Chapter I

Introduction
1.1. Introduction

Cities have a long history and had existed with glory, growth, change, decay and adjustment for the last 8000 years (Berg, 1999). The pre-industrial urban centres were either market centres or administrative centres and they were seen as centres of unproductive consumption. It was the industrial revolution of 17th century that changed the role of cities and with the development of new technology and service industry, cities have become important centres of production (Bali, 1992). As we enter into the 21st century, cities are increasingly becoming the main abode of human kind (White and Whitney 1992). Everywhere in the world, city promotes economic growth, innovation and employment. They completely dominate the region in which they exist and become the mirror of richness and modern life (Hardoy and Sutterthwaite, 1989).

Cities are growing rapidly not only in population, but also in terms of their importance and scale of problems. Being of such importance, they are manifestations of both the positive and negative dimensions of development. On one hand they act as centres of production, consumption and possess all the positive advantages of economies of scale and agglomeration. On the other hand, the rapid growth of urban population particularly in the developing world is creating several environmental and social problems.

After the Second World War urbanisation became a worldwide process and the developing nations have emerged as a significant force in world's urbanisation. Since 1950 the proportion of developing world population living in the cities has been almost doubled. In general, the growth of largest cities of these nations is more rapid than other cities. In 1950s among the 20 largest agglomerations in the world 12 were from the industrially developed countries. At present only 3 of the 20 largest urban agglomerations belong to the developed world. (UNFPA 1999)

However, urbanisation in the developed world did commensurate with its level of development and, in fact, came into being as a result of the necessity to organize and consolidate the expanding economic activities. On the contrary, urbanisation in the developing world is often not associated with economic growth and it is too low for that level of urbanisation. It is rather an outcome of sheer demographic expansion and increased pressure from the rural areas of this part of the world (Davis.K. 1965). Therefore the problems faced by the developing countries are qualitatively different from those that had been faced by the industrially advanced countries at present levels of urbanisation in the
developing countries. It has been gradually recognised that many environmental and social problems of recent times are the consequences of the 20th century’s urban explosion. More and more people are increasingly being concentrated in urban centres, and also from small towns to huge mega cities. This does not only change/increase the consumption pattern, travel behaviour and economic activities of common people but would also has large impact on the environment in terms of resource consumption and waste discharge.

As urban population continues to increase, more and more people will have to share whatever the facilities and services are available in the town/city. There will be more demand for shelter, public transport, health facilities, educational institutions, drinking water, electricity, etc. resulting in increased pressure on urban infrastructure (UNFPA 1999). Even in predominantly rural countries like India, urban population is growing rapidly. According to 2001 Census, only 27.73 percent of total population of India lives in urban areas. But in terms of absolute size of the urban population, India ranks second among the countries of world with 273 million urban population. This scale and speed of urbanisation in India are thus likely to present demanding challenges for urban management and development, in future years to come.

The living conditions and the magnitude of urban problems in the developing countries have been quite lucidly described by McGee (1967):

“The rapid growth of the third world cities is evident everywhere in their physical appearance...housing, and city population are forced into squatter of flimsy miserable huts constructed of makeshift materials which occupy any vacant land in the interstices or fringes of the city...The attempt to build up community and civic pride breaks down under the impact of population growth and “shared poverty” into a condition of urban anarchy. The end product is that the cities of the third world become wasteland, conglomerations of millions of individuals....”

Studies have suggested that local governments have failed miserably not only in India but all over the world. They are weak, short of resources and without competence to manage the complex affairs of large cities. Coupled with that, the regular influx of large population from rural areas, which particularly opt to reside near to core areas for easy convenience; poor structural housing conditions, overcrowded transportation system, unhygienic living environment, make cities overcrowded. As a result of that the newer areas in the periphery
are becoming new centres of attraction for middle and high-income group population. In order to cope up these massive problems, urban governments have to fight at two fronts. Firstly, they have to maintain the level of infrastructure and services of the towns and secondly they have to provide all these services to newly establishing areas and the growing population of towns.

The ultimate goal of urban development is to enhance the quality of life. However, there are substantial evidences that suggest that human conditions in the urban habitat are degrading throughout the world and the urban environment is becoming progressively less viable. The urban environment as a habitat of man is a complex form of heterogeneous natural and social components. In case of the urban habitat, it is the human use or misuse of the naturally occurring elements such as air and water that affects the environment. In regard to the socio-economic aspects of the quality of urban habitat, it is the impairment of the organizational and distributive systems by human beings which causes vertical and horizontal inequalities in access to and provision of basic needs.

The degradation of environmental quality of urban habitats in the developing countries is of a different kind. It basically results out of mass poverty and lopsided development. In an accentuated socially stratified society like India, lopsidedness of urban development has brought out spatial inequalities in the quality of the life and new areas of qualitatively substandard conditions have been added. In the past few decades, concern about such issues has generated new research traditions under the headlines of ‘quality of life’, ‘quality of environment’, ‘social indicators’ and ‘level of living’. Issues related to these topics have been of interest to researchers from a variety of disciplines, such as economics, sociology, political science, psychology, geography, and recently management studies. Various surveys have also been conducted in different countries with the goal to assess the quality of life and the general well being of different population. Initially most of these studies had been undertaken in the industrialized countries of the western world (Rodgers and Converse, 1975).

Despite the differences in the research design and approaches, the single key component that emerges is the qualitative aspects of human development and scholars have come to realise that human development is not necessarily directly related to material wealth of the people, which is measured by the generally accepted national economic indicators or gross national product (GNP). Basically the national income figure touches only tangentially
on most of the essential elements of an adequate urban environment such as decent shelter, suitable community facilities and services, smooth and safe transportation. Therefore the measures of GNP are considered as inadequate to assess the over-all aspects of living conditions and development, since accessibility to health care, leisure, housing condition, working condition, social cohesion and other such indicators are left out from GNP and other such measures.

