



HAL
open science

The influence of quality of life on urban growth. A case study of Barcelona

Esther Vaya Valcarce

► **To cite this version:**

Esther Vaya Valcarce. The influence of quality of life on urban growth. A case study of Barcelona. *Regional Studies*, 2010, 44 (05), pp.551-567. 10.1080/00343400802662682 . hal-00596607

HAL Id: hal-00596607

<https://hal.science/hal-00596607>

Submitted on 28 May 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



The influence of quality of life on urban growth. A case study of Barcelona

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>Regional Studies</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | CRES-2008-0061 |
| Manuscript Type: | Main Section |
| JEL codes: | E00 - General < E0 - General < E - Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics, R00 - General < R0 - General < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics |
| Keywords: | quality of life, urban economics, city growth, geographically weighted regressions |
| | |



The influence of quality of life on urban growth. A case study of Barcelona

Vicente Royuela, Rosina Moreno and Esther Vayá

vroyuela@ub.edu rmoreno@ub.edu evaya@ub.edu

AQR-IREA, University of Barcelona

Received March 2007, in revised form November 2007, March 2008, accepted June 2008

Abstract

There are several determinants that influence household location decisions. More concretely, recent economic literature assigns an increasingly important role to the variables governing quality of life. Nevertheless, the spatial stationarity of the parameters is implicitly assumed in most studies. Here we analyse the role of quality of life in urban economics and test for the spatial stationarity of the relationship between city growth and quality of life.

Keywords: quality of life, urban economics, city growth, geographically weighted regressions

Vicente Royuela, Rosina Moreno and Esther Vayá
生活质量对城市增长的影响，以巴塞罗那为例，区域研究。有很多决定性因素影响家庭置业的区位选择。在目前的经济文献中更是更为具体地强调了决定生活质量的相关变量的重要性。然而，参数的空间固定性依然是大多数研究中都明确提出的假设前提。本文中我们分析了生活质量在城市经济以及测评城市增长与生活质量间相互关系的空间固定性方面所扮演的角色。

生活质量 城市经济 城市增长 地理回归值

1
2
3 L'impact de la qualité de la vie sur la croissance urbaine.
4
5

6 Royuela et al.
7

8 Nombreuses sont les déterminants du choix d'emplacement des ménages. Essentiellement, la
9 documentation économique récente accorde un rôle de plus en plus important aux variables qui
10 déterminent la qualité de la vie. Néanmoins, la plupart des études supposent implicitement une
11 géographie stationnaire des paramètres. On cherche à analyser le rôle de la qualité de la vie dans
12 l'économie urbaine et on fait des analyses pour déceler la géographie stationnaire du rapport
13 entre la croissance urbaine et la qualité de la vie.
14
15

16 Qualité de la vie / Economie urbaine / Croissance urbaine / Régressions géographiques pondérées
17

18
19 **Der Einfluss der Lebensqualität auf das Wachstum von Städten. Eine Fallstudie von**
20 **Barcelona**
21

22 Vicente Royuela, Rosina Moreno and Esther Vayá
23

24
25 Abstract

26 Die Entscheidung für den Standort von Haushalten wird von mehreren Determinanten
27 beeinflusst. Insbesondere wird in der aktuellen Wirtschaftsliteratur den für die Lebensqualität
28 ausschlaggebenden Variablen ein zunehmend hoher Stellenwert eingeräumt. Allerdings wird in
29 den meisten Studien für diese Parameter implizit eine räumliche Unveränderlichkeit
30 angenommen. In diesem Beitrag analysieren wir die Rolle der Lebensqualität in der Ökonomie
31 von Städten und überprüfen die räumliche Unveränderlichkeit der Beziehung zwischen
32 Stadtwachstum und Lebensqualität.
33
34

35 Keywords:

36 Lebensqualität

37 Ökonomie von Städten

38 Stadtwachstum

39 Geografisch gewichtete Regressionen
40
41
42

43
44 **La influencia de la calidad de vida en el crecimiento urbano.**
45 **Estudio del caso de Barcelona**
46

47 Vicente Royuela, Rosina Moreno and Esther Vayá
48

49 Abstract

50 La decisión de elegir el lugar de la vivienda depende de varios factores determinantes.
51 En concreto, la reciente literatura económica asigna un papel cada vez más importante
52 a las variables que gobiernan la calidad de vida. Sin embargo, en la mayoría de
53 estudios se supone implícitamente la estacionalidad espacial de los parámetros. Aquí
54 analizamos el papel de la calidad de vida en la economía urbana y comprobamos la
55 estacionalidad espacial de la relación entre el crecimiento de las ciudades y la calidad
56 de vida.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords:
Calidad de vida
Economía urbana
Crecimiento de las ciudades
Regresiones ponderadas geográficamente

JEL: R00, E00

For Peer Review Only

1. Introduction

In economic terms, urban areas exist due to the presence of externalities related to the higher productivity that agents could achieve by being close to other producers or market agents. Thus, it can be stated that cities are the most economically efficient way of spatially distributing relationships between individuals. The basis for this higher efficiency is the existence of scale economies: more efficient processes can only be developed when a minimum scale is achieved, even if this only occurs in one economic sector, which justifies the urban growth processes observed in the last decades, particularly in developed countries. Nevertheless, several constraints affect the growth of cities, which are basically related to congestion, environmental quality, criminality and other factors. Therefore, agglomeration economies can, beyond a critical point, degenerate into agglomeration diseconomies.

We also believe that decisions to move households from place to place, thereby generating the urban growth processes highlighted above, are not strictly based on economic or monetary motives. On the contrary, a key assumption in our study is that the physical and social environment can also influence the economic behaviour, happiness and collective well-being of individuals. This mechanism can be labelled as both objective and subjective and is influenced by psychological and physiological aspects. From an economic perspective, the work of TIEBOUT, 1956, is a classic reference, in which voters-consumers decide where to locate their household on the basis of where they can gain the best quality of life. It could, then, be concluded that among the factors taken into account by individuals when deciding to migrate, the quality of life offered in a given town or city is a clear determinant (ROGERSON, 1999; CAPELLO and CAMAGNI,

1
2
3 2000). Here we understand quality of life as the degree to which a person's life is desirable
4
5 versus undesirable, with an emphasis on external components, such as environmental factors and
6
7 income (DIENER, 2006).
8
9

10
11
12 Additionally, if we consider the spatial dimension, for example different locations within a
13
14 metropolitan area, it is sensible to think that social and environmental conditions are different in
15
16 locations that are further from the metropolitan centre. Thus, we could expect different types of
17
18 response to the same variables. TÜRKSEVER and ATALIK, 2001, with the aim of examining
19
20 methods for measuring quality of life with respect to regional variations, regress the subjective
21
22 perceptions of quality of life of individuals against a series of variables related to different
23
24 objective dimensions of quality of life. They determine that the dimensions of health, climate,
25
26 crowding, sport, housing conditions, journey to work and environmental pollution are major
27
28 determinants of the satisfaction level in sample districts from the Istanbul metropolitan area.
29
30 However, a number of districts show higher coefficients of determination depending upon a
31
32 number of different independent variables. Consequently, it is one of the first studies in which we
33
34 find spatial differences in the utility functions of households within a metropolitan area.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Within the framework of the urban economic literature, we can think of several possible reasons
45
46 for the spatial differences in the utility functions of household. First, the economic function of
47
48 every city in a national network of cities is a clear example of the specialization of cities in the
49
50 urban hierarchy, which might lead to a situation in which each kind of city carries out different
51
52 functions. The well-known rank size rule is a clear example. Another reason is the separation of
53
54 the space between urban and rural areas, which may lead to very different spatial and sectoral
55
56 specializations.¹ For all these reasons, certain variables related to quality of life may have a
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 different impact on the growth of the cities, according to their characteristics and role, which at
4
5 the same time may be related to their spatial location.
6
7

