INTRODUCTION:

Difference in the degree of development are attributable to the reflections of disparities in the degree of urbanisation and industrialisation among the regions concerned. The fact that world's developed countries are highly urbanised and industrialised may safely justify the validity of the deduction that urbanisation and industrialisation constitute the indices of economic development (N. Sharma, 1972).

Whether there exists any direct correlation between the development of urbanisation and regional development,
more accurately industrialisation has remained the bone of contention in any study of this nature. The two are cited by different researchers as being the cause of the other. Moore W.E (1969) observes a connection between rapid increase in urbanisation and industrialisation, although in part circuity and indirectly. But the perfection of this observation in all cases may invite doubts as, many towns have flourished as cultural centres, trade centres and so on. However, significant ramifications of this relationship is observed by Breese, S (1969), "In spite of the difficulty and lack of success in establishing close or casual relationship between industrialisation and urbanisation, it still, is evident that there is a substantial impact of industrialisation on many aspects of urbanisation."

There is yet no definite consensus whether the existence of cities provides the case for economic development or economic development represents the main cause of urbanisation. However, the inferences drawn from explanations from both the contradictory views, the proper size and number of urban centres and optimum level of urbanisations measured in respect of the total development of the region or nation, put a consistent impact on the socio-economic development of the region (S.S. Verma, 1989). Now, there is a general agreement that urbanisation is not only
an excellent index of economic development and social modernisation, but also a stimulus to such change (Davis, K & Golden H.H, 1954). Behind much of this reasoning is the assumption that the city is the most efficient mode of human settlement having large population concentrated in a small place where friction cost is minimum, the demand density high and production can be expanded within a small space, resulting in specialisation of production and the creation of external economics. External economics are associated not only with decreasing cost of material and services, but also with stimulation of further specialisation. (Lampard, E.E 1955).

Even though Hoselitz B.F (1955) recognised that cities should not be shown at all times to be generative of economic development. He distinguished two types of cities as "generative" and "parasitic". A city is "generative" if its impact on economic growth is favourable i.e. if its formation and continued existence and growth is one of the factors accountable for economic development of the region or the country in which it is located. A city is "parasitic" if it exerts an opposite impact.

Economic development is an offspring of a composite functions of primary, secondary and tertiary sectors of
economic activities. Traditionally, primary activities reflect their association with rural living. Secondary and tertiary activities, on the other hand, are characteristics of urban places. This emphasises the association between the process of urbanisation and increase in secondary and tertiary activities. But urbanisation is not divorced from primary activities in its entirety. To the contrary, extractive functions may also influence the process of urbanisation, and which in turn, helps mechanisation and modernisation of economic activities. Economic development or regional development can well be gauged with the help of employment created and income generated by different sectors of economy, which undergo changes and modifications with the degree of urbanisation (N. Sharma, 1972).

Level of urbanisation has been taken as an index of economic growth. Specialisation of activities based on the 40 indicators taken leads to urbanisation. Industries, Commerce, and Transportation has accelerated the process of urbanisation in modern times. In developing a state, level of urbanisation can precede determination of level of regional development. Economic development and level of urbanisation are complimentary to each other (N. G. Jain, 1982).

Doston and Teune (1974) have suggested that urban-
Urbanisation yields administrative capacity which in turn facilitate national development. This re-iterated by others who regard the thesis that urbanisation tends to be highly correlated with overall economic growth as axiomatic.

N.G.Jain (1982) did a case study of Vidarbha (Maharashtra) on the level of regional urbanisation and development. He gave values to the indicators for regional development and giving the weight he classified into different subgroups and identified the growth centres.

Either on international or regional perspective, the growth of urbanisation or urban economy and its impact on regional development is highly relevant today for developing countries, which are now passing through various phases of economic development (K.V.Sundram, 1972). Urbanisation being a dynamic force involves urban elements that suffer considerable temporal and spatial variations. In case the process is viewed with a definite regional background, urbanisation influence the surrounding rural areas, which can readily be seen in rural urban linkages. Hence, urbanisation is equipped with the potentialities of development on non-agricultural production to solve in a better way the requirements of urban manufactured goods in the rural areas. The term "urban" has developed much wider connotation now
in India than ever before. In the context of regional development at the district level references has been made to the various economic and social problem which are closely connected with the process of urbanisation and growth (Mahesh Chand & R.K. Vishwakarma, 1972). Urbanisation naturally creates a strange behaviour and one would find that there is more impersonality, less mechanical consensus more formal control on behaviour, less informality and high specialisation (U.C. Mallick, 1979).

Some notable contributions have been made during the last three decades or so on the process of urban growth and regional development by geographers, location economists and urban economist (Mallick, 1979).

C.R. Pathak, Miss. A. Aziz and R. N. Chatterjee (1970) have worked out for the districts of Bihar, Orissa and W. Bengal. They ranked the districts as having very low to very high rank.

