

## **Urbanization and Its Impact on Family: A Survey of People Migrated in Last Twenty Years, From Rural Area to be Settled in Karachi**

**Naila Usman Siddiqui\*, Sobia Shahzad,  
Nabeel Zubairi and Kauser Ishaq,**  
Department of Sociology, University of Karachi

### **Abstract**

This study examines opinions and practices of families; migrating from rural Pakistan to get settled in Karachi. The main objective of this study was to observe the shift in family type; i.e. from extended or joint to nuclear family system, patterns of decision making authority among husband and wife, economic satisfaction over time and education of children. Sample of 115 families was selected; out of 115, 60 families migrated from rural area to Karachi 20 years back while 55 families migrated in last 10 or 15 years. Basic assumption of this study was to check impact of urbanization on these families. Urbanization is the movement of people from rural areas to cities and from small cities to larger ones (Spencer, 1990). Sociologist Louis Wirth (1928, 1938) argued that a relatively large and permanent settlement leads to distinctive pattern of behaviour, which he called urbanism (Schaefer, 1999). Findings of the study showed a slight shift in the type of family from extended to nuclear and in satisfaction with the economic condition. No significant shift was observed in patterns of decision making authority of husband. Instead, more than half of the migrated respondents admitted having egalitarian authority and decision making shared by both husband and wife.

*Key Words:* Urbanization, Urbanism, Type of family, Decision making authority, economic satisfaction, child education.

Urbanization refers to a growth in the proportion of a country's population living in urban centres of a particular size. Urbanization is an increase in the percentage of a population living in urban settlements and a resulting increase in the influence of urban culture and life style (Gelles & Levine, 1995). Although cities have always been socially, politically and economically important, the urbanization of western industrialized societies in the nineteenth century was very rapid. For almost all societies urbanization has followed an S shaped curve, building up very slowly, expanding very quickly and then slowing down, or even reversing slightly with greater suburban development. The proportional increase in urban population in the nineteenth century was largely by migration from the countryside. However in contemporary underdeveloped societies, which are urbanizing more rapidly, the increase comes rather more from simple growth in urban population, as public health and medical facilities have improved and tends to be concentrated in a single city. Urbanization has contradictory consequences for economic growth, since it cheapens the cost of providing services such as health and education while increasing the cost of labour that can no longer supplement its wages by small scale agricultural production (Dictionary of Sociology, 1991).

Traditionally cities were founded on what has generally been referred to as the moral order, but during the last century or so a new type of city, the industrial city has emerged on what may best be termed as the technological order. The industrial or commercial city was founded on a new form of power that operated within the traditional moral order; their power was based on liquid capital or exchange values. As trade grew the merchant and middle class grew and the cities gained stature (Gappert & Knight, 1985). For the first time in history, more than half of the world's people live in cities. Urban residents each year. By 2030 all developing regions, including Asia and Africa, will have more people living in urban than rural areas. The urban population of the world's two poorest regions, South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, is expected to double over the next 20 years. Cities account for some 70 per cent of global GDP. No country has grown to middle-income status without industrialising and urbanising. Youth are 40 per cent more likely than older generations to move from rural to urban areas or across urban areas (World Development Report, 2009).

## **Urban Population**

In 2005 the urban population was 2266 million in less developed countries and 344 million in more developed countries. Rural population was 2978 million in less developed countries and 303 million in more developed countries. Today, virtually one out of every two people on the planet is a "citizen" (city dweller). The year was a turning point in human history: the world's urban population for the first time equalled the world's rural population. Asia and Africa we predict to accomplish the urban transition in 2030. However, six countries in Asia and Africa alone contribute to almost half of the 75 million people born into the world every year: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan.

In parts of Southern Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, rates of urban growth now exceed 3 per cent per year, while cities in the more developed regions of the world are growing at a snail's pace of 0.5 per cent per year, on average;

others are in fact losing population. Asia has the largest urban population (more than 1.5 billion people) even though slightly less than 40 per cent of its population is urbanization (Statistical Year Book for Asia and Pacific United Nations, 2011).

