

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT

I
J
R
C
M



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories
Indexed & Listed at:

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., The American Economic Association's electronic bibliography, EconLit, U.S.A., EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A.,
Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland, Open J-Gate, India [link of the same is duly available at Infilbnet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C.)]
as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than Hundred & Twenty One countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

www.ijrcm.org.in

CONTENTS

| Sr. No. | TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S) | Page No. |
|---------|--|----------|
| 1. | SERVICE QUALITY DIMENSIONS IN RETAIL SETTINGS: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY AT SELECTED APPAREL SPECIALTY STORES OF MUMBAI <i>DR. SUDHEER DHUME</i> | 1 |
| 2. | REDUCING HEALTH INEQUALITIES: KERALA COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE SCHEME A ROLE MODEL FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES <i>DEVI NAIR & KORA TUSHUNE</i> | 6 |
| 3. | FACTOR AFFECTING FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT (FDI) INFLOW IN THE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION SECTOR <i>DR. S.A. BUSTANI, I.S. YESUFU, E.A. UFUAH & DR. S.M. JIMAH</i> | 13 |
| 4. | ESTABLISHING CRM IN SMALL ENTERPRISES <i>BORIS MILOVIC</i> | 18 |
| 5. | FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND AGRICULTURAL SECTOR GROWTH IN CAMEROON <i>DR. ARMAND GILBERT NOULA & NEBA CLETUS YAH</i> | 22 |
| 6. | ECONOMIC COST IMPLICATIONS OF THE USE OF GENERATORS AS ALTERNATIVE SOURCE OF ENERGY IN KANO METROPOLIS - NIGERIA <i>DR. AHMAD MUHAMMAD TSAUNI & ABUBAKAR HASSAN</i> | 28 |
| 7. | FACTORS INFLUENCING PATIENT'S DECISION OF SELECTING A HOSPITAL <i>MOHAMMED ARIF RAZA</i> | 34 |
| 8. | AVAILABILITY AND AWARENESS OF MICROFINANCE IN JAMMU & KASHMIR STATE <i>MUBASHIR NABI & DR. ASHOK AIMA</i> | 40 |
| 9. | RURAL LIVELIHOOD MARKETS AND ECONOMIES <i>DR. NITIN RAGHUNATH ZAWARE</i> | 48 |
| 10. | NREGA UNDER SOCIAL AUDIT: A SWOT ANALYSIS <i>S.P. NAGANAGOUD & DR. H. H. ULIVEPPA</i> | 51 |
| 11. | PERCEPTION AND PRACTICES OF INDIVIDUALS ON PUBLIC HEALTH CENTRES <i>V. SANGEETHA, DR. G. PAULRAJ, DR. S. RAMESHKUMAR & L. DINESH.</i> | 56 |
| 12. | THE EFFECT OF MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS ON SHAREHOLDERS' WEALTH – AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS <i>DR. S. VANITHA & DR. M. SELVAM</i> | 59 |
| 13. | A STUDY ON ROADSIDE FOOD STALLS IN TIRUCHIRAPPALLI CORPORATION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO FOOD INDUSTRY AND HOTEL INDUSTRY <i>DR. J. MOHAN RAJ</i> | 70 |
| 14. | BIOFUELS CONSUMPTION IN EASTERN HIMALAYAS HOUSEHOLDS - AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS <i>DR. RABINJYOTI KHATANAR & DR. BIDYUT JYOTI BHATTACHARJEE</i> | 75 |
| 15. | IMPACT OF WOMAN EMPOWERMENT THROUGH MICRO FINANCE INSTITUTES: SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND BEHAVIORAL PERSPECTIVES AFFECTING TO RULER SEGMENT WOMAN OF GANDHINAGAR IN GUJARAT <i>URVI AMIN & BANSI PATEL</i> | 81 |
| 16. | A STUDY OF BANK TRANSACTION COST OF PCARDBS IN MYSORE DISTRICT <i>DR. C. MAHADEVA MURTHY & DR. VEENA. K.P</i> | 89 |
| 17. | WOMEN ENTREPRENEURSHIP THROUGH SELF-HELP GROUPS: A CASE STUDY OF TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT, TAMIL NADU <i>A. ANGEL ANILA</i> | 93 |
| 18. | HANDLOOM AS AN ACTIVITY TO ENSURE FOOD SECURITY SPECIAL REFERENCE TO WEST BENGAL <i>CHITTARANJAN DAS</i> | 97 |
| 19. | AGRICULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE GENERATION OF INCOME AMONG THE SMALL AND MARGINAL FARMERS <i>DR. C. GUNASEKARAN</i> | 102 |
| 20. | FACTORS INFLUENCING THE EFFECTIVE FUNCTIONING OF THE SELF-HELP GROUPS - AN ANALYTICAL STUDY <i>DR. M. GURUPANDI</i> | 104 |
| 21. | PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IN TAMIL NADU NEEDS DEFINITE OVERHAULING <i>DR. S. MAYILVAGANAN & B. VARADARAJAN</i> | 108 |
| 22. | PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE: A STUDY OF SMALL ENTERPRISES IN AMRITSAR <i>DR. GURPREET RANDHAWA & KULDEEP KAUR</i> | 110 |
| 23. | ROLE OF EXCESS OF MALES IN MARRIAGE SQUEEZE OF INDIA AND ITS EAG STATES <i>RANJANA KESARWANI</i> | 114 |
| 24. | PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF MUTUAL FUNDS IN INDIA: AN APPLICATION OF RISK-ADJUSTED THEORETICAL PARAMETERS <i>JOITY TOMER</i> | 120 |
| 25. | SMALL FAMILY NORMS IN INDIA AND ITS QUALITATIVE IMPLICATIONS ON CHILD CARE: A MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS <i>RITWIKA MUKHERJEE</i> | 134 |
| | REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK | 142 |

CHIEF PATRON

PROF. K. K. AGGARWAL

Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Delhi
Founder Vice-Chancellor, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi
Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

PATRON

SH. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL

Ex. State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana
Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri
President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

CO-ORDINATOR

DR. BHAVET

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

ADVISORS

DR. PRIYA RANJAN TRIVEDI

Chancellor, The Global Open University, Nagaland

PROF. M. S. SENAM RAJU

Director A. C. D., School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

PROF. M. N. SHARMA

Chairman, M.B.A., Haryana College of Technology & Management, Kaithal

PROF. S. L. MAHANDRU

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

EDITOR

PROF. R. K. SHARMA

Professor, Bharti Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi

CO-EDITOR

DR. SAMBHAV GARG

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

DR. RAJESH MODI

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

PROF. SIKANDER KUMAR

Chairman, Department of Economics, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

PROF. SANJIV MITTAL

University School of Management Studies, Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

PROF. RAJENDER GUPTA

Convener, Board of Studies in Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu

PROF. NAWAB ALI KHAN

Department of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

PROF. S. P. TIWARI

Department of Economics & Rural Development, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University, Faizabad

