

Patterns of Urbanization in Bihar

THE present work aims at discussing the process and patterns of urbanization of the State of Bihar. Though Bihar, in terms of the population size, is the second largest State of India, the process of its urbanization has not received as much attention as that of some other States or of the country as a whole has. This lack of interest in Bihar's urbanization is perhaps due to the fact that its urbanization has not been as rapid as in other parts of India.

A study of urbanization of the developing country or area is important for the reason, among others, that urbanization is both an indicator and a manifestation of economic development and social change. So the present work is not merely a study of urbanization as such only; rather, it is a study both of economic development and of social change in Bihar.

Level of Urbanization

Bihar constitutes 10.27 percent of total population of the country, while it shares in only 5.16 per cent of the total urban population. In 1971, the urban population constituted only 10.0 per cent of the total population in Bihar, as against corresponding figure of 20.0 per cent for the country as a whole. *Out of 22 States*, 16 States have a higher urban proportion than Bihar (Table I). Those with lower urban proportion include Nagaland, Sikkim, Assam, Orissa, and Himachal Pradesh.

Bihar's low level of urbanization has been a sequel to the poor industrial development of the State. Though the State ranks first in terms of mineral resources, the growth of mineral-based industries have not been adequate by any stan-

TABLE 1—DEGREE OF URBANIZATION IN INDIA, 1971

India	19.91		
1. Maharashtra	31.17	18. Nagaland	9.95
2. Tamil Nadu	30.26	19. Sikkim	9.37
3. Gujarat	28.08	20. Assam	8.87
4. West Bengal	24.75	21. Orissa	8.41
5. Mysore	24.31	22. Himachal Pradesh	6.99
6. Punjab	23.73		
7. Andhra Pradesh	19.31	Union Territories	68.58
8. Jammu & Kashmir	18.59		
9. Haryana	17.66	1. Chandigarh	90.55
10. Rajasthan	17.63	2. Delhi	89.70
11. Madhya Pradesh	16.29	3. Pondicherry	42.04
12. Kerala	16.24	4. Goa, Daman and Diu	26.44
13. Meghalaya	14.55	5. Andaman and Nicobar Islands	22.77
14. Uttar Pradesh	14.02	6. Arunachal Pradesh	3.69
15. Manipur	13.19	7. Dadra and Nagar Haveli	0.00
16. Tripura	10.43	8. Laccadive, Minicoy and Aminidivi Islands	0.00
17. Bihar	10.00		

SOURCE : Based on *Census of India, 1971, Series 1, India, Part II-A (i), General Population Tables*, pp. 54, 55.

dards. This may be due to central and state policies. Minerals are indeed supplied to industries located in other states like West Bengal, Maharashtra, by which, promotion of industries absorbing these minerals within the state has not occurred on a large enough scale. These facts, among others, not only account for the low level of urbanization but also explain the reason of relative economic backwardness of the state.

Decadal Variations in Urbanization

The process of urbanization¹ in Bihar has been very slow. The urban Pro-

I, The concepts of 'degree' and 'level' of urbanization are used interchangeably referring to a, B Index that is some kind of ratio between the urban population and the total population.

portion for the state increased from 4.01 per cent in 1901 to only 30.0 per cent in 1971. The increase in this proportion had been conspicuous only during the period following Independence. In absolute numbers the increase in the state's urban population has, however, been notable, from a little over one million at the beginning of the present century to over 5 million in 1971 (see Table 2)

TABLE 2—DECADAL VARIATIONS IN POPULATION AND LEVEL OF URBANIZATION IN BIHAR, 1901-71

Census Year	Population in Million		Level of Urbanization	Census Decade	Rate of Growth	
	Rural	Urban			Rural	Urban
1901	26.21	1.09	4.01	1901-11	3.90	-1.74
1911	27.23	1.07	3.81	1911-21	-1.01	8.17
1921	26.96	1.16	4.54	1921-31	11.00	22.00
1931	29.92	1.42	4.54	1931-41	11.18	33.66
1941	33.27	1.90	5.41	1941-51	8.68	38.14
1951	36.15	2.62	6.77	1951-61	17.64	49.03
1961	42.53	3.91	8.43	1961-71	19.25	43.95
1971	50.72	5.63	10.00	1901-71	93.48	413.59

SOURCE : Data have been computed on the basis of *Census of India, 1971, General Population Tables, Series I, Part II-A (i)*, pp. 45, 50, 124.

