International Journal of Applied Social Science
Volume 6 (5), May (2019) : 1124-1130
Received : 12.03.2019; Revised : 26.03.2019; Accepted : 13.04.2019

RESEARCH PAPER
ISSN : 2394-1405 (Print)

Influence of Per Capita Income on Gender Equity in Uttar Pradesh: A District wise Analysis

KAUSHLENDRA VIKRAM MISHRA
Associate Professor & Head
Department of Economics, Sri Gandhi P.G. College (V.B.S.Purvanchal University, Jaunpur)
Maltari, Azamgarh (U.P.) India

ABSTRACT

Statistics reveal that in India, males significantly outnumber females and this imbalance has increased over time. According to 2011 census, report the sex ratio stands at 940 per 1000 males. Women face discrimination right from the childhood. In childhood and adulthood, males are fed first and better. The tradition also requires that women eat last and least throughout their lives even when pregnant and lactating. Malnourished women give birth to malnourished children. Women receive less healthcare facilities than men. Many women in rural areas die in childbirth due to easily preventable complications. According to census 2011, Uttar Pradesh has huge population (199581477 persons) and continues to be the most populous state in the country. Here in Uttar Pradesh the birth of the male is celebrated, whereas the birth of a female filled with pain. Sons are showered with love, respect, better food and proper health care. Males are promoted to be tough and outgoing while females are encouraged to be homely and shy. All these differences are gender differences and they are created by our society. In the present study, an attempt has been made to examine the Influence of Per Capita Income on Gender Equity in Uttar Pradesh.

Key Words : Gender equity, Per capita income, Mortality rate, Literacy rate, Work participation rate, Sex ratio

INTRODUCTION

According to census 2011, Uttar Pradesh has huge population (199581477 persons) and continues to be the most populous state in the country. Here in Uttar Pradesh the birth of the male is celebrated, whereas the birth of a female filled with pain. Sons are showered with love, respect, better food and proper health care. Males are promoted to be tough and outgoing while females are encouraged to be homely and shy. All these differences are gender differences and they are created by our society.

Review of Literature:

Bils and Klenow (1998) assert that it is not education that leads to growth, but growth that leads to education. As has been shown in past studies, returns to education increase substantially as an economy becomes more developed.

Barro and Jong-wha (1994) use a panel data set of 138 countries to examine the empirical determinants of growth, including measures for both male and female schooling. In what they see as a "puzzling finding", female education is negatively correlated with growth. Barro and Lee attribute this to a sign of "backwardness" in the society, where gender differences are picking up on aspects of undeveloped countries that may not have been captured with an initial GDP variable. Therefore, such less developed countries may experience higher growth rates due to a convergence mechanism.

Psacharopoulos (1994) finds that returns to female education are positive and higher than, their male counterparts. This micro literature also points to indirect benefits from gender equality.

Quibria (1995) "Gender and Poverty: Issues and

How to cite this Article: Mishra, Kaushlendra Vikram (2019). Influence of Per Capita Income on Gender Equity in Uttar Pradesh: A District wise Analysis. *Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci.,* **6** (5) : 1124-1130.

Policies with Special Reference to Asian Developing Countries." has studied and found that across the globe, women are less educated and receive worse healthcare than their male counterparts receive.

Behrman *et al.* (1999) find that children of more literate mothers in India study nearly two more hours a night. In addition, gender inequality has been shown to influence a number of development related goals, such as lower fertility rates, higher education rates, and better child health.

Seguino (2000a; 2000b) has studied and found that in a sample of export-oriented Asian nations, higher rates of growth are actually correlated with higher rates of gender inequality. She attributes this to the ability of firms to pay female labor less than males without fear of backlash or revolution, thus spurring investment.

Sen (2001), in his essay "Many Faces of Gender Inequality", opined that there is need to take a plural view of gender inequality, which can have many different faces. The prominent faces of gender injustice can vary from one region to another, and also from one period to the next. He further described that the Gender inequality hurts the interests not only of girls and grown-up women, but also of boys and men, through biological connections (such as childhood undernourishment and cardiovascular diseases at later ages) and also through societal connections (including in politics and in economic and social life).

Esteve-Volart (2004) finds that when studying different states in India, those with higher rates of gender discrimination exhibit lower growth rates compared to others. However, do these concerns impact the growth of the country.

