

The Movement of Children and Young People who are CYF Clients in the Four Case Study Communities¹

Bev James

Public Policy & Research Ltd

Ruth Fraser

Centre for Research Evaluation and Social Assessment

and

Kay Saville-Smith

Centre for Research Evaluation and Social Assessment

¹ The authors thank local service providers and individuals in the four communities who provided helpful information and feedback for this paper. The assistance of Child, Youth and Family Service in allowing access to data is also gratefully acknowledged.

1. Introduction

This paper reports on the frequency and patterns of movement of children and young people (aged 0-17 years) who were clients of the government agency, Child, Youth and Family (CYF)² in the four case study areas of the *Building Attachment in Communities Affected by Transience and Residential Mobility Research Programme*. The analysis on which this paper is based was prompted by a perception held by community leaders and local service providers in three of the case study areas in particular that there was a significant and obvious movement of those children and young people, into their communities.

In two of the case study areas those perceptions were associated with anxieties about whether local support structures could cope with the needs of those children and young people, and the potentially negative influence of that group on their peers. There was some concern that CYF clients coming into the area were not always identified and known to the appropriate agencies, and their care could in consequence be compromised. In that respect, the movement of this group of children and young people was seen as potentially undesirable for both the individuals and the community. It also reflected widespread concern in New Zealand that high levels of residential movement may impact on children's education, their access to health services, and place undue burden on the service infrastructure of communities.

Concerns in those communities about the movement of children and young people in the care of CYF were not new at the time. In 2000 one national review reported that the average number of CYF placements for any child was 3.1 per year. In 2003 another review reported that on average, children in CYF care spent 2.5 years in care and experienced 10 different placements.³

Changes in placements inevitably result in changes of residence, a key point acknowledged in CYF's permanency policy, which was introduced in 2006. That policy aimed at placing a child in a permanent living arrangement with kin or others, so as to provide a stable and caring environment. The policy emphasised the possible disruption of multiple moves that could impair a child's mental and physical development and psychological adjustment.⁴

As the following analysis shows, the perceptions in the case study areas that children and young people in the care of CYF were highly transient were not always supported by evidence. The majority of the children and young people did not have multiple moves. Most were local residents prior to the three-year period of analysis (2001-2003), not incomers or strangers to the community. Their residence was also relatively stable; less than half moved in that period. Nevertheless, some of those perceptions were supported and were an understandable response to the dynamics of caring for children and young people in those communities. Overall, 48 percent of the children and young people were movers, and a small proportion experienced a considerable number of moves over the period of analysis; 15 percent moved three or more times over the three year period of analysis.

This paper provides a clearer picture of the patterns of movement experienced by children and young people who were CYF clients in the four case study areas. Section

² Clients include those who are in placements, and those who receive other services from CYF.

³ See Brown 2000, Ministry of Social Development et al 2003.

⁴ Child Youth and Family 2006.

2 outlines the method used to analyse the data set and data limitations. Section 3 describes the profile of children and young people in the data set.

The substantive analysis of the CYF data is found in Section 4 and presents data relating to:

- Numbers of children and young people in the care of CYF in each of the case study areas.
- Number of moves for individual clients.
- Movement of clients into, within and out of the case study areas.
- Sequences of movement of individual clients.
- Duration of stay in case study areas.
- The origins and destinations of clients.
- Reasons for movement.

Section 6 concludes with issues raised by the findings. It should be noted that because of the nature of the data set, the analysis is likely to provide a conservative estimate of movement and is focused primarily on establishing the patterns of movement. Although some comment on movement drivers and commentary on the character of the movement patterns emerging from the analysis are provided, those should be treated as preliminary rather than definitive.

2. The CYF CYRAS Data Set

Data on the movements of children and young people in the care of CYF were obtained through an extract of administrative data from the CYF CYRAS database. That database comprises children and young people who were clients of CYF because they needed protection or had committed an offence. Most of those clients were not in a CYF placement, although the proportion of case study area clients in a placement (almost 25 percent) was far higher than nationally, where only 10 percent of clients were in a placement over the period of analysis.

An initial approach to CYF indicated that they were willing to provide a data extract to assist with the research on the condition that data be anonymised to protect the privacy of children and young people in the data extract. Through CYF's formal approval process, the researchers were given approval to access relevant CYF staff and the database.

