

Productivity and Territorial Specialisation

Chang, Shu-Chun

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Chang, S.-C. (2009). Productivity and Territorial Specialisation. *Applied Economics*, 41(8), 941-946. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840601019091>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



Productivity and Territorial Specialisation

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-05-0528.R3
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
JEL Code:	R11 - Regional Economic Activity: Growth, Development, and Changes < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R12 - Size and Spatial Distributions of Regional Economic Activity < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	Productivity , Territorial Specialisation

powered by ScholarOne
Manuscript Central™

Productivity and Territorial Specialisation

Abstract

On the basis of a relatively free trade world and global economy, specialisation tends to increase the comparative advantages of a country. But in this scenario, not countries but cities are the territorial organization that play the main role. Cities concentrate the economic activity and political influential household that reflects economic changes.

The purpose of this study is to explore the principles underlie the distribution of population on a territory and the likely effect of economic development on redistributing population geographically.

Introduction

Many attempts have been made to explain the distribution of population over territory.

Recently this question has become more significant, especially for less developed countries as they experience the rapid urbanization following World War II, which is today qualitatively different from the patterns followed in developed countries (Mukkala, 2004; Taylor, 1998; Tolley and Thomas, 1987).

Urbanisation, city size, and migration have been seen only as demographic problems.

Cities are considered synonymous with poverty, pollution and so on. Governments have made various efforts to control population size in cities, however, most attempts have not taken into account what determines the distribution of population over territory. The main objective of this paper is to discuss the relationship between economic development and population distribution.

For centuries, city locations depended on the presence of natural resources (water, fertile soil, coal, etc.). Nowadays, changes in population distribution appear to be more complex. Many scholars who wrote about the genesis of urban concentration affirm that the formation of cities resulted from technological innovations in the countryside. The new technology increased agricultural production and generated a

1
2
3
4 food surplus. Thus, people released from agricultural activities were able to move to
5
6
7 cities and work in non-agricultural enterprises.¹
8
9

10
11
12
13 On the other hand, Makkala (2004) and Keyfitz (1965) argue that although this
14
15
16 process was a necessary condition for the creation of cities, it was not sufficient.
17

18
19
20 Some additional kind of social organization was needed to enable people in the city to
21
22
23 appropriate, directly or indirectly, part of the production that kept them alive.
24

25
26 According to Keyfitz, surplus can only be extracted after it has been institutionalised
27
28
29 through taxes, trade, and other means adopted by the state (Keyfitz, 1965). He
30

31
32 further argues that in the early stage of cities' development, agricultural products were
33
34
35 needed to support and finance the creation of new activities such as manufacturing.
36

37
38 The creation of new cities and the expansion of the already existing ones was made
39
40
41 possible by the construction of roads, the widespread use of money, and the political
42
43
44 power of the cities over the territory.
45
46

47
48
49
50 As a result of this process, city economies experienced a structural change from
51
52
53 agricultural to non-agricultural production. That is to say, economic development
54
55
56 implies a radical shift in the composition of national output of goods and services
57
58
59
60

¹ National Resources Committee, 1937, cited in Keyfitz, 1965.

1
2
3
4 from sectors of relatively low productivity to those with higher ones (Morris, 1994,
5
6
7 p.16; Harris, 1990).
8
9

10
11
12
13 At this point it is relevant to ask these questions: What principles underlie the
14
15
16
17 distribution of population over a territory? And, what is the likely effect of economic
18
19
20 development on redistributing population geographically?
21
22
23
24
25

26 In classical political economics, it was argued that the division of the labour has an
27
28
29 impact on the distribution of the population. Towns are defined as the places that
30
31
32 have a greater degree of division of labour, productivity, and specialization (Chang
33
34
35 and Caudill, 2005; Harris, 1988). However, these concepts by themselves do not
36
37
38 explain what mechanism distributes people over territory².
39
40
41
42
43

44 During the 1960s the view that dominated research on the distribution of population
45
46
47 in developing countries suggested that migration was the result of the deterioration of
48
49
50 living conditions in the countryside. However, it has been demonstrated that
51
52
53 migration and urban concentration are more closely correlated with economic
54
55
56 development rather than rural poverty. For example, Keyfitz expounds that in South
57
58
59
60

² In many traditional activities there is a high level of division of labour, and this situation does not imply necessarily a change in population redistribution.

