

The Rural-Urban Relationship As Perceived By Young People

Dr. Manisha Pandurang Wanjari

Associate Professor & Head Department of Home Science
Kohinoor Arts, Commerce & Science College Khultabad

Abstract

This paper explores the concept of rurality and the rural-urban relationship as perceived by young people. First, there is a brief review of the main theoretical approaches to the issue of the definition of “the rural”. Then, the theory of “social representation” is taken into consideration to better understand what makes the rural and natural environment attractive, together with the perception of the difficulties which hinder rural development. Its blurred boundaries between rurality and urbanization was chosen as the area to be studied to verify if it is possible to identify a distinction between urban and rural lifestyles and whether the residents of urban and rural areas have different criteria for evaluation. The differences found among a sample of students in the Region of questionnaire responses on the concept of rurality and the rural-urban relationship are presented with a quantitative model. The analytical framework raises some important concerns for the governance of the socio-economic development of rural environments and suggests that greater attention must be paid to how different social groups in different social environments understand, explain and articulate the complexity of rurality and the rural urban relationship in their everyday life.

Keywords: rurality, rural-urban relationship, social representation

Introduction

In Europe the introduction of new tools for an agricultural policy aiming at the development of rural areas has aroused much public debate about the analysis of rural areas and their prospects. Many of the contributions have addressed the definition of “the rural”. Drawing a line between urban and rural areas seems quite simple in everyday life, but suggesting a conceptual definition which is both precise and statistically meaningful, becomes much more difficult. Conventional approaches to the definition of “the rural” have focused on either descriptive or socio-cultural features. However, the “different ruralities” and the development of economic systems which have shown a growing number of small and medium sized industries and, on the other hand, the decline of traditional rural activities, can be taken into consideration only by an alternative means of definition.

This alternative approach is the theory of social representations which enables us to define “the rural” in terms of the non-tangible space of “social representation”. The point is to give a definition and not a description of “the rural” taking into consideration the viewpoint of the people who actually live in specific rural areas and their perception of that specific place without suggesting any monolithic structure which can be termed “the rural”.

Different social groups in different social environments and with different experiences will probably have a different perception of “the rural”. Urban residents may see rurality as a mythical, idyllic place where people have happy, healthy lifestyles in free environments, away from the stress and uncertainty of urban society and where everybody enjoys the benefits of being part of an ideal community characterized by mutual support, harmony and integration.

The aim of this paper is to find evidence for the possibility of drawing a line between urban and rural young residents’ different perceptions of rurality, and also to highlight the strong and weak points of rural areas as compared to urban areas.

The choice of focusing on the young is based on the firm belief that they are the future of rurality itself and only a shared understanding of rurality will enable the young to contribute to the socio-economic development of the rural environment, becoming, in this way, keenly involved in local decision-making and positively connected with their local environment.

The paper is divided into three main sections. In the first, we briefly outline different theoretical approaches to the issue of the definition of “the rural”. In the second, we consider the specification of a logistic regression model for the investigation of relationships between rural and urban residence. In the last part, we present the results of the questionnaire responses as a contribution to the recognition of the multiple situations lived by young rural people.

1. Rurality: the difficult task of conceptualization

The definition of rural has been in dispute for decades, many different definitions of the rural have been given, each focusing on a different specialized aspect: in turn, statistical, administrative, built-up area, functional regions, agricultural, and population density. Since this paper is not meant as a further contribution to this on-going international debate, there will be only a brief outline of those theoretical approaches which are most useful for better reaching the goals of our analysis. Besides, the on-going debate over recent decades has made it clear that the quest for any single, all-embracing definition of the rural is neither desirable nor feasible.

Historically, traditional agriculture supplied both employment and income in rural areas. However, in today's developed countries the concept of rurality should not be confused with that of an agricultural economy. The historical process of the structural transformation of economy has led to the decline of the importance of agriculture, both in terms of employment and of contribution to GNP, and this has deeply and rapidly modified the economic and social structure of rural areas where previously only very small and slow changes had occurred over the centuries, in this way granting the typical balance of the rural world.

