

# Unit 12

## Trends and Pattern of Urbanisation

---

### Contents

- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Census Classification of Urban Settlements
- 12.3 Trends and Pattern of Urbanisation in India Across Size Class of Urban Settlements
- 12.4 Pattern of Urbanisation: An Interstate Analysis
- 12.5 Trends and Pattern of Urbanisation Across States at the Size Class level
- 12.6 Analysis of Growth of Urban Centres
- 12.7 Growth Rates of Common Towns/UAs during 1971-91
- 12.8 Growth Pattern during 1991-2001
- 12.9 Disparity in Growth Across Size Class of Urban Centres
- 12.10 Conclusion
- 12.11 Further Reading
- 12.12 Tables
- 12.13 Appendix\*

### Learning Objectives

After studying this unit you should be able to:

- define the towns in India as per their size class distribution;1
- describe the trends and pattern of urbanisation in India across size class of towns;
- describe the trends and pattern of urbanisation in India across states at size class levels;
- understand the problems of calculating growth rates of urban centres;
- analyse the growth pattern of common towns/UAs during 1971-91 and 1991-2001; and
- analyse the disparity in the growth across size class of urban centres.

### 12.1 Introduction

Units 1-4 have dealt with the concepts of urban sociology as well as urbanization and urban growth at the macro level. This unit tries to define towns based on their size class distribution. It also attempts to analyse the trends and pattern of urbanisation across size class of towns in the country and explain their development dynamics. It further attempts to describe the pattern of urbanization across states and size class of settlements. It also tries to underline the problems of calculating growth rates of urban centres and calculate the same by taking common towns in both the base and terminal years for the past three decades. Finally, it attempts to analyse the disparity in the growth across size class of urban centres and bring out the emerging pattern. This unit concludes with a summary of the main observations.

## 12.2 Census Classification of Urban Settlements

The Indian Census presents demographic data separately for rural and urban areas. The units of classification for urban areas are towns. In keeping with the age old tradition of the Indian Census, the urban units have been categorised into six population size classes by the Census as follows:

Size class	Population
I	100,000 & above
II	50,000–99,999
III	20,000–49,999
IV	10,000–19,999
V	5000–9999
VI	Less than 5,000

The class I urban units are generally called cities. In other words, all urban agglomerations /towns with a population of 100,000 and above are called cities. Urban agglomerations/ cities with a population of a million and above are often referred to as million-plus cities or metropolitan areas. Towns with a population ranging between 20,000 and 99,999 (classes II and III) are called medium sized towns and those smaller in size (classes IV, V and VI) are generally designated as small towns.

The total number of towns in a district, state or country can be counted by two methods. Firstly, taking the urban agglomeration as one unit (ignoring the number of towns and cities constituting the agglomeration) and secondly taking each constituent town / city separately within the urban agglomeration. In the former, the total numbers of towns are much less since many towns are part of the urban agglomerations and their inclusion as units of the UA reduces the number of towns in the final summation. For example, the 1991 Census reports the total number of towns as 4689 whereas the total number of UAs and cities/ towns are reported as much less at 3768.

### 12.3 Trends and Pattern of Urbanisation in India Across Size Class of Urban Settlements

It may be noted that the 2001 census reported a total of 5161 towns which is a thousand more than 1981<sup>1</sup>. The 1991 Census reported 3768 urban agglomerations and towns and 4689 towns as noted above. The 2001 census reported 68.67 per cent of the urban population in class I cities (with a population above one lakh). There are 35 cities or agglomerations each with a population of ten lakh or above. These cities are also called million plus cities and they constitute about 38 per cent of the country's urban population with a total population of 108 million.

The process of urbanization in India is largely large city oriented. This pattern is evident at the national level as well as in most of the states. Importantly, the share of the class I cities has been going up systematically in all the decades in the last century.

The present section focuses on the analysis of the changing structure of urban population across size class of settlements over the decades especially after independence. The growing top heaviness has been examined in the context of shifting of urban centres across size class of urban centres. Explanation of the changing settlement structure has been sought in terms

of differential demographic growth of urban centres in different size classes.

*Table 12.1* shows that class I cities dominates the urban structure of the country. This share, though very high, was still comparable to the smaller towns. In 1901, the share of class I cities was 26 per cent whereas the class IV and class V towns contributed 20.83 and 20.14 per cent of the urban population. The share of class I cities since then increased and recorded a significant increase during 1931-41, a decade before the partition of the country. At the time of independence, a large proportion of displaced persons were absorbed in the large towns resulting in an increase of the share of urban population to 44.63 per cent in 1951 from 38.23 per cent in the previous decade. This increase of about 7 percentage points of the share of population of the class I cities was maintained in the next two decades as well. Increment in the percentage share of population in these cities has been about 3 percentage points since the 1970s. This has been maintained till the nineties as well when the percentage share of population was reported to be 68.67 as compared to 64.89 in 1991. The share of population in class IV, V and VI towns maintained a steady decline during 1901 to 2001. Their combined share declined from 47 per cent in 1901 to about 7 per cent in 2001. The percentage share of population in the medium sized towns, viz., class II and class III towns have remained by and large stable over the century. Their shares have fluctuated between 11 and 13 per cent respectively.

The tremendous increase in the share of class I cities may be attributed to faster growth of these towns as well as increase in the number of towns as they graduate from lower order towns. In 1901, there were only 24 towns in this category. This figure increased to 393 in 2001. This can be attributed to natural increase in population as also migration to large towns which together result in increase in population of towns below 100,000, enabling these to cross this cut-off point.

Significantly, the general perception among planners, administrators, statisticians and academicians in the country is that larger urban centres in the country are growing at a higher rate in comparison to the small and medium towns. The population census computes the growth rates of towns in a size class by considering the population belonging to a particular size class in the initial as well as terminal years, without taking note of the generally upward movement of the urban centres. As a consequence, the growth rate of class I cities work out to be very high since this is the category which over time gains in the number of cities. On the other hand, those lower order size categories that lose in the number of towns because of the upward graduation of towns generally show a low growth rate. Indeed, the small towns (class V and class VI) at times show negative growth rates not because those towns are facing depopulation but because of the fact that many of them graduate to higher order towns.

In view of the problems of comparability, scholars have proposed that for computing the growth rates, the base year classification of urban centres should be maintained both for base as well as terminal years. This would imply that the population of only those towns that belong to a particular category in the base year should be added up in the terminal year as well. This would make the number of towns at both the time points the same for each category, in computing their growth rates. Fortunately, the 1991 census has given population of common towns in Appendix 10 of the provisional population tables<sup>2</sup>. This information is extremely useful in comparing the growth rates across size classes. It may, however, be noted

that all new towns get excluded from this calculation since the base year categories constitute the basis for classification of towns. Moreover, even the towns declassified in the terminal year get excluded. This might be responsible for an upward bias in the growth estimates in small towns (class V and VI categories) as these would claim most of the declassified towns.

It has been mentioned above that the class I cities have experienced growth rates that are more than that of the smaller towns in most of the states. However, in many states, class VI towns (with population below 5000) have registered phenomenal growth. This is due to the special status accorded to these settlements and corresponding high public sector investment in them. It may be noted that many among the class VI towns have been established or are managed by government departments, public agencies, military establishments or private industries.

