MEASUREMENT OF GENERAL COST OF LIVING FOR URBAN INDIA

ALL-INDIA AND DIFFERENT STATES

by

B. S. MINHAS   L. R. JAIN

S. M. KANSAL   M. R. SALUJA

1. INTRODUCTION

India is particularly rich in regard to the availability of primary data on consumer household expenditures as well as on retail prices. Large scale household expenditure survey data have been in existence since the early 1950s on an almost annual basis till 1972-73 and at regular five-yearly intervals thereafter. The size of samples has been large enough to estimate consumer expenditure patterns at the level of each state of the Indian Union, separately for the rural and urban population in considerable item-wise and commodity-group details. Very extensive quotations on retail prices have also been collected for a very large number of commodities and consumer services on a monthly basis for more than a quarter century from hundreds of villages and rural retail markets and 95 industrial and other urban centres spread over the states and union territories.

This embarrasing surfeit of relevant data notwithstanding, one is indeed saddened to note that we have failed to construct even one consumer price index, which might be taken as a correct representation of the consumer price movements overtime for the entire rural or urban population of India, or any of the states. The available consumer price indices for industrial workers (CPIIW), non-manual employees (CPINM) and agricultural labourers (CPIAL), as their names suggest, have a specific interest group and occupational orientation. All of them are partial in coverage as they are based on the consumption patterns of only certain specific and small parts of the total urban or rural population.

Some research workers have made attempts [see, (1), (3), (4)] to construct price indices for decile groups as well as for the total population, separately for rural and urban India. However, these indices cannot qualify as cost of living (consumer price) indices as these have been obtained by combining the rural or urban household budget data with all-India wholesale prices, instead of the relevant rural or urban retail prices.

In our earlier paper [see, (2)], we constructed an all-India rural consumer price index (CPITR), using rural consumer prices and the NSS-based consumption pattern as the weighting diagram. For the urban population we suggested a weighted combination of the two available consumer price indices (CPIIW and CPINM) and considered this expedient measure (CPICU) as a better index representation for depicting the overall urban consumer price movements in preference to either of the two sectional indices. Nevertheless, we were not fully satisfied with this combined index (CPICU) for the entire urban population, as the two occupational groups combined in CPICU covered only about 42 per cent of the urban households.

The present study is an attempt to construct a brand new all India urban consumer price Index by using the two massive sets of consumer price data, which were being collected over a long period of time for the construction of CPIIW and CPINM series. These retail price data have been combined with the NSS based consumption pattern as the weighting diagram. Indices have been worked out separately for food, non-food and all consumer goods and services (general) by using two different weighting diagrams, one based on the consumption pattern observed in 1960-61 and the other in 1970-71. Detailed urban price indices for 17 commodity subgroups have also been worked out.

In the context of planning at the regional and state level, the need and importance of the consumer price indices, for each individual state can hardly be over-emphasized. The seminar on the "Regional Dimensions of India's Economic Development", organized by the Planning Commission in April 1982 at Nainital, recognized the urgent need for under-

---

taking studies to strengthen the regional data base. In this study we have also taken on the task of constructing state-specific, urban consumer price indices—a task which has thus for not been attempted by any private research group or official agency.[1]

At a later stage we intend to estimate the incidence of poverty state by state. For this purpose we have constructed state-specific urban consumer price indices, using the observed consumption pattern of the middle population (approximately middle 30 per cent of the population in terms of the distribution of population by consumer expenditure) in 1970-71 as the weighting diagram.

For all the three new categories of consumer price index numbers mentioned above, the relevant index values have been computed for the years (the NSS survey years) 1970-71, 1972-73, 1973-74, 1977-78 and 1983 with 1970-71 as the base.

2. DATA AND ITS LIMITATIONS

The construction of a consumer price index involves the use of a weighting diagram (i.e. consumer expenditure on the commodities and services constituting the entire consumption basket in the base year) and retail prices of these commodities and services in the base and the current years, or the relevant price relatives for the current years. As indicated earlier, the focal point of this study is to construct fully representative, urban consumer price indices at the state as well as all-India level for five current periods with two alternative base periods, viz., the calendar year 1960 and the period from July 1970 to June 1971. The five current periods correspond to the survey periods of the five latest NSS rounds in which the consumer expenditure surveys were conducted. These five NSS rounds, alongwith their survey periods, are the 25th round (July 1970 to June 1971), the 27th round (October 1972 to September 1973), the 28th round (October 1973—June 1974), the 32nd round (July 1977—June 1978) and the 38th round (January to December 1983).

The retail prices data are taken from both the CPIIW and the CPINM series, which regularly collect commodity-wise monthly consumer price data from 50 and 45 urban centres respectively. The monthly price data for each CPINM centre are collected for about 180 consumer items with 16 to 48 quotations for each item, depending upon the importance of the centre; and for about 100 items with 8 or more price quotations for each of the items from each CPIIW centre (Note that for big centres the number of quotations per consumer item is very large as large as 96, for instance, in Bombay).

The two series have 17 centres in common. Comparison of the consumer item specifications at some of the common centres showed that the varieties of items covered under the two series are almost similar, with few minor exceptions. For example, some of the costly items, such as superior rice and wheat, fruits and consumer durables are covered under the CPINM, but are excluded from the CPIIW. For some items (like clothing), curiously the CPIIW covers more costly varieties as compared to the varieties covered under the CPINM.

To gather together and make use of the full set of item-wise price quotations collected every month under the series is a daunting task. The basic data set is so massive that the cost of processing, in terms of time and money, would be beyond the means that a few private researchers can marshall. Also the CSO maintains records of detailed price quotations for CPINM series only for the latest 3 months and, as such, it is practically impossible to get hold of original price quotations for the earlier months. In view of the above limitations, we decided to work with the summarised retail price data which are available in the form of monthly price indices for various commodity sub-groups. Further, we restricted our inquiry to only those months which constituted the selected NSS Survey rounds in which consumer expenditure data were collected between 1970-71 and 1983.

Centrewise price indices, with 1960 as the base are available for 22 commodity sub-groups for the CPINM series and for 17 commodity sub-groups for the CPIIW series. For our study, 22 sub-groups of the CPINM series have been aggregated into 17 sub-group (using appropriate weights of the CPINM series so a to have one to one correspondence between the two sets of commodity sub-groups). The list of these sub-groups, under the two series, is given in Appendix Table A1. The CPINM sub-groups with serial Nos. (7 and 8) (9, 10 and 11), (17 and 18), and (21 an 22) have been grouped together so as to correspond to the CPIIW sub-groups with serial Nos. 7, 8, 14 and 17 respectively. Notice that the items and their specifications covered under a sub-group, as expected, are not exactly the same for the two series. They are bound to be somewhat different as the two series relate to two different occupational groups.

---

1. We have also initiated a study to work out fractile group-wise state-specific cost of living indices for the rural and urb population by various commodity sub-groups.

Let us note that different methods are used under the two series for getting the price indices for different commodities/sub-groups. In the CPINM series, the price relatives are worked out first for different quotations of a commodity in a centre and then the average of these price relatives across quotations is worked out to represent the price index of the commodity at that centre. In the CPIIW series, on the other hand, the average of the monthly price quotations of a commodity for a centre is obtained first and then the price relative is worked out to represent the price index of the commodity at this centre. This, however, should not affect the comparability of the two indices in any serious manner.

Ninety-five centres of the two series put together are classified into various states to which they belong. Statewise location of the centres in the two series is presented in the Appendix Table A2. Notice that two (among the 20 states) are union territories, viz., Chandigarh and Delhi. It may further be noted that the four states/union territories—Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Meghalaya and Chandigarh—have only one centre each; whereas most of the other states have 5-8 centres. In view of this limitation, the price indices constructed for these four states/union territories cannot be as representative as those for the other states/union territories.

For obtaining the representative, state-specific weighting diagram (i.e. consumer expenditures on the 17 commodity sub-groups) in each of the two base years, 1960 and 1970-71, for the entire urban population of the different states, we have used the NSS consumer expenditure data (available in tabulated form), relating to the 17th and 25th rounds covering the respective periods from September 1961 to July 1962 and July 1970 to June 1971. These data are taken from the NSS Draft Report No. 200, Part I, and the printed Report No. 231, respectively. In view of the non-availability of detailed consumer expenditure data at the state level for the 16th round (July 1960—June 1961), the state-specific weighting diagrams obtained for the year 1961-62 have been assumed to be the same as for the calendar year 1960. It may be noted that the break-up of the state-specific urban consumer expenditure in 1970-71 for the last five miscellaneous commodity sub-groups was not available from the 25th round data. Nevertheless, we were able to have access to similar details for 1972-73 from the 27th round data, which have been used, alongwith the controlling figures of miscellaneous groups for 1970-71, in order to obtain the relevant sub-groups details for 1970-71.

For estimating state-specific poverty incidence, an appropriate consumer price index (for updating the state-specific poverty line, as indicated earlier) is the one constructed by using the relevant weighting diagram provided by the consumption pattern of the middle population (approximately from the 23rd to 53rd percentile of population when arranged in ascending order with respect to per capita total consumer expenditure). For more details, see (2). Accordingly, the state-specific weighting diagrams for the middle population for the base year 1970-71 have been worked out. The middle population for a state is comprised of persons with monthly per capita total expenditure of more than Rs. 28/- but less than or equal to Rs. 43.

The three state-specific weighting diagrams, two for entire urban population in the two base years, 1960 and 1970-71, and one for the middle band of urban population in the base year 1970-71, are presented in Appendix Tables A3 to A5. It may be noted that for Meghalaya, the NSS consumer expenditure pattern was not available for either of the two periods, 1961-62 and 1970-71. As such, the weighting diagrams for Meghalaya state are taken to be the same as that for Assam. Similarly, as the NSS consumer expenditure patterns for urban Haryana and the Union Territory of Chandigarh were not available for 1961-62, their weighting diagrams for 1960 are taken to be the same as for the united Punjab.

3. *Detailed Steps in the construction of All India and State-wise Urban Consumer Price Indices.*

The following procedures have been adopted for combining the relevant data to obtain all-India and State-specific urban consumer price indices.

(1) For each urban centre of the CPIIW or the CPINM series, monthly price indices for each of the seventeen consumer item groups are averaged (simple) across the months belonging to the survey periods of the NSS rounds.

(2) State-specific price indices for each item group are then worked out by taking simple average of the price indices of the centres (in both the series) belonging to a particular state. These state-specific price indices for each item group have the calendar year 1960 as the base.

(3) The price indices, obtained in step (2), are converted to the new base year, July 1970 to June 1971, by dividing them with the corresponding price indices for 1970-71.

(4) Weighted averages of the state-specific price indices for seventeen consumer item groups, with base

year 1960 as well as 1970-71, as calculated in steps (2) and (3), respectively, are then obtained. The respective weights, being the state-specific weighting diagram for 1961-62 (assuming that the state-specific weighting diagrams for 1961-62 and calendar year 1960 are approximately the same) and 1970-71 are given in Appendix Tables A3 and A4. This provides us the statewise urban consumer price indices with two alternative base years, viz., the old base of 1960 and the new base of 1970-71.

(5) Analogus to step (4), state-wise urban consumer price indices for the middle population, with base 1970-71, are also worked out by combining the price indices obtained in step (3) with weights as given in Appendix Table A5.

(6) All India price indices, with 1960 or 1970-71 base, for each of the seventeen consumer item groups and three major aggregate—food, non-food and general (total)—are worked out in the following manner :

(a) First, the total consumption expenditure of a state on an item group is obtained by multiplying the state-specific average per capita expenditure on the item group with the total urban population of the state.

(b) Second, the all-India index for each item group is obtained by taking the weighted average of the state specific price indices for the item group (as obtined in step (2) or (3) across states, weights being the total consumer expenditure on the item group in different states [as calculated in (6a)].

(c) Finally, the all-India price indices for the three major aggregates, viz. food, non-food and general, are worked out by taking weighted average of the item group—specific all-India indices [as obtained in (6b)] across relevant item groups belonging to an aggregate, weights being the all-India expenditure on various item groups belonging to the major aggregate.

