

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND ITS MEASUREMENT IN INDIA

Dr. Shobha Chaudhary,
Assistant Professor, Department of Economics,
M.D.U. Rohtak.

Introduction

Economic development is a multi-dimensional approach which deals with many issues, such as socio-economic welfare, human and physical development etc. All these issues are measured by taking different indicators that may be related to life, education, health, sanitation, employment, poverty and distribution of income and wealth. Some economists (M.Ghosh, Keya Sengupta, Salam and Zaidi) emphasizes on the approach of human development, because they have assumed human development as base of overall economic growth. It is also shown in the Indian context that income, employment opportunities and economic development are pre conditions for raising nutritional levels of the population (Panikar 1980, Gopalan 1985). By considering the district-level HDI (Geetha Rani,1999) also finds that economic development opportunities as measured by output is an important factor for attaining high human development in India.

Hence human development is of great importance in stimulating the economic growth and economic inputs which are used to make human beings safe, secure and comfortable, because human being is the core of a nation. In traditional view, the concept of human development is merely confined to enlargement of health, education and life expectancy, but in modern view the concept of human development is extended by adding some additional measure of pure water, housing, sanitation conditions, freedom from slum conditions of living, political, economical and social freedom etc.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND UNDP:-

Paul Streeten has said, “human development is the end while economic growth is only a means to this end”. Human development creates human capabilities that lead to productivity enhancement and acceleration in economic growth and development as well. The concept of human development is much broader than economic development. According to this, all efforts of development should be directed towards the people and their well-being who are

considered to be the main objective of economic growth. The concept of human development covers the welfare of not only the present generation, but future generation as well. Human being is the main factor of production, on whose shoulders whole economic development depends. A country will be well developed when its people are literate, skilled and capable. In other words, we can say that it is human beings of a country who determine its growth rate. That is why human development is required. Capability approach, along with the concept of central human capabilities and Basic Human Needs ultimately resulted into a major policy change in international development agencies and developing countries. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) presented for the first time the measurable concept of human development in the form of Human Development Index (HDI). HDI was invented and launched by Pakistani Economist Mahbub-ul-Haq in 1990. The main purpose was “to shift the focus of development economics from national income accounting to people centered policies” (Haq, 1995). Well known economists (Paul Streeten, Frances Stewart, Gustav Ranis, Keith Griffin, Sudhir Anand and Meghnad Desai etc.) have contributed in the development of HDI. But it was Amartya Sen’s work on capabilities and functioning that provided the underlying conceptual framework.

Human Development Index combines three dimensions. These reflect the core ideas of Prof. Amartya Sen’s capabilities and functioning.

- To lead a long and healthy life, as measured by life expectancy at birth.
- To acquire Knowledge, as measured by the adult literacy rate and combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio.
- To have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living as measured by GDP per capita..

The publication of the first Human development report in 1990 by the UNDP marked the beginning of a new approach to the definition of development. The term ‘economic development’ which was replaced by ‘socio-economic development’ during the 1960s, has now transformed into ‘human development’. To quote Mahbub-ul-Haq, the originator of human development reports, “The human dimension of development is not just another addition to development dialogue. Human development has been defined as the ‘process of widening people’s choices and the level of their achieved well being.

“The basic purpose of development is to enlarge people’s choices. In principle, these choices can be infinite and can change over time. People often value achievements that do not show up at all, or not immediately, in income or growth figures: greater access to knowledge, better nutrition and health services, more secure livelihoods, security against crime and physical violence, satisfying leisure hours, political and cultural freedoms and a sense of participation in community activities. The objective of development is to create an enabling environment for people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives”.

Dimensions and Measurement of HDI :-

The series of constructing HDI has been started continuously by UNDP since 1990. UNDP has measured the HDI through three dimensions and each dimension is measured separately through the indices of indicators which are life expectancy at birth; educational attainment, as measured by a combination of adult literacy rate (two-third weight) and combined primary, secondary and tertiary enrolment ratios (one-third weight); and standard of living, as measured by real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita in (US dollar PPP). To construct indices of indicators, UNDP has determined maximum and minimum value as goalposts for all the indicators separately that have been shown in appendix with a formula.

