

***Environment, Human Development and  
Economic Growth after Liberalisation:  
An Analysis of Indian States***

**Sacchidananda Mukherjee**

Research Scholar, Madras School of Economics,  
Gandhi Mandapam Road, Chennai – 600 025, Tamil Nadu, India  
Phone: +91 44 2235 2157, 2230 0304, 2230 0307, Cell: +91 9840699343  
Fax: +91 44 2235 2155, 2235 4847  
Email: sachsmse@gmail.com

*and*

**Debashis Chakraborty**

Assistant Professor, Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, IIFT Bhawan  
B-21, Qutab Institutional Area, New Delhi – 110016, India  
Phone: +91 11 2696 5051, 2696 5124, Cell: +91 9818447900  
Fax: +91 11 2685 3956, 2686 7841  
Email: debchakra@gmail.com



## Acknowledgements

*Earlier versions of the paper have been presented at the National Seminar on 'National Environment Policy 2006: Objectives, Strategies and Implementation', organized by Department of Economics, Jamia Milia Islamia (on 21 February 2007) and at the National Conference on 'Making Growth Inclusive with Special Reference to Imbalance in Regional Development' jointly organized by Department of Economics, Jammu University and Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Shimla (on 12 March 2007). We thank all the participants in these two conferences for their helpful comments. We are especially grateful to Prof. Paul P. Appasamy, Prof. U. Shankar, Dr. Vinish Kathuria and Dr. Ajit Menon for their detailed suggestions on an earlier draft of our paper. We however are fully responsible for all errors remaining.*

## 1. Introduction

The economic reform process initiated in 1991 has played a major role in shaping India's overall as well as its sub-regional economic growth so far. First, the unshackling of domestic industries, coupled with the shift towards export-oriented economic philosophy caused an industrialisation drive across the Indian States. Second, the easing of FDI approval system provided ample opportunities for States with enterprising governments to strike their own growth curves by encouraging investment and thereby ensuring industrialisation within their territories. Third, in the post-1991 period the policy objective of achieving balanced growth no longer remained a driving concern, and thus the possibility of increasing industrial concentration in strategic locations. Fourth, the States characterised by better infrastructural conditions grew at a much higher rate as compared to the natural-resource rich economies (Bhandari and Khare, 2002).

The enhanced growth is likely to raise the general level of human development (HD) in the current period, which in turn may influence future economic growth (EG) potential positively. However, increasing industrialization or urbanization on the other hand, if not associated with requisite level of governance, can considerably influence the environmental sustainability of the State in question (Gulati and Sharma, undated; Indian NGOs, undated). The adverse impact could either come through natural resource depletion and/or adverse health consequences of environmental degradation, e.g., air or water pollution (Brandon and Hommann, 1995).

It can be further argued that with increasing level of HD, public awareness on environmental sustainability increase in a particular State, which in turn will influence its pattern of governance.<sup>1</sup> In other words, States with higher HDI should ideally be ranked higher in terms of environmental performance. The relationship between economic growth, measured through per capita net state domestic product (PCNSDP), and environmental performance might be more complex in nature. In general, higher income level is conducive for ensuring higher HD, and therefore should ideally be favourable for maintaining environmental sustainability (World Bank, 2006). However, some States might also choose to grow in the short run by hosting a number of environmentally damaging but fast-growing industries within their territories, with obvious consequences on local environment.

Globally, the environmental regulation-avoiding attitude of producers often leads to concentration of polluting industries in locations characterized by lax environmental norms ('Pollution Haven Hypothesis - PHH'). Usually it is argued that the developed country producers relocate their polluting units in newly industrializing developing countries (Eskeland and Harrison, 2003).<sup>2</sup> Similarly within a country, relocation

---

<sup>1</sup> Jalan et al (2003) show that raising the level of schooling of woman in an urban household from 0 to 10 years approximately doubles willingness to pay for improved drinking water quality. This is equivalent to increasing the household's wealth level from the first to the third wealth quartile.

<sup>2</sup> Gallagher (2004) cautioned that without environmental laws, regulations, and the willingness and capacity to enforce them, trade-led growth will lead to increases in environmental degradation. By citing the example of post-NAFTA environmental condition of Mexico, he concluded that environmental regulations and enforcement are not generally decisive in most firms' location decision and therefore Governments will not be jeopardizing their access to FDI by enacting strong environmental legislation and enforce it.

along that line from 'cleaner' States to the 'dirtier' States may be noticed for various reasons.<sup>3</sup>

Working with the Indian scenario, while negative environmental performance by transnational corporations during 1980s (Jha, 1999) and higher FDI inflow in relatively more polluting sectors in the post-liberalization period have been reported (Gamper-Rabindran and Jha, 2004); several studies rejected the existence of PHH (Dietznbacher and Mukhopadhyay, 2007; Jena et al, 2005). In long run the PHH may or may not become a reality in some Indian States.<sup>4</sup> However, that is beyond the scope of the current exercise.

The efficiency of environmental governance and pollution-abatement is currently a much-researched area (Costantini and Salvatore, 2006; Dam, 2004; Kathuria, 2004; Kathuria and Sterner, 2005; Murty et al, 2003; Parikh, 2004; Sankar, 1998; Santhakumar, 2001; Somanathan and Sterner, 2003; Sood and Arora, 2006). The intervention of Supreme Court in India has been quite successful in this regard (Antony, 2001; World Bank, 2006), although the limitation

---

<sup>3</sup> For instance, a recent study conducted by the Delhi-based NGO, International Resources, for the Maharashtra Pollution Control Board has shown that although Maharashtra is the biggest producer of electronic waste in India, the more hazardous recycling of these products (e.g. – extraction of copper, gold, breaking-up of cathode-ray tubes etc.) is actually undertaken in Delhi. This particular choice of recycling location comes from the fact that the extracted materials are important inputs for the copper and gold business in Moradabad and Meerat respectively, both close to Delhi (Dastidar, 2006).

<sup>4</sup> Though import of hazardous waste for processing or reusing as raw material is allowed, with environmental consequence within Indian territories. However recently 29 categories of hazardous waste have completely been banned for import and export (Sharma, 2005).

of that approach has also been highlighted (Venkatachalam, 2005).<sup>5</sup> Programmes like joint forest management (JFM) can also be mentioned here, with direct involvement of stakeholders, which has helped natural resource management to a great extent (CBD, undated; Balooni, 2002).<sup>6</sup>

Apart from the internal factors like economic liberalisation, external factors have also influenced the environmental scenario in India significantly. Trade and Environment remained an important issue for discussion at the WTO forums since the inception of the multilateral body in 1995 and standard-setting has been a continuous process. Indian firms, especially doing business in sectors like textile, marine products, leather, chemicals etc., have often complained that the environmental compliance norms for exporting to EU and US are too stringent.<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, owing to sanctions and regular factory visits by importing country officials, the compliance level in India has increased over the years for several industries (Tewari and Pillai, 2005; Sankar, 2006; Schjolden, 2000), with obvious positive implications on the

---

<sup>5</sup> For instance, setting up of the Local Area Environmental Committees (LAECs) with the active participation of the local people for inspection, monitoring of day-to-day development in hazardous waste affected sites; the Supreme Court Monitoring Committee (SCMC) on Hazardous Waste has ensured strict compliance of the Hazardous Wastes (Management and Handling) Rules, 1989 on the part of the industries or any other agency involved in Hazardous Waste generation, collection, treatment and disposal.

<sup>6</sup> Sankar (1998) argues that the government may ensure participation of community based organizations in management of local commons as well as in the enforcement of environmental laws and rules.

<sup>7</sup> In 1989-90 Germany banned the import of leather items containing more than 5 mg/kg of Pentachlorophenol (PCP). It again banned the import of leather (and textiles) treated with azo dyes (benzidine) in 1994 (Chakraborty and Singh, 2005). In case of marine products, the requirement to clean the floors of the processing units with mineral waters has been too stringent (Kaushik and Saqib, 2001).

domestic environment.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, pollution level in upcoming sectors like electronics components industry is on the rise (Saqib et al, 2001).

In this background, on the basis of a secondary data analysis, the current paper attempts to analyze the relationship of environmental quality with human development and economic growth separately for 14 major Indian States over 1991-2004. For a closer analysis of the impact of the reform element on environmental quality of the States, the sample period is bifurcated into two sub-periods - Period A (1990–1996) and Period B (1997–2004) respectively. This period marks an evolving attitude of the country towards environment, although in a gradual manner.<sup>9</sup> The paper is organized as follows. A brief literature survey on environmental sustainability, human development and economic growth is followed by the discussion on the methodology adopted in this paper, the results and the policy observations respectively.

---

<sup>8</sup> However, environmental NTBs significantly affect Indian exports (Bhattacharyya, 1999; Chaturvedi and Nagpal, 2002; Mehta, 2005), and it is believed that too much emphasis on environmental standards might lead to loss of comparative advantage for India (Mukhopadhyay and Chakraborty, 2005).

<sup>9</sup> India introduced the Environment (Protection) Act and the Hazardous Wastes (Management and Handling) Rules in 1986 and 1989 respectively and became a member of Basel Convention in 1992. However, the national rules on hazardous wastes were brought into conformity with Basel norms only in 2000 (Sharma, 2005; Divan and Rosencranz, 2002).

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Environmental Sustainability

Determining the appropriate methodology for arriving at meaningful environmental indices is a debated research question (Ebert and Welsch, 2004; Zhou et al., 2006). It has generally been observed that using a composite environmental index summarizes the environment condition of a region or country or state,<sup>10</sup> and is more meaningful than individual indicators (Rogers et al., 1997; Adriaanse et al., 1995; Adriaanse, 1993, Esty et al, 2005; WWF, 2002; CBD, undated; Jones et al., 2002; RIVM/ UNEP, undated). However the methodology and selection of variables for construction of environmental index vary considerably across these studies.

In **Table 1**, we look at the relationships between Environmental Performance Index (EPI), HDI and Per Capita GDP for a few select economies. The Environmental Performance Index (EPI) data is taken from the recent study by Esty et al. (2006), which constructs the index for 133 countries. The study is based on a compilation of 32 indicators classified into 6 environmental groups. HDI Scores and Ranks are taken from latest Human Development Report 2006, which ranks 177 countries on the basis of their HDI Score. It is observed from the table that the countries having higher HDI scores (e.g. New Zealand) are generally

<sup>10</sup> It is argued that environmental degradation or pollution level cannot be merely measured by actual emissions of certain hazardous materials; but other factors influencing its spread and intensity also need to be considered (Kathuria, 2002, 2004).

characterised by higher values of EPI as well. However, exceptions also exist – for instance Malaysia, despite having a medium HDI score, is characterized by a high EPI. The Per Capita GDP (in PPP USD) for the two countries is found to be higher in comparison with the remaining countries. On the other hand, the South Asian countries with medium HDI performance (e.g. India, Pakistan) have also performed moderately on the EPI front. The countries further down the HDI list (e.g. Niger) are ranked lower in the EPI list as well. It has been observed that the relationships between (1) HDI score and EPI score and (2) Per Capita GDP and EPI Score of the South East and South Asian countries show a non-linear pattern (Mukherjee and Chakraborty, 2007).

**Table 1:** Environmental Performance Index, Human Development Index and Per Capita GDP – A Cross Country View

| Country     | Environmental Performance Index (EPI) Score: 2006 | Human Development Index (HDI) Score: 2004 | Per Capita GDP (PPP USD): 2004 |
|-------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Bangladesh  | 43.5 (125)  | 0.530 (137)                               | 1,870                          |
| India       | 47.7 (118)  | 0.768 (81)                                | 5,896                          |
| Sri Lanka   | 64.6 (67)   | 0.611 (126)                               | 3,139                          |
| Nepal       | 60.2 (81)   | 0.711 (108)                               | 3,609                          |
| Pakistan    | 41.1 (127)  | 0.805 (61)                                | 10,276                         |
| China       | 56.2 (94)   | 0.581 (130)                               | 1,027                          |
| Indonesia   | 60.7 (79)   | 0.527 (138)                               | 1,490                          |
| Malaysia    | 83.3 (9)  | 0.539 (134)                               | 2,225                          |
| Myanmar     | 57.0 (88)   | 0.763 (84)                                | 4,614                          |
| Philippines | 69.4 (55)   | 0.755 (93)                                | 4,390                          |
| Thailand    | 66.8 (61)   | 0.784 (74)                                | 8,090                          |
| Niger       | 25.7 (133)  | 0.311 (177)                               | 779                            |
| New Zealand | 88.0 (1)  | 0.936 (20)                                | 23,413                         |

Note: Figures in parentheses show the corresponding ranks

Source: Esty et al (2006), UNDP's HDR (2006) and World Bank (2004)

## 2.2 Relationships between Environmental Quality and Economic Growth

The literature on the relationship between Per Capita Income (PCI) or the PCNSDP in case of States within a country, and pollution or environmental degradation generally attempts to verify the existence of an inverted U-shaped curve in the PCI vs. pollution plane ('Environmental Kuznets Curve'). The relationship implies that with the rise in PCI, environmental degradation continues up to a certain level of PCI, but improves afterwards as with prosperity, countries shift to cleaner production technologies or spend more resources on pollution abatement (Esty and Porter, 2001-02; Andreoni and Levinson, 2001). Recent empirical studies show that while some local pollutants like Sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), Suspended Particulate Matter (SPM), Carbon monoxide (CO) etc. support EKC hypothesis; other pollutants exhibit either monotonicity or N-shaped curve (Dinda, 2004; Stern, 1998). Studies based on both ambient concentration of pollutants (Baldwin, 1995; Grossman and Krueger, 1995; Selden and Song, 1994; Panayatou, 1993; Shafik and Bandyopadhyay, 1992; Pezzey, 1989) or the actual emissions of pollutants (Bruvold and Medin, 2003; de Bruyn et al., 1998; Carson et al., 1997) also support the EKC hypothesis.

It is argued that working with a composite indicator of pollutants, as a proxy of actual EQ scenario, scores over selection of a single pollutant in determination of the EKC relationship (Mukherjee and Kathuria, 2006), although only a handful of studies have adopted that approach so far. Jha and Bhanu Murthy (2001) created an

Environmental Degradation Index (EDI) for 174 countries and compared that with the Human Development Index (HDI) instead of the PCI. The study found an inverse link between EDI and HDI, which supported the existence of an inverted N-shaped global EKC rather than an inverted U-shaped one.

