



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

CODEN: IJRSFP (USA)

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol. 9, Issue, 1(I), pp. 23513-23523, January, 2018

**International Journal of
Recent Scientific
Research**

DOI: 10.24327/IJRSR

Research Article

URBANIZATION CONCEPTS, DIMENSIONS AND FACTORS

Manzoor Hussain and Iram Imitiyaz

Department of Sociology, University of Kashmir, Srinagar – 190006 (J&K), India

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2018.0901.1483>

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 9th October, 2017

Received in revised form 25th
October, 2017

Accepted 23rd December, 2017

Published online 28th January, 2018

Key Words:

History of urbanization, urbanization concepts, urban dimensions, urban factors, urban places, urban hierarchy, over-urbanization, urban sprawl, urbanism as a way of life.

ABSTRACT

The urbanization as a concept, its dimensions and factors have always attracted the interest of many researchers across the globe. The present study aims to study the history of urbanization, urbanization concepts, its dimensions and factors like urban places, urban hierarchy, urban primacy, over-urbanization, urban sprawl, urbanism as a way of life, and factors of urbanization. After the comprehensive literature survey, results of various studies were correlated in a systematic manner for further analyses to reveal the findings and draw conclusions. The findings clearly depict that urbanized societies, in which a majority of the people live crowded together in towns and cities, represent a new and fundamental step in man's social evolution. The way cities have influenced and shaped social life throughout the history has led the scholars of urban studies to delve into the origin and development of the urban form. Urbanization is a very complex phenomenon, with myriad dimensions. However, size of the place has been the most widely used criteria in the definition of urban population. Urban areas have a higher concentration of population in a limited area and thus a higher density of population and social heterogeneity.

Copyright © Manzoor Hussain and Iram Imitiyaz, 2018, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Urbanization and Urbanism (city centred cultures) have attracted a great variety of scholars over the years: anthropologists, historians, economists, philosophers, political scientists and sociologists. Although the city is not as old as human society, and yet there have been and still are cultures without cities, the city has been widely recognized as central to any understanding of the phenomenon and problems of social organization and change¹. Cities are complex social facts. That is why they have been analysed from a variety of perspectives. Some have treated cities as moral entities, some as products of human history, some as ecological entities, and some as economic entities. Still others have treated cities as the centres of political control while some have analysed cities as a distinct mode of human existence. Moreover, the focus of interest among the scholars with respect to the city has also varied considerably. Some are concerned with the physical environment of the city, some with the social environment. Some concern themselves with the morphology, history and problems of the city. Still others take interest in what comprises the 'distinctive urban way of life' and still others focus on the dimensions of origin, growth and change. In the sociological analysis, however, the city is viewed as a mode or form of human community - a kind of community where there are

particular symbiotic and commensalistic forces of integration, where human beings acquire certain traits by association, and where institutions and forms of organization arise giving to human life a characteristic aspect which we call 'urban'. Sociologists, then, consider the city a distinct form of human community².

Urbanization implies a change in the economic, social and cultural aspects of the society. It is a process of becoming urban, the movement of people or processes to urban areas, increase of urban areas, population or processes³. Urbanized societies, in which a majority of the people live crowded together in towns and cities, represent a new and fundamental step in man's social evolution. The large and dense agglomerations comprising the urban population involve a degree of human contact and of social complexity never before known⁴. The reason behind this complexity lies in the fact that the contemporary urbanized societies have attained such a gigantic size and have received such a substantial degree of population in its ambit, which has been unknown to human history. As per Davis (1961) urbanization is an extremely new phenomenon in human history, so recent that its rapid growth and full potentialities are not yet thoroughly understood or realized. The first small urban centres appeared only some five to six thousand years ago, a fact which demonstrates how

*Corresponding author: **Manzoor Hussain**

Department of Sociology, University of Kashmir, Srinagar – 190006 (J&K), India

recent the faint beginnings were in the long course of socio-cultural evolution⁵. However, as the history unfolds itself, despite its recent past, these cities have acted as the magnets of attraction for a substantial proportion of population, who have aggregated in this spatial entity to spend their lives within its bounds. Those who did not, nevertheless were influenced by the city's peculiar way of life, as the influence of the city radiated towards its peripheries and hinterlands. The world has witnessed many dramatic transformations on the social, economic and political planes in the course of human history. The city, however, has been a central locale for many of these transformations because the city not only has acted as the centre of innovation but also has been a potential source of control on social life.

The aggregation of population from a dispersed settlement pattern to a compact one, indeed was a break from the past, which subsequently paved way for great transformations in the society. Thus, the story of urbanization of human population is the story of change and transformation – change not only in the settlement pattern but change in the normative as well as institutional spheres of social life. The story behind this transformation presents an epitome of the natural inclination and innate tendency of human beings to progress and move forward on the path of development. Tisdale (1942) endorses this point when he accepts the inevitability of the process of urbanization. As per him urbanization is inherent in the society and to understand this inevitability there are two ways. One is to regard it as the inescapable approach of the predestined march of fate. The other is to see it as the simple outgrowth of what has gone before. In the latter sense, then urbanization was inevitable, inevitable in the limited sense that it was quite natural, inevitable in the way man puts on his coat when the wind blows⁶. Thus urbanized societies represent a new and advanced stage in the course of evolutionary development. Before 1850 no society could be described as predominantly urbanized, and by 1900 only one - Great Britain - could be regarded so. Between 1850 and 1950 the index changed at a much higher rate than from 1800 to 1850, but the rate of change from 1950 to 1960 was twice that of preceding fifty years⁷. Today all the industrial nations are highly urbanized and in the world as a whole the process of urbanization is accelerating rapidly. The process of urbanization is especially occurring at an accelerating and unprecedented rate in the third world countries. According to the estimates and projections of the United Nations Population Division, by the turn of this century, over 50 percent of the world population will be urban against 29 percent in 1950, 39 percent in 1975 and 43 percent in 1985. The urban population of the world, which doubled between 1950 and 1970, has further doubled between 1975 and 2000⁸. The rate of urbanization between 1950 and 2014, defined as the growth rate of the proportion urban and equal to the difference between the urban growth rate and the total growth rate, was 0.93 per cent per year on average. As a result of this rapid urbanization, the population of the world became in 2007 more urban than rural for the first time. The urbanization process is expected to continue for decades and an ever-increasing majority of humankind will likely be living in urban areas⁹. Thus, the globe is witnessing an urban explosion.

