



**DATA ON
URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION
IN RECENT CENSUSES**

UNITED NATIONS

POPULATION STUDIES, No. 8

**DATA ON
URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION
IN RECENT CENSUSES**



Department of Social Affairs
Population Division

Department of Economic Affairs
Statistical Office of the United Nations

Lake Success, New York
July 1950

List of reports in this series to date:

Reports on the Population of Trust Territories

- No. 1. The Population of Western Samoa
- No. 2. The Population of Tanganyika

Reports on Population Estimates

- No. 3. World Population Trends, 1920-1947

Reports on Methods of Population Statistics

- No. 4. Population Census Methods
- No. 6. Fertility Data in Population Censuses
- No. 7. Methods of Using Census Statistics for the Calculation of Life Tables and Other Demographic Measures. With Application to the Population of Brazil. By Giorgio Mortara
- No. 8. Data on Urban and Rural Population in Recent Censuses

Reports on Demographic Aspects of Migration

- No. 5. Problems of Migration Statistics

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

Sales No.: 1950 • XIII • 4

FOREWORD

The Economic and Social Council, at its fourth session, adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary-General of the United Nations to offer advice and assistance to Member States, with a view to improving the comparability and quality of data to be obtained in the censuses of 1950 and proximate years (resolution 41 (IV), 29 March 1947).

As part of the implementation of this resolution, a series of studies has been prepared on the methods of obtaining and presenting information in population censuses on the size and characteristics of the population. These studies have been collected in *Population Census Methods* (ST/SOA/Series A, Population Studies, No. 4). In addition, a separate report has been issued, entitled *Fertility Data in Recent Censuses* (ST/SOA/Series A, Population Studies, No. 6).

Chapter XVI of *Population Census Methods*, which deals with urban and rural population, is limited to a brief statement of the main types of classifications which can be made, and of the recommendations on this subject recently adopted by international agencies. The present report contains a greatly amplified discussion of the possible types of classifications as well as a survey of the methods of defining and tabulating urban and rural population used in recent censuses.

The report was prepared by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in collaboration with the Population Division and the Statistical Office of the United Nations.

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | |
| 1. Uses of urban-rural statistics..... | 1 |
| 2. The problem of international comparability..... | 2 |
| II. RECOMMENDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES..... | 3 |
| 1. The International Statistical Institute..... | 3 |
| 2. United Nations Population Commission..... | 3 |
| 3. The Committee on the 1950 Census of the Americas..... | 5 |
| III. DEFINITIONS AND CLASSIFICATIONS IN RECENT CENSUSES..... | 6 |
| 1. Classifications of administrative divisions..... | 7 |
| (a) Classifications by type of local government..... | 7 |
| (b) Classifications by total number of inhabitants..... | 8 |
| (c) Classifications based on characteristics not applicable to the entire population of minor administrative divisions..... | 8 |
| 2. Classifications based on administrative functions..... | 8 |
| 3. Classifications of agglomerations or clusters of population..... | 8 |
| IV. TABULATIONS OF URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION IN RECENT CENSUSES.. | 11 |
| 1. Major characteristics tabulated for urban and rural areas..... | 11 |
| 2. Tabulations by age and sex..... | 11 |
| 3. Tabulations of marital status..... | 11 |
| 4. Tabulations by place of birth, legal nationality and language..... | 12 |
| 5. Tabulations of educational characteristics..... | 12 |
| 6. Tabulations of economic characteristics..... | 12 |
| 7. Tabulations of households or families..... | 12 |
| 8. Tabulations of fertility characteristics..... | 12 |
| 9. Tabulations of other characteristics..... | 12 |
| 10. Other tabulations | 13 |

TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Major characteristics tabulated for urban and rural areas in recent censuses | 14 |
| 2. Tabulations by age and sex for urban and rural areas in recent censuses | 16 |
| 3. Tabulations of marital status for urban and rural areas in recent censuses | 17 |
| 4. Major types of data on birthplace and legal nationality for urban and rural areas in recent censuses..... | 18 |
| 5. Tabulations of educational characteristics for urban and rural areas in recent censuses | 19 |
| 6. Tabulations of economic characteristics for urban and rural areas in recent censuses | 20 |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| | <i>Page</i> |
| 7. Tabulations of household or family characteristics for urban and rural areas in recent censuses..... | 21 |

APPENDIX

| | |
|--|----|
| ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS BY TYPE AND NUMBER, AND URBAN-RURAL DEFINITIONS, FOR FIFTY-THREE COUNTRIES..... | 22 |
|--|----|

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Uses of urban-rural statistics

Census statistics of the urban and rural population have a variety of important uses. The process of urbanization has long been recognized as a concomitant of social and economic development, but the precise inter-relations have never been thoroughly understood and the demographic implications have not been fully analysed. It is desirable, therefore, to follow the process of urbanization in the various countries and to relate it with (1) economic indices that reflect the progress of industrial development in terms of increases in production, trade, national income, etc., (2) indices of social and political change in such fields as education, health, standards of living, political participation and governmental organization, and (3) demographic trends as indicated by rates of population growth, family characteristics, mobility of the population, age structure, size and composition of the economically active population, and the like. The results of such studies should be a valuable guide to planning economic and social development on an international as well as a national scale.

A second large area of application of these data is in the comparison of the conditions and characteristics of urban and rural people with respect to patterns of fertility, mortality, age and sex composition, housing, sanitation, levels of living, etc. Such studies are helpful in determining the particular problems of urban and rural areas and, beyond these, in understanding the role or function of cities in society and in exploring the possibilities of controlling their growth and planning their development.

Another use of the data is in connexion with the implementation of specific projects or programmes such as those undertaken by the United Nations and the specialized agencies. For example, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is especially concerned with the problems and welfare of rural people. Census statistics on the rural population are essential to the furtherance of this work.

In order for analyses of the types just described to be most conclusive in their findings, it is essential that census statistics of urban and rural popu-

lation be as closely comparable as possible. This point is less important for the purpose of comparing the urban and rural components of the population than for comparing degrees or levels of urbanization in various countries or regions, or for comparing urban or rural characteristics in one area with those in another. The reason for this is that urban-rural comparisons, no matter how "urban" and "rural" are defined, are likely to be heavily weighted with the highly concentrated, clearly urban population on the one hand, and with the village, or dispersed and clearly rural population on the other hand, with the result that differences between urban characteristics and rural characteristics are bound to be reflected if not precisely measured in the statistics. However, when the urban or rural population is expressed as a proportion of the total population, differences in definition may have a rather profound effect.

The basic meaning of the terms "urban" and "rural" is fairly clear, the former referring to the city and the latter to the country or to areas outside the city. But actual patterns of settlement are much less clear-cut than the basic concepts imply. Furthermore, the terms themselves have taken on overtones and added meanings whereby they have come to refer to ways of life, cultural patterns, attitudes, value systems, etc. In this process of ideological transformation, the intangible aspects have tended to supersede the tangible as criteria of urban or rural attributes. The intangible aspects are of course quite real, but they are difficult to pin down in a census frame of reference, especially in view of the fact that all kinds of people live in both rural and urban areas.

It would seem advisable, therefore, to use a relatively objective criterion for identifying urban and rural areas in the census and to retain as nearly as may be the original meaning of "city" and "country". A proper unit of classification from this point of view is the agglomeration or cluster of population.

With any concept of urban and rural, there is no definite point, in the continuum from scattered dwellings or small clusters to the great metropolitan agglomerations, where the rural ends and the

urban begins. The concepts are clear only as they apply to the two extremes of the continuum, i.e., to the most urban and the most rural. The distribution is not really a two-fold one in which one part of the population is wholly rural and the other wholly urban, but a graduated distribution along a continuum from the least urban to the most urban or from the most rural to the least rural. Consequently, the line that is drawn between urban and rural for statistical or census purposes is necessarily arbitrary.

These considerations do not invalidate the urban-rural classification, but rather point to the need for a more systematic classification in accordance with a definite criterion such as size of agglomeration (preferably a classification that allows for several size groups rather than only two) on the basis of which trends and differences of an urban-versus-rural character may be more carefully studied and more thoroughly understood.

2. The problem of international comparability

Although the problem of differentiating between urban and rural population is theoretically a demographic one, concerned with the classification of *people* with respect to the size of the agglomerations in which they live, it has generally become (and necessarily perhaps) a matter of the classifi-

cation of the areas in which people live rather than of the people themselves. The two ideas are not, of course, unrelated since agglomerations occur in space and have to be identified in some kind of geographic terms. But as a result of a natural tendency to apply the classification as urban or rural to the territorial or administrative organization already in existence, practices with respect to urban and rural definition or classification are closely bound up with national, historical and political considerations, and a particular scheme of classification, once established, tends to become fixed and resistant to change. The population, on the other hand, changes constantly; agglomerations grow in size and multiply in number without much regard to traditional boundary lines.

There is, then, a wide variation among countries in the type of territorial and administrative organization that has developed, in the point in time at which an urban-rural classification was adopted, and in the rate at which urbanization has proceeded. In consequence, there is also a wide variation both in the definition of urban and rural population and in the degree to which the application of the official or generally accepted definition conforms to the original intention of distinguishing city people from rural people — or city areas from rural areas.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

The truly formidable difficulties in the way of developing standard methods of urban and rural classification have long been recognized, but because of the importance of these data, international organizations have concerned themselves with the problem.