8
9
10 Assuming the former scenario, this paper addresses two main objectives. Firstly, we are
11
12 interested in determining the extent to which quality of life is a relevant factor in the explanation
13
14 of urban growth, while controlling for more traditional determinants. We will analyse which of
15
16 the issues related to quality of life are most influential in urban growth. Secondly, we will test
17
18 whether the responses of individuals to different levels of quality of life present the same
19
20 magnitude across the studied territory. In other words, we intend to analyse whether the effect of
21
22 quality of life on city growth can be considered stable over space or, on the contrary, whether this
23
24 effect varies with the territory considered. And, if it were the case, which possible reasons can be
25
26 behind that behaviour. According to the latter theory it would be necessary to consider the
27
28 possibility that the response of urban growth to changes in quality of life is different according to
29
30 the situation of the city in the territory. One way of modelling this issue is to use geographically
31
32 weighted regression (GWR) techniques. The empirical work is applied to the narrower official
33
34 territorial division within a province, specifically the 314 municipalities in the province of
35
36 Barcelona.²
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The paper is structured as follows. The following section describes the determinants of city
47
48 growth, with a particular focus on quality of life, and describes the theoretical model on which
49
50 we base our study. Section three presents the empirical framework and briefly describes the
51
52 GWR techniques. Data and descriptive analyses of the province of Barcelona are given in section
53
54 four. Section five contains the econometric results and section six concludes the study.
55
56
57
58
59
60

2. The model

2.1. The determinants of city growth

Urbanisation is a phenomenon that has intensified in the last decades due to the advantages of agglomeration associated with size. Agglomeration economies are the key factor in offering higher incomes to city households. However, once a certain size is reached, the generation of negative externalities such as congestion and commuting costs suggests the existence of an optimal city size above which any further increase in physical dimensions reduces the advantages of agglomeration (HENDERSON, 1974). As suggested in RICHARDSON, 1972, a noticeable paradox exists between the theoretical notion of an “optimal city size” and the fact that big cities continue to expand in developing countries. The explanation given by Richardson is based on the existence of determinants other than physical size that influence urban agglomeration economies.

As stated in CAPELLO and CAMAGNI, 2000, the literature has identified determinants of urban location advantages other than urban size, such as the type of economic function developed by the urban centre, its spatial organisation and the efficiency of its internal structure. Some studies have explicitly considered the growth of cities and emphasise the role of the *urban attributes* as determinants of the attractive power of an area. References have been made to climatic variables, aesthetic elements, the presence of public goods and services, local government policies (taxes or benefits) and social interactions (GLAESER *et al.*, 2001; GLAESER and KHAN, 2003; CHESIRE and MAGRINI, 2006; and SHAPIRO, 2006). The importance of these attributes in determining the competitive capacity of territories is related to strictly economic factors, such as the GDP per capita.

1
2
3 The relevance of the specific attributes of each location varies according to the purpose of each
4 study and whether the analysis focuses on sustainable urban growth (the advantages of
5 agglomeration versus dispersion/sprawl) or inter-urban competition. In his discussion of the
6 advantages of cities as urban agglomerations, GLAESER, 2000, highlights the role of what he
7 calls “non-market forces” in achieving urban growth: the flow of ideas among enterprises, human
8 capital spillovers, social capital or peer effects. In a subsequent study, GLAESER *et al.*, 2001,
9 discuss the advantages that cities – as spatial agglomerations – have to offer and link them with
10 the importance of urban amenities as a crucial factor that can determine urban viability and
11 growth. The underlying hypothesis is that the large agglomerations that offer these types of
12 advantages are viable, whereas others could potentially face serious decline. These advantages
13 constitute what the authors call the “urban amenity”, which can be viewed as a desirable package
14 of goods demanded by the “consumers” of an urban space. FLORIDA, 2002, discusses the
15 importance of high quality goods and services – referring to them as “quality of place” – in
16 attracting highly-skilled labour in US cities. Following the growth models of Lucas and Romer,
17 the underlying assumption is the importance of knowledge and human capital in generating
18 economic growth. In this context, Florida underlines the importance of quality of life variables as
19 the driving forces behind the location decisions of the highly-skilled labour force.³ It therefore
20 seems plausible to conclude that, in addition to the economic factors that are important in
21 explaining urban growth, a good quality of life is also a dominant factor.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Recently, quality of life has become a commonly used term among researchers working in different fields. Specifically, it has been viewed as part of the profile of a competitive city, i.e. one that is successful in attracting capital, as well as being a determining factor in patterns of urban growth. Of the different surveys in the literature aimed at interpreting the motivations for

1
2
3 moving among recent migrants, quality of life is raised as one of the reasons considered
4
5 (ROGERSON, 1999). For example, in the study carried out by FINDLAY and ROGERSON,
6
7 1993, quality of life is important to more than 70 per cent of the migrants interviewed and is
8
9 considered more important than employment opportunities, living costs or family ties. From the
10
11 perspective of urban planners, cities are the centre of economics, politics, commerce and other
12
13 activities, so it is necessary to analyse the conditions that contribute to the quality of urban life.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 2.2. The model

21
22 The basic model is the one developed in GLAESER et al (1995). There, cities are treated as
23
24 separate economies that share common pools of labour and capital, which are assumed to be
25
26 mobile. Consequently, cities differ only in terms of the level of productivity and the quality of
27
28 life. Total output is given by:
29
30
31
32
33

$$34 A_{i,t} f(L_{i,t}) = A_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\sigma} \quad (1)$$

35
36
37
38 where $A_{i,t}$ is the level of a broad definition of productivity in city i at time t , $L_{i,t}$ denotes the
39
40 population of city i at time t , $f(.)$ is a common across-cities Cobb-Douglas production function,
41
42 and σ is a nation-wide production parameter. The labour income of a potential migrant will be:
43
44
45
46
47
48

$$49 W_{i,t} = \sigma A_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\sigma-1} \quad (2)$$

50
51
52
53 This potential migrant will have a total utility that equals wages multiplied by a quality of life
54
55 index (QoLi,t), which is assumed to be declining according to the size of the city:
56
57
58
59
60

$$QoL_{i,t} = Q_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{-\delta}, \quad (3)$$

where $\delta > 0$, and where $QoL_{i,t}$ captures a wide range of factors related to crime, housing prices, and traffic congestion, among others. Total utility of individuals equals wage multiplied by a function of the quality of life index:

$$Utility = \sigma A_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\sigma-1} QoL_{i,t}^{\delta} = \sigma A_{i,t} L_{i,t}^{\sigma-\delta-1} Q_{i,t} \quad (4)$$

Free migration across cities is assumed. Consequently, there is a constant utility across space (spatial equilibrium) at a point of time, $U_{i,t} = \underline{U}_t$. Thus, for each city:

$$\log\left(\frac{U_{t+1}}{\underline{U}_t}\right) = \log\left(\frac{A_{i,t+1}}{A_{i,t}}\right) + \log\left(\frac{Q_{i,t+1}}{Q_{i,t}}\right) + (\sigma - \delta - 1) \log\left(\frac{L_{i,t+1}}{L_{i,t}}\right) \quad (5)$$

Changes in productivity and quality of life are assumed to be a function of a vector of city characteristics at time t , $X_{i,t}$:

$$\log\left(\frac{A_{i,t+1}}{A_{i,t}}\right) = X_{i,t}' \beta + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (6)$$

$$\log\left(\frac{Q_{i,t+1}}{Q_{i,t}}\right) = X_{i,t}' \theta + \zeta_{i,t} \quad (7)$$

Combining (5) with (6) and (7), the following equation is obtained:

$$\log\left(\frac{L_{i,t+1}}{L_{i,t}}\right) = \frac{1}{1+\delta-\sigma} X'_{i,t} (\beta + \theta) + \chi_{i,t} \quad (8)$$

Where $\chi_{i,t}$ include any factor influencing quality of life or productivity growth, but not considered in the vector of city characteristics $X_{i,t}$. In this model cities will *increase* their population if they experience an increase in the factors that influence positively both productivity and quality of life, the final drivers of population migration. The results of the model can be interpreted as showing how the city level variables (X) determine the growth of the city population, through the growth of productivity and quality of life. In this model no reverse causality can arise, as the dependent variable is an approximation of a growth rate between t and $t+1$, based on the conditions at time t . Of course, this behaviour is expected for a standard household, without any particular life cycle circumstances.⁴

The grounds of this model do not lead us to expect any spatial non-stationarity in its parameters. Consequently, it might be the result of the violation of some assumptions of the model. First, the production function of every city, $f(\cdot)$, may not be not equal, due to, for instance, different specializations in the territory. Second, the utility function of individuals in the territory may diverge. Although we do not expect this to happen, we have to admit that we can see residential segregation within a city or a metropolitan area, which could lead us to expect different behaviours of different people. Third, we might find spatial non-stationarity if there is a lack of free migration across territories. If, for any reason, this assumption does not hold, then there can

