



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

## **Status of Development of NE States in India in the National Perspective**

Nayak, P and Mishra, SK

North Eastern Hill University

10 August 2013

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/49325/>  
MPRA Paper No. 49325, posted 28 Aug 2013 20:04 UTC

## STATUS OF DEVELOPMENT OF NE STATES IN INDIA IN THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

P. Nayak and S.K. Mishra

### Abstract

*The present paper intends to bring out the position of the North Eastern States vis-à-vis the other states of India in matters of prosperity on the basis of the most recent available as well as comparable data compiled from secondary sources. Development or prosperity encapsulates and represents a multidimensional connotation. To capture the multidimensionality of development, this paper visualizes eight aspects of development, namely (i) physical infrastructure, (ii) social or institutional infrastructure (ii) industrial performance (iv) service sector and openness of the region, (v) human development, (vi) employment of the human resources, (vii) privatization of industry and investment and (viii) public efforts expressed in terms of govt. expenditure to facilitate promotion, maintenance and governance of development activities. Applying the Principal Component Analysis the study measures the indices of prosperity and rank of different states accordingly. The findings reveal that although overall infrastructure is unsatisfactory in the entire northeast, the state of Tripura has done commendably well with respect to industrialization and Assam has done well in privatization. In other aspects of development there is a mixed scenario mainly due to rigidities, gaps, and imbalances in priorities and the efforts made to promote different aspects in coordination with each other. Success in achievement in human development in some states is mostly due to the contributions made by the missionaries and easy flow of funds from the Centre. Impact of globalization is unobservable and privatization is at the back end. Private investment from within the region is not coming up and investment from outside is not encouraged due to protectionist attitude. Two important factors such as land and labor that are crucial to private investment are the major stumbling block in the region because of prevalent land laws and the so-called problems associated with migration of laborers from outside the region.*

**1. Introduction:** The North Eastern Region (NER) of India is a spatio-political region of India comprising of seven contiguous states namely Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland and Tripura, often called as the Seven Sisters. It has of late (in 1990's) been extended to incorporate Sikkim also which, though not geographically contiguous, exhibits its close connection with the Seven Sisters conglomeration in terms of its location in the socio-economic, cultural and demographic space on the one hand and needing suitable policy considerations of managing development on the other. Thus viewed, now the NER is more of a socio-economic region, especially in need of an integrated and specific policy for its socio-economic development. In view of this, the Govt. of India has a special Ministry called the Ministry of Development of North Eastern Region (MDONER) established in 2001, which functions as the nodal Department of the Central Government to deal with matters related to the socio-economic development including removal of infrastructural bottlenecks, provision of basic minimum services, creating an environment for private investment and to remove impediments to lasting peace and security in these eight states.

During the entire British colonial period in India, North East India was ruled as a part of Bengal Province. Assam attained her statehood in 1874. After India won freedom, the Northeastern region of British India consisted of Assam and the Princely States of Manipur and Tripura. The territory under Nagaland

came under the governance of Nagaland Transitional Provisions Regulation in 1961 and later attained its statehood in 1962. Under the North Eastern Region (reorganization) Act, 1971, Tripura, Manipur and Meghalaya became full-fledged states in 1972. Manipur was a union territory from 1962 until it became a full-fledged state in 1972. Tripura was a Union Territory since 1956 until 1972. The state of Meghalaya was carved out of Assam. The Union Territory of Mizoram came into being in 1972 and she attained her statehood in 1987. The territory under Sikkim was under the suzerainty of India, which controlled its external affairs, defense, diplomacy and communications, but Sikkim otherwise retained administrative autonomy. Sikkim became a state in 1975. The North East Frontier Agency (NEFA) was created in 1955. NEFA was renamed in 1972 and became the Union Territory of Arunachal Pradesh, which became the state of Arunachal Pradesh in 1987.