Research Design

Purpose of the study

The present study aims to study the history of urbanization, urbanization concepts, its dimensions and factors like urban places, urban hierarchy, urban primacy, over-urbanization, urban sprawl, urbanism as a way of life and factors of urbanization. After the comprehensive literature survey, results of various studies were correlated in a systematic manner for further analyses to reveal the findings and draw conclusions.

METHODOLOGY

The comprehensive literature survey was conducted through various online and offline secondary sources to observe the variation in urbanization concepts and dimensions in order to reveal the findings.

History of urbanization

The way cities have influenced and shaped social life throughout the history has led the scholars of urban studies to delve into the origin and development of the urban form. Inquiry into the origin and subsequent development of cities has been crucial in the understanding of the ushering of urban revolution and the factors that underlie it. For at least 500,000 years, perhaps even a million years - in any case for the major part of human history - man was without a fixed habitation. Yet the people of the Old Stone Age were probably not restless vagabonds drifting from place to place. Quite possibly real nomadism did not develop until the domestication of animals and the need for large pastures. As do some of the other primates, earliest man may have roamed through limited areas while only the surplus population moved to other places in search of food¹⁰. Whenever the population of settlement increased, an increase that could not be sufficed by the available resources, this portion of population had to hive off in search of a new settlement. Thus, the rudimentary techniques of food procuring did not permit sufficient number of persons a permanent settled existence. The limited supply of food proved to be a great source of constraint for the communal living. The Old Stone Age came to an end with the beginning of Neolithic period. The Neolithic period was pregnant with the seeds of development of human society. It carried within it the seeds of permanent settlement. The diverse technological innovations constituting Neolithic culture were necessary for the existence of settled communities¹¹. It was the period which led to among other things, domestication of plants. The Neolithic revolution certainly allowed the expansion of population and enormously increased the carrying capacity of suitable land¹². In the beginning of Neolithic age, due to the low efficiency of techniques, the surplus produced was not sufficient. However, as the time passed this surplus increased. Between 6000 and 4000 B.C. certain inventions such as the ox-drawn plough and wheeled cart, the sailboat, metallurgy, irrigation, and the domestication of new plants facilitated a more intensive and more productive use of the Neolithic elements themselves. When this enriched technology was utilized in certain unusual regions where climate, soil, water, and topography were most favourable (broad river valleys with alluvial soil not exhausted by successive cropping, with a dry climate that minimized soil leaching, with plenty of sunshine, and with sediment-containing water for irrigation from the river itself), the result

was a sufficiently productive economy to make possible the sine qua non of urban existence, the concentration in one place of people who do not grow their own food¹³. The new economy allowed and indeed required the farmer to produce every year more food than was needed to keep him and his family alive¹⁴. Thus, the production of social surplus on a regular basis was accomplished, surplus that was sufficient to feed the idle mouths.

The social surplus necessitated the emergence and proliferation of crafts and made it feasible for certain amount of population to engage in activities other than agricultural. With improved technology, including the wheel, the road, irrigation, cultivation, stock breeding and improvements in fishing, the surplus became large enough to support a sizeable number of persons freed from the production of food¹⁵. But the rise of towns and cities in addition to highly favourable agricultural conditions, required a form of social organization in which certain strata could appropriate for themselves, part of the produce grown by the cultivator. Such strata-religious and governing officials, traders, and artisans-could live in towns, because their power over goods did not depend on their presence on the land as such. They could thus realize the advantages of town living, which gave them additional power over the cultivators¹⁶. Relatively large aggregation of population required more complex social organization including improved communication, social and political mechanism permitting some form of exchange among the emergent specialists, agricultural and nonagricultural¹⁷. Thus the emergence of city entailed the social process of specialization. The first cities, doubtless small and hard to distinguish from towns, seem to have appeared in the most favourable places sometime between 6000 and 5000 B.C. From that time on, it can be assumed that some of the inventions which made larger settlements possible were due to towns and cities themselves viz., writing and accountancy, bronze, the beginnings of science, a solar calendar, and bureaucracy. By 3000 B.C., when these innovations were all exercising an influence in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and India, there were in existence what may be called "true" cities. After that there appears to have been, for some 2,000 years, a lull during which the most important innovations, toward the end of the period, were alphabetic writing and the smelting of iron. Curiously, the cities in the regions where city life had originated eventually went into eclipse, and it was not until Greco-Roman times that new principles made possible, in new regions, a marked gain in city existence¹⁸. The reasons for the eclipse of city life were the static character of agriculture and economy due to which the proportion of cultivators supporting one man in the city was still high; labour intensive technology of transport which limited the availability of consumption items by the city dwellers from the immediate hinterland, political insecurity and fragility which made the formation of large national units impossible, lack of scientific medicine which made the city deadly, the fixity of peasant on the land which proved to be an obstacle in the rural-urban migration, the bureaucratic control of the peasantry and the traditionalism which hampered technological and economic progress.

The above mentioned factors which significantly led to the oblivion of the earliest cities were brought under control in a new region open to innovations and discoveries. This region

was the Greco-Roman world of Europe, flourishing during the period from 600 B.C to 400 A.D. Iron tools and weapons, alphabetic writing, improved sailboats, cheap coinage, more democratic institutions, systematic colonization; all tended to increase production, stimulate trade, and expand the effective political unit. Towns and cities became more numerous, the degree of urbanization greater. A few cities reached a substantial size. Athens, at its peak in the fifth century B.C., achieved a population of between 120,000 and 180,000. Syracuse and Carthage were perhaps larger¹⁹. However, it was the Roman Empire under which realization of the existence of large city turned a reality. The military genius and administrative capability of the Roman Empire were the factors that led to the creation of the imperial capital, the largest city known in the world until the rise of London in the nineteenth century. However, the fall of Roman Empire brought a decline in the urban development of the Europe. Commerce declined to the barest minimum; each locale became isolated and virtually self-sufficient; the social system congealed into a hereditary system²⁰. The Roman Empire was essentially a city building empire, representing the highest ideals of human ingenuity, thus standing supreme in its aqueducts, the underground sewers, paved streets and amphitheatres. However, the material manifestation of growth and development proved quite detrimental for the Roman Empire. For to take physical expansion and economic growth of cities as epitome of development was a serious mistake. This material manifestation overshadowed the urban misery which revealed itself in overgrowth in terms of population, continuous decay of civic institutions, uncontrolled expansion, exploitation, materialism, chaotic sanitation, deteriorating housing conditions, violence and demoralization, thus eventually leading towards the state of necropolis.

