

Is the Counterurbanization Process a Chaotic Concept in Academic Literature?

Carlos Ferrás Sexto¹

Received: February 2009 | Revised: April 2009 | Accepted: April 2009

Abstract

Counterurbanization has been considered as a chaotic concept in the academic literature. It entails demographic movement and deconcentration in some urban areas and appears to be a new process of population's spatial distribution and the definition of a new settlement pattern which may exceed the Central Place Theory. The results of this process and demographic movement have led to societal diversification and even to the emergence of new classes in the countryside and new urban-rural relationships. We can ask ourselves if there are similarities to the Theory of Even Polycentric Development and if counterurbanization is really an opportunity for peripheral and rural areas. Academic literature about the development of the new economy tied to the III Technological Revolution demonstrates that the obstacle within economic development of spatial dimension and geographical distance is abating. In such circumstances it is not surprising that both problems and opportunities arise when it comes to making territory planning policies. This paper focuses on analyzing the international scientific literature on counterurbanization -particularly that of Anglosaxon and Latin-America countries- with an aim to contribute to the search of meaning in the arguments which support the definition of counterurbanization and to foster its research.

Key words: counterurbanization, return migration, urban-rural relationships, settlement systems.

Introduction

The emergence of the concept of counterurbanization versus suburbanization is recent within international academic literature (Mitchell, 2004); however the process to which it refers is not, given that the Anglophone world claim that counterurbanization was observed in the English settlements of the 19th century (Pooley and Turnbull, 1996).

Berry (1976) speaks of counterurbanization as a phenomenon that begun in the USA in the seventies to label the process against that of urbanisation, that is to say, in front of the classic process of urbanisation that entailed centripetal population movement and economic flows towards the main cities and large metropolitan areas, begins an opposite flow, of centrifugal movements from the great cities to the small urban and rural settlements.

The arguments of counterurbanization are a step ahead of traditional theories like that of "Central Place" and "Size-Range", based on a hierarchical organisation of settlements and the demographic and economic prominence. Counterurbanization comes to represent a reverse of the demographic and economic flows from the larger to the smaller,

in the settlement systems of the most developed countries (Berry, 1976; Fielding, 1982).

We can ask ourselves if there are similarities to the Theory of Even Polycentric Development (Copus, 2001) and if counterurbanization is really an opportunity for peripheral and rural areas; counterurbanization and the "Aespatial Peripherality (Copus, 2001)" are linked to the development of communication and transport infrastructures, to the progress of light manufacturing and with the technological change in the areas of information and communication technologies. Academic literature about the development of the new economy tied to the III Technological Revolution demonstrates that the obstacle within economic development of spatial dimension and geographical distance is abating (Cairncross 2000, Toffler 2006, Friedman 2006).

Currently in Spain counterurbanization is a budding and controversial process; Arroyo (2001) maintains that it is apparent within population redistribution in large metropolitan areas, and points out the uncertainties of the concept; he also theorises regarding its reach and introduces reasonable doubts regarding urban hierarchy and the centre-periphery relations that seem to be becoming

¹ Geography Department, University of Santiago de Compostela, Plaza Universidad 1, 15782. Santiago de Compostela, Spain; e-mail: carlos.ferras@usc.es

less hierarchical and multipolar within the Spanish city system.

The empirical investigations of residential redistribution in Spain began to arise in the second half of the 1980's in a very localised way. In Spanish academic literature from the seventies there are studies about the growth in temporary occupation or second homes in certain rural areas on the periphery of large Spanish cities like Bilbao, Madrid or Barcelona (Ortega, 1975; Valenzuela, 1976; Gómez, 1978). During the early part of the eighties studies continued on the process of urbanisation in relation to the population concentration and industrial activity in the cities (Rodríguez, 1983), which is doubtlessly related to the delayed industrialisation of Spain; Spain in the sixties was in the heat of industrialist-urban apogee, whilst the United States and Great Britain were already experiencing a process of decentralisation within industry and population. The studies on counterurbanization were unpublished in Spain, although they were beginning to study the processes of suburban decentralisation in the municipalities on the periphery of Madrid (García, 1982). The oldest study is by Allende (1983) who presented the urban declivity in the United States and Great Britain as an experience that could be developed and learned from in Spain.

The later empirical investigations, during the second half of the eighties, were fundamentally centred in demonstrating the decentralisation of companies towards rural areas, which happened in the seventies in Catalonia according to Belil (1990), in Asturias according to Benito (1991) and in Madrid according to Pardo (1991), or to the settlements of less than 1,500 inhabitants, according to Ogando, Pedrosa and Fernandez (1989), which encouraged the appearance of migratory flows of people who left the large urban areas to go to other smaller settlements, which had already been demonstrated by Bernabé and Albertos (1986), who confirmed, like Moreno (1987), that Spain was in the initial phase of counterurbanization characterised by the increase in population of the intermediate and small cities. On the other hand, Spain was not part of the urban crisis experienced by Europe and the United States as Ferrer showed (1992). The findings of foreign investigators in Spanish publications are many, demonstrating processes like that of urban decline, new technology diffusion, population redistribution, etc. in its respective countries (Frey, 1988; Stöhr, 1987; Charreyron, 1987; Hall, 1987; Chesire and Hay, 1985). In the case of Spain, we can emphasise based on the albeit insufficient accrued information the following publications: Domingo et al. (1990), in which he studied the population redistribution in the province of Valencia from 1975 to 1986, discovering a migratory current of young families with high levels of education and pensioners, who left the big city to move to smaller settlements on their peripheries; and Bel (1985) who distinguishes a growth period of old regressive towns in the province of Murcia from 1981 to 1985, although not referring to processes of counterurbanization but to the freezing of previous depopulation due to an economical crisis. The urban-industrial development of small Spanish rural and agricultural towns is made evident (Rodríguez, 1997; Ferrás, 2000; Vera, Badía and Pal-larés, 2003; Velasco, 2006; Enríquez and Rodríguez, 2007).

In their part, Torres (2006), Nel.lo (2001), Angelet (2000), Font (1999), Sánchez (1998), Monclús (1998), Lopez (1995), and Borja (1990) demonstrate the decentralisation of employment and residence in the metropolitan areas of Madrid, País Vasco and Barcelona. With Campesino, Troitiño and Campos (1995) it remained evident that there were traditional tendencies of population increase in the periphery of Spanish cities in general and, recently, Morén and Solana (2006) evaluated the actual situation of return emigration towards rural areas and small Spanish cities.

In Latin America there is a lack of academic literature that analyzes or evaluates the presence of counterurbanization. Academic literature begins to notice important changes in the process of urban development in the seventies (de Mattos, 2002) and it speaks of expanded metropolisation and the impacts of globalisation (Parnreiter, 2005), or of rural suburbanisation (Armijo, 2000). They also observed tendencies of demographic deconcentration that translated into a large expansion of the periphery in respect to the centre, and migratory flows from the large to the small settlements.

All this was related to the development in the Latin American cities of agglomeration diseconomy, political-administrative decentralisation, interest for the environment, commuting, second residences, changes in technological telecommunications and urban-rural perception and control on migratory movements. The pollution and crime or social segregation are acting as repelling factors in the large Latin American cities, which have begun to see migratory movements from the urban centre to the periphery or to smaller urban settlements. In Mexico, Graizbord and Mina (1993) demonstrated that all except the federal district experienced a greater demographic vitality. Delgado (1993) analyses the formation of a region in Querétaro on the basis of the study of commuting students and workers who daily travel up to 60 kilometres. Corona and Luque (1992), Velásquez and Arroyo (1992), Brambila (1990), Negrete (1990) and Graizbord (1984) demonstrated, on different scales and with different approaches, the relative growth of medium sized and small cities over metropolitan areas during the seventies and eighties, and, in greater or smaller measurement, maintained that they were referring to the traditional rural-urban migratory movements in favour of urban-urban and urban-rural. As is demonstrated in Albuquerque, by Mattos and Jordan (eds., 1990) Latin America and of course Mexico do not adhere to the margin of change that the technological revolution and the productive reconstruction of the end of the 20th century generated in terms of development and urbanization; this is not something exclusive to the more developed regions of the world. It is possible to interpret that the hints of counterurbanization in Spain and, to a lesser extent in Latin America, are shown in the post-industrial transition of their systems of settlements, as warned Precado Ledo (1986), or in the impact of globalisation (de Mattos, 1998) when recognizing the existence of the population redistribution process and the industrial activities in medium and small cities to the cost of large cities, and consequent metropolitan expansion. Or even as a complement to that of Precado and de Mattos, counterurbanization is shown by Caravaca and Méndez (1995) with respect to the productive-territorial re-