The first decade of the twentieth century recorded decrease of 1.74 per cent in the urban population, while the rural population grew by 3.9 per cent. But during all the subsequent decades, the rate of increase in urban population was consistently higher than that of rural population. This is true of the country as a whole as well. The decrease in urban population in 1901-11 was accidental

and much of it was attributed to the outbreak of plague. This not only entailed push-back migration (urban to rural) but also discouraged rural to urban migration for some time to come. Indeed, at the time of the census operation, plague was raging in many towns. The amount of impact has not been quantitatively assessed. Button, the 1911 Census commissioner observed: "It is impossible to make any estimate of the direct and indirect effects of plague on the growth of towns, but it is quite certain that they have been enormous". (Census of India, 1911, p. 40).

It is well known that from 1921 onwards there has been, as in the country as a whole, a continuous increase in both urban and total general population of Bihar. A possible reason of rapid increase in urban population from 1921 onwards is said to be the increasing pressure of population on limited land base. Quoting the views expressed in 1932 by Sir Edward Gait, Lt. Governor of Bihar and Orissa, Wattal, (1934, pp. 164-65) observes, "... the agricultural population of Bihar and Orissa had already passed the saturation point. He added that in the province there were areas in which large number of agricultural holdings were too small to support the number of people who were dependent on them, and one or two members of each family had therefore to go away for a large part of the year to work in the coal mines or in the jute mills or other industrial occupations in order to remit money to their homes . . .".

The tempo of urbanization was accentuated from 1941 onwards. Important among the factors underlying the rapid increase in urban population were concentration of government upon resource development, greater utilization of mineral wealth of Highland Bihar, influx of refugees from divided Bengal and the Punjab, rapid growth in industries and the urge of growing population having modern education to seek white-collar jobs and shelter in towns.

During the period of seven decades, the highest rate of growth of rural population and the maximum difference between growth in rural and urban population was recorded in the 1951-6] decade (Table' 2). The rural population increased by 17.64 per cent, while the urban, by neatly 50.0 per cent. This rapid pace of urbanization was chiefly due to the influx of rural people into urban areas thanks probably to the increasing opportunities in secondary and tertiary sectors of economic activities.

The level of urbanization moved up from 8.43 to 10.0 per cent and the aggregate urban population from 3.91 to 5.63 million during 1961-71, the rate of urbanization slightly smaller as compared to the previous decade. The rate of growth of urban population was about 44.0 per cent during 1961-71, which is suggestive of a comparative slackening of the pace of industrialization. Industrial development has not been fast enough to meet the increasing employment need of the increasing rural population. Elsewhere, improvement in economic conditions as a result of the green revolution is said to have warded off the stream of population migration to towns from the rural areas; D'Souza's (1976, pp. 349-65) study, however, shows that the process of urbanization of the Punjab during 1961-71 was hardly affected by the Green Revolution in any way.

It will be seen from Table 2, that over the period of 1901-71 as whole, the Urban population increased by 413.59 per cent, while the rural population had increased by only 93.48 per cent. Rural-urban migration has been one of the

crucial factors for the rapid rise in urban population. Natural growth of urban population alone cannot explain the whole of this phenomenon, for the difference between the rate of natural increase of urban areas and that of rural areas is not very considerable. The predominant role of rural-urban migration has also been highlighted by Bogue and Zachariah(1962), who say, "... very little urbanization can take place as a result of vital processes alone" (*ibid.*, 1962, p. 28). Similarly Davis (1962, p. 5) observes, "... normally, the great rise in the proportion of the population in towns and cities can take place only by rural-urban migration."

..., When we analyse the reason why migration takes place, we find industrialization as the most potent factor of rural to urban migration (Sovani, 1966; Singh, 1978, pp. 89-100). Migration is not a mere accident or a matter of chance, it is always a planned and motivated movement of the people on wider geographical space. Numerous are the causes and motives of migration. Anyway, industrialization is the most potent factor of rural-urban migration. Emergence of townships like Jamshedpur, Ranchi, Barauni, and Bokaro has been possible by the establishment of heavy industrial complexes followed by mass migration. There was no township like Jamshedpur and Bokaro before 1901 and 1961, respectively. The population of Jamshedpur which was a little over 5 thousands in 1911 attained to over 1.5 lakhs in 1941. Similarly, where the present Bokaro Steel City is located, a very small number of people were inhabiting in a few tiny villages scattered over a large area before 1961, but now Bokaro including Chas claims over a lakh of population.