1
2
3 be no spatial equilibrium and no constant utility across space. The economic forces driving this
4
5 situation are similar to those that cause the existence of housing submarkets: inefficiencies in the
6
7 housing market, and the special characteristics of the good, such as spatial fixity, durability, and
8
9 so on. For these reasons, certain variables related to quality of life might have a different impact
10
11 on the growth of the cities, according to their characteristics and role, which at the same time
12
13 could be related to their location in the space.
14
15

16 17 18 19 **2.3. Defining quality of life**

20
21 Although the list of specific issues to be included in a definition of quality of life varies between
22
23 studies, there is a consensus over factors such as the physical environment, housing, climate,
24
25 pollution or social facilities linked to education and health. Nevertheless, the agreement is not so
26
27 clear for the alternative ways of conceiving quality of life. It has been argued that perception and
28
29 experiences of quality of life are becoming important in the spatial decision-making of
30
31 individuals. There is not, however, a single way in which quality of life should be measured. As a
32
33 measured variable, quality of life would be determined by both the subject and the object of
34
35 inquiry, which would lead to either a perceptual or an objective perspective.
36
37
38
39

40
41
42 Much of the early research on quality of life (CAMPBELL *et al.*, 1976; ANDREWS and
43
44 WITHEY, 1976, among others) understood it at the individual level and considered how personal
45
46 characteristics and views shape the quality of life of a given individual (perceptual perspective).
47
48 Under this conception, our notion of quality of life is that of the degree of satisfaction or
49
50 dissatisfaction with aspects of our lives. Research considering personal aspects categorised
51
52 quality of life either as satisfaction scales or via responses to surveys and interviews about the
53
54 immediate experience and well-being of respondents (ROGERSON, 1999).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 More recent research is devoted to the concept of quality of life as related to places and their
4 characteristics (objective perspective). Under this view, quality of life is influenced by the
5 environment in which people live (HELBURN, 1982), so any assessment of quality of life should
6 consider the extent to which the necessary conditions for personal satisfaction and happiness are
7 achieved, i.e. those attributes of the environment that stimulate satisfaction. Studies that focus on
8 locations and their characteristics tend to select the attributes and characteristics through expert or
9 other non-survey approaches, such as econometric and revealed preference methods (e.g.
10 BERGER *et al.*, 1987; STOVER and LEVEN, 1992).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Most economists do not explicitly assume a certain definition of quality of life. Rather, they
25 simply consider different indicators potentially influencing quality of life, such as climate
26 variables (CHESIRE and MAGRINI, 2006) or the number of bars and restaurants in an area
27 (GLAESER *et al.*, 2001). Here we will assume a definition given recently by a group of
28 academics from the International Society for Quality of Life. They define quality of life in the
29 following way: “it usually refers to the degree to which a person’s life is desirable versus
30 undesirable, often with an emphasis on external components, such as environmental factors and
31 income. In contrast to subjective well-being, which is based on subjective experience, quality of
32 life is often expressed as more *objective* and describes the circumstances of a person’s life rather
33 than his or her reaction to those circumstances” (DIENER, 2006, p. 4). Therefore, as will be
34 presented in Section 4, in this paper we will measure the factors influencing quality of life by
35 using a set of indicators consisting of goods, services and other attributes related to the social,
36 physical and economic environment of the places where people live.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3. Data and empirical model

3.1 Geographical scope

As mentioned above, the first objective of this paper is to determine to what extent quality of life is a relevant factor in the explanation of urban population growth. As indicated by GLAESER *et al.*, 1995, this measure might not be accurate at the national level, since the population is relatively immobile, whereas at the local level population growth reflects whether cities are becoming gradually more attractive to the population.

The analysis focuses on the province of Barcelona, one of the four provinces in the region of Catalonia. Catalonia (NUTS II in the European administrative classification) is a highly industrialized region located in the north-east of the country and is one of Spain's most developed regions. It is divided into four administrative provinces (NUTS III in the European administrative classification). Barcelona is the most populated of these provinces, with 76% of the region's inhabitants. Its population rose from 4,655,853 in 1991 to 4,737,695 in 2000, an increase of 1.7% in the decade. Together with Madrid, Barcelona is the most populated and urbanized Spanish province. The province is similar to other areas in Europe in that it contains a large city with a relatively wide area of influence, comprising its suburbs, the surrounding towns, industrial clusters, and so on.⁵

We assume that in many developed countries city size is now mainly related to migration and that this migration occurs more frequently within metropolitan areas than between them. Consequently, for a relatively short period of ten years, a narrower territorial scope is more appropriate. In addition, in Spain these local migrations are much more frequent than long-

1
2
3 distance migrations. Of course, we assume that the critical factors affecting these short-distance
4
5 migrations are different to those affecting long-distance migrations (migrations between
6
7 metropolitan areas). In any case, this point does not invalidate our procedure and actually
8
9 stimulates future studies of other territorial dimensions. Consequently, as our basic unit of
10
11 analysis we used municipalities, the smallest one available.
12
13

14
15
16
17 The province of Barcelona has 314 municipalities (NUTS V in the European administrative
18
19 classification), which we established as the basic unit of measurement in our study. This
20
21 administrative definition of the unit of analysis is usually a part of a wider city. In other words,
22
23 *real* cities usually take in more than just one municipality. Nevertheless, several municipalities,
24
25 usually the smaller ones, are isolated from the rest, and do not display an urban continuum.
26
27 Consequently we are assuming a small unit of analysis which, of course, will be connected
28
29 through commuting relationships, belonging to the same local labour markets, and so on.
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 Focusing our analysis in the province of Barcelona is particularly interesting given the high
37
38 heterogeneity of the characteristics of the municipalities that make it up. In addition to the highly
39
40 industrialized area of influence around the city of Barcelona, the province has a long coastline,
41
42 which, together with a mild climate, has helped the municipalities on the coast to attract a large
43
44 population influx over recent decades. This has been accompanied by a group of inland
45
46 municipalities, some way from the central business area of Barcelona, close to the Pyrenees,
47
48 which are mainly active in agriculture. Given this heterogeneity within a relatively small area,
49
50 one would expect non-spatial stationarity in the response in the impact of quality of life on urban
51
52 growth.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3.2 Empirical model

With the aim of analysing whether quality of life is a determinant of urban growth, we estimate a model in which population growth in a municipality is a function of several indicators of quality of life. However, following the literature surveyed in the previous section, we will control for the impact of issues such as population in the initial year, the different functions and specializations played by the municipalities, its network of integration with the rest of the world, and the distance from the main cities. Specifically, we estimate the following growth equations:

$$\ln(POP_{iT} / POP_{i0}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln POP_{i0} + \beta_2 FUNSYS_{i0} + \beta_3 FUNSUB_{i0} + \beta_4 \ln TELEPH_{i0} + \beta_5 \ln DBCN_{i0} + \beta_6 \ln DSYS_{i0} + \beta_7 \ln DSUB_{i0} + \beta_8 \ln CQLI_{i0} + \varepsilon_{iT} \quad (9)$$

where the dependent variable is the population increase in each local area between 1991 and 2000, measured in terms of the log of the population ratio (a measurement that approximates the growth rate). The independent variables are described below.

$\ln POP$ is the log of the population in 1991, and the remaining explanatory variables represent different urban characteristics that act as proxies for the type of economic functions developed by the urban centre, the integration of the city in the network of urban systems (i.e. the spatial organisation of the centre) and the quality of life in the city.