In Indian context, Mukherjee and Kathuria (2006) explored the EKC relationship for 14 major Indian States over 1990-2001 by considering 63 environmental variables, arranged under eight broad environmental groups. The ranking of the States on a constructed Environmental Quality Index (EQI) were determined by using the factor analysis method. The results indicate that the relationship between EQ and PCNSDP is slanting S-shaped, indicating that the economic growth has occurred in Indian States mostly at the cost of EQ. It was observed that except Bihar, all the States are on the upward sloping portion of the EKC. Kadekodi and Venkatachalam (2005) noted evidence of a strong linkage between various natural resources and environment with income and the status of livelihood and concluded that the causal relationship between poverty and environment works in both directions.<sup>11</sup> The research has also highlighted the importance of poverty alleviation while minimising the human health and environmental costs of economic growth (Nadkarni, 2000) and the possibility of entering into a long-run vicious circle of environmental degradation, greater inequality and lower growth (Dutt and Rao, 1996) in that process.

---

<sup>11</sup> However the study noted a mixed effect of improvement in human development on various individual pollution indicators in different states.

### *2.3 Relationship between Environment and Human Well-being*

It is observed from the literature on environmental impacts of structural adjustment programme that if the victims of depletion and degradation of natural environment are not identified and compensated by the beneficiaries, the vulnerable sections face additional economic hardship, which may fuel inequality further (Dasgupta, 2001). It has been argued by Boyce (2003) that, "social and economic inequalities can influence both the distribution of the costs and benefits from environmental degradation and the extent of environmental protection. When those benefit from environmentally degrading economic activities are powerful relative to those who bear the costs, environmental protection is generally weaker than when the reverse is true." The analysis suggests that socio-economic inequality leads to environmental inequality, which may consequently affect the overall extent of environmental quality. Therefore any attempt to reduce inequalities would eventually result in environmental protection.

It is increasingly believed that environmental problems should no longer be viewed as the side effects of development process. On the contrary, a new approach focusing on promotion of their integration need to be adopted (Ginkel et al., 2001). The objective has been met through Target 9 of the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (MDGs),<sup>12</sup> which demands that environmental conservation and

---

<sup>12</sup> "Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the losses of environmental resources" - Target 9 of the UN's MDGs.

conservation of natural resources from quantitative depletion and qualitative degradation, should be an integral part of any economic and development policy.

Melnick et al. (2005) highlight the critical importance of achieving environmental sustainability to meet the MDGs with respect to poverty, illiteracy, hunger, gender inequality, unsafe drinking water and environmental degradation. They argue that achieving environmental sustainability requires carefully balancing human development activities while maintaining a stable environment that predictably and regularly provides resources and protects people from natural calamities.

### *2.4 Relationship between Economic Growth and Human Development*

The literature suggests a two-way relationship between EG and HD, implying that nations may enter either into a virtuous cycle of high growth and large HD gains, or a vicious cycle of low growth and low HD improvement (Ranis, 2004). It is also observed that higher initial level of HD corresponds to positive effects on institutional quality and indirectly on EG (Costantini and Salvatore, 2006). The study by Agarwal and Samanta (2006) involving 31 developing countries, observed that EG is not correlated with social progress, structural adjustment or governance. Nevertheless, all of them might have an impact on the EQ within a country like India, where a two-way causality between EG and HD is observed, indicating possibilities of vicious cycles (Ghosh, 2006), which might have environmental repercussions.



The UNDP annually publishes an extensive analysis of global HD situation in the Human Development Report (HDR) along with country rankings. However, it is often argued that the UNDP HD indicators are perhaps too narrow in nature, and inclusion of certain important socio-economic variables would enrich the analysis further. The Latent Variable Approach adopted by Nagar and Basu (2001) involving 174 countries confirms that with inclusion of additional socio-economic variables, the alternate HD rankings differ significantly from the official UNDP ranking.

While India's HD ranking remained in the low HD category throughout nineties, in 2002 it graduated to medium HD category with the HDI score of 0.577, as compared to the corresponding figure of 0.439 in 1990. India's global HDI rank has improved from 132 in 1999 to 127 in 2003.<sup>13</sup> Recently in association with UNDP, the Government of India has started analysing the State-wise HD status. The National Human Development Report 2001, brought out by the Planning Commission (Government of India, 2002), is worth mentioning in this regard. While the report ranked Kerala, Punjab and Tamil Nadu as the toppers; Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh were at the other extreme in HD scale. The alternate index developed by Guha and Chakraborty (2003), in line with Nagar and Basu (2001), however showed that inclusion of other socio-economic variables changes the State rankings to some extent. For instance, Tamil Nadu, ranked third by NHDR, slides down the ladder to the eighth place according to the alternate index.

<sup>13</sup> In relative sense, India's position actually does not look that bad as UNDP considered 130 and 177 countries in 1990 and 2003 respectively.

### 3. Methodology and Data

#### 3.1 Environmental Quality Index (EQI)

The EQI for the States is postulated to be linearly dependent on a set of observable indicators and has been determined by adopting the HDI method, by putting the selected variables under eight broad categories mentioned in **Table 2**. The idea is that all the 63 environmental variables, when combined, give a composite EQI ranking of the States, unobservable otherwise. We assume  $X_{ij}$  to be the value of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  indicator for  $j^{\text{th}}$  State of India with respect to  $X$  (or environmental quality), where  $X$  consists of a large number of indicators varying from 6 to 12 (see **Appendix 3**). As defined earlier,  $X$ 's are AIRPOL, INDOOR, GHGS, ENERGY, FOREST, WATER, NPSP and LAND respectively.

In line with the HDI method, we transform the indicators into their standardised form, by which the adjusted values of  $X_{ij}$  (i.e.,  $EX_{ij}$ 's) to be used for the analysis become:

$$EX_{ij} = (X_{ij} - X_i^*) / (X_i^{**} - X_i^*) \text{ or } EX_{ij} = (X_i^{**} - X_{ij}) / (X_i^{**} - X_i^*)$$

where,  $X_i^*$  and  $X_i^{**}$  are the minimum and maximum values for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  indicator of environmental quality  $X$  respectively.<sup>14</sup> Now,  $EQIX_j$ , i.e., the environmental quality index score for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  State with respect to each individual environmental quality  $X$  (which constitutes of  $n$  number of indicators,  $n$  varies from 6 to 12), is arrived at by summing the  $EX_{ij}$ s over  $i$  by using the following formula:

$$EQIX_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n EX_{ij}$$

<sup>14</sup> The variables for which these two alternate formulas are used are specified at the end of **Appendix 3**.

In a similar manner,  $EQI_j$ , i.e., the overall environmental quality index score for the  $j^{th}$  State, is arrived at by summing the  $EX_{ij}$ s for all  $X$  over  $i$  by using the following formula:

$$EQI_j = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N=63} EX_{ij} \forall X$$

The obtained EQIs measure the environmental well-being of the States, i.e., the States with higher score are characterised by cleaner environment. The  $EQI_j$ s (where  $j=1$  to 14), thus arrived, is therefore used to obtain the  $REQI_j$ s (the rank of the  $j^{th}$  State), where the States having higher  $EQI_j$  are assigned higher rank.

### 3.2 Human Development Index (HDI)

Following the principle of the NHDR 2001 methodology (Government of India, 2002), for calculation of the Human Development Index (HDI), we consider three variables, namely - inflation and inequality adjusted per capita consumption expenditure ( $X_1$ ); and composite indicator of educational attainment ( $X_2$ ) and composite indicator on health attainment ( $X_3$ ). With this formulation, following the HDI method, the HDI score for the  $j^{th}$  State is given by:

$$HDI_j = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^3 X_i$$

where,  $X_i$  represents the normalized values of the three indicators selected for construction of the HDI score, obtained by using the following formula:

$$X_i = (X_{ij} - X_i^*) / (X_i^{**} - X_i^*)$$

where  $X_{ij}$  refers to attainment of the  $i^{th}$  indicator by the  $j^{th}$  State and  $X_i^{**}$  and  $X_i^*$  are the scaling maximum and minimum values of the indicators respectively ( $i = 1$  to 3).

Although UNDP considers Real GDP Per Capita in PPP USD for generating the HDI, the NHDR 2001 (2002) has preferred total inflation and inequality adjusted per capita consumption expenditure of a State (i.e., Rural and Urban Combined) over that for the analysis. Here the monthly per capita consumption expenditure data obtained from NSSO for two periods (1993-94 and 1999-2000), adjusted for inequality using estimated *Gini* Ratios, and further adjusted for inflation to bring them to 1983 prices by using deflators derived from State specific poverty line (Raju, undated). We follow the NHDR methodology in our analysis and consider total inflation and inequality adjusted per capita consumption expenditure of a State as an explanatory variable.

The composite indicator on educational attainment ( $X_2$ ) is arrived at by considering two variables, namely literacy rate for the age group of 7 years and above ( $e_1$ ) and adjusted intensity of formal education ( $e_2$ ). The idea is that literacy rate being an overall ratio alone may not indicate the actual scenario, and the drop-out rate, needs to be incorporated in the formula. We consider the data on literacy rate for two periods, namely - 1991 and 2001. The adjusted Intensity of Formal Education data is used for two periods – 1993 and 2002. The following weightage is assigned for the two variables so as to determine the composite indicator:

$$X_2 = [(e_1 \times 0.35) + (e_2 \times 0.65)]$$

The adjusted Intensity of Formal Education is estimated as weighted average of the enrolled students from class I to class XII (where weights being 1 for Class I, 2 for Class II and so on) to the total enrolment in Class I to Class XII. This is adjusted by proportion of total enrolment to population in the age group 6-18 (Raju, undated). According to the formula suppose  $E_i$  be the number of children (rural and urban combined) enrolled in  $i^{\text{th}}$  standard in 2002,  $i= 1$  for Class I to 12 for Class XII. Then WAE becomes the Weighted Average of the Enrolment from Class I to Class XII:

$$WAE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{12} i \times E_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{12} i}$$

Now, let TE be the total enrolment of Children from Class I to Class XII in 2002. Then by definition, we have:

$$TE = \sum_{i=1}^{12} E_i$$

Hence, the Intensity of Formal Education (IFE) for children (rural and urban combined) in 2002 becomes:

$$IFE = \frac{WAE}{TE} \times 100$$

From the IFE, we can determine the Adjusted Intensity of Formal Education (AIFE) for children (rural and urban combined) in 2002 by using the following formula:

$$AIFE = IFE \times \frac{TE}{P_c}$$

Where  $P_c$  represents the Population of Children (rural and urban combined) in the age group 6 to 18 years in 2001.

The Composite indicator on health attainment ( $X_3$ ) is arrived at by considering two variables, namely Life Expectancy (LE) at age one ( $h_1$ ) and the reciprocal of Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) as the second variable ( $h_2$ ). For  $h_1$ , which measures the life expectancy at age 1 (Rural and Urban Combined), the two data points considered for the two periods are 1990-94 and 1998-2002 respectively. On the other hand, the IMR (Per Thousand) data is considered for two periods, namely - 1992 and 2000. The following weightage is assigned for the two variables so as to determine the composite indicator used for calculation of the HDI:

$$X_3 = [(h_1 \times 0.65) + (h_2 \times 0.35)]$$

### 3.3 Economic Growth (EG)

Economic growth in the current analysis is measured by the PCNSDP of the States at constant (1993-94) prices. PCNSDP for the Period A is the average PCNSDP for the period 1993-94 to 1995-96 and for Period B, it is the average PCNSDP over 1997-98 to 1999-2000. The average is taken to smoothen out uneven fluctuations. To understand the size of the economy and growth pattern of each of the 14 States, we have classified the States into three categories with respect to their Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP) at constant 1993-94 prices, e.g., high income States (having GSDP: greater than 3<sup>rd</sup> Quartile), medium income States (GSDP: 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> Quartile) and low income States (GSDP: less than 1<sup>st</sup> Quartile), for early 1990s (1993-96), late 1990s (1997-2000) and early years of new millennium (2001-2005).

Mukherjee and Chakraborty (2007) noted that during early 1990s (1993-96), on an average middle income states (e.g. - Gujarat, Rajasthan, Karnataka and West Bengal) were growing faster than others. However, during late 1990s (1997-2000), except for low income States (e.g. – Kerala, Haryana, Bihar and Orissa), growth rate slowed down, indicating a stagnation. On the other hand, during early 2000s (2000-2004), the difference in economic growth rate across the States having different level of income has gone down and barring few exceptions (Rajasthan and West Bengal) both for low and medium income States the growth rate generally slowed down as compared to the late 1990s level.

### 3.4 Data

In order to obtain State level secondary information on environment and natural resources from published government reports and other databases for both the time periods selected in our analysis, i.e., Period A (1990-96) and Period B (1997-2004), the sample is restricted only to 14 major Indian States, namely - Andhra Pradesh (AP), Bihar (BH), Gujarat (GJ), Haryana (HR), Karnataka (KR), Kerala (KL), Madhya Pradesh (MP), Maharashtra (MH), Orissa (OR), Punjab (PB), Rajasthan (RJ), Tamil Nadu (TN), Uttar Pradesh (UP) and West Bengal (WB). Now the data available for various environmental indicators in India are not always necessarily compatible with the time period selected by us, given the varying date and frequency of their publication. To resolve this issue, we have chosen only those indicators with at least two observations, where one of these observations is located within the boundary of the two sample periods. The selected indicators have then been normalized

using appropriate measures of size / scale of the States – geographical area, population and GSDP at current prices.

Here we need to distinguish between two key concepts, namely - endowment effect and efficiency in natural resource management effect. The depletion and degradation of natural resources and occurrence of environmental pollution is chiefly concerned with environmental management. On the other hand, the initial endowments of natural resources (forests, land and water) are determined by geographical, climatic and ecological factors. Quite understandably, the former is comparatively more influenced by human activities. By calculating the change in the natural resource position with respect to a base year we can isolate the two effects.<sup>15</sup> The current study focuses on the environmental management efficiency effect as well as the size effect of the States.

The data sources for our analysis on EQ and descriptions of the actual data series used to construct each group are listed in **Appendix 2** and **3** respectively. A total of 63 variables have been selected for the analysis, placed under eight broad categories, which are summarized in **Table 2**.