structuring as warned in the eighties and nineties tendencies of redistribution of activities and employment between the metropolitan areas and cities and smaller range settlements; the industrial diffusion brings as a consequence the decline of the nuclear city in favour of the metropolitan region (Caravaca and Méndez, 2003). In this we see the results of an investigation centred on one hand in the classification and analysis of the theoretical and empirical investigations which, according to my criteria, could to date be the most significant of those about counterurbanization and related phenomena, and on the other hand, in uniting the different theoretical bodies that have tried to interpret the social and territorial changes implied by counterurbanization. We try with this to draw attention to the need for detailed investigations on counterurbanization in Spain and Latin America and to show, critically, the theoretical and empirical antecedents that exist in the Anglophone cultural scope.

Methodological questions

For this we managed an abundance of literature gathered during the last ten years from the bibliographical foundations in social sciences from University of Santiago de Compostela, University of Guadalajara in Mexico and, mainly, the Boole Library of the University College Cork of Ireland, and in the British Library of London; all of it supported and complemented with the investigation in the databases of scopus (see <http://www.scopus.com/scopus/home.url>). From the methodological point of view it was important to establish clear criteria of organization, because the handling of this varied bibliography presented serious problems in ordering and synthesising different contributions from each author; disadvantages that we have tried to surpass applying three basic criteria:

- A – A spatial criteria** which has allowed me to arrange the bibliography according to its origin; in a first scale differentiating between the United States and Europe and, later, by states and regions.
- B – A chronological criteria** grouping works by decades, sometimes even distinguishing between first and second half of the decade, with the purpose of knowing the changes of approach and intentions. The aligid period of bibliographical production with respect to counterurbanization and related terms is tied to the period of 1980 to 2000; nevertheless, it was possible to find bibliographical documentation from the sixties and seventies. The period of 2000 to 2006 is a point of inflection and production slowed down considerably due to the controversy provoked by the end in academic literature.
- C – A third topic criteria** that has allowed me to distinguish between the monographic studies made in some states or regions, of the studies made on an international scale through comparative analyses. This distinction has been made to show the differences that exist between both types of analysis. The monographic analyses show the presence of counterurbanization in different regions or states, and comparative international analyses offer a general view which is the true scale of the changes and common characteristics.

The application of these criteria has allowed us to carry out a potentially complex critical analysis of the bibliography. The results follow. In the first instance we examine diverse monographic studies within states and regions; later we will widen our point of view and look at studies which focus on an international comparative level. Then we will analyse the social-spatial theories which try to explain and interpret counterurbanization, equally from the urban world as from the rural world, to finish up with a critical summary.

Regional monographical studies

Social investigators agree in indicating that the process of urban-rural change belongs to the developed countries of the western world, showing different but also basically similar experiences in the United States and Europe.

In the United States during the second half of the seventies empirical investigations were made that demonstrated the existence of the urban decline through processes like counterurbanization, highlighting amongst others Berry (1976), Berry and Dahmann (1977), Bradshaw and Blakely (1979); a process which it would appear was not anticipated in the Sixties, Hodge confirmed that in the United States rural depopulation would continue in favour of metropolitan concentration (Hodge, 1966). These investigations demonstrated the demographic growth in metropolitan areas at the cost of non-metropolitan areas; non-metropolitan areas coincided with rural areas. These authors were in accordance on the reverse decline of the metropolitan areas and start of the migratory flow towards non-metropolitan areas in the sixties, although they observed an acceleration of the process in the first half of the seventies.

The exception to the general characteristic studies based on demographic statistics that were made in this period is the global analysis that Bradshaw and Blakely (1979) performed in the rural part of California; they discovered a process of change in rural California that began in the fifties and continued into the seventies, showing us rural development in advanced society in which the service sector grew strongly to the detriment of the industrial sector, producing a larger demographic and economic growth in rural areas greater than that in the large cities, at the same time as the levels of rural schooling grew and the arrival of the social wellbeing to the rural world was declared. In the first half of the eighties empirical investigations descended in their scale of analysis, and began to proliferate those of a thematic character. They are, amongst others, the studies by Friendland (1982), Brown and Wardwell (1984), Fuguitt and Johansen (1984), Campbell and Garkovich (1984) and Ritcher (1985); in these years the previous space division is clarified and they use a new categorisation that differentiates between the metropolitan areas, the adjacent non-metropolitan areas and the non-adjacent non-metropolitan areas, with which they can clarify the process of counterurbanization in relation to the peripheral suburbanisation of the large urban areas, whilst giving continuity to the previous affirmations that maintained the greater growth of the non-metropolitan areas in relation to metropolitan areas.

Counterurbanization is seen as a more general process that implies rural rebirth relating this, from a behaviourist perspective, with the proliferation of anti-urban feelings produced by the deterioration of quality of life in large cities, with the return of the population to a rural environment and the beginning of a new rural future.

Here we highlight Fuguitt and Johansen (1984) regarding the demographic and economic changes experienced by settlements of less than 2,500 inhabitants in the United States during the period 1950-1980, showing the deep demographic change, regularities and characteristics and growth tendencies. It is a rigorous analysis based in elaborate and detailed statistics, as much about the population and its characteristics as the economic activities (retail trade, activity sectors, employment, etc.). It analysed the planning policies and their consequences, and human relations between the immigrants and natives in American villages and rural towns. In their conclusions they spoke of the future of the American rural space showing rural industrialisation as an alternative to the urban de-industrialisation, but did not make any predictions, instead asking questions like 'How will the Information Revolution affect the system of settlements?' 'And the increase in mobility of the population?'. During the second half of the eighties and beginning of the nineties, the study of counterurbanization continued through thematic investigations. The empirical investigations include Wilson (1987), Barkley (1988), Long and Deare (1988), Frey (1988), Suárez-Villa (1986), Gordon, Kumar and Richardson (1989), Plane (1989), Rudzitis (1989), Sinclair (1988), Goodenough (1992). In these investigations different points of view begun to form about the true dimension of urban decline and counterurbanization, in such a way that whilst some investigators continue to analyse the process itself, others begun to put in doubt the continuity of the process, as do Long and Deare (1988) who confirm that in second half of the eighties they saw a greater growth in the metropolitan areas than in non-metropolitan areas, and the beginning of Post-Counterurbanization. Other authors such as Rudzitis (1989) confirm that the non-metropolitan growth is spatially selective, and that not all non-metropolitan areas have the same opportunities.

From an economist's perspective, Plane (1989) found no causal relation between changes in sectorial employment and rural population return from 1950 to 1980, and confirms that these movements have been declining since the mid-eighties. In a more recent publication, Goodenough (1992) confirmed that in California the strong growth of the medium and small settlements due to environmental impact was being questioned. From this we question if the process of counterurbanization is reversing in the United States, although there is no agreement in this. Nevertheless new case studies have appeared in international academic literatures which demonstrate urban-rural migratory flows and their impact in Sierra Nevada-California (Loeffer and Steinicke, 2007).

Other empirical studies to highlight in America are those of Canada from second half of the eighties, highlighting Stabler (1987), Davies (1990) who maintain that there is a recovery of the metropolitan areas in recent years, which is in keeping with the results of the most recent investigations being carried out in the United States.

In summary, the empirical investigations in the United States and Canada have become more detailed through the years, they have descended on the analysis scale going from demonstrating the existence of process based on general demographic statistics, to analyse its genesis and repercussions in the rural and urban world being basing itself on more concrete and precise methodologies.

