

Chapter 14

Focus on Human Development

14.1 The New Development Paradigm

1. The development thinking and planning, and development strategies have been undergoing a change. Slowly but steadily we have been moving away from the relatively narrower notion of income-centred, mono-disciplinary economic development to the relatively broader notion of people and life-centred multi-disciplinary human development. Only four decades ago it would have been heresy to question the tacit assumption of the income-centred mainstream development paradigm, that the purpose of development is to increase national income. But today, it is widely accepted that the real purpose of development is to enlarge people's choices in all fields - economic, social, political and cultural. Mahbub Ul Haq, one of the principal architects of the new paradigm, says that seeking increases in income is one of the many choices people make, but it is not the only one. The income-centred paradigm, while according primacy of growth in income, slighted people, whereas the new one accords primacy of people without slighting growth in income. Besides, the new one is gender-generation-sensitive. People come to occupy the centre stage of development as 'subjects' as well as 'objects' of development; they are means as well as the ends of development. The new development paradigm, inter alia, puts higher accent on people's capabilities and freedom to live the life they value most.

2. The UNDP has developed Human Development Index (HDI) to measure human development. The HDI is a more comprehensive measure of development than GNP or GDP. It is some sort of a blend of GNP which measures economic progress and PQLI which measures social progress. The HDI would cover both economic and social choices of people. Longevity, knowledge and income are the three basic capabilities that make up the HDI. The first one is concerned with people's ability to live healthier lives for long by avoiding premature mortality, and preventable morbidity. The second one is concerned with people's ability to read and write by avoiding preventable ignorance and illiteracy. And the third one is concerned with people's ability to live a reasonable decent standard of living without being constrained by remediable poverty and deprivation through direct participation in the development process. The first variable is concerned with people's capability in terms of health, the second one with people's capability in terms of education / knowledge and third one with people's capability in terms of income / standard of living.

3. Our intention in this chapter is not to make a penetrating inquiry into the new human development paradigm. Our objective here is just to acquaint ourselves with the basics of the new paradigm since we use some of its components in assessing regional imbalances in social aspects development. Of course, our remedial measures also take note of the human development framework.

4. Mahbub Ul Haq begins his work "Reflections on Human Development" (1995) with the words, "the most difficult thing in life is to discover the obvious". Social infrastructure is one such obvious but significant variable in human development which remained undiscovered and under-focussed for quite some time in the past. After many decades of development, the development thinkers, researchers, and policy makers are discovering that social infrastructure comprising, among other things, health and education bases, has a decisive role in taking people to the centre stage of development. Owing to the

predominance of the growth-centred development paradigm, most of the research inquiries pertaining to regional imbalances, assessed regional imbalances by using growth facilitating indicators or growth-manifesting indicators or both. But today, it is not so. Attempts are being made to measure development imbalances not only by using the variables that go into the development paradigm in which growth matters but also by using the variables that go into the new development paradigm in which both growth and people matter. Our exercise is one such attempt.

5. Here it is pertinent to point out that social infrastructure has been acquiring increased focus with the coming into prominence of the theoretical and empirical works of Mahbub-Ul-Haq, and Amartya Sen (especially the latter's works on India and its States) and of the Human Development Reports regularly published annually by UNDP since 1990. This shift in focus is a reflection of the gradual shift that has been taking place from the income-centered mainstream development paradigm to people-centered and capability-oriented human development paradigm. Now it is being realised that without a sound social infrastructure, economic growth, per se, cannot translate itself into the lives of the people across the regions, classes, castes and gender; economic growth has to be consciously transformed into the lives of the people, otherwise, it will be endangered. There are countries and states which are better placed in terms of income levels but not so in terms of the quality of life. Karnataka is one such State in India. For example, as at 1998, Mysore district and Bellary district are placed at 5th and 10th ranks interms of per capita income respectively, whereas they are placed at 14th and 17th ranks respectively interms of Human Development. Probably, one of the important reasons for the distortion of this relationship between wealth and well being is inadequate attention paid to the development of social infrastructure through public policy on health and education. That way, regional imbalances in development may be understood, assessed and interpreted with reference to health and education facilities accessible to people inhabiting different regions and sub-regions. Thus, keeping redressal of regional imbalances in view, an attempt is made in this Chapter to assess regional disparities in social infrastructure, and based on the nature and extent of disparities, to suggest redressal measures.

