



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

CONTENTS

Sr. No.	TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)	Page No.
1.	IMPACT OF MARKETING ACTIVITIES ON CONSUMER BASED BRAND EQUITY - A CASE STUDY OF PAKISTAN'S MOBILE SERVICE SECTOR SHAHZAD GHAFOR & UZAIR FAROOQ KHAN	1
2.	UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIPS OF CORPORATE IMAGE, EMOTION, VALUE, SATISFACTION, AND LOYALTY AMONG AIR PASSENGERS: A CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE DR. HAFEDH IBRAHIM	13
3.	GAME THEORY AS ANOTHER PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION OF POLITICAL MARKETING: EVIDENCE FROM NIGERIA'S ELECTORAL PROCESS DR. ROWLAND E. WORLU	23
4.	CORPORATE UNDERSTANDING OF TAKĀFUL DR. WAHEED AKHTER, MR. HASAN AFZAL & MR. ALI RAZA	30
5.	SMALL AND MEDIUM SCALE ENTERPRISES AS A SURVIVAL STRATEGY FOR EMPLOYMENT GENERATION IN NIGERIA DR. AREMU, MUKAILA AYANDA & DR. (MRS.) ADEYEMI, SIDIKAT LARABA	36
6.	A STUDY ON LABOUR WELFARE FACILITY (WITH REFERENCE TO AFT, PONDICHERRY) S. POONGAVANAM	40
7.	INTERNATIONALIZATION OF INDIAN RUPEE - AN EMPIRICAL STUDY SHRINIVAS R. PATIL & DR. RAMESH R. KULKARNI	45
8.	PROFITABILITY PERFORMANCE OF PUBLIC SECTOR BANKS-AN EMPIRICAL STUDY M. RAJESH & DR. N R V RAMANA REDDY	51
9.	GLOBAL INTEGRATION OF ORGANISATION IS EFFECTIVE THROUGH LEGISLATION: A PERSPECTIVE ON THE CURRENT ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT DR. S. P. RATH, PROF. BISWAJIT DAS & ANAND IYENGAR	56
10.	NON-PERFORMING ASSETS: A STUDY OF SCHEDULED COMMERCIAL BANKS IN INDIA DR. M. JAYASREE & R. RADHIKA	60
11.	SOLVENCY ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SECTOR UNDERTAKING: A CASE STUDY OF POWER FINANCE CORPORATION LIMITED (PFCL) DR. S. K. KHATIK & TITTO VARGHESE	64
12.	GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS AND ITS EFFECT ON REAL ESTATE SECTOR IN INDIA DR. SANMAN JAIN N & NISHI S JAIN	71
13.	AN INTROSPECTIVE ON CONSUMER BEHAVIOR ON THE BASIS OF DEMOGRAPHY: A SURVEY (WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO FMCGS) DR. B. CHANDRA MOHAN PATNAIK & PRAKASH KUMAR PRADHAN	74
14.	PROFITABILITY ANALYSIS OF ICICI BANK DR. K. MANIKANDAN, DR. S. MANIVEL & DR. R. VELU RAJ	81
15.	WHAT SAVED INDIA FROM THE GLOBAL ECONOMIC MELTDOWN? DR. S. RAGHUNATHA REDDY & DR. A. AMRUTH PRASAD REDDY	86
16.	PERFORMANCE AND RISK ANALYSIS OF MONTHLY INCOME PLANS (MIP) OF SELECTED MUTUAL FUNDS DR. ASHOK KHURANA & DR. BHAVET	90
17.	CONSUMER BUYING BEHAVIOUR OF GREEN PRODUCTS DR. H. C. PUROHIT	94
18.	CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY STRATEGIES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: INDIAN EXPERIENCE DR. VILAS M. KADROLKAR	98
19.	A STUDY ON MEASURING THE PERFORMANCE OF INDIAN BANKING SECTOR IN THE EVENT OF RECENT GLOBAL ECONOMIC CRISIS- AN EMPIRICAL VIEW M. S. RAMARATNAM, R. JAYARAMAN & B. BALAJI SRINIVASAN	106
20.	e-PROCUREMENT USING REVERSE AUCTIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS T. BALADHANDAYUTHAM & DR. SHANTHI VENKATESH	110
21.	PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS WITH SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE: A CASE STUDY JAGADISH R. RAIYANI	118
22.	TRANSFER PRICING- A STUDY OF TRANSFER PRICING METHOD USED BY SELECTED COMPANIES MANU KALIA	123
23.	FACTORS IN FACILITATING THE PROCESS OF OBTAINING FUNDS FOR SMES: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT DR. P. P. CHANDRA BOSE	128
24.	EMPLOYEES' WORKPLACE EMOTIONS IN ORGANIZATIONS R. GOPINATH	133
25.	DISPARITIES IN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA – AN INTER-STATE ANALYSES SUMAN RANI & SEEMA	140
	REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK	144