Concretely, the economic functions that characterise the city are important determinants of its size. As stated in HENDERSON, 1996, cities are different to one other: they are characterised by different functions and perform different specialisations. This may allow the development of economies of scale even in relatively small cities. In our empirical analysis, the function of each

1
2
3 city is controlled by a dummy variable that is set at 1 for cities with a minimum amount of basic
4
5 services, such as health and education services. Two different levels of “higher function” cities
6
7 are examined. Thus, from the initial 314 municipalities we chose 24 that act as central cities
8
9 (FUNSYS) and 48 that are basic functional cities (FUNSUB). These dummies are considered as
10
11 cumulative to give a threshold effect.
12
13

14
15
16
17 The logic behind the network city paradigm is that the spatial organisation in which cities operate
18
19 is vital to understanding their growth. This is related to long-run competition and cooperation
20
21 irrespective of the distance barrier (CAMAGNI, 1993). The level of network integration of the
22
23 city with the rest of the world is approximated using an indicator of the telephone lines installed
24
25 in 1996, as in CAPELLO and CAMAGNI, 2000: specifically, the log of installed telephone lines
26
27 per 1,000 inhabitants ($\ln \text{TELPH}$).⁶
28
29
30
31

32
33
34 Since cities exist in an inter-urban environment, we also consider the possible influence of spatial
35
36 interactions. We therefore computed the time measured in minutes that a person needs to travel
37
38 by car to the capital of the province, that is, Barcelona city ($\ln \text{DBCN}$), to the nearest central city
39
40 ($\ln \text{DSYS}$), and to the closest functional city ($\ln \text{DSUB}$).
41
42
43
44

45
46 Finally, quality of life is proxied by an aggregate measurement, $\ln \text{CQLI}$, which is the log of the
47
48 Composite Quality of Life Index. Following previous work (ROYUELA *et al.*, 2003), in which a
49
50 list of factors influencing quality of life was grouped into a composite index of quality of life
51
52 (CQLI), built for the 314 municipalities, based on the structure of the classical study of LIU,
53
54 1973, 1978, for the USA. Here we use the same extensive database⁷ with 17 basic quality of life
55
56 components and three main quality of life components (see Table 1).⁸ We use 17 indices that
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were constructed after the use of a large number of basic indicators, producing an intermediate
4 structure of three indicators, related to the Individual Opportunities for Progress (IOP), the Social
5 Equilibrium (ISE) and the Community Conditions of Life (CCL). All 17 indices are defined in
6 positive terms (the higher, the better). In order to summarize quality of life in a single figure, an
7 average index is constructed and weighted after explicit agreement between policymakers.⁹ As
8 mentioned above, the territorial scope of our analysis is the local level, and particularly
9 municipalities. ROYUELA et al., 2003 explicitly treats the information needed to account for the
10 spatial relationships between the municipalities. For instance, in order to consider the fact that the
11 provision of public goods is not homogeneous in space, a spatial filtering method was used, in
12 order to assign the level of hospital services that is available in a municipality that is 30 km away
13 from the health centre.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Taking into account the three components of the aggregate measurement of quality of life,
33 besides model (9), we also estimate a model where we consider the qualitative characteristics of
34 the urban environment in a more disaggregated way:
35
36
37
38
39
40

$$41 \ln(POP_{i,T} / POP_{i_0}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln POP_{i_0} + \beta_2 FUNSYS_{i_0} + \beta_3 FUNSUB_{i_0} + \beta_4 \ln TELEPH_{i_0} + \quad (10)$$

$$42 + \beta_5 \ln DBCN_{i_0} + \beta_6 \ln DSYS_{i_0} + \beta_7 \ln DSUB_{i_0} + \beta_8 \ln IOP_{i_0} + \beta_9 \ln ISE_{i_0} + \beta_{10} \ln CCL_{i_0} + \varepsilon_{i,T}$$

43
44
45
46
47 Where, instead of the ln CQLI, the log of the Composite Quality of Life Index, we consider its
48 three components: ln IOP represents the log of the Individual Opportunities of Progress index; ln
49 ISE is the log of the Index of Social Equilibrium index; and finally, ln CCL is the log of the
50 Community Conditions of Life index.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Two considerations are in order. Firstly, all the explanatory variables except In TELPH, refer to
4 the initial year under consideration, 1991. And secondly, this definition of quality of life
5 explicitly considers the individual characteristics of the inhabitants, such as the age, wealth,
6 educational levels, and so on. This point, which clearly affects the quality of life of households, is
7 important when we think of patterns over the life cycle or the aspirations that different types of
8 households have to different bundles of amenities.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **3.3 Non-stationarity analysis in the impact of quality of life on urban growth**

23
24 Although the first purpose of this paper is the analysis of the impact of quality of life on city
25 growth while controlling for the more traditional determinants, our second objective is to
26 determine whether the effect of quality of life on city growth can be considered stable over space
27 or whether it varies with the territory studied. From an econometric perspective, this would mean
28 that the average value for the relationship obtained in a regression may not be representative of
29 any particular situation. Further, this could make it necessary to consider the possibility that the
30 response of urban growth to changes in quality of life could vary according to the location of the
31 city in the territory. Besides the economic reasons for the existence of non-stationarity, there are
32 some others coming from an econometric point of view. The first is the sampling variation: we
33 do not expect to obtain exactly the same results simply by virtue of having different samples
34 across space. The second explanation is that the model from which the relationship is estimated is
35 a poor reflection of reality and that important variables are omitted. And a third reason is that
36 some relationships are intrinsically different over space, as we pointed out in our presentation of
37 the model in section 2.2. Whatever the reason, if non-stationarity holds, we need to model this
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 issue: if such a process is analysed using a global traditional estimation, the results can be locally
4
5 misleading.
6
7

8
9
10 Various econometric methods can be used to tackle this issue. One of most popular ones is the
11
12 Expansion Method (CASETTI, 1972, JONES and CASETTI, 1992), where the original
13
14 parameters of the model are allowed to vary over geographic space (for instance the coordinates
15
16 of the observations). This method has played an important role in promoting awareness of spatial
17
18 non-stationarity. Nevertheless, several limitations arise: the spatial variation is restricted to the
19
20 complexity of the spatial expansion, which has to be assumed *a priori*. Besides, the expansion is
21
22 assumed to be deterministic, in order to avoid estimation problems. Other methods that account
23
24 for spatial non-stationarity of the parameters are moving-window regressions, spatially adaptative
25
26 filtering, multilevel modelling, random coefficient models, kernel regressions, spatial regression
27
28 models, drift analysis of regression parameters, and also the one that we will concentrate on here
29
30 Geographic Weighted Regressions (GWR). Of course, none of the methods are above criticism,
31
32 certainly not GWR. Nevertheless, as the aim of our paper is not to let these models compete, we
33
34 decided to use only one technique, GWR, based on its flexibility and the use of understanding of
35
36 the outputs. Next we describe the basic principles of the technique.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The econometrics of the GWR can be followed in FOTHERINGHAM *et al.*, 2002.¹⁰ If we
47
48 consider a global regression model:
49
50

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_k \beta_k x_{ik} + \varepsilon_i \quad (11)$$

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 then GWR extends this framework by allowing local rather than global parameters to be
4
5
6 estimated. The model is rewritten in the following way:
7
8
9

$$y_i = \beta_0(u_i, v_i) + \sum_k \beta_k(u_i, v_i) x_{ik} + \varepsilon_i \quad (12)$$

10
11
12
13
14
15 where (u_i, v_i) denotes the coordinates of the i th point in space and $\beta_k(u_i, v_i)$ is a realisation of the
16
17 continuous function $\beta_k(u, v)$ at point i . We then allow a continuous surface of parameter values
18
19 and measurements of this surface are taken at certain points to denote the spatial variability of the
20
21 surface. The calibration of Equation (12) is particularly problematic as there are more unknowns
22
23 than observed variables. The general method to solve this problem is to assume that the
24
25 coefficients are not strictly random, but rather deterministic functions of other variables, in our
26
27 case, location in space. Although it is not possible to obtain unbiased estimates of the local
28
29 coefficients, estimates with only a small amount of bias can be obtained, always taking into
30
31 account that there is a trade-off between bias and standard error. The calibration is weighted such
32
33 that the observations that are closer to i have a greater influence. In order to determine the
34
35 bandwidth and shape of the weights, we follow the minimisation of the Akaike Information
36
37 Criterion (AIC), based on the likelihood function of the estimates.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 In order to test the spatial non-stationarity of a process, the global model can be compared with
48
49 the GWR model through an ANOVA analysis, where the null hypothesis is that the global model
50
51 holds and that the GWR model represents no improvement over a global model. Additional tests
52
53 concerning the local parameter estimates can be conducted using a Monte Carlo test. The
54
55 comparison between the observed statistic and that obtained from a large number of randomised
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 distributions can form the basis of the significance test. Therefore, the lower the probability
4 associated with this statistic, the more confident we can be that the process generating the local
5 parameter estimates is non-stationary.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **4. Results**

13 14 15 **4.1 Descriptive analysis**

16
17
18 Figures 1 and 2 show the maps of population growth between 1991 and 2000 and the population
19 level in 1991, respectively. Figure 3 shows the map of the CQLI measurements of quality of life.
20
21 Additionally, Figures 4 to 6 show the quality of life components (IOP, ISE and CCL). The
22 descriptive statistics for all variables included in the empirical models are shown in Tables 2 and
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
3.