14.2 Methodology

6. A composite index of social infrastructure is used to assess regional imbalances in development. It is made up of two indices – health index and education index. It is used to capture an overview of regional imbalances in social development. In a way it is an aggregate approach to the assesment of development distances. The discussions of this chapter continues in the next two chapters. Chapters 15 and 16 attempt to measure regional imbalances in social development by using aggregate as well as disaggregate approach – first by indices and then by the indicators that go into each of the two indices (health index and educational index). In all seven indicators are used to construct the Social Infrastructure Index (SII). Of the seven indicators, three indicators – Number of Doctors per 10,000 Population, Number of Government Hospital beds per 10,000 Population, and Percentage of Habitations having Drinking Water Facility of 40 LPCD or more- are compressed into the Health Infrastructure Index (HII), and four indictors – Literacy Rate, Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Percentage of Children out of school in 6-14 Age Group, and Number of Students Enrolled in Government and Government-Aided colleges per lakh Population, are compressed into the Education Infrastructure Index. Incidentally it is to be mentioned that in its First Phase of Recommendations to the Government of Karnataka, the HPC-FRRI had used only three indicators, namely, Number of Primary Schools per lakh Population, Literacy Rate, and

Number of Medical Institutions per lakh Population to assess regional imbalances in social sector (For details, see First Phase of Recommendations of HPC-FRRI 2001, Pp 112-142).

7. The present inquiry into the nature and extent of regional imbalances in social infrastructure facilities in Karnataka analyses imbalances at four areal levels - taluk, district, division, and region - among other things, with the twin objectives of assessing regional imbalances and suggesting redressal measures. With such ends in view, the taluks are classified into four district categories, namely, Relatively Developed, Backward, More Backward, and Most Backward, depending upon their relative levels of development/backwardness. For the purpose of demarcation of the taluks into different categories, the State average achievement is used as the benchmark with reference to each of the indices and indicators employed to assess imbalances. The taluks whose values of achievement are equal to higher than the State average are regarded as 'Relatively Developed' and the remaining taluks whose values are lower than the State average are split into three equal parts. The values below the State average of 1.0 vary from 0.31 to 0.99 in respect of health index and from 0.68 to 0.99 in the case of education index which by any standard highly dispersed. Classifying taluks below the value of 1.0 into categories of priority for resource allocation would have given us widely different numbers of taluks under each category. Therefore, with a view to facilitating any allocation of funds among the taluks which are backward, we have adopted the method of equal distribution of the taluks which fall below the State average into three parts. The taluks which figure in the first part which is closer to benchmark are regarded as 'Backward', those which figure in the middle part are regarded as 'More Backward', and those which figure in the last part are regarded as 'Most Backward'.

- The weightages assigned to all the seven individual indicators in the SII, and the weightage SII is assigned with in the overall Aggregate Development Index are given in the Methodology Chapter of the Report.
- This Chapter focuses on the functional aspects of social infrastructure facilities also. In this regard, we have made use of the following material:
 - i) “Study of Functionality of Infrastructure Facilities in Important Selected Sectors in Karnataka” (Jan. 2002) – a study done by the Directorate of Economics and Statistics for HPC with reference to sectors such as drinking water, health care facilities, and primary and higher primary education.
 - ii) The Final Report of the Task Force on Health and Family Welfare (April 2001).
 - iii) The Task Force Report on Education
 - iv) Commissioned Papers
 - v) Outcome of the district level and divisional level development interaction sessions held in the four divisions and 27 districts as a part of the study.
 - vi) The responses received from various individuals, NGOs, institutions, administrators, etc., to the questionnaires administered to them.
 - vii) The outcome of the discussions held with the chairmen of area development boards such as Hyderabad-Karnataka Area Development Board, Malnad Area Development Board and Bayaluseeme Development Board.