A section of scholars have argued that the Indian urban structure reflects no distortion and a stable morphology as the population growth is more or less uniform across the size classes. It is however, evident from (Table 12.1) that this is not the case. The urban centres in the class I categories are growing at a higher rate than the smaller towns. This was evident in the 1981 census except for the class VI towns. Indeed, the class VI towns show higher growth rates. This is because these towns show different development dynamics as most of these belong to a special category of industrial townships, pilgrimage centres or settlements through establishment of a public sector industry in greenfield locations as mentioned above.

The pattern is identical in the 1991 census, although there is a general deceleration in urban growth in all size categories. However, one notes that the class I cities have grown faster than the towns belonging to the smaller size classes during 1981-91. An attempt has been made by Kundu, A, (2005) to recalculate the figures using data from the 2001 census. The analysis reveals that there are 3415 towns common in both the 1991 and 2001 censuses, after excluding the new towns and the towns that are declassified in the 2001 census. The class VI towns have once again registered a higher growth rate compared to even class I cities<sup>3</sup>. However, the class I centres continued to have an edge over the other towns in terms of their growth rate. One would therefore, argue that the urban structure is becoming increasingly skewed due to higher demographic growth in larger cities.

The adjusted annual exponential growth rate for class I towns (common) during the 1970s and 1980s have been worked out as 3.46 and 2.96 respectively. The 2001 census has indicated a slight decline in the growth rate of class I towns to 2.76 per cent, computed on the basis of 291 common class I towns during 1991-2001. Small towns (IV-VI together) indicate a growth rate of 3.07 and 2.57 per cent growth during 1981 and 1991. This has gone down to 2.22 during 1991-2001. One may, therefore, argue that the decline in the growth rate of small and medium towns (non-class I) is sharper in comparison to the class I cities. This may be attributed to immigration to larger towns and higher natural increase. Further, emergence of satellite townships in the peripheries of large towns and their absorption into the urban agglomeration over time are also explaining factors. There are also outgrowths that have been treated as parts of the agglomeration by the census. Moreover, there have been expansions in the municipal boundaries of the class I cities, contributing to urban growth. All these factors have resulted in higher growth of class I cities.

Metro cities, or cities having a population of a million or more, also corroborate the thesis of concentrated urban development. Million-plus cities have, on the average, grown at the rate of 3.25 per cent during 1981-91, which is higher than the growth rate of common towns at 2.83 per cent, during the same period. The 2001 census, however, brings out that the growth rate of all towns has gone down across all size categories, including that of metro cities. The growth rate of metro cities has gone down to 2.88 but that of common towns has declined more sharply to 2.6 per cent. It is, thus, obvious that the growth of metropolitan cities is higher than that in common towns or class I cities. The spatial concentration of urban population is in class I cities, and more so in metro cities. The share of million plus cities was about 26.41 of the urban population in 1981, which increased to 32.54 in 1991 and 37.81 in 2001.

Significantly, most of the million plus cities comprised at least one municipal corporation and several municipalities. Such agglomerations have the municipal corporation of the biggest city at the core with municipalities of relatively smaller towns forming the periphery. Kundu et al (2005) noted that over the last two decades the metropolitan cities have exhibited four important features, namely, a) declining core-growing periphery, b) growing core-declining periphery, c) growing core and growing periphery, d) declining core and declining periphery. They observed that Greater Mumbai, Kolkata, Delhi and Chennai have recorded a higher growth in their peripheries in comparison to their cores. Pressure of population, deficiency of infrastructure and basic amenities, higher cost of living, and stringent land laws may have decelerated the capacity of core areas of these cities to absorb the incremental population. Such section of the population get settled in the periphery resulting in the faster growth of UAs. Cities like Jamshedpur and Asansol, which have recently attained the status of metro cities have shown fast growing peripheries. This is important from the point of regional development. Bangalore, however, is an exception to this pattern and has a faster growing core. Another pattern of urban growth that has emerged is that of corridor development. This is observed in some cities like Amritsar-Jalandhar-Ludhiana, Vadodara-Ahmedabad-Surat, and Kolkata-Dhanbad-Jamshedpur. This type of spatial development of urban centres is also emerging in other parts of the country as has been brought out by a recent study by the Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi (2001).

It is important to observe that demographic growth in the capitals of the major states and in the national capital is almost at par with that of the million plus cities. This further confirms the proposition of unbalanced urban growth across size categories. It may, however, be noted that the growth rate in ten capital cities has declined in the nineties compared to the previous decades. This may be because of structural adjustment, expenditure control and/or decline in public investment in infrastructure.

## **12.4 Pattern of Urbanisation : An Interstate Analysis**

The dynamics of urban development in a large country like India would be understood by examining the changes in the levels and pace of urbanisation across the states and at the size class level. The present section attempts to do that based on the data from Population Censuses from 1951 to 2001 with special emphasis on the developments in the post liberalisation phase. It analyses the regional pattern of urbanisation focussing on the nineties and examines how it makes a sharp departure from the past pattern.

The Census data reveals that the levels of urbanisation in most of the economically developed states were high in the post Independence period (*Table 12.2*). Developed states like West Bengal, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, that had high per capita income, reported a large percentage of population residing in urban areas. This is due to concentration of economic activities in the three metropolises of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras (now Kolkata, Mumbai and Chennai respectively) and a few of their linked towns. The strong positive correlation between economic and urban development indicators can be explained in terms of location of agro-processing and manufacturing activities in a handful of port cities during the colonial period. The rural population thrown out of the agrarian system due to frequent natural calamities, tottering agriculture and lack of sectoral diversification, sought absorption in these cities. In fact, the correlations of urbanisation works out as positive not only with per capita income but with many other indicators of economic development like share of manufacturing employment, availability of infrastructural facilities, levels of social development etc. The correlations, however, have weakened over the subsequent decades due to diversification of the process of urbanisation, as many among the less developed states have experienced high urban growth.

An analysis of the pattern of urban growth during the decades since Independence until 1991 (*Table 12.3*) reveals that the growth has generally been high in relatively backward states. Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh would figure at the top in the list of the states arranged in a descending order in terms of urban growth. This implies that the relationship between urban growth and economic development was generally negative. The correlations among the relevant indicators, however, were not very strong as a few among the developed states such as, Maharashtra, Gujarat and Haryana, too, recorded high or medium growth, although the others like West Bengal, Tamil Nadu, Punjab etc. experienced low urban growth.

#### Reflection and Action 12.1

Find out from the various sources available in your city/town/village about the population size of that area for the last five years. You may collect other data regarding out-migration, as well as, in-migration within this region; as well as natural growth.

Based on the data collected, write a report on "Population Trend: Urban Growth in My Region". Compare your report with those of other students at your Study Centre.

One observes dualism in urban growth in the post Independence period. The developed states reported in migration and attracted population in urban areas due to industrialisation and infrastructural investment. Interestingly, a few of the backward states too – particularly their backward districts and small and medium towns - experienced rapid urban growth. This can partly be attributed to government investment in the district and taluka headquarters, programmes of urban industrial dispersal, and transfer of funds from the states to local bodies through a need based or what is popularly known as "a gap filling approach". Migration into smaller towns from their rural hinterland in backward states could partly be explained in terms of push factors, owing to lack of diversification in agrarian economy. The rural poor are pushed from their original locations due to reasons of extreme poverty.

Nineties, however, makes a significant departure from the earlier decades. The developed states like Tamil Nadu, Punjab, Haryana, Maharashtra and Gujarat have registered urban growth above the national average. West Bengal is the only exception whose growth rate is not very high. The backward states, on the other hand, have experienced growth either below that of the country or at the most equal to the national average.