The general formula that is used for constructing the individual index for human development indicators and HDI elements is-

$$\text{Dimension Index } X_i = \frac{(\text{Actual value } x - \text{Minimum value } x)}{(\text{Maximum value } x - \text{Minimum value } x)}$$

Here x is the value of any indicator.

HDI is derived with the help of above formula as followed-

$$\text{HDI} = 1/3 \sum X_i$$

Here, HDI stands for human development index and HDI is the average of the three indices (life expectancy index, education index and per capita income index) where “i” stands for dimensions, “Xi” stands for value of any indicator and \sum (sigma) stands for summation.

Here division and numerical range of HDI value is classified into four categories- low, medium, high and very high whose values lies between zero to one. Low category value lies between 0.000 to 0.499, medium category value lies between 0.500 to 0.799, high category value lies between 0.800 to 0.899 and very high between 0.900 to 1.000.

We can write in following manner:-

DIVISION	NUMERICAL RANGE OF HDI		
VERY HIGH	1.000	-	0.900
HIGH	0.899	-	0.800
MEDIUM	0.799	-	0.500
LOW	0.499	-	0.000

The present study follows the UNDP's methodology and formula to construct the HDI for selected districts and state. UNDP uses the above methodology for the construction of HDI with the objective of international comparison.

The **first dimension that has been used by UNDP is 'longevity' and life expectancy** is its indicator by which longevity is measured. UNDP measures life expectancy at birth. The indicator that is used in present study is estimated by Sample Registration System (SRS) for the period of time period 1987 to 2011 in the group of five–five years. Here the used life expectancy of human being is existed during the time 1996 to 2001 and 2006 to 2011. The maximum–minimum values that are used here for this indicator are 85 years and 25 years which is similar to UNDP's goalposts value.

The **second dimension of HDI is 'education attainment'** which is measured by UNDP through adult literacy rate after giving it two-third weight and combined it with the average gross enrolment rate of (primary, secondary, and tertiary classes) after giving it one-third weight. The given total weight by UNDP is equal to one for all the dimensions, here for education attainment weight is also equal to one. But the main thing about this dimension is that the literacy rate which has been used in the present study is among those persons who are 15 year and above for adult literacy rate due to non availability of data in the same form. But the structure of constructing education index is similar to the UNDP methodology and its weight process. The maximum-minimum value for both literacy and gross enrolment rate are 100 per cent and zero per cent respectively which are extreme point.

The **third and most important dimension of HDI is 'decent standard of living'** which has been measured by UNDP through real per capita gross domestic product in US

dollar. The UNDP has expressed that different countries can be different from one country to other in many respect. Therefore, to reflect same relevance of different countries currency into dollar is required to construct the HDI. But during inter- district comparison within a state, there is no need to convert real per capita state domestic product into dollar. In the present study real per capita state domestic product in rupee is used without making any adjustment. Because, among districts of a state the purchasing power of money approximately remain similar. Although, in inter-district case some local goods may be cheaper than national price but the cost of other goods may be higher which are not local. This process may be neutralized by the purchasing power of money. Therefore, to make the simple process of constructing income index per capita income in rupee has been taken in the present study, which may be sufficient indicator to measure the decent standard of living. But along with using per capita income, the present study also follows the UNDP's formula of taking logarithm of per capita income to reflect the conversion or relevance of income into good living of human beings.

METHOD OF CALCULATING HDI

Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite index which combines economic and social factors to evaluate the development of a person, state or a country. There are three indices which are

- Describing dimensions for HDI to include.
- Describing indicators that capture these dimensions.
- Describing the method for combining these indicators to get a single value which represents HDI.

A long and healthy life (life expectancy index), being knowledgeable (education attainment index) and a decent standard of living (per capita income index) are the three proposed dimensions by United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) for calculating HDI. In our analysis we use some specified indicators describe by UNDP which capture these three dimensions. These indicators are then normalised between 0 and 1 by constructing an index for each dimension. To create an index we use the following general formula.

