The study of urban areas is gaining much more importance in the present time than in the past. The urban areas are developing all over the world. They are attracting many more people from the rural areas than ever before. This is due to modernisation, industrialization and westernisation. A wider framework of opportunities are provided to the people in the urban areas. At present nearly one third of the world's population live in the urban areas. There are many problems in the urban life, but the opportunities it provides are varied and diverse.

The city life, another name for the urban life, involves combination of convenience, opportunity and discrimination, and a combination of enlightenment and fear. The city life may be cruel and full of competition,
but is always exciting. The urban areas have more wealth and affluence than the rural areas. More skill, science and technology could be found in the developed urban areas than perhaps in the interior country side.

Definitions

We need to define urbanization before we start discussing urbanization in detail. Usually urbanization is defined in terms of the proportion of the total population of a country that lives in urban areas. That is to say, urbanization is exclusively viewed in terms of number of people in cities. Although density of population is considered to be a criterion of urbanization, population, however, does not represent all characteristics of the processes of urbanization. For example, the urban population of an area can expand without any improvement in urban facilities such as in accommodation, transport and sanitation. The rural population is also increasing. They are not in any way urbanized simply because they are denied of urban facilities. It may, however, be mentioned that urban growth is very rapid in developing countries particularly in tropical Africa where urbanized area is negligible in comparison to rural areas. Obviously we
need some more precise criteria for definition of
urbanisation.

In 1961 the government of India laid down some
more specific criteria for defining and identifying
urbanised areas. They are based on size of population, its
density and people's occupations therein. Until 1961,
however, all persons living in the jurisdiction of
municipal corporations or other types of municipal or
quasimunicipal government bodies, including town committees
notified area committee, and cantonment boards were classified as urban areas. After 1961, however, as many as 800
places lost their urban status. It has been agreed since
then that the criteria of identifying and classifying an
area as urban and giving it urban status is that at least
three-fourth of the working population be working outside
agriculture. The main test is, therefore, non-agricultural
pursuits irrespective of the quality of life, and cultural
and technological changes. The dirty slum areas or the
shanty colonies in a metropolitan area are urban in the
occupational or locational sense, but surely in terms of
urbanism they are worse than villages. The definition
adopted for census by the government of India in 1971 for
an urban area follows that of 1961 which is as follows -
i) A minimum population of five thousand.

ii) At least 75 per cent of the male working population is non-agricultural.

iii) A density of population at least 400 per square kilometre.

Though the occupational pursuits and population size have their own defects in determining the urban and non-urban areas, it must, however, be admitted that they are perhaps the clear and simple ways of classifying urban areas. This population based and occupation oriented method is rule of thumb. That is why would statistics commonly use this simple universal method to avoid some complicated situations. Both demographic and sociological orientation expands the meaning of urbanisation. There are many definitions of urbanisation which separate an urban population from a rural one. As we see below, such definitions are variously determined by political, administrative, historical, cultural and demographic factors.

Mitchell (1954) refers to urbanization as being the process of becoming urban, moving to cities, changing from agriculture to other pursuits common to cities and corresponding behaviour pattern. According to Hauser (1955), however, urbanization is a process of population concentration
or agglomeration. Talking about urbanization Shepard (1981) says that urbanization is the movement of people from rural to urban areas.

Professor Wirth (1938 : 5) a renowned sociologist at the University of Chicago first developed the idea of urbanism as a way of life. He describes city as a relatively large, dense and permanent settlement of social heterogeneous individuals. In his view, because of large size, mixed population, heterogeneous nature of life, urbanization creates new situations to the society. All these new situations led to different type of dependence among urban people. Wirth, however, gives a clear picture of decaying primary relationship and greater dependence on secondary relationship. Urban life is definitely different from rural life. Because of increasing number of population, centre of administration or business trade, commerce etc. urban areas become very important. All round development of roads and transport, easy communication system, various urban facilities like electricity, water supply, gas, modern house, availability of educational institutions etc. educated people are attracted towards urban life. Wirth has put forward a proposition that urbanization produced new social pattern, and that cities were centres of change.
Writing about urbanism and Indian society, Coale (1977: 126) comments that Wirth's formulation of a sociological definition of the city in terms of a way of life and his stress upon urbanization in terms of social process and characteristics have given new perspective to the view of the city in which traditional social forms could not survive. Trivedi (1976) makes a subtle distinction between a city and an urban area and says that the concept of 'city' is based on dominant material or manifest aspects whereas the concept of urban is based on dominant non-material or latent aspects. These two concepts, according to Trivedi are conceptually separable realities. Bell and Newby (1971: 40) remark significantly, "If the city is a community and if urbanization represents the extension of patterns typical of a city, urbanization ought more logically to represent particular kind of community formation rather than community destruction". It is, however, generally accepted that urban society is not possible outside the framework of a city. These two terms city and urban are not synonymous because, by convention, and in reality, they appear to be "both inclusive and exclusive of one another" (Trivedi, 1975: 91).
Raiss Jr. (1964: 331-336) systematically divided all the definitions of urbanisation into four categories.

i. Urbanisation may denote a diffusion of the influence of urban centres to a rural hinterland. The 'influence' diffused usually refers to the customs and traits of these urban centres. This definition of urbanisation is close to the ecological definition of the dominant function of cities. A major disadvantage of this definition, however, is that it confuses the process of concentration in cities with the 'influence' of these centres.

ii. A second major type of definition holds urbanisation as synonymous with the appearance of 'urban traits and characteristics' in a population. This definition is usually found in the literature of rural sociology. The appearance of certain culture practices (usually associated with cities) in a rural area is said to be an evidence that rural population is being 'urbanised' or that it is undergoing urbanization. This definition poses the special difficulty in that the traits and practices must first be clearly differentiated as urban because they naturally presuppose some other processes of urbanisation.
iii. Most demographers look at urbanization as a process of population concentration. H. Tisdale, for example, defines urbanization as a process of population concentration, with the process proceeding in two main ways: the multiplication of the points of concentration and the increase in size of the individual concentrations. The definition of urbanization as a process of population concentration implies a process of moving from a non-urban to a completely urban state of population concentration. There is, however, no implication in the definition that the process is a continuous one, for there can be de-urbanization or equilibrium states short of complete urban concentration. It should, therefore, be clear that the definition of urbanization as a process of population concentration implies a definition of the points of concentration as well. Cities may be defined simply as points of population concentration. We have given above a few definitions of urbanization in terms of city life, and a city in terms of urbanization. City life and urbanization seem to involve an inherent circularity, that is to say, an urban trait is one found in cities and a city is a place characterized by urban traits.
iv. A fourth type of definition holds that urbanisation is a process of population concentration in which the ratio of urban people to the total population in a territory increases. This definition, in fact, implies a definition of cities independent of the urbanisation process. From this point of view, an increase in both the size of individual points of concentration, and of the number of points of urban concentration may possibly occur even without an increase in the urbanisation of a territory. This definition seems to emphasise that urbanisation occurs only when a larger proportion of the inhabitants in an area come to live in cities. This definition of urbanisation is, therefore, not satisfactory.