The growth of industries, however, is not to be regarded as the only factor of urbanization. Historically, urban centres came to exist long before the Industrial Revolution. The medieval period characterized by feudal rule and agricultural economy did have towns of different sizes. In those days, the establishment and expansion of towns occurred in the wake of increasing activities in agriculture, trade and commerce. (Bose, 1969, p. 1169). So, commercialization Of 'tertiarization' is also to be reckoned with as an important factor of urbanization. In the case of India, it has *been* found that 38.0 per cent of the total urbanization has been the result of tertiarization. (Singh, 1978, p. 96).

, Part of the increase in urban population is also explained by rapid natural increase following decrease in urban mortality rate, A relative decline in mortality, as compared to rural areas, has occurred from better medical facilities and the control over various communicable diseases, without affecting the already high rate of fertility to any substantive extent. Thus, the excess of births over deaths pushed up the rate of growth of urban population faster than that of rural population.. This is reported to be true not of India only but of

many of the Asian, African, and Latin American countries also (Zachariah, 1967; Mitra, 1967; World Bank, 1972; Preston, 1979). This situation is contrary to the industrially advanced countries of the West. They increased their urban population from rural to urban migration, the rise in urban population always resulting in the fall of rural population (Peach, 1970, pp. 297-98).

The phenomenon of natural increase in urban population has been conceptualised as 'auto-urbanization' (Singh, 1978, p. 112). On the basis of some factual evidence, the process of auto-urbanization is contended to be faster in a developing region or country than in a developed one. It is the characteristic feature of the urbanization process of slow developing or non-industrial areas.

Besides rural-urban migration and auto urbanization, towns also grow in size by invading adjacent residential areas and setting up a new 'zone of transition' (Burgess, 1924). Davis (1972, p.10) observes, " . they (cities) do not grow by adding ever more people to the same limited space. Instead, they grow by expanding the area in which the population of urban community lives. Indeed, the cities of the world have been expanding faster in territory than in population . ..".

Almost all the towns of Bihar have been sucking up village communities of their umland through the process of spatial expansion. When some parts of the fringe area are absorbed by a town, the umland further expands its 'zone of influence' into the neighbouring rural areas. And again with the increase in density and size of the town's population a section of urban population move outward into the umland. This way a town spreads from its centre to the periphery and from the periphery to the rural areas through a gradual process of spatial accretion resulting in the rise of its population. This is amply obvious both* from observation and from census data. According to the 1971 Census, over 0.3 million people in Bihar, i.e., 5.67 percent of the total urban population of the State, are engaged in agriculture and other allied occupations. The percent* age of people in such occupations in India's population is 3.75 (i.e., 4.08 million of the total urban population). The process of expansion of towns from centre to periphery is more predominant in the plains of Bihar than in the hilly region of Chotanagpur division, since the density of rural settlements in the plain region is comparatively high.

The process of the above kind has been conceived as "suburbanization* or 'decentralization'. (Duncan, 1959, p.697; Narain, 1975-76 pp. 242-43). The amount of suburbanization as a result of out spread towns over the geographical space is greater in Bihar than in India as a whole. Bihar constitutes 5.16 per cent of the total urban population of India, while the percentage of agriculture

rists and cognate workers in urban Bihar is 7.81 (this figure is twice the overall figure for India).

Mention may be made of the fact that generalization, to the effect that the patterns of population density determine the patterns of urbanization or that the areas of high density of population are the areas of high urban concentration made by Davis (1951, pp. 131-32) and supported by Deshpande and Bhatt (1975, pp. 358-76), is not tenable. The Tirhut division, for instance, has got a very high density of population but the lowest concentration of urban population of all the divisions. Conversely, the Chotanagpur plateau shows a very high urban concentration but a low density of population.