During the nineties, one thus observes that the process of urbanisation has become more concentrated in developed regions to the exclusion of the backward states. Furthermore, the larger cities have recorded relatively higher growth in comparison to the small and medium towns. This could, at least partly, be attributed to the measures of globalisation and decentralised governance. Under this new system of governance, the responsibilities of resource mobilisation and launching infrastructural projects have been given to the local bodies (municipalities). Large municipal bodies that have a strong economic base, particularly those located in developed states are in a position to satisfy the conditions required for accessing funds both from national and international agencies. These cities have an advantage that has clearly been manifested in their high economic and demographic growth.

## 12.5 Trends and Pattern of Urbanisation Across States at the Size Class Level

The size class distribution of urban population and changes therein over the past decades (*Table 12.4a*) provides interesting insights into the development dynamics of the country. An analysis of the 1981 and 1991 Census shows that the share of population in class I cities has been going up consistently during the seventies and eighties. One, however, notes that the interstate variation in their share is very high and reveals a distinct regional pattern of concentration. The economically prosperous states of Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal have high concentration of urban population in class I cities besides the smaller states like Chandigarh, Delhi, Pondicherry and Meghalaya. This may be a reflection of the impact of colonial regime wherein much of the industrial activities got concentrated in the metropolitan cities. The developed states of Gujarat, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh also reported high concentration of population in class I cities. Kerala also falls in this category as this state also reports a large number of class I cities. On the other hand, the less developed states of Rajasthan, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh exhibit a low percentage of urban population in these cities.

The share of class II and class III towns, however, has remained stable in most of the states, as is the case at the national level during the seventies and eighties. The only exceptions are the smaller states like Meghalaya, Nagaland, Himachal Pradesh, Goa, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and Mizoram where the number of towns in different categories is small and movement of a few towns upwards or downwards across the size classes makes a significant difference in the percentage shares.

The share of population in smaller towns with population below 50,000 (classes IV, V and VI) have declined significantly during eighties in most of the states where the general trend is towards concentration of population in the larger cities, leading to top heavy urban structure. The exceptions are Goa, Sikkim and Tripura.

The census of 2001<sup>4</sup> provides results which are in conformity with the 1991 census. The pattern of distribution of urban population has not

changed very significantly during 1991-2001 (*Table 12.4 b*), the concentration in larger cities has gone up in most of the states"<sup>5</sup>. The states that reported a high share of population in class I cities in earlier years generally maintained the position in 2001 as well. Kerala, too has registered an increase in this percentage figure. Tamil Nadu is the only state in which the share of the cities has declined. This is due to the emergence of a large number of new towns belonging to lower order size categories. Moreover, the new states of Chattisgarh and Jharkhand report high figures for the share of class I cities, much higher than that of their parent states of Madhya Pradesh and Bihar respectively. The state of Uttaranchal, which is also a new state in the 2001 census, however, has lower concentration of population in these cities – much below the national average and even below the figure of the state of Uttar Pradesh.

The population share of the class II and class III towns has remained stable in most of the states during the nineties as well (*Table 12.4 b*). The exceptions are the smaller states, which a movement of one or two towns upwards or downwards has a significant impact on the size class distribution of urban population. In case of the smaller states, the percentage share of population in these size classes has gone down in almost all the states with the few exceptions of the small north eastern states. This pattern is similar for the country as well.

## 12.6 Analysis of Growth of Urban Centres

The present section attempts to analyse the growth rates of towns in different size classes to understand the development dynamics operating at the size class level. The growth rates of urban centres in different size classes have been computed by taking the base year classification for both initial and terminal years. This has been done to take care of the problems of graduation of towns into higher categories during a particular decade.

For analysing the dynamics of growth or their absence in urban centres, the average of the growth rates during the eighties and nineties (*Table 12.5*) have been computed. These have been worked out by classifying the urban centres based on their population in the base year. It may be mentioned here that these are different from the growth rates of population for different size classes, given in (*Table 12.6*), although the latter too have also been computed by classifying the cities and towns as per the base year population. The two figures for any category for a decade are different since the latter is computed by aggregating the population of all the cities/towns (belonging to the category in the base year) and then computing the growth rates while the latter is obtained by averaging their individual growth rates.

An analysis of the above tables shows that the average growth rates for class I cities is higher than that of other size categories in most of the states. This pattern is evident during the decades of the eighties and nineties. This reconfirms the thesis that the big cities have been experiencing higher demographic growth during eighties and nineties, as was the case in earlier decades<sup>6</sup>.

## 12.7 Growth Rates of Common Towns/UAs during 1971-91

The growth rates of towns in different size classes have been computed by taking the base year classification for both initial as well as terminal years. This has been done to take care of the problems of graduation of



towns into higher categories during a decade as discussed in the previous section (Kundu, 2005). An analysis of the data shows a distinct pattern of growth for different classes of towns. The growth rates for the class I cities worked out as higher than the smaller order towns in the developed states during the period 1971-91, as was noted for the country (Table 12.6a). In states like Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu and Punjab<sup>7</sup>, the growth rates of these cities are significantly higher than that of all lower order towns except those in the lowest category (class VI<sup>8</sup>). It may be noted that West Bengal is the only exception among the developed states wherein the growth rate of class I cities is below that of the small towns. This, however, is similar to the pattern observed for the less developed states. In these states, the smaller towns have grown at similar or higher rate than the class I cities. Bihar, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh fall in this category.

## 12.8 Growth Pattern during 1991-2001

The pattern of growth during the nineties has remained similar to the previous decades. (Table 12.6 b). The developed states exhibit a pattern identical to that of the preceding two decades. Punjab, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu fall in this category. A departure is however noted in case of a few backward states, which also exhibit a similar pattern of growth. In states like Himachal Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, Orissa and Assam, the class I cities are growing at a faster rate than the lower order towns. There are, however, a few exceptions. Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Kerala are among the backward states and Haryana, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh among the developed states where the above pattern exists besides a few of the smaller states. West Bengal, on the other hand, follows the pattern of the previous decades.

## 12.9 Disparity in the Growth Across Size Class of Urban Centres

Stability of growth in different size categories can be ascertained by analysing the disparity in growth rates (Kundu 1983). Table 12.7 (a & b) gives the coefficient of variation for the growth rates of urban centres belonging to the different size categories, during the eighties and nineties. An analysis of the tables show that the class I cities show greater stability and consistency in growth. This is reflected in the lower coefficients of variation of their growth rates during the eighties which is noted to have gone down during the eighties compared to the seventies (Kundu and Bhalla 1984). The lower order size categories show different growth dynamism. The coefficients of variation in their growth rates have remained stable or gone up during the two decades.

### Reflection and Action 12.2

Make a careful study of the Tables 12.1 to 12.7 given at the end of this unit. Note down the Figures or details given in these tables which pertain to the state to which you belong.

Write a report on the analysis of this data regarding your state in about two pages and discuss it with your Academic Counsellor and other learners at your Study Centre.