LIFE EXPECTANCY INDEX

Human development is directly connected with the health of an individual and also the population. Health parameter especially life expectancy at birth is an important ingredient of Human Development Index. Haryana has a long way to go in achieving an

acceptable Human Development Index. Hence health needs of people should be given their due importance.

Life expectancy at birth is used as an indicator for long and healthy life. For calculating the health index we use the general formula. The UNDP use 25 and 85 years as goalposts for life expectancy index. i.e.

$$\text{Life Expectancy Index} = \frac{(\text{life expectancy} - 25)}{(85 - 25)}$$

EDUCATION ATTAINMENT INDEX

Education is a key factor in socio-economic development. A rational education system promotes science and technology, a scientific outlook, increases participation of people in the affairs of the nation and stimulates creative faculties. It also results in greater awareness of available opportunities. To meet cultural requirement and to develop human personality are also other aims or objectives of education. (Gupta, 1999)

The education attainment index is an aggregate index derived from two indices. One is the adult literacy rate i.e. the literacy rate of population of age 15 years and above. The other ratio is the gross enrolment ratio which is obtained by combining primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment in age 6 to 14 years. These two indices are combined, giving two third weights to adult literacy and one third weights to gross enrolment, to obtain the education index. The following mathematical form is thus needed to obtain the education index.

$$\text{Education Attainment Index} = \frac{2(\text{adult literacy index}) + 1(\text{gross enrolment index})}{3}$$

INCOME INDEX

To calculate per capita income index, UNDP uses GDP per capita (PPP\$). The UNDP used 'adjusted per capita income for countries' to calculate income index. The GDP per capita (PPP\$) is then transformed to log (GDP per capita (PPP\$)) because increases of income at lower levels then greater impact on the income index. The following formula is thus used to calculate the income index.

$$\text{Income index} = \frac{\{\log (\text{GDP per capita (PPP\$)}) - \log (\$100)\}}{\{\log (\$40000) - \log (\$100)\}}$$

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX

After computing above three indices, HDI is calculated as simple average of these indices for each district of Haryana i.e.

$$\text{HDI} = \frac{(\text{Life Expectancy Index} + \text{Education Attainment Index} + \text{Income Index})}{3}$$

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA:-

Table -1

Value and Ranking of Indicators of Human Development Index during 1999-2000 to 2007-08

State/Uts	Health Index				Income Index				Education Index			
	1999-2000		2007-08		1999-2000		2007-08		1999-2000		2007-08	
	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank
Andhra Pradesh	0.521	12	0.58	12	0.197	15	0.287	15	0.385	15	0.553	16
Assam	0.339	23	0.407	9	0.152	17	0.288	14	0.516	14	0.636	10
Bihar	0.506	14	0.561	13	0.1	19	0.127	23	0.271	23	0.409	22
Chhattisgarh	0.341	22	0.417	18	0.127	18	0.133	22	0.365	22	0.526	17
Delhi	0.735	2	0.763	2	0.8	1	0.678	1	0.816	1	0.809	2
Goa	0.363	21	0.65	6	0.627	2	0.443	6	0.751	6	0.758	3
Gujarat	0.562	11	0.633	8	0.323	8	0.371	9	0.512	9	0.577	14
Himachal Pradesh	0.681	3	0.717	3	0.426	6	0.491	4	0.636	4	0.747	4
Jammu & Kashmir	0.457	16	0.53	14	0.431	5	0.459	5	0.507	5	0.597	13
Haryana	0.567	8	0.627	9	0.417	7	0.408	7	0.512	7	0.622	11
Jharkhand	0.434	17	0.5	15	0.1	19	0.141	20	0.271	20	0.485	21
Karnataka	0.567	9	0.627	9	0.26	13	0.326	12	0.468	12	0.605	12
Kerala	0.782	1	0.817	1	0.458	3	0.629	2	0.789	2	0.924	1
Madhya Pradesh	0.363	20	0.43	17	0.127	18	0.173	19	0.365	19	0.522	18
Maharashtra	0.601	5	0.65	6	0.297	10	0.351	11	0.606	11	0.715	6
Orissa	0.376	19	0.45	16	0.076	20	0.139	21	0.372	21	0.499	19
Punjab	0.632	4	0.667	4	0.455	4	0.495	3	0.542	3	0.654	8
Rajasthan	0.52	13	0.587	10	0.293	11	0.253	16	0.348	16	0.462	22
Uttarakhand	0.465	15	0.53	14	0.179	16	0.302	13	0.371	13	0.638	9
Uttar Pradesh	0.398	18	0.473	15	0.179	16	0.175	18	0.371	18	0.492	20