However, it was the Western Europe, where the development of the cities reached its zenith not only by overcoming all the limitations imposed on urban development in the ancient world but moving much ahead in that direction. The increasing importance of crafts and trade was the reason behind this urban recovery. The increased awareness among the members of the upper urban groups about their contribution towards the increase in the wealth of the country and about the idleness of the aristocracy, paved way for a dramatic transformation. The power slipped away from the religious leaders and nobility, and the merchants and traders emerged as the new powerful class whose influence was based on the increasing importance of marketplace. Towards the end of eighteenth century revolutionary changes took place. The French revolution broke the political monopoly of the king and aristocracy, although more than hundred years elapsed before bourgeoisie became completely dominant²¹. By the seventeenth century, capitalism had altered the whole balance of power. From this time on, the stimulus to urban expansion came mainly from the merchants, the financiers and the landlords who served their needs. In the nineteenth century these forces were greatly augmented by the pressure of mechanical invention and large scale industrialism²². Under the impetus of industrialization the economic power of the cities was unleashed by leaps and bounds making the city the centre of the capitalistic endeavour. The breakthrough in urbanization came only with the enormous growth in productivity caused by the use of inanimate energy and machinery²³. The development of cities kept going on the

basis of improvement in agriculture, transport, the opening of new lands and new trade routes, and, above all, the rise in productive activity, first in highly organized handicraft and eventually in a revolutionary new form of production - the factory run by machinery and fossil fuel²⁴. Thus, it was in the nineteenth century that a true urban revolution ushered, for the Europe did not witness the rise of few towns and cities but a substantial portion of its population came to inhabit the cities and towns.

By 1801 nearly a tenth of the population of England and Wales were living in the cities of 100,000 or larger. This proportion doubled in 40 years and doubled again in another 60 years. By 1900 Britain was an urbanized society. In general, the later each country became industrialized, the faster was its urbanization. The change from a population with 10 percent of its members in cities of 100,000 or larger to one in which 30 percent lived in such cities took about 79 years in England and Wales, 66 in the United States, 48 in Germany, 36 in Japan and 26 in Australia²⁵. In 1800 there were about 15.6 million people living in cities of 100,000 or more. By 1950 it was 313.7 million, more than twenty times the earlier figure. Much of this increase has obviously come from rural-urban migration, clearly the most massive migration in modern times. In 1800 there were apparently less than 50 cities with 100,000 or more inhabitants. This was less than the number in the million class today and less than the number of 100,000-plus cities currently found in many single countries. By 1950 there were close to 900 cities of 100,000 or more people, which is more than the number of towns and cities of 5,000 or more in 1800²⁶. Between 1950 and 2014, the urban population of the world grew from an estimated 0.7 billion to an estimated 3.9 billion. At the end of this period, the world urban population was more than five times as large as it was at the start. The average annual growth rate of the urban population during this period, at 2.58 per cent, was more than 50 per cent faster than that of the world population as a whole (1.65 per cent). Thus, between 1950 and 2014 the world population was urbanizing rapidly, with the proportion urban rising from 30 per cent in 1950 to 54 per cent in 2014²⁷. However, today the less developed nations have become the centres of rapid urbanization. A stark contrast exists between the more developed nations and less developed nations with respect to the patterns of urbanization. As per the United Nations (2015), in 1950 the urban population of the more developed regions was substantially larger than that of the less developed regions (444 million versus 302 million), so that the more developed regions accounted for 60 per cent of the world's urban population at a time when they had just 32 per cent of the world's total population. But already in the 1950s, the patterns of growth of the urban populations of the more developed and less developed regions were showing signs of divergence, with the former growing more slowly. As a consequence, by 1970 the urban population of the less developed regions had surpassed that of the more developed regions (677 million versus 673 million), and the difference increased rapidly thereafter. In 2014, almost three times as many urban dwellers were estimated to live in the less developed regions as in the more developed regions (2.9 billion versus 1.0 billion). In that year the less developed regions accounted for 75 per cent of the world urban population and 83 per cent of the total world population. As the developing world becomes increasingly urbanized, the difference between these

two figures will decline. By 2050, with 5.2 billion urban dwellers, the less developed regions are projected to have 82 per cent of the world urban population and 86 per cent of the total world population²⁸.

Concept/s of urbanization

Cities are products of the process of urbanization. In other words urbanization is the social process that leads to the creation of cities. Thus the relationship between cities and urbanization is one of cause and effect. Urbanization is a very complex phenomenon, with myriad dimensions which can be analyzed from various perspectives. Owing to the complex nature of this phenomenon, the study of urbanization is an enterprise that is being pursued by different disciplines. This has made the contributions to urbanization interdisciplinary in nature.

As per United Nations (2014), the process of urbanization describes a shift in a population from one that is dispersed across small rural settlements in which agriculture is the dominant economic activity towards one where the population is concentrated in larger, dense urban settlements characterised by industrial and service activities. Urbanization refers both to a condition at a point in time and to a process occurring over time. The condition of urbanization, referred to as the level of urbanization, is indicated by the percentage of a population that is living in urban areas, however defined. The process of urbanization has been used in several ways. These include migration from rural areas to urban areas, absolute growth in the urban population (urban growth) and urban growth that is faster than rural growth²⁹. Hence, urbanization as a process implies an increase in the percentage urban and the rate of urbanization, thus, refers to the growth rate in the level of urbanization.

Lampard (1966) outlines three broad conceptions of urbanization that have gained currency in the social sciences. They are: the behavioral, the structural and the demographic conceptions. The behavioral concept conceives of urbanization as an adjustment of personal behavior in the sense that it focuses on the conduct of individuals. Certain patterns of behavior or thought, regardless of social environment and locale are said to be urban. Hence the process of urbanization is one experienced by individuals over time. The structural concept ignoring the patterned behavior of individual persons focuses on the patterned activities of whole populations. The process of urbanization then involves the movement of people out of agricultural communities into other and generally larger non-agricultural communities. The demographic approach focuses on the space and defines urbanization as a process of population concentration³⁰. Lampard regards the demographic approach as superior to other definitions of urbanization. The reason as per him, lies in the simplicity of this approach.

