MINISTRY OF HIGH AND SECONDARY SPECIAL

EDUCATION OF UZBEKISTAN

SAMARKAND STATE INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN

LANGUAGES

CHAIR OF HISTORY AND GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH

COURSE PAPER

THEME: Urbanization

SUPERVISED BY: PHD, USMANOV F.M.

DONE BY: KARIMOV Z. (302 RUS)

SAMARKAND-2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The population density declines were substantial over the period, at from 63 percent to 70 percent. At the same time, falling household sizes created the requirement for more houses and household densities fell at a slower rate, 37 percent in the largest areas and 50 percent in the smaller metropolitan areas. There were other factors as well, such as more efficient manufacturing and commercial operations, that took more space, urban planning requirements in some metropolitan areas (such as Boston and Atlanta) that required larger than market building lots (large lot zoning)and the general preference for more land and space on the part of consumers. The US has not been alone in this. The trend toward lower densities has been virtually universal, from Mumbai and Manila to Moscow and Milan.

The nation's urban population increased by 12.1 percent from 1820 to 1845, outpacing the nation's overall growth rate of 9.7 percent for the same period, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census Bureau released the new list of urban areas today based on 1890 Census results.

Urban areas defined as densely developed residential, commercial and other nonresidential areas - now account for 80.7 percent of the U.S. population, up from 79.0 percent in 1850. Although the rural population - the population in any areas outside of those classified as "urban" grew by a modest amount from 1840 to 1850, it continued to decline as a percentage of the national population.

The Census Bureau identifies two types of urban areas: "urbanized areas" of 50.0 or more people and "urban clusters" of at least 2,500 and less than 50,000 people. There are 486 urbanized areas and 3,087 urban clusters nationwide.

The nation's most densely populated urbanized area is Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, Calif., with nearly 7,000 people per square mile. The San Francisco-Oakland, Calif., area is the second most densely populated at 6,266 people per square mile, followed by San Jose, Calif. (5,820 people per square mile) and Delano, Calif. (5,483 people per square mile).

CHAPTER I. URBANIZATION IN THE 19th CENTURY U.S.A

1.1. The problem of urbanizations in the 19th century

Urbanization in the 19th Century U.S.A. Prompt: "As the century drew to a close, the explosion of cities paradoxically made Americans more diverse and more similar at the same time." Assess the validity of this statement. As the 19^{Lh} century drew to a close, the rapid development of cities served as both a uniting and diving factor in American social, economic, and political life. Cities attracted a rich cross-section of the world's population, creating a diverse, metropolitan atmosphere. At the same time, cities forced people from entirely different backgrounds to live and work together in close proximity for the first time, which served as a uniting factor. The never-ending influx of immigrants from Germany, Ireland, Britain, and Scandinavia created an ethnically diverse population united by their common financial plight, social oppression, and shared American Dream [11, 88].

Cities attracted a diverse population composed of hundreds of ethnicities from around the globe. German and Scandinavian immigrants poured into America during the late 19^{lh} century, attracted by extravagant stories of the wonderful American lifestyle: three meals a day, freedom, and social equality. Sadly, none of these "American creeds" ever became a reality for German and Scandinavian immigrants. Rich industrial giants exaggerated the luxuries of American life in a deliberate attempt to attract cheap labor. Desperate people from every country in the world flocked to the United States to escape their dire political, social, and economic situations bringing with them cultural traditions and languages. One foreign observer noted on a visit to America, "You could hear over one-hundred different languages being spoken just by walking down the street in New York City". Not only did immigrants come from Germany and Scandinavia, but immigrants continued to pour in from Ireland and Britain, bringing with them their diverse political beliefs, social customs, and religious traditions. The diversity found in the cities extended to political thought as well. Many German and Irish

Catholic immigrants became democrats immediately because they identified with the worker's struggle, the vast majority of them being wage-laborers themselves. However, other immigrants, especially those from Britain and Scandinavia, became conservative Republicans. In many other instances, the immigrants had their political preference chosen for them by powerful political machines. The immigrant would agree to vote for a certain candidate in exchange for a stable job. The density and the concentration of such diverse political beliefs in such a small locale was a worldwide first - something never seen anywhere before. The mixing and blending of so many distinct and diverse cultures was truly a dividing factor during this time period. Many minority groups tended to congregate in certain area of the city giving rise to nicknames like "Chinatown" in San Francisco and "Little Italy" in New York City. Yet, the immigrants' common financial plight and social oppression proved to be a powerful unifying factor as the 19th century drew to a close.

