

## **Diversity of Residential Mobility Dynamics towards Metropolitan Inner Cities in Andalusia**

***José Manuel Torrado-Rodríguez***

*Universidad de Granada*

*josetr@ugr.es*

**Keywords:** Residential mobility, metropolitan areas, centralization, inner cities, recentralization.

Since their generalization from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, metropolitan movements have turned into privileged items in a researcher's agenda relating to the current urban studies. The Spanish treatment of this item was late to a certain point. In addition, it was possible due to the chances provided by the 1991 Census promoted by the Spanish Statistics Institute.

This way, since its generalization in urban life and its recognition in the research field, many authors have dedicated efforts to the study of this new phenomenon of urbanising, particularly its evolution and the mobility it implies.

Simplifying a bit, we can distinguish between three capital phases in the building of metropolitan areas. First: concentration, phase in which an area is established as a labour market due to the movements produced from the towns surrounding a central city into this central point. The cause of these movements is the expansion of the central point's labour market's influence. The second phase is suburbanization. This is characterized by the gradual increasing of residential flows towards the surrounding towns, provoking the residential deconcentration of the population and the establishment of the metropolitan area in a strict sense, not only as a labour market but, in addition, as a housing market. Finalizing, in the latest phases of metropolitan movements, new and more complex mobility dynamics have started to appear. In this new phase we witness movements between the surrounding towns themselves and a phenomenon of recentralization, which both represent the definite establishment of the area as a labour and housing unified market.

The importance of this new recentralization phase is not only its strictly demographic dimension, but also its social dimension. The population's residential mobility is both a demographic dynamic and a social action performed by individuals and households which produces and transforms the urban-metropolitan space.



Thus, as many authors claim, this new phase in the metropolitan development has contributed to a recognizable social transformation in the central spaces due to the arrival of new actors. Households and individuals consequence of the so-called second demographic transition, the economical restructuring which provoked the new economy based on services concentrated in inner-cities and bearers of new urban lifestyles and post-materialist values. These actors find, in this central points, a privileged place for the satisfaction of their residential needs, their labour market insertion and, in general, the realization of life projects in the framework of their social mobility strategies.

These actors are characterized by their belonging to social sectors we could call the “winners” of the new economy. These are groups of new functional middle class born as a consequence of post-industrial society: professionals, technicians and managers placed in the advanced knowledge service industry.

Demographically speaking, these new actors are characterized by living in “non-traditional” households, distant from the traditional model of nuclear family. They are pioneers in new ways of cohabitating, like non-familiar household, monoparental or one-person families.

Nevertheless, the majority of studies related to city-shaping movements reveal two main problems: first, the non-distinction between migratory movements and residential mobility dynamics inside the same vital space. And second, the tendency to understand centripetal residential movements as univocal.

Our text uses Andalusian census data between the years 1991 and 2011 and bases on a complex delimitation of Andalusian metropolitan areas for contributing to the distinction and conceptualization of centralization movements, which shape metropolitan heads.

This complex delimitation allows us a subdivision of metropolitan areas in three components: metropolitan heads or inner-cities (centralization movements’ destination), restricted areas or towns in the first belt (areas integrated in the metropolitan macro labour and housing market) and towns in the second belt (integrated in the metropolitan labour market but not integrated in the residential metropolitan market yet). We can add a fourth component conformed by the rest of towns in the province, which turns functional in the definition of the movements towards metropolitan heads: those coming from the first belt, those coming from the second one and the migrations inside provinces.

The goal we aim to achieve with this triple distinction is the characterization of these mobility flows to know if we can define them a separate dynamics or, on the other hand, there are no substantial differences between them.

To claim that a flow forms a distinguished residential dynamic, we ask for two conditions: First, a distinguished role in the metropolitan development process and



second, the distinction of their main character's profile in relation to other mobility flows.

For contrasting the first condition we must analyse the change of intensity in the three centripetal movements occurred between 1991 and 2011. This period was characterized by the maturation and increasing of the metropolitan phenomena dimension in Andalusia.

The analysis of the changes reveals clear results: movements from less residential areas (coming from the second belt) and non-metropolitan areas tend to exhaust as metropolitan processes increase. On the other hand, centripetal movements from metropolitan areas (the first belt) rally in parallel to an outstanding increase of suburbanization. Therefore, we conclude claiming that centralization movements play a different role during the metropolitan development process according to the degree of insertion in the residential processes of the towns they come. The first requirement is essential for the distinction of these dynamics as independent.

Nevertheless, the roles of flows in metropolitan development are not enough to claim that they constitute separate residential dynamics. It is necessary to investigate their main characters' profile.

For that purpose, we develop an analysis of proportions characterizing the main characters of the three movements, clarifying their socio-demographic and socio-economic profile as well as their relation with the housing stock they accede to as a substitute to their effect on the transformation of cities. We prove that these movements have a different social and demographic base, which means that they have different main characters. Even when their socio-economic characteristics are very similar, differences between the socio-demographic profiles are more relevant. Movements from the first belt stand out due to its spread relation to mature adults and families, and second belt movements reveal similarities to the suburban ones: they are formed, mainly, by groups of adults in ages of high mobility rates and couples without descendants. In addition, migrations inside provinces are distinguished because of a young profile and a relevant presence of non-traditional families.

Therefore, after contrasting the two conditions, we can attribute, provisionally, different dynamics to the three residential flows. This way, movements coming from the first belt could be easily related to recentralization, as their profiles are similar to the old suburbanites who returned to the inner-city. On the other hand, second belt movements could be tagged as metropolitan concentration, due to their suburbanite-like profile, as well as their incidence on the first phases of metropolitan development. All of this makes us think that we witness movements not related to a "return" but to a "departure" with residential and labour improvement as a main goal. To finalize,



migrations inside provinces tend to decrease as the metropolitan phenomenon develops and it is conformed by a young and non-traditional profile of population. Consequently, these migrations could be associated to the urbanization concept, understanding it as a migratory dynamic from rural to urban.