The procedure of index construction described in the six steps given above, can be algebraically expressed as follows :

Let $c_{is}(j)$ denote the total consumption expenditure on item group 'i' (i takes value from 1 to M) for the state 's' (s = 1,....,S) in the year 'j' (j = 1 and 2 correspond to the years 1960 and 1970-71 respectively). Let $I_{is}^{t}(j)$ denote the price relative (or price index) of the i-th item group for the current year 't' relative to the base year 'j' and relating to the s-th state. Then $I_s^{t}(1)$ and $I_s^{t}(2)$ the price indices for the s-th state with alternative base years 1960 and 1970-71 are given by

$$I_s^{t}(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} c_{is}(1) I_{is}^{t}(1) / c_s(1) \qquad (1)$$

$$I_s^{t}(2) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} c_{is}(2) [I_{is}^{t}(1)/I_{is}^{t}(1)]^2 c_s(2) \qquad (2)$$

where $\quad c_s(j) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} c_{is}(j)$

All-India indices, $I_i^{t}(1)$ and $I_i^{t}(2)$, for i-th item group with alternative base years 1960 and 1970-71 are obtained as

$$I_i^{t}(1) = \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_{is}(1) I_{is}^{t}(1) / c_i(1) \qquad (3)$$

$$I_i^{t}(2) = \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_{is}(2) [I_{is}^{t}(1)/I_{is}^{t}(1)]^2 / c_i(2) \qquad (4)$$

where $\quad c_i(j) = \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_{is}(j)$

All-India general price indices $I^{t}(j)$ with respective base years 1960 and 1970-71 corresponding to j=1 and 2, can now be obtained as

$$I^{t}(j) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} c_i(j) I_i^{t}(j) / \sum_{i=1}^{M} c_i(j) \qquad (5)$$

$$\text{or} \quad = \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_s(j) I_s^{t}(j) / \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_s(j) \qquad (6)$$

Notice that equality of (5) and (6) provides us a cross-check for correct calculation of all-India general price index $I^{t}(j)$.

Let us now denote the state-specific price index with 1970-71 as the base by $_1I_s^{t}(2)$ when the weighting diagram for 1960 is used and by $_2I_s^{t}(2)$ when for 1970-71 is used. Then from (1) and (2), we have

$$_2I_s^{t}(2) = I_s^{t}(2) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} u_{is}(2) [I_{is}^{t}(1)/I_{is}^{t}(1)]^2 \qquad (7)$$

and $_1I_s^t(2) = I_s^t(1)/I_s^2(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} u_{is}(1)[I_{is}^t(1)/I_s^2(1)]$ (8)

where $u_{is}(j) = c_{is}(j)/c_s(j)$ for $j = 1$ and 2.

Again, we denote the all-India general and item group-specific price indices with 1970-71 as the base by $_1I^t(2)$ and $_1I_i^t(2)$ when 1960 weighting diagrams are used and by $_2I^t(2)$ (and) $_2I_i^t(2)$ when 1970-71 weighting diagrams are used. Then from (3) and (4) we have

$$_2I_i^t(2) = I_i^t(2) = \sum_{s=1}^{S} v_{is}(2) [I_{is}^t(1)/I_{is}^2(1)]$$ (9)

and

$$_1I_i^t(2) = I_i^t(1)/I_i^2(1) = \sum_{s=1}^{S} v_{is}(1)[I_{is}^t(1)/I_i^2(1)]$$ (10)

where $v_{is}(j) = c_{is}(j)/c_i(j)$ for $j=1$ and 2.

Also, from (3), (4) and (5) we have

$$_2I^t(2) = I^t(2) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{s=1}^{S} w_{is} [I_{is}^t(1)/I_{is}^2(1)]$$ (11)

and

$$_1I^t(2) = I^t(1)/I^2(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{s=1}^{S} w_{is} [I_{is}^t(1)/I^2(1)]$$ (12)

where $w_{is}(j) = c_{is}(j) / \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{s=1}^{S} c_{is}(j)$ for $j=1$ and 2

Comparison of (7) and (8), (11) and (12) and (9) and (10) indicates that the difference in the two alternate expressions of the state-specific $[I_s^t(2)]$, all-India general $[I^t 2]$ and all-India item-group-specific $[_i^t 2)]$ price indices, using the two alternative weighting diagrams for 1960 and 1970-71, is due to the compound effect of two factors, viz., (a) variation in the two weighting diagrams, and (b) variation in $I_{is}^2(1)$ across item-groups and/or states, i.e. state-specific and item-group-specific price index for 1970-71 with 1960 as the base varies across item groups and/or states. It should be emphasised here that as a result of the net effect arising from the interplay of the two factors, the two alternative values of the price

index may or may not differ in general. The difference in the two alternative expressions of the index obviously cannot be attributed only to the use of the different weighting diagrams except in the rare situation where the state-specific price index for 1970-71 with 1960 as the base is same for each item group as well as for each state.

4. *New and Old Urban Consumer Price Indices : Some Comparisons*

The newly constructed urban consumer price indices for 20 states/union territories and for all-India (20 states together) are presented in Tables 1 to 3, using three different weighting diagrams. Table 1 gives the cost of living indices, derived by using the 1960 consumption pattern as the weighting diagram (W_1): whereas in Table 2 the indices are based on the 1970-71 consumption pattern (W_2). The consumer price indices presented in Table 3 are worked out by using the consumption pattern of the middle urban population (W_3)—covering approximately 23rd to 53rd percentile (at all-India level)—which we consider suitable for updating the base year poverty line in the computation of incidence of poverty. The three weighting diagrams are given in Appendix tables A.3 to A.5. As this study is mainly concerned with the general cost of living indices, only passing references shall be made to the cost of living indices for the middle band of urban population.

It should be noted that the two weighting diagrams relating to the years 1960 and 1970-71, used in the two new indices, differ in respect of shares of many item groups in total expenditure at the all-states level (See Appendix Table A.3 and A.4). All states here represent 99.5 percent of the Indian population and the terms all-states level and all-India level can be used interchangeably. There was a slight fall of 0.75 percentage points in the share of cereals and cereal products in 1970-71 as compared with 1960, though the total food share went up by 3.64 percentage points. The shares of other food groups, viz. pulses and products, oils and fats, fruits and vegetables, and other food went up by 0.43, 0.73, 1.12 and 1.72 percentage points, respectively. Among the non-food item groups, shares of pan, supari and tobacco, fuel and light, housing and medical care went up by 1.89, 0.70, 0.47 and 0.54 percentage points, respectively, and that of clothing, education and recreation, personal care and notably of other non-food declined by 1.32, 0.67, 0.44 and 4.73, respectively. Notice that the share of other non-food came down from 10.21 in 1960 to 5.48 percent in 1970-71 registering a decline of about 47 percent.

TABLE 1   STATE-WISE URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES FOR FOOD, NON-FOOD AND GENERAL (FOOD PLUS NON-FOOD) FOR SELECTED NSS SURVEY PERIODS (BASED ON 1961-62 WEIGHTING DIAGRAM FOR ENTIRE URBAN POPULATION)

(1970-71=100)

Sl. No.	Name of the state	1972-73			1973-74			1977-78			1983		
		F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1.	A.P.	125·79	112·52	121·51	142·08	132·39	138·95	177·59	175·03	176·77	267·33	290·35	274·75
2.	Assam	113·01	114·30	113·45	134·81	137·38	135·69	170·01	175·91	172·02	269·61	261·01	266·68
3.	Bihar	120·01	112·99	117·44	154·77	137·51	148·46	166·00	178·73	170·65	272·10	303·50	283·59
4.	Gujarat	131·77	116·01	126·47	157·26	134·52	149·60	175·74	178·68	176·73	290·98	292·50	291·49
5.	Haryana	119·28	122·88	120·61	145·28	147·93	146·26	176·17	195·14	183·17	260·90	326·50	285·11
6.	H.P.	118·37	114·45	117·02	140·16	130·39	136·79	159·74	165·55	161·75	259·01	254·39	260·37
7.	J & K	112·93	113·30	113·04	129·55	125·00	128·15	183·43	165·04	177·76	302·89	273·47	293·82
8.	Karnataka	125·93	113·23	122·06	148·59	134·80	144·39	169·12	182·08	173·07	273·49	310·33	234·36
9.	Kerala	125·37	110·35	120·75	156·54	125·78	147·08	162·99	176·48	167·14	292·22	313·21	300·21
10.	M.P.	125·80	114·94	122·01	152·69	139·19	147·98	176·66	186·07	179·94	259·79	312·33	284·65
11.	Maharashtra	124·80	111·91	119·76	144·64	128·16	138·19	175·87	171·65	174·22	302·07	233·70	297·78
12.	Meghalaya	117·25	111·11	115·25	139·51	123·32	134·23	174·59	172·49	173·90	270·70	332·34	307·03
13.	Orissa	116·89	110·12	114·38	138·49	127·15	134·28	170·25	173·03	171·30	282·86	296·42	287·39
14.	Punjab	113·59	118·07	115·10	139·34	139·57	139·41	171·01	178·16	173·42	258·22	267·98	261·52
15.	Rajasthan	126·01	116·32	123·06	153·40	137·60	148·59	179·12	184·06	180·62	272·76	305·35	282·69
16.	Tamil Nadu	121·67	114·00	118·98	148·98	133·76	143·64	186·47	175·61	182·66	330·82	267·31	303·72
17.	U.P.	123·47	115·58	120·81	150·18	139·37	146·53	177·64	187·37	180·93	269·37	314·04	234·45
18.	W.B.	116·90	114·61	116·11	144·92	136·04	141·87	169·33	170·61	170·09	253·16	274·70	264·50
19.	Chandigarh	110·44	113·06	111·24	129·48	129·44	129·46	165·82	169·80	166·30	237·43	274·91	215·30
20.	Delhi	116·20	111·47	114·25	141·19	136·90	139·36	166·37	183·36	173·33	255·73	281·83	256·53
	All states	122·55	113·92	119·53	147·66	134·50	143·05	174·46	177·61	175·56	281·19	291·59	284·33

Note : F, NF and G refer to Food, Non food and General respectively.

T. 2 : STATE-WISE URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES FOR FOOD, NON FOOD AND GENERAL (FOOD PLUS NON-FOOD) FOR SELECTED NSS-SURVEY PERIODS (BASED ON 1970-71 WEIGHTING DIAGRAM FOR ENTIRE URBAN POPULATION)

(1970-71=100)

Sl. No.	Name of the state	1972-73			1973-74			1977-78			1983		
		F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1.	A. P.	125·10	112·09	120·40	140·82	129·60	136·75	176·14	172·19	174·70	267·63	281·22	272·56
2.	Assam	113·51	114·41	113·82	136·10	134·05	135·41	163·97	173·41	167·17	253·22	244·23	254·81
3.	Bihar	120·05	114·28	118·25	154·44	136·29	148·60	165·93	175·33	169·24	271·44	289·23	277·07
4.	Gujarat	132·87	114·84	127·16	158·19	132·15	149·94	175·39	173·32	174·74	230·33	232·19	238·09
5.	Haryana	121·72	120·09	121·13	146·49	141·77	145·09	175·09	189·09	181·52	261·65	303·90	238·09
6.	H. P.	119·17	114·76	117·44	140·93	127·88	135·85	161·25	163·95	162·32	251·34	251·65	257·55
7.	J. & K.	113·34	112·94	113·21	128·54	125·78	127·53	185·37	165·53	179·30	303·07	263·14	292·16
8.	Karnataka	125·18	113·21	121·09	147·77	132·89	142·68	153·33	177·58	171·54	274·30	294·30	231·14
9.	Kerala	123·90	111·03	119·18	153·81	126·03	143·65	161·30	174·90	168·04	293·59	301·82	296·61
10.	M. P.	126·04	114·62	121·86	151·54	136·58	146·07	175·57	181·79	177·84	269·89	301·63	281·50
11.	Maharashtra	125·06	111·54	120·20	144·61	126·15	137·47	176·55	163·12	173·29	305·64	281·27	296·21
12.	Meghalaya	117·01	113·63	115·87	140·00	127·45	135·74	171·23	173·35	171·95	265·03	402·60	311·70
13.	Orissa	116·12	111·45	114·70	137·25	129·70	134·94	167·27	177·90	170·51	279·07	303·77	286·61
14.	Punjab	115·03	115·98	115·76	141·32	132·96	138·12	172·93	173·13	173·05	262·36	260·27	261·56
15.	Rajasthan	127·02	116·30	123·09	153·50	135·27	145·82	179·44	181·02	180·02	275·84	294·14	282·55
16.	Tamil Nadu	121·11	114·12	118·69	148·04	131·04	142·16	185·49	171·58	180·62	330·88	264·16	307·81
17.	U. P.	123·87	114·59	120·65	149·97	135·63	145·00	177·05	179·04	177·75	269·70	295·51	278·66
18.	W. B.	117·55	115·13	116·74	145·15	133·43	141·22	169·72	165·98	168·80	258·31	263·54	260·07
19.	Chandigarh	113·95	112·41	113·34	132·59	126·91	130·35	167·63	165·85	166·93	238·75	266·63	249·73
20.	Delhi	116·73	111·90	114·69	141·48	134·64	138·59	167·01	178·64	171·93	257·34	277·59	265·90
	All states	123·16	113·74	119·82	147·67	132·04	142·13	174·67	174·03	174·44	282·99	282·49	282·81

Note : F, NF and G refer to Food, Non-food and General respectively.

