Different scholars have defined the concept of urbanisation from the perspectives of their respective disciplines. For instance, demographers\(^1\) (Asok Mitra, Ashish Bose, K.C. Zachariah, M.K. Premi) define urbanisation as a mere population agglomeration. For them, a city or a town means just a concentration of population of different hues. Hauser\(^2\) regards urbanisation as the process of concentration of people involving the multiplication of points of concentration as well as increase in the size of industrial concentration. Such explanations of urbanisation are,

---


\(^2\) "Observation on the Urban-Folk and Urban-rural, Dichotomies on Forms of Western Ethnocentrism", in Hauser, P.M.(ed.) The study of urbanisation 1967, pp.504-17.
however, insufficient for sociologists as their major concern is to analyses the social processes like new forms of associations, social interaction and relations that emerge in the cities. They are also concerned with how the traditional social institutions and social structures undergo changes in the new social milieu of a town or city. For instance, Rao has defined urbanisation as a world wide process and an important factor of social change. Some of the changes occurred in Indian towns and cities have been visualized as those from the caste-system to the class structure, from joint families to nuclear families and from sacred to profane or religious belief system to secular outlook and behaviour. Davis and Pocock have looked at urbanisation as a process of change from rural way of life to urban life patterns and also as a shift from the agricultural economy to the industrial economy. In other words, urbanisation not only covers the spatial movement of people permanently or temporarily from village to town

---


or city, it also refers to the effects of city habits upon the village manners. 6

Urbanisation is, thus a process of expansion in the entire system of inter-relationships by which a population maintains itself in its habitat. There is both increase in the number of people at a point of population (in town or city) and also increase in the number of points (of towns or cities) at which population is concentrated. 7 Yet, the rate of urban growth is distinguished from the rate of urbanisation. The demographers 8 refer to the former as the percentage increase or decrease in the urban population in a given decade or in a particular year, while they signify the latter to the percentage increase or decrease in proportion of the urban population to the total population during a given decade or period.

6 Vishwakarma, R.K., Urban and Regional Planning Policy in India, 1981.


Sociological studies of urbanisation also analyse the physical environment, i.e., some cities grow on account of their location in relation to regions while in other cases the physical growth is dependent on social and demographic pressures. Burgess\(^{11}\) has treated city in terms of its physical expansion and differentiation in space. Citing example of the city of Chicago, he had developed the hypothesis of concentric circles or zones radiating around the central business district (Zone 1). Here, the land values were highest and economically profitable activities were concentrated. The largest number of people used this area as this was a transport centre. It was the original area of settlement of the city. The zone-2 was the "Zone in transition" adjoining to Zone-1. This was historically seen as a natural fringe. Earlier, it attracted the privileged citizens but gradually deteriorated and marked the agglomeration of undesirable elements of the city. It only attracted residents who had no choice. Then, Zone-3 was the "Zone of working mens' house". The predominant residents of this area were factory employees and their settlement in the area was determined by convenience as well as prices of land and of other commodities. Similarly, Zone-4, was

one of the "better - residences". The ecology of this zone was described as one containing of white collar workers and professionals. The area was also marked by local business districts. Finally, the Zone-5 was the "commuters zone" which was marked by the single family dwellings. It also contained some small dwellings associated with crime and vice.

Homer Hoyt\textsuperscript{12} has also analysed that urban growth is usually around the major transportation routes towards the outskirts of the city. A city is divided into a number of sectors and each sector reflects segregation of population groupings according to income and social status. Space is an important factor and is unequally distributed in relation to the provision of facilities and the urban resources\textsuperscript{13} which too are scarce and unequally distributed. How are these distributed depends largely on the actions of individuals who occupy strategic locations in the social system.

