 percent of the population. However, only two percent of mountain and 10 percent of hilly area is cultivable. The Terai lies in the southern part of the country, a low flat land. It comprises 23 percent of the land area and accommodates 48.4 percent of the population of the country. This area includes most of the fertile land and dense forest, which has 40 percent of the cultivatable land form administrative purpose the country is divided vertically into five development regions, Eastern, central, western, mid-western and farwestern regions, 14 zones and 75 districts.

There are cities and villages according to the density of population and land feature. Municipalities are the cities having at least some minimum criteria of Population and Infrastructure and declared as Municipality by government. There are 99 municipalities in Nepal including 41 new declared ones in July 2011.

Nepal is one of the poorest countries in the world with per capita income Rs.19261 (yearly incomes) according to Economic Survey 2068/069. Nepal holds 142<sup>nd</sup> positions of total 177 countries (Economic Survey 2068/069). Nepal economy is basically agrarian. It is evident from the recent facts that agriculture sector alone contributes about 39 percent of the share in Gross domestic product and accommodates about 80 percent of the working age population and provides more than half of the household income (CBS, 2003). The share of agriculture in Gross domestic product however, has been declining consistently over the last two decades leaving the share of employment fairly high almost constant. It implies stagnant or even declining trends of agricultural productivity. The service sector, which has been growing fast in terms of share in Gross domestic product, has marginal impact on the livelihood of rural masses sense it is largely an urban phenomenon. The industry sector has been lagging behind steadily.

## **1.2** Statement of the Problem

Poverty is the problem of developed as well as developing countries, but difference is of nature. Poverty is a major problem of LDCs like Nepal. More than 50 percent of the populations are living below the international poverty line (WDR, 1997). More than 80 percentage of the total population are engaged in the agricultural sectors, whereas 25.2 percent of the total populations of Nepal are below poverty line at present. The problem of poverty exists everywhere in the world. The rural areas are not out of incidence of poverty. Nepal is also affected by rural poverty. The urban area of Nepal has higher density of population than rural area. It is every year the educated as well as economically strong people migrate to the urban area. Due to these reason the rural poverty can't be decreased. They spend all their daily income on the same day. There is sufficient water for drinking in the rural area, only 80 percent households have access to piped water but they don't get pure and safe water for drinking purpose. Government should emphasize on reducing the poverty in the current plan. All the programmes related to poverty reduction in Nepal have been centralized in the urban area. But the poverty in rural areas has not been focused and considered by the government and other NGOs and INGOs related to poverty reduction in Nepal.

As a result, poverty in Nepal has reached at its alarming stage. For poverty alleviation, lots of plans and programs have been undertaken by government and non-government agencies. Every annual plan has stated the objectives of poverty alleviation. Although poverty alleviation is given priority only on theoretical ground but not in practical one. Poverty is found in both rural and urban areas but the efforts to reduce and studies have been centered areas.

All programmes are focused on only urban areas from the point of view of successful implementation rural poverty has not been heeded so far. So, this study focuses on the rural poverty and tries to find out the rural condition of "the state of the rural poverty." On the other hand, the present study is related to an exploration of rural poverty as a rural problem and it is an analysis of the problem. Rural poverty exists but not addressed so this micro level study helps solve that problem with the appropriate suggestion against the poverty of Bhalam VDC, Kaski. The following problems have were seen before the study. They are as follows;

- What is the demographic status of the study area?
- What are the different sources of income?
- How is income distributed in different households?
- What is the employment status of the study area?
- What is the nature of poverty in specific area?
- What is the occupational status among the poor population?
- How is the educational status of rural poor people?
- Is there a health service facility in the study area?
- Is there residential infrastructure developed in the study area?

# **1.3** Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to explore and understand the incidence of poverty in study area. However, the specific objectives are given below.

- To assess the present socio-economic situation of the respondents.
- To measure the incidence of income of the poverty stricken people in the study area.
- To analyzes the Multi-Dimensional poverty situation in the study area.
- To describe the nature of poverty profile in the study area.

# **1.4** Justification of the Study

The present study is basically concerned with the poverty problem of Bhalam VDC of Kaski district. There are many problems like lack of employment opportunities, lack of irrigation facilities in cultivable land, lack of vocational and practicable education, low level of income, low living standard, superstitions benefits etc. So, most of the people are facing poverty problem in the VDC. Nepal has completed eleventh annual development plans. Despite the experience of wide range of policies focused against rural poverty in the country from the first five year plan to the present, no visible impact on the lives of the people in the rural society is seen. Instead over the years, people who are below the poverty line are growing in number. Due to inability to identify the poor a large share of development benefits goes to the non-poor and the poor people are by pasted. Thus the main need to day is to design a composite index to identify poverty and suggest measures to curtail it.

Before the 8<sup>th</sup> five years plan in Nepal poverty was not the primary issue. Along with the rapid growth of population, poverty also increased rapidly. So, that poverty has become a principle concern of the nation. According to the 8<sup>th</sup> five year plan (1992-1997), 42 percent of the total populations were below the poverty line in Nepal. Therefore the principal objectives of 9<sup>th</sup> five year plan had been designed. Poverty reduction was felt from 42 percent to 32 percent during the plan period. Since then government has been designing the long-run (20 years) perspective plans including the 9<sup>th</sup> plan. According to the 9<sup>th</sup> five year plan the poverty reduction target was from 42 percent to 32 percent but it did not get success to achieve the goal. 38 percent of the people were poor. There was no decrease in the percentage. Due to the political and technical issues the five year plan did not succeed. So, the new three year plan was launched from 10-11<sup>th</sup> plan. There were many organizations like, NGOs, INGOS and government plan. Also the people were educated and they started earning themselves and there was the trend of going abroad to earn money it was also positive way to reduce poverty. From the implementation of plans and people's awareness it headed to the achievement of the goal was reduced to 25.16% both in rural and urban areas.

Though this study will wake as an effort to analyze only the poverty situation in Bhalam VDC of Kaski District, it also tries to present the incidence of poverty in the study area and shows the relationship between poverty and other economic factors like income, employment, land holding etc. In this sense, this study seems to be significant because it is able to present the recent information and also able to give some recommendations for poverty alleviation program which is helpful to develop the economic condition of the study area in near future.

## **1.5** Limitations of the Study

This research has focused on Bhalam VDC, Kaski as a case study area. No study can be free from limitation. This is an academic research. Basically this study has the following limitations

- This study is related to Bhalam VDC, Kaski district.
- This study has based upon three dimension of poverty i.e. health, education and living standard besides these there are 10 indicators which represent the poverty. (Such as, nutrition and child mortality rate, health, years of schooling, school attendance are included on education, cooking fuel, sanitation, water, electricity, floor and asset are included in raising living standards.
- This study has been based on 150 households.
- All the data were collected through primary and secondary sources.
- Economic variables such as income, consumption, household site etc. are used to analyze the situation of poverty. Other variables like education, land holding, caste and ethnicity have been used to measure the line of poverty.
- Simple statistical tools have been used to analyze the sample data.
- All the results drawn in the study is related to current time period.

# **1.6** Organization of the Study

The present study has been divided into five chapters. The first chapter contains basic matters like the introduction, statement of the problem, objective of the study, justification of the study and limitation of the study, chapter two includes review of literature, chapter three involves research methodology, chapter four involves data analysis and interpretation and chapter five includes summary, conclusion and suggestions.

# CHAPTER-II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## 2.1 Conceptual Overview

Poverty has different meanings in different stages. Such as, illiteracy, poor health, lack of sanitation and deprivation of basic right and security, powerlessness. There are various definitions of poverty a hunger insufficiency of basic needs for minimum requirements, ill health, illiteracy, poor clothing, low purchasing power, low life expectancy, landlessness. Poverty is the situation in which a person is not able to maintain a minimum standard of living. The standard of living is measured by income or consumption (WB, 1990).

The world "Poverty" has different meanings in different stages of development. Poverty is one of the most important economic and social policy issues in the developing countries. Poverty is closely related to the degree of social, political and economic exclusion. Poverty is a state where a person who is unable to maintain basic needs and suffering from poor clothing, weak health, low purchasing power, low life expectancy and landlessness. The poor can't earn money to fullfill their minimum necessities. In developed countries, poverty can be defined as the failure in maintaining a desired level of living, whereas in developing countries, it reflects the picture of hunger, illiteracy, high infant mortality, malnourishment, inadequate shelter, rapid growth rate of population and unemployment (Todaro: 1981).

## **Economical View**

Michel Lipton (1998) he has described, The "Poverty in South Asia", His article was published in the World Bank staff working paper. He has introduced the nation of poverty based on minimum requirement of 2250 calorie per person per day. He has analyzed the absolute poverty in south Asia. Objectives are found out the factor responsible to the poverty and to suggest policy program led to deal with problem. He has used secondary data. He has used simple statistical method. Lipton has estimated that 80 percent of population in south Asia consume less than minimum calorie requirement more children under six are stunted. Food security is complicated by high level disease and infections so intake of adequate calorie is necessary but not sufficient to present malnutrition. He has suggested that objectives will be achieved through improving lack of nutritional knowledge, superstition, culture inappropriate cooking process and strong problems (Micheal Lipton 1988).

"Poverty is a complex phenomenon not easy to conceptualize. Poverty is said to exist when the resource of family or individuals are inadequate to provide a socially acceptable standard of living" (Johnson 1996).

The World Bank Encyclopedia (1996) defines "Poverty is the state of fact of being in want. People are poor if they lack enough income and resources to be adequately by the accepted living standard of their community. Standards may vary greatly according to time and place. Most of people who live in western industrial countries, for example, believe they must have a car. They would consider themselves poor if they could not afford to buy one. In developing countries like Nepal, Bangladesh, people consider having it as luxury does not compare that the lack of a car as sign of poverty. When the motor car was first introduced in industrialized countries it could be the same of have as that time" (cited Karki 2012).

Sen (1999) shows the vivid picture of the problem of poverty and causes of famines in the context of Africa and Asian countries in his book "Poverty and Famines". He has attempted to discuss on the concept of poverty. There are mainly three approaches.

- Biological approach
- Inequality approach
- Relative deprivation approach

Moreover, some other approaches, that is value and judgment policy definition, standard and aggregation etc.

The Biological approach is related to biological requirement and nutritional norms, which provide the most elementary concept of basic requirement in broader terms to grip with the modern understanding of poverty. Biological considerations related to the survival or work efficiency both in absolute and relative terms.

So, in addition, inequality approach is concerned with the concept of poverty as an essentially one of inequality that has some immediate possibility, inequality is related with a situation when people possess loss of some desired attribute, poverty may look like inequality between the poorest group and the rest of the community, it is descriptive case.

The concept of relative deprivation has been used in the analysis of poverty, especially in the sociological literature. Being poor has clearly deprived and it is natural that for a social being choice of reference groups and comparison. Different issue related to the relative deprivation on the social analysis of poverty. Poverty is a matter of deprivation, the recent shift in focus, especially in the sociological literature from absolute to relative deprivation.

WB (World Development Report 2000-01) "Poverty is more than inadequate income or human development. It is also vulnerability, lack of voice, power and representation". The World Bank has termed the people with per capital income of \$275 as extremely poor and with per capita income of \$370 as poor. The world development report 2000-01 refers to four types of deprivation and four dimensions and four dimension of poverty are as follows:

- Material deprivation (income poverty)
- Low level of education and health (Social/Human Poverty)
- Vulnerability and exposure to risk
- Voiceless and powerlessness.

#### **Sociological View**

"Poverty is a complex phenomenon not easy to conceptualize. Poverty is said to exist when the resources of individuals are inadequate to provide a socially acceptable standard of living" Harry Jahnson (1996).Sociologist Gillen and Gillen (1982) define, "poverty is that condition in which a person either because of inadequate or unwise expenditure does not maintain a standard of living high enough to provide for his physical and mental efficiency and to enable him and his natural dependents to function usefully according to the standard of society in which he is a member".

The dictionary of sociology distinguishes the difference between relative poverty and absolute poverty. Absolute poverty occurs when people fail to receive sufficient resources to support a minimum level of physical health and efficiency that often expressed in terms of calories or nutrition levels. Relative poverty is defined as the general standard of living in different societies and what is culturally stated as being poor and ultra poverty line is below the absolute poverty line its half by the gestation as a rule of thumb.