TABLE 3 : STATE-WISE URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES FOR FOOD, NON FOOD AND GENERAL (FOOD PLUS NON FOOD) FOR SELECTED NSS SURVEY PERIODS (BASED ON 1970-71 WEIGHTING DIAGRAMS FOR MIDDLE URBAN POPULATION)

(1970-71=10))

Sl. No.	Name of the state	1972-73			1973-74			1977-78			1983		
		F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1.	A.P.	126·31	111·24	122·42	142·23	127·67	138·48	175·92	172·82	175·12	263·98	289·38	270·52
2.	Assam	110·93	112·86	111·36	135·79	131·46	134·81	158·32	169·13	160·77	252·32	240·62	249·58
3.	Bihar	120·84	114·70	119·52	157·29	136·19	152·78	163·37	177·16	165·32	271·44	299·98	277·52
4.	Gujarat	133·93	115·62	129·59	159·28	133·79	153·24	175·18	174·87	175·10	290·36	288·03	289·83
5.	Haryana	120·35	118·29	119·82	146·21	139·34	144·44	175·63	187·51	178·69	260·16	319·53	275·44
6.	H.P.	120·09	116·46	118·90	140·50	128·96	136·71	158·31	165·66	161·05	262·50	273·70	255·17
7.	J. & K.	113·29	111·09	112·71	128·06	120·71	126·13	187·23	158·83	179·75	310·13	257·34	296·24
8.	Karnataka	127·04	113·48	123·61	151·39	134·11	147·02	168·30	179·40	171·11	270·10	307·47	279·63
9.	Kerala	125·97	111·40	121·93	157·66	126·97	149·43	162·53	177·82	166·63	291·18	318·88	298·61
10.	M.P.	126·29	114·56	123·03	153·05	137·42	148·71	176·01	183·45	178·03	267·54	314·73	280·63
11.	Maharashtra	126·24	111·92	122·22	146·65	128·29	141·50	176·38	173·11	175·45	304·45	301·34	303·57
12.	Meghalaya	115·95	111·56	114·96	141·74	123·17	137·54	166·82	163·61	165·09	257·00	301·34	308·40
13.	Orissa	116·03	110·65	114·86	136·74	127·51	134·74	165·79	177·27	168·27	280·75	484·34	289·84
14.	Punjab	114·22	116·30	114·82	140·19	133·59	138·28	170·80	173·87	171·69	257·94	322·76	259·62
15.	Rajasthan	128·43	116·97	125·53	154·47	136·73	149·98	180·10	183·14	180·87	274·33	263·76	281·75
16.	Tamil Nadu	121·62	113·25	119·39	150·92	129·75	145·29	185·15	170·56	182·01	335·52	303·65	316·31
17.	U.P.	123·97	115·29	121·60	151·20	136·51	147·20	176·96	179·98	177·79	269·30	263·27	279·57
18.	W.B.	114·74	115·50	114·92	145·54	134·42	142·93	163·17	163·94	164·76	249·86	306·97	236·89
19.	Chandigarh	110·25	111·40	110·55	128·47	124·27	127·38	160·74	161·56	160·96	230·17	279·80	240·27
20.	Delhi	116·39	111·79	115·17	140·67	133·13	138·67	166·44	176·07	169·01	253·77	269·02	263·28
	All states	123·74	113·85	121·18	149·50	132·47	145·13	174·05	175·76	174·44	281·97	293·54	284·96

Note : F, NF and G refer to Food, Non-food and General respectively.

Inspite of the fact that the two weighting diagrams differ, the difference in the two new indices is marginal in all the years 1972-73, 1973-74, 1977-78 and 1983. This shows, as already indicated in Section 3, that variation in the two weighting diagrams is not the only factor responsible for the outcome. The presence of the other factor, viz., the price index for 1970-71 with 1960 base varies over the different states and different item groups, can be confirmed by looking at column 4 of the Appendix Table A.6 and Column 2 of Appendix Table A.7. Thus both the factors have interacted and that too in such a peculiar fashion that the compound effect is only of marginal significance in changing the all-India general price index. Let it be noted that the present outcome, is a particular one and, therefore, can not be regarded true in general.

4.1 *All-India Urban General Consumer Price Indices (CPITU)*

To facilitate comparisons, the two new all-urban general consumer price indices (CPITU) with weighting diagrams W_1 and W_2 alongwith the already available consumer price indices (CPIIW and CPINM) and CSO's implicit deflator[2] are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4: ALL-URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES, 1970-71 TO 1983

NSS Rounds	Survey periods	CPITU		CPIIW	CPINM	CSO's Implicit deflator
		W_1	W_2			
		INDEX VALUE				
25th	July 70 to June 71	100	100	100	100	100
27th	Oct· 72 to Sept. 73	119·5	119·8	120·2	116·3	116·8
28th	Oct. 73 to June 74	143·0	142·1	146·8	135·1	139·0
32nd	July 77 to June 78	175·6	174·4	174·9	170·5	171·5
38th	Jan. to Dec. 1983	284·8	282·8	285·4	274·2	288·4
		ANNUAL INFLATION RATE (%)				
1970-71 to 1983		8·7	8·7	8·8	8·4	8·8
1970-71 to 1972-73		8·2	8·4	8·5	6·9	7·1
1972-73 to 1977-78		8·4	8·2	8·2	8·4	8·4
1977-78 to 1983		9·2	9·2	9·3	9·0	9·9

2. Although it is clearly inappropriate to compare the urban consumer price indices with CSO's implicit deflator for private consumption, the Planning Commission (1985) have used this. deflator as a common proxy for price indices both for rural and urban sectors. Our comparison of the CSO's deflator with the new urban price indices may therefore be taken only as an illustration of the inadequacy of the former to depict price movements in the two sectors.

The two new indices for the entire urban population come quite close to each other. Differences between them are less than one percent in all the NSS survey years from 1970-71 to 1983.

Let us note that the new consumer price indices turn out to be higher than the CPINM, by 3 to 10 percentage points in different survey periods and only marginally different (mostly on the lower side) from the CPIIW. However, compared to the CSO's implicit deflator the two new indices (based on W_1 and W_2) are higher by about 2 to 4 percentage points upto 1977-78, but are lower in 1983 by 3.6 and 5.6 percentage points, respectively.

The average annual increase in the urban cost of living (inflation rate) over the entire periods of twelve and half years (from 1970-71 to 1983) works out to be around 8.7 percent from both the new indices as compared to 8.8 percent from the CPIIW as well as

the CSO's implicit deflator and 8.4 percent from the CPINM. This observation may tempt one to conclude that the new all-urban price indices, though more representative, are only marginally different in numerical terms from the available indices (CPIIW, CPINM and CSOs deflator). However, this is not true if one compares the annual inflation rates worked out from the newly constructed and the available indices over the three periods viz. 1970-71 to 1972-73, 1972-73 to 1977-78 and 1977-78 to 1983, separately. Over the period 1970-71 to 1972-73 the two new indices showed annual inflation rates of 8.2 and 8.4; whereas the CPINM and the CSO's deflator showed much smaller annual rate of increase of 6.9 percent and 7.1 percent, respectively. Between 1972-73 and 1977-78 all the indices (new as well as existing) showed almost similar annual inflation rates

varying between 8.2 to 8.4 percent. However, during 1977-78 and 1983, the CSO's implicit deflator showed an annual inflation rate of 9.9 percent as compared to 9.2 percent by each of the two new indices, 9.0 percent by the CPINM and 9.3 percent by the CPIIW. It may be noted that annual inflation rates registered by all the indices were higher over the last five year period from 1977-78 to 1983 (9.0 to 9.9 percent) as compared to those over the middle five year period from 1972-73 to 1977-78 (8.2 to 8.4 percent), or over the entire period of twelve and half years under study (8.4 to 8.8 percent).

4.2 *Country-wide General Consumer Price Index*

For meaningful comparisons with the CSO's impli-

cit deflator for private consumption, one needs a general consumer price index for the entire country. Of course, there does not exist at present any general index of this type. In the previous section we presented a representative consumer price index for urban India (CPITU). In an earlier paper, Minhas et. al. (1987), had constructed a consumer price index for rural India (CPITR). We can combine the CPITU and CPITR by taking the weighted average of the rural and urban indices, the weights being the aggregate consumer expenditure, respectively, of the rural and urban sectors in different years under consideration. The general consumer price index for the country as a whole is given in Table 5, along with CSO's implicit deflator.

TABLE 5 : ALL INDIA CONSUMER PRICE INDICES, 1970-71 TO 1983

Round	Year	Rural (CPITR)	Urban (CPITU)	Combined (All-India)	CSO's Implicit Consumer price Index
25th	1970-71	100	100	100	100
27th	1972-73	125·1	119·8	123·7	116·8
28th	1973-74	151·8	142·1	149·3	139·0
32nd	1977-78	177·1	174·4	176·3	171.5
38th	1983	284·2	282·8	283·8	288.4

The movements in the country-wide consumer price index (Col. 4, Table 5) between 1970-71 and 1983 are entirely different from the movements exhibited by the CSO's implicit deflator for private consumption. While the former rose much faster upto 1977-78, the CSO's implicit deflator shot up between 1977-78 and 1983. The latter reached an absolute level of 288.4 in 1983 (1970-71=100), whereas the former stood at 283.8.

On the basis of the observations made in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 we may conclude that notwithstanding the marginal differences in annual average rate of increase over the entire twelve and half years worked out from the two new all-India urban cost of living indices and the already available sectional indices, there are notable differences between the new and the existing indices in terms of annual inflation rate during the periods 1970-71 to 1972-73 and 1977-78 to 1983. Furthermore, it must be stressed that the new indices are conceptually superior and truly representative of the entire urban population in comparison to CPIIW, CPINM and the CSO's implicit deflator. While CPIIW and CPINM cover only small sections of urban population, the CSO's implicit deflator does not differentiate

between rural and urban population and provides only one deflator relating to the entire population of India.

4.3 *Item-Group-Specific Price Indices for Urban India*

Table 6 presents two alternative all-India Urban price indices for various individual item groups for 1972-73, 1973-74, 1977-78 and 1983 with 1970-71 as the base, one based on the use of the weighting diagram (shares of states in item group-specific total expenditure of all the states) for 1960 (W_1) and the other of the weighting diagram for 1970-71 (W_2)[3]. A comparison of the two commodity-group-specific indices at the four different points of time reveals that, like the two general indices, the two item-group-specific indices are only marginally different for each item-group and in all the periods except for the item-group housing, or the broad item-group all non-food, in the period 1983, which happens to be farthest from the base of 1970-71. It may be noted that similar to what has been noted above in the case of the two new general indices, the marginal difference in the two item-group-specific indices has been due to the interplay of both the factors, viz. (a) visible difference in the two weighting diagrams W_1 and W_2 and (b) for each item-group, the state-specific

---

3. From users point of view, we report in Appendix Table A. 7 All-India urban item-group-specific price indices for twenty item groups and for five NSS survey periods 1970-71, 1972-73, 1973-74, 1977-78 and 1983, with the same base as that of the CPINM and the CPIIW series, i.e. 1960·

price index for 1970-71 with 1960=100 varying over the states.

