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Development studies became an important focus for research and teaching in the post World War-II period, a time when a large number of Afro-Asian and Latin-American countries got political freedom (liberation). Subsequent rise of development consciousness in these countries led to a drive for development. These newly liberated countries by and large were aware of their colonial exploitation which resulted in their underdevelopment. A serious concern for the heritage of poverty on the part of these countries, the observance of a wide gap in the income levels of the developed and developing countries, the realization of economic growth as a human right, and the extension of the rivalry amongst great powers in offering economic assistance to new nations, generated a universal interest in issues relating to development.

Recently, international agencies such as the World Bank, United Nations Development Programme and UNICEF are increasingly focusing on questions of disparities and poverty. Debate on the priority between social development and economic development is gaining grounds. The World Development Report, 1990 deals exclusively with the question of global poverty (World Bank, 1990). It highlights that the most effective way of achieving rapid and political sustainable improvements in the quality of life for the poor should aim at productive use of the poor man's main asset - labour, and at improving the productivity of the poor through investment in basic social services, such as primary health care, family planning, nutrition and primary educations.

Of recent the concept of sustainability has become popular. It has been defined as a matter of ensuring that development 'meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (Brundt and Commission, 1987, United Nations: Rio Declaration, 1992; UNECE, 2001). With reference to its contents, it is an amalgam of such forces as approximation of modernity, imbued by an indigenous culture and having traditions which do not militate against growth, with a differentiated attitude.
towards knowledge and practice of technology, a flexible orientation towards ecology and with its roots in an economic system with social justice (Narain, 1994).

Thus, development is best defined as growth with equity and sustainability where technological change is playing a vital role in the development process. On the whole, it can be said that less developed economies are characterised by low levels of living, reflected in such indices as low income, high inequalities, poor health and inadequate education; by low level of productivity; by high rates of population growth and dependency burdens; by high and rising levels of unemployment and underemployment by substantial dependence on agricultural production and primary export products; by the prevalence of imperfect markets and limited informations; and by dominance, dependence and vulnerability in international relations (Hodder, 2000).

Hinderink and Sterkenburg (1978) classified development studies dealing with spatial aspect into three types; (i) those in which space has been used as a mere framework to describe regional differences in development; (ii) those in which space has been employed, particularly in terms of physical space and built environment as an explanatory variable to analyse spatial inequality; and (iii) those in which space has been adopted, with reference to the developed politico-economic and social structures.

Thus, regarding development process, geography is concerned with the spatial aspects of all dimensions of development i.e. economic, social, political and ecological, individually or collectively. Here space is used both as a framework for the understanding of the differentiation and diffusion of the development process and an explanatory and explainable variable.

It is important to make the point that there can be no correct definition
of development because the approaching perspective to development geography are many, varied and often conflicting (Hodder, 2000). Development studies generally is a fertile, dynamic and inter-disciplinary field. As a result, in spite of considerable amount of multidisciplinary research on the subject, development still awaits a precise definition. A number of interchangeable words like growth, progress, modernization, transformation and development are in vogue. This further compounds the confusion.

It is perhaps important to recall the distinction made by Boudeville (1968) among the three concepts of growth, development and progress. 'Growth' he stated, "is merely a set of increases in quantities produced; development is growth plus a favourable change in production techniques and in consumer behaviour, progress is development plus a diminution of social tensions between groups within a society." Same views have been advocated by Clower (1966) regarding the distinction discussed above. If these definitions are accepted, it follows that growth without development and development without progress, are possible situations which an area or a country may experience. Implicit in it is the related ideal whilst growth is an economic process, development is socio-economic process in nature and progress is primarily a social phenomenon based upon economic growth. Within this continuum from growth to progress, geographers are primarily concerned with spatial aspects of development (Singh, 1998).

Since, Geography is distinguished by its spatial perspective from other social sciences, it is concerned with the spatial aspects of the economic, social, political and ecological dimensions of development, individually or collectively (Krishan, 1980; Gosal and Krishan, 1984; Munton, 1996; Singh, 1998; Rupert Hodder, 2000).