During the last decade, a significant departure from the earlier trends is noted in the growth scenario. The class I cities recorded a significant

increase in the coefficient of variation of their growth rates. This implies that class I cities, although they have maintained an edge in terms of growth rates, are now subject to greater instability. The disparity is particularly high in the two developed states of Tamil Nadu and West Bengal. In Tamil Nadu, the cities like Tiruppur have grown by about 80 per cent while the population in towns of Thoothikudi (Tuticorin) and Valparai has gone down by 10 per cent. A similar growth pattern is seen in West Bengal in which the cities like Siliguri have grown by 120 per cent whereas Nabadwip has lost population at 20 per cent during 1991-2001. One can attribute this growing instability in the growth of class I cities to the policies of globalisation and linking of only a few of these to the national and international market that have registered high demographic growth.

It may nonetheless be argued that despite the coefficient of variation being high in class I cities, this is less than that of all lower order towns. The smaller towns in the country have had high instability in their growth even in the earlier decades and hence this cannot be linked to the policies of structural adjustment and their impact on the process of urbanisation.

## 12.10 Conclusion

India after experiencing a very fast rate of urbanisation during the seventies has reported a significant deceleration during the eighties as also nineties. The decline is witnessed in all size categories and in most of the states. However, the class I cities in the developed states have maintained a higher growth in comparison to the small towns. These cities have also reported a reduction in variation in their growth rates. The small and medium towns in the less developed states, on the other hand, have experienced rapid growth but high fluctuation in their growth rates. The faster pace of growth of class I cities in the developed states may be attributed to their strong economic and industrial base and growth therein. The phenomenon of the growth of new towns on the peripheries of metros may be attributed to the process of limited industrial dispersal around the larger cities. As opposed to this, the rapid growth of the small and medium towns and emergence of new towns in the backward states is due to the slow pace of sectoral diversification and outmigration from villages due to rural poverty.

One would also observe that the economic base of ULBs in the developed states is such that they are in a position to fetch more revenues than their counterparts in the backward states. Moreover, the high percentage share of workers in the industrial sector in Class I cities allows them to have a broader tax base. On the other hand, the high percentage of workers in the household industry and Other Services in small and medium towns limits their tax raising capacity. All these lead to a significant disparity in the municipal capacity to invest in basic amenities across the states as also size classes.

A distinctly different spatial pattern exists between the level of urbanization and pace of urban growth. The pattern and trend of urbanization in the backward states has historically been different from that of the relatively developed states. Since independence, the developed states of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu and Haryana have had a high level of urbanization although they experienced medium or low growth. This pattern of growth continued until 1991. The relatively backward states that had low urban population in contrast registered high urban growth rate. These states are Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh. The 1990s, however, make a significant departure. Many of the

developed states have registered urban growth above the national average whereas the backward states have experienced growth either below that of the national average or equal to that. As a result, one notices the disparity in terms of growth to have gone up across the states during the 1990s.

A changing pattern of urbanization in the size class distribution of towns across the states is observed during the 1990s. During the previous decades, class I cities in developed states had reported higher growth rates when compared to smaller towns whereas in the backward states the smaller towns had grown at similar or higher rate than the class I cities. This pattern witnessed a change in the nineties. Many of the backward states have reported high urban growth in their class I cities. These states are Himachal Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, Orissa and Assam. However, the pattern in the developed states has remained similar to the earlier decades. Moreover, among class I cities, million plus cities and capital cities are recording a higher growth rate. This has resulted in increasing disparity in the growth rates within the class I cities during 1991-2001. The process of globalization which is resulting in linking a few cities of the developing countries to the global economy is indeed resulting in widening of the disparity in their growth rates.

The share of the medium towns or those belonging to the class II and III categories is more or less stable in most of the states as also at the national level. Small towns (class IV to VI) report a decline in their share in urban population as few new towns have come up in the last decade. Moreover, many of these have moved up to the next higher category or have been declassified. The small towns, however, have reported similar or higher growth rates than class I cities in backward states. The small towns in the states of Bihar, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh show such growth dynamics. The reasons for the growth in small towns could be distress outmigration from the villages to the small towns due to high levels of poverty in such regions and decline in new job opportunities in the big cities.

## 12.11 Further Reading

- Bhalla, G. S. and A. Kundu (1984), 'Small and Medium Towns in a Regional Perspective—The Case of Batala and Moga in Punjab State (India), in O.P. Mathur(ed.), *The Role of Small Cities in Regional Development*, UNCRD, Nagoya.
- Kundu, A. (1983), 'Theories of City Size Distribution and the Indian Urban Structure; A Reappraisal', *Economic and Political Weekly*, July.
- (1992), *Urban Development and Urban Research in India*, New Delhi: Khama. Publications, New Delhi.

## Tables 12.12

Table 12.1: Profile of Urban Growth in India during 1901-2001

Census Year	Number of Towns						Percentage of Urban Population						Annual Exponential Growth Rate					
	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI
1901	24	43	130	391	744	479	26	11.29	15.64	20.83	20.14	6.1	—					
1911	23	40	135	364	707	485	27.48	10.51	16.4	19.73	19.31	6.57	0.54	-0.73	0.46	-0.55	-0.43	0.72
1921	29	45	145	370	734	571	29.7	10.39	15.92	18.29	18.67	7.03	1.57	0.68	0.50	0.03	0.46	1.47
1931	35	56	183	434	800	509	31.2	11.65	16.8	18	17.14	5.21	2.24	2.89	2.28	1.59	0.89	-1.25
1941	49	74	242	498	920	407	38.23	11.42	16.35	15.78	15.08	3.14	4.81	2.59	2.51	1.47	1.50	-2.26
1951	76	91	327	608	1124	569	44.63	9.96	15.72	13.63	12.97	3.09	5.02	2.10	3.07	2.01	1.97	3.31
1961	102	129	437	719	711	172	51.42	11.23	16.94	12.77	6.87	0.77	3.72	3.50	3.05	1.65	-4.05	-11.62
1971	148	173	558	827	623	147	57.24	10.92	16.01	10.94	4.45	0.44	4.29	2.93	2.65	1.67	-1.14	-2.32
1981	218	270	743	1059	758	253	60.37	11.63	14.33	9.54	3.58	0.5	4.34	4.43	2.69	2.43	1.64	5.05
1991	300	345	947	1167	740	197	65.2	10.95	13.19	7.77	2.6	0.29	3.84	2.38	2.26	1.02	-0.13	-2.45
2001	393	401	1151	1344	888	191	68.67	9.67	12.23	6.84	2.36	0.23	3.42	1.76	2.15	1.64	1.93	0.80