However, there can be urban growth without urbanisation if we accept it as a process consisting of


\textsuperscript{13} Pahl, R.E. \textit{Whose City?} 1975, p. 151.
several other attributes or characteristics as mentioned by sociologists. Urbanisation, on the other hand, is different from urbanism wherein it is the condition that results from the process of urbanisation. Sociologists mostly refer the concept of 'urbanism' to the style of life that characteristically develops under urban conditions. Louis Wirth\textsuperscript{14} wrote in 1938 on urbanism treating it as a way of life which in the later literature has been accepted for explaining both urbanism and urbanisation. Nonetheless, he defined urbanism as that complex of traits which make up the characteristic mode of life in cities. And urbanisation, in his opinion, is the development and extension of these traits. For him, urbanism and urbanisation are found in settlements which are called cities in the physical and demographic senses. The core of his essay contained three main assumptions from which other assumptions were drawn. The main assumptions for him are centered around size, density and heterogeneity of population attributing to various characteristics of urbanism in cities. The increase in size of population he contended, limits the possibility of each member of the community knowing all others personally. The limitation of personal interaction

\textsuperscript{14} Wirth, Louis, "Urbanism as a way of life", \textit{American Journal of Sociology}, 1938, pp. 1-24.
encourages the development of segmental social contacts by which urbanites come to know fewer people as intimately as would be the case in a small community. Urbanites do not become fully involved, at interactional or social relational level, with others; rather, their interaction and social relations with others are mostly definite and for instrumental reasons. Urbanites are more dependent for their daily needs on specialized groups rather than on particular person or persons. Hence, secondary relations are dominant in towns and cities.

Further, density was seen by Wirth as reinforcing the effect of numbers in increasing diversification of men and complexity of the social structure. The competition for space increases in the urban areas. Each area tends to be put to the use which yields the greatest economic return. The place of work becomes dissociated from the place of residence. Typically, in an urban area physical contacts are close but social contacts are distant. Finally, heterogeneity is the third characteristic of urbanism. Here, the person is not simply associated to a simple hierarchical arrangement. Instead, by virtue of his having different interests arising out of various aspects of social life the individual acquires the membership in different groups
each of which functions with reference to a single segment of his personality. The process of depersonalization also enters. Superficiality and anonymity are the distinctive features of inter-personal relations in the urban milieu. Looking into the Indian urban situation in the Wirthian framework, the social interaction will tend to break down the rigidity of the caste system and the system of other primordial allegiances.

Urbanism\textsuperscript{15} is, thus, a dynamic phenomenon. It is just not confined to urban places only; rather, it tends to radiate from cities to the outward. It spreads even to the rural areas through the channels of trade and communication, medicines, style of dress and manners, cosmetics, songs and music, education, etc. To accept them even partially is to accept urbanism albeit urbanisation and become urbanised irrespective of spatial location.

\textbf{Urbanisation in India}

Historically speaking, urbanisation in India had supposedly begun in about 2500 BC when a number of urban

centres like Mohanjodaro and Harappa were flourishing in the Indus Valley. A number of recent archaeological excavations have suggested that the then existed urban sites covered a large area in the western part of the Indian sub-continent. But this great Indus Valley civilization was destroyed by natural and human forces around 1700 BC. This was followed by the Vedic age which was associated with the advent of the Aryans around 1400 B.C. The Aryans had settled down in the village communities which later grew into urban centres around 6 BC. A large number of urban centres like Hastinapur, Indraprastha, Kurukshetra, Mathura, etc had emerged around this time.

The historical evidences also suggest that during the Gupta period (4-5 AD) there was an all around development in agriculture, industry and trade. There was overseas trade too with the Roman Empire resulting in the growth of industrial centres and port towns. However, with the fall of the Gupta Empire the urbanisation process stagnated until about 1000 A.D. It was re-activated with the establishment of a number of capital fort-towns during the regimes of the Rajputs (A.D. 800-

---

1200) and the Mughal sultans (1526-1556). During this period several types of urban centres like industrial and commercial cities, trade centres, pilgrimage centres, etc were built. North India especially areas around Delhi, Agra, Allahabad, Varanasi, Patna, etc. were more urbanised. Towns in the south emerged on the trade routes or mining sites. But the western coast of India felt quick urbanisation with the arrival of the Europeans for trade who later established their colonies in important urban centres like Bombay, Goa, Kochin, etc.

