

Factors affecting residential mobility: A comparative analysis between Old Delhi and New Delhi

Fatema Khatun

Phd Scholar, Geography, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi (India)

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 10 December 2018

Keywords

Residential Mobility, Income Groups, locational Preference, Old Delhi, New Delhi

ABSTRACT

Residential mobility relates with the urbanization process especially the physical aspects of it as expressed under the built environment. The general or overall pattern of residential mobility in any given city is characterized by individual decisions to move and the associated quality of environment. Fundamentally, people move in the expectation of achieving a better living environment. Considering the factors affecting the residential mobility in Delhi, it differs from one part to another part of the city. For the present study this problem is identified for Old Delhi and New Delhi. Therefore, the present study aims to analyze the trends, patterns and factors of residential mobility with reference to specific income groups. The methodology includes the analysis of data obtained from primary sources collected from field survey based on selected indicators of residential mobility affecting urban built environment. The result of the study points out that residential mobility is practiced in New Delhi while Old Delhi is characterized by residential immobility mainly where despite of unhygienic living environment, people belonging to even high income groups show preferences to stay there for a variety of reasons. The conclusion of the study is followed by suggestions.

1. Introduction

The study of Residential mobility is a major theme in social science, which has drawn the attention of many researchers in fields such as Geography, Sociology, Demographics, Economics, Psychology etc. Most of the research acknowledges that there are two broad categories of factors that affect household mobility: their individual characteristics and changes in the residential housing market. Thus, residential mobility is interpreted as a phenomenon of the housing market, with families changing their housing stock as they experience changes in both family status and socio-economic status. It is this mobility that is largely responsible for the socio-economic segregation of population in a particular region within the cities. The residential mobility is found out by focuses on the number of addresses where respondents have lived during last few years.

The term residential mobility means frequent change of residence, either in the same city or town or between cities, states or communities. Residential mobility is mainly caused by certain push and pull factors. Push factors are like high densities of population with congestion, crowding, lack of amenities, environmental deterioration, increase of pollution levels etc. Pull Factors are planned colonies, better infrastructure, nearness to workplace/ educational institutes, social security, social bonds etc. Thus, residential mobility is a characteristic to varying degree of all urban neighborhoods. Indeed, it is this mobility that is largely responsible for the changing socio-economic structure of neighborhood and is generally associated with the deterioration and decline of environmental quality of parts of cities. There are a number of potential reasons for increasing or declining residential mobility in a region within city. Perhaps the most significant regularity in terms of mobility patterns is that households seem to move between areas of similar socio-economic status generally.

There is an interrelationship between mobility rates and other features of the urban environment, such as socio-economic, demographic, and housing characteristics of any neighborhood. So, residential mobility relates with the urbanization process especially the physical aspects of it as expressed under the built environment. Thus, the housing demand and its supply is determined by both the economic price as well as location preferences which itself is the outcome of a number of social, economic, environmental and behavioral factors.

Today National Capital Territory of Delhi is in full expansion, with a continuous inflow and increase in population which has contributed significantly to the growth of population and rising density in Delhi. This high rate of growth of population can be attributed to its status as the National capital with a high concentration of political and administrative activities, expanded trade and commerce and a fast growing industrialization. The growth in civic amenities and infrastructural facilities in Delhi during the post- independence era compared to other metropolitan cities in the country has attracted migrants, not only from neighboring countries but also from other countries.

Thus, increasing population growth in Delhi causes many problems to the residents of the city such as congestion, crowding, population density, and lack of amenities, environmental deterioration, attitudinal and behavioral changes. This results in residential migration in the city, which is shaped and directed by the above laid factors in addition to the other various factors such as socio-economic status, family status, housing space, economic changes, employment and opportunities in an area etc. This has resulted in chaotic development of unplanned urban built environment, encouraging unplanned mixed land-use along with alarming

increase of pollution levels. Due to the limited land for urban development, the cost of land is rising very rapidly. Thus, all these together results in the movement of population from one neighborhood to other neighborhood. Therefore, to achieve a sustainable urban development in terms of provision of housing, the study of residential mobility is significant.

Considering The pattern and rates of residential mobility in Delhi, it differs from one part to another part in city. The Old city of Delhi is characterized by more congestion and overcrowding than New Delhi, still out migration is less in Old Delhi in comparison to other parts of Delhi. Quality of environment is rapidly degrading in unplanned localities of Old Delhi while planned areas are better off as in parts New Delhi. Both residential mobility and quality of environment are cause of concern for sustainable urban development. Hence, For the present study this problem is identified for Old Delhi and New Delhi..