TABLE 6 : ALL-INDIA URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES FOR VARIOUS ITEM GROUPS FOR THE SELECTED NSS SURVEY PERIODS.

(BASED ON THE USE OF 1960 AND 1970-71 WEIGHTING DIAGRAM—W_1 AND W_2)

Sl. No.	Name of the Item	1972-73		1973-74		1977-78		1983	
		W_1	W_2	W_1	W_2	W_1	W_2	W_1	W_2
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1.	Cereals and products	124·63	125·38	154·68	155·62	159·21	160·69	265·02	268·11
2.	Pulses and products	148·05	148·28	156·72	156·74	236·22	236·38	342·61	343·65
3.	Oils and fats	126·53	127·20	163·38	163·68	175·84	174·79	288·16	287·67
4.	Meat, fish and eggs	119·16	118·98	146·92	148·01	194·42	194·73	343·38	344·16
5.	Milk and products	113·44	113.49	138.21	137·90	171.35	171·92	260·42	261·28
6.	Condiments & spices	100·57	100·89	132·65	133·13	199·77	200·43	252·86	253·65
7.	Fruits and Vegetables	113·74	114·34	136·03	136·23	170·54	171·53	285·39	287·67
8.	Other food	129·70	129·36	140·90	140·43	176·29	176·05	296·71	297·02
	All food	122·55	123·16	147·66	147·67	174·46	174·67	281·19	282·99
9.	Pan, supari, Tobacco and intoxicants	113·84	114·32	128·91	129·95	175·62	176·80	295·24	292·73
10.	Fuel and light	116·19	116·15	141·03	141·03	191·04	191·07	368·21	356·89
11.	Housing	107·35	108·49	112·50	113·50	138·51	141·27	197·83	206·40
12.	Clothing & footwear	121·33	121·25	153·89	153·66	201·58	202·37	297·07	298·97
13.	Medicalcare	106·96	106·65	111·60	111·30	144·99	144·69	211·90	211·76
14.	Education & recreation	111·85	112·56	116·71	117·65	139·07	140·83	200·53	202·42
15.	Transport and Communication	111·99	112·34	122·53	123·17	167·64	168·49	267·04	259·15
16.	Personal Care	110·94	110·84	139·29	138·73	177·14	176·68	290·32	288·72
17.	Other non-food	112·78	113·21	135·29	135·33	184·95	186·32	314·78	316·26
	All non-food	113·92	113·74	134·50	132·04	175·56	174·03	291·59	282·49
	All items	119·53	119·82	143·05	142·10	175·56	174·44	284·83	282·81

Note: Cols. (2), (4), (6) and (8) of this table have been worked out from Appendix.
Table A.7 on dividing its cols. (4), (5), (6) and (7) by col (3).

4.4 *State-Specific Consumer Price Indices*

With a view to examine the movement of the two state-specific price indices, using alternative weighing diagrams (W_1 and W_2), we have worked out from Tables 1 and 2, the state-wise annual rate of increase (%) in urban cost of living under each weighting diagram during the period 1970-71 to 1977-78 (Period I) and 1977-78 to 1983 (Period II) as well as over the entire period 1970-71 to 1983. These are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7 STATE-SPECIFIC ANNUAL RATE OF INCREASE (%) IN THE TWO ALL-URBAN COST OF LIVING INDICES DURING THE THREE PERIODS: 1970-71 To 1977-78, 1977-78 TO 1983 AND 1970-71 TO 1983 [BASED ON THE WEIGHTING DIAGRAM OF 1960 (W_1) AND 1970-71 (W_2)]

Sl. No.	Name of the State	1970-71 to 1977-78		1977-78 to 1983		1970-71 to 1983	
		W_1	W_2	W_1	W_2	W_1	W_2
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	8·5	8·3	8·3	8·4	8·4	8·4
2.	Assam	8·0	7·6	8·3	8·0	8·2	7·8
3.	Bihar	7·9	7·8	9·7	9·4	8·7	8·5
4.	Gujarat	8·5	8·3	9·5	9·5	8·9	8·8
5.	Haryana	9·0	8·9	8·4	8·1	8·7	8·5
6.	Himachal Pradesh	7·1	7·2	9·1	8·8	8·0	7·9
7.	J. & K.	8·6	8·7	9·6	9·3	9·0	9·0
8.	Karnataka	8·2	8·0	9·5	9·4	8·7	8·6
9.	Kerala	7·6	7·7	11·2	10·9	9·2	9·1
10.	M. P.	8·8	8·6	8·7	8·7	8·7	8·6
11.	Maharashtra	8·3	8·2	10·2	10·2	9·1	9·1

(1) (2)		(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
12. Meghalaya	.	8·2	8·0	10·9	11·4	9·4	9·5
13. Orissa	.	8·0	7·9	9·9	9·9	8·8	8·8
14. Punjab	.	8·2	8·1	7·8	7·8	8·0	8·0
15. Rajasthan	.	8·8	8·8	8·5	8·5	8·7	8·7
16. Tamil Nadu	.	9·0	8·8	10·0	10·2	9·4	9·4
17. U. P.	. .	8·8	8·6	8·6	8·5	8·7	8·5
18. West Bengal	.	7·9	7·8	8·4	8·2	8·1	7·9
19. Chandigarh	.	7·6	7·6	7·3	7·6	7·4	7·6
20. Delhi	.	8·2	8·0	8·1	8·3	8·2	8·1
All-States	.	8·4	8·3	9·2	9·2	8·7	8·7
Rank correlation in the two state-specific indices	.		0·97		0·97		0·96

(a) *Effect of Weighting Diagram :*

A look at the annual inflation rates for the various states, worked out by using the two alternative weighting diagrams, suggests that almost in all states and union territories the two price indices are only marginally different. Except for Assam during Period I and Meghalaya during Period II, in all other states the differences in inflation rates based on the two indices are only 0.2 percentage points or less. The rank correlation for each of the three periods, from the ranking of the states by the annual inflation rate derived under the two weighting diagrams, also turns out to be very close to one (0.97 for periods I and II and 0.96 for the entire period 1970-71 to 1983). This indicates that in any period the ranking order of states in terms of annual inflation rate, derived by using either of the two weighting diagrams, remains practically unchanged. The above observation at the state level is quite in line with our finding at the all-India level i.e. the differences in the two weighting diagrams do not seem to make any notable impact on the consumer price indices for the period studied by us.

(b) *Changes in Inflation Rate Over Time*

In view of the marginal effect of the alternative weighting diagrams on the state-specific consumer price index, we will now confine our attention to the price indices derived by using the weighting diagram of the more recent year, i.e. 1970-71. The average annual increase in urban cost of living in different states during period I varied from 7 to 9 percent, whereas at the all-India level it was 8.3 percent. During period II, it increased considerably for most of the states : it varied from 7 to 11 percent with 9.2 percent for all-India. Four northern states (Punjab, Haryana, UP and Rajasthan) are the exception where the average annual inflation rate showed a decline from period I to period II—from 8.1,

8.9, 8.6 and 8.8 percent in period I to 7.8, 8.1, 8.5 and 8.5 percent in period II, respectively. Three southern states (Karnataka, Kerala and Tamil Nadu) and two Western States (Gujarat and Maharashtra) showed substantial increases in annual inflation rates from 8.0, 7.7, 8.8, 8.3 and 8.2 percent in period I to 9.4, 10.9, 10.2, 9.5 and 10.2 percents in period II, respectively. Eastern states (Assam, Bihar, Meghalaya, Orissa and West Bengal) also showed notable increases in the inflation rates from 7.6, 7.8, 8.0, 7.9 and 7.8 percent in period I to 8.0, 9.4, 11.4, 9.9 and 8.2 percents in period II, respectively. The states which showed only marginal increase in annual inflation rates during the two periods, I and II, are Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chandigarh and Delhi.

Only in six states, the annual inflation rates during period I were higher than the All-India inflation rate of 8.3 percent : whereas in period II nine states showed higher inflation rates as compared to All-India figure of 9.2 percent. For the entire period of twelve and half years (1970-71 to 1983). seven states showed higher inflation rates than the All-India rate of 8.7 percent. However, only two states, Tamil Nadu and Jammu and Kashmir, showed consistently higher inflation than that for India as a whole during both the periods.

To facilitate comparisons of annual inflation rates in different states over the three periods we have classified states in terms of state-specific annual inflation rate expressed as percentage of the all-India inflation rate into three categories (below 97.5%, 97.5 to 102.5% and above 102.5%) in Table 8. It is interesting to note that Kerala, Meghalaya and Orissa had annual inflation rates in period I considerably lower than that for All-India and belonged to the first category (below 97.5 percent). However in period II they crossed into the third category (above

102.5 per cent) due to steep increase in inflation rates in period II as compared to period I. Kerala and Meghalaya showed higher average annual inflation rates for the combined period of twelve and half years and, therefore, fell into the third category; whereas Orissa got classified under the second category with only slightly higher inflation rate than that for all-India. Four states i.e. Haryana, Rajasthan, UP and MP, were placed in the third category in period I with relatively higher inflation rate compared to all-India, whereas in period II they fell in the first category showing relatively lower inflation rate than all-India. Delhi, West Bengal, Assam, Chandigarh and Himachal Pradesh showed considerably lower inflation rates compared to All-India and were placed in the first category in all the three periods. Bihar and Karnataka showed relatively lower inflation rates than all-India in period I. However, in period II

they shifted to the second category as there were notable increases in their inflation rates from period I to period II. Upward shifts were also observed in case of Maharashtra and Gujarat which moved from the second category in period I to the third category in period II.

4.5 *State-Specific Food and Non-Food Price Indices*

It may be noted from Table 6 that, at the all-India level, the use of the weighting diagram of 1970-71 W_2) in place of 1960 (W_1) causes the urban price index (with 1970-71=100) for the broad item group all non-food to decline at the rate of 0.16, 1.83, 2.02 and 3.12 percent in the years 1972-73, 1973-74, 1977-78 and 1983, respectively. However, for the other broad item group all-food, the rise of the index is at the rate of less than one percent in all the four years.

TABLE 8 : CLASSIFICATION OF STATES ACCORDING TO THE INDEX OF STATE URBAN/INFLATION RATE RELATIVE TO ALL-INDIA URBAN INFLATION RATE (SUIRI) OVER THE THREE PERIODS: 1970-71 TO 1977-78, 1977-78 TO 1983 AND 1970-71 TO 1983.

STATES WITH SUIRI		
Below 97·5%	97·5 to 102·5%	above 102·5%
·PERIOD I : 1970-71 TO 1977-78		
Meghalaya (96·4)	Andhra Pradesh (100)	Haryana (107·2)
Karnataka (96·4)	Gujarat (100)	Rajasthan (106·0)
Delhi (96·4)	Maharashtra (98·8)	Tamil Nadu (106·0)
Orissa (95·2)	Punjab (97·6)	J & K (104·8)
Bihar (94·0)		M. P. (103·5)
West Bengal (94·0)		U. P. (103·6)
Kerala (92·8)		
Assam (91·6)		
Chandigarh (91·6)		
Himachal Pradesh (86·7)		
PERIOD II : 1977-78 TO 1983		
Himachal Pradesh (94·6)	Bihar (102·2)	Meghalaya (123·9)
Madhya Pradesh (94·6)	Karnataka (102·2)	Kerala (118·5)
Rajasthan (92·4)	J & K (101·1)	Tamil Nadu (110·9)
Uttar Pradesh (92·4)		Maharashtra (110·9)
Andhra Pradesh (91·3)		Orissa (107·6)
Delhi (90·2)		Gujarat (103·3)
West Bengal (89·1)		
Haryana (88·0)		
Assam (87·0)		
Punjab (84·4)		
Chandigarh (92·6)		
PERIOD III: 1970-71 TO 1983		
Andhra Pradesh (93·1)	Gujarat (101·1)	Meghalaya (109·2)
Delhi (93·1)	Orissa (101·1)	Kerala (104·6)
Punja (92·0)	Rajasthan (100)	Tamil Nadu (108·0)
Himachal Pradesh (90·8)	Karnataka (98·8)	Maharashtra (104·6)
West Bengal (90·8)	Madhya Pradesh (98·8)	J & K (103·4)
Assam (89·6)	Bihar (97·7)	
Chandigarh (87·4)	Uttar Pradesh (97.7)	
	Haryana (97.7)	

Note: Figures within bracket refer to the value of SUIRI.