With the British coming to power, their Initial policies were harmful to the process of urbanisation because Indian economy was transformed into a colonial market for the supply of raw materials to the British industries. This hit adversely on natural growth of a number of towns and cities in the country, i.e. Mirzapur, Baroda, etc. The British empire had its imperial capital, provincial capitals and district headquarters that had developed an urban character. For instance, Bombay and Calcutta grew as centres of cotton and jute textiles respectively. The first Railway line from Bombay to Thane was also laid down during this period.

Ibid., p.4.
Brush has distinguished two facts about distribution of urban population during the colonial period. These were: extremely high densities occurred in both the indigenous inland centres and the Indo-British sea-ports, and there was sharp difference in density of population between wards in the central or old part of a city and the peripheries between which the cantonments and civil lines were located. The regional picture of India's urbanisation, however, showed high ranging variation even in the past. For instance, the coastal areas were more urbanised than the inland cities. Similarly, south India as a whole was more urbanised than the north India. The Bombay region comprising of Thane, Poona and Nasik districts was associated with trade and port industries. The migrants from far-off states like Gujarat, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Punjab came to the towns and cities located in these districts. Brush has also mentioned about the causes of extreme concentration and abrupt gradients of high density of population in the central districts of Indian towns. In his opinion, there were four different

---


19 Bala, Raj, op. cit, p. 138.

20 Brush, J., op.cit, p.225.
reasons or causes for this. These were: 1. Protection from the dacoits and the hostile neighbours in times of insecurity and unrest. 2. Prestige for the wealthy, prosperous and high status citizens of the towns. 3. Proximity to the centres of power, commerce, business, religious worship, etc., and 4. Poverty of those whose services for menial, semi-skilled works and domestic duties were in great demand and who could not afford to live farther away from the place of work.

As a result of this, India recorded only 10.8 percent of its total population as urban in the 1901 census. The Calcutta agglomeration was the largest followed by Bombay and Madras. Calcutta was the only city that had attained the status of being a 'million city'. However the decade 1901-1911 was marked by a sluggish process of urbanisation as it was frequented by a number of natural calamities like epidemics of plague, cholera and malaria and also frequent femines. On the contrary, the cities of Kerala and Tamil Nadu in south India recorded positive growth of population. Here, the irrigation facilities led to the commercial cultivation of tea, rubber plantation, rice, cotton and oil seeds resulting into the growth of a number of market towns.

21 Bala, Raj, op cit. p. 49.
The subsequent decade (1911-1921) represented a growth rate of 8.3 percent of the towns and the increase was the outcome of urbanward migration. The World War I saw a heavy movement of troops and goods even in India from one area to another by rail resulting into the growth of rail towns. In spatial terms, the urban growth rate was not uniform as some areas had a sluggish urbanisation due to epidemics, as stated above, while others recorded high urban development due to new economic activities. In the next decade (1921-31) the urban population increased by 19.1 percent due to fall in death rate through the improved public health services and a gradual check over the epidemic and perennial diseases. Famines were also reduced in their impact by increased agricultural production and more regulated system of food distribution.

The migration was induced by new employment opportunities in the industrial sector. The rate of natural increase of population rose further during 1931-41. With the progress of industrialization and worsening of the employment situation in rural areas, the process of urbanisation got accelerated. The urban population of India increased by 32 percent during the decade. The following decade (1941-51) was eventful with the rapid urban growth due to the influx of displaced persons from
East Bengal and West Punjab on the eve of India's independence. Many small, medium and large-sized towns grew during 1951-61 leading to a spatial expansion of the urban settlements around industrial and service activities centres. Cities grew faster but the small towns stagnated because of the newly emerging rural services centres. The two decades (1961-1971 and 1971-1981) that followed saw further increase in the process of urbanisation\(^2\) and India's urban population increased from 109.1 millions to 159.7 millions in 1981. This became possible because rural - urban migration was more towards the metropolitan cities due to pull factor. Ashish Bose\(^3\) attributes this to the push-back effect of the rapid population growth in the rural areas. Though the push factor operated both in the rural and urban areas, it was more active in rural areas by forcing people to migrate and seek urban unemployments. Today, India accounts for 25.72 percent of the urban population according to the 1991 census. That means, nearly a quarter of Indian population lives in urban areas though not the entire urban population is urbanised in sociological sense of the term.

\(^2\) Ibid. P. 130.