Oxford advanced learner's dictionary defines poverty as the state of being poor or lack of something. It refers to the condition of having insufficient resources or income. Webster's dictionary defines poverty as the state or condition or living little or no money, goods or means of support. According to Encarta Encyclopedia, poverty is a lack of basic human needs such as adequate and nutrition's food, clothing, housing, clean water and health services. Poverty contributions to low life expectancy, low literacy ratio and educational attainment and low standard of living (Human Development Concept of UNDP 1998).

The World Bank Encyclopedia 1996 defines, "poverty is the state of fact of being in want. People are poor if they lack enough income and resources to be adequately by the accepted living standard of their community. Standards may vary greatly according to time and place most of people who live in western industrial countries, for example, belive they must have car and they would consider themselves poor if they could not afford to buy one. In developing countries like Nepal, Bangladesh people consider having it is luxury doesn't compare that the lack of a car as a sign of poverty. When the motorcar was first introduced in industrialized countries it could be the same of here as that time.

Generally, poverty is defined on the basis of land holding or per capita income. These indicators explain the extent and depth of rural poverty. The definition of poverty varies from region to region depending upon their economic status. The characteristic of poor people in rural area can be identified as landlessness, too little land , large family malnutrition, ill health, illiteracy, high infant mortality, low life expectancy, low income, irregular income, weak position, isolation due to poor communication focus on survive and indebtedness (Dixion 1990). The rural people under poverty have their economy below subsistence level. They have little access to political power and little say in decision making. The five major characteristic of poor people can be identified as powerlessness, isolation, poverty, physical weakness and vulnerability (Chamber 1983) explanation of rural poverty can be made with the help

12

of socio-cultural factor, economic factor, political factor and environmental factor.

#### 2.2 Review of Related Studies

NPC (1978) has a survey of "Employment, income distribution and consumption pattern in Nepal was the first official attempts of define the level of poverty. The minimum subsistence level of income and expenditure were used for derivation of the poverty line. An income of Rs. 2 per capita per day 1976/77 prices was taken a minimum subsistence level of income to buy 605 grams of cereals and 60 grams of pulses to meet the average calories 2256 as suggested by FAO. According to this survey 40.3 percent of households or 36.2 percent of population are below absolute poverty line and 20-50 percent households or 18.8 percent of populations are above absolute poverty line.

The Human Development Index (HDI) was introduced in the HDR, 1990 comprising of indicators documenting life Span, literacy enrollment ratio and employment for each country. The HDR 1990 demonstrates that the ranking of countries, which depends upon the income of HDIs. The human Development Report (1991) emphasized the poverty alleviation in an integral part of human wealth of nation and the end of development is human well being. The purpose of human development is not only to enhance incomes but to enlarge all human choices. The HDRs have provided better understanding of concepts of poverty and focused world attention on the social, cultural and political measures to tackle it.

J.P. Aryal, in his dissertation paper, Poverty in Nepal has analyzed the nature of poverty problem by establishing relationship with various socio-economic characteristics such as level of education, ethnic group and employment etc. To analyze the poverty, he has used various statistical tools like Gini-Coefficient, Sen's poverty index, Chi-Square test etc. His study concludes that 41.03 percent people were absolutely poor and 18.57 percent of household and 16.91 percent people were relatively poor. In this study, primary data were used for analyzing and data were collected from 70 sample household of Purna Jhanga Jholi VDC of Sindhuli district (Aryal 1994).

K.K. Dahal and M.K. Shrestha (1987) in their research work rural poverty study was based on primary data, for this purpose that they had used some statistical tools like Sen's poverty index, breakeven point etc. Shrestha attempted to identify the rural poverty had been analyzed by taking various factors like the size of land holding, literacy, monthly income by ethnic group etc. (Dahal and Shrestha 1987).

Dawadi (1996) has studied, "The extent and nature of poverty problems in rural Nepal. "A case study of Nawalparasi district, Adarsh VDC. He has introduced the nation of absolute poverty and established poverty lines based on minimum required calories per-person per day. He has taken primary data through the field survey and also used secondary data. He has used various methods like Gini-Coefficient, chi-square and so on.

He has listed some major findings. He concludes that 37.27 percent of sample households and 46.26 percent of population are absolute poor and 23 percent of sample households and 20-25 percent of populations are relative poor. At last, he insists land as the basic factor of production. So there is positive relationship between land and income most of the people are poor due to less land.

So far recommendations are concerned, Mr. Dawadi has ended up as land in the main sources of the income generation and most of the households are landless or marginal land holder, equality in land distribution should be practiced. He argues that women development programs should be extended to uplift living standard of women. As the educated households have relatively higher income in the study area. It is clear that education may help to reduce the extend of poverty. So, compulsory education for children should be instituted, non formal education programme should be increased (Dawadi 1996).

Shrmila Acharya, in her dissertation paper, Nature of Poverty has Examined the Pattern of Income Dissertation and Inequality in Trarigoun VDC of Dang district with 70 sample household, various statistical tools like Keynesian Consumption Function, Wolf-Point, Sen's Poverty Index, Gini-Coefficient, Range etc. where used in this study. She also determined the relationship between poverty and unemployment. This analysis found that 48.57 percent households and 57.87 percent of total population were living below than absolute poverty line. Similarly, 30 percent of households and 25 percent population were relatively poor and 21.43 percent households and 17.13 percent population were non-poor. Unequal distribution of land is the main problem to raise the poverty and agriculture is the main source of income in the study area. She recommended some policies for alleviating the poverty such as irrigation facilities, new technology in 'farming, provision of fertilizer, etc. (Acharya 1998).

Adhikari in his dissertations paper, Poverty in Nepal: A case study of Faramini Village Development Committee of Jhapa district, has analyzed the nature of poverty and socio-economic condition and indentified absolute and relative poverty in the study area. For this purpose, he had used some statistical tools like Gini-Coefficient, Lorenz Curve, Range, Mean Deviation etc. The nature of poverty has been analyzed by establishing its relationship with various socio-economic characteristics such as occupation size of land holding literacy etc. The study was based on primary data. He had selected one study area and 80 households with 502 people as sample. In this study, he found 62.5 percent household and 57.96 percent people were living below the absolute poverty line. Similarly he found 17.5 percent households and 19.32 percent population were relatively poor in the study area (Adhikari 2000).

Bhandari, in his dissertation paper 'Poverty in Nepal' established poverty line and measured the extend of poverty and highlighted the nature of poverty. For this purpose he has used some statistical tools such as Gini-Coefficient, Sen's poverty index, regression, correlation etc. The nature of poverty has been analyzed by dividing the data into ethnic groups, land holding literacy etc. The study was based on primary data. In this study, he analyzed the poverty problems, its causes and its extent. He found that 47.06 percent of household and 42.0 percent population were living below absolute poverty line and earned only 16.73 percent of total income. Similarly he found 22.50 percent populations were relatively poor in the study area (Bhandari 59-60).

Srivastav and Suthar (1998) conducted a research on 'A study of poverty at Pokhara sub-metropolitan city by categorizing the poor households in to two groups viz. Very poor and poor. To identify as very poor and poor households, various indicators had been used like total consumption expenditure, composition of consumption expenditure saving and social indicators (housing, clothing, education, health etc). From their study they found that on the basis of consumption expenditure criterion all the 95 percent households were poor. Regarding the composition of consumption expenditure 67.40 percent families seemed to be very poor and the remaining 32.60 percent were classified as poor. On the basis of housing 26.30 percent households were very poor and the remaining 73.70 percent were poor.

Regmi (2003) performed a study on "Nature of poverty: A case study of Thuladihi VDC, Syangja District. It was found that 36.38 percent

of people were below the poverty line (Rs. 22.15 per capita per day). Moreover, poverty in the study area has remained sever due to the various reasons such as lower literacy rate, unemployment, small size of land holding, low productivity of land, large family size and equal distribution of income.

Dhamala (2004) conducted a study on "poverty reduction and the tenth plan on the background of the previous periodic plans. He mentioned that the tenth plan was primarily focused on poverty reduction aiming at reducing the poverty rate from 38 percent to 30 percent. Also the plan intended to achieve the overall annual economic growth rate of 6.2 percent including 4.2 percent in agricultural sector 4.1 percent in the non-agricultural sector.

Lamsal (2008:69) conducted a research on "Impact of community forestry on poverty reduction: A case study of Akala community forest, Vyas municipality, Tanahun she conducted that there was great potential for community forest user group to contribute to livelihood improvement and people's employment. Also found that there was very limited contribution of community forestry in poverty alleviation.

It was only the seventh plan (1985-1990) that addressed and formulated a district programme with a long-term perspective for poverty alleviation. Subsequently, poverty alleviation became one of the major objectives of the eighth plan (1992-1997) and the sole goal of the ninth plan (1997-2002) which established long-term targets with various poverty related indication was to decrease the poor people to a minimum.

The policies and strategies of the ninth plan aimed at achieving broad based growth and providing basic sources to address various aspects of poverty. Accordingly, government tried to tackle poverty through three simultaneous strategies: (a) broad based economic growth, (b) sociological sector development and (c) a set of targeted programmes and focused on rural infrastructure. Priority accorded to the social sector and interventions targeted to poor and vulnerable groups accompanied by safety nets, decentralization and social mobilization programmes. Basically, very limited programmes reach to the poor particularly in remote areas and lack of co-ordinated efforts resulted in inadequate coverage. Since vulnerable, disadvantaged and marginalized communities have remained far from mainstream, obviously, their achievements could not be accessible to them. To sum, up past plans could not contribute to the poverty alleviation to a considerable extent due to several causes like delay in signing agreements and receiving foreign assistance, lack of coincidence of National interest and interest of donors, unfavorable national circumstances, unfavorable monsoon, topographical difficulties and land-lockedness, ecological imbalance, under-spending, improper use of resources, defects in plan and planning, inadequate construction materials, shortage of technical manpower, insufficiency of other necessary inputs, administrative and procedural delays, lack of coordination etc.

So, the ninth plan (1997-2002) could not achieve its targeted objective to reduce poverty from 42 percent to 32 percent. By the end of ninth plan, poverty reduced from 42% to 38%. The tenth plan has given continuity to this trend. The tenth plan (2002-2007) primarily has focused on poverty reduction aiming at reducing the poverty rate from 38 percent to 30 percent. To achieve the target of poverty reduction it has also intended to adopt the main strategy of promoting economic opportunities justifiable, increasing the accessibility of disadvantaged communities to these opportunities together with making them capable even to participate in the decision making process and launching several safety programmes, including self employment and income generating programme for needy people. This strategy seems to have four pillars.

- High sustainable and broad based growth.
- Development of social sectors and infrastructure.
- Targeted programmers for the backward and vulnerable groups and safety nets and
- Good governance.

Even after five decades of planned development, Nepal remains one of the least developed countries in the world. Absolute poverty is widespread. About 38 percent of its population is below the officially defined poverty line (10<sup>th</sup> plan NPC 2003). Eighty percent of the population in Nepal is still dependent on agriculture. Distribution of land, the most important productive resource, is substantially uneven.

The tenth plan (2002-2007) lays strong emphasis on implementation, monitoring progress towards the attainment of key poverty reduction goals including those in the context of Millennium Development goal and ensuring that the feedback received from intended beneficiaries and target groups is effectively utilized for improving poverty innervations.

The poverty reduction strategy has been implemented by many actors, including the central government, and agencies, local bodies, community groups, the private sector, INGOs, NGOs, CBO.

From the overview of related review of study it has been tried to analyze the situation of rural poverty in specific area. Furthermore this study has tried to compare the different previous studies. There are more research works on rural poverty but there is no reduction and alleviation the poverty. The previous studies couldn't give detailed analysis of the rural poverty. It can be concluded that there has been no formal research work on rural poverty "A poverty profile of Bhalam VDC, Kaski district". Therefore, this study is essential to identify the poverty profile. The study is difficult from the other research work because this study is done two poverty measurement methods they are income poverty measurement and multidimensional poverty index methods. Income poverty measurement method includes Head Count Ratio, Poverty Gap ratio and poverty profile and in multidimensional poverty index method includes Health status, Education level and living standards. So, present study has tried to give detail explanation regarding rural poverty which helps to complete the previous study.