DR. ANIL CHANDHOK

Professor, Faculty of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

DR. ASHOK KUMAR CHAUHAN

Reader, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

DR. SAMBHAVNA

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

DR. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA

Associate Professor, P. J. L. N. Government College, Faridabad

DR. VIVEK CHAWLA

Associate Professor, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

DR. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE

Asst. Professor, Government F. G. College Chitgappa, Bidar, Karnataka

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

PROF. ABHAY BANSAL

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engineering & Technology, Amity University, Noida

PARVEEN KHURANA

Associate Professor, Mukand Lal National College, Yamuna Nagar

SHASHI KHURANA

Associate Professor, S. M. S. Khalsa Lubana Girls College, Barara, Ambala

SUNIL KUMAR KARWASRA

Principal, Aakash College of Education, Chander Kalan, Tohana, Fatehabad

DR. VIKAS CHOUDHARY

Asst. Professor, N.I.T. (University), Kurukshetra

TECHNICAL ADVISORS

MOHITA

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

AMITA

Faculty, Government M. S., Mohali

FINANCIAL ADVISORS

DICKIN GOYAL

Advocate & Tax Adviser, Panchkula

NEENA

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

LEGAL ADVISORS

JITENDER S. CHAHAL

Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA

Advocate & Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

SUPERINTENDENT

SURENDER KUMAR POONIA

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to recent developments & practices in the area of Computer, Business, Finance, Marketing, Human Resource Management, General Management, Banking, Insurance, Corporate Governance and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting Education; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Monetary Policy; Portfolio & Security Analysis; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Business Education; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law, Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labor Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; Public Administration; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism, Hospitality & Leisure; Transportation/Physical Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Digital Logic; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Multimedia; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic and Web Design. The above mentioned tracks are only indicative, and not exhaustive.

Anybody can submit the soft copy of his/her manuscript **anytime** in M.S. Word format after preparing the same as per our submission guidelines duly available on our website under the heading guidelines for submission, at the email addresses: infoijrcm@gmail.com or info@ijrcm.org.in.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: _____

THE EDITOR
IJRCM

Subject: SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF _____.

(e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/Economics/Psychology/Law/Computer/IT/Engineering/Mathematics/other, please specify)

DEAR SIR/MADAM

Please find my submission of manuscript entitled ' _____ ' for possible publication in your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the author (s) have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the manuscript and their inclusion of name (s) as co-author (s).

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I/We agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal & you are free to publish our contribution in any of your journals.

NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Designation:

Affiliation with full address, contact numbers & Pin Code:

Residential address with Pin Code:

Mobile Number (s):

Landline Number (s):

E-mail Address:

Alternate E-mail Address:

NOTES:

- a) The whole manuscript is required to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only (pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration), which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript.
- b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN** of the mail:
New Manuscript for Review in the area of (Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/Economics/Psychology/Law/Computer/IT/Engineering/Mathematics/other, please specify)
- c) There is no need to give any text in the body of mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any specific message w.r.t. to the manuscript.
- d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is required to be below **500 KB**.
- e) Abstract alone will not be considered for review, and the author is required to submit the complete manuscript in the first instance.
- f) The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of manuscript, within two days of submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending separate mail to the journal.

2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be in a 12 point Calibri Font. It should be bold typed, centered and fully capitalised.

3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** The author (s) **full name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline numbers, and email/alternate email address** should be in italic & 11-point Calibri Font. It must be centered underneath the title.

4. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in fully italicized text, not exceeding 250 words. The abstract must be informative and explain the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a single para. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.

5. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of five. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stops at the end.
6. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER**. It must be prepared on a single space and single column with 1" margin set for top, bottom, left and right. It should be typed in 8 point Calibri Font with page numbers at the bottom and centre of every page. It should be free from grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors and must be thoroughly edited.
7. **HEADINGS:** All the headings should be in a 10 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
8. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings should be in a 8 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
9. **MAIN TEXT:** The main text should follow the following sequence:

INTRODUCTION**REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESES****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****ACKNOWLEDGMENTS****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE**

It should be in a 8 point Calibri Font, single spaced and justified. The manuscript should preferably not exceed **5000 WORDS**.

10. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, centered, separately numbered & self explained, and **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure.** It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.
11. **EQUATIONS:** These should be consecutively numbered in parentheses, horizontally centered with equation number placed at the right.
12. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript and they are supposed to follow **Harvard Style of Referencing**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
 - All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
 - Use **(ed.)** for one editor, and **(ed.s)** for multiple editors.
 - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc, in chronologically ascending order.
 - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
 - The title of books and journals should be in italics. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
 - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parentheses.
 - The location of endnotes within the text should be indicated by superscript numbers.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:**BOOKS**

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–22 June.

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS AND THESES

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

ONLINE RESOURCES

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

WEBSITE

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Natural Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>

ROLE OF EXCESS OF MALES IN MARRIAGE SQUEEZE OF INDIA AND ITS EAG STATES

RANJANA KESARWANI

RESEARCH SCHOLAR

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR POPULATION SCIENCES

MUMBAI

ABSTRACT

In the last few decades India has developed both economic and social sector. Preliminary results of the Indian census 2011 shows that child sex ratio is 914 females per 1,000 males, which has been declined from year 2001 (927 females per 1,000 males) indicating that female birth rate has been declined and implying prevailing gender discrimination is one of the major problem in Indian society. Also it is seen that strong son preference is culturally imbedded in Indian society, resulting in imbalanced sex ratio at birth and hence in marriage market in future. Therefore in this context broad objective of the paper is to study the impact of imbalanced sex ratio on marriage squeeze in future years in India and EAG states for period 2001-2051. The study uses data from NFHS-3, and Report of the Technical group on Population Projections. Preliminary findings of the study show that there is strong son preference in India and among all EAG states. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh will face high imbalanced sex ratio till 2051 and it is favorable to male; hence resulting into male marriage squeeze. However Orissa, Uttaranchal and Jharkhand will achieve balanced sex ratio almost by year 2051.

KEYWORDS

Marriage squeeze, Gender discrimination in India.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, demographers have noted worrying trends in the sex ratio at birth (SRB) in some of the countries of Asia like India, China and the Republic of Korea. A statement by Amartya Sen in the year 1990 supports about the female deficit in Asia and Africa. He concludes that about 11 percent of women are missing in both continents. In the last few decades India has developed both economic and social sector, but the evidences show that the prevailing gender discrimination is one of the major problem in the Indian society. A distinctive dimension of India's recent population dynamics has been its unexpected masculinisation means increasing number of males in total population. According to preliminary results of the census 2011 child sex ratio is 914 females per 1,000 males, which has been declined from year 2001 (927 females per 1,000 males) indicating that female birth rate has been decline as compared to census 2001 and showing that prevailing gender discrimination is one of the major problem in the India.