\(^3\) Bose, Ashish, Op Cit, p. 160.
The cities located in the proximity of Delhi, Bangalore, Bombay, etc have accelerated urban growth rate\(^24\). However, the regional disparities in urban growth declined during 1971-81 though the fast urban growth has remained typical of the metropolitan cities. For example, Delhi has been expanding administratively, industrially and commercially since it became the imperial capital of the British in 1912. During the subsequent period towns in the western U.P. lost migrants to cities like Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta due to lack of employment opportunities. Here, many Muslim towns like Moradabad, Saharanpur, Rampur and Shahjahanpur\(^25\) got deserted as Muslims in large numbers fled to Pakistan at the time of partition of the country. Thus, the sluggish urbanisation has always remained characteristic of two contrasting types of areas: the first type of areas, sparsely populated with problems in resource utilization, are the Western Himalayas, central, tribal belt, Rajasthan desert, etc. The second type are the thickly populated areas with the subsistence agricultural economy. These are eastern U.P., north Bihar and the middle Gangetic Plain. The new developmental activities

\(^{24}\) Bala, Raj, Op Cit, p. 138.

also have led migration to both urban and rural centres located in the second type of areas.

Qualitatively also, the nature of urbanisation has varied in different areas. Two specific patterns of business locations and thereby distribution of population in towns and cities, in accordance with the increased demand for goods and services, were seen during the first two decades after independence.\(^{26}\) These were: one, unrestricted accretion of small shops along the main roads particularly the arteries of the traffic leading from the old bazaars and residential areas to the railway stations or new factories. Two, there was haphazard filling of the open spaces within the cantonments and civil lines. While the cantonments were reserved for the military purpose, the spacious grounds available in the civil lines were used without considerations for aesthetic values or sanitary conditions. Fringes around the urban agglomerations had more rural outlook as some of the inhabitants or villages close to a city or a town would have taken up urban employment. There were also intensification of farming in the fringes to fulfil heavy demands of the city dwellers for fresh vegetables, fruits and milk.

Migration taken place to the urban areas has also followed certain pattern along the primordial allegiances of the people. Rao\textsuperscript{27} notes that the city-ward migration as a social process has followed the lines of caste, kinship, friendship, village, linguistic and regional ties. The older migrant residents in the city have acted as a source of security and taken initiatives in inducting the new migrants to the urban ways of living. Consequently, the immigrants have tended to cluster around people with whom they have possessed linguistic, local, regional, caste and kinship ties. Such segregation of immigrants has given them the character of a community life though superficially. The immigrants have all along maintained contact with their native villages. They have, however, tended to recreate their local, cultural and social environments in the city. The "Little Madras in Bombay city\textsuperscript{28}" gives an account of the migration of middle or lower middle class Tamilians to the Bombay metropolis where they have maintained their identify amidst a variety of social and cultural heterogeneities. They have created a small cultural world of their own-the Little Madras and a well-knit community life and

\textsuperscript{27} Rao, M.S.A. (ed) \textit{Urban Sociology in India}, 1974, pp. 238-239.

neighbourhood ties in the city. This in no way makes them less Bombayites. This is also seen in the case of south Indians residing in Karolbagh locality in Delhi metropolis.29

Another consequence of large-scale migration to metropolitan cities is the development of slums. The slum dwellers are a category of migrants having little resources to pay for the urban civic facilities. They tend to squat on public land and pavements which results into the formation of slums. These migrants are usually unskilled and semi-skilled workers and they seek jobs in the informal sector. They are mostly employed as construction workers, domestic servants, hawkers, etc. These jobs obviously cater to needs of the various socio-economic strata. Thus, slums are distinctive in terms of housing patterns and availability of civic amenities.

Besides, there are semi-urban pockets30 within a city. These are mainly residential areas with a population ranging between 5,000 and 20,000 persons.


These are also surrounded by contiguous planned colonies or unauthorised slums and are inhabited by people with relatively better occupations and substantive income. Majority of the families have settled in these semi-urban pockets for not less than two generations and are more urbanised than the slum dwellers.

