

## **The Causes of Metropolitan Suburbanization**

Peter Mieszkowski and Edwin S. Mills

**I**n the United States, 69 percent of the population lived in what the government statisticians call metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) in 1970, 75 percent in 1980 and 77 percent in 1990. But while a greater proportion of the population is living in urban areas broadly defined, a smaller proportion is living and working in the central cities. In the 1950s, 57 percent of MSA residents and 70 percent of MSA jobs were located in central cities; in 1960, the percentages were 49 and 63; in 1970, they were 43 and 55; in 1980, they were 40 and 50; in 1990, they were about 37 and 45. The United States is approaching the time when only about one-third of the residents within an MSA will live in central cities and only about 40 percent of MSA jobs will be located there.

Many popular discussions are written as if suburbanization were a postwar U.S. phenomenon, induced by circumstances peculiar to the period. For example, during the 1950s, it was claimed that home mortgage insurance by the federal government was responsible for suburbanization. In the 1960s, the interstate highway system and racial tensions were popular explanations of decentralization. More recently, crime and schooling considerations have been prominent explanations of urban decentralization. While all of these factors have played some role in causing suburbanization, they are all postwar phenomena, and are mostly provincial U.S. problems. In reality, the trend toward suburbanization has been prewar as well as postwar, and has been international in scope.

■ *Peter Mieszkowski is Allyn R. and Gladys M. Cline Professor of Economics and Finance, Rice University, Houston, Texas. Edwin S. Mills is Gary Rosenberg Professor of Real Estate and Finance, Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.*

The growth and suburbanization of MSAs have been international trends. Most high income countries are 60–85 percent metropolitan, and the growth in U.S. metropolitan population has slowed relative to national population growth as it has approached the upper end of that range. Suburbanization in metropolitan areas has also occurred worldwide during the postwar period, although it has proceeded farther and faster in the United States (Mills and Tan, 1980).

Two classes of theories of suburbanization have been offered. The first, favored by urban theorists and transportation experts, might be called a natural evolution theory. When employment is concentrated at the center of a city, around a port or railhead, residential development takes place from the inside out. To minimize commuting costs for work trips to the Central Business District (CBD), central areas are developed first, and as land in the central city becomes filled in, development moves to open tracts of land in the suburbs. As new housing is built at the periphery, high income groups who can afford larger and more modern housing settle there. The older, smaller, centrally located units, built when average real incomes were lower, filter down to lower income groups. This natural working of the housing market leads to income-stratified neighborhoods, and there is a tendency for low income groups to live in central locations and for affluent households to reside in outlying suburban areas. The majority of the middle class apparently prefers larger single family lots in the suburbs to denser multi-family residences in the central city.

The tendency of the middle class to live in the suburbs has been reinforced by transportation innovations and travel time considerations. During the mid-19th century, when the cost of moving goods and people within cities was high, and urban areas were dense and spatially small, high income groups located at the center, while low income groups walked to work. When streetcars, commuter railroads, and finally the automobile were developed, they were fast but (relative to earnings) expensive modes of transportation; they were initially utilized by the well-to-do, who used these fast modes to commute from suburbs. Increases in real incomes allowed the general public to adopt the faster modes of transportation. Moreover, the falling cost of intra-urban transport following the construction of freeways significantly increased the size of the urban area, decreased residential densities and allowed MSAs to develop in all directions at suburban locations.

The decentralization of residential activity was followed by employment decentralization, made possible in part by the adoption of truck transport for goods. Firms followed the population to the suburbs, both to provide services to suburban residents and to take advantage of lower suburban wages and land costs. This process was self-reinforcing: as large employers became suburbanized, their employees followed them.

This natural evolution theory of urban development emphasizes the distance of residential sites to central work places, the effects of rising real incomes over time, the demand for new housing and land, and the heterogeneity of

the housing stock. Other important considerations for this theory are transportation costs, innovations of intra-urban transportation and changes through time in the comparative advantage of different income groups at commuting longer distances to work.

In contrast, a second class of explanations for suburbanization stresses fiscal and social problems of central cities: high taxes, low quality public schools and other government services, racial tensions, crime, congestion and low environmental quality. These problems lead affluent central city residents to migrate to the suburbs, which leads to a further deterioration of the quality of life and the fiscal situation of central areas, which induces further out-migration.

Those who move to the suburbs often seek to form homogenous communities, for several reasons. There is the preference for residing among individuals of like income, education, race, and ethnicity. By residing in income-stratified communities, the affluent avoid local redistributive taxes. Homogenous community formation is also motivated by varying demands for local public goods, caused by income and taste differences. Homogenous groupings enhance the quality of education, as there is evidence that peer-group effects are important in the production of educational achievement. In earlier periods, people of English backgrounds moved away from the influx of low income European immigrants. More recently there has been the flight of middle class residents from central cities caused, in part, by the fact that low-income blacks commit a disproportionate share of crime.

The fiscal-social problems approach is a generalization of the well-known Tiebout (1956) model. Although Tiebout did not mention land use controls, they have clearly been an important part of the suburban homogenization process at least since World War II. Once a relatively homogenous group has collected in a suburban jurisdiction, they can exclude people whose housing demands are very different by land use controls on residences. To some extent, they can exclude other types of people by similar controls on commercial development. Land use controls have become increasingly stringent in the 1970s and 1980s, and residential segregation now works increasingly by income, and somewhat less by race and ethnicity.

Also, as affluent groups first had the means to use expensive transportation innovations to commute from suburbs, this natural process was instrumental in the formation of well-financed and high-achieving school districts. Once high quality school districts became established, they became magnets for further suburbanization and attracted other households that placed a high value on education, furthering their quality and reputation.

The two theories have a number of interactions and interrelations, and consequently, it is difficult to distinguish between them empirically. For example, income differences among households is a primary explanatory variable for both the natural evolution and "flight from blight" explanations of suburbanization. The "flight from blight" theory implies that important externalities are

involved between income groups: positive externalities from the affluent to the poor, and negative externalities running the other way. But the other theory, based on income changes and technology, is consistent with the same externalities.<sup>1</sup>

Take another example: as a large share of new, modern houses is built on open suburban land, the demand for the new housing also satisfies the demand for affluent neighborhoods and low-tax communities. As MSAs are naturally expanded at their peripheries, new communities form there; as affluent groups have controlled this process, these communities have facilitated the introduction of a variety of exclusionary and fiscally motivated land use controls. In this way, the natural evolution and fiscal-social factors can interact. Once residential decentralization was established it promoted the movement of employment to the suburbs, and thus led to further residential suburbanization. The two hypotheses are by no means mutually exclusive.

With these approaches to the issue of suburbanization in mind, let us now move to examining how suburbanization has been measured and studied.

## **The Monocentric Model and Analyzing Suburbanization with Gradients**

Before offering some cross-country comparisons of suburbanization, we first sketch the monocentric model of urban areas and discuss the gradient measure of suburbanization.

The monocentric model of urban spatial structure was developed by Alonso (1964), Mills (1967) and Muth (1969). The model formalizes what we have referred to as the natural evolution model of urban areas. In this model, all employment is concentrated at the central business district (CBD), and the locational choice of identical households is modeled solely on the basis of access to the employment center. In the monocentric model, centrally located housing is expensive, and households economize on housing and live in small housing units. Households that incur higher commuting cost are rewarded by lower housing prices farther from the CBD and consume more housing. Under certain simplifying assumptions about preferences and technology population density is shown to have an exponential form (Brueckner, 1982),  $D(\theta) = D_0 e^{-\gamma\theta}$ , where  $\theta$  is the distance from the CBD,  $D_0$  is the population density at the edge of the CBD, and  $\gamma$  is the gradient or the constant percentage change in the population density per unit change in distance from the CBD.

The basic form of the monocentric model assumes that there is one mode of transportation and the cost per unit distance is constant. The best theoretical

<sup>1</sup>A number of studies bearing on these views will be discussed throughout this paper. However, the reader interested in a good starting point on the "flight from blight" theory might begin with Oates, Howrey, and Baumol (1971) and Bradford and Kelejian (1973). A good starting point for the alternative view might be Mills and Price (1984), or the papers by Straszheim (1987), and by Brueckner (1987).

and historical account of the importance of transportation innovations in explaining suburbanization in general and the suburbanization of the affluent is developed by LeRoy and Sonstelie (1983). They extend the basic model of urban location by allowing for slow and fast modes of intra-urban transportation. Initially, the slow mode was walking and the fast mode was streetcar—later replaced by the automobile. As the rich could better afford the fast mode they were the first to suburbanize, but as the ownership of the automobile became general among income classes the less affluent also moved to suburban locations. As the affluent place a higher value on their commuting time, they are at a comparative disadvantage in commuting and LeRoy and Sonstelie predict the gentrification of central cities by the more affluent as the poor became more suburbanized. This historical explanation of the location of different income groups in terms of transportation modes of varying speeds is an ingenious explanation of the income stratification of MSAs and confirms the difficulty of establishing the relative quantitative importance of competing explanations of suburbanization. This is economics in its purest form, as preferences are stable over time and are invariant among income levels. Observed changes over time and differences in choice for different households at a point in time are simply the result of differences in budget opportunity sets and changes in these sets over time.

Beginning with the work of Colin Clark (1951), many writers have used estimates of the density gradient, the slope of the log density function, as a measure of the degree of decentralization of MSAs. The more uniform the population density as a function of the distance from the central business district the smaller the gradient, so decreases in the value of the gradient over time have been taken as increases in the decentralization or suburbanization of urban areas. Clark's work was based on census tract data for a number of urban areas throughout the world, some dating back to the early nineteenth century. He established declining density gradients and the flattening of density functions over time. Muth's (1969) work for a sample of U.S. cities was also based on census tract information.

In contrast, the work of Mills (1972) and the later work of Mills and Tan (1980) and Edmonston (1975) is not based on census tract information, which is nonexistent for early time periods. Mills assumed, first and most importantly, that population density follows the exponential form. Second, he assumed that population density is zero at the boundary of the urban area. The second assumption is unnecessary and was dropped in later work. With these two assumptions, he is able to obtain a perfect fit for the function yielding the population density at the CBD and the density gradient from information on the population of the central city, the population of the suburbs and the distance of the central city boundary from the CBD. On the basis of these two-point estimates, Mills and Tan (1980) conclude that density gradients have flattened for a large number of countries over long time periods. Mills (1972) found that population and employment density gradients decreased for a large number of MSAs in the United States in the postwar period. Also, Mills

estimated gradients to be declining from 1880 to 1940 for a sample of five MSAs. On the basis of the estimates of the density gradients for the early part of this century, Mills concluded that American suburbanization has not accelerated in the post-World War II period, when central city fiscal problems and racial tensions were at their height. This finding, and the findings that suburbanization as measured by the flattening of the density gradient is a worldwide phenomena and has occurred over a long time period, are strong evidence in favor of the natural evolution theory of suburbanization.

Mills's estimates for the early part of the twentieth century have been questioned by Harrison and Kain (1974), who developed an alternative set of density gradient estimates based on historical information of the percentage of structures which house single families. Their estimates of density gradients, while generally lower, are in general accord with Mills's estimates for the postwar period.

But while Mills found gradients to be declining from 1910 to 1930 for a sample of five MSAs, the Harrison-Kain estimates indicate an *increase* in the density gradient for the same MSAs, as vacant land in the central city is filled in. The difference is especially striking for Denver in 1910 for which Mills estimated sharply declining density, while Harrison-Kain estimated uniform population density. These authors remind us that urban development is not just a simple outward expansion, a point to which we will return later.

Edmonston (1975) applied Mills's method of two-point estimates to a much larger sample of cities. For 41 cities that were metropolitan districts in 1900, Edmonston found that the average density gradient was roughly constant at .8 between 1900 and 1920. Between 1920 and 1930 the average gradient fell to .66, and between 1940 and 1950 it fell significantly from .61 to .39. There was no acceleration in the rate of decline between 1950 and 1970.

Data on population growth between 1900 and 1950 for individual metropolitan areas contained in Bogue (1953) confirm these findings. For virtually all older metropolitan areas along the eastern seaboard and in the midwest the population growth of central cities was quite modest after 1930, with virtually all growth occurring in the suburban rings. Also, large older cities such as Boston, Chicago and Philadelphia have decentralized continuously since 1900.

We conclude that Mills overstated the rate of suburbanization for MSAs as a whole for the period 1900–1920. But it remains true that the most rapid period of suburbanization as measured by the change in the density gradient occurred between 1920 and 1950, a period not known for racial tensions, school desegregation, rising local taxes and high crime rates. In fact, between 1940 and 1950, national crime rates fell.

Muth (1969) was the first to attempt to explain variations in density gradients statistically. He found no relationship between suburbanization and a variety of "flight from blight" variables. More recently, Mills and Price (1984) and Mills (1986) estimated population and employment densities for 62 urban

areas for 1960 and 1970 and then used regression analysis to explain urban decentralization.

They find that lagged (1960) population decentralization influences current (1970) employment decentralization. But the prior decentralization of employment does not explain current population decentralization. A number of proxy variables for commuting costs or convenience have the wrong sign or are statistically insignificant. The most important finding of Mills and Price is that the set of measures of central city problems—crime, educational attainment and taxes—adds nothing to the understanding of population and employment suburbanization. The strong exception was racial shares. It was consistently found that both population and employment density gradients were smaller, the larger the ratio of percent black in the central city to percent black in the suburbs. Mills (1985) considers the effect of moving 50,000 central city blacks to the suburbs and replacing them with 50,000 whites from the suburbs. For a hypothetical MSA of two million, after the movement of the population, 45 percent of the central city and 10 percent of the suburbs are black. The long-term effect of this modest integration of suburban housing is estimated (based on earlier Mills and Price regressions) to increase central city employment from 54 to 65 percent of metropolitan employment, a 19.5 percent increase in central city employment, and to increase central city population by 8 percent. The importance of race in influencing suburbanization is confirmed in alternative measures of decentralization as discussed later on.

### **Inter-country Comparisons of Suburbanization**

One advantage of the density gradient as a measure of urban decentralization is that it readily accommodates cross-country comparisons. Casual observation indicates that U.S. MSAs are less dense and more suburbanized than metropolitan areas in other high income countries. These differences have been attributed to the abundance of land in the United States, greater reliance on the automobile, a more extensive system of freeways within urban areas, greater suburban fiscal autonomy, higher crime rates in central cities, and greater ethnic and social diversity in the United States.