Everyone has acknowledged the need for an in-depth analysis of the evolutionary processes and the social economic mechanisms occurring in rural areas, therefore the approaches suggested for the conceptualization of rurality are still many and varied. Up to this point, no consensus has been reached on what is meant by "rural". They are immediately understood because they suggest a physical, social and cultural concept opposed to the concept of "urban". However, to give an objective and unambiguous definition of rurality seems quite impossible".

Approaches range from descriptive to social representation of the rural. Descriptive definitions are all geared towards various planning and academic purposes and they consider rural areas as deeply different and/or opposed to urban ones. As for the social representation of the rural, how it cannot be separated from the representation of the urban and from the links between these two concepts, which change in time and space.

We believe the concept of rurality is changing due to the evolution of the processes of socioeconomic development of these areas, but evolution may occur in different ways at different times in different countries or even in different regions of the same country. The weighty study of based on this assumption and they give a definition and a description of "the rural mosaic" in Europe and of the diversity in national approaches to defining rural.

Different cultural, demographic, environmental, political and socio-economic circumstances in European countries lead their residents and their governments to emphasize dissimilar attributes as key characteristics of "their rurality". Faced with the difficulty of reaching a consensus on the concept of rurality, some authors suggest a pragmatic approach in which the definition to be used is the one that best fits the aims of the study. A useful classification of the different approaches to the conceptualization of rurality has been suggested on the basis of different modalities through which the heterogeneity of the space is analysed, has classified three different approaches: a) the spatial approach, b) the territorial approach, and c) the structural approach.

In the first case, the space has been interpreted as a set of points endowed with attributes and separated by distances, as a territory in which there could be competition for the use of its resources. The fundamental problem faced in this trend of studies is the choice of localization for optimizing agents.

The second approach does not consider the space as a set of points or surfaces, but as a group of entities that represent a strong internal structure. The main problems faced in these studies concern the motivations on which the different performances of the territories are based.

Finally, the third approach is less interested in the objective characteristics of the space, but studies, instead, what representation of the space the social actors perceive. The main focus of the analysis is centered on the social construction of this representation.

This latter approach, not being based on the study of geography and variables, but on different representations of the space specific to the social actors, allows for the investigation of how the rural area is lived by those who integrate themselves in it every day. In this kind of study, it is necessary to refer to the theory of "social representation" so as to explicate how people understand, explain and articulate the complexity of demands and experiences coming from the social and physical environments in which they are immersed.

In a later paper, the same author underlines the renewed importance of the "paramount realities of everyday life". The latter proposes that "people use social representations in order to deal with the complexity

of the social world. These are defined as organizational mental constructs which guide us towards what is 'visible' and must be responded to, relate appearance and reality, and even define reality itself. The world is organized, understood and mediated through these basic cognitive units. Social representations consist of both concrete images and abstract concepts, organized around 'figurative nuclei' which are a 'complex of images that visibly reproduce a complex of ideas'. Therefore, whilst they are partly a description of the physical material world, social representations are irreducible to it. They are both iconic and symbolic".

Underlined the need to distinguish between the rural as a space and the rural as a represented space, the so-called social representation which, in a post-modern society permeated by symbolic elements, can evolve in a different way than the material space. Outline how a social representation of rurality allows for the connection of these studies to a more solid theoretical basis, mainly in those cases in which the analyses aim to understand the activities of residents in low density areas, or the opportunities offered by the countryside, or the residential strategies or recreational activities of residents in urban environments. In contrast to this well-developed study, little attention has been paid to the representation of the rural held by rural and urban residents. Indeed we find it crucial to analyse what different social groups link with the concept of rurality in order to understand and explain strengths and weakness of the rural areas.

To verify if young residents in rural and urban areas have different interpretations of the concept of rurality and also different life styles, we chose the theoretical approach of 'social representation' because it provides guidelines for finding out if there is a degree of specificity of social representation in specific social groups. We feel this kind of analysis can be extremely useful for understanding the perception of structural constraints and/or the existence of development opportunities for rural areas due to on-going processes in the society.

2. Methodology

Therefore, this nonprobability sample is limited to a specific social group consisting of a minority of young people; despite its theoretical weakness, various forms of nonprobability sampling are widely used in practice, mainly for reasons of cost and convenience, they do supply some useful information and are an interesting starting point in considering the issue of the rural-urban relationship.