Awoyemi and Adeoti (2006) have examined the effect that gender inequality in employment has in rural cassava farm holdings in southwest Nigeria, and found that increased gender inequality decreases productive efficiency.

Quentin (2008), "The Effect of Gender Inequality on Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Study" has studied and found that an under investment in women's education has a negative effect on growth.

Objectives of the study:

Following are the main objectives of the study-

1. Highlight the gender equity among districts of Uttar Pradesh,

2. To illustrate the status of per capita income among districts of Uttar Pradesh,

3. To focus on effects of per capita income on gender equity.

METHODOLOGY

This study is based on secondary data source. The data are collected from Census of India and Department of Statistics. The time series and cross sectional data are collected for 71 districts of Uttar Pradesh. We have selected seven indicators; six of gender equality and one of per capita income. The indicators are discussed below-

Indicators of gender equality:

1. **Gaps between Male and Female Mortality Rate (U5 MR) (R1):**
   Less Gaps between Female and Male Mortality Rate (under 5 years) means more gender equality.
2. **Sex Ratio at Birth (R2):**
   More Sex Ratio at Birth means more gender equality.
3. **Sex Ratio at All Age Group (R3):**
   More Sex Ratio at all age group means more gender equality.
4. **Gaps between Male and Female Literacy Rate (R4):**
   Less Gaps between Literacy Rate of Male and Female means more gender equality.
5. **Gaps between Male and Female Work Participation Rate (R5):**
   Less Gaps between Male and Female work participation rate means more gender equality.
6. **Child Sex Ratio 0-6 Year (R6):**
   More Child Sex Ratio means more gender equality.

Indicator of income:

We have taken PCI as indicator for Income.

Per capita income:

More per capita income means more economically sound district.

Limitations of the study:

Doing research on gender equity is very complicated in nature because society has traditional as well as modern characteristics simultaneously. Moreover, the secondary data source has its own limitations. In spite of

the above difficulties, an attempt is made here to bring out information and analyze it with all care.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Meaning of Gender Discrimination:

According to Kofi Annan "Gender equality is more than a goal in itself. It is a precondition for meeting the challenges of reducing poverty, promoting sustainable development, and building good governance." Gender inequality has adverse impact on development goals as reduces economic growth. It hampers the overall well being because blocking women from participation in social, political and economic activities can adversely affect the whole society. Many developing countries including India have displayed gender inequality in education, employment and health. It is common to find girls and women suffering from high mortality rates. There are vast differences in education level of two sexes.

Statistics reveal that in India, males significantly outnumber females and this imbalance has increased over time. According to 2011 census, report the sex ratio stands at 940 per 1000 males. Out of the total population, 180 million are women who live in abject poverty. The maternal mortality rate in rural areas is among the world's highest. The deaths of young girls in India exceed those of young boys by over 300,000 each year and every 6th infant death is specifically due to gender discrimination.

The tradition also requires that women eat last and least throughout their lives even when pregnant and lactating. Malnourished women give birth to malnourished children, perpetuating the cycle. Women receive less healthcare facilities than men. A primary way that parents discriminate against their girl children is through neglect during illness. As an adult they tend to be less likely to admit that they are sick and may wait until their sickness has progressed far before they seek help or help is sought for them. Many women in rural areas die in childbirth due to easily preventable complications. Women's social training to tolerate suffering and their reluctance to be examined by male personnel are additional constraints in their getting adequate health care.

Sex ratio and gender inequality:

Sex ratio is the simple way to understand gender inequality. Generally, if the sex ratio of any society is high it means gender equality otherwise, it seems gender inequality.

Discrimination of sex ratio - Top five and bottom five states in India:

As per Census 2011, top five states/Union territories, which have the highest sex ratio, are Kerela (1,084) followed by Puducherry (1,038), Tamil Nadu (995), Andhra Pradesh (992) and Chhattisgarh (991). Five states/Union territories, which have the lowest sex ratio, are Daman and Diu (618), Dadra and Nagar Haveli (775), Chandigarh (818), NCT of Delhi (866) and Andaman and Nicobar Islands (878).