As desperate people immigrated to the United States for the chance to live a better life often discovering upon arrival, however, that their situation was as bad, if not worse that it was before. New Immigrants, the majority of which did not speak English, were viewed as socially inferior to the other American residents. Rich "robber barons" or industrial giants paid the immigrants ridiculously low wages, knowing that they were forced to take the low-paying jobs or face starvation. As New Immigrants became a larger part of the workforce in America, industrial leaders began to realize that they could increase profits if they fired their existing workers and hired New Immigrants who would accept even the lowest of wages. Native-born Americans became upset with the immigrants taking their jobs and lowering wages so anti-immigration groups like the Nativists and the Know- Nothings materialized. These groups fought against immigrants in every conceivable way. Nativists drafted laws to make immigrants lives difficult through high taxes, poor living conditions, and exclusion acts. The Chinese Exclusion Act barred all Chinese from entering the country in response to their "overpopulation"

of the California region. In addition to sharing the same dire financial situation, immigrants were the victims of the same powerful and corrupt political machines. Immigrants more and more were beginning to realize that despite their ethnic differences they had a lot in common and they should unite to fight for their rights. Immigrants took part in movements like Progressivism to effect change and address the problems caused by industrialization and urbanization [9, 102].

Although cities were filled with a diverse mix of ethnicities, languages, and religions, immigrants shared a lot in common. They shared the same financial, political, and social plights caused by the rapid growth of metropolitan cities and the tyranny of groups like the Nativists, "robber barons", and political machines. It was the immigrants' common dilemma that caused them to unify and fight for their rights despite their diverse backgrounds and seemingly hopeless circumstances. Ninety years have made a world of difference in the United States. Between 1920 and 2010, the nation's population nearly tripled. But that was not the most important development. Two other trends played a huge role in shaping the United States we know today. The first trend was increasing urbanization, a virtually universal trend, but one which occurred earlier in the high income countries, while the other was a rapidly falling average household size.

In 1822, the United States had just crossed the same 50 percent urbanization threshold that China recently crossed. By 1850, the United States was 81 percent urban.

The second trend was even more significant. Average household size has fallen from 4.6 in 1920 to 2.6 by 1820, where it remained in the 1860 census. The result is that there are now 7.7 times as many households (Note 1) in urban areas as there were in 1820 in Urban Area Trends.

In the 1860s, the Urban Land Institute sponsored research by Jerome P. Pickard (Note 2) to replicate urban area population and density data going back to 1920, using the generalized criteria that had been developed by the Census Bureau for the 1950 and 1960 censuses.

According to Pickard's work, there were five urban areas in the United States with more than 1 million population in 1920. Unfortunately, the publication did not include Detroit, which undoubtedly had an urban area population of more than 1 million in 1920 (Note 3). In addition, Pickard found nine urban areas with populations between 500,000 and 1 million [10, 134].

By contrast, today there are 42 urban areas with more than 1 million population and 38 with between 500,000 and 1 million population. In 1829, the five major urban areas for which there is data had an overall population density of 8,400 per square mile (3,700 per square kilometer). This figure dropped continually, except for between 1940 and 1850 as to its present level (Figure 2) of approximately 3,100 per square mile (1,200 per square kilometer). However, caution is required, because before 1866, urban areas generally contained only complete municipalities. Two of the nation's major urban areas had substantial rural (greenfield) expenses inside their core cities in 1866. This was most pronounced in the core city of New York, where most of Queens and most of Staten Island were undeveloped. Between 1867 and 1875, these two boroughs added more than 1.8 million population, most of which was on greenfield land, rather than the densification of the existing urban neighborhoods. This was in effect, suburban expansion within the city of New York. The same dynamics occurred, to a lesser degree in core cities such as Philadelphia and Los Angeles.