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that development in geographical parlance, denotes the quality of functioning of a regional system
in terms of economic progress, social advancement, political maturity and environmental conservation. Economic progress may be measured in terms of standard of living of people, full and rational utilization of manpower, and diversification of economy. Social advancement may be referred to matters of social justice, social cohesion and quality of population. Political maturity may be judged from the degree of decentralization of power, administrative efficiency, and progressive reduction and eventual elimination of malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, squalor, unemployment and inequalities. Environmental conservation stands for the state of ecological balance with effective check on erosion of soil, contamination of water and pollution of air apart from maintenance of the quality of the habitat. The geographic concept of development is a synthesis of viewpoints of various social sciences in this regard. Applying his skill of analysis and synthesis in the spatial perspective, the geographer identifies regional disparities in development which is a prerequisite for regional planning.

In requirement of the title of this research work, "Regional Disparities in the Levels of Socio-Economic Development: A Case Study of Haryana" the main focus of the present study is only on the economic and social dimensions of development. In the light of the meaning of each concept, indicators have been selected for an empirical analysis in the following chapters.

Indian Geography and Regional Development:

The geographic interest in development studies in India is still more recent, dating back to late 1960's. It emerged with the growing realization that in a vast country like India, with geographical diversities of high order, there has to be an intertwining of the sectoral and the regional approaches to planning in order to optimize economic efficiency and at the same time minimize regional disparities. The observance of the sixties as the first development decade by the United Nations provided the necessary stimulus to
this emerging thought. At the international level also, geographers had started evincing interest in development studies (Singh, 1998).

The issue of regional disparities also came into sharp focus almost at the same time of framing the Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-74) of India. Whereas the earlier three five year plans (1951-66) and the three subsequent annual plans (1966-69) were growth oriented, the problem of structural and regional inequalities drew special attention in all successive plans. Several area development programmes, such as the Hill Area Development Programme, Desert Development Programme, and Drought Prone Area Development Programme, along with schemes for other disadvantaged areas, such as the waterlogged and floodplain tracts, industrially backward districts, and tribal areas, were geared to the task of reduction in regional disparities. To reduce the structural inequality and specifically to benefit the weaker sections of the society a number of programme, namely, Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM), Antyodaya, National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS) and Development of women and Children in Rural Areas (DWACRA.) were undertaken in some selected areas.

The chief attribute of all these areas and people-oriented programmes was that these programmes were formulated by the central agency and were extended to the state governments for the implementation. Mostly the central or state line departments were responsible for their implementation at the grass roots level with blocks or districts as the spatial units of implementation. A large number of departments independently involved in development without proper coordination at grass roots level, resulted into multiplicity of functions in one area and altogether neglect of another area that also accelerated the process of regional disparities in development.
To solve the problem of regional disparities by accelerating the process of development in backward areas decentralized planning or micro area approach was suggested by working Group on Block Level Planning (1977), Working Group on District Planning and Rao Committee (HPA, 1987). Most of the states started decentralized planning and district was adopted as the grass root planning unit. Now the development budget of the states is divided into two heads: (i) 'divisible pool' earmarked for the district plan sector, and (ii) non-divisible pool remained under the state sector schemes pattern of development in India as a whole or in its different parts.

Krishan (1989) reviewed the spectrum of studies on regional disparities in India. It is found that most of such studies are by economists and only some by geographers. The prevailing regional disparities in India found an explanation largely in the colonial experience of the country which caused concentration of development in few favoured pockets and underdevelopment over large neglected areas (Bhardwaj, 1982). Efforts were made to narrow down regional disparities through planned development after independence (Mathur, 1978). With the result the disparities showed a tendency toward a decline by the middle of sixties (Mahajan, 1982). The subsequent years, however, recorded an opposite trend (Ansari, 1983; Mishra ed., 1985). This is attributed to a decline in the relative share of government investment in development plans which hit the backward regions more (Ahluwalia, 1985). Eighties reveal a reduction in disparities, albeit negligible (Prasad, 1988). Mathur (1987) found that the regional growth differences within India are significantly explained by the initial, such as irrigation, power and transport.

