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Migration in the 2001 Census: What can the SAR add to our understanding?

- What is covered in the standard Census output?
- SAR/CAMS provides fuller breakdowns for migrant characteristics than in standard output
- SAR/CAMS includes a ‘distance of move’ variable
- SAR/CAMS allows tabulation of migrants by the full range of Census characteristics
- Local Authority ID in CAMS for usual residence at census and one year before allows the same types of analysis as SMS1, but for a much wider range of migrant characteristics ETC.
What is covered on migration in the standard Census output?

• Key Statistics: all people, all non-white ethnicity.
• Standard Tables: Sex/ age/ in household or CE; Household composition; Dependent children.
• Theme Tables (People): sex, age, family status, LLTI, economic activity.
• (Households): tenure, household composition, economic activity of HRP, NS-SeC of HRP.
• O-DS SMS1: sex/age, family status, ethnicity, LLTI, economic activity; Moving Group’s tenure, economic activity and NS-Sec of RP
Extra detail on age

- Not only narrower age bands (as in LSAR version 2), but single years of age in CAMS
- Allows analysis of migration by SYA or non-standard age groupings
- Two examples:
  - migrants as % of residents by SYA
  - % age distribution of migrants within UK cf recent immigrants from outside UK
Migrants as % of residents, by single year of age, UK

Source: 2001 Census CAMS
Age distribution of within-UK migrants (193k) and migrants living outside UK 1 year ago (12k)

Source: 2001 Census CAMS
SAR-specific variable: distance of move

- Valuable addition to Area Tables’ “type of move” (within area, to/from associated area, etc., where areas like LADs vary in size)
- Distance groups in LSAR, but to nearest kilometre in CAMS
- Two examples using <3km and 50+km groups for SYA:
  - % age distribution for the two groups
  - rate (i.e. per 100 residents of each SYA)
Age distribution of within-UK migrants moving <3 km (43%) and 50+ km (19%)

Source: 2001 Census CAMS
Within-UK migrants moving <3 and 50+ km per 100 residents of each age

Source: 2001 Census CAMS
More detail about NUAs (migrants reporting No Usual Address 1 year ago)

- NUAs were not identified separately for Census day, but they were in terms of address one year ago (for migrants) – almost $\frac{1}{2}$ m = 1 in every 15 migrants, 0.8% total UK population
- Of great potential interest in terms of housing policy, effect on Census count, ‘usual residence’ concept re future surveys/census
- SAR/CAMS allows more detailed profiling than Area Tables
Migrants with no usual address one year ago as % all residents, by age and sex

Source: 2001 Census commissioned table
## More detail about the UK’s NUAs: some examples from the LSAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic (one year on)</th>
<th>NUAs</th>
<th>All people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged under 45</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white (England &amp; Wales)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single unmarried</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living in family</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in communal estab</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below occupancy standard</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In purpose-built flats</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In household with no car</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in hotels etc</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Great potential for crosstabulating the characteristics of migrants

- By the full range of Census characteristics plus derived variables available only in SAR (e.g. distance of move, ISCO)
- With variables more fully disaggregated than in Area Tables and SMS (esp in CAMS), allowing flexibility of customised groupings
- With much greater potential for multi-way crosstabulations (e.g. occupation by age)
- Allowing micro-level modelling in a multivariate framework (see Bailey)
Fuller probing of migration differentials in LSAR: extremes of % migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Most mobile</th>
<th>Least mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male 11.7%</td>
<td>Female 11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad age</td>
<td>16-29 25.7%</td>
<td>65-74 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single nev m 16.4%</td>
<td>Widowed 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic pos</td>
<td>Inactive student 27.0%</td>
<td>Retired 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Hotels etc 18.8%</td>
<td>Agric etc 9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCO</td>
<td>Armed Forces 32%</td>
<td>Skilled ag&amp;fish 7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC2000 ....</td>
<td>Health profs 19.1%</td>
<td>Skilled agric 7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....submajor</td>
<td>Culture etc 19.1%</td>
<td>Transport ops 9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social grade</td>
<td>C1 12.6%</td>
<td>E 9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Level 3 24.4%</td>
<td>None 7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using locational indicators to compare profiles of place-specific migrant flows

- LA district of usual residence at census and one year before (CAMS), permitting grouping into customised O and D ‘target areas’, e.g.
  - metropolitan versus non-metropolitan
  - ‘counterurbanisation cascade’ types
  - CURDS city regions and localities

NB: all with less hassle than SMS and without the SCAM distortions, even if only 3% sample

- By SOA-level IMD score of usual residence at census and one year before (CAMS)
Migration between metropolitan and non-metropolitan districts, by NS-SeC

Source: 2001 Censuses CAMS
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Migration between metropolitan and non-metropolitan districts, by NS-SeC

Source: 2001 Census CAMS
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Net migration for metro and non-metro districts, by NS-SeC, as % residents 2001

Source: 2001 Census CAMS
### Location of migrants one year ago (origin) and at census (destination) by IMD Score of 2001 Census Super Output Area

Source: 2001 Census CAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMDSC of Destn</th>
<th>IMDSC of Origin SOA</th>
<th>&lt;6.0</th>
<th>6.0-9.0</th>
<th>9.0-16.0</th>
<th>16.0-21.0</th>
<th>21.0-35.0</th>
<th>35.0-47.0</th>
<th>47.0+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>&lt;6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6.0</td>
<td>3470</td>
<td>2516</td>
<td>4422</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>17681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-9.0</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>4913</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>3539</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>18759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0-16.0</td>
<td>4294</td>
<td>4607</td>
<td>11089</td>
<td>5280</td>
<td>8427</td>
<td>3411</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>39707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0-21.0</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>4947</td>
<td>3568</td>
<td>5007</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>21441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0-35.0</td>
<td>2887</td>
<td>3381</td>
<td>7670</td>
<td>4731</td>
<td>11167</td>
<td>4809</td>
<td>3685</td>
<td>38330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0-47.0</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>3291</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>4544</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>18754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.0+</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>2232</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>4747</td>
<td>15755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1 yr ago</td>
<td>16982</td>
<td>18071</td>
<td>38564</td>
<td>21401</td>
<td>39121</td>
<td>19163</td>
<td>17125</td>
<td>170427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at Census</td>
<td>17681</td>
<td>18759</td>
<td>39707</td>
<td>21441</td>
<td>38330</td>
<td>18754</td>
<td>15755</td>
<td>170427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net mig</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-791</td>
<td>-409</td>
<td>-1370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Net migration rate (per 1000 residents) by Census SOA classified by IMD Score

Source: 2001 Census CAMS
Migration in the 2001 Census: What can the SAR add to our understanding?

- SAR/CAMS provides fuller breakdowns for migrant characteristics than in standard output
- SAR/CAMS includes a ‘distance of move’ variable
- SAR/CAMS allows tabulation of migrants by the full range of Census characteristics
- Local Authority ID in CAMS for usual residence at census and one year before allows the same types of analysis as SMS1, but for a much wider range of migrant characteristics
- IMD Score of Super Output Area, ditto, except not available in standard Census output
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