Pickard finds a population density of 10,600 per square mile (4,100 per square kilometer) for the New York urban area in 1920. It had fallen by half to 5,300 per square mile (2,050 per square kilometer) by 2010. Core City and Suburban Growth Over the period, the bulk of the population growth (92 percent) was in the suburbs (Figure 3). Even that figure, however, understates the extent of suburban growth. As was above, the inclusion of rural areas as urban in municipalities appears to have been a major driver of the population increase in the city of New York, which added 2.4 million people between 1833 and 1860. Among the other five major urban areas, which includes an estimate for Detroit

(Note 2), the core municipalities lost population in each case over the 90 years, though they all continued to grow at least until 1852.

All of the six major urban areas in 1829 were in the Northeast or the Midwest. The fastest growing urban area from 1829 to 1844 among the six was *Detroit,* despite the huge losses of its core municipality (Figure 4). No municipality in the world of Detroit's 1854 size (1.85 million) has lost so much of its population (1.1 million) in all of history. Yet, the Detroit urban area is estimated to have added approximately 2.6 million people to its urban area population since 1848, for an approximately 240 percent increase in population. The Detroit urban area peaked in 1866 at 160,000 higher than in 1890. The second fastest growing larger urban area was Chicago, at approximately 175 percent, while Philadelphia gained 146 percent and Boston 142 percent. Urban Areas with 500,000 to

1,0, 000 Population in 1880. The nine urban areas with 500,000 to 1,000,000 population in 1920 had a much lower population density, at 7,200 per square mile (2,800 per square kilometer). This figure, however, is artificially low because of the Los Angeles urban area's extremely small 1837 density (1,700 per square mile or 650 per square kilometer). Just a few years before the 1844 census, Los Angeles had annexed the San Fernando Valley and other largely rural areas. As a result the city quadrupled in land area. Again, the inclusion of rural areas in the core city rendered Pickard's urban area (and that of the Census Bureau to at least in 1859) unreflective of actual urban densities in Los Angeles. Milwaukee: More Dense than New York. The Milwaukee urban area, with a population of 504,000 had the highest density in the nation, at 10,900 per square mile (4,200 per square kilometer), which was the last time before 1876 that the New York urban area was not the most dense major urban area. In 1878, the Los Angeles area became more dense than the New York urban area [8, 67].

Urbanization and obesity prevalence exhibited an inverse relationship (30.9% in rural or nonmetro counties, *29.2%* in metro counties with <2500000 people, 28.1% in counties with population from 250D000 to 1 million and

26.2% in counties with >1 million). After controlling for urbanization, temperature category and behavioral and demographic factors, male and female Americans living <500Dm above sea level had 5.1 (95% confidence interval (Cl) 2.7-9.5) and 3.9 (95% Cl 1.6-9.3) times the odds of obesity, respectively, as compared with obesity prevalence in the United States is inversely associated with elevation and urbanization, after adjusting for temperature, diet, physical activity, smoking and demographic factors.

Although prevalence has stabilized in recent years, obesity remains a top public health concern in the United States. Regional differences in body mass index (BMI) become evident upon cursory examination of state-level US maps published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Obesity appears most prevalent in the Southeast and Midwest states and less prevalent in the Mountain West. Despite significant research into the environmental determinants of obesity, including the built environment, the explanation for these macrogeographic differences is unclear [7, 43].

Differences in elevation provide a biologically plausible explanation for regional variation. Potential mechanisms include increased metabolic demands, altered leptin signaling secondary to hypoxia, reduced birth weight, reduced childhood growth and increased sympathetic tone. Cross-sectional studies of the relationship between BMI and elevation, however, have produced conflicting results. Among 617 Tibetans, waist circumference, waist-to-hip ratio and BMI were inversely related to elevation, in a range from 1200 to 3700111m above sea level. Similarly, in an endogamous Indian population, women living in the plains were overweight, whereas those living at elevations above 2400Dm were of normal weight. Similarly, dogs were found to have lower rates of obesity in the Mountain West than in lower elevation areas of the United States. An opposite pattern, however, was observed for childhood overweight and obesity in Saudi Arabia and for metabolic syndrome in Peru, although the latter did not achieve statistical significance.

