International Journal of Applied Social Science
Volume 6 (7), July (2019) : 1720-1723
Received : 03.05.2019; Revised : 12.05.2019; Accepted : 16.05.2019

RESEARCH PAPER
ISSN : 2394-1405

Regional Disparity of Sex-Ratio in Uttar Pradesh: A Comparative Study between Central Region and Bundelkhand Region

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 disparity of Sex-Ratio between Central Region and Bundelkhand Region in Uttar Pradesh.

Key Words : Regional Disparity, Central Reign, Bundelkhand Region, 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:

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 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.

Bils and Klenow (1998) assert that it is not education

How to cite this Article: Mishra, Kaushlendra Vikram (2019). Regional Disparity of Sex-Ratio in Uttar Pradesh: A Comparative Study between Central Region and Bundelkhand Region. *Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci.,* **6** (7) : 1720-1723.

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.

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 Adetola (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 underinvestment in women's education has a negative effect on growth.

Objective of the Study:

The main objective of the study is:

To highlight the disparity of Sex-Ratio between Central Region and Bundelkhand Region in Uttar Pradesh.

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.

Limitations of the study:

Doing research on Sex-Ratio 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 Sex-Ratio:

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. 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.

Regional Disparity of Sex Ratio in Uttar Pradesh:

It would be quite useful to analyze sex ratio in different regions of Uttar Pradesh and compare it with not only each other but national average as well. Uttar Pradesh has 4 regions, namely Eastern Region, Western Region, Central Region and Bundelkhand Region. We have taken Central Region and Bundelkhand Region, for comparison of the Sex Ratio.

Sex Ratio in Bundelkhand Region of Uttar Pradesh (1951-2011):

It can be observed from the table no.1 that as far as Bundelkhand region of Uttar Pradesh is concern it consists only 7 districts. Most of the districts are not only backward in nature but also have less rainfall compared to other region. However, this region of Uttar Pradesh is having terrible Sex-Ratio compared to other region in Uttar Pradesh.

Table 1 : Sex Ratio in Bundelkhand Region of Uttar Pradesh (1951-2011)

Districts of Bundelkhand Region of Uttar Pradesh
SEX-RATIO 1951-2011
(In 1951 U.P's Average Sex-Ratio : 908)
(In 2001 U.P's Average Sex-Ratio : 898)
(In 2011 U.P's Average Sex-Ratio : 908)
(In 2011 India's Average Sex-Ratio : 936)

Districts	Year		
	1951	2001	2011
Jalaun	908	849	865
Jannsi	916	871	885
Lalitpur	931	882	905
Hamirpur	937	852	860
Mahoba	958	864	880
Banda	931	860	863
Chitrakoot	910	872	879
Average	927	864	877

In 1951, the average of 7 districts is 927 per thousand. Furthermore, few districts of this region mainly, Mahoba (958) Hamirpur (937), and Lalitpur (931) have quite good Sex-Ratio. However, this diminish picture of Sex Ratio has become more diminished in 2001, where the average of 7 districts declined to 864 per thousand.

Though, awareness of society and Government incentives has changed the situation a little. Consequently, the Sex Ratio in this region has somewhat changed in 2011 and slightly increased up to 877 per thousand, which is still showing worse Sex-Ratio in this region. Because of continuous drought, illiteracy and poverty in this region the society has become worse in sex-ratio.

Sex Ratio in Central Region of Uttar Pradesh (1951-2011):

It can be clearly observed from the Table 2 that as far as Central Region of Uttar Pradesh is concern it consists of 10 districts. In this region most of the districts are forward in nature. However, this Central Region of Uttar Pradesh is having worse Sex-Ratio compared to other region in Uttar Pradesh. In 1951, the average of 10 districts is 870 per thousand. Kanpur Nagar has sex-ratio of 770, which is lowest in U.P. Moreover, few districts of this region mainly, Lucknow (842), Kheri (850), Kanpur Dehat (855), Sitapur (860), and Hardoi (864), have very low Sex-Ratio. However, this situation of Sex Ratio has slightly increased in 2001, where the average of 10 districts slightly increased to 880 per thousand. It has further improved a little in 2011 and increased up to 888 per thousand. This is because of industrial development in this Central Region. Mostly men came here for employment reason from other parts of Uttar Pradesh and make the sex-ratio unfavorable to the female. However, this is not only lower than U.P's Average Sex-Ratio (908) but also National average of 936 per thousand.

Table 2 : Sex Ratio in Central Region of Uttar Pradesh (1951-2011)

Districts of Central Region of Uttar Pradesh
SEX-RATIO 1951-2011
(In 1951 U.P's Average Sex-Ratio : 908)
(In 2001 U.P's Average Sex-Ratio : 898)
(In 2011 U.P's Average Sex-Ratio : 908)
(In 2011 India's Average Sex-Ratio : 936)

District	Year		
	1951	2001	2011
Kheri	850	871	887
Sitapur	860	864	856
Hardoi	864	844	901
Unnao	902	898	906
Lucknow	842	888	941
Rae Bareli	954	951	862
Kanpur Dehat	855	852	862
Kanpur Nagar	770	855	852
Fatehpur	915	893	900
Barabanki	888	887	908
Average	870	880	888

Central Region vs. Bundelkhand Region:

This is quite interesting to compare Sex Ratio of Central Region and Bundelkhand Region of Uttar Pradesh. Since 1951 the average Sex Ratio of Central Region (870 in 1951), (880 in 2001) and (888 in 2011) is more or less to the same of Bundelkhand Region (927 in 1951), (864 in 2001) and (877 in 2011). Hence, in the case of Sex Ratio, it is clearly evident that Central Region and Bundelkhand Region have almost the same sex-ratio in Uttar Pradesh.

Conclusion:

From the above discussion it can be concluded that since 1951 the average Sex Ratio of Central Region (870 in 1951), (880 in 2001) and (888 in 2011) is more or less the same average Sex Ratio of Bundelkhand Region (927 in 1951), (864 in 2001) and (877 in 2011).

Hence, in the case of Sex Ratio, it is clearly evident that Central Region and Bundelkhand Region have almost the same sex-ratio in Uttar Pradesh.

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.

****