Questionnaire surveys were administered through personal interviews. A pre-questionnaire was used to define structured questions that were asked to solicit information on a variety of topics including demographics, concepts of rurality, opinions on positive/negative aspects of living in rural/urban areas, motivations for moving, shopping habits and free-time activities. Responses to these questions provided the data necessary to classify residents in urban or rural areas and to compare both their perception and opinion of rurality and their lifestyles.

The independent variables used concerned income, ownership of goods and use of services, food shopping habits, the perception of the identifying elements of rurality and the overall opinion of the positive aspects of rural residency. The data cases have been classified in an exploratory mode with a logistic regression model, a versatile and powerful multivariate technique that allows for a careful examination of how various factors influence a binary outcome and that requires far fewer assumptions than discriminant analysis or multiple regression analysis. When the dependent variable has only two values, in this case urban and rural residency, and many independent variables concern qualitative aspects, the assumptions necessary for hypothesis testing in regression analysis are necessarily violated. For example, it is unreasonable to assume that the distribution of errors is normal. Another difficulty with multiple regression analysis is that predicted values cannot be interpreted as probabilities. The logistic regression model directly estimates the probability of an event occurring; the parameters of the model are estimated using the maximum-likelihood method. That is, the coefficients that make our observed results most "likely" are selected. Since the logistic regression model is nonlinear, an iterative algorithm is necessary for parameter estimation.

As has already been mentioned, this method was chosen not so much for its predictive potential, as for its ability to define a model that shows the importance of various aspects that differentiate both the perception of rurality and the behavioural models of the young residents in the two different contexts. Concerning this, it should be pointed out how, the descriptive analysis allowed for giving importance to the presence of a dominating perception of the concept of rural based on the importance attributed, mainly by urban residents, to the element of landscape.

Results- In this paper only a small fraction of the collected data has been taken into consideration for demonstration purposes: the aim of the statistical model presented here is to provide a simple descriptive

summary of a part of the complex relationship between rural and urban residents. The specification of the logistic regression model highlights two main results of the study: in which is characterized by a diffuse SME (Small and Medium Enterprises) industrial development and by a consequent widespread economic stability, there is a large common base of consumer and other behaviours shared by both the rural and urban residents. Many variables were not included in the model because of the high level of homogeneity in the responses of rural and urban residents. For example, the ownership of goods like cars or TV sets and Internet access were so widespread as not to be meaningful for lifestyles. The income indicator itself did not make any significant difference between the two groups taken into consideration; on the contrary, other aspects of lifestyles varied greatly between rural and urban residents, in particular the ownership of a cellular phone, the places where food shopping was done and the ways in which free time was spent.

Only 116 cases were included in the analysis, 54 cases were rejected because of missing data. Data processing terminated with the definition of a final equation in which 9 of the initial 33 have been included on the base of maximum-likelihood function using the Backward Stepwise method. That is, the model starts with all of the variables and then, at each step, variables are evaluated for entry and removal. The score statistic, the likelihood ratio statistic in this case, is used to determine whether or not variables should be added to the model and only the coefficients that make the observed results most “likely” are selected.

The coefficients of the logistic regression equation that show a greater capacity to explain the complexity of relations between rural and urban residents are those related to the cellular phone, owned more frequently by the rural residents, the higher frequency of food shopping at local farms, the higher frequency of spending for comic books and the higher number of visits to discotheques by rural residents who, at the same time, spend more frequently for music products. The odds ratio, in the column labelled, shows a change of 6.5189 in odds for the variable CELL for a case in which the variable increases by 1, which means that this variable makes a relevant contribution to the probability of rural residence; this result underlines the importance of this means of communication in rural zones.

The second variable, in order of contribution to the probability of rural residence, is GAAZAGR with an odds ratio of 2.4563, which indicates, for rural more than for urban residents, the relevance of farms as places where food shopping is done. The negative coefficient of the variable MOTO 351, for which a value of 1 indicates ownership and the value of 0 indicates not owning one, shows that the probability of rural residence is associated with a low value of this indicator, that is, in particular, with not owning a motorcycle greater than 350 cc.