**2. Specialties of the North Eastern Region:** Topographically, except the Brahmaputra, Barak (in Assam) and Imphal (in Manipur) valleys and some flat lands in between the hills of Meghalaya and Tripura that together account for about one-third of its total area, the remaining two-thirds of the area in the region is hilly terrain interspersed with valleys and plains. Most of the states in the region have about two-third of their geographical area under forests. The economy in the region is primarily agrarian, although little land, mostly in the plains, is available for settled cultivation. The practice of *Jhum* (shifting) cultivation is prevalent in many parts of the region. As a result, the agricultural productivity is low. Although the region is endowed with a considerably rich reserve of natural resources, topographical features, inaccessibility, socio-economic climate, etc. inhibit rapid industrialization. It may be noted that the region has a number of constraints in its connectivity to the rest of the nation. The Siliguri Corridor (West Bengal), with a narrow pass, connects the region with the mainland of the country. The region shares about 4500 km. of international border (approximately 90 per cent of its entire border area) with China, Myanmar, Bangladesh and Bhutan, with its special prospects and constraints. The region has over 150 Scheduled Tribes and some 400 other ethnic groups, most of them struggling with the problems of identity and self-preservation as well as special claims to attention and privileges. Development is often associated with connectedness, deterritorialisation and integration facilitating easy flow of resources as well as people. Unfortunately, the specialties of the region provide only a modest scope for them, mainly due to its disadvantageous geographical location. The region requires, therefore, political integration with the rest of the country and economic integration with the rest of Asia on its borders.

**3. Objectives and the Basis of the Discourse:** This exposition intends to bring out the position of the North Eastern States vis-à-vis the other states of India in matters of prosperity or development. This

attempt to positioning has been done on the basis of the most recent data that are available as well as comparable. The data have been compiled from different secondary sources publically available and pertain mostly to the year 2007-08. Thus, an attempt has been made to present a quantitative picture of relative prosperity of the states in the North Eastern region in comparison to the other states in the country.

Like many other words representing complex concepts, development or prosperity also is a tag that encapsulates and represents a multidimensional connotation that an economic or spatial entity such as a country, state or district possesses and which may be described by an indefinite array of properties or characteristics oftentimes expressible in cardinal or ordinal numbers. When we say that a state A is more developed vis-à-vis state B, we usually mean that the former is more evolved, happy, powerful, resourceful, wealthy, etc. than the latter. To capture this multidimensionality of development, this study visualizes eight aspects of development, namely (i) availability of physical infrastructure related to transport, communication and power, (ii) industrial performance, (iii) social or institutional infrastructure relating to health and education, (iv) service sector relating to financial institutions and openness of the region as measured by performance of tourism sector, (v) human development relating to some demographic features, health, education and purchasing power, (vi) employment of the human resources, (vii) privatization of industry and investment and (viii) public efforts expressed in terms of govt. expenditure to facilitate promotion, maintenance and governance of development activities. All these aspects of development may be represented by a set of quantitative measures and thus each of these aspects of development is multidimensional in nature. The list of various indicators for quantification of development aspects has been presented in Table-1.

This effort on quantification of different aspects of prosperity does not assert that every aspect thereof can or should be quantified, nor does it assert that there are no aspects of development that warrant only qualitative or descriptive exposition. We fully agree with Adelman and Morris (1965, p.578) who assert: “[T]he purely economic performance of a community is strongly conditioned by the social and political setting in which economic activity takes place. ... [T]he splitting off of *homo economicus* into a separate analytic entity ... is much less suited to countries which have not yet made the transition to self-sustained economic growth.” The historical forces – the sequence of events that took place in political integration of the North Eastern states in the Indian nation and the manner in which the inhabitants of the North Eastern states have welcomed them bear vitally on the performance of development of these states and those influences can only be described and not quantified. It also may take note of the fact that quantification of development, especially in less developed regions, has its

own limitations since development and availability as well as reliability of quantitative indicators of development reciprocate each other. As Kuznets (1957, p. 548) has observed: "There is little question that, unless critically analyzed, much of the apparently quantitative record for the early periods of developed economies and even the current statistics for underdeveloped countries is almost worthless." Imposing too much structure (sophisticated statistical analysis presumes a number of conditions that the data must satisfy for the analysis to be applicable and yielding meaningful results) on deficient data may be unavailing (Fogel, 2001). Thus quantitative analysis of data without caution may be ineffective or misleading.

