



Understanding urban poverty in Tamil Nadu: A micro level explorative study

Dr. R Karthikeyan¹, Dr. D Vettriselvi², Dr. S Dharmaraj¹

¹ Department of Economics, Faculty Members, A.V.C. College (Autonomous), Mayiladuthurai, Tamil Nadu, India

² Principal, Agaram Matriculation School, Karuppampulam, Vedaranyam, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

The growth in the incidence of urban poverty has been rapid and represents a challenge for the urban populations, policy makers and professionals in cities world-wide. Despite the scale of the task we are faced with, it is only recently that the attention of researchers, multi-lateral and international organizations have turned more specifically to the urban dimension of poverty. Urban poverty is a major challenge before the urban managers and administrators and one can look the problem of poverty in the context of accessibility to basic services. Though the anti-poverty strategy comprising of a wide range of poverty alleviation and employment generating programmes has been implemented but results show that the situation is grim. It is a fact that segments of the urban population are not income-poor, they face deprivation in terms of lack of access to sanitary living conditions, and their well-being is hampered by discrimination, social exclusion, crime and violence, insecurity of tenure, hazardous environmental conditions and lack of voice in governance. In spite of a number of urban poverty alleviation measures taken by the government still the incidence of poverty exists and further there are social, economic and regional variations observed both at macro level as well as micro level. Hence, the present study tries to understand the characteristics of urban poverty in one of the recently incepted districts, Mayiladuthurai, Tamil Nadu, South India. The specific objectives of the present study are to analyse the accessibility of the basic facilities and services to the urban poor; to know the affordability of basic facilities and services; to know whether the basic services and facilities are adequately available or not to the urban poor in the study area; and to suggest possible policy measures to reduce the incidence of urban poverty and to make the basic services available, affordable and adequate to the needy people in the study area and to improve the standard of living of the respondents of the study area. It is observed from the analysis that the state-wise poverty ratios have witnessed a secular decline continuously over the period of time. Though poverty has declined at the macro-level - the HCR has declined from 55.34 in 2005-06 to 14.96 in 2020-21 in India, there are more variations found among states. The overall perception of the accessibility of basic services to the sample respondents registered that only 21% of the respondents are found with poor access, low affordability and inadequacy of basic services while 36% are found with moderately accessible, affordable and adequate of the services. Thus, in the study area, 43% of the respondents are highly accessible, affordable and adequate with these basic services to them. To conclude, it is hoped that the achievement of SDGs at Global level, Viksit Bharat-2047 at National Level and Tamil Nadu- Vision 2023 at State Level can play a pivotal role in the promotion of the urban quality and removal of the incidence of poverty in the urban area in the study region.

Keywords: Urban poverty, head count ratio, sdgs, viksit bhara, basic services

Introduction

The Human Development Reports and other United Nations/World Bank reports identify South Asia is one of the most deprived regions in the World, has the largest number of people in the world living in absolute poverty which accounts 46 per cent of the developing world's population. Poverty, is a multi -faceted issue, is a fact that about half of the world's population lives in cities. UNCHS projects that during the period 1990 to 2030 the population of urban areas will have grown by about 3.3 billion, 90 percent of which will accrue to cities of developing countries. The growth has been rapid and represents a challenge for the urban populations, policy makers and professionals in cities world-wide. Despite the scale of the task we are faced with, it is only recently that the attention of researchers, multi-lateral and international organizations have turned more specifically to the urban dimension of poverty. India is urbanizing, which will see India's urban population reach a figure close to 600 million by 2031, is not simply a shift of demographics. It places cities and towns at the centre of India's development trajectory. In the coming decades, the urban sector will play a critical role in

the structural transformation of the Indian economy and in sustaining the high rates of economic growth. Ensuring high quality public services for all in the cities and towns of India is an end in itself, but it will also facilitate the full realization India's economic potential. Urban poverty is a major challenge before the urban managers and administrators and one can look the problem of poverty in the context of accessibility to basic services. Though the anti-poverty strategy comprising of a wide range of poverty alleviation and employment generating programmes has been implemented but results show that the situation is grim. Importantly, poverty in urban India gets exacerbated by substantial rate of population growth, high rate of migration from the rural areas and mushrooming of slum pockets. Migration alone accounts for about 40 per cent of the growth in urban population, converting the rural poverty into urban one. If we count those who are deprived of safe drinking water, adequate clothing, or shelter, the number is considerably higher. Housing conditions in large cities and towns are depicting sub human lives of slum dwellers. With the reconstruction of poverty alleviation programmes in urban India, it is expected that social and economic benefits

will percolate to the population below the poverty line. However, eradication of poverty and improving the quality of life of the poor remain one of the daunting tasks.