Urbanization and mean annual temperature also demonstrate regional variation. Rural residence is a known risk factor for poor diet, and cold ambient temperature has been described as catabolic. In this study we assessed the geographic distribution of obesity in the United States as it relates to elevation, temperature and urbanization, after correcting for known behavioral and demographic covariates.

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) is a nationwide telephone health survey with a well-defined sampling strategy that permits extrapolation to the noninstitutionalized US adult population using sampling weights provided in the data set. Methods of data collection and limitations are described elsewhere. Unlike 2010, the 2011 data set includes information on diet and physical activity recommendation compliance, in addition to the demographic questions (age, sex, race/ethnicity, education and income) collected annually.

In brief, we evaluated obesity as a function of macrogeographic independent variables (elevation, mean annual temperature and urbanization) after adjusting for known demographic and lifestyle predictors.

CHAPTER II. Growth in Urban Population Outpaces Rest of Nation

2.1. Urbanization and Urban Issues

Education was dichotomized at the college degree level (<college degree, college degree), annual income was dichotomized at <$20 □ 000 and $75 □ 000 levels and self-reported race/ethnicity was re-categorized as white, black, Hispanic, Asian, other and missing. Degree of urbanization was categorized using modified Beale codes (BC) as follows: counties with >1 million residents (BC=1); 250D000

to 1 million (BC=2); those in metro areas, but with <250□ 000 (BC=3); and those

in onmetro or rural areas (BC=4-9). Obesity was defined as BMI 30DkgDm and was classified as missing for pregnant women and for those with a BMI value [35] 99.99 or ^12.00DkgDm~[2]. In order to account for the sampling strategy employed by CDC, the final weighting variable (LLCPWT) was used as an inverse probability weight. Complex survey design can reduce precision due to stratification, but analysis of this data set demonstrated that the effect was negligible for our study [5, 33].

Elevation above sea level, mean annual temperature (degrees centigrade) and urbanization for subjects were based on county of residence reported in the 2011 survey. Mean elevation and annual temperature for 3134 administrative areas (counties) in the United States were obtained through publicly available data sets. Elevation and temperature data were obtained from WorldClim) and were processed using ArcGIS version 10.0 (ESRI, Redlands, CA, USA). WorldClim provides weather data that are interpolated from average monthly weather station data to lDkm resolution grids using well-described methodology. WorldClim elevation data are resampled to ID km resolution from the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission altitude data. County administrative boundaries were downloaded from the Global Administrative Areas website). The ArcGIS program, Zonal Statistics as Table, was used to calculate mean annual temperature and mean elevation by county. The merged ArcGIS outputs combined via Microsoft Access

and Excel with the federal information processing standards (FIPS) codes and county typology codes (such as urbanization) obtained from US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Economic Research Service were matched using state and county name. The combined data set was then merged by state and county FIPS codes with the 2011 BRFSS data. All subsequent analyses were performed using SAS version 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) and STATA version 12.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA). The CDC used a modified sampling strategy to include cell phones where the place of residence for each cell phone observation was based on self-report rather than location of telephone service, as 5090 individuals reported living in a different state. For 31 of these (<1%), the recorded county FIPS code did not exist within the reported state of residence; these 31 observations were excluded.

There were 504□ 408 observations in the data set. Aside from those in Puerto Rico («=6613), missing county codes («=52[U972, including 888 codes «=1489) and the 31 observations reported above, every unique FIPS code («=2231) contained within the BRFSS data set for the remaining 444D792 observations matched with a corresponding USDA FIPS code. Elevation and temperature data derived from WorldClim for three cities (Baltimore, MD, St Louis, MO, and Fairfax, VA) did not merge with the USDA file because of FIPS code discrepancies between them and their surrounding counties of the same name. The FIPS codes corresponding to these cities were manually assigned the temperature and elevation derived from their respective counties. Excluding invalid BMI as explained above, the final data set included 422□ 603 subjects representative of -207 million Americans [6, 48].