Characteristics of Urbanism

Usually we make a distinction between a rural person and an urban person. We regard the rural person as less literate, or at least less educated, less familiar with modern science and technology, more attached to his family and kin and so on. Though these are subjective attributes, there is more truth in these factors. If we, for example, make a rigorous analysis of census data on rural areas and urban areas in any given country, we find
clear difference in the sex ratios, literacy percentages, and surely in family situations. But characteristics of urbanism vary not only from country to country but also from period to period. To cite an example, the fertility rate of Indian cities may vary with that of the cities of Japan, and even India, the fertility rate may not be the same as it was fifty years ago. The magnitude of India may not be the same as it was fifty years ago. Furthermore, the magnitude of difference between rural and urban areas in one country, may be less or more than the same in another country. For example, there is a great difference between Indian city life and Indian village life while in the U.S.A. rural life is not different, to that extent, from the city life of that country.

According to Murre (1930 : 474), the city is a place where people live in physical proximity, but they do live at a social distance. It may be observed, the bigger the city, the more un-social it becomes. Unified social leadership becomes almost impossible, and group leadership takes its place. The city dwellers think in groups; they become strongly group conscious; hence many of the community’s social problems have to be handled by make-shifts and compromises rather than by vigorous, unified
constructive effort. Many of the most difficult problems in modern city arise from the absence of planning. Most of the modern cities are unplanned and disorganised. Still the contrast between the city and the village is quite obvious. The city has more wealth than the village. The city has more skill, science and technology than the village. However, the city has more divorces, disharmonies, more aliens, births and deaths and accidents than we can have in the rural areas. All sorts of people, rich and poor, wise and stupid meet and mingle in the city without in the least understanding one another. Every man seems to be an island by himself.

Urban life constitutes of two aspects as suggested by Sjoberg (1966 : 159) - one is material and the other is non-material. The materialistic approach emphasises external environment, population structure, land-use pattern etc. while the non-materialistic approach emphasises the role of social or cultural values, attitudes and human action as the key determinants of urbanisation. The non-material nature of urban life is derived from the 'natural will' or instinctive elements ingrained in attitude and behaviour. According to Trivedi (1976 : 95) these two aspects do not oppose each other but one
supplements and complements the other. Thus it appears that the non-materialistic approach largely deals with phenomena of urbanism as a way of life in the light of value connotation and behavioural denotation of this term. As defined by Meadows and Mizuchi (1969: 2), urbanism is a pattern of existence which deals with (i) the accommodation of heterogeneous groups to one another; (ii) a relatively high degree of specialization in labour; (iii) involvement in non-agricultural occupational pursuits; (iv) a market economy; (v) an interplay between innovation and change against the maintenance of social traditions; (vi) development of advanced learning and the arts; and (vii) tendencies towards city based, centralized governmental structures. Likewise, the non-materialistic approach deals with the phenomenon of urbanization which primarily refers to the processes, causes and effects of change leading to concentration of the people in an area affecting its ecological features. From this point of view, we can safely conclude that material and non-material approaches are not mutually exclusive but complementary to each other. According to Trivedi it is, therefore, necessary for us to look upon these approaches as composing one integrated whole phenomenon which we may call urbanization. The term
includes the meaning of both urbanism and urbanization.

Wirth (1938) put forward as many as twelve propositions towards the understanding of urbanization. Discussing the aims of Wirth's theory, Morris (1968 : 16) asserts that Wirth tried to suggest that (i) urbanism was not necessarily peculiar to city dwellers, (ii) size was a poor indicator of urbanization, (iii) urbanization could not possibly be explained in terms of location, size, age and function, (iv) features of the Western cities were not comparable to features, for example, of the past or other cultures, (v) cities might possibly be classified in terms of location, size, age and function, (vi) in terms of cause and effect relationships, the growth in size, density and heterogeneity were not the prime movers.

Morris further adds that Wirth's critics maintained that Wirth (i) placed too much emphasis upon city's problems of disorganisations, (ii) that he believed that social relationships in rural society tend to be secondary in character, further that he emphasised much on heterogeneity, and lastly (iii) that he did not examine the consequences of heterogeneity influencing personality and attitude of individuals.
After having examined various concepts, theories and definitions of urbanisation, Trivedi (1976: 175) has tried to develop a hypothesis, or at least, more comprehensive definition of urbanisation. According to him, "urbanisation is the outcome of the impact of continuous and instantaneous forces to which human societies have been subjected and on account of which they have assumed a variety of new forms and structures". Trivedi has tried to show objectively that Indian society is selectively changing and gradually becoming fluid and moving towards greater complexity.

Noble and Dutt (1977: 10) have gone little further to observe that as time passes India will become more urbanised. The dawn of the twenty first century will, they believe, find India an urban country with an elaborate planning mechanism to cope with the problems of the complex process of modernization.

Difference between Urbanisation and Urbanism

These two terms are closely interrelated. Urbanization is the process and urbanism is the end result of this process. Urbanism indicates a way of life.
characterized by certain standardized modes of behaviour, forms of organization and values and norms. Urbanization can also be conceived of as one of the causes of culture-change. Urbanization is a process of development towards the goal of urbanism. Urbanism and urbanization represent two different meanings. Raj rightly remarks "Urbanism is a goal and an objective — a way of life in terms of culture and socio-economic conditions and a state of techniques and civilisation — to be attained through a process of development of socio-economic and technological change moving towards a new balance of human activities and settlement patterns" (Raj, 1975: ix). Seen in this context, even rural development in terms of social change is a step towards urbanism.