**4. Methodology:** It has already been mentioned that this study visualizes eight aspects of development that are multidimensional. However, it is well recognized that, like in case of all other objects that have multidimensional connotation, it is not always possible to establish an order relationship among different instances of the object on the basis of the criterion of development or prosperity. Therefore, for the sake of comprehension as well as practical purposes, it is often required that the multidimensional point is made to collapse into a single dimensional point, the latter being an image of the former. Such an exercise is necessarily an endeavor to represent the array of points by some sort of averages derived from them.

There is no single, unanimously acceptable and 'the best' method to represent the array of multidimensional points by their corresponding single dimensional points. The alternative methods, therefore, range between working out un-weighted (arithmetic or geometric) averages to weighed measures of central tendency in which weights are chosen subjectively/arbitrarily, determined by extraneous considerations or derived intrinsically so as to satisfy certain given criteria. The prevalent measures of human development apply the technique of un-weighted averages, whether arithmetic or geometric. The methods of principal component analysis (without rotation) and factor analysis (with varied schemes of extraction and rotation) are the methods of the last sort that derive weights intrinsically so as to satisfy certain given criteria.

Let us denote the array of single dimensional points (each point being a measure of the level of prosperity of an economic, geographical or political object such as a country or state) by  $Z$  which is an image (more often a linear combination) of the  $m$ -dimensional points,  $X$  such that  $z_i = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{ij} w_j$  where  $w_j$  is the weight assigned to the  $j^{th}$  characteristics of the  $i^{th}$  instance. If the weights are determined such that the sum of squared correlation between  $Z$  and  $x_j \in X$  or, alternatively stated,

$\sum_{j=1}^m r^2(Z, x_j)$ , is maximized, we obtain  $Z$  as the principal component based array of single dimensional points, called an index. Such  $Z$  attains the global maximum. Moreover, if there is another linear combination  $Y = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j v_j; v \neq w$  that attains a local maximum, then  $Z$  and  $Y$  is orthogonal or the coefficient of correlation between  $Z$  and  $Y$ ,  $r(Z, Y)$ , is zero. The method of principal component for constructing an index,  $Z$ , derived from  $X$  (an array of multidimensional points measuring some particular aspects of prosperity) is attributed to Hotelling (1933). Kuznets (1949) paved the way and provided a conceptual framework to represent and measure prosperity of economic-cum-spatio-political units by an array of variables measuring various aspects of prosperity (Syrquin, 2005). Adelman and Morris (1965, 1967) first applied factor analysis for measuring levels of development (Fagerberg & Srohlec, 2007).

**5. Empirical Findings:** The scores obtained by different states for various aspects of prosperity (development) have been presented in Table-2 and accordingly the ranks obtained by different states regarding various aspects of prosperity have been presented in Table-3.

From Table-3 it may be leant that in matters of physical infrastructure (INF) all the North Eastern states are placed at a below-median position, which is corresponded by their ranks in matters of industrialization (IND). Tripura is only an exception that it has occupied an above-median rank of 15, even with a poor state of infrastructure. In matters of privatization Assam is an exception (ranks 11), else all other states in the NER obtain below-median ranks. In other aspects we have a rather mixed scenario. In financial services, banking, and exposure to the state to visitors (SRV) Mizoram, Nagaland and Sikkim win above-median ranks while Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya and Tripura obtain below-median ranks. In matters of employment (EMP) Meghalaya and Mizoram are below-median states while other six states in the NER are placed in the above-median positions. Regarding human development (HUM) Arunachal Pradesh, Assam and Meghalaya rank below-median. In matters of public efforts to facilitate and maintain developmental activities (P-FIN) Assam, Manipur and Sikkim are placed at below-median positions. Incongruence among the different aspects of development shows rigidities, gaps, imbalances in priorities and the efforts made to promote different aspects in coordination with each other. It may also emerge on account of the physical differences that the states in the NER have with each other.