It is now agreed that development or quantitative change in human conditions goes beyond some aggregate measures of level of consumption and production of good and services. 'Knox' has discussed the measurement of improvement in living conditions in the context of Britain and has also given the following operational definition:

"The level of living of persons residing within a given geographical area is constituted by the overall composition of housing, health, education, social status, employment, affluence, leisure, social security and social stability aggregatedly exhibited in the area, together with those aspects of demographic structure, general physical environment and democratic participation which may determine the extent to which needs and desires relating to the foregoing constituents of level of living can, or are met".

It may be also noted that definition and measurement of urban quality of life usually varies from country to country as well as from one region to another region within the same country, with respect to their socio-economic and cultural life. As already we have noted that there has been little consensus on, as to what urban quality of life means and how it should be defined, but we can divide the views of different scholars into two groups. In the first group, the urban quality of life is measured by the existence and availability of basic services and amenities, which refers to objectively to the observable factors and conditions of social life, without regard to people's perception and assessment of these factors and conditions. In the second group, urban quality of life is measured by the people's subjective perception and assessment of their lives under given circumstances. However, satisfaction of an individual with his life cannot be assessed simply by privately evaluated aspects of life by people, via certain subjective expressions or indicators. Keeping all this in view, in the present research urban quality of life will be measured on an objective basis. In this, means of development of urban quality of life will be analysed.
1.2. Conceptual Framework:

Urbanisation has been one of the most striking phenomenon in the history of human progress. The spread of capitalism and the technological advances had made the urban centre a hub of economic growth, innovation, and employment generation. All these factors had resulted in millions of people to migrate from the country side to the city with the hope of a better life. In 2000, world population reached 6.1 billion, and continued to grow at an annual growth rate of 1.2 percent, or 77 million people per year. A study of World Development Report (1992) shows that today at world level, cities are gaining on an average about 160,000 people per day from country side.

In the absence of a fast pace of development in the developing world; particularly due to the lack of employment opportunities, health and other services in rural areas, people are forced to migrate towards the cities. Most of the Indian cities too are recording a very high increase in population, which is resulting in serious shortfall in housing, public utilities, and urban services such as water supply, sanitation, drainage, sewage, lighting and transport as well as differential education and welfare facilities. These problems affect the urban quality of life adversely.

In physical terms, urban centres are the habitat of large population with distinctive economic strength, life style, livelihood, organization, land use and institutions. Therefore, development of urban centres requires a proper planning. In India, urban centres are generally governed by different Urban Local Bodies, but in order to maintain the urban infrastructure and services a huge amount of resources are required. After the 74th amendment of Indian Constitution, three levels of government, namely, Union Government, State Government and Local Government have to cooperate to fulfill the financial requirements of urban centres. While the Union Government enacts the policy statement and acts, the State Government has to provide the necessary legal and financial base of the municipalities (Reddy P.L., 2005), although, the actual work is undertaken by the municipalities themselves. Several studies have shown that there is an absence of firm data on municipal revenue and expenditure in India. However, it is assumed that per capita expenditure is relatively low.

Against this conceptual background the principal avenues for investigation thereby incorporates the extent to which urban centres of Jharkhand are being able to provide certain infrastructure and services to their inhabitants. Attempt has been also made to evaluate the
financial conditions of municipalities of the cities/towns of Jharkhand. To have a deep insight of the level of urban development this study has been focused on Ranchi city. At present Ranchi is the third largest city of Jharkhand after Jamshedpur and Dhanbad, and is the home of about 8.5 lakh persons. Its population is increasing at a higher rate (40.35 percent) compared to the national average (32.88 percent) during 1991-2001. It is now governed by Ranchi Municipal Corporation, which was established in 1979. After becoming the capital of Jharkhand, large increments to population are also expected in the near future. So to what extent urban services are being provided by the municipality and accessed by the residents of different localities and social groups of Ranchi has been investigated in this study.

1.3. Study Area

The state of Jharkhand is located between 21°58’ to 25°18’ north latitudes and 83°20’ to 87°54’ east longitudes. It covers an area of 79,261 square km. Jharkhand is a part of the ancient Chotanagpur Plateau which is characterised by a complex geological structure, rugged topography and micro physical units. A large portion of land is covered by forests,
and that is why in the medieval period this region had been named as “Jharkhand”. According to 2001 Census, Jharkhand has eighteen districts. From the viewpoint of economic resources the state happens to be one of the richest states in the entire country. It accounts for nearly 60 percent of copper, 80 percent of uranium ore, 50 percent of mica, kyanite, apatite, bauxite, and 21.6 percent of the coal reserves of the country. In 2001 Census, the total population of Jharkhand was 2,69,09,428 and the decadal population growth rate was 23.19 percent. There are ninety six towns in Jharkhand, among them ten were class I towns and these includes Jamshedpur, Dhanbad, Ranchi, Bokaro, Phusro, Hazaribag, Ramgarh, Patratu and Giridih. At present Ranchi is the capital city of the state.