Shepard (1981: 395) points out that urbanization process has had several important consequences. From the point of view of those living in cities, one of the most significant of these is the development of specific way of life unique to city residents that sociologists refer to as urbanism. According to him, urbanisation refers to a change in population patterns, whereas urbanism refers to changes in culture, social structure and life-style.
Urbanisation and Industrialisation

Urbanisation and industrialisation are often maintained together, as if urbanisation is a part of industrialisation. But these two concepts have distinct connotations. While urbanisation implies changes due to the influence of city life, industrialisation implies changes due to development of industries. In underdeveloped countries, there are large concentration of population in single settlements; and in such agglomerations, a type of life develops quite distinct from village life. On the other hand, in countries like Switzerland and Japan, industries have developed and become one of the factors of social change without the growth of cities or towns. In fact, city phenomena in particular, and urban phenomena in general are antedating modern industrialisation. To-day it has become a fashion to say and to prove that urbanisation and modern industrialisation are invariably linked, and have had definite relationships (Trivedi, 1976 : 7). The evidences, of ancient urban growth centres such as Babylon, Mohenjo-daro, Harappa etc. do not support such arguments. However, in most of the countries, urbanisation and industrialisation have gone hand in hand, because both are manifestations
of development. There is no correlation between industrialization and urbanization, though one may lead to the other. Availability of skilled and unskilled labour, facilities of communication, nearness to ancillary industries help an industry to grow up in an urban centre. On the other hand, when an industry is started in a rural area, it is gradually transformed into an urban area, mainly because of growth of population caused by migration, development of markets, establishment of ancillary industries.

History of Urbanization

It is true that all the countries all over the world are not equally urbanized. Urbanization is a recent development in human history. The first city was probably founded only 5,000 or 6,000 years ago. The earliest great cities made their appearance in the valley of the Nile. Mauro (1930 : 474) mentioned that the earliest city of which we have any definite record is Memphis, the capital of Egypt under the old empire, which came to its close about 2500 B.C. Next, Thebes, Babylon and Nineveh developed in the valleys of Euphrates and Tigris. Ur was situated at the meeting place of these two rivers which had a population of about 24,000.
Then arose the cities of Greece, Athens, Corinth, Sparta, Syracuse and Mileta were not mere palace cities or trading centres or holy places or citadels of defence, they were urban communities in the modern sense, with a high degree of economic vitality.

Rome was one of the great ancient cities and in fact it was the largest and best governed city that the world possessed at any time during the first fifteen Christian centuries. It had not far from a million people at her zenith which made her by far the largest city of ancient time. Although her population dwindled to less than a half million in the fourth century, she was still the world's largest urban community. Rome introduced the first municipal corporation and codes of law and still half of the world preserve the principles of Roman jurisprudence.

When the Roman power dwindled, the whole of European towns and countries were affected. In fact many of them dwindled into small villages or totally disappeared. Tribes who were adverse to urban restrictions and confinements overrun the imperial territories. Even, after the Romans evacuated Britain, the metropolises on the Thames turned into a heap of ruins after fifty years. During the
period from the fifth to the tenth century, the cities of Western Europe declined in population, in importance in trade, in security and in the provisions which they made for the comfort and convenience of their citizens.

However, city life showed the sign of reviving with the beginning of the eleventh century. In later centuries, London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna Madrid and Washington have owed much of their growth to political factors. According to Muaro (1930: 474) in future neither defence nor politics is likely to play much part in the location and growth of great communities. Trade and industry are the determining factors in the growth of the twentieth century municipality. This is true of city growth in the Orient as well as in Europe and America.

In recent times North America and Europe are highly urbanized, whereas majority of the people of Asia and Africa live in rural areas. The first modern society was the outcome of the Industrial Revolution in England during the late 18th and early 19th centuries (Gereami, 1985: 255). Growth and improvement of cities led to the growth of population and division of labour. Greater division of labour led to increased specialization. Increased specialization operates to increase productivity both
because the specialist can concentrate on relatively simple activity and because the specialised function can more easily be mechanized and accomplished through the use of non-human energy.

Not only did cities facilitate industrialization but also, conversely, industrialisation had a striking effect on the growth of cities. In the pioneer country of industrialisation, Great Britain, for example, there were each in 1801 only 106 cities or urban places/containing 5,000 inhabitants or more representing no more than 26 per cent of the country's total population. A half century later, in 1851, there were 265 urban places, constituting 45 per cent of the total population. By 1891 the growth had reached 622 places, representing 68 per cent of the population. By the turn of the century, most of Europe had joined or was joining the processes of industrialisation and urbanization. By 1920 the population of Europe (excluding the U.S.S.R.) was 32 per cent urban, by 1985 it was more than 70 per cent with the heaviest densities in such industrial areas as the Rhineland and the English midlands. Parallel development, of course, took place in the United States. Hanser (1969 : 31) has shown that in 1970, 95 per cent of the population of the United States lived in
rural areas. The 5 per cent of the population who lived in cities were concentrated in 24 places. Only New York and Philadelphia had populations/25,000 or more. By 1850 population in urban places was still as low as 15 per cent. By 1900, however, almost two-fifths of the population lived in cities. But it was not until as recently as 1920 that the United States became an urban nation in the sense that more than half of the population lived in cities. In 1985 the figure was about 78 per cent. Such figures contrast with the figures for countries and regions that have not yet industrialized or are only now beginning the processes of modernization. Although the overall population densities in the underdeveloped world are generally far greater, their urban percentages are smaller. In 1985 East Asia was about 36 per cent urban, South Asia was about 30 per cent, Latin America about 68 per cent, and Africa was about 36%. The industrial country of Japan, in comparison, was about 80 per cent urban.

Rural-Urban Differences

Human behaviour is not inborn but it is acquired. Human beings can adapt themselves to any situations and form a way of life through the process of habit formation.
Culture, which implies a way of life, is a great mechanism that helps man to adapt himself to social settings such as manners, customs and to physical needs. Man does the process of adaptation with minimum trouble. Culture of a particular society or community helps in training people for a normal life. When a newly born baby is socialized through several rites and social processes, the baby gradually grows physically and learns all the social norms, standards and patterns of behaviour of that particular society that he finds himself born into. If, for example, he is born in a rural situation, he will, naturally, learn the rural way of life. If, on the other hand, he is born in an urban situation, he will learn the urban way of life, that is, he will develop the characteristics of the urban community and their ethos. The cultural training that an individual receives in a social setting either urban or rural through the adaptive mechanism in the human mind helps the individual to adjust him or her into the environment. The rural-urban differences, thus, are only the creation of environment into which human beings are to adapt themselves through the process of socialization.

Bertrand (1958 : 23) defines socialization as 'the process by which the human organism is made into a
person. A person starts with various contacts with his family, friends and neighbours, schools, religious places, working places, markets and so forth. These contacts continue to influence him through his life. Bertrand has rightly mentioned/the folkways, the mores and other cultural requirements, such as ideals, ideologies, attitudes and values are learned by the individual as he becomes socialized. In order to speed the learning process and to ensure conformity to accepted standards, a complicated system of rewards and punishments is continually in operation even in the simplest society. According to him (Bertrand, 1958 : 25), three major environmental differences — geographical, social and cultural — account, in the main, for differences in behaviour or socialization between groups and individuals.