In general, the cross-country comparisons found in the work of Mills and Ohta (1976), Mills and Song (1979), Glickman (1979) and Goldberg and Mercer (1986) confirm the common perception that cities in Japan, Canada and Germany are relatively less suburbanized. However, it is difficult to decompose these differences into specific factors and explanations.

Evidence developed by Mills and Ohta and reproduced by Glickman demonstrates that central densities and density gradients in Japan are relatively high. Japan is ethnically and socially homogeneous, but it is also relatively land

poor and relies to a much greater extent than the United States on public transportation for intra-urban travel.

Glickman used population information for small areas (wards) to estimate density gradients for German and British metropolitan areas for 1960 and 1970. He found that German metropolitan areas are relatively less decentralized and that the rate of suburbanization between 1960 and 1970 was much slower there than in the United States. Somewhat unexpectedly, Glickman demonstrated that, on average, the central density and density gradients in United Kingdom metropolitan areas are similar to those in the United States.

Goldberg and Mercer set out to demonstrate that Canadian metropolitan areas are relatively compact and more centralized than those in the United States. However, the authors conclude from density gradients estimated for the period 1950 to 1975 that Canada and U.S. metropolitan areas were decentralizing at the same rate. They also conclude that the central densities of Canadian metropolitan areas are roughly twice those of U.S. metropolitan areas, but the average density gradient is the same in both countries. However, larger metropolitan areas, with populations exceeding 500,000, are denser and more decentralized in the United States. For population size 500,000 to one million, the average density gradients are .48 and .26 for Canada and the United States, respectively. For metropolitan areas one million the average gradients are .4 in Canada and .19 in the United States.

Evidence is presented that metropolitan areas in Canada have fewer fiscal jurisdictions. There are fewer freeway miles per capita in Canada, confirming map analysis which shows that major U.S. metropolitan areas have many more freeways running through their central areas. Also, public transit is more important in Canada as a means of intra-urban transportation. Goldberg and Mercer also present evidence that the percentage of households resident in Canadian central cities and with school-age children is much higher, 57 percent versus 40 percent in the United States.

Finally, there are no significant differences in urban property crime rates between Canada and the United States. However, violent crime is 4 to 6 times higher in the United States, and the differential between center cities and suburbs is much greater in the United States.

This cross-country evidence is consistent with the "flight from blight" explanation of the greater degree of suburbanization in the United States. But there is no precise way of determining what portion of the difference should be attributed to crime and schooling considerations and what portion is explained by the more centralized integrated approach to land use planning and transportation policy in Canada and Europe.

## **Conclusions about Suburbanization from the Gradient Approach**

The gradient approach has several advantages. It's relatively simple. The exponential density function is a reduced form equation of a simple and robust



model of metropolitan spatial organization. Also, the assumption of the exponential density function permits estimation of central densities and density gradients from simple information about the central city population, the metropolitan population, and the radius of the central city—the two-point estimates.

The fundamental problem with using the density approach to test different explanations of suburbanization is that small errors translate into large absolute quantities. Even if the effect of the “flight from blight” factor is relatively small, it could have considerable effect on the margin. It should be remembered that the measurement of gradients is on an exponential scale rather than a linear one. An absolute change of .05 in the density gradient in the range .20 to .25 is quite significant. Mills and Hamilton (1989, p. 381) calculate that an MSA with a central city radius of eight miles and a density gradient of .20 implies that 47.5 percent of the population lives in the central city; with a gradient of .25 the percentage living in the central city rises to 59 percent. Thus, it could be that even if “flight from blight” is a relatively small explanation for suburbanization, it is an important factor on the margin, and thus a key to whether it is considered a manageable phenomenon or a “problem.”

It is difficult to measure “flight from blight” effects precisely. One problem was first noted by Harrison and Kain (1974). They argue that the exponential form for density may not be appropriate for small urban areas. As noted earlier, they estimate uniform density for Denver in 1910. But for this case, the two-point estimate of the exponential form yields a high central density and a large density gradient.

Edmonston (1975) and Goldberg and Mercer (1986) find that gradients for small urban areas are considerably larger than those for large urban areas. To explain this result it is necessary to compromise the exponential form by noting that employment decentralization is more likely to occur in large urban areas. There is also the possibility that estimates of density gradients for small urban areas are biased upwards, because two-point estimates of an exponential form for a city with a small area force the population density to decline quickly and yield high densities close to the center. But as noted by Harrison and Kain (1974), population densities in small cities are actually quite uniform. This bias affects the Mills-Price conclusion that race has a significant effect on employment decentralization if minorities tend to reside in large metropolitan areas.

Beyond the interpretation of gradient-based results, the idea of an exponential gradient itself has been questioned (Mills, 1992). First, if variables that relate to local government jurisdictions are important, no theoretical approach implies that the same exponential density function should hold within or among jurisdictions. Thus, the fiscal and social factors call into question the functional form.

Perhaps more important, although the widespread existence of gradients has been taken to support the basic monocentric model of MSAs, this approach may fail to offer a good approximation of many MSAs. Western and southern MSAs have tended to grow in a dispersed pattern, with leap-frog development,

rather than simply spreading out. Mieszkowski and Smith (1991) have shown for Houston that population density on developed residential land is quite uniform and that the declining density gradient is largely a statistical artifact, resulting from the increase in the amount of vacant land with distance from the central business district.

Moreover, the 1970s and 1980s have seen the development of large suburban office complexes, or the formation of "Edge Cities" as described by Garreau (1991). They are to be understood as collections of employment and surrounding residential areas which are located in the suburbs—often distant suburbs—of large urban areas. They increasingly resemble small, free-standing and self-contained cities, often containing 50,000 to 100,000 people. One important factor which has enabled such cities to arise is the beltways around large cities, which create intersections of important highways.

Although the monocentric model and the exponential density function have been valuable in understanding and documenting past trends in urban decentralization, the rise of "Edge City" makes the model and function increasingly irrelevant. Also, explanations of variations in the density gradient among metropolitan areas have not been successful in determining the relative importance of the natural evolution and the "flight from blight" explanations of suburbanization.

## **Conclusions and Policy Implications**

Our judgment is that both the natural evolution and fiscal-social approaches are important. Much evidence and analysis indicate that MSA size, income levels and distribution, transportation evolution and housing demand are important in understanding MSA structure and decentralization. On the other hand, no careful study has failed to confirm that central city racial mix and suburban land use controls interact to help explain both the extent and pattern of suburbanization in U.S. MSAs.

However, the relative importance placed on the two theories can lead to different policy conclusions. At issue is the appropriate role of the federal and state governments in shaping urban development. If suburbanization is largely the result of natural evolution, and technologically- and income-induced changes in the demand for land, then it is appropriate for the public sector to accommodate these demands. State and federal governments should be neutral in allocating development funds between suburbs and the central city. If households prefer to live in low density suburbs, and to use automobiles as their primary means of intra-urban transportation, the public sector should validate these preferences with the appropriate highway and infrastructure investments.

From this view, the requests of central city landowners to prop up their declining fortunes with area-specific transportation investments or subsidies

should be resisted. Rail transportation might be justified as part of an overall public investment strategy, but only if it is the best means of satisfying trip demand, whether these work trips are from the suburbs to the central city, from central city to suburbs, or within the central city, and only if rail is cost-effective relative to an alternative means of transportation such as the automobile. While this point of view would still allow the use of eminent domain in some cases—on the grounds that markets do not work perfectly in assembling land for central city redevelopment—this power should not be accompanied by fiscal subsidies; otherwise the apparently high cost of residential and non-residential redevelopment (because of the strategic behavior of individual landowners) will be confounded with the remaining service value of existing properties.

In an idealized policy environment, the allocative and distributive objectives of higher level governments should be separated. Direct income assistance to the poor should be the responsibility of the federal and state governments. Also, if large numbers of poor are concentrated in central cities, grants to local governments can be justified as a means of increasing the government service levels for low income groups. But the strict separation between allocation and distribution is difficult to maintain, except for the special case where all redistribution for private and governmentally-provided goods are provided directly to individuals and all local governments impose benefit taxes and charges on all income groups residing within their jurisdictions.

When all income groups are initially located within one central city jurisdiction, fiscal factors do not affect location. From this starting point, if some affluent households move to the suburbs to satisfy their demands for new housing, in all probability they also improve their fiscal situation. The creation of income-stratified suburbs weakens the fiscal base of the central city, and their existence creates a fiscal incentive for other affluent households to move to suburbs. So even when non-fiscal factors are the initial forces behind suburbanization and remain important, once affluent suburbs are formed, fiscal considerations necessarily influence suburbanization to some extent.

The magnitude of the fiscal distortion resulting from these fiscal effects in influencing location is uncertain. Part of the differential between central city and suburbs is neutralized through capitalization in land values. But as long as industrial and residential land densities can vary and/or land can remain vacant, allocative distortions are not fully eliminated by capitalization. In addition, land use controls prevent resource mobility. Another consideration is the extent to which local governments respond to fiscal competition and move towards benefit taxation.

There are several ways of characterizing or representing the inefficiency associated with redistributive taxation within the central city. If taxes are higher in the central city than in the suburbs, and households are indifferent between the two general locations, a move to the suburbs by these households results in a social loss. The difference in taxes represents a loss of output with no change

in welfare for the households that move. The loss in output may be largely the higher commuting costs associated with suburban residence. Households trade off higher commuting costs against the higher taxes and lower service levels at central locations.

We judge that tax and government service level considerations inhibit central city redevelopment. In many cities, affluent households are willing to pay high prices for housing in secure, high-income, centrally located neighborhoods. Yet since 1950, many central cities have lost large amounts of population and appear ripe for redevelopment. This development would be more likely to occur if the vacant or underutilized central city land could be incorporated as an independent jurisdiction. Or equivalently, the centrally located land would be worth more if the landowners could secede from the central city. The difference between the value of land in a hypothetical independent jurisdiction and its current value is a measure of the welfare loss, for a specific area, of being part of a redistributive central city fiscal system.

Once fiscal distortions are recognized, the decision-making process of higher level governments becomes more complex, since the effects of redistributive policies include the aid they provide low income groups, the fiscal relief this aid provides to the immediate neighbors of the poor, and the allocative improvement that these policies may bring about by moderating out-migration to the suburbs. Similarly, the benefits of state government financed investments in either the suburbs or in the central city should account for direct benefits and the social benefits of promoting central city location.

A necessary condition for an efficiency-based intervention on behalf of central cities is the demonstration that fiscal and related factors are quantitatively important in affecting the degree of decentralization of MSAs. This evidence would also strengthen the case for equity-based aid to central areas so as to share more equitably the cost of central-city government services and to aid low income groups.

A more direct use of the quantitative research on the causes of suburbanization is for the policy formulation of local governments. Evidence that high crime rates are important in determining population and employment growth would provide a justification for large expenditures on crime prevention. The finding that high central city taxes lead employment but not population to move to suburbs might be used to impose higher taxes on city residents relative to business.

■ *We are grateful to Joseph Stiglitz, Carl Shapiro, and Timothy Taylor for their helpful comments. Also, we would like to thank Henry Aaron and Helen Ladd for their comments on an earlier draft.*

## References

- Alonso, William**, *Location and Land Use*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Bogue, Donald**, *Population Growth in Standard Metropolitan Areas*. Washington, D.C.: Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1953.
- Bradford, David, and Henry Kelejian**, "An Econometric Model of the Flight to the Suburbs," *Journal of Political Economy*, May/June 1973, 81:3, 566-89.
- Brueckner, Jan K.**, "The Structure of Urban Equilibria: A Unified Treatment of the Muth-Mills Model." In Mills, Edwin S., ed., *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics*, Volume 2. Amsterdam: North Holland-Elsevier Publishers, 1987, Chapter 20, 821-45.
- Clark, Colin**, "Urban Population Densities," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A, December 1951, 490-96.
- Downs, Anthony**, *New Visions of Metropolitan-Area Growth*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, draft, 1992.
- Edmonston, Barry**, *Population Distribution in American Cities*. Lexington: Heath and Company, 1975.
- Carreau, Joel**, *Edge City*. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Glickman, Norman**, *The Growth and Management of the Japanese Urban System*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- Goldberg, Michael, and John Mercer**, *The Myth of the North American City*. Vancouver, B.C.: The University of British Columbia Press, 1986.
- Harrison, David, and John Kain**, "Cumulative Urban Growth and Urban Density Functions," *Journal of Urban Economics*, January 1974, 1:1, 61-98.
- LeRoy, Stephen, and Jon Sonstelie**, "Paradise Lost and Regained: Transportation Innovation, Income and Residential Location," *Journal of Urban Economics*, January 1983, 13:1, 67-89.
- Mieszkowski, Peter, and Barton Smith**, "Analyzing Urban Decentralization: The Case of Houston," *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, July 1991, 21:2, 183-200.
- Mills, Edwin S.**, "An Aggregative Model of Resource Allocation in a Metropolitan Area," *American Economic Review*, May 1967, 57, 197-210.
- Mills, Edwin S.**, *Studies in the Structure of the Urban Economy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1972.
- Mills, Edwin S.**, "Open Housing Laws as Stimulus to Central City Employment," *Journal of Urban Economics*, March 1985, 17:2, 184-88.
- Mills, Edwin S.**, "Metropolitan Central City Population and Employment Growth During the 1970s." In Peston, M. H., and R. E. Ivandt, eds., *Prices, Competition and Equilibrium*. London: Philip Allan Publishers, 1986, 268-84.
- Mills, Edwin S.**, "The Measurement and Determinants of Suburbanization," *Journal of Urban Economics*, November 1992, 32:3, 377-87.
- Mills, Edwin S., and Bruce Hamilton**, *Urban Economics*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1989.
- Mills, Edwin S., and Katsutoshi Ohta**, "Urbanization and Urban Problem." In Patrick, Hugh, and Henry Rosovsky, eds., *Asia's New Giant: How the Japanese Economy Works*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1976, Chapter 10, 673-751.
- Mills, Edwin S., and Richard Price**, "Metropolitan Suburbanization and Central City Problems," *Journal of Urban Economics*, January 1984, 15:1, 1-17.
- Mills, Edwin S., and Byung-nak Song**, *Urbanization and Urban Problems: Studies in the Modernization of the Republic of Korea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Mills, Edwin S., and Jee Peng Tan**, "A Comparison of Urban Population Density Functions in Developed and Developing Countries." *Urban Studies*, October 1980, 17:3, 313-21.
- Muth, Richard**, *Cities and Housing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Oates, Wallace, William Howrey, and William Baumol**, "The Analysis of Public Policy in Urban Models," *Journal of Political Economy*, January/February 1971, 79, 142-53.
- Straszheim, Mahlon**, "The Theory of Urban Residential Local." In Mills, Edwin S., ed., *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics*, Volume 2. Amsterdam: North Holland-Elsevier Publishers, 1987, Chapter 18, 717-57.
- Tiebout, Charles, M.**, "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditure," *Journal of Political Economy*, October 1956, 64:5, 416-24.