Table: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/Urban</th>
<th>Area (Sq. Km)</th>
<th>Urban Population</th>
<th>Urban Density</th>
<th>Growth in percent</th>
<th>Urban Literacy</th>
<th>Urban Sex Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamshedpur</td>
<td>159.55</td>
<td>1,101,804</td>
<td>6906</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>82.75</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanbad</td>
<td>201.53</td>
<td>1,064,357</td>
<td>4893</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>75.46</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchi</td>
<td>182.09</td>
<td>862,850</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>40.35</td>
<td>78.29</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bokaro</td>
<td>187.74</td>
<td>497,855</td>
<td>2652</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>82.49</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phusro</td>
<td>85.16</td>
<td>174,367</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td>84.44</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazaribag</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>135,446</td>
<td>5140</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>87.03</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deoghar</td>
<td>35.89</td>
<td>112,501</td>
<td>3134</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramgarh</td>
<td>50.24</td>
<td>110,497</td>
<td>2199</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirkunda</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>106,200</td>
<td>4331</td>
<td>148.74</td>
<td>72.86</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giridih</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>105,512</td>
<td>10790</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>79.08</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>1581.942</td>
<td>355,0901</td>
<td>2245</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>75.22</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: - Census of India, (2001), Rural-Urban Distribution, Jharkhand, Series-21

Ranchi city is located centrally on the Chotanagpur plateau and extends over 182.09 sq. Km. Ranchi a fast changing city now, was once a surprisingly small tribal town in the pre British period. It’s rapid growth started during the Second World War when its military importance increased suddenly. After independence it started developing as an important educational centre, but the most significant factor behind its phenomenal growth has been the evolution and growth of the Heavy Engineering Corporation (H.E.C.) in Hatia. H.E.C. industrial complex was established to support the industrialisation process in India. At one point of time it had more than twenty four thousand employees and had also become an instrumental factor for the establishment of several subsidiary/ancillary industries in Hatia and other parts of Ranchi.
1.4. Review of Literature

The study of urban development and quality of urban life incorporates several dimensions of a city like their physical and social environment, demographic characteristics, basic infrastructure and standard of living of urban people. Therefore literature reviewed on urban development and quality of life deal with the different aspects of urbanisation, urban growth and development in this section. This multidisciplinary nature of the study makes it imperative to review a wide variety of literature on urbanisation, urban problems, and urban development in general, as contributed by various social scientists and academicians.

Keeping all this in view, we can categorise the available literature on urbanisation under separate heads:

(i) Concept of Urbanisation
(ii) Processes of Urbanisation
(iii) Urbanisation, Environment and Development
(iv) Components of Good Quality of Urban Life
(v) Municipal Financing

(i) Concept of Urbanisation:-

Mumford (1938) had defined the city as a geographical place, an economic organisation, and industrial process, and thereafter of social action and aesthetic symbol of collective unity.

The term urbanisation also implies the movement of people to the urban areas. Taylor (1953) had used the term in the same way and had stated that “Urbanisation is a shift of people from villages to city”. Davis and Golden (1954) had also explained urbanisation in an elaborate way. According to them, “urbanisation represents a revolutionary charge in the whole pattern of social life and itself is a product of basic economic and technological developments”.

Thomson (1955) had viewed urbanisation as being the same and he provided a broad idea about it and had stated that urbanisation is characterised by movements of people from small communities to generally larger ones whose activities are primarily centred in government, trade, manufacture or allied interests.
The definition of urban area has been also given by United Nations Demographic Year Book (1955), and its definition can be categorised into three major groups: (1) Classification of minor civil divisions on chosen criteria which includes (a) type of local government (b) number of inhabitants (c) proportion of population engaged in agriculture (2) Classification of administration centres of minor rural areas as urban. (3) Classification of certain size localities (agglomerations) as urban, irrespective of administrative boundaries.

According to Ehrlich (1956), urbanisation is a process of population concentration and the scholars have identified the elements in the process i.e. (i) the multiplications of points of concentration, and (ii) increase in the size of individual concentrations themselves.

Gibbs (1961) had referred the word 'urban' in terms of demographic attributes (size/density) or economic variables (percentage of non-agricultural workers). He had also stated that in its demographic sense, urban is usually considered as an agglomeration of a given size. In terms of economic variables he had identified an urban area as one, where more than three fourth of the total population is engaged in non agricultural occupations.

Hauser (1965) had characterised urbanisation as a change in the pattern of population distribution, involving an increase in the relative size of the urban population and also a growth in the number of such places. Riesman (1964) had interpreted urbanisation as the whole process of changing a society and the consequences of this has been also explained by him. Urbanisation results into a transformation of a society from a homogenous one to a heterogeneous mass.

Gosal (1972) had provided a detailed description about the town. According to him an urban place acts as a central place for its umland. It is the focus of distinct human settlement, characterised by the complexity of human life and economic activities. He had further described that a town has an internally differentiated land use pattern, and is essentially the centre of innovation and diffusion of new ideas.

Prakasa Rao (1983) had expressed a similar thought about urbanisation and had stated that urbanisation involves the transformation of rural attributes to urban ones, the concentration of people at a point and also the multiplication of points of concentration, i.e. urban settlements.

Singh and Singh (1988) had chosen certain socio-economic parameters to define urbanisation and were of the view that urbanisation meant the proportion of total population
concentrated in urban settlements. It is also the expression of the contemporary political, social, economic and cultural processes prevailing in a region.

Mandal (1998) had provided an extensive definition of urbanisation. He had used certain demographic, social and economic parameters and had categorised them into four factors in explaining urbanisation. These factors include: (a) concentration of people at one place (b) population shift (migration) from rural to urban area (c) occupational shift from agriculture to non agriculture and (d) land use shift from agriculture to non agriculture.

(ii) Processes of Urbanisation

Urbanisation does not occur evenly over space and time, because processes leading to urbanisation change from one region to another and from one period of time to another. Dayal (1959) had placed forward the opinion that rural poverty and unemployment push people from rural areas, whereas higher wages and better living conditions in urban areas pull population, ultimately increasing the urban population.

Bogue and Zachariah (1962) had opined that in India and in fact almost everywhere in the world, the rate of reproductive change is not very different in rural areas from the urban areas, and urbanisation does not take place as a result of the vital processes alone. They have cited the example of Calcutta, where the registered number of deaths was always greater than the registered number of births up to 1951.

Davis (1967) had suggested that the factor of natural increase was scarcely significant for the growth in urban population. Haggett (1972) had observed in his study that urbanisation in European countries was mostly a product of industrialisation and rural to urban migration. But urbanisation in developing countries had been the product of population explosion in the rural areas, which accelerated the massive migration of population to the urban centres.