It is necessary to view urban poverty as apart from being distinct from rural poverty also has another dimension which reveals that the problems being faced by the poor in small urban areas are different from that of large cities. However, in general, the urban poverty manifests in the form of inadequate provision of housing and shelter, water, sanitation, health, education, social security and livelihoods along with special needs of vulnerable groups like women, children, differently-abled and aged people. Most of the poor are involved in informal sector activities where there is constant threat of eviction, removal, confiscation of goods and almost non-existent social security cover. Even when segments of the urban population are not income-poor, they face deprivation in terms of lack of access to sanitary living conditions, and their well-being is hampered by discrimination, social exclusion, crime, violence, insecurity of tenure, hazardous environmental conditions and lack of voice in governance. These deprivations are often cumulative in nature i.e. one dimension of poverty is often the cause of or contributor to another dimension. Town and Country Planning Organization Report 2021 also explored that the ratio of urban poverty in some of the larger states is higher than that of rural poverty leading to the phenomenon of Urbanization of Poverty. In the terms of human deprivation or poverty, (education, health, etc.) the Scheduled Tribes are at the bottom. The increasing concentration of poverty among socially deprived people who suffer from multiple deprivations is a matter of concern. The incidence of poverty among females tended to be marginally higher in both rural and urban areas. The proportion of females living in poor households in urban areas being 34 and 25 per cent and the percentage of males living in poverty in urban areas was 32 and 23 per cent, respectively. Females accounted for slightly less than half of the poor, about 49 per cent in both rural and urban areas in both the years (D. Vettriseli & R. Karthikeyan, 2018) ^[10, 11, 12]. By GDP norms, India is ranked fifth globally, but in terms of the absolute number of people in poverty, India ranks first in the world. Though the anti-poverty strategy comprising of a wide range of poverty alleviation and employment generating programmes has been implemented but results show that the situation is grim. Importantly, poverty in urban India gets exacerbated by substantial rate of population growth, high rate of migration from the rural areas and mushrooming of slum pockets. It is measured by using the method proposed by Rangarajan Committee to calculate the poverty line in 2022–23 for rural areas (Rs 2,515) and (Rs 3,630) for urban areas. This resulted in an overall poverty head-count ratio of 26.4%. Using a low poverty line threshold, that too in data that possibly contains an upward bias we still found that more than one in four Indians lives in poverty. (Karthikeyan, et.al, 2025) ^[13, 14].

It is targeted that by 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, the First Goal which aspires to eradicate poverty in all of its forms worldwide, this entails not just lifting earnings over the official poverty line, but also doing it in a way that takes into account the different social and economic circumstances of women, children, and other vulnerable groups. That involves putting in place social safety nets, ensuring disadvantaged groups have access to

economic resources, making direct investments in vulnerable areas, and devising disaster mitigation techniques. The Niti Aayog report on multi-dimensional poverty estimates found that India's 'Multidimensional Poverty Line' has significantly declined from 24.85 % in 2015-16 to 14.96 % in 2019-21. Further it is estimated that about 135 million people have advanced above poverty between 2015-16 and 2019-21. It is also noted that as of 2021, the SDG Index score for reducing poverty ranges between 32 and 86 for Indian states and union territories. Further, among the states, Tamil Nadu and Kerala were the front runners with a score of 86 and 83 respectively, and among the union territories, Delhi was a front runner with a score of 81 (R. Karthikeyan, et. al. 2023).