It is in this tradition of demographic approach that Kingsley Davis (1965) has used the term urbanization in a particular way. As per Davis, it refers to the proportion of the total population concentrated in urban settlements, or else to a rise in this proportion. For him, urbanization is a finite process, a cycle through which nations go in their transition from agrarian to industrial society³¹. To Davis, urbanization is the movement of people from agricultural into industrial employment, which leads to urban living³². Attention thus is on the movement of

people to urban like work in urban like places where they can be counted³³. However, Davis is well aware of the role of urbanism as an agent of change in the whole pattern of social life.

For Tisdale (1942), urbanization is the process of population concentration. It proceeds in two ways: the multiplication of the points of concentration and the increase in the size of individual concentration. It is a process of becoming. It implies a movement, not necessarily direct, steady or continuous, from a state of non-urbanism to a state of complete urbanism, or rather from a state of less concentration to a state of more concentration. Thus as per Tisdale, urbanization is a togetherness of a progressive nature, brought about by the utilization of technological devices resulting in an increase in the population tolerance of the areas in which they operate³⁴.

Mitchell (1956) regards urbanization as the process of becoming urban, the movement of people or processes to urban areas, increase of urban areas, population or processes. He clearly identifies dual aspects of the definition of urbanization. One is the demographic aspect which implies movement to the urban areas. But there is a second frame of reference also. Urbanization may also have a meaning within a sociological frame of reference when it implies change in behaviour as a result of living in town³⁵. The urban way of life is marked by a distinctive way of living.

Thompson (1935) has defined urbanization as characterized by movement of people from small communities concerned chiefly or solely with agriculture to other communities generally larger, whose activities are primarily centred in government, trade, manufacture or allied interest³⁶. Anderson (1960) has defined urbanization as more than shifting of population from country to city and from land bound work to urban type of work. Urbanization involves basic changes in the thinking and behaviour of people and changes in their social values³⁷. Jacobson and Ved Prakash define urbanization as a phenomenon describing a process of change in the status of populations due to changing conditions in the society at large³⁸. Breeze (1969) described urbanization as a process of becoming urban, moving to cities, changing from agriculture to other pursuits common to cities and corresponding changing of behaviour pattern³⁹. Hauser and Duncan regard urbanization as a change in the pattern of population distribution. It involves an increase in the relative size of the urban population, a growth in number and size of urban settlement or places and an increasing concentration of population in such places⁴⁰.

Dimensions of urbanization

Urban places and urban hierarchy

In spite of several decades of discussion and many recommendations, no general agreement has been reached on an international definition of the urban population. Variations in national levels of economic and social development, differences in the social and political institutions of countries, and different historical and geographical conditions make international comparisons very difficult⁴¹. However, size of the place has been the most widely used criteria in the definition of urban population. But this criteria suffers from certain disadvantages and raises several practical problems. Thus the criteria for defining a place as urban involves the recognition of

a set of criteria. These criteria generally fall into five categories: demographic, economic, social, morphological and functional. A place can be defined as urban or rural on the basis of size of the settlement. Urban areas have a higher concentration of population in a limited area and thus a higher density. Demographic dimension is the simplest criteria used to identify a place as urban, however, the main drawback of this criteria is disagreement on the cut-off point. The economic criteria delineates a settlement as rural or urban on the basis of occupation of the working population. In the definition of various social scientists and sociologists economic character of a place defines its urbaneness. Agriculture qualifies as a non-urban occupation whereas the urban occupations include secondary and tertiary services. Thus the non-agricultural occupational profile of a settlement qualifies it as urban. However, ground level situation reveals the prevalence of secondary and tertiary occupations even in villages, in some measure. The social criteria include the features of new value systems and patterns of behaviour prevalent in the urban places. The morphological criteria expresses itself in terms of the difference in appearance of the spatial units whereas the functional criteria determines a place as urban in terms of the role it plays with respect to other settlements.

As per the United Nations Demographic Yearbook, the definitions of 'urban' fall into three major types: 1) classification of minor civil divisions on a chosen criteria which may include; a) type of local government b) number of inhabitants c) proportion of population engaged in agriculture. 2) Classification of administrative centres of minor rural division as urban and the remainder of the division as rural and 3) classification of certain size localities as urban irrespective of administrative boundaries⁴². In the Indian context, from 1901 the census organization have come up with its own set of criteria in the definition of a place as urban. However, the criteria have changed from time to time. But for the year 1971 and 1981 the census has used the same criteria which has given stability to the definition of urban.

The census of India 1981 defines a place as urban:

- a. Any place with a municipality, corporation, or cantonment or notified town area or
- b. Any other place which satisfies the following criteria:
 1. A minimum population of 5000.
 2. At least 75 percent of the male working population as non-agricultural, and
 3. A population density of at least 400 square kilometres (i.e. 1000 persons per square meter)⁴³.

The urban settlements system envisage a hierarchical order in which the number of urban places in a country differ along the demographic dimension, with the cities of larger demographic size standing at the apex followed by the urban centres whose position depends on their respective size and other factors, as we move down the ladder. The position of an urban centre in this hierarchy is determined by the role of the settlement in providing goods and services to settlements lower in the hierarchy, thus focusing on the interrelationship between settlements of varying size classes. Thus the inter-urban linkages generate a hierarchically ordered system of communities in which the location of each unit is largely determined by the function(s) it performs for the system as a

whole. The most influential places tend to have much higher concentrations of wholesale activities; transportation and communication facilities; and decision-making units that regulate productive activities, thereby controlling capital flows, credit, the dissemination of information, and employment, thereby attracting large number of people. Large metropolitan areas exert enormous influence because they are the loci where major organizational decisions are made. Important innovations in technology and organizational forms tend to originate within the boundaries of the "super-cities" and then diffuse throughout the urban hierarchy. This hierarchical structuring of decision-making and innovation has important implications for the differential growth of urban communities⁴⁴. The concentration of economic, employment opportunities, capital flows, transport and communication make the cities, which lie on the apex of hierarchical pyramid centres of attraction, thus facilitating rural urban migration. As a result of this, the hierarchy swells from bottom to the top.