In 2010, 43% of the population of the Asia and the Pacific region lived in urban areas, the second lowest urban proportion of a region in the world;

Table 1

*Largest 30 urban agglomerations, Asia and the Pacific countries by international ranking, top 08 selected, 2010*

World rank order	Country	Urban agglomeration	Population (millions)
1	Japan	Tokyo	36.67
7	Bangladesh	Dhaka	14.65
8	Pakistan	Karachi	13.12
5	China	Shanghai	16.58
6	India	Kolkata (Calcutta)	15.55

However, in the last two decades the Asia-Pacific urban proportion has risen by 29%, more than any other region. Between 2005 and 2010, the urbanized proportion of the world's population overtook the rural population (rising from 49% in 2005 to 51% in 2010); and the urban population continues to grow (the average annual growth between 2005 and 2010 was 1.9%). As of 2010, Asia and the Pacific is the second least urbanized region of the world, with only 43% of the population living in urban areas; however, it has the second fastest urban population growth rate, at an average of 2.0% per annum (2005-2010). Currently, Africa is the least urbanized region and has the highest urban population growth in the world, at an average annual rate of 3.5% (2005- 2010). Across the Asia-Pacific region, the urban proportion and urban population growth rates vary dramatically (Statistical Year Book for Asia and Pacific United Nations, 2011).

South and South-West Asia had the fastest urban population growth rate of all the Asian and Pacific sub regions at an average of 2.4% per year during 2005-2010. The South-East Asia urban population growth was somewhat slower at 2.2% per year, followed by East and North-

East Asia at 2.0% and the Pacific at 1.8%. In North and Central Asia the urban population growth rate has hovered close to zero over the last two decades (0.3% for 2005-2010).

In general, countries with the fastest urban population growth rates are also those with the lowest levels of urbanization. All ten of the Asia-Pacific countries with an average annual urban population growth rate above 3.0% have an urban proportion at or below 40%. In the Asia-Pacific region, rapid economic growth is closely linked with urbanization levels. By and large the more developed countries have relatively high levels of urbanization – for example, Asia-Pacific high income countries have an average urbanized proportion of 75%, while the LDC's of the region have an average of 27% (Statistical Year Book for Asia and Pacific United Nations, 2011).

Rapid economic development has encouraged rural inhabitants to migrate to urban areas to improve their economic opportunities and access to services. Rural-to-urban migration is also caused by such “push” factors as the inability of households to sustain livelihoods in rural areas for economic reasons, conflicts, natural disasters and environmental changes.

The population growth rate in Asia and the Pacific is 1.0%, while urban population growth is 2.0%. Hence, assuming that fertility in urban and rural areas is comparable, roughly half of urban population growth comes from rural-to urban migration and reclassification of rural areas as urban; the rest is due to population growth. Part of the urbanization picture in Asia and the Pacific is the growth of mega-cities – cities whose population exceeds 10 million. Of the world's 21 mega-cities in 2010, 12 are in Asia, including 7 of the largest 10 cities.

Although mega-cities are often portrayed as the face of urbanization in Asia and the Pacific, the reality is that most of the region's urban population lives in secondary cities and small towns. Specifically, as of 2009, 60% of the urban population in continental Asia lived in cities with a population of less than 1 million, while only 21% lived in cities of 1 to 5 million (United Nations statistical year book for Asia and Pacific 2011).

### **Rural Urban Migration in Pakistan:**

Rural – Urban migration is an important cause of urban growth in many developing countries. For a long time migration was defined as a once in a life time change in place of residence.

Only during the last decade has it been recognized that recitative mobility is not an extraordinary form of migration which only occurs under special conditions but rather a prevalent manifestation of migration in the third world. In Pakistan increasing urbanization stimulated by rural urban migration is one of the most pervasive processes in national development (Linden & Selier, 1991). The population of Karachi has increased mostly due to rural - urban migration and has left a negative impact on social structure. One of the indicators of such impacts is education. Pakistan was ranked first out of 126 world,s nations where 6,303,212, children were out of school that is the number of primary-school-age children not enrolled in primary or secondary school, in 2005 (Education Statistic, 2005 report, 2010). In this study an attempt was made to observe the situation of children in school in families of the respondent's.

Table 2

*Urban annual growth rate (%) 1985-2040 Pakistan, United Nations Department of economic and social affairs.*

<b>Year</b>	<b>Urban annual growth rate</b>
1985-1990	4.29
1990-1995	3.27
1995-2000	3.26
2000-2005	2.82
2005-2010	3.04
2010-2015	3.27
2015-2020	3.28
2020-2025	3.11
2025-2030	2.80
2030-2035	2.55
2035-2040	2.33