# CHAPTER-III RESERCH METHODOLOGY

## 3.1 Research Design

The major emphasis in this study is on analyzing and identifying the state of rural poverty. Considering this fact both exploratory as well as descriptive research designs have been used in this study.

# 3.2 Nature and Sources of Data

The necessary data have been collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data have been collected through the structured questionnaire by taking personal interviews with the members of the group. Secondary data have been gathered from VDCS office, Kaski district office and publication of NPC, NRB, WB, ADB, CBS, articles and journals. Secondary data have been used for the purpose of analysis and comparison.

# **Primary Data**

Primary data have been collected by the Thesis writer himself by visiting and interviewing each respondent of selected household of study area through the questionnaires. Each sampling unit is selected by simple random sampling without replacement using lottery method, out of 759 households of wards no. 1, 3, and 8 in Bhalam VDC. 150 household were selected as a sample size.

#### **Secondary Data**

Secondary data have been collected from central bureau of statistic, NPC, Bhalam VDCS profile and unpublished sources.

#### **3.3 Population and Sample**

Before any research method each researcher should know about the study area. But every ward cannot be selected for the information or data collection. There were many obstacles which affected on the study time. They are the time boundary and the huge study area. So, the researcher selected a few wards for research method which represented all the wards of VDC. The wards which were selected for the study area were represented on the below tables:

Ward No.	Total Household	Sample Household	Percentage
1	153	75	49%
3	125	50	40%
8	50	25	50%
Total	328	150	45%

 Table 3.1: Wards Wise Population and Sample

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Above table shows the households of the ward number 1, 3 and 8. Purposive sampling method is used for the wards selection. Because in different wards there are the people of different castes, religious groups, beliefs. So only three different wards have been selected as a sample unit for the study i.e. 1, 3 and 8 wards. In ward number 1 mostly Chhetries have been found, in wards number 3 Brahmins and Dalits have been found and in ward number 8 mostly Gurung and the people of other castes have been found living. Lottery method is applied for household selection. Respectively 49 percent, 40 percent and 50 percent of households were selected from wards 1, 3 and 8. Out of total 328 households 150 households have been selected and the percentage is 45.

To collect the desired information for fulfilling the objective of the study, the field survey was conducted in 150 households during July to November 2012.

#### **3.4** Methods of Data Collection

To achieve the specified objective of the study necessary data and information has been collected by using different available tools and appropriate techniques by preparing and filling structural questionnaire, direct personal interview, field observation etc. but secondary data were collected from Bhalam VDCS profile. In order to gather reliable information relievable instruments have seen used for data collection.

## **3.5** Specification of Variables

#### **Household Size**

Household is defined as an economic unit, in which a single individual or more than one family members have been living together.

## **Total Household Income**

The income which is earned by all family members from different sources is known as household income. In this study, it is the sum total of net income from agriculture, governmental, non-governmental sources, abroad and private sector and other specific work.

#### Size of Landholding

The land holding considered as irrigation or non-irrigated land, cultivated or non-cultivated, including both self owned and tenant.

#### **Illiterate, Literate and Educated**

A person who can't read and write is known as illiterate, who has ability to read and write is known as literate and who has passed S.LC. Higher secondary level, bachelor and masters are known as highly educated or educated.

#### **Living Standard**

It means that a person who has got all facilities like electricity, drinking water, sanitation, flooring, cooking fuel and assets is considered as having enjoyed what we called standard life.

#### Health

Health is a state of body, mind and soul .So, every person should be aware of disease. If someone suffers from disease he/she uses his/her money to become healthy. Such a person can meet the expenses.

#### Nutrition

Nutrition is a balanced diet, food which is required to build our body. If a child is malnourished than the mortality rate increases.

#### **3.6** Methods of Data Processing and Analysis

All the collected data from the field have been analyzed qualitatively as pieces of information collected from the field were coded and entered to the computer by using the statistical. And analyses was made in two ways: poverty measurement by income and multi-dimension poverty index.

#### **Determination of Income Poverty Line**

Poverty is measured by income method. The poverty measured is based on Economy survey 2068-69. In these surveys poverty was indicated on the bases of poverty line 19261(yearly income). Likewise if the people's income rate is above 19261 they are counted economically rich persons. And if the people's income rate is below 19261 annually they are included in the poverty line.

#### **Income Poverty Measurements**

Income poverty measurement is the best method of measuring the poverty. In these method the following measurement index is given below;

# **Head Count Index**

The proportion of total population lying below the poverty line is the proportion of poor in total population. This measure is indifferent to the extent of poverty of the poor. It is only sensitive to their number and reflects the prevalence of poverty.

Thus,  $EF\infty=0$ , FGT Index  $P_{\infty}$  becomes:

$$P_0 = \frac{q}{N}$$

Where,

q = Number of poor below poverty line.

N= Total sample size population.

## **Income Gap Ratio**

Income gap ratio is the mean income of the poor expressed as a fraction of poverty line. Income gap ratio takes the following formula.

$$I = \frac{1}{q} \sum \left[ \frac{Zp - yi}{Zp} \right] = 1 - \frac{\overline{Y}p}{Zp}$$
$$\overline{Y_p} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^{q} Y_i$$
 is the poor

Where,

Zp = poverty line

Yi= income the i<sup>th</sup> poor person

q = Number of poor below poverty line

 $\overline{Y_p}$  = mean income the poor

#### **Poverty Gap Index**

Poverty gap index is the income gap ratio multiplied by the Head count index. Poverty gap index, gives a good measure of the extent or intensity of poverty as it reflects how far the poor are from the poverty line. It may also be used to show the amount of income, under perfect targeting, that need to be transferred to the poor to close the poverty gap in order to eradicate poverty and provide a measure of the resource required to eliminate poverty. However, p1 is insensitive to income distribution among the poor.

Thus, If  $\infty = 1$  FGT index p $\infty$  becomes:

$$P1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left[ \frac{Z_p - Y_i}{Z_p} \right] = I.P0$$

Where,

I = Income gap ratio

Po = Head Count Index

## **Measurement of Multidimensional Poverty**

The MPI is an index designed to measure acute poverty. Acute poverty refers to two main characteristics. First, it includes people living under conditions where they do not reach the minimum internationally agreed standards in indicators of basic functioning, such as being well nourished, being educated or drinking clean water. Second, it refers to people living under conditions where they do not reach the minimum standards in several aspects at the same time. In other words, the MPI measures those experiencing multiple deprivations, people who, for example, are both undernourished and do not have clean drinking water, adequate sanitation or clean fuel.

The MPI combines two key pieces of information to measure acute poverty: the incidence of poverty, or the proportion of people (within a given population) who experience multiple deprivations, and the intensity of their deprivation - the average proportion of (weighted) deprivations they experience.

Both the incidence and the intensity of these deprivations are highly relevant pieces of information for poverty measurement. To start with, the proportion of poor people is a necessary measure. It is intuitive and understandable by anyone. People always want to know how many poor people are in a society as a proportion of the whole population.

# Indicators

The index uses the same three dimensions as the Human Development Index: health, education, and standard of living. These are measured using ten indicators.

Dimension	Indicators
Health	Child Mortality
	Nutrition
Education	Years of school
	Children enrolled
Living Standards	Cooking fuel
	Sanitation/Toilet
	• Water
	• Electricity
	• Floor
	• Assets

Each dimension and each indicator within a dimension is equally weighted.

# **Indicators Used**

The following ten indicators are used to calculate the MPI:

- Education (each indicator is weighted equally at 1/6)
- ⇒ Years of schooling: deprived if no household member has completed five years of schooling
- ⇒ Child school attendance: deprived if any school-aged child is not attending school up to class 8

- Health (each indicator is weighted equally at 1/6)
- $\Rightarrow$  Child mortality: deprived if any child has died in the family
- ⇒ Nutrition: deprived if any adult or child for whom there is nutritional information is malnourished
- Standard of Living (each indicator is weighted equally at 1/18)
- $\Rightarrow$  Electricity: deprived if the household has no electricity
- ⇒ Sanitation: deprived if the household's sanitation facility is not improved (according to MDG guidelines), or it is improved but shared with other households
- ⇒ Drinking water: deprived if the household does not have access to safe drinking water (according to MDG guidelines) or safe drinking water is more than a 30-minute walk from home roundtrip
- $\Rightarrow$  Floor: deprived if the household has a dirt, sand or dung floor
- ⇒ Cooking fuel: deprived if the household cooks with dung, wood or charcoal
- ⇒ Assets ownership: deprived if the household does not own more than one radio, TV, telephone, bike, motorbike or refrigerator and does not own a car or truck

The multidimensional poverty index is composed of three dimensions made up of ten indicators. In the study area 150 households are taken on the bases of MPI methods 69 households are under poverty line. The deprivations of each person are weighted by the indicators weight. If the person is deprived from more than 3 indicators than they can be considered as a multidimensionally poor. And if the rate of deprivation is below 3 indicators than they were known as multidimensionally rich.

A person is considered poor if he/she deprived of at least 33.33% of the weighted indicators. The intensity of poverty denotes the proportion of indicators in which they are deprived.

## **CHAPTER-IV**

# **DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

This chapter focuses on the socio-economic and demographic background of the study area and profile of respondent's. This includes introduction of the study area, age composition of the respondents, profile of respondents cast /ethnicity, size of land holding and family size of respondents.

# 4.1 Introduction to the Study Area

The study area is located in Gandaki Zone and Kaski district. There are 43 VDCs. Bhalam VDC is one of the beautiful VDCs of the district. The VDC is far away from sub-metropolitan city of Pokhara. The VDC is developed rather than other VDC. Because this VDCs has many infra structure facilities like electricity, drinking water, transportation, school, health post, post office, and other. The total area of the VDC is 9.86 square kilometers and total population is 3764 in 759 household and comprising 1885 males and 1857 females. And the selected wards are 1, 3 and 8 out of 9 wards. Here households are the samples selected by using random sampling method.

This VDCs lies about 5 km in the eastern of the Pokhara submetropolitan city. There is a transportation facility from Mahendrapool and Phulbari to Bhalam VDCS. There is a suspension bridge to connect Bhalam VDC with Pokhara city. There is a temple i.e. Harihar temple, it is situated at high peak of the northern part of the Bhalam VDCs. This VDC is separated from kali khola which flow from northern part and Bhalam khola flows from eastern part. The VDC is closely connected with Armala in the northern part, Arba Vijay in eastern part and Kahun VDCS in southern part. Agriculture is the main sources of employment in this VDC. About 60 percent of the economically active people are employed in agriculture, and remaining 25 percent of the people are engaged in government and non government jobs the reaming 15 percent are engaged in different fields i.e. labor, sales man, and other.

In this VDC the land is suitable for production of rice, maize, millet, potato, and other vegetables production etc. Mainly the Bhalam rivulet is used for irrigation and the products are used according to the season though the products cannot full- fill the demands so that the people should buy from Pokhara city. Now days the people are aware of the recent condition and so, they have new concept about modern agriculture which helps increase income and this will help to reduce the poverty.

In order to provide social facilities there is one sub-health post and one sub-post office. At present there are one government high school, one higher secondary school, and 5 Primary schools in this VDC.

The total population of the study area is 731 out of which 387 are male and 344 female. The total number of households is 150, table 4.1 presents the distribution of households by wards and distribution of population by sex.

30

Ward No.	Sample	Sample Population		
	Households	Male	Female	Total
1	75	179	170	349
3	50	147	113	260
8	25	61	61	122
Total	150	387	344	731

Table 4.1: Population by Ward and Sex of Study Area

Sources: Field Survey, 2012, Village Profile, 2012

The table 4.1 shows, word wise sample households and male/female population. In this VDCS there are various different castes so that sample word No is 1, 3 and 8 and total sample households are 150. 150 households population are 387 male populations and 344 female populations. The greater number of population is in ward No.1 and lowest number of population is in ward No.8.



Bhalam VDC (Kaski, Pokhara)

#### 4.2 **Profile of Respondents**

This chapter deals with general characteristics of sample wards and profile of respondents. There are certain respondent characteristics in the study area, they are follows:

#### **Education Status of Respondent**

Education is very important to sustain life. Besides education is important for national, social and economically development. It is important to measure poverty. If he has education definitely he can sustain his life by earn money. The level of education is divided into four categories i.e. illiterate, just literate, S.LC. and higher education.

