



Continue

Meaning of human development pdf

Definition: The Human Development Index (HDI) is a statistical tool used to measure the country's overall achievement in its socioeconomic dimension. Socio-economic dimensions of the country are based on people's health, their levels of education and their standard of living. **Description:** Pakistani economist Mahbub ul Haq created HDI in 1990, which was later used to measure the country's development by the UNITED NATIONS Development Programme (UNDP). The index calculation combines four main indicators: life expectancy for health, expected years of schooling, secondary years of study for education and gross national per capita income for living standards. Every year UNDP ranks countries based on the HDI report published in their annual report. HDI is one of the best tools for tracking the level of development of the country, as it combines all the main social and economic indicators that are responsible for economic development. Posted in P. Nayak (ed) Growth and Human Development in Northeast India, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, pp 3-18. Human development: Purusottam Nayak Abstract Conceptual and Measuring Issues The human development approach to development and growth proposed by UNDP in 1990 is a widely accepted approach worldwide. This article in this regard is an attempt to describe in detail the evolution of the concept of human development, its emergence as an approach to development and methodical questions about its measurement. It provides a story about various changes in measurement methods de-commissioned by THE U.N., the Planning Commission, the Government of India and individual researchers at various points in time since 1990. The experience of many fast-growing countries has shown that their high growth rates of GDP have failed to reduce socio-economic deprivation of large segments of the population. Even developed industrial countries have realized that high income is not a protection against the rapid spread of problems such as drugs, alcoholism, AIDS, homelessness, violence and the breakdown of family relations. At the same time, some low-income countries have demonstrated that it is possible to achieve a high level of human development if they skillfully use the means available to expand basic human capabilities. This establishes the fact that expanding production and wealth is only a vehicle for development. The end of development is the welfare of man. Therefore, the central focus of development analysis and planning should be on people's needs and is focused on achieving this ultimate goal. As a first step to achieving this goal, there is a need to create a database on improved social statistics and new development measures. In order to meet this need, the concept of human development and its measurement through a measure called the Human Development Index (HDI) was introduced by UNDP (1990) in its first Report. The approach of human development to development, as is commonly understood, differs from conventional approaches to economic growth, human capital formation, human resource development, human welfare and basic human needs. The following arguments help us in understanding the same: (1) the growth of GDP is seen as necessary but not sufficient for human development. Human progress may be lacking in some societies, despite the rapid growth of GDP or high per capita income, unless about 2 additional steps are taken to improve the same. (2) Theories of human capital formation and human resource development view people primarily as a means rather than as an end. They take only the supply side, with human beings as tools for further commodity production. It is true that people are active agents of all production and wealth creation, but they are also the ultimate ends and beneficiaries of this process. Thus, the concept of human capital formation (or the development of human resources) captures only one side of human development, but not in its fullness. (3) Approaches to human well-being look at people more as beneficiaries of the development process than as participants in it. They emphasize only distribution policies, not production structures. (4) The basic approach of needs tends to concentrate on a package of goods and services such as food, shelter, clothing, healthcare and water that has deprived the group's population of the needs. It focuses on providing these goods and services, not on the issue of human choice. The concept of human development Human development is the process of expanding people's choices. In principle, this election can be endless and can change over time. But, at all levels of development, the three main options are for people to lead healthy and long lives, gain knowledge and have access to the resources they need for a decent standard of living. If these important options are not available, many other features remain unavailable. But this human development does not end there. The additional choice highly valued by many people ranges from political, economic and social freedom to