14.3 Social Infrastructure Index (SII)

8. Social infrastructure index, comprising health index and education index, is used in the present study to assess regional imbalances in social sector development. By and large, it is an index of people's basic capabilities; ability to live healthier lives for long by escaping avoidable morbidity and premature mortality, and ability to read, write and understand. These capabilities, it is to be pointed out, have instrumental as well as intrinsic value in expanding people's choices to participate in the development process. As such, social infrastructure has a determining role in the level of development/ backwardness of any given region. An assessment of regional imbalances would be of use in suggesting redressal measures to initiate and accelerate the forces of convergence. To a considerable extent, regional imbalances are attributable to imbalances in social infrastructure. Karnataka does present, as the following discussion unfolds, a sad spectacle of maldistribution of social infrastructure facilities.

9. The data pertaining to the social infrastructure index are presented in three tables (one appendix table and two derived tables). Annexure table 14.1 presents the index values of all the 175 taluks. By ranking the taluks based on their values, it shows the relative positions of the taluks in the development/backwardness scale. The ranking also tells us how far or how near each and every taluk is from the State average development of social infrastructure. Table 14.1 presents an important aspect of regional imbalances; it gives us an idea as to the proportion of their taluks that the divisions and regions have in each of the four categories. That way it throws light on the extent of development/ deprivation spatially. And Table 14.2 gives a classified presentation of taluks by their names across the four categories against each of the 27 districts.

Table 14.1

**Social Infrastructure Index: Classification of Taluks into Relatively Developed, Backward, More Backward, and Most Backward Taluks
by Divisions and Regions in Karnataka.**

| Sl. No | Division/Region | Relatively Developed Taluks | | | Backward Taluks | | | More Backward Taluks | | | Most Backward Taluks | | | Total Taluks | |
|--------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-----------------|---|---|----------------------|---|---|----------------------|---|---|--------------|------------|
| | | No | Percentage share in the total taluks of the Division/Region | Percentage share in the total taluks of the State | No | Percentage share in the total taluks of the Division/Region | Percentage share in the total taluks of the State | No | Percentage share in the total taluks of the Division/Region | Percentage share in the total taluks of the State | No | Percentage share in the total taluks of the Division/Region | Percentage share in the total taluks of the State | No | Percentage |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 1 | Banga-lore | 15 | 29.41 | 25.00 | 19 | 37.26 | 48.72 | 15 | 29.41 | 39.47 | 2 | 3.92 | 5.26 | 51 | 100.00 |
| 2 | Mysore | 24 | 54.55 | 40.00 | 13 | 29.54 | 33.33 | 07 | 15.91 | 18.42 | Nil | Nil | Nil | 44 | 100.00 |
| | SKR | 39 | 41.05 | 65.00 | 32 | 33.68 | 82.05 | 22 | 23.16 | 57.89 | 2 | 2.11 | 5.26 | 95 | 100.00 |
| 3 | Belgaum | 19 | 38.78 | 31.67 | 05 | 10.20 | 12.82 | 13 | 26.53 | 34.21 | 12 | 24.49 | 31.58 | 49 | 100.00 |
| 4 | Gulbarga | 2 | 06.45 | 3.33 | 02 | 06.45 | 5.13 | 03 | 9.68 | 7.90 | 24 | 77.42 | 63.16 | 31 | 100.00 |
| | NKR | 21 | 26.25 | 35.00 | 07 | 8.75 | 17.95 | 16 | 20.00 | 42.11 | 36 | 45.00 | 94.74 | 80 | 100.00 |
| | Karnat-aka | 60 | 34.29 * | 100.00 | 39 | 22.29 * | 100.00 | 38 | 21.71 * | 100.00 | 38 | 21.71 * | 100.00 | 175 | 100.00 |

Source : Derived from Annexure 14.1

Note : SKR: South Karnataka Region

NKR: North Karnataka Region

* The figures indicate the proportion of taluks in the State in the respective categories.