---

<sup>15</sup> For instance, a higher index for Orissa as compared to Punjab by merely ranking the forest resources of the two States (by taking the percentage of geographical area under forests land) comes from the fact that Punjab possess very little of the selected variable to begin with. Therefore the analysis does not imply that forest conservation practices of the former are in any way better than the same of the latter. Ranking the change in their forest area (as a percentage of geographical area) during any two periods would be the ideal exercise for comparing their forest conservation practices.

**Table 2:** Description of the Environmental Groups

| Groups | Description                                      | Number of variables |
|--------|--|---------------------|
| AIRPOL | Air Pollution                                    | 6                   |
| INDOOR | Indoor Air Pollution Potential                   | 9                   |
| GHGS   | Green House Gases (GHGs) Emissions               | 6                   |
| ENERGY | Pollution from Energy Generation and Consumption | 6                   |
| FOREST | Depletion and Degradation of Forest Resources    | 8                   |
| WATER  | Depletion and Degradation of Water Resources     | 12                  |
| NPSP   | Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Potential        | 10                  |
| LAND   | Pressure and Degradation of Land Resources       | 6                   |
|        | <b>Total</b>                                     | <b>63</b>           |

For the analysis on education, we use the data available from the “7th All India Educational Survey (AIES): All India School Education Survey (AISES)”, published by NCERT (2002). On the health front, IMR data is taken from Sample Registration System (SRS) Bulletins; Registrar General of India, New Delhi and LE data is taken from Indiastat database website ([www.indiastat.com](http://www.indiastat.com)). The data on EG of the States is obtained from EPW Research Foundation Database Software and RBI’s Database on Indian Economy.

## 4. The Results

### 4.1 EQI

In **Table 3**, we present the EQ scores and rankings of the States for Period A, both for individual categories as well as for the composite index. It is observed that Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra were the toppers during this period, while Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and Haryana had been the laggards. Interestingly the topper Kerala, despite a good performance in AIRPOL, GHGS, ENERGY, WATER and NPSP, fared among the laggards in case of INDOOR, LAND and FOREST. Karnataka had good performance in case of AIRPOL and GHGS, while maintaining moderate performance in other categories. The third ranking of Maharashtra, an industrialized state, is justified by the fact that the State performed appreciably in several categories like INDOOR, GHGS, LAND and NPSP, however the performance with respect to ENERGY, WATER, FOREST and AIRPOL was not that satisfactory. Looking at the other extreme, we can see that the overall rankings of laggards like Haryana and Uttar Pradesh were influenced by their performance in sub-categories like LAND, NPSP etc. It is observed that while some major States like Madhya Pradesh (tenth) and West Bengal (ninth), placed in the lower segment, others like Gujarat (sixth) and Andhra Pradesh (seventh) had performed moderately well. Interestingly, a relatively poorer State, Orissa, obtained the fourth rank, owing to comparatively better performance in case of AIRPOL, ENERGY and WATER.

**Table 3:** Environmental Quality Scores and Ranks of the States: 1990-1996

| States         | AIRPOL<br>(1) | INDOOR<br>(2) | GHGS<br>(3) | ENERGY<br>(4) | LAND<br>(5) | WATER<br>(6) | FOREST<br>(7) | NPSP<br>(8) | EQI SCORE<br>(9) |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|
| Andhra Pradesh | 0.876 (4)     | 0.320 (11)    | 0.685 (5)   | 0.524 (8)     | 0.592 (5)   | 0.535 (6)    | 0.506 (13)    | 0.489 (8)   | 0.544 (7)        |
| Bihar          | 0.647 (8)     | 0.129 (14)    | 0.467 (11)  | 0.555 (7)     | 0.502 (10)  | 0.604 (5)    | 0.515 (12)    | 0.467 (11)  | 0.480 (11)       |
| Gujarat        | 0.432 (12)    | 0.643 (3)     | 0.617 (7)   | 0.282 (13)    | 0.616 (4)   | 0.482 (9)    | 0.594 (6)     | 0.630 (2)   | 0.545 (6)        |
| Haryana        | 0.783 (6)     | 0.574 (4)     | 0.494 (9)   | 0.450 (12)    | 0.183 (13)  | 0.381 (13)   | 0.671 (2)     | 0.333 (13)  | 0.475 (12)       |
| Karnataka      | 0.912 (1)     | 0.435 (5)     | 0.901 (1)   | 0.673 (5)     | 0.535 (7)   | 0.516 (7)    | 0.573 (9)     | 0.541 (6)   | 0.607 (2)        |
| Kerala         | 0.874 (5)     | 0.327 (10)    | 0.870 (3)   | 0.709 (3)     | 0.520 (8)   | 0.696 (3)    | 0.517 (11)    | 0.559 (5)   | 0.617 (1)        |
| Madhya Pradesh | 0.483 (11)    | 0.367 (8)     | 0.355 (13)  | 0.468 (10)    | 0.719 (1)   | 0.695 (4)    | 0.158 (14)    | 0.597 (4)   | 0.493 (10)       |
| Maharashtra    | 0.653 (7)     | 0.715 (2)     | 0.697 (4)   | 0.473 (9)     | 0.652 (2)   | 0.514 (8)    | 0.581 (8)     | 0.599 (3)   | 0.605 (3)        |
| Orissa         | 0.909 (2)     | 0.228 (12)    | 0.350 (14)  | 0.771 (1)     | 0.543 (6)   | 0.760 (1)    | 0.584 (7)     | 0.516 (7)   | 0.578 (4)        |
| Punjab         | 0.644 (9)     | 0.803 (1)     | 0.427 (12)  | 0.274 (14)    | 0.181 (14)  | 0.244 (14)   | 0.840 (1)     | 0.267 (14)  | 0.456 (13)       |
| Rajasthan      | 0.631 (10)    | 0.397 (7)     | 0.881 (2)   | 0.622 (6)     | 0.637 (3)   | 0.465 (10)   | 0.520 (10)    | 0.642 (1)   | 0.577 (5)        |
| Tamil Nadu     | 0.896 (3)     | 0.412 (6)     | 0.656 (6)   | 0.458 (11)    | 0.513 (9)   | 0.381 (12)   | 0.612 (4)     | 0.478 (10)  | 0.525 (8)        |
| Uttar Pradesh  | 0.152 (14)    | 0.222 (13)    | 0.600 (8)   | 0.682 (4)     | 0.363 (12)  | 0.447 (11)   | 0.620 (3)     | 0.478 (9)   | 0.443 (14)       |
| West Bengal    | 0.248 (13)    | 0.357 (9)     | 0.473 (10)  | 0.758 (2)     | 0.369 (11)  | 0.699 (2)    | 0.611 (5)     | 0.442 (12)  | 0.508 (9)        |

Note: figures in the parenthesis show the ranks

**Table 4** provides the EQ scores and ranking of the States for Period B. As in the earlier case, we see that Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra retained their positions at the top (although the latter two interchange their positions), while Haryana, Bihar and Punjab now turned out to be the laggards. It is observed that the toppers improved their position in certain sub-categories (Kerala in AIRPOL, INDOOR, GHGS, FOREST; Karnataka in ENERGY, FOREST etc.). However, their performance deteriorated in certain key areas as well. For instance, the lower ranking of Karnataka in AIRPOL in Period B can be explained by rapid urbanization, industrialization and vehicular pollution.<sup>16</sup> Its relative performance on WATER also raises concern. On the other hand the laggards continued to perform poorly in several sub-categories (e.g. - Punjab – AIRPOL, GHGS, ENERGY, LAND, WATER and NPSP; Bihar - AIRPOL, INDOOR, GHGS, LAND, FOREST and NPSP; Haryana – ENERGY, LAND, WATER and NPSP). Energy management and forest conservation should be the first two priority areas for environmental management in Maharashtra. For Karnataka, conservation of land and water should be priority areas for environmental management.

<sup>16</sup> In several major Karnataka cities suspended particulate matter (SPM) and respirable suspended particulate matter (RSPM) are far above the permissible limits (The Hindu, 2005, 2006).

**Table 4: Environmental Quality Scores and Ranks of the States: 1997-2004**

| States         | AIRPOL<br>(1) | INDOOR<br>(2) | GHGS<br>(3) | ENERGY<br>(4) | LAND<br>(5) | WATER<br>(6) | FOREST<br>(7) | NPSP<br>(8) | EQI SCORE<br>(9) |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|
| Andhra Pradesh | 0.802 (3)     | 0.498 (7)     | 0.553 (5)   | 0.585 (5)     | 0.617 (3)   | 0.479 (9)    | 0.781 (9)     | 0.474 (9)   | 0.580 (6)        |
| Bihar          | 0.433 (12)    | 0.141 (14)    | 0.428 (10)  | 0.574 (7)     | 0.436 (10)  | 0.675 (2)    | 0.480 (13)    | 0.422 (12)  | 0.455 (13)       |
| Gujarat        | 0.310 (13)    | 0.718 (3)     | 0.547 (6)   | 0.231 (13)    | 0.653 (1)   | 0.539 (8)    | 0.769 (10)    | 0.599 (4)   | 0.564 (7)        |
| Haryana        | 0.715 (5)     | 0.714 (4)     | 0.542 (7)   | 0.362 (10)    | 0.088 (14)  | 0.332 (13)   | 0.790 (7)     | 0.278 (14)  | 0.472 (12)       |
| Karnataka      | 0.684 (6)     | 0.610 (6)     | 0.885 (1)   | 0.679 (3)     | 0.568 (7)   | 0.465 (11)   | 0.807 (5)     | 0.563 (6)   | 0.636 (3)        |
| Kerala         | 0.791 (4)     | 0.467 (8)     | 0.882 (2)   | 0.644 (4)     | 0.534 (9)   | 0.541 (7)    | 0.942 (1)     | 0.598 (5)   | 0.656 (1)        |
| Madhya Pradesh | 0.510 (10)    | 0.453 (10)    | 0.302 (14)  | 0.349 (12)    | 0.647 (2)   | 0.689 (1)    | 0.230 (14)    | 0.627 (1)   | 0.497 (10)       |
| Maharashtra    | 0.676 (7)     | 0.771 (2)     | 0.682 (4)   | 0.428 (9)     | 0.578 (6)   | 0.606 (5)    | 0.731 (11)    | 0.615 (2)   | 0.641 (2)        |
| Orissa         | 0.823 (2)     | 0.189 (13)    | 0.381 (11)  | 0.745 (2)     | 0.612 (4)   | 0.673 (3)    | 0.864 (2)     | 0.527 (7)   | 0.593 (5)        |
| Punjab         | 0.600 (9)     | 0.812 (1)     | 0.349 (13)  | 0.211 (14)    | 0.118 (13)  | 0.273 (14)   | 0.789 (8)     | 0.279 (13)  | 0.434 (14)       |
| Rajasthan      | 0.670 (8)     | 0.459 (9)     | 0.807 (3)   | 0.564 (8)     | 0.603 (5)   | 0.470 (10)   | 0.804 (6)     | 0.614 (3)   | 0.606 (4)        |
| Tamil Nadu     | 0.949 (1)     | 0.624 (5)     | 0.376 (12)  | 0.361 (11)    | 0.567 (8)   | 0.356 (12)   | 0.842 (3)     | 0.483 (8)   | 0.555 (8)        |
| Uttar Pradesh  | 0.471 (11)    | 0.305 (12)    | 0.518 (8)   | 0.584 (6)     | 0.366 (11)  | 0.566 (6)    | 0.507 (12)    | 0.458 (10)  | 0.473 (11)       |
| West Bengal    | 0.212 (14)    | 0.417 (11)    | 0.476 (9)   | 0.794 (1)     | 0.347 (12)  | 0.610 (4)    | 0.825 (4)     | 0.422 (11)  | 0.522 (9)        |

Note: figures in the parenthesis show the ranks

We can compare the relative performance of the States on EQ scale during the two time periods looking at their ranks. It is observed that although the overall position of the better performing States remained unchanged, there had been some interesting movements of their ranking within the sub-categories. For instance, Maharashtra's rank declined in LAND and FOREST,<sup>17</sup> while it improved its performance in WATER. Karnataka had been subjected to greater variations - while its ranking improved in ENERGY and FOREST, but declined for AIRPOL, INDOOR and WATER. Kerala on the other hand improved its relative performance in a number of sub-categories (notably FOREST).<sup>18</sup> Nonetheless, its score got affected by the decline in its ranking in categories like WATER.<sup>19</sup> Looking across categories, it is observed that Punjab and Uttar Pradesh experienced a sharp decline in their ranking in case of FOREST, indicating degradation on that front.

<sup>17</sup> Rithe and Fernandes (2002) argued that Maharashtra has achieved the current level of industrialization at the cost of the loss of much of its forests. However, the findings of Kadekodi and Venkatachalam (2005) do not support this.

<sup>18</sup> Apart from the Government regulations, exporter firms increasingly adopted environment-friendly processes to comply with strict norms in export markets (e.g. - marine industries in Kochi), which had a significant positive influence on the environment of the State.

<sup>19</sup> Nair (2006) noted that depletion of the groundwater table due to indiscriminate sand mining, shrinkage in natural forest cover and reclamation of wetland and paddy fields are major environmental challenges that Kerala is facing today.

## 4.2 HDI

**Table 5** provides the HDI scores and rankings of the States in the three sub-categories and the composite index for two periods, Period A and Period B. It is observed that while for the first period, Kerala, Punjab and Maharashtra were holding the top three positions; in the second period, Haryana had replaced Maharashtra at the top three. Looking at the sub-categories, it is observed that Kerala continued to perform well in all categories. Punjab performed comfortably in terms of consumption and health, but was in the mid-level on educational attainments. Looking at the other end of the distribution, we observe that Bihar, UP and MP were consistently at the bottom for most of the categories, which in turn leads to their poor overall HDI ranking.