At the state level, the impact of replacing W_1 by W_2 on the two urban price indices, one for all-food and the other for all non-food, has been somewhat different from the one noted at the all-India level in section 4.1 (see Tables 1 and 2). Over the different states the change in the weighting diagram from W_1 to W_2 caused the urban index for all food to change at rates (%) lying in the intervals (—1.17 to 1.02), (—1.00 to 1.01), (—3.55 to 1.01) and (—3.48 to 10.2) in the years 1972-73, 1973-74, 1977-78 and 1983, respectively. For all non-food, the corresponding intervals of the percentage rate of change in the index turned out to be (—2.27 to 1.77), (—4.74 to 0.60), (—4.44 to 1.03) and (—6.41 to 1.05). The reason for this seems to reside in the fact that the shares of all-food and all non-food in total consumption expenditure had undergone substantial change between 1960 and 1970-71 for most of the states. From the Appendix Table A.8 it is noted that the percentage change in the shares of all-food or all non-food for different states from 1960 to 1970-71 happened to fall in the interval (—2.62 to 23.28).

To examine the performance of the state-specific urban indices for all-food and all non-food, the annual rates of increase in the price index for all-food (AIRF) and for all non-food (AIRNF) using alternative weighting diagrams, over period I (1970-71 to 1977-78), period II (1977-78—1983) and the combined period III (1970-71 to 1983), have been worked out for each state. The statewise comparative picture in terms of AIRF and AIRNF is presented below in Tables 9 and 10.

TABLE 9 :   STATEWISE ANNUAL RATE OF INCREASE (%) IN FOOD AND NON-FOOD URBAN PRICE INDICES (AIRF AND AIRNF) OVER THREE PERIODS I, II AND III USING WEIGHTING DIAGRAM FOR 1960

Sl. No.	Name of the state	AIRF			AIRNF		
		Period			Period		
		I	II	III	I	II	III
	(A) AIRF higher than AIRNF in all the periods						
1.	Maharashtra	8·4	10·4	9·3	8·0	10·0	8·9
2.	Tamil Nadu	9·3	11·0	10·0	8·4	8·0	8·2
	(B) AIRF lower than AIRNF in all the periods						
3.	Bihar	7·5	9·4	8·3	8·6	10·1	9·3
4.	Haryana	8·4	7·4	8·0	10·0	9·8	9·9
5.	Karnataka	7·8	9·1	8·4	8·9	10·2	9·5
6.	Kerala	7·2	11·2	9·0	8·5	11·3	9·7
7.	Madhya Pradesh	8·5	8·0	8·3	9·3	9·9	9·5
8.	Orissa	7·9	9·7	8·7	8·2	10·3	9·1
9.	Rajasthan	8·7	7·9	8·4	9·1	9·6	9·3
10.	Uttar Pradesh	8·6	7·9	8·3	9·4	9·8	9·6
11.	West Bengal	7·9	8·0	7·9	7·9	9·0	8·4
12.	Chandigarh	7·5	6·7	7·2	7·8	8·3	8·0
13.	Delhi	7·5	8·1	7·8	9·5	8·1	8·6
	(C) AIRF lower in period (i) but higher in period (ii) than AIRNF						
14.	Assam	7·9	8·7	8·3	8·4	7·4	8·0
15.	Gujarat	8·4	9·6	8·9	8·6	9·4	9.0
16.	Himachal Pradesh	6·9	9·2	7·9	7·5	8·9	8·1
17.	Punjab	8·0	7·8	7·9	8·4	7·7	8·2
	(D) AIRF higher in period (i) but lower in period (ii) than AIRNF						
18.	Andhra Pradesh	8·6	7·7	8·2	8·3	9·6	8·9
19.	J. & K.	9·1	9·5	9·3	7·4	9·6	8·4
20.	Meghalaya	8·3	8·3	8·3	8·1	15·6	11·3

TABLE 10 :   STATEWISE ANNUAL RATE OF INCREASE (%) IN FOOD AND NON-FOOD URBAN PRICE INDICES (AIRF AND AIRNF) OVER THREE PERIODS I, II AND III USING WEIGHTING DIAGRAM FOR 1970-71

Sl. No.	Name of the state	AIRF			AIRNF		
		Period			Period		
		I	II	III	I	II	III
	(A) AIRF higher than AIRNF in all the periods						
1.	Gujarat	8·4	9·6	8·9	8·2	9·3	8·7
2.	Jammu & Kashmir	9·3	9·6	9·4	7·5	8·5	7·9
3.	Maharashtra	8·5	10·5	9·3	7·7	9·8	8·6
4.	Tamil Nadu	9·2	11·1	10·0	8·0	8·2	8·1
	(B) AIRF lower than AIRNF in all the periods						
5.	Bihar	7·5	9·4	8·3	8·4	9·4	8·9
6.	Haryana	8·5	7·4	8·0	9·6	9·3	9·4
7.	Karnataka	7·7	9·3	8·4	8·5	9·6	9·0
8.	Madhya Pradesh	8·4	8·1	8·3	8·9	9·6	9·2
9.	Meghalaya	8·0	8·3	8·1	8·2	16·6	11·8
10.	Orissa	7·6	9·8	8·6	8·6	10·2	9·3
11.	Rajasthan	8·7	8·1	8·4	8·8	9·2	9·0
12.	Uttar Pradesh	8·5	8·0	8·3	8·7	9·5	9·1
	(C) AIRF lower in period I but higher in phriod II than AIRNF						
13.	Assam	7·3	8·8	8·0	8·2	6·4	7·4
14.	Himachal Pradesh	7·1	9·2	8·0	7·3	8·1	7·1
15.	Kerala	7·4	11·1	9·0	8·3	10·5	9·2
16.	Punjab	8·1	7·9	8·0	8·2	7·7	8·0
17.	Delhi	7·6	8·9	8·2	8·6	8·3	8·5
	(D) AIRF higher in Periods I but lower in period II than AIRNF						
18.	Andhra Pradesh	8·4	7·9	8·2	8·1	9·3	8·6
19.	West Bengal	7·8	7·9	7·9	7·6	8·6	8·1
20.	Chandigarh	7·7	6·6	7·2	7·5	9·0	8·2

In these tables the statewise comparison of AIRF with AIRNF over the three periods is presented in four categories, viz. (A) AIRF is greater than AIRNF in all the periods, (B) AIRF < AIRNF in all the periods (C) AIRF < AIRNF in period I but AIRF \ AIRNF in period II and (D) AIRF is higher in period I but lower in period II than AIRNF. Under categories A and B there were 2 and 11 states when weighting diagram W_1 is used and 4 and 8 states when W_2 is used respectively. For both the weighting diagrams two states were common under category A and seven states under category B. Categories C and D contained 4 and 3 states under W_1 and 5 and 3 states under W_2, respectively. Among these states, three under category C and one under category D were common for both W_1 and W_2.

Based on the use of the latest weighting diagram (1970-71) over the combined period, AIRF was noted to be higher than AIRNF in six states, viz. Assam, Gujarat, H.P., J.K., Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu. Except Assam and H.P., the remaining four out of

these six states experienced higher AIRF than AIRNF in both periods, I and II. For Assam and H.P. compared to AIRNF, AIRF was on lower side in period I but on higher side in period II. From among the fourteen states, where AIRF was lower than AIRNF over the combined period, eight states had lower AIRF compared to AIRNF over both the separate periods, I and II. Three states (Kerala, Punjab and Delhi) showed AIRF less than AIRNF in period I and the contrary (i.e. AIRF \ AIRNF) in period II, whereas the remaining three states (A.P., W.B. and Chandigarh) turned out with higher AIRF in period I and lower AIRF in period II compared to AIRNF.

4.6 *Comparison of Price Indices Derived by Using All-Urban (W_2) and Middle-Urban (W_3) NSS Consumption Pattern.*

In our earlier study [2] we observed that in the context of estimating poverty incidence among all-India rural and Urban population, the consumption pattern of middle section of population is more relevant and suitable than that of entire population for the construc-

tion of consumer price index. We compare below (Table 11) the two state-specific urban consumer price indices (IW$_2$ and IW$_3$) which were constructed by using the consumption pattern of all-urban (W$_2$) and middle-urban (W$_3$)[4] population as weights (see Table Nos. 2 and 3).

At the all-India level as well as in four states (Gujarat, Maharashtra, Tamilnadu and UP), the consumer price indices derived by using the consumption pattern of the middle-urban population (IW$_3$) were found to be consistently higher in all the four periods than those derived by using the all-urban consumption pattern (IW$_2$). This implies that for these four states as well as for all-India the use of IW$_2$

for updating the state poverty lines would result in lower poverty incidence as compared to the poverty incidence derived by using the IW$_3$. In three states (Assam, Haryana and Chandigarh), on the other hand, the W$_3$ based consumer prices indices were consistently lower in all periods than the W$_2$ based price indices. This also indicates that the use of IW$_3$ would result in lower poverty incidence in these three states as compared to poverty incidence derived by using IW$_2$. In rest of the 13 states, too, notable differences were observed between IW$_2$ and IW$_3$ in different periods. For example, out of 52 observations (in 13 states and four periods) in 35 cases IW$_3$ was different from IW$_2$ by more than one percentage point and only in 17 cases the differences were marginal (one percentage point or less).

TABLE (11) :   DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MIDDLE-URBAN (IW$_3$) AND ALL-URBAN (IW$_2$) BASED CONSUMER PRICE INDICES (IN PERCENTAGES POINTS WITH 1970-71 AS 100)

State	IW$_3$ ≥ IW$_2$				IW$_3$ < IW$_2$			
	1972-73	1973-74	1977-78	1983	1972-73	1973-74	1977-78	1983
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Andhra Pradesh	2·0	1·7	0·4	—	—	—	—	2.0
2. Assam	—	—	—	—	2·4	0·6	6·4	5·1
3. Bihar	1·3	4·1	—	0·4	—	—	2·9	—
4. Gujarat	2·4	3·3	0·4	1·7	—	—	—	—
5. Haryana	—	—	—	—	1·3	0·6	2·8	3·2
6. Himachal Pradesh	1·5	0·9	—	8·6	—	—	1·3	—
7. Jammu & Kashmir	—	—	0·4	4·1	0·5	1·5	—	—
8. Karnataka	2·5	4·3	—	—	—	—	0·4	1·5
9. Kerala	2·8	5·8	—	2·0	—	—	1·4	—
10. Madhya Pradesh	1·2	2·6	0·2	—	—	—	—	0·9
11. Maharashtra	2·0	4·0	2·2	7·4	—	—	—	—
12. Meghalaya	—	1·8	—	—	0·9	—	5·9	3·3
13. Orissa	0·7	—	—	3·2	—	0·2	2·2	—
14. Punjab	—	0·2	—	—	0·9	—	1·4	1·9
15. Rajasthan	2·4	3·2	0·8	—	—	—	—	0·8
16. Tamilnadu	0·7	3·1	1·4	8·5	—	—	—	—
17. Uttar Pradesh	1·0	2·2	neg.	0·9	—	—	—	—
18. West Bengal	—	1·7	—	—	1·6	—	4·0	3·2
19. Chandigarh	—	—	—	—	2·8	3·0	6·0	9·4
20. Delhi	0·5	—	—	—	—	neg.	2·9	2·6
All States	1·4	3·0	0·0	2·2	—	—	—	—

4. In this study the middle-urban populations in different states consist of all those persons whose per capita total expenditure lies between Rs. 28 and Rs. 43. This was done keeping in view that at the all-India level the poverty line in urban areas in 1970-71 was below Rs. 43. Technically, the middle band of urban population can be improved further by taking into account the state specific levels of poverty. However, we have empirically verified that this improvement by selecting middle band population in different states changes the price indices only marginally.