opportunities to be creative and productive and enjoy self-meddy and guaranteed human rights. Human development has two sides: (1) the formation of human capabilities, such as improving health, knowledge and skills and (2) using their acquired opportunities for productive purposes, leisure or for activity in cultural, social and political affairs. Significant human freedom leads to the fact that the scale of human development does not finely balance the two sides. In this sense, income is clearly one option that people would like to have, albeit an important one. But this is not the sum of a lifetime. Consequently, development should be more than just an expansion of income and wealth. Its focus should be on people (HDR, 1990). HDR (1991) develops the concept of along the following lines. People should be at the heart of human development. Development should be woven around people, not people around development. It should be the development of the people, the people and the people. Previous development concepts have often paid exceptional attention to economic growth on the assumption that the benefits of growth will be shaken by different segments of society. But past experience does not really support this hypothesis. Higher growth does not necessarily bring a higher degree of well-being for every part of society. Growth needs to translate to improvements in people's lives. Human development also covers elements that pose critical issues of gender and development. The concept of human development has four main elements, such as productivity, justice, sustainable development and empowerment. As for productivity, people should be prepared to improve their productivity and participate fully in the revenue generation and reward employment process to achieve higher economic growth, which is a subset of human development patterns. Productivity is not the only means to achieve wellbeing in society. People should have access to equal opportunities. All barriers to economic and political opportunity must be removed so that people can participate and benefit from these opportunities. These benefits must also be shared over generations. Access to opportunities must be provided not only for the present generation, but also for future generations. All forms of capital, such as physical, human and environmental, should be replenished. In addition, empowerment is a necessary for human development. People need to fully participate in decision-making that can shape their lives. Human development is not a concept separate from sustainable development, but it can help save sustainable development from the misconception that it only includes an ecological dimension of development. All these approaches emphasized the need to develop people with concerns about human empowerment, participation, gender equality, fair growth, poverty eradication and long-term sustainability (HDR, 1996). According to Haq (1976), the defining difference between economic growth and human development schools is that the former focuses solely on expanding only one choice, i.e. income, and the second encompasses the expansion of all human elections, whether economic, social, cultural or political. There are at least six reasons we speak out and strive for human development and the eradication of poverty. First, it is itself the end. Indeed, that's the whole development goal. Secondly, it helps to increase productivity. Third, it reduces productivity and therefore controls population growth. Fourth, poverty alleviation reduces environmental degradation from soil erosion, deforestation and desertification. Fifth, the growth of civil society and democracy leads to greater social stability. Finally, its political appeal is that it not only reduces civil unrest, but also acts as a vehicle for political stability (Streeter, 1995). Human Development Measurement: UNDP Method That Includes HDI? How is this measured? These are several issues that need to be addressed first. HDI is a composite index of three main components of human development, viz. longevity, knowledge and standard of living. Longevity is measured by life expectancy. Knowledge is measured by a combination of adult literacy, which has two-thirds weight and average years of study with a third of the weight. Living standards are measured by purchasing power based on real GDP per capita, adjusted for the local cost of living (purchasing power parity or PPP). Then the question arises: Why do we take only these three components to measure human development? In any system for measuring and monitoring human development, the ideal could reflect all aspects of human development to get as comprehensive a picture as possible. In support of the selection of three HDI components, the following arguments are made in HDR (1990): One of the probable reasons is the lack of data, which imposes some limitations on its measurement. Secondly, 5 complexity is not always desirable. Too many indicators can lead to a snagging picture, perhaps politicians with its traction. Moreover, some indicators may echo the existing indicators. Infant mortality, for example, is already reflected in life expectancy. Thus, arbitrary inclusion of more variable indicators may not solve the purpose for which the index is built. Therefore, the decisive issue arises: How to combine these three indicators measured in three different units? The breakthrough for HDI, however, is to find a common measuring rod for socioeconomic distance. For each of these three dimensions, the report identified minimum achievements, viz. lowest national life expectancy, lowest national adult literacy rate and lowest national income per capita. It also set the maximum or desired level of achievement for each of these measurements, and then showed where each country stood in relation to these proportions. It is expressed in terms of numeric value from 0 to 1. Income above the global average income was adjusted using a progressively higher discount rate. Scores for the three dimensions were then averaged in the overall index. HDI was built in three steps: In the first step, the country's deprivation measure was made for each of the three main indicators according to the following formula: $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y - Y_{min}}{Y_{max} - Y_{min}} + \frac{L - L_{min}}{L_{max} - L_{min}} + \frac{I - I_{min}}{I_{max} - I_{min}})$ Variable indicator (jused in (1) refers to the country deprivation indicator for fitrivable. In the second step, the average deprivation rate is recognized by adopting a simple average of three indicators as follows: $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ 3131.