**Table 5: HDI Scores and Ranks of the States over the Sample Period**

| States         | Consumption     |                 | Health          |                 | Education       |                 | HDI SCORE       |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                | Period A<br>(1) | Period B<br>(2) | Period A<br>(3) | Period B<br>(4) | Period A<br>(5) | Period B<br>(6) | Period A<br>(7) | Period B<br>(8) |
| Andhra Pradesh | 0.338<br>(8)    | 0.196<br>(10)   | 0.300<br>(8)    | 0.410<br>(7)    | 0.136<br>(11)   | 0.344<br>(11)   | 0.258<br>(9)    | 0.317<br>(9)    |
| Bihar          | 0.000<br>(14)   | 0.025<br>(13)   | 0.125<br>(11)   | 0.143<br>(11)   | 0.000<br>(14)   | 0.000<br>(14)   | 0.042<br>(14)   | 0.056<br>(14)   |
| Gujarat        | 0.575<br>(5)    | 0.636<br>(4)    | 0.275<br>(9)    | 0.374<br>(9)    | 0.484<br>(4)    | 0.531<br>(4)    | 0.445<br>(6)    | 0.514<br>(6)    |
| Haryana        | 0.610<br>(3)    | 0.792<br>(3)    | 0.499<br>(4)    | 0.614<br>(3)    | 0.366<br>(8)    | 0.497<br>(6)    | 0.492<br>(4)    | 0.635<br>(3)    |
| Karnataka      | 0.295<br>(9)    | 0.402<br>(8)    | 0.466<br>(5)    | 0.481<br>(5)    | 0.371<br>(7)    | 0.478<br>(8)    | 0.377<br>(8)    | 0.454<br>(7)    |
| Kerala         | 0.831<br>(2)    | 1.000<br>(1)    | 1.000<br>(1)    | 1.000<br>(1)    | 1.000<br>(1)    | 1.000<br>(1)    | 0.944<br>(1)    | 1.000<br>(1)    |
| Madhya Pradesh | 0.052<br>(12)   | 0.000<br>(14)   | 0.000<br>(14)   | 0.000<br>(14)   | 0.165<br>(10)   | 0.396<br>(9)    | 0.072<br>(12)   | 0.132<br>(13)   |
| Maharashtra    | 0.459<br>(7)    | 0.490<br>(6)    | 0.549<br>(3)    | 0.570<br>(4)    | 0.541<br>(2)    | 0.710<br>(2)    | 0.516<br>(3)    | 0.590<br>(4)    |
| Orissa         | 0.258<br>(11)   | 0.069<br>(11)   | 0.083<br>(12)   | 0.089<br>(13)   | 0.235<br>(9)    | 0.377<br>(10)   | 0.192<br>(10)   | 0.178<br>(11)   |
| Punjab         | 1.000<br>(1)    | 0.907<br>(2)    | 0.765<br>(2)    | 0.837<br>(2)    | 0.414<br>(5)    | 0.505<br>(5)    | 0.726<br>(2)    | 0.750<br>(2)    |
| Rajasthan      | 0.294<br>(10)   | 0.307<br>(9)    | 0.241<br>(10)   | 0.312<br>(10)   | 0.038<br>(13)   | 0.317<br>(12)   | 0.191<br>(11)   | 0.312<br>(10)   |
| Tamil Nadu     | 0.489<br>(6)    | 0.583<br>(5)    | 0.366<br>(6)    | 0.454<br>(6)    | 0.517<br>(3)    | 0.658<br>(3)    | 0.457<br>(5)    | 0.565<br>(5)    |
| Uttar Pradesh  | 0.039<br>(13)   | 0.054<br>(12)   | 0.050<br>(13)   | 0.134<br>(12)   | 0.073<br>(12)   | 0.238<br>(13)   | 0.054<br>(13)   | 0.142<br>(12)   |
| West Bengal    | 0.583<br>(4)    | 0.441<br>(7)    | 0.358<br>(7)    | 0.383<br>(8)    | 0.378<br>(6)    | 0.486<br>(7)    | 0.440<br>(7)    | 0.437<br>(8)    |

Note: figures in the parenthesis show the ranks



Comparison of the relative performance of the States on HDI during the two time periods covered in our analysis shows interesting results. We observe that there had not been major changes in the overall HDI Score of the States, and in all cases their ranks changed by one unit only. Some changes in the relative positions of the States in terms of consumption can be noted, reflecting their relative growth pattern, but in case of education and health the relative positions of fifty percent of the States remained unchanged. We observe that the aggregate picture do not always show the dynamics of different components of HDI, e.g., for MP aggregate HDI Score had gone up from 0.072 to 0.132, however its consumption score had gone down from 0.052 to 0.000. A declining trend in the HDI is noticed for AP as well. For MP, since health status remained unchanged it is only the improvement in education, which had driven its HDI score up. Movement in consumption expenditure is interesting; it had gone down both for poor States like Orissa (insignificant poverty reduction over NSSO 50<sup>th</sup> (1993-94) and 55<sup>th</sup> (1999-2000) round) and moderate performers like West Bengal (9 percent poverty reduction over NSSO 50<sup>th</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> round). One reason may perhaps be that the decline in income inequality (*Gini* ratio) in these two States over 1993-94 to 1999-00 (Government of India, 2002) had been marginal.


#### 4.3 Cross-Period Analysis between HDI and EQI

**Figure 1** shows the EQI score of the States over the two periods. It is observed that while the toppers during both the periods lie in the North-Eastern corner of the diagram (Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra), the laggards are concentrated in the South-West corner (Bihar, Haryana, Punjab, UP). For Punjab, Bihar and Haryana the EQI


Score had gone down during Period B (1997-2004) as compared to the earlier period. Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal seem environmentally vulnerable, given their lower ranking in both periods.

**Figure 2** compares the HDI Scores of the States over the periods. For Orissa and West Bengal HDI Score had gone down during Period B, which is due to the fall in score of consumption expenditure. While the States characterized by high HD Score are located in the North-Eastern corner of the diagram (Punjab and Kerala), the laggards are placed in the South-West corner (Bihar, UP, MP, Orissa and Rajasthan). The condensation of States at the mid-level indicates that there exist a sharp difference in the HDI Score obtained by Kerala and Punjab and the same secured by the others.

**Figure 1:** Comparison of EQI Scores over Period



**Figure 2: Comparison of HDI Scores over Period**




4.4 EQI and HDI

**Figure 3** plots the EQI and HDI Scores of the 14 States during Period A. While the States located in the North-East corner of the Figure characterized States with both high EQI and HDI scores, States placed in South-West corner represents those with worst performance on both counts. The States positioned in the North-West corner of the figure on the other hand indicates the States performing appreciably in terms of EQI, but not in terms of HDI. We can see that Kerala and Maharashtra are clearly the top performers on both counts while Bihar and UP are located at the other extreme. Orissa and Rajasthan on the other hand had performed poorly in terms of HDI (placed below the first quartile), despite putting up a commendable performance on EQ front. Looking at the other major States it is observed that while AP had performed moderately well in terms of EQI, its accomplishment in terms of HDI

was rather limited. Other major States like Gujarat and Tamil Nadu were moderately placed on both counts. Karnataka on the other hand despite being a top performer in terms of EQI fared moderately on the HDI front (placed below the second quartile line). The HDI had been quite high for northern States like Punjab and Haryana (characterized by a vibrant agricultural and industrial sector), but they secured a lower place on the EQI scale, primarily owing to overexploitation of natural resources.<sup>20</sup>


**Figure 3: HDI Score Vs. EQI Score (1990-1996)**



<sup>20</sup> Sidhu (2002) notes that in Punjab more than nine lakh tube wells are being supplied electricity free of cost, leading to indiscriminate use. This in turn is causing underground water to deplete at a rate of 23 centimeter per annum, which in future would require submersible pumps to be installed, meaning that only rich farmers could afford to bear the expenditure. Apart from severe environmental consequences, this is expected to fuel rural inequality further. Bhullar and Sidhu (2006) have also reported disregard to environmental sustainability for short run income and productivity gain in Punjab, which has resulted in overexploitation of land and water resources.

**Figure 4** plots the EQI and HDI Scores of the States in Period B. It is observed that while Kerala retained its position in the North-East corner, no other State is placed in that region. Haryana, a top performer on HDI front, had marginally improved its score on EQI but still retains its position among the poor performers on EQI ladder. Punjab, another top performer in HDI, experienced a decline in EQI score. Looking at the South-West corner, we can see that while the EQI score had declined for Bihar, it had marginally increased for MP and UP. Moreover, Orissa maintained its position in the North-West corner, with a marginal increased in its EQI. AP and Rajasthan had improved their performance both in EQI and HDI substantially. All the middle HDI category States improved their performance in EQI during Period B. Maharashtra fell back to middle HDI category and stood with Karnataka (below the second quartile line). Broadly, the relationship between EQI Score and HDI Score is found to be slanting N-shaped owing to the divergence in performance of toppers like Punjab, Haryana and Kerala.

**Figure 4:** HDI Score Vs. EQI Score: 1997-2004




#### 4.5 EQI and PCNSDP

**Figure 5** plots the EQI Scores and PCNSDP of the States during Period A, which suggests a convex relationship between the two. It is observed that Maharashtra, placed in the North-East corner, is the only State to perform equally well in both categories. UP on the other hand, performed poorly on both counts. Orissa, despite a poor performance in terms of EG (placed below the first quartile), had fared moderately on EQI front. On the opposite end of this group there are Punjab and Haryana, who despite being better performers in terms of EG (placed above the third quartile), can be clubbed with UP in terms of EQI achievements. Kerala and Karnataka, despite being toppers in terms of EQI are on the other hand found to be performing moderately in terms of EG. West Bengal and Tamil Nadu were however mediocre in both respects. It is observed that Punjab and Haryana had grown at the cost of their environmental sustainability.


**Figure 6** plots the EQI scores and PCNSDP of the States during Period B, again indicating a convex relationship. Maharashtra still maintains its top position on both counts. Bihar and MP on the other hand can now be clubbed with UP at the other extreme. Despite improvement in EQI Score, Orissa still remained at the bottom in terms of EG (i.e., below the first quartile line). Likewise, Punjab and Haryana maintained their location in the South-East corner of the Figure. Karnataka, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh had higher EQI scores, but are placed among the medium income States. Interestingly, Rajasthan had improved its position both in terms of EQI and EG. West Bengal and Tamil Nadu, who more or less retained their positions, were the laggards

among middle income States.<sup>21</sup> Except Orissa, the performance of the low income States generally had deteriorated.

**Figure 5: PCNSDP Vs. EQI Score: 1990-1996**



**Figure 6: PCNSDP Vs. EQI Score: 1997-2004**



<sup>21</sup> While Tamil Nadu needs to control industrial pollution (Mukherjee and Nelliya, 2006; Appasamy et al., undated); tackling groundwater arsenic contamination in the rural belt is a major policy challenge for West Bengal (JU, 2006).

#### 4.6 Testing the Existence of the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC)

For testing the EKC hypothesis, multivariate OLS regression models are estimated for individual environmental groups. Different variants of the models are estimated by assuming a non-linearity between PCNSDP and EQ. Apart from PCNSDP (in Rs. thousand at constant 1993-94 Prices); various other explanatory variables are introduced to capture the dynamic aspects of EQ. **Tables 6a** and **6b** present the regression results which show a mixed picture: while non-linearity exist for a number of environmental groups like ENERGY, GHGS, LAND, NPS; linear relationship is observed for other groups like INDOOR, WATER and FOREST (See **Appendix 4** for graphical representation of the obtained relationships between PCNSDP and various environmental groups). Similarly, with respect to controlling variables, it is observed that share of primary sector in GSDP (PRISHARE)<sup>22</sup> is negatively related to ENERGY, LAND, NPS and FOREST. This is because with the fall in share of primary sector in GSDP; pressure on land, water and forest resources goes down and EQ improves. With the rise in share of secondary sector in GSDP (SECSHARE),<sup>23</sup> ENRGY score falls and the same for WATER increases and as the share of tertiary sector improves, the scores of GHGs and WATER increase. The results imply that composition of income of a State has substantial impacts on its environmental quality. Increased share of workers in agriculture (AGRWRK) shows a mixed trend (positive for GHGS, INDOOR and NPS etc. and negative for LAND and AIRPOL). Population density (POPD) and level of urbanisation (URB) is generally showing a negative relationship with EQ.

<sup>22</sup> Percentage share of Primary Sector in GSDP (at constant 1993-94 Prices), which includes Agriculture, Forestry and Logging and Fishing.

<sup>23</sup> Secondary sector includes Mining and Quarrying, Manufacturing and Construction.

**Table 6a:** Testing the Existence of the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC)  
(Number of observations: 28)

| Dependent Variable                | ENERGY                | ENERGY                | ENERGY                | GHGS                  | GHGS                  | GHGS                   | INDOOR                | INDOOR                | INDOOR | LAND   | LAND   | LAND   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Explanatory Variable              | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                 | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff. | Coeff. | Coeff. | Coeff. |
| Constant                          | 0.2827<br>(0.1782)    | 0.9792 *<br>(0.245)   | -0.7672 *<br>(0.2798) | -1.0282 *<br>(0.2474) | -0.1426 *<br>(0.0439) | 0.1144 *<br>(0.0575)   | 1.5019 *<br>(0.105)   | 1.6652 *<br>(0.1515)  |        |        |        |        |
| PCNSDP                            | 0.0794 *<br>(0.0352)  | 0.0725 *<br>(0.0418)  |                       |                       | 0.0440 *<br>(0.0101)  | 0.0245 *<br>(0.0117)   | -0.0389 *<br>(0.0062) | -0.0439 *<br>(0.0068) |        |        |        |        |
| PCNSDP^2                          | -0.0059 *<br>(0.0019) | -0.0053 *<br>(0.002)  | 0.0102 *<br>(0.0024)  | 0.0072 *<br>(0.0033)  | 0.0010 *<br>(0.0006)  | 0.0018 *<br>(0.0007)   |                       |                       |        |        |        |        |
| PCNSDP^3                          |                       |                       | -0.0006 *<br>(0.0002) | -0.0005 *<br>(0.0002) |                       |                        |                       |                       |        |        |        |        |
| PRISHARE                          |                       | -0.0087 *<br>(0.0033) |                       |                       |                       |                        | -0.0162 *<br>(0.0022) | -0.0143 *<br>(0.002)  |        |        |        |        |
| SECSHARE                          |                       | -0.0136 *<br>(0.0055) |                       |                       |                       |                        |                       |                       |        |        |        |        |
| TERSHARE                          |                       |                       | 0.0184 *<br>(0.0041)  | 0.0183 *<br>(0.0036)  |                       |                        |                       |                       |        |        |        |        |
| POP                               | 0.0002 *<br>(0.0001)  |                       |                       |                       |                       | -0.0001 *<br>(0.00003) | -0.0003 *<br>(0.0001) | -0.0005 *<br>(0.0001) |        |        |        |        |
| AGRWRK                            |                       |                       | 0.0066 *<br>(0.0034)  | 0.0103 *<br>(0.003)   | 0.0030 *<br>(0.0006)  |                        |                       | -0.0038 *<br>(0.002)  |        |        |        |        |
| NAGRWRK                           |                       |                       |                       | 0.0072 *<br>(0.0037)  |                       |                        |                       |                       |        |        |        |        |
| Adj. R <sup>2</sup>               | <b>0.495</b>          | <b>0.524</b>          | <b>0.264</b>          | <b>0.315</b>          | <b>0.955</b>          | <b>0.941</b>           | <b>0.749</b>          | <b>0.774</b>          |        |        |        |        |
| F-Stat                            | 9.823                 | 8.431                 | 3.427                 | 3.478                 | 192.002               | 145.550                | 27.799                | 24.053                |        |        |        |        |
| D-W Stat                          | 2.104                 | 1.882                 | 1.873                 | 1.690                 | 2.069                 | 2.105                  | 1.679                 | 1.900                 |        |        |        |        |
| 1st Turning Point<br>(in Rs. 000) | 6.729                 | 6.840                 | 11.333                | 9.600                 | N.A.                  | N.A.                   | N.A.                  | N.A.                  |        |        |        |        |

Note: Figure in the parenthesis shows the White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors

\* - implies coefficient is significant at most at 0.10 level.