**This article has been cited by:**

1. Stephen Calabrese. 2024. Household mobility and the political economy and welfare effects of local tax limits. *Journal of Urban Economics* **142**, 103656. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Jim Lee, Hua Zhang, Yuxia Huang. 2024. Toward a more socially equitable stormwater management fee: The case of Corpus Christi in Texas, USA. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* **51**:4, 939-953. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Kuzey Yilmaz. 2024. Two-worker Households, Decentralized Employment, and Residential Segregation. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **33**. . [[Crossref](#)]
4. Chenchen Sun, Yuya Shibuya, Yoshihide Sekimoto. 2024. Social segregation levels vary depending on activity space types: Comparison of segregation in residential, workplace, routine and non-routine activities in Tokyo metropolitan area. *Cities* **146**, 104745. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Sebastian Gnat. 2024. Population Change as an Aspect of Suburbanization of Major Cities in Poland. *Real Estate Management and Valuation* **32**:1, 13-25. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Yi Yang, Michelle Whitford, Leonie Lockstone-Binney. 2024. Reconceptualising urban space with second home tourism: The emergence of an urban second-home tourism enclave. *Annals of Tourism Research* **105**, 103708. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Kala Seetharam Sridhar, Paavo Monkkonen. 2024. Urban form in India 1975–2015: Have India's cities become flat?. *Cities* **145**, 104705. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Hashem Dadashpoor, Neda Malekzadeh, Sadegh Saeidishirvan. 2023. A typology of metropolitan spatial structure: a systematic review. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* **25**:12, 13667-13693. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Honorata Bogusz, Szymon Winnicki, Piotr Wójcik. 2023. What factors contribute to uneven suburbanisation? Predicting the number of migrants from Warsaw to its suburbs with machine learning. *The Annals of Regional Science* **82**. . [[Crossref](#)]
10. Wenjun Zou, Lei Wu, Yunrui Chang, Qiang Niu. 2023. Is Ride-Hailing an Effective Tool for Improving Transportation Services in Suburban New Towns in China? Evidence from Wuhan Unicom Users' Mobile Phone Usage Big Data. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* **12**:8, 299. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Rainer Schulz, Verity Watson, Martin Wersing. 2023. Teleworking and housing demand. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **101**, 103915. [[Crossref](#)]
12. R. Sukanya, Veerta Tantia. Urbanization and the Impact on Economic Development 369-408. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Bumsoo Kim. 2023. Structural pluralism and incivility: comparing patterns of moral foundations and incivility in responses to news posts. *Online Information Review* **47**:3, 433-452. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Jan K. Brueckner, Matthew E. Kahn, Gary C. Lin. 2023. A New Spatial Hedonic Equilibrium in the Emerging Work-from-Home Economy?. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **15**:2, 285-319. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
15. Hiroyuki Usui. 2023. Cost-Efficient Urban Areas Minimising the Connection Costs of Buildings by Roads: Simultaneous Optimisation of Criteria for Building Interval and Built Cluster Size. *Networks and Spatial Economics* **23**:1, 65-96. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Chen-Fu Lu, Chia-Yi Cheng. 2023. Does the change of agricultural zoning policy achieve farmland protection in Taiwan?. *Land Use Policy* **126**, 106518. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Imam Buchori, Abdurrahman Zaki, Pangi Pang, Anang Wahyu Sejati, Yudi Basuki, Angrenggani Pramitasari. 2023. Industrial Development-Induced Gentrification. *International Review for Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development* **11**:1, 276-296. [[Crossref](#)]

18. Kuzey Yılmaz, Muharrem Yeşilirmak. 2023. Access to transportation, residential segregation, and economic opportunity. *Contemporary Economic Policy* 41:1, 103-127. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Shipeng Sun, Dawn C. Parker, Daniel G. Brown. 2023. From an agent-based laboratory to the real world: Effects of “neighborhood” size on urban sprawl. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 99, 101889. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Richard J. Cebula, Malissa L. Davis. 2022. Determinants of poverty in the US state of Virginia: an examination of the impact of rent (the neglected variable). *Regional Studies, Regional Science* 9:1, 818-830. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Ines Grigorescu, Gheorghe Kucsicsa, Bianca Mitrică, Irena Mocanu, Monica Dumitraşcu. 2022. Driving factors of urban sprawl in the Romanian plain. Regional and temporal modelling using logistic regression. *Geocarto International* 37:24, 7220-7246. [[Crossref](#)]
22. AA McCormack, LM Foldnes Lunde, JL McDowell, A Iqbal, S Ojee, A Nowokreschenow. 2022. Area Neutrality: safeguarding urban biodiversity with a new land management framework in Trondheim. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 1122:1, 012017. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Yanxi Wang, Yunxia Zhuo, Tao Liu. 2022. Population Dynamics in China’s Urbanizing Megaregion: A Township-Level Analysis of the Beijing–Tianjin–Hebei Region. *Land* 11:9, 1394. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Patricia Romero-Lankao, Alana Wilson, Daniel Zimny-Schmitt. 2022. Inequality and the future of electric mobility in 36 U.S. Cities: An innovative methodology and comparative assessment. *Energy Research & Social Science* 91, 102760. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Yasi Tian, Junyi Chen. 2022. Suburban sprawl measurement and landscape analysis of cropland and ecological land: A case study of Jiangsu Province, China. *Growth and Change* 53:3, 1282-1305. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Guillaume Xhignesse, Gerlinde Verbist. 2022. An assessment of the spatial efficiency of tax benefits for home mortgages in Belgium. *Housing Studies* 37:7, 1198-1224. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Anasua Chakraborty, Sujit Sikder, Hichem Omrani, Jacques Teller. 2022. Cellular Automata in Modeling and Predicting Urban Densification: Revisiting the Literature since 1971. *Land* 11:7, 1113. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Ke Zhao, Danling Chen, Xupeng Zhang, Xiaojie Zhang. 2022. How Do Urban Land Expansion, Land Finance, and Economic Growth Interact?. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19:9, 5039. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Zifeng Chen, Anthony Gar-On Yeh. 2022. Delineating functional urban areas in Chinese mega city regions using fine-grained population data and cellphone location data: A case of Pearl River Delta. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 93, 101771. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Lena Edlund, Cecilia Machado, Maria Sviatschi. 2022. Gentrification and the Rising Returns to Skill. *Economica* 89:354, 258-292. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Yaara Mann, Ravit Hananel. 2022. Moving away from equality. *Progress in Planning* 157, 100537. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Olalekan John Taiwo. 2022. Modelling the spatiotemporal patterns of urban sprawl in Ibadan metropolis between 1984 and 2013 in Nigeria. *Modeling Earth Systems and Environment* 8:1, 121-140. [[Crossref](#)]
33. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2022. Trends in commuting time of European workers: A cross-country analysis. *Transport Policy* 116, 327-342. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Junda Huang, Yuncai Wang, Lang Zhang. 2022. Identifying Spatial Priority of Ecological Restoration Dependent on Landscape Quality Trends in Metropolitan Areas. *Land* 11:1, 27. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Keisuke Sakamoto, Takahiro Yamazaki, Keigo Kato, Toru Terada, Noriko Akita, Akito Murayama, Akiko Iida, Marco Amati, Makoto Yokohari. 2022. Polarised Residential Preferences for the Centre



- and Outer Suburban Tokyo after the Experience of Covid-19. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **110**. . [[Crossref](#)]
36. John R. Ottensmann. 2022. The Decline of the Density Gradient is Not a Good Measure of Decentralization. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **36**. . [[Crossref](#)]
37. Piotr LITYŃSKI. 2021. Business Urban Sprawl. A Financial Evaluation of Enterprises in Poland. *Journal of Settlements and Spatial Planning* **SI**:11, 5-13. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Gizem HAYRULLAHOĞLU, Yeşim ALİEFENDİOĞLU, Harun TANRIVERMİŞ. 2021. Kentsel Yayılma Alanları ve Bu Alanlardaki Konut Talebi Üzerine Nitel Bir Araştırma. *İDEALKENT* **12**:34, 1413-1439. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Marianne Tønnessen. 2021. Movers from the city in the first year of Covid. *Nordic Journal of Urban Studies* **1**:2, 131-147. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Różycka-Czas Renata, Czesak Barbara, Staszek Andrzej. 2021. Which Polish Cities Sprawl the Most. *Land* **10**:12, 1291. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Donata Wysocka, Jadwiga Biegańska, Elżbieta Grzelak-Kostulska. 2021. Construction Activity as an Element of Suburban Zone Development. *Land* **10**:11, 1229. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Thomas M. Guterbock. 2021. The beginning and the end of urban population deconcentration in the United States: New insights from application of the Density Distribution Index. *Cities* **118**, 103349. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Rikard Forslid, Toshihiro Okubo. 2021. Agglomeration of low-productive entrepreneurs to large regions: a simple model. *Spatial Economic Analysis* **16**:4, 471-486. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Miriam Marcén, Marina Morales. 2021. Culture and the cross-country differences in the gender commuting gap. *Journal of Transport Geography* **96**, 103184. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Mark Matsa, Oshneck Mupepi, Tatenda Musasa. 2021. Spatio-temporal analysis of urban area expansion in Zimbabwe between 1990 and 2020: The case of Gweru city. *Environmental Challenges* **4**, 100141. [[Crossref](#)]
46. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2021. Two-way commuting: Asymmetries from time use surveys. *Journal of Transport Geography* **95**, 103146. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Weidong Qu, Zhen Yan, Bing Zhu. 2021. Unpaid commuting stress: Evaluation of the relocation policy of the Beijing Municipal Government. *Cities* **113**, 103166. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Daniel M. Koenemann, Amber Durand, Janelle M. Burke. 2021. A Floral Checklist for Wheaton Regional Park, Montgomery County, Maryland. *Castanea* **86**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
49. Su Wu, Neema Simon Sumari, Ting Dong, Gang Xu, Yanfang Liu. 2021. Characterizing Urban Expansion Combining Concentric-Ring and Grid-Based Analysis for Latin American Cities. *Land* **10**:5, 444. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Aleksandra Jadach-Sepiolo, Maciej Zathej. 2021. Alternative between Revitalisation of City Centres and the Rising Costs of Extensive Land Use from a Polish Perspective. *Land* **10**:5, 488. [[Crossref](#)]
51. David Cuberes, Klaus Desmet, Jordan Rappaport. 2021. Urban growth shadows. *Journal of Urban Economics* **123**, 103334. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Michael R. Greenberg. 2021. Environmental and Social Justice on the Border of Five Major U.S. Cities. *Environmental Justice* **55**. . [[Crossref](#)]
53. Jinzhou Cao, Qingquan Li, Wei Tu, Qili Gao, Rui Cao, Chen Zhong. 2021. Resolving urban mobility networks from individual travel graphs using massive-scale mobile phone tracking data. *Cities* **110**, 103077. [[Crossref](#)]

54. Ihsan Abbas Jasim, Sabeeh Lafta Farhan, Haider Majid Hasan. 2021. Ways to Activate Urban Transport to Achieve Urban Sustainability. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* **1090**:1, 012034. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Ka Shing Cheung, Chung Yim Yiu, Chuyi Xiong. 2021. Housing Market in the Time of Pandemic: A Price Gradient Analysis from the COVID-19 Epicentre in China. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* **14**:3, 108. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Bhaswati Mondal, Gopa Samanta. Suburban Railways, Commuting, and Metropolitan Expansion 35-55. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Adelheid Holl. Transport Cost and Location of Firms 291-296. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Henning Nuissl, Stefan Siedentop. Urbanisation and Land Use Change 75-99. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Chandra Prakash Morya, Mehram Ram. 2020. Dynamics of suburbanization and influence of National Capital Territory of Delhi on towns. *GeoJournal* **85**:6, 1725-1743. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Yuval Arbel, Chaim Fialkoff, Amichai Kerner. 2020. The Chicken and Egg Problem: Obesity and the Urban Monocentric Model. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* **61**:4, 576-606. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Sanggyun Kang. 2020. Warehouse location choice: A case study in Los Angeles, CA. *Journal of Transport Geography* **88**, 102297. [[Crossref](#)]
62. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2020. Commuting and self-employment in Western Europe. *Journal of Transport Geography* **88**, 102856. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Tomasz Spórna, Robert Krzysztófik. 2020. 'Inner' suburbanisation – Background of the phenomenon in a polycentric, post-socialist and post-industrial region. Example from the Katowice conurbation, Poland. *Cities* **104**, 102789. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Michael Overton, Julius Nukpezah. 2020. Investigating Sales Tax Revenue Competition Among Principal Cities and Their Neighboring Cities in Texas. *International Journal of Public Administration* **43**:11, 937-948. [[Crossref](#)]
65. T. M. Tonmoy Islam. 2020. The impact of population agglomeration of an area on its neighbors: evidence from the USA. *The Annals of Regional Science* **65**:1, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Meng Le Zhang, Gwilym Pryce. 2020. The dynamics of poverty, employment and access to amenities in polycentric cities: Measuring the decentralisation of poverty and its impacts in England and Wales. *Urban Studies* **57**:10, 2015-2030. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Yi Qiang, Jinwen Xu, Guohui Zhang. 2020. The shapes of US cities: Revisiting the classic population density functions using crowdsourced geospatial data. *Urban Studies* **57**:10, 2147-2162. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Youjung Kim, Galen Newman, Burak Güneralp. 2020. A Review of Driving Factors, Scenarios, and Topics in Urban Land Change Models. *Land* **9**:8, 246. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Dani Broitman, Eric Koomen. 2020. The attraction of urban cores: Densification in Dutch city centres. *Urban Studies* **57**:9, 1920-1939. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Barbara Korwel-Lejkowska. 2020. Transformation of the Landscape Structure of the Selected Testing Grounds in the Tri-city Agglomeration in the Years 1985–2012. *Quaestiones Geographicae* **39**:2, 31-42. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Kuzey Yilmaz. 2020. States and school finance. *Regional Science Policy & Practice* **12**:3, 539-549. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Angelina Hackmann, Torben Klarl. 2020. The evolution of Zipf's Law for U.S. cities. *Papers in Regional Science* **99**:3, 841-852. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Daria Ponstingel. 2020. The impact of exurban development on forested areas in Kurgan City, Russia. *Land Use Policy* **94**, 104485. [[Crossref](#)]