2. Approach to the Present Study

The aspect of residential mobility is mainly attempted in western world where residential mobility is studied in context with housing stock and market.

Turner (1976) has considered housing simultaneously as a product (from an individual housing unit to the housing stock in a neighborhood) as well as a process by referring to the provision and maintenance of all kinds of residential building. He has examined a multiple interrelations between housing conditions and human processes in a particular locality. Michelson (1977) has examined that the housing demand is usually considered in terms of the availability and affordability of a combination of characteristics of housing unit, the residential building and its site, and the features of the neighborhood. Duncan (1981) has examined that housing is an indicator of cultural identity, a sign of social status and a catalyst for the expression of individual preferences. He has considered all these attributes of housing in studies of residential mobility. Van Viet (1998) has investigated that the overall pattern of residential mobility in any given city is composed of individual decisions to move and their associated spatial flows, affected by physical, economical, behavioral and environmental parameters. Ioannides (2002) has worked upon residential neighbourhood effects, effect of social interactions within residential neighbourhoods, dwelling unit characteristics. Hur and Morrow-jones (2008) found that homeowners' satisfaction with their neighbourhoods is a major factor associated with residential mobility. There are neighborhood factors that influence residents' satisfaction and that these factors differ between satisfactory and unsatisfactory areas in a city. For instance, safety and social problems were much more significant influences than physical factors in neighborhood satisfaction in unsatisfactory areas.

However, residential mobility for the present study has been linked with quality of environment and the cause and effect between the two has been considered in terms of housing mobility as any change in the usual residence that involves a movement from one physical structure to another at inter locality, intra locality levels in response to changing quality of environment mainly with socio-economic causes.

3. Aims and Objectives of the Study

1. To find out the *status of outdoor and indoor living environment* of different surveyed localities in Old and New Delhi.
2. To find out the *status of indoor and indoor living environment* of different surveyed localities in Old and New Delhi.
3. To find out the *factors* of residential mobility in terms locational preferences for a particular locality with reference to *specific income groups*.

4. Data Base and Methodology

The present study is based on both primary data and related secondary data collected from various sources. The primary data has been collected from field survey based on selected indicators of residential mobility and urban built environment through a self-structured questionnaire.

To conduct the field survey, the area for sampling is selected from Old Delhi (Old city and extension) and New Delhi on the basis of population density and growth rates so as to bring out the variations in patterns of residential mobility. In all, thirteen localities from Old Delhi and New Delhi are selected as per the methodology. For calculating the sample size from the on line random sample calculator is used. Thus, out of 9809 households in the study area, a sample size of 492 households is calculated which proved to be significant at 95% confidence level. The survey is conducted through stratified random sampling.

Therefore, to conduct the survey on parameters related to residential mobility in Old Delhi, in all, 5 localities of Suiwalan, Matia Mahal, Farash Khana, Qasabpura and Jhandewalan Road are selected as per the methodology. All these localities of Old Delhi are authorized but unplanned. In New Delhi, the localities of Kalindi Colony, Sarita Vihar, Dwarka, Abul Fazal Enclave, Zakir Nagar, Welcome Colony, Bihari Colony Extension and Sanjay Enclave are selected. All the localities are authorized except some parts of Zakir Nagar and Abul Fazal Enclave. Kalindi Colony, Sarita Vihar and Dwarka are the planned localities whereas the other five localities are unplanned with mixed land uses. However, New Delhi is newer part of Delhi, so it represents modernity and progress. Wide roads, sky-rocketing buildings, stunning infrastructures and great flyovers, shopping centers are some of the important features of New Delhi. It is also the centre of all administrative, commercial, educational and recreational activities. Thus, it attracts the potential migrants here from different parts of the country.

The data is first crossed classified on the basis of income levels and tabulated for various localities falling within Old and New Delhi. After calculating simple percentages, the data is tested to study the *impact of income on various parameter* used for quality of environment and residential mobility, the *correlation coefficient 'r'* is calculated.

5. Results and Discussion

The present study has been carried out to understand and analyze the process of residential mobility in the study area

from the selected parts of Old Delhi and New Delhi. Considering the nature of urban development in both the above areas, the study aims to find out the factors of residential mobility. The study also focuses upon the socio-economic compositions of the households and their levels of satisfaction in practicing residential mobility.