Distribution of Population by Size-classes of Towns

The definition of town was changed drastically by the census authorities in 1961. The definition of town followed since then has been more rigorous than before (during 1872-1951)². This led to declassification and reclassification of hundreds of old and new towns all over the country. This affected the general pattern of growth of urban centres with respect to the size-classes of towns. As it did not disturb the distribution of population by size-classes of towns of Bihar significantly, a comparative view of the trend of growth of towns is possible.

Table 3 reveals that Class I towns claimed over 45.0 per cent but Class V towns, share only 0.5 per cent of the total urban population in 1971. Class I and II taken together had 29 of the total towns but over 56.0 per cent of the total urban population. The proportion of urban population living in Class I towns showed a decline of nearly 3 points in 1921. From 1931 onwards, it progressively rose to reach a level of 45.4 per cent in 1971. The proportion of population of Class II to Class V towns, was higher than that of Class I towns upto 1931; since the disparity in favour of Class I towns has rapidly enlarged

2. Tests of eligibility for places to be treated as towns before the 1961 Census: (i) Municipal corporation, (ii) Municipal area, (iii) Town area committee, (iv) Civil lines not included in municipal limits, (v) Cantonment, and (vi) Every continuous collection of houses inhabited by not less than 5,000 persons, which the provincial Superintendent may decide to treat as II town.

Tests of eligibility for places to be treated as towns for the 1961 Census and the subsequent one: (i) Municipal corporation, (ii) Municipal area, (iii) Town committee, (iv) Notified area committee, (v) Cantonment board, (vi) Selected places with, (a) density of not less than 400 persons per km², (A) a population of 5,000; (c) three fourths of the working population should be outside agriculture, (d) or any other place which, according to the Director, possesses pronounced urban characteristics and amenities.

See Census of India, Series-1, Part II-A (i), *General Population Tables*, 1971, pp. 41-43.

TABLE 3-PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION IN EACH CLASS TO TOTAL URBAN POPULATION, 1901-71

<i>Census year</i>	<i>Class I 100,000 and above</i>	<i>Class II 50,000- 99,999</i>	<i>Class III 20,000- 49,999</i>	<i>Class IV 10,000- 19,999</i>	<i>Class V 5,000- 9,999</i>	<i>Class VI Below 5,000</i>
1901	12.60	19.44	31.73	19.48	15.46	1.29
1911	12.96	12.71	36.18	20.00	16.46	1.69
1921	10.29	21.23	29.28	19.97	17.31	1.92
1931	11.23	30.12	24.34	19.99	14.05	0.27
1941	24.57	26.56	18.94	19.91	9.07	0.95
1951	32.62	18.96	20.61	18.54	7.79	1.48
1961	39.36	15.36	22.36	14.87	7.54	0.51
1971	45.39	11.08	23.91	14.36	4.79	0.47

SOURCE: *Census of India, 1971, Part II-A (i), Series 1, General Population Tables, pp. 205-07.*

Class I towns have claimed at each census date from 1951 onwards the highest **share** of the urban population.

Rural to urban and urban to urban migrations play an important role in swelling up the size of Class I towns. Industries, public offices, academic institutions, and services of public utilities are invariably found to concentrate in big towns and as a result thereof the stream of migration is encouraged both from rural areas and from small towns. This is the reason why cities like Ranchi, Jamshedpur, Patna, and Bokaro have increased their size at a faster rate than Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Darbhanga, Muzaffarpur, and other towns. Towns depending partly on services, small scale industries and partly on agricultural economy have a slow rate of growth due to their low employment potentiality. Part of the rapid increase in the population of bigger towns is also due to the vertical movement of towns from lower class to higher class as a result of increase in the population size. The persistent increase in population of cities (Class I towns) has little chance of abating either in the present or in the coming decade. The big cities will continue to grow faster and faster with all the associated problems of bursting urban agglomerations³.

3. Various problems of urbanization and city life have been dealt with in ray paper "Problems of Urbanization in India", *Mainstream*, Vol. **XVII**, No. 25 (February 17), 1979, pp. 13-14.

The smallest size Class VI shows a little variation in its share of urban population, within the range from 1.9 per cent in 1921 to 0.3 percent in 1931. This category is important as it is on the margin between urban and rural areas. Their pulsating character pushes them up to the higher class of towns with the increase in their size and they are pushed back to the rural category with the decline in their population and/or the disappearance of any 'pronounced urban characteristics*. Low employment potential resulting from low industrial development, migration of people towards big towns, and the upgrading of small towns to higher classes of towns account for the slower rate of growth of the small towns.