Many scholars have treated urbanisations as the child of industrial revolution. So with the rise of industrialisation, the pace of urbanisation increases. However, according to Sundra Ranising (1979), five major factors determine the process of urbanisation, such as, (i) agricultural revolution, (ii) industrial revolution, (iii) commercial revolution, (iv) increasing efficiency of transportation, and (v) the demographic revolution.
Bogue (1979) had studied the processes of urbanisation in the U.S. in 1950s and had been of the view that urbanisation has a positive relationship with industrialisation and negative relation with agricultural density. He had also pointed out that high agricultural density indicates the lack of modernisation in agriculture, which ultimately results in low percentage of urban population. He found that where agriculture was highly mechanised and modernised, very less number of people lived in rural areas.

Preston (1979) had studied the urbanisation process in developing countries. He viewed that urban growth in these countries had been mainly due to natural increase of urban population. In one of his studies he had examined the data of 29 developing countries and had found that 24 countries had a faster rate of urban natural increase than net in-migration.

Premi (1981) had provided a broad analysis of the factors of urbanisation and had identified them as (a) natural increase in the existing urban areas (b) net rural to urban migration (c) relocation of the rural settlements in urban areas due to the extension of municipal boundaries and (d) the emergence of new points of concentrations. Premi had also pointed out that the first three components indicate concentration of urban activities in the already existing urban centres, while the emergence of new towns and cities suggest a dispersal of urban functions over a wider geographical area.

It has been pointed out in the Census of India (Occasional Paper, 1981) that besides natural growth (net addition due to birth and death) and area changes (emergence of new towns); net gain due to movement of human population from rural to urban area had been a significant factor in the process of urban growth of any geographical area. Again, Rakesh Mohan (1985) had taken urbanisation as a determinant as well as a consequence of economic development.

Ramchandran and Ramchandran (1987) had explained that the survival and growth of cities depends upon the functions they perform. In ancient times towns evolved due to surplus from agricultural production and concentration of political power. Today organised commerce and manufacturing technology are the new forces resulting in the urbanisation. (Ghosh S. 1987).

Mitra (1992) had analysed India’s urbanisation in the light of a number of aspects such as unprecedented growth of urban areas and has pointed out to the proliferation of slums in recent years. He had stated that one of the demographic features of urbanisation in several
newly developing countries in the past decades was the substantial increase in labour force through the natural increase of population and rural to urban migration in particular.

(iii) Urbanisation, Environment and Development:

Many scholars believe that not only the increasing population pressure but also industrialisation and economic development is deteriorating the urban environment. For example Khosla (1980) held the same view and according to him population growth contributes to the picture of urban pollution. Basically, industrialisation process raise the standard of living of the people involving more per capita transportation, energy usage, industrial gas consumption, and results in urban environmental problems.

World Council on Environment and Development (1987) in a report had brought forth that basically the majority of essential human needs can be met only through goods and services provided by industries. But in this process, industry at one hand extracts materials from the natural resource base and on the other hand releases both wasteful materials and pollution into the human environment. Therefore, industries have the ability to create regional imbalance by causing either resource depletion or environmental degradation.

On the basis of 1981 Census data, Gupta (1989) had studied the relationship between industrialisation, urbanisation and rural development, in the context of the major Indian states. This paper is divided into two sections, in the first section, the author had discussed industrialisation, economic and technological development and urbanisation links. The author had also selected ten variables to determine industrial, economic and technological development of the study area.

Pollution problems in India are becoming more and more serious due to rapid and unplanned urbanisation and industrialisation, and the most serious effects of these include the increase in air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution, problems of solid waste management, and proliferation of slums and squatters. Singh and Kayastha (1988), in their study had demonstrated that in case of Jamshedpur town, the waste in the form of liquid and gas from iron and steel industry have created several environmental ills. These pollutants not only results in morbidity among the population but also significantly pollute river Subarnarekha and the soils of the surrounding region.

A strong relationship and an inseparable association between development and environment had been identified by Dafulani (1991). This relationship has been so strong that
a non concomitant concentration of effects of one negates the importance of others and results into distortion and disequilibrium of the environment. As a result, environmental problem per se are those, which could be overcome by the developmental process. However, development without goal-oriented objectives will create environmental problems, resource depletion, physical, chemical and biological pollution.

Choudhary (1995) had examined the impact of population growth and economic development separately on global warming. According to him the nature of environmental problems depend upon the level of economic development (GNP), the nature of industrialisation, the degree of urbanisation and the effectiveness of public policies. In general, due to low economic development, developing countries experience immediate environmental problems related to scarcity and safety of drinking water, inadequate sanitation facilities, air pollution in urban areas, soil depletion and degradation, indoor pollution from burning biomass (wood, coal and dung) and outdoor pollution from burning coal for industrial production.

Generally, large metropolitan centres and large towns dominate economic development and economic activities and also contribute towards the corresponding environmental damages/stress. Prasad (1995) in his report had pointed out to India’s current position in economic development and had identified its relationship with urban environment. He had stated that by 2025, one out of every four households would suffer from lack of safe drinking water. Similarly, one out of every four households would face inadequate sanitation by 2025. Concentration of sulphur dioxide would increase by 70 percent, and per capita municipal waste has been projected to double by the year 2025 from the present level.

Henderson (1995) held the same view that there is a strong relationship between economic development and urbanisation. In many developing countries the worst forms of environmental problems occur in very large urban areas because of the heavy polluting industries that are forced to be set up in the large urban areas. He had suggested that these industries should be located in small cities and in hinterlands where raw materials are located. This would not only limit the size of large urban areas but perhaps a part of the population would also migrate there.