District wise sex ratio in Uttar Pradesh:

It is interesting to analyze sex ratio in different districts of Uttar Pradesh and compare it with not only each other but national average as well. Among the 71 district of the state, we arranged in three groups as high sex ratio, medium sex ratio and low sex ratio groups. From the Table 1, it can be seen that sex ratio of 17 districts are higher than national average (936/1000male). Moreover, the contribution of these districts in population of Uttar Pradesh is 26.15 per cent (5.21 carors).

Likewise, top five district of Uttar Pradesh, which have the highest sex ratio, are Jaunpur (1018), Azamgarh (1017), Deoria (1013), Pratapgarh (994) and Sultanpur (978). However, five districts that have the lowest sex ratio are Gautam Buddh Nagar (852), Kanpur Nagar (852), Hardoi (856), Mathura (858), and Bagpat (858).

Sex ratio of India in comparison to neighboring countries:

It would be quite useful when we compare sex ratio of Uttar Pradesh with neighboring countries. From the Table 2, it can be revealed that India and Uttar Pradesh are far behind their neighboring countries. India placed before only Bhutan (897) and Afghanistan (931) and remaining all neighboring countries- Myanmar (1,048), Sri Lanka (1,032), Nepal (1,014), and Bangladesh (978) are better positioned as far as sex ratio is concerned. Besides, India and Uttar Pradesh are placed rear as compared to world average (984). From the above explanation, it can be concluded that condition of sex ratio in Uttar Pradesh is unjust.

District wise per capita income on current price (11-12):

District wise gender equity index:

It is useful to analyze Per Capita Income in different districts of Uttar Pradesh and compare it with each other.

Among the 71 district of the state, we arranged in three groups as high Per Capita Income, medium Per Capita Income and low Per Capita Income groups. From the Table 3 it can be seen that Per Capita Income of only one district Gautam Budha Nagar (Rs. 123283) is higher than national average (Rs. 61560). It is also evident that Per Capita Income of Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 30051) is just half of the national average (Rs. 61560), showing poor condition of state's economy.

From the Table 3 it can also be evident that Per Capita Income of 32 districts is higher than state average (Rs. 30051) and rest 39 district's Per Capita Income is lower.

For the study of Gender Equity, we made a composite Index which comprising six of gender equalities. The indicators are- R1: Gaps between Male and Female Mortality Rate (U5 MR), R2: Sex Ratio at Birth, R3: Sex Ratio at All Age Group, R4: Gaps between Male and Female Literacy Rate, R5: Gaps between Male and Female Work Participation Rate, R6: Child Sex Ratio 0-6 Year.

After that we have added all the ranks of R1, R2, R3, R4, R5 and R6 of each district and made a composite index called Gender Equity Index. Less the Gender Equity Index shows high the gender equity and more the Gender Equity Index means low the gender equity.

It is interesting to analyze Gender Equity Index in different districts of Uttar Pradesh and compare it with each other. Among the 71 district of the state, we arranged in three groups as high Gender Equity Index, medium Gender Equity Index and low Gender Equity Index groups.

From the Table 5 it can be seen that having least Gender Equity composite index Mau (94) is the topper of all 71 districts followed by Ambedkar Nagar (101) Pratapgarh (118) Deoria (126) Ghazipur (129) SantKabirNagar (133) Basti (134) Barabanki (137) Kushinagar (138) and Azamgarh (140). From the above table it can be seen that these top 10 districts are having good gender equity in U.P. Similarly, having most

Table 1 : District wise Sex Ratio in U.P. - 2011

District Wise Sex-Ratio In Uttar Pradesh - 2011
(High, Medium, and Low)
(In 2011 U.P's Average Sex-Ratio : 908)
(In 2011 India's Average Sex-Ratio : 936)