According to an analysis by SBI Research, Rural poverty fell to 4.86% in 2023-24 from 7.2% in 2022-23 and 25.7% in 2011-12. In contrast, urban poverty fell to 4.09% in 2023-24 from 4.6% in the previous year and 13.7% in 2011-12, the report said. Overall, the poverty rate in India now stands in the range of 4-4.5%, with "almost minimal existence of extreme poverty" (SBI Research 2025). Economic growth is a necessity, but not a sufficient condition for alleviating poverty. Still, urban poverty is a major challenge for policymakers in our country as the urban population in the country is growing; urban poverty is also on the rise due to various factors. There is an urgent need to develop strategies to develop poverty reduction approaches to attack the multi-dimensional issues of urban poverty. In spite of a number of urban poverty alleviation measures taken by the government still the incidence of poverty exists and further there are social, economic and regional variations observed both at macro level as well as micro level. Hence, the present study tries to understand the characteristics of urban poverty in one of the recently incepted districts, Mayiladuthurai, Tamil Nadu, South India.

Objectives and Hypotheses

The specific objectives of the present study are to analyse the accessibility of the basic facilities and services to the urban poor; to know the affordability of basic facilities and services; to know whether the basic services and facilities are adequately available or not to the urban poor in the study area; and to suggest possible policy measures to reduce the incidence of urban poverty and to make the basic services available, affordable and adequate to the needy people in the study area and to improve the standard of living of the respondents of the study area.

Methods and Materials

The present study has adopted the Multi Stage Random Sampling Technique. In the First Stage the Study Area, Mayiladuthurai Municipality, has been purposively chosen as it is the fast growing and big municipality of the recently incepted district of Tamil Nadu, Mayiladuthurai district. Followed by, out of 36 wards 10% of the wards 04 wards having the average number of households about 562 households in the municipality have been chosen. Then 5 % of households from each ward have been randomly chosen as the sample size, numbered 112 for the present study. The present study has been mainly based on Primary Data which have been collected from the selected respondents through a well structured and pretested interview schedule and for supporting the primary data, secondary data have also been used.

Discussion and Observations

The state-wise poverty ratios have witnessed a secular decline continuously over the period of time. Though poverty has declined at the macro-level - the HCR has declined from 55.34 in 2005-06 to 14.96 in 2020-21 in India, there are more variations found among states. For the states Bihar and Jharkhand, the HCR was around 75% in 2005-06 and has declined to around 30% in 2020-21; for Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Orissa, Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh and Assam, the HCR was above 60% in 2005-06 and has

declined to less than 20% (except Meghalaya and UP) in 2020-21. Similarly, there has been a significant reduction in poverty during the period in Kerala (0.55), Goa (0.84) and Pudhucherry (0.85); while Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, Delhi, Chandigarh, Tamil Nadu, Sikkim, Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep have registered the HCR of less than 5. However, in 2005-06, the maximum HCR was registered in the state Bihar (78.28) and it was 33.76 in 2020-21; the minimum in the state Kerala (12.31) and it was only (0.55) in 2020-21 (see Table 1)

Table 1: Head Count Ratio (% of Population who are Multi Dimensionally Poor)

Sl. No	State/UT	2005-06	2015-16	2019-21
1	Andhra Pradesh	48.80	11.77	6.06
2	Telangana	--	13.18	5.88
3	Arunachal Pradesh	60.67	24.23	13.76
4	Assam	60.78	32.65	19.35
5	Bihar	78.28	51.89	33.76
6	Jharkhand	74.04	42.10	28.81
7	Goa	18.20	3.76	0.84
8	Gujarat	39.79	18.47	11.66
9	Uttaranchal	40.38	17.67	9.67
10	Haryana	41.84	11.88	7.07
11	Himachal Pradesh	60.67	24.23	13.76
12	Jammu Kashmir	40.45	12.56	4.80
13	Karnataka	46.71	12.77	7.58
14	Kerala	12.31	0.70	0.55
15	Madhya Pradesh	69.44	36.57	20.63
16	Maharashtra	40.07	14.80	7.81
17	Manipur	44.13	16.96	8.10
18	Meghalaya	62.54	32.54	27.79
19	Mizoram	32.95	9.78	5.30
20	Nagaland	58.82	25.16	15.43
21	Orissa	63.84	29.34	15.68
22	Punjab	26.66	5.57	4.75
23	Rajasthan	64.15	28.86	15.31
24	Sikkim	38.85	3.82	2.60
25	Tamil Nadu	36.54	4.76	2.20
26	Tripura	52.78	16.62	13.11
27	Uttar Pradesh	69.52	37.68	22.93
28	Uttarkhand	-	-	17.72
29	West Bengal	57.60	21.29	11.89
30	A & Nicobar Island	-	4.29	2.30
31	Chandigarh	-	5.97	3.52
32	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	-	19.58	9.21
33	Daman & Diu	-	19.58	9.21
34	Delhi	14.63	4.44	3.43
35	Lakshadweep	-	1.82	1.11
36	Puducherry	-	1.71	0.85
37	All India	55.34	24.85	14.96