Park (1997) in his book had set up the interrelationship between population, resource and environment. For this he had devised a model which shows the inter linkages among
them. It has been stated by the author that an increase in the number of people on the earth will increase the utilisation of limited resources and thus it would inevitably lead to decrease in environmental quality resulting in the emergence of several health problems. The use of resources leads to depletion of resources which in turn reduce the per capita availability.

Lodha, and Tatya (1997), had studied the environmental hazards due to industrial pollution in Udaipur and Jodhpur and had described that the various large scale chemical units of Rajasthan are responsible for the widespread air and water pollution in their neighbourhood. It had been also mentioned that these units have been wrongly sited from the point of view of both drainage and wind direction. Therefore, the effluents from these factories are spoiling the surface as well as the ground water resources.

Dube and Kumar (1997), in their study had highlighted the environmental problems of Varanasi city. They mentioned that increasing population, urbanisation and consumerism are adding to solid waste generation and disposal problems in the city. They had stated that despite all possible efforts by the people of Varanasi, wastes remain lying for several days in the garbage dumping sites. Thus it pollutes the entire surrounding.

The large increase in the number of vehicles particularly in the urban areas also raises the level of air pollution. According to Ramchandran (1998), the density of petrol driven vehicles in Hyderabad-Secundarabad had gone up nine times per square Km. during 1981-96. This had resulted in frequent traffic jams and deceleration of speeds of vehicles on roads. Other manifestations had been the emission of higher level of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxides due to partial burning of the fuel.

In India large scale immigration from the villages to urban centres for employment, services, education, medical facilities have caused changes in the socio-economic and cultural life style and also have resulted in unplanned and haphazard urban development (Dube and Kumar, 1997). The misuse, overuse and exploitation of natural recourses also have resulted in land scarcity, housing congestion, overcrowding and traffic congestion problems in cities. Simultaneously, these have resulted in the non-availability of fresh air and pure drinking water along with various environmental problems like sewerage and garbage disposal, water, air and land pollution.

(iv) Components of Good Quality of Urban Life:

There is no unanimity over the constituents of a good quality of life. Initially standard of living has been related with economic development of the country, but economic
development is not an end in itself, rather than it is a means to better life. Gardener (1965) had stated the same view, that the object of economic development is the welfare and dignity of the individuals. We must concern ourselves, not with aggregate statistics, but with the progress made in assuring each person a full satisfactory life, adequate levels of personal consumption, including food and housing, health and education and also satisfaction of those political, cultural and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all human beings. So there is no direct relationship between economic goods or commodities on one hand and welfare or well being on the other.

Lowdon Wingo (1973), in his article had mentioned that quality of life is a term in the public domain, any one has right to define it in his /her own way- it is fundamentally a normative construct, like welfare and happiness and presents problems of clarity in its definitions. He has further mentioned that the definition of quality of life must include two fundamental elements, (a) an internal psycho-physiological mechanism which produces the sense of gratification, and (b) external phenomenon which engage that mechanism.

Liu (1974) had considered quality of life as a concept, which varies across time, place and individuals. It had been defined as the output of two aggregate inputs: physical (quantifiable goods and services and material wealth) and non-physical (non- measurable psychological factors such as common belongings; self-actualisation, and others.

William (1976) had been of the view that defining the term ‘quality’ even for an individual is a difficult task and that for the society, it is perhaps impossible. He had also observed the quality of life in terms of basic human needs and these needs are essentially related with the totality of goods, services and situations).

Research by Andrews and Whitey (1976) had shown that structural analysis of the aspects of quality of the life reveals three clusters of domains. The first cluster represents satisfactions, with domains related to important primary groups such as family, marriage and friendship. The second cluster is concerned with the satisfaction of the domains related to transactions with the environment such as work and level of education. The third cluster represents satisfaction with domains related to less personal aspects of the environment such as transportation and neighbourhood.

Olsen and Merwin (1977) had observed that “whatever contributes to the quality of life of a population, ultimately it is the people who determine it. People’s notion of quality of life is thoroughly infused with normative values concerning what is good and right in their
life. Thus, in a similar manner, Helburn (1982), for instance, had argued that in a given time, place and society, both necessities and amenities are culturally defined. Therefore, quality of life is highly relative and evaluative, and what is beneficial to one group of people may be detrimental to another.

Mukherjee (1987) had stated that even though concept of QOL is new in most of the developing countries, its notion has spread all over and the venture has become so popular that politicians, policy makers, researchers and social workers who previously spoke of welfare of the masses, now speak of ‘QOL of people’.

According to Ceccato and Snickers (1998) quality of life is a complex concept which has often been associated with numerous other concepts such as level or people’s satisfaction with their conditions. Therefore, it is difficult to have a consensus about what QOL is, especially because QOL has been based on so many different approaches. Basically, quality of life is not an absolute concept but it is multidimensional by nature. It is quite possible that what may appear very important to a particular person in one context may appear to be meaningless to another.

Many researchers and scholars had opined that quality of life approach is very much concerned with the level of satisfaction of the needs of population. It is assumed that satisfaction of these needs generate the welfare of the population and enhances the quality of life. Studies in the past also identified a number of approaches to the study of satisfaction in life. However, two different but complementary approaches have been frequently used. They are the discrepancy approach and the domain satisfaction approach (Hooi and Keng, 1995). The discrepancy approach assumes that feelings of satisfaction are dependent on the way individuals perceive and evaluate aspects of their lives in relation to important standards. The other approach is based on the premise that individuals tend to divide their lives into separate but related aspects (called domains), such as family, work, health and so on.

The effects of the processes of urbanisation are not confined to the economic transformation of a society alone, but their consequences are to be seen in the physical and social transformation of the people also. Mitchell (1956) had argued that urbanisation has accelerated the process of economic development. It does not only imply the growth of national income but also qualitative changes in the levels of living, provision of basic amenities and emergence of a healthy value system and modern culture.
Holford (1959) had stated that, amenity is not a single quality. It is a catalogue of values which include the beauty that an artist sees, and an architect designs for. Amenity includes utility—light, clean air, water, domestic and community services, comfort stations or facilities that reduce the drudgery and hazards of mere existence.