Level of Education	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Illiterate	140	19.15
Just literate	305	41.72
S.L.C.	143	19.56
Higher education	143	19.56
Total	731	100

**Table 4.2: Education Status of Respondents** 

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.2 presents the education status of the respondents. The study shows the level of education of education of respondent, 19.15 percent are illiterate, 41.72 present are just literate and 19.56 present are S.L.C. And 19.56 present are respondents are higher education. It is clear that the just literate are higher than the educated among the respondents. Thus, the education status of the respondents is seems to be satisfactory. It can be shown in the following pie chart diagram.

# **Occupation of the Respondents**

In the study area the respondents are engaged in different occupations according to their level of education such as agricultural, governmental, service, foreign employment, wage labor and other specific work. The total samples of respondents engaged in major occupations are shown in table.

Main Occupation	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Agriculture	63	42
Govt. /private service	43	22.66
Foreign employment	31	20.66
Wage labor	17	11.33
Business	5	3.33
Total	150	100

 Table 4.3: Occupation of Respondents

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.3 shows that the various occupation of the respondents. It shows 42 percent people depend on agriculture and works in agriculture field, 22.66 percent of people engaged on jobs, 20.66 percent people works in foreign country, 11.33 percent of people works on wage labor and 3.33 percent people engaged in business.

# **Caste and Ethnicity of Respondent**

The caste and ethnicity of respondents are discussed below in table 4.4.

Caste /Ethnicity	No. of Respondent	Percentage
Brahmin	161	22.02
Chettries	308	42.13
Dalit	107	14.63
Ethnic group	155	21.20
Total	731	100

 Table 4.4: Caste and Ethnicity of Respondents

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.4 Shows Brahmin, Chettries, Ethnic, composition of the study area. The data presented in the table show 22.02 percentages are Brahmins 42.13 percent are Chettries, Dalits are 14.63 percent 21.20 percent group are ethnic combined Brahmins are higher in number than Dalits.

# Size of Land Holding

Land is one of the most important economic variable and one of the major sources of income of employment. It is also the indicator of the wealth status of every household and individuals in Nepali society. The table 4.5 shows that there is unequal distribution of land.

Size of Landholding	No. of Respondents	Percentage
(in Ropani)		
Less than 1 Ropani	20	13.33
1-4 Ropani	78	52
4-8 Ropani	36	24
8 and above	16	10.66
Total	150	100

 Table 4.5: Size of Landholding of the Respondents

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.5 shows that there is unequal distribution of land among the total respondents. In my study area the higher size of land holding was 1-4 ropani i.e. 52 percent and lower size of land holding is 8 or a little.

#### **Family Size of Respondent**

In the study area, there are different family sizes i.e. nuclear and joint families of respondents. Family size also plays an important role in social and economic development. If a family is Joint then there is high expenditure on different fields where as in nuclear family there is low expenditure. Family sizes of respondent are shown in table 4.6.

Family Size	No. of Respondent	Percentage
1-4	81	54
4-6	48	32
6 and above	21	14
Total	150	100

**Table 4.6: Family Size of Respondents** 

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.6 shows that family size of respondents. It is clear that most of the respondents 54 percentage have 1-4 family members. The respondents 32 percentage have family members and 14 percentage have 6 and above family members.

In my study area it shows that the higher family members was 1-4 person only its percentage was 54 percentage and 6 and above family members have low percentage 14 percent among the respondents.
## **Different Types of House**

According to structure of the respondents household also helps to measure the poverty. It seems that most of the riched persons household is strong and more facilities rather than poor personed.

Types of House	No. of Households	Percentage
Made with stone	148	98.66
Made with bamboo	2	1.33
Total	150	100

 Table 4.7: Types of Respondents Houses

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Out of my study survey the above table shows most of the houses are made of stone its percentage was 98.66 percentages and 1.33 percentage houses were made from bamboo.

# **Different Types of Roof**

On the bases of their roof also show the poverty. If the respondent roof is made by tin or cemented is counted as a rich respondent .And who house is made by different poor materials then they were counted as a poor respondents .the following table represent the roof of the respondents.

 Table 4.8:
 Types of Households Roof of the Respondents

Types of Roof	No. of Households	Percentage
Khar	4	2.66
Tin	133	88.66
Cemented	13	8.66
Total	150	100

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

According to the above table it shows 88.66 percentage of house roof made from tin, 8.66 percentage of house roof were made from cemented, 2.66 percent of house roof were made from khar, but most of the respondents house roof were made from tin.

#### **Different Types of Floor**

According to the Multidimensional poverty index method it denotes if the floor is made by cemented then the respondents become rich and if the floor is made by mud or dung then they are poor. And these were represented by the following tables;

 Table 4.9:
 Types of Respondents Households Floor

Types of Floor	No. of Respondent	Percentage	
Mud	98	62.66	
Cemented	52	37.33	
Total	150	100	

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.9 shows 62.66 percent of household floor have been made by mud, 37.33 percent of floor using cement.

## **Types of Latrine**

If the respondents have water seal latrine then they can be multidimensionally rich and who pit latrine they are multidimensional poor. These were represented on the table 4.10.

Types of Latrine	No. of Households	Percentage
Pit latrine	46	30.67
Water seal latrine	104	69.33
Other	0	0
Total	150	100

 Table 4.10: Types of Latrine Used by the Respondents

Above table 4.12 shows that most of respondents have 69.33 percent water seal latrine and few of them have 30.67 percent pit latrine.

## Sources of Drinking Water Used by the Respondents

If the respondents took less than 30 minutes to take a pure water for drinking purpose on the bases of multidimensional poverty measured method they were included as a multidimensional riches if the sources of water took more than 30 minutes then they were multidimensional poor.

 Table 4.11: Type of Water Sources

Types of Sources	No. of House	Percentage
Тар	120	80
Other	30	20
Total	150	100

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Above table shows that 80 percentage of respondents use tap water and 20 percentage of respondent use other sources of water for drinking purpose.

## **Types of Electricity**

In Multidimensional poverty index methods if the respondents use hydroelectricity then the respondents were included on Multidimensional riched or otherwise they were poor. These were shown by the following tables;

Types of Electricity	No. of Households	Percentage
Kerosene	5	3.33
Hydro-electricity	135	90.00
Other	10	6.67
Total	150	100

 Table 4.12: Types of Electricity Used by the Respondents

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Above table shows that most of the respondent 90.00 percent of household use hydro- electricity, remaining 10 percent household used kerosene and other sources for their brightness.

## **Different Types of Fuel Used for Cooking Purpose**

One the bases of multidimensional poverty index any respondents apply L.P. Gas or Bio- Gas then they were multidimensionally richer and if the respondents who apply wood or dung then they were multidimensionally poor the table no 4.13 shows the types of fuel.

Types of Fuel	No. of Households	Percentage
Bio – Gas	42	28.00
Wood	104	69.33
L.P. gas	4	2.66
Total	150	100

 Table 4.13: Types of Fuel Applied by the Respondents

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Above table shows 28.00 percent used bio Gas, 69.33 percent used wood and 2.66 percent used L.P. gas. It shows that most of the respondent used wood and less used L.P. gas for cooking purpose.

## 4.3 Analysis of Income Poverty Incidence

## 4.3.1 Overall Poverty Incidence

The present study is to identify and analyze the extents and incidence of poverty problem in Bhalam VDC. In this study out of 150 households 55 households are poor. The state of overall poverty incidence of the study area is shown in the table 4.14.

Units	Poverty Incidence
Number	150
Rs.	21476.86
Rs.	18115.51
Ratio	0.351
Ratio	0.208
Ratio	0.073
	UnitsNumberRs.Rs.RatioRatioRatio

 Table: 4.14: State of Overall Poverty Incidence

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.14 shows that the incidence of poverty positive of the study area. The average annual income and expenditure of 150 households are 21476.86 and 18115.51 respectively. It is clear that income is higher than expenditure. The head count ratio, income gap ratio and poverty gap ratio are 0.351, 0.208 and 0.073 respectively. It shows that 36.66 percent of households are found to be poor in study area.

### 4.3.2 The State of Ward Wise Poverty Incidences

The Bhalam VDC of Kaski district divided into different 9 words. The study covered only word No 1, 3 and 8. It shows that number of poor household differ from three words is shown in table 4.15

Ward	Total	No. of	HCI in %	PGI in	Annual	Annual
No.	Sample	Poor		%	Income[Rs]	Expenditure[Rs]
	HHS	HHS				
1	75	23	33.66	7.72	16081.754	14138.67
3	50	18	36.00	9.07	15847.89	14331.92
8	25	14	56.00	14.11	13123.34	13927.87
Total	150	55				
~		~			•	•

 Table 4.15: State of Ward Wise Poverty Incidence

Above table 4.15 shows that wise poverty incidence so only three words have been selected as sample words for the study area. 150 households have been selected by simple random sampling method. It shows that 23 households are found to be poor out of the total sampling of words No.1.Similarlly 18 households are found to be poor out of the total sampling word no.3. And 14 households are found to be poor out of the total sampling words No.8. It reveals that HCI, PGI, annual average mean income and average expenditure are found to be 33.66 percent, 7.72 percent, Rs.16081.754 and Rs.14138.67 respectively in wards No.1. Similarly, ward no 3 and 8 reveals that HCI, PGI, annual average mean income and average expenditure are found to be 36.00 percent, 9.07 percent, Rs.15847.89 and Rs.14331.92 and 56.00, 14.11, 13123.34 and 13927.87 respectively.

## 4.3.3 Income Poverty Profile

A poverty profile shows the characteristics of poverty and demonstrates how the measure of poverty varies across sub-group of population such as poverty by level of education, poverty by caste and ethnicity, poverty by family size, poverty by size of land holding, poverty by place of origin. Poverty profile shows compare the measure of poverty across subgroups of population based on socio-economic and demographic categories of sample population.

#### **Poverty by the Level of Education**

Level of education is one important determining factor of the nature of the poverty problem. In the study area, level of education has been divided in to four categories viz, illiterate, just literate, S.L.C and higher education. There is close relationship between level of education and income because education and skill go together. Table 4.16 shows the literacy status of poor household head and daily per capita mean income and expenditure compositions.

Level of	Total	No. of	HCR in	PGR in	Annual	Annual
Education	Sample	Poor	%	%	Mean	Average
	HHS	HHS			Income	Expenditure
Illiterate	44	22	50	12.60	13008.04	11634.04
Just	40	14	35	8.82	14474.33	14111.36
literate						
S.L.C.	50	12	24	6.04	18292.88	15911.66
Higher	16	7	43.75	11.05	18461.17	14243.86
Education						
Total	150	55				

**Table 4.16: Poverty by the Level of Education** 

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

The table 4.16 it is found that 55 absolute poor households, 50 percent are illiterate, 35 percent just literate, 24 percent SLC passed and 43.75 percent household are higher educated. It shows that 12.60 percent is the highest and 6.04 percent is lowest poverty gap ratio in illiterate and SLC education respectively. The illiterate households have lowest annual income 13008.04, just literate; SLC and Higher Education have 14474.33, 18292.88 and 18461.17 respectively. So, that the native of

poverty is effected by literacy status. As the level of education is increasing, the average mean income also increases.

#### **Poverty by Caste and Ethnic Group**

Less developed countries poverty problem is highly concentrate in all caste and ethnic groups. It is important to see the relationship between caste, ethnic groups and poverty in the study area. The caste and ethnic composition of absolute poor households is given in table 4.17.

Caste	Total	No. of	HCR	PGR	Annual	Annual Average
Ethnic	Sample	Poor	in %	in %	Mean	Expenditure[Rs]
Group	HHS	HHS			Income[Rs]	
Brahmin	54	14	25.92	6.53	17998.15	15378.23
Chettri	57	19	33.33	8.40	16246.72	14051.34
Dalit	15	10	66.66	16.80	12577.90	12376.42
Ethnic	24	12	50.00	12.60	12679.49	14343.58
group						
Total	150	55				

 Table 4.17: Poverty by Caste and Ethnic Groups

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Above the table 4.17 shows that 55 absolute poor HHS out of 150 sample HH. Among 55 absolute poor HHS 14 households are Brahmins, 19 HH are Chhetries, 10 HH are Dalit and 12 HH are Ethnic group. Head Count Ratio of the Brahmin, Chhetri, Dalit and Ethnic group are 25.92, 33.33, 66.66 and 50.00 respectively Dalit have the highest HCR whereas Bharmin have the lowest HCR i.e. 66.66 And 25.92. Poverty Gap ratio of Brahmin, Chhetri, Dalit and Ethnic group are 6.53, 8.40, 16.80 and 12.60 respectively.