Rural urban differences are considered from two points of view. One is rural-urban dichotomy, and the other one is rural urban continuum. The supporters of the former theory hold that differences between rural and urban are categoric in nature and in direct opposition to one another. The supporters of the continuum theory, however, feel that rural-urban differences occur in relative degree in a range extending between two polar extremes of
the ruralites and the urbanites. Bertrand (1958: 25) holds the view that "the major characteristics of the one shade blend into those of the other as the observer moves from the core areas of either". In his view the continuum theory received increasing attention.

According to Pocock (1960), the village and the city are elements of the same civilization, and hence we cannot regard these two as different types of society. Redfield (1956) also envisages rural communities as having a relationship of different kinds with the outside communities, of which towns and cities form an integral part, that is, the village and the city or the town are complementary to each other. His followers, however, try to interpret social change in terms of the so-called folk-urban continuum. Redfield (1947: 293) points out that as one moves along the continuum from folk communities to urban communities there is increasing group size, disorganization, role-segregation, individualization and secularization. Redfield's distinction between 'great tradition' and 'little tradition' is worth mentioning. The formal literate tradition of a civilization maintained by the elite of the society is, according to Redfield, 'great tradition', and the culture of the rural people of the same civilization is, according to him, little tradition.
No study, however, on rural urban difference has been undertaken on a world wide basis. The following distinctions were found by Duncan (1950: 27-30) in his objective study in the U.S.A.

1. Diversity of population - Diversity declines regularly with decreasing community size. The density of the entire rural population is undoubtedly well below that of any of the urban categories.

2. Occupation - As community size increases, there is a decline in the proportion of the working force engaged in farm occupations.

3. Heterogeneity - There is a tendency for the proportion of non-whites and foreign born whites to vary directly with community size. The least ethnic heterogeneity was observed in the case of the small villages.

4. Male-female ratio - The masculinity of the population is almost constant in communities varying in size.

5. Age distribution - The percentage of persons being 65 years old and over shows gradual increase from largest cities to smallest villages.
6. Residential mobility - No correlation was found between residential mobility and community size.

7. Educational standards - Percentage of High school graduates gradually decreases with the decrease of community size.

8. Percentage of White Collar Workers - Percentage of white collar workers in the non-farm labour force gradually declines with the decline of community size.

9. Income levels - Income levels show decline with the decline of the community size.

10. Percentage of married females - The percentage of married females increases gradually in the largest cities to the small villages.

11. Labour force participation of females - More females participate in gainful occupation in large cities in comparison to villages.

12. Fertility ratio - The fertility ratio tends to be higher in rural areas. In big cities the number of children under the age of five per 100 married women of child bearing age is 56 while in the village the same ratio is 70.
13. Size of the family - Family size does not show any appreciable difference between urban and rural communities.

In a study of Latin American countries Davis and Casas (1946 : 186-207) found the following rural urban differences. The urban population has a markedly lower fertility and a lower natural increase. As a result of the low birth rate and the heavy intake of migrants, the cities have a concentration of persons in the productive ages. Moreover, in the cities, the adult sex ratios are predominantly feminine. The Latin American cities show a higher proportion of married persons than the rural sections do. The cities are much more literate, in some cases, twice as literate than rural areas.

Duncan and Reiss (1950) have pointed out some of the social characters that go with the size of the population. According to them large cities tend to be more attractive to the long distance migrants than small places do. There seems to be a disproportionate drift of persons in the younger productive ages towards large places and a counter drift of older men. Community size, the ecological factors in the situation, is associated with conditions affecting the strength of familistic values. Urbanisation
reduces the economic return from children and increases the cost of child rearing. Housing facilities and living arrangements in large communities are less suitable for large families.

Davis (1967: 328-336) comments that the city is a diffusion centre. Effect of city life cannot be measured by rural-urban differences in contemporary society. People need not live in a city to be affected by it. He tries to find out the major social traits of the city from its demographic uniqueness in the following way.

Social heterogeneity - The concentration of a large population in a small area cannot support itself by agriculture but only by manufacture and trade, which flourish on specialisation. The fact that goods must be brought from a wide area means contact with regional diversity. Since competition decreases the birth rate and therefore requires the continual recruitment of population from the countryside, the diversity of different regions is incorporated into the very texture of the city.

Secondary association - In the city people must associate constantly with strangers. Hence the purely rural reaction to strangers - a reaction of either hostility or
hospitality must be replaced by indifference. Although superficial manners of politeness and mutual convenience evolve in the city, they are mechanical; in general the urbanite treats the myriad of strangers he meets in daily contact as animated machines rather than as human beings.

Social tolerance - Given the diversity of its population and the impersonality of its contacts, a certain tolerance characterises the city. The indifference arises partly through necessity, partly through the superficiality and brevity of contacts, and partly through familiarity. It is the public behaviour that the city regulates, the private behaviour that it ignores.

Secondary control - A city dweller can escape the oppressive control of any primary group when he wishes, simply by disappearing into the sea of strangers. This is the famous anonymity of the city, which frees the urban dweller from close moral control. As primary controls can be evaded, the city must ultimately have recourse to secondary controls. The specialised policeman, the department store and hotel detective, the numerous civic bodies and planning commissions, all have a hand in regulating the complex and predatory relations between urbanites.
Social mobility - The urban person can raise or lower his status to a remarkable degree during his lifetime, and the competition for status becomes a perpetual preoccupation. The exercise of talent, the achievement of education, the accumulation and display of wealth - these are avenues to a high position in all the different spheres of urban life. It is characteristic of the city that nearly everything is professionalised, from sports and entertainment on the one hand to politics and business on the other. Status increasingly centres on the occupation, on the nature and competence of the activity, rather than on the accident of birth.

Voluntary association - The sheer size of the urban population, its close proximity, diversity and easy contact, make it the perfect setting for the voluntary association. No matter what a person's hobby or vocation, national background or religion, age or colour, he can always find others with a similar basis of interest. For this reason nearly every kind of group tends to acquire a strongly voluntaristic character, membership depending neither on the accident of geography nor the accident of kinship. Entirely new kinds of groups arise, based on extremely specialised interests. Thus the number of group
memberships per capita is extremely high in the urban population, and these are divided among a bewildering variety of cliques, clubs, nationalities, and neighbourhoods having relatively little to do with one another except in an economic sense. In the city the group must organize or its cause will perish.