Following discussions with CYF staff regarding reliability issues, it was agreed that the data extract should be limited to the period 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2003. The specific target population was defined as current CYF clients who had resided at an address within one of the four case study areas at any time in that period. The data extract captured only children and young people who were current CYF clients at the time of the extract in June 2004.

To aid in the specification of variables for inclusion in the data extract, CYF provided a sample extract from the CYRAS database. This sample enabled the research team to test the analysis method, clarify apparent definitional anomalies, and to refine the parameters of the query used in the data extract. Discussions with CYF staff as part of that process were invaluable in providing insight into the limitations of particular variables for the type of analysis planned, and also the suggestion of variables that could act as proxies for desired information not captured in the administrative database.

The final data extract included information for around 1,043 children and young people, including date of birth, age, sex, ethnicity, reason for CYF involvement, role start date, placement status, address information for the period 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2003, and last known address before 1 January 2001 (where available). Each address included the arrival date at that address, the street name (street numbers were removed to protect anonymity), suburb and town/city.

Data was cleaned before analysis to refine the extract. In total, 780 children and young people remained in the extract following data cleaning. The data cleaning involved a number of steps.

In the first step clients aged over 17 at 1 January 2001 were excluded. The second step of data cleaning involved checking anonymised client addresses to determine whether an address was inside or outside a case study area. Inclusion in the sample required that a client have at least one address within one of the four case study areas during the sample period. A few addresses had similar names to locations within the case study areas, but were actually outside of those areas. Some addresses were also outside the boundaries of the case study area, as determined for the purpose of the research. Any clients with all addresses coded as outside the case study areas were excluded from the extract.

The data extract was provided as an excel sheet with variable information in text format. The data was re-coded and imported into SPSS to enable univariate analysis of frequencies and cross-tabulations.

Mapping movement

The data set shows the movement of all CYF clients, within and outside of the case study areas over the period 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2003. Because of data limitations, only individual client movements were focused on; there was no data on whether the client moved by him/herself, or with a family or household group. The data set shows moves within the period that were before arrival into a case study area (if applicable) as well as moves within the area, and moves out.

Movement of CYF clients during the period was quantified using a count of addresses for each person. A small number of addresses were not known. The number of movements for each person was then calculated by subtracting 1 from their total number of addresses. For instance a young person with a single address for the entire period was recorded as having zero movements, a young person with 8 addresses recorded for the period would be noted as moving 7 times over the period, and so forth.

To map patterns of movement for CYF clients in the sample all addresses were analysed and re-coded as being either inside a case study area (“i”) or outside a case study area (“o”). In addition to addresses that fell within the 2001-2003 sample period, the address immediately before the period (where applicable) was also coded as inside or outside a case study area.⁵ Not all young people had an address before the sample period, such as a new client after 1 January 2001. Those with no “address before period” were noted as ‘not applicable’ for the address before period variable.

To provide a baseline for tracking movement a new variable was created using the “address before period” data. In this new variable (“first known address”) an

⁵ The “arrival date” variable in the set of address information provided in the extract enabled addresses specific to the sample period to be identified.

individual with no address “before the period” had their first address “within the period” used as a substitute. The “first known address” variable was used to recode the individual into three categories based on location inside or outside the case study area at the start of the period. Those categories were as follows:

- no address changes (i.e. within a case study area at first known address and no subsequent moves);
- already in (within a case study area at first known address with one or more subsequent moves between 1 January 2001 and 31 December 2003); or
- came in (outside the case study areas at 1 January 2001 but subsequently moves into a case study area).

The baseline variable, along with the individual addresses coded as “i” or “o” enabled further analysis of movement for the latter two groups i.e. those with one or more addresses. This allowed the following questions to be addressed: of those who “came in” or were “already in” the area, were there subsequent moves within the case study area? Did they have subsequent moves outside the area? In this way a history of all moves for each individual over the period was built up. Some individuals only had one address in a case study area over the period, but had moved several times outside of the area.