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

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

Dean (Academics), Tecnia Institute of Advanced Studies, Delhi

CO-EDITOR

DR. SAMBHAV GARG

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

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

DR. AMBIKA ZUTSHI

Faculty, School of Management & Marketing, Deakin University, Australia

DR. VIVEK NATRAJAN

Faculty, Lomar University, U.S.A.

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. 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. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE

Asst. Professor, Government F. G. College Chitguppa, 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

Vice-Principal, Defence College of Education, 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

Lecturer, E.C.C., Safidon, Jind

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

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. 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, **info@ijrcm.org.in** or **infoijrcm@gmail.com**.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

Dated: _____

The Editor

IJRCM

Subject: **Submission of Manuscript in the Area of** _____ **(Computer/Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/other, please specify).**

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find my submission of manuscript titled ' _____ ' for possible publication in your journal.

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 anywhere.

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

Name of Corresponding Author:

Designation:

Affiliation:

Mailing address:

Mobile & Landline Number (s):

E-mail Address (s):

2. **INTRODUCTION:** Manuscript must be in English prepared on a standard A4 size paper setting. 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 12 point Calibri Font with page numbers at the bottom and centre of the every page.
3. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be in a 12 point Calibri Font. It should be bold typed, centered and fully capitalised.
4. **AUTHOR NAME(S) & AFFILIATIONS:** The author (s) full name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline numbers, and email/alternate email address should be in 12-point Calibri Font. It must be centered underneath the title.
5. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in fully italicized text, not exceeding 250 words. The abstract must be informative and explain background, aims, methods, results and conclusion.
6. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by 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.

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 be in a 8 point Calibri Font, single spaced and justified.
10. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, centered, separately numbered & self explained, and titles must be above the tables/figures. 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. It must be single spaced, and at the end of the manuscript. 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 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.
 - Use endnotes rather than footnotes.
 - 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.

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

- Chandel K.S. (2009): "Ethics in Commerce Education." 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. (2006): "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

- Kelkar V. (2009): Towards a New Natural Gas Policy, Economic and Political Weekly, Viewed on February 17, 2011 <http://epw.in/epw/user/viewabstract.jsp>

DISPARITIES IN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA – AN INTER-STATE ANALYSES

SUMAN RANI

RESEARCH SCHOLAR

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

MAHARSHI DAYANAND UNIVERSITY

ROHTAK

SEEMA

RESEARCH SCHOLAR

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

MAHARSHI DAYANAND UNIVERSITY

ROHTAK

ABSTRACT

Disparity is an important issue for debate and analyses. As far it concerned to Indian economy, it is composite of federal states. States are heterogeneous in natures which have resulted in wide variations in economic structures of the states. There is empirical evidence from the very starting in this regard, infact from mughal period. National planners and state planners have been putting efforts to have a balanced growth of the Indian economy since independence so that every household and each individual of our Indian society gets the benefit of economic growth. Though these efforts have not proved successful, achievements are not often commensurate with efforts. Considerable level of regional disparities still persists. The present paper is a modest attempt to study the divergence in industrial growth across selected Indian states for the period 1980-81 to 2007-08. The results of the study are completely based on secondary data taken from annual survey of industries of different years. A total of fifteen states have been selected for the present study insuring proper representation across all regions of the country. Coefficient of variation and principal component method are used for the better analyses. The results of the study indicate that there persistently exited inter-state disparity in terms of industrial development. Furthermore, inequality in this regard increased during 1980-81 to 2007-08.