Source: NITI Aayog, New Delhi

Measurement of poverty is important not only to estimate poverty ratio but also to analyse the reasons for poverty and plans to alleviate poverty. The most widely used monetary measures of poverty are based on consumption of adequate food or basic needs. Income is well spent on essentials of life is the prime assumption of monetary measure of poverty. However, the nonmarket transactions based on social relations will affect the socially depressed classes even with adequate income in accessing basic utilities. Persons with equal income need not have equal capability to convert into equal amounts of goods and services and then into well-being. Neither income nor goods are sufficient to

ensure wellbeing. Since 1990s Sen's capability approach influenced many scholars to devise measurements of capabilities so as to distinguish between poor and non-poor. Capabilities are essentially outcomes, rather than an input like income, to decide the well-being. Unlike income, capabilities are sustainable and therefore not influenced by fluctuations in the economy. Based on capability conception, the multidimensional poverty approach captures a set of functioning. Functioning are located as achievements of people in education, health, housing, assets, access to public utilities like drinking water and sanitation and many other items.

Table 2: Indicator wise Incidence of Deprivation (NFHS-3; NFHS-4; NFHS-5)

Sl. No	Period/ Indicator	Incidence of Deprivation (% of Population)			Reduction Rate (%)
		2005-06	2015-16	2019-21	2005-06 to 2019-21
1	Nutrition	57.47	37.60	31.52	44.34
2	Mortality	4.84	2.69	2.06	57.43
3	Maternal Health	33.00	22.58	19.17	41.90
4	Years of Schooling	24.98	13.86	11.40	54.36
5	School Attendance	21.27	6.40	5.27	75.22
6	Cooking Fuel	74.40	58.47	43.90	40.99
7	Sanitation	70.92	51.88	30.93	56.38
8	Drinking Water	21.34	10.92	7.32	65.69
9	Electricity	32.95	12.16	3.27	90.07
10	Housing	55.93	45.65	41.37	26.03
11	Assets	46.87	13.97	10.16	78.32
12	Bank Account	58.11	9.66	3.69	93.65

It is observed from the various surveys of NFH, the deprivation level of different basic indicators viz, Nutrition, Mortality, Maternal Health, Years of Schooling, School Attendance, Cooking Fuel, Sanitation, Drinking Water, Electricity, Housing, Assets and Bank Account at macro level has been considerably declined in India over the period of time. For instance, among the various basic indicators the deprivation level was the highest in Cooking Fuel followed by Sanitation and the minimum level in the Mortality Rate, School Attendance, Drinking Water, Electricity and Bank Account. Further it was observed that in 2005-06 people are highly deprived of (above 45%) with Cooking Fuel, Sanitation, Bank Account, Housing facilities, Nutrition and Asset Holdings while in the Mortality rate only 4.84% of the people are deprived; in 2019-21 among the indicators people are moderately deprived of (30 % to 45 %) with Housing facilities, Cooking Fuel, Nutrition and Sanitation facilities and in all other indicators very lower level deprivation is registered. Further, it is calculated that in the case of Bank Account and Electricity facilities, the maximum level of reduction (above 90 % reduction) was registered, followed by above 75% of reduction was registered in Assets holding and School attendance rate, and only 26 % of reduction was registered in the case of Housing facilities during the survey periods. This appreciable achievement is mainly due to enunciation of various government initiatives like, Poshan Abhian and Anaemia Mukh Bharat, National Food Security Act, Pradhan Mantri Garib Kalyan Anna Yojana, Mission Poshan 2.0 and Saksham Anganvadi, Pradhan Mantri Poshan Shakti Nirman, Pradhan Mantri Surakshit Matritva Abhiyan, Ujjwala Yojana, Swachh Bharat Mission, Jaljeevan Mission, Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana, to mention a few. (see Table 2)

