

## Gender poverty in India

Dr. Manjula Devappa  
Dept/ women's studies  
KSAWU VIJAYAPURA

“poor women in rural villages and urban locations to ascertain relative levels of their well-being. Rural poverty and its implications for women have received some attention in the literature; however urban poverty is relatively of newer vintage” (Rodgers, 1989; Mathur, 1994). unrewarded of the site, there is a tough watercourse of argumentation that highlights the identical twin disadvantages emanate from gender and poverty highlighting that women are the most horrible sufferers from poverty related deprivation. Given the active gender based deprivations and inequality; poverty can be very incapacitating and put in on to the vulnerabilities of women. one more important issue is concerning the piece of information that experience and response to poverty are far removed from among men and women, due to the gendered constraints and variations in the opportunities (Masika, et al., 1997; Razavi, 2000). so, assessment of gender dimensions of poverty are exceptionally decisive both for a better sympathetic of the intertwine age as on form as for effectual policy intervention.

Gender dimension of poverty frequently gain importance from the belief that women comprise the poorest of the poor, being the lowest in social and economic hierarchies. but, gender and poverty are two separate forms of inconvenience and therefore, collapsing them into a ‘feminisation of poverty’ notion of women as the poorest of the poor is not adequate (Jackson and Palmer Jones, 2000). A frequently made link between gender and poverty is the equation of women headed households with the poor (Chant, 2003; Gangopadhyay and Wadhwa, 2003; Pearce, 1978; among others). Female headed households are necessarily poorer and suffer from vulnerabilities when compared with those of male headed households (Gangopadhyay and Wadhwa, 2003). but, it would not be accurate to state that all female headed households are poor. In fact, numerous more female headed households fall into the comparatively higher use expenses quintiles. It is true that the fraction of female heads working compare to the on the whole female work participation rates is higher, since in most cases the female head is the active earner of the family. Who comprise the female heads? Is there a difference in the middle of the rural and urban locations? What penalty does this have on the poverty impact upon women? Poverty is an income based concept, defined and deliberate through the

household as a unit. complications in access to precise income data and the point of view that stress on the importance of use as a proxy for household standard of living highlight the latter to be a better gauge of well being than income (World Bank, 1990). Current consumption (including consumption from own production) reflect the ability of the household to buffer their standard of living wage from side to side saving and borrow, despite income fluctuations. Therefore, household consumption expenditure as a proxy acts as the data for estimate of per capita using up.

This is then used to delegate the poor using poverty appearance as benchmark. There are various problems with such agency of poverty, but the pertinent one in this context is regarding the intra-household inequalities in utilization that studies have noted and that may be deduced to operate under the throttlehold of patriarchal ideals that govern the household implementation, so discriminating against women. Women have a tendency to be doubly weighed down by poverty thereby ornamental their exposure extensively. The pressure to seek market forms of service among inferior women is intensify by the need for the further contribution to the household income (Mitra and Pool, 2000). The hackneyed role casting whereby women have the responsibility of providing for sure basic facilities in reality constrains their availability for paid work as well. In some households where cultural norm and taboos prevent public participation of women as wage earners in the labour market, the encumber of reducing costs by deploy their own labour military to stay away from market procure puts women under marvellous nervous tension. not together from the gender based division of labour within the domestic sphere, marketplace jobs are also gendered in ways that result in discrimination against women in conditions of employment and wage returns. There are very few women who have better human capital endowment and find themselves in the high-end jobs. Even these few women are for the most part those who belong to the well-to-do sections of society.