N.A. - implies not applicable

**Table 6b:** Testing the Existence of the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC)  
(Number of observations: 28)

| Dependent Variable   | NPS                   | NPS                   | WATER                 | WATER                 | WATER                 | FOREST                | FOREST                | FOREST | AIRPOL |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| Explanatory Variable | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff.                | Coeff. | Coeff. |
| Constant             | 0.9442 *<br>(0.0991)  | 0.8553 *<br>(0.084)   | 0.2996 *<br>(0.1683)  | 1.0884 *<br>(0.0969)  | -0.0640<br>(0.214)    | 1.0679 *<br>(0.2948)  | 1.5312 *<br>(0.2477)  |        |        |
| PCNSDP               | -0.0172 *<br>(0.0043) |                       | -0.0331 *<br>(0.0064) | -0.0353 *<br>(0.0043) | 0.0724 *<br>(0.017)   | 0.0715 *<br>(0.0205)  | -0.0197<br>(0.0118)   |        |        |
| PCNSDP^2             |                       | -0.0009 *<br>(0.0002) |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |        |        |
| PRISHARE             |                       | -0.0123 *<br>(0.0013) |                       | -0.0075 *<br>(0.0022) |                       | -0.0116 *<br>(0.0054) |                       |        |        |
| SECSHARE             |                       |                       | 0.0058 *<br>(0.003)   |                       |                       |                       |                       |        |        |
| TERSHARE             |                       |                       | 0.0089 *<br>(0.0029)  |                       | 0.0132 *<br>(0.0045)  |                       |                       |        |        |
| POP                  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       | -0.0007 *<br>(0.0002) |        |        |
| URB                  |                       |                       |                       |                       | -0.0202 *<br>(0.0076) | -0.0265 *<br>(0.0113) |                       |        |        |
| AGRWRK               | 0.0031 *<br>(0.0014)  | 0.0031 *<br>(0.0014)  |                       |                       |                       |                       | -0.0130 *<br>(0.0036) |        |        |
| Adj. R <sup>2</sup>  | <b>0.591</b>          | <b>0.597</b>          | <b>0.490</b>          | <b>0.502</b>          | <b>0.425</b>          | <b>0.393</b>          | <b>0.273</b>          |        |        |
| F-Stat               | 13.979                | 14.338                | 9.649                 | 14.583                | 7.646                 | 6.820                 | 4.378                 |        |        |
| D-W Stat             | 1.282                 | 1.283                 | 1.323                 | 1.245                 | 1.557                 | 1.590                 | 2.156                 |        |        |

Note: Figure in the parenthesis shows the White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors

\* - implies coefficient is significant at most at 0.10 level.

#### 4.7 Relationship between HDI Score and Individual Environmental Groups

For analyzing the relationship between the HDI score and composite indicator of individual environmental groups, we estimate different specifications of multivariate OLS regression models by assuming the presence of non-linearity. In addition, apart from HDI score, various other explanatory variables are introduced. From **Tables 7a** and **7b**, summarizing the regression results for different variants of the models, it is observed that non-linearity exist for all the eight environmental groups (See **Appendix 5** for graphical representation of the obtained relationships between HDI score and various environmental groups). The results show that investment in human development will have both direct and cumulative impacts on the natural resources conservation. In addition, with respect to controlling variables, it is observed that share of primary sector in GSDP (PRISHARE) is negatively related to most of the environmental groups, but positively related to INDOOR. The exception can be explained by the fact that the fall in PRISHARE leads to sophistication in domestic energy use, thereby improving INDOOR. With the rise in share of secondary sector in GSDP (SECSHARE), ENRGY and WATER score fall and the same for LAND and NPS increase. As the share of tertiary sector improves, the scores of GHGs, LAND and NPS improve. The findings indicate that composition of income of a State significantly influence its EQ. Like the EKC result, increased share of workers in agriculture (AGRWRK) shows a mixed trend (positive for FOREST, GHGS and INDOOR and negative for AIRPOL). Share of workers in non-agriculture (NAGRWRK) is negatively related to AIRPOL. Population density (POPD) generally shows a negative relationship with EQ (exception: ENERGY). The relationship between level of urbanisation (URB) and EQ however shows a mixed trend (positive for INDOOR, LAND and NPS and negative for ENERGY and FOREST).

**Table 7a: Relationship between HDI and Environmental Quality** (Number of observations: 28)

| Dependent Variable   | AIR                   | ENERGY                | ENERGY                | ENERGY                | FOREST                | GHGS                  | INDOOR               | INDOOR |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Explanatory Variable | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                | Coef.  |
| Constant             | 1.4445<br>(0.2587) *  | 1.4238<br>(0.3788) *  | 0.1977<br>(0.0919) *  | 0.3321<br>(0.1214) *  | -1.0008<br>(0.254) *  | -0.1518<br>(0.1536)   | -0.0311<br>(0.122)   |        |
| HDI                  | 4.2322<br>(1.3751) *  | 2.7629<br>(1.2293) *  | 3.2469<br>(0.648) *   | 1.3688<br>(0.69)      | 3.0151<br>(0.9611) *  |                       |                      |        |
| HDI^2                | -7.2035<br>(2.8178) * | -5.8169<br>(2.7605) * | -8.8858<br>(1.5277) * | -1.3020<br>(0.5882) * | -6.1352<br>(2.2971) * | 1.7530<br>(0.4173) *  | 2.2598<br>(0.436) *  |        |
| HDI^3                | 5.0476<br>(1.8388)    | 3.3176<br>(1.751)     | 5.8978<br>(1.0053) *  |                       | 3.9813<br>(1.4975) *  | -1.5379<br>(0.4299) * | -1.9498<br>(0.437) * |        |
| PRISHARE             |                       | -0.0127<br>(0.0049)   |                       |                       |                       | 0.0062<br>(0.0025) *  |                      |        |
| SECSHARE             |                       | -0.0188<br>(0.0071) * |                       |                       |                       |                       |                      |        |
| TERSHARE             |                       |                       |                       |                       | 0.0172<br>(0.0045) *  |                       |                      |        |
| POPD                 | -0.0003<br>(0.0002)   |                       | 0.0003<br>(0.0001) *  |                       |                       | -0.0002<br>(0.0001) * | -0.0001<br>(0.0001)  |        |
| URB                  |                       | -0.0123<br>(0.0067)   |                       | -0.0112<br>(0.0063)   |                       | 0.0127<br>(0.0038) *  | 0.0077<br>(0.0027) * |        |
| AGRWRK               | -0.0078<br>(0.0037) * |                       |                       | 0.0097<br>(0.0056)    |                       | 0.0118<br>(0.0025) *  | 0.0039<br>(0.0017) * |        |
| NAGRWRK              | -0.0330<br>(0.0078) * |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |                      |        |
| Adj. R <sup>2</sup>  | <b>0.5425</b>         | <b>0.5455</b>         | <b>0.4904</b>         | <b>0.4291</b>         | <b>0.4317</b>         | <b>0.8375</b>         | <b>0.8359</b>        |        |
| F-stat               | 6.3366                | 6.4004                | 7.4961                | 6.0731                | 5.1022                | 28.8319               | 28.5053              |        |
| D-W stat             | 2.2089                | 1.3008                | 1.7509                | 1.9056                | 1.4486                | 1.5498                | 1.6831               |        |

Note: Figure in the parenthesis shows the White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors  
\* - implies coefficient is significant at most at 0.10 level.

**Table 7b: Relationship between HDI Score and Environmental Quality**  
(Number of observations: 28)

| Dependent Variable   | LAND                  | LAND                  | LAND                  | NPS                   | NPS                   | WATER                 | WATER                 |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Explanatory Variable | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 | Coef.                 |
| Constant             | -0.3019<br>(0.1865)   | 1.2517 *<br>(0.0836)  | -0.0512<br>(0.0959)   | 0.7769 *<br>(0.1097)  | 0.8395 *<br>(0.0807)  | 1.0513 *<br>(0.2165)  | 1.0513 *<br>(0.2165)  |
| HDI ^ 2              | -2.9027 *<br>(0.7745) | -2.2677 *<br>(0.3768) | -1.7022 *<br>(0.2622) | -1.8293 *<br>(0.3335) | -1.8201 *<br>(0.3755) | -1.5433 *<br>(0.5667) | -1.5433 *<br>(0.5667) |
| HDI ^ 3              | 2.7043 *<br>(0.755)   | 2.2011 *<br>(0.3627)  | 1.685 *<br>(0.2704)   | 1.7538 *<br>(0.3223)  | 1.749 *<br>(0.4138)   | 1.4337 *<br>(0.6239)  | 1.4337 *<br>(0.6239)  |
| PRISHARE             |                       | -0.0147 *<br>(0.0022) |                       | -0.0083 *<br>(0.0018) | -0.0053 *<br>(0.002)  | -0.0081 *<br>(0.0037) | -0.0081 *<br>(0.0037) |
| SECSHARE             | 0.0139 *<br>(0.0046)  |                       | 0.014 *<br>(0.0021)   |                       |                       | -0.0057<br>(0.0055)   | -0.0057<br>(0.0055)   |
| TERSHARE             | 0.0114 *<br>(0.004)   |                       | 0.0077 *<br>(0.002)   |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| POPD                 |                       | -0.0003<br>(0.0001)   |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
| URB                  | 0.0072<br>(0.0051)    |                       |                       | 0.0049<br>(0.0029)    |                       |                       |                       |
| Adj. R <sup>2</sup>  | <b>0.627</b>          | <b>0.758</b>          | <b>0.660</b>          | <b>0.642</b>          | <b>0.374</b>          | <b>0.370</b>          | <b>0.370</b>          |
| F-stat               | 10.085                | 22.178                | 14.106                | 13.117                | 6.377                 | 4.972                 | 4.972                 |
| D-W stat             | 1.640                 | 2.228                 | 2.077                 | 1.847                 | 1.878                 | 1.877                 | 1.877                 |

Note: Figure in the parenthesis shows the White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors  
\* - implies coefficient is significant at most at 0.10 level.

#### 4.8 The Changing Perspective

**Table 8** highlights the evolving economic growth-EQ-HDI profile of the States. The overall growing trend of the Indian economy has been reflected here at the State level as well, and barring the exception of laggards like Bihar, Orissa and UP, all other States have registered a growth rate higher than 6 percent. Although Rajasthan has registered a high growth rate, it has started from a low base. It is observed that Bihar, Punjab and Madhya Pradesh have achieved their economic growth at the cost of their environmental quality. On the other hand, States like Karnataka and Rajasthan have achieved high economic growth, at the same time maintaining their environmental quality. It is observed that Punjab, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh show a comparable level of economic growth (6.5 to 6.7 %); but while Kerala and AP have positive changes in EQ score, the same for Punjab is negative. On the other hand, although UP, Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan and Karnataka, have achieved different levels of economic growth, the changes in environmental quality is quite similar for these four States.

The last column of **Table 8** enables us to compare the economic growth-HDI scenario for the States. It is observed that high economic growth of West Bengal did not result in incremental benefits of human well-being. Both for Orissa and West Bengal, economic growth actually has negative impacts on incremental benefits of human development. On the other hand, high economic growth of Haryana, Tamil Nadu and Rajasthan has left significant impact on their human well-being. Interestingly, the impact of economic growth on incremental benefits of HD is minimum for Bihar and Punjab, who are placed at polar opposite ends on the economic growth scale. While for Bihar a vicious cycle is most likely at work, it seems Punjab has reached a plateau on HD front and a major effort is required for ensuring further benefits.

Comparing the change in HDI and EQI Score, Mukherjee and Chakraborty (2007) observed that for Karnataka, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and UP a comparable level of change in EQI score is observed at various level of changes in HDI. Gujarat and Orissa have achieved a comparable level of change in EQI, but with a positive and negative change in HDI respectively. For Orissa and West Bengal, though change in HDI is negative, they have witnessed positive changes in EQI. The opposite is true for Bihar, Punjab and Haryana. MP and Kerala witnessed a comparable level of change in HDI score.

