



An Analytical Study Regional Disparity Pattern in India

Mr. Ashish Narsing Pawar

Assistant Professor, Sir Parashurambhau College, Pune-30 &
Research Scholar, Vidya Vikas Arts, Commerce & Science College, Samudrapur
E-mail: ashish.pawar57@gmail.com Mobile No. 8208495454

Abstract

In this paper, highlighted regional disparities or inequalities in a few states in India. Balanced regional development means equal development in all economic zones. Balanced regional development is needed for the economy to grow. 12th planning aims for equitable regional development in India but few states are highly developed and many states are still lagging behind economically. The purpose of this paper is to explore regional differences and to raise certain points to overcome differences in India.

Keywords: *Regional Diversity, Indian Economy, Economic Development, Various regions of India*

1. Introduction

Regional differences vary from country to country, nationally and evenly as a state level. Regional diversity means uneven spatial structures in a particular area or region. Regional diversity is reflected in many areas of health and in unequal economic power and development. Differences between urban and local districts are also understood as a means of zoning. India forms 28 counties and eight Union Territories (UTs). Within the context of the Indian economy, the region means country or UT. According to the Global Inequality Report (2018), India is the second most “unequal” country in the world after Russia. This paper has tested the regional diversity in many provinces of India with the help of other indicators of diversity.

2. Objectives of the study

- a) To Review of regional inequality or pattern of differences between all provinces of India.
- b) To Introducing specific suggestions for overcoming regional inequalities

3. Research Methodology

This study is explanatory and descriptive in nature. Its secondary based data is collected from verified sources. The date is compiled from the Economic Survey, Population Reports and NSSO Reports, Indian Economic Statistics Book, India Statistics Framework etc.

4. Regional Disparity Pattern in India

4.1 Net Domestic Product (NDP)

Table 4.1: Contribution of various Regions in Net Domestic Product of India for 2019-20 (at Current Prices)

High Income States	Net Domestic Product (Rs. In Lakh)	Share in Net Domestic Product of India (in %)
1. Maharashtra	248253582	13.32
2. Tamil Nadu	161971992	8.69
3. Uttar Pradesh	149575799	8.02

4. Karnataka	147527677	7.91
5. Gujrat	144768273	7.76
6. West Bengal	110065072	5.90
Low Income States	Net Domestic Product (Rs. In Cr.)	Share in Net Domestic Product of India (in %)
1. Uttarakhand	22758680	1.22
2. Jharkhand	29319200	1.57
3. Assam	29956920	1.60
4. Punjab	48234744	2.58
5. Odisha	48344801	2.59
All India	1863581609	

Source: Economic Survey, 2019-20; Handbook of Statistics on Indian Economy, 2019-20
Table No. 4.1 depicts that Net Domestic Product in numerous states of India. Maharashtra state is larger productive state than other state. The share of Maharashtra state in net domestic product of India is 13.32%.

4.2 Gross Domestic Product

Table: 4.2 **Gross State Domestic Product (Current Prices)**

States (High Gross Domestic Product)	Food Grain Yield per hectare (in kg.) (average of years 2007-09)	States (Low Gross Domestic Product)	Gross Domestic Product
Maharashtra	281855457	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	971923
Tamil Nadu	179722872	Mizoram	2514857
Uttar Pradesh	168781799	Arunachal Pradesh	2804613
Gujrat	163024012	Nagaland	2953593

Source: Statistical Outline of India, RBI Report 2019-2020.

In the above table no.4.2 clearly depicts that Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh state and Gujrat these are the upper Gross Domestic Production states than Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh and Nagaland.

4.3 Industrial Production and Development in Factory Sector

Table: 4.3 Net Values Added in Industries Year 2019-20 (Current Price)

Forward States	Net Value Added (Rs. In Lakhs)	% with Total Value added	Backward States	Net Value Added (Rs. in Lakh)	% with Total Value added
1. Tamil Nadu	48501646	10.58	1. Bihar	8417860	1.83
2. Gujrat	57438103	12.53	2. Jharkhand	10093030	2.20
3. Maharas htra	61900149	13.50	2. Uttarakhand	10538572	2.29
All India = 458315406					

Source: RBI Reports 2019-20

Table no. 4.3 describes the commercial Production and Development in Factory Sector. There are Tamil Nadu, Gujarat and Maharashtra these are the Forward states in terms of commercial Production and Development in Factory Sector

