

Shastri, Siddharth

Conference Paper

A strategy for developing micro-regions

38th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Europe Quo Vadis? - Regional Questions at the Turn of the Century", 28 August - 1 September 1998, Vienna, Austria

Provided in Cooperation with:

European Regional Science Association (ERSA)

Suggested Citation: Shastri, Siddharth (1998) : A strategy for developing micro-regions, 38th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Europe Quo Vadis? - Regional Questions at the Turn of the Century", 28 August - 1 September 1998, Vienna, Austria, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/113546>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

A STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPING MICRO REGIONS

European Regional Science Association

Thirty Eighth European Congress

Vienna, Austria, August 28 - September 1, 1998

SIDDHARTH SHASTRI

Professor, Department of Economics

Banasthali Vidyapith - 304022 (Rajasthan) - India

Email: siddharth@bv.ernet.in, Fax: 91-01438-28365

ABSTRACT

A uniform macro-sectoral development strategy for all the regions is far from appropriate for reducing regional disparities in a large country with vast regional differences. Only its integration with region specific micro-level development strategy taking care of requirements, resources and potentials of a particular region can deliver the goods. The micro-level planning thus becomes an imperative for checking the regional variations in the levels of economic development.

The aim of the study is to suggest a methodology for formulating an appropriate strategy for developing micro regions. The State of Rajasthan (India) has been selected for the purpose of illustration. The State economy is divided into ten sectors and a number of development indicators are chosen for each of them. The level of development of various regions are ascertained by computing sectoral and composite indices of development using the principal component model. This is followed by an examination of the dimensions and typology of development/backwardness. Using the levels, dimensions and typology, the different regions are brought under seven homogeneous groups (i.e. homogeneous planning regions) so as to bring them under the purview of a common policy. This analysis helped evolving different development strategies for different regions in accordance with their need and potential.

INTRODUCTION :

The widening gap between the rich and the poor, between the advantaged and the disadvantaged and between the developed and the underdeveloped region is one of the main issues of our times. Most of the countries, both developed as well as underdeveloped, are faced with the problem of regional imbalances and regional disparities. The problem is, however, more acute and there is more pressing need for its removal in case of developing countries.

Macro-level sectoral planning has shown modest overall gains but at the local levels the impact, if at all visible, has been uneven leading to lopsided development of various regions. A plan predominantly based on macro-sectoral development strategy does not automatically ensures its applicability at local levels as each area represents a unique combination of resources, potential and requirements. Instead of a vertical sectoral approach, a plan is needed to be horizontal to satisfy local ambitions and aspirations. It is, therefore, largely felt that a balance should be maintained between national priorities and local needs of the regions. This necessarily calls for an integration of area specific micro-level development strategy with the macro-sectoral development strategy. This is an ideal thing and the only way out for resolving the conflict between efficiency and regional balance or between national and regional objectives.

Regional and area based planning are the basic tools which may be used to achieve the goal of balanced regional development. The micro-level planning is an imperative for checking the existing regional variations in the levels of economic development. The need for planning micro regions, however, does not necessarily originate from the imperative of reducing regional disparities as is the case with the planning for backward regions. The primary objective of micro regional planning is to develop the micro regions into viable economic units making use of the locally available resources and local technology. This calls for the evolution of an appropriate growth strategy. A growth strategy for such micro regions cannot be the same as the one followed to promote the backward bigger regions - a strategy that merely aims at reducing regional disparities. The strategy for developing the micro-regions should originate from the growth imperatives of these regions and should aim at exploiting their growth potential so that there is a simultaneous rise in income and its equitable distribution within the region and among the socio-economic groups.

In order to achieve the objective of promoting growth rate in the backward regions and to reduce regional disparities, it is essential to formulate plans at the micro-regional levels based on the characters, requirements and capacities of the regions. This requires identification of regions according to their differential levels of development and study of dimensions and typologies of development/backwardness. Homogeneous regions should than be delineated so that different strategies may be adopted for different types of regions. The aim of this study is to suggest a methodology for formulating an appropriate strategy for developing micro-regions in the above perspective. The State of Rajasthan¹ has been selected for the purpose of illustration.