1. The International Statistical Institute

In 1938, the Congress of the International Statistical Institute adopted proposals for standard urban and rural classifications, in response to the request of the Health Section of the League of Nations. The main purpose of these proposals was to obtain data for use in computing internationally comparable vital rates for rural areas. The proposals submitted were as follows:

"(1) The rural population is the total population of all the *communes* (or smallest administrative districts) designated as rural.

"(2) The *communes* (or smallest administrative districts) should be divided, if possible, into categories according to the proportion of the total population of the *commune* that is agricultural population (i.e., all persons actively engaged in agricultural occupations and family members directly dependent upon them).

"*Communes* should be divided into at least three categories:

"Rural *communes*, more than 60 per cent;

"Mixed *communes*, 40 to 60 per cent;

"Urban *communes*, less than 40 per cent.

"The total population in each of these three categories should be obtainable. If more than three categories are distinguished, their limits should be such as to permit combination into the three categories indicated above.

"(3) In countries where this classification cannot be made, *communes* should be classified according to the size of the principal nucleus (the most populous centre) of the *commune* and divided into two categories:

"(a) *Communes* whose principal nuclei contain no more than 2,000 inhabitants;

"(b) *Communes* whose principal nuclei contain more than 2,000 inhabitants."¹

These proposals were adopted after deletion of the words "rural", "mixed" and "urban" in paragraph 2.

It will be noted that the Congress endorsed an occupational approach to the problem of urban-rural classification. Adoption of this approach would involve an abandonment of the attempt to obtain a direct measure of the patterns and degrees of population agglomeration and dispersion.

Subsequent actions taken by international organizations have indicated a disposition to separate the concept "agricultural" from the concept "rural", at least in so far as census operations are concerned, and to follow the principle of measuring the urban population directly in terms of the unit of urbanization, namely the city or the agglomeration. This does not mean that the relating of occupational data to urban-rural data is not an important type of analysis. Rather, it furnishes an independent source of information which can make the study of inter-relations more fruitful.

The alternative proposal of the Congress — the classification of administrative divisions according to the size of the largest populated centre in the division — presents rather serious problems of comparability. These are related primarily to variations in the size of the area, the organization, and the function of the smallest administrative divisions of the various countries. The *commune* in France, for example, is quite different from the minor civil division in the United States, the latter being, in many parts of the country, little more than a convenient device for keeping land and tax records and bearing no such consistent relation to community organization or patterns of settlement as appears to be the case in France and in many other countries.

2. United Nations Population Commission

At its fourth session, in April 1949, the United Nations Population Commission made the follow-

¹ Original text in French. See: Bunle, Henri. "Rapport de la Commission pour la Définition de la Population Rurale", *Bulletin de l'Institut International de Statistique* 30 (2): 158-163, 1938 (The Hague).

ing recommendations concerning urban-rural classification in censuses of population to be taken in or around 1950:

"Urban and rural population

"Because of the diversity of conditions affecting the classification of areas as urban and rural in various countries, it is not practicable at present to establish uniform definitions of urban and rural population for international use. It is desirable, however, that in each census provision be made for obtaining the aggregate population of all identifiable agglomerations or clusters of population, classified by size and other characteristics so that the results may be used as far as possible to improve the international comparability of existing data on this subject.

"It is therefore suggested that, for purpose of international comparisons, the following classification of the population by size of the agglomeration or cluster be tabulated, in addition to the tabulations normally made for urban and rural populations as defined in each country:

"(a) Population in places of 500,000 or more inhabitants;

"(b) Population in places of 100,000 to 500,000 inhabitants;

"(c) Population in places of 25,000 to 100,000 inhabitants;

"(d) Population in places of 10,000 to 25,000 inhabitants;

"(e) Population in places of 5,000 to 10,000 inhabitants;

"(f) Population in places of 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants;

"(g) Population in places of 1,000 to 2,000 inhabitants;

"(h) Population in places of 500 to 1,000 inhabitants;

"(i) Population in places of less than 500 inhabitants;

"(j) Population not in identifiable agglomerations or clusters (if the whole population is not included in the above categories).

"It is also desirable that the number of places of each size group be tabulated.

"Since this distribution involves more classes than the usual urban-rural classification, the problem of tabulation by other characteristics is somewhat enlarged. In view of this fact, it may not be feasible to make extensive cross-tabulations. It is desirable, however, that the population in places of various size classes be tabulated for each sex, at

least by age groups listed in paragraph 17. [Under 5 years, 10-year groups from 5 to 64 years, 65 years and over.] In this cross-tabulation, some of the categories in the above classification by size of place may have to be combined. In that case, however, it is desirable that at least the distinction between places of 10,000 or more and those with less than 10,000 inhabitants be maintained."²

At its fifth session, in May 1950, the Commission reconsidered its recommendations in regard to the size groups of agglomerations or clusters of population to be used in summary cross-tabulations in those cases in which an extensive classification by size of place would not be feasible. It proposed, in place of the originally suggested distinction between places of 10,000 or more and those with less than 10,000 inhabitants:

"(a) that population censuses include summary tabulations of the population classified as a minimum by sex and age (under 5, 10-year groups from 5 to 64 years, and 65 and over) for agglomerations or clusters of population living in built-up contiguous areas which, according to the definition adopted in each country, are considered as single localities or population centres. These summary tabulations would be made for such population agglomerations grouped by size, as follows:

"Under 2,000, together with the population not in identifiable agglomerations or clusters,

"2,000 and under 10,000,

"10,000 and over;

"(b) that the categories presented in such tabulations not be termed 'urban' or 'rural' for purposes of international comparability . . ."

In addition, the Commission called attention to the fact that the World Health Organization Regulations, no. 1, article 6, calls for the classification of mortality for certain urban-rural aggregates by sex and by age in the following groups as a minimum: under 1 year; 1-4 years; 5-14 years; 15-24 years; 25-44 years; 45-64 years; 65-74 years; 75 years and over.

It was suggested by the Commission that if population tabulations by age are to be used in conjunction with these mortality tabulations, the age group 65 and over in the former should be divided into 65-74 years and 75 years and over.³

² Report of the fourth session of the Population Commission. United Nations document E/1313. Lake Success, 21 April 1949. Pages 38-39.

³ Report of the Population Commission (fifth session). United Nations document E/1711. Lake Success, 2 June 1950. Pages 13-14.

3. The Committee on the 1950 Census of the Americas

At its third session, in January 1950, this Committee made the following recommendations:

"Urban and rural population

"(a) Topic

"It is recommended that in each census, in addition to the information on urban and rural population needed for national purposes, measures be taken to obtain data on the population of all places or agglomerations of population which are identifiable by quantitative, socio-economic, and other objective criteria, whether or not such places would be urban according to the definitions of the particular country.

"(b) Tabulations

"It is recommended as a minimum tabulation that the population be presented according to size (number of inhabitants) of agglomeration.

"The population should be classified according to the size (number of inhabitants) of the agglomeration in at least the following categories: 500,000 or more inhabitants, 100,000-500,000, 25,000-100,000, 10,000-25,000, 5,000-10,000, 2,000-5,000, 1,000-2,000, 500-1,000, less than 500 inhabitants. If the entire population is not included in these categories, data should be presented also for the population not classified in agglomerations or identifiable settlements.

"The tabulations should show at least the number of places of each size and their population,

classified by (1) sex, and (2) whether urban or rural according to the country's own definition. The definitions of urban and rural adopted in the census of each country should be stated in the census publications."⁴

It will be noted that the recommendations of both the Commission and the Committee refrain from attempting to establish a definitive or final dichotomy between urban and rural, but provide for the classification of agglomerations or clusters of population into a series of size groups which represent breaks along the continuum from scattered dwellings and small villages to large concentrations. This type of classification not only ensures comparability of the results, but is in keeping with the realities of the situation, which preclude a two-fold mutually exclusive division. The comparability obtained is, to be sure, strictly in terms of the unit being classified, namely, the agglomeration. If size of agglomeration shows a closer correspondence in some countries than in others to characteristics that are commonly regarded as "urban", this is the result of cultural differences and is itself an appropriate subject of inquiry, but not one for which the other systems of classification described in this report could readily furnish the materials — unless they were made in combination with the one proposed by the Commission. Such a combination is in fact proposed by the Committee on the 1950 Census of the Americas.

⁴ *Resolutions and motions of the third session of the Committee on the 1950 Census of the Americas*, Bogotá, January 9-21, 1950. Document 1950 a — (COTA) — 2/1/50 — 400. Page 14.

III. DEFINITIONS AND CLASSIFICATIONS IN RECENT CENSUSES

Some distinction between urban and rural population is made in the statistics of practically all censuses. The categories shown may not bear the labels "urban" and "rural"; the country may not even have an official definition of urban and rural population; but almost without exception, the census data can be made to yield information for purposes of urban-rural comparison. The distinction between urban and rural may be in the form of statistics for individual important cities which, taken together, furnish data on urban characteristics that may be compared with data for the country as a whole, or for the remainder of the country. Again, the distinction may be in the form of statistics for small geographic divisions, which, when classified into population size groups, usually bear a positive relation to the degree of urbanization and may therefore form a basis for urban-rural comparisons of a simple type.