**6. The overall Level of Prosperity:** For obtaining the overall indices of prosperity, the sectoral or aspect-wise indices have been subjected to the principal component analysis. In this analysis two components have clearly emerged. The scores related to the 1<sup>st</sup> principal component are closely correlated with human development (HUM), services (SRV) and public finance (P-Fin) while the 2<sup>nd</sup> principal component scores are closely correlated with infrastructure (physical and institutional) and privatization. These indices and the ranks obtained by different states are presented in Table-4. According to the scores of component-I, two groups of states in the NE emerge. Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur and Meghalaya fall in the first group that obtain below-median ranks. The other four states are in the second group that lies above the median. According to the scores of component-II, none of the states obtain above-median rank. This clearly shows that in matters of infrastructure and privatization (that is closely correlated with industrialization and globalization) the NE states clearly lag behind. However, in matters of human development and services some NE states (Mizoram, Nagaland, Tripura and Sikkim) are better off. Such indications have been given in other research works (Govt. of Tripura, 2007; Nayak, 2010).

**Concluding Remarks:** Overall infrastructural development is observed to be unsatisfactory in the entire northeast. In spite of poor infrastructure the state of Tripura has done commendably well with respect to industrialization and Assam has gone ahead to encourage privatization. In other aspects of development such as banking, financial services, employment generation, tourism, human development and public efforts to facilitate and maintain developmental activities, there is a mixed finding among different states in the region. This is mainly due to rigidities, gaps, and imbalances in priorities and the efforts made to promote different aspects in coordination with each other. Success in achievement in better human development index in some states is mostly due to the contributions made by the missionaries and easy flow of funds from the Centre. Impact of globalization is unobservable or insignificant and privatization is at the back end for obvious reasons. Globalization and protection cannot go hand in hand. Private investment from within the region is not coming up and investment from outside is not encouraged due to protectionist attitude. Two important factors such as land and labor that are crucial to private investment are the major stumbling block in the region because of prevalent land laws and the so-called problems associated with migration of laborers from outside the region. How to resolve the contradiction between inner line permit systems, protection of indigenous cultures of the region, region's political integration with the rest of the country and economic integration with the rest of Asia is a matter to ponder.

## References:

- Adelman, I., Morris, C.T. (1965). "A Factor Analysis of the Interrelationship between Social and Political Variables and Per Capita Gross National Product" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 79(4): 555-578.
- Adelman, I., Morris, C.T. (1967). *Society, Politics and Economic Development*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.
- Fagerberg, J. and Srholec, M. (2007). "National innovation systems, capabilities and economic development" TIK Working Paper No. 20071024, Centre for Technology, Innovation and Culture, Univ. of Oslo. [http://www.sv.uio.no/tik/InnoWP/0710\\_TIKwp\\_FagerbergSrholec.pdf](http://www.sv.uio.no/tik/InnoWP/0710_TIKwp_FagerbergSrholec.pdf)
- Fogel, R. W. (2001), *Simon Kuznets, 1901-1985: A Biographical Memoir*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC.
- Govt. of Tripura (2007) *Tripura Human Development Report*, Agartala, Tripura.
- Hotelling, H. (1933). "Analysis of a Complex of Statistical Variables into Principal Components" *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 24: 417-441 and 498-520.
- Kuznets S. (1949). "Notes on the Quantitative Approach to Economic Growth" In Universities-National Bureau (ed.) *Problems in the Study of Economic Growth*, NBER, <http://www.nber.org/books/univ49-1>.
- Kuznets, S. (1957). Summary of Discussion and Postscript to W. W. Rostow, John R. Meyer, and Alfred H. Conrad – The Integration of Economic Theory and Economic History. *Journal of Economic History*, 17(4): 545-53.
- Nayak, P. (ed.) (2010) *Growth and Human Development in North East India*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Syrquin, M. (2005). "Kuznets and Modern Economic Growth Fifty Years Later" Conference paper at WIDER conference: *Thinking Ahead: The Future of Development Economics*, Helsinki.