Methodology : The first step is to ascertain the levels of development of various regions (tehsils). followed by identification of dimensions of development/backwardness. By dimensions of development/backwardness is meant the development that is taking place in the number of sectors. Thus one dimension could be that all sectors in a region are backward, another dimension could be uni-sector development and still another multi-sector development. After identifying the dimensions, typology² of development or backwardness could be understood. By typology is meant the type of development

whether a region is agriculturally developed or industrially developed and so on. Using the levels, dimensions and typology of development, the different regions could be brought under some convenient groups (i.e. homogeneous planning regions) so as to bring them under the purview of a common policy. Such an analysis could help evolving different development strategies for different regions in accordance with their need and potential.

The levels of development of 212 tehsils³ of the State of Rajasthan were measured using the available data*. The State economy was divided into ten sectors (agriculture, general industrial, small scale industrial, education, health, transport, power, communication, banking and co-operative) and 48 indicators were chosen to assess their levels of development. For each of these sectors, ten separate sectoral indices were arrived at by employing following factor analysis model :

$$z_j = a_{j1} P_1 + a_{j2} P_2 + a_{j3} P_3 + \dots + a_{ji} P_i + \dots + a_{jm} P_m$$

Where :

(i) z_j [$j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$] = j^{th} observed variable in the standardised form i.e. $Z_j = (\bar{x}_j - x_j) / \sigma_{x_j}$

x_j = j^{th} observed variable.

\bar{x}_j = mean of the j^{th} observed variable

σ_{x_j} = standard deviation of j^{th} observed variable

(ii) P_i { $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, m$ } = j^{th} principle component

(iii) a_{ji} [$j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$] = factor loading of j^{th} variable relating to i^{th} component
[$i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, m$]

Sectoral indices provide only a partial and not total view of the level of development of a region (tehsil). A region may be backward in one sector but may be highly developed with respect to another. This makes difficult to level a region as developed or backward. It was, therefore, necessary to derive composite index of development by combining all the ten sectoral indices so as to measure the overall level of development. Composite index of development was computed by taking ten sectoral indices as raw data and employing the same technique of factor analysis. Factor loadings (Table-1) pertaining to various sectoral indices were used as weights. For constructing sectoral/composite index of development, only the first principle component was considered i.e. the composite index either at the sectoral or at the aggregate level is nothing but first principle component itself. Based on the factor loadings shown in Table-1, the composite index of development ' C_i ' was calculated by using the following equation :

$$C_i = 0.80865 X_1 + 0.87728 X_2 + 0.79375 X_3 + 0.79704 X_4 + 0.65496 X_5 + 0.34662 X_6 + 0.32975 X_7 + 0.42539 X_8 + 0.80571 X_9 + 0.87557 X_{10}$$

Here C_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, 212$) refer to composite index for i^{th} tehsil and $X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_{10}$ to sectoral indices in the order shown in factor matrix (Table-1). By using the above equation, tehsilwise indices of development were derived to ascertain levels of development of various regions. Based on these composite index values all the tehsils were classified into ten categories according to their levels of development as shown (Table-2).

*The data required for the study are drawn from a wider study conducted by the author.: "Analysis of Micro- Regional Disparities in Rajasthan and Strategy for Development",

Classic Publication, Jaipur 1997. The study is based on secondary data obtained from a variety of official sources.