It is now widely accepted that urbanization is as much a social process as it is an economic and territorial process. It transforms societal organizations, the role of the family, demographic structures, the nature of work, and the way we choose to live and with whom. It also modifies domestic roles and relations within the family, and redefines concepts of individual and social responsibility. As a result, families become smaller relatively quickly, not only because parents have fewer children on average, but also because the extended family typical of rural settings is much less common in urban areas. Children are clearly less useful in urban settlements, as units of labor and producers, than in rural settings, and are more expensive to house and feed. In fact, fertility levels in developed countries have dropped so low that cities are seldom capable of reproducing their own populations. They grow, if at all, largely through in-migration from other cities or from rural areas—the latter is now a largely depleted source of population in Western countries—and increasingly through immigration. Ironically, overpopulation in the Third World and historically low fertility levels in developed countries have combined to produce a massive immigration into those cities in the latter countries that serve as contemporary immigrant gateways or world cities (Sassen, 2001; Castles & Miller 1998). Those cities, in turn, have been transformed, in social and ethno-cultural terms, as a result of this immigration.

Urbanization reflects, a complex set of processes involving a series of linked transformations, not only in where people live and what they produce, but in how they live; in terms of economic well-being, political organization and the distribution of power, demographic structure e.g. fertility, and social and family relations (World Development Report United Nations, 2000).

### **Family Structure and Urbanization**

Sociologists have always been interested in understanding how people order their relationships and conduct their activities in space. They provide a number of models that attempt to capture the ecological patterns and structures of city growth: the concentric circle model, the sector model, the multiple nuclei model and social area analysis (Zanden, 1990).

Sociologists have found two typically basic structures of family in traditional societies. Extended family, a family group that extends; beyond the immediate relationship of husband, wife and their children and includes several generations. Nuclear family is a family group consisting of a mother, a father and their children. This is a family of procreation (Bryjak & Soroka, 1997).

George Simmel (1964) was one of the first sociologists who studied urbanization and its impact on family structure and human relationship . He saw urban life as distinctive because the city contains so many people, objects and events in a limited area, Simmel argued, the urbanite can become overwhelmed by all the stimulation. Consequently, city people typically develop what Simmel called a *blaise* attitude, By this, he meant they learn to be selective about their responses and focusing their attention only on what they deem important. As the relationship of family and urbanization has always been of interest to sociologists, one impetus for the sociological study of the family has been the problematic relationship between urbanization and industrialization on the one hand and the family on the other. Reduction in the societal purposes that the family serves is one possibly negative effect frequently attributed to urbanization. Despite Goode's (1963) conceptualization of the conjugal family and Sussman and Burchinal's (1962) introduction of the "modified extended family", which allow for family ties to family members outside of the household , the focus has been on the change from the extended to the nuclear family , especially in the context of migration to the city (Street: 164) The dichotomization of the family into extended and nuclear form is subsumed Farber's (1975) conceptualization of kinship institution (Street, Hunter, Harkess, Kromus and Johnson, 1978).

Khasgiwala (1993) observed that toward the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, changes in the family due to rapid urbanization and industrialization started concerning social scientists. Visible poverty, child labor, increase in divorce rate, prostitution and such salient evils affected the smooth functioning of the family. Khasgiwala (1993) noted the prevailing image of urban life as both positive and negative. While it is a centre of learning, technology, light communication and a variety of attractions; it brings pollution, alienation insecurity, because of its complexities, calculative rationality and sophisticated advancement. Macionis, (1989) saw an urban revolution occurring within societies of the third world. By the beginning of the twenty first century, he saw, most of the world's largest urban areas would be seen in third world (Macionis, 1989).

### **Functions of the Family and Urbanization**

Rural and Urban family structures vary from culture to culture and the same case prunes with the functions of the family. Just like family structures, family functions, vary widely. In

most traditional societies the family performs four central functions. The first is the regulation of sexual activity, the second is reproduction; and the third is the socialization of children. The family bears primary responsibility to teaching children the language, values, norms beliefs, technology and skills of their culture. The fourth function of the family is economic. The family bears primary responsibility for providing for the physical needs of both young and old members including food, shelter, protection and health care (Gelles & Levine, 1995). Urbanization affects a family's functions in many ways the values , norms, skills and technology available in urban centre is quite different from rural area which leads to the family's lesser control or influence on the minds of their young. Also as a result of change in structure of family, the care of the elderly becomes a burden instead of a function for nuclear urban families.