Of the fifty-three countries for which one or more censuses were examined for this study, fifty-one give statistics which may be regarded as urban-rural classifications. The two exceptions are Costa Rica (1927) and Thailand (1947) which specifically disclaim such a classification, but which do give statistics for minor geographic divisions that can be combined into size groups. In a few other cases there is not an official designation of these data as urban or rural, and perhaps no official definition of urban or rural population, but the authorization to regard the data as approximating an urban-rural classification is nevertheless given. In the 1930 census of the Netherlands, for example, statistics are shown for *communes* by size classes, but it is pointed out that, while *communes* of 20,000 or more inhabitants may be regarded as urban, there are several *communes* in this class that are partially or entirely rural and a number of smaller *communes* that should be considered as urban. Again, in connexion with the Belgian census of 1930, it is stated that *communes* having 5,000 or more inhabitants are "generally considered as urban".

The methods used in the various censuses for classifying the population as urban or rural represent two general approaches. The first is the classification of administrative divisions (usually the

relatively small or smallest geographic units into which the country is divided for administrative purposes) in which the whole population of the *commune*, municipality, township or other minor civil division is classified as either urban or rural on the basis of chosen criteria. In this method, the unit of classification is the administrative division rather than the agglomeration.

A variation of this approach, which perhaps represents a third approach (and which will be treated separately in the discussion that follows) is the method in which the administrative centres of all minor divisions are classified as urban and the remainders of the divisions are classified as rural.

The other general approach is the classification of agglomerations or population clusters, in which the urban population is identified as the inhabitants of closely settled "localities", "places", or "centres" above a given size, or with other specified characteristics. In this method, the unit of classification is the agglomeration, and official boundary lines of administrative divisions are ignored unless they happen to furnish convenient units for combination to form the larger agglomerations.

Since administrative organization is so closely bound up with urban-rural classification, information on the administrative divisions of the various countries is presented in the appendix table of this report. The definitions of urban and rural population are given also, in order to show the relation between administrative divisions and urban-rural definitions and thus to make the definitions themselves more comprehensible. The information on administrative divisions is limited to the class name and number of major, intermediate, and minor divisions, and to other types of divisions not necessarily administrative in character, but relevant to the problem of urban-rural classification. A fuller description of the governmental and administrative organization of each country would be even more helpful in understanding urban-rural classifications, but was not undertaken for this report for reasons of time and space.

It should be understood that the definitions given in the table are not necessarily "official" in

any strict sense of the word. Some of them were implied by the organization of the data, rather than specified in so many words, in the sources from which they were taken. However, it was considered advisable to include censuses with relevant classifications, even though these classifications might not be labelled "urban" or "rural", for the present report is concerned as much with the availability and comparability of census data that can be used for urban-rural analysis as with the existence of explicit definitions.

1. Classifications of administrative divisions

The smallest administrative divisions in the different countries vary in area, organization and function. They often contain some concentrated population and some dispersed population, some population engaged in typically urban occupations and some in typically rural pursuits. Any classification in which the whole population of these administrative divisions is treated as a unit therefore yields somewhat heterogeneous categories. However, such a classification has the advantage of producing census statistics for areas that have relatively stable and generally recognized boundaries. Usually, comparable classifications can readily be made in other statistics, such as vital statistics, that are compiled only for administrative areas. The possibility of combination with statistics from other sources is much more limited when special areas that do not conform to established geographic boundaries are delineated by the census for the purposes of urban-rural classification.

The classification of administrative divisions is effected in a number of different ways and in accordance with various criteria. They are of three general types: (a) based on the kind of local government, (b) based on the total number of inhabitants, and (c) based on characteristics that do not apply to the whole area (e.g., the size of the principal cluster or the percentage of the population engaged in agriculture).

(a) CLASSIFICATIONS BY TYPE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The most common basis for classifying administrative divisions into urban and rural categories is the type of local government or administration. By this method, centres of population that have what is regarded as a city or urban form of government are classified as urban and all other areas are classified as rural. Somewhat less than half the censuses included in this review used this criterion in one form or another in distinguishing the urban from the rural population.

In many countries, it is the practice to set up special forms of local government, involving considerable autonomy in matters of taxation, police protection, sanitation, etc., in areas of significant concentration of population. The establishment of these city or urban forms of government may be through incorporation, issuance of charters, or some other official action. This type of procedure furnishes a very convenient basis for identifying urban areas. Among the countries which are covered in this study, the following have defined the urban population, for census purposes, as residents of such areas (or have presented separate statistics for such areas):

| | |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| Australia | Romania |
| Bulgaria | Union of South Africa |
| Canada | USSR |
| Ceylon | United Kingdom |
| Finland | England and Wales |
| Hungary | Northern Ireland |
| Ireland | Scotland |
| Japan | United States |
| New Zealand | Yugoslavia |
| Poland | |

In addition, Denmark, Norway and Sweden have published statistics in accordance with this definition as well as in accordance with a more comprehensive definition that includes in the urban classification, suburban concentrations and population clusters of a non-administrative type.

Because practices differ, both within and among the countries, with respect to the granting of "urban" status in the administrative or governmental sense, there is considerable variation in the size and characteristics of the population units that were classified as urban in the censuses. Thus, the smallest urban places in Canada had less than 200 inhabitants, while the smallest in Japan had more than 20,000. Again, the boundaries of the incorporated place in the United States, while usually enclosing only thickly settled territory, often excluded suburban concentrations that might well be classified as urban; whereas the incorporated municipality of Japan often included more than one cluster of population as well as considerable territory of a definitely rural character.

Certain of the countries listed above have restricted the urban classification, for census purposes, to those areas with urban status that have more than a given number of inhabitants. Scotland has adopted a minimum of 1,000, Ireland of 1,500 and the United States of 2,500. In the statistics of Canada, the urban is often taken as incorporated places of 1,000 or more, although the official definition includes incorporated places of all sizes.

Further, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland and the United States have departed from the basic definition by delineating certain additional population clusters, and classifying them as urban even though they have not been formally established as such.

It should be noted again here that some of the countries which give statistics separately for areas with urban status and for other areas do not have "official" definitions. Moreover, it should be remembered that some countries may not have very close equivalents of the terms "urban" and "rural" in their languages or at least in their census terminology. For example, in the statistics of Japan, the term *shi* (referring to the incorporated municipality) is usually translated as "city" and the term *gun* as "rural county". The terms *machi* and *mura* (referring to the two types of area that comprise the *gun*) are often translated as "towns" and "villages". Actually these areas, like the *shi*, generally contain one or more clusters of population and some dispersed population and open country. On the whole, the *machi* contains larger clusters than the *mura*. For many purposes, the division between urban and rural is made by taking each *shi*, *machi* and *mura* above a given population size as urban and the remainder as rural.

(b) CLASSIFICATIONS BY TOTAL NUMBER OF INHABITANTS

In some censuses, the basis of the urban-rural classification is the total number of inhabitants of the minor administrative divisions. The minimum number that has been set for qualifying an area as urban varies considerably. The seven countries using this type of definition in their censuses had the following minimum requirements:

| | |
|----------------------|--------|
| Austria | 2,000 |
| Belgium | 5,000 |
| Czechoslovakia | 2,000 |
| Germany | 2,000 |
| Netherlands | 20,000 |
| Spain | 10,000 |
| Switzerland | 10,000 |

The Netherlands and Spain also show statistics for an intermediate size class, the Netherlands for *communes* of 5,000 to 20,000, and Spain for *municipios* of 2,000 to 10,000 inhabitants.

(c) CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON CHARACTERISTICS NOT APPLICABLE TO THE ENTIRE POPULATION OF MINOR ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS

In four censuses, the entire division was classified as rural or urban on the basis of character-

istics of part of the population. In the censuses of France and Luxembourg, *communes* containing an administrative centre (or *chef-lieu*) of 2,000 or more inhabitants were classified as urban, all other *communes* as rural. In the 1940 census of Greece, *communes* or municipalities whose largest agglomeration exceeded 5,000 inhabitants were classified as urban, all others as rural. In the 1936 census of Italy, *communes* with less than 50 per cent of the economically active population engaged in agriculture were classified as urban, all others as rural.

2. Classifications based on administrative functions

In some censuses, the population cluster that serves as a seat of administration for the minor administrative division is classified as urban and the remainder of the division as rural. Such seats of administration of course include national capitals and the capitals of major or intermediate divisions. In general, the capital of a major division is also the administrative centre of the intermediate or minor division in which it is located. Countries which have used this type of classification in their censuses are: Egypt, Brazil, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Peru, and Turkey.¹ In these countries, some urban places may be very small, in some cases less than 100 inhabitants.

Turkey has added to the urban classification all other towns with a population of more than 2,000, but there were in the census of 1945, eight places of less than 500 inhabitants which qualified as urban through being the chief centres of minor divisions. Similarly, Peru has added to the urban classification all non-administrative clusters with a population that exceeds the national average for administrative centres. Colombia, on the other hand, has limited the urban classification to capitals and administrative centres of over 1,500 inhabitants.

3. Classifications of agglomerations or clusters of population

In nine of the countries, census statistics of the urban and rural population have been based on a classification of agglomerations or clusters of population. In one case (Cuba, 1943) all nuclei of population were included in the urban total, the smallest places containing less than fifty inhabi-

¹ The definition used by Nicaragua in 1940 has not been determined, but inspection of the census data for geographic areas suggests that this type of classification was made in that census.

tants. However, rather extensive tabulations were given for places of 5,000 or more inhabitants, so the latter might be regarded as the effective definition. The other nine countries have adopted minimum size designations, as follows:

| | |
|-----------------|-------|
| Argentina | 2,000 |
| Chile | 1,000 |
| Denmark | 250 |
| Iceland | 300 |
| India | 5,000 |
| Mexico | 2,500 |
| Panama | 1,500 |
| Portugal | 2,000 |
| Venezuela | 2,500 |

The statistics for Denmark are generally shown by the following divisions:

1. The Capital;
2. Suburbs of the Capital;
3. Provincial cities;
4. Suburbs of provincial cities;
5. Agglomerations in rural *communes*;
6. Strictly rural areas.