Gardener (1965) believed that education plays a multifaceted role in the development process. It enhances people's understanding of themselves, society, and their natural environment, living skills, increases productivity by improving work skills, and lowers reproduction by raising women's status in society. It plays an important part in the nature and quality of an individual's life and work. So education is a process and the end product for the achievement of good quality of life.

Hartley (1972) had stated that continuous increase of population makes the job of improving the quality of life in general, and human potential in particular, more difficult and automatically, it also reduces the per capita income.

A number of studies have consistently showed that quality of life is very much related with family life. Andrews and Whithey, (1976); Northam (1975) had stated that perhaps in terms of their relative explanatory powers, it is the socio-economic component that can be considered as the most significant element of the quality of urban life.

Richard F. (1994) had pointed out that the experience of several countries clearly shows that improvement in the physical quality of life can be brought about even at low levels of per capita G.N.P. and that a high level of per capita G.N.P. does not necessarily bring about improvement in the physical quality.

Several studies have shown that the higher income groups have better access to the basic requirements of medical and educational facilities. For example, Singh and D'Souza, (1980) in a study of slum and pavement dwellers of different cities of the country had observed that people with higher income are more equipped to send their children to good schools for the quality education. Panikar and Soman (1984), also reported that in cities, poor have very little access to higher qualities and free medical services. It has been also pointed out that better quality of life is primarily determined by the health status of a population and their health status is shaped by factors such as the level of income, standard
of living, housing, sanitation, water supply and by the coverage and accessibility of medical care facilities.

Streeten (1984) had pointed out that basic amenities mainly refer to the minimum specified quantities and level of such things like shelter, water, sanitation, medicine, and education that are necessary to prevent ill health and underdevelopment of human beings. According to Ceccato and Snickars (1998), people living in a place with better services and infrastructure are highly satisfied and their working capability is better than those who do not.

According to UNDP’s Human Development Report (1988) human development depends on the extent of the availability of the resources required to fulfil the basic choices of the people (i) to lead a healthy life and (ii) to acquire knowledge and access to the common resources needed for a decent standard of living.

Haq (1995) had considered that, level of human development depends mainly on the literacy levels, per capita income and life expectancy. Sharma and Prabhavati (2000), had stated that besides per capita income of any person, their quality of life also depends on health, education and nutritional status. However the role of GDP/GNP cannot be ignored as it still acts as a good facilitator for most aspects of development and is closely associated with human development indicators.

Beyer (1965), had explained the causes for the emergence of slums in the cities, and was of the opinion that poor people can afford housing only in fragile and deteriorated environments, and because of their high concentrations in rather small habitable spaces, the housing stock gets deteriorated fast, and as this happens, the neighborhood also deteriorates further, reinforcing the initial sub-standard conditions.

Rao and Desai (1965), in their study of greater Delhi had focused on the impact of immigration during the period 1940-1957, which led to the rapid expansion of the city and changed the socio-economic setup of the urban area.

The concept of quality of life, as applied to the urban environment, is usually understood in two ways. Firstly it concerns the living environment and involves the patterns of inequitable advantages and opportunities that affect each citizen through accessibility to services, facilities and amenities. Proximity to these is a key factor in improving living
conditions. The other elements of the living environment include economic vitality and social equity, which encapsulate an infinite number of specific issues - for example, quality and affordability of housing. The second approach in understanding urban quality of life, according to Perloff (1969), relates to the natural environment in urban spaces. This approach holds that such factors as air, water and soil quality and the amount of green space available affect the way we live.

If population growth is rapid, then there will be more gaps between the resources and the needs of the city. A World Bank Report (1972) had articulated this dilemma in these terms 'what most distinguishes the current problems of the developing countries is their scale and intensity. The severity of the problems reflects primarily the overall rapid population growth and acute shortage of resources. In many developing countries cities have grown far beyond anything imagined only a few decades ago. The essential infrastructure for a city like roads, public transport, health services, water supply, sewerage and sanitation are under pressure. Often, contaminated drinking water causes several water borne diseases like diarrhoea, dysentery, hepatitis, typhoid etc (WCED 1987).

Within the developing countries negative impacts of the rising level of pollution are greater for citizens living in slum and squatter settlements than for the elites and growing middle class in the city. Here, most of the low income settlements are located in areas with low or even dangerous levels of environmental quality. (Douglass and Zoghlin, 1994).

Smith (1995), had supported the view of Douglass and had stated that industrial pollution of land, air, and water in the city affect the poor more than any other section of the community since it is primarily the poor who work and live in polluted environments. This situation is of course made much worse by the failure of the urban authorities to provide adequate infrastructural facilities, particularly in the fields of energy, water supply, and waste disposal, all of which combined with inadequate diets and inadequate housing conditions produce very high levels of morbidity and mortality amongst the urban poor.

Chakravarti (1997), had raised different issues, and had stated that little attention has been paid to the dangerously growing problems of non industrial pollution of air, water, soil and noise; directly related to the overcrowding of the urban areas, in the developing countries. For example in India, where specific data and report on non-industrial
environmental pollution are not available and are not collected by private or government agencies, lack of awareness is creating deteriorating environmental condition in many crowded areas.

Mir, Evaelawn and Bengali (1993) had stated that the city provides good chances to their residents for upward mobility, particularly economic development, that are often absent in rural areas, and for that reason urban areas act as magnets for rural migrants. In case of basic amenities like medical and educational facilities, studies have shown that higher income groups have better access to these.

Singh (1986) had reported that the poor have little access to higher quality of medical services available in the cities. He had also pointed out that rich people are better equipped to avail schooling and educational facilities than the low income groups.