Individuation - The secondary and voluntary character of urban association, the multiplicity of opportunities, and the social mobility all force the individual to make his own decisions and to plan his life as a career. His awareness of differences in others and his knowledge of human relativity give him perspective on himself, so that he can view himself with greater objectivity. On one side stand the individuals and on the other side stand the great associations and institutions of the city. There is nothing much in between. The individual stands over against the whole city, never completely absorbed by any one social group.

Spatial segregation - The competition for space in the heterogeneous and dynamic city leads to a characteristic segregation of groups and functions, visible in the city's spatial pattern. The centre of the urban area is monopolized by finance and government, commercial activities, for example quality jewelry stores, big departmental stores,
legitimate theatres, fine hotels etc. are located in the centre. The land in the centre is so costly that the buildings expand vertically, filling the centre of the city with skyscrapers. Residential areas become separated from the place of work.

Since residence is a symbol of one's social status, there arise in the city segregated residential areas where the inhabitants are distinguished by racial, ethnic, religious, occupational, or pecuniary characteristics. In general the higher the social status the more advantageous the residence from the point of view of space per person, architectural and scenic beauty, and freedom from nuisances such as smoke and noise. Spatial segregation offers a convenient means of understanding the city's social organisation. It is found that fertility, mortality and morbidity, illegitimacy, illiteracy, vice, pauperism, and many other indices of social behaviour differ sharply from one area of the city to another. It is also true that no section of a city is absolutely homogeneous and that often it is necessary to relate different indices of behaviour to the individual as a unit rather than to the area.

Urbanisation in India

Now let us examine the trend of urbanisation in India. The existence of city is not new in India. From the
remains of Harappa and Mehenjodaro it can be assumed that the inhabitants of these places had urban characteristics. Coelen (1978: 127) observes that cities have not been alien to Indian cultural heritage for they have been a component of South Asian civilization for virtually its entire history. Kane (1946: 66) also writes the normative literature of which Hindu tradition, for example, emphasized the city as a centre of political authority charged with the function of upholding essential social values including those of caste.

The urbanism prevalent in ancient India is different not only in degree but also in kind from that prevalent in modern India. Growth of industrialization and urbanization have changed the trend of urbanization in India. According to census of India, in 1961, 17.97 per cent of the total population were living in urban areas as against 10.84 per cent in 1901. Till 1931 the extent of change was not significant. In 1961, the big cities which constituted only 3.96 per cent of the total number of urban centres contained 44.50 per cent of the urban population. On the other hand, small towns with less than 20,000 population each constituted 71.70 per cent of the total number of urban centres contained only 23.48 per cent of the urban population. Compared with 1911 census, it is found that during the course of 50 years,
62.2 per cent of the small towns have either decayed or remained stagnant. On the other hand, the large towns are gaining ground both in number and size of population.

Kar (1971 : 67) observes that though the overall mobility of Indian population is rather small in comparison with industrialised countries of the Western World, with a much smaller proportion of Indian population changing their residences, there has been remarkable growth of immigrant population in India during the last few decades. From the perspective of regional pattern of Indian population mobility based on districtwise data, it appears that regions comprising metropolitan cities and large urban nodes, mining areas, plantation zone etc. are the force of migrational flow. Taking the different states of India, a study of inter-state and between adjoining states migration and resulting net gain in population, indicates that states like West Bengal, Maharastra, Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Mysore, Gujarat and finally Delhi acted as major areas of population gain, which is also dominated by males, unskilled to semi-skilled labour, and rural-born folks. This trend has persisted throughout the last 50 years, the exceptions being Punjab, Kerala, Madras and Andhra Pradesh changing from areas of immigration in 1911 to those of out-migration
in 1961. Areas like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Jammu and Kashmir, Rajasthan have persistently remained as areas of out-migration throughout the period. Kar (1971: 71) also remarks that the urbanisation in India seems to have entered into an interesting stage, that is the precursor to an era of 'metropolitanism'.

Bulsara (1971: 63-65) gives a general appraisal of the urban situation in India as follows -

1) India is still 18 per cent urban and 82 per cent rural in contrast to some western countries where the population is 80% urban and less than 20 per cent rural.

2) Forbidding condition of rural living and difficult accessibility because of extremely poor communications, are also driving out the young, educated, able and ambitious persons to explore the amenities of organised urban life.

3) The birth rate of rural India is characteristically higher in contrast to urban India.

4) Commercial, industrial and administrative towns and cities produce the bulk of industrial goods in India, maintain the major part of educational, scientific
and technological institutions, and keep the wheel of
civilized life moving. There is a glaring contrast and
imbalance between the rural and urban sectors.

5) The general low standard of living of the 82
per cent rural population has made its impact felt in the
urban centres. 30 per cent and more of our urban citizens
live in slums; nearly 70 per cent of these living in
metropolitan areas having a single room as residence,
wherein they make a living room, bed room, kitchen, study
and sick room all in an average area of 120 square feet of
space between 4.8 persons of the average urban household.
Nearly 70 per cent to 80 per cent have no independent tap,
bathroom or latrine in their tenement. Nearly 75 per cent to
80 per cent of the households have a monthly income of less
than Rs. 250/- per month between 5 members and some of the
metropolitan estimates put 25 per cent of the populations
below destitution line and 37 per cent below poverty line.

6) The housing shortage and its inadequacy is
reflected in the quality of family life, which can be gauged
that
partially from the fact/every city without a solitary
exception has an extremely adverse sex ratio. This varies
from 1,660 to 1,710 males to every 1,000 females as in
Bombay and Calcutta to 500 and 800 females to 1,000 males
in most of the other cities of 100,000 and more population.

7) The average urban income is estimated to be higher than the average rural income of gainfully employed persons. The average per capita expenditure is 40 per cent more than that of rural households.

Urbanization in Assam

Assam is poorly urbanized. According to 1971 census it had an urban population of 12,89222 representing only 9 per cent of the total population as against 20 per cent in India (1971) as a whole. Though urbanization in Assam is not new its progress is very slow. According to 1971 census Assam had 72 towns. In fact Guwahati is the only city in the whole of the North East India. The following table (Table I : 1) gives a clear picture of the towns of Assam.
Table I : 1
Towns of Assam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : Census of India 1971

According to 1971 census Guwahati had a population of 123,783, only class I town of Assam. The most interesting fact about Guwahati is that it has become the centre of Assamese culture. Assamese people from all over Assam have in recent years migrated to this city and in fact have given shape to a common Assamese urban culture. As the central area of the city is mainly occupied by non-Assamese population the new Assamese migrants have settled in colonies around the main city which were till very recent times rural areas occupied mainly by the tribal population. Guwahati was an ancient
urban centre of religion and spiritual enlightenment from time immemorial. It was an administrative headquarters for several centuries as well. Until the recent times it has remained essentially an Assamese city, though its heterogeneity has started growing rapidly. Demographically, morphologically and sociologically it has all the characteristics of an urban centre. Hence it furnishes the ideal conditions for studying a culture in an urban setting.