Social Profile: Since the incidence of poverty is closely attributed with social variables like, sex, religion, community, age, family size and type, etc...the analysis on social profile of the respondents has its own policy Implications. In the study area, out of 112 respondents, 94 i.e. 84% are male and 18 who accounts to only 16% are female; with regard to the age distribution, majority 56% respondents are under the age group 35-50 years and only

13% respondents are above 65 years old. It is also noted that 77 % (86) are Hindu 13 % (15) are Christian and 10 % (11) belong to Muslim community; and further, majority of the selected respondents are MBC (44%) followed by BC (26%), SC (20%) and OC (10%) Further, 87 percent of the respondents reside at nuclear family. With regard to the family size distribution Majority of households have the family members in between 5 - 8 i.e.70 % and 87 Percent of the respondents are married. Further, majority i.e. 66% is daily wage earners, 23 % are industries workers and 11 % of the respondents are doing small businesses. (Refer Table 3)

Economic Profile: Since Poverty is closely related to the economic status of the respondents the major economic variables such as income, expenditure, savings position, Asset Position, indebtedness of the respondents has been considered. It is found that only 10 % of the respondents have earned less than Rs.10000/- monthly and about 55 % belong to the income group of Rs.10000 - Rs.15000 and only 5% of the sample respondents have earned above Rs.20000 per month. The same trend is attributed in the case of asset position, expenditure and savings also; Majority of the respondents i.e. 85 % have owned the assets valued Rs 5 to 15 Lakhs and only 10% the respondents have above Rs.15 Lakhs; More than half of the respondents (52%) have spent less than Rs10000/- per month and nearly half, i.e. about 48 % of the respondents have spent above Rs.10000 per month on food items. With regard to saving, about 53 % of the respondents have saved less than Rs.10000 and only 03 respondents have saved more than Rs.20000 so far in the study area. Similarly, all the respondents are indebted to some extent, 23 % have borrowed less than Rs.25000 in one side and only 3 % have borrowed above Rs.1 Lakh on the other. (Refer Table 3)

The Accessibility, Adequacy and Affordability of Potable Drinking Water, Basic Health Services, Schools, Transport Facilities, Electricity Supply, Sewage Collection and Sanitation Facilities, Housing Facilities, Banking facilities to the selected respondents of the study area inferred that among the sample respondents with regard to the accessibility of basic services 54% of the respondents are highly accessed with the facilities while 35% are moderately accessed with and only 11 % are poor access to the basic services.

Table 3: Social and Economic Profile of Urban Poor

Social Profile			Economic Profile		
Description	Respondents		Description	Respondents	
	Nos	%		Nos	%
Total	112	100	Monthly Income		
Sex Male	94	84	Below 10000	11	10
Female	18	16	10001 to 15000	62	55
Religion Hindu	86	77	15001 to 20000	34	30
Christian	15	13	Above 20000	05	05
Muslim	11	10	Asset Position		
			Below 5 Lakhs	10	09
Community SC/ST	22	20	5 to 10 Lakhs	57	51
MBC	49	44	10 to 15 Lakhs	34	30
BC	30	26	Above 15 Lakhs	11	10
OC	11	10	Consumption Expr.		
Age Below 35	09	08	Below 5000	03	03
35- 50	63	56	5001 to 10000	55	49
51-65	26	23	10001 to 15000	36	32
65& Above	14	13	15001 and Above	18	16
Family Type Nuclear	98	87	Indebtedness		
Joint Family	14	13	Below 25000	26	23
Family Size Less than 4	28	26	25001 to 50000	21	19
5-8	78	70	50001 to 75000	39	35
More than 08	06	04	75001 to 1 Lakh	22	20
Marital Status			Above 1 Lakh	04	03
Married	97	87	Savings		
Un-Married	06	05	Below 5000	36	32
Widow	09	08	5001 to 10000	24	21
Occupation Business	12	11	10001 to 15000	38	34
Daily Wage Labour	74	66	15001 to 20000	11	10
Industry Worker	26	23	20001& Above	03	03

Source: Primary Data

Table 4: Basic Services and Facilities: Accessibility, Affordability and Adequacy Distribution