With regards to Europe, counterurbanization was first discovered in Great Britain. Hall (1981, 1983) maintains that the European experience was later than that of the United States; in the first case urban deconcentration reached its height in the seventies and in the second case in the sixties. In other European countries like Germany, Spain, Portugal or Italy the metropolitan areas continued growing in the sixties.

Literature about the urban decline in Great Britain has evolved like in the United States, moving from general focus to well contrasted empirical studies. In a selection of the more relevant empirical studies the following authors are highlighted: Cloke (1978) and Grafton (1982) demonstrated the existence of a migratory flow in the rural remote areas in Britain at the end of the sixties that peaked in the seventies. Other later authors, like Robert and Randolph (1983), Dean, Shaw, Brown, Perry and Thorneycroft (1984), Jones, Caird, Berry and Dewharst (1986) and Champion (1986), continued to study the process of counterurbanization started in the seventies, demonstrating its continuity. Through these studies important theoretical contributions of the understanding of urban-rural change were also made which we will have opportunity to see in later pages, mainly in the Highlands of Scotland and in Cornwall. Later investigations, at the end of the eighties, began to give importance to the dimensions of the process of change. Champion (1987) confirmed that the British metropolitan areas already knew a much smoother demographic decline at the same time as rural areas population and economic growth slowed down. On the other hand Weekley (1988) demonstrates in a parochial level study that counterurbanization did not always mean a population increase in rural areas, because it could represent "geriatrification" of villages due to the predominance of retired immigrants. Both authors contributed new elements to understand and explain in their own measure the rural rebirth associated with counterurbanization, and perhaps to pinpoint the tendency of the phenomenon in the nineties.

On the other hand, summaries about the process of urbanization in Great Britain were made. D. Clark (1989) published the first book on urban decline with a consultation manual approach for university students, which created academic recognition of counterurbanization. This work consists of a theoretical and an empirical part based on statistics of the loss of population and employment in the main cities of Great Britain, and its contributions to the in-depth knowledge of the process of urban decline are low, the only novelty being the political interpretation of the process; it maintains, in respect of Great Britain, that the loss of power with the abolition of the "County Borough", which were its old control and administration systems, passed in 1974 by the conservative government, decisively influenced the decline of the cities; the author in his conclusions positions

himself in favour of once again harnessing the urban areas from the British organs of political decision. From their perspective, Champion and Watkins (1991) show the return of the people from the city to the country in the seventies and eighties as characterised by the rural depopulation in favour of the urban areas during the twentieth century; there are case studies in South Wales in which counterurbanization is coastal (Sant and Simons, 1993). Urban decline is explained in relation to the technical advances that implied the improvement of communications and the rural industrialisation process. In Ireland, a country with a lower level of development to that of the United States or Great Britain but that is included in generic terms in the Anglophone cultural scope, in the most recent decades counterurbanization was the object of study of different investigators. Rural rebirth in relation to counterurbanization was observed by Brady (1988) and Gillmor and Jeffers (1987); the former demonstrated that the centre of Dublin lost population to its rural and suburban areas, and the latter discovered a strong population and economic increase in the small towns of County Louth between 1961 and 1981 due to the phenomenon of return emigration. Grimes (1987) studied the growth of non-agricultural employment in the traditionally more rural areas of Donegal, Leitrim and Sligo, identifying a double process: of return immigration adults and emigration of young people. Coward (1989) and Cawley (1990) studied the demographic tendencies from 1970 to 1986, identifying the strong rural and suburban growth of the seventies, simultaneous to the greater relative growth of the more dynamic and prosperous western counties in relation to traditional Eastern ones. Hourihan (1992) showed the fact that presently there continues a strong demographic loss in the three main Irish cities, Dublin, Cork and Limerick, which started in the seventies to the benefit of suburban spaces. From the point of spatial distribution of industrial employment, Brunt (1989), speaking of the spatial change process in Ireland, observed that from the sixties to the eighties the majority of new businesses chose urban centres of less than 5,000 inhabitants. Finally, in the second half of the eighties and the nineties studies appeared on the process of counterurbanization in different European countries amongst which we should mention Court (1985) in Denmark, Ogden (1985), Anglade (1992) and Soumagne et al. (1992) in France, Dematteis and Petsimeris (1989) and Muscará (1991) in Italy, etc., whose common denominator is putting in evidence urban decline from demographic and economic statistics, in some cases like a mature process, in the case of France, and in others as an incipient process.

International comparative studies

International comparative studies are scarcer than monographic ones, despite the great importance that they possess for knowing the true dimension of the population redistribution process and the economic activities between the urban and rural world. This is related to the great difficulty that investigations of this type present with socioeconomic, political and cultural diversity of different countries and

regions. Most of these international studies make comparisons from demographic macromagnitudes that demonstrate population movements on three different levels: at an intraurban level, from the city centre to the suburbs; at an interurban level, from the larger to the smaller settlements, and at a regional level, from the more populated and economically developed central regions, to the less populated peripheral regions traditionally with less economic potential. Although, as we see next, there is no shortage in detailed investigations on very localised regions in which they study the genesis and impact of counterurbanization. The first studies of these characteristics were made in Europe at the beginning of the eighties, highlighting those made by: Fielding (1982, 1986) and Van den Berg (1982, 1987). Both studies agreed with the spatial framework, based on Western Europe, but they differ in the analysis, scale and focus. Van den Berg (1982, 1987) in collaboration with other investigators studied, at intraurban and interurban levels, the growth and decline of the large urban areas of Europe from 1950 to 1975. It was based on very general demographic tendency data to propose from that point a cyclical model that differentiates four stages in the evolution of metropolitan areas: Urbanisation, Suburbanisation, Disurbanisation and Re-urbanisation. He studied the urban development of 100 metropolitan areas pertaining to Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Holland, Sweden and Switzerland; of which 23 were in the stage of disurbanisation from 1970-1975. In the conclusion he confirms that it is necessary to cut this tendency to avoid the high economic costs that it entails; he says that it is necessary that the planning policies promote reurbanisation (fourth phase) looking for solutions to the problem of traffic, improving the quality of the houses, finding new houses in the urban regions, etc. He advises that the ruining of urban culture of the 20th century should be avoided.

Fielding (1982, 1986) studies at an interurban level counterurbanization in Western Europe during the seventies, understanding by counterurbanization the migratory flows of people who leave the large agglomerations for the smaller settlements; for this a statistical index relating emigration and population density should be created, obtaining positive results, which is to say that emigration is greater when the population density is greater, in all countries of Western Europe with the exception of Italy, Austria, Norway, Portugal and Spain. He also studied in great depth the relationship between migration and the size of the settlements in France from 1954 to 1982, showing that the main cities become depopulated in favour of rural spaces and small cities: those that grew most were those that had a population between 15,000 and 1,000 inhabitants. He concludes confirming and presenting a model of "Migration and size of the settlements" in which immigration increases progressively from the fifties to the eighties as the demographic size of the settlements descends.

Another important comparative study, different from previous in the high level of detail and concretion of its analysis, was that by Perry, Dean and Brown (1986). It studies the process of counterurbanization in the "Celtic regions": Cornwall, French Britain, the Highlands and islands of Scotland, the western region of Ireland and the rural areas

of Wales, and in California, although it fundamentally oriented its interests towards the region of Cornwall, in south-west England, where there is an in depth empirical study. In this study we can see that counterurbanization is not a homogenous or uniformed process in neither time nor space, to which it doesn't have a universal explanation but entails several processes that vary from one spatial scope to another in terms of economic, social and cultural characteristics, etc. In the conclusion it confirms that the models only exist in the minds of the theorists. Nevertheless, Perry, Dean and Brown define the main demographic dimensions of counterurbanization with common characteristics for all of the regions studied:

- 1st the return of the population to rural environment (re-population).
- 2nd the inversion in the net migration flow. After a long period of population loss there will follow a period of growth.
- 3rd the influx of economically active immigrants to rural areas.

Other investigators also clarified the universal character of the urban decline from macromagnitudes: Cloke (1988) demonstrates processes of counterurbanization in Great Britain, Canada, the United States and Australia, but points out that in these countries there are stagnant areas at the expense of counterurbanization. In addition, Frey (1988) demonstrated that demographic deconcentration is not a universal process in all of the developed countries.

