



## **RURAL – URBAN DISPARITIES IN HEALTH AND EDUCATION – A STUDY IN SELECTED DISTRICTS OF TELANGANA STATE**

**Asst. Prof. M. Sambaiah**

*Asst. Professor, in Commerce and Business Management, Chaitanya Institute of Science of  
Technology (Deemed to be University), Warangal.*



*Scholarly Research Journal's* is licensed Based on a work at [www.srjis.com](http://www.srjis.com)

It is also a well-established and documented fact that balanced regional development has been one of the proclaimed goals of our country. Infact, the successive governments have repeatedly stressed the need for reducing regional imbalances. So at the completion of nearly ten decades of planning, it is only legitimate to ask whether we are on the way to reducing rural and urban disparities?

Broadly our planning methodology is pre-dominantly a macro approach where planning and decision making powers remain centralized. The growing regional consciousness visible in many parts of our country also makes it clear that planning objectives and means for achieving them determined in a national capital or state capital cannot hope to meet social needs as they are seen and felt within each region. Experience reveals that while it may be workable to set plan objectives in the centre of governments, where local needs are unimportant, it is not likely to be workable for objectives directed towards meeting social needs at the grass roots. Despite the fact that quite efficient methods and techniques have been developed, this approach suffers from the weakness of putting of much emphasis on macro economic aggregative indicators of development.

The levels of at which planning, in the sense of decision making, should be undertaken have always attracted the attention of economists, planners and policy makers in India. D.R.Gadgil<sup>1</sup> advocated that district to be the centre of planning and had suggested for the division of districts into smaller homogenous units involving integration through what is known as mandi centre approach. Another economist V.K.R.V. Rao<sup>2</sup> has suggested the creation of economic areas within the district to act as the level of grass root planning. Prof.S.Chakaravarthy<sup>3</sup>, as early as in seventies accepted only the states and the district as decision making levels. K.N.Raj<sup>4</sup> has emphasized that planning should be from below, encompassing the district, block or village level.

Notwithstanding difference in economic systems or stage of development, existence of disparities between the rural and urban areas is a normal feature in our country. The magnitude and nature of inequality differ within a nation between rural and urban areas. Perfect equality is neither possible nor desirable. Complaint is often voiced in highly skewed distribution. The skewness may be seen among social classes, regions and areas with regard incomes, wealth or consumption. Needless to mention that high and widening disparities tantamount to exploitation and aggravate social and political tensions.

Drewnowski and Scott<sup>5</sup> developed a level of living index which was specially aimed at measuring 'basic needs' fulfillment. Basic needs comprises physical needs (nutrition, shelter and health) and cultural needs (education, leisure and security). Obviously, the data an amount of leisure, etc., would not be available and hence it is very difficult to construct such an index. Mc.Granahan<sup>6</sup>, after examining 73 indicators from economic and social areas found that there were a fairly high inter-correlations among these variables. After elimination, he constructed an index using in social indicators and nine economic indicators and concluded that social development occurred at a more rapid pace than economic development.

In order to supplement or correct per capita GNP, some researchers began to use varies development indicators reflecting or representing various facets of development. Adelman and Morris<sup>7</sup> study to gain more precise empirical knowledge about the inter-dependence of economic and non-economic (particularly institutional) aspects of the development process. They juxtaposed 40 indicators belonging to political, social and economic fields, along with per capita, the indicators, viz., strength of democratic institutions, political strength of traditional elite, character of basic social organization etc., were qualitative in nature. Factor analysis was used to throw light on the nexus between the social and political variables on one hand and the level of economic development on the other.

Harbison<sup>8</sup> and his colleagues did quantitative analysis of human resource development using the taxonomic method earlier developed by Polish mathematicians in the 1950's and later developed by Hellwig<sup>9</sup>. Indicators were converted to a common scale by process of standardization based on the mean and standard deviation of each indicator. Countries were classified into homogenous groups by calculating the numerical distance on each variable. The pattern of development for each country was measured by ranking of differences on each variable from the ideal country in each group. A measure of development

*Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*

was obtained by calculating the percentage distribution from the ideal, for each indicator. The method, therefore, is essentially classificatory covering relatively small but an important area development<sup>10</sup>.

Morris<sup>11</sup> developed an index known as physical quality life index (PQLI). The PQLI is based on only three indicators viz., literacy, infant mortality and life expectancy at age one, which are indicative of 'basic needs' fulfillment in education. The emphasis of the index is on results rather than inputs. He gives equal weight age to the three indicators in the index, which is considered by some people as arbitrary. The term 'quality of life' is perhaps a misnomer, since what is really measured is the effectiveness in reducing mortality, raising literacy and life expectancy. But the advantages of using PQLI are many. It facilitates inter-state, inter-district comparisons over time. Even it can applied to various social classes living in the same region. Secondary, since the indicators are all non-monetary indicators, it obviates the necessity of adjustments for differences in purchasing power of national currencies.