4.4 Foreign Direct Investment

Table 4.4: Statement on FDI Equity Inflows in India October 2019 to March 2020

State (High FDI Inflow States)	Percentage with Inflows (Total Amt. Inflow 171558.77)	States (Low FDI Inflow States)	Percentage with Inflows
Maharashtra	30.35	Uttar Pradesh	1.01
Karnataka	17.92	Punjab	0.41
Delhi	16.6	Madhya Pradesh	0.32
Gujrat	11.05	Goa	0.27
Jharkhand	7.7	Kerala	0.24
Tamil Nadu	4.21	Bihar	0.02

Source: Reserve Bank of India 2020

Table No.4.4 depicts the FDI inflows in India during October, 2019 to March, 2020. It shows that Maharashtra and Karnataka together have around half the FDI investments, and adding Delhi accounted for two third of the total investments, which nears around three fourth with the whole investments in Gujarat. Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh etc. states are backward in FDI inflow during October, 2019 to March 2020.

4.5 Development of Private Investment

Since, the economic reforms of 1991, private investment has assured special significance within the economic development of various states of India. Almost, all states are offering several styles of facilities and concessions to draw in domestic and foreign private investment. Within the post economic reforms period, about 50% of investment proposals were received by 4 states alone i.e. Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. Bihar and Jharkhand have received the minimum number of investment proposals. National level financial institutions have given maximum financial assistance to Delhi, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu etc. The share of Bihar in total financial assistance from financial institutions is a smaller amount.

4.6 Development of Infrastructure

Table: 4.5 Level of Infrastructure Development

States	Gross Irrigated area as % of Total Cropped Area in Hector 2019-20	Per Capita Power Consumption (kwh) 2019-20	Length of highways in India March-end 2021 (Km.)	Offices of Scheduled Commercial Banks March 2021
Forward States				
1 Uttar Pradesh	14392	12437	11831	18125
2 Madhya Pradesh	11349	8344	8941	7248
3 Rajasthan	8283	8531	10350	7871
4 Punjab	4111	5845	4099	6700
5 Karnataka	4032	6885	7412	10875

6 Haryana	3273	5316	3237	5225
7 Bihar	3115	3417	5421	7584
8 Andhra Pradesh	2796	6208	7340	7431
Backward States				
1 Puducherry	13	264	64	268
2 Goa	16	408	299	687
3 Arunachal Pradesh	55	72	2537	169
4 Tripura	87	148	854	579
5 Meghalaya	101	203	1156	367
6 Himachal Pradesh	117	1019	2607	1683
7 Nagaland	118	83	1548	180

Source: Compiled from Statistical Outline of India, 2019-20 and 2020-21.

In the above table no. 4.5 Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Punjab, Karnataka, Haryana, Bihar, Andhra Pradesh etc. are the forwarded states in infrastructure level.

4.7 Poverty Level

**Table No. 4. 6 Personal Income Combine Rural and Urban
(Based on MRP Consumption 2011-12)**

Forward States	% of Persons BPL	Backward States	% of Persons BPL
Chhattisgarh	39.93	Himachal Pradesh	8.6
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	39.31	Sikkim	8.19
Jharkhand	36.96	Punjab	8.26
Manipur	36.89	Andhra Pradesh	9.20
Arunachal Pradesh	34.67	Puduchchery	9.69

Source: Reserve Bank of India Reports

Table No. 4.6 depicts the poverty line combine rural and urban which is predicted on MRP consumption year 2011-2012. Chhattisgarh (39.39%) of persons are below poverty level and also the other hand, Andhra Pradesh 9.20% of persons are below poverty level.

4.8 Literacy Rate

Table 4.7: Literacy Rates of Selected States (in %, Year 2011)

Forward (Top) States	Literacy Rates	Backward (Bottom) States	Literacy Rates
Kerala	93.9	Bihar	63.8
Lakshadweep	92.3	Arunachal Pradesh	67.0
Mizoram	91.6	Rajasthan	67.1
Tripura	87.8	Jharkhand	67.6
Goa	87.4	Andhra Pradesh	67.7

Source: Census Report, 2011

In the above table no.4.7 Kerala and other states i.e. Lakshadweep, Mizoram, Tripura, Goa are at top level within the literacy rate as per the census report data, 2011.



5. Findings

The current study shows that, the study shows that the peripheral regions of the country such as Punjab, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu have seen rapid economic development against those states such as Bihar, Odisha, MP, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan, UP etc.

