
An Analysis of Individual Variables Affecting the Perception of Livability in Peri-urban Villages (Case Study: Varamin City)

Mohammad Amin Khorasani *

Assistant Professor of Geography and Rural Planning, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

Mohammad Reza Rezvani

Professor of Geography and Rural Planning, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

Mohammad Molaei Ghelichi

PhD Candidate in Geography and Urban Planning, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

Received: 15 march 2015

Accepted: 20 December 2015

1. Introduction

The peri-urban villages are scenes of the formation, growth, and the continuity of opportunities and threats affecting the environmental quality and the way of supplying the needs of residents. Thus, assessing the livability of these villages as a new concept is of great importance in the literature of settlement planning. The study areas in this study include the peri-urban villages in the city of Varamin and in the vicinity of four cities in this region. What is considered in this study is the individual variables affecting the perception of livability in the peri-urban villages of Varamin located in Tehran Metropolis.

2. Theoretical Framework

Livability is a concept related to the number of concepts and terms such as sustainability, quality of environment, healthy communities, etc. Although definitions vary in different communities, the defined objectives of planning should be used to create native standards for livability. Livability is often used for defining the different dimensions of community and common experiences; it is usually focused on human experiences of place within the specified time and place. In addition, livability as a concept can be expanded or limited depending on the context in which it is defined. However, life quality is often at the center of attention in this concept and includes a wide range of measurable indicators with proven components including density, transportation, security, and sustainability. Livability, however, is an interconnected concept derived from the economic, environmental and social concepts, which aims at preventing its one dimensional and reductive state. Therefore, there should be a network of relationships between various domains in terms of livability standards. Vergunst (2003) introduced a framework for livability in Aspinge rural area in Sweden. In this context, the livability is a product of interaction between local

* Corresponding Author: Email : khorasani_ma@ut.ac.ir

residents, community life, service level, physical location, and local economy. Local population, demographic structure (age and gender), and lifestyle are among important factors in this regard. Service level refers to communications services, schools, stores, and homes for the elderly.

3. Methodology

Research method used in the study is analytical-descriptive. Indicators and indexes of livability in urban and rural settlements extracted and then complete with the conditions in the per-urban villages. In this study, Cochran method for sampling is used. Based on the number of resident families living in these villages, 380 people were selected. To increase the accuracy of the results, 400 questionnaires were designed, distributed, and completed. , Meanwhile, some experts were consulted with to assess the validity of the questionnaire. As for But for reliability of the 30 questionnaire provided and distributed between the residents in four rural villages in the vicinity of each of the cities and towns in the cities of Varamin, Qarchak,, Pishva and Javadabad. To measure the reliability of questionnaire, Cronbach's alpha was used. The Cronbach's alpha obtained in this study was 0.955.

4. Results & Discussion

The relationship between individual characteristics and livability indices has been studied in this study as the main dependent variable. Thus, Phi and Cramer's correlation method was used to explore the variable of education with a ordinal scale, the variables of age and the duration of residence in the village with an interval scale, and also the variables of gender and occupation with a nominal scale. There is no significant relationship between the variable of gender with any of the indicators except for entertainment and leisure time; however, there is a statistically significant relationship between the variable of occupation in the individuals in charge and the indicators of public transport and green and open spaces. Of all education levels of respondents with no livability indicators, there is no statistically significant relationship. Finally, there is a relationship between the duration of residence in the village and the indicators of employment, income, and the sense of continuity and belonging to the place and its landscape. No relationship was found between the age, education, and livability in the villages under study. In fact, people of different ages and with different levels of education have the same attitudes towards the environmental needs, which can bring about positive aspects of the issue. This is due to the fact that the difference in attitudes between people of different ages in these villages is low, whereas low-literate and illiterate people are also aware of their civil rights and their attitudes do not show any significant differences with the attitudes of people with higher education and/or university education.