**Note** : Size class wise figures exclude Assam in 1981 and Jammu & Kashmir in 1991.

**Source** : Paper-2, Rural-Urban Distribution, 1981, 1991.

**Table 12.2:**  
**Level of Urbanisation Across States**

Sl. No.	States	1971	1981	1991	2001
1	Andhra Pradesh	19.31	23.25	26.84	27.08
2	Arunachal Pradesh	3.7	6.32	12.21	20.41
3	Assam	—	—	11.08	12.72
4	Bihar	10	12.46	13.17	10.47
5	<i>Chattisgarh</i>	—	—	—	20.08
6	Delhi	89.7	92.84	89.93	93.01
7	Goa	26.44*	32.46*	41.02	49.77
8	Gujarat	28.08	31.08	34.4	37.35
9	Haryana	17.66	21.96	24.79	29
10	Himachal Pradesh	6.99	7.72	8.7	9.79
11	Jammu & Kashmir	—	—	23.83	24.88
12	<i>Jharkhand</i>	—	—	—	22.25
13	Karnataka	24.31	28.91	30.91	33.98
14	Kerala	16.24	18.78	26.44	25.97
15	Madhya Pradesh	16.29	20.31	23.21	26.67
16	Maharashtra	31.17	35.03	38.73	42.4
17	Manipur	13.19	26.44	27.69	23.88
18	Meghalaya	14.55	18.03	18.69	19.63
19	Mizoram	11.36	25.17	46.2	49.5
20	Nagaland	9.95	15.54	17.28	17.74
21	Orissa	8.41	11.82	13.43	14.97
22	Punjab	23.73	27.72	29.72	33.95
23	Rajasthan	17.63	20.93	22.88	23.38
24	Sikkim	9.37	16.23	9.12	11.1
25	Tamil Nadu	30.26	32.98	34.2	43.86
26	Tripura	10.43	10.98	15.26	17.02
27	Uttar Pradesh	14.02	18.01	19.89	20.78
28	<i>Uttaranchal</i>	—	—	—	25.59
29	West Bengal	24.75	26.49	27.39	28.03
	<i>Union Territories</i>				
1	Andaman & Nicobar	22.77	26.36	26.8	32.67
2	Chandigarh	90.55	93.6	89.69	89.78
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0	6.67	8.47	22.89
4	Daman & Diu	—	—	46.86	36.26
5	Lakshadweep	0	46.31	56.29	44.47
6	Pondicherry	42.04	52.32	64.05	66.57
	<b>All India</b>	<b>20.22</b>	<b>23.73</b>	<b>25.72</b>	<b>27.78</b>

**Note:** The figures for Goa in 1971 and 1981 (\*) corresponds to Goa, Daman and Diu.

Source: Population Census, Paper 2, 1981, 1991 and Provisional Population Totals 2001.

Annual Exponential Growth Rate of Urbanisation Across States

Sl. No.	States	1971-81	1981-91	1991-01
1	Andhra Pradesh	3.94	3.55	1.37
2	Arunachal Pradesh	8.32	9.28	7.00
3	Assam	0.00	3.27	3.09
4	Bihar	4.34	2.65	2.57
5	<i>Chattisgarh</i>	—	—	3.09
6	Delhi	4.56	3.79	4.14
7	Goa	4.37	3.96	3.32
8	Gujarat	3.42	2.90	2.8
9	Haryana	4.65	3.58	4.11
10	Himachal Pradesh	3.02	3.11	2.81
11	Jammu & Kashmir	0.00	3.78	6.87
12	<i>Jharkhand</i>	—	—	2.55
13	Karnataka	4.08	2.55	2.53
14	Kerala	3.19	4.76	0.74
15	Madhya Pradesh	4.45	3.71	2.71
16	Maharashtra	3.35	3.27	2.95
17	Manipur	9.70	2.98	1.21
18	Meghalaya	4.87	3.10	3.16
19	Mizoram	11.79	9.57	3.27
20	Nagaland	8.49	5.58	5.27
21	Orissa	5.21	3.08	2.61
22	Punjab	3.62	2.55	3.19
23	Rajasthan	4.52	3.31	2.71
24	Sikkim	9.55	-3.23	4.83
25	Tamil Nadu	2.45	1.76	3.56
26	Tripura	3.26	6.19	2.53
27	Uttar Pradesh	4.78	3.29	2.84
28	<i>Uttaranchal</i>	—	—	2.84
29	West Bengal	2.75	2.54	1.84
	<i>Union Territories</i>			
1	Andaman & Nicobar	6.38	4.10	4.40
2	Chandigarh	5.92	3.07	3.40
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	—	5.28	14.59
4	Daman & Diu	—	4.93	1.87
5	Lakshadweep	—	4.46	-0.77
6	Pondicherry	4.66	4.92	2.26
	All India	3.79	3.09	2.73

Note: Based on Kundu et al 2005

Table 12.4a: Percentage of Population in Different Size Categories to Total Urban Population

	States	1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991
	I	I	I	II	II	III	III	IV-VII	IV-VII	Total	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	53.69	66.88	16.17	12.6	20.95	16.53	9.19	3.99	100	100
2	Arunachal Pradesh	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	100	100	100
3	Assam	N.A	37.56	N.A	11.65	N.A	25.61	N.A	25.18	NA	100
4	Bihar	54.12	52.62	14.38	17.58	19.26	20.8	12.24	9	100	100
5	Delhi	99.32	99.38	-	-	-	-	0.68	0.62	100	100
6	Goa	-	-	65.61	51.84	8.05	6.59	26.34	41.57	100	100
7	Gujarat	57.92	66.43	14.53	12.73	13.37	10.52	14.18	10.32	100	100
8	Haryana	56.64	58.54	10.82	15.11	14.8	11.95	17.74	14.4	100	100
9	Himachal Pradesh	-	24.7	21.54	-	12.49	19.6	65.97	55.7	100	100
10	Jammu & Kashmir	65.8	NA	-	NA	11.74	NA	22.46	NA	100	NA
11	Karnataka	58.6	64.6	5.46	7.35	17.75	17.68	17.19	10.37	100	100
12	Kerala	53.13	66.34	9.52	7.22	31.86	19.08	5.49	7.36	100	100
13	Madhya Pradesh	46.84	50.38	18	13.94	12.24	12.82	22.92	22.86	100	100
14	Maharashtra	75.24	77.85	5.95	6.49	10.88	10.39	7.93	5.27	100	100
15	Manipur	41.72	39.66	-	-	11.18	17.96	47.1	42.38	100	100
16	Meghalaya	72.39	67.54	-	-	14.61	20.18	13	12.28	100	100
17	Mizoram	-	48.68	61.15	-	-	17.79	38.85	33.53	100	100
18	Nagaland	-	-	-	52.38	55.9	21.71	44.1	25.91	100	100
19	Orissa	41.63	44.43	12.76	14.65	21.83	19.73	23.78	21.19	100	100
20	Punjab	46.4	54.36	13.28	19.79	21.31	12.89	19.01	12.96	100	100
21	Rajasthan	46.52	50.09	10.05	13.67	22.02	21.31	21.41	14.93	100	100
22	Sikkim	-	-	-	-	71.93	67.52	28.07	32.48	100	100
23	Tamil Nadu	62.19	65.96	15.99	15.21	12.52	11.19	9.3	7.64	100	100
24	Tripura	58.6	37.62	-	-	9.22	27.59	32.18	34.79	100	100
25	Uttar Pradesh	51.49	55.99	12.71	11.45	12.34	13.94	23.46	18.62	100	100
26	West Bengal	76.84	81.71	10.78	6.58	7.71	7.66	4.67	4.05	100	100
	<i>Union Territories</i>										
1	Andaman & Nicobar	-	-	-	100	100	-	-	-	100	100
2	Chandigarh	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	100
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	100	100	100
4	Daman & Diu	-	-	-	-	72.37	100	27.63	-	100	100
5	Lakshadweep	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	100	100	100
6	Pondicherry	79.55	77.64	-	11.97	13.74	3.93	6.71	6.46	100	100
	All India	60.37	65.2	11.63	10.95	14.33	13.19	13.62	10.66	100	100

Note : NA- Not Available; All-India average excludes Assam and Jammu & Kashmir.