We have hardly any information about the nature of growth of small towns. A detailed study of small towns as to why some of them appear to be stagnating, while others are decaying needs no emphasis. Besides explaining the process, patterns, and correlates of urbanization at regional level, their study will also explain the background of formation and decay of small towns, motives of migration, purpose of human concentration at a given place and the nature of development of urban economy. A study of the problem of small towns seems to have been avoided consciously by the researchers for the reasons that they do not find adequate data in the census reports.

Measure of Uneven Urbanization

Distribution of urban population is quite uneven in Bihar. This is, in fact, one of the important characteristic of India's urbanization (Singh, 1978). Let us measure the unevenness of urbanization by one of the simplest methods of measuring the level of concentration of urban population at the district level*.

It is clear that neither population nor the area is divided equally among the districts. The percentage of the total population located in a district bears no

4. The following is the formula to compute urban concentration (c) :

$$C = x - y/2$$

Where x is the per cent of the total urban area in a territorial division and y is the per cent of the total population located within its boundaries. The difference between each pair of percentage figures is treated as positive number in the process of summation. One of the serious defects of the measure is that different results may be obtained with different boundaries. However, in all cases, this measure would show an uneven concentration of urban population. Variation is a matter of degree only. J. P. Gibbs(ed.), *Urban Research Methods*, New Delhi: Affiliated East-West Press Ltd., 1966, pp. 236-40.

relation to the percentage of the total area of its jurisdiction. This is quite apparent, however, a quantitative expression of the degree to which the population is concentrated calls for the application of a mathematical formula.

The uneven concentration of urban population is reflected in a discrepancy between the district's share of the total area (see column 3 in Table 4). The

TABLE 4-MEASUREMENT OF CONCENTRATION OF URBAN POPULATION AT DISTRICT LEVEL IN BIHAR, 1971

<i>Districts</i>	<i>Urban area km²</i>	<i>Urban area % of total (x)</i>	<i>(x) — (y)</i>	<i>Population as % of total (y)</i>	<i>Urban population</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Patna	210.0	7.57	6.66	14.23	801,793
2. Gaya	131.3	4.73	1.30	6.03	340,005
3. Shahabad	138.7	5.00	0.75	5.75	323,883
4. Satna	59.4	2.14	1.04	3.18	179,532
5. Champaran	94.2	3.40	0.12	3.28	184,711
6. Muzaffarpur	73.5	2.65	1.85	4.50	253,962
7. Darbhanga	30.7	1.11	3.01	4.12	231,996
8. Monghyr	204.6	7.37	0.84	5.21	462,065
9. Bhagalpur	64.4	2.32	1.63	3.95	221,868
10. Saharsa	94.3	3.40	1.50	1.90	106,475
11. Purnea	165.6	5.97	1.53	4.44	250,044
12. Santal Parganas	98.1	3.54	0.28	3.26	183,577
13. Palamau	60.3	2.17	0.92	1.25	70,557
14. Hazaribagh	413.1	14.89	7.99	6.90	388,779
15. Ranchi	210.6	7.59	1.26	6.33	356,927
16. Dhanbad	425.0	15.32	4.00	11.32	638,028
17. Singhbhum	300.4	10.83	0.52	11.35	639,764
N =	2,774.2	100.00	35.20	100.00	5,633,966

Source : *Census of India, 1971, Series-I, part II-(i) Union Primary Census Abstract, pp. 32-43.*

degree to which the residents are concentrated may be gauged by determining the percentage of the total population who would have to move out of one district into another to bring about a uniform urban population density throughout the urban area. Thus, 6.66 per cent of the total population would have to move out of Patna to equalize residents in urban areas in this State. In contrast, 1.5 per cent of the urban area's population would have to move into the