In demographic literature, any imbalance in the sex ratio of prime marriageable males and females is defined as marriage squeeze. In other words, when the number of males (females) in the prime marriageable age group surpasses the number of females (males) in the preferred age group at a certain point of time in a particular geographical area, then this phenomenon is called *male (female) marriage squeeze*. The term marriage squeeze was introduced by Glick *et al.* (1963) quoted by Glick (1988). It has also been termed as *marriage deprivation* and *marriage exclusion* (Zhigang *et al.*, 1967). As many demographic, biological, social and economic factors influence the nuptial behaviour, they can sometimes cause a squeeze on the marriage market and on the possible choices of people involved. In the absence of large scale international migration there are two main demographic such as *mortality transition* and *fertility transition* causes of imbalance of marriage market. Due to *mortality transition* the successive birth cohorts become larger and under the assumption that males seek younger females to get married it can be concluded that mortality decline will result in more female chasing lesser number of males for marriage resulting in female marriage squeeze. The phenomenon can ease when the *fertility transition* starts and results in smaller birth cohorts, that is, less females chasing more males resulting in male marriage squeeze.

Besides these two the other factor influencing in marriage squeeze is skewed sex ratio at birth (SRB, the ratio of boys per 100 girls at birth). Generally in most of the population sex ratio at birth ranges between 104-106 due to some biological reasons (Guilmoto, 2007), but in some population due to strong son preference and consequent sex selective abortion SRB is getting distorted and becoming much favorable to males. The large number of male children compared to female children results in to future male marriage squeeze. Marriage squeeze can also be due to the some societal norms like spousal age gap, remarriages etc.

Asia has the highest proportion of males in the world with the fact that overall sex ratio (number of males per 1000 females) is almost stable from 1950 to 2005 as 105 (Guilmoto, 2007). In India estimated overall sex ratio according to census 2011 is recorded as 940 females per 1,000 males whereas among all Empowered Action Group (EAG) states Uttar Pradesh have lowest overall sex ratio (908 females per 1,000 males). This imbalance in India is mainly due to strong son preference in terms of economic and social utility of son. Son preference is culturally imbedded in our society but its strength varies from one region to another. So the rapid fertility decline in the some of the region and increasing SRB favorable to male is expected to results in to strong imbalance between the number of men and women and marriage market. Therefore here an attempt is made to study the impact of imbalanced sex ratio on marriage market of India as well as in eight EAG states (Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Uttaranchal, Jharkhand, Orissa and Rajasthan).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Firstly Akers (1967) made an attempt to measure the marriage squeeze of USA considering the situation of 1960s. He concludes that due to changes in marriage pattern there will be some impact on birth rate and the family formation. It was also concluded that single men will go for first marriage at faster rate as compared to earlier in 1960s. Muhsam (1974) did a study considering the situation of marriage squeeze in Australia. In his study it was concluded that female deficit in the population shows negative effect in terms of women succeed to avoid the marriage with relatively old or young men and also men face a force to marry with relatively old or very younger women. Lena Edlund (1999) made an attempt to establish the link among son preference, sex ratios and marriage pattern in China. In his study he concludes that preference for sons could be a factor behind men's marrying younger women than themselves.

The study of Verma (2000) was based on the phenomenon marriage squeeze in India. In her study she gave a conclusion that India is passing through the male marriage squeeze. Also the marriage squeeze has great impact on permanent celibacy. Shuzhuo Li (2005) did a study to lay down the focus on the implications of son preference on marriage squeeze in China. This study concludes that there will be large male marriage squeeze due to strong son preference from 2000 onwards in China. Jean Louis Rallu (2006) did a study to understand the situation of female deficit and marriage market in Korea. Study shows that for small populations like Korea, migration could be a solution to imbalances on the marriage market through emigration of males or immigration of foreign females from neighbouring Asian countries but in large populated countries like India and China migration cannot be a solution. Ranjana (2010) made an attempt to study the association between skewed sex ratio at birth and marriage squeeze in selected south Asian countries including India. The study reflects that countries like India, Korea and China will face high male marriage squeeze in future years and it is due to strong preference for male child.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

There are various studies on marriage squeeze but no one study shows the implication of distorted sex ratio on marriage squeeze in the context of comparative study among EAG states in future years. Also it is seen that strong son preference is culturally imbedded in India which is resulting in imbalanced sex ratio at birth and hence in marriage market. Thus in this context this study is trying to answer some queries; what is the situation of marriage market of India as well as EAG states at present time? In the context of strong son preference in selected states what will be the intensity of imbalanced in the marriage market in future?

OBJECTIVES

The broad objective of the paper is to study the situation of marriage squeeze in present and future years in India and EAG states. The specific objectives are

1. To study the son preference and its association with sex ratio at birth.
2. To study the sex differential in mortality in EAG states of India.
3. To study the marriage squeeze in EAG states for the period 2001-2051.

ASSUMPTIONS

In this study we are assuming that age gap between spouses on an average is five years that is almost all males are getting married with five years younger females than themselves.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

The data utilized in this study came from National Family Health Survey and Report of the Technical group on Population Projections. The National Family Health Survey (NFHS) programme was started in 1990s under the supervision of Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MOHFW), Government of India and co-ordinated by International Institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai. In the present study we have used the third series of NFHS (NFHS-3, 2005-06). It covered 29 states of India. The NFHS is national representative Survey. The sample selection was based on systematic, multistage and stratified design. The major topic cover in the survey include fertility, marriage patterns, knowledge and practice of family planning method, use of antenatal care services, child health and nutrition, vaccination, HIV/AIDS etc. Technical group or Expert Committee was constituted by National Commission on Population (NCP) in 2001 under the Chairmanship of the Registrar General of India to prepare population projection for the period 2001-2051.

There are various indicators which can be used to investigate the son preference. Here we are using a few indicators which are as follows: *Desire for more children, Use of contraceptive method and Ideal Family Size*. The indicators used for sex differential in mortality are *Infant mortality rate (IMR), Childhood mortality rate (CMR), under five mortality rate (U5MR) and Life Expectancy at Birth (LEB)*.

To study the marriage squeeze in future years we have used Software **Spectrum** to project the future year population by age and sex taking base year (2001) from Population Projections for India and states 2001-2026, Report of the Technical group on Population projection constituted by National Commission on Population, May 2006.