The first five items represent sub-divisions of the urban population. This list indicates how an administrative or governmental definition of urban, which included items 1 and 3, has been revised to approximate an "agglomeration" type of definition. For most purposes, the inclusion of agglomerations as small as 250 may seem to stretch the concept of urban areas too far, but the collection of data of this type furnishes the basis for a graduated distribution that can be classified into successive size groups and be used in accordance with various definitions of urban.

Norway and Sweden have adopted similar classification schemes (see appendix table) which offer the possibility of expanding the urban category to include suburbs of cities and agglomerations of a non-administrative character, but for most of their tabulations they retain the local-government type of definition.

India and Panama made certain exceptions to the established minimum and included some places of smaller size that had definite urban characteristics. Chile included centres of less than the minimum (1,000 inhabitants) that were administrative centres of *communes*.

Some fifteen additional countries identified all "inhabited places" designated variously as "localities", "populated centres", "populated places" or "villages", for purposes of the census but most of them did not use these data for purposes of urban-rural classification (see appendix table). It has already been indicated that Peru, Ireland, and Australia made certain adaptations of the basic administrative definition to add suburbs or

agglomerations to the urban classification. New Zealand and the United States have also delineated areas for special purposes which include with a central city the thickly settled outlying areas ordinarily classified as rural for general census purposes. These are the "urban areas" in New Zealand and the "metropolitan districts" in the United States.

For the 1950 census, the United States has made plans for identifying the "urban fringe" around all incorporated places of 50,000 or more inhabitants and for identifying all agglomerations in unincorporated territory that have 2,500 or more inhabitants. These areas will be included in the urban classification.

The chief problem involved in implementing a classification by agglomerations is the identification of the agglomerations or clusters of population in the census. Comparability depends in some measure on the use of relatively uniform rules for delimiting the cluster. The object is to count together all the inhabitants of a continuous, thickly settled area that functions as an integrated social unit. Cities and towns with official status and fixed boundaries furnish a convenient starting point. Separate data for such places are usually required in any case for various administrative or fiscal purposes. It is the delimitation of suburban fringes and of agglomerations that do not have official status that creates some difficulty.

Various methods have been used to delimit such areas. As indicated earlier, approximately half the countries included in this report have obtained separate population counts either for all inhabited places or for those above a stated minimum. In some cases, the census instructions provided for the preliminary determination by local authorities of the places that were to be counted as separate units. In others, enumerators were instructed to count together the inhabitants of all places with names and to specify the category to which each place belonged, as town, village, settlement, farm, ranch, station, camp, etc. In still others, enumerators were instructed to classify as urban and count together the inhabitants of any group of structures that had a place name and was laid out in streets with names and house numbers.

The classification of areas on the basis of population density is a possible method, but one that involves complications connected with the size and constitution of the geographic units for which the density is to be computed. For the purpose of distinguishing agglomerations from unagglomerated population, this method rather begs the question, since the density of an agglomeration cannot

be computed until its limits have been set. A density criterion does have some value, however, in the delimiting of suburbs or urban fringes, providing data are obtainable on the area and population of small geographic units. The United States has used such a criterion in delineating "metropolitan districts", adding to the central incorporated city all the adjacent and contiguous minor civil divisions with a density above a predetermined level.

Another kind of criterion that has been suggested, and appears to have been used to a limited extent, is the presence or absence of certain institutionalized services that are usual concomitants of urban life. Among these are: systems of local public transportation; telephone service; availability of running water, electricity and gas; door-to-door mail delivery; presence of churches, schools, market places, or other symbols of localized community life. The difficulty here is that in some regions, some or all such services have been extended far into farm and rural areas. In other regions, many of these services are lacking even in rather important centres of population. Thus, they represent characteristics that are not necessarily confined to or typical of the city in the spatial or physical sense, but are associated with urbanism in the cultural sense. It would seem, therefore, that any use of criteria of this type would necessarily be, at most, of a supplementary nature only, their application confined to cases where other conditions more closely related to agglomerations *per se* have already been met.

The applicability or relevance of the methods described above varies in accordance with the conditions existing in the several countries. It would be impossible to construct a set of specific rules for the identification and delimitation of population clusters that would be susceptible of international adoption at this juncture. Probably, the comparability of statistics would not be seriously affected by considerable variation in the methods whereby the limits of the cluster are determined. The greatest potential contribution to comparability is already achieved when agreement is reached on the general principle of classifying the population by size of agglomeration and when a standard set of size classes has been adopted.

Whatever particular method is adopted, a preliminary listing and mapping of all clusters that are to be identified and counted in the census is desirable, since this ensures relatively uniform and objective standards of classification, at least at the national level. Where it is not practicable to undertake listing and subsequently enumerating all the numerous very small clusters of population that exist in almost every country, a careful guess at the size of small clusters could be made during the preliminary listing, and places below a given size eliminated from the list. This "given size" should be well below any minimum that is contemplated for presentation in census results, so as to provide for a full count of clusters at the minimum level.

IV. TABULATIONS OF URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION IN RECENT CENSUSES

It should be emphasized that the size-of-place classification proposed by the Population Commission, with a cross-classification by age and sex, is recommended *in addition* to the tabulations normally made for urban and rural populations as defined in each country. Many countries have made rather extensive tabulations for urban and rural divisions of their population and these data are of considerable value for analytical purposes in spite of their limited comparability. The discussion in this section is concerned with the principal types of urban-rural tabulations that have appeared in recent publications.

The information on tabulations covers forty-nine countries. This information does not in all cases refer to the latest census. In general, the census selected was the latest one for which complete information could be obtained. The definitions presented in the appendix table apply to the censuses mentioned in this section as well as to the later censuses for which tabulations are not available.

1. Major characteristics tabulated for urban and rural areas

For the purposes of this report, "major characteristics" were taken as those recommended by the United Nations Population Commission for investigation in population censuses to be taken in or about 1950. Table 1 shows, for each census, which of these characteristics were represented in census reports for urban and rural areas.

Of the forty-nine countries, four (Canada, the United States, Belgium and Czechoslovakia) presented tabulations for all ten of the characteristics listed. Four countries (Switzerland, Mexico, Romania and the USSR) presented tabulations for nine of the characteristics.

The characteristics most frequently tabulated, in order of frequency, were:

| | <i>Censuses</i> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Sex | 47 |
| Age by sex | 32 |
| Families or households | 32 |
| Marital status | 30 |
| Birthplace | 27 |
| Economic characteristics | 26 |

Each of the remaining characteristics was tabulated in less than half of the forty-nine censuses, the lowest frequency being that for mother tongue, with only seven censuses presenting tabulations. However, thirteen of the censuses gave tabulations of language spoken, ability to speak designated languages, or mother tongue.

The discussion which follows on the major types of data tabulated for each subject does not touch on problems of comparability in census methods or definition. These are dealt with in the United Nations report, *Population Census Methods*.¹

2. Tabulations by age and sex

All except two of the countries that classified the urban and rural population by age cross-classified the data by sex. The age-groups tabulated show considerable variation (see table 2). It would be impossible to select a set of useful age groups into which the data for all the countries could be combined. However, for the three broad age groups, under 15, 15-59, 60 and over, which are useful for many purposes, the desired combinations could be made for twenty-seven of the censuses shown in the table. For the eight age-groups proposed by the Population Commission, the appropriate combinations could be made for twenty-four of the censuses.

3. Tabulations of marital status

Data on the marital status of the population in urban and rural areas are valuable for various purposes. These data are particularly useful if cross-classified by age and sex. All but one of the censuses that presented data on marital status for

¹ United Nations. Department of Social Affairs, Population Division and Department of Economic Affairs, Statistical Office of the United Nations. *Population Census Methods*. (ST/SOA/Series A, Population Studies, No. 4.) Lake Success, 1950.

the urban and rural population made the classification by sex (see table 3). All except eight tabulated the data by age for each sex.

4. Tabulations by place of birth, legal nationality and language

Differences between urban and rural areas are often related to differences in the composition of the population with respect to nativity, legal nationality, and language. In thirty of the censuses, data on one or more of these subjects were presented separately for the urban and rural population. The major types of data presented are shown in table 4 for place of birth and legal nationality and in table 1 for mother tongue, language spoken, or ability to speak designated languages.

5. Tabulations of educational characteristics

Another basic consideration in urban-rural differences is education. Of the nineteen censuses presenting such data for the urban and rural population, nine gave data on literacy and illiteracy and ten gave data on educational attainment (see table 5). Four of these presented data on both literacy and educational attainment.

6. Tabulations of economic characteristics

The relevance of tabulations of economic characteristics to urban-rural analysis needs no explanation. Most of the censuses that presented tabulations of the economically active population by occupation or industry group for the urban and rural population classified these data by industrial or social status (see table 6). About half of them also presented tabulations of the population dependent on various types of economic activity (i.e., the economically active in each type of economic activity plus inactive persons dependent upon them for a livelihood).