Ahluwalia and Chenery<sup>12</sup> have suggested that the growth of GNP in itself is a misleading indicator of development, since it is heavily weighted by the income shares of the rich. A growth of ten percent in the income of the upper 20 percent have more impact on the aggregate rate of growth than a growth than a growth of 10 percent in the income of lower 20 percent. They suggest two alternatives; either the equal weighting of each decline on income recipients or the introduction of poverty weights, which would place more weight on the growth of incomes of tower 40 percent. The result is a revised aggregate growth rate, which makes an allowance for differences and changes in income distribution.

Professor Merrial K.Bennet's<sup>13</sup> attempt to construct a non-monetary index of development to compare consumption levels of various countries and implicitly their stages of development is noteworthy. In his work, consumption was broken into five components viz., 1) Food; 2) Medical and sanitary services; 3) Housing and Clothing; 4) Education and Recreation; and 5) Transportation and Communications. For each component at least two indicators were used. However, Adalman<sup>14</sup> et. al., sought to refine Bennet's analysis. For example, they suggested per capita news print consumption is a more reliable indicator than the number of pieces of mail circulated per capita as was originally used by Bennet. In addition to a score of indicators of the main components of consumption, they suggested that two balancing items should be used in order to reduce bias in favour of either industrialized or agricultural economics. These items are, total energy consumed per capita

*Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*

and livestock units per capita. Further, they suggested that these nonmonetary indices should be juxtaposed with per capita income data.

Of late, there has been a revival of emphasis on the development of the rural economy. This is evident from the fact that planners and policy makers are making specific resource allocation in the plan for rural development. While it is not known on what allocation criterion, 50 percent outlay on rural development is being mentioned in the Eighth Five Year Plan document as something that must be achieved. Seldom do we come across the recognition of the need for rural-urban balance as an important inter-sectorial balance in the process of development.

The strategies of rural and urban development, in other words, should aim at balanced rural and urban development (BRUD)<sup>15</sup>. It is only, of late, the term integrated Rural Development (IRD) has come to be heard, which is neither rural nor integrated but pertains to rural poverty alleviation exclusively. No doubt, poverty alleviation is an important but the IRDP in vogue presently is not really an integrated development strategy pertaining to the rural areas.

“The Government has been experimenting with various programmes in one form or the other to alleviate rural poverty. During the span of the three and a half decades of planned development it had innovated, initiated and implemented various schemes to develop a self sustaining rural development”<sup>16</sup>. Regarding urban development. There is as yet no strategy of integrated urban development (IUD) even in name of not in form. This is in spite of the high urbanization.

It is surprising that the urban population, which is rising as a proportion of the total population (17.3% to 23.3%), and which presently numbers a quite massive 160 million is still left without an IUDB (Integrated Urban Development Strategy) even in name as noted. This is a glaring omission in our planning.

The result of the lack of proper rural and urban development strategies can be well imagined to be the rural and urban population still greatly stepped in among other things, illiteracy, ill-health, poverty and lack of basic civic needs about which our villages and towns and cities are very badly effected. The need, therefore, obviously, is for really integrated strategies of rural and urban development, which will result in balanced, integrated rural and urban development, rural and urban. These strategies, as we started with, should aim at human and material development. In these strategies, public goods like roads, schools, hospitals, ration shops, drinking water facilities and so on play major roles.

*Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*

The strategies in other words, should have human face, without which they cannot benefit the people, rural or urban as a whole<sup>17</sup>. It may be said that adhocism greatly mark the present strategies of rural and urban development. For this, there is a great need to really evolve really integrated and balanced strategies of Rural Urban Development (RUD) Bid the current rural urban debate is an opportune time to accomplish this act<sup>18</sup>.

It is a well known fact that Education and Health are important indicator for development and infact many economists had emphasized the importance of these sectors in the human resource development. Hence, an attempt has been made in this study to find out the availability of educational and medical facilities both in rural urban areas of selected districts of formed Telangana State.

Table - 1 indicates the level of literacy position in rural and urban population of Telangana region. Only 34 percent of the entire population of the region is found to be literates. Whereas in Andhra and Rayalaseema regions, of literates (percentage-wise) is found to be 38.98 and 37.58 respectively. Even the State as a whole, the percentage of literacy is found to be only 36.82. Thus, Telangana region is backward in education field even compared to that of Rayalaseema.

Total literates in rural areas of Telangana region is found to be only 15 percent population in the rural areas are literates. Surprisingly rural areas of Ranga Reddy district is not having even 13 percent literates. Interestingly, in Nalgonda district, literates in rural areas are more compared to other rural areas of the districts of the region. Warangal occupied second position (19.68 percent literates in rural areas) and percentage of literates in rural areas of Khammam and Karimnagar district is almost the same, i.e., less than 18 percentage.

Except in two districts namely Hyderabad and Ranga Reddy, literacy rate in all other urban areas of the districts is lesser than the region average. In the case of Hyderabad, urban literacy in the total population is more than 90 percent.