S No	Description	Accessibility		Affordability		Adequacy		Overall	
		Nos	%	Nos	%	Nos	%	Nos	%
1	Potable Drinking Water								
	High	21	19	22	20	29	26	24	21
	Moderate	46	41	43	38	41	37	43	39
	Low	45	40	47	42	42	37	45	40
2	Health Services								
	High	39	35	25	22	12	11	25	22
	Moderate	66	59	51	46	38	34	52	47
	Low	07	06	36	32	62	55	35	31
3	Schools								
	High	78	70	35	31	45	40	53	47
	Moderate	34	30	56	50	41	37	43	38
	Low	00	00	21	19	26	23	16	15
4	Transportation Services								
	High	77	69	45	40	48	43	57	51
	Moderate	29	26	56	50	36	32	40	36
	Low	06	05	11	10	28	25	15	13
5	Electricity Supply								
	High	88	79	58	52	60	54	69	62
	Moderate	24	21	28	25	38	34	30	27
	Low	00	00	26	23	14	12	13	11
6	Cooking Fuel								
	High	68	61	38	34	80	72	62	55
	Moderate	24	21	18	16	28	25	23	21
	Low	20	18	56	50	04	03	27	24
7	Housing Facilities								
	High	66	58	58	52	60	54	61	54
	Moderate	22	20	28	25	38	34	29	26
	Low	24	22	26	23	14	12	22	20
8	Sewage Collection								
	High	45	40	16	14	45	40	35	31
	Moderate	57	51	45	40	37	33	46	41
	Low	10	09	51	46	30	27	31	28

9	Sanitation Facilities								
	High	34	30	24	21	23	20	27	24
	Moderate	65	58	43	38	78	70	62	55
	Low	13	12	45	41	11	10	23	21
10	Banking Facilities								
	High	91	81	68	61	60	54	73	65
	Moderate	21	19	28	25	38	34	29	26
	Low	00	00	16	14	14	12	10	09
11	Overall High	60	54	39	35	46	41	49	43
	Moderate	39	35	39	35	42	37	40	36
	Low	13	11	33	30	24	22	23	21

Source: Primary Data

To know affordability of these basic services and facilities the respondents’ opinion were sought and it is known that they are highly affordable to 35% of the respondents while moderately affordable to 35% and non-affordable to 30% of the respondents. The data relating to the extent of availability of these services witnessed that they are highly adequate to 41% of the respondents while moderately adequate to 37% of the respondents and inadequate to 22% of the respondents. The overall perception of the accessibility of basic services to the sample respondents registered that only 21% of the respondents are found with poor access, low affordability and inadequacy of basic services while 36% are found with moderately accessible, affordable and adequate of the services. Thus, in the study area, 43% of the respondents are highly accessible, affordable and adequate with these basic services to them. (Refer Table 4)

Conclusion

Poverty is currently a serious socio-economic concern in India. Poverty may create and contribute to the incidence of various socio- economic- environmental issues and other negative behavioural problems. Though efforts to reduce poverty and income inequality have made significant progress in recent decades, much work remains to be done to address poverty and ensure that all people have the opportunity to lead healthy, enjoyable lives. It is suggested that district level urban poverty alleviation strategies focusing on vocational education and training since vast majority people living in poverty cannot afford and have access to training opportunities, which are commercially managed should be designed; Creation of additional opportunities to poor youth through financial investment in jobs and employment; the programmes and various government initiatives like, Poshan Abhian and Anaemia Mukh Bharat, National Food Security Act, Pradhan Mantri Garib Kalyan Anna Yojana, Mission Poshan 2.0 and Saksham Anganvadi, Pradhan Mantri Poshan Shakti Nirman, Pradhan Mantri Surakshit Matritva Abhiyan, Ujjwala Yojana, Swachh Bharat Mission, Jaljeewan Mission, Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana, Skill India should be strengthened further; Measures may be taken to encourage forming not only women SHGs but also Men SHGs in the study district; It is also suggested that special field level training must be provided to the local level authorities municipal managers, administrators and personnel who are directly involving with the vulnerable people. Academic institutions, local NGO’s, private organizations, Service Organisations like Rotary Club, Lions Club, Jaycees Club, etc. may periodically design special projects for removal of poverty; Awareness programmes may also be inculcated among the people of the study area relating to the