7. Tabulations of households or families

About three out of five of the censuses examined gave information on the number of households or families in urban and rural areas. These data can be used for computing the average size of family (or household). In addition some of the censuses presented tabulations of households by the number of persons in the household and a few presented tabulations by the number of children in certain age groups (see table 7). These data permit some insight into urban-rural differences with respect to family size and composition.

8. Tabulations of fertility characteristics

Only ten censuses presented data for urban and rural areas that can be regarded as direct measures of fertility. The censuses presenting such data are indicated in column (8) of table 1. The types of classifications made include tabulations of the number of women by number of children borne (Canada, United States, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Switzerland) and tabulations of married persons or married couples by duration of marriage and number of children (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway). In some cases, the data are tabulated by age of woman or by age of one or both spouses.

Although data of this type are valuable for intensive analysis of fertility trends and levels, it should be noted that indirect measures of fertility may be obtained from the tabulations by age, sex and marital status, and from data on household (or family) size and composition.

9. Tabulations of other characteristics

A number of censuses have presented urban and rural tabulations for such characteristics as religion, income, migration, physical and mental defect, and housing. Censuses presenting data on these characteristics are listed below:

(a) Religions of the population:

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Canada, 1941 | Netherlands, 1930 |
| Mexico, 1940 | Norway, 1930 |
| India, 1931 | Romania, 1930 |
| Bulgaria, 1934 | Switzerland, 1941 |
| Czechoslovakia, 1930 | Northern Ireland, 1937 |
| Finland, 1940 | Yugoslavia, 1931 |
| Hungary, 1930 | Australia, 1933 |
| Iceland, 1930 | New Zealand, 1936 |
| Ireland, 1936 | |

(b) Income:

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| Canada, 1941 | Sweden, 1945 |
| United States, 1940 | Australia, 1933 |
| Norway, 1930 | New Zealand, 1936 |

(c) Migration data:

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| Canada, 1941 | Iceland, 1930 |
| United States, 1940 | Switzerland, 1941 |
| Czechoslovakia, 1930 | USSR, 1926 |
| Denmark, 1940 | Australia, 1933 |

(d) Physical or mental defect:

| | |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Mexico, 1940 | Iceland, 1930 |
| Turkey, 1935 | Norway, 1930 |
| Bulgaria, 1934 | Romania, 1930 |
| Czechoslovakia, 1930 | USSR, 1926 |

(e) Housing characteristics:

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Cuba, 1943 | Romania, 1930 |
| United States, 1940 | Switzerland, 1941 |
| Belgium, 1930 | England and Wales, 1931 |
| Czechoslovakia, 1930 | Northern Ireland, 1937 |
| France, 1946 | Scotland, 1931 |
| Hungary, 1930 | Yugoslavia, 1931 |
| Ireland, 1936 | Australia, 1933 |
| Netherlands, 1930 | New Zealand, 1936 |
| Norway, 1930 | |

10. Other tabulations

The present report has not exhausted the data that are available in the censuses examined. Numerous detailed tabulations and further cross-classifications were presented for many of the characteristics investigated by the various censuses. Only the main categories and more basic cross-classifications have been indicated here.

Table 1. Major characteristics tabulated for urban and rural areas in recent censuses

"x" indicates that the specified characteristic was presented; "(x)" that it was presented only for certain urban areas and for the remainder of the country (see note at end of table); "-" that it was not presented; ".." that information was not available or was not complete.

| Country | Census year | Sex | Age by sex | Marital status | Place of birth | Legal nationality | Language ¹ | Educational characteristics | Fertility | Economic characteristics | Households or families |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----|------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| AFRICA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Egypt | 1937 | x | (x) | (x) | - | (x) | - | (x) | - | .. | (x) |
| Union of South Africa .. | 1936 | x | x | x | x | x ² | x ^{2 3} | - | - | - | - |
| AMERICA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina | 1947 | x | .. | .. | .. | .. | - | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Brazil | 1940 | x | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. ⁴ | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Canada | 1941 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | (x) | x |
| Chile | 1940 | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | x |
| Colombia | 1938 | (x) | (x) | - | - | - | - | (x) | - | - | - |
| Cuba | 1943 | (x) | (x) | (x) | (x) | (x) | - | (x) | - | - | (x) |
| Dominican Republic | 1935 | x | - | - | - | x | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Salvador | 1930 | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Guatemala | 1940 | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Honduras | 1945 | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mexico | 1940 | x | (x) | (x) | (x) | (x) | (x) ⁵ | (x) | - | (x) | (x) |
| Nicaragua | 1940 | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Panama | 1940 | x | x | x | x | x | - | x | - | (x) | x |
| Peru | 1940 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | x |
| United States | 1940 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Venezuela | 1941 | x | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASIA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ceylon | 1946 | x | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| India | 1931 | x | (x) | (x) | (x) | - | - | (x) | - | - | x ⁶ |
| Japan | 1930 | x | x | x | x | x | - | - | - | x | x |
| Turkey | 1935 | x | x | (x) | (x) | (x) | (x) | x | - | (x) | - |
| EUROPE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Austria | 1934 | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | x | - | - |
| Belgium | 1930 | x | x | x | x | x | x ⁷ | x | x | x | x |
| Bulgaria | 1934 | x | x | x | x | - | x ⁸ | x | - | x | x |
| Czechoslovakia | 1930 | x | (x) | (x) | (x) | (x) | (x) ⁸ | (x) | (x) | x | (x) |
| Denmark | 1940 | x | x | x | (x) | - | - | - | - | x | (x) |
| Finland | 1940 | x | x | x | x | - | x ⁵ | - | - | x | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------|----|--------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|----|-----|-----|-----|
| France | 1946 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | - | .. | .. | .. | x |
| Germany | 1933 | x | x | x | - | - | - | - | x | x | x |
| Greece | 1940 | x | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Hungary | 1930 | x | ⁹ | x | (x) | x | x | x | (x) | x | x |
| Iceland | 1930 | x | x | x | x | x | - | - | - | x | x |
| Ireland | 1936 | x | (x) | (x) | (x) | - | - | - | - | (x) | (x) |
| Italy | 1936 | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | x | x |
| Netherlands | 1930 | x | x | x | x | x | - | x | x | - | x |
| Norway | 1930 | x | x | x | x | x | - | - | x | x | x |
| Poland | 1946 | x | ⁹ | - | - | x | - | - | - | - | - |
| Portugal | 1940 | x | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Romania | 1930 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | - | x | x |
| Sweden | 1945 | x | x | x | x | .. | - | x | - | x | x |
| Switzerland | 1941 | x | x | x | x | x | x | - | (x) | x | x |
| United Kingdom: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| England and Wales | 1931 | x | x | x | (x) | (x) | - | - | - | x | x |
| Northern Ireland | 1937 | x | x | x | x | - | - | - | - | - | x |
| Scotland | 1931 | x | (x) | (x) | - | - | - | - | - | (x) | (x) |
| USSR | 1926 | x | x | x | x | x | x ⁵ | x | - | x | x |
| Yugoslavia | 1931 | x | x | - | - | - | - | x | - | x | x |
| OCEANIA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Australia | 1933 | x | x | x | x | x | - | x | - | x | x |
| New Zealand | 1936 | x | x | x | x | - | - | - | - | x | x |

NOTE. Items marked "(x)" were presented for areas that do not wholly conform to official definitions. Adjustments of the urban category were as follows: Egypt—excluding chief-towns of districts; Canada—excluding urban places of less than 1,000 inhabitants; Colombia—including administrative centres of less than 1,500 inhabitants; Cuba—excluding urban places of less than 5,000 inhabitants; Mexico—excluding localities of 2,500 to 10,000 inhabitants; Panama—excluding urban centres of less than 2,000 inhabitants; India—excluding towns of less than 100,000 inhabitants; Turkey—excluding towns of less than 10,000 inhabitants; Czechoslovakia—excluding places of less than 10,000 inhabitants; Denmark—excluding suburbs and urban agglomerations in rural *communes*; Hungary—excluding "county towns"; Ireland—including seven towns of less than 1,500 inhabitants; Switzerland—excluding urban places of less than 30,000 inhabitants; England and Wales—excluding urban areas of less than 50,000 inhabitants, but including all county boroughs and metropolitan boroughs; Scotland—excluding special districts (age, marital status, households or families), excluding urban places of less than 20,000 (economic characteristics).

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, the data referred to mother tongue.

² These data were tabulated for the Asiatic, Coloured and European populations only.

³ The tabulations showed languages spoken and ability to speak designated languages.

⁴ Final tabulations are not available. The language questions on the census schedule, however, referred to languages spoken and ability to speak designated languages.

⁵ The tabulations showed languages spoken.

⁶ The tabulations showed number of occupied houses.

⁷ The tabulations showed ability to speak designated languages.

⁸ The tabulations were labelled "ethnic nationality" but pertained almost exclusively to the mother tongue reported.

⁹ The data were tabulated separately by age and by sex but not by age and sex together.