Data limitations

There is no research that systematically and comprehensively profiles the characteristics and movement of children and young people who are CYF clients. That lack of comparable data makes it difficult to assess how representative the data from the current analysis is. However, for the reasons detailed below it is suggested that the findings be treated with caution. The findings provide a snapshot of movement for a group of children and young people within a specified time period. The data should not be seen as generalisable to represent the experience of all children and young people who are CYF clients.

The data extract captured children and young people who were current CYF clients at June 2004. It is unclear whether the profile of children and young people who were no longer CYF clients at June 2004 varies substantially from the children and young people in the sample. It is also not possible for the purposes of this analysis to quantify the numbers of children and young people who may have resided in one of the case study communities during the sample period of 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2003 that were no longer clients as at 30 June 2004. Furthermore, the data extract focused on the four case study areas and is not generalisable outside of these areas.

There are also complications around the use of administrative data for the purpose of this analysis. As a primarily administrative database, the CYF CYRAS database is a dynamic relational database not designed for the type of inquiry intended in this research. The nature of the database as an administrative tool for case managers means that information is entered by many users. The reliability of the data depends on the accuracy and timeliness of those inputting the information. There is a possibility that address changes are under-reported. For instance, where a child or young person is placed in temporary accommodation while more permanent arrangements are made, it is possible that by the time the database is updated the permanent address is known and only that address, not the intermediary address, is recorded. Furthermore, some moves may not have been counted. Because house

numbers were not known, more than one consecutive address in the same street for an individual were counted as one move only, unless there was clear evidence that there was an actual move.

Since the majority of variables in the data extract are free-text, there is a small risk that in re-categorising such variables for analytic purposes, outside the context of the wider data file, the meaning is misinterpreted. The database does not use standardised categories in address variables, such as city names or postal codes. As the query to extract data relied on text contained in address fields there is a possibility that eligible young people was excluded due to incomplete or incorrect address information.

3. CYF clients' profile in the case study areas

The profile of children and young people in the case study areas extracted from the CYF CYRAS database is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Profile of CYF Clients in the Case Study Areas at Jan 2001

Profile Characteristic	Clients	
	Number	Percent
Age:		
▪ not born until after 2001	67	8.6
▪ 0 – 4 yrs	204	26.2
▪ 5 – 9 yrs	187	24.0
▪ 10 – 14 yrs	276	35.4
▪ 15 – 17 yrs	46	5.9
<i>Total</i>	<i>780</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Sex:		
▪ Male	418	53.6
▪ Female	351	45.0
▪ Not specified	11	1.4
<i>Total</i>	<i>780</i>	<i>100.0</i>
Ethnicity:		
▪ NZ European/European	134	17.2
▪ NZ Maori	447	57.3
▪ Pacific Island	68	8.8
▪ Asian	2	0.3
▪ Other	5	0.6
▪ Not specified	124	15.9
<i>Total</i>	<i>780</i>	<i>100.1*</i>
Community ⁶ :		
▪ Community A	20	2.6
▪ Community B	147	18.8
▪ Community C	363	46.5
▪ Community D	250	32.1
<i>Total</i>	<i>780</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Source: CYF CYRAS Database

*Due to rounding

⁶ Details of the analysis were initially kept confidential to the community reference groups. Accordingly, the communities have not been identified in this paper. The outcomes of the analysis and the way they were used in one of the case study communities is discussed in James 2008.

4. Analysis of Movement Among CYF Clients

This section reports on movement data for 780 children and young people who were CYF clients during the period 1 January 2001 – 31 December 2003 in the four case study areas. The following are described:

- Numbers of children and young people in the care of CYF in the case study areas.
- Number of moves for individual clients.
- Movement of clients into, within and out of the case study areas.
- Sequences of movement of individual clients.
- Duration of stay in case study areas.
- The origins and destinations of clients.
- A comment on reasons for movement.

Number of children and young people who were CYF clients

As Table 1 has already shown, the number of children and young people who were CYF clients in each of the case study areas within the period 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2003 (as at June 2004) varied considerably. Community C had the largest number with 363, followed by Community D with 250. Community B had 147, while Community A, the smallest of the case study areas, had only 20.

The differences are even more obvious when the numbers in this CYF client group are considered as a proportion of the population of 0–17 year olds in each of the case study areas. Calculating the proportion is, of course, problematic because the census provides a snapshot of the usually resident population at one point in time, March 2001. The data set from CYRAS, however, includes all those CYF clients who were in a case study area during a three year period *and* were still clients in June 2004.