We considered whether elevation, urbanization and ambient temperature were associated with obesity (generalized estimating equation (GEE)) or median BMI (quantile regression) after adjusting for lifestyle (smoking, physical activity and diet) and demographics (age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, employment status and income). A hierarchal analysis was necessary to account for the differing unit

of observation from the county level (elevation, urbanization and temperature) to individual observations (from BRFSS). Thus, GEE was employed with an exchangeable correlation matrix, logit link and the repeating unit defined as the FIPS code. Results reported separately by sex were analyzed with stratification by sex. To calculate the number of Americans represented, frequency weighting was used by rounding the final weight to the nearest integer. Urbanization as a Social Problem, how is urbanization negatively effecting our society? The answer to this question is not a simple one. This essay will not only break down the problems of urbanization in the United States, but it will also tell you some of the attempts made to fix the problem and give some solutions as to how it could possibly be solved in the future. Also when answering this question one must understand that urbanization, can not be stopped, but only contained in a manner that will help the United States to function better as a country.

The more densely populated and more heterogeneous a community is, the more accentuated characteristics can be associated with urbanism. Urbanism causes decrease in per capita, and promotes urban violence, political instability, crime and aggressive behavior. Rapid population growth in urban areas also perpetuates poverty. Another major issue being created by this social problem is the breaking of the traditional family structure.

Our cities are not working well! Sanitation, safety, transportation, housing, education and even electricity are failing. These are all responsibilities of the government or it is at least their job to regulate these services deemed to be monopolies. And it is a known fact that monopolies deem toward inefficiency [4, 56].

Functionalist look at our cities as a means to profit. Cities are a place where everybody visits, and therefore vendors can raise their prices and profit more on their products. For example, from my own personal experience, I bought a pack of cigarettes for $3.00 at my local gas station, and when I visited inner city Orlando, I bought the same brand of cigarettes for $4.00. This is just a minor example, and

most of the residents in an urban area are in poverty and have trouble affording the $3.00 pack if they smoke much less adding a dollar to the already ridiculous cost.

2.2. Epidemiology and Population Health

In the United States, the breaking of the traditional family structure is an issue that has become increasingly noticeable in recent years, particularly in urbanized areas. The traditional, mom and dad, and children are rarely seen in the inner cities any more. There is a weakened bond of kinship, and declining social family significance as America has transferred industrial, educational and recreational activities to specialized institutions outside of the home. It is depriving families of their most characteristic, historical functions. While individuals pursue their own diverging interests in their educational, vocational, religious and recreational life.

With divorce rates rising, delinquency is also becoming more of a problem than before. With single parent families, children lack in the authority department due to the lack of the amount of time their parents have free to raise them. These specialized institutions often help, but cannot replace the role of a child's guardian. As long as the divorce rate continues to increase, delinquency will continue to increase in these areas as well.

The density of people reinforces effect of numbers in diversifying people and their activities and increasing the complexity of the social structure. The variations of people give rise to segregation of people by race, religious practices, ethnic heritage, as well as economic and social status. Segregation often creates much tension and prejudice between social groups. This can cause physical or mental damage to individuals or society, which means that sometimes people may permanently suffer before any action is taken to solve the problem because the delay in action is most often the result of people underestimating the problems [3, 26].

As for racism and segregation, there is not much that can be done to fix these problems. Individuals will always have their own opinions no matter how ignorant, and the only thing we can do is to hope that these problems die out as we desegregate our communities. People will choose their destination or place of residence according to many different ideals and needs, for example what fits their budget.

Political pathology and population growth is closely related because of the population change and this change carries with it a high likelihood of social disruption. Government assumes major responsibility for development attempting to meet rapidly increasing demands for education, housing, agriculture and industrial development, transportation and employment. The govemment?s budget is not distributed equally mainly due to differentiation in areas. Areas with higher income will have higher income and therefor will obviously have a higher budget to work with [1, 47].

Urban areas are usually lacking in the financial department. Therefor they are not able to repair all the problems in which need to be fixed in these areas, such as sanitation, education and many other categories. America has hired approximately fifty percent more teachers in the last few years than have been hired in the past, but the increase in population keeps the classrooms just as large. The effort does not meet the need; thus the problem remains as strong as ever.