It may be noted that the selection of the base year in computing the price indices is very important for depicting the changes in the two indices (IW_2 and IW_3). For instance if we use 1973-74 as the base year (instead of 1970-71), then we get entirely different picture than the one obtained by taking 1970-71 as the base year. At the all-India level as well as for fifteen states, the W_2 based price indices were observed to be higher than the W_3 based indices in all the periods. Jammu and Kashmir is the only state where IW_3 was higher than IW_2 in all the four periods. The reason is quite visible as in 1973-74, IW_3 (with 1970-71 as base) was considerably higher than IW_2 for most of the states. Thus, if 1973-74 is taken as base, the resultant IW_2 would come out to be higher than IW_3.

5. *Some Concluding Remarks and Recommendations*

Two massive sets of data on retail price quotations for about 200 different commodities and services, collected every month since 1960 from 95 urban areas, have been combined with NSS—based urban consumption patterns to compute almost fully representative urban cost of living indices for the total urban population of India and twenty separate states/Union Territories. The resulting urban consumer price indices have been presented for the five recent NSS survey periods, 1970-71, 1972-73, 1973-74, 1977-78 and 1983, using three different weighting diagram. Separate urban consumer prices indices for three broad aggregate commodity groups—all-food, all non-food and all item-groups in urban India, have been provided.

Certain crucial gaps in our knowledge of the urban cost of living in India have been filled by this study. Many of the numerical results given in this study were not available to the users earlier : It is our hope that these results, which are far too many to summarise here, would be found useful by the research workers and policy makers.

This study demonstrates that even with very limited resources, it is possible to construct adequately representative urban consumer price indices for different states as well as for all-India by using NSS urban consumption data and the price data which are already being collected regularly for the computation of CPIIW and CPINM series. In a similar fashion, adequately representative rural consumer price indices can also be constructed by using the NSS rural consumption data and the rural price data which are regularly collected from 422-600 village markets (soon to be increased to 1000) for the computation of consumer price index for agricultural labourers.

We recommend that the task of constructing fully representative rural-urban consumer price indices should be taken up by the official agencies (CSO, Labour Bureau and the States) and published regularly on a monthly or annual basis. To start with, the 1983 NSS consumption data sets can be used for the base year weighting diagrams. All the detailed consumer price data collected month after month should be transferred on to computer tapes. Once this is done, it would be relatively easy to work out representative cost of living indices. The availability of these consumer price indices should improve the deflation procedures employed in National Income Accounts as well as in numerous planning exercises at the national and state levels.

REFERENCES

(1) Iyengar, N.S. and L.R. Jain (1976), "Inflation and its Differential Effects," *Indian Economic Review*, Vol. XI (New Series), No. 1.

(2) Minhas, B.S., L.R. Jain, S.M. Kansal and M.R. Saluja (1987) "On the Choice of Appropriate Consumer Price Indices and Data Sets for Estimating the Incidence of Poverty in India", *Indian Economic Review*, Vol. XXII, No. 1, January-June, pp. 19—50.

(3) Murty, G.V.S.N. and K.N. Murthy (1977), "On Differential Effects of Price Movements", *Indian Economic Review*, Vol. XII (New series), No. 2 (October), pp. 169-179.

(4) Radhakrishna, R. and A. Sharma (1976), 'Inflation and Disparities in the level of Living", *Indian Economic Journal*, Vol. 2 3, No. 4.

(5) Planning Commission (1985), *The Seventh Five Year Plan*, Vol. I, October 1985.

APPENDIX TABLE A·1 : LIST OF GROUPS OF CONSUMER ITEMS WHOSE MONTHLY CONSUMER PRICE INDICES (WITH 1960-100) ARE AVAILABLE FOR EACH CENTRE OF THE CPIW AND THE CPINM SERIES

CPIIW Series		CPINM Series	
Sl. No.	Name of the item group	Sl. No.	Name of the item group
1	Cereals and products	1	Cereals
2	Pulses and products	2	pulses
3	Oils and fats	3	Oils and fats
4	Meat, fish and eggs	4	Meat, fish and eggs
5	Milk and products	5	Milk
6	Condiments and spices	6	Condiments and spices
7	Fruits and vegetables	7	Vegetables
8	Other food	8	Fruits
9	Pan, supari, tobcco and intoxicants	9	Sugar (including gur)
10	Fuel and Light	10	Non-alcoholic beverages
11	Housing	11	Prepared meals and refreshments
12	Clothing, bedding and foot wear	12	Pan, supari, tobacco
13	Medical care	13	Fuel and Light
14	Education, Recreation and amusement	14	Housing
15	Transport and communication	15	Clothing, Bedding and footwear
16	Personal care and effects	16	Medical care
17	Other non-food	17	Education
		18	Recreation
		19	Transport and communications
		20	Personal care and effects
		21	Household requisites
		22	Other non-food

APPENDIX—TABLE A·2 : STATEWISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE CENTRES OF THE CPINM AND THE CPIIW SERIES

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Name of Centres	
		CPINM Series	CPIIW Series
1	Andhra Pradesh	Hyderabad, Secunderabad, Kurnool, Vijayawada, Waltair-Visakhapatnam	Gundur, Guntur, Hyderabad
2	Assam	Gauhati	Digboi, Doom-Dooma, Labac, Mariani, Rangipira.
3	Bihar	Muzaffarpur, Patna, Ranchi	Jamshedpur, Jharia, Kodirma, Noamundi, Mongyr.
4	Gujarat	Ahmedabad, Rajkot	Ahmedabad, Bhavnagar
5	Haryana	—	Yamunanagar
6	Himachal Pradesh	Simla	—
7	Jammu & Kashmir	Jammu, Srinagar	Srinagar
8	Karnataka	Bangalore, Gulbarga Hubli-Dharwar, Manglore	Ammathi, Bangalore, Chikmagalur, Kolar Gold Field
9	Kerala	Kozhikode, Trivandrum	Alleppey, Alwaye, Munda-Kayam.
10	Madhya Pradesh	Bhopal, Gwalior, Indore, Jabalpur	Balaghat, Bhopal, Gwalior, Indore
11	Maharashtra	Bombay, Nagpur, Poona	Bombay, Nagpur, Sholapur
12	Meghalaya	Shillong	—
13	Orissa	Cuttack-Bhubaneswar, Sambalpur	Barbil, Sambalpur
14	Punjab	Amritsar	Amritsar
15	Rajasthan	Ajmer, Jaipur, Jodhpur	Ajmer, Jaipur
16	Tamil Nadu	Madras, Madurai, Tiruchirapalli	Coimbatore, Coonoor, Madras, Madurai
17	Uttar Pradesh	Agra, Allahabad, Kanpur, Lucknow, Meerut	Kanpur, Saharanpur, Varanasi
18	West Bengal	Calcutta, Kharagpur	Asansol, Calcutta, Darjeeling Howrah, Jalpaigari, Raniganj.
19	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	
20	Delhi	Delhi-New Delhi	Delhi

APPENDIX—TABLE A.3 : STATE-WISE PERCENTAGE SHARES OF GROUPS OF CONSUMER ITEMS IN TOTAL CONSUMER EXPENDITURE FOR URBAN POPULATION : 1961-62

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Cereals and Products	Pulses and Products	Oils and fats	Meat fish and eggs	Milk and Products	Spices etc.	Fruits & veg.	Other food	Intoxicants etc.	Fuel and light	Housing	Clothing etc.	Medical care	Education and recl.	Transport and comm.	Personal care	Other non-food	Urban popln. (000)
(0)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
1.	A.P.	51.84	3.22	3.29	4.61	6.19	4.09	4.17	6.63	0.56	5.92	2.34	7.82	2.26	2.18	1.95	3.14	9.80	627
2.	Assam	20.12	4.34	4.23	9.52	6.38	1.66	5.87	7.12	2.14	7.37	4.90	8.04	1.10	4.29	1.53	2.32	9.07	82
3.	Bihar	26.02	3.55	3.15	3.00	7.21	1.43	5.18	5.86	0.74	4.58	1.94	6.86	1.83	5.78	2.09	2.29	18.49	391
4.	Gujarat	20.30	3.40	5.48	1.39	14.02	1.73	5.96	10.59	0.72	7.25	3.50	4.60	2.49	4.66	1.39	2.21	10.31	532
5.	Haryana	20.94	2.36	4.07	1.02	16.67	1.40	5.23	5.75	0.10	6.49	2.84	13.39	1.61	3.66	1.61	2.25	7.61	131
6.	H.P.	20.94	2.36	4.07	1.02	16.67	1.40	5.23	8.75	0.10	6.49	2.84	13.39	1.61	3.66	1.61	2.25	7.61	18
7.	J. & K.	25.54	1.49	4.42	7.80	14.08	2.57	4.34	8.85	0.12	8.89	1.13	5.67	1.17	3.02	1.25	2.29	7.37	59
8.	Karnataka	28.04	3.79	2.24	2.98	6.69	3.56	4.19	14.08	1.32	6.39	3.45	6.39	1.76	3.16	1.73	3.01	7.22	527
9.	Kerala	27.30	1.86	2.28	3.76	4.53	2.63	6.20	16.46	0.85	6.12	2.63	3.72	3.14	4.11	1.98	3.68	8.75	255
10.	M.P.	23.52	3.82	4.19	2.43	11.24	2.28	4.19	7.79	2.58	6.89	2.51	8.99	2.21	2.77	2.10	2.51	9.98	463
11.	Maharashtra	17.32	2.67	4.34	4.12	9.41	2.32	5.24	1.04	1.17	6.03	5.70	7.34	2.45	5.48	3.03	2.95	10.39	1116
12.	Meghalaya	20.12	4.34	4.23	9.52	6.38	1.66	5.87	7.12	2.14	7.37	4.90	8.04	1.10	4.29	1.53	2.32	9.07	9
13.	Orissa	23.91	3.23	3.26	5.25	5.25	2.08	7.45	6.67	1.81	5.56	1.60	6.23	2.43	5.78	3.50	3.23	11.76	111
14.	Punjab	20.94	2.36	4.07	1.02	16.67	1.40	5.23	8.75	0.10	6.49	2.84	13.39	1.61	3.66	1.61	2.25	7.61	257
15.	Rajasthan	25.52	2.42	4.11	1.38	16.80	2.56	4.60	7.75	1.04	6.71	2.56	6.40	2.77	3.15	1.62	2.25	8.36	328
16.	Tamilnadu	28.31	2.89	2.89	4.10	6.42	3.50	4.71	9.63	1.04	6.49	3.30	6.32	1.45	3.73	1.92	3.53	9.78	399
17.	U.P.	24.88	3.55	3.75	2.27	10.94	1.99	4.96	8.32	1.33	6.60	2.81	7.77	3.09	3.01	2.27	2.27	10.10	948
18.	West Bengal	21.06	2.06	3.62	6.95	7.16	1.51	6.64	10.33	1.25	4.76	6.22	5.62	1.56	4.27	2.68	2.76	11.55	854
19.	Chandigarh	20.94	2.36	4.07	1.09	16.67	1.40	5.23	8.75	0.10	6.49	2.84	3.39	1.61	3.66	1.61	2.25	7.61	10
20.	Delhi	12.91	1.90	3.73	1.96	14.65	1.45	6.83	8.90	0.32	4.71	10.30	10.39	1.51	3.60	3.84	3.24	9.76	236
	All States	23.69	2.96	3.68	3.58	9.51	2.40	5.21	9.43	1.09	6.15	3.85	7.18	2.15	3.91	2.22	2.78	10.21	7853

Note : All State taken together covers 99.5 per cent population of all India

APPENDIX—TABLE A·4 : STATE-WISE PERCENTAGE SHARES OF GROUPS OF CONSUMER ITEMS IN TOTAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE FOR URBAN POPULATION : 1970-71