Therefore, to conduct the study, various objectives were designed so as to achieve the desired information regarding the factors of residential mobility in Old and New Delhi.

1. To attain the **1st objective**, "to find out the *status of outdoor living environment* of different surveyed localities in Old and New Delhi", lane level analysis has shown the quality of outdoor living environment as analyzed from the surveyed data:

The status of congestion and crowding in the surveyed localities in Old Delhi, especially in Suiwalan and Jhandewalan Road shows that almost half of the lanes have a width of 8-12 feet. While in Matia Mahal and Farash Khana around 65% of lanes are under <8 feet with unpaved lanes also. While in New Delhi, planned localities like Kalindi Colony, Sarita Vihar and Dwarka have 100% lanes of >12 feet. Sanjay Enclave, Bihari Colony and Welcome Colony have lanes of 8-12 feet mainly. However, unpaved lanes are also noticeable in Zakir Nagar, Abul Fazal Enclave and Sanjay Enclave

In Old Delhi, the households living in Suiwalan, Qasabpura and Jhandewalan Road, Matia Mahal have mainly complaints of noise pollution from workshops, heavy street traffic and overhead utility lines since they are living along the roads/lanes. While in New Delhi, Kalindi Colony, Sarita Vihar, Abul Fazal Enclave, Zakir Nagar and Sanjay Enclave are located on the flood prone areas. Besides, almost 25% of the households in Abul Fazal Enclave and Zakir Nagar have mainly complaints of heavy street traffic and noise from workshops and overhead utility lines.

Correlation Coefficient analysis has shown a strong negative relationship between the various income levels and percentages of population living close to sources of pollution in Old Delhi. Almost 40%-45% of households in Old Delhi within all income groups are living near the sources of pollution. While in New Delhi, a weak negative relationship is established between the levels of income and percentages of households living close to sources of pollution. Within above 60,000 income groups the percentage of households under this category is very low (only 6%). Therefore, H_1 is rejected at 0.05 level of significance for Old Delhi and accepted for New Delhi

Thus, the importance of income on site selectivity is not noticed at all in the surveyed localities of Old Delhi where almost half of households within all income groups are living near the sources of pollution. However, in case of New Delhi, the effect of income is noticed for the households belonging to very high income groups in the localities like Kalindi Colony, Sarita Vihar and Dwarka since these are planned residential localities but the effect of income is not seen in the localities

like Abul Fazal Enclave and Zakir Nagar which record almost 25% of the households located near the sources of pollution.

2. To attain the **2nd Objective**, "to find out the *status of indoor living environment* of different surveyed households in Old and New Delhi", house level analysis has shown the quality of living environment in the household as analyzed from the surveyed data.

Majority of the households in the surveyed localities of Old Delhi are mainly dominated by 50-75 sq. yards size of accommodations. Besides, <50 sq. yards size of accommodations are more common in Jhandewalan Road and >125 sq. yards size of accommodations are more noticeable in Farash Khana and Suiwalan. While in New Delhi, Kalindi Colony, Sarita Vihar and Dwarka are dominated by >100 sq. yards size of accommodations and rest of the unplanned localities are mainly dominated by 50-75 sq. yards and 75-100 sq. yards of accommodations.

Room density index is found very high in Jhandewalan Road and Qasabpura in Old Delhi. While in New Delhi, it is highest in Zakir Nagar and Abul Fazal Enclave. But the density index is very low in the planned localities of Kalindi Colony, Sarita Vihar and Dwarka. In Old Delhi, almost 30% of the houses in the surveyed localities lack *ventilation* as they are having windows only for ventilation. While in New Delhi, this problem is acute in Sanjay Enclave and Bihari Colony Extension. Besides, conditions of *kitchen ventilation* are better in New Delhi in comparison to Old Delhi.

Analysis of Correlation Coefficient has shown a strong positive relationship between the various income groups and percentages of population living in houses with well ventilation in Old Delhi. While in New Delhi, a weak positive relationship is seen between the levels of income and percentages of population living in well ventilated houses. But it can be observed that the percentage of households with proper ventilation is almost 100% in the planned localities like Kalindi Colony, Sarita Vihar and Dwarka. Therefore, H_1 is accepted at 0.05 levels of significance for Old Delhi as well as for New Delhi.