As can be seen in the Figures and in Table 3, there is no clear negative correlation between the
size of the municipality (in terms of population) at the beginning of the studied period and its
corresponding growth rate. Although it is true that those municipalities with larger populations in
1991 (including Barcelona) generally showed lower increases (which suggests the possible
presence of negative externalities derived from higher levels of saturation and congestion), the
opposite effect was not generally observed in those municipalities with smaller populations at the
beginning of the period. In fact, the greatest population growths were observed in various
municipalities located both in coastal areas (with the exception of Barcelona and the immediate
surrounding area) and in the first and second rings around the capital. In contrast, inland
municipalities in the northern part of the province that had low population levels in 1991 showed
low growth rates over the ten-year period analysed.

1
2
3 Table 3 also shows a certain positive relation between population growth and quality of life.
4
5 Therefore, it appears that the municipalities with high values for the Composite Quality of Life
6
7 Index (CQLI) at the beginning of the period recorded high growth rates, and vice versa. This
8
9 result can also be extended to two of the three components that make up the composite index:
10
11 individual opportunities for progress (IOP) and social equilibrium (ISE). In contrast, the negative
12
13 correlation detected between the growth variable and the Community Conditions component
14
15 (CCL) was unexpected. It therefore appears that the municipalities with the highest provision of
16
17 services at the beginning of the period did not attract a significant number of new inhabitants and
18
19 in fact recorded low growth rates. In order to understand this result it should be considered that
20
21 the total services in the community are relative to the population size so that, in addition to
22
23 Barcelona, the municipalities with smaller populations, particularly those located in the north of
24
25 the province, show the greatest provision of services relative to population size. As a result, the
26
27 greater distance from the centre of the province and the fewer individual opportunities for
28
29 progress (shown in Figure 4) could far outweigh the advantages of these municipalities in terms
30
31 of relative provision of services. In addition, this negative correlation between the growth and
32
33 CCL variables could also be influenced by the situation of the Barcelona city municipality,
34
35 which, as the capital of the province, contains a considerable proportion of its services but which
36
37 also showed a net decrease in population between 1991 and 2000 (as was the case in most large
38
39 provincial capitals).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **4.2. Empirical evidence**

54
55 The results of the estimates of the empirical models (9) and (10) are displayed in Table 4. In this
56
57 equation the growth in cities is regressed against the population size, the functional position of
58
59
60

1
2
3 each city in the urban environment, the network economies, the distance from Barcelona, the
4 distance from the nearest functional city and finally the measure of quality of life. Columns (a)
5 and (b) consider the composite measurement of quality of life. Columns (c) and (d) consider
6 quality of life with the three main components included separately and without constructing a
7 composite index. Columns (b) and (d) display the estimates with only significant variables.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14
15
16
17 In the first and second columns of every regression we show the estimates and the t-statistics of
18 the global regression parameters. The third column displays the p-values of the Monte Carlo test
19 in order to determine whether the local parameter estimates are stationary (null hypothesis) or
20 non-stationary (alternative hypothesis). We also give a list of statistics for every regression: AIC,
21 R^2 and adjusted R^2 . Finally, an ANOVA test is performed in order to test the hypotheses that the
22 global model holds and the GWR model represents no improvement over the global model.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 We first comment on the results of the model using the global measure of quality of life. In
35 columns (a) and (b) it can be seen that the goodness of fit of the model is approximately 38%.
36 Although most variables are significant, we observe that those related with the functions of
37 municipalities with a second order function in the system are clearly non-significant. The
38 significant variables display the expected signs: larger cities show a lower population increase,
39 which would imply a convergence towards a steady state of city size; the network economies
40 variable is positive and very significant; the distance of the municipalities from Barcelona or
41 from the first order function cities has a negative influence, which would lead to intense
42 suburbanisation of the main cities. Finally, the quality of life variable is clearly significant and
43 positive, which implies that well-being is a relevant factor in the explanation of urban population
44 growth, after controlling for more traditional determinants. Consequently, the CQLI measures a
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 list of factors that influence the growth of quality of life, and subsequently induces the population
4
5 growth of the municipalities.
6
7

8
9
10 Columns (c) and (d) of Table 4 present the estimates of the model using the three main
11
12 components of quality of life instead of the composite index. The global adjustment is clearly
13
14 improved, with an R^2 of 0.48. This is a key result: composite measurements can lead to worse
15
16 adjustments. The same signs and significances as in the former estimates are observed, so the
17
18 main conclusions are maintained. As for the quality of life parameters, they display very different
19
20 results. We observe that the indices of Individual Opportunities for Progress (IOP) and Social
21
22 Equilibrium (ISE) have the expected positive signs and that the latter has a greater influence on
23
24 city growth. In contrast, the Community Conditions of Life (CCL) index shows a counterintuitive
25
26 negative result, implying that municipalities initially experiencing high (low) levels of CCL
27
28 display low (high) population growth rates.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 Therefore, as far as the first objective is concerned, we have observed that quality of life is an
37
38 important determinant of urban growth, so that those territories with higher well-being level will
39
40 attract population from other locations. Besides, if disaggregated, we detect that the initial level
41
42 of the individual characteristics (IOP) and the social equilibrium (ISE) have a positive influence
43
44 on quality of life growth and subsequently on population growth, whereas high initial levels of
45
46 community conditions of life (CCL) do not seem to reflect an increase in quality of life. Among
47
48 possible explanations, we should point out that since Barcelona is a province with a high level of
49
50 development in which the welfare state provides social services, individuals may attribute more
51
52 importance to economic issues and their opportunity for progress than to the relatively higher
53
54 provision of community conditions (schools, hospitals, transport, and so on).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 So far we have considered stationarity in the magnitude of the impact of the variables in the
7
8 model of urban growth throughout the territory. However, taking into account the arguments
9
10 presented above on the spatial heterogeneity of the municipalities making up the province of
11
12 Barcelona, we will now look at the potential non-stationarity of the parameters in the model.
13
14

15
16
17 In both models we find that the GWR alternatives show significantly improved goodness of fit
18
19 indices: in the model with the CQLI the adjustment increases to 0.58 compared to the global
20
21 model once the non-significant variables have been removed (column b), where the adjustment is
22
23 0.38. In the disaggregated quality of life model (column d) we also find a significantly better
24
25 behaviour of the GWR model (0.68 versus 0.48). This better performance is due to the fact that
26
27 not all variables can be seen as spatially stationary.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Specifically, we see that the intercept and the variable proxying network economies are
35
36 significantly non-stationary. We also find that the result for the distance from Barcelona in the
37
38 column (b) model and the distance from the closest central city in the column (d) are significantly
39
40 non-stationary. To study the non-stationarity of these variables in more depth, Figures 7a and 7b
41
42 show the maps of the network economies parameter and the corresponding t-statistics. It can be
43
44 seen that the variable is not significant in the upper part of the map and is very significant in the
45
46 coastal municipalities of the south. It makes sense that the municipalities in the upper part close
47
48 to the Pyrenees, which are more isolated and have a less benign climate, should be the ones where
49
50 the impact of network economies on population growth is non-significant. Figures 8a and 8b
51
52 show the same concepts for the variable of distance to Barcelona. We see that the variable is
53
54 significant mainly in the middle distance from the capital of the province, facing moderate values
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Therefore, municipalities that are closer to or very far from Barcelona are not significantly
4 influenced: the closer municipalities because they are integrated into the real metropolitan area
5 and the further municipalities because they are too far away from the city to be influenced. In
6 contrast, the mid-distance municipalities are sufficiently close that they are necessarily influenced
7 by the city but also too far away to benefit from its agglomeration economies.
8
9