Urban primacy

Urban primacy is conceptualized as the extent to which the first city of a national urban system stands out in both influence and population. It is measured simply in terms of population: as the percentage of the total urban population residing in the largest city⁴⁵. Urban primacy is a condition where a single city dominates other cities in the intra-national urban system or, more precisely, where one or a very few cities deviate substantially from log-normalcy in the national urban system in terms of population size⁴⁶. In many countries of the world like U.K, France, Netherlands, Thailand and Philippines, the largest city accounts for as much as one-fifth of the country's population. Further the largest city is five to ten times larger than the second biggest city. The possible reasons for the emergence of primate cities has been explained by Mark Jefferson in 1939. His theory focuses on the forces of agglomeration and cumulative effects of agglomeration in the growth of large cities. Once a town or a city attains a premier position in a nation or region, it tends to retain that position and in actual fact grows faster than other towns and cities. Eventually it tends to overshadow all other cities or even retard their growth⁴⁷. This overshadowing by a leading city stagnates the whole urban system where class I cities become the hub of political, economic and social activities, thus in-turn further reinforcing the phenomenon of primacy and retarding the growth of small cities and towns in the urban hierarchy. However, the primate city due to its centrality, faces stark challenges in terms of population overload and the required urban facilities and infrastructure.

Indivisibilities and externalities, income inequality, level of economic development, ethnic composition, structure of political and administrative organization, and type of economic and social system are some of the factors that affect primacy. The types of indivisibilities and externalities that are likely to concentrate population in a primate city or in a few selected cities due to higher economic efficiency afforded to firms or due to site-specific utility to individuals are the following: indivisibilities in production leading to increasing returns to scale; indivisibilities in consumption associated with collective services or public goods; economies arising from a higher level of utilization of urban infrastructure and from a higher articulation of economic activities in terms of both time and

industry; pecuniary and technical positive externalities arising from the spatial proximity of production units; economies afforded by further division of labor; economies afforded by bigger cities as environments conducive to learning and technical change; and consumption externalities afforded by the variety and range of choice in big cities. On the production side, the existence of indivisibilities and positive externalities means that the marginal product of labor will be higher in large population concentrations than in small ones, turning the larger centers into magnets of attraction for migrants⁴⁸. The income inequality also has a bearing on the primacy of an urban settlement. Income inequality tends to give rise to primacy not only because of the spatial concentration of the high-income group with its accompanying effects on the concentration of demand and employment but also because of its adverse effects on the rest of the economic land-scape⁴⁹. Size of the country also has a bearing on the primacy generation. In small countries, the access costs to consumers are likely to be small, and within-plant economies of scale coupled with the need for access to external economies limited by the small size of the industrial environment are likely to overweigh the access costs. This results in concentration at a single location and leads to primacy. However, in countries with large populated areas the access costs overweigh the scale economies and the threshold demand requirements in industries subject to high economies of scale are likely to be fulfilled at more than one locations. This leads to the emergence of competing centers, thus providing checks on primacy⁵⁰. The administrative centralization, centralization of government services and centralized power forms a single focus for the spatial concentration of the mutually symbiotic, political, administrative, and economic elites and for the adjunct bureaucracy, leading to the concentration of the market and of the physical and social infrastructure. Spatial decentralization of power forms a brake on these processes and, hence, on spatial primacy⁵¹. Economic development (or lack of it), peripheral status in the world system are some other factors that have implications for the primacy of an urban unit⁵². The phenomenon of primacy thus denotes a lack of economic, social and political integration in a system of cities. It represents an imbalance that is the symptom of underdevelopment, an important component of dependent capitalism.

Primacy is considered to be undesirable because of the fact that it negatively impacts the urban system of a country. Primate cities contribute to an imbalanced urban system. The prevalence of primate cities are related to low levels of socio-economic development and early phases of growth. Hauser (1957) thus, labeled the primate city as "parasitic" rather than "generative" because of the reason that it retards the development of other cities⁵³. Imbalanced urban system represents both a symptom of underdevelopment and perhaps a structural constraint to future development through such mechanisms as inadequate investment in rural areas, sectorial distortions of the economy, retarded fertility and mortality decline due to socioeconomic dis-articulation, and poor political integration⁵⁴. The manifestation of the phenomenon of primacy is manifested in the concept of mega city. The mega cities are fraught with severe environmental problems, which form an inevitable part of the agglomeration phenomenon.

Over-urbanization

The rapid rate of urbanization in the third world countries has led to the development of a debate over the accelerated pace of this process, its causes and consequences. The debate referred to as over-urbanization thesis, has gained considerable attention from the academic community. As per this line of thought, Asia is said to be over-urbanized at present in the sense that at comparable levels of urbanization, the developed countries of today had a correspondingly greater proportion of their labor force engaged in non-agricultural occupation. The main reason for the over-urbanization has been the burgeoning influx of rural migrants into the cities due to the operation of push factors at the place of origin and the pull factors of the city. Such a scenario has resulted in the making the cities a center of urban misery and poverty against the dynamic role it was supposed to play. The idea dates back to Hozelitz (1954) who advanced the thesis that urbanization in developing nations could be too great given the industrial mix of their economies⁵⁵. As per the proponents of this thesis, the process of urbanization in third world countries is incapable of yielding positive and dynamic forces of social change, as it was in the developed world.

As per Sovani (1964), in defining over-urbanization, two indices are being related to one another, the percentage of population living in urban areas, and the distribution of the total labor force in the country as between agricultural and non-agricultural occupations. The first is a spatial index without being an occupational one, and the second is the opposite. As modern urbanization is associated with industrialization, we may generally agree that there is justification for such a comparison⁵⁶. As per Abu Lughod (1965), many students of urbanization have suggested that countries in the early stages of industrialization suffer an imbalance in both the size and distribution of their urban populations, implying primarily that they have a higher percentage of people living in cities and towns than is "warranted" at their stage of economic development. The term used to describe this phenomenon is "over-urbanization," which refers to the end result of excessive migration of un- and underemployed rural folk to the cities in advance of adequate expansion of urban employment opportunities⁵⁷. The labor force in these great cities continue to swell due to unabated migration from the country-side, resulting in the high rate of unemployment and underemployment in the cities.