Table 14.2

Social Infrastructure Index: Classification of Taluks into Relatively Developed, Backward, More Backward, and Most Backward Taluks by Districts in Karnataka.

| Sl. No. | Districts | Relatively Developed Taluks | Backward Taluks | More Backward Taluks | Most Backward Taluks |
|----------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 | Bangalore Urban | 1. Bangalore (N) 2. Bangalore (S) | Nil | Nil | 1. Anekal |
| 2 | Bangalore Rural | 1. Nelamangala | 1.Chennapatana 2. Ramanagaram 3. Kanakapura 4. Magadi 5. Doddaballapur | 1. Hoskote 2.Devanahalli | Nil |
| 3 | Chitradurga | 1.Chitradurga 2. Hiriyur | 1. Hosadurga 2. Challakere | 1. Holalkere 2. Molekalmuru | Nil |
| 4. | Davanagere | 1.Davanagere | 1. Channagiri | 1. Harapanahalli 2. Harihara 3. Honnali 4. Jagalur | Nil |
| 5 | Kolar | 1.Kolar 2.Chintamani 3. Bangarpet | 1.Mulbagal 2. Gawribidanur 3.Srinivasapur 4. Chickkaballapur 5. Gudibanda 6. Bagepalli | 1.Malur 2.Sidlaghatta | Nil |
| 6 | Shimoga | 1.Shimoga 2.Thirthahalli 3. Sagara 4. Bhadravathi | 1.Hosanagara 2. Shikaripura | 1.Soraba | Nil |
| 7 | Tumkur | 1.Tumkur 2. Tiptur | 1. Koratagere 2. C.N.Halli 3. Turuvekere | 1.Madhugiri 2. Gubbi 3. Sira 4.Kunigal | 1. Pavagada |
| | Bangalore Division | 15 | 19 | 15 | 2 |
| 8 | Chamarajanagar | Nil | 1.Kollegal 2.Gundalpet 3.Yelandur | 1. Chamarajanagar | Nil |

Contd...

| Sl. No. | Districts | Relatively Developed Taluks | Backward Taluks | More Backward Taluks | Most Backward Taluks |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9 | Chickmangalur | 1. Sringeri 2. Koppa 3. Mudigeri. 4.N.R. Pura 5.Chickmangalur | 1.Kadur | 1. Tarikere | Nil |
| 10 | D. Kannada | 1.Mangalore 2.Suly 3.Puttur 4. Belthangadi | 1. Buntwal | Nil | Nil |
| 11 | Hassan | 1. Hassan 2. Sakaleshpur 3. Holearasipura 4. Arasikere | 1. Alur 2. Channarayapatna 3. Arakalgudu | 1. Belur | Nil |
| 12 | Kodagu | 1.Madikere 2.Virajpet 3. Somwarpet | Nil | Nil | Nil |
| 13 | Mandya | 1.Mandya 2. Malavalli | 1. Maddur | 1.Srirangapattana 2.Pandvapura 3.Nagamangala 4.Krishnarajpet | Nil |
| 14 | Mysore | 1.Mysore 2. K.R.Nagar 3. Hunsur | 1. T.Narasipura 2.Nanjanagud 3. Periyapatna 4. H.D.Kote | Nil | Nil |
| 15 | Udupi | 1.Karkala 2.Udupi 3.Kundapur | Nil | Nil | Nil |
| | Mysore Division | 24 | 13 | 07 | Nil |
| | South Karnataka Region | 39 | 32 | 22 | 02 |
| 16 | Bagalkot | 1.Bagalkot 2. Hunagund | Nil | 1.Mudhol 2.Jamakhandi 3. Badami | 1. Bilgi |

Contd....