Source : Based on Kundu et al 2005 , (Computed from the data of Paper-2 Rural-Urban Distribution, 1981, 1991)

**Table 12.4b: Percentage of Population in Different Size categories to  
Total Urban Population in 2001**

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	CLASS IV	CLASS V	CLASS VI	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	75.31	13.95	8.35	1.69	0.68	0.04	100
2	Arun Pradesh	—	—	37.66	43.23	15.40	3.72	100
3	Assam	44.34	14.37	18.56	13.74	8.44	0.54	100
4	Bihar	59.31	13.66	23.57	3.23	0.23	—	100
5	Chattisgarh	63.02	8.94	13.17	11.12	3.74	—	100
6	Delhi	99.78	—	—	0.12	0.10	—	100
7	Goa	15.65	28.90	9.20	29.55	14.60	2.09	100
8	Gujarat	76.50	9.67	9.47	3.55	0.67	0.14	100
9	Haryana	72.57	5.78	11.89	7.65	2.03	0.07	100
10	Hima Prad.	24.30	—	25.87	19.06	19.10	11.66	100
11	Jammu & Kash.	63.03	14.70	3.89	10.02	5.85	2.51	100
12	Jharkhand	71.34	7.09	12.34	5.16	3.51	0.55	100
13	Karnataka	67.20	9.63	17.28	4.68	1.07	0.13	100
14	Kerala	68.82	11.32	14.05	4.98	0.82	—	100
15	Madhya Pradesh	55.77	12.00	15.95	12.13	4.01	0.15	100
16	Maharashtra	79.70	6.66	9.42	3.31	0.84	0.07	100
17	Manipur	43.12	—	19.41	17.12	17.66	2.69	100
18	Meghalaya	59.19	12.90	10.39	15.61	1.91	—	100
19	Mizoram	52.08	—	16.73	15.19	10.48	5.51	100
20	Nagaland	30.44	22.27	34.40	12.89	—	—	100
21	Orissa	48.41	17.12	18.20	12.65	3.17	0.45	100
22	Punjab	58.39	16.45	12.50	9.82	2.52	0.33	100
23	Rajasthan	57.23	13.94	20.80	6.92	1.00	0.11	100
24	Sikkim	—	—	48.60	24.45	9.05	17.90	100
25	Tamil Nadu	56.35	11.64	12.21	14.37	5.26	0.17	100
26	Tripura	34.86	—	33.37	21.12	10.65	—	100
27	Uttar Pradesh	62.16	9.95	14.40	10.39	2.97	0.13	100
28	Uttaranchal	47.10	12.04	20.47	9.46	8.91	2.02	100
29	West Bengal	83.54	4.34	5.96	3.14	2.59	0.43	100
	<i>Union Territories</i>							
1	Andaman & N	86.07	—	—	—	13.93	—	100
2	Chandigarh	100.00	—	—	—	—	—	100
3	Dadra & N	—	—	100.00	—	—	—	100
4	Daman and Div	—	—	100.00	—	—	—	100
5	Lakshadweep	—	—	—	37.53	62.47	—	100
6	Pondicherry	78.01	11.47	10.52	—	—	—	100
	All India	68.67	9.67	12.23	6.84	2.36	0.23	100

Source: Based on Kundu et al 2005 (Computed from the unpublished data of Paper-2, Rural-Urban Distribution, 2001).



Table 12.5a. The average of Growth Rates during 1981-91 of Towns as per Their Size Class Distribution in 1981

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	CLASS IV	CLASS V	CLASS VI
		1981-91	1981-91	1981-91	1981-91	1981-91	1981-91
1	Andhra Pradesh	3.35	3.27	2.78	3.08	2.42	0.80
2	Arunachal Pradesh	—	—	—	—	7.07	3.82
3	Assam	10.70	5.12	3.79	4.83	5.77	6.49
4	Bihar	2.07	2.50	2.76	2.59	3.08	—
5	Chattisgarh	2.86	3.06	2.97	2.45	3.57	3.84
6	Delhi	3.85	—	—	—	—	—
7	Goa	—	1.60	1.97	1.13	3.52	11.18
8	Gujarat	3.10	2.17	2.17	1.85	2.59	4.15
9	Haryana	2.92	2.83	2.69	3.96	3.08	3.02
10	Himachal Pradesh	—	4.13	0.35	2.74	3.04	2.98
11	Jammu & Kashmir	3.34	—	2.26	3.57	3.43	4.41
12	Jharkhand	2.68	1.45	2.13	2.15	1.57	-0.08
13	Karnataka	2.71	2.75	1.95	1.96	1.77	2.01
14	Kerala	3.35	4.79	2.58	1.21	1.34	—
15	Madhya Pradesh	2.60	3.32	2.66	2.77	3.08	1.79
16	Maharashtra	4.03	2.43	2.59	2.56	2.14	13.98
17	Manipur	2.59	—	—	2.52	3.69	2.08
18	Meghalaya	2.46	—	2.67	4.66	2.43	9.69
19	Mizoram	—	7.35	—	7.27	7.21	—
20	Nagaland	—	—	4.81	4.37	4.73	—
21	Orissa	3.11	2.59	2.38	2.07	2.23	5.22
22	Punjab	2.31	2.62	2.63	1.88	2.17	1.08
23	Rajasthan	3.32	2.65	3.21	2.72	2.26	—
24	Sikkim	—	—	-3.84	—	—	-1.23
25	Tamil Nadu	1.43	1.30	1.44	1.45	1.81	2.54
26	Tripura	—	—	2.19	1.48	2.11	2.60
27	Uttar Pradesh	2.99	2.80	3.22	2.92	2.72	2.90
28	Uttaranchal	2.39	2.49	3.69	3.64	3.43	3.47
29	West Bengal	2.55	3.23	3.77	2.88	2.91	8.28
	<i>Union Territories</i>						
1	Andaman & Nicobar	—	—	4.12	—	—	—
2	Chandigarh	3.09	—	—	—	—	—
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	—	—	—	5.28	—	—
4	Daman and Diu	—	—	2.48	—	9.45	—
5	Lakshadweep	—	—	—	—	—	—
6	Pondicherry	4.68	—	2.28	5.57	—	—
	All India	2.97	2.72	2.62	2.57	2.89	4.13

Note: The size class distribution is made on the basis of population on the base year and average of individual growth rates of the towns/cities is computed.

Source: Based on Kundu et al 2005 (Paper-2 Rural-Urban Distribution, 1991)

Table 12.5b. The Average of Growth Rates during 1991-2001 of Towns as per Their Size Class Distribution in 1991

