PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

DETERMINANTS OF URBAN SOCIAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF BAHAWALPUR CITY

[1]Hassan Mujtaba Nawaz Saleem, [2] Syed Muhammad Imran [3]Taswar Javed, [4]Muhammad Farooq Shabbir, [5] Muhammad Suhail Sharif, [6] Syed Mumtaz Ali Kazmi

[1,3,4,5] Institute of Business, Management, and Administrative Sciences, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan
[2] Impact of Mangers' Experience on Firm's Innovation: Empirical Evidence from Middle East and North African (MENA)
[6] National College of Business Administration and Economics, Bahawalpur campus, Pakistan
(Corresponding Author: Hassan.Saleem@iub.edu.pk)

Hassan Mujtaba Nawaz Saleem, Syed Muhammad Imran, Taswar Javed, Muhammad Farooq Shabbir, Muhammad Suhail Sharif, Syed Mumtaz Ali Kazmi: Determinants Of Urban Social Sustainable Development: A Case Study Of Bahawalpur City-- Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17 (11), 473-479. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Social Sustainable Development, Social Capital, Trust, Participation, Public Awareness, Bahawalpur.

Abstract:
Debate about social capital and social sustainable development has recently entered into the literature of development economics during last few decade, James Coleman and Robert Putnam conceptualize these terms into the literature. Social capital like other capital is one the important pillar of the socially sustainable development of community. The objective of this research is to expose the important determinants of urban social sustainable development of Bahawalpur City of Southern Punjab, Pakistan having different social classes, cultures and ethnicities. The results indicates that Trust, Public Participation level and Public Awareness are the core determinants while Household size, Education and Age of respondents are significant peripheral variables.

1. Introduction:

Social Capital consists of trust, interaction and network of social relationship which empower people to gain resources. According to World Bank "Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions".

OECD in 2001 define social capital as "Networks, norms, values and under standings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups". The well-known definition of the social capital belongs to Robert Putnam, who define the social capital as "features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, which facilitate co-ordination and cooperation for mutual benefit".

Burton, Jenks, & Williams, 2003; Choguill, 2008; Haapio, 2012 define social sustainability as the decision-making process to provide reasonable and equal distribution of social and physical capital. Dempsey, Brown, and Bramley (2012) define the urban social sustainability as *"*the continuous ability of a city to function as a viable, long-term setting for cultural development, human interaction and communication*".* Chiu (2003) Maintenance and improvement of current and future generations' well-being is known as social sustainability.

All over the world, cities planning, housing and urban policy has been remarkably influenced by social sustainability over the past few decades. Economist all over the globe often puzzles to explain the economic disparities across nations that are enjoying more or less equal access to resources. For many decade developmental experts have used Solow growth model and Walrasian equilibrium model for variation in economic activity in different nation. All these model focus on economic variables while socio-cultural factors have been ignored in determining the economic growth and development (Billing, 2000). Economic theories based on traditional factors (Technology, Physical and Human Capital) can't fully explain all aspect of economic growth and development. Factors such as Trust, norms and values play important role in the social sustainable development of countries and these should be included in the model as core variable. For social sustainable development we can't fully rely on economic factors because the social values affect the individual behavior that in turn effects the economic development. Therefore, socio-cultural factor are very important indicators for sustainable development and economic theory with regard to development is incomplete without these social factors. (Easterly and Levine, 2001; Christoforou, 2005). In the past social dynamics falls outside the bound of economic behavior. But without these dynamics there is increase in social problem and lack of welfare in the economy. This leads to redefining the concept of development in which weightage should be given to social values and norms (Ner and Putterman, 1997). In 1960s for the first time, the developmental economist recognized that social norms and values are the important determinants of development. So, in 1990s a new concept of social capital introduced to address the development related issue that were unsolved in the presence of physical and human capital. (OECD, 2001). Recently social sustainability has considered as one of the important part of sustainable development. In a meeting of European Council (EC) in 2000, social sustainability was considered as the third important pillar of sustainable development for the first time. But since 2000, it is being ignored as an important agenda for sustainable development. In comparison to environmental and economics dimensions social factors of sustainable development has been given relatively less importance. (Burton, 2000; Colantonio & Lane, 2007; Drakakis-Smith, 1995). So there is gap in the literature specific to Pakistan and our study is an attempt to fill that gap up to some extent. There is too much conflict regarding defining, analyzing, measuring and assessing multi-dimensional aspect of the social sustainability. (Bramley, Dempsey, Power, & Brown, 2006; Dempsey, Bramley, Power, & Brown, 2011; Littig & Griessler, 2005).