1. Many criticisms were 6 raised against the construction and reliability of the index. As a result of these criticisms, two improvements in its construction were made in the subsequent HDR (1991). First, variables of knowledge, such as adult literacy and years of schooling, were combined to produce a synthetic measure of educational attainment. By assigning weight to two components as follows: $\frac{1}{2}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}})$ These weights were taken both $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ in a 1991 report, while the same were taken by both $\frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{3}$ in a 1990 report. Secondly, a modification was made in the treatment of income. As we know HDI in a 1990 report was based on the premise of reducing income revenue, which was reflected by using logarithm income and assigning zero weight income under the poverty line. However, in 1991, the method was revised using the well-known and commonly used Atkinson formula to measure the usefulness of income as follows: $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$

5. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ is a usefulness or well-being derived from income, and the parameter α measures the degree of decrease in income. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ modification adopted in HDI (1991) allowed the cost of pee to grow slowly with revenue growth. To do this, the full range of income was divided into multiples of income below the poverty line^Y. Thus, most countries fall in the income range between Y^{10} , some between Y^{20} , even less between Y^{32} and so on. For all countries for which Y (poor countries) are established equal to 0 means there has been no decrease in profits. For income between Y^{20} and Y^{32} , there is a set equal to 10. To generate income between Y^{10} and Y^{20} , it was set at 2/3 and so on. Overall, 7 when Y^{10} , this means what (where constants such as 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. represent, to multiply with income line poverty to identify different income ranges where the country falls according to its income level). Таким чином, ми маємо $Y^0, \dots, Y^{10}, Y^{20}, Y^{32}, \dots, Y^{100}$ where 1H is a life expectancy index based on life expectancy in age one and 2H is an infant mortality index based on infant mortality rates. In the case of MIP, the indicator reciprocity is used. The various indicators included in the development radar have been scaled and normalized to take value at a scale of 0 to 5. As a result, on each indicator, including the IIR and poverty ratio, where reciprocity of the indicator was used, and scalable least achievements correspond to 0, while the best achievements is closer to 5. When it is carried out under such a scaling procedure, the desired norms had to be adopted for the selected indicators (NHRD 2002, p.133). In some cases, the norms are independently selected, for example, it is a case of access to safe drinking water or literacy, and in some others, such as per capita consumption costs or even infant mortality, there is an element of appraisal judgments. In the case of inflation-adjusted per capita costs (at 1983 prices), the maximum tied to 500 per capita per month. For poverty minimum at 5 percent in any way that it corresponds to the value of 5 on a scale of 0.5 on the radar. In all other cases, the scaling standards are as follows: MEASURABLE INDEXES Scaling Indicators Norms of maximum minimum life expectancy HDI at age 1 (years) 60 50 Infant mortality rate - 20 per 1000 literacy rate over 7+ years 100 0 Adjusted intensity of formal education (estimated) 7 0 Spending on monthly per capita consumption (Rs.) 325 65 Source: NHRD 2001, Planning Commission, New Delhi 16 Links $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1993): Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 12, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1995): Gender inequality in Human Development: Theories and Measurements, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 19, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (2000): Revenue Component of the Human Development Index, Journal of Human Development, Vol.1, No.1. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and M. Ravallion (1993): Human Development in Poor Countries: The Role of Private Income and Public Services, Journal of Economic Prospects, Vol.7, p.133-150. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Chauthey, P.K (2002): Human Development Index: Contribution to Its Construction, Indian Journal of Economics, Vol. 83, No. 328, p. 95-100. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Haq, Mahboub UH (1976): Choosing a value of poverty for the Third World, Columbia University Press, New York, 35. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Nayak, P. and E.D. Thomas (2007): Human Development and Deprivation in Mechalaya, Akasha Publishers, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Planning Commission (2002): National Human Development Report 2001, Govt. of India, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Sziltes, P.P. (1995): Thinking about development, Cambridge University Press, pp.19-20. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ UDP: Report on human development, volumes for 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004 and 2006, 2006.