10
11 Finally, we also see that quality of life variables display non-stationary behaviour, both in the
12 composite model (column b) and in the disaggregated model (column d). Interestingly, in the
13 latter, the only non-stationary parameter is the one related to CCL, the variable with an
14 unexpected negative sign. Figures 9a and 9b show the maps of the parameter and the
15 corresponding t-statistics for the CQLI, while figures 10a and 10b show the geographic parameter
16 estimates and corresponding t-statistics for the CCL index.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Interestingly, the CQLI is not significant in the upper part of the map, in the city of Barcelona or
35 in some of its closer municipalities. In these locations it does not seem to be a key variable in
36 explaining the population increase. When we disaggregate the CQLI into its three components,
37 we can see that the non-spatial stationarity of this index is due to the CCL component. The
38 parameter of the CCL variable is not significant surrounding the city of Barcelona, showing that
39 in the area close to the capital city variations in population are not influenced by the relative
40 provision of services. In contrast, this parameter shows a clear negative significance to the north
41 and to the south-west. This means that even the municipalities in those areas with relatively low
42 (south west) or high (north) relative levels of education, health and other important types of
43 services experience an increase (south west) or decrease (north) in population.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 There are several possible explanations for the non-stationarity of all these variables and the
4 differences detected among three geographical areas: the north of the province, the area
5 surrounding the city of Barcelona and the south-west of the province. First, we have seen that the
6 north of the province displays significantly differentiated parameters for several variables: the
7 network economies variable (Figure 7b), the CQLI (Figure 9b) and the CCL (Figure 10b). In view
8 of the theoretical foundations of the model, we conclude that this part of the province shows a
9 clearly differentiated behaviour, and probably not an equal production function. Consequently
10 this part of the province, by far the most rural, does not belong to the same functional or
11 economic area as the rest of the territory. Besides, specifically in the case of the sign of the CCL,
12 although high indices of services per inhabitant can be observed (Figure 6), due to the low
13 population density, they coincide with low population growth rates. The most plausible
14 explanation, besides the differences in functions noted above, is that the great distance from the
15 central business of the province and the low level of agglomeration economies exert a negative
16 impact on urban growth which more than compensates the positive impact of better conditions in
17 community services.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Secondly, we see a permanently differentiated behaviour of the area surrounding the city of
42 Barcelona with respect to the parameters concerning the distance from Barcelona (Figure 8b),
43 and the parameters concerning CQLI (Figure 9b) and CCL (Figure 10b). These parameters are
44 not significantly different from zero for any of these variables from a local point of view. In our
45 view, this means that the population growth of that area is not the response to the differences in
46 the initial levels of the quality of life variables mentioned above. This means that these
47 differences are perfectly compensated in terms of, for instance, housing prices or wages. Here,
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 housing and/or labour markets are playing an efficient role, probably due to the existence of a
4
5 large housing and/or labour market.
6
7

8
9
10 Thirdly, we find a differentiated behaviour of some of the parameters in the south west of the
11
12 province, together with a negative sign of the parameter of the CCL index. The differentiated
13
14 behaviour of the area is not related to the isolation or ruralization of this territory. Here, we
15
16 interpret the non-stationarity and negative sign in terms of an imperfect functioning of the free
17
18 migration assumption of the model. In this part of the province of Barcelona a highway was built
19
20 at the beginning of the period under analysis, connecting the south west part of the province with
21
22 the capital city. The highway crossed a mountain which had previously formed a natural barrier.
23
24 This led to a sudden increase in the proximity of the metropolitan area to the centre, which in turn
25
26 increased the attractiveness of the area (for example thanks to the lower housing prices in this
27
28 area in contrast to the city of Barcelona) despite the low levels of common services. Here, we see
29
30 low CCL levels together with high population growth rates. Consequently, an initial spatial
31
32 disequilibrium caused by the emergence of a new infrastructure is slowly developing and
33
34 changing the situation in the area, and thus, we could expect a negative sign in the parameter, as a
35
36 consequence of the new circumstances in this area, which are not instantly cleared due to
37
38 inefficiencies in the housing and/or labour markets.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **5. Conclusions**

49
50
51
52

53 This paper addresses several main points. First, we assess the influence of quality of life on
54
55 household decisions, which has been neglected in most explanations of city growth. Our results
56
57 for the case of the municipalities in the province of Barcelona suggest that the factors influencing
58
59
60

1
2
3 the growth of cities are those that are usually suggested in the literature: urban size, network
4
5 economies and distance from the centre of the metropolitan area. But as we hypothesized, quality
6
7 of life also seems to play an important role.
8
9

10
11
12 Second, we should highlight the importance of the multidimensionality of the concept, which
13
14 shows that the use of disaggregated indices of quality of life leads to better adjustments than the
15
16 use of a composite indicator. Specifically, we consider three dimensions of quality of life:
17
18 Individual Opportunities for Progress, Social Equilibrium and Community Conditions of Life.
19
20 Interestingly, we also found that when the composite index of quality of life is disaggregated into
21
22 its three main components, a better model is achieved. However, whereas the expected positive
23
24 effect in city growth is obtained for two of the quality of life components of the composite
25
26 indicator (Index of Opportunities for Progress and Index of Social Equilibrium), the third
27
28 parameter accompanying the variable Community Conditions of Life presents an unexpected
29
30 negative sign. In other words, those areas with a high/low endowment of relative educational,
31
32 health and infrastructure services seem to have experienced low/high population growth rates.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Thirdly, taking into account the high heterogeneity of the characteristics of the municipalities in
42
43 the province of Barcelona, within a relatively close distance, we expect non-spatial stationarity in
44
45 the response in the impact of quality of life on urban growth. In order to confirm the existence of
46
47 such a problem, we used the technique of geographically weighted regressions. Interestingly, the
48
49 only non-stationary parameter linked with quality of life is the one related to the community
50
51 conditions of life, the variable with the unexpected negative sign. Various reasons have been
52
53 proposed in the paper for this non-stationarity, one of them being the emergence of a new
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 infrastructure which is slowly developing and changing the situation in the area, thus generating
4
5 this non-stationarity.
6
7
8
9

10 In our view, the particular case of the province of Barcelona is interesting for several reasons. We
11 see a wide area, in which different behaviours (production functions) exist, so that we cannot
12 treat a previously administratively defined territory in a homogeneous manner. We also see how a
13 change in the connectivity of the territory, such as the emergence of a new highway linking the
14 central business area with municipalities that were previously separated by a natural barrier, can
15 have dramatic influences on the territory. In our view, policy makers must respond quickly to
16 these situations, as the newly connected zones may experience an intense growth in population
17 which should be accompanied by a parallel growth in the provision of public services, in order to
18 maintain the social equilibrium of the area.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Acknowledgement:**

35
36 We thank J. Lauridsen for his useful comments on a previous version of this paper presented at the II Workshop on
37 Spatial Econometrics held in Zaragoza in October 2006.

38
39 Vicente Royuela acknowledges the support of CICYT SEJ2006-07665 project and the Mobility grant of the
40 Education and Science Ministry Ref PR2005-0253. Rosina Moreno acknowledges financial support from Ministerio
41 de Ciencia y Tecnología, Programa Nacional de I+D+I, SEJ2005-07814/ECON. Esther Vayá acknowledges financial
42 support from Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, Programa Nacional de I+D+I, SEJ2005-04348/ECON.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- ANDREWS F. M. and WITHEY S. B. (1976) *Social indicators of well-being: America's perception of life quality*. Plenum Press, New York.
- BERGER M.C., BLOMQUIST G.C. and WLADNER W. (1987) A revealed-preference ranking of quality of life for metropolitan areas, *Social Science Quarterly* **68**, 761-778.
- BIAGI B, LAMBIRI D., and ROYUELA V. (2006) Urban Economics and Quality of Life, *Mimeo*.
- CAMAGNI R. (1993) From city hierarchy to city network: reflections about an emerging paradigm, in: T. LACHMANAN T. and NIJKAMP P. (Eds) *Structure and Change in the Space Economy*, pp. 60-90. Springer Verlag, Berlin.
- CAMPBELL A., CONVERSE P. E. and RODGERS W. L. (1976) *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations, and Satisfaction*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- CAPELLO R. and CAMAGNI R. (2000) Beyond Optimal City Size: An Evaluation of Alternative Urban Growth Patterns, *Urban Studies* **37** (9), 1479-1496.
- CASETTI E (1972) Generating models by the expansion method: applications to geographic research, *Geographical Analysis* **4**, 81-91.
- CHESIRE P. and MAGRINI S. (2006) Population growth in European cities: weather matters – but only nationally, *Regional Studies* **40-1**, 23-37.
- DIENER E. (2006) Guidelines for National Indicators of Subjective Well-Being and Ill-Being, *Journal of Happiness Studies* **7**(4), 397-404.
- DOUGLAS S. (1997) Estimating relative standards of living in the United States using cross-migration data, *Journal of Regional Science* **37**(3), 411-436.
- DREWNOWSKI J. (1974) *On Measuring and Planning the Quality of Life*, Mouton, Paris.