2. Review of Literature

Yiftachel and Hedgcock (1993) demonstrate that role of urban planning and social aspect of urban sustainability has been neglecting while focus has been given to economic and environmental factors. The paper addresses such deficiency by analyzing the impact of urban planning on urban social sustainability as a case study of Australian city, Perth. The authors have developed the three key factors such as urbanity, community and equity. They

concluded that in the urban area of the Perth there is the lack of social values and such deficiency has been due to urban planning failure.

Fox and Gershman (2000) comparatively analysis ten rural development projects in Philippines and the Mexico funded by the World Bank. They Inspects how the policy is affected by the intersectoral social capital and how the policy affects the social capital horizontally. The findings of the paper based upon the empirical data shows that the policy maker use the social capital as an important policy resource for the rural development.

Goodwin (2003) differentiated between the five kinds of capital, Such as Financial, Natural, Produced, Human and Social, all of these are essential for the sustainable development. He concluded that only with traditional capital sustained development is not possible. For sustainable development human and social capital are equally important.

Paras (2003) used Social Capital as a suitable and potent way to show the consequences of crime. Victims of crimes avoids participation in various social activities due to low level of trust on people and on governmental institutions.

Staveren and Knorringa (2007) conducted two case studies, one on Ethiopia and other on Vietnam on Small and Medium Size Enterprises of footwear sector on which they tried to unpack the concept of Social Capital. They concluded that the social relation does matter and such social relation contributes toward economic development.

Davidson (2010) concludes that over the past few decades the sustainable development was define in triple-bottom-line concept. But this paper makes an attempt to update the existing literature by introducing the concept of social sustainability. They highlighted the several contemporary policy recommendations to the government for the sustainability of the cities something typically restrained to the Anglo context

Dempsey, Bramley, Power, and Brown (2011) investigated the relationship between the social sustainability and urban form in which they have discovered two important aspects of social sustainability such as the sustainability of the community and equitable access toward resources.

They concluded that the social sustainable development has significant influence on the UK economy specifically in urban policy, planning and in housing sector.

Ghahramanpouri, Lamit, and Sedaghatnia (2013) used the desk research methodology for the analysis of social sustainability in order to investigate the phenomenon in depth regarding the definition and to review the existing literature because social sustainability have attracted many scholars from various disciplines in recent decades. They concluded that diverse aspects have been used in the literature for defining the social sustainability such as human well-being, satisfaction of need, inclusion and cohesion, sense of place and community, socially interaction and quality of human life. They also mentioned that majority of research on social sustainability has been done on developed countries in urban context.

Mahmood (2015) considered Social capital like other capital as strong determinant for organizational success. Participation, awareness and trust component of social capital help any organization in maximizing their dividends. They concluded that existence of social capital enhances the organizational capabilities in terms of effective management and ultimately organization gain competitive advantage hence contributes toward the economic development of the nation.

3. Methodology

Bahawalpur City of Punjab Province is the total Population of the study under consideration. We have used the purpose-based Cluster Sampling technique for data collection. Sample size of this study is 300. Questionnaire has been filled from High Income Class (Model Town A, Hashmi Garden), Middle Income Class (Model Town C, Commercial Area, Faisal Bag and Satellite Town) and Labor Class (Jail Road, Shahdara, Islami Colony and from Farid Gate). We have use Ordinal Logistic Regression Model for data analysis. The dependent variable in this study is Sustainable Development, which is estimated by using sixteen questions. The Justification about security question is that the internal stability and the security of a country is an important component of sustainable development. In the last four decades, the globe has witnessed a series of insecurity and instability at various national and regional levels. Pakistan has been suffering for such type of activities at varying level in different regions of the country. Furthermore, in the Islamic state as well there is the surgence of extremism waves. For the sustainability such type of insecurity and socio-economic instability may either hinder the sustainable development. Another issue is the ethnic and sectarian violence in Pakistan. To capture the effect of such type of activities on sustainable development we have included the question regarding the safety from the terrorism ethnic or sectarian violence. Justification about Schooling facility is that the education of children of the nation is responsibility of the provincial government of the Pakistan. The state is responsible for education of 10 year to every child in the Pakistan. In the country the secondary education in provided by the provincial government along with the private sector. As the education of the society is basically the responsibility of the public sector. So, we have included in our sustainable social index the schooling facility provided by the public sector. Justification about the Hospital facility is that the health care of the nation is responsibility of provincial government. The health policies clearly mentioned the access of people towards the public sector health providers. So, we have included in the sustainable social index the facility of health provided by public sector in Bahawalpur.