The simplest approach for measuring the marriage squeeze is based on the calculation of overall sex ratio. It means the ratio of total males and females. Let I_1 be the Mate Availability Index, M and F be the total male and female population respectively. Then Availability Index can be measured as

$$I_1 = (M/F) * 100$$

The drawback of this Index (I_1) is that it assumes all the population of a region has the same risk of getting married including children and elderly which is not possible in any society. Therefore in the next Availability Index we will consider the only population which is at the risk of getting married. Let us consider that all marriages takes place within age range (x, x + n) then Index of marriage squeeze can be measured as

$$I_2 = \left(\frac{{}_nM_x / {}_nF_x}{\text{Total}} \right) * 100$$

In this study we have made an attempt to measure the Index of marriage squeeze by considering that all marriages are taking place between ages 15-49 and 15-54. But in most of the society it is seen that marriages are concentrated only over the few ages which is assumed as peak marriageable ages and known as prime marriageable ages (Akers, 1967). Prime marriageable age varies from one region to another. Let us consider that for females prime marriageable age is x to x + m and for males it is y to y + n. Then Index of marriage squeeze can be represented as

$$I_3 = \left(\frac{{}_nM_y / {}_mF_x}{\text{Total}} \right) * 100$$

In the present paper on the basis of above index we have calculated two indices by assuming two different prime marriageable ages in which one is considering that prime marriageable ages for female is 15-29 years and for male it is 20-34 and another is considering that 20-34 for female and 25-39 for males.

Age gap between spouses also affects the availability of mates or partners. In most of the society it is expected that grooms should be older than their brides. Due to this norm bride always belongs to younger cohort than groom. Thus for the purpose of Index of marriage squeeze it will more adoptable to calculate the sex ratio by assuming age gap between spouses is five years. Thus on this basis we can represent the Index of marriage squeeze/ Mate Availability Index for male as

$$AI = \left(\frac{{}_5M_{x+5} / {}_5F_x}{\text{Total}} \right) * 100$$

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis is divided in three different parts according to three objectives.

RESULTS FOR SON PREFERENCE

The first part of the discussion is about the indicators of son preference.

In **Table 1** we are taking into account the actual and behavioral attitude of the women regarding the sex composition of family size. Table presents the percentage of currently married women who have desire for more children according to the sex composition of family size (total number of living children). Table shows that in all states as well as in India among currently married women, whose family size is one and who have only one boy have less desire for another child as compared to the women who have only one girl. Among all selected states in Uttaranchal women with only one daughter have highest desire for more children as compared to women with only sons. Table also indicates that married women who have two or three sons have less desire for more children compared to those who have two or three daughters respectively indicating they are satisfied with the sex composition of family. Table also describes the reflection of son preference on contraceptive use. At national level 14 percent women with one child as a son using family planning method; whereas only four percent women having one child as a girl using contraception, it means they want to go for more children. From table we see that the contraceptive use is high where there is at least one son in the family and less where the number of girls is high. It is also observable that in Bihar and Rajasthan where family size is 3 and all of them are boys, the contraceptive use is respectively 36 and 12 times high compared to women having three girls indicating higher preference for male child.

Table 2 indicates the gender difference in median duration of exclusive breastfeeding and vaccination of living children, which reveals differential treatment given to girls and boys. At national level median duration for exclusive breastfeeding for male and female is 2.1 and 1.9 months respectively. Difference in median duration of exclusive breastfeeding is favorable to male in states like Bihar, Rajasthan, Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh. However Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa shows not much difference in care giving to children in terms of exclusive breastfeeding. Only in state Jharkhand median duration of exclusive breastfeeding is much favorable to female child (1.5 months) than the male child (0.6 months). Table also discusses that percentage of children of both sexes not received vaccination. In India 6.0 percent girl children did not received any vaccination; however this percentage is declined up to 4.3 for male children indicating girl child receive less attention in health care. Uttar Pradesh treats girl and boy children equally. In states Bihar, Rajasthan, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh and Uttarakhand girl children are less vaccinated compared to male children; whereas in Jharkhand and Orissa percentage of children not vaccinated is higher for males than females.

Table 3 describes about the sex ratio at birth (SRB) for EAG states for the time period 2001-2051 which are projected by Registrar General of India (2006). In this projection constant SRB is considered over the period. From table it is clear that in states like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Rajasthan SRB is higher than the national average. Uttar Pradesh (UP) has highest sex ratio (115 male live births per 100 female live births) favorable to male among all EAG states. Rajasthan is second highest (114 male live births per 100 female live births) followed by Bihar (112 male live births per 100 female live births). Madhya Pradesh (MP) and Uttaranchal are having same SRB as 110 male live births per 100 female live births. Generally in most of the population sex ratio at birth ranges 104-106 due to some

biological reasons (Guilmoto, 2007). Therefore analysis points out that Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh have almost balanced SRB; whereas Orissa shows slightly higher SRB than the balanced.

Therefore from above it can be summarized that state UP, MP, Bihar and Rajasthan have strong preference for male child.

RESULTS FOR SEX DIFFERENTIAL IN MORTALITY

The second part of the analysis deals with mortality differential between males and females.

Table 4 contains information about the infant mortality rate (IMR), childhood mortality rate (CMR) and under five mortality rates (U5MR) by sex. As we know that there is huge difference in treatment and care giving to the two sexes, so this results in difference in mortality pattern between the two sexes. Table shows that IMR is highest for both male and female as 81 and 85 per 1000 live births respectively in Uttar Pradesh among the selected EAG states. However at national level IMR is 56 for males and 58 for females. Also IMR is lowest for both male and female (55 per 1000) in Uttaranchal. From table it can be also observed that the difference in IMR of male and female children is highest in Orissa and IMR for male is higher than female. The table shows that except Orissa, Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh in all remaining EAG states female infant mortality is higher than male infant mortality. Sex differential in child mortality shows that except in Orissa girl children suffer substantially higher mortality than male. Table also reflects that except in Orissa and Chhattisgarh girls suffers higher mortality from birth to five years of age compared to boys.

Table 5 describes the life expectancy at birth (LEB) during time period 2001-2051 in EAG states as well as India sex wise. It is observed that LEB for female is higher than males almost in all selected states. At national level during 2001, the difference in LEB of male and female was observed about 2 years and favorable to female and this difference will increase up to 3.5 years in 2051. Results reveal that till 2051, the difference in male and female LEB will be 4.5 years showing improvement in health condition of women. However results slightly reflect for UP, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh in year 2001 and 2011; means during this period male LEB surpasses the female LEB.

RESULTS FOR MARRIAGE SQUEEZE

Now this section deals with analysis of marriage squeeze.

Table 6 presents the various sex ratio indices for measuring the marriage squeeze in selected states. In this table there are five sex ratio based indicators. The first one is simple sex ratio (Males per 100 Females) based on total population of male and female. From table we found that in 2001 sex ratio were 107 males per 100 females in India. Among all EAG states UP consist of highest sex ratio (111 males per 100 females) in 2000, means it had faced high male squeeze during 2000. However Uttaranchal, Jharkhand, Orissa and Chhattisgarh were on balanced situation. Analysis reveals that UP will be no improvement in situation till 2051 implying UP will face high excess of males till 2051. There are several other states like Bihar, Rajasthan and MP which will join UP till 2051. However remaining other states will achieve almost balanced SRB till 2051.