**Social Structure in Urban India**

Sociologically speaking, study of social structure leads to a fuller understanding of nature of India's urbanisation. Since social structure mainly consists of a varieties of social institutions both old and new, the analyses of nature and changes in these especially traditional institutions like caste, family, religion or culture which have equally been present in urban centres are important for this purpose. The Census of India has defined an urban area with a minimum population of 5,000 persons wherein atleast 400 persons live in per Sq Km and 75 percent of the male working population is engaged in non-agricultural activities.\(^\text{31}\) None of these characteristics fulfills sociological requirements of delineating an urban area least to talk of urban social structure. Nevertheless, an urban social structure is

\(^{31}\) *Census of India*, 1991, Series 1, p. 7.
said to be a stratified occupational hierarchy which is highly differentiated. Status of a person in urban area is achieved rather than ascribed. Society is heterogeneous and changeful and the city's elite tend to exercise control over the society's labour force and production of goods and services. Similarly, an urban social system is analysed in terms of three types of social relationships. These are: structural relationship referring to situations where there are defined norms and role expectations; categorical relationship also called ethnic relations with visible characteristics; and personal relationship with which a person enters into different situations.  

An urban social structure, thus, differs from the rural social structure on the basis of occupational pursuits, community size, density of population, heterogeneity in social structure and relationship, social differentiation and mobility, and social interaction.  

People in urban areas are engaged in unskilled, semi skilled and skilled occupations contrary to those predominantly engaged in agriculture in rural

---

areas. Rural communities are smaller whereas urban communities are much larger in size. So also is the thin density of population in rural but very high in urban areas. Contrary to a very heterogeneous socio-economic background and socio-cultural traits of the people living in urban areas, people in rural areas are still homogenous on these lines. They also have relatively stronger we-feeling or emotional attachment to their community living.

Further, social differentiation and stratification are, in a way, mechanical in rural areas whereas these are complex and organic in urban areas. In the case of former not only social status is ascriptive - based on birth in a caste or religious - community but even spatial, occupational and social mobility are less pronounced in comparison to that in the latter. Finally, the system of interaction in terms of numerous social contacts and predominantly secondary or formal relations in urban areas is different from the rural one where it is simpler and is based on face to face contact.

Some characteristics of rural society such as close or personal relationship, primary groups, etc. are also found in the Indian cities due to the large-scale
migration from villages. However, the influence of mass media, greater dependence on urban economy and secondary or impersonalised relationship have, in a way, neutralised the effects of these traditional attributes in urban areas. The rural-urban differences or dichotomies have now forwarded to the concept of rural-urban continuum\(^{34}\) which has necessarily made the urban social structure more complex specially in the metropolitan cities than that in villages.

**Statement of the Problem**

The degree and range of urbanisation differs from area to area with varying spatio-social structure which, in turn, influences the degree of urbanisation. The spatio-social structure of an area also influences that of the other depending on its farness from or nearness to it. It has been observed that spatial structure partly reflects and is partly determined by the social structure and vice-versa. The social-structure and the spatial structure are interrelated to each other to a great extent as one influences the other. The purpose in this study is to empirically examine the nature of such relationship between both spatial and social structures

\(^{34}\) *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, 1968, p. 583.
as this relationship has an important bearing on the nature of social integration of the community.

Besides, there have been both qualitative and quantitative changes in the nature and composition of spatial structure(s) in the city. This has occurred due to introduction of planning measures for regional development of the city. This emergent spatial structure has a close bearing with social structure prevalent there though the latter has also undergone various changes due to changes in the former or otherwise.

Further, the population living in areas with little influence of urban centres differs in both physical and social-cultural characteristics from the population living in the highly urbanised areas. The city region accommodates the city proper, urban villages, urban fringes and fringe villages. Each one can easily be identified by its differential social cultural and ecological traits. Even the squatter settlements mostly form the micro-environment of a city where they are located and they accommodate mainly the rural migrants as stated in the earlier section in this chapter. Therefore, our major emphasis in this study is to enquire into the spatial structure consisting of housing patterns,
differential use of public spaces, water channels, sewage system, etc in the city.

The spatial segregation of population in each area in a city may be found due to one or more social factors. Also, population living in one area may be segregated from that of another in terms of economic, religious, linguistic or any other socio-cultural characteristics. In all such cases, the spatial segregation has the effect of deepening the social cleavages and interaction among different socio-cultural segments because of the existence of physical or spatial barriers.