The Dependent variable is an index of social sustainable development. The Core Independent Variable of this study are the Social capital (measured by through various question regarding Trust, Participation and Public awareness) while peripheral independent variables are Household Size, Education level and Age.

Model Specification:

We have used Ordered Logistic Regression method to estimate the following relationship.

$$Y_i^* = \alpha_1 Trust + \alpha_2 Participation + \alpha_3 Awareness + \alpha_4 HouseholdSize + \alpha_5 Education + \alpha_6 Age + \varepsilon_i$$

In summation notation above equation is written as:

$$Y_i^* = \sum_{n=1}^{k} \alpha_n X_{in} + \varepsilon_i$$

Where

Y_i^*= Unobserved Polychotomous dependent (Latent or Index) variable.

X_s= Independent Variables

ε_i= Error Term

In this study we have 300 individuals or observations facing 5-ordered alternatives, such that:

$Y_i = 1, if\ Y_i^* \leq \alpha_1$ (Indicate very Low Category)

$Y_i = 2, if\ \alpha_1 \leq Y_i^* \leq \alpha_2$ (Indicate Low Category)

$Y_i = 3, if\ \alpha_2 \leq\ Y_i^* \leq \alpha_3$ (Indicate Average Category)
$Y_i = 4, if\ \alpha_3 \leq\ Y_i^* \leq \alpha_4$ (Indicate High Category)
$Y_i = 5, if\ \ \alpha_4 \leq\ Y_i^*$ (Indicate Very High Category)
Where
$\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_4$ Are the Threshold Parameters.

4. Results

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Errors	Probability Value
Awareness	.4985137	.3218858	0.121
Participation	.3457997	.1586641	0.029
Trust	1.615652	.263764	0.000
HHS	.7685821	.1587054	0.000
Edu	.9294644	.3293662	0.005
Age	.0120461	.0175269	0.492
Observation	300		
F-Test	112.58		
Prob	0.000		

The coefficient of awareness is 0.4985137 which indicate that keeping all other variable constant, a unit change in awareness increases the ordered log-odds of being in higher social sustainable development category by about 0.498. The coefficient of participation is 0.3457997 which indicate that if we increase the level of participation by a one unit, the ordered log-odds of being in higher social sustainable development category increases by about 0.345. The coefficient of trust is 1.615652 which indicate that if we increase the level of trust by a one unit, the ordered log-odds of being in higher social sustainable development category increases by about 1.62. The coefficient of household size is 0.7685821 which indicate that if household size is increases by a one unit, the ordered log-odds of being in higher social sustainable development category increases by about 0.7686. The coefficient of education is 0.9294644 which indicate that keeping all other variable constant, a unit change in education increases the ordered log-odds of being in higher social sustainable development category by about 0.93. The coefficient of Age is 0.0120461 which indicate that as the household become one year elder, the ordered log-odds of being in higher social sustainable development category increases by about 0.012.

MARGINAL EFFECT

Variables	Social Sustainable Development				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	VERY LOW	**LOW**	**AVERAGE**	**HIGH**	**VERY HIGH**
awareness	-.0090479 (.00622) ((0.146))	-.0724133 (.04708) ((0.124))	.0711003 (.04609) ((0.123))	.0051257 (.00413) ((0.214))	.0052351 (.00391) ((0.180))
participation	-.0062762 (.00362)	-.0502303 (.0253)	.0493196 (.02516)	.0035555 (.00239)	.0036314 (.00212)

	((0.083))	((0.047))	((0.050))	((0.137))	((0.087))
Trust	-.0293237 (.00926) ((0.002))	-.2346869 (.04558) ((0.000))	.2304318 (.04735) ((0.000))	.016612 (.00776) ((0.032))	.0169668 (.00636) ((0.008))
HHS	-.0139496 (.0043 ((0.001	-.1116429 (.02656) ((0.000))	.1096188 (.027) ((0.000))	.0079025 (.00356) ((0.026))	.0080713 (.00321) ((0.012))
Edu	-.0168696 (.00731 ((0.021	-.1350124 (.04928) ((0.006))	.1325645 (.04965) ((0.008))	.0095567 (.00506) ((0.059))	.0097608 (.00459) ((0.034))
Age	-.0002186 (.00032 ((0.493	-.0017498 (.0025) ((0.483))	.0017181 (.00245) ((0.483))	.0001239 (.00019) ((0.517))	.0001265 (.00019) ((0.498))

(*) dy/dx is for discrete change of dummy variable from 0 to 1. (Single parenthesis indicate standard errors), while ((double parenthesis indicate probability values))