1
2
3
4 and Southeast Asia, as in Europe ‘...the expansion of cities was a function of the
5
6
7 demand for labour within them, rather than of a lack of opportunities in rural areas’
8
9
10 (Keyfitz, 1965, p.285).
11

12
13
14
15
16
17 As the national output composition changes there are transformations in the shares of
18
19 labour demand by economic sectors. Since cities are the traditional sites of
20
21 industrial activities, industrial expansion attracts workers and their families to urban
22
23 areas. With the rise of the number of migrants to the cities there is an increase in the
24
25 demand for manufactured goods and services. As a consequence, this creates a
26
27 greater demand for labour (Bai and Zhang, 2005; O’Sullivan, 2000; Verma, 1986).
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 As the output of goods and services changes, relative city sizes change. Therefore,
36
37 the mechanism linking economic development and urbanization is the labour market
38
39 (Taylor, 1998, pp.28-65; Harris, 1990).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Economic development requires a continuing rise in productivity. Many authors
49
50 have argued that productivity is higher where urban agglomeration economies are
51
52 more prominent. For example, Verma (1986) explains that in Indian States during
53
54 the 1970s, productivity was related to the increase of migration into urban areas and
55
56 to the percentage of states’ urban populations. According to Verma, productivity
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 was affected by the number and the size of urban agglomerations as well as by the
5
6
7 populations of the largest cities. Yet, while the contribution of large cities to
8
9
10 productivity declined, it increased in medium-size cities. This means that since the
11
12
13 1970s, large cities in India have grown at a slower pace than medium-size cities.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 City size and urban growth are related to scale and agglomeration economies. In
21
22
23 order to satisfy the growth of output during economic development, it is necessary to
24
25
26 have a labour force concentration. This in turn affects city size. On one hand, large
27
28
29 population concentrations make it possible to have scale economies and larger
30
31
32 markets. Harris (1990) argues that sectorally different potentials for scale economies
33
34
35 generate and sustain different settlement sizes. In other words, scale economies
36
37
38 determine the distribution of urban populations between settlements of different sizes,
39
40
41 and the patterns of specialization by localities. On the other hand, concentration of
42
43
44 economic activities generates agglomeration economies by permitting innovations in
45
46
47 transport and communication networks that reduce the costs of access to national and
48
49
50 international markets (Lee & Wills, 1997; William et al, 2000; Henderson, 1988).
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Economic development enhances territorial specialization. It is evident that in some
58
59
60 areas economic, social, and natural conditions play an important role in producing

1
2
3
4 cheaper commodities. As a result, many less-developed countries have lost their
5
6
7 agricultural self-sufficiency as they engaged in manufacturing export goods that
8
9
10 allowed them to gain from international specialization. “The sharp difference in
11
12
13 productivity between sectors and subsectors of the national differentiation (and
14
15
16 territorial differentiation in turn enhances the growth of productivity)” (Harris, 1990,
17
18
19 p.10).

20
21
22
23
24
25
26 According to Mukkaala (2004), Henderson (1988) and Tolley (1987), city size and the
27
28
29 proportion of urbanised population are affected by demand conditions within the
30
31
32 country, and changes in the degree of international specialization that occur during
33
34
35 development. All cities have patterns of specialization that depend on their
36
37
38 participation in national and international markets. Large cities are more complex
39
40
41 than small ones. Hypothetically, a city’s pattern depends on its contribution to the
42
43
44 national and international output. “Different population sizes of cities indicates
45
46
47 different ‘peak sizes’ for the complex of specialization in a city’s externally traded
48
49
50 output of goods and services” (Chang and Caudill, 2005; O’Sullivan, 2000;
51
52
53 Henderson, 1988).