For his part, Champion (1989) showed a study of counterurbanization at an international level, but on a greater scale and with a different approach from that of Perry, Dean and the Browns (1986) who studied population movement between settlements. In this study a comparative analysis is made at the level of various states of Western Europe, of the United States, Australia and Japan. A specialist for each country presents a diagnosis of counterurbanization of their own country, giving a variety of situations and different styles of work. The most interesting part of the work is a final chapter in which Champion makes a summary of the contributions of the different authors, showing the counterurbanization process from three different viewpoints: a temporary anomaly, a lasting tendency and a transitory phase; that basically they agree with the theoretical interpretations acknowledged by Bourne, 1980; Berry, 1976; and Van den Berg, 1982. Basically, in the thesis of Perry, Dean and Brown (1986) is reinforced in which counterurbanization has still not reached universal status, and that its characteristics and genesis vary from one state to another or from one region to another. More recently Majerin (2006) carried out a study by surveying new rural residents in communities of Holland, United Kingdom and Germany, identifying the different reasons and lifestyles of the people and families who leave the city for the countryside, which are mainly ideological, ecological and dissatisfaction, etc.

After this we can confirm that counterurbanization is found in most societies of the western world, in Europe as in America, to the benefit of certain rural areas who have known a period of economic development and demographic growth following a phase of decline. These urban-rural

changes are initially related to the new types of diffused urbanisation and they represent the success of industrial urbanisation. The empirical studies on this matter have changed their scale of analysis from the use of macro-magnitudes, mostly demographical, to the carrying out of localised investigations using micro-magnitudes, equally demographic as much as socioeconomic or other characters, concerning themselves with the consequences and impacts that the overcoming of traditional relations between the rural and urban world can bring. Social investigators have been interested in studying the process of change since the seventies. The common denominator of the studies is the concern with analysis of migratory tendencies which invert their direction, to change from rural-urban to urban-rural, allowing the development of general theoretical models, which from my point of view could be premature. The rural-urban change associated with counterurbanization does not appear to have been sufficiently investigated at an internationally comparative level. In most cases the empirical investigations have not been deep enough to explain the causes, consequences and dimensions of the process and associated change phenomenon, since their empirical arguments have been based on very general and almost always demographical statistical data.

In the following pages we will talk about the classification and analysis of the different spatial theories that try to explain counterurbanization.

The Theories

The change that classic urban-rural relations experienced from different interpretations or epistemological points of view, giving different, but not opposed explanations, according to the different scientific-ideological position of the investigators. The majority of these explanations are speculative, in that they tend to demonstrate empirical investigations, (D. Clark, 1989), and more so than strict theoretical positions are interpretations based on different approaches and paradigms. As shown by Vartiainen (1989) counterurbanization represents a theoretical challenge for geographic science when questioning the validity of the structural logic of the urban capitalist world. Nevertheless, other less optimistic visions like that of Spencer (1995) maintained that counterurbanization was a local phenomenon, only perceivable in concrete places, never generalised. Next we will examine the spatial-social theories of counterurbanization.

Ever since the phenomenon of demographic and economic regression of cities in favour of rural areas was identified, a theoretical debate was opened regarding which was the true dimension of the same and what was its explanation. The theories followed one another chronologically from second half of the seventies to the present day, some developed in the United States and others in Europe. The diversity of theories and interpretations doubtlessly presently serves to show the existence of a wide process of change in the migratory and economic flows that was generalised bit by bit in developed countries; also serving as an incentive for later investigators. It is possible to differentiate two different approaches in spatial interpretations

of counterurbanization: those made by urban investigators and those made by rural investigators; that in addition are two traditional approaches in social science.

A rapprochement of Anglophone literature on counterurbanization allows us to observe that most of the investigations are from and for urban space; all of them are based on analysis of the evolution of urban areas of developed countries. They are true interpretations of the change experienced by large urban areas and try to serve as explanatory marks of its evolution. The majority agree in the recognition of the existence of a current urban decline, but they conceive it from different points of view: from positions that see this phenomenon as a transitory phase towards urban rebirth (Van de Berg, 1982) to others who see it as a lasting trend (Berry, 1978) going through sceptical positions which see importance in urban decline confirming that it is no more than a statistical illusion (Gordon, 1979).

The investigations and theorisations from the rural viewpoints are fewer. In general, studies made from a rural approach mainly focus on demonstrating rural rebirth, rural regeneration or rural recovery (Cloke, 1985; Brandshaw and Blakely, 1979; Fuguitt and Johansen, 1984; Kaiser, 1990), although, unlike the studies with an urban approach, they are more concerned in empirical demonstrations and the impact represented by the arrival of culturally urban residents to the countryside, in reference to the cultural shock, change of habits, levels of acceptance, processes of segregation, etc. Recently the debate on counterurbanization acquired a more applied direction, as in case of Stockdale (2006) which assuming the importance of return immigration to the country asks about the impacts on the rural economic development, and confirms that it is not enough. In the following pages we will see the generic content and the basic characteristics of the different theoretical bodies.

The "Clean Break" or the rupture with the past

Its origin goes back to second half of the seventies in the United States, where we first saw the existence of a demographic and economic decline in large metropolitan areas. This interpretation is maintained by authors like Berry (1976), Vining and Kontuly (1978), and Fielding (1982); and is characterized by (19) maintaining that the decline marks the future as growth characterised the past. They make special emphasis in demonstrating the defects and environmental and social problems that are seen in urban areas: pollution, crime, racism, etc. showing them like factors of demographic expulsion towards the smaller settlements and rural areas of greater environmental quality and human relations.

They maintain that the process of demographic concentration and urbanisation that characterized industrialisation will not be repeated, since technological innovations and the improvement of the communications have opened a new phase in the evolution of the cities and in the hierarchy of the settlements. A redistribution of the population in an opposite direction to the classic process of concentration takes place, favouring population dispersion from the large cities to the small urban settlements or rural areas. They insist upon the existence of a change in the residential preferences of people and families who essentially take an anti-

urban direction, as well as emphasising the relaxing of the contrasts which traditionally separate the urban areas from the rural, fundamentally instigated by the improvement of communications and general increase in accessibility.

They reject the interpretation that maintains that the changes in the economic distribution of the population and economic activities constitute a temporary disturbance caused by the economic recession and they are identified with theses that maintain that the movement from Industrial Society to Post-industrial Society through the substitution of the industrial economies for the service and information technologies is taking place.

The "Spillover" or urban spilling

The interpretation of the "Spillover" or urban spilling is after the "Clean Break", its origins are with Gordon (1979) who did not accept the confirmations of urban decline and demographic deconcentration in a literal sense; he maintains that, to a large extent, it was a statistical illusion due to the variance of the limits of American metropolitan areas in the collection of statistical data (Burns, 1987).

This interpretation maintains that what happened is no more than a continuation of the past, that is to say, the continuation of the suburbanisation processes towards the periphery of the cities or a new suburbanisation in areas officially designated as rural. They consider it a decentralisation process that entails the reinstallation of people as much as of employment in the periphery of the urban areas due to the growth of its areas of influence in relation to the technical advances in transport and the increase of spatial accessibility. According to Champion (1989) this interpretation does not recognise counterurbanization and the only thing it demonstrates is the continuation of suburbanisation.

In any case, this interpretation allows us to glimpse certain doubts when it confirms that the most that could happen would be a temporary disturbance derived from the economic crisis of the seventies.

Spatial Cycles

The interpretation of spatial cycles occurs in Europe in the eighties thanks to Hall (1981) and Van de Berg (1982, 1987). These authors create true models of the evolution of urban areas, relating the states through which it passes with the level of economic development from the countries to which they belong. They directly relate to the states of development through a dialectic which maintains that growth is succeeded by decline and growth decline.

They recognize the existence of a process of urban decline and demographic deconcentration of the inhabitants and economic activities of large cities, but they do not recognize the process of counterurbanization the break from the past (Clean Break). They clearly distance themselves from the position of Berry (1976) when they confirm that the urban decline of some agglomerations.