Literacy position (except Hyderabad) in the total population is found to be very low both in rural and urban areas of the region.

**Table - 1 Literacy Position in the Districts**

Name of the District	Total Population	Total Literates	% of Literates	Total Literates in Rural Area	% of Literates in Rural Area	Total Literates in Urban Area	% of Literates in Urban Area
Adilabad	2082479	553232	26.57	304876	14.64	248356	11.93
Hyderabad	3145939	1890244	90.77	0	0.00	1890244	90.77
Karimnagar	3037486	950878	45.66	530421	25.47	420457	20.19
Khammam	2215809	741660	35.61	380002	18.25	361658	17.37
Mahaboobnagar	3077050	732703	35.18	487407	23.41	245296	11.78
Medak	2269800	601869	28.90	314372	15.10	287497	13.81
Nalgonda	2852092	894309	42.94	612486	29.41	281823	13.53
Nizamabad	2037621	577911	27.75	302174	14.51	275737	13.24
Ranga Reddy	2551966	1027386	49.33	316184	15.18	711202	34.15
Warangal	2818832	918815	44.12	554796	26.64	364019	17.48
<b>Total</b>	<b>26089074</b>	<b>8889007</b>	<b>34.87</b>	<b>3802718</b>	<b>14.92</b>	<b>5086289</b>	<b>19.95</b>
Average	2608907	888901		380272		508629	
Standard Deviation	408743	369389		168299		478732	
Co-efficient of Variation	0.16	0.42		0.44		0.94	

**Source:** Official records of District census.

Male literacy position in rural and urban population of ten districts of Telangana is presented in the Table - 2. Out of total rural population, male literates in rural areas are not even 15 percent whereas percentage of literacy in urban areas is 50. Particularly in rural areas of six districts namely Adilabad, Khammam, Mahaboobnagar, Medak, Nizamabad and Ranga Reddy do not have even 15 percent male literacy. Similarly, male in urban areas of Khammam, Mahaboobnagaar, Nizamabad, Ranga Reddy and Medak do not have even 50 percent literates. However, male literates in Hyderabad is found to be sixty percent followed by urban areas of Warangal district - 57 percent.

Area-wise analysis has revealed that in the case of rural, male literates (percentage-wise) is found to be very less in Mahaboobnagar, Medak, Nizamabad and Ranga Reddy. Similarly literacy rates of male in the urban areas of Medak, Adilabad is very less-not even 35 percent. Thus, literacy position of male in rural and urban areas has revealed that except in urban areas of Hyderabad and Warangal, in all other areas literates are found to be very less in Telangana region.

**Table – 2 Male Literacy Position in Rural and Urban Areas**

Name of the District	Total Population in Rural Areas	Total Male Literates in Rural Areas	% of Male Literates to Total	Total Population in Urban Areas	Total Male Literates in Urban Areas	% of Male Literates to Total
Adilabad	1600802	224880	14.05	481677	160663	33.35
Hyderabad	0	0	0	3145939	1890270	60.09
Karimnagar	2413283	384955	15.95	624203	269025	43.10
Khammam	1767772	251228	14.21	448037	217045	48.44
Mahabubnagar	2734858	351847	12.87	342192	159392	46.58
Medak	1941313	235959	12.15	328487	190114	57.88
Nalgonda	2513639	426508	16.97	338453	180940	53.46
Nizamabad	1624677	219563	13.51	412944	175594	42.52
Ranga Reddy	1346789	179058	13.30	1205177	474997	39.41
Warangal	2272210	396489	17.45	546622	223838	40.95
<b>Total</b>	<b>18215343</b>	<b>2670487</b>	14.66	<b>7873731</b>	<b>3941878</b>	<b>50.06</b>
Average	1821534	296721		787373	3941878	
Standard Deviation	7425999	87142		823472	506500	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.29		1.05	1.28	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Table – 3 depicts the female literary position in the rural and urban population of Telangana region. Female literary in urban areas is found to be 28.27 percent, whereas in rural areas it's percentage is not even seven percent. Even, in urban areas, female literacy is found to be very less in Adilabad and Ranga Reddy districts – 18.20 and 19.59 per cent respectively. On the other, urban areas like Hyderabad is having up to 34.38 percent female literacy and in Warangal 30.53 per cent and in Khammam 32.27 per cent.

In the case of rural areas, except in Ranga Reddy none of the rural areas of Telanagana region is having even 10 per cent female literacy. Particularly female population of Medak, Adilabad, Mahaboobnagar do not have even 5 per cent literates. Thus, female literacy position in both rural and urban areas is vey less and backward compared to rural and urban areas of Andhra region. Further, it is to be noted that if we exclude Hyderabad, literacy position even in urban areas of Telangana region is relatively backward to that of not only Andhra but also Rayalaseema region.