Table 2. Tabulations by age and sex for urban and rural areas in recent censuses

This table is limited to censuses for which tabulations by age and sex for urban and rural areas were available. Tabulations are for the same urban or rural categories as indicated in table 1. Except where otherwise noted, age and sex were cross-tabulated.

| Country | Census year | Most detailed age groups shown | | | Other age groups shown |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Age range covered by single years | Age range covered by 5-year groups (but not by single years) | Age range covered by 10-year groups (but not by 5-year groups) | |
| AFRICA | | | | | |
| Egypt | 1937 | 0 to 4 | 5 to 59 | 60 to 99 | 100+ |
| Union of South Africa .. | 1936 | 0 to 20 | 20 to 99 | - | 21-24, 100+ |
| AMERICA | | | | | |
| Canada | 1941 | 0 to 94 | - | - | 95+ |
| Colombia | 1938 | 7 to 14 | - | - | 0-7, 15-29, 30+ |
| Cuba | 1943 | - | 0 to 4 | - | 5-13, 14-19, 20-49, 50+ |
| Mexico | 1940 | 0 to 4 | 5 to 99 | - | Under 1 month, 1-11 months, 100+ |
| Panama | 1940 | - | 0 to 89 | - | 90+ |
| United States | 1940 | 0 to 99 | - | - | 100+ |
| Venezuela | 1941 | Under 1 | 0 to 9 | 10 to 69 | Under 1 month, 1-5 months, 6-11 months, 70+ |
| ASIA | | | | | |
| India | 1931 | 0 to 4 | 5 to 19 | 20 to 59 | 60+ |
| Turkey | 1935 | 6 to 19 | 0 to 4 | 20 to 94 | 95+ |
| EUROPE | | | | | |
| Belgium | 1930 | - | - | - | 0-6, 7-14, 15-20, 21-59, 60+ |
| Bulgaria | 1934 | 0 to 89 | - | - | 90+ |
| Czechoslovakia | 1930 | - | 0 to 4 | 5 to 24 | 25-44, 45-64, 65-79, 80+ |
| Denmark | 1940 | 0 to 99 | - | - | 100+ |
| Finland | 1940 | 0 to 104 | - | - | 105+ |
| Germany | 1933 | 0 to 99 | - | - | 100+ |
| Hungary | 1930 ¹ | - | 10 to 19 | 20 to 59 | 0-2, 3-5, 6-9, 10-11, 12-14, 60+ |
| Iceland | 1930 | - | All ages | - | - |
| Ireland | 1936 | 0 to 99 | - | - | 100+ |
| Netherlands | 1930 | 0 to 99 | - | - | Under 1 month, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-11 months, 100+ |
| Norway | 1930 | 0 to 99 | - | - | 100+ |
| Poland | 1946 ¹ | - | - | - | 0-17, 18-59, 60+ |
| Romania | 1930 | 0 to 99 | - | - | 100+ |
| Sweden | 1945 | 0 to 94 | - | - | 95+ |
| Switzerland | 1941 | - | 0 to 94 | - | 95+ |
| United Kingdom: | | | | | |
| England and Wales ... | 1931 | 0 to 99 | - | - | 100+ |
| Northern Ireland | 1937 | - | 0 to 94 | - | 95+ |
| Scotland | 1931 | Under 1 | 0 to 84 | - | 1-4, 85+ |
| USSR | 1926 | 0 to 99 | - | - | 100+ |
| Yugoslavia | 1931 | - | - | - | 0-10, 11-19, 20-39, 40-59, 60+ |
| OCEANIA | | | | | |
| Australia | 1933 | - | 0 to 99 | - | 100+ |
| New Zealand | 1936 | - | 0 to 24 | 25 to 74 | 15, 16-19, 20, 21-24, 75+ |

¹ The data were tabulated separately by age and by sex, but not by age and sex together.

Table 3. Tabulations of marital status for urban and rural areas in recent censuses

This table is limited to censuses for which tabulations of marital status for urban and rural areas were available. Tabulations are for the same urban or rural categories as indicated in table 1. "x" indicates that the specified classification was presented; "-" that it was not presented.

| Country | Census year | Number of marital status categories shown ¹ | Cross-classifications | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--|-----------------------|------------|
| | | | Sex | Age by sex |
| | | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| AFRICA | | | | |
| Egypt | 1937 | 4 | x | - |
| Union of South Africa | 1936 | 4 | x | x |
| AMERICA | | | | |
| Canada | 1941 | 5 ² | x | x |
| Cuba | 1943 | 4 | x | - |
| Mexico | 1940 | 5 ³ | x | x |
| Panama | 1940 | 5 ³ | x | - |
| United States | 1940 | 4 | x | x |
| ASIA | | | | |
| India | 1931 | 3 ⁴ | x | x |
| Turkey | 1935 | 4 | x | x |
| EUROPE | | | | |
| Belgium | 1930 | 4 | x | x |
| Bulgaria | 1934 | 4 | x | x |
| Czechoslovakia | 1930 | 5 ² | x | - |
| Denmark | 1940 | 5 ² | x | x |
| Finland | 1940 | 4 | x | x |
| Germany | 1933 | 4 | x | x |
| Hungary | 1930 | 4 | - | - |
| Iceland | 1930 | 4 | x | x |
| Ireland | 1936 | 3 ⁴ | x | x |
| Netherlands | 1930 | 5 ² | x | x |
| Norway | 1930 | 4 | x | x |
| Romania | 1930 | 4 | x | - |
| Sweden | 1945 | 4 | x | x |
| Switzerland | 1941 | 4 | x | x |
| United Kingdom: | | | | |
| England and Wales | 1931 | 4 | x | x |
| Northern Ireland | 1937 | 4 | x | x |
| Scotland | 1931 | 4 | x | - |
| USSR | 1926 | 4 | x | x |
| OCEANIA | | | | |
| Australia | 1933 | 4 | x | - |
| New Zealand | 1936 | 5 ⁵ | x | x |

¹ Where four categories are indicated, they were: single, married, widowed, divorced.

² The categories were: single, married, separated, widowed, divorced.

³ The categories were: single, married, consensually married, widowed, divorced.

⁴ The categories were: single, married, widowed.

⁵ The categories were: single, married, legally separated, widowed, divorced.

Table 4. Major types of data on birthplace and legal nationality for urban and rural areas in recent censuses

This table is limited to censuses for which tabulations of either birthplace or legal nationality for urban and rural areas were available. Tabulations are for the same urban or rural categories as indicated in table 1. "x" indicates that the specified classification was presented; "-" that it was not presented; "..." that information was not available or was not complete.

| Country | Census year | Birthplace | | Legal nationality | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Distinction between native and foreign-born | Locality of birth of natives | Distinction between nationals and aliens | Country of legal nationality of aliens |
| | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| AFRICA | | | | | |
| Egypt | 1937 | - | - | x | x |
| Union of South Africa | 1936 | x ¹ | x | x ² | x ² |
| AMERICA | | | | | |
| Canada | 1941 | x ¹ | x | x | - |
| Cuba | 1943 | x ¹ | - | x | - |
| Dominican Republic | 1935 | - | - | x | - |
| Mexico | 1940 | x | - | x | x |
| Panama | 1940 | x | - | x | x |
| United States | 1940 | x ¹ | x | x ³ | - |
| ASIA | | | | | |
| India | 1931 | x | x | - | - |
| Turkey | 1935 | x ¹ | x | x | x |
| EUROPE | | | | | |
| Belgium | 1930 | x ¹ | x | x | x |
| Bulgaria | 1934 | x ¹ | x | - | - |
| Czechoslovakia | 1930 | x | x | x | x |
| Denmark | 1940 | x ¹ | - | - | - |
| Finland | 1940 | x ¹ | x | - | - |
| Hungary | 1930 | x ¹ | - | x | - |
| Iceland | 1930 | x | x | x | x |
| Ireland | 1936 | x ¹ | x | - | - |
| Netherlands | 1930 | x | x | x | x |
| Norway | 1930 | x ¹ | x | x | x |
| Poland | 1946 | - | - | x | x |
| Romania | 1930 | x | x | x | x |
| Sweden | 1945 | x | x | .. | .. |
| Switzerland | 1941 | x | x | x | - |
| United Kingdom: | | | | | |
| England and Wales | 1931 | x ¹ | x | x | - |
| Northern Ireland | 1937 | x | - | - | - |
| USSR | 1926 | x | x | x | - |
| OCEANIA | | | | | |
| Australia | 1933 | x ¹ | x | x | x |
| New Zealand | 1936 | x ¹ | x | - | - |

¹ Foreign-born were shown by country of birth.

² The data were shown for the Asiatic, Coloured and European populations only.

³ The data were shown for the white population only.

Table 5. Tabulations of educational characteristics for urban and rural areas in recent censuses

This table is limited to censuses for which tabulations of educational characteristics for urban and rural areas were available. Tabulations are for the same urban or rural categories as indicated in table 1. "x" indicates that the specified classification was presented; "-" that it was not presented.

| Country | Census year | Types of data shown | | |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| | | Ability to read and write | Ability to read only | Educational attainment |
| | | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| AFRICA | | | | |
| Egypt | 1937 | x | - | x |
| AMERICA | | | | |
| Canada | 1941 | - | - | x |
| Colombia | 1938 | - | x | - |
| Cuba | 1943 | - | x | - |
| Mexico | 1940 | x | x | x |
| Panama | 1940 | - | - | x |
| United States | 1940 | - | - | x |
| ASIA | | | | |
| India | 1931 | x | - | - |
| Turkey | 1935 | x | x | - |
| EUROPE | | | | |
| Belgium | 1930 | x | - | - |
| Bulgaria | 1934 | x | - | x |
| Czechoslovakia | 1930 | x | x | - |
| Hungary | 1930 | x | - | - |
| Netherlands | 1930 | - | - | x ¹ |
| Romania | 1930 | - | x | x |
| Sweden | 1945 | - | - | x |
| USSR | 1926 | - | x | - |
| Yugoslavia | 1931 | x | - | - |
| OCEANIA | | | | |
| Australia | 1933 | - | - | x ² |

¹ The data related to university graduates.