But Williamson J.G. (1965) said that a region with a higher degree of prosperity may not necessarily be the more industrialised one, or a region with higher rates of literacy or survival need not be the more prosperous one.

To reemphasise, the pattern and nature of urban and
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regional development among the districts, it is attributed that higher the degree of urbanisation, greater the level of regional or economic development and vis versa.

With regard to the role of urbanisation in regional development its clear that the process of urbanisation is not only desirable but essential for generating economic growth and social change in developing countries. The growth of urban centres has great impact on regional development. The reason for this inter relationship are quite obvious (Verma S.S. 1989). Dutta T.N and Chattopadhyaya R.N (1983) have concluded that states having metropolitan cities have higher degree of urbanisation and in turn exhibit higher composite value in terms of development.

From the preceding pages it becomes clear that industrialisation and urbanisation an complementary to each other. That is if there is a higher level of industrialisation in a region, it goes without saying that urbanisation must be high. Secondly, if there is an industrialisation and urbanisation it should accomplish development in terms of various services and amenities that go with higher standards of living.

Industrialisation has influenced urban growth. The rural heritage of the industrial workers and the social and
cultural poverty of the factory environment have obstructed
the integration of the amorphous masses of labour into orga-
nised communities, through which they could enjoy the bene-
fits of urban civilization.

In order to understand whether there is any strong
association between industrialisation (Industrial Intensity)
and percentage of urban population in the districts of Andhra
Pradesh, Pearson's Product Movement Correlation has been
computed. The coefficient value achieved is 0.71. This
clearly establishes that there is a high positive relation-
ship between industrial intensity and percentage of urban
population in Andhra Pradesh State.

On the basis of the assumption an attempt is made here
to bring out a relationship between urbanisation and regional
development. An analysis of urbanisation in the earlier
chapter has clearly established that it is comparatively
high in the districts (region) of Hyderabad, Krishna, Visak-
apatnam and Guntur, Moderate in East Godavari, West Godavari
Rangareddy, Anantapur, and Kurnool and Nellore; and low
in the districts of Cuddapah, Adilabad, Nizambad, Warangal,
Khammam, Chittoor, Vijayanagaram etc. (Table.23).

Similarly the levels of development in various distric-
ts of Andhra Pradesh is shown against the levels of urbanis-
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ation. (Table.23). From this it may be inferred that in general there is a relationship between levels of urbanisation and levels of development. As per instance the districts of Hyderabad, Krishna, Visakapatnam and Guntur there is a high urbanisation and they also show high regional development. However, it may be indicated that in some cases the level of urbanisation does not correspond with the level of development.

When going through the Table 23 carefully it is observed that 50 per cent of the districts show a direct relationship between each other i.e., they both are concomitant to each other. Whereas in 12 districts there is a variation. Krishna district show high urbanisation and moderate regional development, Kurnool and Anantapur show moderate urbanisation but low level of development. Rangareddy and East Godavari districts of Andhra Pradesh show moderate and high, urbanisation and development respectively. It is seen that low urbanised districts such as Nizamabad and Chittoor show high development and Vizianagaram, Prakasam, Cuddapah and Warangal with also low urbanisation show moderate regional development.

This is due to the local situation like development in agriculture, dairying etc. It may be pointed out that due to
## Table 23

**Andhra Pradesh: Classification of Districts on the Basis of Levels of Urbanisation and Regional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBANISATION</th>
<th>REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.H Krishna</td>
<td>Rangareddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishakapatnam</td>
<td>Vishakapatnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Guntur</td>
<td>Chittoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurnool</td>
<td>Guntur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangareddy</td>
<td>Nizamabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Godavari</td>
<td>East Godavari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M West Godavari</td>
<td>Nellore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellore</td>
<td>Krishna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantapur</td>
<td>West Godavari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddapah</td>
<td>Vizianagaram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulabad</td>
<td>Srikakulam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizamabad</td>
<td>Prakasam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Warangal</td>
<td>Cuddapah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khammam</td>
<td>Warangal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittoor</td>
<td>Kurnool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vizianagaram</td>
<td>Anantapur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karimnagar</td>
<td>Nalgonda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakasam</td>
<td>Mahaboobnagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medak</td>
<td>Khammam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.L Nalgonda</td>
<td>Adilabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehaboobnagar</td>
<td>Karimnagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srikakulam</td>
<td>Medak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development of industries (small, medium and large) in certain districts where in spite of low urbanisation it still shows higher level development.

As it has been pointed out earlier that the level of urbanisation in Andhra Pradesh state is generally low and it is much lower in different districts is reflected in their level of development. What ever may be the little differences between level of urbanisation and regional development there is a general influence of urbanisation on regional development.