the services of other women to ease their own burden in household responsibilities. but, what this use by well-to-do women of the services of moderately poorer women means for the latter in turn needs some thought. the first section provides an estimation of poverty in absolute numbers crosswise rural and urban areas. Bulk of the poor leftovers in rural areas even though the urban areas put on show an increase in the unqualified numbers of poor persons over time, from 1993-94 to 2004-05. Is this due to shifts in the poor persons

from rural locations through immigration into urban areas? In terms of the gender work of art, poorer households tend to have a more even-handed sex ratio, implying more women have to bear the encumber of poverty. This is true in both urban and rural locations. but, manifestation of poverty in the two locations be different in confident respects, especially with look upon to access to basic facilities. Social environment and access to employment avenue also differ from rural to urban location. These aspect will be dealt with in the second and third section. The proportion of female headed households is often supposed to reflect the levels of feminization of poverty. Is this the case in the Indian context? Are convenient further female headed households in urban or rural areas and are they for the most part poor? And how is the fraction of FHHs changing over time? The fourth section will deal with these aspect and also see the sights the marital and work profiles of the female heads. The fifth section is devoted to the educational status of women. Is it improving in rural areas or urban locations? Are the poorer women also benefiting from educational inputs? The sixth section will look at the employment measurement, comparing subordinate women vis-à-vis relatively better off women. The inevitability to work compel poor women to take up paid employment, at the same time as it may be an exercising of an option for the relatively better-off women. This is reflect in the natural history and nature of jobs undertaken by the women. How is this different crossways rural-urban locations? Given the landowning households, especially the middle and small farm cultivating households, which make use of the labour of household women as well, the rural situation could be separate from that of the urban areas. Poverty has been a concern for rural areas and so gender dimensions of poverty have also been for the most part debate in that context. This paper highlights the characteristic features of poverty and elaborate on how it affect women in rural and urban locations. Amidst assured similarity, the analysis project the distinctive elements. Rural poverty continue to remain a major issue, while there are also shifts to urban poverty noticeable. How does this impact on women? The poverty levels and numbers of persons calculated to be living under poverty in urban and rural areas are presented first.

**Female headed households** The concept of female headed households and its erstwhile association with feminisation of poverty occurred due to at least two sets of issues, however, there are major problems in limiting to this view given the current state of awareness. The strong link was an offshoot of observations made in the western countries context wherein increasing female headed households as a result of divorces or break ups within families were often seen

to be more income poor compared to others. The non-presence of male members due to strains in family relations or irregular, intermittent remittances lead to increasing poverty levels of the female headed households (Chant, 1992; Masika, de Haan and Baden, 1997) The nonattendance of state support for divorced and single women by way of social safety method was highlighted by Pearce, 1978, where she associated the pauperization and welfare dependence as the price of independence (McLanahan and Kelly, 1999). The varying family organization was answerable by McLanahan and her colleagues in 1989 as the most important culprit for feminization of poverty as it uncover women's dormant economic vulnerabilities. This factor may be extended to the social transition in family structures in the country from joint to nuclear families. The exclusive responsibility of household work on women in nuclear household context, as compare to the being there of joint or widespread families increases the burden on them. This issue certainly is at engage in recreation in terms of constrain the leave go of of women for work in paid labour markets. It is also critical in terms of support structures for child care and domestic duties, activities that limit women from labour market participation and improve levels of stress faced by them. Given the limits on analyzing feminisation of poverty that come into view from data constraints, measures of poverty and recognition of intra-household inequalities, one segment which is expected to shed light on this dimension is by looking at households with female heads. This option when exercised to analyse data available supported the expectation that women headed households were inferior in urban areas. The 61st round NSSO data reveals an increase in the proportion of female headed households from 9 per cent in 1999-00 to 11 per cent in 2004-05. The Census of India 2001 also generates a similar figure of 11 per cent for urban FHHs. The total FHHs estimated by NSS 61st round (2004-05) reveal a slightly higher proportion of them in rural areas. but, it is in the urban areas that most of the FHHs are poor. This share of FHHs among the poor was higher earlier in 1993-94. As per the 2004-05 figures, the FHHs among the better off sections of urban locations have registered an amplify. Majority of the FHHs consist of the widowed category as per the marital status classification. With improving educational levels, the potential of taking up compensatory jobs or pursue ones own employment among the widows allows for improvement in economic levels. This is a also in part a reflection of the increasing tendencies of professional and working couple living independently in different location pursuing their careers. In rural villages

on the contrary, there are more female headed households among the relatively better off sections.