**Table – 3 Female Literacy Position In Rural And Urban Areas**

Name of the District	Total Population in Rural Areas	Total Male Literates in Rural Areas	% of Male Literates to Total	Total Population in Urban Areas	Total Male Literates in Urban Areas	% of Male Literates to Total
Adilabad	1600802	79996	5.00	481677	87693	18.21
Hyderabad	0	0	0	3145939	1081782	34.39
Karimnagar	2413283	145466	6.03	624203	151432	24.26
Khammam	1767772	128774	7.28	448037	144613	32.28
Mahabubnagar	2734858	135560	4.96	342192	85904	25.10
Medak	1941313	78413	4.04	328487	97383	29.65
Nalgonda	2513639	185978	7.40	338453	100883	29.81
Nizamabad	1624677	82611	5.08	412944	100143	24.25
Ranga Reddy	1346789	137126	10.18	1205177	236205	19.60
Warangal	2272210	158307	6.97	546622	140181	25.64
<b>Total</b>	<b>18215343</b>	<b>1132231</b>	<b>6.22</b>	<b>7873731</b>	<b>2226219</b>	<b>28.27</b>
Average	1821534	113223		787373	222622	
Standard Deviation	7425999	50744		823472	289602	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.45		1.05	1.30	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Table - 4 depicts the availability of Government Primary educational institutions to total rural and urban population in the ten districts of Telangana region.

Intra-region wise analysis has revealed that for the total rural population of 18215343, only 11978 Govt. Primary Schools are available. In other words, one primary school is available for a population of 1520. Particularly rural areas of Adilabad, Mahaboobnagaar and Warangal are having more Government primary educational institutions compared to other rural areas of the districts. On the other hand, rural areas of the Nizamabad and Ranga Reddy districts are having very less number of Government Primary schools i.e., 766 and 903 respectively.

One interesting finding of the study is that a backward district like Adilabad is having one Govt. primary educational institutions for 844 population whereas in rural areas of Karimnagar and Nizamabad district is having one primary school for a population of around 2120 respectively. One of the reasons might be that private schools are not gaining momentum in rural areas of backward districts of Telangana region and rural population is excessively depending upon government institutions.

Total primary educational institutions in the urban areas are found to be 3465 for a population of 7873731. Each Govt. primary educational institution is available for a urban population of 2272. In other words, compared to rural, Govt. primary schools for in urban



population are found to be very less - only 3465 in urban and 11978 in rural. Further, on an average for 1520 rural population, one Govt. primary school is available in rural whereas for 2272 population one government school is established.

Standard deviation is found to be 381 in rural areas and 118 for urban areas and co-efficient of variance is 0.29 for primary schools in rural areas and 118 for urban areas. Thus, Govt. primary schools are available more in rural areas and lesser in urban areas in the region.

**Table – 4 Primary Educational Institutions to Rural And Urban Population**

Name of the District	Total Population in Rural Areas	Total P.Es. in Rural Areas	P.Es. to Total Rural Population	Total Population in Urban Areas	Total P.Es in Urban Areas	P.E.s to Total Urban Population
Adilabad	1600802	1895	844.75	481677	358	1345.47
Hyderabad				3145939	658	4781.06
Karimnagar	2413283	1139	2118.77	624203	307	2033.23
Khammam	1767772	1236	1430.24	448037	402	1114.52
Mahabubnagar	2734858	1773	1542.50	342192	241	1419.88
Medak	1941313	1072	1810.93	328487	327	1004.55
Nalgonda	2513639	1457	1725.22	338453	387	874.56
Nizamabad	1624677	766	2120.99	412944	307	1345.09
Ranga Reddy	1346789	903	1491.46	1205177	247	4879.26
Warangal	2272210	1737	1308.12	546622	231	2366.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>18215343</b>	<b>11978</b>	<b>1520.73</b>	<b>7873731</b>	<b>3465</b>	<b>2272.36</b>
Average	1821534	1331		787373	347	
Standard Deviation	7425999	381		823472	118	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.29		1.05	0.34	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Further, an attempt has been made to find out the primary school enrollment in Government primary educational institutions of rural and urban population of the region. Table - 5 shows that out of rural population of 18215343, not even six percent population is enrolled in govt. Primary educational institutions and in the urban areas also out of 7873731 population, enrollment percentage is same to that of rural.

One shocking notice is that in the rural areas of Ranga Reddy district not even one percent population is enrolled in primary educational institutions whereas in Adilabad, Mahaboobnagar and Warangal districts enrollment is to the extent of seven percent population.

Co-efficient of variation in rural areas is found to be 0.57 and in urban is 0.38. Further, standard deviation for enrolment in rural areas is 59502 and in urban 16750.