availability of various opportunities and government programmes on employment generations, poverty alleviations through Local Media. In the study area there are a number of educational institutions including Medical, Engineering, Agricultural and general, it is suggested that all higher educational institutions may adopt each one ward of this corporation and device programmes for the upliftment of the vulnerable group of the people. Though Poverty has been a serious issue in the development process across the world for quite a long period of time and alleviation of poverty has been one of the major challenges faced by most of the countries of the world, the issue of urban poverty is not new, but it is often narrowly viewed as an economic issue that is best addressed by economic policies and interventions. Urban poverty today, as driven by globalization and rapid uncontrolled urbanization, also needs to be recognized as a social, political, and cultural process that has profound impacts on overall economic progress. It is a complex phenomenon of many dimensions but not merely the economic dimension. Measures may be strategized by ensuring significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for alleviating poverty in general and in urban areas in particular; through implementing programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions; and by creating sound policy frameworks at the national, regional and international levels, based on pro-poor, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions. In a nutshell, it is hoped that the achievement of SDGs at Global level, Viksit Bharat-2047 at National Level and Tamil Nadu- Vision 2023 at State Level can play a pivotal role in the promotion of the urban quality and removal of the incidence of poverty in the urban area in the study region.

References

1. Ahluwalia MS. Policies for Poverty Alleviation. Asian Development Review,1990:8(1):111–132.
2. Banerjee A, Duflo E. The Economic Lives of the Poor. Journal of Economic Perspectives,2007:21(2):141–167.
3. Bhalla SS. Recounting the Poor, Poverty in India 1983–1999. Economic and Political Weekly,2003:38(4):338–349.
4. Chakraborty A. Some Normatively Relevant Aspects of Inter-State and Intra-State Disparities. Economic and Political Weekly,2009:44(26–27):179–184.
5. Chaudhuri S, Gupta N. Level of Living and Poverty Patterns: A District-wise Analysis from India. Economic and Political Weekly,2009:45(9):94–110.
6. Dandekar VM, Rath N. Poverty in India. Economic and Political Weekly,1971:6(1–2):1–28.

7. Datta K. Index of Poverty and Deprivation in Context of Inclusive Growth. *Indian Journal of Human Development*,2010:4(1):45–73.
8. Deaton A. Price Trends in India and Their Implications for Measuring Poverty. *Economic and Political Weekly*,2008:43(6):43–49.
9. Dev MS. Calorie Norms and Poverty. *Economic and Political Weekly*,2005:40(8):789–792.
10. Karthikeyan R, Vettriselvi D. Incidence of Urban Poverty in Tamil Nadu: A Micro Level Socio Economic Analysis. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*,2018:8(1):1–9.
11. Karthikeyan R, Vettriselvi D. Urbanisation and Economic Development Relations in Tamil Nadu: A Descriptive Analysis. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*,2018:5(10):923–931.
12. Karthikeyan R, Vettriselvi D. Inter-State Variations in Urban Poverty in India: A Composite Analysis. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*,2018:5(12):621–632.
13. Karthikeyan R, Sulthana Barvin M, Nalini V. Socio Economic Implications of Urban Poverty in Tamil Nadu: A Field Survey Study. *International Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities*,2025:6(5):30–39.
14. Karthikeyan R, Sulthana Barvin M, Nalini V. Economic Implications of Changes in Demographic Dividend in India: An Analysis. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*,2025:7(2):1–13.
15. Narayanamoorthy A, Hanjra MA. What Contributes to Disparity in Rural-Urban Poverty in Tamil Nadu? A District Level Analysis. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*,2010:65(2):228–243.
16. Patnaik U. Trends in Urban Poverty under Economic Reforms: 1993–94 to 2004–05. *Economic and Political Weekly*,2010:45(4):42–53.
17. Amis P. Making Sense of Urban Poverty. *Environment and Urbanization*,1995:7(1):145–157.
18. Sundaram K, Tendulkar SD. Poverty among Social and Economic Groups in India in 1990s. *Economic and Political Weekly*,2003:38(50):5263–5276.
19. Sundaram K. Employment, Wages and Poverty in the Non-Agricultural Sector: All India, 2000–05. *Economic and Political Weekly*,2008:43(22):81–92.