### **Decision making Authority Pattern: Who Rules**

One of the assumptions in this study was that men are decision makers in rural families and women have less or no choice or authority even in most personal issues related to themselves, family and children, but once they move and get settled in urban areas, family decision making becomes more egalitarian. Schaefer (1999) argues that societies vary in the way that power within the family is distributed. If a society expects males to dominate in all family decision making, it is termed as Patriarchy. Women hold low status in such societies and rarely are granted full and equal rights within the legal system. By contrast in Matriarchy women have greater authority than men. Matriarchies emerged among in nations in which men were absent for a long periods of time for warfare or food gathering. A third type of authority pattern, the egalitarian family is one in which spouses are regarded as equals. This does not mean, however, that each decision in these families is shared. Wives may hold authority in some spheres, husbands in others. Wives and mothers have considerable authority in many societies but the status of a wife still has a lower social standing than that of a husband , Most families still prefer male children and most children are given their father's last name(Macionis,1989). This study looks into the authority and decision making pattern of spouses and shift as a result of migration from rural to urban centers.

### **Urbanization and Community**

Sociologists disagree on the consequences of urbanization in community life. Some argue that it inevitably brings a loss of community, that is, a loss of the common value and the close, enduring ties the characteristics of small towns. Others contend that community persists within urban neighborhoods. They say that cities have enclaves in which relationships are similar to those in small towns. Still others argue that urbanization has produced a different kind of community, one that does not depend on people's living near one another. Research suggests that each of these views have validity, but each tend to apply under different circumstances (Callhoun, Light & Keller, 1997).

### **Sociological Perspective: Chicago School**

Louis Wirth, a most proponent scholar of urban sociology, presented Urban anomie theory in his essay "Urbanism as a way of life " According to Wirth , the urban environment has three distinct features : huge population size , high population density and great social diversity. These characteristics, Wirth argued, have both sociological and a psychological impact, producing both social and personality disorder (Thio, 1989).The department of sociology at the University of Chicago was in the forefront of this new field of urbanization and its impact on family, and it produced many studies on various aspects of American society and especially about life in the

cities. Although they were not concerned with studying the family per se, they looked at the consequences of urbanizing forces on family structure. In doing this, they took up classical European sociological themes of "mechanical" to "organic" solidarity by Durkheim and a variant called "gemeinschaft" and "gesellschaft" by Tonnies. In very broad terms, both pairs of concepts compare and contrast with an earlier form of society where people were held together by consensus and shared norms, whereas in modern society, relationships are more differentiated. The Chicago School wrote of the alienating and disintegrating forces of urbanization on the family where the extended family is fragmented into nuclear families (Hew, 2003).

### **Functionalist Perspective**

Another perspective that has some relevance in examining changes in family structure is that of the functionalists. Talcott Parson's concept of institutional differentiation caused by modernization argues that functions that were formerly performed by the family, for example, the education of children, the care of the sick, and economic production, have now been taken over by other institutions in society. Thus, the family has new functions and the central responsibilities of the family have changed (Hew, 2003).

### **The Marxist Perspective**

The Marxists, linked their analysis of the family to changes in the mode of production. Family forms and the mode of production are closely enmeshed, and the transformation of the former will follow closely on the heels of the latter. In other words, a certain mode of production will facilitate the reproduction of a certain family form while impeding the development of others. When discussing the changing family form during the first and second industrial revolutions in Europe, he points out that the capitalist mode of production severed the bonds between adult children and their parents. This was because the individuated wage could not sustain anything more than a nuclear family of parents and their children. Those who did not stand to inherit any productive property or a father's trade had to sell their labour as free workers in the labour market. Thus, the young left home to find employment, spent their wages as they liked, married a spouse of their own choice, and lived wherever they could afford. In addition, the transformation of family relationships in the context of structural changes was complex and involved the adaptation of traditional values in new situations (Hew,2003).

### **Method**

Main objective of this study was to observe shift in type of family system, changes occurring in decision making authority pattern of spouse's, children's education and satisfaction with economic satisfaction of families. A sample of 115 families was selected from Karachi East, Landhi area, for this purpose. Respondents were divided into former and new residents, 60 families were migrated from rural area some 20 years back while 55 families were new residents. An interview schedule was used to collect data, which was finalized after pretesting on 25 respondents. Chi square and phi coefficient test of association were applied to analyse the data.