54
55
56
57
58
59
60 It should have become evident that there is a close relationship between a high rate of

1
2
3
4 economic development and urbanisation³. However some authors point out that in
5
6
7 addition to the level of economic development, regional localisation and individual
8
9
10 country conditions have an impact on the level of urbanisation. For that reason, they
11
12
13 affirm that there is no “simple association between economic development and the
14
15
16 degree to which a country is urbanized” (Tolley and Thomas, 1987, p.4).
17
18

19
20
21
22 Tolley and Thomas demonstrated that urban population growth rates have a tendency
23
24
25 to decline with a rise of income. They predicted that the high rates of urbanization
26
27
28 observed in developing countries would decline as their income levels rise. In
29
30
31 regard to urban concentration, they argue that there have been significant differences
32
33
34 between developed and developing countries. In the case of developing countries,
35
36
37 large proportions of the population tend to be concentrated in one or few cities, while
38
39
40 in developed countries the share of the population that lives in large cities tends to be
41
42
43 lower.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 In the same direction, Harris explains that in some countries the association between
52
53
54 economic development and urbanisation is weak. On the one hand, many
55
56
57 developing countries with low levels of *per-capita* GNP have high urban population
58
59
60

³ Urbanisation is the change in the proportions of rural and urban populations.

1
2
3
4 growth rates, whereas, developed countries have low rates of urbanization. On the
5
6
7
8 other hand, immigration levels are lower in developed countries, although they have
9
10
11 high rates of economic growth, while in developing countries with low levels of
12
13
14 economic growth, immigration levels may be high. This means that “the association
15
16
17 of economic activity and urbanization varies with the “stage of development”(Harris,
18
19
20 1990, p.4).

21
22
23
24
25
26 According to Harris (1990), the size and distribution of land holding, household
27
28
29 income, and colonial heritage, among other factors, seem to have an impact on
30
31
32 population distribution. For example, during the 1980s, sub-Saharan Africa went
33
34
35 through an economic crisis, which was manifested in a negative rate of agricultural
36
37
38 growth, severe declines in export commodities, and a significant fall in urban incomes.
39
40
41 Sub-Saharan Africa had rapid urbanization, but poor rates of economic growth.

42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Theoretically, there is a close relationship between economic development and
49
50
51 redistribution of the population, however, empirically, there are examples that do not
52
53
54 support this general proposition.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **“Maquiladora”, Economic Development and Urbanisation in Northern Mexico.**
5
6
7
8
9

10 The *maquiladora* industry started developing in many Northern Mexico cities in the
11
12 1960s. This activity is based on using a cheap labour force and low capital
13
14 investment to produce manufactured export goods. The *maquiladora* sector imports
15
16 raw material and parts⁴, without restrictions, and its output is exported (Harris, 1993
17
18 and Pradilla, 1993). Taking into consideration the concepts expounded in the
19
20 preceding section, the objective of this section is to analyse, in broad terms, the
21
22 relationship between economic development and urbanization in Northern Mexico.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 When they began in Mexico, the government considered *maquiladoras* only as a
36
37 transitional process that would alleviate the unemployment generated by the United
38
39 States’ suspension of the “*braceros*’ programme. However, during the 1980s, as
40
41 Mexico went through an economic crisis⁵, the government changed its policy and
42
43 liberalized the economy, promoting export activities. Since then, the *maquiladora*
44
45 industry has been seen as a strategic activity to help recovery of the Mexican
46
47 economy (Pradilla, 1993).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ⁴ According to INEGI, between January and October of 1991 the *maquiladora* sector along the
59 northern border imported 99.0% of its raw materials and parts (INEGI, 1992, cited in Pradilla, 1993).