LEVELS AND DIMENSIONS OF DEVELOPMENT :

The table 2 shows that out of a total of 212 tehsils as many as 116 are backward, 21 have average level of development and only 75 are developed. Infact out of 75 developed tehsils only 25 can be considered as really developed since the remaining 50 (D and MD combined) have very low levels of development. This shows that overall development in the State is highly concentrated only in a very small number of tehsils. Only 35 percent of the tehsils fall under various categories of development and of these less than 12 percent have high levels of development. Not only there is concentrated development but the magnitude of disparity is also very high. The most developed tehsil Jaipur has an index value of 117.3 against -24.03 obtained by the most backward tehsil Chohtan. Not only the disparity is high between the most developed and the most backward tehsils, the difference between index values obtained by the most and the least developed tehsils within the category of developed tehsils is also very high. The index value of highest ranked tehsil Jaipur is 117.31 against just 1.14 obtained by the 76th ranked tehsil Baswa(which is least developed among the developed tehsils). The range of difference among the backward tehsils is, however, much smaller. Clearly the extent of disparity is much smaller among the backward tehsils than what it is among the developed tehsils. This shows that even within the developed tehsils the spread of development is not uniform and it is rather uneven and lopsided.

In Table 3 tehsils are grouped according to the dimensions and levels of development. It can be seen that all the exceptionally highly backward tehsils, i.e., hundred per cent of the tehsils in this group have total backwardness. The percentages of tehsils having total backwardness decline as their development level goes up. Thus, the percentage of tehsils having total backwardness is only 55.17 per cent for the extremely backward tehsils, it further declines of 25.64 per cent for the highly backward tehsils and to 7.69 per cent for the backward tehsils. For tehsils with average and above average levels of development the percentage of tehsils with total backwardness is zero. On the other hand there is total development in case of 28.57 percent of the exceptionally highly developed tehsils. The percentage declines to 20 per cent for the extremely developed tehsils, to 15.38 per cent for highly developed tehsils, to 7.69 per cent for developed tehsils and ultimately to 0.00 percent for the tehsils with moderate or below moderate levels of development. Similar trends largely hold for other categories starting from uni - sectoral to nine - sectoral development. It implies that there is a direct and positive relationship between the levels of development and dimensions of development. Thus along with an increase in the level of development, dimensions of development also start increasing from uni-sectoral to bi-sectoral and then to multi-sectoral development. This indicates the inter-dependency of various sectors in the process of development and hence brings forth the importance of integrated regional sectoral development approach. Regional development strategy should be such that development of one sector helps and leads to the development of the other sector and in this process the overall level of development is raised.

TYPOLGY OF DEVELOPMENT :

Just as there is a relationship between the levels and the dimensions of development, there is relationship between level and typology of development. It is revealed that out of 39 tehsils in group 'B', 15 have uni-sectoral development in terms of cooperation followed by agriculture (9) and health(4). While three tehsils have developed educational sector, other sectors are developed in only one or two tehsils. It is worth pointing that with the exception of two tehsils with average levels of development, all other are backward in this group. (Table 3.). There are 39 tehsils which have a bi-sectoral development(group c). In 34 of these tehsils development is in combination of health, agriculture, cooperation and educational sectors. Only four combinations(BT, IsCom, IsP, IsIg) involving 5 tehsils are without atleast one of these sectors. Out of these 34 tehsils, 20 have combinations of these four sectors themselves. Thirty three of these tehsils belong to backward and six to average categories of development(Table3). In the three sectoral development group, the most common combinations continue to include health, agriculture, cooperation and education. Out of 16 tehsils, all but one tehsil include at least one of these and eight include two of these as developed sectors. A cursory look at Table 4 brings out that the backward tehsils have made strides mainly in respect of cooperation, health, agriculture and education. It may, however, be seen that alongwith the development of these four sectors in two and three sectoral development groups, infrastructural sectors like transport and power also start developing and take lead in the development among sectors other than these four.

As the level of development goes up, the typology of development changes and shows signs of higher level of development. Generally speaking developed tehsils comprise of developed industrial and infrastructural sectors like transport, power, banking etc. Development of co-operation and agriculture is most common among the blocks which are classified as below the average level of development. Thus the tehsils which are in the initial process of development have mainly developed cooperative and agriculture sectors and as the development level goes up, development spreads to social infrastructure like health followed by education. After the average or above average position secondary and tertiary sectors develop.

DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES :

An attempt has so far been made to present the levels of development of various tehsils under study and, on the basis of dimensions of development, to identify the typology of development that has occurred in each of the blocks. It is now proposed to make use of level and typology of development to bring these tehsils under some convenient groups so that from each of these groups a strategy of development suggests itself on the basis of their developmental needs and potential. Accordingly the tehsils under study may be brought under the following groups:

Group A : Consisting of developed tehsils with all the three productive sectors as developed and includes tehsils like Jaipur, Alwar, Bharatpur, Bhilwara and Aburoad.

Group B : Consisting of developed tehsils with all the three backward productive sectors and tehsils like Jhunjhunu, Pahari, Sikar and Nasirabad are included here.

- Group C₁ : Consisting of developed tehsils having one of the productive sectors backward and includes tehsils like Kishangarh and Merta.
- Group C₂: Consisting of developed tehsils having two backward productive sectors e.g. the tehsils of Weir and Dausa.
- Group D : Consisting of backward/average tehsils having all the three backward productive sectors and includes majority of backward tehsils such as Taranagar, Pokaran, Chohtan, Kotra, Sanchoore and Jaisalmer.
- Group E : Consisting of backward/average tehsils having all the three productive sectors as developed e.g. the tehsils of Mandal and Khanpur.
- Group F : Consisting of all backward/average tehsils having either developed agricultural or industrial sector e.g. the tehsils of Baseri, Thanagaji, Ramgarh and Udaipurwati.

Based on the above observations the following broad policy guidelines have been drawn for promoting the development of the tehsil groups under study:

- (a) The tehsils falling under this group may be further sub-classified into three categories. Firstly, there are tehsils having not only all the three productive sectors developed but also all other sectors are developed or at the most having a situation of unidimensional backwardness. Such tehsils do not require any special plan efforts as the present level of plan efforts is adequate to keep them moving forward. They have attained a stage where they can be self supporting attracting capital, labour and entrepreneurship for further development. Secondly, there are tehsils having developed productive sectors but have backward or inadequately developed infrastructure. These tehsils could be said to have entered into take off stage and they just require special attention towards the development of social and economic infrastructure which would help their productive sectors to grow at a faster rate. Thirdly, there are tehsils which have attained mediocre (MD and D) levels of development (contrary to first and second category tehsils which have attained higher level of development i.e. HD, ED and EXHD levels) and have good development potential. These tehsils require greater attention towards the development of productive sectors.
- (b) The tehsils falling under Group 'B' have fairly good infra-structural network and hence concentrated efforts towards the development of the three productive sectors needed.
- (c) The tehsils falling under Group 'C₁' and C₂' have developed in terms of either industry or agriculture. These tehsils, therefore, require special emphasis on

the productive sector that is backward or whose backwardness is hindering the overall progress.

- (d) Group 'D' tehsils should be accorded top priority in the development plans. The process of development in these tehsils is still in initial stages. These tehsils require an entirely new strategy of development. A detailed survey of various development potentials, problems and needs of the people and inventory of resources need to be undertaken and planning should be done in a phased manner.
- (e) The tehsils coming under Group 'E' can be developed at a faster rate by improving economic, financial and social infra-structure. These backward sectors are hindering the overall growth.
- (f) In Group 'F' tehsils either agriculture or industrial sector has recorded high development indicating the growth potential of the regions. While these regions also need a strategy similar to the tehsils of Group 'D', emphasis may, however, be given on further development of the sector which has shown better performance and on the sectors that help the development of this progressive sector.

NOTES :

1. The State of Rajasthan is one of the least developed states of the Indian Union. Physiographically, it is difficult to find a region more varied and diverse than Rajasthan. It is a land of lofty hills and shifting sand-dunes, of scorching heat and freezing cold, of fertile plains, rugged ravines and dense forests. However, desert, which covers a large part of the State (the famous Thar Desert) remains its dominant peculiarity, besides the mountaneous Aravalli Range that divides the land into two natural divisions. On the basis of present land forms the State can be divided into four physiographic divisions : (1) Western Sandy Plains, (2) Aravalli Range and Hilly Regions (3) Eastern Plains (4) South Eastern Plateau.