Aim of the present study

In our theoretical discussions in the preceding pages we touched the point of urbanization as a factor of culture change. Initially urbanization causes the development of an urban version of a culture and this urban version of the culture is distinctly different from the rural version. Though nobody yet attempted to a monographic description of the Assamese culture, whatever description we find of Assamese culture, even in fragments (Barua, 1961; Bordoloi, 1963; Cantlie, 1984) these are of the rural version. But the growth of towns among the Assamese population, particularly the growth of Guwahati has certainly caused the development of an urban Assamese culture.
The proposed study will try to substantiate the hypothesis that the culture of the Assamese population inhabiting permanently in Guwahati has undergone tremendous changes. It is the aim of this researcher to examine how far the Assamese culture that we find in Guwahati today has deviated from the traditional, material and normative aspects that we had before.

This study brings into focus the various aspects of Assamese culture. In doing so, the researcher would take an earnest note of interactions between Assamese culture and other cultures which have been found in its proximity as a result of urban habitation.

Guwahati has been selected to study the urban version of Assamese culture for the following reasons:

1) Guwahati is the oldest town in Assam.

2) Guwahati is the only town in Assam which has some of the characteristics of a metropolitan area.

3) Guwahati has drawn Assamese population from all over the Assamese habitat.

4) Among all the towns of Assam only Guwahati has two strata, the comparatively old population inhabiting the old township and the recent migrants inhabiting the outgrowths.
It is expected that different stages of transformation can be found among different strata of population — among new migrants and among old migrants. The Assamese population will, therefore, be studied in the old town of Guwahati as well as the recent outgrowths.

Urban studies in North East India are very scanty. Moreover, all of these studies are mostly the works of urban geographers and as such their main emphasis is on the spatial aspect of urban growth.

The proposed study is expected to throw a new light on the urban studies of North East India because its main aim is to focus on the cultural aspect — the aspect of a culture taking a new shape in the urban environment. It is further hoped that the study will make some constructive contributions to the theoretical implications of the problems of continuity and change of a culture in the urban setting. Since the beginning of the present century Anthropological studies in North East India have centred around rural small tribal communities — and it may perhaps be emphasized that there have been nothing more than ethnographic descriptions. It is remarkable to note here that an humble effort has been made to study the dominant culture of the North East — the culture of the Assamese people.
Some Important Studies on Urbanisation

Booth (1902) has done the pioneer work on urbanisation in the west when he enquired into the life of the people of London. Various urban studies are made after him. Wirth (1938) gave a definition of a city and laid great emphasis on the non-material rather than material aspects of life in cities.

Barnes (1939) published his work on problems of changing age where he tried to study the dynamic character of American urban and industrial culture. He tried to show that transition in society was bound to be far more rapid than it was in any preceding epoch of world change and emphasized on the contrast between the material and non-material factors which he called a gulf between technology and social institutions and suggested improvement of social institutions to cope with modern life.

Davis and Casis (1946) studied growth of urban populations among cities in different size classes. Duncan and Reiss (1950) in their study of urban and rural communities pointed out that the metropolis generally provides more extensive market for goods and services, can more easily support a number of highly specialized activities,
but it also requires a more or less diversified economic base. Duncan and Reiss observed in their study that the Suburban population is relatively homogeneous, ethnically.
It enjoys a relatively high socio-economic status, as indicated by occupational composition, average educational attainment or income.

Gibbs (1966) tried to acquaint beginning students with methods of studying cities and urbanization. He also presented a series of projects sponsored by International Urban Research (University of California, Berkeley) to further the investigation of cities and urbanization throughout the world.

Moylan (1969) edited Voice of America Forum lectures on Urban America which analyzed various problems of urban development. Hauser (1965) emphasized in economic activities, geographic, ecological, land use pattern and housing research. He tried to explain historical events, personages, trends and movements which play key roles in the development of the urban areas. Hauser (1969) has also studied population composition and migration trends in U.S.A. He shows migration in the United States, as elsewhere, represents mainly a movement of population from places of lesser economic opportunity to places of greater opportunity.
The increase in urban and metropolitan population is the result of net migration as well as natural increase. Cities have over the years received large number of migrants from rural and no-metro areas of the United States as well as through immigration from abroad.

Urbanisation of American communities has been studied by Mitchell (1969). He tried to analyse the problems of social stability which is associated with ones breaking away from rural folks and gradual settlement in towns and cities, projecting non-traditional forms and structures of relationships. The hold of traditional cultures and sub-cultures is loosened in relation to ascriptive status of individuals and their traditional roles. He studied all round changes in social, economic, political and cultural spheres of life which may lead to realignment of different types of tribal groups into ethnically heterogeneous groups and associations of like minded persons, into effective pressure groups in the local bodies. These new identities and solidarities result into resettlements of native folk into separate social areas and enclaves. In African states a number of voluntary organisations have come into being in large towns for the protection and safeguard of the people coming from diverse ethnic origins, so that they are not widely scattered and totally absorbed in the hostile
culture of the city. Mitchell and Bogdan (1969) discussed these aspects of urbanization in Africa.

Urban study in India started during 1936. Since then various urban studies have been completed and it is not possible to record all the urban studies. We will discuss about only a few to show the trend of such studies.

The first urban survey in India was conducted by Gadgil (1936). His report on Poona appeared in 1945. Sporadic efforts were made by Census Operations, Gazetteer writers, British Scholars and a number of geographers, economists, demographers, sociologists and social anthropologists took up seriously the challenge of urbanization studies in India.

Sociologist George (1956) completed a study on the beggar problems of the city of Madras which was the first work of the sociologists on urban studies. Similar survey was conducted by Gore (1956) in Delhi (sponsored by Planning Commission in Delhi). The first report deals with the nature of the beggar problem, the phases in the growth of begging and recommendations. The second report presents a detailed account of the nature of beggar problem, the types of beggars, their community life and suggests measures for
tackling the problems. Sen Gupta (1957) studied the women employees in Jute factories at Titagarh, Purakar and Rae (1962) completed a study of prostitutes in Bombay.

A socio-economic survey of Hyderabad–Secunderabad city has been made by Iyengar (1957) where he tried to assess how far urban life has been affected by the influx from the countryside, socially and economically, whether the immigration has or has not been on the whole healthy or unhealthy; and whether it would be possible for the Planning Commission to evolve a policy with regard to internal migration and utilization of manpower potential on the basis of such city surveys.