Some studies dealt with sectorwise analysis of disparity. Disparities in agricultural sector were noted as having increased over the years (Sen, 1969; Bhalla and Alagh, 1979; Bhalla and Tyagi, 1989; Krishanji, 1993). This fact is attributed to the Green Revolution which occurred in limited irrigated parts of
the country. Disparities declined in the industrial sector (Sekhar, 1982). This was a consequence of the deliberate policy on the part of the government to favour backward areas more in their industrial growth.

Examining the spatial pattern of economic development during early fifties, Schwartzberg (1962) observed that a peculiar feature of the Indian development map was the existence of a number of important manufacturing, commercial or administrative centers, such as Kanpur, Hyderabad and Jaipur, whose level of growth did not reflect the development of their surrounding areas. Such developed pockets were simply islands in the ocean of poverty around.

Analysing the situation as existing in the sixties, Mitra (1967) brought out some positive aspects of otherwise undesired regional disparities in India. He noted that these disparities in India were not along the ethnic or sub-cultural lines. There was nothing like the north/south polarization one found in Europe or the Americas.

In respect of situation obtaining in the seventies, Kundu and Raza (1982) carried out an in-depth analysis of the regional dimension of Indian economy. They analysed the regional disparities in terms of agricultural development, industrialization process and space organization. They reached several negative conclusions: regional disparities in agricultural development widened as a consequence of the Green Revolution, the major industrial projects in the public sector have not been successful in stimulating the regional economy; and the big cities have not been effective in promoting the development of their surrounding areas.

On the basis of the study of the emerging trends during the eighties, Krishan (1989) identified some new features on the development map of India. First, there is an incipient form at corridor development, particularly along the trunk railway lines connecting Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras with each
other. Second, the sharp distinction between the former British administered areas and the erstwhile princely states, in terms of their development level, was getting blurred. Third, there was some significant diffusion of development in areas of commercial agriculture, thereby reducing their urban-rural disparity. Fourth, all the union territories and smaller states were recording faster rate of development. Finally, an incongruity between the economic development and the social development of some parts of India, such as Punjab and Kerala, was striking. The future contours of regional disparity will be determined by the relative strength of the three forces - economic decentralization, in favour of the market through a policy of liberalization, privatization and globalization: political decentralisation through enactment of the Constitution - (73rd Amendment, 1992 and 74th Amendment, 1992 empowering the local rural and urban bodies respectively in an effective manner; and regionalisation of Indian electoral policy with regional parties emerging as a strong pressure group at the national level (Krishan and Singh, 1998).


Efforts at identification of regional disparities at the level of individual Indian states are only a few to count. Some comprehensive attempts in this direction include: Andhra Pradesh (Alam, 1974), Punjab (Gosal and Krishan, 1979), and Uttar Pradesh (Dubey, 1981), and Haryana (Kalwar and Yadav, 2004-05; Hassan, 2007). Most of these studies pertained to a single frame of time.

Dubey (1992) has also explored the process of socio-economic development in Uttar Pradesh not only spatially but also sectorally for the period 1971-81; a time frame during which the stance of planning in Uttar Pradesh, as in India, had shifted from macro, sectoral based on the principle of
economic efficiency, to regional balance, spatial and distributive justice.

A case for the study of Haryana

Surprisingly, studies on regional disparities within individual states are only a handful to count. In this context, Haryana offers a challenging and potentially rewarding area of study of this kind. It is one of the most prosperous and progressive states of India. Its advancements in the agricultural sphere have been exemplary and its achievements in providing infrastructural facilities for all round progress are creditable.

This however does not mean that all parts of the state are equally developed. There are rather striking regional disparities in development, discernible even to lay eye. One can contrast the intensive development in the eastern and southern east corridor with western and southern-west Haryana. It seems that this development follows the pattern of level of literacy, urbanization and industrialization. The western and southern-west belt of Haryana is far behind in the field of industrialization. It would be a matter of great academic and practical utility to investigate precisely the relative levels of development attained by various parts of the state. What is accomplished in such a study will have a direct relevance for the future socio-economic planning of the state especially in respect of reduction in inter-regional disparities in development needs no emphasis that studies of this kind are a prerequisite for framing regional development schemes anywhere in the country.

The present study answers the following questions: What is the state of disparities in socio-economic development in the state? What are its spatial manifestations? Do the various dimensions of development - economic and social behave alike or differently? Which areas have benefited or suffered more?