High Sex Ratio (24District) (909-1018)		Medium Sex Ratio (24District) (879-908)		Low Sex Ratio (23District) (852-879)	
Jaunpur	1018	Barabanki	908	Kashiram Nagar	879
Azamgarh	1017	Jyotiba Phule Nagar	907	Ghaziabad	878
Deoria	1013	Lucknow	906	Aligarh	876
Pratapgarh	994	Kaushambi	905	Mainpuri	876
Sultanpur	978	Lalitpur	905	Shrawasti	875
Mau	978	Rampur	905	Farrukhabad	874
Ambedkar Nagar	976	Moradabad	903	Mahamaya Nagar	870
Siddharth Nagar	970	Allahabad	902	Firozabad	867
Sant Kabir Nagar	969	Unnao	901	Etawah	867
Faizabad	961	Mirzapur	900	Jalaun	865
Basti	959	Fatehpur	900	Shahjahapur	865
Kushi Nagar	955	Bulandshahar	892	Auraiya	864
Ghazipur	951	Bahraich	891	Etah	863
Sant Ravidas Nagar	950	Pilibhit	889	Banda	863
Gorakhpur	944	Kheri	887	KanpurDehat	862
Rae Bareli	941	Sharanpur	887	Hamirpur	860
Mahrajgang	938	Muzaffar Nagar	886	Agra	859
Ballia	933	Jhansi	885	Budaun	859
Balrampur	922	Meerut	885	Bagpat	858
Gonda	922	Bareilly	883	Mathura	858
Sonbhadra	913	Mahoba	880	Hardoi	856
Chandauli	913	Sitapur	879	Kanpur Nagar	852
Bijnor	913	Chitrakoot	879	Gautam Buddh Nagar	852
Varanasi	909	Kaunnauj	879		

Table 2 : Sex Ratio of India in Comparison to Neighboring Countries

Sex Ratio of India in Comparison to Neighboring Countries[#]
(In 2010 World Average: 984)
(In 2011 U.P's Average Sex-Ratio : 908)
(In 2011 India's Average Sex-Ratio : 936)

Sr. No.	Country	Sex Ratio
1.	Myanmar	1,048
2.	Sri Lanka	1,032
3.	Nepal	1,014
4.	Bangladesh	978
5.	Pakistan	942
6.	Afghanistan	931
7.	Bhutan	897

composite index Mathura (344) is the lowest gender equity among all districts followed by Budaun (341), Hathras (328), Agra (312), Banda (310) Firozabad (301), Etah (284), Muzaffarnagar (282), Shahjahanpur (282) and Gautam Buddha Nagar (280). From the above table it can be observed that these lowest 10 districts are having worst gender equity in U.P.

District wise Gender Equity Index and Per capita income:

In this research, we are trying to analysis the impact of Per Capita Income (economic prosperity) on gender equity. For this purpose we have two-way- data classification, we have arranged high, medium and low of gender equity on the top of the table, while high, medium and low of Per Capita Income on the left side of the table.

It can be clearly seen by the Table 5 that Lucknow (HH) and Sonbhadra (HH) district are good at both-gender equity as well as per capita income. Similarly, two district Hardoi (LL) and Shrawasti (LL) are worst in both characterstics. Moreover, 10 districts Unnao, Sitapur, Allahabad, Moradabad, Kannauj, Fatehpur, Sant Ravidas Nagar, Rampur, Kheri, Kanpur Dehat and

Table 3 : District wise Per Capita Income on Current Price (11-12)

District wise Per Capita Income on Current Price (11-12)
(High, Medium, and Low)
(In 2011-12 U.P's Per Capita Income on Current Price Rs. 30051)
(In 2011-12, India's Per Capita Income on Current Price Rs.61560)

High Per Capita Income		Medium Per Capita Income		Low Per Capita Income	
Districts	PCI(Rs.)	Districts	PCI(Rs.)	Districts	PCI(Rs.)
Gautam Budha Nagar	123283	Lalitpur	31497	Gorakhpur	23858
Jyotiba phule Nagar	49969	Hamirpur	31278	Balrampur	23697
Baghpat	49434	Etah	30753	Sultanpur	23533
Lucknow	48256	Moradabad	30695	Barabanki	22113
Meerut	47154	Budaun	30383	Hardoi	22042
Bulandshahar	45241	Kheri	30197	Mau	21752
Ghaziabad	44946	Kaushambi	30185	Mirzapur	21731
Mahoba	44108	Shahjhapur	30163	Ballia	21256
Kanpur Nagar	44078	Banda	29614	Rae Bareli	20817
Jannsi	43807	Etawah	28589	Gonda	20236
Mathura	43178	Allahabad	28233	Gazipur	19643
Mahamaya Nagar	43118	Mainpuri	27651	Ambedkar Nagar	19509
Chitrakoot	42786	Rampur	27269	Bahraich	18950
Muzaffarnagar	40017	Unnao	27061	Basti	18679
Saharanpur	39981	Firozabad	26688	Sant Kabir Nagar	18452
Bareilly	39813	Faizabad	26220	Siddharth Nagar	17826
Agra	37743	Knnauj	26170	Kushi Nagar	17688
KashiramNagar	36360	Varanasi	26092	Mahrajganj	17628
Aligarh	36236	Kanpur Dehat	25878	Deoria	17625
Bijnor	35471	Farrukhabad	25600	Jaunpur	16934
Pilibhit	34243	Fatehpur	25223	Pratapgarh	16876
Auraiya	34118	Sitapur	24805	Azamgarh	16584
Sonbhadra	33191	Sant Ravidas Nagar	24560	Shrawasti	14600
Jalaun	33085	Chandauli	24315		