KEYWORDS

Industrial, Economy, Growth, Development.

INTRODUCTION

Indian economy is composite of federal states. States are heterogeneous in natures which have resulted in wide variations in economic structures of the states. It is well known that there is widespread disparity in the levels of economic and social development between the different regions of the Indian nations and there is empirical evidence from the very starting in this regard, we can say that from the mughal period. At that time the economy was village-based and Indian villages were highly segmented both socially and economically. The same situation continued during the British period also. At the time of independence also Considerable difference in economic as well as social development of different regions of the country existed. After dependence, reduction in inter-state/region disparities has been emphasizing. Disparity in economic and social development across the regions and intra-regional disparities among different segments of the society have been the major planks for adopting planning process in India since independence. One of the main objectives of the planning process indicated in the early 1950s was to reduce these regional differences and to achieve, regionally balanced development. Various policy instruments including direct public investment by the centre in infrastructure, guided private investment and building up of capacity enhancing institutions have been tried to achieve this objective. Though these measures have not proved highly successful, achievements were very less than the objectives.. Considerable level of regional disparities exists even after the 59 years of planned economy. An important question, however, is why after fifty years of planned development efforts, such inter-state disparities remain unattended? Often, the answer depends on whether it is given by people who are the victims of underdeveloped or not. The present study attempts to examine inter-state disparities, in terms of industrial development of organized industrial sector. The study is divided in to two sections. The first section deals with the comparison of the values of the various indicators of industrial development for different Indian states. In the second section coefficient of variation and composite index (from principal component method) are determined with the purpose of explaining the inter-state disparities in a better way.

DATA BASE AND METHODOLOGY

The data for the present paper have been taken from annual survey of industries of various years. A total of fifteen states have been selected for the present study ensuring representation across all regions of the country. To analyse inter -state imbalance five industrial indicators i.e. Number of factories, Number of workers, Value of industrial output, Net value added, Fixed capital have been selected. Coefficient of variation and composite index (from principal component method) has also been obtained for the better analyses.

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

SECTION 1

This section discloses the inter-state imbalance with the help of the values of the various industrial indicators. Following tables discloses inter-state inequality by recording the values on these indicators.

Table 1 discloses the number of factories in fifteen major Indian states for the years 1980-81 to 2007-08. As the table indicates the highest number of factories in 1980-81 and 1990-91 was in Maharashtra with the number 15576 and 15595, respectively. In 2000-01 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, in contrast, the highest number of factories was found in Tamil Nadu; 20601, 21265, 23691 and 21042, respectively. The lowest number of factories, on the other hand was recorded in Orissa in 1980-81 and 1990-91, 1563 and 1465, respectively. However, where in 2000-01 Assam registered the least number of factories with 1435 factories, in 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 the lowest number was found in Bihar with 1669, 1602 and 1783 factories, respectively.

TABLE-1: STATE WISE NUMBER OF FACTORIES

State	1980-81	1990-91	2000-01	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
1.Andhara Pradesh	11155	15205	14029	15790	15874	16741
2.Assam	1583	1548	1435	1864	1967	1859
3.Bihar	4250	3409	1535	1669	1602	1783
4.Gujarat	11208	10943	14090	14055	1432	15107
5.Haryana	2486	3070	4448	4304	4410	4707
6.Karnataka	5381	5911	7010	7835	7827	8443
7.Kerala	3049	3484	4853	5643	5554	5584
8.Madhaya Pradesh	3488	3962	3221	2951	3069	3165
9.Maharashtra	15576	15595	18528	18711	18612	18304
10.Orissa	1563	1465	1665	1862	1906	1822
11.Punjab	5688	6255	7137	8332	9256	10178
12.Rajasthan	2696	3358	5112	6005	6053	6337
13.Tamil Nadu	10292	14617	20601	21265	23691	21042
14.Uttar Pradesh	7151	10417	9635	10503	10688	10717
15.West Bengal	6359	5606	6091	6077	5928	5987