As Table 2 shows even in March 2001 when the number of CYF clients was considerably smaller, the proportions of CYF clients in the 0-17 year old population in both Community C and Community D were higher than the national experience. Consequently, it is not surprising that this group was visible to residents and that some residents highlighted issues concerning the care and support of those children and young people.

Table 2: CYF Clients as Proportion of Population 0–17 years March 2001 by Area

Case Study Area	Total Population 0–17 yrs March 2001	All Clients as at March 2001	All Clients As Proportion of 0-17 yrs (Percent)
A	591	6	1.0
B	6,186	62	1.0
C	2,493	86	3.4
D	3,057	65	2.6
National	1,008,390	19,980	2.0

Placement status

What was notable about the CYF clients in the case study areas were the relatively high proportions in placement compared to the national proportions of clients in placement. Across the four case study areas, almost 25 percent of clients were in a placement, compared to 10 percent nationally. Table 3 shows the number and proportion of placements in each case study area. Community D had the highest proportion of clients in a placement, while Community C had the highest number of clients in a placement.

Table 3: Number and Proportion of Placements in the Case Study Areas

Case Study Area	Placement		No Placement	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	4	20.0	16	80.0
B	28	19.1	119	80.9
C	93	25.7	270	74.3
D	67	26.8	183	73.2
<i>Total</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>24.6</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>75.4</i>

Table 4 shows the types of client placements in each case study area. There were a wide range of placement types⁷ across the case study areas. The most common type in Community C and Community D was CYF caregiver placement. This was also the most common type of placement nationally. Also important across the four case study areas was family/whanau placement, almost 32 percent of placements. This was a far higher proportion than nationally, where 21 percent of placements were family/whanau placements.

Table 4: Client Placements in the Case Study Areas

Placement Type	Community A		Community B		Community C		Community D		Total	
	N=4	%	n=28	%	n=93	%	n=67	%	n=192	%
CYF caregiver	0	0.0	8	28.6	41	44.0	25	37.3	74	38.5
Family/whanau	2	50.0	10	35.7	28	30.2	21	31.3	61	31.8
Other*	2	50.0	10	35.7	24	25.8	21	31.3	57	29.7

*Spread across : child and family support services – bednight, family home placement, iwi social service, CYF residence, residential transfer, YSS SFH placement.

These data suggest that some case study areas were providing placement care to children and young people, in excess of some other communities, and that family/whanau placements were important in the case study areas. Family and whanau members were providing a considerable level of support for children and young people who were CYF clients. It could be expected that, even if children and young people were moving to those areas, they were moving to kin and therefore had some connection with those areas.

⁷ Child and family support services – bednight, CYF caregiver, family home placement, family/whanau placement, iwi social service, CYF residence, residential transfer, YSS SFH placement.

Number of moves

In three case study areas, the majority of the children and young people in the data set did not move within the three-year period (see Table 5). Those living in Community A appeared to be the most settled, with 65 percent (13 out of 20) having no change of address. In both Community C and Community D, just over half had no change of address (196 and 135 respectively). Only in Community B did more than half move. That community had the lowest proportion of clients who did not move, and the movers were most likely to move repeatedly, with 42 percent of the movers moving three or more times in the data period (Table 6).

Table 5: Proportion of Moves made by Clients 1/1/01 – 31/12/03

Case Study Area	% No move	% 1 move	% 2 moves	% 3 - 11 moves
A	65	15	10	10
B	40	25	10	25
C	54	17	13	15
D	54	24	14	8
<i>Total</i>	52	21	13	15

Source: CYF CYRAS Database

While the majority did not move at all, those who did move tended to move more than once. As Table 6 shows, the exception to this is Community D where the majority of movers only moved once during the data period. That community had the lowest proportion of all the case study areas of people moving three or more times.