1
2
3 EVANS A. (1990) The assumption of equilibrium in the analysis of migration and interregional
4 differences: a review of some recent research, *Journal of Regional Science* **30(4)**, 515-531.
5

6
7
8 FINDLAY A. and ROGERSON R. (1993) Migration, places and quality of life: voting with their
9 feet, in CHAMPION A. (Ed.) *Population Matters*, pp. 33-49. Paul Chapman, London.
10

11
12 FLORIDA R. (2002) The economic geography of talent, *Annals of the Association of American*
13 *Geographers* **92 (4)**, 743-75.
14

15
16
17 FOTHERINGHAM A.S., BRUNDSON C. and CHARLTON M. (2002) *Geographically*
18 *weighted regressions*, Wiley, Chichester.
19

20
21
22 GLAESER E.L., SHCEINKMAN J. and SCHLEIFER A. (1995) Economic Growth in a Cross-
23 Section of Cities, *Journal of Monetary Economics* **36**, 117-143.
24

25
26
27 GLAESER E.L. (2000) The Future of Urban Research: Non-Market Interactions, *Brookings-*
28 *Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, 101-138.
29

30
31
32 GLAESER E.L., KOLKO J. and SAIZ A. (2001) Consumer City, *Journal of Economic*
33 *Geography* **1**, 27-50.
34

35
36
37 GLAESER E.L. and KAHN M.E. (2003) Sprawl and urban growth, HIER Discussion Paper N
38 2004.
39

40
41
42 HELBURN N. (1982) Geography and the quality of life, *Annals of the Association of American*
43 *Geographers* **72**, 445-456.
44

45
46 HENDERSON J.V. (1974) The sizes and types of cities, *American Economic Review* **64**, 640-56.
47

48
49 HENDERSON J. (1996) Ways to think about urban concentration: Neoclassical urban systems
50 vs. the new economic geography, *International Regional Science Review* **19**, 31-39.
51

52
53 JONES J P III and CASETTI E (1992) *Applications of the expansion method*, Routledge,
54 London.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 LAMBIRI D., BIAGI B. and ROYUELA V. (2007) Quality of life in the Economic and Urban
4
5 Economic Literature, *Social Indicators research*, **84(1)**, 1-25.

6
7
8 LIU B C (1973) *Quality of Life in the U.S., 1970*, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City.

9
10
11 LIU B C (1978) Variations in social quality of life indicators in medium metropolitan areas,
12
13 *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* **37(3)**, 241–260.

14
15 MUÑIZ I., GALINDO A. and GARCÍA M.A. (2003) Cubic Spline Population Density Functions
16
17 and Satellite City Delimitation: The case of Barcelona, *Urban Studies* **40(7)**, 1303-1321.

18
19
20 RICHARDSON H.W. (1972) Optimality in city size, systems of cities and urban policy: a
21
22 sceptic's view, 9(1), 29-48.

23
24
25 ROGERSON R.J. (1999) Quality of life and city competitiveness, *Urban Studies* **36(5-6)**, 969-
26
27 985.

28
29
30 ROYUELA V and ARTÍS M (2006) Convergence Analysis in Terms of Quality of Life in the
31
32 Urban Systems of the Barcelona province in the period 1991-2000, *Regional Studies* **40(5)**, 485-
33
34 492.

35
36
37 ROYUELA V., SURIÑACH J. and REYES M. (2003) Measuring quality of life in small areas
38
39 over different periods of time. Analysis of the province of Barcelona, *Social Indicators Research*
40
41 **64(1)**, 51-74.

42
43
44 ROYUELA V. and SURIÑACH J. (2005) Constituents of quality of life and urban size, *Social*
45
46 *Indicators Research* **74(3)**, 549-572.

47
48
49 SHAPIRO J.M. (2006) Smart Cities: Quality of Life, Productivity and the Growth Effects of
50
51 Human Capital, *Review of Economic and Statistics* **88(2)**, 324-335.

52
53
54 STOVER M.E. and LEVEN C.L. (1992) Methodological issues in the determination of the
55
56 quality of life in urban areas, *Urban Studies* **29(5)**, 737-754.

1
2
3 STRAZHEIM M. (1975) Hedonic Estimation of the Housing Market Prices: a further comment,
4
5 *Review of Economics and Statistics* **56**, 404-406.
6

7
8 TIEBOUT C.M. (1956) A pure theory of local expenditures, *Journal of Political Economy* **64**,
9
10 416-424.
11

12 TÜRKSEVER N.E. and ATALIK G. (2001) Possibilities and limitations for the measurement of
13
14 the quality of life in urban areas, *Social Indicators Research* **53**, 163-187.
15

16
17 WATKINS C. (2001) The definition and identification of housing submarkets, *Environment and*
18
19 *Planning A* **33**, 2235-2253.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Quality of Life Components and their variables

COMPOSITE QUALITY OF LIFE INDEX (CQLI)

$$\text{CQLI} = 1/3 \text{ IOP} + 1/3 \text{ ISE} + 1/3 \text{ CCL}$$

IOP = Individual Opportunities for Progress

$$\text{IOP} = 0.30 \text{ WI} + 0.25 \text{ LI} + 0.175 \text{ ELI} + 0.175 \text{ MotI} + 0.10 \text{ DI}$$

WI= Wealth Index

LI= Labour Index

ELI= Educational Level Index

MotI = Motorization Index

DI = Demographic Index

ISE = Index of Social Equilibrium

$$\text{ISE} = 0.2 \text{ HAI} + 0.2 \text{ SII} + 0.2 \text{ OCI} + 0.2 \text{ CongI} + 0.2 \text{ SOASI}$$

HAI= HOUSING ACCESS INDEX

SII= SEX INEQUALITY INDEX

OCI= Obligatory Commuting Index

CongI= Congestion Index

SOASI= Social and Old Age Services Index

CCL = Community Conditions of Life

$$\text{CCL} = 0.15 \text{ HC} + 0.065 \text{ PTI} + 0.21 \text{ EFI} + 0.21 \text{ HFI} + 0.15 \text{ CEI} + 0.15 \text{ CFMMI} + 0.065 \text{ MFSI}$$

HC= Housing Characteristics

PTI= Public Transport Index

EFI= Educational Facilities Index

HFI= Health Facilities Index

CEI= Climate and Environment Index

CFMMI= Cultural Facilities and Municipal Media Index

MFSI= Municipal Financial State Index

Source: ROYUELA *et al.*, 2003.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics (1).

| | <i>Min</i> | <i>Max</i> | <i>Average</i> | <i>Median</i> | <i>Std Dev</i> | <i>Kurtosis</i> | <i>Skewness</i> |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| POP | 28 | 1643542 | 14828 | 1769 | 96284.46 | 263.91 | 15.70 |
| Growth rate (1991-2000) | -54.1% | 228.9% | 22,95% | 11,56% | 0.35 | 7.34 | 2.20 |
| FUNSUB | 0 | 1 | 0.153 | 0 | 0.36 | 1.77 | 1.94 |
| FUNSYS | 0 | 1 | 0.076 | 0 | 0.27 | 8.32 | 3.20 |
| TELEPH | 125 | 1095.2 | 439.8 | 414.7 | 121.04 | 5.32 | 1.71 |
| CQLI | 76.34 | 117.31 | 100.29 | 100.90 | 6.02 | 1.29 | -0.71 |
| IOP | 65.62 | 136.57 | 95.50 | 94.70 | 11.70 | 0.28 | 0.44 |
| ISE | 74.79 | 146.63 | 107.10 | 107.00 | 8.73 | 1.81 | 0.15 |
| CCL | 63.84 | 175.25 | 92.88 | 87.80 | 17.63 | 2.61 | 1.56 |
| D_BCN | 0.00 | 139.15 | 49.03 | 46.69 | 22.29 | 0.80 | 0.79 |
| D_SYS | 0.00 | 68.45 | 18.05 | 16.00 | 10.56 | 1.31 | 0.75 |
| D_SUB | 0.00 | 68.45 | 15.76 | 14.33 | 10.98 | 1.02 | 0.67 |

Note: FUNSYS: dummy variable for the 24 central cities of the province. FUNSUB: dummy variable for the 48 functional cities; TELEPH: installed telephone cells; POP: population of each municipality; CQLI Composite Quality of Life Index; IOP: Individual Opportunities for Progress; ISE: Index of Social Equilibrium; CCL: Community Conditions of Life. D_ means the distance measured in minutes from one city to Barcelona (D_BCN) or to the nearest city that can be considered the head of a System or Subsystem (D_SYS and D_SUB, respectively).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics (2). Correlations

| | Growth rate (1991-2000) | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| | POP | FUNSUB | FUNSYS | TELEPH | CQLI | IOP | ISE | CCL | D_BCN | D_SYS | D_SUB |
| Growth rate (1991-2000) | -0.092 | | | | | | | | | | |
| FUNSUB | 0.299 | -0.160 | | | | | | | | | |
| FUNSYS | 0.369 | -0.150 | 0.677 | | | | | | | | |
| TELEPH | 0.045 | 0.545 | -0.061 | -0.017 | | | | | | | |
| CQLI | -0.008 | 0.315 | -0.068 | -0.039 | 0.172 | | | | | | |
| IOP | 0.059 | 0.445 | 0.069 | 0.038 | 0.359 | 0.623 | | | | | |
| ISE | -0.137 | 0.290 | -0.039 | -0.020 | 0.070 | 0.719 | 0.171 | | | | |
| CCL | 0.064 | -0.269 | -0.196 | -0.115 | -0.193 | 0.381 | -0.221 | 0.057 | | | |
| D_BCN | -0.213 | -0.247 | -0.370 | -0.235 | -0.196 | -0.344 | -0.576 | -0.147 | 0.235 | | |
| D_SYS | -0.207 | -0.101 | -0.481 | -0.493 | -0.018 | -0.320 | -0.333 | -0.228 | 0.060 | 0.751 | |
| D_SUB | -0.193 | -0.055 | -0.611 | -0.414 | 0.011 | -0.321 | -0.336 | -0.224 | 0.059 | 0.772 | 0.923 |

See foot note from Table 2.