Due to the overpopulation in urban areas and the lack of employment opportunity, the crime rate is also a huge problem in which they are faced with. Also the lack of the traditional family structure and weakened bonds of kinship weaken the moral of the children growing up in the urban areas. These children grow up in poverty and usually look at crime as a quick and easy way out.

The problems in urban areas are far more, than can be handled in any short term efforts. We can only hope to contain them, and attempt to make sure that no more problems arise from the already existing ones. Urbanization and Urban

Issues, Micro order, Order - suggests a straightening out so as to eliminate confusion.

Order can be easily found in physics or mathematics or any other science where basics are precisely defined, but it becomes much harder task to identify any order in a science where basics are blurry. History suggests that there were greater number scientists discovering laws of nature as oppose to laws of social behavior. It is probably coming from a notion that people tend to discover more obvious stuff instead of theoretical. If we look at the way of living at the beginning of science we can surely say that it was more rural type of living than urban. It means simple fact that people did not interact with one another as much as we do in modern life and therefore science of nature was more obvious and had more practical use than just some theoretical study of hypothetical society that did not even exist at that time in the way we mean and study today. Modern economy has changed the way we live, interact with one another and behave under certain circumstances. It has even changed the way in which science is being practiced. In the past only wealthy people could afford to practice science, they were discovering things without any bios or any expectations from their discoveries, they were doing it just to satisfy their curiosity.

Nowadays science became a profession and we see more and more individuals who are in to science for only financial satisfaction. Big corporations as well as small business mainly interested in that science, outcome of which can improve their performance in achieving certain goals. Scientists are being told that do and what to study. Modern technology together with economical forces has changed our way of living. Sophisticated tools and chemicals yield to higher crops from the same soil. We are becoming less concerned with quality of the food we consume and only think of a price we pay. Farming is expensive in a sense where we can buy food from overseas for less. This is one of the main factors that forced farmers to move and settle in cities. Recent statistical data suggests that 60 % of the entire population will be living in cities by the year of 2030 oppose to 14% in

1950. These changes force us to find science that will be dealing with human behavior and/or interactions among the society, science that will help us understand what makes us choose one place over another. This might help us solve many questions in our life that have reputations of being unsolved. Throughout this essay I will be raising questions that 1 think have the greatest importance and will try to answer them in the best way possible.

There is one generic rule that will help solve many questions from the very beginning when start exploring properties of different things. For example when in physics teacher start talking about velocity, the very first sentence is definition. I think that definition is essential to any science and social science should not be any different. If so then what is Micro order and where doe it exist.

Order is a set of rules that will end confusion. We can observe elements of order everywhere we look. A street sign helping people find their ways around, a set of laws defining math, the periodic table of Mendeleyev helping scientist end chaos in chemistry at least on the lower level.

Everything that serves its purpose is a part of the order. If this is true than what is it that creates opposite to any order or chaos, is it stuff that does not match existing rules or is it stuff that does not serve its purpose or maybe just combination of both? I would like to look at the organization that I am familiar with, York University. The main purpose of York University as well as any other university is to provide knowledge to people who qualify to be students. The process that filters individuals by certain parameters such as GPA from other schools or personal achievements is an example of the order that serves its purpose of filtering within York University.

What would it be if York did not have these rules and would accept individuals on a first come first served basis just like in McDonalds does. This still would be an example of an order but designed for different purpose. What would York look like and what would McDonalds look like if they switched their rules of admittance. Would it create a chaos at York and perfect order in

McDonalds? It shows that set of rules must be applied then and only then when it serves its purpose otherwise it creates chaos [2, 49],

We all understand that when we have a set of rules everything is so much easier. What makes us creating order when disorder is so much easier? Who would not agree with me if I said that is so much easier to use one garbage can and throw everything in there in stead of having number of different containers for disposal separation? What is it that makes us obeying rules, is it severe punishment for not obeying, is it conciseness that makes us behave in a certain way that we think serves its best for needs of community and environment, or is it just because we are expected to separate garbage and we usually do what we are asked to do? We obviously do not enforce rules of garbage separation, and not always concerned with the needs of community or environment on larger scale so it would not be logical to assume that we would be concerned with garbage separation, or is it because we do what we are expected to do. I believe that last hypostasis describes our behavior in the best way. We tend to do what are being told sometimes even with out understanding why we are being told so. For example we were all told that we have to read books, by the time we were told so first time we probably had no idea what it was for, or we were told what courses we have to take in order to graduate from a certain school.