Therefore, the social structure of an urban area of community will be analysed in this study in the context of a number of social groupings, their roles and statuses, and also their inter-relationships. Since the roles and statuses of these groups are largely determined by kinship, caste, class, religion, etc., this study also intends to examine nature of these structures. In other words, this study proposes to analyse social structure of an urban area in terms of structures and functions and changes, if any, taking place in them, of a number of institutions and their inter-linkages. It also tends to analyse social interaction and social relation among the
people living in the city.

Finally, this study seeks to examine the nature of changes in both spatial and social structures along with contributing factors in the city. It also tends to analyse such changes in terms of changes in the size, density and relationship of population living in the city.

Main objectives

In brief, following are the main objectives of this study:
1. To analyse the nature and various properties of process of urbanisation in the city.
2. To identify the factors contributing to variations, if any, in the levels of urbanisation in different spatial units in the city.
3. To examine the nature and properties of spatial and social structures and also to elucidate the nature of relationships between the two in the urban centre.
4. To find out the level or quality of life of the people along with their access to the available resources and civic amenities in the city.
5. Finally, to examine the level of urbanism and urbanisation in terms of changes in size and density and existing social relations of population in the city.

Hypotheses

In light of the above mentioned objectives, the present study tends to verify the following main hypotheses:

1. Urbanisation is not uniform in the city, i.e. more the distance from the main centre of the city, less is the degree of urbanisation.

2. More discrete the spatial patterns of settlements, more are variations in the nature of urbanisation.

3. Higher the degree of differential access to the hierarchy of power, wealth and prestige, more is social differentiation in a given spatio-social unit.

4. Higher the degree of variations in nature of spatial structure, higher is the degree of variations in the nature of social structure in the city.

5. Lastly, higher the degree of change in the given spatial structure, higher is the degree of change in an urban social structure.
Relevance of the study

The process of urbanisation has been studied extensively by urban geographers, demographers and sociologists and social anthropologists as seen in the earlier section of this chapter. A number of studies have examined the impact of urbanisation on several social institutions like family, caste, kinship, etc found in urban areas. But most of these studies have accepted urbanisation in terms of mere increase of urban population over certain span of time and its social and cultural aspects have largely been undermined. The relationship between spatial and social structures has also remained untouched in most of the studies. There is lack of theoretical explanations of urbanisation, especially in relation to social, cultural and institutional aspects. The findings of the proposed study may, therefore, contribute in a modest way to the theoretical understanding of the process of urbanisation and its impacts on both the spatial and social structures prevalent in urban areas.

The present study has its practical relevance also as it may unfold and analyse various elements of the spatial and social structures found in varying nature in
different parts of city. It may point out the uneven degree of urbanisation and its impact on social and cultural life of the people living in different localities in the city. Such unevenness may produce various kinds of social tensions, maladjustments and asymmetrical relationship among various localities. Therefore, the present study may point out certain shortcomings of urbanisation process and its impact on social and cultural life of the people living in different areas. It may also suggest certain ways and means through which more tenable relationship could be established between the process of urbanisation and social and spatial structures prevalent in different localities in an urban area.

Chapter Scheme

The present introductory chapter, contains an extensive critical review of the existing studies related to the issues undertaken in this study. It identifies the issues or problems along with objectives of the study and relevant hypotheses. It also points out both theoretical and empirical relevance of the present study. The next chapter is about the methodology or research methods adopted for collection and analysis of data. It also
identifies the areas or localities and sample of population drawn from these for the purpose of data collection. Chapter 3 highlights the research setting. More precisely, it explains spatio-social characteristics of the city, areas under study and socio-personal background of the respondents. The relationship between urbanisation and spatial structures of the selected areas or localities has been analysed in chapter 4. In the subsequent chapter the relationship between urbanisation and social structures of the studied areas has been examined. Chapter 6, has analysed in detail the inter-relationship between urbanisation, spatial and social structures prevalent in the areas under study. Finally, the main findings of the study along with their both theoretical and practical implications have been recorded in the concluding chapter.