Accordingly the main objectives of the present study are:
To identify disparities in the levels of economic and social development of different parts of the state;

To explain these disparities in the context of physical resource base, stage of technological advancement and nature of institutional framework of the areas; and

To suggest a suitable strategy for accelerating the pace of overall development while simultaneously narrowing down regional disparities in this regard.

The data used in this study is secondary in nature. It has been collected from:

(i) Census of India (2001), Primary Census Abstract, Series – 7, Haryana.

(ii) Statistical Abstract of Haryana, various issues issued by Economic and Statistical Adviser, Planning Department, Govt. of Haryana.

**METHODOLOGY**

In conformity with the focus of study on the economic and social dimensions of development, regional disparities has been examined in terms of (i) agricultural development, (ii) industrial development, (iii) infrastructural facilities and (iv) demographic development. The first two dimensions encompass the economy of the state and the latter two take stock of its social progress. Secondly, an integrated picture of socio-economic development has been obtained by knitting together the regional patterns of development in all the four spheres - agricultural, industrial, infrastructural facilities and demographic attributes.

Judicious indicators have been selected for identification of regional disparities in the levels of economic and social development. The focus of study is on the year 2001. All possible efforts have been made to get the requisite data, where it is not existing or missing from the official records, it
has been taken for the nearby year. Appropriate techniques have been used for data processing. The data has been examined for the state at the level of districts. It has been represented through tables and maps.

Principal Component Analysis Method has been used to assess the relative levels of development. The data regarding all the selected indicators is subjected to this method to derive ‘composite scores’ of individual districts in terms of the levels of development. The technique involves transformation of the original data set into a new set consisting of general components, the number of which equals to the number of variables in the original data set. The eigen values corresponding to each of the components indicates the explanatory power of the respective components. It is generally seen that the first few components explain a greater part of the total variance in the original data set. Further, the correlation coefficient of each of the component with the variables in the original data set – i.e., the component loadings can be meaningful interpreted only in the case of first few components. Generally, the components having eigen value less than 1 are usually skipped over in the analysis.

The loadings of the selected components (correlation coefficient between the component and the original values and interpreted very much in a similar way) are used as weights of the standardized values of the given variables for working out component scores corresponding to each of the observation. It may be expressed in the following way (Johnston, 1978).

\[ S_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} D_{ij} L_{jk} \]

Where, \( D_{ij} \) is the standardized values of observation ‘i’ on the variable ‘j’; \( L_{jk} \) is the loading of variable ‘j’ on the component ‘k’; \( S_{ik} \) is the score of observation ‘i’ on component k; and summation is overall ‘n’ variables.

During tabulation of data the size of class interval has been obtained by using modified Sturje’s rule (Gupta, 1993) given as:
\[ i = \frac{\text{Range}}{\text{Number of Classes}} \]

Where,

\[ i \quad = \text{Interval size} \]

Range = The difference between the largest and the smallest value in the distribution.

However, in case of levels of development to maintain comparability between different dimensions of development, the class limits have been adjusted to some extent.

Maps have been prepared to represent disparities in respect of individual indicators of development. Secondly, indicators belonging to each dimension of development have been taken and represented on maps. These maps show disparities in regard of all the four dimensions of development i.e., agricultural, industrial, infrastructural facilities and demographic attributes.

Lastly, all the indicators of above discussed four components of development were taken together in order to work out the levels of socio-economic development. The component scores of all the districts have been multiplied by their respective eigen values in order to find out the weighted score. This resultant value will show the relative position of any particular district. Thus obtained weighted scores of all the districts regarding extracted components have been added up to calculate the overall scores. A high and positive score indicate that a particular district is more developed than others with lower scores. These overall scores have been classified into four categories to find out the comparative levels of development and represented on map.
ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY MATERIAL

In order to build the whole theme in a logical sequence, the main body of this study will be divided into three chapters on patterns of economic, social and socio-economic development.

Two chapters on (i) conceptual framework and (ii) physical and cultural setting of the state precede these chapters to provide the necessary background regarding the problem and study area undertaken. The last chapter is devoted to summary and conclusion.
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