2. An analysis of dimensions helps regional planner adopt differential strategies of development and formulate sectoral plans. A study of typology is important while planning for a region as it helps assigning priorities to the sectors that are backward or whose backwardness is hindering the overall development of the region.

3 States in the Indian Union are generally divided into districts, sub-divisions and tehsils for the sake of administrative convenience. A district, as it is generally known, is a territory marked off for special administrative purposes. In India it is the

main unit of regional administration. A tehsil, also known as taluk, is a sub-division of the district. In the present study micro-region refers to a tehsil which is the smallest administrative unit for which required data are available. However, for developmental works, the unit of administration in most of the Indian states is block. Generally a block is a smaller unit than tehsil comprising of about 100 villages. At present the State comprises of 31 districts, 90 sub-divisions and 213 tehsils. Four of the districts have been recently formed. The study is based on the earlier division of the State into 27 districts and 212 tehsils.

REFERENCES

1. Adelman, I and Morris, C. (1974) Society , Politics and Economic Development, John Hopkins.
2. Aziz , Abdul (1983) Studies in Block Planning , Concept Publishing Company , New Delhi.
3. Benett, M. K (1951) "International Disparities in Consumption Levels", American Economic Review, September.
4. Budhraj, J.C. (1987) Micro-Level Development Planning, Commonwealth Publisher, New Delhi.
5. Chand, Mahesh and Puri, V. K. (1983) Regional Planning in India. Allied Publishers, New Delhi .
6. Chattopadhyaya, B. and Raza, Moonis (1975) "Regional Development : Analytical Framework and Indicators", I J R S, Vol. VII . No. 1.
7. Das Gupta, B. (1971) "Socio-Economic Classification of Districts--A Statistical Approach ", EPW, August 14.
8. Degankar, C. K. (1990) District Planning and Economic Development, Pointer Publishers, Jaipur.
9. Duntelman, G.H. (1984) Introduction to Multivariate Analysis, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California.
10. Gnaguli, B. N. and Gupta, D. B. (1976) "Levels of Living in India -- An Inter-State Profile", S. Chand & Co., New Delhi.
11. Government of Rajasthan, Statistical Abstracts of Rajasthan (Annual) and Basic Statistics (Annual), Directorate of Economics and Statistics , Jaipur.
12. Harman, H.G. (1960) Modern Factor Analysis, Chicago Press.
13. Iyengar, N. S. and Sudershan, P. (1982) "A Method of Classifying Regions from Multivariate Data", EPW , Vol.No.21, December 18.
14. John, Friedman and William, Allonso (1964) Regional Development and Planning, Cambridge.
15. Kutsoyiannis, A. (1986) Theory of Econometrics, Macmillan, Hongkong.
16. Kulkarni, K. M. (1977) "Micro Regional Variation in Economic Development of Rajasthan", IJRS, Vol. IX, No. 2.