74. Kfir Mordechay, Jennifer B. Ayscue. 2020. Does Neighborhood Gentrification Create School Desegregation?. *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education* **122**:5, 1-34. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Jing Zhao, Narumasa Tsutsumida. 2020. Mapping Fragmented Impervious Surface Areas Overlooked by Global Land-Cover Products in the Liping County, Guizhou Province, China. *Remote Sensing* **12**:9, 1527. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Myung-Jin Jun. 2020. The effects of polycentric evolution on commute times in a polycentric compact city: A case of the Seoul Metropolitan Area. *Cities* **98**, 102587. [[Crossref](#)]
77. William Larson, Weihua Zhao. 2020. Self-driving cars and the city: Effects on sprawl, energy consumption, and housing affordability. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **81**, 103484. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Attila Ambrus, Erica Field, Robert Gonzalez. 2020. Loss in the Time of Cholera: Long-Run Impact of a Disease Epidemic on the Urban Landscape. *American Economic Review* **110**:2, 475-525. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
79. Sanggyun Kang. 2020. Relative logistics sprawl: Measuring changes in the relative distribution from warehouses to logistics businesses and the general population. *Journal of Transport Geography* **83**, 102636. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Carrie Makarewicz. Balancing education opportunities with sustainable travel and development 299-331. [[Crossref](#)]
81. José Ignacio Giménez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina Chueca, Jorge Velilla. 2020. Trends in Commuting Time of European Workers: A Cross-Country Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **122**. . [[Crossref](#)]
82. Mitchell T. Bonney, Yuhong He. 2019. Attributing drivers to spatio-temporal changes in tree density across a suburbanizing landscape since 1944. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **192**, 103652. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Kuo-Cheng Hsu. 2019. Effect of Distinct Land Use Patterns on Quality of Life in Urban Settings. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* **145**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
84. MARYAM GHASEMI. 2019. The Rise of Crime in Affordable Housing in Suburbs, Case of Iran. *Journal of Contemporary Urban Affairs* **3**:2, 137-143. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Christopher B. Goodman. 2019. The Fiscal Impacts of Urban Sprawl: Evidence From U.S. County Areas. *Public Budgeting & Finance* **39**:4, 3-27. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Gidon S. Jakar, James R. Dunn. 2019. (Turning Rust into Gold?) Hamilton, Ontario and a Canadian perspective of shrinking and declining cities. *Cities* **94**, 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Wanfu Jin, Chunshan Zhou, Shijie Li, Guojun Zhang. 2019. Factors affecting newly increased construction land at different development stages: Evidence from 352 Chinese cities. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* **30**, 239980831987481. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Kh Md Nahiduzzaman, Adel S. Aldosary, Ishak Mohammed. 2019. Framework Analysis of E-Commerce Induced Shift in the Spatial Structure of a City. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* **145**:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
89. Cory P. Haberman, Wendy H. Stiver. 2019. The Dayton Foot Patrol Program: An Evaluation of Hot Spots Foot Patrols in a Central Business District. *Police Quarterly* **22**:3, 247-277. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Xiaoqing Ge, Buchen Wu. Real Estate and Land Management 868-876. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Abdullah Tirgil, William T Dickens, Rifat Atun. 2019. Effects of expanding a non-contributory health insurance scheme on out-of-pocket healthcare spending by the poor in Turkey. *BMJ Global Health* **4**:4, e001540. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Sushobhan Sen, Jeffery Roesler, Benjamin Ruddell, Ariane Middel. 2019. Cool Pavement Strategies for Urban Heat Island Mitigation in Suburban Phoenix, Arizona. *Sustainability* **11**:16, 4452. [[Crossref](#)]

93. José Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, José Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2019. Modelling commuting time in the US: Bootstrapping techniques to avoid overfitting. *Papers in Regional Science* **98**:4, 1667-1685. [[Crossref](#)]
94. Ping Yin. 2019. Urban–rural inequalities in spatial accessibility to prenatal care: a GIS analysis of Georgia, USA, 2000–2010. *GeoJournal* **84**:3, 671-683. [[Crossref](#)]
95. S.M. Patella, S. Sportiello, M. Petrelli, S. Carrese. 2019. Workplace relocation from suburb to city center: A case study of Rome, Italy. *Case Studies on Transport Policy* **7**:2, 357-362. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Ronghui Tan, Kehao Zhou, Hengzhou Xu. 2019. Effects of Urban Road Centrality on Property Values: Spatial Hedonic Analysis of the Housing Market in Wuhan, China. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* **145**:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
97. Dóra Nagyné Demeter, Gábor Koncz. 2019. Development Opportunities of Homesteads in Rural Areas a Social or an Economic Question?. *Visegrad Journal on Bioeconomy and Sustainable Development* **8**:1, 42-46. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Alexander Bogin, William Doerner, William Larson. 2019. Local House Price Dynamics: New Indices and Stylized Facts. *Real Estate Economics* **47**:2, 365-398. [[Crossref](#)]
99. JunJie Wu, Steven Sexton, David Zilberman. 2019. Energy price shocks, household location patterns and housing crises: Theory and implications. *Energy Economics* **80**, 691-706. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Seyyed Hadi Hosseini, Mehran Hajilou. 2019. Drivers of urban sprawl in urban areas of Iran. *Papers in Regional Science* **98**:2, 1137-1159. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Adam Eckerd, Yushim Kim, Heather Campbell. 2019. Gentrification and Displacement: Modeling a Complex Urban Process. *Housing Policy Debate* **29**:2, 273-295. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Kevin Kane, William AV Clark. 2019. Mapping the landscape of urban work: Home-based businesses and the built environment. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* **51**:2, 323-350. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Khaled Alawadi, Ouafa Benkraouda. 2019. The Debate over Neighborhood Density in Dubai: Between Theory and Practicality. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* **39**:1, 18-34. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Manisha Jain, Artem Korzhenevych, Karina Pallagst. 2019. Assessing growth management strategy: A case study of the largest rural-urban region in India. *Land Use Policy* **81**, 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Youjung Kim, Galen Newman. 2019. Climate Change Preparedness: Comparing Future Urban Growth and Flood Risk in Amsterdam and Houston. *Sustainability* **11**:4, 1048. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Kuzey Yilmaz. 2019. The role of government in regentrification. *Papers in Regional Science* **98**:1, 575-595. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Aaron Gurwitz. Social Democracy and Suburbanization 449-499. [[Crossref](#)]
108. John C. Henshall. Downtown Decline and Revitalisation: National Trends and Clarksdale’s Experience 7-27. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Chang Gyu Choi, Sugje Lee, Heungsoon Kim, Eun Yeong Seong. 2019. Critical junctures and path dependence in urban planning and housing policy: A review of greenbelts and New Towns in Korea’s Seoul metropolitan area. *Land Use Policy* **80**, 195-204. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Jessica Trounstine. Segregation by Design **39**, . [[Crossref](#)]
111. Jae Sik Jeon, Casey Dawkins, Rolf Pendall. 2018. How Vehicle Access Enables Low-Income Households to Live in Better Neighborhoods. *Housing Policy Debate* **28**:6, 920-939. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Qi-Li Gao, Qing-Quan Li, Yang Yue, Yan Zhuang, Zhi-Peng Chen, Hui Kong. 2018. Exploring changes in the spatial distribution of the low-to-moderate income group using transit smart card data. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* **72**, 68-77. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Paolo Veneri. 2018. Urban spatial structure in OECD cities: Is urban population decentralising or clustering?. *Papers in Regional Science* **97**:4, 1355-1375. [[Crossref](#)]

114. Marek Jaśkiewicz, Juraj Hammer, Miloš Poliak. 2018. The Impact of the Route of Transport on Price Formation in Road Freight Transport. *New Trends in Production Engineering* 1:1, 119-125. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Yehua Dennis Wei, Reid Ewing. 2018. Urban expansion, sprawl and inequality. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 177, 259-265. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Saeid Nazari Adli, Stuart Donovan. 2018. Right to the city: Applying justice tests to public transport investments. *Transport Policy* 66, 56-65. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Elena Omelchenko, Sviatoslav Poliakov. 2018. Everyday Consumption of Russian Youth in Small Towns and Villages. *Sociologia Ruralis* 58:3, 644-664. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Jenny Schuetz, Jeff Larrimore, Ellen A. Merry, Barbara J. Robles, Anna Tranfaglia, Arturo Gonzalez. 2018. Are central cities poor and non-white?. *Journal of Housing Economics* 40, 83-94. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Joan Josep Pujadas. 2018. Etnografía móvil, entre el sombreado y el acompañamiento: notas a partir del estudio de la movilidad cotidiana en la Región Metropolitana de Barcelona (RMB). *Etnográfica* :vol. 22 (2), 361-386. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Paavo Monkkonen, Andre Comandon, Jorge Alberto Montejano Escamilla, Erick Guerra. 2018. Urban sprawl and the growing geographic scale of segregation in Mexico, 1990–2010. *Habitat International* 73, 89-95. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Mikaela Backman, Pia Nilsson. 2018. The role of cultural heritage in attracting skilled individuals. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 42:1, 111-138. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Haoyang Ding, Min Yang, Wei Wang, Chengcheng Xu. 2018. Simulating and analyzing the effect on travel behavior of residential relocation and corresponding traffic demand management strategies. *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering* 22:2, 837-849. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Liu Liu, Zhuqing Liu. The Recognition of CAZ in Shanghai Based on Evaluated POI 99-112. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Stefan Siedentop. Ursachen der Flächeninanspruchnahme in Deutschland – eine Zwischenbilanz 45-55. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Rongxu Qiu, Wei Xu, John Zhang, Karl Staenz. 2018. Modeling and simulating industrial land-use evolution in Shanghai, China. *Journal of Geographical Systems* 20:1, 57-83. [[Crossref](#)]
126. J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, Jose Alberto Molina, Jorge Velilla. 2018. The commuting behavior of workers in the United States: Differences between the employed and the self-employed. *Journal of Transport Geography* 66, 19-29. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Sanghoon Lee, Jeffrey Lin. 2018. Natural Amenities, Neighbourhood Dynamics, and Persistence in the Spatial Distribution of Income. *The Review of Economic Studies* 85:1, 663-694. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Federico Curci, Federico Maserà. 2018. Flight From Urban Blight: Lead Poisoning, Crime and Suburbanization. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
129. Jadwiga Gałka, Anna Warych-Juras. 2018. Suburbanization and migration in Polish metropolitan areas during political transition. *Acta geographica Slovenica* 58:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
130. Ashok Kumar. Urbanization 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Fred Emanuel Foldvary, Luca Andrea Minola. 2017. The taxation of land value as the means towards optimal urban development and the extirpation of excessive economic inequality. *Land Use Policy* 69, 331-337. [[Crossref](#)]
132. ###, Kyung-sup Ahn. 2017. The Effect of the Change of Racial Residential Segregation on Housing Variables between 2000 and 2010 in Dallas-Arlington-Ft. Worth Metropolitan Area in Texas. *Journal of Policy Development* 17:2, 147-177. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Lingqian Hu. 2017. Job accessibility and employment outcomes: which income groups benefit the most?. *Transportation* 44:6, 1421-1443. [[Crossref](#)]

134. Benjamin D. Leibowicz. 2017. Effects of urban land-use regulations on greenhouse gas emissions. *Cities* **70**, 135-152. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Jan Smutek. 2017. Change of municipal finances due to suburbanization as a development challenge on the example of Poland. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-economic Series* **37**:37, 139-149. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Neil Debbage, Bradley Bereitschaft, J. Marshall Shepherd. 2017. Quantifying the Spatiotemporal Trends of Urban Sprawl Among Large U.S. Metropolitan Areas Via Spatial Metrics. *Applied Spatial Analysis and Policy* **10**:3, 317-345. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Ying Xu, Xiaoling Zhang. 2017. The residential resettlement in suburbs of Chinese cities: A case study of Changsha. *Cities* **69**, 46-55. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Rahul Pathak, Christopher K. Wyczalkowski, Xi Huang. 2017. Public transit access and the changing spatial distribution of poverty. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **66**, 198-212. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Beatriz Nayeli Pérez Tamayo, Fernando Gil Alonso, Jordi Bayona Carrasco. 2017. La segregación socioespacial en Culiacán, México (2000-2010): ¿de la ciudad dual a la ciudad fragmentada?. *Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos* **32**:3, 547-591. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Jungah Kim, Changwoo Shon, Seonju Yi. 2017. The Relationship between Obesity and Urban Environment in Seoul. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **14**:8, 898. [[Crossref](#)]
141. Peng Will Chen, Yu Marco Nie. 2017. Analysis of an idealized system of demand adaptive paired-line hybrid transit. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* **102**, 38-54. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Sławomir Palicki. 2017. Housing Resources and Needs in Light of Modern Urban Transformations: the Case of Poznan. *Real Estate Management and Valuation* **25**:2, 72-78. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Pia Nilsson. 2017. Are valuations of place-based amenities driven by scale?. *Housing Studies* **32**:4, 449-469. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Michal Jaroszynski, Jeffrey Brown, Torsha Bhattacharya. 2017. An examination of the relationship between urban decentralisation and transit decentralisation in a small-sized US metropolitan area. *Urban Studies* **54**:6, 1500-1518. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Ian Caine, Rebecca Walter, Nathan Foote. 2017. San Antonio 360: The Rise and Decline of the Concentric City 1890–2010. *Sustainability* **9**:4, 649. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Danielle Christine Rhubarth. 2017. Identifying Associations Between State Medicaid Expansion Decisions and Spatial Disparities in County Insurance Rate Changes Under the Affordable Care Act. *Population Research and Policy Review* **36**:1, 109-135. [[Crossref](#)]
147. S. T. A. Pickett, M. L. Cadenasso, E. J. Rosi-Marshall, K. T. Belt, P. M. Groffman, J. M. Grove, E. G. Irwin, S. S. Kaushal, S. L. LaDeau, C. H. Nilon, C. M. Swan, P. S. Warren. 2017. Dynamic heterogeneity: a framework to promote ecological integration and hypothesis generation in urban systems. *Urban Ecosystems* **20**:1, 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
148. Rongxu Qiu, Wei Xu. 2017. Modes of land development in Shanghai. *Land Use Policy* **61**, 475-486. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Sara Reux. 2017. Trajectoires résidentielles et morphologiques des franges périurbaines : une méthode appliquée au Limousin. *Cybergeo* . [[Crossref](#)]
150. Mingfei Ma. A Comparative Study of the Evolution of Greenbelts in London and Beijing 235-259. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Anugya, Virendra Kumar, Kamal Jain. Site Suitability Evaluation for Urban Development Using Remote Sensing, GIS and Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) 377-388. [[Crossref](#)]
152. John R. Ottensmann. 2017. The Degree of Centralization in Large Urban Areas in the U.S., 1950-2010. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