Source: Annual survey of industries of 1980-81, 1990-91, 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08

In addition this, it can be found that there persistently existed an interstate disparity in regard to the number of factories. It may also be observed that there has consistently been a large gap between the highest and lowest number of factories recorded state wise from 1980-81 to 2007-08, and this gap increased with each measurement except from 2006-07 to 2007-08. In 1980-81, for instance there was a gap of 14013 between the number of factories in Maharashtra and Orissa. In 1990-91 the gap between the numbers for the same states rose to 14130. The discrepancy again had risen to 19166 between the numbers for Tamil Nadu and Assam. A gap of 19596 in 2005-06 and 22089 in 2006-07 (between the number of Tamil Nadu and Bihar) reflects further the increasing trend. However, in 2007-08 this gap declined to 19259 between the numbers for the same states.

As an additional note, the table reveals that a persistent increase in number of factories took place only in two states (Punjab and Rajasthan). In all other states number of factories fluctuated from 1980-81 to 2007-08.

Table 2 is a record of state wise number of workers for the fifteen states in India. It is evident from the data that in 1980-81 numbers of workers varied from 988040 in Maharashtra to 101544 in Assam- a difference of 886496. Ten years later, the same states held the highest and lowest values; Maharashtra and Assam with 908457 and 108953 workers, respectively in 1990-91. In 2000-01, Maharashtra was unseated as the top position in relation to the number of workers when Tamil Nadu took this place with 925389 workers. However, the lowest number was again recorded in Assam, where the number was 92475, resulting in a difference of 832915. Same trend continued as the same states (Tamil Nadu and Assam) maintained their positions until 2007-08. In 2005-06 the number was 1114421 and 110036 (a difference of 1004385); in 2006-07 1347122 and 116253 (a difference of 1230869) and in 2007-08, 1283472 and 113132 (a difference of 1170346).

TABLE-2: STATE WISE NUMBER OF WORKERS

State	1980-81	1990-91	2000-01	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
1.Andhara Pradesh	564244	832120	763892	819703	840577	862414
2.Assam	101544	108953	92474	110036	116253	113132
3.Bihar	285756	360362	49190	56901	55159	62319
4.Gujarat	572350	675447	553704	669324	749597	797443
5.Haryana	131624	252974	217532	305740	331865	400895
6.Karnataka	302312	307929	359199	498526	551364	567836
7.Kerala	232486	228353	262981	289480	297533	308641
8.Madhaya Pradesh	231152	287899	191131	165807	178154	194046
9.Maharashtra	988040	908457	817305	879248	1005380	953097
10.Orissa	103421	116918	99127	110246	125195	145276
11.Punjab	174947	311670	278303	350747	402588	435386
12.Rajasthan	149205	181067	175566	227081	240326	278541
13.Tamil Nadu	638949	766377	925389	1114421	1347122	1283472
14.Uttar Pradesh	613602	619864	401647	500540	533794	589695
15.West Bengal	756333	578651	455812	420663	403095	421280

Source: Annual survey of industries of 1980-81, 1990-91, 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08.

The data in the table further demonstrate that a large gap between the highest and lowest number of workers took place, but trend in regard to this gap continuously changed with each measurement. In 1981, for instance there was a gap of 886496. In 1991, the gap had fallen to 799504. To the contrary, in 2001 the gap rose to 832915. In fact, it rose to 1004385 and 1230869 in 2005-6 and 2007-08, respectively. However, in 2007-08 the gap declined to 1170346. Beyond these points it can also be surmised from the data that only in one state i.e. Karnataka, the number of workers persistently increased during 1980-81 to 2007-08.