Of the socio-economic dimensions explaining much of the variability in urban quality of life, the housing component is most visible. Even a casual visitor or passerby cannot fail to notice differences in the physical quality of the housing. Ceccato and Snickers (1998), in their study on the ‘Quality of Life in Stockholm Region’ had stated that people living in a place with better services and infrastructure evaluate their living places more highly than those who do not, even if in both areas the population affirm to be, in general, satisfied with their living place.

Suresh (1999) had identified the house as a basic need and being as important as food and clothing and had stated that high and rapid urbanisation and high cost of conventional dwelling units have continued to widen the gap between demand and supply in housing.

(vi) Municipal Financing:

All over the world growing urban population has become a key challenge for the urban planners and policymakers. Reliable energy, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, efficient transport and modern telecommunication systems are very much essential for every resident of urban centres. Therefore, proper financial measures are essential to improve the quality of infrastructure and that of basic services in urban areas.
Past studies had shown that cities containing large population and having high urban growth find themselves in an extremely difficult situation. While studying public expenditure on urban infrastructure Roy and Nath (1986) had asserted that the ability of developing countries to maintain and expand their stock of urban infrastructure, in response to population growth depends upon administrative, financial, and management skills of their administrators.

Bahl and Linn (1983) had set out a framework for pinpointing the sources of revenue that are appropriate to finance expenditure. He had also viewed that borrowing is an appropriate source of financing capitals outlays on infrastructural services, particularly public utilities and roads.

Baross and Linden (1990) had asserted that ‘urban chaos’ is perhaps the most accurate description of metropolitan or large-scale city growth in developing countries and this has been especially true in Africa where urban administration appears not to be up to the mark.

Chatterji and Mitra (1990) had mentioned that in India nationalisation of peripheral land in Delhi has completely failed. They had pointed out that access to land for low-income-housing has become impossible for the poor people and it is not because of the policy, but because of the inefficient administration and unrealistic price control mechanisms.

Cohen (1990), also had recognised that public-sector bureaucracy has played a major role in the build-up of the current crisis. He had argued that the inflated expectations of the public sector carried within them the seeds of ultimate financial crisis.

While comparing the different modules of urban governance, Pierre (1999) had argued that despite different models of local urban management, state factors play an important role in shaping urban governance.

Gilbert (1992) had stated that few governments in the developing nations have ever managed their cities very well and in general, their water systems leak: there are frequent electricity black-outs; there is a lack of competent policing and there are holes in the roads. Therefore Governments of these countries should take more efforts in this direction.
Johannes and Deborah (2002) had placed forward three arguments in support of fiscal decentralisation. The first is that if expenditure and tax rates are determined by those who run the city rather those who run the country; local preferences will be better addressed, local services will improve, and local residents will be more satisfied with government services. The second argument made in support of fiscal decentralisation is that stronger local governments will contribute to the development of democratic institutions because people can identify themselves more closely with local rather than the central government. The third argument is that local revenue mobilisation will increase, because local governments are more aware of and can tax more effectively than the central governments.

Mohan and Dasgupta (2005) had explained that it is not necessary that higher tax rates would improve the income of urban local bodies, actually improved tax administration and better compliance will go a long way in increasing resources for investment in urban infrastructure. They had also proposed an improvement in the user charges that account a very small proportion of total revenues in developing countries.

Kim (1997) had stated that enormous wealth generated through urbanisation is not being utilised properly to finance shelter and urban infrastructure development and service delivery; so as to further economic development and to improve the quality of life of urban dwellers.

1.5. Selection of indicators:

There is no commonly accepted way to conceptualise what urban development and quality of urban life mean and how they should be addressed, defined and measured. So for measuring and evaluating urban development and quality of urban life a series of representative indicators which are some times called quality of life indicators are needed. Ideally, those indicators should posses the following characteristics. According to Liu, B.C. (1988), they are-

1. The indicators should be sufficiently universal so that the underlined principle would apply to the majority of the people.
2. They should be easily understood and there should be a general consensus with respect to their selection.
3. They should be flexible enough to encompass any lifestyle among individuals at different places and different points of time.

4. They should be adaptable to the changing social, economic, political and physical conditions in a dynamic society and open to verification according to recognized scientific approaches.

Therefore, in the present research an attempt is being made to judge urban development through the concept of urban quality of life by analysing the availability and accessibility of basic needs such as health, education, housing and household amenities, transport and communication. Again, under these heads several sets of indicators have been chosen, which will be elaborated further in the methodology section.

1.6. Objectives and Research Questions

Objective-1
To trace the spatial and temporal trends in the pattern of urbanisation in Jharkhand.

Research question-1
(i) To what extent the level and pace of urban growth has varied across the districts and towns in Jharkhand, over a period of 1951-2001?
(ii) Is there any marked intra-state disparity in the density of urban centres?
(iii) Are the city size distributions and hierarchy of settlements in Jharkhand highly skewed?
(iv) Have the towns having larger share of their workers in manufacturing sector showed faster growth?

Objective-2
To analyse the status of physical and social infrastructure and basic amenities in terms of their progress and quality in the towns/cities Jharkhand.

Research question-2
(i) Are the smaller towns of Jharkhand facing acute shortage of basic services?
(ii) Does the industrial and mining towns have better physical, social infrastructure and basic amenities?
(iii) Does the availability of physical and social infrastructure and basic amenities vary among different social groups?

**Objective-3**
To study the intra-city variations in the physical, social infrastructure and basic amenities in Ranchi.

**Research question-3**
(i) Does the degree of variability in the living environment of Ranchi vary spatially within the city?
(ii) Are the newly developed fringe areas lagging behind in infrastructure and basic amenities?

**Objective-4**
To analyse the distributional aspects of the services and amenities availed by the different population groups and localities.

**Research question-4**
Does the quality of services and amenities vary across different socio-economic groups of Ranchi?