8 For the construction of measurable indicators, maximum and minimum values were recorded as shown in the following window. DIMENSION INDICATORS Indexes Scaling Norms for HDI Maximum minimum life expectancy at birth (years) 85 25 Adult Literacy level (percent) 100 0 Combined gross registration rate (percent) 100 0 GDP per capita (U.S. PPP \$) 40,000,100 Source: HDR 2005 , UNDP Formula Before 1999 Atkinson was used to build the Income Index (GDP) in the Human Development Report. The main approach in the treatment of income was due to the fact that achieving a respectable level of human development does not require unlimited income. To reflect this, revenue has always been lowered when calculating HDI. To calculate the reduced cost of maximum income in the amount of 000.40 PPP, what falls between the income range Y^{10} and Y^{20} uses the following formula (built before 1999): $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ USPPP The main problem with this formula is that it very much discounts income above the threshold level by punishing countries in which income exceeds the threshold level. This reduces \$200.34 PPP between the threshold and the maximum income level to a simple \$21. PPP. In many cases, income loses its relevance as a proxy for all dimensions of human development, except long and healthy life and knowledge. To overcome this problem, HDR (1999) brought out a thorough review of the treatment of income and suggested its improvement. Putting the methodology on more than 9 solid analytical basis by entering the formula as shown below made the clarification: $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ In many cases, the norms are independently selected, for example, it is a case of access to safe drinking water or literacy, and in some others, such as per capita consumption costs or even infant mortality, there is an element of appraisal judgments. In the case of inflation-adjusted per capita costs (at 1983 prices), the maximum tied to 500 per capita per month. For poverty minimum at 5 percent in any way that it corresponds to the value of 5 on a scale of 0.5 on the radar. In all other cases, the scaling standards are as follows: MEASURABLE INDEXES Scaling Indicators Norms of maximum minimum life expectancy HDI at age 1 (years) 60 50 Infant mortality rate - 20 per 1000 literacy rate over 7+ years 100 0 Adjusted intensity of formal education (estimated) 7 0 Spending on monthly per capita consumption (Rs.) 325 65 Source: NHRD 2001, Planning Commission, New Delhi 16 Links $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1993): Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 12, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1995): Gender inequality in Human Development: Theories and Measurements, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 19, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (2000): Revenue Component of the Human Development Index, Journal of Human Development, Vol.1, No.1. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and M. Ravallion (1993): Human Development in Poor Countries: The Role of Private Income and Public Services, Journal of Economic Prospects, Vol.7, p.133-150. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Chauthey, P.K (2002): Human Development Index: Contribution to Its Construction, Indian Journal of Economics, Vol. 83, No. 328, p. 95-100. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Haq, Mahboub UH (1976): Choosing a value of poverty for the Third World, Columbia University Press, New York, 35. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Nayak, P. and E.D. Thomas (2007): Human Development and Deprivation in Mechalaya, Akasha Publishers, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Planning Commission (2002): National Human Development Report 2001, Govt. of India, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Sziltes, P.P. (1995): Thinking about development, Cambridge University Press, pp.19-20. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ UDP: Report on human development, volumes for 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004 and 2006, 2006.

12 $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ is a usefulness or well-being derived from income, and the parameter α measures the degree of decrease in income. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ modification adopted in HDI (1991) allowed the cost of pee to grow slowly with revenue growth. To do this, the full range of income was divided into multiples of income below the poverty line^Y. Thus, most countries fall in the income range between Y^{10} , some between Y^{20} , even less between Y^{32} and so on. For all countries for which Y (poor countries) are established equal to 0 means there has been no decrease in profits. For income between Y^{20} and Y^{32} , there is a set equal to 10. To generate income between Y^{10} and Y^{20} , it was set at 2/3 and so on. Overall, 7 when Y^{10} , this means what (where constants such as 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. represent, to multiply with income line poverty to identify different income ranges where the country falls according to its income level). Таким чином, ми маємо $Y^0, \dots, Y^{10}, Y^{20}, Y^{32}, \dots, Y^{100}$ where 1H is a life expectancy index based on life expectancy in age one and 2H is an infant mortality index based on infant mortality rates. In the case of MIP, the indicator reciprocity is used. The various indicators included in the development radar have been scaled and normalized to take value at a scale of 0 to 5. As a result, on each indicator, including the IIR and poverty ratio, where reciprocity of the indicator was used, and scalable least achievements correspond to 0, while the best achievements is closer to 5. When it is carried out under such a scaling procedure, the desired norms had to be adopted for the selected indicators (NHRD 2002, p.133). In some cases, the norms are independently selected, for example, it is a case of access to safe drinking water or literacy, and in some others, such as per capita consumption costs or even infant mortality, there is an element of appraisal judgments. In the case of inflation-adjusted per capita costs (at 1983 prices), the maximum tied to 500 per capita per month. For poverty minimum at 5 percent in any way that it corresponds to the value of 5 on a scale of 0.5 on the radar. In all other cases, the scaling standards are as follows: MEASURABLE INDEXES Scaling Indicators Norms of maximum minimum life expectancy HDI at age 1 (years) 60 50 Infant mortality rate - 20 per 1000 literacy rate over 7+ years 100 0 Adjusted intensity of formal education (estimated) 7 0 Spending on monthly per capita consumption (Rs.) 325 65 Source: NHRD 2001, Planning Commission, New Delhi 16 Links $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1993): Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 12, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1995): Gender inequality in Human Development: Theories and Measurements, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 19, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (2000): Revenue Component of the Human Development Index, Journal of Human Development, Vol.1, No.1. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and M. Ravallion (1993): Human Development in Poor Countries: The Role of Private Income and Public Services, Journal of Economic Prospects, Vol.7, p.133-150. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Chauthey, P.K (2002): Human Development Index: Contribution to Its Construction, Indian Journal of Economics, Vol. 83, No. 328, p. 95-100. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Haq, Mahboub UH (1976): Choosing a value of poverty for the Third World, Columbia University Press, New York, 35. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Nayak, P. and E.D. Thomas (2007): Human Development and Deprivation in Mechalaya, Akasha Publishers, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Planning Commission (2002): National Human Development Report 2001, Govt. of India, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Sziltes, P.P. (1995): Thinking about development, Cambridge University Press, pp.19-20. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ UDP: Report on human development, volumes for 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004 and 2006, 2006.