The positive coefficient of the variable DISCOTEC shows that the higher the number of visits to discotheques, the higher the probability of rural residence. The coefficient for NO IND is negative, indicating that the higher the perception of rurality as an area with few factories, the lower the probability of rural residence. This result could be explained by a stereotyped vision of the rural world on the part of young people who reside in urban areas and who identify rurality with a lack of industrial activity, more so than those residents of the rural zones who, probably thanks to the above-mentioned widespread SME industrial development, notice this element less.

Applying this to a student who doesn't own a motorcycle with more than 350 cc., owns a cellular phone, goes to the discotheque at least four times a month, buys magazines three times a month, buys comic books once a month, buys music compact discs or tapes four times a month, whose family sometimes buys food at a local farm and often at a hypermarket, does not think that rural areas are characterized by an absence of factories, we find. Based on this estimate, we would predict that the student is likely to reside in a rural area. In fact, cases with a predicted probability of 0.5 or greater are classified as having rural residence.

The percentage of correct classification is an indicator of a satisfactory capacity of the model to operate a diversification of the sample in relation to residence. As points out, “it is not necessary or indeed likely that such significant groupings will articulate strongly distinctive representation”. Indeed, considering the perception of rurality, we noticed a dominating perception based on the importance attributed to the landscape by both groups of rural and urban residents; on the other hand, we found rival representation concerning some less relevant elements, such as the lack of factories, which still contribute in a significant way to classify the sample students in relation to their residence. Our results have shown that similar dominant perceptions of rurality can be associated with different lifestyles and that there is only a partial homogeneity of the aspects of life between rural and urban environment.

Conclusion

What we have attempted to show is how academic analysis and its subject, the concept of rurality and the rural-urban relationship, can be linked, and, to do so we have put together some notions about the representation of rurality and some aspects of the lifestyles highlighted by an important part of the population: the young. The analysis allowed us to begin to delineate the complex concept of rurality among young people residing in different territorial contexts: urban and rural. We verified the presence both of elements common to the two groups and of differentiating factors. An important element in common in the two groups was the tendency to interpret the rural in terms of landscape. Also common to both groups was the ownership of goods like cars, Internet access and TV sets. On the contrary, some other elements, such as lifestyles and consumption, although partially represented by the variables utilized in this first phase of the study, show a clear differentiation. Those elements which made the most difference in the perception of rurality and the behaviour of the young people interviewed, were those relative to the indication of lack of factories as identifying elements of rural areas, owning a cellular phone, the places where food shopping is done and the ways in which free time is spent.

These differences in evaluation and behaviour, as demonstrated by the model, can be traced to the subjects' residence in urban or rural areas. We present our results in the belief that an understanding of the idea of rurality and of the spending behaviour of young people can be of great help in directing policies towards an integrated and sustainable rural development in which the young are keenly involved in local decision-making and in the politics of their place, in this way becoming more integrated in the processes of local rural development.

References

1. BLANC M. (1997) La ruralise: diversity des approches. *Economic Rurally* 242,5-12.
2. BODIGUEL M. (1986) *Le Rural en question*, L. Harmattan, Paris.
3. EUROPEAN COMMISSION (1997) *Situation and Outlook: Rural developments*, CAP 2000 working document of the Directorate-General of Agriculture (DG VI).
4. GILBERT J. (1982) Rural theory: the grounding of rural sociology, *Rural sociology* 47, 609- 633.
5. HALFACREE K. H. (1993) Locality and Social Representation: Space, Discourse and Alternative Definitions of the Rural, *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1.
6. HOGGART K., BULLER H., BLACK R., (1995) *Rural Europe. Identity and Change*, Arnold, London.
7. MATTHEWS A. M. (1988) Variation in the conceptualization and measurement of rurality: conflicting findings on the elderly widowed, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 4, 141-150.
8. MOSCOVICI S. (1981) On social representation, in Forgas J. (ed.) *Social Cognition Perspectives on Everyday Understanding*, Academic Press, London.
9. SCHUTZ A. (1967) *The phenomenology of the Social World*, North Western U.P., Evanston.
10. SCHUTZ A. (1970) *On Phenomenology and Social Representation*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.