The second indicator which is a sex ratio based on only marriageable (15-49 age group) population of male and female. From table it is clear that in 2001 there was highest male marriage squeeze in UP. Also table indicates that till 2051 almost all selected states will face the male marriage squeeze except Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh. UP, Bihar and MP will face highest male marriage squeeze with sex ratio 115, 114 and 112 respectively. The next indicator considers that all marriages will take place between 15-54 age groups. On the basis of this indicator table shows that the states like UP, Bihar, MP and Rajasthan were facing male marriage squeeze while in remaining states there were no crises in 2001. The situation will be almost same till 2051 in UP, Bihar, MP and Rajasthan.

It is seen that marriages are concentrated only over the few ages which is assumed as peak marriageable ages or prime age for marriage. Prime marriage age vary from region to region. Thus because of this reason here we have considered two indicators for marriage squeeze by considering the different prime age at marriage.

The fourth indicator of marriage squeeze assumes that prime marriageable age for female is 15-29 years and for male it is 20-34. Result shows that in India there was 5 percent shortage of male during 2001 in prime marriageable age group. Also from table it is clear that in 2001 all states were passing through male marriage squeeze. In 2001 among all selected states UP takes place as a state which was suffering through highest (128 males per 100 females) male marriage squeeze and Rajasthan takes place as a second highest having (116 males per 100 females) male marriage squeeze. Also in 2051, we found that there will be strong male marriage squeeze in EAG states except UP, MP, Bihar and Rajasthan. Uttaranchal, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Orissa will attained almost balanced situation till 2051 in marriage market.

The last index of marriage squeeze based on sex ratio, in which prime marriageable age for female is 20-34 and for male it is 25-39. Taking into the consideration of the last index, we notice that all considered states were passing through male marriage squeeze in 2001. Analyzing the table we can see that in 2051 there will be high male marriage squeeze with highest value (119 males per 100 females) in UP. Bihar, Rajasthan and MP will also face high male marriage squeeze with index value approximately as 117, 115 and 116 respectively.

Considering the last indicator we can conclude that in 2001 UP, Bihar, Rajasthan and MP have faced the very intense male marriage squeeze. The remaining all states also experience the male marriage squeeze but not very intense.

Table 7 represents the mate availability index (males per 100 females) for males in selected states for the time period 2001-2051, assuming that all marriages takes place within age groups 15-54 and age gap between spouses is five years. Since several available literatures point out that most of the marriages in India are taking place during ages 20-34, so our main focus here will be to see the availability of mates for males in this age range. Study reveals that there were high female marriage squeeze in India as well as in all EAG states in year 2011. Considering the age group 20-24, we found that during 2001 Uttaranchal was facing highest female marriage squeeze (86 males per 100 females). However at national level there was around only 4 percent shortage of males for females. But when we move over year 2021, we noticed that there will be high male marriage squeeze in age group 20-34 in all states; after this age range there will be again crises of males for females. It may be because female have life expectancy high than the male, means their survival chances are high so they can stay for a long time in marriage market. Also we assess that during 2051, India as well as all considered states will face high level of marriage squeeze in age range 20-34.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is already mentioned that rapid decline in fertility and mortality results in to imbalance in the male and female population of marriageable ages. In Indian society added factor is son preference resulting in to sex ratio at birth much favorable to male children. As most of the EAG states have strong preference for male child and hence experiencing skewed sex ratio at birth so there are chances of marriage squeeze. The analysis reveals that though there is son preference in all states but its intensity is high in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. The son preference has resulted in to skewed sex ratio only in above four states. The first indicator of marriage squeeze reveals that during 2001-2011 except Orissa, Uttaranchal and Chhattisgarh all other states were facing the male marriage squeeze implying more males in marriageable ages than females. There will be no problem in states like Uttaranchal, Jharkhand, Orissa and Chhattisgarh in marriageable ages. The serious problem will be in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh.

The cohorts which will be in marriageable ages are already born so it is not possible to change that situation. In order to avoid the problem of male marriage squeeze beyond 2051 these states need to take strict measures to stop sex determination test and subsequent female feticides.

LIMITATIONS

The broad objective of the paper is to study the situation of marriage squeeze in present and future. For this study we are taking the total population of different age group. The phenomena of marriage squeeze can be better studied by considering the age-sex distribution by marital status also by including first and remarriage rate. Here the analysis is restricted to only total population.

REFERENCES

- 1) Akers, D.S. (1967) "On measuring the marriage squeeze." *Demography*, 4(4):907-924.
- 2) Arnold, Fred. and Minja Kim Choe and T.K.Roy (1998) "Son Preference, the Family Building Process and Child Mortality in India." *Population Studies*, 52(3):301-315.

- 3) Bhat, Mari, P. N. and S.S. Halli (1999) "Demography of Bride Price and Dowry: Causes and Consequences of the Indian Marriage Squeeze." *Population Studies*, 53:129-148.
- 4) Guilamoto, Z.C. (2006) "Sex-ratio imbalance in Asia: Trends, Consequences and Policy responses."
- 5) Isfahani, S.D. and Taghvatalab, G. (2009) "Marriage Squeeze and the Changing Pattern of Marriage in Iran." *Department of Economics, Virginia Tech.*
- 6) Jiang, Q. and Shuzhuo Li and M.W. Feldman (2005) "China's son preference and measurement of marriage squeeze: The integrated analysis of first marriage and remarriage market." In CEPED-CICRED-INED Seminar on the Female Deficit in Asia: Trends and Perspective, Singapore.
- 7) Jones, H.J. and Ferguson, B. (2006). "The Marriage Squeeze in Colombia, 1973-2005: The Role of Excess Male Death." *Social Biology*, 53(3-4):140-151.
- 8) Musham, H.V. (1974) "The marriage squeeze." *Demography*, 11(2): 291-299.
- 9) Rallu, L.J. (2006) "Female deficit and the marriage market in Korea." *Demographic Research*, 51(3): 51-60.
- 10) Samaiyar, P. and William Joe. (2010) "Implications of Declining Sex Ratio on Marriage Squeeze of India." *Unwanted Daughters: Gender Discrimination in modern India*.205-221
- 11) Schoen, R. (1983) "Measuring the tightness of a marriage squeeze." *Demography*, 20(1): 61-77.
- 12) South, J.S. and Lloyd, M.K. (1992) "Marriage Opportunities and Family Formation: Further Implications of Imbalanced Sex Ratios." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 54(2): 440-451.
- 13) Verma, S. (2000) "Marriage Scenario of India with special reference to Marriage squeeze." *Ph.D. Thesis*, International institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai, India.
- 14) Verma, S. (2003). "Marriage Squeeze in India." *Demography India*, 32 (2): 181-199