5. Conclusion

It is a general assumption that per-urban villages provide more appropriate and desirable levels of livability for their residents due to the special geographical

locations; however, the results of the study indicate that the situation in per-urban villages of Varamin is quite different.

Key Words: Livability, Per-urban Villages, Individual variables, Varamin City.

References (In persian)

1. Khorasani, M. (2012). Exploring the livability of peri-urban villages with focus on quality of life approach (Case Study: Varamin City) (Unpublished doctoral Dissertation). University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.
2. Motiee Langroodi, S. H. (2003). *Rural Planning with an emphasis on Iran*. Mashhad: Jahad Daneshgahi Publications.
3. Saidi, A. (2003). Urban-rural relations and linkages: A comprehensive review, *Journal of Geography*, 1(1), 73-92.

References (In English)

1. Balsas, C. J. L. (2004). Measuring the livability of an urban center :An exploratory study of key performance indicators. *Planning Practice, and Research*, 19(1), 101-110.
2. Bell, S., & Morse, S. (2003). *Measuring sustainable development: Learning for doing*. Earthscan, London: Routledge.
3. Blasingame, L. (1998). Sustainable cities: Oxymoron, utopia, or inevitability? *Social Science Journal*, 35(1), 1-13.
4. Clinton-Gore Administration. (2000). *Building livable communities: Sustaining prosperity, improving quality of life, building a sense of community*. Retrieved from www.livablecommunities.gov.
5. Evans, P. (2002). *Livable cities: Urban struggles for livelihood and sustainability*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
6. Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.
7. Heylen, K. (2006,). *Livability in social housing: Three case studies in Flanders*. Paper presented at the European Network for Housing Research Conference, Ljubljana, Slovenia. Retrieved from <https://lirias.kuleuven.be/handle/123456789/288700>.
8. Inglehart, R. (1990). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
9. Kotkin, J. (2001). *The new geography: How the digital revolution in reshaping the American landscape*. New York: Random House Paper Backs.
10. Mc Gregor, D., & Simon, D., & Thompson, D. (2005). *The Peri-urban interface: Approaches to sustainable natural and human resource use*. London: Earthscan.
11. National Research Council. (2002). *Community and quality of life: Data needs for informed decision making*. Washington: National Academy Press.

12. Norris, T., & Pittman, M. (2000). The health community's movement and the coalition for healthier cities and communities. *Public Health Reports*, 115(2-3), 118-124.
13. Owens, C. (2009). *Challenges in evaluating livability in Vancouver Canada, case study prepared for planning sustainable cities: Global report on human settlements*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhabitat.org/grhs/2009>.
14. Perogordo Madrid, D. (2007). The Silesia Megapolis. *European Spatial Planning*, 17(1), 23-33.
15. Pryor, R. (1968). *Defining the rural- urban fringe*. *Social Forces*, 47(2), 202-215.
16. Timmer, V., & Seymoar, N. (2005). *The world urban forum, Vancouver Working Group Discussion Paper*. Vancouver: International Centre for Sustainable Cities.
17. Vergunst, P. (2003). *Livability and ecological land use the challenge of localization* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Swedish University of Agriculture Sciences, Sweden.
18. Wheeler, S. M. (2001). *Livable communities: Creating safe and livable neighborhoods, towns and regions in California (Working Paper 2001–2004)*. Berkeley: Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California.
19. Wolfenson, J. (1997). *Livable cities for the 21st century: The post habitat agenda for the World Bank*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/extme/habitat.htm>.
20. Zhangmao, L. (2009). The study on the evaluation index system for rural living standards. *Science Development*, 7(3), 56-63.

How to cite this article:

Khorasani, M. A., Rezvani, M. R., & Molaei Ghelichi, M. (2016). An analysis of individual variables affecting the perception of livability in peri-urban villages (Case study: Varamin City). *Journal of Geography and Regional Development*, 13(25), 159-181.
URL <http://jgrd.um.ac.ir/index.php/geography/article/view/33411>