Above table shows the marginal effect for each category of the dependent variable (Social Sustainable Development) with respect to all the independent variables. A unit increase in the level of awareness decrease the social sustainable development for very low and low category by about 0.0090479 and 0.0724133 respectively while it increases the social sustainable development for average, high and very high category by about 0.0711003, 0.0051257 and 0.0052351 respectively. A unit increase in the level of participation decrease the social sustainable development for very low and low category by about 0.0062762 and 0.0502303 respectively while it increases the social sustainable development for average, high and very high category by about 0.0711003, 0.0035555 and 0.0036314 respectively. A unit increase in the level of trust decrease the social sustainable development for very low and low category by about 0.0293237 and 0.2346869 respectively while it increases the social sustainable development for average, high and very high category by about 0.2304318, 0.016612 and 0.0169668 respectively. A unit increase in the household size decrease the social sustainable development for very low and low category by about 0.0139496 and 0.1116429 respectively while it increases the social sustainable development for average, high and very high category by about 0.1096188, 0.0079025 and 0.0080713 respectively. A unit increase in the level of education decrease the social sustainable development for very low and low category by about 0.0168696 and 0.1350124 respectively while it increases the social sustainable development for average, high and very high category by about 0.1325645, 0.0095567 and 0.0097608 respectively. A one-year increase in the age decreases the social sustainable development for very low and low category by about 0.0002186 and 00017498 respectively while it increases the social sustainable development for average, high and very high category by about 0.0017181, 0.0001239 and 0.0001265 respectively.

5. Conclusion and Policy Recommendation

The above paper concludes that the social capital which is measured by level of trust, awareness and participation is positively associated with the urban social sustainable development of the Bahawalpur city. The social urban sustainable development increases from very low level to very high level as the level of trust, awareness and participation of the household increases in the city. Government should adopt serious action to control the

security situation as well as to provide basic health and education facilities so that the trust participation and awareness level in the economy would increase, which in turn increase the social capital and hence social sustainable urban development.

6. References:

Ner, & Putterman, L. (1997) "Values and Institutions in Economic Analysis". Department of Economics Working Paper No. 97/4. Providence, RI: Brown University.

Bilig, M. S. (2000) "Institutions and Culture: Neo-Weberian Economic Anthropology". Journal of Economic Issues 3

Bramley, G., Dempsey, N., Power, S., & Brown, C. (2006). What is 'social sustainability', and how do our existing urban forms perform in nurturing it. Paper presented at the Sustainable Communities and Green Futures' Conference, Bartlett School of Planning, University College London, London.

Burton, E., Jenks, M., & Williams, K. (2003). *The compact city: a sustainable urban form?* : Routledge.

Christoforou, A. (2005) "On the Determinants of Social Capital in Greece Compared to Countries of the European Union". Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) Working Paper No. 05/68. Milan: FEEM.4 (4): 771-778.

Colantonio, A., & Lane, G. (2007). Measuring social sustainability, Best Practice from Urban Renewal in the EU, 2007/01: EIBURS Working Paper Series: Oxford Brookes University.

Davidson, M. (2010). Social Sustainability and the City: Social sustainability and city. *Geography Compass*, *4*(7), 872–880.

Easterly, W. and Levine, R. (2001) "It is not Factor Accumulation: Stylized Facts and Growth Models". World Bank Economic Review (2001): 177-219.

Fox, J., & Gershman, J. (2000). The World Bank and social capital: Lessons from ten rural development projects in the Philippines and Mexico. *Policy Sciences*, *33*(3-4), 399–419.

Ghahramanpouri, A., Lamit, H., & Sedaghatnia, S. (2013). Urban Social Sustainability Trends in Research Literature. *Asian Social Science*, *9*(4), 140-157.

Goodwin, N. R. (2003). *Five kinds of capital: Useful concepts for sustainable development*. Tufts University Medford, MA.

Littig, B., & Griessler, E. (2005). Social sustainability: a catchword between political pragmatism and social theory. *International Journal of Sustainable Development, 8*(1), 65-79.

Mahmood, K. (2015). Social Capital: From Concept To Theory. *Pakistan Journal of Science*, *67*(1).

OECD (2001) The Well-Being of Nations: The Role of Human and Social Capital. Paris: Office of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

Oren Yiftachel and David Hedgcock (1993) Urban social sustainability: The planning of an Australian city. Cities Elsevier Publishers

Paras, P. (2003). Unweaving the social fabric: The impact of crime on social capital. *Center for US-Mexican Studies*. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5001c5qw.pdf

van Staveren, I., & Knorringa, P. (2007). Unpacking social capital in Economic Development: How social relations matter. *Review of Social Economy*, *65*(1), 107–135.