Table 3 communicates the state wise value of industrial output. It is observed in the table that highest value of production was repeatedly recorded in Maharashtra, where the value was rupees 1440587 lakh, rupees 6141791 lakh, rupees 18497146 lakh, rupees 37358862 lakh., rupees 47665711 lakh and rupees 51993933 lakh in 1981, 1991, 2001, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, respectively. The lowest value, on the other hand recorded in Assam in 1980-81 and 1990-91, at rupees 64669 lakh and rupees 288690 lakh, respectively. In 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, in contrast the lowest value was found in Bihar; rupees 725487 lakh, rupees 1678498 lakh, rupees 1904144 lakh and rupees 2187362 lakh, respectively.

TABLE-3: STATE WISE VALUE OF INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT (RUPEES LAKH)

State	1980-81	1990-91	2000-01	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
1.Andhara Pradesh	318418	1660800	6134702	11801646	15816396	18253326
2.Assam	64669	288690	874144	2560914	3047619	3104360
3.Bihar	310613	1295454	725487	1678498	1904144	2187362
4.Gujarat	715976	2759271	12797728	30795504	37258066	44824316
5.Haryana	187102	989725	4467504	8579899	10244621	12488415
6.Kernataka	259181	1242437	4625883	13117752	16274620	18425766
7.Kerala	209141	608154	2671055	4326786	5057943	5556577
8.Madhaya Pradesh	245000	1421609	3671237	4954288	6434068	7872158
9.Maharashtra	1440587	6141791	18497146	37358862	47665711	51993933
10.Orissa	102421	787019	1324267	2797711	3664160	4801383
11.Punjab	249106	1248100	3501849	5943945	7749046	9616285
12.Rajasthan	161211	849946	3078418	5422077	6580310	7662696
13.Tamil Nadu	663469	2765359	10353989	18998170	25700144	26543807
14.Uttar Pradesh	377662	2636780	6485418	11886143	16587655	19381502
15.West Bengal	599252	1628735	3918267	8137279	9834214	10946382

Source: Annual survey of industries of 1980-81, 1990-91, 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08.

In addition to this it can be found that there persistently existed a large gap between the highest and lowest value recorded state wise from 1980-81 to 2007-08, and this gap increased with each measurement. In 1980-81 for instance, there was a gap of rupees 1375918 lakh between the value of Maharashtra and Assam. In 1990-91 the gap between the values for the same states raised to rupees 5853101 lakh. This discrepancy again had risen to rupees 17771659 lakh, rupees 35680364 lakh, rupees 45761567 lakh and rupees 49806571 lakh in 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, respectively.

Table further demonstrates that in all the states except from Bihar the value of industrial output persistently increased during the time period of 1980-81 to 2007-08.

Table 4 discloses the state wise net value added in industrial sector from the years 1980-81 to 2007-08. Table reveals the same trends about the highest and lowest values as was revealed in the previous table. The highest value was repeatedly recorded in Maharashtra: rupees 298599 lakh, rupees 1200354 lakh , rupees 3126098 lakh, rupees 7435401 lakh, rupees 9537109 lakh and rupees 11053762 lakh in 1980-81, 1990-91, 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, respectively. At the other end, the lowest value for 1980-81 and 1990-91 was in Assam with the value of rupees 11580 lakh and rupees 73363 lakh, respectively. However, in 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 the lowest value was recorded in Bihar: rupees 72926 lakh, rupees 42223 lakh, rupees 31610 lakh and rupees 115947 lakh, respectively.

TABLE-4: STATE WISE NET VALUE ADDED (RUPEES LAKH)

State	1980-81	1990-91	2000-01	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
1.Andhara Pradesh	58369	298141	887867	1766116	2707610	3145778
2.Assam	11580	73363	128390	357617	364199	327473
3.Bihar	50123	259830	72926	42223	31610	115947
4.Gujarat	113871	446824	1685587	4787158	4795240	6210755
5.Haryana	34571	163618	557054	1358920	1530711	1827000
6.Kernataka	60302	276914	830163	2089464	3129507	3438424
7.Kerala	39063	122207	355381	446784	355895	592824
8.Madhaya Pradesh	60211	300669	620834	714211	1112914	1422273
9.Maharashtra	298599	1200354	3126098	7435401	9537109	11053762
10.Orissa	19815	115271	235168	628749	902270	1351150
11.Punjab	38607	185728	430080	661710	1042899	1416746
12.Rajasthan	33405	155559	525802	802700	1215276	1224435
13.Tamil Nadu	122940	579285	1653632	2798101	3778425	3934122
14.Uttar Pradesh	74930	462484	957702	1642591	2282767	2344490
15.West Bengal	137494	319842	569917	947059	1148784	1417593