Sl. no.	Name of the state	Cereals and products	Pulses and products	Oils and fats	Meat fish and eggs.	Milk and products	Spices etc.	Fruits & veg.	Other food	Intoxicants etc.	Fuel and light	Housing	Clothing etc.	Medical care	Education and recn.	Transport and comn.	Personal care	Other non-food	Urban popln. (0000)
(0)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
1.	A.P.	27·59	02·96	03·63	3·92	06·70	04·23	05·04	09·63	04·33	05·80	03·91	05·94	02·82	03·15	02·19	03·15	05·01	840
2.	Assam	27·51	02·71	04·55	8·42	05·66	01·79	05·33	10·11	04·58	06·57	04·50	07·30	01·63	03·47	01·23	02·21	02·43	129
3.	Bihar	32·24	04·50	04·19	03·55	07·49	01·83	06·14	08·40	02·57	05·03	02·91	06·87	02·45	0·91	01·58	01·70	05·64	563
4.	Gujarat	21·84	04·35	08·00	01·59	13·28	02·50	06·61	10·16	02·31	06·69	04·45	04·00	02·97	02·83	01·60	01·95	04·88	750
5.	H ryana	19·36	03·15	04·67	00·70	17·52	02·03	06·79	09·84	02·11	06·20	02·93	07·73	02·78	03·96	02·58	01·90	05·75	177
6.	H·P.	17·06	02·77	05·21	01·67	14·93	01·65	05·19	12·31	03·07	07·17	04·71	08·36	01·30	04·43	02·31	02·24	05·57	24
7.	J. & K.	21·72	02·33	06·53	06·11	12·88	02·93	05·63	08·67	22·88	08·64	02·09	07·04	02·88	02·60	01·62	02·31	03·14	86
8.	Karnataka	26·05	03·64	03·16	03·38	07·45	03·77	05·66	12·66	02·88	06·59	01·74	07·22	01·58	02·74	02·23	02·25	04·00	712
9.	Kerala	23·13	01·69	02·44	04·49	05·44	02·84	07·12	15·99	03·48	05·08	02·43	06·55	01·09	03·22	02·63	02·46	04·30	347
10.	M.P.	23·65	04·59	05·05	02·03	10·23	02·69	05·71	09·49	03·42	05·93	03·70	06·69	06·12	02·44	01·73	01·92	04·03	67
11.	Maharashtra	16·44	03·19	05·13	03·75	09·88	02·70	06·77	13·48	02·88	05·68	05·58	05·13	02·89	04·36	03·36	02·65	04·97	1571
12.	Meghalaya	27·51	02·71	04·55	08·42	05·06	01·79	05·33	10·11	04·58	06·57	04·50	07·30	01·63	03·47	01·23	02·43	02·43	15
13.	Orissa	29·90	02·91	04·29	05·50	05·08	02·29	08·08	11·62	08·45	05·59	02·84	06·02	01·08	02·59	01·23	01·44	05·49	185
14.	Punjab	15·94	02·44	04·78	01·67	16·92	02·03	06·29	10·98	02·72	06·24	02·96	06·57	03·25	04·01	02·08	02·57	07·16	322
15.	Rajasthan	20·17	0·68	05·19	01·57	16·22	02·53	05·75	09·24	03·05	05·65	04·16	05·37	03·91	02·42	02·22	02·11	04·42	454
16.	Tamil Nadu	26·05	03·16	03·78	03·95	06·69	04·10	05·06	12·04	02·30	05·78	05·98	04·43	01·99	02·91	02·02	02·11	04·41	436
17.	U.P.	24·43	04·93	04·02	02·02	11·34	02·57	06·24	08·45	03·10	06·43	03·27	06·46	04·14	03·74	01·88	02·02	04·11	1239
18.	W. Bengal	23·13	02·31	04·33	06·58	06·76	01·76	07·67	13·89	03·23	04·75	05·84	05·17	02·22	03·71	02·38	02·08	04·21	1497
19.	Chandigarh	13·94	02·16	05·58	1·50	15·84	01·27	06·34	13·44	02·00	05·28	06·49	05·81	01·78	05·52	04·32	04·38	07·72	23
20.	Delhi	12·10	02·21	05·83	2·94	14·56	0·69	03·00	10·56	02·06	05·75	07·26	07·87	02·15	04·02	04·06	02·02	07·55	365
	All state	22·94	03·39	04·41	03·60	09·52	02·75	06·34	11·15	02·98	06·85	4·32	05·86	02·69	03·24	02·39	02·34	05·45	19923

NOTE :   All states taken together cover 99·5 per cent population of All-India.

APPENDIX—TABLE A.5 :   STATE-WISE PERCENTAGE SHARES OF GROUPS OF CONSUMER ITEMS IN TOTAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE FOR MIDDLE URBAN POPULATION : 1970-71

Sl. no. Name of the State	Cereals and prds.	Pulses and prds.	Oils and fats	Meat fish and eggs	Milk and prds.	Spices etc.	Fruits & veg.	Other food	Intoxicants etc.	Fuel and light	Housing	Clothing etc.	Medical care	Edn. and recn.	Tpt. and comn.	Personal care	Other non-food	Middle popln. (COCO food)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
1. A.P.	39·23	03·44	03·98	04·44	05·06	05·45	04·95	07·68	05·03	06·26	02·57	02·08	01·70	01·90	0·32	01·90	03·01	280
2. Assam	42·98	03·70	05·23	06·96	04·69	02·46	06·12	05·25	03·69	07·73	02·82	01·96	00·95	02·03	00·72	01·29	01·42	031
3. Bihar	47·29	06·30	04·49	02·69	03·82	02·25	06·18	05·88	02·52	05·79	01·82	02·85	01·44	01·71	00·93	01·00	03·34	180
4. Gujarat	26·98	05·15	09·44	01·56	12·85	02·93	07·38	10·00	02·44	07·27	03·31	01·47	01·93	01·84	01·04	01·27	03·17	277
5. Haryana	26·82	03·82	06·96	00·50	18·85	02·71	06·51	09·09	01·40	07·73	02·11	03·57	01·79	02·55	01·66	01·23	03·70	04·6
6. H.P.	26·42	04·45	06·81	01·14	11·03	02·16	03·72	09·45	03·98	10·66	00·69	05·62	00·97	03·36	02·11	01·68	03·81	C05
7. J. & K.	26·10	02·77	07·15	05·57	13·58	03·53	06·14	08·84	02·54	09·92	01·05	03·40	02·16	01·95	01·21	01·73	02·36	035
8. Karnataka	96·20	04·53	03·67	03·78	06·76	04·91	05·28	09·56	03·00	07·72	03·26	03·25	00·99	01·71	01·39	01·39	02·50	207
9. Kerala	33·34	01·73	02·78	05·22	03·88	03·71	07·25	15·26	03·99	06·27	01·05	03·98	02·47	01·94	01·59	01·79	03·75	095
10. M.P.	32·17	05·97	05·52	01·90	09·12	03·26	05·17	08·14	03·31	06·81	02·50	04·82	01·30	01·50	01·06	01·17	05·28	232
11. Maharashtra	29·94	05·04	05·94	04·42	06·29	04·31	05·88	10·14	03·03	07·37	02·82	03·61	01·67	02·33	01·94	01·42	03·85	407
12. Meghalaya	42·98	03·70	05·23	06·96	04·69	02·46	06·12	05·25	03·69	07·73	02·82	01·96	00·95	02·03	00·72	01·29	01·42	004
13. Orissa	45·26	03·14	04·19	04·60	02·44	02·75	08·15	07·84	03·26	06·44	01·17	02·10	01·16	01·64	00·84	01·26	03·76	0518
14. Punjab	26·19	03·70	06·48	00·74	16·46	02·71	04·98	09·78	02·30	07·62	02·81	04·07	02·03	02·50	01·68	01·48	04·47	090
15. Rajasthan	30·75	03·64	06·48	01·79	15·21	03·59	5·30	07·94	02·92	07·00	02·15	03·58	01·67	01·62	01·62	01·16	03·58	130
16. Tamil Nadu	35·42	03·65	03·96	04·20	05·00	05·20	5·72	10·27	02·39	07·60	04·26	01·79	01·39	02·04	01·46	02·29	03·36	399
17. U.P.	32·66	06·14	05·44	03·04	09·98	02·76	06·01	06·70	03·01	07·28	02·27	03·47	03·01	02·43	01·13	01·47	03·20	377
18. West Bengal	38·66	03·32	05·43	05·77	04·44	02·46	08·56	07·87	03·14	05·92	03·38	02·28	01·33	02·23	01·43	01·26	02·52	282
19. Chandigarh	29·23	20·65	07·94	00·00	16·63	01·78	04·53	11·26	00·00	08·44	04·82	00·00	01·14	03·55	02·78	00·88	04·37	003
20. Delhi	25·14	04·02	07·89	03·47	13·09	02·83	07·56	09·39	02·35	07·42	03·52	01·97	01·24	02·30	02·33	01·15	04·33	072

APPENDIX—TABLE A·6 : STATEWISE URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES FOR FOOD, NON-FOOD AND GENERAL (FOOD PLUS NON-FOOD) FOR SELECTED NSS SURVEY PERIODS (BASED ON 1961-62 WEIGHTING DIAGRAM)

(1960=100)

Sl. No.	Name of the State	1970-71			1972-73			1973-74			1977-78			1983		
		F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
1.	A.P.	198·63	168·20	187·69	249·87	189·27	228·03	282·22	222·68	260·81	352·77	294·42	331·78	531·02	488·38	515·68
2.	Assam	20·48	152·88	182·84	229·96	174·76	207·45	274·31	210·05	248·11	345·94	268·96	314·55	548·61	399·06	487·62
3.	Bihar	219·59	157·42	191·86	263·53	177·87	225·33	339·88	216·48	284·85	364·53	281·36	327·44	597·52	477·78	544·12
4.	Gujarat	192·88	166·01	182·91	254·18	192·60	231·34	303·33	223·33	273·65	338·98	296·64	323·27	561·26	485·59	533·19
5.	Haryana	204·08	182·37	195·49	243·43	224·09	235·78	296·51	269·79	285·94	359·55	355·88	358·10	532·46	595·43	557·38
6.	H.P.	195·02	157·37	180·12	230·86	180·13	210·97	273·35	205·21	246·39	311·53	260·54	291·36	505·13	416·09	469·90
7.	J. &K.	182·59	182·01	182·41	206·20	206·21	206·21	236·56	227·53	233·77	334·94	300·39	324·27	553·07	497·75	535·98
8.	K'rna-taka	202·84	169·16	191·25	255·45	191·55	233·45	301·42	228·05	276·15	343·06	308·02	331·00	554·78	525·83	541·81
9.	Kerala	206·90	170·90	194·31	259·40	188·61	234·64	323·89	214·96	285·80	337·24	301·63	324·79	604·61	543·84	583·36
10.	M.P.	215·36	169·30	196·69	270·93	194·61	240·00	328·85	235·66	291·03	380·47	315·03	353·95	581·03	528·90	559·90
11.	Maha-rashtra	197·23	157·87	179·70	246·16	176·68	215·21	285·28	202·33	248·33	346·88	270·99	313·07	597·56	457·37	535·11
12.	Megh-laya	205·52	144·36	180·59	241·00	160·40	208·14	286·73	178·03	242·42	358·84	249·01	314·07	556·38	551·97	554·55
13.	Orissa	208·95	164·13	189·73	244·26	180·75	217·02	289·39	208·70	254·78	355·75	284·10	325·01	591·06	486·53	546·22
14.	Punjab	212·49	165·50	193·90	241·37	195·42	223·19	296·09	231·00	270·34	363·39	294·87	336·28	548·71	443·54	507·09
15.	Rajas-than	201·71	165·16	188·97	254·19	192·12	232·56	309·44	227·27	280·81	361·31	304·00	341·34	550·20	504·36	534·22
16.	T. N.	183·30	164·65	176·30	223·04	187·12	209·78	273·09	221·26	253·25	341·82	289·16	322·04	606·42	440·93	544·28
17.	U.P.	210·15	165·20	192·47	259·49	190·95	232·53	315·62	230·26	282·04	373·33	309·56	348·24	556·10	518·82	547·50
18.	W.B.	198·37	151·27	179·21	231·90	173·38	208·09	287·49	205·79	254·25	336·89	258·09	301·83	514·11	415·55	474·01
19.	Chandi-garh	218·34	147·85	190·45	241·14	167·16	211·87	282·71	191·37	246·53	362·06	249·83	318·68	518·55	388·72	467·19
20.	Delhi	214·43	165·32	191·02	249·19	184·28	218·24	302·56	226·52	266·21	356·76	305·15	331·20	548·48	465·93	509·12
	All states	201·14	162·25	185·58	246·52	184·84	221·84	297·01	215·23	265·50	350·92	258·19	325·82	565·61	473·12	528·61

NOTE : F, NF and G refer to Food, Non-food and General respectively.