### **Discussion**

The income group of most respondents was low, as 90% reported an income less than 10,000 rupees (table 3)



Table 3

*Characteristics of resident's who migrated from rural to urban area in last 20 years*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>percentage (%)</i>
Male	67	58
Female	48	42
<i>Age</i>		
45 or less	61	53
45+ or more	54	47
<i>Educational Qualification</i>		
Illiterate	62	54
Matric or less	30	26
Intermediate or above	23	23
<i>Family Income</i>		
10,000 or less	104	90
10,001 or more	11	10
<i>No. of Children</i>		
6 or less	88	76.5
7 or more	27	23.4
<i>No. of Sibling</i>		
6 or less	64	6
7 or more	51	44
Total	115	100

It also shows that more than half 54% of the respondents were illiterate; here a shift can be observed when 86% of the same respondents reported affirmatively that their children were getting education.

Table 4

*Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondent According to Children Getting Education*

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Yes	99	86%
No	16	14%
<i>Reason why Children not getting education</i>		
Poverty	06	38%
Lack of child's interest	05	31%
Lack of Parent's Education	05	31%

Table 5 shows that 38% respondent's children were not getting education due to poverty. 76% respondents reported to have children 6 or less (table 1), while only 56% had number of siblings lesser or 6. This difference in this data confirms the slight decline in average size of Pakistani family, once they move from rural setting to urban, they tend to have lesser children, and it's a trend that has been observed in early studies of this nature, as well.

Significant change in thought and practice can be observed in the frequency and percentage of – Table 3. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondent according to the type of family they were living in rural area or urban area represented in table 5 Table 3 of this study. Not only does it clearly indicate a shift in the type of family from extended to nuclear as families migrated from rural area to urban, but also confirms to most theories of urbanization as almost half 50.5% of the respondents wanted to live in a nuclear family, if they are given a choice.

Table 5

*Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondent According to the Type of Family they were Living in Rural Area.*

	<u>Extended</u>		<u>Nuclear</u>	
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>percentage</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>percentage</u>
Type of family in rural area	75	65%	30	26%
Type of family in urban area	57	40.5%	40	35%
Type of family respondents Like to live in.	85	74%	58	50.5%

The most significant shift can be observed in Table 6 of this study.

Table 6

*Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondent according to Decision Making Pattern of Authority in Rural Area and Later in Urban Area*

	<u>Rural</u>		<u>Urban</u>	
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Husband or Father	83	72%	44	38%
Wife or Mother	18	16%	18	16%
Both	14	12%	53	46%

When asked about the authority and decision making pattern of husband and wife, 46% people reported that it is shared by both which is a huge change of opinion from that of 12 % that decision making was done by husband solely when the respondents lived in rural area.

Table 7

*Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondent According to Economic Condition in Rural Area and Economic Condition in Urban Area.*

Table 7 shows that while 26% of the respondents were satisfied with their economic condition only 19% reported complete satisfaction in present economic conditions, 94% were willing to improve their economic condition. The cause of this dissatisfaction can be anything from family expenses to demanding life style of urban canters. Association between number of years in urban areas and the type of family and children getting education was found (table 8,9,10).

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Good	36	31%	49	43%
Satisfactory	30	26%	22	19%
Bad	49	43%	44	38%

*Satisfaction with economic Situation, Want to Improve Economic Situation*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Yes	40	35%	108	94%
No	36	31%	07	06%
To Some Extent	39	34%	-----	-----

Table 8

*Relationship between number of years in urban areas and type of family.*

				<i>Type of family</i>		
				<i>Nuclear</i>	<i>Extended</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Years in urban area</i>	<i>More</i>	<i>Count</i>		52	08	60
		<i>Expected</i>		44.3	15.6	
	<i>Less</i>	<i>Count</i>		33	22	55
		<i>Expected</i>		40.6	14.3	
		<i>Total</i>		85	30	115

Table 9

*Relationship between number of years in urban areas and children getting education*

			Children getting education		Total
			Yes	No	
Years in urban area	More	Count	56	04	60
		Expected	51.6	8.3	
	Less	Count	43	12	55
		Expected	47.3	7.6	
		Total	99	16	115

Table 10

*Chi square, phi and p value for table 6 and table 7*

	Table 6	df	Table 7
Yates	9.25*	1	4.31*
Pearson	10.58**	1	5.5**
Phi	-0.3	----	-0.22

\*p = 0.0024    \*\* p = 0.0011    \*p = 0.037889    \*\* p = 0.019016

## Conclusion

This paper relates to the concept of Urbanization; i.e., the movement of people from rural areas to cities and from small cities to larger ones. The main objective of this study was to observe shift in type of family system, changes occurring in decision making authority pattern of spouses, children's education and satisfaction with economic satisfaction of families. The researchers observed significant change in thought and practice, shift in type of family from extended to nuclear as families, slight decline in average size of Pakistani family, once they move from rural setting to urban and a huge change of opinion when asked about authority and decision making pattern of husband and wife. It also reflects that the respondents were willing to improve their economic condition.