12 $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ is a usefulness or well-being derived from income, and the parameter α measures the degree of decrease in income. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ modification adopted in HDI (1991) allowed the cost of pee to grow slowly with revenue growth. To do this, the full range of income was divided into multiples of income below the poverty line^Y. Thus, most countries fall in the income range between Y^{10} , some between Y^{20} , even less between Y^{32} and so on. For all countries for which Y (poor countries) are established equal to 0 means there has been no decrease in profits. For income between Y^{20} and Y^{32} , there is a set equal to 10. To generate income between Y^{10} and Y^{20} , it was set at 2/3 and so on. Overall, 7 when Y^{10} , this means what (where constants such as 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. represent, to multiply with income line poverty to identify different income ranges where the country falls according to its income level). Таким чином, ми маємо $Y^0, \dots, Y^{10}, Y^{20}, Y^{32}, \dots, Y^{100}$ where 1H is a life expectancy index based on life expectancy in age one and 2H is an infant mortality index based on infant mortality rates. In the case of MIP, the indicator reciprocity is used. The various indicators included in the development radar have been scaled and normalized to take value at a scale of 0 to 5. As a result, on each indicator, including the IIR and poverty ratio, where reciprocity of the indicator was used, and scalable least achievements correspond to 0, while the best achievements is closer to 5. When it is carried out under such a scaling procedure, the desired norms had to be adopted for the selected indicators (NHRD 2002, p.133). In some cases, the norms are independently selected, for example, it is a case of access to safe drinking water or literacy, and in some others, such as per capita consumption costs or even infant mortality, there is an element of appraisal judgments. In the case of inflation-adjusted per capita costs (at 1983 prices), the maximum tied to 500 per capita per month. For poverty minimum at 5 percent in any way that it corresponds to the value of 5 on a scale of 0.5 on the radar. In all other cases, the scaling standards are as follows: MEASURABLE INDEXES Scaling Indicators Norms of maximum minimum life expectancy HDI at age 1 (years) 60 50 Infant mortality rate - 20 per 1000 literacy rate over 7+ years 100 0 Adjusted intensity of formal education (estimated) 7 0 Spending on monthly per capita consumption (Rs.) 325 65 Source: NHRD 2001, Planning Commission, New Delhi 16 Links $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1993): Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 12, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1995): Gender inequality in Human Development: Theories and Measurements, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 19, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (2000): Revenue Component of the Human Development Index, Journal of Human Development, Vol.1, No.1. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and M. Ravallion (1993): Human Development in Poor Countries: The Role of Private Income and Public Services, Journal of Economic Prospects, Vol.7, p.133-150. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Chauthey, P.K (2002): Human Development Index: Contribution to Its Construction, Indian Journal of Economics, Vol. 83, No. 328, p. 95-100. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Haq, Mahboub UH (1976): Choosing a value of poverty for the Third World, Columbia University Press, New York, 35. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Nayak, P. and E.D. Thomas (2007): Human Development and Deprivation in Mechalaya, Akasha Publishers, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Planning Commission (2002): National Human Development Report 2001, Govt. of India, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Sziltes, P.P. (1995): Thinking about development, Cambridge University Press, pp.19-20. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ UDP: Report on human development, volumes for 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004 and 2006, 2006.