As mentioned the above Dalit have the highest PGR whereas Brahmin has the lowest PGR. The annual mean income of Brahmin, Chhetri, Dalit and Ethnic group are 17998.15, 16246.72, 12577.90 and 12679.49 respectively. In the table, only other caste has the higher average expenditure is higher than income.

#### **Poverty by Family Size**

Family Size as a responsible factor of determining the level of Income, Standard of living or Poverty level of family. In the study area, it is found to be poor family have grater family size in comparison with least family size. Table 4.18 shows family size, HCR, PGR, Average annual mean income and Average annual expenditure of absolute poor families.

Family	Total	No. of	HCR	PGR	Annual	Annual Average
Size	Sample	Poor	in %	in %	Mean	Expenditure[Rs]
	HHS	HHS			Income[Rs]	
1-4	81	11	13.58	3.44	15682.72	11358.13
4-6	48	29	60.41	60.41	14129.27	15363.22
6 and	21	15	71.42	18.00	11558.82	13267.75
above						
Total	150	55				

 Table 4.18: Household Size and Poverty Incidence

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Above table 4.18 shows that if family size increases the annual mean income is decreases. That means poor families have large family size. It shows that the size of 1-4 family have 13.58 percent, 3.44 HCR and PGR respectively. The highest HCR of 6-above is comparison to others family size similarly PGR of family size 4-6 is greater than other family size.

#### **Poverty by Land Holding**

It is also a major source of income for every individual and also engaged them as and their employment so it helps to measured the poverty ratio. Table 4.19 shows the relationship between the size of land holding and level of income in the study area.

Size of Land	Total	No. of	HCR	PGR	Annual	Annual
Holding	Sample	Poor	in %	in %	Mean	Average
[rapani]	HHS	HHS			Income[Rs]	Expenditure[Rs]
Having land	138	47	34.08	8.58	16338.20	13118.88
No land	12	8	66.66	16.8	12076.80	12679.57
Total	150	55				

 Table 4.19: Poverty by Land Holding

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

From the above table, No land has the highest HCR and PGR than having land. Annual mean income and annual mean expenditure are greater than the no land than having land.

# Poverty by Gender of Household Head

Generally gender play an important role to raise the living stander of the house, female households is less than male headed households. We also believe that female could manage more economically rather than male counterpart, including less expense so that female headed household may be less poor. The table headed households

Table 4.20: Poverty by Gender of Household Head

-	1					
Gender	Total	No. of	HCR	PGR	Annual	Annual Average
	Sample	Poor	in %	in %	Mean	Expenditure[Rs]
	HHS	HHS			Income[Rs]	
FHH	25	12	48.00	12.09	14325.72	12253.25
MHH	125	43	34.40	8.66	15205.01	14780.50
Total	150	55				

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Above table 4.20 shows that out of 55 HH 12 HH have female headed are poor and 43 HH have male headed are poor. HCR and PGR are female headed are greater than male headed family.

### **Poverty by Size of Land Holding**

Poverty also measured by the size of land holding by the respondents if they have more land than they were ecolomically riched but if the respondents who don't have land but less ropani of the land then they were economically poor. These also represented by the table4.21

Size of Land	Total	No. of	HCR	PGR	Annual	Annual Average
Holding	Sample	Poor	in %	in %	Mean	Expenditure[Rs]
[rapine]	HHS	HHS			Income[Rs]	
1 Ropani	20	15	75.00	18.90	12457.12	12280.50
1-4 R0pani	78	30	38.46	9.69	12570.66	11890.76
4-8 R0pani	36	8	22.22	5.60	13980.23	12106.05
8 and above	16	2	12.50	3.15	16343.42	14833.57
Ropani						
Total	150	55				

 Table 4.21: Poverty by Size of Land Holding

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Above table 4.21 shows that the HCR and PGR are in descending order of magnitudes as the land holding size increasing. It clearly shows that HCR and PGR are inversely related to the land holding.

## 4.4 Analysis of Multi-Dimensional Poverty Incidence

The multidimensional poverty index is composed of three dimensional made up of ten indicators. A person is considered poor if they are deprived in at least 33.33% of the weighted indicators. The intensity of poverty denotes the proportion of indicators in which they are deprived.

The deprivations of each person are weighted by the indicators weight. If the person is deprived from more than 3 indicators than they can be considered as a multidimensional poor. And if the rate of deprivation is below 3 indicators than they were known as multidimensional rich.

According to measurement and analysis of poverty the extent and incidence of poverty relates with the number of people living under the poverty. So in this study area out of 150 households 46 percent households are poor. The state of overall poverty incidence of the study area is shown in the table.

### 4.4.1 State of Overall Poverty Incidence

Present study is done to achieve the set objectives to determine the nature of poverty. These were based on Multidimensional poverty index methods. So in this study area 150 sample households 69 households are poor. The state of overall poverty incidence is shown in the table 4.20.

Particular	Units	Poverty Indicator
Total Sample Households	No.	150
No .of Poor Households	No.	69
Head Count Ratio	Ratio	0.503
Intensity of Poverty	Ratio	0.418
MPI	Ratio	0.210

 Table 4.22: State of Overall Poverty Incidence

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.22 Shows that the overall poverty incidence. The Head Count Ratio Intensity of Poverty and MPI are 0.503, 0.418 and 0.210 respectively and it shows that 46percentage of households are found to be poor in the study area. It is also clear that 69 households out of 150 sample households are found to be poor out of total sample households its

percentage was 46. On the other hand 731 number of population out of 368 total sample population are found to be below the poverty line in Bhalam VDC.

## 4.4.2 State of Ward Wise Poverty Incidence

The study covered a sample 150 household of the word No. 1, 3 and 8. It shows the number of poor household differ from different five wards is shown in table 4.21.

Word	Total	Sample	No. of	Poor	MDHR	I of P	H×A
No.	Sample	Pop <sup>n</sup>	Poor	Pop <sup>n</sup>	[H]	[A]	
	HHS		HHS				
1	75	349	30	168	0.481	0.432	0.208
3	50	260	21	110	0.423	0.439	0.186
8	25	122	18	90	0.738	0.367	0.271
Total	150	731	69	368			

 Table 4.23: State of Ward Wise Poverty Incidence

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.23 shows that ward wise poverty incidence so only 3 wards have been selected as sample wards for the study area only 150 households have been selected by simple random sampling methods and its total population is 731. Out of total population 368 populations were poor and their households are 69. MDHR, I of P and H×A are 0.481, 0.432 and 0.208, 0.423, 0.439 and 0.186 and 0.738, 0.367 and 0.271 of the ward no 1, 3, and 8 respectively.

### 4.4.3 Multidimensional Poverty Profile

A poverty profile shows the characteristic of poverty and demonstrates how the measure of poverty varies across sub-group of population such as poverty by level of education, caste and ethnicity, family size, land holding size and gender wise poverty. Poverty profile shows the compare the measure of poverty across subgroups of population based on socio-economic and demographic categories of sample population.

#### **Poverty by Level of Education**

Level of education is one of the important determining factors of the nature of the poverty problem in the study area, level of education has been divided into four categories like illiterate, just literate, S.L.C. and higher education.

Level of	Total	Sample	No. of	Poor	MDHR	I of P	H×A
Education	Sample	Pop <sup>n</sup>	Poor	Pop <sup>n</sup>	[H]	[A]	
	HHS		HHS				
Illiterate	44	140	27	109	0.779	0.747	0.582
J. literate	40	305	21	147	0.482	0.251	0.121
S.L.C.	50	143	18	98	0.685	0.345	0.236
Higher	16	143	3	14	0.098	0.250	0.025
Education							
Total	150	731	69	368			

Table 4.24: Poverty by the Level of Education

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

The table 4.24 shows that as the education level increases the indicators MDHR, I of P and  $H \times A$  are goes on decreases except SLC level.

#### **Poverty by Caste and Ethnicity**

Poverty problem is highly concentrated in all cast and ethnic groups. It is important to see the relationship between cast, ethnic groups and poverty in the study area. The caste and ethnic composition of absolute poor households is given in table 4.23.

Caste	Total	Sample	No. of	Poor	MDRH	I of P	H×A
	Sample	Pop <sup>n</sup>	Poor	Pop <sup>n</sup>			
	HHS		HHS				
Brahmin	54	198	18	88	0.444	0.392	0.176
Chettri	57	278	26	117	0.421	0.401	0.169
Dalit	15	104	11	67	0.644	0.525	0.338
Ethnic	24	151	14	96	0.636	0.517	0.329
group							
Total	150	731	69	368			

 Table 4.25: Poverty by Caste and Ethnic Groups

The table shows that 69 absolute poor households out of 150 sample household. Among 69 absolute poor household 18 household are Brahmin, 26 household are Chetries, 11 household are Dalit and14 household are ethnic group. It shows that number of population below the poverty line or MDRH found to be 0.444, 0.401, 0.644, and 0.636 respectively Brahmin, Chettri, Dalit and ethnic group. The I of P of Brahmin, Cheetri, Dalit and Ethenic groups are 0.392, 0.401, 0.525, and 0.517 respectively. And H×A of Brahmin, Chettri, Dalit and ethnic group are 0.176, 0.169, 0.338, 0.329 respectively. Dalit MDRH, I of P, H×A ratio is slightly higher than ethnic group.

### **Poverty by Family Size**

The size of family as responsible factor for determining the level of Income, Health, Education, living standard or poverty level of family. In the study area, it is found to be poor family percentage have grater family size in comparison with least family size percentage.

Family Size	Total	Sample	No. of	Poor	MDRH	I of P	H×A
	Sample	Pop <sup>n</sup>	Poor	Pop <sup>n</sup>			
	HHS		HHS				
1-4	81	245	23	69	0.282	0.225	0.063
4-8	48	297	32	180	0.606	0.547	0.331
8 and above	21	189	14	119	0.630	0.690	0.435
Total	150	731	69				

 Table 4.26: Household Size and Poverty Incidence

Table 4.26 reveals that if family size increases their MDRH, I of P and H×A is increases. The family size is small it means household have less expenses, so income is high on the other hand large families have large expenses so income is low. As a result there is strong relationship between family size and poverty. It is clear that big family size have deeply rooted in poverty circle.

## Poverty by Gender of Household Head

Household head is considered to play vital role in decision making. Nepalese society is generally patriarchal society. Female households head is less than male headed households. Generally gender plays vital role to raise the living of standard. We also believe that female could manage more economically than her male counterpart, including less expense so that female headed household may be poor. The table shows that difference in poverty between the male and female headed.

Household	Total	Sample	No. of	Poor	MDRH	I of P	H×A
Head	Sample	Pop <sup>n</sup>	Poor	Pop <sup>n</sup>			
	HHS		HHS				
FHH	25	120	9	44	0.367	0.215	0.079
MHH	125	611	60	324	0.530	0.413	0.219
Total	150	731	69	368			

 Table 4.27: Poverty by Gender of Household Head

Table 4.27 shows that out of 69 households, 9 households have female headed are poor and 60 households are male headed households are respectively. It is clear female headed and male headed are found to be 36 percent and 48 percent respectively. Male headed household the MDRH, I of P, H×A is higher than female headed households.

# **Poverty by Land Holding**

Nepal is an agricultural country. The size of land holding is most important factor. It is major sources of income and employment. It is also an indicator of wealth status, education level, health status of every household and individuals. The nature of poverty is highly affected by the size of land holding. Table 4.28 shows the relationship between the size of land holding and health, education, living standards of poor in the study area.