| Sl. No. | Districts | Relatively Developed Taluks | Backward Taluks | More Backward Taluks | Most Backward Taluks |
|---------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 17 | Belgaum | 1.Belgaum | Nil | 1.Bailhongala | 1.Soundathi 2. Ramadurga 3. Chikkodi 4. Khanapura 5. Athani 6.Hukkeri 7. Gokak 8. Raibagh |
| 18 | Bijapur | 1.Bijapur | Nil | 1.Muddebihal 2. Basavana Bagewadi | 1.Sindgi 2.Indi |
| 19 | Dharwad | 1.Hubli 2.Dharwad | Nil | 1.Navalgund 2. Kundagol | 1. Kalghatgi |
| 20 | Gadag | 1. Gadag | 1.Ron 2.Mundargi | 1.Shirahatti 2.Naragund | Nil |
| 21 | Haveri | 1.Ranebennur 2.Shiggaon | 1.Haveri 2.Hirekerur 3. Byadagi | 1. Savanur 2. Hangal | Nil |
| 22 | Uttar Kannada | 1.Karwar 2.Supa 3. Ankola 4. Kumta 5. Mundagod 6. Siddapur 7. Yellapur 8. Haliyal 9. Honnavar 10. Sirsi | Nil | 1.Bhatkal | Nil |
| | Belgaum Division | 19 | 05 | 13 | 12 |
| 23 | Bellary | 1.Bellary | 1.Hospet | 1.Hadagalli 2.Kudligi | 1. H.B. Halli 2. Sandur 3. Siruguppa |
| 24 | Bidar | Nil | 1.Bidar | Nil | 1. Bhalki 2. Aurad 3. Humnabad 4.Basava kalyana |

Contd...

| Sl. No. | Districts | Relatively Developed Taluks | Backward Taluks | More Backward Taluks | Most Backward Taluks |
|---------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 25 | Gulbarga | 1.Gulbarga | Nil | Nil | 1.Sedam 2. Jewargi 3. Yadgiri 4. Afzalpur 5. Aland 6. Shorapura 7. Shahapur 8. Chittapur 9. Chincholi |
| 26 | Koppal | Nil | Nil | Nil | 1.Kushtigi 2. Koppal 3. Yelburga 4. Gangavathi |
| 27 | Raichur | Nil | Nil | 1.Raichur | 1.Lingsugur 2. Sindhanur 3. Devadurga 4. Manvi |
| | Gulbarga Division | 02 | 02 | 03 | 24 |
| | North Karnataka Region | 21 | 07 | 16 | 36 |
| | Karnataka State | 60 | 39 | 38 | 38 |

Source: Annexure 14.1

10. From the data, we may draw the following inferences regarding regional disparities in social infrastructure:

- (i) There are considerable variations in the index values of the taluks. The index value varies from a low of 0.49 in Manvi to a high of 2.06 in Hubli, as against the State average value of 1.00. Regionally, both the taluks belong to North Karnataka Region (NKR), and intra - regionally, the former belongs to Gulbarga division and the latter to Belgaum division.
- (ii) The data do not lend support to the popular view that entire NKR is backward; they do show the presence of backward pockets in SKR also. Of course, backwardness is more pronounced in NKR.

- (iii) Inter-regionally, SKR's position is better than that of NKR's. With 45% of its taluks in the Most Backward Category, 20% in the More Backward Category, 8.75% in the Backward Category, and 26.25% in the Relatively Developed Category, NKR emerges as the most backward region in Karnataka. On the contrary, the corresponding figures for SKR are 2.11%, 23.16%, 33.68% and 41.05% respectively. (Table – 14.1)
- (iv) Among the divisions, Gulbarga, with only 6.45% of its taluks in the Relatively Developed Category, on the one hand, and 77.42% of its taluks in the Most Backward Category, on the other emerges as the Most Backward division not only in NKR, but also in the State. At the other end of the scale there is Mysore, which has 54.55% of its taluks in the Relatively Developed Category and none in the Most Backward Category. (Table – 14.1)
- (v) Among the districts, Kodagu and Udupi with all their taluks in the Relatively Developed Category, Uttara Kannada, Dakshina Kannada, Chickmagalur and Bangalore Urban with 91%, 80%, 71% and 67% of their taluks respectively in that category emerge as the relatively better placed districts in the State. On the contrary, Koppal with all its taluks in the Most Backward category, Gulbarga, with 90% of its taluks, Belgaum, Raichur and Bidar with 80% of their taluks in that category, emerge as the relatively lagging districts in Karnataka. Further, there are 16 districts which have none of their taluks in the Most Backward category. Of them 13 belong to SKR and only three to NKR. (Table – 14.2).