60 ⁵ The Mexican economy was highly affected by the rise of real interest rates on loans from
international banks, Mexico being the most indebted Latin America country; the drop in oil prices, the
main export product of Mexico; and two million U.S. dollars were taken out of the country.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The pace of *maquiladora* growth has been dependent on international market
8
9
10 conditions, especially those in the United States, because of its particular features and
11
12 border location. For instance, between 1975-1976 many plants in the northern states
13
14 were closed as the result of the economic crisis in USA. In the oil boom period
15
16
17 *maquiladoras* experienced stagnation and lost international competitiveness. Since
18
19
20 1989, as a consequence of the North American economic recession, the pace of
21
22
23 growth of the *maquiladora* sector has been slower than expected (Paradilla, 1993).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Yet, between 1975 and 1990, the *maquiladora* sector has grown in size. The number
33
34 of establishments increased from 454 to 2,033 and the number of employees from 67,
35
36
37 214 to 465, 800. *Maquiladoras* created 88% of the new national industrial jobs,
38
39
40 between 1985 and 1990, and the northern Mexico states of *Baja California Norte*,
41
42
43 *Sonora*, *Chihuahua*, *Coahuila*, and *Nuevo Leon y Tamaulipas* accounted for 86.9 % of
44
45
46 the total number of establishments, 90.2% of the employment, and 87.1% of the total
47
48
49 *maquiladora* production value⁶.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 The *maquiladora* sector in Mexican border cities increased significantly between
58
59
60

⁶ INEGI, 1992, cited in *Pradilla Cobos, Emilio*, 1993.

1
2
3
4 1975 and 1989. As Table 1 shows, employment and value-add growth rates were
5
6
7 over 7.0% and 6.5%, respectively, which exceeded the national economy growth rate
8
9
10 of 0.9% between 1980-1988 (Garza, 1992). The *maquiladora* sector is considered
11
12
13 very important in terms of international trade because it produces about a quarter of
14
15
16 the value of the country's manufactured exports (Harris, 1993).
17
18

19
20
21
22
23 As consequence of the continuous *maquiladora* industrialization process, the
24
25
26 economic structure of the northern cities has been transformed. As Table 1 shows, in
27
28
29 the period 1975-1989 *Cd, Juarez, Tijuana, Matamoros, Nogales, and Reynosa y*
30
31
32 *Mexicali* had the highest concentration of employment and value add in Mexico.
33
34
35 Economic development has also affected the size of the cities along Mexico's
36
37
38 northern border as expansion of the *maquiladora* sector attracted workers. Between
39
40
41 1980-1990, the population growth rates in northern cities were much higher than the
42
43
44 growth rate at the national level, as Table 2 shows; the only exception was *Matamoros*
45
46
47 City. *Tijuana* (7.6%) and *Ensenada* (8.0%) are the most significant examples.
48
49
50

51
52
53 To conclude, it should have become evident that the case of Mexico's northern border
54
55
56 shows a clear correlation between economic growth and urbanization. That is not to
57
58
59 say that the *maquiladora* development is the only factor behind the rapid urbanization
60

1
2
3
4 in northern cities. Other determinants, such as regional location and individual city
5
6
7 conditions that affect the level of urbanization⁷ should also be considered. Note
8
9
10 also that the *maquiladora* industry is highly linked with international markets,
11
12
13 therefore, the future of most of these cities depends on fluctuations in world trade
14
15
16
17 markets.

22 **Conclusions**

23
24
25
26
27
28
29 To understand the territorial distribution of population and to improve national
30
31
32 productivity, the role each city plays in the national and international economy must
33
34
35 be considered. Nowadays, cities are the key factors in economic development and
36
37
38 the globalization process since they concentrate the labour force, economic activities,
39
40
41 and infrastructure⁸, which are important in elevating productivity and being
42
43
44 competitive in international markets.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Cities such as *maquiladora* are marked by territorial specialization. This
52
53
54 specialization indicates the strengths and weaknesses of the city and its manufacturing
55
56
57

58
59 ⁷ For instance, the northern cities of the Mexico attracts people from both countries that want to cross
60 the border (legally or illegally) for several reasons: tourism, business, trade, services and so on.

⁸ For instance, business and professional services, financial resources, transports, market information, all kind of consumers, and so on.