**Table – 5 Enrolment in Primary Schools of Rural and Urban Areas  
(Both Boys and Girls)**

Name of the District	Total Population in Rural Areas	Enrolment in Rural Areas	% of Enrolment in Rural Areas	Total Population in Urban Areas	Enrolment in Urban Areas	% of Enrolment in Urban Areas
Adilabad	1600802	115126	7.19	481677	60858	12.63
Hyderabad				3145939	85906	2.73
Karimnagar	2413283	108744	4.51	624203	32976	5.28
Khammam	1767772	109704	6.21	448037	46074	10.28
Mahabubnagar	2734858	201266	7.36	342192	48758	14.25
Medak	1941313	103468	5.33	328487	41370	12.59
Nalgonda	2513639	151180	6.01	338453	33529	9.91
Nizamabad	1624677	83161	5.12	412944	34382	8.33
Ranga Reddy	1346789	8227	0.61	1205177	33598	2.79
Warangal	2272210	159822	7.03	546622	26643	4.87
<b>Total</b>	<b>18215343</b>	<b>1040698</b>	<b>5.71</b>	<b>7873731</b>	<b>444094</b>	<b>5.64</b>
Average	1821534	104070		787373	44409	
Standard Deviation	7425999	59502		823472	16750	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.57		1.05	0.38	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

When we look at the availability of Govt. upper primary schools in rural and urban areas of Telangana Region. Table - 6 depicts that an altogether 2816 schools are available in this region. On the other, in Andhra and Rayalaseema regions their number is being observed to 2047 and 871 respectively.

Further, it is observed that upper primary schools in the rural areas of entire region are 1964 and in urban areas it's strength is 842. Each school in rural areas is serving to a population of 9274 and in urban areas 9251. Particularly upper primary schools in rural areas are mostly found in Mahaboobnagar and Medak and in urban areas both Hyderabad and Ranga Reddy areas put together possessed 274 schools.

Rural areas of Adilabad are having very less number of upper primary schools - only 156 and each school in rural areas of this district is covering to the rural population of 10261. Whereas urban areas of Khammam is having only 50 government upper primary schools. Further, standard deviation is 28 in urban areas and 65 in rural areas. There is not much

difference in the co-efficient of variance between rural and urban areas - 0.30 and 0.34 respectively.

**Table – 6 Upper Primary Schools to Rural and Urban Population**

Name of the District	Total Population in Rural Areas	U.P. Schools in Rural Areas	U.P. Schools to Rural Population	Total Population in Urban Areas	U.P. Schools in Urban Areas	U.P. Schools to Urban Population
Adilabad	1600802	156	10261.55	481677	82	5874.11
Hyderabad	0	0	0	3145939	147	21400.95
Karimnagar	2413283	238	10139.84	624203	74	8435.18
Khammam	1767772	199	8883.28	448037	50	8960.74
Mahabubnagar	2734858	340	8043.70	342192	70	4888.46
Medak	1941313	160	12133.21	328487	74	4439.01
Nalgonda	2513639	202	12443.76	338453	77	4395.49
Nizamabad	1624677	167	9728.60	412944	61	6769.57
Ranga Reddy	1346789	180	7482.16	1205177	80	15064.71
Warangal	2272210	322	7056.55	546622	127	4304.11
<b>Total</b>	<b>18215343</b>	<b>1964</b>	<b>9274.61</b>	<b>7873731</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>9351.22</b>
Average	1821534	218		787373	84	
Standard Deviation	7425999	65		823472	28	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.30		1.05	0.34	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Availability of upper primary schools in rural and urban areas has been presented in the Table - 7. It indicates that out of 8814 villages in rural areas only 1964 villages are having upper primary schools. In other words, more than 4 villages do not have at least one upper primary schools in rural Telangana. Even out of 1919 urban areas only 842 areas are having upper primary schools. Like rural villages, in urban areas also every two areas do not even upper primary schools.

Intra-area wise analysis has revealed that in Adilabad district, not only rural villages are found to be more (1406), but availability of upper primary schools are also found to be very less. In other words, every 9 villages do not have even one upper primary schools. In Warangal and Karimnagar and Mahaboobnagar, every two or three villages are having upper primary schools and their total strength is found to 340 in Mahaboobnagar, 322 in Warangal and 238 in Karimnagar.

In the case of urban areas, a large number upper primary schools area found in Hyderabad i.e., 147 followed by Ranga Reddy 127. On the other, urban areas of Karimnagar district are having only 50 government upper primary schools which indicates that every four urban areas do not have upper primary schools. In the case of rural areas, they are found to be 218 in rural villages. Standard deviations is found to be 65 for upper primary schools in rural and 28 in urban areas. Further, co-efficient of variation of upper primary schools in rural and urban areas is found to be 0.30 and 0.34 respectively. Thus, the analysis on the availability of upper primary schools in rural and urban areas of Telangana region has revealed that only few upper primary schools are located both in rural and urban areas of Telangana region.