## References

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. & Turner, B. S. (1991). *The Penguin dictionary of Sociology*. Penguin Books.
- Bryjak, G. J. & Soroka M. P. (1997). *Sociology: Cultural diversity in a changing world*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Babbie, E. (2007). *The Practice of social research*. 11<sup>th</sup> ed. USA Thomson Wadsworth.

- Callhoun, C., Light, D. & Keller, S. (1997). *Sociology*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: The McGraw-Hill Company.
- Castles, S. & Miller, M. (1998). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Education Statistics (2005). Children out of school, primary (most recent) by country. World Development Indicators database. (2010) Retrieved from [http://www.NationMaster.com/graph/edu\\_chi\\_out\\_of\\_sch\\_pri-education-children-out-school-primary](http://www.NationMaster.com/graph/edu_chi_out_of_sch_pri-education-children-out-school-primary).
- Gappert, G. & Knight, R. V. (1985) Cities in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: *Urban Affairs Annual Reviews*, 23 Beverly Hills: Sage publications.
- Gelles, R. J & Levine, A. (1995) *Sociology : An Introduction*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Hew, C.S. (2003). The impact of urbanization on family structure, the experience of Sarawak, Malaysia. *SOJOURN: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*; 18 89.
- Ishaq, K. (2002) . Impact of Urbanization on Families who have been migrated from rural area to Landhi, Karachi, since last decade. An Unpublished thesis submitted for fulfillment of Master's Degree in Sociology. Jary, D. & Jary, J. (1991) *Collins dictionary of sociology*. London: Harper Collins.
- Khasgiwala, A. (1993) *Family dynamics: Social work perspective*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.
- Linden, J. V. D. & Selier, F. (1991). *Karachi: Migrants, Housing and Housing Policy*. Lahore, Pakistan: Vanguard Books Pvt. Ltd.
- Macionis, J. J. (1989) *Sociology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New Jersey: Prentice- Hall Englewood Cliffs.
- Schaefer, R. T. (1999) *Sociology: A brief Introduction*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sassen, S. (2001). *The Global City: New York, London and Tokyo*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sarantakos, S. (1993) *Social research*. South Melbourne, Australia: Macmillan Education.
- Spencer, M. (1990). *Foundations of Modern Sociology*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Ontario, Canada: Prentice- Hall Canada Inc.
- Statistical year book for asia and the pacific (2011) Urbanization Report. United Nations economic and social commission for asia and pacific. Retrieved from [www.unescap.org/stat/data/syb2011/I-People/Urbanization.asp](http://www.unescap.org/stat/data/syb2011/I-People/Urbanization.asp)
- Street, D., Hunter, A., Harkess, S., Kronus, S., Johnson, M.H. (1978): *Handbook of contemporary urban life An examination of urbanization, organization, and metropolitan politics*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Thio, A. (1989) *Sociology: An Introduction*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- UN-HABITAT, State of the World's Cities 2008/2009: Harmonious Cities, HS/1031/08E.
- United Nations (2000). World development Report. New York: *Oxford University Press*.
- United Nations (1996). *An urbanizing world: Global Report on Human Settlement*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Urbanization - The Social Impacts of Urbanization - Family, Family, and Household Retrieved from <http://family.jrank.org/pages/1732/UrbanizationSocialImpactsUrbanization.html#ixzz1oyxxr930>.

Urban Agglomeration ( 2009). United Nations publication, Sales No. E.10.XIII.7. Available from [http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Documents/WUP2009\\_Wallchart\\_UrbanAgglomerations\\_Final.pdf](http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Documents/WUP2009_Wallchart_UrbanAgglomerations_Final.pdf).

Urban annual growth rate (2010). Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, *World Population Prospects*. retrieved from <http://esa.un.org/unup/unup/p2k0data.asp>

World Urbanization Prospects revision (2007). retrieved from <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wup2007/2007wup.htm>

World Development Report (2009). Retrieved from <http://go.worldbank.org/ESAZBVZVU0>

World Agglomerations (2010). Largest 30 urban agglomerations, Asia and the Pacific countries by international ranking retrieved from <http://www.unescap.org/stat/data/syb2011/I-People/Urbanization.asp>

World Urbanization Prospects: (2007 Revision), Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wup2007/2007wup.html>.

Zanden, V. (1990) *Sociology: The core*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: McGraw- Hill.