A study of Poona conducted by Sovani, Apte and Pandise (1956) and have tried to show occupational structure, employment and migration, together with the levels of living. In 1957 Bopaganage studied Delhi and tried to consider how the individual and social needs of people are affected by the physical design of a city, apply some of the principles of sociological theory to study of an urban community and to make available the kind of factual sociological information that city planners and administrators need, in drawing up their blue-prints for redevelopment and fill the gap in developing areas, between
the need for knowledge and its availability.

Unesco Research Centre made initial efforts to study urbanisation of Southern Asia in the year 1953-55. This project covered the researches on Bangkok by Textor (1956), on the social effect of urbanisation in Bombay by Prabhu (1956), on impact of technological change in Dacca by Hussain (1956), on process of urbanisation in Djakarta by the Institute of Economic and Social Research (1956) and on the floating migration in Delhi by Deshmukh (1956).

Another series of urban studies undertaken by the UNESCO research centre envisaged to cover the Steel cities in India: Jamshedpur, Burnpur, Bhadravati, Rourkela, Bilai and Durgapur (1958). Such studies leads us to understand urbanism as a way of life and urbanisation as a process of transformation affecting the way of life. Considering the importance of industrial urbanisation Vidyarthi (1970) undertook study of Hatia Industrial Complex and took a diachronic view of the situation, studied the area for a long period of time in a number of phases. It was realised that the problem of social adjustment was made much more acute during the initial phases of the establishment of the industrial complex and perhaps much less when the factory started working.
Vidyarthi (1984) studied Ranchi applying anthropological methods. He made an attempt to study the primitive rural pockets within the town of Ranchi and the new pattern of life emerging out as a result of technological, political and economic developments. He tried to look at this city as a link in the interactions of two somewhat distinct cultures, the folk and the urban, or the tribal and non-tribal. This is considered important in view of the rapidly growing population of this city owing to the increasing and varied types of industrial, administrative, commercial and educational institutions in and around Ranchi. Another approach was made to study the role of Ranchi as a regional urban centre for the transformation of various tribal societies in the midst of which it is located.

Majumdar (1960) conducted a social survey of Kanpur where he tried to assess the complex conditions of urban life in an industrial metropolis. He stated that generally social scientists were interested in the problems of the concentration of population, urban development, increased commercial and industrial activities, levels of living, the rise of elite, mobility of labour, trade unionism, social pathology, cultural change, the extent of the social services and the nexus of social reactions.
Organised industries carry with them urbanised sectors as well, and both afford employment opportunities for the people. The nature of migration to and from the cities and towns have been one of the most important problems of Indian demography. While during the period preceding the Second World War, migration was mostly of unskilled labour belonging to lower castes, recent migration to Kanpur has been found to be more of the higher castes. The reasons put forward are (i) economic difficulties 53.6 per cent, (ii) dissolution of family 13.5 per cent, (iii) trouble in or dissatisfaction with the village 11.5 per cent, (iv) brought or attracted to city by relatives 16.3 per cent. In Kanpur a very significant fact has been the masculine complexion of industrial labour. Whereas Madras, Bombay, Ahmedabad, Sholapur and other parts of the south attract women labour — and the factories do have a large population of female workers — Kanpur has few women workers. The reason appears to be that in some parts of Uttar Pradesh in Kanpur region the percentage of the lower castes is comparatively small. The upper castes do not encourage their women to migrate or work outside their home. Migration of women caused by marriage and not by industrial employment.
Chauhan (1970) studied the process of urbanisation in tribal areas in Rajasthan. Aurora (1972) carried on such studies in Madhya Pradesh. He makes interesting effort at interpreting the interrelations between tribe, caste and class and suggests that Sanskritisation came to the region with the political intrusion of the Rajput dynasties. The process of diffusion from the marketing centre to the peripheries, from the town to the tribal villages indicates universalisation of the high culture traits. High culture in turn has been influenced by westernisation and secularisation. In his study of Agra, Chauhan (1966) has tried to provide a case study of the trends of urbanisation in the city of Agra.

Malkani (1958) studied Bareda and tried to find out the extent of migration in the city since 1941 and the amount of unemployment prevalent in the various sections of the population.

In the study of Bhopal city and Bairagarh Malhetra (1965) examined the problems of the migration of population from rural to urban areas and the extent of unemployment.

In the study of Calcutta — The Primate City, Census of India, Monograph No. 2, Ghosh (1961) tried to
examine the two streams of migration into the city with reference to their impact on the original residents and on the life and economy of the city itself. He also tried to collect economic and demographic information regarding the population of the area for a type-study of the growth of suburbs of Calcutta in general and that of squatter colonies in particular, as a result of the impact of immigration from East Pakistan. He tried to analyse the major forces at work, which are shaping the demographic and economic life of the Calcutta metropolitan region.

Misra (1959) tried to examine the problem of rapid urbanisation in his study of Jamshedpur. He also tried to investigate the main features of urbanisation, such as, growth in urban area, increase in population and in commercial and industrial establishments, employment opportunities provided by organised industries and unorganised industrial and commercial sectors, nature and extent of migration, urban unemployment, factors which promote or hamper development, such as housing, transport, power, water supply and social amenities. He also studied the scope of development of unorganised sectors and employment opportunities available in unorganised industrial and commercial sectors.
Mhaha (1964) has published a report on Problems of Rapid Urbanisation in India after completing socio-economic survey of 10 Indian cities (viz., Baroda, Hubli, Hyderabad—Secunderabad, Jasshodpur, Kampur, Poona, Garahpur, Lucknow and Surat). He studied mainly the demographic aspects of urban development, the problem of rural immigration into cities, the literary and other socio-cultural equipment of the migrant and resident inhabitants, the occupations followed by them, their income, unemployment, under-employment, the people's housing conditions and adequacy or otherwise of urban amenities.

Various studies are also conducted on small towns of India. Harve and Ramade (1965) studied Phalton and have tried to give an insight into the mutual relationships of a market town and its surrounding area and the population trends in recent years. It presents a comprehensive picture of a slice of society at a given time.

Mohsia (1964) in his study of Chittaranjana tried to understand the social anatomy of a newly-born urbe-industrial community, and to study how a mono-nuclear town which is predominantly inhabited by the people who are the employees of its only industry — the Chittaranjana Locomotive Works — and also is polythemic and multilingual in
content behave when the hierarchy of the plant is projected into the community set-up.