**Table – 7 Upper Primary Schools in Rural and Urban Areas**

Name of the District	Total Rural Villages	U.P. Schools in Rural Villages	U.P. Schools to Rural Villages	Total Urban Villages	U.P. Schools in Urban Villages	U.P. Schools to Urban Villages
Adilabad	1406	156	9.01	339	82	4.13
Hyderabad	0			65	147	0.44
Karimnagar	846	238	3.55	216	74	2.92
Khammam	863	199	4.34	235	50	4.70
Mahabubnagar	1303	340	3.83	198	70	2.83
Medak	958	160	5.99	265	74	3.58
Nalgonda	947	202	4.69	172	77	2.23
Nizamabad	701	167	4.20	161	61	2.64
Ranga Reddy	872	180	4.84	183	80	2.29
Warangal	918	322	2.85	85	127	0.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>8814</b>	<b>1964</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>1919</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>2.28</b>
Average	881	218		192	84	
Standard Deviation	357	65		76	28	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.30		0.40	0.34	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Table - 8 shows that in rural areas of entire Telangana region, there are 1762 Govt. high schools for a population of 18215343. In other words, for a population of 10337 only one high school is available. On the other, for a total urban population of 7873731, there are 1129 Govt. high schools. It means one high school is established for a population of 6974. Thus, in urban areas, we find a high school, for a lesser population but in rural areas even for more than 10000 population, we don't find a high school.

Area-wise analysis has revealed that Warangal district has large number of Govt. high schools in rural areas followed by rural areas of Nalgonda, Mahaboobnagar and Karimnagar. One interesting finding is that in Ranga Reddy district for a rural population of 1346789, we

*Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*

find only 109 Govt. high schools which obviously indicates that one high school is established for a population of 12355. Whereas in Warangal district, for a population of 6885 one high school is available.

When we look at urban position, there are only 1129 Govt. high schools for a population of 7873731 in Telangana region. It means for every 6974 population, one Govt. high school is established. A large number of high schools are found in urban areas of Hyderabad (452) followed by Nizamabad (91), Nalgonda (89), Khammam (87) and Warangal (85) in that order. One interesting finding is that in the urban areas of Nalgonda for a population of 3802 one Govt. high school is available and in Medak also we find one school for a population of 4224. Thus, in urban areas, Govt. high schools are established more in Hyderabad and in rural areas of Warangal.

Average value for high schools in rural areas is found to be 196 and in urban areas it is 113. Standard deviations is 67 in urban and 114 in rural areas. Coefficient of variance is 0.34 in rural and 1.01 for urban areas.

**Table – 8 High Schools to Rural and Urban Population**

Name of the District	Total Population in Rural Areas	High Schools in Rural Areas	High Schools to Rural Population	Total Population in Urban Areas	High Schools in Urban Areas	High Schools to Urban Population
Adilabad	1600802	135	11857.79	481677	65	7410.42
Hyderabad				3145939	452	6960.04
Karimnagar	2413283	203	11888.09	624203	48	13004.23
Khammam	1767772	146	12108.03	448037	87	5149.85
Mahabubnagar	2734858	237	11539.49	342192	81	4224.59
Medak	1941313	162	11983.41	328487	78	4211.37
Nalgonda	2513639	270	9309.77	338453	89	3802.84
Nizamabad	1624677	170	9556.92	412944	91	4537.85
Ranga Reddy	1346789	109	12355.86	1205177	53	22739.19
Warangal	2272210	330	6885.48	546622	85	6430.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>18215343</b>	<b>1762</b>	<b>10337.88</b>	<b>7873731</b>	<b>1129</b>	<b>6974.08</b>
Average	1821534	196		787373	113	
Standard Deviation	7425999	67		823472	114	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.34		1.05	1.01	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Table - 9 depicts the availability of Govt. high schools in rural and urban areas of the ten districts of Telangana region. Out of 10733 villages, only 2891 villages are having government high schools. Particularly in rural areas, out of 8814 villages, only 1762 high

schools are found. It obviously indicates that every five villages do not have high schools. However, in the case of urban, which reveals that almost every two urban areas are having high school facilities.

Rural villages of Warangal are having more high school facilities followed by Nalgonda i.e., 330 and 270 respectively. But in the case of Adilabad even more than 10 rural areas do not have government high schools. On the other, every three villages in Warangal and Nalgonda are having the high school facilities.

In the case of urban areas, Hyderabad is having more number of high schools and, infact compared to the whole region, more than two and half times facilities is found only in Hyderabad city itself. But on the other hand, 339 urban areas of Adilabad district do not have more than 65 high schools, which obviously reveals that more than five villages in this district do not have high schools. Thus, compared to all districts, Adilabad - both in rural and urban is lagging far bashing in the availability of government high schools.

Average value for the rural villages is found to be 881 and for high schools it is only 196. Similarly in urban areas, average value for areas is 192 and 113 for schools. Standard deviation is 67 for schools in rural villages and 114 for urban areas. Thus, there is much deviations in the establishment of high schools in the urban areas and it is solely due to high concentration of high school in the urban areas of Hyderabad.