TABLE (1): PERCENTAGE OF CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN WHO HAVE DESIRE FOR MORE CHILDREN AND USING ANY CONTRACEPTIVE METHOD ACCORDING TO THE SEX COMPOSITION OF FAMILY SIZE

| States | India | Uttar Pradesh | Bihar | Rajasthan | Madhya Pradesh | Jharkhand | Orissa | Chhattisgarh | Uttarakhand |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------------|-------|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------|--------------|-------------|
| Number of living children | | | | | | | | | |
| One Child | | | | | | | | | |
| No son | 74.4 | 66.6 | 66.1 | 67.0 | 79.3 | 72.4 | 79.6 | 68.1 | 81.6 |
| One son | 32.1 | 30.2 | 29.0 | 29.1 | 27.9 | 26.9 | 32.4 | 26.7 | 33.7 |
| Two Children | | | | | | | | | |
| No son | 68.2 | 58.7 | 57.5 | 56.7 | 68.8 | 72.8 | 71.0 | 58.0 | 75.9 |
| Two son | 4.6 | 7.8 | 4.9 | 5.9 | 2.8 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 3.9 |
| Three Children | | | | | | | | | |
| No son | 64.2 | 52.6 | 55.7 | 64.7 | 82.5 | 78.8 | 73.3 | 68.4 | 57.6 |
| Three son | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Number of living children | | | | | | | | | |
| One Child | | | | | | | | | |
| No son | 4.4 | 3.9 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 3.5 |
| One son | 14.2 | 13.8 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 10.9 | 16.7 | 9.7 | 11.2 |
| Two Children | | | | | | | | | |
| No son | 10.8 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 5.1 | 9.4 | 4.2 | 6.2 |
| Two son | 49.6 | 37.0 | 41.7 | 41.2 | 45.7 | 40.2 | 47.9 | 41.1 | 57.7 |
| Three Children | | | | | | | | | |
| No son | 10.5 | 3.2 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 4.3 | 5.3 | 13.4 | 4.3 | 5.2 |
| Three son | 25.3 | 25.1 | 32.5 | 27.6 | 28.6 | 30.2 | 28.3 | 32.7 | 21.3 |

Data sources: National Family Health Surveys-3.

TABLE (2): SEX DISCRIMINATION IN TREATMENT IN INDIA AND EAG STATES

| States | India | Uttar Pradesh | Bihar | Rajasthan | Madhya Pradesh | Jharkhand | Orissa | Chhattisgarh | Uttarakhand |
|---|-------|---------------|-------|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------|--------------|-------------|
| Median duration of Exclusive breastfeeding (in months) | | | | | | | | | |
| Male(M) | 2.1 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 6.1 | 0.6 |
| Female(F) | 1.9 | 2.4 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 5.3 | 1.5 |
| Ratio(M/F) | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| No vaccination (%) | | | | | | | | | |
| Male(M) | 4.3 | 2.7 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 5.8 | 12.9 | 0.8 | 5.6 |
| Female(F) | 6.0 | 2.7 | 10.3 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 3.2 | 10.1 | 4.2 | 12.4 |
| Ratio(M/F) | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 |

Data sources: National Family Health Surveys-3.

TABLE (3): SEX RATIO AT BIRTH (MALES PER 100 FEMALES) PRESENT AND PROJECTED FUTURE LEVELS

| Years | 2001 | 2006 | 2011 | 2016 | 2021 | 2031 | 2036 | 2041 | 2051 |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| India | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 | 111 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 |
| Bihar | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 |
| Rajasthan | 114 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 114 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 |
| Uttaranchal | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 | 110 |
| Jharkhand | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 |
| Orissa | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 |
| Chhattisgarh | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 103 |

Data sources: Expert Committee Report, 2006

TABLE (4): SEX DIFFERENTIAL IN MORTALITY RATES IN SELECTED EAG STATES

| Regions | India | Uttar Pradesh | Bihar | Rajasthan | Madhya Pradesh | Jharkhand | Orissa | Chhattisgarh | Uttarakhand |
|---|-------|---------------|-------|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------|--------------|-------------|
| Infant mortality rate (per 1000) | | | | | | | | | |
| Male(M) | 56.3 | 80.9 | 59.7 | 70.5 | 80.9 | 77.2 | 75 | 86.6 | 54.5 |
| Female(F) | 57.7 | 85.2 | 70.8 | 75.2 | 82.8 | 76.1 | 59.4 | 74.7 | 55.1 |
| Ratio(M/F) | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Child mortality (per 1000) | | | | | | | | | |
| Male(M) | 14.2 | 21.7 | 24.5 | 18.5 | 24.7 | 36.7 | 31.1 | 23.1 | 13.8 |
| Female(F) | 22.9 | 43.2 | 40.4 | 26.2 | 32.6 | 40.7 | 26.5 | 31.0 | 18.8 |
| Ratio(M/F) | 0.62 | 0.50 | 0.61 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 1.17 | 0.75 | 0.73 |
| Under-five mortality (per 1000) | | | | | | | | | |
| Male(M) | 69.7 | 100.9 | 82.7 | 87.7 | 103.6 | 111.1 | 103.7 | 107.7 | 67.6 |
| Female(F) | 79.2 | 124.7 | 108.3 | 99.4 | 112.7 | 113.7 | 84.4 | 103.3 | 72.9 |
| Ratio(M/F) | 0.88 | 0.81 | 0.76 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.98 | 1.23 | 1.04 | 0.93 |

Data sources: National Family Health Surveys-3

TABLE (5): SEX DIFFERENTIALS IN LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH IN PRESENT AND PROJECTED FUTURE LEVEL FOR THE PERIOD 2001-2051

| States/Year | 2001 | 2011 | 2021 | 2031 | 2041 | 2051 |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| India | | | | | | |
| Male | 61.8 | 65.8 | 68.8 | 70.8 | 72.4 | 73.3 |
| Female | 63.5 | 67.5 | 70.5 | 72.9 | 74.9 | 76.7 |
| Uttar Pradesh | | | | | | |
| Male | 59.6 | 64.1 | 67.6 | 70.0 | 72.0 | 73.8 |
| Female | 58.7 | 63.7 | 68.5 | 72.0 | 74.7 | 76.9 |
| Bihar | | | | | | |
| Male | 61.6 | 65.6 | 68.6 | 70.6 | 72.2 | 73.5 |
| Female | 59.7 | 63.7 | 67.7 | 70.7 | 73.1 | 75.1 |
| Rajasthan | | | | | | |
| Male | 60.7 | 64.7 | 68.2 | 70.2 | 71.8 | 73.1 |
| Female | 61.8 | 65.8 | 69.3 | 72.0 | 74.2 | 76.0 |
| Madhya Pradesh | | | | | | |
| Male | 57.2 | 62.2 | 66.2 | 68.9 | 71.1 | 73.1 |
| Female | 56.9 | 60.9 | 64.9 | 68.9 | 71.6 | 73.8 |
| Uttaranchal | | | | | | |
| Male | 62.0 | 66.0 | 68.5 | 70.5 | 72.1 | 73.4 |
| Female | 66.0 | 69.5 | 72.2 | 74.4 | 76.2 | 77.8 |
| Jharkhand | | | | | | |
| Male | 62.2 | 66.2 | 68.7 | 70.7 | 72.3 | 73.6 |
| Female | 62.7 | 66.7 | 70.2 | 72.6 | 74.6 | 76.4 |
| Orissa | | | | | | |
| Male | 58.6 | 62.6 | 66.6 | 69.1 | 70.9 | 72.5 |
| Female | 58.7 | 63.7 | 68.5 | 72.0 | 74.7 | 76.9 |
| Chhattisgarh | | | | | | |
| Male | 62.0 | 66.0 | 68.5 | 70.5 | 72.1 | 73.4 |
| Female | 65.2 | 69.2 | 71.9 | 74.1 | 75.9 | 77.2 |