Third World cities have substantial surplus labor in various guises. Their labor force continues nevertheless to increase, swelled not by natural population growth but also by rural-urban migration that contributes between one-third and one-half of the urban growth in most third world countries⁵⁸. The pressure of population on land in the rural areas in the third world countries is great. Economic pressure or "push" in the countryside pushes out people to the cities in search of employment and livelihood. The rural-urban migration that leads to over-urbanization is mainly a product of the "push" from the countryside, rather than the demand for labor by developing economic activity in the cities, or what is called their "pull." These migrants only get employment in activities with very low productivity or swell the ranks of the unemployed. Rapid urbanization in underdeveloped countries hampers economic development. Because of rapid urbanization

the demand for provision of economic and social infra-structure investment increases much more rapidly than do several other sectors. This means that demand for less productive projects will be made on the scarce capital resources of these economies in the early stages of their development⁵⁹. According to those most critical of this phenomenon, the structural condition of over-urbanization and its growth lead to saturated urban labor markets, truncated opportunity structures in rural areas, overburdened public services, distorted sectorial development in national economies, the isolation of large segments of the urban and rural population from the fruits of economic development, and retarded economic growth due to the high costs of urban development⁶⁰. However, the critique that N.V Sovani has put forward has turned the over-urbanization upside down. Sovani demonstrates that the definition of over-urbanization is vague and the cause and consequences oversimplified. As per him, the assertion that rapid urbanization is inimical to economic development does not hold ground. Neither does the assertion that the urbanization will not play a creative role in the third world countries. As per Sovani these assertions should be investigated.

Urban sprawl

Modern usage of the term sprawl was coined by Earle Draper in 1937, one of the first city planners in the southeast United States. Since the introduction of the term by Draper, popular concern on this issue has grown substantially⁶¹. The conception of urban sprawl is multidimensional in nature which adds to the complexity of its usage. Different scholars have used it in a variety of ways, according to their focus of research. Johnson (2001) notes that urban sprawl is not binary with only two categories sprawl and non-sprawl but occurs to different degrees on a continuous scale⁶². Urban sprawl is defined as the spreading of the city and its suburbs over rural land at the fringe of an urban area. Urban planners emphasize the qualitative aspects of sprawl like lack of transportation options and pedestrian friendly neighbourhoods. Conservationists tend to focus on the actual amount of land that has been urbanized by sprawl⁶³. However, the term denotes undesirable urban development. Urban sprawl is characterized by certain features. These features are low density, leap frog development, segregated land use, consummation of large quantities of ex-urban agricultural land, reliance on automobiles and lack of integrated land use plan.

Urban sprawl is the combined effect of growing affluence, changing lifestyle and the vast advance in personal mobility made possible by private automobile. The car has shaped the dispersed form of the modern metropolis and has caused the metropolis to depend on the car⁶⁴. The central theme of urban development over the past century has been the increasing trend toward suburbanization, as central cities have struggled to hold onto households and jobs. In explaining this trend, the urban economics literature casts a primary focus on the role of declining transportation costs and rising incomes, with supporting forces emerging from various government tax, expenditure and zoning policies. The local public finance literature, on the other hand, emphasizes the desire of mobile households to segregate, based on preferences for local taxes and amenities as well as the desire by such households to take advantage of peer externalities. Urban sprawl can take different forms. It may involve low-density residential developments or

so-called "edge cities" (clusters of population and economic activity at the urban fringe) that give rise to business activity like office buildings, retail and even manufacturing. It can take the form of planned communities that have their own "downtown" or are aligned to a lake or park. Or it can occur as individual houses pop up across formerly rural landscapes. In any case, a common way to document the presence of urban sprawl over time is to look first at the evolution of rural and urban population levels and then to look within urban areas at the evolving relationship between suburbs and central cities⁶⁵. The move to suburbs is also guided by a search of place where people feel socially comfortable. A desire towards homogenous environment and an environment best suited to the upbringing of children, close to the ideals of family life and the romantics of rural life are the factors that drive people towards the suburbs. Whereas the portrayal of city as symbols of malice, vice, crime, social and physical disorganization led people to flee the central city. Thus the suburbs emerged as safe havens, depopulating central city areas and resettling people in outskirts.

The consequences of sprawl can be both positive as well as negative, though the negative implications have got precedence. On the positive side the low density settlement pattern, the realization of the ideal of garden city, better social atmosphere compared to the disorganized city core, lower land prices, preference of homogenous neighbourhood are the positive effects of the process of urban sprawl. As per, Gordon and Richardson (1997) current sprawling city patterns are the efficient outcome of markets, just affected by external effects due to transportation subsidies, land-use regulations and other market distortions⁶⁶. On the negative side, however, the urban sprawl is deemed as highly unsustainable, affecting all the three dimensions of sustainability which are ecological, social and economic. The loss of open space, urban decay, unsightly strip mall developments, urban air and water pollution, traffic congestion, low-density housing developments, the loss of a sense of community, patchwork housing developments in the midst of agricultural land, increasing reliance on the automobile, the separation of residential and work locations and a general spreading of urbanized development across the landscape stand as the negative consequences of urban sprawl⁶⁷. As urban sprawl occurs on the outskirts of cities, it is characterized by unplanned dispersed urban development and high land consumption per capita. Natural areas are built up which imply a loss of fertile arable land for agriculture as well as ecologically valuable habitats, and also deforestation⁶⁸. Environmental services like water infiltration and purification of built-up soils degrade, and risks of natural hazards like floods increase⁶⁹. At the social level, urban sprawl leads to the depopulation of the core areas which impacts its creativity and vitality. Such depopulation has a class and ethnic component. In U.S.A the economically prosperous section of the city and predominantly white population moved to the outskirts, a process referred to as 'white flight', thus leaving the city core in a state of social degradation. Such a flight has led to the degeneration of city core, as landmark ghettos marked by social exclusion, poverty and social disorganization. Thus urban sprawl leads to the polarization of urban community into rich suburban communities and the marginal city core poor. Thus socio-economic and racial segregation are the concomitants of urban sprawl. On the other hand the population that migrated to

the urban fringe has become car dependent and faces the problems of deficiency in the availability of civic amenities.

Factors of urbanization

Five major factors stand out as determinants of city growth and urbanization. While each of these has had its effects upon urban expansion in various periods of history, the period beginning roughly with the middle of eighteenth century saw them intensified. In a sense, it is rapid changes in these factors which have created what is loosely called modern society, typified by industrialization and urbanization⁷⁰. Agricultural revolution stands as the leading factor that paved the way for the process of urbanization. For the emergence and growth of cities, the development of agricultural surplus was a prerequisite. The generation of surplus released a significant proportion of manpower from the land and opened the avenues to follow different pursuits. The release of population from the necessity of producing food led to the concentration of people in cities and permitted this section of population to engage in non-agricultural endeavours characteristic of city life. The application of technology to agriculture led to increase in agricultural production. The proportion of agricultural workers supporting those engaged in non-agricultural activities decreased and the productivity per worker increased due to the application of science of chemistry and genetics in the agriculture. In one hundred and fifty years between 1787 and 1937, great shifts in farm and city balances occurred. The produce of nine farms was required to support one city family in 1787 but by 1937 one farm family was feeding seven urban families⁷¹. Thus the advancement in the field of science and technology, and utilization of mechanization process on agricultural front further minimized this ratio, releasing ever more, significant chunk of population from the necessity of producing food. This released section of population, subsequently proved to be the potential reservoir of migrant labourers that came to be employed in the factories during the industrial revolution.