They differentiate four successive stages in the process of urban development: Urbanisation, Suburbanisation, Disurbanisation and Reurbanisation. They avoid the concept of counterurbanization for the state of urban decline, equally when the centre and peripheral ring lose population, call-

ing it disurbanisation. They do not relate this process with the systems of settlements, and its interpretation is closer to the interpretation that relates urban decline with the economic crisis than with that of the rupture of the classic models of demographic concentration and urbanisation.

They emphasise that the public policies must come into play to halt urban decline and the process of deconcentration; confirming that in the past they concerned themselves with halting the urbanisation and concentration process to avoid territorial imbalance and excessive agglomerations. They see it as being down to the public powers to stimulate urban recovery.

They are fierce defenders of the city and the urban culture as one of the fundamental values of human society, and predict a stage of reurbanisation after the transitory decline. They consider urban decline to be transitory phase.

The Rural-Urban Continuum and Urbanisation of the Countryside

This theory is based on overcoming the rural-urban dichotomy based on the acknowledgement of the similarities of both spatial fields and the communities that live in them. Its origin goes back to the sixties when Pahl (1966) (see Clouth 1976, p. 71), from a sociological approach, confirmed that the differences between city and field and the rural and urban communities were more diverse every time. This affirmation was based on the observation of an opposite process to that of population concentration in the cities after WWII, when in many developed countries the inhabitants of the cities began to move to the country in search of homes and recreation areas. Pahl (1966) deemed the places where these ex-city dwellers settled as parts of the country that were mentally urbanised but physically rural, in a study that he made on this process in Great Britain; in this study he observed that the proliferation of the second residence implied the movement of urban inhabitants to the country, that Pahl already designated “farmer-workers”, turning the rural areas into spaces inhabited by “commuters” that travelled daily or temporarily to the city or the country. The second residence and the “farmer-workers” acted like generators of the countryside urbanisation. In relation to all this a general deconcentration of the city to the country takes place thanks to the improvement and efficiency of the individual and collective transport, to the increase in mobility of people with the steep increase in the number of private vehicles and the improvement of road networks and communications in general.

This theory maintains that there is a rural-urban dichotomy as far as the morphology and landscape, but with very imprecise limits between both; the open spaces, the areas of cultivation, the settlements of small dimensions, the morphology of the houses, etc. are characteristics which differentiate the country from the city. The Rural-Urban Continuum is culturally manifested from the urban scope which extends across the countryside. It produces a generalised diffusion of the urban activities and ideas within the space.

From a more spatial point of view, although without abandoning the proposals of Urban-Rural Continuum of Pahl (1966), Clout (1976) interpreted the economic, social and land use changes in the developed world as the urbanisation of

the countryside.(22) He confirmed that you cannot define the rural by the agricultural since the urban, industry and service economies activities each time are present more in rural areas, either directly with its physical installation or indirectly through the pendular movements of population that reside in the countryside and commute to the city. Nevertheless, Clout confirms that the most appropriate thing spatially is to conceive a scale more so than a dichotomy to classify the population by its urban or rural characteristics.

In summary, these interpretations are based on valid reasoning and represent the overcoming in the seventies of the view that rural and urban were opposed. Pahl, from a sociological approach, interpreted the changes in rural areas as the invasion by urban culture of the countryside, and created the Theory of Rural-Urban Continuum to show that each time the differences were less. The spatial component was introduced by Clout confirming that the most correct thing was to speak of a process of countryside urbanisation that gradually manifested an increase in distance from the city.

The Cyclical Model of Lewis and Maund

The Cyclical Model of Lewis and Maund (1976) represents an advance in the interpretation of social change which brings with it the process of urbanisation of the countryside. It criticizes the point of view of the Rural-Urban Continuum as being simplistic and generic, because it considers the social change as a process of diffusion of new ideas and attitudes perceiving society as a homogenous one without considering the geographic location. Lewis and Maund think that the diffusion is socially and spatially selective, and consequently produces different aspirations and codes of conduct based on the differences in social class and life cycle.

They created a model to interpret the evolution of the rural communities combining socioeconomic, cultural and demographic factors. In this model there are three successive stages: Depopulation, Population and Repopulation.

The first stage of “Depopulation” is characterized primarily by emigration, which affects the youngest and most qualified people of rural society, who move to the city creating an aged demographic structure, a very loose perspective of economic development and a pyramid social structure, as well as contributing to the maintenance of the traditional value system with few possibilities of change in the communities of origin. This stage occurs in the countryside at the same time that the cities feel the urbanisation and industrialisation process, offering employment opportunities in the secondary and tertiary sector to which rural people aspire. The migratory movements are country-city.

Later, in accordance with post-industrial era, follows a stage of “Population”, characterised by the population increase in rural communities in relation to a migratory flow of urban population that is at an early stage of the life cycle, altering the economic, social and demographic structures. The new immigrants live in rural areas, but they maintain their urban employment and they tend to be relatively young and well-off, often with middle class lifestyles. Generally they do not mix with natives and show no interest in integrating themselves in local society; there is social segregation.

In the third stage called “Repopulation” we see the pulling out of individuals or entire families who are in an advanced

stage of the life cycle, contributing to a demographic ageing and an increase in middle class residents in the countryside, which continues to increase urban dependency. The segregation processes remains, maintaining the demographic tendencies of the previous state and the social structure in expansion. When rural societies know these stages they change their systems of values, going from the merely local or rural, present in the stage of Depopulation, to the urban ones of the stages of population and repopulation. Lewis and Maund consider the urban value system dominant in society, corresponding to the stages of Population and Repopulation the diffusion of the same in rural areas.

In summary, the model of Lewis and Maund interprets the process of urbanisation in the countryside from a different perspective than from the models of Dichotomy/Rural-Urban Continuum, when considering the spatially and socially selective process of urban diffusion. It represents the change from the traditional focus of rural investigators who studied the physical appearance, size of settlements and use of land, morphology and landscape, to studying socio-economic structures, human behaviour and system of values.

Counterurbanization from a rural perspective of Cloke

In 1985 Cloke made an interpretation of counterurbanization from a rural perspective. For this he makes a differentiation of two different spatial scopes: the rural areas submitted to a direct urban pressure which identifies it with the suburbs, and remote rural areas; the latter being where he finds meaning and content of counterurbanization that is otherwise considered synonymous with rural regeneration.

He differentiates a dynamic of Depopulation-Repopulation in remote areas, identifying the phase of Depopulation, the same as the interpretations of the Rural-Urban Continuum and the Cyclical Model of Lewis and Maund, with the industrialisation process that the concentration of population and urbanisation brings. The second phase or Repopulation is associated with the arrival of the Post-industrial Society in the area of communications, new technologies, new industries, etc. and the process of demographic deconcentration in the large urban areas, showing a migratory flow to the rural areas.

According to Cloke the repopulation of remote rural areas can be explained by two scales: a macro-scale which refers explicitly to the general changes experienced by advanced societies, like the decentralisation of industries and services, new lifestyles, greater distances in the pendular movements of people, generalized increase of accessibility levels, etc, but this not always is fulfilled. The novel contribution of Cloke is the explanation of counterurbanization on the basis of a series of local factors which act like elements of attraction of new inhabitants in remote rural areas, making it clear beforehand that the most attractive rural areas are those with the highest immigrant flow. These factors are the following:

1. The land market: the good prices are attractive in the eyes of the industries and the families who want to build themselves a new house, either a primary or secondary residence.
2. The environment and its quality.

3. The quality of the settlements: by which we mean aesthetically, degree of conservation, infrastructures, etc.
4. Property prices.
5. Social and community factors: social tranquillity, human relations, etc.

In addition Cloke makes a demographic reasoning that emphasises the importance that migratory movements have in population growth of developed countries. He confirms that the population increase in rural areas comes from the migratory balance, because natural growth tends to be null or negative.