<b>Table 1: Sector wise Variables used in constructing Prosperity Indices</b>	
<b>Sector</b>	<b>Variables used</b>
Infrastructure	(1). Registered motor vehicles PLP, (2). Power generation (MU) PLP, (3). Road length (kms) PLP, (4). Surface road length (kms) PLP, (5). Railway line length (kms) PLP, (6). Telephone connections PLP, (7). Percentage of villages electrified, (8). Per capita electricity consumption (kwh).
Industry	(1). No. of working factories submitting returns PLP, (2). Average daily no. of workers PLP, (3). No. of factories PLP, (4). Average daily employment PLP, (5). Gross fixed capital formation Rs. PLP, (6). Value addition in stock Rs/PLP, (7). Employment in public sector PLP, (8). Employment in private sector PLP.
Services, Banking, etc	(1). No. of domestic tourist visits PLP, (2). No. of foreign tourist visits PLP, (3). Small savings Rs. PLP, (4). No. of bank branches PLP, (5). Micro savings per SHG, (6). Micro savings per regional rural coop bank branch, (7). Microfinance distributed (commercial banks) per SHG, (8). Micro savings per branch of financial organization (all banks).
Human Development	(1). Birth rate, (2). Death rate, (3). Infant mortality rate, (4). Educational index, (5). Literacy rate, (6). Per capita NSDP at constant prices (2004-05)
Institutional Infrastructure	(1). Social sector spending as percent to total public spending, (2). Per capita health expenditure, (3). No. of govt. hospital beds PLP, (4). No. of doctors PLP, (5). Primary schools PLP, (6). Upper primary schools PLP, (7). Secondary schools PLP, (8). Higher secondary schools PLP.
Privatization	(1). Gross fixed capital formation in private sector PLP (current prices), (2). Growth rate of gross fixed capital formation in private sector (1999-2000 to 2005-06), 3. Ratio of employment in private sector to that in public sector.
Employment	(1). Registered unemployed per employment exchange units, (2). No. of workers (15+) according to usual status approach PLP (rural), (3). No. of workers (15+) according to usual status approach PLP (urban), (4). Employment in public sector PLP, (5). Employment in private sector PLP
Public Finance	(1). Per capita public expenditure (rural), (2). Per capita public expenditure (urban).
<i>Note: PLP = Per Lakh Population</i>	