² The data related to persons receiving schooling, tabulated by place of instruction.

Table 6. Tabulations of economic characteristics for urban and rural areas in recent censuses

This table is limited to censuses for which tabulations of economic characteristics for urban and rural areas were available. Tabulations are for the same urban or rural categories as indicated in table 1. "x" indicates that the specified classification was presented; "-" that it was not presented.

| Country | Census year | Economically active population | | Population dependent on various branches of economic activity |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | | Occupation or industry group | Industrial or social status | |
| | | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| AMERICA | | | | |
| Canada | 1941 | x | - | - |
| Mexico | 1940 | x | x | - |
| Panama | 1940 | x | - | - |
| United States | 1940 | x | x | - |
| ASIA | | | | |
| Turkey | 1935 | x | - | - |
| EUROPE | | | | |
| Belgium | 1930 | x | x | - |
| Bulgaria | 1934 | x | x | x |
| Czechoslovakia | 1930 | x | x | x |
| Denmark | 1940 | x | x | x |
| Finland | 1940 | x | x | x |
| Germany | 1933 | x | x | x |
| Hungary | 1930 | x | x | x |
| Iceland | 1930 | x | x | x |
| Ireland | 1936 | x | - | - |
| Italy | 1936 | x | - | - |
| Norway | 1930 | x | x | x |
| Romania | 1930 | x | x | - |
| Sweden | 1945 | x | x | x |
| Switzerland | 1941 | x | - | x |
| United Kingdom: | | | | |
| England and Wales | 1931 | x | x | - |
| Scotland | 1931 | x | - | - |
| USSR | 1926 | x | x | x |
| Yugoslavia | 1931 | x | x | x |
| OCEANIA | | | | |
| Australia | 1933 | x | x | - |
| New Zealand | 1936 | x | - | - |

Table 7. Tabulations of household or family characteristics for urban and rural areas in recent censuses

This table is limited to censuses for which tabulations of either household or family characteristics for urban and rural areas were available. Tabulations are for the same urban or rural categories as indicated in table 1. "x" indicates that the specified classification was presented; "-" that it was not presented; ".." that information was not available or was not complete.

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Census year</i> | <i>Number of households or families</i> | <i>Households by number of persons</i> | <i>Households by number of children of specified ages</i> |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---|--|---|
| | | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| AMERICA | | | | |
| Canada | 1941 | x | x | x |
| Chile | 1940 | x | .. | .. |
| Cuba | 1943 | x | x | - |
| Mexico | 1940 | x | x | - |
| Panama | 1940 | x | - | - |
| Peru | 1940 | x | - | - |
| United States | 1940 | x | x | x |
| ASIA | | | | |
| India | 1931 | x ¹ | - | - |
| EUROPE | | | | |
| Belgium | 1930 | x | x | x |
| Bulgaria | 1934 | x | x | x |
| Denmark | 1940 | x | x | x |
| France | 1946 | x | x | .. |
| Germany | 1930 | x | - | x |
| Hungary | 1930 | x | x | - |
| Iceland | 1930 | x | x | - |
| Italy | 1936 | x | - | - |
| Netherlands | 1930 | x | x | x |
| Norway | 1930 | x | x | - |
| Romania | 1930 | x | x | - |
| Sweden | 1945 | x | - | x |
| Switzerland | 1941 | x | - | - |
| United Kingdom: | | | | |
| England and Wales | 1931 | x | x | - |
| Northern Ireland | 1937 | x | x | - |
| Scotland | 1931 | x | x | - |
| USSR | 1926 | x | - | - |
| Yugoslavia | 1931 | x | - | - |
| OCEANIA | | | | |
| New Zealand | 1936 | x | x | - |

¹ The data referred to the number of occupied houses.

APPENDIX

Administrative divisions by type and number, and urban-rural definitions, for fifty-three countries

| Continent and country | Number and type of division | | | | | Census definition of urban or rural areas ¹ |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| | Year | Major | Intermediate | Minor | Other divisions or classifications | |
| AFRICA | | | | | | |
| Egypt | 1937 | 5 governorates 14 provinces 4 frontier governorates | 6 cities 85 districts 15 districts and oases | 3,756 towns and villages 84 villages | | Urban: governorates, chief towns of provinces, and chief towns of districts |
| Union of South Africa | 1936 | 4 provinces | 248 magisterial districts | 493 areas with some form of local gov- ernment: municip- alities, village boards and coun- cils, health commit- tees, township boards, etc. .. Other: rural sub- urbs, rural town- ships, farming areas, Native re- serves, etc. | | Urban: all areas possessing some form of local government |
| AMERICA | | | | | | |
| Argentina | 1947 | 1 federal capital 14 provinces } 10 territories } | | .. Departments and districts | .. Cities and other populated centres identified for census purposes | Urban: cities and populated cen- tres of 2,000 or more inhabi- tants |
| Brazil | 1940 | 1 federal district } 20 states } 1 territory } | 1,574 <i>municipios</i> | 4,842 districts | .. Urban, suburban and rural zones | Urban: principal towns of dis- tricts and their suburbs. A dis- trict may not be established until the chief centre contains at least 30 households and the urban and suburban limits have been determined |
| Canada | 1941 | 2 territories 9 provinces | 157 counties 61 census divisions } | .. Townships and cen- sus sub-divisions | 1,640 incorporated cities, towns and villages —Unincorporated territory | Urban: incorporated cities, towns and villages |
| Chile | 1940 | 25 provinces | 84 departments | 258 <i>communes</i> ² | .. Localities classi- fied as: cities, towns, villages, farms, ranches, etc. | Urban: populated centres of more than 1,000 inhabitants. Also seats of <i>communes</i> , re- gardless of the number of in- habitants |
| Colombia | 1938 | 14 departments } 4 <i>intendencias</i> } 6 <i>comisarias</i> } | 811 <i>municipios</i> | .. Districts | | Urban: centres of more than 1,500 inhabitants which are seats of <i>municipios</i> or districts |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Costa Rica | 1947 ^a | 7 provinces | 63 cantons | 304 districts | 7 capitals of provinces | No definition, but statistics are given for provincial capitals and for districts |
| Cuba | 1943 | 6 provinces | 126 <i>municipios</i> | 1,213 <i>barrios</i> | 892 populated centres—other areas | Urban: populated centres (<i>poblaciones</i>) of all sizes |
| Dominican Republic ... | 1935 | 1 national district 12 provinces | 61 <i>communes</i> 5 municipal districts | { National capital and 66 seats (<i>Cabeceras</i>) of <i>communes</i> and municipal districts 1,592 municipal sections | | Urban: national capital, seats of <i>communes</i> and municipal districts |
| El Salvador | 1930 | 14 departments | 37 districts | | 258 <i>municipios</i> | Urban: capitals of departments, seats of districts, administrative centres of <i>municipios</i> |
| Guatemala | 1940 | 5 regions | 22 departments | 309 <i>municipios</i> | | Urban: the administrative centres of <i>municipios</i> |
| Honduras | 1945 | 17 departments | | 19 districts 249 <i>municipios</i> | | Urban: capitals or administrative centres of districts and <i>municipios</i> |
| Mexico | 1940 | 1 federal district 3 territories 28 states | | Capital city and 12 delegations 14 delegations 2,298 <i>municipios</i> | { 122,434 populated centres (<i>localidades</i>): cities, villages, towns, farms, ranches, etc. | Urban: populated centres of more than 2,500 inhabitants |
| Nicaragua | 1940 | 15 departments | | 118 <i>municipios</i> | | Definition not determined—probably similar to that of Honduras |
| Panama | 1940 | 9 provinces | 64 districts | 366 <i>corregimientos</i> | 4,687 populated centres (<i>lugares poblados</i>) of 10 or more inhabitants —Other | Urban: populated centres of 1,500 or more inhabitants, but including a few places of less than 1,500 with essentially urban characteristics |
| Peru | 1940 | 23 departments | 122 provinces | 1,064 districts | 57,365 populated centres (<i>centros poblados</i>) | Urban: capitals of departments, provinces and districts; other populated centres with a population exceeding the average for the capitals (2,103) and not possessing typically rural characteristics |
| United States | 1940 | 1 national capital 48 states | 3,098 counties | 51,627 minor civil divisions | 16,612 incorporated places (cities, towns, boroughs, etc.) —Unincorporated territory | Urban: incorporated places of 2,500 or more inhabitants (including national capital) and certain additional unincorporated but thickly settled areas that were designated as urban for purposes of the census Rural: all other areas, classified as (1) non-farm areas or (2) farms |
| Venezuela | 1941 | 1 federal district 20 states 2 territories 1 federal dependency | 2 departments 149 districts | Capital city and 12 parishes 598 <i>municipios</i> 7 departments | { .. Populated centres (<i>lugares poblados</i>) | Urban: populated centres of 2,500 or more, including the capital city |