TABLE 5-DISTRICTWISE PROPORTION OF URBAN POPULATION TO THE TOTAL POPULATION IN DESCENDING ORDER, 1971

<i>District</i>	<i>Total population.</i>	<i>Urban population</i>	<i>% to total population</i>	<i>Number of towns</i>
1. Dhanbad	1,466,417	638,028	43.51	26
2. Singhbhum	2,437,799	639,764	26.24	20
3. Patna	3,556,945	801,793	22.54	14
4. Ranchi	2,611,445	356,927	13.67	12
5. Hazaribagh	3,020,214	388,779	12.87	22
6. Monghyr	3,892,609	462,065	11.87	17
7. Bhagalpur	2,091,103	221,868	10.61	5
8. Shahabad	3,939,034	323,883	8.22	12
9. Gaya	4,457,473	340,005	7.63	12
10. Purnea	3,941,863	250,044	6.34	8
11. Santal Parganas	3,186,908	183,577	5.76	11
12. Muzaffarpur	4,840,681	253,962	5.24	8
13. Champaran	3,543,103	184,711	5.21	10
14. Palamau	1,504,350	70,557	4.69	5
15. Saharsa	2,350,268	106,475	4.53	7
16. Darbhanga	5,233,904	231,996	4.43	6
17. Saran	4,279,253	179,532	4.20	7
N=	56,353,369	5,633,966	10.00	202

SOURCES: *Census of India*, 1971, Series 4—Bihar, Part VI-A, *Town Directory*, pp. 5, *Census of India*, 1971, Series 1—India, Paper I of 1972, *Final Population*, pp. 85-88.

district of Saharsa. Since all the residents who move out of a district also move into one, each movement is counted twice in arriving at the total of 35.2. Consequently, this number is divided by 2 to find out the per cent of the total population who would have to change their place of residence from one district to another to equalize the distribution of population. The percentage in this case is 17.1.

All districts in Bihar are still rural in character, although urbanization has touched every district, Barringpatna, Monghyr, and Bhagalpur, other districts of the Gangetic plain are very largely rural in character. The districts of highland Bihar, except Palamau and Santal Parganas, have higher level of urbanization than those of the plains. In terms of percentage of urban population, the districts of Dhanbad, Singhbhum, Ranchi, and Hazaribagh dominate all districts, except Patna. The urban population of the Patna district is very high primarily because Patna has been the capital city of Bihar for a long time. According to the 1971 census, the population of Patna alone is about half a million. The level of urbanization of the districts of highland Bihar varies from about 13.0 to 45.0 per cent (see Table 5). The districts of Dhanbad, Singhbhum and Patna cover more than one-third of the total urban population of the State. The first seven of the seventeen districts have a higher level of urbanization than that of the State as a whole (see Table 5).

Districts like Shahabad, Gaya, Purnea, Santal Parganas, Muzaffarpur, Champaran, Palamau, Saharsa, Darbhanga, and Saran have a very low urban proportions of urbanization varying from 4.2 to 8.22 per cent, which is less than the level of urbanization for the State as a whole (i.e., 10.0 per cent).

TABLE 6—DIVISIONWISE DISTRIBUTION OF URBAN POPULATION IN BIHAR, 1971

Division	Urban urban population	Percentage of population	Number, of towns
1. Patna	1,465,681	26.01	38-
2. Tirhut	850,281	15.09	31.
3. Bhagalpur	1,224,029	21.73	48
4. Chotanagpur	2,094,055	37.17	85
' N =	5,633,966	100.00	202

SOURCE : Based on *Census of India, 1971*, Series 1— India, Paper I of 1972 *Final Population*, pp. 85-88.

The difference in the level of urbanization is sharp not only at the district level but also at the division level. Of the total urban population of Bihar, 37.17 per cent live in 85 towns of Chotanagpur division, while Tirhut has got **only** 15.09 percent in its 31 towns. Besides this, the urban population of Chotanagpur division is increasing at a faster rate than that of the other three divisions.

The main reasons of uneven patterns of urbanization are uneven concentration of natural resources and unbalanced economic development (Singh, 1978, pp. 307-23; 1979, pp. 171-94). The districts or divisions which have a greater development in secondary and tertiary sectors like industry, trade, commerce, communication, transportation, storage, and so forth have a higher level of urbanization. Districts having a lower level of urbanization have got their population predominantly in the primary or agricultural sector. In an agricultural region, the concentration of population in towns is lesser and the rate of growth of urban population slower than that of industrial region.