**Table 8:** Economic Growth, Change in Environmental Quality and Change in Human Development

| States         | Average GSDP at Constant Prices: 1993-94 to 1996-97 (in Rs. Lakh) | Average GSDP at Constant Prices: 1997-98 to 2000-01 (in Rs. Lakh) | Annual Exponential GSDP Growth Rate* | Difference in EQ Scores (Period A to Period B) <sup>§</sup> | Difference in HDI Scores (Period A to Period B) <sup>#</sup> |
|----------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| (1)            | (2)   | (3)   | (4)                                  | (5)   | (6)  |
| Andhra Pradesh | 6,312,953   | 7,707,798   | 6.7                                  | 0.036   | 0.059  |
| Bihar          | 2,421,359   | 2,832,840   | 5.2                                  | -0.025  | 0.014  |
| Gujarat        | 5,961,594   | 7,451,784   | 7.4                                  | 0.019   | 0.069  |
| Haryana        | 2,429,864   | 3,011,469   | 7.2                                  | -0.002  | 0.143  |
| Karnataka      | 4,523,392   | 6,225,243   | 10.6                                 | 0.029   | 0.076  |
| Kerala         | 2,887,629   | 3,520,175   | 6.6                                  | 0.039   | 0.056  |
| Madhya Pradesh | 4,066,861   | 4,870,160   | 6.0                                  | 0.004   | 0.060  |
| Maharashtra    | 12,415,228  | 15,502,773  | 7.4                                  | 0.037   | 0.074  |
| Orissa         | 1,912,394   | 2,212,770   | 4.9                                  | 0.014   | -0.014   |
| Punjab         | 3,215,978   | 3,909,562   | 6.5                                  | -0.021  | 0.023  |
| Rajasthan      | 3,914,937   | 5,151,492   | 9.1                                  | 0.029   | 0.120  |
| Tamil Nadu     | 6,498,542   | 8,283,152   | 8.1                                  | 0.030   | 0.108  |
| Uttar Pradesh  | 8,787,154   | 10,249,185  | 5.1                                  | 0.030   | 0.088  |
| West Bengal    | 5,933,398   | 7,832,031   | 9.3                                  | 0.014   | -0.003   |

Source: EPWRF (2003)

Note: \* - implies growth rate of a state =  $(\ln(\text{GSDP Period A}) - \ln(\text{GSDP Period B})) / 3 * 100$   
 $\$$  - Difference in Environmental Quality Index (EQI) Score has been computed from Column 9 (Table 4) – Column 9 (Table 3).  
 $\#$  - Difference in Human Development Index (HDI) Score has been computed from Table 5, Column 8 – Column 7.

The changing dynamics gives rise to a slanting N-shaped relationship between change in HDI and change in EQI. This particular shape of the curve originates from the similarity in incremental HD or EQ benefits experienced by dissimilar States in terms of EQ or HD achievements. In other words, the result indicates that state specific factors have a major role to play in determining the EQ scenario.

## 5. Discussion

A number of developing countries located in Asia, Africa and Latin America witnessed economic stagnation or crisis during eighties, and had to undergo structural adjustment in the subsequent period, either unilaterally or as part of policy package offered by external development agencies. Given the focus on growth in the short run, many developing countries created little room to accommodate environmental and natural resource concerns in their economic policy. A similar picture emerges if one analyses the cross-region scenario within a country as well. However, despite the attempts by various studies to evaluate different environmental parameters, determination of a composite overall environmental quality index is still lacking. The current study makes an attempt to bridge that gap by constructing an index of EQ for Indian States by using 63 environmental indicators.

Based on inter- and intra-sectoral differences in economic activities, different States in India in the post-1991 period have different levels of stress on their natural resources. To understand the impacts of economic growth on environmental quality, the current analysis first



constructs the environmental quality index for the 14 major Indian States and look for its possible relationship with economic growth. This paper also attempts to capture the relationship between environmental sustainability and human well-being – as measured by the Human Development Index. To capture the temporal aspects of environmental quality and to understand the dynamics of economic liberalization process, the entire period of our study has been divided into two broad time periods – Period A (1990-1996) and Period B (1997-2004).

It is observed that different States possess different strengths and weaknesses in managing various aspects of EQ. For instance, while Maharashtra is in the second position in terms of EQI during period B, and fares satisfactorily in terms of INDOOR and NPSP; its performance on ENERGY and FOREST is not that satisfactory. On the other hand, Punjab, the state at the bottom in terms of overall EQI and ENERGY and WATER, is actually topper for INDOOR. It also shows that there are scopes for the States to learn from each other about different aspects of environmental management. Therefore, adoption of a 'one-size-fits-all' National Environmental Policy at the country-level might have limited impact on the local environmental quality. In other words, individual States should adopt environmental management practices based on their local (at the most disaggregated level) environmental information. Furthermore, over time performance of an individual State varies across the environmental criteria, which shows that environmental management practices should take into account this dynamic nature of environment, and review their environmental status or achievement regularly.

The analysis on the relationship between economic growth and EQ does not reveal a very clear picture during the two time periods under consideration. For different States, the impacts of economic restructuring process, as adopted by them during 1990s, have affected the environmental quality differently. It is observed that while States like Maharashtra has performed well on both counts, growth in northern States like Punjab and Haryana has taken place mostly at the cost of EQ. On the other hand Orissa, despite being a low-income State, performed well during both period A and B in terms of EQ. The results indicate that laggards like Bihar and MP have also achieved their economic growth at the cost of their EQ. On the other hand a few States like Karnataka and Rajasthan have achieved economic growth and also maintained their environment well. The obtained results again indicate that individual States should adopt special environmental measures, based on their environmental impacts assessment of major economic activities, to achieve sustainable economic growth.

The formal testing for the existence of Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) through multivariate OLS regression models are estimated by assuming non-linearity in the relationship between PCNSDP and the composite score of the defined environmental sub-categories. It is observed that while for a few categories an inverted U-shaped relationship exists between PCNSDP and individual indicator of environmental quality (e.g. – GHGS, LAND, ENERGY, NPS),<sup>24</sup> a linear

---

<sup>24</sup> However it goes against the popular EKC hypothesis, which shows inverted U-shaped relationship between PCI and environmental degradation (pollution) instead of environmental quality.

relationship exist for other categories (INDOOR, WATER, FOREST) and no relationship in case of AIRPOL. The absence of the EKC in the Indian framework can be explained by the mixed performance of the States across environmental groups – e.g., worse EQ for economically advanced Punjab and better EQ for economically lagging Orissa.

Estimation of multivariate OLS regression models between individual EQ Scores and HDI Score indicate presence of non-linear relationships (in most cases, slanting N-shaped and parabolic in case of FOREST). The results originate from the concentration of several States in low HDI-Low EQ category (Bihar, UP) and high EQ-mid HDI category (AP, Rajasthan) on one hand, and presence of the outliers like Orissa (high EQ-Low HDI) on one hand and Punjab and Haryana (high HDI-Low EQ) on the other. The result indicates the need to re-examine the methodology for calculating the HD achievements of the States. Perhaps, the HD ranking of States like Punjab and Haryana has been influenced too heavily by their high per capita consumption expenditure. Broad-basing the HD index by incorporating other social achievements might reveal interesting results.

A few policy issues need to be highlighted here. First, the increment in HD indicators and economic growth can effectively increase the demand for a better environment, and therefore provide a demand side solution to the problem of environmental sustainability. Second, in contrary to popular belief, industrial pollution is not the source of all the problems. In Punjab and Haryana, it seems that the thrust on agriculture is increasingly becoming a serious concern. Third, given

the need to arrive at local State-level solutions, there seems to be enough scope to involve local communities with direct interest in certain initiatives (e.g. - JFM). Fourth, it is difficult to comment on the choice of optimal level of income and its composition for a State, which would be in line with the objective of sustainable development. For instance, we observe a high level of EQ for a poor State like Orissa, which clearly is a result of unutilised resources. Fifth, as has been observed, improved governance can play a key role (e.g. – Supreme Court intervention) in ensuring sustainable development, and there is increasing need for implementing that in environmentally vulnerable States. Finally, here we focus only on the economic growth of the Indian States during the two periods (1990-96 and 1997-2004) and look into its relationship with EQ. However, income inequality varies across Indian States and it has often been observed that inequality has increased in the post-reform period (Deaton and Dreze, 2002). An area of future research can be to analyse the relationship between income inequality of the States, their EQ and HD achievements.

Finally, a few limitations of the study are as follows. We have confined our analysis only to 14 major Indian States, the constraint being the availability of various secondary environmental information for both the time periods under consideration. Given the fact that a number of Indian States are currently in the process of preparing their environmental profile, one future area of research would be to extend the analysis to the remaining States. The analysis can be further extended by dividing the post-1997 period into more sub-groups, as permitted by availability of newer data points.

## References

- Adriaanse, A. (1993), "Environmental Policy Performance Indicators: A Study of the Development of Indicators for Environmental Policy in the Netherlands", SDU Publishers, The Hague.
- Adriaanse, A., D. Bryant, A.L. Hammond, E. Rodeburg, and R. Woodward (1995), "Environmental Indicators: A Systematic Approach to Measuring and Reporting on Environmental Policy Performance in the Context of Sustainable Development", World Resources Institute, Washington D.C.
- Agarwal, M and S. Samanta (2006), "Structural adjustment, governance, economic growth and social progress", *Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 387 – 401.
- Andreoni, J. and A. Levinson (2001), "The simple analytics of the Environmental Kuznets curve", *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 80, No.1, pp. 269–286.
- Antony, M. J. (2001), "Landmark Judgements on Environmental Protection", Indian Social Institute, New Delhi.
- Appasamy, P., P. Nellyyat, N. Jayakumar and R. Manivasagan (undated), "Economic Assessment of Environmental Damage: A Case Study of Industrial Water Pollution in Tiruppur", Environmental Economics Research Committee Working Paper Series: IPP-1, available at [http://coe.mse.ac.in/eercrep/fullrep/ipp/IPP\\_FR\\_Paul\\_Appasamy.pdf](http://coe.mse.ac.in/eercrep/fullrep/ipp/IPP_FR_Paul_Appasamy.pdf).
- Baldwin, R. (1995), "Does sustainability require growth?", in Goldin, I. and Winters, L.A. (Eds.): *The Economics of Sustainable Development*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 19–47.
- Balooni, K. (2002), "Participatory Forest Management in India - An Analysis of Policy Trends amid Management Change", Policy Trend Report 2002: 88-113, The Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), Japan, available at [www.iges.or.jp/en/fc/pdf/report5/PTR0207.pdf](http://www.iges.or.jp/en/fc/pdf/report5/PTR0207.pdf).
- Bhandari, Laveesh and Aarti Khare (2002), "The Geography of Post-1991 India Economy", *Global Business Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 321-340.
- Bhattacharyya, B. (1999), "Non-Tariff Measures on Indian Exports: An Assessment", Occasional Paper No. 16, Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, New Delhi.
- Bhullar, A.S. and R.S. Sidhu (2006), "Integrated Land and Water Use: A Case Study of Punjab", *Economic and Political Weekly*, December 30, pp. 5353-5357.
- Boyce, J.K. (2003), "Inequality and Environmental Protection", Working Paper Series No. 52, Political Economy Research Institute, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Brandon, Carter and Kirsten Hommann (1995), "The Cost of Inaction: Valuing the Economy-Wide Cost of Environmental Degradation in India", paper presented at the "Modelling Global Sustainability" conference held in United Nations University, Tokyo, October 1995.
- Bruvoll, A. and Medin, H. (2003) "Factors behind the environmental Kuznets curve: A decomposition of the changes in air pollution", *Environmental and Resource Economics*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 27–48.
- Carson, R.T., Y. Jeon, and D. R. McCubbin (1997) "The relationship between air pollution emissions and income: US data", *Environment and Development Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 433–450.
- Centre for Science and Environment (CSE), "State of India's Environment", various issues of Citizen's Reports, New Delhi.
- Chakraborty, P. and J. Singh (2005), "Leather Bound: A Comprehensive Guide for SMEs", The Energy and Resources Institute, New Delhi.
- Chaturvedi, Sachin and Gunjan Nagpal (2002), "WTO and Product related Environmental Standards: Emerging Issues and Policy Options before India", *RIS Discussion Paper No. 36*, New Delhi.
- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (Undated), "Global Biodiversity Outlook, United Nations Environment Program", Montreal, Quebec, Canada, available at <http://www.biodiv.org/gbo/annex.asp?ann=1>
- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (undated), "Case study on Joint Forest Management (JFM) as an example of non-monetary positive incentive", available at [www.biodiv.org/doc/case-studies/inc/cs-inc-india-forest-en.doc](http://www.biodiv.org/doc/case-studies/inc/cs-inc-india-forest-en.doc).
- Costantini, V. and M. Salvatore (2006), "Environment, Human Development and Economic Growth", The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Note di Lavoro Series, February 2006, available at <http://www.feem.it/NR/rdonlyres/CA11D877-29E3-462F-A591-7738FBD508F0/1891/3506.pdf>

Dam, S. (2004), "Green Laws for Better Health: The Past that was and the Future that may be – Reflections from the Indian Experience", *Georgetown International Environmental Law Review*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 593-615.

Dasgupta, P. (2001), "*Human Well-Being and the Natural Environment*", Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Dastidar, Avishek G. (2006), "Maharashtra 'outsources' toxic e-waste to Delhi", *Hindustan Times*, December 30.

Deaton, A. and J. Dreze (2002), "Poverty and Inequality in India: A Re-Examination", *Economic and Political Weekly*, September 7, pp. 3729-3748.

de Bruyn, S.M., J.C.J.M. van den Berg and J.B. Opschoor (1998) "Economic growth and emissions: reconsidering the empirical basis of Environmental Kuznets Curve", *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 161–175.

Dietzenbacher, Erik and Kakali Mukhopadhyay (2007), "An Empirical Examination of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis for India: Towards a Green Leontief Paradox?", *Environmental and Resource Economics*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 427-449.

Dinda, S. (2004), "Environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis: a survey", *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 431–455.

Divan, Shyam and Armin Rosencranz (2002), "*Environmental Law and Policy in India: Cases, Materials and Statutes*", Second Edition, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Dutt, A. K. and J.M. Rao (1996), "Growth, Distribution, and the Environment: Sustainable Development in India", *World Development*, Vol. 24, No. 2. pp. 287-305.

Ebert, Udo and Heinz Welsch (2004), "Meaningful environmental indices: a social choice approach", *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 47, pp. 270–283.

EPWRF (2003), "Domestic Product of State of India: 1960–1961 to 2000–2001", Database Software, Economic and Political Weekly Research Foundation, Mumbai.

Eskeland, G.S. and A.E. Harrison (2003), "Moving to greener pastures? Multinationals and the pollution haven hypothesis", *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 70, No. 1, pp. 1-23.

Esty, D.C., M.A. Levy, T. Srebotnjak, A. de Sherbinin, C.H. Kim and B. Anderson (2006), "*Pilot 2006 Environmental Performance Index*", Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy and Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), available at [http://www.yale.edu/epi/2006EPI\\_Report\\_Full.pdf](http://www.yale.edu/epi/2006EPI_Report_Full.pdf)

Esty, D.C., M. A. Levy, T. Srebotnjak and A. de Sherbinin (2005), "*2005 Environmental Sustainability Index: Benchmarking National Environmental Stewardship*", Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, New Haven.