12 $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ is a usefulness or well-being derived from income, and the parameter α measures the degree of decrease in income. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ modification adopted in HDI (1991) allowed the cost of pee to grow slowly with revenue growth. To do this, the full range of income was divided into multiples of income below the poverty line^Y. Thus, most countries fall in the income range between Y^{10} , some between Y^{20} , even less between Y^{32} and so on. For all countries for which Y (poor countries) are established equal to 0 means there has been no decrease in profits. For income between Y^{20} and Y^{32} , there is a set equal to 10. To generate income between Y^{10} and Y^{20} , it was set at 2/3 and so on. Overall, 7 when Y^{10} , this means what (where constants such as 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. represent, to multiply with income line poverty to identify different income ranges where the country falls according to its income level). Таким чином, ми маємо $Y^0, \dots, Y^{10}, Y^{20}, Y^{32}, \dots, Y^{100}$ where 1H is a life expectancy index based on life expectancy in age one and 2H is an infant mortality index based on infant mortality rates. In the case of MIP, the indicator reciprocity is used. The various indicators included in the development radar have been scaled and normalized to take value at a scale of 0 to 5. As a result, on each indicator, including the IIR and poverty ratio, where reciprocity of the indicator was used, and scalable least achievements correspond to 0, while the best achievements is closer to 5. When it is carried out under such a scaling procedure, the desired norms had to be adopted for the selected indicators (NHRD 2002, p.133). In some cases, the norms are independently selected, for example, it is a case of access to safe drinking water or literacy, and in some others, such as per capita consumption costs or even infant mortality, there is an element of appraisal judgments. In the case of inflation-adjusted per capita costs (at 1983 prices), the maximum tied to 500 per capita per month. For poverty minimum at 5 percent in any way that it corresponds to the value of 5 on a scale of 0.5 on the radar. In all other cases, the scaling standards are as follows: MEASURABLE INDEXES Scaling Indicators Norms of maximum minimum life expectancy HDI at age 1 (years) 60 50 Infant mortality rate - 20 per 1000 literacy rate over 7+ years 100 0 Adjusted intensity of formal education (estimated) 7 0 Spending on monthly per capita consumption (Rs.) 325 65 Source: NHRD 2001, Planning Commission, New Delhi 16 Links $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1993): Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 12, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1995): Gender inequality in Human Development: Theories and Measurements, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 19, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (2000): Revenue Component of the Human Development Index, Journal of Human Development, Vol.1, No.1. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and M. Ravallion (1993): Human Development in Poor Countries: The Role of Private Income and Public Services, Journal of Economic Prospects, Vol.7, p.133-150. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Chauthey, P.K (2002): Human Development Index: Contribution to Its Construction, Indian Journal of Economics, Vol. 83, No. 328, p. 95-100. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Haq, Mahboub UH (1976): Choosing a value of poverty for the Third World, Columbia University Press, New York, 35. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Nayak, P. and E.D. Thomas (2007): Human Development and Deprivation in Mechalaya, Akasha Publishers, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Planning Commission (2002): National Human Development Report 2001, Govt. of India, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Sziltes, P.P. (1995): Thinking about development, Cambridge University Press, pp.19-20. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ UDP: Report on human development, volumes for 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004 and 2006, 2006.