Table 4. Estimates of equation (3)

| | (a) | | | (b) | | | (c) | | | (d) | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----------|------------------|----------|-----------|--------------|----------|-----------|--------------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| | Estimate | t - stat. | Spatial test (*) | Estimate | t - stat. | Spatial test | Estimate | t - stat. | Spatial test | Estimate | t - stat. | Spatial test |
| Intercept | -7.563 | -5.430 | 0.01 | -7.426 | -5.504 | 0.00 | -5.988 | -4.219 | 0.14 | -6.001 | -4.374 | 0.08 |
| ln POB | -0.064 | -3.971 | 0.29 | -0.066 | -4.475 | 0.31 | -0.064 | -4.172 | 0.22 | -0.069 | -4.897 | 0.14 |
| FUNSYS | -0.491 | -1.984 | 0.22 | -0.339 | -2.335 | 0.43 | -0.426 | -1.869 | 0.14 | -0.305 | -2.269 | 0.15 |
| FUNSUB | 0.169 | 0.730 | 0.29 | | | | 0.122 | 0.574 | 0.43 | | | |
| ln TELEPH | 0.590 | 8.848 | 0.01 | 0.594 | 8.957 | 0.00 | 0.479 | 7.458 | 0.04 | 0.484 | 7.572 | 0.04 |
| ln DBCN | -0.148 | -2.922 | 0.01 | -0.142 | -2.841 | 0.00 | -0.114 | -2.136 | 0.25 | -0.108 | -2.060 | 0.17 |
| ln DSIS | -0.164 | -1.790 | 0.19 | -0.104 | -2.037 | 0.12 | -0.144 | -1.702 | 0.09 | -0.088 | -1.859 | 0.04 |
| ln DSUB | 0.072 | 0.794 | 0.42 | | | | 0.067 | 0.801 | 0.37 | | | |
| ln CQLI | 1.204 | 4.069 | 0.15 | 1.172 | 4.126 | 0.06 | | | | | | |
| ln IOP | | | | | | | 0.565 | 3.548 | 0.20 | 0.562 | 3.557 | 0.13 |
| ln ISE | | | | | | | 1.143 | 5.733 | 0.24 | 1.144 | 5.815 | 0.14 |
| ln CCL | | | | | | | -0.753 | -4.099 | 0.00 | -0.746 | -4.150 | 0.00 |
| | Global | GWR | | Global | GWR | | Global | GWR | | Global | GWR | |
| AIC | 104.62 | 65.61 | | 101.03 | 45.15 | | 54.85 | 5.09 | | 51.59 | -16.64 | |
| R2 | 0.385 | 0.568 | | 0.383 | 0.580 | | 0.482 | 0.668 | | 0.480 | 0.679 | |
| adj-R2 | 0.367 | 0.506 | | 0.369 | 0.528 | | 0.463 | 0.609 | | 0.465 | 0.627 | |
| | ANOVA | DF | F test | ANOVA | DF | F test | ANOVA | DF | F test | ANOVA | DF | F test |
| OLS Residuals | 24.1 | 9 | 3.839 | 24.1 | 7 | 4.678 | 20.3 | 11 | 4.087 | 20.3 | 9 | 4.855 |
| GWR Improvement | 7.2 | 30.52 | | 7.7 | 28.1 | | 7.3 | 36.8 | | 7.8 | 34.65 | |
| GWR Residuals | 16.9 | 275.48 | | 16.4 | 279.9 | | 13 | 267.21 | | 12.6 | 271.35 | |

(*) p-values associated with the spatial stationarity test

Figure 1. Map of Population Growth Rate. 1991-2000.




Figure 2. Map of Population. (ln POP) 1991.




Figure 3. Map of the Composite Quality of Life Index (ln CQLI). 1991.





Figure 4. Map of Individual Opportunities for Progress (ln IOP). 1991.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 5. Map of the Index of Social Equilibrium (In ISE). 1991.




Figure 6. Map of the Community Conditions of Life (In CCL). 1991.




Figure 7a. Map of the network economies (LTELEPH) parameter. Model (b).




Figure 7b. Map of the network economies (LTELEPH) t-statistic. Model (b).




Figure 8a. Map of the distance to Barcelona (ln DBCN) parameter. Model (b).

Figure 8b. Map of the distance to Barcelona (ln DBCN) t-statistic. Model (b).







Figure 9a. Map of quality of life (ln CQLI) parameter. Model (b).


Figure 9b. Map of quality of life (ln CQLI) t-statistic. Model (b).



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 10a. Map of Community Conditions of Life (ln CCL) parameter. Model (d).

Figure 10b. Map of Community Conditions of Life (ln CCL) t-statistic. Model (d).



Notes

¹ Besides the factors used to find differences between areas, we can also expect to find spatial differences within a city. Some of them can arise due to the classical processes driving to segregation (see VARGAS and ROYUELA, 2007, for a review), while others can be due to the existence of housing submarkets. Regarding the latter, in the early urban economic literature of the 1950s and 60s, and in the long-run equilibrium models the city is treated as one entity and housing as a homogeneous commodity demanded in it. Different preferences for location and housing size and in households' ability to pay indicate segmentation in the urban housing market. From a supply point of view STRAZHEIM, 1975, highlights the heterogeneous and fixed nature of housing as a commodity, and proposes the treatment of urban space in discrete areas. Thus, the housing market is both spatially and sectorally complex, and an imperfect market with high probability of short-run disequilibria. But also in the long run, the lengthy adjustment lags on both the supply and the demand side mean that the housing market hardly ever adjusts fully and is continuously on a dynamic path towards equilibrium WATKINS, 2001.

² Municipalities are the smallest official territorial division in Spain, and correspond to NUTS V in the European administrative classification. In 2006, the 44,708,964 Spanish inhabitants lived in 8,110 municipalities. In section 4 we discuss the election of the municipalities as the basic unit of analysis.

³ For a review of the connections between quality of life and urban economics see LAMBIRI *et al.*, 2007.

⁴ As EVANS, 1990, shows, migrations can occur even if no quality of life differentials are present between locations due to, among other reasons, the existence of consistent patterns over the life cycle. Consequently, although not included in the model, we understand that individual/household circumstances are important in defining QoL or aspirational amenities, and that they may vary over the life course.

⁵ In MUÑIZ *et al.*, 2003, the Barcelona area was defined as a Mediterranean polycentric city, where the polycentricity is derived from the large urban centre expanded into its commuting area, incorporating medium-sized cities that had previously been self-sufficient.

⁶ In fact, CAPELLO and CAMAGNI, 2000, discuss how the lack of information on the flows of interaction between their sample cities (duration of phone calls or number of phone calls) obliged them to include a variable that represented the number of telephone subscribers. We therefore understand that, although this variable may no longer be appropriate, for the considered period it can be seen as a good indicator of the network paradigm. In addition, we use the information for 1996 as a proxy for the 1991 data due to the lack of available data for this year.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁷ We used more than 500 basic variables, referring to all 314 municipalities and to different time periods between 1991 and 2000. These figures indicate the size of the database.

⁸ In the aforementioned study, a weighted (*a priori*) arithmetic average index of partial indicators is developed, which expresses the relative standardised position of each local territory, having combined the variability of all variables with a Paasche-type temporal aggregation.

⁹ As in DREWNOWSKI, 1974.

¹⁰ They also provide software for computing spatial analysis. GWR release 3 is the last version available at the time of writing this article.