11. As far as redressal measures are concerned, 38 taluks of the Most Backward category (36 taluks of NKR and two taluks of SKR) attract redressal measures in the first phase, 38 taluks of the More Backward category (16 taluks of NKR and 22 taluks of SKR) attract remedial measures in the second phase, and 39 taluks of the Backward category (7 taluks of NKR and 32 taluks of SKR) warrant remedial action in the third phase (See ch 6 Annexure 6.4).

Annexure 14.1**Infrastructure (Social) Index: Relative Position of the Taluks**

| Rank | District | Taluk Name | Index |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Dharwad | Hubli | 2.06 |
| 2 | Mysore | Mysore | 1.82 |
| 3 | Kodagu | Madikeri | 1.78 |
| 4 | Chickamagalore | Sringeri | 1.68 |
| 5 | Uttarakannada | Karwar | 1.60 |
| 6 | Udupi | Karkala | 1.59 |
| 7 | D.Kannada | Mangalore | 1.55 |
| 8 | Hassan | Hassan | 1.52 |
| 9 | D.Kannada | Puttur | 1.47 |
| 10 | Shimoga | Shimoga | 1.42 |
| 11 | Chitradurga | Chitradurga | 1.40 |
| 12 | Davanagere | Davanagere | 1.36 |
| 13 | Kodagu | Virajpet | 1.34 |
| 14 | Kolar | Kolar | 1.33 |
| 15 | Udupi | Udupi | 1.32 |
| 16 | D.Kannada | Sullya | 1.32 |
| 17 | Shimoga | Thirthahalli | 1.31 |
| 18 | Bagalkote | Bagalkote | 1.29 |
| 19 | Uttarakannada | Supa (Joida) | 1.26 |
| 20 | Gulbarga | Gulbarga | 1.25 |
| 21 | Tumkur | Tumkur | 1.24 |
| 22 | Bellary | Bellary | 1.23 |
| 23 | Chickamagalore | Koppa | 1.22 |
| 24 | Mandya | Mandya | 1.22 |
| 25 | Uttarakannada | Sirsi | 1.21 |
| 26 | Hassan | Sakaleshpura | 1.20 |
| 27 | Dharwad | Dharwad | 1.19 |
| 28 | Bangalore(U) | Bangalore (N) | 1.19 |
| 29 | Uttarakannada | Ankola | 1.17 |
| 30 | Kolar | Chintamani | 1.16 |
| 31 | Bangalore(U) | Bangalore (S) | 1.16 |
| 32 | Bijapur | Bijapur | 1.16 |

Contd...

| Rank | District | Taluk Name | Index |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 33 | Uttarakannada | Kumta | 1.15 |
| 34 | Hassan | Holenarasipura | 1.15 |
| 35 | Uttarakannada | Mundagod | 1.14 |
| 36 | Tumkur | Tiptur | 1.13 |
| 37 | Chickamagalore | Mudigere | 1.12 |
| 38 | Mandya | Malavalli | 1.12 |
| 39 | Udupi | Kundapur | 1.12 |
| 40 | Uttarakannada | Siddapur | 1.10 |
| 41 | Kodagu | Somwarpet | 1.10 |
| 42 | Haveri | Ranebennur | 1.09 |
| 43 | Bagalkote | Hunagund | 1.08 |
| 44 | Uttarakannada | Yellapur | 1.08 |
| 45 | Belgaum | Belgaum | 1.08 |
| 46 | Mysore | K.R.Nagar | 1.08 |
| 47 | Kolar | Bangarpet | 1.07 |
| 48 | Shimoga | Sagara | 1.07 |
| 49 | Hassan | Arasikere | 1.07 |
| 50 | Gadag | Gadag | 1.07 |
| 51 | Uttarakannada | Haliyal | 1.06 |
| 52 | Haveri | Shiggaon | 1.06 |
| 53 | Chickamagalore | Narasimharajapura | 1.05 |
| 54 | Uttarakannada | Honnavar | 1.05 |
| 55 | Chitradurga | Hiriyur | 1.04 |
| 56 | Chickamagalore | Chickamagalore | 1.04 |
| 57 | D.Kannada | Belthangadi | 1.02 |
| 58 | Mysore | Hunsur | 1.02 |
| 59 | Shimoga | Bhadravathi | 1.02 |
| 60 | Bangalore (R) | Nelamangala | 1.00 |
| 61 | Mysore | T.Narasipur | 0.99 |
| 62 | Haveri | Haveri | 0.99 |
| 63 | Mysore | Nanjanagud | 0.98 |
| 64 | Mysore | Periyapatna | 0.98 |
| 65 | Bangalore (R) | Chennapatna | 0.97 |