Tamil Nadu	0.586	7	0.637	7	0.285	12	0.355	10	0.57	10	0.719	5
West Bengal	0.6	6	0.65	6	0.21	14	0.252	17	0.455	17	0.575	15
NE states & Assam	0.567	10	0.663	5	0.319	9	0.386	8	0.535	8	0.67	7
All India	0.497		0.563		0.323		0.271		0.442		0.568	

Table-1 shows the all India level had the Health Index value 0.497 in 1999-2000 and it was 0.563 in 2007-08. Andhra Pradesh had the value at 0.521 in 1999-2000 and it was 0.580 in 2007-08. Assam had value at 0.339 in 1999-2000 and it had value 0.407 in 2007-08. Bihar had value at 0.506 in 1999-2000 and it had value at 0.561 in 2007-08. Chhattisgarh had value at 0.341 in 1999-2000, and the value at 0.417 in 2007-08. Delhi had at 0.735 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.763 in 2007-08. Goa had the Health Index value at 0.363 in 1999-2000 and had value at 0.650 in 2007-08. Gujarat had value at 0.562 in 1999-2000 and value at 0.633 in 2007-08. Himachal Pradesh had value at 0.681 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.717 in 2007-08. Jammu & Kashmir value at 0.457 in 1999-2000 again it had value at 0.530 in 2007-08. Haryana had value at 0.567 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.627 in 2007-08. Jharkhand had value at 0.434 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.500 in 2007-08. Karnataka had the value at 0.567 in 1999-2000 again it had value at 0.627 in 2007-08. Kerala had value at 0.782 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.817 in 2007-08. Madhya Pradesh had the value at 0.363 in 1999-2000 after that it had value at 0.430 in 2007-08. Maharashtra had the value at 0.601 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.650 in 2007-08. Orissa had the value at 0.376 in 1999-2000; again it had value at 0.450 in 2007-08. Punjab had the value at 0.632 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.667 in 2007-08. Rajasthan had the value at 0.520 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.587 in 2007-08. Uttarakhand had value at 0.465 in 1999-2000 after that had the value at 0.530 in 2007-08. Uttar Pradesh had value at 0.398 in 1999-2000, and had value at 0.473 in 2007-08. Tamil Nadu had value at 0.586 in 1999-2000, again it had value at 0.637 in 2007-08. West Bengal had value at 0.600 in 1999-2000, and had value at 0.650 in 2007-08., NE and Assam had value at 0.567 in 1999-2000 again NE and Assam had the value at 0.663 in 2007-08.

Table shows that Kerala was at top position in the Health Attainment Index in 1999-00 as well as in 2007-08. Delhi Health Attainment Index lied after the Kerala at 2nd position in 1999-00 as well as in 2007-08. Health Attainment Index value was lowest of state Bihar in

1999-00 as well as in 2007-08 with rank 23 in both the time periods. Other states have changed their positions but it was only a minor change. Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Gujarat, J&K, Haryana, Jharkhand, Punjab remained at same position, west Bengal showed no changes, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh shown the declining trend in Health index ranking. Bihar, Himachal Pradesh not changed its position, Karnataka remained at same level in ranking. States like Assam, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal and NE states and Assam shown their position has improved from before and got rank 5th form 10th.