Appendix (concluded)

| Continent and country | Number and type of division | | | | | Census definition of urban or rural areas ¹ |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | Year | Major | Intermediate | Minor | Other divisions or classifications | |
| ASIA | | | | | | |
| Ceylon | 1946 | 9 provinces | 19 districts | 3 municipalities 38 urban council areas .. Villages | | Urban: municipalities and urban council areas |
| India | 1941 | 17 provinces | 231 districts | 764 municipalities .. Unincorporated territory | 960 "towns" for census purposes 459,391 villages 979 municipalities and "towns" 196,501 villages | Urban: municipalities and towns, i.e., places of 5,000 or more in- habitants, possessing definite urban characteristics. A few places of less than 5,000 were also included |
| | | 23 states and agencies | .. Districts | | | Rural: villages |
| Japan | 1947 | 46 prefectures | 214 incorporated municipalities (<i>shi</i>) .. Rural counties (<i>gun</i>) | { 1,811 towns (<i>machi</i>) 8,480 villages (<i>mura</i>) | | Urban: incorporated municipali- ties, most of which contained a population cluster of at least 30,000 inhabitants |
| Thailand | 1938 | 70 provinces | 479 districts | 4,728 <i>communes</i> | 49,752 villages | No definition, but statistics for communes classified into popu- lation size groups are given in the census |
| Turkey | 1945 | 63 provinces | 1 Istanbul City 459 districts | 458 chief towns of districts ⁴ 940 communes (<i>bucak</i>) | 34,065 towns and villages | Urban: towns, i.e., places with a municipal organization. This includes chief towns of prov- inces and districts regardless of size and other populated cen- tres of more than 2,000 inhabi- tants |
| EUROPE | | | | | | |
| Austria | 1934 | 1 capital city 8 provinces | 91 districts | 4,396 <i>communes</i> (<i>Gemeinden</i>) | | Urban: <i>communes</i> of more than 2,000 inhabitants including the capital city |
| Belgium | 1947 | 9 provinces | 41 districts | 2,670 <i>communes</i> | | Urban: <i>communes</i> of 5,000 or more inhabitants |
| Bulgaria | 1946 | 9 districts | 95 <i>arrondissements</i> | 3,000 <i>communes</i> ⁵ | 106 towns .. Villages | Urban: towns, i.e., places legally established as urban |
| Czechoslovakia | 1930 | 4 provinces | 1 national capital 656 districts (<i>okres</i>) | 7 autonomous cities 15,724 <i>communes</i> | 20,479 villages and settlements | Urban: <i>communes</i> of 2,000 or more inhabitants, including the national capital and the 7 au- tonomous cities |
| Denmark | 1945 | 1 capital 22 departments | 86 towns 1,304 rural <i>communes</i> | 1,801 parishes | 549 agglomerations with 250 or more inhabitants | Urban: the capital; towns; sub- urban <i>communes</i> and parishes in rural areas; agglomerations of 250 or more inhabitants in rural areas |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Finland | 1940 | 10 departments | | 38 towns 541 rural <i>communes</i> | | Urban: towns, i.e., places legally established as urban |
| France | 1946 | 90 departments | 311 <i>arrondissements</i> ^a | 37,983 <i>communes</i> | | Urban: <i>communes</i> having more than 2,000 inhabitants in the chief town (<i>chef-lieu</i>) |
| Germany | 1933 | 29 states (<i>Länder</i>) and provinces | 65 major administrative districts ^r | 50,881 <i>communes</i> (<i>Gemeinden</i>) | | Urban: <i>communes</i> of 2,000 or more inhabitants |
| Greece | 1940 | 38 departments | 140 provinces | 72 municipalities 5,619 <i>communes</i> | | Urban: municipalities and <i>communes</i> having 5,000 or more inhabitants in the largest centre of population |
| Hungary | 1948 | 14 autonomous cities 25 counties | 45 county towns 150 <i>arrondissements</i> | 3,241 <i>communes</i> | | Urban: autonomous cities and county towns |
| Iceland | 1930 | 8 towns 18 <i>cantons</i> | | 204 <i>communes</i> | 24 populated centres of 300 or more inhabitants | Urban: towns and centres with more than 300 inhabitants |
| Ireland | 1946 | 4 provinces | Dun Laoghaire Borough and 4 county boroughs 26 counties | 6 municipal boroughs 51 urban districts 160 rural districts | 26 administrative towns 20 census towns .. Other clusters of 20 or more houses | Urban: boroughs, urban districts, administrative towns and census towns of 1,500 or more inhabitants |
| Italy | 1936 | 94 provinces | | 7,339 <i>communes</i> | .. Populated centres .. Scattered houses | Urban: <i>communes</i> with less than 50 per cent of the economically active population engaged in agriculture |
| Luxembourg | 1935 | 4 districts | 13 <i>cantons</i> | 125 <i>communes</i> | .. Inhabited places: towns, villages, hamlets, farms, etc. | Urban: <i>communes</i> having more than 2,000 inhabitants in the chief town (<i>chef-lieu</i>) |
| Netherlands | 1946 | 11 provinces | | 1,016 municipalities (<i>gemeenten</i>) | | Urban: municipalities of 20,000 or more inhabitants |
| Norway | 1946 | 2 prefectural cities 18 prefectures | 64 towns 56 rural districts | 680 rural <i>communes</i> | .. Suburbs and agglomerations in rural <i>communes</i> | Urban: cities and towns. In addition, the following classifications are shown: (1) suburbs of cities and towns in rural <i>communes</i> , (2) agglomerations in rural <i>communes</i> , (3) strictly rural |
| Poland | 1946 | 2 independent cities 14 <i>voivodships</i> | 20 cities 274 counties | 720 towns 3,016 rural boroughs | .. Villages | Urban: cities and towns regardless of number of inhabitants |
| Portugal | 1940 | 22 districts | 302 counties (<i>Conselhos</i>) | 3,975 parishes | 37,761 inhabited places (<i>lugares habitados</i>) | Urban: places of more than 2,000 inhabitants |

Appendix (concluded)

| Continent and country | Year | Number and type of division | | | | Census definition of urban or rural areas ¹ |
|--|-------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | Major | Intermediate | Minor | Other divisions or classifications | |
| Romania | 1945 ^a | 9 provinces | 58 districts | 155 cities and towns 6,480 rural <i>communes</i> | 13,418 villages and hamlets | Urban: cities and towns established by law |
| Spain | 1940 | 50 provinces | 540 judicial districts | 9,254 <i>municipios</i> | .. Populated centres (<i>Entidades de población</i>): cities, towns, villages, settlements, etc. | Urban: <i>municipios</i> of 10,000 or more inhabitants |
| Sweden | 1945 | 1 national capital 24 departments | 124 cities (<i>städer</i>) 284 <i>cantons</i> | 64 market towns (<i>Köpingar</i>) 2,323 rural <i>communes</i> | 235 municipal districts 1,222 agglomerations of 200 or more inhabitants | Urban: cities, including national capital Rural: all other areas, classified into: (1) market towns, (2) municipal districts, (3) agglomerations of 200 or more inhabitants, (4) other rural |
| Switzerland | 1941 | 25 <i>cantons</i> | | 3,107 <i>communes</i> | | Urban: communes of more than 10,000 inhabitants |
| United Kingdom: England and Wales.. | 1931 | 83 county boroughs 62 administrative counties | | 285 municipal boroughs 780 urban districts 645 rural districts | | Urban: London administrative county, county boroughs, municipal boroughs and urban districts |
| Northern Ireland ... | 1937 | 2 county boroughs 6 counties | | 2 municipal boroughs 30 urban districts 32 rural districts | | Urban: cities (county boroughs), municipal boroughs and urban districts |
| Scotland | 1931 | 4 cities 31 counties | | 24 large burghs 170 small burghs .. Landward areas | 388 special lighting and scavenging districts .. Other districts | Urban: cities, burghs, special lighting districts and special scavenging districts of 1,000 or more inhabitants |
| USSR | 1926 | 9 constituent republics | 15 autonomous republics 15 autonomous provinces (<i>oblasts</i>) .. National regions (<i>okrugs</i>) | .. Districts (<i>Rayons</i>) | .. Towns (i.e., legal towns) .. Settlements .. Villages | Urban: towns of 500 or more inhabitants, having an urban form of government |
| Yugoslavia | 1931 | 1 Belgrade prefecture 9 provinces | 32 cities and towns 346 counties | 4,623 <i>communes</i> (<i>Obština</i>) | 27,358 inhabited places | Urban: cities and towns |

OCEANIA

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| Australia | 1947 | 6 states 2 territories } | | <div> <div> 303 incorporated cities, towns and municipalities 707 shires, districts etc. .. Unincorporated territory </div> <div> .. Populated centres of 100 or more inhabitants 20 "census towns" in Tasmania </div> </div> | Urban: capital cities of states and adjoining urban municipal areas within boundaries defined for census purposes; capital cities of territories; those cities and towns of the states which are separately incorporated; unincorporated towns in Tasmania whose boundaries were determined for census purposes |
| New Zealand | 1945 | 10 provincial districts | 128 independent cities and boroughs 32 independent town districts 129 administrative counties | 600 ridings ⁴ 20 dependent town districts .. Populated centres | Urban: independent cities, boroughs and town districts having a population of 1,000 or more Alternate: 14 "urban areas" established for census purposes, each composed of (1) central city or borough, (2) associated boroughs and independent town districts and (3) urbanized portion of surrounding county |

¹ When only the urban is defined, it is understood that the remainder of the country is rural.

² *Communes* are composed of 2,576 districts.

³ Not a census year. Data on administrative divisions could not be obtained for a census year.

⁴ One district has its chief town in common with the national capital.

⁵ Approximate number.

⁶ *Arrondissements* are composed of 3,028 *cantons*.

⁷ Major administrative districts are composed of 938 small administrative districts.