**Table – 9 High Schools in Rural and Urban Areas**

Name of the District	Total Rural Villages	High Schools in Rural Villages	High Schools to Rural Villages	Total Urban Villages	High Schools in Urban Villages	High Schools to Urban Villages
Adilabad	1406	135	10.41	339	65	5.22
Hyderabad	0			65	452	0.14
Karimnagar	846	203	4.17	216	48	4.50
Khammam	863	146	5.91	235	87	2.70
Mahabubnagar	1303	237	5.50	198	81	2.44
Medak	958	162	5.91	265	78	3.40
Nalgonda	947	270	3.51	172	89	1.93
Nizamabad	701	170	4.12	161	91	1.77
Ranga Reddy	872	109	8.00	183	53	3.45
Warangal	918	330	2.78	85	85	1.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>8814</b>	<b>1762</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>1919</b>	<b>1129</b>	<b>1.70</b>
Average	881	196		192	113	
Standard Deviation	357	67		76	114	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.34		0.40	1.01	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Availability of Junior Colleges both in rural and urban areas has been shown in the Table - 10. It indicates that an altogether 278 colleges are found in the entire region of Telangana region. The highest concentration is observed in the urban areas of Hyderabad itself - 114 colleges out of 204 colleges of urban areas. But in the case of rural areas, such a glaring concentration is not observed as in almost all the districts, number of junior colleges are ranging between 7 to 10.

Area-wise analysis has revealed that for a rural population of 18215343, very few - 74 junior colleges are established, and for a urban population of 7873731 - also only 204 colleges are existing. One observation of the study is that for a rural population of 273858 in Mahaboobnagar district, only 7 junior colleges are available. Whereas for a population of 1346789 in the rural areas of Ranga Reddy district, 8 colleges are established.

In the case of urban, after Hyderabad, we can observe that urban areas of Adilabad is having 17 government junior colleges, which obviously indicates that majority of the rural folk in Adilabad district is excessively depending upon government institutions.

Average value is observed to be eight for rural areas and 23 in urban areas. There is not much deviation in rural areas whereas it is to be more in urban areas. Similarly, co-efficient of variance is only 0.40 in rural and 1.53 for urban areas. Thus, the analysis on the availability of junior colleges has revealed that in rural areas of Telangana district, there is not much variance but in the urban areas, the highest concentration is observed in Hyderabad itself.

**Table – 10 Availability of Junior Colleges in Rural and Urban Areas**

Name of the District	Total Population in Rural Areas	Junior Colleges in Rural Areas	Junior Colleges to Rural Population	Total Population in Urban Areas	Junior Colleges in Urban Areas	Junior Colleges to Urban Population
Adilabad	1600802	7	228686.00	481677	16	30104.81
Hyderabad				3145939	114	37595.96
Karimnagar	2413283	10	241328.30	624203	11	56745.73
Khammam	1767772	7	252538.86	448037	5	89607.40
Mahabubnagar	2734858			342192		
Medak	1941313	8	242664.13	328487	13	25268.23
Nalgonda	2513639	7	359091.29	338453	9	37605.89
Nizamabad	1624677	9	180519.67	412944	9	45882.67
Ranga Reddy	1346789	8	168348.63	1205177	4	301294.25
Warangal	2272210	11	206564.55	546622	13	42047.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>18215343</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>271870.79</b>	<b>7873731</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>40586.24</b>
Average	1821534	7		787373	22	
Standard Deviation	7425999	3		823472	33	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.40		1.05	1.53	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies

Further an attempt has been made to find out the availability of junior college in rural and urban areas of Telangana region. Table - 11 shows that out 8814 rural areas, only 74 areas are having junior colleges - which obviously indicates that for 119 rural areas one junior college is available. But in the case of urban areas, 204 junior colleges are available for 1919 areas. In other words, each college is catering to the needs of more than 9 urban areas. Such a glaring disparities is being observed when we compared to both rural and urban positions.

Particularly in urban areas of Hyderabad is having 114 junior colleges whereas such a glaring concentration is not found in other urban and rural areas. Particularly junior colleges are ranging between 7 to 10 in rural areas. In Nizamabad district, for 701 rural areas only 9 junior colleges are found whereas in Adilabad, also for 1406 rural areas only 7 colleges are found. After Adilabad, Mahaboobnagar district is having lesser number of Junior colleges for 1303 population.

Average value for rural villages is 881 and 8 for colleges, whereas average value for urban villages is 192 and 20 for junior colleges. There is not much deviations in rural areas but standard deviation is found to be 31 in urban. Coefficient of variance for colleges in rural areas is 0.17 and 1.54 for urban. Thus, availability of junior college are found to be more in urban areas of Hyderabad and in the case of rural areas, it is in Warangal.

If we look at the availability of Hospitals and Dispensaries in rural and urban areas of Telangana region, an altogether 761 hospitals and dispensaries are found for a population 26089074. Out of this, 414 hospitals are in rural areas for a population of 18215343, which means only one hospital is serving for a population of 43998. Even in urban areas also, for a population of 43998. Even in urban areas also, for a population of 7873731 only 347 hospitals are existing which obviously indicates that for a population of 22690 only one hospital is available. Thus, both in rural and urban population, medical facilities are very meagre which requires immediate attention for the policy makers to provide more so that to improve the health conditions of the people living in backward region like Telangana.