153. John R. Ottensmann. 2017. Negative Exponential Model Parameters and Centralization in Large Urban Areas in the U.S., 1950-2010. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
154. William D. Larson, Weihua Zhao. 2017. Self-Driving Cars and the City: Long-Run Effects On Land Use, Welfare, and the Environment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
155. Hefeng Wang, Yishao Shi, Anbing Zhang, Yuan Cao, Haixin Liu. 2017. Does Suburbanization Cause Ecological Deterioration? An Empirical Analysis of Shanghai, China. *Sustainability* 9:1, 124. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Mischa Young, Georges A. Tanguay, Ugo Lachapelle. 2016. Transportation costs and urban sprawl in Canadian metropolitan areas. *Research in Transportation Economics* 60, 25-34. [[Crossref](#)]
157. S. C. Christopher, R. D. Vese, M. A. Boyd, A. D. Reddy, A. P. Mulhollen, D. E. Zand, T. F. Leslie. 2016. Servicing Our Economy: Producer Service Location and Government Procurement 2004-2010 in the Washington DC Metropolitan Area. *Growth and Change* 47:4, 631-647. [[Crossref](#)]
158. . Moving toward More Livable and Inclusive Mexican Cities 59-76. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Kuo-Cheng Hsu, Tsung-Yu Lai, Chia-Nung Li. 2016. Why is there an urban pattern toward sprawling development?. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Urban Design and Planning* 169:4, 200-208. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Blanca Fernandez Milan, Felix Creutzig. 2016. Municipal policies accelerated urban sprawl and public debts in Spain. *Land Use Policy* 54, 103-115. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Sophie Legras, Jean Cavailhès. 2016. Environmental performance of the urban form. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 59, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Sara Reux. 2016. Étalement et émiettement urbains. *Revue d'Économie Régionale & Urbaine* Juin:3, 587-618. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Miguel Gómez-Antonio, Miriam Hortas-Rico, Linna Li. 2016. The Causes of Urban Sprawl in Spanish Urban Areas: A Spatial Approach. *Spatial Economic Analysis* 11:2, 219-247. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Lee Hachadoorian. 2016. Homogeneity tests of Tiebout sorting: A case study at the interface of city and suburb. *Urban Studies* 53:5, 1000-1021. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Kala Seetharam Sridhar, Priya Narayanan. 2016. Suburbanization of Indian Cities. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA* 7:1, 93-112. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Syed Toqueer Akhter, Muhammad Hammad Noon. 2016. Modeling Spillover Effects of Leapfrog Development and Urban Sprawl upon Institutional Delinquencies: A Case for Pakistan. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 216, 279-294. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Thomas E. Lambert, James Catchen, Victoria Vogelgesang. 2016. The Impact of Urban Sprawl on Disaster Relief Spending: An Exploratory Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
168. Lefteris Jason Anastasopoulos. 2016. The Effects of Urban Diversity on Geographic Polarization: Evidence from Hurricane Katrina Migration. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
169. Lena Edlund, Cecilia Machado, Marra Micaela Sviatschi. 2016. Bright Minds, Big Rent: Gentrification and the Rising Returns to Skill. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 89. . [[Crossref](#)]
170. Agustin Leon-Moreta. 2016. Municipal Incorporation: Socioeconomic and Policy Factors of Influence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
171. Lynn Roche Phillips. 2015. A comparative study of growth management effectiveness and urban sprawl in two thoroughbred landscapes in the U.S. *Applied Geography* 65, 58-69. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Kiranmayi Raparathi. 2015. Assessing Smart-Growth Strategies in Indian Cities: Grounded Theory Approach to Planning Practice. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* 141:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
173. Agustin Leon-Moreta. 2015. Municipal incorporation in the United States. *Urban Studies* 52:16, 3160-3180. [[Crossref](#)]

174. Agustin Leon-Moreta. 2015. Municipal Incorporation. *State and Local Government Review* 47:4, 255-270. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Hind Aissaoui, Louafi Bouzouina, Patrick Bonnel. 2015. Choix de localisation résidentielle, entre contraintes du marché et préférences individuelles : application à l'aire urbaine de Lyon (1999). *Revue d'Économie Régionale & Urbaine* Octobre:4, 629-656. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Marie-Line Glaesener, Geoffrey Caruso. 2015. Neighborhood green and services diversity effects on land prices: Evidence from a multilevel hedonic analysis in Luxembourg. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 143, 100-111. [[Crossref](#)]
177. David J Giacomini, David M Levinson. 2015. Road network circuitry in metropolitan areas. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 42:6, 1040-1053. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Georg Hirte, Stefan Tscharaktschiew. 2015. Optimal Fuel Taxes and Heterogeneity of Cities. *Review of Regional Research* 35:2, 173-209. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Thomas E. Lambert, James Catchen, Victoria Vogelgesang. 2015. The Impact of Urban Sprawl on Disaster Relief Spending: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Economic Issues* 49:3, 835-864. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Rebecca W. Dolan, Jessica D. Stephens, Marcia E. Moore. 2015. Changes in Plant Species Composition and Structure in Two Peri-urban Nature Preserves over 10 Years. *The American Midland Naturalist* 174:1, 33-48. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Marco Helbich. 2015. Do Suburban Areas Impact House Prices?. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 42:3, 431-449. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Dominique Peeters, Geoffrey Caruso, Jean Cavailhès, Isabelle Thomas, Pierre Frankhauser, Gilles Vuidel. 2015. EMERGENCE OF LEAPFROGGING FROM RESIDENTIAL CHOICE WITH ENDOGENOUS GREEN SPACE: ANALYTICAL RESULTS. *Journal of Regional Science* 55:3, 491-512. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Yolanda K. Kodrzycki, Ana Patricia Muñoz. 2015. Economic Distress and Resurgence in U.S. Central Cities. *Economic Development Quarterly* 29:2, 113-134. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Tej Kumar Karki. 2015. Mandatory Versus Incentive-Based State Zoning Reform Policies for Affordable Housing in the United States: A Comparative Assessment. *Housing Policy Debate* 25:2, 234-262. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Andrew Foote. 2015. Decomposing the Effect of Crime on Population Changes. *Demography* 52:2, 705-728. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Clayton Nall. 2015. The Political Consequences of Spatial Policies: How Interstate Highways Facilitated Geographic Polarization. *The Journal of Politics* 77:2, 394-406. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Zan Yang, Rongrong Ren, Hongyu Liu, Huan Zhang. 2015. Land leasing and local government behaviour in China: Evidence from Beijing. *Urban Studies* 52:5, 841-856. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Mi Diao. 2015. Are Inner-City Neighborhoods Underserved? An Empirical Analysis of Food Markets in a U.S. Metropolitan Area. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35:1, 19-34. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Alex Anas. 2015. WHY ARE URBAN TRAVEL TIMES SO STABLE?. *Journal of Regional Science* 55:2, 230-261. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Miriam Hortas-Rico. 2015. SPRAWL, BLIGHT, AND THE ROLE OF URBAN CONTAINMENT POLICIES: EVIDENCE FROM U.S. CITIES. *Journal of Regional Science* 55:2, 298-323. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Gilles Duranton, Diego Puga. Urban Land Use 467-560. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Yong Liu, Wenze Yue, Peilei Fan, Yan Song. 2015. Suburban residential development in the era of market-oriented land reform: The case of Hangzhou, China. *Land Use Policy* 42, 233-243. [[Crossref](#)]



193. Fabio Grazi, Henri Waisman. 2015. Agglomeration, Urban Growth and Infrastructure in Global Climate Policy: A Dynamic CGE Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
194. Manuel García Docampo. 2014. Theories of Urban Dynamics. *International Journal of Population Research* **2014**, 1-11. [\[Crossref\]](#)
195. K. C. Hsu, T. Y. Lai, C. H. Lee. 2014. The Causes Which Influence the Change of Spatial Development Pattern in Taipei Metropolitan Area. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology* **6:6**, 497-502. [\[Crossref\]](#)
196. Rafa Madariaga, Joan Carles Martori, Ramon Oller. 2014. Income, distance and amenities. An empirical analysis. *Empirical Economics* **47:3**, 1129-1146. [\[Crossref\]](#)
197. Miriam Hortas-Rico. 2014. Urban sprawl and municipal budgets in Spain: A dynamic panel data analysis. *Papers in Regional Science* **93:4**, 843-865. [\[Crossref\]](#)
198. Vicente Romero, Eloy Solís, José M. De Ureña. 2014. Beyond the metropolis: new employment centers and historic administrative cities in the Madrid global city region. *Urban Geography* **35:6**, 889-915. [\[Crossref\]](#)
199. Paavo Monkkonen, Xiaohu Zhang. 2014. Innovative measurement of spatial segregation: Comparative evidence from Hong Kong and San Francisco. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **47**, 99-111. [\[Crossref\]](#)
200. Fahui Wang, Quan Tang, Lei Wang. 2014. Post-Katrina Population Loss and Uneven Recovery in New Orleans, 2000–2010. *Geographical Review* **104:3**, 310-327. [\[Crossref\]](#)
201. Louafi Bouzouina, Jorge Cabrera Delgado, Guillaume Emmerich. 2014. Inégalités d'accessibilité à l'emploi en transport collectif urbain : deux décennies d'évolutions en banlieue lyonnaise. *Revue d'Économie Régionale & Urbaine* **août:1**, 33-61. [\[Crossref\]](#)
202. Sarah Diem, Erica Frankenberg, Colleen Cleary, Nazneen Ali. 2014. The Politics of Maintaining Diversity Policies in Demographically Changing Urban-Suburban School Districts. *American Journal of Education* **120:3**, 351-389. [\[Crossref\]](#)
203. Changjoo Kim, Sunhee Sang, Hyowon Ban. 2014. Exploring job centers by accessibility using fuzzy set approach: the case study of the Columbus MSA. *GeoJournal* **79:2**, 209-222. [\[Crossref\]](#)
204. Donna Gardner, John L. Rury. 2014. Suburban Opposition to District Reorganization: The 1968 Spainhower Commission and Metropolitan Kansas City and St. Louis. *The Urban Review* **46:1**, 125-145. [\[Crossref\]](#)
205. John H. Lowry, Michael B. Lowry. 2014. Comparing spatial metrics that quantify urban form. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* **44**, 59-67. [\[Crossref\]](#)
206. Elżbieta Zuzńska-Żyśko. 2014. The Real Estate Market in the Upper-silesian Metropolitan Area. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* **120**, 374-385. [\[Crossref\]](#)
207. Devajyoti Deka. 2014. The Living, Moving and Travel Behaviour of the Growing American Solo: Implications for Cities. *Urban Studies* **51:4**, 634-654. [\[Crossref\]](#)
208. Kenneth Gibb, Liv Osland, Gwilym Pryce. 2014. Describing Inequalities in Access to Employment and the Associated Geography of Wellbeing. *Urban Studies* **51:3**, 596-613. [\[Crossref\]](#)
209. Pia Nilsson. 2014. Natural amenities in urban space – A geographically weighted regression approach. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **121**, 45-54. [\[Crossref\]](#)
210. Yongling Yao, Shuai Wang. 2014. Commuting tools and residential location of suburbanization: evidence from Beijing. *Urban, Planning and Transport Research* **2:1**, 274-288. [\[Crossref\]](#)
211. L. Jason Anastasopoulos. 2014. A Theory of Partisan Sorting and Geographic Polarization: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)

212. Holger Johann, Margeret Hall, Steven O. Kimbrough, Nicholas Quintus, Christof Weinhardt. 2014. Service District Optimization: Usage of Facility Location Methods and Geographic Information Systems to Analyze and Optimize Urban Food Retail Distribution. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
213. Agustin Leon-Moreta. 2014. Municipal Incorporations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
214. Óscar A. Alfonso Roa. Capítulo VII. Breve ensayo sobre la cuestión tributaria local en un mundo en metropolización 329-358. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Óscar A. Alfonso Roa. Capítulo IV. El sistema de ciudades y el desequilibrio en la ocupación del territorio colombiano, 1985-2012 125-187. [[Crossref](#)]
216. Armando Ortuño-Padilla, Patricia Fernández-Aracil. 2013. Impact of fuel price on the development of the urban sprawl in Spain. *Journal of Transport Geography* **33**, 180-187. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Siqi Zheng,, Matthew E. Kahn. 2013. Understanding China's Urban Pollution Dynamics. *Journal of Economic Literature* **51**:3, 731-772. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
218. Manisha Jain, Stefan Siedentop, Hannes Taubenböck, Sridharan Namperumal. 2013. From Suburbanization to Counterurbanization?. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA* **4**:2, 247-266. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Sebastian Gnat, Marcin Bas. 2013. Statistical Analysis of Chosen Aspects of the Suburbanization Process in Szczecin in 2006-2011. *Real Estate Management and Valuation* **21**:3, 71-80. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Sainan Zhang, Abigail M. York, Christopher G. Boone, Milan Shrestha. 2013. Methodological Advances in the Spatial Analysis of Land Fragmentation. *The Professional Geographer* **65**:3, 512-526. [[Crossref](#)]
221. Chen Feng Ng. 2013. Heterogeneous households and firms in an urban model with open space and agglomeration economies. *Papers in Regional Science* **92**:3, 609-632. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Marlon G. Boarnet. 2013. The declining role of the automobile and the re-emergence of place in urban transportation: The past will be prologue. *Regional Science Policy & Practice* **5**:2, 237-253. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Shelley McDonough Kimelberg, Chase M. Billingham. 2013. Attitudes Toward Diversity and the School Choice Process. *Urban Education* **48**:2, 198-231. [[Crossref](#)]
224. Sugie Lee, Chang Gyu Choi, Wansoo Im. 2013. Metropolitan growth and community disparities: Insights from the state of New Jersey in the US. *Cities* **30**, 149-160. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Henning Nuissl, Stefan Siedentop. Landscape Planning for Minimizing Land Consumption 323-354. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Eduardo S. Brondízio, Rinku Roy Chowdhury. Human-Environment Research: Past Trends, Current Challenges, and Future Directions 391-400. [[Crossref](#)]
227. Miriam Hortas-Rico. 2013. Sprawl, Blight and the Role of Urban Containment Policies: Evidence from US Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
228. Sanghoon Lee, Jeffrey Lin. 2013. Natural Amenities, Neighborhood Dynamics, and Persistence in the Spatial Distribution of Income. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **92** . [[Crossref](#)]
229. Carolina Rojas, Iván Muñiz, Joan Pino. 2013. Understanding the Urban Sprawl in the Mid-Size Latin American Cities through the Urban Form: Analysis of the Concepci&#243;n Metropolitan Area (Chile). *Journal of Geographic Information System* **05**:03, 222-234. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Ric Kolenda, Cathy Yang Liu. 2012. Are Central Cities More Creative? the Intrametropolitan Geography of Creative Industries. *Journal of Urban Affairs* **34**:5, 487-512. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Stefan Siedentop, Stefan Fina. 2012. Who Sprawls Most? Exploring the Patterns of Urban Growth across 26 European Countries. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* **44**:11, 2765-2784. [[Crossref](#)]