1
2
3
4 and service industries. In order to promote local economic growth, local authorities
5
6
7 have to analyse the patterns that follow such activities. Their dynamics and
8
9
10 evolution will depend strongly on the policies implemented by the city government.
11
12

13
14
15
16 Economic development enhances productivity and territorial specialization, which
17
18
19 underlie the distribution of population. Among the factors that must be considered
20
21
22 are first, concentration of the labour force and productivity and specialization levels,
23
24
25 second, the effects of national and international markets on the distribution of
26
27
28 population, these should include openness in a city's trading system, third, the
29
30
31 national and regional conditions that determine the pattern of development and
32
33
34 urbanization; and fourth, noting that the relationship between economic development
35
36
37 and population distribution is not an historical process, it occurs only under specific
38
39
40
41 circumstances.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Table 1: Maquiladora Sector: Employment and Value Add
by Northern Border Cities, 1975-1989**

<i>Ciudades</i>	1975	<i>Personal Ocupado</i> 1989	T.C. %	1975	<i>Valor agregado*</i> 1989	T.C. %
<i>Ensenada, B.C.N.</i>	314	1 556	12.1	12.6	45.6	9.6
<i>Mexicali, B.C.N.</i>	6 324	21 374	9.1	363.4	1 228.8	9.1
<i>Tecate, B.C.N.</i>	803	4 640	13.3	44.1	236.0	12.7
<i>Tijuana, B.C.N.</i>	7 844	58 029	15.4	472.4	2 774.3	13.5
<i>Cd. Acuna, Cuah.</i>	1 900	13 173	14.8	52.9	407.3	15.7
<i>P.Negras, Coah.</i>	2 561	8 051	8.5	90.7	254.2	7.6
<i>Cd. Juarez, Chih.</i>	19 775	124 386	14.0	1 048.9	6 047.5	13.3
<i>Agua Prieta, Son.</i>	2 636	6 806	7.0	98.9	255.7	7.0
<i>Nogales, Son.</i>	6 794	22 635	9.0	390.5	955.6	6.6
<i>Cd. Reynosa, Tamps.</i>	1 255	23 938	23.4	53.4	1 215.2	25.0
<i>Matamoros, Tamps.</i>	9 778	38 132	10.2	400.7	2 024.2	12.3
<i>Nvo. Laredo, Tamps.</i>	1 928	14 747	15.6	69.8	770.1	18.7
<i>Total en la frontera</i>	61 912	339 319	12.9	3 098.3	16 307.3	12.6

Source; INEGI, *Estadísticas de la Industria Maquiladora de Exportación, 1975-1986, Agascalientes Mexico, 1983* and INEGI, *Avance de Información económica. Industria Maquiladora de Exportación, 1987, 1988, 1989, Mexico*, cited in Pradilla (1993).

Table 2: Population growth rate of the main border cities with maquiladora activity, 1970-1980, 1980-1990

	1970-1980	1980-1990
Mexico	3.3	2.2
<i>Ensenada</i>	4.40	8.00
<i>Mexicali</i>	2.40	5.40
<i>Tecate</i>	5.20	7.60
<i>Tijuana</i>	4.30	5.20
<i>Cd. Acuna</i>	2.50	3.30
<i>Piedras Negras</i>	1.90	3.40
<i>Cd. Juarez</i>	2.60	3.50
<i>Agua Prieta</i>	3.20	2.70
<i>Nogales</i>	2.00	4.60
<i>Cd. Reynosa</i>	2.80	4.40
<i>Matamoros</i>	3.00	0.40
<i>Nuevo Laredo</i>	3.40	3.30