Types of counterurbanization of Clare J.A. Mitchell

In a recent article published in the Journal of Rural Studies, Clare Mitchell (2004) undertook an attempt to order the concept of counterurbanization. From the point of view of existing bibliographies in Anglophone countries, she observes the existence of a great diversity in visions and interpretations of counterurbanization which has different meanings depending on the author and their subjectiveness. She observes how Halfacree (1994) describes counterurbanization as a chaotic concept in specialised literature. Mitchell (2004) speaks of three concepts to describe changes in spatial redistribution of the population:

- a. The counterurban model referring to overcoming of the classic model of industrial urbanisation and concentration in the large cities and which is related to postindustrialisation and dispersed development of the city and the metropolisation of rural space.
- b. The process of counterurbanization through which space is urbanised in a diffused way to the detriment of the rural landscape.
- c. The movement of counterurbanization referring to the demographic displacements in the system of settlements and the redistribution of population between large and small settlements.

From a demographic focus, Mitchell (2004) manages to differentiate three types of counterurbanization according to the social profile and the reasons that make people move from urban to rural areas: the ex-urbanization of families and individuals originally from the city who perceive a 'limited dream' of the countryside; "Displaced-Urbanization" of families and people who look for new jobs in rural environments, either young people with liberal professions or families with unemployed members who see job opportunities far from the city, or families who are attracted by the low land prices and the offer of lower prices properties than in the city.

Conclusions

We can reach the general conclusion that counterurbanization is known in different countries and regions of the developed western world, with the singularities and characteristics of each case, and we do not yet know the implications in developing countries and the recognition and conceptual concretion. We can say that it is a new explanatory paradigm of the urbanisation process; that is to say, the concentration of economic activities and population of the

industrial society is followed by the deconcentration of the same in post-industrial society, in relation to a structural and technological change in the developed economies and negative cultural predispositions of the urban population towards large agglomerations. The true dimension of the change phenomenon is currently a question of debate and investigation; it would seem that new re-urbanisation tendencies are being discovered in large cities.

The studies until now on counterurbanization or associated phenomena like urban decline or rural rebirth have fundamentally been elaborated from general demographic statistics, and it has fallen to Anglophone investigators to make theorisations on the matter. There is a need for more detailed studies, above all at a comparative level, which will give more information on the impact and implications generated in rural communities and the significance for urbanisation, for future cities and territorial policies.

The urban investigators confirm that the urban decline, which is manifested in the loss of population in densely populated areas, is a phase of the evolution of the cities, although there has been no agreement as to whether this is irreversible or transitory; and the rural investigators confirm that urbanisation of the countryside is a process that acquires greater relevance with the passage of time. Counterurbanization contributes to the diffusion of urbanisation in the territory and society, because it implies the diffusion of values, habits, culture, economic activities, etc. in said areas. With counterurbanization the traditional country-city migratory flows are changed to city-country, the rural areas begin to gain population. These new migratory flows can be considered the main urbanisation of the country.

Today, social investigators must acknowledge the existence of an urban degradation, remembering, at the same time, that the urban diffusion is spatially and socially selective. Counterurbanization seems to be closely related to the concept of the de-concentrated city, which is opposed to the traditional compact or grouped city. The de-concentrated city is characterised by the urban population dispersion, understanding by this that it is not tied to the activities of the rural areas, that is to say, the population that resides in the rural areas who are not involved in agricultural activities; it is a concept of the post-industrial society and it can be considered the dominant form developed in the system of settlements after WWII, a form that consists of the differentiation of two parts, one compactly constructed and concentrated and another openly constructed and dispersed. We can define counterurbanization as a new process of urbanisation, a model of spatial distribution of population and, even, a demographic movement through which a displacement of people and economic activities takes place from the urban areas towards the rural ones, conforming a model of dispersed urbanisation as opposed to the traditional one of concentrated urbanisation; the conception of the city emanated by counterurbanization is closely related to the urbanisation of the country. Nevertheless many questions arise about what it is the dimension of the new process, its origin and development, lasting or ephemeral, planned or spontaneous; who are the social actors who carry out the return movements from the great cities towards the smaller settlements and rural regions, why and why now, these are questions that re-

quire empirical investigation on different scales and on an international comparative level.

The investigation of counterurbanization can be a scientific and academic challenge. Its implications for the policies of rural, regional and urban development, for the demography and the urban-rural and rural-urban migratory flows, for the systems of unbalanced settlements, etc., must be the focus of attention. Counterurbanization has rebalancing forces on the distribution of population in the territory and between settlements, correcting inequalities and injustices in so far as the distribution of social welfare in the territory, but also negative impacts in relation to the environment. These are excellent topics for an in-depth investigation of its consequences and impact, of the study concrete cases in different countries and regions, to evaluate the possibilities for the design of balanced policies for regional development and urban and rural planning. Planned counterurbanization could become a factor of balance and territorial justice capable of overcoming the traditional marginalisation of the periphery as opposed to the centre and the end of the vertical hierarchical structure in the systems of settlements.

Acknowledgements

This work was carried out with the financial support of the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science within the project "Plan Nacional de I+D+i Sociedad de la Información y desarrollo urbano y regional (SINDUR) (Sec2002-01874) (Sej2006-08889)".

References

- Albuquerque, F., De Mattos, C., Jordan, R. (eds.) 1990. *Revolución tecnológica y reestructuración productiva: impactos y desafíos territoriales*. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano.
- Angelet Cladellas, J. 2000. La descentralización del empleo y de la residencia en las Áreas Metropolitanas de Barcelona y Madrid. *Urban* 4, 124-144.
- Anglade, F. 1992. Counterurbanized areas around La Rochelle. *Noröis* 154, 229-240.
- Allende Landa, A. 1983. Crisis Metropolitana y Enterprise Zones. Una nueva experiencia en la política urbana. *Ciudad y Territorio* 55, 37-50.
- Armijo, G. 2000. La faceta de la Región Metropolitana: entre la suburbanización campesina y la urbanización de la élite. *Revista Eure* 78, 131-135.
- Arroyo, M. 2001. La Contraurbanización: un debate metodológico y conceptual sobre la dinámica de las áreas metropolitanas. *Scripta Nova. Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales* 97.
- Barkley, D.L. 1988. The Decentralization of High-Technology Manufacturing to Nonmetropolitan Areas. *Growth and Change* 19, 13-30.
- Bel Adell, C. 1985. Transformaciones demográficas y espaciales en la región de Murcia, 1970-1985. *Papeles de Geografía* 12, 25-48.