Kaushambi are (MM) moderate at both the conditions- per capita income and gender equity.

The districts Mau, Ambedkar Nagar, Pratapgarh, Deoria, Ghazipur, Sant Kabir Nagar, Basti, Barabanki, Kushinagar, Azamgarh, Maharajganj, Balrampur, Gorakhpur, Sultanpur, Jaunpur, Siddharthnagar and Ballia

Table 4 : District Wise Gender Equity Index

District of High Gender Equity	Gender Equity Index	District of Medium Gender Equity	Gender Equity Index	District of Low Gender Equity	Gender Equity Index
Mau	94	Rae Bareli	191	Varanasi	235
Ambedkar	101	Pilibhit	191	Etawah	236
Pratapgarh	118	Gonda	192	Aligarh	238
Deoria	126	Saharanpur	200	Kanpur Nager	239
Ghazipur	129	Unnao	203	Chitrakoot	239
Sant Kabir Nagar	133	Mirzapur	204	Farrukhabad	241
Basti	134	Bahraich	205	Bijnor	242
Barabanki	137	Sitapur	206	Hamirpur	243
Kushinagar	138	Allahabad	211	Mahoba	248
Azamgarh	140	Moradabad	211	Ghaziabad	252
Chandauli	152	Kannauj	213	Hardoi	253
Lucknow	153	Fatehpur	214	Meerut	254
Maharajganj	162	Sant Ravidas Nagar	216	Shrawasti	279
Balrampur	169	Jalaun	219	Gautam Buddha Nagar	280
Gorakhpur	170	Rampur	221	Shahjahanpur	282
Sultanpur	171	Kheri	222	Muzaffarnagar	282
Faizabad	171	Baghpat	225	Etah	284
Jaunpur	176	KanpurDehat	226	Firozabad	301
Siddharthnagar	178	Bareilly	228	Banda	310
Sonbhadra	179	Bulandshahar	230	Agra	312
Lalitpur	184	Jyotiba Phule Naga	230	Hathras	328
Ballia	188	Auraiya	231	Budaun	341
Mainpuri	189	Kaushambi	233	Mathura	344
		Jhansi	233		

Table 5 : District wise Gender Equity Index and Per Capita Income

	High (GEI: 94 to 189)	Medium (GEI: 191 to 233)	Low (GEI: 235 to 344)
High (Rs.33085 to 123283)	(HH) Lucknow, Sonbhadra	(HM) Pilibhit, Saharanpur, Baghpat, Bareilly, Bulandshahar, Jyotiba Phule Naga, Auraiya, Jhansi, Jalaun	(HL) Aligarh, Kanpur Nagar, Chitrakoot, Bijnor, Mahoba, Ghaziabad, Meerut, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Muzaffarnagar, Agra, Hathras, Mathura
Medium (Rs.24315 to 31497)	(MH) Chandauli, Faizabad, Lalitpur, Mainpuri	(MM) Unnao, Sitapur, Allahabad, Moradabad, Kannauj, Fatehpur, Sant Ravidas Nagar, Rampur, Kheri, Kanpur Dehat, Kaushambi	(ML) Varanasi, Etawah, Farrukhabad, Hamirpur, Shahjahanpur, Etah, Firozabad, Banda, Budaun
Low (Rs.14600 to 23858)	(LH) Mau, Ambedkar Nagar, Pratapgarh, Deoria, Ghazipur, Sant Kabir Nagar, Basti, Barabanki, Kushinagar, Azamgarh, Maharajganj, Balrampur, Gorakhpur, Sultanpur, Jaunpur, Siddharthnagar, Ballia	(LM) Rae Bareli, Gonda, Mirzapur, Bahraich	(LL) Hardoi, Shrawasti

are (LH) low at per capita income but high at gender equity. Similarly, the districts Aligarh, Kanpur Nager, Chitrakoot, Bijnor, Mahoba, Ghaziabad, Meerut, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Muzaffarnagar, Agra, Hathras and Mathura are (HL) high at per capita income whereas low at gender equity. It can also be seen that out of 71 district 26 district are having inverse characteristics, either (LH) or (HL).