- Economic development of major regions such as UP, Rajasthan, MP, and Bihar etc. it was slow moving while small and central states such as Goa, Delhi, Haryana, Punjab and Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh etc.
- Since the start of economic planning, some provinces have made significant economic progress, e.g. Punjab, Maharashtra, and Gujarat etc.
- Developed agricultural regions such as Punjab, Haryana, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh etc. they have maintained their position among the richest regions of the country. While Bihar, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh etc. remained undeveloped from the beginning.
- Industrial states of the country namely, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu etc. have maintained their prominence in industrial sector.
- States such as Bihar, Odisha, and MP Etc. rich natural resources are still economically declining, as they may not fully exploit their natural resources such as mineral products, forests, fertile soils etc.
- Many reasons for India's regional inequality are poor infrastructure, improper allocation of resources, lack of basic resources, flawed transformation policy, poor growth of support units in backlogs, incorrect institutional lending policy, political instability, and instability in learning rates, less effort on the part of other regional governments etc.

6. Suggestions

- I. There should be a separate infrastructure development board in the back provinces.
- II. In order to achieve balanced regional development, an additional percentage should be allocated to arrears.
- III. Government should implement special dry farming projects in backward regions. •
- IV. Government should provide additional tax concessions and subsidies to upgrade industrial units in the back states.
- V. Government should promote industrial development programs. It will create jobs, improve quality of life and help improve society.
- VI. In the backward regions, Government should encourage transparency and accountability for funding.
- VII. Government must intensify its implementation of programs
- VIII. Education should be strengthened in the back regions.
- IX. Government must take steps to develop agriculture in the backlog by providing quality seeds and fertilizers through subsidized measures.
- X. The Government of India has taken a number of steps such as loan financing by financial institutions, financial and financial agreements, state government compensation, BRGF, special rural development fund, Raashtriya Vikas Yojana etc.

7. Conclusion

It is clear from the study that the pattern of regional development in India is kind of inequality. On the other hand, there are some states like Punjab, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Haryana, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh etc. which are constantly developing while the opposite side some states like Bihar, Odisha, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, UP, Rajasthan and



MP etc. still lagging behind in terms of industrial production and agriculture. To be concluding, regional development of the country is unbalanced. Some states are relatively more developed and lots of states are quite backward. Government and social organizations must therefore make additional efforts to reduce regional inequality in the country.

8. References:

- i. Ahluwalia, M S (2011): “Regional Balance in Indian Planning”, accessed from http://planningcommission.nic.in/about-us/history/spe_regional1206.pdf
- ii. Bode Ville, J R (1966): Problems of Regional Economic Planning (Edinburg h: Edinburgh University Press).
- iii. Das, M B, S Kapoor and D Nikitan (2010): “A Closer Look at Child Mortality among Advises in India”, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series, available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1565992>
- iv. Debroy, B and L Bhandari (2003): “District Level Deprivation in the New Millennium”, RGICS and Indices Analytics.
- v. Hirschman, A and M Rothschild (1973): “The Changing Tolerance for Income Inequality in the Course of Economic Development”, The quarterly Journal of Economics, Oxford University Press, Vol. 87, No 4, pp 544-66.
- vi. http://www.Business-standard.com/article/government-press-release/regional-imbalance-in-industrial-development-of-states-114121800024_1.html
- vii. <http://www.dawn.com/news/1207578>
- viii. <https://gulfnnews.com/world/asia/india/india-second-most-unequal-country-after-russia-report-1.1890825>
- ix. <http://www.epw.in/special-articles/regional-imbalance-Indian-economy.html>
- x. http://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/1719102/regional_disparitiesin_indias_socioeconomic
- xi. Dr. Parul Mittal & Jyoti Devi- An Inter-State Analysis of Regional Disparity Pattern in India- International Journal of Management Research and Social Science (IJMRSS) ISSN 2394-6415 Vol. Volume 2, Issue 4, October – December 2015
- xii. <http://www.Yourarticlelibrary.com/essay/causes-of-regional-imbalance-in-India/42477/>
- xiii. <https://nagahistory.wordpress.com/2014/03/01/regional-imbalance>
- xiv. Parr, J B (1999): “Growth Pole Strategies in Regional Economic Planning: A Retrospective View”, (Part 1, Origins and Advocacy), Urban Studies, 36, pp 1195-215
- xv. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 64, pp 89-104, Oxford University Press.
- xvi. Planning Commission (2013): Twelfth Five Year Plan, Government of India, New Delhi.
- xvii. Roy Burman, B K (1989): Tribes in Perspective (New Delhi: Mittal Publications).
- xviii. Shah, M (2014): “Fairy Tale Capitalism”, The Indian Express, 24 April, see: <http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/fairy-tale-capitalism/>
- xix. Shah, M, D Banerjee, P S Vijay Shankar and P Ambasta (1998): India’s Drylands: Tribal Societies and Development through Environmental Regeneration (New Delhi: Oxford University Press).
- xx. Williamson, J (1965): “Regional Inequality and the Process of National Development: A Description of the Patterns”, Economic Development and Cultural Change, 13, pp 3-45.