All india level had the Income Index value 0.223 in 1999-2000 and it was 0.271 in 2007-08. Andhra pradesh had the value at 0.197 in 1999-2000 and it was 0.287 in 2007-08. Assam had value at 0.152 in 1999-2000 and it had value 0.288 in 2007-08. Bihar had value at 0.100 in 1999-2000 and it had value at 0.127 in 2007-08. Chhattisgarh had value at 0.127 in 1999-2000, and the value at 0.133 in 2007-08. Delhi had at 0.800 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.678 in 2007-08. Goa had the Income Index value at 0.627 in 1999-2000 and had value at 0.443 in 2007-08. Gujarat had value at 0.323 in 1999-2000 and value at 0.371 in 2007-08. Himachal Pradesh had value at 0.426 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.491 in 2007-08. Jammu & Kashmir value at 0.431 in 1999-2000 again it had value at 0.459 in 2007-08. Haryana had value at 0.417 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.408 in 2007-08. Jharkhand had value at 0.100 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.141 in 2007-08. Karnataka had the value at 0.26 in 1999-2000 again it had value at 0.326 in 2007-08. Kerala had value at 0.458 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.629 in 2007-08. Madhya Pradesh had the value at 0.127 in 1999-2000 after that it had value at 0.173 in 2007-08. Maharashtra had the value at 0.297 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.351 in 2007-08. Orissa had the value at 0.076 in 1999-2000, again it had value at 0.139 in 2007-08. Punjab had the value at 0.455 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.495 in 2007-08. Rajasthan had the value at 0.293 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.253 in 2007-08. Uttarakhand had value at 0.179 in 1999-2000 after that had the value at 0.302 in 2007-08. Uttar Pradesh had value at 0.179 in 1999-2000, and had value at 0.175 in 2007-08. Tamil Nadu had value at 0.285 in 1999-2000, again it had value at 0.355 in 2007-08. West Bengal had value at 0.210 in 1999-2000, and had value at 0.252 in 2007-08., NE and Assam had value at 0.319 in 1999-2000 again NE and Assam had the value at 0.386 in 2007-08.

Table shows that Delhi was at top position in the Income Attainment Index in 1999-00 as well as in 2007-08. Goa Income Attainment Index lied at 2nd position in 1999-00 and it slipped to 6th position in 2007-08. Income Attainment Index value was lowest of state Orissa in 1999-00 and of Bihar in 2007-08 with rank 23. Other states have changed their positions but it was only a minor change. Andhra Pradesh remained at same position, Gujarat slipped to 9th position, J&K remained at same position, Haryana remained at same position, Jharkhand showed worse position, Punjab improved its position, west Bengal showed worse changes, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh shown the declining trend in Income index ranking. Himachal Pradesh changed its position to 4th from 6th, Karnataka improved its ranking. States like Chhattisgarh, Goa, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, and NE states and Assam shown their position has decreased from before.

All India level had the Education Index value 0.442 in 1999-2000 and it was 0.568 in 2007-08. Andhra Pradesh had the Education Index value at 0.385, Assam had value at 0.516, Bihar had value at 0.271, and Chhattisgarh value at 0.365, Delhi had at 0.816 in 1999-2000. Goa had the Education Index value at 0.751, Gujarat had value at 0.512, Himachal Pradesh had value at 0.636, Jammu & Kashmir value at 0.507, Haryana had value at 0.512, Jharkhand had value at 0.271, Karnataka had the value at 0.468, Kerala had value at 0.789, Madhya Pradesh had the value at 0.365, Maharashtra had the value at 0.606, Orissa had the value at 0.372, Punjab had the value at 0.542, Rajasthan had the value at 0.348, Uttarakhand had value at 0.371, Uttar Pradesh had value at 0.371, Tamil Nadu had value at 0.570, West Bengal had value at 0.455, NE and Assam had value at 0.535. Again Andhra Pradesh had the Education Index value at 0.553 in 2007-08, Assam had value at 0.636, Bihar had value at 0.409, Chhattisgarh had the value at 0.526, and Delhi had the value at 0.809 in 2007-08. Goa had value at 0.758 Gujarat had value at 0.577, Himachal Pradesh had the value at 0.747, Jammu & Kashmir had value at 0.597, Haryana had the value at 0.622, Jharkhand had value at 0.485, Karnataka had value at 0.605, Kerala had value at 0.924, Madhya Pradesh had value at 0.522, Maharashtra had the value at 0.715, Orissa had value at 0.499, Punjab had value at 0.654, Rajasthan had the value at 0.462, Uttarakhand had the value at 0.638, Uttar Pradesh had value at 0.492, Tamil Nadu had value at 0.719, West Bengal had value at 0.575, NE and Assam had the value at 0.670 in 2007-08.