232. Robert Kirkman, Douglas S Noonan, Sean K Dunn. 2012. Urban transformation and individual responsibility: The Atlanta BeltLine. *Planning Theory* 11:4, 418-434. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Wayde Morse. Changing Stakeholders and the Planning Process 201-224. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Jyh-Fa Tsai, Fu-Chuan Lai. 2012. Urban Configurations with Suburban Employment by a Monopoly Vendor. *International Regional Science Review* 35:4, 424-441. [[Crossref](#)]
235. James Vanderleeuw, Thomas Sowers, Terri Davis, Jason Sides, Michael Pennington. 2012. The Economic Development Strategy Preferences of Community Leaders in Texas. *SAGE Open* 2:4, 215824401246828. [[Crossref](#)]
236. John I. Carruthers. The Public Finance of Urban Form 539-562. [[Crossref](#)]
237. Venkatesh Dutta. 2012. Land Use Dynamics and Peri-urban Growth Characteristics. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA* 3:2, 277-301. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Georges A Tanguay, Ian Gingras. 2012. Gas Price Variations and Urban Sprawl: An Empirical Analysis of the Twelve Largest Canadian Metropolitan Areas. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 44:7, 1728-1743. [[Crossref](#)]
239. Hui Wang, Fubing Su, Lanlan Wang, Ran Tao. 2012. Rural Housing Consumption and Social Stratification in Transitional China: Evidence from a National Survey. *Housing Studies* 27:5, 667-684. [[Crossref](#)]
240. John I. Carruthers, Selma Hepp, Gerrit-Jan Knaap, Robert N. Renner. 2012. The American Way of Land Use. *International Regional Science Review* 35:3, 267-302. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Fernando Moliní, Miguel Salgado. 2012. Sprawl in Spain and Madrid: A Low Starting Point Growing Fast. *European Planning Studies* 20:6, 1075-1092. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Patrick Rérat. 2012. Housing, the Compact City and Sustainable Development: Some Insights From Recent Urban Trends in Switzerland. *International Journal of Housing Policy* 12:2, 115-136. [[Crossref](#)]
243. Yu-Ting Tang, C. Paul Nathanail. 2012. Sticks and Stones: The Impact of the Definitions of Brownfield in Policies on Socio-Economic Sustainability. *Sustainability* 4:5, 840-862. [[Crossref](#)]
244. Ville Helminen, Hannu Rita, Mika Ristimäki, Panu Kontio. 2012. Commuting to the Centre in Different Urban Structures. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 39:2, 247-261. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Cathy Yang Liu, Gary Painter. 2012. Immigrant Settlement and Employment Suburbanisation in the US. *Urban Studies* 49:5, 979-1002. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Zoltán Cséfalvay, Chris Webster. 2012. Gates or No Gates? A Cross-European Enquiry into the Driving Forces behind Gated Communities. *Regional Studies* 46:3, 293-308. [[Crossref](#)]
247. SHU-HEN CHIANG. 2012. The Source of Metropolitan Growth: The Role of Commuting. *Growth and Change* 43:1, 143-166. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Albert Solé-Ollé, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2012. Lobbying, political competition, and local land supply: Recent evidence from Spain. *Journal of Public Economics* 96:1-2, 10-19. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Henning Nuissl, Stefan Siedentop. Landscape Planning for Minimizing Land Consumption 5785-5817. [[Crossref](#)]
250. R. Arnott. Simulation Models for Urban Economies 342-349. [[Crossref](#)]
251. Melissa A. Iverson, Emma P. Holmes, A. A. Bomke. 2012. Development and use of rapid reconnaissance soil inventories for reclamation of urban brownfields: A Vancouver, British Columbia, case study. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science* 92:1, 191-201. [[Crossref](#)]
252. Nathaniel Baum-Snow,, Byron F. Lutz. 2011. School Desegregation, School Choice, and Changes in Residential Location Patterns by Race. *American Economic Review* 101:7, 3019-3046. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]

253. Myungje Woo, Jean-Michel Guldmann. 2011. Impacts of Urban Containment Policies on the Spatial Structure of US Metropolitan Areas. *Urban Studies* 48:16, 3511-3536. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Alain Pirotte, Jean-Loup Madre. 2011. Determinants of Urban Sprawl in France. *Urban Studies* 48:13, 2865-2886. [[Crossref](#)]
255. André De Palma, Moez Kilani, Michel de Lara, Serge Piperno. 2011. Cordon pricing in the monocentric city: theory and application to Paris region. *Recherches économiques de Louvain* Vol. 77:2, 105-124. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Abigail M. York, Milan Shrestha, Christopher G. Boone, Sainan Zhang, John A. Harrington, Thomas J. Prebyl, Amaris Swann, Michael Agar, Michael F. Antolin, Barbara Nolen, John B. Wright, Rhonda Skaggs. 2011. Land fragmentation under rapid urbanization: A cross-site analysis of Southwestern cities. *Urban Ecosystems* 14:3, 429-455. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Belal N. Fallah, Mark D. Partridge, M. Rose Olfert. 2011. Urban sprawl and productivity: Evidence from US metropolitan areas. *Papers in Regional Science* 90:3, 451-473. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Emery N. Castle, JunJie Wu, Bruce A. Weber. 2011. Place Orientation and Rural-Urban Interdependence. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 33:2, 179-204. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Weiqi Zhou, Ganlin Huang, Steward T. A. Pickett, M. L. Cadenasso. 2011. 90 years of forest cover change in an urbanizing watershed: spatial and temporal dynamics. *Landscape Ecology* 26:5, 645-659. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Michael K. Hollar. 2011. CENTRAL CITIES AND SUBURBS: ECONOMIC RIVALS OR ALLIES?\*. *Journal of Regional Science* 51:2, 231-252. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Antonio M. Bento, Sofia F. Franco, Daniel Kaffine. 2011. Is there a double-dividend from anti-sprawl policies?\*. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 61:2, 135-152. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Jan K. Brueckner, Robert W. Helsley. 2011. Sprawl and blight. *Journal of Urban Economics* 69:2, 205-213. [[Crossref](#)]
263. Zoltán Cséfalvay. 2011. Searching for Economic Rationale behind Gated Communities. *Urban Studies* 48:4, 749-764. [[Crossref](#)]
264. Rick Ruddell, Matthew O. Thomas, Ryan Patten. 2011. Examining the Roles of the Police and Private Security Officers in Urban Social Control. *International Journal of Police Science & Management* 13:1, 54-69. [[Crossref](#)]
265. Li An, Daniel G. Brown, Joan I. Nassauer, Bobbi Low. 2011. Variations in development of exurban residential landscapes: timing, location, and driving forces. *Journal of Land Use Science* 6:1, 13-32. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Caroline B. Brettell, Faith G. Nibbs. 2011. Immigrant Suburban Settlement and the "Threat" to Middle Class Status and Identity: The Case of Farmers Branch, Texas. *International Migration* 49:1, 1-30. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Pengjun Zhao, Bin Lü, Gert de Roo. 2011. Impact of the jobs-housing balance on urban commuting in Beijing in the transformation era. *Journal of Transport Geography* 19:1, 59-69. [[Crossref](#)]
268. S. Habibi, N. Asadi. 2011. Causes, Results and Methods of Controlling Urban Sprawl. *Procedia Engineering* 21, 133-141. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Moon Jeong Kim, Hazel A. Morrow-Jones. 2011. Intrametropolitan residential mobility and older inner suburbs: A case study of the Greater Columbus, Ohio, metropolitan area. *Housing Policy Debate* 21:1, 133-164. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Jan K. Brueckner, Robert W. Helsley. 2011. Sprawl and Blight. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
271. Andrew Mark Bennett. 2011. Local Government Structure and Poverty in U.S. Metropolitan Areas. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

272. Georges A. Tanguay, Ian Gingras. 2011. Gas Prices Variations and Urban Sprawl: An Empirical Analysis of the 12 Largest Canadian Metropolitan Areas. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
273. Christopher B. Goodman. 2011. The Fiscal Impacts of Residential Land Use Characteristics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
274. Grzegorz Zębik. 2011. Typology of Suburban Communities in Poland. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-economic Series* 16:16, 173-188. [[Crossref](#)]
275. Aurélien Decamps. 2011. La dynamique de la ségrégation urbaine à travers l'évolution des profils de quartiers : étude sur l'agglomération bordelaise. *Revue d'Économie Régionale & Urbaine* février:1, 151. [[Crossref](#)]
276. Russell N. James. 2010. The Origin of Spaces: Understanding Residential Satisfaction from Ape Nests, Human Cultures and the Hierarchy of Natural Housing Functions. *Housing, Theory and Society* 27:4, 279-295. [[Crossref](#)]
277. Miquel-Àngel Garcia-López, Ivan Muñiz. 2010. Employment Decentralisation: Polycentricity or Scatteration? The Case of Barcelona. *Urban Studies* 47:14, 3035-3056. [[Crossref](#)]
278. Ingrid Gould Ellen, Katherine O'Regan. 2010. Crime and urban flight revisited: The effect of the 1990s drop in crime on cities. *Journal of Urban Economics* 68:3, 247-259. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Karen A. Kopecky, Richard M. H. Suen. 2010. A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF SUBURBANIZATION AND THE DIFFUSION OF THE AUTOMOBILE\*. *International Economic Review* 51:4, 1003-1037. [[Crossref](#)]
280. Chunhua Wang. 2010. Falling commuting costs, amenity advantages, and suburbanization. *The Annals of Regional Science* 45:2, 351-364. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Karina Schaake, Jack Burgers, Clara H. Mulder. 2010. Ethnicity at the Individual and Neighborhood Level as an Explanation for Moving Out of the Neighborhood. *Population Research and Policy Review* 29:4, 593-608. [[Crossref](#)]
282. Ivan Muñiz, Miquel-Àngel Garcia-López. 2010. The Polycentric Knowledge Economy in Barcelona. *Urban Geography* 31:6, 774-799. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Eunseong Jeong, Irene K. Shim, Mark I. Wilson. 2010. Urban regeneration, retail development and the role of information and communication technologies. *Netcom* :24-1/2, 133-146. [[Crossref](#)]
284. Kristin Lovejoy, Susan Handy, Patricia Mokhtarian. 2010. Neighborhood satisfaction in suburban versus traditional environments: An evaluation of contributing characteristics in eight California neighborhoods. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 97:1, 37-48. [[Crossref](#)]
285. Peter Howley. 2010. 'Sustainability versus Liveability': An Exploration of Central City Housing Satisfaction. *International Journal of Housing Policy* 10:2, 173-189. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Miriam Hortas-Rico, Albert Solé-Ollé. 2010. Does Urban Sprawl Increase the Costs of Providing Local Public Services? Evidence from Spanish Municipalities. *Urban Studies* 47:7, 1513-1540. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Kala Seetharam Sridhar. 2010. Impact of Land Use Regulations: Evidence from India's Cities. *Urban Studies* 47:7, 1541-1569. [[Crossref](#)]
288. Brendan O'Flaherty, Rajiv Sethi. 2010. The racial geography of street vice. *Journal of Urban Economics* 67:3, 270-286. [[Crossref](#)]
289. JunJie Wu. 2010. ECONOMIC FUNDAMENTALS AND URBAN-SUBURBAN DISPARITIES. *Journal of Regional Science* 50:2, 570-591. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Jonathan Rodden. 2010. The Geographic Distribution of Political Preferences. *Annual Review of Political Science* 13:1, 321-340. [[Crossref](#)]

