Population turnover for deprived neighbourhoods: structural or pathological?
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Context

• Spatial segregation is a source of injustice ...

• ... and this is recognised by current Govt
  – “My vision is of a nation where no-one is seriously disadvantaged by where they live ...” (PM’s Foreword to SEU, 2001)
  – "By 2021 no one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live." (PMSU, 2005)
  – “We are committed to building a better Scotland, where a child’s potential, and not their ... postcode, will decide their future.” (Scottish Executive, 2002)
Context

- Migration – a dynamic view of area deprivation
  - Net flows – (preventing) area change
  - Gross flows and area instability
  - Geography of flows and connection/isolation
Gross turnover for SOAs in England by deprivation

Note: CAS data; excluding people living in communal establishments.
Gross flows and area deprivation

• High turnover seen as a characteristic of deprived areas which contributes to their problems
  – Empty properties, higher management costs, opportunity for vandalism
  – Erosion of social networks, loss of support
  – Loss of social control, problems of disorder
  – Associated with range of problems, e.g. mental health problems (Faris and Dunham, 1939; Silver et al, 2002)
Gross flows and area deprivation

• Why do deprived areas have higher levels of turnover than non-deprived?
  – Neighbourhead-level explanations
    • Area “pathologies”
  – Structural explanations
    • Compositional factors (Rossi, 1980)
    • Wider context – city-regional, regional (Dielman et al, 2000)

• Aim to separate out these various factors to inform policy responses
Individual migration

- Determinants of individual migration
  - Age (life stage)
  - Ethnicity
  - Household type and size
  - Employment status
  - Education
  - Housing tenure
  - Health
  - Caring responsibilities
  - Student

- SARs data, logistic regression model (Bailey and Livingston, 2005)
  - No communal establishment
Determinants of individual migration

Notes: CAMS dataset, people in private households aged 19-74 in GB.
Measuring gross turnover

![Graph showing scatter plot of % Gross turnover vs. % Net turnover with a trend line and a vertical line at 0.00.](image_url)
Area turnover

- Determinants of area churn
  - Age composition (life stage)
  - Area ethnicity
  - Household type and size
  - Area employment status
  - Area education (age standardised no quals)
  - Housing tenure
  - Area health (age standardised LLTI)
  - Area caring responsibilities
  - Area students

- CAS data for SOAs/DZs, linear regression
  - No communal establishment
Determinants of Area Churn including deprivation

Adjusted R squared = 0.86
Standard Error = 3.27
Deprivation Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation</th>
<th>Regression coefficient (standardised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% (most deprived)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99%</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-97%</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-95%</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-90%</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-85%</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14%</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9%</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3%</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% (Most Affluent)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not significant
Model including house building and density

Adjusted R squared = 0.86
Standard Error = 3.25

Regression Coefficients (Standardised)
Summary

• Compositional factors most important in relation to churn (86% of variation)

• High deprivation associated with slightly higher levels of churn
  – but so is low deprivation

• House building rates in locality associated with higher churn
  – even after removing neighbourhood-level population growth

• Explore residuals for further clues to drivers of churn
Conclusions

• Compositional factors explain most variance in churn

• Some additional neighbourhood-level effect from deprivation but fairly weak

• Errors partly systematic suggesting further contextual, compositional and wider-area factors at work

• Area model adds to analysis of individual data
Conclusions

• Policy implications
  – Challenges views which ‘pathologise’ deprived areas by highlighting structural basis of high churn in deprived areas
  – Provides basis for distinguishing between churn which is structural and that which does reflect local problems
  – Supports arguments for more ‘mixed communities’ but mix needs to be seen in terms of demographics (age, household types) not incomes