Table shows that Delhi was at top position among all the states, it has the highest Education Attainment Index in 1999-00 but Kerala was at top position in the same index in 2007-08. Delhi Education Attainment Index lied after the Kerala in 2007-08. There Education

Attainment Index value was lowest of state Bihar in 1999-00 as well as in 2007-08 with rank 23 in both the time periods. Other states have changed their positions but it was only a minor change. Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Gujarat, J&K, Haryana, Jharkhand, Punjab, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh had shown the declining trend in education index ranking. Bihar,

State/Uts	Human Development Index			
	1999-2000		2007-08	
	Value	Rank	Value	Rank
Andhra Pradesh	0.37	14	0.473	15
Assam	0.34	16	0.444	16
Bihar	0.39	18	0.367	21
Chhattisgarh	0.28	19	0.358	23
Delhi	0.78	1	0.75	2
Goa	0.6	4	0.617	4
Gujarat	0.47	9	0.527	11
Himachal Pradesh	0.58	3	0.652	3
Jammu & Kashmir	0.47	10	0.529	10
Haryana	0.5	6	0.552	9
Jharkhand	0.27	21	0.367	19
Karnataka	0.43	11	0.519	12
Kerala	0.68	2	0.79	1
Madhya Pradesh	0.29	19	0.375	20
Maharashtra	0.5	6	0.572	7
Orissa	0.28	2	0.362	22
Punjab	0.54	5	0.605	5
Rajasthan	0.39	13	0.434	17
Uttarakhand	0.34	15	0.49	14
Uttar Pradesh	0.32	17	0.38	18
Tamil Nadu	0.48	7	0.57	8
West Bengal	0.42	12	0.492	13
NE states & Assam	0.48	8	0.573	6
All India	0.39		0.467	

Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka remained at same level in ranking. States like Assam, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal and NE states and Assam shown their position has improved from before. **Table-2 Value and Ranking of Human Development Index during 1999-2000 to 2007-08**

NOTE: correct hdi ranking of Orissa is 19 instead of 2 in HDI column.

Table -2 shows the all India level had the Human development index value 0.39 in 1999-2000 and it was 0.467 in 2007-08. Andhra Pradesh had the value at 0.37 in 1999-2000 and it was 0.473 in 2007-08. Assam had value at 0.340 in 1999-2000 and it had value 0.444 in 2007-08. Bihar had value at 0.29 in 1999-2000 and it had value at 0.367 in 2007-08. Chhattisgarh had value at 0.28 in 1999-2000, and the value at 0.358 in 2007-08. Delhi had at 0.780 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.75 in 2007-08. Goa had the Human development index value at 0.600 in 1999-2000 and had value at 0.617 in 2007-08. Gujarat had value at 0.470 in 1999-2000 and value at 0.527 in 2007-08. Himachal Pradesh had value at 0.58 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.652 in 2007-08. Jammu & Kashmir value at 0.47 in 1999-2000 again it had value at 0.529 in 2007-08. Haryana had value at 0.500 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.517 in 2007-08. Jharkhand had value at 0.270 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.376 in 2007-08. Karnataka had the value at 0.43 in 1999-2000 again it had value at 0.519 in 2007-08. Kerala had value at 0.68 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.79 in 2007-08. Madhya Pradesh had the value at 0.29 in 1999-2000 after that it had value at 0.375 in 2007-08. Maharashtra had the value at 0.500 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.572 in 2007-08. Orissa had the value at 0.28 in 1999-2000, again it had value at 0.362 in 2007-08. Punjab had the value at 0.54 in 1999-2000 then it had value at 0.605 in 2007-08. Rajasthan had the value at 0.39 in 1999-2000 and had the value at 0.434 in 2007-08. Uttarakhand had value at 0.34 in 1999-2000 after that had the value at 0.49 in 2007-08. Uttar Pradesh had value at 0.32 in 1999-2000, and had value at 0.38 in 2007-08. Tamil Nadu had value at 0.48 in 1999-2000, again it had value at 0.57 in 2007-08. West Bengal had value at 0.42 in 1999-2000, and had value at 0.492 in 2007-08., NE and Assam had value at 0.48 in 1999-2000 again NE and Assam had the value at 0.537 in 2007-08.