291. Ali Modarres, Andrew Kirby. 2010. The suburban question: Notes for a research program. *Cities* 27:2, 114-121. [[Crossref](#)]
292. Abigail M. York, Darla K. Munroe. 2010. Urban encroachment, forest regrowth and land-use institutions: Does zoning matter?. *Land Use Policy* 27:2, 471-479. [[Crossref](#)]
293. Darla K. Munroe. Pattern-Based Evaluation of Peri-Urban Development in Delaware County, Ohio, USA: Roads, Zoning and Spatial Externalities 149-169. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Sung Y. Park, Guochang Zhao. 2010. An estimation of U.S. gasoline demand: A smooth time-varying cointegration approach. *Energy Economics* 32:1, 110-120. [[Crossref](#)]
295. Ingrid Gould Ellen, Katherine M. O'Regan. 2010. Crime and Urban Flight Revisited: The Effect of the 1990s Drop in Crime on Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
296. Ciriya Jayaprakash, Keith Warren, Elena Irwin, Kan Chen. 2009. The Interaction of Segregation and Suburbanization in an Agent-Based Model of Residential Location. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 36:6, 989-1007. [[Crossref](#)]
297. Geoffrey Caruso, Dominique Peeters, Jean Cavailhes, Mark Rounsevell. 2009. Space-Time Patterns of Urban Sprawl, a 1D Cellular Automata and Microeconomic Approach. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 36:6, 968-988. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Ingrid Gould Ellen, Katherine O'Regan. 2009. Crime and U.S. Cities: Recent Patterns and Implications. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 626:1, 22-38. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Marco Helbich, Michael Leitner. 2009. Spatial Analysis of the Urban-to-Rural Migration Determinants in the Viennese Metropolitan Area. A Transition from Suburbia to Postsuburbia?. *Applied Spatial Analysis and Policy* 2:3, 237-260. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Elena G. Irwin, Kathleen P. Bell, Nancy E. Bockstael, David A. Newburn, Mark D. Partridge, JunJie Wu. 2009. The Economics of Urban-Rural Space. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 1:1, 435-459. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Peter Howley, Mark Scott, Declan Redmond. 2009. Sustainability versus liveability: an investigation of neighbourhood satisfaction. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 52:6, 847-864. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Peter Howley. 2009. Attitudes towards compact city living: Towards a greater understanding of residential behaviour. *Land Use Policy* 26:3, 792-798. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Ralph M. Braid. 2009. The employment effects of a central city's source-based wage tax or hybrid wage tax. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 39:4, 512-521. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Peter Howley, Brian Clifford. 2009. The transformation of inner Dublin: exploring new residential populations within the inner city. *Irish Geography* 42:2, 225-243. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Frederic Gilli. 2009. Sprawl or Reagglomeration? The Dynamics of Employment Deconcentration and Industrial Transformation in Greater Paris. *Urban Studies* 46:7, 1385-1420. [[Crossref](#)]
306. Daniel Joly, Thierry Brossard, Jean Cavailhès, Mohamed Hilal, François-Pierre Tourneux, Céline Tritz, Pierre Wavresky. 2009. A Quantitative Approach to the Visual Evaluation of Landscape. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 99:2, 292-308. [[Crossref](#)]
307. Nnyaladzi Batisani, Brent Yarnal. 2009. Urban expansion in Centre County, Pennsylvania: Spatial dynamics and landscape transformations. *Applied Geography* 29:2, 235-249. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Jill K. Clark, Ronald McChesney, Darla K. Munroe, Elena G. Irwin. 2009. Spatial characteristics of exurban settlement pattern in the United States. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 90:3-4, 178-188. [[Crossref](#)]

309. Jean Cavailhès, Thierry Brossard, Jean-Christophe Foltête, Mohamed Hilal, Daniel Joly, François-Pierre Tourneux, Céline Tritz, Pierre Wavresky. Chapitre 3 - Valeur des paysages ruraux et localisation résidentielle 69-92. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Peter Howley. 2009. New residential neighbourhoods within the inner city: an examination of neighbouring. *Irish Geography* 42:1, 85-99. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Tiit Tammaru, Kadri Leetmaa, Siiri Silm, Rein Ahas. 2009. Temporal and Spatial Dynamics of the New Residential Areas around Tallinn. *European Planning Studies* 17:3, 423-439. [[Crossref](#)]
312. DARREN M. SCOTT, KENNETH BRUCE NEWBOLD, JAMIE E.L. SPINNEY, RUBEN MERCADO, ANTONIO PÁEZ, PAVLOS S. KANAROGLOU. 2009. New Insights into Senior Travel Behavior: The Canadian Experience. *Growth and Change* 40:1, 140-168. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Peter Howley, Mark Scott, Declan Redmond. 2009. An examination of residential preferences for less sustainable housing: Exploring future mobility among Dublin central city residents. *Cities* 26:1, 1-8. [[Crossref](#)]
314. Paul A. Jargowsky, Yoonhwan Park. 2009. Cause or Consequence?. *Crime & Delinquency* 55:1, 28-50. [[Crossref](#)]
315. Yolanda K. Kodrzycki, Ana Patricia Munoz, Lynn Elaine Browne, DeAnna Green, Marques Benton, Prabal Chakrabarti, David Plasse, Richard C. Walker, Bo Zhao. 2009. Reinvigorating Springfield's Economy: Lessons from Resurgent Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
316. KEVIN BEHAN, HANNA MAOH, PAVLOS KANAROGLOU. 2008. Smart growth strategies, transportation and urban sprawl: simulated futures for Hamilton, Ontario. *Canadian Geographies / Géographies canadiennes* 52:3, 291-308. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Joong-Hwan Oh. 2008. The Quest to Understand Self-employment in American Metropolitan Areas. *Urban Studies* 45:9, 1769-1790. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Robert W. Wassmer. 2008. Causes of Urban Sprawl in the United States: Auto reliance as compared to natural evolution, flight from blight, and local revenue reliance. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 27:3, 536-555. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Anneli Kährik, Tiit Tammaru. 2008. Population Composition in New Suburban Settlements of the Tallinn Metropolitan Area. *Urban Studies* 45:5-6, 1055-1078. [[Crossref](#)]
320. Chansung Kim. 2008. Commuting time stability: A test of a co-location hypothesis. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 42:3, 524-544. [[Crossref](#)]
321. David Card, Alexandre Mas, Jesse Rothstein. 2008. Tipping and the Dynamics of Segregation \*. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123:1, 177-218. [[Crossref](#)]
322. Jean Cavailhès, Thierry Brossard, Mohamed Hilal, Daniel Joly, François-Pierre Tourneux, Céline Tritz, Pierre Wavresky. Pricing the Homebuyer's Countryside View 83-99. [[Crossref](#)]
323. Patrick Bajari, Matthew E. Kahn. Estimating Hedonic Models of Consumer Demand with an Application to Urban Sprawl 129-155. [[Crossref](#)]
324. Richard C. Falco, Gary P. Wormser, Thomas J. Daniels. Suburbanization in developed nations 138-170. [[Crossref](#)]
325. Edward L. Glaeser, Matthew E. Kahn, Jordan Rappaport. 2008. Why do the poor live in cities? The role of public transportation. *Journal of Urban Economics* 63:1, 1-24. [[Crossref](#)]
326. Katrin B. Anacker, Hazel A. Morrow-Jones. 2008. Mature suburbs, property values, and decline in the midwest? The case of Cuyahoga county. *Housing Policy Debate* 19:3, 519-552. [[Crossref](#)]
327. Wolfgang R. Koehler. 2008. Suburbanization and Homeownership Rates. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

328. Albert Sole-Olle, Miriam Hortas-Rico. 2008. Does Urban Sprawl Increase the Costs of Providing Local Public Services? Evidence from Spanish Municipalities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
329. Elena G. Irwin, Nancy E. Bockstael. 2007. The evolution of urban sprawl: Evidence of spatial heterogeneity and increasing land fragmentation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **104**:52, 20672-20677. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Laurent Gobillon, Harris Selod, Yves Zenou. 2007. The Mechanisms of Spatial Mismatch. *Urban Studies* **44**:12, 2401-2427. [[Crossref](#)]
331. Paul Thorsnes, John W. Reifel. 2007. TIEBOUT DYNAMICS: NEIGHBORHOOD RESPONSE TO A CENTRAL-CITY/SUBURBAN HOUSE-PRICE DIFFERENTIAL\*. *Journal of Regional Science* **47**:4, 693-719. [[Crossref](#)]
332. Austin R. Troy, J. Morgan Grove, Jarlath P. M. O'Neil-Dunne, Steward T. A. Pickett, Mary L. Cadenasso. 2007. Predicting Opportunities for Greening and Patterns of Vegetation on Private Urban Lands. *Environmental Management* **40**:3, 394-412. [[Crossref](#)]
333. JunJie Wu. 2007. How Does Suburbanization Affect Local Public Finance and Communities?. *Review of Agricultural Economics* **29**:3, 564-571. [[Crossref](#)]
334. Sarah A. Bunton, William T. Mallon. 2007. The Impact of Centers and Institutes on Faculty Life: Findings from a Study of Life Sciences Faculty at Research-Intensive Universities' Medical Schools. *Innovative Higher Education* **32**:2, 93-103. [[Crossref](#)]
335. Bumsoo Lee. 2007. "EDGE" OR "EDGELESS" CITIES? URBAN SPATIAL STRUCTURE IN U.S. METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1980 TO 2000\*. *Journal of Regional Science* **47**:3, 479-515. [[Crossref](#)]
336. Tiit Tammaru, Kadri Leetmaa. 2007. Suburbanisation in relation to education in the Tallinn metropolitan area. *Population, Space and Place* **13**:4, 279-292. [[Crossref](#)]
337. Kenneth Mulder, Austin Troy, Roelof Boumans. 2007. The Role of Built, Human, Social, and Natural Capital in Determining Land Values, and the Influence of Demographics upon this Relationship. *Spatial Economic Analysis* **2**:2, 135-156. [[Crossref](#)]
338. Casey J. Dawkins. 2007. Exploring Changes in Income Clustering and Centralization during the 1990s. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* **26**:4, 404-414. [[Crossref](#)]
339. Jean Cavailhès, Thierry Brossard, Mohamed Hilal, Daniel Joly, Pierre-François Tourneux, Céline Tritz, Pierre Wavresky. 2007. Le prix des paysages périurbains. *Économie rurale* :297-298, 71-84. [[Crossref](#)]
340. Kala Seetharam Sridhar. 2007. Density gradients and their determinants: Evidence from India. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **37**:3, 314-344. [[Crossref](#)]
341. Ming Yin, Jian Sun. 2007. The Impacts of State Growth Management Programs on Urban Sprawl in the 1990S. *Journal of Urban Affairs* **29**:2, 149-179. [[Crossref](#)]
342. N. Baum-Snow. 2007. Did Highways Cause Suburbanization?. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **122**:2, 775-805. [[Crossref](#)]
343. Haydar Kurban, Joseph Persky. 2007. Do Metropolitan Areas With Rich Central Cities Experience Less Sprawl?. *Economic Development Quarterly* **21**:2, 179-184. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Sukkoo Kim. 2007. CHANGES IN THE NATURE OF URBAN SPATIAL STRUCTURE IN THE UNITED STATES, 1890-2000\*. *Journal of Regional Science* **47**:2, 273-287. [[Crossref](#)]
345. Claude Lacour, Sylvette Puissant. 2007. Re-Urbanity: Urbanising the Rural and Ruralising the Urban. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* **39**:3, 728-747. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Jed Kolko. 2007. The Determinants of Gentrification. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]



347. Thomas E. Lambert, Peter B. Meyer. 2006. Ex-Urban Sprawl as a Factor in Traffic Fatalities and EMS Response Times in the Southeastern United States. *Journal of Economic Issues* 40:4, 941-953. [[Crossref](#)]
348. Siqi Zheng, Yuming Fu, Hongyu Liu. 2006. Housing-choice hindrances and urban spatial structure: Evidence from matched location and location-preference data in Chinese cities. *Journal of Urban Economics* 60:3, 535-557. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Gudmundur F Ulfarsson, John I Carruthers. 2006. The Cycle of Fragmentation and Sprawl: A Conceptual Framework and Empirical Model. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 33:5, 767-788. [[Crossref](#)]
350. Rachel Guillain, Julie Le Gallo, Celine Boiteux-Orain. 2006. Changes in Spatial and Sectoral Patterns of Employment in Ile-de-France, 1978-97. *Urban Studies* 43:11, 2075-2098. [[Crossref](#)]
351. Thomas A. Rhoads, Jason F. Shogren. 2006. Why do cities use supply side strategies to mitigate traffic congestion externalities?. *Economics Letters* 92:2, 214-219. [[Crossref](#)]
352. Isabelle Reginster, Mark Rounsevell. 2006. Scenarios of Future Urban Land Use in Europe. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 33:4, 619-636. [[Crossref](#)]
353. William A. Fischel. 2006. Why Voters Veto Vouchers: Public Schools and Community-Specific Social Capital. *Economics of Governance* 7:2, 109-132. [[Crossref](#)]
354. M. Burchfield, H. G. Overman, D. Puga, M. A. Turner. 2006. Causes of Sprawl: A Portrait from Space. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121:2, 587-633. [[Crossref](#)]
355. Jordi Pons-Novell, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2006. Cities and the Internet: The end of distance?. *Journal of Urban Technology* 13:1, 109-132. [[Crossref](#)]
356. Timothy F. Leslie, Breandán Ó HUallacháin. 2006. Polycentric Phoenix. *Economic Geography* 82:2, 167-192. [[Crossref](#)]
357. Samuel D. Brody, Virginia Carrasco, Wesley E. Highfield. 2006. Measuring the Adoption of Local Sprawl. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 25:3, 294-310. [[Crossref](#)]
358. Robert W. Wassmer. 2006. The Influence of Local Urban Containment Policies and Statewide Growth Management on the Size of United States Urban Areas\*. *Journal of Regional Science* 46:1, 25-65. [[Crossref](#)]
359. Isaac Bayoh, Elena G. Irwin, Timothy Haab. 2006. Determinants of Residential Location Choice: How Important Are Local Public Goods in Attracting Homeowners to Central City Locations?\*. *Journal of Regional Science* 46:1, 97-120. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Antonio M. Bento, Sofia F. Franco, Daniel Kaffine. 2006. The efficiency and distributional impacts of alternative anti-sprawl policies. *Journal of Urban Economics* 59:1, 121-141. [[Crossref](#)]
361. . Bibliographie 177-184. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Jean-Louis Rullière. Choix de localisation en agglomération et externalités de congestion : une approche par l'économie expérimentale (définition de projet) 498-502. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Ivan Muñiz, Anna Galindo. 2005. Urban form and the ecological footprint of commuting. The case of Barcelona. *Ecological Economics* 55:4, 499-514. [[Crossref](#)]
364. Allen C. Goodman. 2005. Central cities and housing supply: Growth and decline in US cities. *Journal of Housing Economics* 14:4, 315-335. [[Crossref](#)]
365. Torben Dall Schmidt. 2005. Cross-border regional enlargement in Øresund. *GeoJournal* 64:3, 249-258. [[Crossref](#)]
366. Tiit Tammaru. 2005. Suburbanisation, Employment Change, and Commuting in the Tallinn Metropolitan Area. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 37:9, 1669-1687. [[Crossref](#)]