The second major factor behind urbanization is the technological revolution. The invention of steam engine, development of mass production techniques, factory system made possible the agglomeration of people in a densely settled pattern. The application of steam as the source of power for industry and transport was a development which revolutionized the nineteenth century. Steam not only made possible a vast increase in man's potential means of subsistence and consequently in his numbers but indirectly by releasing a rapidly increasing proportion of population from the actual tilling of the soil, it became an overwhelming force in city-ward migration and played a major role in determining the internal structure of the city and of economic organization of which it became the nucleus⁷². Prior to this development, provisioning and supplying of raw materials to the city were difficult. The centripetal force of steam, thus played a significant role in the creation of large, dense and rapidly grown urban centres. The city requires a means of livelihood for its populace, who in turn can exist apart from the land only so far as a livelihood and an agricultural surplus permit them. Because of the fact that special conditions exist in particular localities, mass production may be specialized. The power of the factory to support large number of people depends upon the availability not only of food but also access to the products of a

highly varied industrial system. A city which produces large amounts of one product could not support its workers unless the products of other cities could be brought in by the exchange of commodities⁷³. A critical factor recognized in the increased productivity was thus the utilization of non-human energy in production-the emergence of the machine, initially powered by natural forces of water and wind, then by steam and subsequently by mineral fuels or electricity derived therefrom, with atomic energy in prospect⁷⁴. Thus it was the centripetal force of steam which eventually led to the concentration of manufacturing, managerial and wholesale distributing activities and population into large urban areas.

The commercial revolution is the next factor in the growth of urbanization. The development of world markets, exchange systems and radically improved means of transport and communication allowed cities to develop under conditions which otherwise would have prevented their appearance. Cities located in areas which dictate a high degree of specialization are possible as consequence of trade and transport, and indeed it is no longer necessary nor uncommon for a city to depend heavily upon its own immediate hinterland for the needed agricultural surplus. In fact it is much more the case that cities are supported by agricultural products from far flung, interrelated trade system which embraces most of the earth. Historically, the impetus to the city growth given by the expansion of trade actually preceded the principle effects of industrialization⁷⁵. The commercial revolution in juxtaposition with revolution in communication technology, narrowed down the physical distance and led to the shrinkage of space which ultimately made the world interdependent. As a result, the developments in one part of the world necessarily had influence and impact on the other parts of the world, diffusing all over the globe. This resulted in the less reliance of cities on local circumstances and more upon the global conditions.

Increased efficiency of transportation is the next important factor in the ushering of urbanization. Cities being the centre of trade, the transportation system forms the lifeline of the thriving city life. The advances made in the long distance transportation like steam rail road and consequently motor car had a great impact on the urban growth. The increased efficiency of transport facilitated the movement of goods and people quickly and at lower costs from place to place, within the city as well as between the city and its hinterland. The development of transportation facility thus paved way for the growth of metropolitan centres of today. The flexibility, speed and individualization of transport effected by internal combustion engine as embodied in the automobile and the air plane and new technological devices likely altered the structure of urban community and national life profoundly⁷⁶. The introduction of electricity as a new force in the automobile industry had significant implications for the process of urbanization. The use of electricity exercised a centrifugal influence upon the growth of the cities, thus paving the way for the emergence of metropolis and megalopolis.

The fifth factor, the demographic revolution, is a consequence of the developments that took place in the field of agriculture, commerce, industry and transportation. The appearance of urban, industrial society was marked by the developments in the field of medical sciences. The discoveries in the medical

field certainly led to improvement in the health conditions of the people by providing cures to a multitude of ailments and diseases. This led to a sharp decreases in mortality. Birth rates, however, did not fell so rapidly and one result was a phenomenal growth of the population in western society during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These population increments in large measure found their way either to colonial agricultural lands or to the cities. The demographic evolution in this way contributed heavily to the needs of the cities for an increasing labour force and consumer markets.

CONCLUSION

Urbanized societies, in which a majority of the people live crowded together in towns and cities, represent a new and fundamental step in man's social evolution. The way cities have influenced and shaped social life throughout the history has led the scholars of urban studies to delve into the origin and development of the urban form. Cities are products of the process of urbanization. Urbanization is a very complex phenomenon, with myriad dimensions. However, size of the place has been the most widely used criteria in the definition of urban population. Urban areas have a higher concentration of population in a limited area and thus a higher density and social heterogeneity.

References

1. Meadows, P., & Mizruchi, E. (1969). *Urbanism, urbanization and change: Comparative perspectives*. California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. p. 9.
2. Hatt, P., & Reiss, A. (1961). *Cities and society*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc. p. 17.
3. Hussain, M. & Imtiyaz, I. (2016). Social Impact of Urbanization on the Institution of Family in Kashmir: A Study of Srinagar City. Vol. 24 (1). p. 109
4. Davis, K. (1965). The Urbanization of human population. *Scientific American*. 213, pp. 26-27.
5. Davis, K. (1961). Urban research and its significance. In Gibbs, J. P. (Ed.), *Urban research methods*. Toronto: D. Van Nostrand. Foreword.
6. Tisdale, H. (1942). The process of urbanization. *Social Forces*, 20(3), pp. 31-316.
7. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1965). p. 27.
8. United Nations. (1982). *Estimates and projections of urban, rural and city populations, 1950-2025: The 1980 assessment*. New York: United Nations.
9. United Nations. (2015). *World urbanization prospects: The 2014 revision*. New York: United Nations. Retrieved from <http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2014-Report.pdf>.
10. Bergel, E.E. (1955). *Urban sociology*. London: Mac-Graw-Hill Book Company, Inc. p. 17.
11. Davis, K. (1955). The origin and growth of urbanization in the world. *American Journal of Sociology*, 60, pp.429-58.
12. Childe, G. (1950). The urban revolution. *The Town Planning Review*, 21(1), pp. 3-17. Retrieved on 5 July, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40102108>.
13. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1955).p.430.
14. Op. cit., Childe, G. (1950). p. 22.