Table shows that Delhi was at top position in the Human development index Attainment Index in 1999-00 and Kerala was at top position in 2007-08. Delhi slipped to 2nd position in 2007-08. Human development index Attainment Index value was lowest of state Jharkhand in 1999-00 and of Orissa in 2007-08 with rank 22. All other states changed their positions. Assam, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, J&K and Punjab remained at same position, Gujarat slipped to 11th position from 9th, Haryana slipped to 9th position from 6th. Jharkhand showed signs of improvement. West Bengal showed good changes, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh shown the declining trend in Human development index ranking, Karnataka declined in its ranking.

States like Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, and NE states and Assam shown their position has decreased from earlier year of comparison.

Conclusion:-

Over all, it may be concluded that there if we want to achieve high human development of in the country we have to extend the literacy rate by reducing the male-female literacy gap, health facilities should have to increase. Human development is of great importance in stimulating the economic growth and economic inputs which are used to make human beings safe, secure and comfortable, because human being is the core of a nation. In traditional view, the concept of human development is merely confined to enlargement of health, education and life expectancy, but in modern view the concept of human development is extended by adding some additional measure of pure water, housing, sanitation conditions, freedom from slum conditions of living, political, economical and social freedom etc. The ranking of all states should be improved through the better facilities given to the population and reduce the poor conditions of the people. Thus, efforts should be made to develop the social infrastructure with more stress on the development of health and education infrastructure. Special efforts should be made to spread female education. To achieve the high ranking in all parts of the country equal development is necessary.

References

- ❖ Dreze, J and Sen, A.K. (1995), "India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity" Oxford University Press, New Delhi
- ❖ Ghosh M (2006), "Economic Growth and Human Development in Indian States" *Economic and Political Weekly*, 29 July, Vol. 41, No. 30, pp. 3321-3329
- ❖ Government of India (2011), "*Economic Survey of 2010-2011*" Ministry of Finance, New Delhi
- ❖ Government of India (2002), "*National Human Development Report 2001*" Planning Commission, New Delhi
- ❖ Government of India (2009), "*Haryana Development Report*" Planning Commission, Academic Foundation, New Delhi
- ❖ Government of India (2011), "*Economic Survey of 2010-2011*" Ministry of Finance, New Delhi

- ❖ Haq, Mahboob-Ul (1995), "Reflections on Human Development" Oxford University Press, New York
- ❖ Haq, Mahbub ul, (1996), "Reflections on Human Development" Oxford University Press, New York
- ❖ Haryana Development Report (2009), "Planning commission of India" Government of India, Published by Academic foundation.
- ❖ Sengupta Keya (2002), "Indian Economy: Economic Growth And Human Development" *Man & Development*, March, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 37-50
- ❖ Rani. P Geetha (1999), "Human Development Index in India: A District Profile" *ArthaVijnana*, March, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 9-30
- ❖ Zaidi N. A. and Salam Md. A (1998), "Human Development in India: An Inter-state Comparision" *The Indian Journal of Economics*, April, Vol. 78, No. 311, pp. 447-460.