<b>Table 2: State wise Prime Indices of Prosperity in different Sectors/ aspects in India</b>								
State/Union Territories	Indices of Prosperity of the States/ UT other than those in the North Eastern Region							
	INF	IND	SRV	HUM	I-INF	PVT	EMP	P-FIN
A & N Islands	-0.688	-0.389	0.480	0.886	1.683	-0.810	2.126	1.012
Andhra Pr.	0.142	0.395	-0.133	-0.462	-0.467	0.144	-0.571	-0.190
Bihar	-0.140	-0.991	-0.727	-1.962	-1.629	-0.215	-0.127	-1.700
Chandigarh	1.248	1.914	0.616	1.535	-0.302	0.413	1.323	1.448
Chhattisgarh	0.067	-0.591	-0.782	-1.302	-0.514	-2.116	-1.026	-0.818
D & N Haveli	0.444	-1.284	1.474	0.509	-0.623	0.686	-0.304	1.014
Daman & Diu	2.036	-0.725	1.739	1.137	-0.839	2.449	-1.069	1.448
Delhi	1.291	0.659	0.281	0.988	-0.187	0.366	0.066	-1.421
Goa	-0.302	3.304	4.402	1.336	0.833	0.840	2.307	1.448
Gujarat	0.691	0.563	-0.394	-0.053	-0.523	1.906	-0.987	-0.228
Haryana	0.901	0.765	0.077	-0.070	-0.358	0.535	-0.554	0.470
Himachal Pr.	-0.400	-0.356	0.237	0.268	2.404	0.106	-0.212	0.223
J & K	0.385	-0.641	-0.325	-0.379	0.174	-0.626	-0.220	-0.124
Jharkhand	-0.107	0.637	-0.632	-1.303	-1.390	-1.827	0.108	-1.027
Karnataka	0.094	0.496	-0.632	-0.104	-0.311	1.271	-0.507	0.073
Kerala	-0.389	0.406	-0.495	1.431	-0.753	0.702	0.741	1.948
L' dweep	-0.104	-0.657	0.748	1.003	1.261	-0.527	2.240	1.014
Madhya Pr.	0.478	-0.577	-0.666	-1.676	-0.473	-0.033	-0.796	-1.380
Maharashtra	0.878	0.596	-0.583	0.566	-0.746	1.042	-0.718	0.272
Odisha	-0.478	-0.637	-0.748	-1.302	-0.651	-1.137	-0.572	-1.009
Puducherry	0.810	0.558	0.825	0.996	0.832	0.980	-0.571	0.789
Punjab	1.036	0.779	-0.635	0.523	-0.488	0.437	-0.646	1.017
Rajasthan	0.070	-0.404	-0.480	-1.241	-0.359	0.139	-0.913	-0.841
Tamil Nadu	1.138	2.159	-0.062	0.388	-0.678	0.340	-1.256	-0.453
Uttar Pr.	0.315	-0.945	-0.492	-1.291	-1.173	-1.150	-0.495	-1.425
Uttarakhand	-0.129	-0.551	0.195	0.138	0.670	0.865	-0.549	-0.929
West Bengal	0.762	0.453	-0.608	-0.783	-1.051	0.331	0.264	-0.659
Indices of Prosperity of the States of the North Eastern Region								
Arunachal Pr.	-3.031	-0.748	-0.528	-0.484	0.703	-1.232	1.000	0.085
Assam	-0.441	-0.536	-0.762	-1.423	-0.530	0.500	-0.148	-0.441
Manipur	-0.835	-0.793	-0.641	0.672	0.726	-0.570	-0.164	-1.305
Meghalaya	-0.620	-0.868	-0.628	-1.117	0.664	-0.547	-0.575	0.552
Mizoram	-1.037	-0.749	-0.094	0.804	2.219	-0.799	-0.620	0.751
Nagaland	-2.179	-0.733	-0.215	0.790	-0.130	-0.845	0.191	1.158
Skkim	-0.253	-0.888	0.643	0.422	1.832	-1.243	1.235	-0.894
Tripura	-1.655	0.374	-0.456	0.561	0.172	-0.374	1.998	0.124
<i>Note:</i> INF- Infrastructure, IND- Industry, SRV- Services, HUM- Human, I-INF- Institutional Infrastructure, PVT- Privatization, EMP- Employment, P-FIN- Public Finance.								