**Objective-5**
To study the relationship between different socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the households and availability of basic amenities and services.

**Research question-5**
Does the socio-economic status of households affect the pattern of utilisation of basic amenities and services?

**Objective-6**
To introspect critically the role played by the municipalities and local bodies in the urban development of Jharkhand and Ranchi.
Research question-6

(i) Do the municipality and the local bodies of Jharkhand and particularly Ranchi experience shortage of resources?

(ii) Are there disparities due to the differences in the provision of resources or development work by municipalities or urban local bodies?

1.7. Data Base and Sample Design:

The present study is based on both primary and secondary data. The town/city level information has been used mainly for the purpose of comparative study of the towns/cities of Jharkhand. The study incorporates Ranchi city as a distinct urban geographical unit. Data at city and ward level of various social, demographic, economic and physical environments have been collected form secondary sources. Municipal level study has been done to capture the internal variations in the level of development of physical and social infrastructure in Ranchi city.

Diagram: 1.2
Flow Chart of Sample Design

The information regarding infrastructure and basic services at colony level has been gathered through primary surveys. The sample areas have been selected in a way that they
can best represent the entire residential area of Ranchi. Initially, six municipal wards have been selected by composite index. The ward with highest value of composite index represents the developed ward and ward with middle value of composite index represents average development. Again the ward with lowest value of composite index represents the less developed ward. For the analysis of levels of development of different socio-economic groups stratified random sampling has been done and households have been selected from lower, middle and upper areas of the each municipal ward. It is true that geographical location may not necessarily be the indicator of people’s status but such a selection has been done due to the unavailability of per capita income data. After selecting the colonies, a total of 396 households from 18 housing colonies (22 household from each colony) spreading in 6 wards have been taken as samples for detailed investigation. For the selection of households a simple random sampling has been utilized.

For this study most of secondary data have been taken from Census of India and other government sources like the Municipal Corporation of Ranchi. Population and Socio-Economic data have been taken from the following volumes.

(ii) Census of India, Provisional Population Table India, Jharkhand, 2001, paper II.
(vi) Census of India, Village and Town Directory, Jharkhand, 2001
(vii) Census of India ,General Economic Tables, Part iii(a) and iii (b), Bihar, 1971, 1981, 1991.
(viii) Statistical Abstract of India for Bihar. 1971, 81. 91.

1.8. Methodologies:

Research material has been collected from both primary and secondary sources. Most of the study has been focussed at micro level and primary source information i. e. household survey data has been analysed. Nevertheless, secondary sources have also been analysed at a macro level for comprehending the overall development of urban Jharkhand.
In chapter II, degree of urbanisation, tempo of urbanisation, primacy index, rank size relationship, location quotient, nearest neighbour analysis have been calculated.

In chapter III, firstly a composite index has been calculated with help of a set of selected indicators of basic infrastructure facilities and services. For analysing the relationship between the level of urban development, size of towns and Municipal expenditure of the two towns of Jharkhand, correlation matrix has been applied.

In chapter V, apart from the composite index, mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation has been used to examine the degree of disparity among the different social groups and regions of Ranchi City.

In chapter VI, physical accessibility index has been generated to gauge the accessibility of neighbourhood services and amenities. In order to gauge the salient factors influencing the overall urban development in Ranchi, the Principal Component Analysis had been attempted finally, to bring out the conclusions.

The statistical formula applied in different chapters has been mentioned in their respective chapters.

Variations in the urban development as reflected through the spatial differentiation has been considered as the function of different means of development. Here means of development involves the physical and social means of development. In physical means of development availability of goods, toilet facilities, and drinking water (tap, well, tank, etc.), electricity, house and household amenities, transport and communication have been considered. Within the social means of development educational and health facilities, library, park, play ground, cinema hall have been considered. Indicators collected through sample surveys have been clubbed into different sets to analyse the spatial pattern of urban development as well as the levels among development of different social groups of Ranchi city.

1.9. Scheme of Study

Chapter I deals with the conceptual background, study area, objectives, research questions, data base and methodologies of the study. It also incorporates reviews of literature.

Chapter II contains with the historical evolution of urban centres in Jharkhand, trends and pattern of urbanization by state and districts. The distribution of urban centres as well as growth of population by size class towns have been also examined. While attempting to measure the different dimensions of urbanisation in Jharkhand, certain statistical methods,
such as, primacy index, rank size rule, nearest neighbour analysis and location quotient have been used in this chapter.

Chapter III is divided into two sections, the first section examines the financial conditions of different ULBs of the towns of Jharkhand. The second section deals with the evaluation of urban infrastructure and services in all the cities/towns of Jharkhand. An attempt has been also made to evaluate the availability of housing and household amenities among the different social groups of Jharkhand.

Chapter IV deals with the factors influencing the evolution and growth of Ranchi city. The spatial expansion of Ranchi city since its establishment has been studied in this chapter. This has been followed by the study of demographic composition of Ranchi City. The entire study has been based on ward level analysis. The financial status of Ranchi Municipal Corporation has also been analysed in this chapter.

Chapter V is devoted to the detailed study of the level of urban development in different parts of Ranchi. To find out the variations in the intra city development, ward level and colony level data have been utilized. To examine the disparity in urban development of different regions and social groups, indicators have been divided into housing and household amenities, household assets, neighbourhood health, educational and recreational facilities, inconvenience of localities and solid waste management systems and others.

The focus of the VIth chapter is on the availability of health, educational, recreational and other essential facilities in the neighbourhood of the study areas. To assess the living environment in the colonies of Ranchi, the availability of drainage system and sewer line and other causes of inconvenience in the selected colonies of Ranchi have been investigated. Garbage disposal methods and related problems have been also analysed in this chapter.

Chapter VII is the last chapter, where a presentation has been made on the summary of the entire work and major conclusions emerging from this research works.
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