17. Mandal, S. K. (1987) Regional Disparities and Imbalances in India's Planned Economic Development, Deep Publications, New Delhi.
18. Mehar, Irfan., (1987), Geography of Rajasthan, Granthagar, Jodhpur.
19. Mirra, et. al. (1978) Regional Planning and National Development, Vihar Publishing House, New Delhi.
20. Mitra, Ashok (1961) "Levels of Regional Development in India", Census of India, Part-A(i).
21. Morrison, D.F. (1996) Multivariate Statistical Methods, Mc-GrawHill, New York.
22. Mukherjee, M. and Rao, S.K. (1977) "A Method of Combining Diverse Partial Measures of Development", Journal of Income and Wealth, Vol. 2.
23. Nanjappa, M.B. and Sudershan, P. (1981) "A Note on Inter-District Differentials in Karnataka Development", Journal of Income and Wealth Vol., 4.
24. Pal., M. N. (1961) "Quantitative Delineation of Regions", Bombay Geographical Magazine, No. 8, 9.
25. Pal, M. N. (1975) "Regional Disparities in the Levels of Development in India", IJRS, Vol. VII No.1.
26. Pal, M. N. (1971) "Quantitative Techniques in Regional Planning ", IJRS, Vol. III, No.1.
27. Pathak, C. R. et. al. (1970) "Identification of Planning Areas in the Three State Region - Bihar, Orissa and West Bengal with Respect to Their Levels of Development and Planning Problems", IJRS, Vol. 2, No.1.
28. Rao, Hemlata (1984) Regional Disparities and Development in India, Ashish Publishing House, New Delhi.
29. Rao, Hemlata (1977) "Identification of Backward Regions and Trends in Regional Disparities in India" Artha Vijanana.
30. Rao, Hemlata (1987) "Strategy for Developing Mico-Regions - An Exploratory Exercise", in A.C. Angrish (Ed.), Regional Economic Planning in India, 21st Century Publishers, Meerut.
31. Rao S.K. (1973) "A Note on Measuring Economic Distance Between Regions in India", EPW, April 28.
32. Schildernick, J.H.F. (1977) "Factor Analysis Applied to Developed and Developing Countries", Rotterdam University Press.

33. Sharma, P.N. and Katiyar, P.C. (1974) "Identifying Underdeveloped Districts of U.P.", IJRS, Vol. VI, No. 1.
34. Sharma, K.L. (1975) "Spatial Disparities in Rajasthan - A Comparative Study of Levels of Development Between Two Points of Time" IJRS, Vol. VIII, No. 1.
35. Shastri, Siddharth (1988) "Regional Disparities in Economic Development of Rajasthan (1961-84)", IJRS, Vol. XX, No. 2.
36. Shastri, Siddharth (1991) "Flow of Funds and Regional Disparities in Rajasthan", IJRS, Vol. XXIII, No. 2.
37. Shastri, Siddharth (1990) "Intra-District Disparities in Rajasthan", Times of India, Jaipur, May 24.
38. Shastri, Siddharth (1997) "Analysis of Micro-Regional Disparities in Rajasthan and Strategy For Development", Classic Publications, Jaipur.
39. Singh, A.K. (1990) Planning Strategy for a Developing Region, Print House, Lucknow.
40. Suar, Damodar (1984) "Development Indicator Identification and Regional Disparities in Orissa : A Factor Analytic Study", IJRS, Vol. XVI, No. 2.
41. Sudershan, P. (1985) "Identification of Backward Districts in Andhra Pradesh - An Application of Factor Analysis", IJRS, Vol. XVII, No. 2.

Abbreviation Used :

EPW	=	Economic and Political Weekly, Bombay, India
IJRS	=	Indian Journal of Regional Science, Calcutta, India

Table 1 : Factor Matrix

S.No. of Indices	Factor Loadings		
	Factor- I	Factor-II	Factor-III
1. General Industrial Development Index	0.80865	-0.18642	-0.03386
2. Small Scale Industrial Development Index	0.87728	-0.21719	-0.07369
3. Educational Development Index	0.79375	-0.02751	-0.00483
4. Communication Development Index	0.79704	-0.18847	-0.24759
5. Transport Development Index	0.65496	0.41070	0.38152
6. Health Development Index	0.34662	0.76549	-0.08178
7. Cooperation Development Index	0.32975	-0.13617	0.85798
8. Agriculture Development Index	0.42539	0.57229	-0.07332
9. Power Development Index	0.80571	-0.02388	-0.27653
10. Banking Development Index	0.87557	-0.22878	0.04994
Percentage of variance explained	49.44	12.72	10.36

Table 2 : Classification of Tehsils According to Levels of Development

S. No.	Development Levels (composite index values)	Level Symbols	No. of Tehsils
1.	above 30.00	Exceptionally highly developed (EXHD)	7
2.	30.00 - 20.00	Extremely developed (ED)	5
3.	20.00 - 10.00	Highly developed (HD)	13
4.	10.00 - 5.00	Developed(D)	26
5.	5.00 - 1.00	Moderately developed (MD)	24
6.	1.00 - -1.00	Average(A)	21
7.	-1.00 - -5.00	Backward(B)	39
8.	-5.00 --10.00	Highly backward(HB)	39
9.	-10.00 - -15.00	Extremely backward(EB)	29
10.	-15.00 - and above	Exceptionally highly backward(EXHB)	9
Total number of tehsils			212

