GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF TRIBAL AFFAIRS

RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED OUESTION NO- # 142

TO BE ANSWERED ON- 07/12/2022

PROBLEMS OF TRIBAL AREAS

142 # SMT. PHULO DEVI NETAM:

Will the Minister of TRIBAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

- (a) the social, economic inequality and backwardness of tribals in tribal dominated States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Odisha, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal and Karnataka, State-wise details thereof; and
- (b) the major problems faced by the tribals in the said States, the details of the steps being taken by Government to resolve the problems?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF STATE FOR TRIBAL AFFAIRS (SMT. RENUKA SINGH SARUTA)

(a) & (b): Estimates of some socio-economic indicators for the States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Odisha, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal and Karnataka are given below:

S.N.	States/ Indicators	Literacy Rate		Sex- R	atio	Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) at Secondary Level 2021-22	
		ST	All	ST	All	ST	All
1	Chhattisgarh	59.1	70.3	1020	991	70.5	78.3
2	Jharkhand	57.1	66.4	1003	948	61.4	68.4
3	Madhya Pradesh	50.6	69.3	984	931	59.4	70
4	Rajasthan	52.8	66.1	948	928	76.8	79.2
5	Odisha	52.2	72.9	1029	979	84.2	80.3
6	Maharashtra	65.7	82.3	977	929	93.8	93.7
7	Gujarat	62.5	78.0	981	919	76.2	75.2
8	Andhra Pradesh	48.8	67.4	1009	993	81.6	85.4
9	West Bengal	57.9	76.3	999	950	102.5	88.2
10	Karnataka	62.1	75.4	990	973	91.8	94.7

Source: Literacy Rate, Sex Ratio: Census 2011, GER: UDISE+, M/o Education 2021-22

S.N.	States	% of Persons below poverty line, 2011-12 (Tendulkar Methodology)					
		Rur	al	Urban			
		ST	All	ST	All		
1	Chhattisgarh	52.6	44.6	35.2	24.8		
2	Jharkhand	51.6	40.8	28.7	24.8		
3	Madhya Pradesh	55.3	35.7	32.3	21.0		
4	Rajasthan	41.4	16.1	21.7	10.7		
5	Odisha	63.5	35.7	39.7	17.3		
6	Maharashtra	61.6	24.2	23.3	9.1		
7	'Gujarat	36.5	21.5	30.1	10.1		
8	Andhra Pradesh	24.1	11.0	12.1	5.8		
9	West Bengal	50.1	22.5	44.5	14.7		
10	Karnataka	30.8	24.5	33.7	15.3		

Source: NITI Aayog - erstwhile Planning Commission based on National Sample Survey data

S.N.	States/ Indicators	Infant Mortality Rate		Institutional Delivery (%)		Prevalence of Under Weight children under (5) years of age (%) (Weight for age)	
		ST	All	ST	All	ST	All
1	Chhattisgarh	58.0	44.2	77.4	85.7	36.3	31.3
2	Jharkhand	44.4	37.9	66.4	75.8	46.4	39.4
3	Madhya Pradesh	41.3	41.3	82.0	90.7	39.8	33.0
4	Rajasthan	43.2	30.2	94.0	94.9	32.0	27.6
5	Odisha	55.9	36.3	82.8	92.2	42.1	29.7
6	Maharashtra	31.1	23.2	84.8	94.7	46.5	36.1
7	Gujarat	31.9	31.2	89.3	94.3	48.7	39.7
8	Andhra Pradesh	NA	30.2	89.3	96.5	46.3	29.6
9	West Bengal	(26.7)	22.0	90.8	91.7	44.4	32.2
10	Karnataka	28.7	25.4	95.7	97.0	35.8	32.9

Source: National Family Health Survey-5 (2019-21)

NA: Not Available

Figures in parentheses are based on 250-499 unweighted person-years of exposure to the risk of death.

As informed by NITI Aayog, the major problems faced by the Scheduled Tribes across India including in the States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Odisha, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal and Karnataka are low level of education, under-employment, lack of marketing opportunities, lack of connectivity, substantial dependency on wage labour etc.

Government is implementing Tribal Sub-Plan (TSP)/Schedule Tribe Component (STC)/Development Action Plan for Development of STs (DAPST) for overall development of tribal people across the country. Besides Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 41 Central Ministries / Departments are earmarking certain percentage of their total scheme allocation every year as DAPST funds for tribal development. DAPST funds are spent by the Central Ministries / Departments under their schemes for various development projects relating to education, health, agriculture, irrigation, roads, housing, drinking water, electrification, employment generation, skill development, etc. for accelerated socio-economic development of Scheduled Tribes in the country. State Governments are also supposed to earmark TSP funds in proportion to ST population (Census 2011) in the State with respect to total State Plan for the development of Scheduled Tribes.