3. To attain the **3rd objective**, "to find out the *reasons of residential mobility* in terms of locational preferences for a particular locality with reference to *specific income groups*", household level analysis has shown the following findings as analyzed from the surveyed data:

In Old Delhi, 80% of the surveyed households have place of birth within Delhi in which >60,000 income group records the maximum concentration. While in New Delhi, around 76.5% of households in the surveyed localities of New Delhi have place of birth outside Delhi in which 30,000-44,999 income group has shown maximum concentration. Thus, Old Delhi is dominated by the native population of Delhi itself mainly as majority of them living since birth. Whereas, New Delhi is dominated by the in-migrant population from various states other than Delhi. In the process of residential mobility, frequency of changing residences is noticed more in New Delhi in comparison to Old Delhi. However, frequency of residential mobility is noticed very

high in lower income group households mainly in both Old Delhi and New Delhi. However, it is noticed from the locality wise data analysis that households in Sanjay Enclave, Zakir Nagar, Abul Fazal Enclave, Dwarka and Sarita Vihar in New Delhi practice more residential mobility in New Delhi.

The immobile population of Old Delhi shows preference to stay mainly because of their *nearness to work place/ school/ college* in which Matia Mahal (56%), Qasabpura (47%) and Jhandewalan Road (42%) have the maximum influence of this factor. Besides, *feeling of community belongingness* also plays an important role for the households to prefer staying in the surveyed localities. In case of New Delhi, around 39% of movers have opted for the present stay for the reason of *availing better accommodation* and enjoying *better quality of life* like in Dwarka (69%), Sarita Vihar (67%) and Kalindi Colony (57%) have shown maximum proportion of households. While 15% of them have preferred the localities for their feelings of community belongingness and social security in which Zakir Nagar (54%) and Abul Fazal Enclave (46%) have shown maximum concentration. Besides, Welcome Colony and Bihari Colony Extension have shown the influence of the factor nearness to work place/ school/ college.

Analysis of Correlation Coefficient has shown a weak negative relationship between the various income groups and percentages of households preferring to stay in the present locality because of *nearness to workplaces/ schools/ colleges* in Old Delhi. But it is noticed that almost 73% households in <15,000 income group are living nearby workplaces/ schools/ colleges in which Matia Mahal, Qasabpura and Jhandewalan Road record maximum concentration. While in New Delhi also, a weak negative relationship is found under this category. However, there is not much difference within various income levels and around 15%-20% households are living under this category within all income groups. Therefore, H_1 is accepted at 0.05 level of significance for Old Delhi and rejected for New Delhi.

Correlation Co-efficient between the various income levels and percentages of households *changed their previous accommodation as they constructed/ purchased/ inherited a better one* has established a positive relationship in Old Delhi. It is noticed that majority of the households in 15,000-30,000 income group and above 60,000 income group are noticed under this category in Matia Mahal, Farash Khana and Qasabpura. While in New Delhi, a strong positive relationship is established and the impact of income is found highest under this category in localities like Sarita Vihar, Zakir Nagar, Welcome Colony, Abul Fazal Enclave and Sanjay Enclave. However, it is noticed that within all income groups, the percentages of households lying under this category is around 30% to 35% except below 15,000 income group where the percentage is quite low (20%). Therefore, H_1 is accepted at 0.05 level of significance for Old Delhi as well as for New Delhi.

Further, in the process of residential mobility, *need of space* plays another important role in changing the previous accommodation. In Old Delhi, almost 20%-30% households in every income groups except >60,000 income group are recorded under this category. In case of New Delhi also, 20% of

the households in <15,000 income group reported the need of space mainly in Sanjay Enclave and Bihari Colony Extension. *Correlation Co-efficient Analysis* has shown a strong negative relationship between the various income groups and percentages of population who changed their previous accommodation to need more space in both Old Delhi as well as in New Delhi. Therefore, H_1 is accepted at 0.05 level of significance for Old Delhi as well as for New Delhi.