Land	Total	Sample	No. of	Poor	MDRH	I of P	H×A
	Sample	Pop <sup>n</sup>	Poor	Pop <sup>n</sup>			
	HHS		HHS				
Having land	138	663	61	325	0.492	0.278	0.137
No. land	12	68	8	42	0.618	0.437	0.270
Total	150	731	69	368			

Table 4.28: Poverty by Land Holding

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.28 shows number of sample households, number of sample population, number of absolute poor households, number of poor population, MDRH, I of P, H $\times$ A. 69 poor household, 61 households are having land and 8 households are without land. It shows Noland households have highest MDRH, I of P and H $\times$ A.

### Poverty by Size of Land Holding

Poverty can be measured on the bases of land holding if a respondent has less rapines of land then he/she is multidimensionally poor and who has more rapines of land then he/she rich is according to MPI. Table 4.29 shows it below;

Size of land	Total	Sample	No. of	Poor	MDRH	I of P	H×A
Holding	Sample	Pop <sup>n</sup>	Poor	Pop <sup>n</sup>			
	HHS		HHS				
Less than 1Ropani	20	9	16	69	0.750	0.670	0.503
1-4Ropani	78	358	33	179	0.500	0.35	0.173
4-8Ropani	36	220	18	110	0.500	0.32	0.160
8 and above	16	61	2	10	0.164	0.112	0.018
Ropani							
Total	150	731	69				

 Table 4.29: Size of Landholding of the Respondents

Sources: Field Survey, 2012

From the above table 4.29 shows that as land holding size increases the poverty level decreases and vice versa according to the indicators MDRH, I of P and  $H \times A$ .

## 4.5 Major Findings

• This study is based on a sample survey of 150 households out of the total 759 households. The survey technique is structured on questionnaire interviews with the sample households.

- The main objective of this study area is to analyze nature and extent of poverty and to determine appropriate solution for its alleviations.
- The absolute poverty line has been calculated to be Rs.52.78 which is the minimum subsistence level of income per capita per day. 36.67 percent households are absolutely poor on the based on income and 46 percent on MPI.
- The problem of poverty has been found in all family size.
- The mean income of absolutely poor households has been found to be Rs.41.790 per capita per day.
- The value of head count index is 0.351based on income and 0.503 based on MPI.
- The value of income gap ratio is 0.208 and poverty gap ratio is 0.066 based on income and intensity of poverty is 0.418 and MPI was 0.210 based on MPI analysis.
- Among 55 absolutely poor households 22 household heads are illiterate, 14 household heads are just literate, 12 household heads are S.L.C. and 7 household heads are highly educated based on income pattern. Similarly, 69 HH are absolute poor households, 27 household heads are illiterate, 21 household heads are just literate, 18 household heads are S.L.C. and 3 household heads are higher educated based on MPI pattern.
- Out of 55 absolutely poor households of Brahmins are 14 households, Chettris are 19 households, Dalits are 10 and other castes are 12 based on income pattern. Similarly, 18 Brahmins, HH are 26 HH Chettri, 11 HH Dalit and 14 HH are other caste out of 69 HH based on MPI pattern.
- According to income pattern, 55 absolutely poor household sizes of land holding having land was 41 and none having land was 14.

Similarly out of 69 HH, 61 HH were land holding and 8HH are none having land according to the MPI.

- It is also found that out of 55 households female head was12 and 43 were male head in their house in income pattern analysis. Similarly, 9 HH are female and 60 HH are male head out of 69 HH based on MPI.
- The annual mean income of total sample household was Rs.21476.868 and annual average expenditure was Rs.18115.51 where as precipitate annual income of poor was Rs.15254.146 and annual expenditure was Rs.14148.263. It shows that mean income of the poor was below the poverty line.
- Lack of education, illiterate, unemployment, lack of saving capacity etc. was also cause of rural poverty in the study area.
- The nature of poverty was serious in all cast and ethnic group.
- The ward wise higher poverty is ward no.1 and lower poverty was ward no. 8.
- The nature of poverty was highly affected by educational status, therefore the poverty problem was higher among them the illiterate poor but it was also found higher may be poor households.
- The income level of household is relatively low, who are engaged in labor work, depend on agricultural and the income level of the households was higher whose main occupation is business, job, foreign country employer.
- In the study area caste was also an important factor of income inequality enhance of poverty. Most of the lower cast people spend a large proportion of their income on liquor consumption, smoking and traditional festivals.
- In the study area there was positive relation between poverty and family size.

## **CHAPTER-V**

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

#### 5.1 Summary

Poverty is one of the main characteristics of the people living in rural areas of Nepal because more than 80 percent of the country's people live in rural areas and most of them are engaged in the agricultural sector for their live hood. Therefore we can infer that the highest proportion of the poverty problem is in the agricultural sector. In income is very low due to various reasons such as the lack or inadequacy of irrigation, fertilizers and agricultural credits and the use of and back ward technology and small and fragmented land holdings.

Poverty is the main obstacle to the economic growth of country. The problem of poverty arises due to various reasons such as small size of land holding, lack of market facilities, lower literacy rate, unemployment problem, and large household size.

Nepal has carried out various programs and policies from time to time to uplift the standard of living of the poor and to minimize the gap between rich and poor. However, these policies and programs could not be implemented effectively in uplifting the living standard of the poor. This is chiefly because such programs and policies could not benefit the targeted groups of the rural areas. But, the nature and extent of poverty are not same for all areas. It depends up on the socio-economic structure and other factors of the particular area. This study was done to find out the poverty profile of Bhalam VDC, Kaski district. The main objectives of the study area to describe the nature of poverty, measure absolute poverty line, relative poverty and total poverty, analyze the extend and incidence of the poverty and examine the poverty profile. To measure the relationship between poverty and other factors. I used three dimensions of poverty i.e. health, education, and living standards. Out of these ten indicators are followed besides these they are nutrition, child mortality, ill health, years of schooling, school attendance on education, and cooking fuel, sanitation, water, electricity, floor and assets are included in living standard. Bhalam VDC, Kaski has been taken as the study area. The study has been carried out selecting 150 household on the basic of simple random sampling to meet the objectives sets. Only ward no 1, 3 and 8 have been taken for sample wards. These wards have randomly been selected to collect data for achieving set objectives.

Both primary and secondary data have been collected for the study. Primary data have been collected from field survey i.e. structured questionnaire, interviews and observation. Secondary data have been collected from VDC profile and other articles.

Despite the measurer applied the actual result of the research has not been properly achieved. The measures to be applied for alleviation of this type of poverty depend upon the joint initiative of the dwellers and the government.

## 5.2 Conclusion

It can be concluded that Bhalam VDC is little bite affected by poverty. According to measurement of poverty the extent and incidence of poverty relates with the number of people living under the poverty. The main causes of poverty are unemployment, small size of landholding, lower literacy rate, lack of skill and technical knowledge, income inequality, social culture factors, cast and ethnicity and family size are also directly or indirectly affects on the development. Beyond these there are different factors like; low income which affect on Health, Education and living Standers. In the study area most of the poor households are illiterate, just literate, Unemployed and traditional workers. So there is a vicious cycle of the people living below poverty. So it is necessary to reduce the extent of poverty in the rural area of the country in order to reduce the extent and intensity of poverty problem. The government should conduct effective programs and policies with aim of making people aware of the condition they are in to reduce the poverty rate of rural area further socio-culture problems should be addressed by the government as well as nongovernmental organization so that it can successfully help in the poverty rate reduction and make rural poverty go away forever.

## 5.3 Suggestions

Poverty should be rooted out from the world as well as every family or from all the communities. So there should be launched different programs, facilities and other supplementary programs which help to reduce poverty in the area. On the basis of the findings some specific and important policies for the improvement the poor should be implemented are recommended below;

- Education and employment opportunities should be provided to the poor families.
- Government should make education compulsory for all poor households.
- Program should focus for the lower caste, female and ethnic group.
- Government should lunch significant programs related with the poor areas and education about the family planning.
- The government should launch different technical tools and materials which are needed for the development of traditional agriculture.

- Government should provide financial support for different sectors like; education, health, transportation and other infrastructure to the area.
- Emphasis should be given for to bio- gas, latrine manufacture etc.
- Public awareness programmes related to family education, health, sanitation, education and gender equity etc should be started to give high paid job opportunities should be launched by the government agency and other non governmental agencies to pull up the poor people from the poverty line. So that it helps to uplift the living stander of the people.
- Government should control and reduce high price rate.
- Vocational training should provide to promote the status of the poor family.
- Government should invest in agricultural sectors.
- People of Bhalam VDC mostly poor Dalits and ethnic groups spend more money in celebrating their festivals. So that government should reduce traditional festivals.
- At last but not least, there should be a strong commitment of people towards reducing poverty and also co ordination between NGO, INGIO, government and society in the poverty alleviation programme.

From these policies implication can be drawn in poverty alleviation programmes should be focused on structural transformation of all sector and opportunities to better education and employment. More over special attention should be given to labor, Ethnicity and Dalits. In this way only one attempt or measure is not sufficient for reducing poverty from the study area.

# **Appendix-A**

# An Analysis of Rural Poverty in Kaski With Reference to Bhalam VDC

## **Interview Schedule**

1. Name of respondent.....Caste.....

 Age......Sex....Occupation....

 Education.....Word No...

Language......Religion.....

2. Family Structure by Age, sex, Educational level and occupation

S.No.	Age	Sex	Religion	Literate/Illiterate	Education	Occupation
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

3. Ownership of the household

a. Self owned b. Shelter in other house

c. Rented from others without payment

4. Housing Structure

a. Wall type

i. Made with stone

iii. Made with wood

ii. Made with fired bricks

iv. Others.....

b. Roof type	
i. Straw roof	ii. Cemented roof
iii. Just roof	iv. Stone roof
c. Floor type	
i. Mud	ii. Stone-slipped
iii. Cemented	iv. Other
5. Types of latrine	
i. Pit latrine	ii. Water seal latrine
iii. Other	
6. Types of drinking water	
i. Tap	ii. River/stream
iii. Other	
a. How long does it take to fetch w	rater
i. less than 10 minutes	ii. 10-20 minutes
iii. 20-30 minutes	iv. More than 30 minutes
7. Which fuel does your family often us	e for cooking?
i. Electricity	ii. Gas [l.P]
iii. Bio- gas	iv. Wood
v. Kerosene	vi. Other
8. Which of the following utilities	and amenities are available in your
household?	
i. Telephone	ii. Refrigerator
iii. Television	iv. Bike
v. Car/ tractor/ bus	vi. Other
9. Do you have Electricity in your home	??
i. Yes	ii. No
10. Have you heard of Malnutrition?	
i. Yes	ii. No
If yes what do you think the cause	s of Malnutrition?
a. Touch of pregnant women	b. Insufficient food
c. No idea	

11. Do you have any child mortality in your home?

i. Yes ii. No

12. Land Holding [in Ropani]

S.No.	Types of land Holding	Land Units
1	Own	
2	Rented in	
3	Rented out	
4	Total	

13. Annual sources of Income

a. Income from Agriculture

S.No.	Crops	Production	Local Unit Price	Total Income
1	Paddy			
2	Wheat			
3	Maize			
4	Barely			
5	Oil seed			
6	Potato			
7	Vegetables			
8	Pulse			
9	Other			

b. Annul Income from live stock and poultry

S.No.	Kinds	Quantity per live	Price per live	Total income
1	Buffalo			
2	Cow			
3	Ox			
4	Pig			
5	He/ She goat			
6	Poultry			
7	Other			
8	Total			

# c. What are the other sources of income of your household?

S. No.	Sources	Total income[Rs]
1	Cottage industry	
2	Service[private/government]	
3	Daily wage	
4	Pension	
5	Foreign country	
6	Other	
7	Total	

# 14. Annual Expenditure

a. Expenditure on food items

S.No.	Item	Quantity [Muri	Price per	Total
		/ Pathi]	unit[Rs]	amount[Rs]
1	Paddy[rice]			
2	Wheat			
3	Milk and milk items			
4	Cooking oil			
5	Maize			
6	Tea and sugar			
7	Fish/meat			
8	Fruit			
9	Vegetables			
10	Total			

# b. Expenditure on non food items

S. No.	Item	Expenses[Rs]
1	Clothing	
2	Social events[marriage, birth, death etc]	
3	Fest and festival	
4	Health care	
5	Education	
6	Smoking /tobacco	
7	Lighting/ heating/ cooking[firewood]	

8	Interest on loan	
9	Land tax	
10	Total	

c. How much did you spend on agricultural input last year?