15. Hauser, P.M & Schnore, L.F. (Eds.). (1965). *The study of Urbanization*. London: John Wiley and sons.p.2.
16. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1950).p.430.
17. Op. cit., Hauser, P. M.& Schnore, L. F. (1965).p.2.
18. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1950).p.430
19. Ibid.p.432.
20. Pirenne, H. (1939).*Medieval cities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 84-85.
21. Op. cit., Bergel, E. E. (1955). p.25
22. Mumford, L. (1961). *The city in History*. New York: Hartcourt.p.410.
23. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1965). p. 27.
24. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1955).pp.432-433.
25. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1965). p.28.
26. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1955).pp.433-434.
27. Op. cit., United Nations. (2015). p.20
28. Ibid. p. 25.
29. Op. cit., United Nations (2015). p. 21.
30. Lampard, E. (1966). Historical aspects of urbanization. In P. Hauser & L. Schnore (Eds.), *The study of urbanization* (pp. 519-554). London: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
31. Op. cit., Davis, K. (1965). p. 28.
32. Anderson, N. (1959). Urbanism and urbanization. *American Journal of Sociology*, 65(1), pp. 68-73. Retrieved on 14 May 2013 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2773622>.
33. Davis, K., & Golden, H. (1954). Urbanization and the development of preindustrial areas. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 3(1), pp. 6-26. Retrieved on 14 May 2013 from <http://www.jstor.org/Stable/1151656>.
34. Op. cit., Tisdale, H. (1942). p. 311.
35. Mitchell, J. (1956). "Urbanization, detribalization and stabilization in Southern Africa: A problem of definition and measurement. In *Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization in Africa south of the Sahara*. (pp. 693-711). Paris: International African Institute: UNESCO.
36. Thompson, W. S. (1935). *Urbanization in encyclopedia of social sciences (vol. xv)*. Macmillan. p. 189
37. Anderson, N. (1960). *Urban community*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.p.32.
38. Kopardekar, H.D. (1986).*Social aspects of urbanization*. Bombay: Popular Prakashan. p. 16.
39. Ibid. p. 16.
40. Hauser, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (Eds.). (1959). *The study of population: An inventory and appraisal*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. p. 34.
41. Macura, M. (1961). The influence of the definition of the urban place on the size of the urban population. In J. P. Gibbs (Ed.),*Urban research methods*. Toronto: D. Van Nostrand. pp.21-31.
42. United Nations. (1955). *Demographic year book*. New York: United Nations. p.16.
43. Ramachandran, R. (1989). *Urbanization and urban systems in India*. Delhi: Oxford University press. p.104-105.
44. Wilson, F. D. (1984). Urban ecology: Urbanization and systems of cities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10 (1), p. 287.
45. Clark, D. (1988). The primate city and the elephant city: A tale of two thesis. *Social Science Quarterly*, 69(1), pp. 40-52.
46. Kasarda, J.D. & Crenshaw, E.M. (1991). Third world urbanization: Dimensions, theories and determinants. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, pp. 467-501.
47. Op. cit., Ramachandran, R. (1989). p.192.
48. Mutlu, S. (1989). Urban concentration and primacy revisited: An analysis and some policy conclusions. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 37(3), pp. 611-639.
49. Ibid. p. 614.
50. Mera, K. (1981). City size distribution and income distribution in space. *Regional Development Dialogue*, 2(1), pp. 105-120.
51. Op. cit., Mutlu, S. (1989). p. 618.
52. Smith, D. A. & London, B. E. (1990). Convergence in world urbanization? A quantitative assessment. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 25, pp. 574-590.
53. Hauser, P. M.(1957). World and Asian urbanization in relation to economic development and social change. In P.M. Hauser (Ed.), *Urbanization in Asia and the Far East*. Calcutta, India: UNESCO.
54. Gugler, J. (1982). Over-urbanization reconsidered. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 31, pp. 173-89.
55. Hozelitz, B. (1954).Generative and Parasitic Cities.*Economic Development and Culture Change*. 32, pp. 277-302.
56. Sovani, N. V. (1966). *Urbanization and urban India*. Bombay, Calcutta: Asia Publishing House. p. 1.
57. Abu-Lughod, J.L. (1965). Urbanization in Egypt: Present state and future prospects. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 13(3), p. 313.
58. United Nations. (1980).*Patterns of Urban and Rural Population Growth*. New York: United Nations. p. 24.
59. Op cit., Sovani, N. V. (1966). p.11
60. Op cit., Kaskarda, J. D & Crenshaw, E. M. (1991). p. 471.
61. Nechyaba, T. J. & Walshsource, R. P. (2004). Urban sprawl. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 18(4), pp. 177-200.
62. Johnson, M. P. (2001). Environmental impacts of urban sprawl: A survey of the literature and proposed research agenda. *Environment and Planning A*, 33(4), pp. 717-735. doi: 10.1068/a3327.
63. Patachini, E., Zenou, Y., Henderson, J.V., & Epple, D. (2009). Urban Sprawl in Europe. *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, pp. 125-149.
64. Newman, P. & Kenworthy, J. (1998). *Sustainability and cities: Overcoming automobile dependence*. Washington, D. C: Island Press
65. Op. cit., Nechbaya, T. J & Walshsource, R. P. (2004). pp.178-179.
66. Gordon, P. & Richardson, H. W. (1997). Are compact cities a desirable planning goal? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(1), pp. 95-106.
67. Op. cit., Nechbaya, T. J & Walshsource, R. P (2004). p. 186.
68. Op. cit., Johnson, M. P. (2001). pp. 717-735.
69. Romero, H., & Ordenes, F. (2004). Emerging urbanization in the southern Andes: Environmental

- impacts of urban sprawl in Santiago de Chile on the Andean Piedmont. *Mountain Research and Development*, 24(3), pp. 197-201 Ibid. p. 25.
70. Op cit. Hatt, P. & Reiss, A. (1961). p.79
71. Ibid. p.79
72. National Resource Committee (1937). *Our cities: Their role in the national economy*. Washington, D.C: National Resource Committee.p.30.
73. Op. cit., Hatt, P. & Reiss, A. (1961). p.80
74. Cottrell, F. (1955). *Energy and society*. New York; Mac-Graw Hill.
75. Ibid.
76. Op. cit., National Resource committee (1937). p.30

How to cite this article:

Manzoor Hussain and Iram Imitiyaz.2018, Urbanization Concepts, Dimensions And Factors. *Int J Recent Sci Res*. 9(1), pp. 23513-23523. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2018.0901.1483>