Table 3 : Distribution of Tehsils According to Dimensions and Levels of Development

S.No.	Dimensions of Development	No. of tehsils	Distribution of tehsils according to levels of development									
			EXHB	EB	HB	B	A	MD	D	HD	ED	EXHD
1.	All sectors backward	38	9	16	10	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.	Uni-sector development	39	-	12	13	12	2	-	-	-	-	-
3.	Bi-sectors development	39	-	1	16	16	6	-	-	-	-	-
4.	Three sectors development	16	-	-	-	6	10	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Four sectors development	7	-	-	-	2	3	2	-	-	-	-
6.	Five sectors development	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-
7.	Six sectors development	18	-	-	-	-	-	10	5	3	-	-
8.	Seven sectors development	16	-	-	-	-	-	4	8	4	-	-
9.	Eight sectors development	17	-	-	-	-	-	5	8	-	2	2
10.	Nine sectors development	12	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	4	2	3
11.	Total all sectors development	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	1	2
	Total number of tehsils	212	9	29	39	39	21	24	26	13	5	7

Table 4 : Typology of Backwardness

A-Total Backwardness		B-Uni-Sector Development		C-Bi-Sector Development		D-Three-Sector Development		E-Four Sector Development		F-Five Sector Development	
Develo- ped Sector	No. of Tehsils	Develo- ped Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils	Develo- ped Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils	Develo- ped Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils	Develo- ped Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils	Develo- ped Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils
All sectors backward	38	C	15	HE	5	HAE	2	AHTP	1	AHTPCom	2
		A	9	HA	4	HAP	2	AHTC	1	ATPEC	1
		H	4	HC	3	HAT	1	AHTE	1		
		E	3	HT	2	HIIsT	2	AHECom	1		
		B	2	HCom	1	HIgT	1	AEComP	1		
		Is	2	HP	1	HET	1	EHComP	1		
		Com	2	HB	2	HEP	1	EBCP	1		
		Ig	1	AC	4	ACT	1				
		P	1	AE	3	AComP	1				
				AT	2	IsCCom	1				
				ET	2	IsIgCom	1				
				EP	2	EBC	2				
				EC	1						
				BT	1						
				IsP	2						
				IsCom	1						
				IsIg	1						
				CP	2						
Total	38	Total	39	Total	39	Total	16	Total	7	Total	3

G-Six Sector Development		H-Seven-Sector Development		I-Eight-Sector Development		J-Nine-Sector Development		K-All Sector Development	
Backward Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils	Backward Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils	Backward Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils	Backward Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils	Backward Sector Symbol	No. of Tehsils
HIgIsCom	2	HAT	2	HC	4			ALL	7
HIgIsE	1	HAP	1	HA	2			sectors	
HIgIsA	1	HAIs	1	HT	1			developed	
HIgCP	1	HIgP	1	BA	1				
HIgBE	1	HIgCom	2						
HIsComA	2	HCom	1	BE	1	H	4		
HIsComT	1	HBC	2	AIg	1	A	2		
HAComE	1	IgIsB	1	AE	1	C	2		
HAComT	1	IgIsA	1	IgIs	2	Com	2		
HACT	1	IgIsC	2	ComP	2	Ig	1		
HBCT	1	IgComA	1	ComIg	2	B	1		
IgIsEC	1	ABCom	1						
IsComAC	1								
IAComAE	1								
Total	18	Total	16	Total	17	Total	12	Total	7

Symbols :

A = Agriculture
E = Education
C = Cooperation
P = Power

Ig = General Industries
H = Health
T = Transport

Is = Small Scale Industries
B = Banking
Com = Communication