Source: CONAPO, *Demografía de la Frontera Norte* cited in Pradilla, 1993

REFERENCES

- Bai Yuanliang & Zhang Zongyi (2005) 'Aggregate Cigarette Demand and Regional Differences in China'. *Applied Economics Volume 37, Number 12*. pp. 2523-2528.
- Brunn, D. S. & Jack F. W. (eds.) (1993) *Cities of the World: World Regional Urban Development*. Second Edition. London: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Chang, Tasangyao & Caudill, Steven B. (2005). 'Financial Development and Economic Growth: the Case of Taiwan'. *Applied Economics Volume 37, Number 12*. pp. 1329-1335.
- Dunning, J.H., Morgan, E.V., Peacock, A. T., Lees, D.S. J., Wiseman, M. L. (1968) *An Economic Study of the City of London*. London: Corporation of London.
- Harris, N. (1978) *Economic Development, Cities and Planning: The Case of Bombay*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, N. (1988) 'Economic Development and Urbanisation'. *Habitat International, Volume 12*, No.3, pp.5-15.
- Harris, N. (1990a) *Environmental Issues in the cities of the Developing World*. Development Planning Unit (DPU) Working Paper, No.20. London:University College London (UCL)Press.
- Harris, N. (1990b) *Urbanisation, Economic Development and Policy in developing Countries*. DPU Working Paper, No.19. London: UCL Press.
- Harris, N. (1992a). *Cities in the 1990s: the Challenge for Developing Countries*. ODA - London: DPU, UCL Press
- Harris, N. (1992b) 'The Global Economy, Flexibility, and Urban Development' (memio), Nagoya.
- Harris, N. (1994). Urban Cost, Lecture given at DPU, London, 20 January 1999.

- 1
2
3 Henderson, V. J. (1988) *Urban Development, Theory, Fact and Illusion*. Oxford:
4 Oxford University Press.
5
6
7
8 Knox P, Agnew J & McCarthy L. (2003) *The Geography of the World Economy*.
9 London:Hodder Arnold.
10
11
12
13 Lee, R. and Wills, J. (eds) (1997) *Geographies of Economies*. London: Arnold.
14
15
16 Mera, K. (1973). 'On the Agglomeration and economic Efficiency'. *Economic*
17 *Development and Cultural Change, Volume 21*. No. 2, pp. 309-324.
18
19
20 Mukkala Kirsi. (2004) 'Agglomeration Economies in the Finnish Manufacturing
21 Sector'. *Applied Economics Volume 36, Number 21*, pp. 2419-2429.
22
23
24
25 Richardson, H.W. (1972) 'Optimality in City Size, Systems of Cities and Urban
26 Policy: A Skeptic's View'. *Urban Studies, Volume 9*, No.1, pp.24-46.
27
28
29
30 Segal, D. (1976) 'Are There Returns to Scale in City Size?' *Review of Economics*
31 *and Statistics, Volume 63*, pp. 339-50.
32
33
34 Speare, A. J. (1969) "The Determinants of Rural to Urban Migration in Taiwan". Ph.D
35 thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
36
37
38
39 ----- (1971) "A Cost-Benefit Model of Rural to Urban Migration in
40 Taiwan", *Population Studies*, 25:117-30.
41
42
43 Speare, A. J., Liu, P. K. C. & Tsay, C. L. (1988) *Urbanization and Development, The*
44 *Rural-Urban Transition in Taiwan*. Brown University Studies in Population and
45 Development. Colorado: Westview Press.
46
47
48
49
50 Sveikauskas, L. (1975). 'The Productivity of Cities'. *Quarterly Journal of*
51 *Economics, Volume 89*, pp. 393-413.
52
53
54
55 Therivel, R., Wilson, E., Thompson, S., Heaney, D., and Pritchard, D. (eds.) (1995)
56 *Strategic Environmental Assmssment*. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.
57
58
59 UNCHS. (1996) *An Urbanizing World: Global Report on Human Settlements*.
60 Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1
2
3
4
5 United Nations. (1984) *Fifth Population enquiry among Governments: Monitoring*
6 *Government Perceptions and Policies on Demographic trends and Levels in*
7 *Relation to Development as of 1982*. Population Division, United Nations, New
8 York, pp.19.
9

10
11
12
13 Westen, A. C. M. V. (1995) “Unsettled: Low-income housing and mobility in
14 Bamako, Mali”. *Nederlandse Geografische Studies*, 187, Netherlands.
15
16

17
18 Vermon, R. (1972) ‘External Economies’ in Retenberg (eds.). *Reading in Urban*
19 *Economics*. London: Mcmillian, pp.37-48.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60