APPENDIX TABLE A ·7 :　ALL INDIA URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES FOR THE VARIOUS ITEM GROUPS FOR THE SELECTED NSS SURVEY PERIODS

(Based on 1961-62 Weighting Diagram)

(1961-100)

Sl. No.	Name of the item group	1970-71	1972-73	1973-74	1977-78	1983
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Cereals and products	191·81	239·07	296·71	305·40	503·35
2	Pulses and products	244·14	361·46	382·62	575·72	335·15
3	Oils and fats	235·03	297·40	384·72	413·30	677·30
4	Meat, fish and eggs	212·36	253·05	312·02	412·00	720·44
5	Milk and products	206·13	233·35	284·90	353·20	535·82
6	Condiments and spices	243·30	244·70	322·75	436·07	615·22
7	Fruits and vegetables	204·07	232·13	277·62	313·04	532·42
8	Other food	175·94	228·20	247·90	310·17	522·03
	All food	201·14	246·52	297·01	350·92	565.61
9	Pan, supari, tobacco and intoxicants	185·21	210·84	238·77	325·28	545·32
10	Fuel and light	175·12	203·40	215·00	334·57	644·35
11	Housing	133·86	143·70	150·53	135·12	251·33
12	Clothing, bedding and footwear	158·55	192·39	244·00	319·63	471·03
13	Medical care	125·24	133·97	130·77	131·50	255·3
14	Education & recreation	137·89	154·23	160·94	191·77	276·51
15	Transport & communication	144·48	161·81	177·04	242·22	335·34
16	Personal care	182·60	202·53	254·35	323·48	530·15
17	Other non-food	181·67	204·89	245·79	336·01	571·38
	All non-food	162·25	184·84	218·23	288·19	473·12
	All items	185·58	221·84	265·50	325·32	523·61

APPENDIX—TABLE A ·8 :　STATEWISE PERCENTAGE SHARES IN TOTAL CONSUMER EXPENDITURE OF BROAD ITEM GROUPS FOOD AND NON-FOOD FOR ENTIRE URBAN POPULATION IN 1961-62 AND 1970-71 AND FOR MIDDLE URBAN POPULATION IN 1970-71

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Entire urban population				Middle urban population in 1970-71	
		1961-62		1970-71			
		Food	Non-Food	Food	Non-Food	Food	Non-Food
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	Andhra Pradesh	64·0	36·0	63·7	36·3	74·2	25·8
2	Assam	59·2	40·8	66·1	33·9	77·4	22 6
3	Bihar	55·4	44·6	68·3	31·7	73·6	21·4
4	Gujarat	62·9	37·1	68·3	31·7	76·3	23·7
5	Haryana	60·4	39·6	64·1	35·9	74·3	25·7
6	Himachal Pradesh	60·4	39·6	60·8	39·2	67·2	32·3
7	Jammu & Kashmir	69·1	30·9	66·8	33·2	73·7	26·3
8	Karnataka	65·6	34·4	65·8	34·2	74·7	25·3
9	Kerala	65·0	35·0	63·3	36·7	73·2	26·3
10	Madhya Pradesh	59·5	40·5	63·4	36·6	72·2	27·8
11	Maharashtra	55·5	44·5	61·3	33·7	72·0	23·0
12	Meghalaya	59·2	40·8	66·1	33·9	77·4	22·6
13	Orissa	57·1	42·9	69·5	30·5	73·4	26·6
14	Punjab	60·4	39·6	61·0	39·0	71·0	29·0
15	Rajsthan	65·1	34·9	63·4	36.6	74.7	25·3
16	Tamil Nadu	62·4	37·6	65·4	34·6	73·4	26·6
17	Uttar Pradesh	60·7	39·3	65·3	34·7	72·7	27·3
18	West Bengal	59·3	40·7	66·4	33·6	76·5	23·5
19	Chandigarh	60·4	39·6	60·6	39·4	74·0	26·0
20	Delhi	52·3	47·7	57·3	42·7	73·4	26·6
	All States	60·5	39·5	64·1	35·9	74·1	25·9

NOTE :　All state taken together covers 99·5 per cent of all-India population in 1961-62 as well as 1970-71

APPENDIX—TABLE A·6 : STATEWISE URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES FOR FOOD, NON-FOOD AND GENERAL (FOOD PLUS NON-FOOD) FOR SELECTED NSS SURVEY PERIODS (BASED ON 1961-62 WEIGHTING DIAGRAM)

(1960=100)

Sl. No. Name of the State	1970-71			1972-73			1973-74			1977-78			1983		
	F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G	F	NF	G
(0) (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
1. A.P.	198·63	168·20	187·69	249·87	189·27	228·03	282·22	222·68	260·81	352·77	294·42	331·78	531·02	488·38	515·68
2. Assam	20·48	152·88	182·84	229·96	174·76	207·45	274·31	210·05	248·11	345·94	268·96	314·55	548·61	399·06	487·62
3. Bihar	219·59	157·42	191·86	263·53	177·87	225·33	339·88	216·48	284·85	364·53	281·36	327·44	597·52	477·78	544·12
4. Gujarat	192·88	166·01	182·91	254·18	192·60	231·34	303·33	223·33	273·65	338·98	296·64	323·27	561·26	485·59	533·19
5. Haryana	204·08	182·37	195·49	243·43	224·09	235·78	296·51	269·79	285·94	359·55	355·88	358·10	532·46	595·43	557·38
6. H.P.	195·02	157·37	180·12	230·86	180·13	210·97	273·35	205·21	246·39	311·53	260·54	291·36	505·13	416·09	469·90
7. J.&K.	182·59	182·01	182·41	206·20	206·21	206·21	236·56	227·53	233·77	334·94	300·39	324·27	553·07	497·75	535·98
8. Karnataka	202·84	169·16	191·25	255·45	191·55	233·45	301·42	228·05	276·15	343·06	308·02	331·00	554·78	525·83	541·81
9. Kerala	206·90	170·90	194·31	259·40	188·61	234·64	323·89	214·96	285·80	337·24	301·63	324·79	604·61	543·84	583·36
10. M.P.	215·36	169·30	196·69	270·93	194·61	240·00	328·85	235·66	291·03	380·47	315·03	353·95	581·03	523·90	559·90
11. Maharashtra	197·23	157·87	179·70	246·16	176·68	215·21	285·23	202·33	248·33	346·88	270·99	313·07	597·56	457·37	535·11
12. Meghalaya	205·52	144·36	180·59	241·00	160·40	208·14	286·73	178·03	242·42	358·84	249·01	314·07	556·38	551·97	554·53
13. Orissa	208·95	164·13	189·73	244·26	180·75	217·02	289·39	208·70	254·73	355·75	284·10	325·01	591·06	456·53	546·22
14. Punjab	212·49	165·50	193·90	241·37	195·42	223·19	296·09	231·09	270·34	363·39	294·87	336·28	543·71	443·54	507·09
15. Rajasthan	201·71	165·16	188·97	254·19	192·12	232·56	309·44	227·27	270·81	361·31	304·69	341·34	550·20	504·36	534·22
16. T.N.	183·30	164·65	176·30	223·04	187·12	209·73	273·09	221·26	253·25	341·82	299·16	322·04	606·42	459·98	544·28
17. U.P.	210·15	165·20	192·47	259·49	190·95	232·53	315·02	230·25	282·05	373·33	309·56	348·23	556·10	518·82	547·50
18. W.B.	198·37	151·27	179·21	231·90	173·38	208·69	267·49	205·79	243·25	339·89	258·69	306·93	514·11	415·45	474·01
19. Chandigarh	218·34	147·85	190·45	241·14	167·16	211·87	282·71	191·97	252·55	362·06	299·95	338·65	518·55	385·72	467·19
20. Delhi	214·43	165·32	191·02	249·19	184·28	218·24	302·56	227·52	269·91	356·76	313·15	331·20	548·45	445·93	529·12
All states	201·14	162·25	185·58	246·52	184·84	221·84	297·01	218·23	265·50	350·92	288·19	325·82	565·61	473·12	525·61

NOTE : F, NF and G refer to Food, Non-food and General respectively.

APPENDIX TABLE A·7 :   ALL INDIA URBAN CONSUMER PRICE INDICES FOR THE VARIOUS ITEM GROUPS FOR THE SELECTED NSS SURVEY PERIODS

(Based on 1961-62 Weighting Diagram)

(1950=100)

Sl. No.	Name of the item group	1970-71	1972-73	1973-74	1977-78	1983
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Cereals and products	191·81	239·07	296·71	305·40	503·35
2	Pulses and products	244·14	361·46	382·62	575·72	335·15
3	Oils and fats	235·03	297·40	384·72	413·39	677·39
4	Meat, fish and eggs	212·36	253·05	312·02	412·99	722·44
5	Milk and products	206·13	233·35	284·90	353·20	535·82
6	Condiments and spices	243·30	244·70	322·75	486·07	615·22
7	Fruits and vegetables	204·07	232·13	277·62	343·01	532·42
8	Other food	175·94	228·20	247·90	310·17	522·03
	All food	201·14	246·52	297·01	350·92	565.61
9	Pan, supari, tobacco and intoxicants	185·21	210·84	238·77	325·28	546·32
10	Fuel and light	175·12	203·49	215·99	331·57	644·35
11	Housing	133·86	143·70	150·53	135·42	254·33
12	Clothing, bedding and footwear	158·55	192·39	244·00	319·63	471·03
13	Medical care	125·24	133·97	139·77	131·59	255·3
14	Education & recreation	137·89	154·23	169·94	191·77	276·51
15	Transport & communication	144·48	161·81	177·04	242·22	335·34
16	Personal care	182·60	202·53	254·35	323·43	530·45
17	Other non-food	181·67	204·89	245·79	336·91	571·38
	All non-food	162·25	184·84	218·23	288·19	473·12
	All items	185·58	221·84	265·50	325·32	523·61

APPENDIX—TABLE A·8 :   STATEWISE PERCENTAGE SHARES IN TOTAL CONSUMER EXPENDITURE OF BROAD ITEM GROUPS FOOD AND NON-FOOD FOR ENTIRE URBAN POPULATION IN 1961-62 AND 1970-71 AND FOR MIDDLE URBAN POPULATION IN 1970-71

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Entire urban population				Middle urban population in 1970-71	
		1961-62		1970-71			
		Food	Non-Food	Food	Non-Food	Food	Non-Food
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	Andhra Pradesh	64·0	36·0	63·7	36·3	74·2	25·8
2	Assam	59·2	40·8	66·1	33·9	77·4	22·6
3	Bihar	55·4	44·6	68·3	31·7	73·6	21·4
4	Gujarat	62·9	37·1	68·3	31·7	76·3	23·7
5	Haryana	60·4	39·6	64·1	35·9	74·3	25·7
6	Himachal Pradesh	60·4	39·6	60·8	39·2	67·2	32·3
7	Jammu & Kashmir	69·1	30·9	66·8	33·2	73·7	25·3
8	Karnataka	65·6	34·4	65·8	34·2	74·7	25·3
9	Kerala	65·0	35·0	63·3	36·7	73·2	25·3
10	Madhya Pradesh	59·5	40·5	63·4	36·6	72·2	27·3
11	Maharashtra	55·5	44·5	61·3	33·7	72·0	23·0
12	Meghalaya	59·2	40·8	66·1	33·9	77·4	22·6
13	Orissa	57·1	42·9	69·5	30·5	78·4	21·6
14	Punjab	60·4	39·6	61·0	39·0	71·0	29·0
15	Rajasthan	65·1	34·9	63·4	36.6	74.7	25·3
16	Tamil Nadu	62·4	37·6	65·4	34·6	73·4	26·6
17	Uttar Pradesh	60·7	39·3	65·3	34·7	72·7	27·3
18	West Bengal	59·3	40·7	66·4	33·6	76·5	23·5
19	Chandigarh	60·4	39·6	60·6	39·4	74·0	26·0
20	Delhi	52·3	47·7	57·3	42·7	73·4	26·6
	All States	60·5	39·5	64·1	35·9	74·1	25·9

NOTE :   All state taken together covers 99·5 per cent of all-India population in 1961-62 as well as 1970-71