- Belil, M.I.C. 1990. Industrialización y espacio urbano. *Documents d'Analisi Geogràfica* 17, 121-131.
- Benito, P. 1991. Descentralización productiva y nuevas formas de agrupación industrial: los corredores industriales de Asturias. *Ciudad y Territorio* 90, 365-371.
- Bernabé, J.M., Albertos, J.M. 1986. Migraciones interiores en España. *Cuadernos de Geografía* 39-40, 175-202.
- Berry, B.J. 1976. *Urbanization and Counterurbanization*. New York: Arnold.
- Berry, B.J., Dahmann, D.C. 1977. Population Redistribution in the United States in the 1970s. *Population and Development Review* 3, 443-471.
- Berry, B.J. 1978. The Counterurbanization Process: How General?. In N. Hansen: *Human Settlement Systems. A International Perspectives on Structure, Change and Public Policy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger, p. 25-50.
- Borja, J. 1990. *Barcelona y el sistema urbano europeo*. Town Council of Barcelona.
- Bourne, L.S. 1980. Alternative Perspectives on Urban Decline and Population Deconcentration. *Urban Geography* 1.1, 39-52.
- Bradshaw, T.K., Blakely, E.J. 1979. *Rural Communities in Advanced Industrial Society*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Brady, J.E. 1988. Changing Ireland. Population Change in Dublin 1981-1986. *Irish Geography* 21, 41-44.
- Brambila, C. 1990. Dinámica demográfica del crecimiento urbano en México: 1940-1980. *Revista de Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* 5, 3, 413-452.
- Brown, D.L., Wardwell, J.M. (eds.) 1984. *New Directions in Urban and Rural Migrations: the Population Turnaround in Rural America*. New York: Academia Press.
- Brunt, B.M. 1989. The new industrialisation in Ireland. In Carter, R. and Parker, A. (ed.): *Ireland: A Contemporary Geographical Perspective*. London: Routledge, p. 201-236.
- Burns, L.S. 1987. Urban Growth and Decline as a force in regional development: issues and research agenda. In L. Van den Berg et al.: *Spatial Cycles*, p. 253-266. Aldershot (England): Gower Publishing.
- Cairncross, F. 2000. *La muerte de la distancia*. Paidós: Barcelona.
- Campbell, R., Garkovich, N. 1984. Turnaround Migration as an Episode of Collective Behavior. *Rural Sociology* 49.1, 89-105.
- Camposino, A.J., Troitino, M.A., Campos, M.L. (coord.) 1995. *Las ciudades españolas a finales del siglo XX. I Coloquio de Geografía Urbana*. Universidad de Castilla La Mancha.
- Caravaca, I., Méndez, R. 1995. Efectos territoriales de la reestructuración productiva en España. *Ciudad y Territorio-Estudios Territoriales* 3.106, 715-744.
- Caravaca, I., Méndez, R. 2003. Trayectorias industriales metropolitanas: nuevos procesos, nuevos contrastes. *Revista Eure* 87, 37-50.
- Cawley, M.E. 1990. Population change in the Republic of Ireland 1981-1986. *Area* 22.1, 67-74.
- Clark, A.N. 1989. *Dictionary of Geography*. London: Longman.
- Clark, D. 1989. *Urban Decline: the British experience*. London: Routledge.
- Cloke, P. (dir.) 1988. *Policies and Plans for Rural People. A International Perspective*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cloke, P. 1985. Counterurbanization: a Rural Perspective. *Geography* 70.1, 13-29.
- Clout, H.D. 1976. *Geografía Rural*. Barcelona: Oikos-Tau.
- Copus, A.K. 2001. From Core-Periphery to Polycentric Development: Concepts of Spatial and Aspatial Peripherality. *European Planning Studies* 9.4, 539-552.
- Corona, R., Luque, J-R. 1992. Cambios recientes en los patrones migratorios a la zona metropolitana de la ciudad de México. *Revista de Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* 7, 2-3, 557-587.
- Court, Y.K. 1985. Recent patterns of population change in Denmark. *Geography* 70.4, 353-356.
- Coward, J. 1989. Irish population problems. In Carter, R. and Parker, A. (eds.): *Ireland: A Contemporary Geographical Perspective*. London: Routledge, p. 55-83.
- Champion, A.G. 1989. *Counterurbanization. The Changing pace and Nature of Population Desconcentration*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Champion, A.G. 1987. Recent changes in the Pace of Population Deconcentration in Britain. *Geoforum* 18.4, 379-401.
- Champion, A.G. 1986. The stages of urban development model applied to upper-tier regions in the British Urban System. *Area* 18.3, 239-245.
- Champion, T., Watkins, CH. (eds.) 1991. *People in the countryside: studies of social change in Rural Britain*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Charreyron, A. 1987. Nuevas tecnologías de comunicación y dinámicas urbanas. *Ciudad y Territorio* 25, 173-178.
- Cheshire, P.C., Hay, D.G. 1989. *Urban Problems in western Europe: an economic analysis*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cheshire, P., Hay, D. 1985. Problemas de declive y crecimiento en las ciudades de Europa. *Estudios Territoriales* 19, 31-56.
- Davies, W.K.D. 1990. What Population Turnaround? Some Canadian Prairie Settlement Perspectives, 1971-1982. *Geoforum* 21.3, 303-319.
- Dean, K.G., Shaw, D.P., Brown, B.J., Perry, R.W., Thorneycroft, W.T. 1984. Counterurbanization and the characteristics of Persons Migrating to West Cornwall. *Geoforum* 15.2, 177-190.
- Delgado, J. 1993. Querétaro: hacia la ciudad región. *Revista de Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* 8.3, 655-699.
- Dematteis, G., Petsimeris, P. 1989. Italy: counterurbanization as a transitional phase in settlement reorganization. In A.G. Champion (ed.): *Counterurbanization: the changing face and nature of population deconcentration*. London: Arnold, p. 187-207.
- De Mattos, C.A. 2002. Transformación de las ciudades latinoamericanas. ¿Impactos de la globalización?. *Revista Eure* 85, presentation.
- De Mattos, C.A. 1998. Reestructuración, crecimiento y expansión metropolitana en las economías emergentes latinoamericanas. In Gorenstein, S; Bustos, R. (comps.): *Ciudades y regiones frente al avance de la globalización*. Bahía Blanca, Universidad Nacional del Sur, p. 13-38.
- Domingo, C.; Asensi, M.; Crespo, A. et all. 1990. Redistribución de la población. Inmigrados en la Provincia de Valencia en 1980-1986. *Cuadernos de Geografía* 48, 141-182.

- Enríquez, R.O., Rodríguez, S.G. 2007. La desconcentración urbana en el sistema territorial de Galicia: un enfoque conceptual y empírico. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles* 44, 259-277/383-386.
- Ferrás, C. 2000. La urbanización del campo y la desconcentración urbana. Análisis empírico comparado de casos en Irlanda y España. *Boletín de la AGE* 29, 73-92.
- Ferrer, M. (1992): *Los Sistemas Urbanos*. Colección Espacios y Sociedades 14. Madrid: Ed. Síntesis, p. 27-28/109-113.
- Fielding, A. 1982. Counterurbanization in Western Europe. *Progress in Planning*, 17.1, 1-52.
- Fielding, A. 1986. Counterurbanization in Western Europe. In A. Findlay and P. White (eds): *West Population Change*. London: Croom Helm, p.35-49.
- Friedman, T. 2006. *La Tierra es plana. Breve historia del mundo globalizado del siglo XXI*. Madrid: MR.
- Font, J. 1999. La experiencia reciente de Cataluña. *Urban* 5, 60-82.
- Frey, W.H. 1988. Migración y desdoblamiento de las metrópolis. ¿Reestructuración regional o renacimiento rural?. *Estudios Territoriales* 26, 15-38.
- Friendland, W.H. 1982. The end of Rural Society and the future of Rural Society. *Rural Sociology* 47.4, 589-608.
- Fuguitt, G.V., Johansen, H.E. 1984. *The changing rural village in America. Demographic and economic trends since 1950*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- García Ballesteros, A. 1982. Transformaciones demográficas en la provincia de Madrid en el intercensal 1970-1981. *Estudios Geográficos*, p. 379-409.
- Gillmor, D.A., Jeffers, A.J. 1987. Village expansion in Co. Louth. *Irish Geography* 20.2, 95-97.
- Gómez Mendoza, J. 1978. *Agricultura y expansión urbana: la campiña del Bajo Henares en la aglomeración urbana de Madrid*. Madrid: Alianza Universidad.
- Goodenough, R. 1992. The Nature and Implications of recent Population Growth in California. *Geography* 77.2, 123-133.
- Gordon, P., Kumar, A., Richardson, H.W. 1989. Congestion, Changing Metropolitan Structure, and City Size in the United States. *International Regional Science Review* 12.1, 45-56.
- Gordon, P. 1979. Deconcentration without a Clean Break. *Environment and Planning* 11, 281-290.
- Grafton, D.J. 1982. Net migration, outmigration and remote rural areas; a cautionary note. *Area* 14.4, 313-318.
- Graizbord, B. 1984. Perspectivas de una descentralización del crecimiento urbano en el sistema de ciudades de México. *Revista Interamericana de Planificación* 13.71.
- Graizbord, B., Mina, A. 1993. Poblacion-territorio: cien años de evolución 1895-1990. *Revista de Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* 8.1, 31-66.
- Green, A. 1992. Migration trends for Wales: rural revival? In J. Stillwell, P. Rees and P. Boden (eds.): *Population Redistribution in the United Kingdom. Migration Processes and Patterns*, vol. 2. London: Belhaven Press, p. 129-143.
- Grimes, S. 1987. Non-Agricultural employment in North-western Ireland. *Irish Geography* 20.2, 61-74.
- Halfacree, K.H. 1994. The importance of "the rural" in the constitution of counterurbanization: Evidence from England in the 1980s. *Sociologia Ruralis* 34, 164-189.
- Hall, P. 1981. Urban change in Europe. In A. Pred: *Geographical Essays for Torsten Hägerstrand*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Hall, P. 1983. Decentralisation without End? A Re-valuation. In *The expanding city*. London: Academic Press.
- Hall, P. 1987. Capitales nacionales, ciudades intermedias y la nueva división internacional del trabajo. *Estudios Territoriales* 25, 15-24.
- Hodge, G. 1966. Do Villages grow? Some perspectives and predictions. *Rural Sociology* 31, 183-196.
- Hourihan, K. 1992. Population change in Irish Cities, 1981-1986: County Boroughs, Suburbs and Daily Urban System. *Irish Geography* 25.2, 160-168.
- Jones, H., Caird, J., Berry, W., Dewhurst, J. 1986. Peripheral Counter-Urbanization: findings from an Integration of Census and Survey Data in Northern Scotland. *Regional Studies* 20.1, 15-26.
- Kayser, B. 1990. *Le Renaissance Rurale. Sociologie des campagnes de monde occidental*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Lewis, G.J., Maund, D.J. 1976. The Urbanisation of the Countryside: a framework for analysis. *Geografiska Annaler* 58B, 17-27.
- Loeffer, R., Steinicke, E. 2007. Amenity migration in the US Sierra Nevada. *Geographical Review* 93.1, 67-88.
- Long, L., Deare, D. 1988. US population redistribution: a perspective on the nonmetropolitan turnaround. *Population and Development Review* 14.3, 433-450.
- López de Lucio, R. 1995. La tendencia hacia la dispersión/fragmentación de los territorios urbanos. Notas sobre la estructura espacial de la región urbana de Madrid. *Economía y Sociedad* 12, 45-57.
- Meijering, L. 2006. Making a place of their own: Rural intentional communities in Northwest Europe. *Nederlandse Geografische Studies* 349, 1-171.
- Mitchell, C.J.A. 2004. Making sense of counterurbanization. *Journal of Rural Studies* 20, 15-34.
- Monclús, J. 1998 (ed.). *La ciudad dispersa*. Barcelona: CCCB.
- Morén, R., Solana, M. 2006. The immigration in rural areas and small Spanish Cities: current situation. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica* 47, 141-155.
- Moreno, A. 1987. Concentración de la población y jerarquía de asentamientos en España. Evolución y Perspectivas. *Estudios territoriales* 24, 77-108.
- Muscará, C. 1991. Italian Urban Geography. Counterurbanization versus Peripheral Development. *Urban Geography* 12.4, 363-380.
- Negrete, M.E. 1990. La migración a la ciudad de México: un proceso multifacético. *Revista de Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* 5.3, 641-654.
- Nello, O. 2001. *Ciutat de ciutats*. Barcelona: Empúries.
- Ogando, O., Pedrosa, R., Fernández, J.E. 1989. Análisis territorial de la inversión industrial en las regiones españolas. *Estudios Territoriales* 31, 79-94.
- Ogden, P.E. 1985. Counterurbanization in France: the results of the 1982 Population Census. *Geography* 70.2, 24-25.
- Ortega, J. 1975. *Residencias secundarias y espacio de ocio en España*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Pardo, C.J. 1991. La liberación de suelo industrial en Madrid como indicador de los cambios urbanos. *Estudios Territoriales* 37, 139-156.