Data sources: Expert Committee Report, 2006

TABLE (6): SEX RATIOS (MALES PER 100 FEMALES) OF TOTAL POPULATION IN MARRIAGEABLE AGES IN SOME SELECTED STATES

| Sex Ratio Indices | States | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|---------------|-------|-----------|----------------|-------------|-----------|--------|--------------|--|
| | India | Uttar Pradesh | Bihar | Rajasthan | Madhya Pradesh | Uttaranchal | Jharkhand | Orissa | Chhattisgarh | |
| 2001 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total M/F | 107.2 | 111.4 | 108.8 | 108.6 | 108.8 | 103.9 | 106.3 | 102.8 | 101.1 | |
| Total M(15-49)/F(15-49) | 107.3 | 110.4 | 106.4 | 109.1 | 110.6 | 101.1 | 106.4 | 102.7 | 102.2 | |
| Total M(15-54)/F(15-54) | 107.6 | 110.7 | 106.9 | 109.2 | 110.7 | 101.4 | 107.0 | 103.1 | 102.2 | |
| Total M(20-34)/F(15-29) | 95.0 | 127.9 | 118.4 | 124.0 | 122.4 | 118.6 | 117.4 | 107.9 | 110.9 | |
| Total M (25-39)/F(20-34) | 93.7 | 117.8 | 108.8 | 118.2 | 117.4 | 111.6 | 110.8 | 108.3 | 107.4 | |
| 2011 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total M/F | 107.4 | 112.4 | 110.0 | 109.8 | 109.5 | 103.8 | 105.8 | 103.5 | 100.7 | |
| Total M(15-49)/F(15-49) | 107.3 | 112.0 | 108.9 | 109.8 | 110.5 | 103.0 | 106.1 | 101.6 | 101.9 | |
| Total M(15-54)/F(15-54) | 107.4 | 111.9 | 108.8 | 109.8 | 110.6 | 102.7 | 106.3 | 102.2 | 102.0 | |
| Total M(20-34)/F(15-29) | 100.2 | 138.9 | 140.4 | 131.8 | 131.0 | 117.7 | 128.7 | 110.9 | 118.5 | |
| Total M (25-39)/F(20-34) | 96.0 | 141.8 | 137.3 | 132.9 | 132.8 | 122.4 | 129.4 | 111.7 | 118.7 | |
| 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total M/F | 107.5 | 113.1 | 110.9 | 110.5 | 109.9 | 103.9 | 105.3 | 103.7 | 100.4 | |
| Total M(15-49)/F(15-49) | 108.3 | 113.7 | 111.1 | 107.9 | 110.8 | 105.3 | 106.2 | 103.0 | 101.8 | |
| Total M(15-54)/F(15-54) | 107.5 | 112.7 | 110.0 | 110.3 | 110.2 | 104.3 | 105.5 | 102.5 | 101.3 | |
| Total M(20-34)/F(15-29) | 108.7 | 118.2 | 114.4 | 113.7 | 113.0 | 109.5 | 103.5 | 100.5 | 101.6 | |
| Total M (25-39)/F(20-34) | 104.6 | 126.9 | 129.4 | 123.5 | 122.6 | 110.1 | 118.6 | 106.3 | 112.2 | |
| 2031 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total M/F | 107.3 | 113.4 | 111.3 | 110.8 | 110.0 | 104.0 | 104.6 | 103.4 | 99.9 | |
| Total M(15-49)/F(15-49) | 109.7 | 115.3 | 113.7 | 107.6 | 111.6 | 107.2 | 106.4 | 105.4 | 102.0 | |
| Total M(15-54)/F(15-54) | 109.2 | 115.1 | 113.1 | 112.2 | 111.5 | 106.4 | 106.2 | 104.5 | 101.7 | |
| Total M(20-34)/F(15-29) | 106.3 | 126.2 | 120.0 | 119.7 | 117.7 | 117.2 | 107.9 | 109.3 | 104.0 | |
| Total M (25-39)/F(20-34) | 108.4 | 120.1 | 114.2 | 114.9 | 114.1 | 113.4 | 103.3 | 103.8 | 101.7 | |
| 2041 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total M/F | 107.1 | 113.4 | 111.5 | 110.8 | 110.0 | 104.1 | 104.0 | 102.9 | 99.5 | |
| Total M(15-49)/F(15-49) | 109.4 | 114.8 | 112.9 | 107.0 | 110.7 | 107.4 | 104.9 | 106.8 | 101.2 | |
| Total M(15-54)/F(15-54) | 109.3 | 114.8 | 113.2 | 112.5 | 111.0 | 107.1 | 105.2 | 106.0 | 101.2 | |
| Total M(20-34)/F(15-29) | 108.4 | 123.6 | 122.7 | 119.6 | 117.2 | 109.3 | 110.8 | 108.2 | 105.6 | |
| Total M (25-39)/F(20-34) | 104.8 | 127.6 | 126.7 | 123.9 | 120.6 | 113.4 | 115.6 | 113.0 | 108.8 | |
| 2051 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total M/F | 107.0 | 113.1 | 111.4 | 110.6 | 110.0 | 104.2 | 103.3 | 102.4 | 99.0 | |
| Total M(15-49)/F(15-49) | 110.2 | 115.8 | 114.0 | 106.8 | 111.6 | 107.5 | 104.9 | 107.3 | 101.2 | |
| Total M(15-54)/F(15-54) | 109.5 | 114.9 | 113.1 | 112.8 | 111.0 | 107.2 | 104.5 | 106.8 | 100.9 | |
| Total M(20-34)/F(15-29) | 113.8 | 115.4 | 112.1 | 111.8 | 110.4 | 107.1 | 101.8 | 102.6 | 99.6 | |
| Total M (25-39)/F(20-34) | 111.7 | 118.8 | 116.8 | 114.8 | 113.4 | 106.9 | 105.1 | 104.0 | 101.7 | |