6. Conclusion and Suggestions

Thus, the patterns of residential mobility in relation to quality of environment bring out certain interesting results between Old Delhi and New Delhi. While Old Delhi is dominated by the native population of Delhi mainly as majority of them (80%) are living since their birth despite of all related outdoor environmental constraints as noticed in Matia Mahal, Qasabpura and Jhandewalan Road. The immobile populations shows preference to stay mainly because of their nearness to work place/ school/ college in which Matia Mahal (56%), Qasabpura (47%) and Jhandewalan Road (42%) have the maximum influence of this factor. Whereas, New Delhi is dominated by the in-migrant population (77%) from various states other than Delhi. Though, the overall the quality of environment is better in the surveyed localities of New Delhi in comparison to Old Delhi barring few localities which have recently regularized/ authorized like Zakir Nagar, Abul Fazal Enclave and Welcome Colony. Thus, the outdoor environment in New Delhi shows contradiction between planned and clean colonies to unplanned, haphazardly developed newly established colonies. Despite of this limitation, the localities of New Delhi are going through a very active phase of residential mobility where around 39% of movers have opted for the present stay for the reason of availing better accommodation and enjoying better quality of life like in Dwarka (69%), Sarita Vihar (67%) and Kalindi Colony (57%) have shown maximum proportion of households. While 15% of them have preferred the localities for their feelings of community belongingness and social security in which Zakir Nagar (54%) and Abul Fazal Enclave (46%) have shown maximum concentration. Besides, Welcome Colony and Bihari Colony Extension have shown the influence of the factor nearness to work place/ school/ college.

Residential mobility is a very planned process with impacts on both the household's decisions, motives and behaviors based on various factors, because decisions to move or relocate to an environment or particular neighbourhood comes with a number of factors both negative and positive. This way residential mobility may be seen as the adjustment of the housing situation to suit, as much as possible, the housing need of households through a change in place of residence in which the NCT of Delhi is full of contradictory circumstances promoting or discouraging residential mobility.

Residential mobility in future from the congested localities of Old Delhi as well as New Delhi can be more systematically managed under the various plans and programmes by government agencies. There is also a greater need for providing manageable loans to especially for middle and low income groups to rejuvenate their houses in case of old and

ancestral buildings. The role RWA (Resident Welfare Association) should also be enhanced and they may be included at grass root level to participate in area improvement programmes. While organizations like the Delhi Development Authority, Housing and Urban Development Corporations, various state housing boards, and town planning organizations could do the necessary specialized work in preparation of model colony scheme to meet out the need.

Besides, duration of stay of migrants and causes of migration clearly show a desire for economic motivation for migration process in NCT of Delhi. Therefore, to control in-

migration to NCT of Delhi, there is an urgent need to establish new institutions, economic enterprises and to develop industrial base in the place of origin of migrants from where they are moving to Delhi. Therefore, integrated urban development is required which can only be achieved through decentralized economic activities and creation of more centres of economic pull away from NCT of Delhi. In this background, the economic policies and urban development strategies adopted in NCR(National capital region) are going to play a significant role in reorganization/redistribution of urban population in and around NCT of Delhi in future.

References

1. Auluck, S.V. (1980), *Intracity Residential Mobility in an industrial City: A Case Study of Ludhiana*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi
2. Boehm, T.P. and Schlottmann, A. (2006), "A Comparison of Household Mobility for Owned Manufactured, Traditional Owned, and Rental Units Using the American Housing Survey", *Journal of Housing Economics*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 126-142
3. Cadwallader, M. (1981): *Urban Geography*, Prentice Hall, USA
4. Clark, W.A.V. and Cadwallader, M. (1973), "Locational Stress and Residential Mobility", *Environment and Behavior*, Vol. 5, pp. 29-41
5. Clark, W.A.V., and Cadwallader, M. (1973), "Residential Preferences: An Alternative View of Intra Urban Space", *Environment and Planning*, Vol. 5, pp. 693-703.
6. Duncan, J.S. (ed) (1981). *Housing and Identity: Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Croom Helm, London, UK
7. Hur, M. and Morrow-Jones, H. (2008), "Factors That Influence Residents' Satisfaction with Neighborhoods", *Environment and Behavior*, September 1, 2008, Vol. 40 pp. 619-635
8. Ioannides, Y.M. (2002), "Residential Neighborhood Effects", *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, Vol. 32, No.2, pp. 145-165
9. Michelson, W. (1977), "Environmental Choice, Human Behaviour and Residential Satisfaction", New York: Oxford University Press
10. Turner, J. (1976), "Housing by People: Towards Autonomy in Building Environment", Pantheon Books, New York, USA.
11. Van Vliet, W. (ed) (1998), "The Encyclopedia of Housing", Sage Publications, Newbury CA, U.S.A.
12. <https://dda.org.in/ddanew/housing.aspx#>
13. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p23-204.pdf>
14. <http://www.census.gov/population/pop-profile/dynamic/Mobility.pdf>