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	CLASS IV	CLASS V	CLASS VI
1	Andhra Pradesh	1.78	2.19	1.74	1.74	-0.02	-
2	Arunachal Pradesh	-	-	-	4.37	3.03	-
3	Assam	2.80	2.73	2.08	2.08	2.04	5.15
4	Bihar	2.69	2.79	2.53	2.39	2.87	1.47
5	Chattisgarh	4.67	2.17	2.15	1.41	1.42	-
6	Delhi	4.18	-	-	-	-	-
7	Goa	-	1.87	2.37	1.65	0.75	2.16
8	Gujarat	3.12	1.88	2.09	1.96	1.86	1.99
9	Haryana	3.75	4.81	3.35	2.86	3.84	5.47
10	Jammu & Kashmir	7.71	-	8.34	4.98	6.16	6.75
11	Jharkhand	2.64	2.41	2.99	1.75	1.11	-1.71
12	Himachal Pradesh	2.70	-	2.41	2.40	1.99	2.68
13	Karnataka	2.21	2.96	2.15	2.64	0.87	0.55
14	Kerala	1.10	1.55	1.16	1.54	2.24	-
15	Madhya Pradesh	2.44	2.95	2.72	2.30	2.08	-0.25
16	Maharashtra	2.77	2.78	2.03	2.51	2.43	3.17
17	Manipur	1.93	-	1.92	1.80	1.96	1.21
18	Meghalaya	1.82	-	2.16	4.24	3.23	-
19	Mizoram	3.92	-	2.63	3.29	2.43	1.80
20	Nagaland	-	5.32	2.89	7.10	5.35	-
21	Orissa	3.04	1.84	2.14	1.55	1.90	-0.63
22	Punjab	2.71	2.32	2.20	2.36	2.37	6.30
23	Rajasthan	2.82	2.78	2.42	2.42	1.63	-
24	Sikkim	-	-	1.53	-	-	2.95
25	Tamil Nadu	1.41	0.98	1.27	1.21	1.20	-1.01
26	Tripura	-	-	1.24	2.47	2.66	1.85
27	Uttar Pradesh	2.84	2.42	2.82	2.36	2.41	2.87
28	Uttaranchal	3.21	2.52	2.12	1.89	2.37	3.68
29	West Bengal	2.23	2.45	2.28	1.61	1.67	0.52
	<i>Union Territories</i>						
1	Andaman & Nicobar	-	2.90	-	-	-	-
2	Chandigarh	3.40	-	-	-	-	-
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	-	-	-	6.24	-	-
4	Daman and Diu	-	-	1.71	-	-	-
5	Lakshadweep	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Pondicherry	2.31	1.85	2.80	-	-	-
	<b>All India</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.21</b>	<b>3.54</b>

Note: The size class distribution is made on the basis of population on the base year and average of individual growth rates of the towns/cities is computed.

Source: Based on Kundu et al 2005 (Computed from the unpublished data of Paper-2, Rural-Urban Distribution, 2001).

Table 12.6a. Annual Exponential Growth Rate of Urban Population of Common Towns/UA s

Sl. No	States	1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991
		I	I	II	II	III	III	IV-VI	IV-VI
1	Andhra Pradesh	3.80	4.00	3.69	3.35	3.76	2.81	3.55	2.58
2	Arunachal Pradesh	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.57	5.91
3	Assam	N.A	NA	N.A	NA	N.A	NA	N.A	N.A
4	Bihar	4.48	2.14	2.40	1.97	4.34	2.51	3.59	2.84
5	Delhi	4.52	3.80	-	-	-	-	-	2.62
6	Goa	-	-	2.65	1.60	3.54	1.95	3.80	3.64
7	Gujarat	4.11	3.13	2.68	2.66	2.79	2.14	2.87	2.31
8	Haryana	5.16	3.42	4.10	2.77	3.39	2.84	2.99	3.51
9	Himachal Pradesh	-	-	2.42	4.09	-0.25	0.33	1.98	2.69
10	Jammu & Kashmir	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
11	Karnataka	4.44	2.95	3.59	2.99	3.19	1.85	2.88	1.90
12	Kerala	2.71	3.32	3.46	4.86	1.65	2.56	3.16	2.36
13	Madhya Pradesh	3.95	2.85	3.48	3.34	3.95	2.75	3.15	2.77
14	Maharashtra	3.48	3.28	3.08	2.41	2.66	2.47	2.34	2.62
15	Manipur	4.45	2.48	-	-	-	3.26	8.37	3.17
16	Meghalaya	3.53	2.41	-	-	-	2.59	6.80	6.67
17	Mizoram	-	-	-	7.28	8.53	-	10.51	7.20
18	Nagaland	-	-	-	-	4.66	4.93	5.34	4.47
19	Orissa	4.80	3.17	3.29	2.65	3.91	2.40	3.86	2.11
20	Punjab	3.32	3.04	3.58	2.61	2.86	2.65	3.11	2.00
21	Rajasthan	4.29	3.28	3.38	2.68	3.84	3.21	3.31	2.63
22	Sikkim	-	-	-	-	-	-3.80	9.54	-1.70
23	Tamil Nadu	2.77	1.88	2.20	1.32	2.06	1.35	1.71	1.52
24	Tripura	2.76	1.76	-	-	-	2.19	1.59	1.69
25	Uttar Pradesh	2.68	3.14	3.24	2.80	3.63	3.29	3.31	2.87
26	West Bengal	2.32	2.05	2.88	3.37	4.12	3.50	3.59	3.59
	<i>Union Territories</i>								
1	Andaman & Nicobar	-	-	-	-	6.38	4.10	-	-
2	Chandigarh	5.96	3.06	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Dadra & Nagar H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.27
4	Daman & Diu	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.09	4.93
5	Lakshadweep	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.29
6	Pondicherry	4.84	4.68	-	-	5.09	3.54	1.86	3.70
	All India	3.46	2.96	3.09	2.75	3.33	2.59	3.07	2.57

Note: NA - Not Available as Census was not held in Assam & J&K in '81 and '91 respectively.

Source: Based on Kundu et al 2005 (Paper-2, Rural-Urban Distribution, 1991).

Table 12.6 b Annual Exponential Growth Rate of Urban Population of Common Towns/UA s in 1991-2001

Sl.No.	States/U.Ts	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	CLASS IV	CLASS V	CLASS VI
1	Andhra Pradesh	2.02	2.14	1.71	1.74	-0.03	--
2	Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	4.46	3.11	--
3	Assam	3.05	2.70	2.16	2.10	2.07	4.70
4	Bihar	3.23	2.74	2.60	2.33	2.95	1.47
5	Chattisgarh	3.94	2.02	2.00	1.38	1.40	--
6	Delhi	4.18	--	--	--	--	--
7	Goa	--	1.82	2.37	1.61	0.75	2.18
8	Gujarat	3.60	1.98	2.10	1.99	1.87	-1.38
9	Haryana	4.12	4.80	3.30	2.84	3.84	5.58
10	Hima Pradesh	2.70	--	2.41	2.30	1.86	2.69
11	Jammu & Kashmir	6.44	--	8.30	5.07	6.16	6.75
12	Jharkhand	2.79	2.48	3.05	1.78	0.98	-1.71
13	Karnataka	2.69	3.03	2.18	2.52	0.98	0.56
14	Kerala	1.10	1.38	1.12	1.68	2.12	--
15	Madh Pradesh	2.67	2.84	2.72	2.27	2.04	-0.25
16	Maharashtra	2.91	2.72	2.05	2.55	2.41	3.23
17	Manipur	1.93	--	1.96	1.79	1.97	1.01
18	Meghalaya	1.82	--	2.24	4.24	3.15	--
19	Mizoram	3.92	--	2.69	3.29	2.41	1.80
20	Nagaland	--	5.38	2.84	7.38	5.37	--
21	Orissa	3.08	1.87	2.13	1.58	1.88	-0.64
22	Punjab	2.99	2.34	2.23	2.26	2.59	6.45
23	Rajasthan	3.24	2.82	2.39	2.42	1.65	--
24	Sikkim	--	--	1.53	--	--	3.00
25	Tamil Nadu	1.71	0.97	1.31	1.16	1.31	-0.83
26	Tripura	--	--	1.35	2.39	2.63	1.85
27	Uttar Pradesh	2.87	2.46	2.83	2.36	2.42	2.83
28	Uttaranchal	3.19	2.46	2.13	1.87	2.31	2.73
29	West Bengal	1.99	2.43	2.23	1.60	1.68	0.52
	<i>Union Territories</i>						
1	Andaman & Nicobar	--	2.90	--	--	--	--
2	Chandigarh	3.40	--	--	--	--	--
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	--	--	--	6.24	--	--
4	Daman and Diu	--	--	1.87	--	--	--
5	Lakshadweep	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	Pondicherry	2.31	1.85	2.38	--	--	--
	All India	2.76	2.37	2.27	2.19	2.22	3.26

