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Internal migration in England and Wales (since 1971): Are people becoming more stuck in place?
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What are current trends, and who, when and how far do people move? Are long-term trends overriding cyclical factors?

• Long-term trends override short-term factors although cycles still exist
• Most people move short distances
• Migration is structured mainly by age, housing tenure, education (plus region)
• Some people move very frequently, this is not necessarily positive
• Well-established empirically that internal migration has slowed in the UK
  • In England & Wales since 1971 – 55% of people changed address at least once 1971-81; 45% 2001-11 – mainly moves of < 10km; longer distance decline offset by moves to/from HE since 1990s
  • In Northern Ireland since 1981 – between SOAs (Shuttleworth et al 2020),
  • In Scotland since 2001, (McCollum et al 2020)
• This is part of a broader global pattern with falls seen in
  • USA – across all distances but most at longer distances, Cooke (various)
  • Australia – across all distances but most at longer distances (Bell et al 2018)
  • Canada – across all distances but most at longer distances
  • Iceland – inter-regionally (Bjarnason et al 2020)
  • In Europe picture more mixed eg Sweden (Champion, Cooke and Shuttleworth 2018)
What are current trends, and who, when and how far do people move? Are long-term trends overriding cyclical factors?

- Factors that are cited as general include
  - Ageing
  - Delayed life transitions (especially young people leaving home)

- The differences in the degree and the type of fall between countries indicates nationally-specific reasons are also important

- In England & Wales, the short-distance decrease suggests housing market important eg older people moving less, delaying departure from family-size housing because of better health, lack of downsizing opps, tax disincentives and owners sitting on an appreciating asset? In USA and Australia, across all distance bands, other factors including economic and structural/geographical may be significant

- In England & Wales, about half of the 1971/81-2001/11 decrease explained by ageing and changing aggregate housing tenure – but this leaves a lot still unexplained here and elsewhere

- Other candidates here might be
  - Secular rootedness – Cooke 2011 – preferences/culture
  - Substitution of housing moves by other mobilities (eg commuting)
  - Delayed life transitions (especially young people leaving home)
  - IT
What implications does this evidence raise for policy?

• In England & Wales
  • Slowing of migration may suggest labour market inflexibility at different spatial scales
  • Investment to people (eg jobs), not vice versa, given short commutes for some demographic groups
  • But social effects are double-edged (blue=positive, red=negative)
    • More stable communities
    • Greater community social capital
    • Less social mobility via housing market
    • Market failure to allocate housing?
    • Frustrated stayers – but some people move very frequently, this is not necessarily positive
    • Entrenchment of spatial privilege and deprivation
    • More commuting for some?
  • Evidence that spatial immobility is associated with new populism and spatial mobility/immobility represents an open/closed attitude......(Bjarnason et al 2019)
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For all moves, a decrease from 55% to 45%, but nearly all this is due to a reduction in moves of <10km.

Proportion (%) of all people with a different address at the end of the decade compared to the start, by distance of move:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>30.0</th>
<th>40.0</th>
<th>50.0</th>
<th>60.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated from ONS Longitudinal Study. Crown copyright.
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ABSTRACT
While the profound effects of spatial mobility on social structures and patterns of interactions have long been recognized, the association of mobility experiences and tolerance towards immigrants has received limited attention. In this paper, we examine such patterns in Iceland, a country with a long history of emigration and return migration of the local population but a recent surge in international immigration. We find in-migrants and locals who have lived in the capital city area or abroad for at least a year to be more tolerant of immigrants than locals who have never lived elsewhere. These patterns of tolerance among more mobile respondents persist after controlling for other predictors such as age, gender, education and language skills, employment status, income, community integration, residential satisfaction and generalized trust. These results are discussed in the context of changing patterns of mobility and immobility in western countries.