Source: Annual survey of industries of 1980-81, 1990-91, 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08

Let us turn now to the gap between the highest and the lowest value of net value added. It can be seen that there existed a large gap between these values. In 1980-81 there was a gap of rupees 287019 lakh. In 1990-91 this gap raised to rupees 1126991 lakh. The gap further rose to rupees 3053172 lakh in 2000-01, rupees 7393173 lakh in 2005-06, rupees 9505499 lakh in 2006-07 and finally rupees 11169709 lakh in 2007-08.

As an additional note, the table reveals that the net value added increased in all the states except from Bihar, Assam and Kerala with each measurement.

Table 5 is a record of state wise fixed capital .upon examining the data, one can see that in 1980-81 value of state wise fixed capital varied from rupees 477668 lakh in Maharashtra to rupees 28771 lakh in Assam- a difference of rupees 448897 lakh, the same states held the highest and lowest values; Maharashtra and Assam at rupees 2216154 lakh and rupees 1032091 lakh, respectively in 1990-91, with a difference of rupees 1184063 lakh. However, in 2000-01 the value varied from rupees 6753151 in Maharashtra to rupees 153263 lakh in Bihar, with a difference of rupees 6599888 lakh. Maharashtra and Bihar maintained these positions until 2007-08. In 2005-06 the amount were rupees 10197038 and 292353 lakh, respectively (a difference of rupees 9904686 lakh); in 2006-07, rupees 1214912 and 295118 lakh (a difference of rupees 11854005 lakh); and in 2007-08 rupees 13729202 (a difference of rupees 13427732 lakh).

TABLE-5: STATE WISE FIXED CAPITAL (RUPEES LAKH)

State	1980-81	1990-91	2000-01	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
1.Andhara Pradesh	182122	1577908	2633788	3932393	5108918	6425102
2.Assam	28771	103209	554998	752035	801962	891081
3.Bihar	342270	693761	153263	292352	295118	301470
4.Gujarat	268497	1309868	7208836	11953996	13162362	14540034
5.Haryana	95990	365835	1398028	1852399	2237053	2886838
6.Karnataka	129642	484351	2633063	4368896	4975429	5996709
7.Kerala	80045	366106	682688	769483	855082	914336
8.Madhaya Pradesh	210626	1032393	1408361	1900597	2128561	2441823
9.Maharashtra	477668	2216154	6753151	10197038	12149123	13729202
10.Orissa	75055	474477	1146938	2361133	2957210	4337008
11.Punjab	135025	566733	849312	1392579	1836524	2178348
12.Rajasthan	133954	509871	1367300	1624464	1908983	2258736
13.Tamil Nadu	204128	1138526	3743029	6034229	7506812	7933659
14.Uttar Pradesh	309593	1469097	3477513	3763086	4499515	5845002
15.West Bengal	211554	848988	1725304	2650026	2773464	3233151

Source: Annual survey of industries of 1980-81, 1990-91, 2000-01, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08.

From this, one may conclude that the difference between the highest and lowest values in each year beginning with 1980-81 showing a gap increasing first by 735166 and then by 5415825, 3304798, 1949319 and finally by 1573727. In addition to this, it can be found that value of fixed capital persistently increased in all the states except from Assam and Bihar.

SECTION 2

In this section coefficient of variation and composite index are determined to evaluate the inter-state disparity in regards to industrial development. Following table reveals the results in this regard.