Though over time there seems to be an increase across mace category among FHHs in rural areas. Widows constitute nearly 70 per cent of all FHHs in urban areas, while they constitute 63 per cent in rural areas. Among FHHs, the divorces or separated women constitute the smallest share, close to 3 per cent, in both rural and urban areas. While 8 per cent of the FHHs are that of never married women, 20 per cent are that of at present married women as well in urban areas. The category of married women heads is moderately higher in rural areas, at 31 percent, while the single women constituent for villages is less than 4 per cent in general, both urban and rural areas reflect declining work participation among female heads, apart from among the two lower quintiles in urban areas. This depict the compulsions of poverty as well as the ease of use of opportunities for women in urban locations. In rural areas although the female heads report a higher work participation rate compared to the urban counterpart, the distinctions across the inferior and better off households seems to be lesser. The absorption of female heads in regular employment is one major positive change over time. Especially in urban areas, the female heads are seen to be shifting from self employment and unfussy employment towards regular work in a significant manner. The rural situation is somewhat different with only informal employment showing a decline over time. but across mace quintiles, the lower quintiles which constitute the poorer households with female heads are dependent on casual employment and self employment with a few variations across rural and urban location. The major distinction is with stare to the regular employment which is gaining significantly in urban locations. avenue for poor women in usual jobs seem to be available and this of necessity has to do with some improvements in their education attainment, even if only that of becoming literate.

Even the demographic gender masterpiece or sex ratios among different expenses quintiles disclose higher or more equitable gender equilibrium amongst the poorer households in both rural and urban locations. This naturally also means that women bear the burden of poverty much further in judgment to men. Apart from this gender balance in the populations, the societal biases stemming from the patriarchal values discriminates and assigns undue burden on poor women who have to shoulder the domestic responsibilities as well as economic work. Without sufficient educational attainment the employment

avenue available to them remain informal, low paying and highly unconfident. The lack of access to basic facilities and civil rights to the poor migrant who seek livelihood in urban areas makes their working and living conditions very susceptible, and women among the poor endure most due to this. The female headed households are also noted to be more amongst the urban poor in contrast to rural poor.

## Reference

1. Agnihotri, S.B. (2000). Sex Ratio Patterns in the Indian Population –A Fresh Exploration, Sage, New Delhi.
2. Buvinic, Mayra; Margaret A. lycette and William Paul McGreevey (ed.), (1983). Women and Poverty in the Third World, The John Hopkins university Press, Baltimore and london.
3. Cagatay, N. (1998). “Gender and Poverty”, UNDP Social Development and Poverty Elimination Division, Working Paper Series, No.5, May.
4. Chant, Sylvia (1992). Gender and Migration in Developing Countries, Belhaven, london.
5. Chant, Sylvia (2003). “Female Household Headship and the Feminisation of Poverty: Facts, Fictions and Forward Strategies”, Gender Institute, New working Paper Series, Issue 9, ISE Gender Institute, london School of Economics, london.
6. Gangopadhyay, Shubhashis and Wilima Wadhwa (2003). “Are Indian Female – Headed Households More vulnerable to Poverty”, India Development Foundation, Delhi, November.
7. Ghosh, Jayati (1998). “Assessing Poverty Alleviation Strategies for their Impact on Poor Women: Study with Special Reference to India”, Discussion Paper No. 97, united Nations Research Institute for Social Development, October.
8. GOI (2007). Poverty Estimates for 2004-05, Press Information Bureau, New Delhi, 21st March.
9. Jackson, Cecile and Richard Palmer-Jones (2000), “Rethinking Gendered Poverty and Work”, in Razavi (ed.), Gendered Poverty and Well-Being,
10. Kundu, Amitabh (1993). In the Name of the Poor: Access to Basic Amenities, Sage, New Delhi
11. Mahadevia, Darshini and Sandip Sarkar (2004). Poverty, levels of living and Employment Structure in the Small and Medium Size Towns, Report submitted to CSO by Institute for Human Development, New Delhi.