Bolpur was studied by Mukherjee (1964) to find out the relationship of Bolpur town with the villages covered by the jurisdiction of Bolpur Police Station, and also to study the growth of an area, predominantly rural and agricultural, but having as its centre, a town, that was till recently an enlarged village and a market place. He also tried to find out the trend of prices of urban land which is considered essential for economic planning and whether mechanisation of the milling process has proved beneficial to the society and what is the extent of integration of rural and urban sectors, as reflected in the flow of traffic between the town and the villages around it.

Desai (1964) tried to find out in his study of Nahuva, how segregation based on caste and religion, restricts social intercourse and to give an authentic account of what is happening to the institution of family in the essentially pre-industrial small town. The same town was studied by Pandit (1965) and examined the changing patterns of occupations and the micro-problems of occupational choice.
Moreover Census Organisation of India has undertaken to produce a report on each city, having a population of one million or more. Census Organisation of India published reports on small towns also. *Ponda : A Small Town in Goa* edited by Burman (1961) surveyed thoroughly morphology of the town indicating streets, functional areas, important public places, residential pattern with reference to ethnic groups and density of population, history of growth and the present position; economic resources, organisational and operational aspects of commercial, industrial and other types of institutions, work and employment statistics of the population, ethnic and demographic characteristics of the population; history of migration and settlement of families, neighbourhood pattern, organisation of power and prestige, leisure, religion and crime, activities of voluntary organisations and nature of relationship with the hinterland. Roy Burman (1971) stated that many symbols of urbanism have spread to the rural areas. According to his urban studies in India require two types - firstly, integrated study of the physical, social, economic and political aspects of the urban communities and secondly, the pattern of rural urban interaction in different situations, including the metropolitan areas.
Trivedi (1975) has attempted to develop a theory relating to macro-social change with special reference to contemporary India. His concept is the semi-urban pockets which emerged out of the increasing imbalances between the old urban and rural macrosomes. According to him social change is the outcome of the ongoing social processes at a point of time coupled with the influence of latent historical forces or elements.

Very little work on urbanisation has been done in North East India. Bhattacharyya (1981), a geographer, published an analytic-synthetic study of *Morphology of the Towns of Assam with special reference to the city of Gauhati*. He studied the trends of urbanisation in Assam with special reference to a few selected towns — Dhubri, Texpert, Dibrugarh, Silchar and Guwahati.

The Directorate of Census Operations undertook a programme of the detailed study of a few selected towns all over the country. Under this programme Chhetry (1971) published *Special Survey Reports on Selected Towns — Gauhati* and studied the aspects of the growth history of town, various servicing institutions in the towns in response to the different factors of change and the concomitant changes in the pattern of distribution of
community power and prestige, frequency and pattern of interaction among the different segments of the population, nature and intensity of linkages with other towns of the region on the one hand and rural hinterland society and other ancillary matters.

Najumdar (1984) studied aspects of urbanization in Nagaland and tried to trace out the urban version of Naga culture. He undertook a macro level study of the scheduled tribe populations in the urban areas of North East India. The study covered the three towns, Kohima, Dimapur and Mokokchung and analysed the situation of age and sex, literacy and education, occupational pattern, migration, heterogeneity and homogeneity, family size and type and utilization of civic amenities.

Bhattacharyya (1988) edited Problems of Urban Development in Guwahati and tried to find out the city's problems. Drainage and water logging problems, road accident, sanitation, education, medical and health problems, saving of archaeological objects and implementation of Master Plan etc. are discussed in detail. This has come out as a result of the Seminar on "Save Guwahati" organised by ASHINAM.
Mahanta (1999) studied a town of Assam and its impact on the hinterland. He conducted the study in Dibrugarh and covered various aspects of household, population and socio-ethnic composition of villages in the hinterland zone, rural-urban migration, connection with parental village by migrant families, education, occupation, concept of disease and cure and kinship and friendship pattern.

In reviewing the studies on urbanization in India in general and North East India in particular it can be pointed out that though since 1936 the problem of urbanization has attracted the attention of social scientists, the main thrust of the studies has been on the morphological aspects — demographic structure, growth pattern, in and out migration, so on and so forth. It has been rare for a study to focus on the culture change aspect — how a culture takes a new shape in the urban environment. It is also to be noted that culture change studies like Social Change in Modern India by Srinivas (1960); Social Change in India by Rupaswamy (1972); Modernisation of Indian Tradition by Singh (1973); Social Change in Malabar by Rao (1950) do not take into account urbanization as an important cause of culture change except
the work of Rao (1970) on Urbanization and Social Change
in which he studied the impact of urbanization on a metropol-
litan fringe.

Thus after careful observation on various studies
it has been found that no attempt has been made to focus
the importance of urbanization as a cause of social change
in any traditional society. The author's aim in this study
will be to examine the impact of urbanization on a
traditional culture.

Methodology

It is very difficult to study the investigator's
own community, because such an investigator is likely to
overlook many points in his or her own community, which to
a person from outside the community may be most interesting
and relevant. Out of a multifarious problems faced by an
investigator in studying his or her own community the
greatest stumbling block is the difficulty of keeping
within the limits of reasonable objectivity. Though
treatises in methodology speak about a number of methods,
they do not prescribe any particular method for an
investigator to study his or her own community.
The investigator of this study belongs to the category of persons she has studied. She is born and brought up in an Assamese rural environment and later shifted to urban environment. When she had occasions to visit her kins in rural areas, the differences between the urban Assamese culture and the rural Assamese culture struck her and this was the genesis of this study. To keep within the limits of objectivity data were collected in such a way that they can be reduced to numerical figures. A household survey schedule (in Assamese) was devised (see Appendix) to collect information on all the points required for the study. The city was divided into two zones, the central zone (the old Guwahati Municipal area) and the peripheral zone (the Guwahati Municipal Corporation area, Map - 3).

The families were selected on the basis of the Corporation Voters' lists. First the serial numbers of Assamese families were noted separately for the central and the peripheral zones, after a preliminary survey. From the Assamese family serial numbers of families were selected on random sampling basis.

The investigator collected data from 1992 Assamese households of Guwahati city for the study. These sample households include 1899 Hindu, 108 Muslim, 3 Christian and
2 Sikh households of the city. Though this is relatively small sample for a city of Amritsar's size, this limitation could not be overcome because of the shortage of time.

The investigator encountered some difficulties regarding collection of information about income and expenditure. Many families did not like to give their incomes for obvious reasons. Due to this reason some forms remained incomplete and these are cancelled later on. Many families do not keep accounts of their expenditure, except fixed items of expenditure like house rent, school/college fees, etc. As most of the information were collected from females, the investigator found that majority of the females are very bad in giving an account of the expenditure.