12 $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ is a usefulness or well-being derived from income, and the parameter α measures the degree of decrease in income. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ modification adopted in HDI (1991) allowed the cost of pee to grow slowly with revenue growth. To do this, the full range of income was divided into multiples of income below the poverty line^Y. Thus, most countries fall in the income range between Y^{10} , some between Y^{20} , even less between Y^{32} and so on. For all countries for which Y (poor countries) are established equal to 0 means there has been no decrease in profits. For income between Y^{20} and Y^{32} , there is a set equal to 10. To generate income between Y^{10} and Y^{20} , it was set at 2/3 and so on. Overall, 7 when Y^{10} , this means what (where constants such as 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. represent, to multiply with income line poverty to identify different income ranges where the country falls according to its income level). Таким чином, ми маємо $Y^0, \dots, Y^{10}, Y^{20}, Y^{32}, \dots, Y^{100}$ where 1H is a life expectancy index based on life expectancy in age one and 2H is an infant mortality index based on infant mortality rates. In the case of MIP, the indicator reciprocity is used. The various indicators included in the development radar have been scaled and normalized to take value at a scale of 0 to 5. As a result, on each indicator, including the IIR and poverty ratio, where reciprocity of the indicator was used, and scalable least achievements correspond to 0, while the best achievements is closer to 5. When it is carried out under such a scaling procedure, the desired norms had to be adopted for the selected indicators (NHRD 2002, p.133). In some cases, the norms are independently selected, for example, it is a case of access to safe drinking water or literacy, and in some others, such as per capita consumption costs or even infant mortality, there is an element of appraisal judgments. In the case of inflation-adjusted per capita costs (at 1983 prices), the maximum tied to 500 per capita per month. For poverty minimum at 5 percent in any way that it corresponds to the value of 5 on a scale of 0.5 on the radar. In all other cases, the scaling standards are as follows: MEASURABLE INDEXES Scaling Indicators Norms of maximum minimum life expectancy HDI at age 1 (years) 60 50 Infant mortality rate - 20 per 1000 literacy rate over 7+ years 100 0 Adjusted intensity of formal education (estimated) 7 0 Spending on monthly per capita consumption (Rs.) 325 65 Source: NHRD 2001, Planning Commission, New Delhi 16 Links $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1993): Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 12, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (1995): Gender inequality in Human Development: Theories and Measurements, Office of Human Development Reports, Random Article No. 19, New York, UNDP. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and A. Sen (2000): Revenue Component of the Human Development Index, Journal of Human Development, Vol.1, No.1. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Anand, S. and M. Ravallion (1993): Human Development in Poor Countries: The Role of Private Income and Public Services, Journal of Economic Prospects, Vol.7, p.133-150. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Chauthey, P.K (2002): Human Development Index: Contribution to Its Construction, Indian Journal of Economics, Vol. 83, No. 328, p. 95-100. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Haq, Mahboub UH (1976): Choosing a value of poverty for the Third World, Columbia University Press, New York, 35. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Nayak, P. and E.D. Thomas (2007): Human Development and Deprivation in Mechalaya, Akasha Publishers, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Planning Commission (2002): National Human Development Report 2001, Govt. of India, New Delhi. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ Sziltes, P.P. (1995): Thinking about development, Cambridge University Press, pp.19-20. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ UDP: Report on human development, volumes for 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004 and 2006, 2006.

12 $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ is a usefulness or well-being derived from income, and the parameter α measures the degree of decrease in income. $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{Y}{Y_{max}} + \frac{L}{L_{max}} + \frac{I}{I_{max}})$ modification adopted in HDI (1991) allowed the cost of pee to grow slowly with revenue growth. To do this, the full range of income was divided into multiples of income below the poverty line^Y. Thus, most countries fall in the income range between Y^{10} , some between Y^{20} , even less between Y^{32} and so on. For all countries for which Y (poor countries) are established equal to 0 means there has been no decrease in profits. For income between Y^{20} and Y^{32} , there is a set equal to 10. To generate income between Y^{10} and Y^{20} , it was set at 2/3 and so on. Overall, 7 when Y^{10} , this means what (where constants such as 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. represent, to multiply with income line poverty to identify different income ranges where the country falls according to its income level). Таким чином, ми маємо $Y^0, \dots, Y^{10}, Y^{20}, Y^{32}, \dots, Y^{100}$ where 1H is a life expectancy index based on life expectancy in age one and 2H is an infant mortality index based on infant mortality rates. In the case of MIP, the indicator reciprocity is used. The various indicators included in the development radar have been scaled and normalized to take value at a scale of 0 to 5. As a result, on each indicator, including the IIR and poverty ratio, where reciprocity of the indicator was used, and scalable least achievements correspond to 0, while the best achievements is closer to 5. When it is carried out under such a scaling procedure, the desired norms had to be adopted for the selected indicators (NHRD 2002, p.133). In some cases, the norms are independently selected, for example, it is a case of access to safe drinking water or literacy, and in some others, such as per capita consumption costs or even infant mortality, there is an element of appraisal judgments. In the case of inflation-adjusted per capita costs (at 1983 prices), the maximum tied to 500 per capita per month. For poverty minimum at 5 percent in any way that it corresponds to the value of 5 on a scale of 0.5 on the radar. In all other cases, the scaling standards are as follows: MEASURABLE INDEXES Scaling Indicators Norms of maximum minimum life expectancy HDI at