S.No.	Inputs	Local cost[Rs]
1	Seeds	
2	Fertilizers	
3	Harvesting	
4	Pesticides	
5	Irrigation	
6	Total	

d. Expenditure on live stock and poultry

S.No.	Kinds	Fooding	Medicine	Other	Total expenditure
1	Cow			enpenditure	enpenditure
2	Buffalo				
3	He/ She got				
4	Ox				
5	Poultry				
6	Pig				
7	Other				
8	Total				

15. What are your intentions on becoming rich?

i. To construct a house for living

ii. For the family's education and health

iii. To purchase radio, television, cassettes, bike, car

iv. If others.....

16. What type of support and programs do you see from the government?

.....

## **Appendix-B**

# **A] Head Count Index**

H=q/N

Where,

H=Head count index

q=Number of poor below poverty line [246]

N=Total number of Population [701]

Since,

# **B] Income Gap Ratio**

$$\mathbf{I} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left[ \frac{zp - yi}{zp} \right] = 1 - \frac{\overline{y}p}{zp}$$

Where,

Zp=poverty line

yi=Income of the i<sup>th</sup> of the poor person

q=Number of poor below poverty line

yp=mean income of the poor

We have,

# **C]** Poverty Gap

$$\mathbf{P}_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left[ \frac{zp - yi}{zp} \right] = z \cdot p_0$$

Where,

Zp=Poverty line yi=Income of the i<sup>th</sup> poor person N=Total number of poor I=Income gap ratio P0=Head count index

We have,

# Appendix-B

# **Basic Data Set -Income Method**

S.N.	HHS	DPCI(Yi)	DPCE(Ci)	YixCi	(Yi)2	(Ci)2	Ci(Yi)2
1	4	52.34	43.23	2262.658	2739.476	1868.833	118427.5
2	10	56.66	34.32	1944.571	3210.356	1177.862	110179.4
3	6	54.89	54.55	2994.25	3012.912	2975.703	164354.4
4	11	55.96	39.37	2203.145	3131.522	1549.997	123288
5	5	56.01	45.8	2565.258	3137.12	2097.64	143680.1
6	3	56.78	47.98	2724.304	3223.968	2302.08	154686
7	6	57.65	55.65	3208.223	3323.523	3096.923	184954
8	5	34.56	42.12	1455.667	1194.394	1774.094	50307.86
9	8	49.66	47.99	2383.183	2466.116	2303.04	118348.9
10	5	95.7	91.1	8718.27	9158.49	8299.21	834338.4
11	7	31.13	36.9	1148.697	969.0769	1361.61	35758.94
12	4	57.8	45.08	2605.624	3340.84	2032.206	150605.1
13	5	61.98	39.7	2460.606	3841.52	1576.09	152508.4
14	3	82.19	58.72	4826.197	6755.196	3448.038	396665.1
15	4	47.55	36.78	1748.889	2261.003	1352.768	83159.67
16	7	58.35	50.08	2922.168	3404.723	2508.006	170508.5
17	6	57.8	52.12	3012.536	3340.84	2716.494	174124.6
18	4	62.25	37.89	2358.653	3875.063	1435.652	146826.1
19	6	54.77	45.84	2510.657	2999.753	2101.306	137508.7
20	3	15.8	21.69	342.702	249.64	470.4561	5414.692
21	5	47.79	36.87	1762.017	2283.884	1359.397	84206.81
22	1	58.7	48.07	2821.709	3445.69	2310.725	165634.3
23	3	73.19	66.7	4881.773	5356.776	4448.89	357297
24	4	53.05	46.67	2475.844	2814.303	2178.089	131343.5
25	3	47.89	35.65	1707.279	2293.452	1270.923	81761.57
26	5	68.7	47.06	3233.022	4719.69	2214.644	222108.6
27	5	58.09	43.89	2549.57	3374.448	1926.332	148104.5

S.N.	HHS	DPCI(Yi)	DPCE(Ci)	YixCi	(Yi)2	(Ci)2	Ci(Yi)2
28	4	41.23	41.26	1701.15	1699.913	1702.388	70138.41
29	5	58.88	52.08	3066.47	3466.854	2712.326	180553.8
30	3	89.06	57.85	5152.121	7931.684	3346.623	458847.9
31	4	86.3	82.57	7125.791	7447.69	6817.805	614955.8
32	5	39.71	30.31	1203.61	1576.884	918.6961	47795.36
33	4	57.53	42.84	2464.585	3309.701	1835.266	141787.6
34	5	27.67	39.91	1104.31	765.6289	1592.808	30556.25
35	6	64.9	42.24	2741.376	4212.01	1784.218	177915.3
36	3	78.05	51.74	4038.307	6091.803	2677.028	315189.9
37	4	50.04	40.51	2027.12	2504.002	1641.06	101437.1
38	6	40.89	38.79	1586.123	1671.992	1504.664	64856.57
39	7	57.67	41.35	2384.655	3325.829	1709.823	137523
40	9	77.45	53.32	4129.634	5998.503	2843.022	319840.2
41	8	36.75	42.89	1576.208	1350.563	1839.552	57925.63
42	5	67.89	46.75	3173.858	4609.052	2185.563	215473.2
43	6	53.32	46.79	2494.843	2843.022	2189.304	133025
44	4	98.88	76.87	7600.906	9777.254	5908.997	751577.5
45	5	97.8	101.3	9907.14	9564.84	10261.69	968918.3
46	6	47.6	32.39	1541.764	2265.76	1049.112	73387.97
47	8	110.23	87.35	9628.591	12150.65	7630.023	1061360
48	5	88.46	80.29	7102.453	7825.172	6446.484	628283
49	9	41.84	33.24	1390.762	1750.586	1104.898	58189.47
50	5	38.55	41.98	1618.329	1486.103	1762.32	62386.58
51	3	59	45.65	2693.35	3481	2083.923	158907.7
52	6	68.79	54.46	3746.303	4732.064	2965.892	257708.2
53	5	75.86	64.76	4912.694	5754.74	4193.858	372676.9
54	4	36.74	33.31	1223.809	1349.828	1109.556	44962.76
55	2	57.68	26.72	1541.21	3326.982	713.9584	88896.97
56	3	58.44	37.97	2218.967	3415.234	1441.721	129676.4

S.N.	HHS	DPCI(Yi)	DPCE(Ci)	YixCi	(Yi)2	(Ci)2	Ci(Yi)2
57	4	101.95	85.26	8692.257	10393.8	7269.268	886175.6
58	6	48.7	47.8	2327.86	2371.69	2284.84	113366.8
59	3	28.45	27.88	793.186	809.4025	777.2944	22566.14
60	4	116.9	99.08	11582.45	13665.61	9816.846	1353989
61	6	52	48.3	2511.6	2704	2332.89	130603.2
62	3	130.13	90.14	11729.92	16933.82	8125.22	1526414
63	6	76.88	56.67	4356.79	5910.534	3211.489	334950
64	8	64.53	47.64	3074.209	4164.121	2269.57	198378.7
65	4	89.78	96.99	8707.762	8060.448	9407.06	781782.9
66	3	49.6	45.61	2262.256	2460.16	2080.272	112207.9
67	5	45.37	40.41	1833.402	2058.437	1632.968	83181.44
68	4	54.58	34.52	1884.102	2978.976	1191.63	102834.3
69	5	57.87	54.58	3158.545	3348.937	2978.976	182785
70	4	86.5	53.47	4625.155	7482.25	2859.041	400075.9
71	6	57.25	53.12	3041.12	3277.563	2821.734	174104.1
72	4	86.25	82.41	7107.863	7439.063	6791.408	613053.1
73	5	51.36	49.8	2557.728	2637.85	2480.04	131364.9
74	7	43.23	35.64	1540.717	1868.833	1270.21	66605.2
75	8	35.69	42.36	1511.828	1273.776	1794.37	53957.16
76	6	58.9	47.97	2825.433	3469.21	2301.121	166418
77	5	21.05	38.06	801.163	443.1025	1448.564	16864.48
78	6	47.67	45.67	2177.089	2272.429	2085.749	103781.8
79	4	59.35	52.12	3093.322	3522.423	2716.494	183588.7
80	6	73.56	56.73	4173.059	5411.074	3218.293	306970.2
81	4	43.47	37.8	1643.166	1889.641	1428.84	71428.43
82	5	34.75	31.53	1095.668	1207.563	994.1409	38074.45
83	3	79.61	47.21	3758.388	6337.752	2228.784	299205.3
84	4	40.34	35.9	1448.206	1627.316	1288.81	58420.63
85	3	81.91	41.46	3395.989	6709.248	1718.932	278165.4

S.N.	HHS	DPCI(Yi)	DPCE(Ci)	YixCi	(Yi)2	(Ci)2	Ci(Yi)2
86	1	38.62	21.67	836.8954	1491.504	469.5889	32320.9
87	3	48.53	45.89	2227.042	2355.161	2105.892	108078.3
88	4	65.34	54.35	3551.229	4269.316	2953.923	232037.3
89	4	47.55	42.66	2028.483	2261.003	1819.876	96454.37
90	5	28.6	43.67	1248.962	817.96	1907.069	35720.31
91	4	58.79	49.7	2921.863	3456.264	2470.09	171776.3
92	5	56.69	53.88	3054.457	3213.756	2903.054	173157.2
93	4	43.47	35.14	1527.536	1889.641	1234.82	66401.98
94	5	31.5	32.25	1015.875	992.25	1040.063	32000.06
95	6	65.46	50.88	3330.605	4285.012	2588.774	218021.4
96	5	30.63	34.67	1061.942	938.1969	1202.009	32527.29
97	5	52.12	46.43	2419.932	2716.494	2155.745	126126.8
98	4	47.7	45.42	2166.534	2275.29	2062.976	103343.7
99	4	55.56	67.43	3746.411	3086.914	4546.805	208150.6
100	8	60.61	65.87	3992.381	3673.572	4338.857	241978.2
101	3	48.7	34.5	1680.15	2371.69	1190.25	81823.31
102	6	68.45	54.47	3728.472	4685.403	2966.981	255213.9
103	5	87.7	67.84	5949.568	7691.29	4602.266	521777.1
104	3	47.86	37.96	1816.766	2290.58	1440.962	86950.4
105	5	55.47	52.37	2904.964	3076.921	2742.617	161138.3
106	4	78.71	75.32	5928.437	6195.264	5673.102	466627.3
107	8	34.46	47.58	1639.607	1187.492	2263.856	56500.85
108	5	59.76	43.25	2584.62	3571.258	1870.563	154456.9
109	8	46.58	41.27	1922.357	2169.696	1703.213	89543.37
110	3	101.24	57.6	5831.424	10249.54	3317.76	590373.4
111	6	47.69	46.79	2231.415	2274.336	2189.304	106416.2
112	5	35.46	38.95	1381.167	1257.412	1517.103	48976.18
113	4	59.99	49.04	2941.91	3598.8	2404.922	176485.2
114	5	67.56	43.2	2918.592	4564.354	1866.24	197180.1