367. Antonio M. Bento, Maureen L. Cropper, Ahmed Mushfiq Mobarak, Katja Vinha. 2005. The Effects of Urban Spatial Structure on Travel Demand in the United States. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **87**:3, 466-478. [[Crossref](#)]
368. Daniel T. McGrath. 2005. More evidence on the spatial scale of cities. *Journal of Urban Economics* **58**:1, 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
369. PILLSUNG BYUN, BRIGITTE S. WALDORF, ADRIAN X. ESPARZA. 2005. Spillovers and Local Growth Controls: An Alternative Perspective on Suburbanization. *Growth and Change* **36**:2, 196-219. [[Crossref](#)]
370. Pillsung Byun, Adrian X. Esparza. 2005. A Revisionist Model of Suburbanization and Sprawl. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* **24**:3, 252-264. [[Crossref](#)]
371. John I. Carruthers, Alexander C. Vias. 2005. Urban, Suburban, and Exurban Sprawl in the Rocky Mountain West: Evidence from Regional Adjustment Models\*. *Journal of Regional Science* **45**:1, 21-48. [[Crossref](#)]
372. Sugie Lee, Nancey Green Leigh. 2005. The Role of Inner Ring Suburbs in Metropolitan Smart Growth Strategies. *Journal of Planning Literature* **19**:3, 330-346. [[Crossref](#)]
373. Gerrit-Jan Knaap, Yan Song. The Transportation-Land Use Policy Connection 91-107. [[Crossref](#)]
374. David M. Brasington, Diane Hite. 2005. Demand for environmental quality: a spatial hedonic analysis. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **35**:1, 57-82. [[Crossref](#)]
375. Gordon Mulligan, John Carruthers, Meagan Cahill. Urban Quality of Life and Public Policy: A Survey 730-802. [[Crossref](#)]
376. Genevieve Giuliano. 2005. Low Income, Public Transit, and Mobility. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* **1927**:1, 63-70. [[Crossref](#)]
377. Lawrence Southwick. 2005. Sewer plant operating efficiency, patronage, and competition. *Managerial and Decision Economics* **26**:1, 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
378. Robert T. Greenbaum, George E. Tita. 2004. The Impact of Violence Surges on Neighbourhood Business Activity. *Urban Studies* **41**:13, 2495-2514. [[Crossref](#)]
379. A. Croitoru, Y. Doytsher. 2004. Right-Angle Rooftop Polygon Extraction in Regularised Urban Areas: Cutting the Corners. *The Photogrammetric Record* **19**:108, 311-341. [[Crossref](#)]
380. Thomas J. Nechyba, Randall P. Walsh. 2004. Urban Sprawl. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **18**:4, 177-200. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
381. Carmen Carrión-Flores, Elena G. Irwin. 2004. Determinants of Residential Land-Use Conversion and Sprawl at the Rural-Urban Fringe. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **86**:4, 889-904. [[Crossref](#)]
382. Russ Lopez. 2004. Urban Sprawl and Risk for Being Overweight or Obese. *American Journal of Public Health* **94**:9, 1574-1579. [[Crossref](#)]
383. Richard W. Martin. 2004. Spatial Mismatch and the Structure of American Metropolitan Areas, 1970-2000. *Journal of Regional Science* **44**:3, 467-488. [[Crossref](#)]
384. F Frederic Deng, Youqin Huang. 2004. Uneven land reform and urban sprawl in China: the case of Beijing. *Progress in Planning* **61**:3, 211-236. [[Crossref](#)]
385. Lance Freeman, Frank Braconi. 2004. Gentrification and Displacement New York City in the 1990s. *Journal of the American Planning Association* **70**:1, 39-52. [[Crossref](#)]
386. Tracy M. Gordon. 2004. Moving Up by Moving Out? Planned Developments and Residential Segregation in California. *Urban Studies* **41**:2, 441-461. [[Crossref](#)]
387. Gordon Mulligan, John Carruthers, Meagan Cahill. Urban Quality of Life and Public Policy: A Survey 729-802. [[Crossref](#)]

388. Wouter Vermeulen, Jos van Ommeren. 2004. Interaction of Regional Population and Employment: Identifying Short-Run and Equilibrium Adjustment Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
389. Cecile Detang-Dessendre, Florence Goffette-Nagot, Virginie Piguët. 2004. Life-Cycle Position and Migration to Urban and Rural Areas: Estimations of a Mixed Logit Model on French Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
390. Brian A. Baird, Norman W. Garrick. 2004. Decentralization in the Hartford, Connecticut, Metropolitan Region, 1900-2000. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* **1898**:1, 157-164. [[Crossref](#)]
391. Zsombor Cseres-Gergely. 2003. The Effect of Economic Incentives on Residential Mobility and Migration in Hungary, 1990-1999. *Society and Economy* **25**:3, 351-382. [[Crossref](#)]
392. Daniel P McMillen. 2003. The return of centralization to Chicago: using repeat sales to identify changes in house price distance gradients. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **33**:3, 287-304. [[Crossref](#)]
393. Youngsun Kwon. 2003. The Effect of a Change in Wages on Welfare in a Two-Class Monocentric City. *Journal of Regional Science* **43**:1, 63-72. [[Crossref](#)]
394. F Frederic Deng. 2003. The Rebound of Private Zoning: Property Rights and Local Governance in Urban Land Use. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* **35**:1, 133-149. [[Crossref](#)]
395. Russ Lopez, H. Patricia Hynes. 2003. Sprawl In The 1990s. *Urban Affairs Review* **38**:3, 325-355. [[Crossref](#)]
396. Edward L. Glaeser, Matthew E. Kahn. 2003. Sprawl and Urban Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
397. Zhou Yu. 2003. Immigration and Sprawl: Race/Ethnicity, Immigrant Status, and Residential Mobility in Household Location Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
398. Jean Cavaillès, Dominique Peeters, Evangelos Sékeris, Jacques-François Thisse. 2003. La ville périurbaine. *Revue économique* **54**:1, 5. [[Crossref](#)]
399. Matthew E. Kahn. 2002. Demographic change and the demand for environmental regulation. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **21**:1, 45-62. [[Crossref](#)]
400. Paul L. Hettler. 2002. Central city fiscal conditions and MSA population distribution. *International Advances in Economic Research* **8**:4, 334-347. [[Crossref](#)]
401. Richard Voith, Joseph Gyourko. 2002. Capitalization of federal taxes, the relative price of housing, and urban form: density and sorting effects. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **32**:6, 673-690. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Robert W. Wassmer. 2002. Fiscalisation of Land Use, Urban Growth Boundaries and Non-central Retail Sprawl in the Western United States. *Urban Studies* **39**:8, 1307-1327. [[Crossref](#)]
403. Anne Aguilera. 2002. Services aux entreprises, centralité et multipolarisation. Le cas de Lyon. *Revue d'Économie Régionale & Urbaine* **juillet**:3, 397-422. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Ingrid Gould Ellen, Katherine Hempstead. 2002. Telecommuting and the Demand for Urban Living: A Preliminary Look at White-collar Workers. *Urban Studies* **39**:4, 749-766. [[Crossref](#)]
405. Andrew F. Haughwout. 2002. Public infrastructure investments, productivity and welfare in fixed geographic areas. *Journal of Public Economics* **83**:3, 405-428. [[Crossref](#)]
406. Jacqueline Geoghegan. 2002. The value of open spaces in residential land use. *Land Use Policy* **19**:1, 91-98. [[Crossref](#)]
407. William A. Fischel. 2002. Why Voters Veto Vouchers: Public Schools and Community-Specific Social Capital. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

408. Zhou Yu. 2002. Does Immigration Induce Urban Sprawl in the U.S.? A Demographic Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
409. Akram Temimi, Manfred Dix. 2001. Federal grants and the flight to the suburbs. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 41:4, 533-543. [[Crossref](#)]
410. Lee Sigelman, Jeffrey R. Henig. 2001. Crossing the Great Divide. *Urban Affairs Review* 37:1, 3-18. [[Crossref](#)]
411. Tiit Tammaru. 2001. Suburban Growth and Suburbanisation under Central Planning: The Case of Soviet Estonia. *Urban Studies* 38:8, 1341-1357. [[Crossref](#)]
412. S. Wong. Cities, Internal Organization of 1825-1829. [[Crossref](#)]
413. Robert A. Beauregard. 2001. Federal policy and postwar urban decline: A case of government complicity?. *Housing Policy Debate* 12:1, 129-151. [[Crossref](#)]
414. Thomas W. Sanchez, Casey J. Dawkins. 2001. Distinguishing city and Suburban Movers: Evidence from the American housing survey. *Housing Policy Debate* 12:3, 607-631. [[Crossref](#)]
415. Matthew E. Kahn, Patrick Bajari. 2001. Why Do Blacks Live in the Cities and Whites Live in the Suburbs?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
416. Harry J. Holzer, Jess Reaser. 2000. Black Applicants, Black Employees, and Urban Labor Market Policy. *Journal of Urban Economics* 48:3, 365-387. [[Crossref](#)]
417. Nathaniel Baum-Snow, Matthew E. Kahn. 2000. The effects of new public projects to expand urban rail transit. *Journal of Public Economics* 77:2, 241-263. [[Crossref](#)]
418. Igor Vojnovic. 2000. Shaping Metropolitan Toronto: A Study of Linear Infrastructure Subsidies, 1954-66. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 27:2, 197-230. [[Crossref](#)]
419. Jan K. Brueckner. 2000. Urban Sprawl: Diagnosis and Remedies. *International Regional Science Review* 23:2, 160-171. [[Crossref](#)]
420. Sukkoo Kim. 2000. Urban Development in the United States, 1690-1990. *Southern Economic Journal* 66:4, 855-880. [[Crossref](#)]
421. Matthew E. Kahn. 2000. The environmental impact of suburbanization. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 19:4, 569-586. [[Crossref](#)]
422. Kenneth Button. Where Did the 'New Urban Economics' Go after 25 Years? 30-50. [[Crossref](#)]
423. Zhongcai Zhang, Richard D. Bingham. 2000. Metropolitan Employment Growth and Neighborhood Job Access in Spatial and Skills Perspectives. *Urban Affairs Review* 35:3, 390-421. [[Crossref](#)]
424. Richard Voith. 1999. The Suburban Housing Market: Effects of City and Suburban Employment Growth. *Real Estate Economics* 27:4, 621-648. [[Crossref](#)]
425. TRUDI E. BUNTING, PIERRE FILION. 1999. DISPERSED CITY FORM IN CANADA: A KITCHENER CMA CASE EXAMPLE. *Canadian Geographies / Géographies canadiennes* 43:3, 268-287. [[Crossref](#)]
426. Virginia L. Carlson, Joseph J. Persky. 1999. Gender and Suburban Wages. *Economic Geography* 75:3, 237-253. [[Crossref](#)]
427. Julie Berry Cullen, Steven D. Levitt. 1999. Crime, Urban Flight, and the Consequences for Cities. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 81:2, 159-169. [[Crossref](#)]
428. Andrew F. Haughwout. 1999. Regional fiscal cooperation in metropolitan areas: An exploration. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 18:4, 579-600. [[Crossref](#)]
429. Yorgos Y. Papageorgiou, David Pines. Introduction 1-30. [[Crossref](#)]
430. Yorgos Y. Papageorgiou, David Pines. Extensions 113-140. [[Crossref](#)]
431. Yorgos Y. Papageorgiou, David Pines. From Monocentricity to Polycentricity 191-201. [[Crossref](#)]

432. Matthew E. Kahn, Nathaniel Baum-Snow. 1999. The Effects of New Urban Rail Transit: Evidence from Five Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
433. . References . [[Crossref](#)]
434. Devajyoti Deka. 1998. Job Decentralization and Central-City Well-Being. *Urban Affairs Review* **34**:2, 263-290. [[Crossref](#)]
435. Richard Deitz. 1998. A Joint Model of Residential and Employment Location in Urban Areas. *Journal of Urban Economics* **44**:2, 197-215. [[Crossref](#)]
436. Stacy Jordan, John P Ross, Kurt G Usowski. 1998. U.S. suburbanization in the 1980s. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **28**:5, 611-627. [[Crossref](#)]
437. H. J. Holzer, K. R. Ihlanfeldt. 1998. Customer Discrimination and Employment Outcomes for Minority Workers. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **113**:3, 835-867. [[Crossref](#)]
438. Subhrajit Guhathakurta, Michele L. Wichert. 1998. Who Pays for Growth in the City of Phoenix?. *Urban Affairs Review* **33**:6, 813-838. [[Crossref](#)]
439. Ronald C. Fisher, Robert W. Wassmer. 1998. Economic Influences on the Structure of Local Government in U.S. Metropolitan Areas. *Journal of Urban Economics* **43**:3, 444-471. [[Crossref](#)]
440. Peter Gordon, Harry W. Richardson. 1997. Are Compact Cities a Desirable Planning Goal?. *Journal of the American Planning Association* **63**:1, 95-106. [[Crossref](#)]
441. Reid Ewing. 1997. Is Los Angeles-Style Sprawl Desirable?. *Journal of the American Planning Association* **63**:1, 107-126. [[Crossref](#)]
442. Douglass B. Lee. Uses and Meanings of Full Social Cost Estimates 113-148. [[Crossref](#)]
443. Edward W. Hill, Harold L. Wolman. 1997. Accounting for the Change in Income Disparities between US Central Cities and their Suburbs from 1980 to 1990. *Urban Studies* **34**:1, 43-60. [[Crossref](#)]
444. Georgette C. Poindexter. 1996. Legal Empowerment of the Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies* **33**:10, 1821-1829. [[Crossref](#)]
445. Charles F. Adams, Howard B. Fleeter, Yul Kim, Mark Freeman, Imgon Cho. 1996. Flight from Blight and Metropolitan Suburbanization Revisited. *Urban Affairs Review* **31**:4, 529-543. [[Crossref](#)]
446. L.S. Bourne. 1996. Reinventing the suburbs: Old myths and new realities. *Progress in Planning* **46**:3, 163-184. [[Crossref](#)]
447. Edward W. Hill, Harold L. Wolman, Coit Cook Ford. 1995. Can Suburbs Survive without their Central Cities?. *Urban Affairs Review* **31**:2, 147-174. [[Crossref](#)]
448. Jacques H. Drèze. 1995. Forty Years of Public Economics: A Personal Perspective. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **9**:2, 111-130. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
449. Sadatsugu Nishiura, Takashi Ohnishi. 1994. A Study on the State of Florida's Experience in State Growth Management. *Journal of the City Planning Institute of Japan* **29**:0, 613-618. [[Crossref](#)]
450. GEORGETTE C. POINDEXTER. 1994. Locational Perception: City Versus Suburban Home-Buying Preference\*. *Law & Policy* **16**:4, 473-499. [[Crossref](#)]
451. Charles Barnard, Keith Wiebe, Vince Brenemanl. Urban Influence: Effects on U.S. Farmland Markets and Value 319-341. [[Crossref](#)]
452. Jean-Philippe Meloche. Chapitre 3. La rationalité économique du choix résidentiel des familles 53-73. [[Crossref](#)]