Data sources: Expert Committee Report, 2006

TABLE (7): MATE AVAILABILITY INDEX (MALES PER 100 FEMALES) IN DIFFERENT MARRIAGEABLE AGE GROUP IN SELECTED STATES

| Availability Index for males | States | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|---------------|-------|-----------|----------------|-------------|-----------|--------|--------------|
| | India | Uttar Pradesh | Bihar | Rajasthan | Madhya Pradesh | Uttaranchal | Jharkhand | Orissa | Chhattisgarh |
| 2001 | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 96.4 | 93.9 | 91.3 | 94.2 | 97.5 | 85.9 | 90.0 | 89.8 | 87.8 |
| 25-29 | 95.3 | 95.0 | 93.8 | 94.7 | 98.2 | 82.5 | 94.2 | 92.0 | 93.6 |
| 30-34 | 92.9 | 92.9 | 90.8 | 93.2 | 95.4 | 84.6 | 93.5 | 91.6 | 93.3 |
| 35-39 | 92.8 | 92.0 | 90.1 | 92.5 | 93.7 | 88.2 | 92.7 | 92.3 | 89.9 |
| 40-44 | 91.6 | 91.9 | 89.9 | 90.9 | 91.1 | 87.5 | 91.7 | 91.3 | 86.6 |
| 45-49 | 91.5 | 92.7 | 90.7 | 90.5 | 90.5 | 87.7 | 92.4 | 90.7 | 86.2 |
| 50-54 | 89.2 | 92.3 | 90.5 | 88.7 | 89.6 | 86.3 | 90.9 | 88.2 | 84.9 |
| 2011 | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 106.8 | 105.1 | 100.3 | 102.9 | 103.5 | 108.9 | 99.5 | 103.1 | 98.2 |
| 25-29 | 96.9 | 93.3 | 88.6 | 93.5 | 95.2 | 94.6 | 87.9 | 90.2 | 87.3 |
| 30-34 | 96.1 | 93.8 | 91.3 | 93.9 | 97.3 | 85.4 | 89.9 | 89.6 | 87.4 |
| 35-39 | 94.7 | 94.7 | 93.6 | 94.1 | 97.9 | 81.8 | 93.9 | 91.5 | 92.8 |
| 40-44 | 91.7 | 92.0 | 90.2 | 92.1 | 94.5 | 83.3 | 92.7 | 90.6 | 92.0 |
| 45-49 | 90.7 | 90.6 | 88.7 | 90.4 | 91.8 | 85.9 | 91.0 | 90.2 | 87.7 |
| 50-54 | 88.0 | 88.6 | 87.0 | 87.3 | 87.5 | 83.7 | 88.6 | 87.5 | 82.9 |
| 2021 | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 112.9 | 107.0 | 117.6 | 116.0 | 109.0 | 97.8 | 120.7 | 118.0 | 111.2 |
| 25-29 | 110.8 | 110.7 | 106.2 | 108.8 | 105.5 | 113.9 | 105.2 | 112.8 | 100.0 |
| 30-34 | 106.4 | 104.7 | 100.2 | 102.6 | 103.2 | 108.3 | 99.3 | 102.7 | 97.7 |
| 35-39 | 96.3 | 92.9 | 88.4 | 93.0 | 94.8 | 93.8 | 87.5 | 89.7 | 86.6 |
| 40-44 | 95.0 | 93.0 | 90.7 | 92.9 | 96.4 | 84.3 | 89.1 | 88.6 | 86.2 |
| 45-49 | 92.8 | 93.1 | 92.2 | 92.2 | 96.0 | 79.9 | 92.2 | 89.5 | 90.7 |
| 50-54 | 88.4 | 89.0 | 87.5 | 88.7 | 91.2 | 80.0 | 89.7 | 87.1 | 88.4 |
| 2031 | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 104.2 | 105.4 | 102.3 | 103.7 | 102.9 | 101.7 | 94.5 | 102.6 | 93.6 |
| 25-29 | 102.8 | 105.8 | 104.8 | 103.1 | 102.9 | 97.4 | 95.1 | 101.0 | 93.3 |
| 30-34 | 112.5 | 106.6 | 117.4 | 115.6 | 108.6 | 97.4 | 120.4 | 117.5 | 110.7 |
| 35-39 | 110.2 | 110.0 | 105.9 | 108.2 | 105.1 | 113.1 | 104.7 | 112.0 | 99.3 |
| 40-44 | 105.4 | 103.8 | 99.5 | 101.5 | 102.4 | 107.0 | 98.5 | 101.6 | 96.6 |
| 45-49 | 94.6 | 91.3 | 87.1 | 91.2 | 93.3 | 91.9 | 86.1 | 87.8 | 84.9 |
| 50-54 | 91.9 | 90.0 | 88.1 | 89.8 | 93.5 | 81.2 | 86.4 | 85.4 | 83.2 |
| 2041 | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 113.5 | 114.1 | 112.1 | 113.9 | 110.8 | 110.5 | 106.6 | 113.3 | 102.6 |
| 25-29 | 108.0 | 108.5 | 105.1 | 107.6 | 105.6 | 107.3 | 98.7 | 107.2 | 96.8 |
| 30-34 | 103.8 | 104.9 | 102.1 | 103.4 | 102.6 | 101.2 | 94.3 | 102.2 | 93.2 |
| 35-39 | 102.3 | 105.1 | 104.4 | 102.6 | 102.5 | 96.8 | 94.7 | 100.3 | 92.7 |
| 40-44 | 111.5 | 105.5 | 116.6 | 114.5 | 107.8 | 96.3 | 119.4 | 116.2 | 109.6 |
| 45-49 | 108.4 | 108.1 | 104.4 | 106.4 | 103.6 | 111.0 | 103.1 | 109.9 | 97.6 |
| 50-54 | 102.3 | 100.8 | 96.9 | 98.5 | 99.7 | 103.6 | 95.8 | 98.2 | 93.6 |
| 2051 | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 113.4 | 117.2 | 117.0 | 116.5 | 113.7 | 108.0 | 108.1 | 109.9 | 104.2 |
| 25-29 | 114.8 | 116.7 | 116.7 | 117.0 | 113.7 | 109.0 | 110.2 | 113.5 | 105.2 |
| 30-34 | 113.1 | 113.6 | 111.8 | 113.6 | 110.5 | 110.1 | 106.3 | 112.9 | 102.3 |
| 35-39 | 107.5 | 108.0 | 104.8 | 107.1 | 105.3 | 106.7 | 98.3 | 106.6 | 96.3 |
| 40-44 | 103.0 | 103.9 | 101.5 | 102.6 | 102.0 | 100.3 | 93.6 | 101.3 | 92.4 |
| 45-49 | 100.9 | 103.5 | 103.1 | 101.1 | 101.3 | 95.3 | 93.4 | 98.7 | 91.3 |
| 50-54 | 108.6 | 102.8 | 113.8 | 111.4 | 105.5 | 93.6 | 116.3 | 112.7 | 106.6 |

Data sources: Expert Committee Report, 2006

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce, Economics & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as on the journal as a whole, on our E-mails i.e. **infoijrcm@gmail.com** or **info@ijrcm.org.in** for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries please feel free to contact us on our E-mail **infoijrcm@gmail.com**.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-

Co-ordinator

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

Our Other Journals