Table-6: Rank and value of composite index of different states with respect to the industrial development

States	1981		1991		2001		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Index	Rank	Index	Rank	Index	Rank	Index	Rank	Index	Rank	Index	Rank
1.Andhara Pradesh	7.41	6	10.48	3	8.14	4	7.62	4	7.29	4	8.28	4
2. Assam	1.24	15	1.28	15	1.10	14	1.19	14	1.06	14	1.07	14
3.Bihar	5.98	7	4.79	8	0.70	15	0.66	15	0.54	15	0.67	15
4.Gujarat	9.93	2	9.92	4	11.75	3	12.27	2	9.69	3	12.40	2
5.Haryana	2.69	13	3.27	11	3.58	9	3.44	9	3.19	9	3.77	9
6.Karnataka	4.71	8	4.74	9	5.35	6	5.94	5	5.82	5	6.34	6
7.Kerala	3.17	11	2.87	13	2.88	12	2.47	11	2.07	12	2.36	12
8.Madhaya Pradesh	4.60	9	5.42	7	3.23	10	2.21	12	2.19	11	2.48	11
9.Maharashtra	18.36	1	17.88	1	16.00	1	14.95	1	14.62	1	15.16	1
10.Orissa	1.80	14	2.38	14	1.63	13	1.77	13	1.84	13	2.35	13
11.Punjab	4.06	10	4.65	10	3.61	8	3.45	8	3.45	8	4.17	7
12.Rajasthan	2.99	12	3.20	12	3.22	11	2.84	10	2.68	10	3.03	10
13.Tamil Nadu	9.46	3	11.08	2	11.95	2	10.97	3	11.13	2	11.12	3
14.Uttar Pradesh	8.02	5	9.86	5	6.79	5	5.84	6	5.68	6	6.39	5
15.West Bengal	9.07	4	6.65	6	4.67	7	3.99	7	3.49	7	3.84	8
c.v=			c.v=		c.v=		c.v=		c.v=		c.v=	
	70.54		67.95		79.55		81.66		82.00		78.53	

Source: Derived by the authors with the help of the data taken from annual surveys of industries of various years

Table 6 reveals the rank and values of major fifteen Indian states in regard to industrial development. It may be seen from the table that the top position in this regard was occupied Maharashtra in all the years i.e. 1981, 1991, 2001, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08. In contrast, the last position was secured by Assam in 1981 and 1991. However in 2001, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, Assam was unseated by Bihar for the last position. As an additional note the table reveals that a very slight improvement was shown by Andhra Pradesh, Assam and Orissa and a marginal improvement was shown by Haryana, Karnataka, Punjab and Rajasthan in this regard during 1981 to 2007-08. However, in Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Kerala and West Bengal the situation in relation to the industrial development worsened for the period of time.

Further it may be seen from the data that the value of coefficient of variation was 70.54 in 1981, which had fallen to 67.95 in 1991. Hence, one sees that the disparity declined from 1981 to 1991. To the contrary, the value of coefficient of variation rose from 67.95 in 1991 to 79.55 in 2001, from 79.55 in 2001 to 81.66 in 2005-06 and further to 82.00 in 2006-07. However it finally declined from 82.00 in 2006-07 to 78.53 in 2007-08.

Thus the inter-state disparity in relation to the industrial development first declined during 1981 to 1991, then continuously rose during 1991 to 2006-07 and finally again declined during 2006-07 to 2007-08.

CONCLUSION

It may be concluded from the above discussion that there exists significant regional divergence in industrial development across Indian states. Where Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh are some developed states in terms of industrial sector, Assam, Bihar, Kerala and Orissa are underdeveloped states in this regard. Moreover this divergence increased during 1980-81 to 2007-08.

REFERENCES

1. Annual surveys of industries, CSO, MOSPI.
2. Lal, Somik, and Sanjoy Chakravorty. 2005. "Industrial Location and Spatial Inequality: Theory and Evidence from India.", Review of Development Economics, 9, 1, 47-68
3. Srivastava, Ravi. 1994. "Planning and Regional Disparities in India", in Terence Byres (Ed), The State and Development Planning in India: Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Esteemed & Most Respected Reader,

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

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

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

Hoping an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-

Co-ordinator