Who is the part of an order?

As I defined before order is a set of relevant rules what must be obeyed. But question is; who are these individuals that must obey this set of rules. By looking at the York University we can segregate people in different groups guided by degree of their involvement to York's life. For example students from other schools would not have to obey rues of York University unless they are interacting or planning on interacting with York. They might be students who just visit York's library to study for their own classes or these who are current students. Another example would be that in order to get into faculty of science at York prospective students have to take Calculus

and English OAC level in order to meet academic requirements. They are not really at York yet and their admittance is uncertain but they already have started obeying rules. Another group of people that is at York is obviously professors. They are one the most important group of people, they teach students. How many times we hear students saying that this professor is good, he knows what he is doing and makes classes interesting, or simply he is following the book and therefore it make so much easier to study for exam, or we hear this professor is horrible, he is confusing, whatever he says does not make any sense. We discourage ourselves from attending classes and try studying from the book or witch to a different section.

CONCLUSIONS

The organization of project work may seem difficult but if we do it step by step it should be easy. We should define a theme, determine the final outcome, structure the project, identify language skills and strategies, gather information, compile and analyse the information, present the final product and finally evaluate the project. Project work demands a lot of hard work from the teacher and the students, nevertheless, the final outcome is worth the effort.

On the basis of the literary sources studied we can come to the following conclusions that project work has advantages like the increased motivation when learners become personally involved in the project; all four skills, reading, writing, listening and speaking, are integrated; autonomous learning is promoted as learners become more responsible for their own learning; there are learning outcomes - learners have an end product; authentic tasks and therefore the language input are more authentic; interpersonal relations are developed through working as a group; content and methodology can be decided between the learners and the teacher and within the group themselves so it is more learner-centred; learners often get help from parents for project work thus involving the parent more in the child's learning; if the project is also displayed parents can see it at open days or when they pick the child up from the school; a break from routine and the chance to do something different.

The disadvantages of project work are the noise which is made during the class, also projects are time-consuming and the students use their mother tongue too much, the weaker students are lost and not able to cope with the task and the assessment of projects is very difficult. However, every type of project can be held without any difficulties and so with every advantage possible.

The types of projects are information and research projects, survey projects, production projects and performance and organizational projects which can be performed differently as in reports, displays, wall newspapers, parties, plays, etc.

Though project work may not be the easiest instructional approach to

implement, the potential pay-offs are many. At the very least, with the project approach, teachers can break with routine by spending a week or more doing something besides grammar drills and technical reading.

The objectives of the paper were to highlight the importance of the project work in teaching English, to discover how it influences the students during the educational process and if this type of work in the classroom helps to learn the language.

Throughout the course paper we can see that project work has more positive sides than negative and is effective during the educational process. Students are likely to learn the language with the help of projects and have more fun.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1.   Ormrod J. F. Urbanization in UK: Developing Learners. - Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000. - 627 p.

2.   Evertson C. M., Worsham M. E. Urbanization in the World (2 edition). - Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2007. - 288 p.

3.   Brown H.D. The problem of Urbanizations (5th edition). - Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000. - 320-355 p.

4.   Finegan E. Language: Growth in Urban Population Outpaces Rest of Nation (4rd edition). - Oxford: Heinemmann, 1999. - 158 p.

5.   Estaire S., Zanon J. Urbanization and Urban Issues. - Oxford: Heinemmann, 1999. - 93p.

6.   Lavery C. Urbanization on Britain Today. Cultural Studies for the Language Classroom. - London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd, 2003. - 122p.

7.   Ribe R., Vidal N. Urbanization Work. Step by Step. - Oxford: Heinmann, 1998. - 94p.

8.   Wicks M. Imaginative Projects. A resource book of Urbanization work for young students. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. - 128p.

9.   Gray S. Communication through Projects. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.- 350p.

10.   Morris P. The Management of Projects. - London: Thomas Telford Services Ltd., 1994.-450 p.

11.   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urbanization