We also applied Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation (r) between per capita income (PCI) and gender equity index (GEI) and found r value -0.62. This negative r value has also confirmed the inverse impact of Per Capita Income on Gender Equity.

Hence, It can be concluded that the impact of Per Capita Income on Gender Equity is showing negative.

Conclusion:

From the above discussion it can be concluded that-

Per Capita Income: Per Capita Income of only one district Gautam Budha Nagar (Rs.123283) is higher than national average (Rs.61560). It is also evident that Per Capita Income of Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 30051) is just half of the national average (Rs.61560), showing poor condition of state's economy.

Gender Equity: it can be seen that having least Gender Equity composite index Mau (94) is the topper of all 71 districts. Similarly, having most composite index Mathura (344) is the lowest gender equity among all districts.

Impact of PCI on Gender Equity: It can be clearly seen that Lucknow(HH) and Sonbhadra(HH) district are good at both-gender equity as well as per capita income. Similarly, two district Hardoi(LL) and Shrawasti(LL) are worst in both characteristics. The districts Mau, Ambedkar Nagar, Pratapgarh, Deoria, Ghazipur, Sant Kabir Nagar, Basti, Barabanki, Kushinagar, Azamgarh, Maharajganj, Balrampur, Gorakhpur, Sultanpur, Jaunpur, Siddharthnagar and Ballia are (LH) low at per capita income but high at gender equity. Similarly, the districts Aligarh, Kanpur Nager, Chitrakoot, Bijnor, Mahoba, Ghaziabad, Meerut, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Muzaffarnagar, Agra, Hathras and Mathura are (HL) high at per capita income whereas low at gender equity. It can also be seen that out of 71 district 26 district are having inverse characteristics, either (LH) or (HL).

We also applied Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation (r) between per capita income (PCI) and gender equity index (GEI) and found r value -0.62. This negative r value has also confirmed the inverse impact of Per Capita Income on Gender Equity.

Hence, It can be concluded that the impact of Per Capita Income on Gender Equity is showing negative.

REFERENCES

Awoyemi, Taiwo and Adeoti, Adetola I. (2006). Gender Inequalities and Economic Efficiency: New Evidence from Cassava-Based Farm Holdings in Rural South-Western Nigeria. *African Development Review*, **18** (3) : 428-443.

Barro, Robert and Jong-wha, Lee (1994). International Comparisons of Educational Attainment. *J. Monetary Economics*, **32** (3) : 363-394.

Behrman, Jere, Andrew D. Foster, Mark R. Rosenzweig and Prem Vashishtha (1999) "Women's Schooling, Home Teaching, and Economic Growth. *J. Political Economy*, **107** (4) : 682-714.

Bils, Mark and Klenow, Peter J. (1998). Does Schooling Cause Growth or the Other Way Around?. *NBER Working Paper 6393*.

Esteve-Volart, Berta (2004) Sex Discrimination and Growth". *IMF Working Paper*, April 2000. Gender discrimination and growth: Theory and evidence from India. *Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines, LSE, STICERD - Development Economics Papers*, 2004.

Psacharopoulos, George (1994). Returns to Investment in Education: A Global Update. *World Development*, **22** (9) : 1325-1343.

Quibria, M.G. (1995). Gender and Poverty: Issues and Policies with Special Reference to Asian Developing Countries. *J. Economic Surveys*, **9** (4) : 373-411.

Quentin Brummet (2008). The Effect of Gender Inequality on Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Study. *The Park Place Economist*, **22** (XVI) : 20-21.

Seguino, Stephanie (2000a; 2000b). Gender Inequality and Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Analysis. *World Development*, **28** (7) : 1211-1230.

Sen, Amartya (2001). Many Faces of Gender Inequality. *Frontline, India's National Magazine*, **18** (22) : 1-1.

****