<b>Table 3: State wise Ranks of Prosperity in different Sectors/ aspects in India</b>								
State/ Union Territories	Ranks of Prosperity of the States/ UT other than those in the North Eastern Region							
	INF	IND	SRV	HUM	I-INF	PVT	EMP	P-FIN
A & N Islands	30	17	8	8	4	28	3	9
Andhra Pr.	15	14	15	24	20	17	24	20
Bihar	22	34	32	35	35	21	13	35
Chandigarh	3	3	7	1	16	13	5	4
Chhattisgarh	18	22	35	31	23	35	33	25
D & N Haveli	12	35	3	15	26	9	18	8
Daman & Diu	1	26	2	4	31	1	34	3
Delhi	2	6	9	7	15	14	12	33
Goa	24	1	1	3	6	7	1	2
Gujarat	10	9	18	20	24	2	32	21
Haryana	26	16	10	18	1	19	16	15
Himachal Pr.	6	5	12	21	18	10	22	13
J& K	13	24	17	23	12	26	17	19
Jharkhand	20	7	28	32	34	34	11	30
Karnataka	16	11	27	22	17	3	20	18
Kerala	25	13	22	2	30	8	8	1
L' dweep	19	25	5	5	5	23	2	7
Madhya Pr.	11	21	31	34	21	20	30	32
Maharashtra	7	8	24	12	29	4	29	14
Odisha	28	23	33	30	27	30	25	29
Puducherry	8	10	4	6	7	5	23	10
Punjab	5	4	29	14	22	12	28	6
Rajasthan	17	18	20	28	19	18	31	26
Tamil Nadu	4	2	13	17	28	15	35	23
Uttar Pr.	14	33	21	29	33	31	19	34
Uttarakhand	21	20	11	19	10	6	21	28
West Bengal	9	12	25	26	32	16	9	24
Ranks of Prosperity of the States of the North Eastern Region								
Arunachal Pr.	35	28	23	25	9	32	7	17
Assam	27	19	34	33	25	11	14	22
Manipur	31	30	30	11	8	25	15	31
Meghalaya	29	31	26	27	11	24	26	12
Mizoram	32	29	14	9	2	27	27	11
Nagaland	34	27	16	10	14	29	10	5
Sikkim	23	32	6	16	3	33	6	27
Tripura	33	15	19	13	13	22	4	16

*Note:* INF- Infrastructure, IND- Industry, SRV- Services, HUM- Human, I-INF- Institutional Infrastructure, PVT- Privatization, EMP- Employment, P-FIN- Public Finance.

<b>Table 4: State wise Ranks of Prosperity in different Sectors/ aspects in India</b>									
Indices and Ranks of Overall Prosperity of the States/UT other than those in the North Eastern Region									
State/Union Territories	Component-I		Component-II		State/Union Territories	Component-I		Component-II	
	Index	Rank	Index	Rank		Index	Rank	Index	Rank
A & N Islands	0.980	6	-1.761	34	Karnataka	-0.003	20	0.758	9
Andhra Pr.	-0.269	22	0.493	13	Kerala	0.980	7	0.047	20
Bihar	-1.649	35	0.352	16	L' dweep	1.075	4	-1.397	32
Chandigarh	1.650	2	0.579	10	Madhya Pr.	-1.295	31	0.539	12
Chhattisgarh	-1.473	34	-0.235	24	Maharashtra	0.185	16	1.174	4
D & N Haveli	0.553	8	0.396	16	Odisha	-1.335	32	-0.226	23
Daman & Diu	1.224	3	1.918	1	Puducherry	1.017	5	0.576	11
Delhi	0.228	14	0.794	7	Punjab	0.343	11	0.954	5
Goa	3.143	1	-0.243	25	Rajasthan	-0.950	29	0.431	14
Gujarat	0.033	19	1.413	3	Tamil Nadu	0.196	16	1.492	2
Haryana	0.256	13	0.905	6	Uttar Pr.	-1.444	33	0.178	17
Himachal Pr.	0.398	9	-0.873	28	Uttarakhand	-0.128	21	0.105	19
J & K	-0.440	23	-0.136	22	West Bengal	-0.467	24	0.771	8
Jharkhand	-1.141	30	-0.040	21	-	-	-	-	-
Indices and Ranks of Overall Prosperity of the States of the North Eastern Region									
NE States	Component-I		Component-II		NE States	Component-I		Component-II	
	Index	Rank	Index	Rank		Index	Rank	Index	Rank
Arunachal Pr.	-0.488	25	-2.188	35	Mizoram	0.258	12	-1.341	31
Assam	-0.859	28	0.150	18	Nagaland	0.100	18	-1.325	29
Manipur	-0.527	26	-0.799	27	Sikkim	0.127	17	-1.529	33
Meghalaya	-0.637	27	-0.595	26	Tripura	0.360	10	-1.335	30

Note: Component-I and Component-II refer to the scores obtained from the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Principal Components.