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Mobility as a policy issue

- Key component of demographic change
  - effects population size, distribution and composition
- Policy impacts on mobility
  - Spatial flows
  - Relationship to other characteristics
  - Mobility transition – convergence?
- Mobility impacts on policy
  - Hyper-mobility
  - Service delivery and service populations
NATSISS Mobility questions 2002 & 2008

2002:
• “In the last 12 months, have you lived in any other dwellings?”
• “How many dwellings have you lived in?”

2008:
• “How long have you lived in this house?”
• “How long did you live in the house immediately before this one?”
One year census and survey-based adult age-specific Indigenous mobility rates: 1996 to 2008

- One year adult mobility rate in 2002 = 31.0
- One year adult mobility rate in 2008 = 21.0
One year Indigenous adult mobility rates by State and Territory: 2002 and 2008 NATSISS
# Main reasons for last move

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main reason for last move</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>Main reason for last move</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What about spatial flows?

- Location of current and previous dwelling opens up the possibility of examining direction of flows,

However,

- Current dwelling is coded by remoteness

- Whereas previous dwelling is in relation to current dwelling and coded by Same Locality/Capital City/Remainder of State and by Section of State
2008 NATSISS Populations for mobility analysis

- Total survey: 13,307
- Children: 5,484
- Adults: 7,823

From duration of residence data:
- Children ever moved: 3,360 (61.3%)
- Adults ever moved: 7,551 (96.5%)
- Child movers over last 5 years: 2,995 (54.6%)
- Adult movers over last 5 years: 4,750 (60.7%)
- Adult movers over last year: 1,664 (21.3%)
Measuring Population Mobility & Migration…

• No international norms for mobility questions
• No common metrics (eg like life expectancy)

• Australian Census asks
  > Place of residence 1 year ago
  > Place of residence 5 years ago

• NATSISS asks
  > How long have you lived in this house?
  > How long did you live in the house immediately before this one?
Types of Data Collected: 141 Global Censuses

Place of Birth (within country) - 115
Place of previous residence - 126
Duration of residence - 82
Number of moves - 1

Source: Bell 2005
Countries Collecting Census Data on Duration of Residence

Source: Bell 2005
Median duration of (current) residence

- Total population: 3.56 years
- Males 15 and over: 4.28 years
- Females 15 and over 4.27 years
- Remote 15+: 4.00 years
- Non-remote 15+: 4.48 years
- US Total population: 5.2 years
Median duration of residence by age and remoteness

![Graph showing median duration of residence by age and remoteness.]
Duration of residence by age

![Chart showing duration of residence by age group.](chart.png)
Duration of Stay in Previous Dwelling

After 2 years, only:
- 52% of 15-19 yr olds
- 61% of 30-49 yr olds
  still lived in same dwg

After 5 years, only:
- 22% of 15-19 yr olds
- 27% of 30-49 yr olds
  still lived in same dwg
Migration expectancy – Indigenous males

The diagram illustrates the migration expectancy for Indigenous males across various age brackets. The x-axis represents different age groups ranging from 1-4 to 75+. The y-axis shows the per cent of lifespan and moves. The graph displays a decreasing trend in migration expectancy as age increases.
Distribution of adult movers by duration of stay in current and previous dwelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in previous dwelling</th>
<th>Time in current dwelling</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Share of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>&gt; 4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>&gt; 4 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 years</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>&gt; 4 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never moved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Typology of short term/long term stays**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chronic adult movers and long term residents: key characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for move</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Short term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labour force status</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Short term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NILF</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing tenure</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Short term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rental</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rental</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community rental</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Net effects of socio-economic characteristics on adult Indigenous mobility: logistic regression 2008

Reference person: Male, married, employed in non-CDEP, no post-school qualifications, Year 10, attended vocational training, lives in public rental dwelling, does not live in homeland, does not have neighbourhood problems, does not live in a remote area, reports very good health
Key findings

- Mobility appears to have fallen sharply since 2002 but this is misleading because the 2 surveys measure movement differently.
- The 2002 questions appear to pick up excess short term movement except in the NT where reported movement is consistently low regardless of the question. This is surprising.
- Open-ended questions produce more family-related reasons for movement whereas single-move questions emphasise housing.
- The NATSISS is constrained as a policy tool by an inability to explore characteristics of spatial flow.
- Duration of residence data are unusual in migration collections, but have benefits in segmenting the population: supercede mover-stayer framework, but need to collect previous duration for all movers.
- Mobility has fairly weak relationship with other variables except unemployment and housing tenure.
- Remoteness loosely linked to duration of residence.
Key implications

• Need to be explicit in stating policy/analytic reasons for changes to questions
• Should produce a geography to enable a link between current and previous location
• 2008 enables wider comparability, but has limited policy application; 2002 better because it focuses on multi-locale residence and chronic movers, but needs refinement.
• To understand causes migration data need to be accompanied with data on contingent events – eg family and employment changes
• Also need data on household context - who moved with you? – requires a household rather than individual survey