- Parnreiter, C. 2005. Tendencias de desarrollo en las metrópolis latinoamericanas en la era de la globalización: los casos de Ciudad de México y Santiago de Chile. *Revista Eure* 92, 5-28.
- Plane, D.A. 1989. Population Migration and Economic Restructuring in the United States. *International Regional Science Review* 12.3, 263-280.
- Perry, R., Dean, K., Bronwn, B. 1986. *Counterurbanization. Case Studies of Urban to Rural Movement*. Glasgow: Geo Books.
- Pooley, C.G., Turnbull, J. 1996. Counterurbanization: the nineteenth century origins of a late-twentieth century phenomenon. *Area* 28.4, 514-524.
- Precedo, A.J. 1986. Las modificaciones del sistema urbano español en la transición postindustrial. *Estudios Territoriales* 20, 121-138.
- Richter, K. 1985. Nonmetropolitan growth in the late 1970s: the end of the turnaround? *Demography* 22.2, 245-263.
- Robert, S., Randolph, W.G. 1983. Beyond Decentralization: the Evolution of Population Distribution in England and Wales, 1961-1981. *Geoforum* 14.1, 75-102.
- Rodríguez, R. 1997. *As vilas do interior. Análise xeográfica dun proceso de urbanización*. Universidad de Santiago, PhD thesis.
- Rodríguez, J. 1983. Procesos de Urbanización y desarrollo económico en España. *Ciudad y Territorio* 55, 25-42.
- Rudzitis, G. 1989. Migration, Places, and Nonmetropolitan Development. *Urban Geography* 10.4, 396-411.
- Sánchez, J-E. 1998. Efectos de los cambios en el sistema productivo sobre la expansión metropolitana de Barcelona. In Capel, H., Linteau, P-A. *Barcelona - Montreal. Desarrollo urbano comparado*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, p. 39-50.
- Sant, M., Simona, P. 1993. Counterurbanization and coastal development in New South Wales. *Geoforum* 24.3, 291-306.
- Sinclair, R. 1988. Cambio demográfico y redistribución espacial dentro de las metrópolis de Estados Unidos. In II Congreso Mundial Vasco: *Espacios rurales y urbanos en áreas industrializadas*. Barcelona: Ed. Oikos Tau, p.145-163
- Soumagne, J., Bouly, C., Fournier, Y. 1992. Counterurbanization around Poitiers. *Norois* 154, 241-248.
- Spencer, D. 1995. Counterurbanization: the local dimension. *Geoforum* 26.2, 153-175.
- Stabler, J.C. 1987. Non-Metropolitan Population Growth and the Evolution of Rural Service Centres in the Canadian Prairie Region. *Regional Studies* 21.1, 43-54.
- Suárez Villa, L. 1986. Metropolitan evolution, sectorial economic change, and the city size distribution. *Urban Studies* 25, 1-20.
- Stockdale, A. 2006. Migration: pre-requisite for rural economic regeneration? *Journal of Rural Studies* 22.3, 354-366.
- Stöhr, W.B. 1987. El desarrollo económico regional y la crisis económica mundial. *Estudios Territoriales* 25, 15-24.
- Toffler, A. 2006. *La revolución de la riqueza*. Barcelona: Plaza y Janés.
- Torres Elizburu, R. 2006. La Contraurbanización en la Comunidad Autónoma del País Vasco. *Lurralde*, no. 29.
- Valenzuela, M. 1976. Los espacios recreacionales. Un aspecto de la influencia regional de Madrid. *Ciudad y Territorio* 4, 63-77.
- Van den Berg, L. et. al. 1982. *Urban Europe. A Study of Growth and Decline*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Van den Berg, L., Klaassen, L.H. 1987. The contagiousness of urban decline. In Van Den Berg, L., Burns, L.S., Kaassen, L.H. (eds.): *Spatial Cycles*. Aldershot: Gower, p.84-99.
- Vartiainen, P. 1989. Counterurbanization: a challenge for a socio-theoretical geography. *Journal of Rural Studies* 5.3, 217-225.
- Velasco, M.J.P. 2006. Los parques naturales como factor de atracción de la población. Un estudio exploratorio sobre el fenómeno de la naturbanización en Andalucía. *Cuadernos Geográficos* 38.1, 87-110.
- Velásquez, L.A., Arroyo, J. 1992. La transición de los patrones y las ciudades medias. *Revista de Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* 7.2-3, 555-574.
- Vera, A., Badia, A., Pallarés, M. 2003. La adopción de internet en la red de empresas y la percepción de la nueva economía en comarcas semi-remotas de tradición industrial de Catalunya. *Boletín de la AGE* 36, 129-147.
- Vining, D.R., Kontuly, T. 1978. Population dispersal from mayor metropolitan regions: An international comparison. *International Regional Science Review* 3, 50-73.
- Weekley, Y. 1988. Rural Depopulation and Counterurbanization: a paradox. *Area* 20.2, 127-134.
- Wilson, F.D. 1987. Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan migration streams: 1935-1980. *Demography* 24.2, 211-228.