**Table – 11 Junior Colleges in Rural and Urban Areas**

Name of the District	Total Rural Villages	Junior Colleges in Rural Villages	Junior Colleges to Rural Villages	Total Urban Villages	Junior Colleges in Urban Villages	Junior Colleges to Urban Villages
Adilabad	1406	7	200.86	339	16	21.19
Hyderabad	0			65	114	0.57
Karimnagar	846	10	84.60	216	11	19.64
Khammam	863	7	123.29	235	5	47.00
Mahabubnagar	1303	7	186.14	198	10	19.80
Medak	958	8	119.75	265	13	20.38
Nalgonda	947	7	135.29	172	9	19.11
Nizamabad	701	9	77.89	161	9	17.89
Ranga Reddy	872	8	109.00	183	4	45.75
Warangal	918	11	83.45	85	13	6.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>8814</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>119.11</b>	<b>1919</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>9.41</b>
Average	881	8		192	20	
Standard Deviation	357	1		76'	31	
Co-efficient of variance	0.41	0.17		0.40	1.54	

**Source:** District Hand Books.

Intra-area wise analysis has revealed that in Table 4.12 rural population of Mahaboobnagar district is having only 68 hospitals and even in Warangal and Adilabad also only few hospitals are existing.

In the case of urban population also, except Hyderabad and Warangal districts, in all other districts hospitals are very meager and unable to cope up the demand the large number of population. Infact, Govt. hospitals in urban areas are very less numerically and obviously urban folk are excessively depending upon private hospitals and dispensaries.

Standard deviations for hospitals in rural areas is found to be 15, whereas in urban areas it is 31. Co-efficient of variation is 0.32 in rural and 0.89 for urban. Thus, the analysis on the availability of hospitals and dispensaries in rural and urban areas of the region has revealed that in urban areas, concentration is found to be more in Hyderabad and Warangal districts and in rural areas of Mahaboobnagar, Nalgonda and Karimnagar, through slightly higher than other areas, but not at all sufficient to cope up the demand of the rural folk.

Thus, the analysis on the availability of educational and medical facilities has revealed that not only rural areas but also urban areas of entire Telangana State is lagging behind and requires immediate attention by policy makers to provide these facilities in this region so that to reduce the differentials in both rural and urban areas.

## References:

- D.R. Gadgil, *District Development and Planning*, Gokhale Institute of politics and Economics, Poona, 1967, p.16.
- V.K.R.V. Rao, *Some Neglected Factors in Integrated Rural Development*, Presidential address XVI, Convocation of Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, 1977.
- S. Chakaravorthy, *the Planning Progress in India; An Appraisal and Framework*, Paper circulated in Ahmedabad Institute Training programme for Planning Officers, 1982.
- See, K.N.Raj, *Some Thoughts on De-centralisation of Development Planning and Implementation*, Key-note paper presented for the Seminar held at institute for social economic Change, Bangalore, 1984.
- Drewnowski, Jan and Scott, Wolf; *The level of living index*, United nations Research Institute for Social Development, Report No.4, Geneva, Switzerland, 1966.
- Mc. Granahan, *Development indicators and Development Models*, *Development Studies*, Vol.8, (April 1972).
- I. Adelman and C.T. Morris, *Society, Politics and Economic Development*, Baltimore, John Hopkins press, 1967.
- F.H. Harbison, et.al., *Quantitative Analysis of Modernization and Development*, Industrial Relations section, Princeton University, 1970.
- L. Hellwig, *Procedure for evaluating high level manpower data and typology of countries by means of taxonomic method*, UNESCO working paper, 1970.
- Hancy Baster, *Development indicators, An Introduction*, *Development Studies*, Vol.8, April, 1972, pp. 1-20.
- H.D. Morris and P.B. Liser, *The PQLI, Measuring Progress in Meeting Human Needs*, Overseas Development Council, *Communique on Development Issues*, No.32, 1977.
- M. Ahulawalia and H. Chenery; *A Conceptual Framework for Economic analysis in Holl is Chenery*, Ed., *Redistribution with Growth*, Oxford, 1972.
- Bennet, *International Disparities in consumption Levels*, *American Economic Review*, XLI (September 51), pp.632-49.
- Adalman, Irme; Papelasis; and Lean Mears, *Economic Development, Analysis, Case Studies*, Universal Book Stall, New Delhi, 1967.
- V.K.R.V. Rao, *A National Policy for Integrated Urban and Rural Development*, *Yojana*, Vol.XXV, No.17, September 16, 1980, pp.7-10.
- Vasant Desai, *Rural Development*, Vol.II, *Programmes and Strategies*, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1988.
- John S. Augustine (ed), *Strategies for Third World Development*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1989.
- K. Vijayaraghavan, *Rural Development – The Latent Issues*, *the Economic Times*, February 2, 1990, p.9.