Contd...

| Rank | District | Taluk Name | Index |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 66 | Kolar | Mulbagal | 0.97 |
| 67 | Bidar | Bidar | 0.96 |
| 68 | Gadag | Ron | 0.96 |
| 69 | Bangalore (R) | Ramanagaram | 0.95 |
| 70 | Shimoga | Hosanagara | 0.95 |
| 71 | Chickamagalore | Kadur | 0.94 |
| 72 | Kolar | Gowribidanur | 0.94 |
| 73 | Bangalore (R) | Kanakapura | 0.94 |
| 74 | Hassan | Alur | 0.94 |
| 75 | Bangalore (R) | Magadi | 0.94 |
| 76 | Shimoga | Shikaripura | 0.93 |
| 77 | Kolar | Srinivaspura | 0.93 |
| 78 | Gadag | Mundaragi | 0.92 |
| 79 | Hassan | Channarayapatna | 0.92 |
| 80 | Kolar | Chickkaballapur | 0.92 |
| 81 | Haveri | Hirekerur | 0.92 |
| 82 | Chamarajanagar | Kollegal | 0.92 |
| 83 | Chamarajanagar | Gundlpet | 0.92 |
| 84 | D.Kannada | Buntwal | 0.91 |
| 85 | Mysore | H.D.Kote | 0.91 |
| 86 | Bangalore (R) | Doddaballapur | 0.91 |
| 87 | Hassan | Arakalgod | 0.90 |
| 88 | Tumkur | Koratagere | 0.90 |
| 89 | Tumkur | C.N.Halli | 0.90 |
| 90 | Chitradurga | Hosadurga | 0.90 |
| 91 | Bellary | Hospet | 0.90 |
| 92 | Chamarajanagar | Yelandur | 0.90 |
| 93 | Haveri | Byadagi | 0.90 |
| 94 | Mandya | Maddur | 0.89 |
| 95 | Kolar | Gudibanda | 0.89 |
| 96 | Tumkur | Turuvekere | 0.88 |
| 97 | Kolar | Bagepalli | 0.88 |
| 98 | Chitradurga | Challakere | 0.88 |
| 99 | Davanagere | Channagiri | 0.88 |
| 100 | Davanagere | Harappanahalli | 0.88 |
| 101 | Bijapur | Muddebihal | 0.88 |
| 102 | Raichur | Raichur | 0.87 |

Contd...