S.N.	HHS	DPCI(Yi)	DPCE(Ci)	YixCi	(Yi)2	(Ci)2	Ci(Yi)2
115	10	105.24	120.32	12662.48	11075.46	14476.9	1332599
116	6	29.32	34.8	1020.336	859.6624	1211.04	29916.25
117	4	59.45	66.45	3950.453	3534.303	4415.603	234854.4
118	5	39.4	41.85	1648.89	1552.36	1751.423	64966.27
119	6	59.35	50.22	2980.557	3522.423	2522.048	176896.1
120	5	56.54	48.89	2764.241	3196.772	2390.232	156290.2
121	7	58.55	46.58	2727.259	3428.103	2169.696	159681
122	5	57.67	45.57	2628.022	3325.829	2076.625	151558
123	6	54.56	65.43	3569.861	2976.794	4281.085	194771.6
124	4	56.43	48.5	2736.855	3184.345	2352.25	154440.7
125	2	64.42	34.54	2225.067	4149.936	1193.012	143338.8
126	5	53.24	51.2	2725.888	2834.498	2621.44	145126.3
127	4	76.68	60.44	4634.539	5879.822	3652.994	355376.5
128	3	49.5	37.67	1864.665	2450.25	1419.029	92300.92
129	6	62.13	54.25	3370.553	3860.137	2943.063	209412.4
130	5	54.35	47.48	2580.538	2953.923	2254.35	140252.2
131	6	56.8	49.22	2795.696	3226.24	2422.608	158795.5
132	4	87.46	69.04	6038.238	7649.252	4766.522	528104.3
133	3	69.86	51.2	3576.832	4880.42	2621.44	249877.5
134	5	44.35	41.22	1828.107	1966.923	1699.088	81076.55
135	4	69.67	45.32	3157.444	4853.909	2053.902	219979.2
136	5	39.4	38.9	1532.66	1552.36	1513.21	60386.8
137	5	49.44	42.55	2103.672	2444.314	1810.503	104005.5
138	3	53.45	49.8	2661.81	2856.903	2480.04	142273.7
139	4	50.46	45.79	2310.563	2546.212	2096.724	116591
140	5	53.32	42.34	2257.569	2843.022	1792.676	120373.6
141	4	55.46	65.48	3631.521	3075.812	4287.63	201404.1
142	5	67.46	46.87	3161.85	4550.852	2196.797	213298.4
143	4	65.47	57.68	3776.31	4286.321	3326.982	247235
S.N.	HHS	DPCI(Yi)	DPCE(Ci)	YixCi	(Yi)2	(Ci)2	Ci(Yi)2
------	-----	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
144	5	56.67	47.58	2696.359	3211.489	2263.856	152802.6
145	3	46.35	32.75	1517.963	2148.323	1072.563	70357.56
146	4	54.47	48.41	2636.893	2966.981	2343.528	143631.5
147	5	83.09	71.54	5944.259	6903.948	5117.972	493908.4
148	4	68.49	36.4	2493.036	4690.88	1324.96	170748
149	3	63.4	54.02	3424.868	4019.56	2918.16	217136.6
150	2	51.33	28.94	1485.49	2634.769	837.5236	76250.21
	731	8826.11	7444.73	474345.1	573337.6	407180.6	33543740

## Appendix - C People in Households -MPI Method

Indicators	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
Indicators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Household	4	10	6	11	5	3	6	5	8	5	7	4	5	3	4	7	6	4	6
Education																			
5.S	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
S.Att	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Health																			
Nu	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C.Mo	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Living Standard																			
electricity	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Water	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Sanitation	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Dirt floor	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
Cooking fuel	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
Assets	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ci	0.444	0.222	0.056	0.555	0.222	0.389	0.167	0.333	0.389	0.389	0.167	0.111	0.111	0.056	0.389	0.167	0.167	0.111	0.389
Is household Poor?	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Censored (Li)	0.444	0.222	0.056	0.555	0.222	0.389	0.167	0.333	0.389	0.389	0.167	0.111	0.111	0.056	0.389	0.167	0.167	0.111	0.389

Indicators	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
Household	3	5	1	3	4	3	5	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	6	3	4	6
Education																			
5.S	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
S.Att	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Health							0												
Nu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
C.Mo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Living																			
Standard																			
electriciy	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Water	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Sanitation	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Dirt floor	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
Cooking fuel	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
Assets	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Ci	0.111	0.389	0.278	0.111	0.389	0.389	0.333	0.389	0.389	0.389	0.444	0.111	0.389	0	0.389	0.444	0.056	0.389	0.111
Is household	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Poor?																			
Censored (Li)	0.111	0.389	0.278	0.111	0.389	0.389	0.333	0.389	0.389	0.389	0.444	0.111	0.389	0	0.389	0.444	0.056	0.389	0.111

Indicators	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57
Household	7	9	8	5	6	4	5	6	8	5	9	5	3	6	5	4	2	3	4
Education																			
5.S	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
S.Att	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health																			
Nu	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
C.Mo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Living																			
Standard																			
electricity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Sanitation	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dirt floor	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
Cooking	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
fuel																			
Assets	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ci	0.222	0.500	0.222	0.222	0.389	0.056	0.056	0.056	0.500	0.056	0.556	0.278	0.056	0.167	0	0.111	0.056	0.111	0.444
Is	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
household																			
Poor?																			
Censored	0.222	0.500	0.222	0.222	0.389	0.056	0.056	0.056	0.500	0.056	0.556	0.278	0.056	0.167	0	0.111	0.056	0.111	0.444
(Li)																			

Indicators	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76
Households	6	3	4	6	3	6	8	4	3	5	4	5	4	6	4	5	7	8	6
Education																			
5.S	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
S.Att	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Health																			
Nu	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
C.Mo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Living																			
Standard																			
electricity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sanitation	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Dirt floor		1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
Cooking	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
fuel																			
Assets	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Ci	0.389	0.111	0	0.389	0.056	0.056	0.389	0.056	0.389	0.167	0.056	0.111	0	0.444	0.056	0.111	0.389	0.389	0.500
Is	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
household																			
Poor?																			
Censored	0.389	0.111	0	0.389	0.056	0.056	0.389	0.056	0.389	0.167	0.056	0.111	0	0.444	0.056	0.111	0.389	0.389	0.500
(Li)																			

Indicators	77	78	<b>79</b>	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95
Households	5	6	4	6	4	5	3	4	3	1	3	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	6
Education																			
5.S	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S.Att	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Health																			
Nu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
C.Mo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Living																			
Standard	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
electricity	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Sanitation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Dirt floor	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1		1	0
Cooking	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
Tuer	1	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0
Assets	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Ci	0.444	0.389	0.111	0.389	0	0.056	0	0.056	0.056	0.444	0.056	0.111	0.111	0.444	0.111	0.389	0	0.500	0.056
Is household	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Poor?																			
Censored (Li)	0.444	0.389	0.111	0.389	0	0.056	0	0.056	0.056	0.444	0.056	0.111	0.111	0.444	0.111	0.389	0	0.500	0.056

Indicators	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114
Households	5	5	4	4	8	3	6	5	3	5	4	8	5	8	3	6	5	4	5
Education																			
5.S	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
S.Att	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Health																			
Nu	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
C.Mo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Living																			
Standard																			
electricity	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sanitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Dirt floor	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
Cooking	0	0	1	0	1	1	1		1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
fuel																			
Assets	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Ci	0.389	0.167	0.111	0	0.389	0.111	0.389	0.056	0.389	0.111	0	0.389	0.056	0.444	0.444	0.389	0.056	0	0.056
Is	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
household																			
Poor?																			
Censored	0.389	0.167	0.111	0	0.389	0.111	0.389	0.056	0.389	0.111	0	0.389	0.056	0.444	0.444	0.389	0.056	0	0.056
(Li)																			

Indicators	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133
Households	10	6	4	5	6	5	7	5	6	4	2	5	4	3	6	5	6	4	3
Education																			
5.S	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
S.Att	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Health																			
Nu	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
C.Mo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Living																			
Standard																			
electricity	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Water	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Sanitation	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Dirt floor	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cooking	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
fuel																			
Assets	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ci	0.500	0.389	0.111	0.056	0.389	0.	0.222	0.389	0.222	0.167	0.389	0.278	0.444	0.056	0.556	0.389	0.389	0.167	0.389
Is	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
household																			
Poor?																			
Censored	0.500	0.389	0.111	0.056	0.389	0	0.222	0.389	0.222	0.167	0.389	0.278	0.444	0.056	0.556	0.389	0.389	0.167	0.389
(Li)																			

Indicators	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150
Households	5	4	5	5	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	6	4	3	2
Education																	
5.S	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
S.Att	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Health																	
Nu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
C.Mo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Living Standard																	
electricity	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Water	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Sanitation	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Dirt floor	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Cooking fuel	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
Assets	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Ci	0.500	0.389	0.389	0.278	0	0.389	0.389	0.389	0.167	0.167	0.444	0	0.389	0.556	0.222	0.389	0.389
Is household	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Poor?																	
Censored (Li)	0.500	0.389	0.389	0	0	0.389	0.389	0.389	0.167	0	0.444	0	0.389	0.556	0.222	0.389	0.389

H = Household Size, E = Education, 5s = No one has completed five years of schooling, S.att. = At least one member is malnourished, Nu = At least one member is malnourished, C.MO = One or more children have died, Electricity = No electricity, water = No access to clean drinking water, sanitation = House has dirt floor, Cooking fuel = Household uses "dirty" cooking fuel (dung, firewood or charcoal), Assets = Household has no car and owns at most one bicycle, motorcycle ,radio, refrigerator, telephone or television, CI= Some is deprivation multiplied by its weight.

Multidimensional Headcount ration: (H)  $\frac{q}{N} = \frac{368}{731} = 0.503$ Intensity of poverty: (A)  $= \frac{153.839}{368} = 0.418$ 

 $MPI = H \times A = 0.503 \times 0.418 = 0.0210$ 

## **BIBLOGRAPHY**

- Acharya, Sharmila (1998). Nature of Poverty: A Case Study of Traigaun VDC, Dang District. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation. CEDECON, T.U. Kirtipur, Nepal.
- Adhikari, Rajendra (2000). *Rural Poverty in Nepal: A Case Study of Giramani VDC, Jhapa*' Unpublished ma Dissertation, CEDECON, to Kritipur, Nepal.
- Aryal, J.P. (1994). Rural Poverty in Nepal: A Case Study of Purnajanga Jholi VDC, Sindhuli District. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation, T.U. Kirtipur, Nepal.
- Bhandari, S.R. (1987). Poverty in Nepal: A Case Study of Bhaktpur District. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation CEDECON, Kirtipur, Nepal.
- Bhattarai, Lekhnath (2004). Poverty and Environment Linkages: A Study of Use and Management of Forest Resources in Mahabharat Tract, West Nepal. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to JNU, India.
- Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural Development: Putting the Last First.* Harlow: Longman.
- Dahal, K.K. and M.K. Shrestha (1987). *Rural Poverty in Nepal: A Case Study of Panchthar District*. Winrock Project, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Dawadi, L.P. (1996). *The Extent and Nature of Poverty Problem in Rural Nepal.* The Economic Journal of Nepal, Vol. 19, no.4
- Dhamala, B.P. (2004). Poverty Reduction and the Tenth Plan. (2002-2007)
- Economic Survey, (2067-68). Ministry of Finance, HMG, Nepal
- Harry, Johnson (1996). Unemployment and Poverty in Leo Fisherman(ed), Poverty Amid Affluence. Yale University Press.
- JAIN, S.C. (1981). *Poverty to Prosperity in Nepal*. Development Publishers, Indian.

- Jhingan, M.L. (2003). *The Economic of Development and Planning*. Virinda Publication P.Ltd. India.
- Karki, D. (2010). The state of urban poverty in Nepal: A Poverty Profile of Pokhara Sub-metropolis. An Unpublished M.A. Dissertation Submitted to Department of Economic, P.N. Campus, Pokhara.
- Lamsal, Maya (2008). Impact of Community Forestry on Poverty Reduction: A Case Study of Akala Community Forest, Vyas Municipality Tanahun. An Unpublished M.A. Dissertation Submitted to Department of Economic, P.N. Campus, Pokhara.
- Micheal, Lipton (1988). *The Poor the Poorest World Staff Working Paper*. Vol. No. 4, WB. Washington D.C.
- Nepal Government Ministry of Finance (2068). Economic Survey.
- Nepal Planning Commission (1978). A Case Study of Employment, Income Distribution and Consumption Pattern in Nepal, NPC/ HMG, Nepal.
- Papola, T.S. (2002). Poverty Alleviation in Mountain Area of Chain International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development in Went Capacity Building International. Germany.
- Srivastav Nagendra Lal, and Deo Narayan Sutihar (1998). A Study of Poverty at Pokhara Sub-Metropolitan City. Research Submitted to the Secretariat of University Grant Commission, Nepal.
- Todaro, M.P. (1981). *Economic Development in the Third World*. P. 33-34, Washington D.C.
- Todaro, Michal, (2003). *Economic Development*. Pearson Education (Singapore) Pvt. Ltd. India Branch, Delhi.

VDC Profile, (2010). Bhalam VDC.

- World Bank (1990). *World Development Report*, Washington D.C: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank/UNDP (1990). *Nepal: Relieving in a Resource Scarce Economy*, Washington D.C: World Bank.