Source: Based on Kundu et al 2005. (Computed from the data of Paper-2, Rural-Urban Distribution, 2001)

**Table 12.7a: The Coefficient of Variations of Growth Rates of Towns as per Their Size Class Distribution in 1981**

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	CLASS IV	CLASS V	CLASS VI
1	Andhra Pradesh	54.32	77.55	51.45	62.23	62.55	—
2	Arunachal Pradesh	—	—	—	—	44.70	—
3	Assam	—	47.31	71.46	101.06	106.95	154.27
4	Bihar	22.29	56.39	47.67	67.23	75.58	—
5	Chattisgarh	27.54	59.50	30.73	33.30	44.29	—
6	Delhi	—	—	—	—	—	—
7	Goa	—	61.82	—	119.64	142.12	114.27
8	Gujarat	46.27	93.79	58.28	81.03	106.19	109.67
9	Haryana	57.25	44.55	46.59	214.86	65.79	55.11
10	Himachal Pradesh	—	—	215.03	60.66	109.03	90.28
11	Jammu & Kashmir	12.78	—	15.18	67.52	69.66	191.15
12	Jharkhand	45.24	129.78	47.03	75.69	129.91	—
13	Karnataka	43.52	86.19	61.00	69.56	92.38	111.59
14	Kerala	45.31	87.63	166.06	46.55	7.77	—
15	Madhya Pradesh	35.53	56.76	47.11	49.67	64.78	145.61
16	Maharashtra	57.94	45.67	62.36	65.93	82.69	212.12
17	Manipur	—	—	—	39.66	110.61	87.10
18	Meghalaya	—	—	—	—	—	70.49
19	Mizoram	—	—	—	—	47.48	—
20	Nagaland	—	—	27.67	45.08	22.53	—
21	Orissa	70.55	40.25	39.97	52.61	74.87	159.99
22	Punjab	84.06	27.07	93.98	90.91	71.35	78.40
23	Rajasthan	33.21	28.11	33.97	40.81	63.28	—
24	Sikkim	—	—	—	—	—	-260.08
25	Tamil Nadu	65.32	50.99	74.10	87.46	119.59	108.49
26	Tripura	—	—	—	41.78	23.84	62.27
27	Uttar Pradesh	45.28	31.25	39.41	63.27	43.05	47.58
28	Uttaranchal	7.31	39.99	50.45	51.83	79.29	91.45
29	West Bengal	48.10	87.66	138.95	57.43	71.17	80.25
	<i>Union Territories</i>						
1	Andaman & Nicobar	—	—	—	—	—	—
2	Chandigarh	—	—	—	—	—	—
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	—	—	—	—	—	—
4	Daman and Diu	—	—	—	—	—	—
5	Lakshadweep	—	—	—	—	—	—
6	Pondicherry	—	—	92.10	—	—	—
	<b>All India</b>	<b>63.42</b>	<b>75.93</b>	<b>80.18</b>	<b>90.81</b>	<b>87.08</b>	<b>241.44</b>

Table 12.7b: The Coefficient of Variations of Growth Rates of Towns as per Their Size Class Distribution in 1991

Sl. No.	States/U.Ts	CLASS I	CLASS II	CLASS III	CLASS IV	CLASS V	CLASS VI
1	Andhra Pradesh	64.6	92.4	62.2	97.3		—
2	Arunachal Pradesh	—	—	—	82.7	32.2	—
3	Assam	67.8	78.2	70.6	86.7	64.8	94.6
4	Bihar	35.6	51.1	42.0	54.6	24.8	—
5	Chattisgarh	91.1	103.9	54.7	114.0	74.3	—
6	Delhi	—	—	—	—	—	—
7	Goa	—	41.1	—	56.5	138.4	51.0
8	Gujarat	47.1	75.1	83.3	97.3	104.2	428.6
9	Haryana	46.4	57.7	29.0	52.1	123.0	88.5
10	Himachal Pradesh	—	—	—	—	—	—
11	Jammu & Kashmir	68.0	—	37.53	38.22	67.16	77.70
12	Jharkhand	23.6	38.0	95.2	53.4	190.9	-9.4
13	Karnataka	41.3	71.2	51.5	150.2	230.3	269.7
14	Kerala	54.0	151.7	174.0	194.09	57.9	—
15	Madhya Pradesh	46.5	115.5	55.7	163.0	92.3	—
16	Maharashtra	50.1	118.2	63.9	127.9	211.0	78.9
17	Manipur	—	—	23.5	49.6	65.9	82.0
18	Meghalaya	—	—	15.5	1.9	31.4	—
19	Mizoram	—	—	14.2	14.8	25.4	96.8
20	Nagaland	—	35.2	32.3	54.7	33.9	—
21	Orissa	45.0	48.5	58.4	65.0	151.9	-40.2
22	Punjab	30.8	44.8	64.7	57.1	110.6	96.5
23	Rajasthan	34.8	38.9	39.1	54.4	104.3	—
24	Sikkim	—	—	—	—	—	67.8
25	Tamil Nadu	112.8	68.7	120.0	122.2	146.4	-104.0
26	Tripura	—	—	219.1	123.8	32.1	5.0
27	Uttar Pradesh	60.0	33.4	85.8	52.6	52.1	65.9
28	Uttaranchal	47.9	49.2	59.7	41.6	58.0	178.7
29	West Bengal	109.6	47.3	89.3	86.7	85.2	191.9
	<i>Union Territories</i>						
1	Andaman & Nico.	—	—	—	—	—	—
2	Chandigarh	—	—	—	—	—	—
3	Dadra & Nagar H.	—	—	—	—	—	—
4	Daman and Diu	—	—	109.0	—	—	—
5	Lakshadweep	—	—	—	—	—	—
6	Pondicherry	—	—	97.2	—	—	—
	All India	72.12	86.16	81.30	108.13	110.52	136.19

Source: Based on Kundu et al 2005 (Computed from Paper-2, Rural-Urban Distribution, 2001).

## 12.13 Appendix

- 1) The 1981 Census reported a total of 4029 towns.
- 2) Provisional Population Totals: Rural-Urban Distribution, Census of India, Paper 2 of 1991, Page No. 419.
- 3) The reasons for this growth pattern have been already discussed.
- 4) An analysis of the growth pattern of towns for the 2001 Census has been carried out by Kundu et al in 2006. The study clubbed the smaller towns with population below 20,000 into one category for analysing the growth profile as also structure of urban population.
- 5) Andaman Nicobar Islands merit a special mention as its share has gone up from zero to 85 per cent due to the city of Port Blair graduating to a class I city.
- 6) Kundu (1983).
- 7) In case of Punjab, this holds good for 1981-91 only.
- 8) It may be noted that class VI towns are of special type as many of them have come to exist with the establishment of a large public or private sector unit. Their socio-economic characteristics including demographic growth do not follow the pattern observed in case of other size class of urban centres.