Esty, D.C. and M.E. Porter (2001-02), "*Ranking National Environmental Regulation and Performance: A Leading Indicator of Future Competitiveness?*", Chapter 2.1, p. 78-100, Harvard Business School, Global Competitiveness Report, available at [http://www.isc.hbs.edu/GCR\\_20012002\\_Environment.pdf](http://www.isc.hbs.edu/GCR_20012002_Environment.pdf)

Gallagher, K.P (2004), "*Free Trade and the Environment: Mexico, NAFTA, and Beyond*", available at <http://ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/rp/NAFTAEnviroKGAmerProgSep04.pdf>

Ginkel, Hans van, Brendan Barrett, Julius Court and Jerry Velasquez (edited) (2001), "*Human Development and the Environment: Challenges for the United Nations in the New Millennium*", United Nations University Press, Tokyo, Japan.

Gamper-Rabindran, Shanti and Shreyasi Jha (2004), "*Environmental Impact of India's Trade Liberalization*", available at <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN024230.pdf>

Garg, A. and P.R. Shukla (2002), "*Emission Inventory of India*", Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi.

Ghosh, Madhusudan (2006), "Economic Growth and Human Development in Indian States", *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 29, pp. 3321-3329.

Government of India (2002), Planning Commission, "*National Human Development Report, 2001*", March 2002.

Grossman, G.M. and Krueger, A.B. (1995), "Economic growth and the environment", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 110, No. 2, pp. 353–378.

Guha, A. and D. Chakraborty (2003), "Relative Positions of Human Development Index Across Indian States: Some Exploratory Results", *Artha Beekshan*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 166-181.

Gulati, S.C. and Suresh Sharma (undated), "Population pressure and Deforestation in India", Population Research Centre, Institute of Economic Growth, available at [http://iegindia.org/dis\\_scg\\_17.pdf](http://iegindia.org/dis_scg_17.pdf)

Indian NGOs (undated), "Environment Overview", available at <http://www.indianngos.com/issue/environment/overview.htm>

Jadavpur University (JU) (2006), "Groundwater Arsenic Contamination in West Bengal", School of Environmental Studies, available at <http://www.soesju.org/arsenic/wb.htm>

Jalan, Jyotsna, E. Somanathan and Saraswata Chaudhuri (2003), "Awareness and the Demand for Environmental Quality: Drinking Water in Urban India", Economics Discussion Paper No. 03-05, Indian Statistical Institute, New Delhi.

Jena, P.R., N. C. Sahu and B. Rath (2005), "Does Trade Liberalisation Create Pollution Haven? An Indian Experience", paper presented at the "International Conference on Environment and Development: Developing Countries Perspective", April 7-8, 2005, ITD, SIS, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

Jha, R. and Bhanu Murthy, K.V. (2001), "An Inverse Global Environmental Kuznets Curve", Departmental Working Papers: 2001-2002, Division of Economics, RSPAS, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

Jha, V. (1999), "Investment Liberalization and Environmental Protection: Conflicts and Compatibilities in the Case of India", Occasional Paper No. 1, Cross Border Environmental Management Project, CHP: Copenhagen Business School.

Jones, L., Fredricksen, L. and Wates, T. (2002), "Environmental Indicators", 5th ed., The Fraser Institute, available at <http://www.fraserinstitute.ca/shared/readmore.asp?snv=pb&id=314>.

Kadekodi, Gopal K. and L. Venkatachalam (2005), "Human Development, Environment and Poverty Nexus in India", Institute for Social and Economic Change, Report prepared for the United Nations Development Programme, New Delhi.

Kathuria, V. and T. Sterner (2005), "Monitoring and Enforcement: Is Two-Tier Regulation Robust? – A case study of Ankleshwar, India", April 2005, available at <http://www.hgu.gu.se/files/nationalekonomi/personal/thomas%20sterner/kathuria.sterner%20ecological%20economics%20revised.pdf>

Kathuria, Vinish (2004), "Informal Regulation of Pollution in a Developing Country: Empirical Evidence from India", Working Paper No. 6-04, South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics (SANDEE), Kathmandu, Nepal.

Kathuria, V. (2002) "Vehicular pollution control in Delhi, India", *Transportation Research, Part D: Transport and Environment*, Vol. 7D, No. 5, pp. 373-387.

Kathuria, V. (2004) "Impact of CNG on vehicular pollution in Delhi: a note", *Transportation Research, Part D: Transport and Environment*, Vol. 9D, No. 5, pp. 409-417.

Kaushik, A and M. Saqib (2001), "Environmental Requirements and India's Exports: An Impact Analysis", Rajiv Gandhi Institute for Contemporary Studies (RGICS) Working Paper No. 25, New Delhi.

Mehta, R. (2005), "Non-Tariff Barriers affecting India's Exports", *RIS Discussion Paper No. 97*, New Delhi.

Melnick, D., J. McNeely, Y. K. Navarro, G. Schmidt-Traub and R.R. Sears (2005), "Environment and human well-being: a practical strategy", UN Millennium Project, Task Force on Environmental Sustainability, available at <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/Environment-complete-lowres.pdf>

Mukherjee, S. and D. Chakraborty (2007), "Environment, Human Development and Economic Growth of Indian States after Liberalisation", presented at the National Conference on 'Making Growth Inclusive with Special Reference to Imbalance in Regional Development' jointly organized by Department of Economics, Jammu University and Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, March 12, 2007.

Mukherjee, S. and P. Nelliya (2006), "Groundwater Pollution and Emerging Environmental Challenges of Industrial Effluent Irrigation in Mettupalayam Taluk, Tamil Nadu", Working Paper No. 7/2006, Madras School of Economics, Chennai.

Mukherjee, S. and V. Kathuria (2006), "Is Economic Growth Sustainable? Environmental Quality of Indian States After 1991", *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 38-60.

Mukhopadhyay, K. and D. Chakraborty (2005), "Is liberalization of trade good for the environment? Evidence from India", *Asia-Pacific Development Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 109-136, available at [http://www.unescap.org/pdd/publications/apdj\\_12\\_1/5\\_kakali.pdf](http://www.unescap.org/pdd/publications/apdj_12_1/5_kakali.pdf).

Murty, M. N., S. C. Gulati and A. Banerjee (2003), "Health Benefits from Urban Air Pollution Abatement in the Indian Subcontinent", Institute of Economic Growth Working Paper, New Delhi.

Nadkarni, M.V. (2000), "Poverty, environment, development: a many patterned nexus", *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 1, pp. 1184–1190.

Nagar, A.L., and S.R. Basu (2001), "*Weighing Socio-Economic Indicators of Human Development: A Latent Variable Approach*", Working Paper, National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, New Delhi.

Nair, G.K. (2006), "*Water scarcity hits parts of south Kerala*", *The Hindu*, March 31, available at <http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/2006/03/31/stories/2006033101981900.htm>

NCERT (2002), "*7th All India Educational Survey (AIES): All India School Education Survey (AISES)*", National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India, New Delhi, available at <http://www.7thsurvey.ncert.nic.in/>

Panayatou, T. (1993), "*Empirical Tests and Policy Analysis of Environmental Degradation at Different Stages of Economic Development*", World Employment Research Programme, Working Paper No. WP238, Technology and Employment Programme, International Labour Office, Geneva.

Parikh, J. (2004), "*Environmentally Sustainable Development in India*", available at <http://scid.stanford.edu/events/India2004/JParikh.pdf>

Pezzey, J. (1989), "*Economic Analysis of Sustainable Growth and Sustainable Development*", Environment Department Working Paper No 15, The World Bank, Washington DC.

Raju, S. Durai (Undated), "Measurement of Human Development – District Level", available at <http://www.undp.org.in/hdrc/events/Aggregates/Goa/2>

Ranis, Gustav, "*Human Development and Economic Growth*", Center Discussion Paper No. 887, Economic Growth Center, Yale University, May 2004, available at [http://www.econ.yale.edu/growth\\_pdf/cdp887.pdf](http://www.econ.yale.edu/growth_pdf/cdp887.pdf)

Rithe, Kishor and Ashish Fernandes (2002), "*Maharashtra's tiger troubles*", April, available at [www.satpuda.org/maharashtratiger.doc](http://www.satpuda.org/maharashtratiger.doc)

RIVM/UNEP (Undated), "*Global Environment Outlook (GEO-3)*", National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), UNEP, Bilthoven, The Netherlands, available at <http://arch.rivm.nl/env/int/geo/>

Rogers, P., K.F. Jalal, B.N. Lohani, G.M. Owens, C-C. Yu, M. Christia and J.B. Dufournaud (1997), "*Measuring Environmental Quality in Asia*", Harvard University Press and ADB, London, UK.

Sankar, U. (2006), "Trade Liberalisation and Environmental Protection Responses of Leather Industry in Brazil, China and India," *Economic and Political Weekly*, June 17, pp. 2470-2477.

\_\_\_ (1998), "*Laws and Institutions relating to Environmental Protection in India*", presented at the Conference on 'The Role of Law and Legal Institutions in Asian Economic Development', Rotterdam, November 1998, available at [http://www.mse.ac.in/pub/op\\_sankar.pdf](http://www.mse.ac.in/pub/op_sankar.pdf)

Santhakumar, V. (2001), "*Will Public Interest Litigations and Citizens' Actions Lead to Sustainable Development? An economic analysis with empirical cases from India*", available at <http://www.ccsindia.org/ccsindia/santhakumar.doc>

Saqib, Mohd., Yashika Singh and Ritu Kumar (2001), "*Stimulating Sustainable Trade in Electronics: Challenges, Realities and Strategies for the Indian Components Sector*", Rajiv Gandhi Institute for Contemporary Studies (RGICS), New Delhi.

Schjolden, A. (2000), "*Leather tanning in India: Environmental regulations and firms' Compliance*", F.I.L. Working Papers, No. 21, available at <http://www.cicero.uio.no/media/1677.pdf>

Selden, T.M. and Song, D.S. (1994), "Environmental quality and development: is there a Kuznets curve for air pollution emissions?" *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 147–162.

Shafik, N. and Bandyopadhyay, S. (1992), "*Economic Growth and Environmental Quality: Time-Series and Cross-Country Evidence*", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 904, The World Bank, Washington DC.

Sharma, D.C. (2005), "By Order of the Court: Environmental Cleanup in India", *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 113, No. 6, pp. A394-A397.

Sidhu, H S., "Crisis in Agrarian Economy in Punjab: Some Urgent Steps", *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 27– August 2, 2002, pp. 3132-38.

Somanathan, J.E. and T. Sterner (2003), "*Environmental Policy Instruments and Institutions in Developing Countries*", Initiative for Policy Dialogue Working Paper Series, Columbia University, available at <http://www0.gsb.columbia.edu/ipd/pub/EnvironmentalPolicyInstruments.pdf>.

Sood, Atul and Bimal Arora (2006), "*The Political Economy of Corporate Responsibility in India*", Technology, Business and Society – Paper No. 18, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva, Switzerland.

Stern, D.I. (1998) "Progress on the Environmental Kuznets curve", *Environment and Development Economics*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 175–198.

Tewari, M. and P. Pilai (2005), "Global standards and environmental compliance in India's leather industry", *Oxford Development Studies*, Vol 33, No. 2, pp. 245-267.

The Hindu (2006), "Air pollution the bane of Davangere", Wednesday, October 4, available at <http://www.hindu.com/2006/10/04/stories/2006100414400300.htm>

(2005), "Air quality around hospitals, schools deteriorating: *SPM levels are at least 25 per cent more than standard values*", November 18, available at <http://www.hindu.com/2005/11/18/stories/2005111817640300.htm>

UNDP, "Human Development Report", various issues, available at <http://hdr.undp.org/>, United Nations Development Programme, New York, USA.

Venkatachalam, L. (2005), "Damage Assessment and Compensation to Farmers: Lessons from Verdict of Loss of Ecology Authority in Tamil Nadu", *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 9, 2005.

World Bank (2006), "*India: Strengthening Institutions for Sustainable Growth*", Country Environmental Analysis (India CEA), September 2006, available at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INDIAEXTN/Resources/295583-1176163782791/complete.pdf>

World Bank (2004), "*World Development Indicator - 2004*", available at <http://www.worldbank.org/data/countrydata/countrydata.html>

World Wildlife Fund (WWF) (2002), "*WWF's Living Planet Report 2002*", WWF International, Switzerland, available at [http://www.panda.org/news\\_facts/publications/general/living\\_planet/lpr02.cfm](http://www.panda.org/news_facts/publications/general/living_planet/lpr02.cfm)

Zhou, P., B.W. Ang, K.L. Poh (2006), "Comparing aggregating methods for constructing the composite environmental index: an objective measure", *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 59, pp. 305-311.