| Rank | District | Taluk Name | Index |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 103 | Shimoga | Soraba | 0.87 |
| 104 | Davanagere | Harihara | 0.86 |
| 105 | Bellary | Hadagalli | 0.86 |
| 106 | Bagalkote | Mudhol | 0.86 |
| 107 | Belgaum | Bailhongala | 0.86 |
| 108 | Haveri | Savanur | 0.86 |
| 109 | Gadag | Shirahatti | 0.86 |
| 110 | Chitradurga | Holalkere | 0.85 |
| 111 | Gadag | Naragund | 0.85 |
| 112 | Bagalkote | Jamakhandi | 0.85 |
| 113 | Hassan | Belur | 0.84 |
| 114 | Chitradurga | Molakalmuru | 0.84 |
| 115 | Dharwad | Navalgund | 0.83 |
| 116 | Bangalore (R) | Devanahalli | 0.82 |
| 117 | Davanagere | Honnali | 0.82 |
| 118 | Bangalore (R) | Hosakote | 0.81 |
| 119 | Uttarakannada | Bhatkal | 0.81 |
| 120 | Mandya | Srirangapattana | 0.81 |
| 121 | Mandya | Nagamangala | 0.81 |
| 122 | Haveri | Hanagal | 0.81 |
| 123 | Davanagere | Jagalur | 0.81 |
| 124 | Bellary | Kudlugi | 0.81 |
| 125 | Kolar | Malur | 0.81 |
| 126 | Chickamagalore | Tarikere | 0.80 |
| 127 | Mandya | Pandavapura | 0.80 |
| 128 | Tumkur | Madhugiri | 0.78 |
| 129 | Chamarajanagar | Chamarajanagar | 0.77 |
| 130 | Kolar | Sidlaghatta | 0.77 |
| 131 | Bagalkote | Badami | 0.76 |
| 132 | Tumkur | Gubbi | 0.75 |
| 133 | Bijapur | B Bagewadi | 0.75 |
| 134 | Tumkur | Sira | 0.74 |
| 135 | Mandya | Krishnarajpet | 0.74 |
| 136 | Dharwad | Kundagol | 0.74 |
| 137 | Tumkur | Kunigal | 0.74 |
| 138 | Belgaum | Soundatti | 0.74 |
| 139 | Gulbarga | Sedam | 0.73 |

Contd...

| Rank | District | Taluk Name | Index |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| 140 | Bijapur | Sindgi | 0.73 |
| 141 | Bangalore(U) | Anekal | 0.72 |
| 142 | Belgaum | Ramdurg | 0.72 |
| 143 | Belgaum | Chikkodi | 0.72 |
| 144 | Koppal | Koppal | 0.72 |
| 145 | Bellary | H.B.Halli | 0.72 |
| 146 | Gulbarga | Jevargi | 0.71 |
| 147 | Belgaum | Khanapur | 0.71 |
| 148 | Bidar | Bhalki | 0.71 |
| 149 | Gulbarga | Yadgiri | 0.70 |
| 150 | Tumkur | Pavagada | 0.69 |
| 151 | Belgaum | Athani | 0.68 |
| 152 | Raichur | Lingsugar | 0.68 |
| 153 | Koppal | Kushtagi | 0.68 |
| 154 | Koppal | Yelburga | 0.67 |
| 155 | Belgaum | Hukkeri | 0.67 |
| 156 | Bidar | Aurad | 0.66 |
| 157 | Dharwad | Kalghatagi | 0.66 |
| 158 | Gulbarga | Afzalpur | 0.65 |
| 159 | Bidar | Humnabad | 0.65 |
| 160 | Gulbarga | Aland | 0.65 |
| 161 | Belgaum | Gokak | 0.64 |
| 162 | Bidar | Basavakalyan | 0.64 |
| 163 | Koppal | Gangavathi | 0.64 |
| 164 | Raichur | Sindanur | 0.64 |
| 165 | Bijapur | Indi | 0.64 |
| 166 | Gulbarga | Shorapur | 0.64 |
| 167 | Bellary | Sandur | 0.62 |
| 168 | Bagalkote | Bilagi | 0.60 |
| 169 | Gulbarga | Shahapur | 0.60 |
| 170 | Bellary | Siriguppa | 0.57 |
| 171 | Gulbarga | Chittapur | 0.57 |
| 172 | Gulbarga | Chincholi | 0.56 |
| 173 | Raichur | Devdurga | 0.55 |
| 174 | Belgaum | Raibagh | 0.53 |
| 175 | Raichur | Manavi | 0.49 |

Source: High Power Committee for Redressal of Regional Imbalances, Govt. of Karnataka.