Conclusions

The trend of urbanization in Bihar is very inconsistent and indefinite. Sometimes the rate of growth is very fast while at others it becomes very slow. The level of urbanization at district or division level is quite uneven. The differential patterns of urbanization can be attributed mainly to the erratic variations in economic development as a consequence of the pursuance of inadequate economic policies. Bihar has got a lower level of urbanization than most of other States and the country as a whole despite its resource base. The patterns of growth of towns of difference size-classes are, however, largely akin to those of India.

The process of urbanization is a very complex one and is associated with numerous overlapping factors and forces. All are not necessarily at work at the same time; their propensity, in fact, varies from time to time in accordance with the given socio-economic and political situations. It is true that factors of urbanization are numerous, rural-urban migration ensuing from industrialization, rural poverty, and 'tertiarization' and 'auto-urbanization' (natural increase in urban population) can be enumerated as factors more predominant than others.

References

1. Bgoue, D. J. and Zachariah, K. C-, 1962, Urbanization and migration in India. ID : Turner, Roy (ed.), *India's Urban Future*, Bombay : Oxford University Press.
2. Bose, D. K., 1969, Urbanization, industrialization and planning for regional development, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Special Number (July), 1169-72-

3. Burgess, E. W., 1924, The growth of the City, *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, **XVIII**, 85-97.
4. _____, 1911, Vol. 1, *India*, Part I, *Report*.
5. _____, 1971, Series 1—India, Part II-A (i), *General Population Tables*.
6. _____, 1971, Series 1—India, Part II-A (ii), *Union Primary Census Abstract*.
7. _____, 1971, Series 1—India, Paper I of 1972, *Final Population*.
8. _____, 1971, Series 4—Bihar Part VI-A, *Town Directory*.
9. Davis, Kingsley, 1951, *The Population of India and Pakistan*, Princeton : Princeton University Press.
10. _____, 1962, Urbanization in India ; Past and future. In: Turner, R. (ed.), *India's Urban Future*, Bombay : Oxford University Press.
11. _____, 1972, *World Urbanization, 1950-1970*, Vol. II, Institute of International Studies, Berkeley: University of California.
12. Deshpande, C.D. and Bhat, L. S., 1975, India. In : Jones, Ronald (ed.), *Essays on World Urbanization*, London : George Philip and Sons Ltd., pp. 358-76.
13. D'Souza, V. S., 1976, Green Revolution and Urbanization in Punjab during 1961-71. ID ; Alam, S. Manzoor *et al.* (eds.), *Urbanization in Developing Countries*, Hyderabad ; Osmania University, pp. 349-65.
14. Duncan, O. D., 1959, Human ecology and population studies. In : Hauser, P. M. and Bunca, O. D. (eds.), *The Study of population : An Inventory and Appraisal*, Chicago ; The University of Chicago Press, pp. 678-716.
15. Gibbs, J. P. (ed.), 1966, *Urban Research Methods*, New Delhi: Affiliated East-West Press Ltd,
16. Mitra, Asok, 1967, *Internal Migration and Urbanization in India, 1961*, Bangkok (Paper prepared for ECAFE expert working group on internal migration and urbanization, Bangkok, 1967).
17. Narain, V., 1975-76, Demographic aspects of urbanization, *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, XXXVI (3 and 4), 233-58.
18. Peach, G. C. K., 1970, Urbanization in India. In ; Beckinesale, R. P. and Houston, J.M. (eds.), *Urbanization and its Problems*, Oxford : Basil Blackwell, pp. 297-303.
19. Preston, Samuel H., 1979, Urban growth in developing countries : A demographic reappraisal, *Population and Development Review*, 5 (2).
20. Singh, J. P., 1978, The demographic aspects of the system of the growth of cities, *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, XXXVIII(4), 307-23.
21. _____, 1978, Demographic aspects of urbanization in India : A sociological analysis, M-Phil Dissertation (Unpublished), New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru University.
22. _____, 1979, Problems of Urbanization in India, *Mainstream*, XI (25), 13-14.
23. Sovani, N. V., 1966, *Urbanization and Urban India*, Bombay : Asia Publishing House.
24. Watal, P. K., 1934, *The Population Problem in India*, Bombay: Bennett Coleman and Co. Ltd.
23. World Bank, 1972, *Urbanization*, Sector Working Paper, June.
24. Zacchariah, K- C., 1967, International migration and urbanization, *Population Change : Asia and Oceania Report of the IUSSP Conference*, Sydney.