## Appendix 1: Abbreviations used in Text

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| AGRWRK          | Percentage of Agricultural Workers in Total Workers |
| AIES            | All India Educational Survey                        |
| AIFE            | Adjusted Intensity of Formal Education              |
| AISES           | All India School Education Survey                   |
| AP              | Andhra Pradesh                                      |
| BH              | Bihar   |
| CBD             | Convention on Biological Diversity                  |
| CH <sub>4</sub> | Methane   |
| CO              | Carbon monoxide                                     |
| CPCB            | Central Pollution Control Board                     |
| CSO             | Central Statistical Organisation                    |
| EDI             | Environmental Degradation Index                     |
| EG              | Economic Growth                                     |
| EKC             | Environmental Kuznets Curve                         |
| EPI             | Environmental Performance Index                     |
| EQ              | Environmental Quality                               |
| EQI             | Environmental Quality Index                         |
| EU              | European Union                                      |
| FDI             | Foreign Direct Investment                           |
| GDP             | Gross Domestic Product                              |
| GHGs            | Green House Gases                                   |
| GJ              | Gujarat   |
| GSDP            | Gross State Domestic Product                        |
| HD              | Human Development                                   |
| HDI             | Human Development Index                             |
| HDR             | Human Development Report                            |
| HR              | Haryana   |
| HSD             | High Speed Diesel                                   |
| HT              | Hindustan Times                                     |
| IFE             | Intensity of Formal Education                       |
| IMR             | Infant Mortality Rate                               |
| JFM             | Joint Forest Management                             |
| JU              | Jadavpur University                                 |
| K               | Kerosene  |
| KL              | Kerala  |
| KR              | Karnataka   |
| LAECs           | Local Area Environmental Committees                 |
| LDO             | Light Diesel Oil                                    |
| LE              | Life Expectancy                                     |
| LPG             | Liquefied Petroleum Gas                             |
| MDGs            | Millennium Development Goals                        |
| MG              | Motor Gasoline                                      |
| MH              | Maharashtra   |
| MP              | Madhya Pradesh                                      |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| N <sub>2</sub> O | Nitrous Oxide   |
| NAFTA            | North American Free Trade Agreement   |
| NCERT            | National Council of Educational Research and Training   |
| NGOs             | Non-Governmental Organizations  |
| NHDR             | National Human Development Report   |
| NO <sub>x</sub>  | Oxides of Nitrogen  |
| NAGRWRK          | Percentage of Workers in Non-agricultural Sector in Total Workers   |
| NSDP             | Net State Domestic Product  |
| NSSO             | National Sample Survey Organisation   |
| NTBs             | Non-Tariff Barriers   |
| OLS              | Ordinary Least Square   |
| OR               | Orissa  |
| PB               | Punjab  |
| PCI              | Per Capita Income   |
| PCNSDP           | Per Capita Net State Domestic Product   |
| PCP              | Pentachlorophenol   |
| PHH              | Pollution Heaven Hypothesis   |
| POPD             | Population Density in Person Per Square Kilometre   |
| PPP              | Purchasing Power Parity   |
| PRISHARE         | Percentage Share of Primary Sector in GSDP (at constant 1993-94 Prices), which includes Agriculture, Forestry and Logging and Fishing |
| RBI              | Reserve Bank of India   |
| RIVM             | National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, Netherlands  |
| RJ               | Rajasthan   |
| RSPM             | Respirable Particulate Matter   |
| SCMC             | Supreme Court Monitoring Committee  |
| SECSHARE         | Percentage Share of Secondary Sector in GSDP (at constant 1993-94 prices), which includes Mining, Manufacturing and Construction.     |
| SO <sub>2</sub>  | Sulphur dioxide   |
| SPM              | Suspended Particulate Matter  |
| SRS              | Sample Registration System  |
| TE               | Total Enrolment   |
| TERSHARE         | Percentage Share of Tertiary Sector in GSDP (at constant 1993-94 prices)  |
| TN               | Tamil Nadu  |
| UNDP             | United Nations Development Programme  |
| UNEP             | United Nations Environment Programme  |
| UP               | Uttar Pradesh   |
| URB              | Level of Urbanisation (Urban Population/Total Population*100)   |
| US               | United States   |
| WAE              | Weighted Average Enrolment  |
| WB               | West Bengal   |
| WTO              | World Trade Organization  |
| WWF              | World Wildlife Fund   |

## Appendix 2: Data sources

| Environmental group | Data sources   |
|---------------------|--|
| AIRPOL              | <i>MoEF</i> : National Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Programme Database   |
| INDOOR              | <i>TERI</i> : TERI Energy Data Directory and Yearbook (TEDDY) – Various Years<br><i>CSE</i> : State of India's Environment: The Citizens' Fifth Report (Part II: Statistical Database)<br><i>RGI</i> : Census of India 2001 – Tables on Houses, Amenities and Assets (Database Software) |
| GHGS                | Garg and Shukla (2002)<br><i>RGI</i> : Census of India 2001 – CensusInfo India 2001 (Version 1.0) – Database Software  |
| ENERGY              | <i>CMIE</i> : India's Energy Sector – Various Years<br><i>TERI</i> : TEDDY – Various Years<br><i>RGI</i> : CensusInfo India 2001<br><i>EPWRF</i> (2003)<br><i>CSO</i> : Compendium of Environmental Statistics – 2000 and 2002   |
| FOREST              | <i>FSI</i> : State of Forest Reports – 1997, 1999 and 2001<br><i>MoEF</i> : The State of Environment – India: 1999, 2001<br><i>CSE</i> : Citizens' Fifth Report<br><i>RGI</i> : CensusInfo India 2001<br><i>EPWRF</i> (2003)   |
| WATER               | <i>MoWR</i> : Annual Report – Various Years<br><i>CMIE</i> : India's Agriculture Sector – Various Years<br><i>MoEF</i> : National Rivers Water Quality Monitoring (NRWQM) Programme Database<br><i>MoA</i> : Annual Report – Various Years<br><i>CSE</i> : Citizens' Fifth Report        |
| NPSP                | <i>CMIE</i> : India's Agriculture Sector – Various Years<br><i>MoA</i> : Annual Report – Various Years<br><i>DoAHD&amp;F</i> : Livestock Census Data – 1992, 1997 and 2003<br><i>RGI</i> : Census of India 2001 – Tables on Houses, Amenities and Assets (Database Software)             |
| LAND                | <i>CMIE</i> : India's Agriculture Sector – Various Years   |

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <i>CMIE</i> :        | Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy, Mumbai.  |
| <i>CSE</i> :         | Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi.   |
| <i>CSO</i> :         | Central Statistical Organisation, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India (GoI), New Delhi. |
| <i>DoAHD&amp;F</i> : | Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries, MoA, GoI, New Delhi.   |
| <i>EPWRF</i> :       | Economic and Political Weekly Research Foundation, Mumbai.   |
| <i>FSI</i> :         | Forest Survey of India, Ministry of Environment and Forest, GoI, Dehradun.   |
| <i>MoA</i> :         | Ministry of Agriculture, GoI, New Delhi.   |
| <i>MoEF</i> :        | Ministry of Environment and Forests, GoI, New Delhi.   |
| <i>MoWR</i> :        | Ministry of Water Resources, GoI, New Delhi.   |
| <i>RGI</i> :         | Office of the Registrar General, Director of Census Operation, Ministry of Home Affairs, GoI, New Delhi.                     |
| <i>TERI</i> :        | The Energy Resources Institute, New Delhi.   |



### Appendix 3: Descriptions of Environmental Groups (Variables) and Indicators

#### AIR POLLUTION (12 indicators)

- Maximum Concentration of NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub> and SPM in Residential and Industrial Area (µg/m<sup>3</sup>): 1990-1995 and 1996-2000 \*

#### INDOOR AIR POLLUTION POTENTIAL (18 indicators)

- Monthly Per-Capita Expenditure (MPCE) on Fuel & Lighting (Rs./month/head) Rural and Urban Areas: 1993-94 and 1999-2000 \$
- Percentage of Rural Households using Bio-fuels (Firewoods and chips, Dung cake) as primary source of energy (Traditional & Commercial) for cooking (%): 1993-1994 and 1999-2000 \*
- Percentage of Urban Households using Bio-fuels (Firewoods and chips) as primary source of energy (Traditional) for cooking (%): 1993-1994 and 1999-2000 \*
- Percentage of Rural and Urban Households Do Not Have Access to Electricity: 1991 and 2001 \*
- Achievement in Installation of Biogas Plants: Upto 1994-95 and Upto 2001-2002 \$
- Kerosene as a Primary Source of Energy for Lighting for Rural and Urban Households (%): 1993-94 and 1999-2000 \*

#### GREEN HOUSE GASES EMISSIONS (12 indicators)

- CO<sub>2</sub> Equivalent GHGs (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O) Emissions (Kg. /Person): 1990 and 1995 \*
- CO<sub>2</sub> Equivalent GHGs (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O) Emissions (Tons/Rs. Lakh of GSDP at Constant 1980-81 Prices): 1990 and 1995 \*
- CO<sub>2</sub> Equivalent GHGs (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O) Emissions (Tons/hectare of Reporting Area of Land Utilisation): 1990 and 1995 \*
- Other GHGs (NOx, SO<sub>2</sub>) Emissions (Kg. /Person): 1990 and 1995 \*
- Other GHGs (NOx, SO<sub>2</sub>) Emissions (Tons/Rs. Lakh of GSDP at Constant 1980-81 Prices): 1990 and 1995 \*
- Other GHGs (NOx, SO<sub>2</sub>) Emissions (Tons/hectare of Reporting Area of Land Utilisation): 1990 and 1995 \*

#### POLLUTION FROM ENERGY GENERATION AND CONSUMPTION (12 indicators)

- Annual Percentage Increase in Motor Vehicles Number (given geographical area) during 1991-92 to 1995-96 and during 1995-96 to 2000-2001 \*
- Average Per Capita Consumption of LPG, MG, Kerosene, HSD & LDO (in Kg. per person): 1993-94 to 1996-97 and 1997-98 to 2000-2001 \*
- Average Petroleum Consumption (in tonnes) Per Rs. Lakh of GSDP (at constant 1993-94 Prices): 1993-94 to 1996-97 and 1997-98 to 2000-2001 \*
- Average Thermal Electricity Generation as a Percentage of Total Electricity Generation (%): 1990-91 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \*
- Average Electricity Consumption (in Kwh) per Rs. Lakh of GSDP at Constant (1993-94) Prices: 1993-94 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2001 \*
- Average Per Capita Consumption of Electricity (in Kwh/Person): 1990-91 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \*

#### DEPLETION AND DEGRADATION OF FOREST RESOURCES (16 indicators)

- Change in Forest Cover (Dense and Open Forest) as Percentage of Geographical Area (in percentage points): 1995 to 1997 and 1999-2001 \$
- Change in Per Capita Forest Cover (Dense Forest, Open Forest, Mangrove, Scrub) (in Hectare): 1995 to 1997 and 1999 to 2001 \$
- Change in Recorded Forest Area as a Percentage of Total Geographical Area: 1997 to 1999 and 1999 to 2001 \$
- Change in Common Property Forest Area@ as Percentage of Total Recorded Forest Area: 1997 to 1999 and 1999 to 2001 \$
- Change in Common Property Forest Area@ as a Percentage of Geographical Area: 1997 to 1999 and 1999 to 2001 \$
- Change in Per Capita Availability of Recorded Forest Area (Person/ha): 1997 to 1999 and 1999 to 2001\$
- Change in Per Capita Availability of Common Property Forest Area (in Person/ha): 1997 to 1999 and 1999 to 2001\$
- Change in Protected Area (National Park & Sanctuary) as a Percentage of Total Geographical Area: 1997 to 1999 and 1999 to 2001 \$

*Note: @ - Common Property Forest Area = Protected + Unclassed Forest Area*

#### DEPLETION AND DEGRADATION OF WATER RESOURCES (24 indicators)

- Level of groundwater development (%): 1996 and 2004 \*
- Percentage of Irrigated Area Irrigated by Surface Water Sources (Canals & Tanks): 1992-93 and 1998-99 \$
- Inland Surface Water Resources (% of geographical area): 1995 and 2001 \$
- Major & Medium Irrigation Potential Created (Developed) upto the end of the 8th Plan (1992-1997) as a Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential of the State \*
- Major & Medium Irrigation Potential Utilised as a Percentage of Irrigation Potential Created Upto March 1997 \*
- Minor Irrigation Potential Created (Developed) upto the end of the 8th Plan (1992-1997) as a Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential of the State \*
- Minor Irrigation Potential Utilised as a Percentage of Irrigation Potential Created Upto March 1997 \*
- Major & Medium Irrigation Potential Created (Developed) upto the end of the 9th Plan (1997-2002) as a Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential of the State \*
- Major & Medium Irrigation Potential Utilised as a Percentage of Irrigation Potential Created Upto March 2002 \*
- Minor Irrigation Potential Created (Developed) upto the end of the 9th Plan (1997-2002) as a Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential of the State \*
- Minor Irrigation Potential Utilised as a Percentage of Irrigation Potential Created Upto March 2002 \*
- Average Gross Irrigated as a Percentage of Total Cropped Area (%): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \*

- Average Area Irrigated more than Once as a Percentage of Gross Irrigated Area (%): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \*
- Average Agricultural Consumption of Electricity (in Kwh) Per Rs. Lakh of Agricultural GSDP at Constant (1993-94) Prices: 1993-94 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2001 \*
- Number of Energised Pumpsets Per Hectare of Gross Irrigated Area (No./ha): 1995-96 and 1999-2000 \*
- Change in Number of Energised Pumpsets Per Hectare of Gross Irrigated Area (No./ha)/: 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1995-96 to 1999-2000 \*

#### NON-POINT SOURCE WATER POLLUTION POTENTIAL (20 indicators)

- Population Density (Person Per Km<sup>2</sup> of Geographical Area): 1991 and 2001\*
- Percentage of Rural and Urban Households Without Latrine: 1993 and 1998 \*
- Average Fertilisers Consumption (Kg./hectare): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 2000-01 \*
- Average Annual Rainfall (in mm): 1990-95 and 1996-2000 \$
- Pesticides Consumption: (Kg./hectare) 1995-96 and 1999-2000 \*
- Area under Pulses as a Percentage of Gross Cropped Area: 1990-91 and 2000-2001 \$
- Livestock Per Head of Person (No. in Cattle unit Per Person): 1992 and 1997 \*
- Poultry Birds Per Head of Person (No. Per Person): 1992 and 1997 \*
- Average Total Cropped Area as a Percentage of Reporting Area of Land Utilisation (%): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \*

#### PRESSURE AND DEGRADATION OF LAND RESOURCES (12 indicators)


- Average Forest Area as a Percentage of Reporting Area of Land Utilisation (%): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \$
- Average Non-Forest Common Property Land as a Percentage of Reporting Area of Land Utilisation (%): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \$
- Average Non-Forest Common Property Land Per Capita (in ha/person): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \$
- Average Area Sown more than Once as a Percentage of Total Cropped Area (%): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \*
- Average Gross Irrigated as a Percentage of Total Cropped Area (%): 1992-93 to 1995-96 and 1996-97 to 1999-2000 \*
- Land Degradation as a Percentage of Geographical Area: 1994 and 2001 \*

#### Note:

\* - implies that for the environmental indicator we have used (Maximum – Actual) / (Maximum – Minimum) for standardisation.

\$ - implies that for the environmental indicator we have used (Actual – Minimum) / (Maximum – Minimum) for standardisation.

#### Appendix 4: Graphical Relationship between PCNSDP and Various Components of Environmental Quality Scores



## Appendix 5: Graphical Relationship between HDI Score and Various Components of Environmental Quality Scores