Table 6: Number and Proportion of Moves made by Clients 1/1/01 – 31/12/03

Case Study Area	Total Movers	% Total Movers Moving Once	% Total Movers Moving Twice	% Total Movers Moving 3-11 Times
A	7	43	29	29
B	88	42	16	42
C	167	38	29	34
D	115	53	30	17
<i>Total</i>	377	44	26	30

Source: CYF CYRAS Database

Across all the case study areas, 114 individuals (30.2 percent) moved three or more times. We assess these individuals as experiencing frequent movement. Community C had the highest number of individuals who moved three or more times (56). The most number of moves was eleven moves by one person. Community D had six individuals with six or more moves. Only one of those individuals had more than one move within the area, while the rest had come into the area and then moved out.

Movement into the case study areas

Table 7 shows almost two thirds of the children and young people (64.8 percent) who were current CYF clients in June 2004 had their first known address during the data period in a case study area. They were not strangers to the area.

Table 7: First Known Address of Clients

Case Study Area	Inside Area		Came into Area	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	14	70	6	30
B*	89	61	57	39
C*	236	66	124	34
D*	163	65	86	35
<i>Total*</i>	<i>502</i>	<i>64.8</i>	<i>273</i>	<i>35.2</i>

Source: CYF CYRAS Database * The first known addresses of 5 were unknown

Around a third of the children and young people moved into the case study area over the data period. For Community C, this meant that a substantial number of CYF clients (124) came into the area during the period and remained CYF clients in June 2004. Community D had 86 clients move into the area, while Community B had 57 clients move into the area over the data period who were there as clients there in June 2004.

Movement within and out of the case study areas

Table 8 shows all case study communities experienced both movement within, and movement out of the area. Community D was somewhat more likely to experience individuals moving out than the other areas. In Community B, less than half the clients moved during the three year period (48 percent). In Community C and Community D just less than one third of clients moved, while in Community A only 15 percent (3 clients) moved.

Table 8 includes all clients with their first address within the data period who made a subsequent move after becoming a client and all those coming into a case study area who made a subsequent move in the area. Table 8 counts only the number of individuals who moved during the data period, not the number of movements made by individuals. For example, if an individual moved within and outside of the area several times he/she was counted only once in each category.

**Table 8: Moves of CYF Clients Within and
CYF Clients Moving Outside a Case Study Area**

Case Study Area	Move within	Move out
A(n = 3)	2	2
B* (n = 70)	49	50
C* (n = 111)	67	74
D* (n = 80)	33	63
<i>Total* (n=264)</i>	<i>151</i>	<i>189</i>

Source: CYF CYRAS Database
Multiple response

* The addresses of 4 were unknown

Table 9 and Table 10 demonstrate the often complex ways in which CYF clients moved. Table 9 focuses on clients with their first known address in the case study area and shows that they were more likely to remain at the same address (i.e. not move at all) than those who came into the area from elsewhere. Of the clients who did move, those clients in Community B and Community C were more likely to move within their respective areas, than to move away from the area. Community D had more clients with their first known address in the area who moved out of the area.

Table 9: Patterns of Movement of CYF Clients with First Known Address in Case Study Area

Case Study Area	Already In & Did Not Move	Already In & Moved Within	Already In & Moved Out	Already In Both Moved Within & Out
A (n = 14)	13	0	1	0
B (n = 89)	52	16	7	14
C* (n = 236)	180	30	12	13
D (n = 163)	117	15	25	6
Total* (n=502)	362	61	45	33

Source: CYF CYRAS Database

* The 1st known address was missing for 1 individual

Table 10 shows that in all case study areas, clients who moved into the area were more likely to move again, either within the area or out of it. They were especially likely to move out of the area. Notwithstanding, with the exception of Community B, the majority of clients who came into a case study area were likely to have had no further moves after they arrived.

Table 10: Patterns of Movement of CYF Clients With First Known Address Outside of Case Study Area

Case Study Area	Came In & Did Not Move	Came In & Moved Within	Came In & Moved Out	Came In Both Moved Within & Out
A (n = 6)	4	1	0	1
B* (n = 57)	23	4	14	15
C* (n = 124)	66	8	34	14
D* (n = 86)	52	2	23	8
Total* (n=273)	145	15	71	38

Source: CYF CYRAS Database

* The first known addresses of 4 were missing

Sequences of movement

The data give further detail on the sequence of movement of individuals over the period 1 January 2001 – 31 December 2003.

Ten mutually exclusive sequences were identified within the period. Firstly, two broad categories were identified, based on whether a client started within or outside a case study area during the period. For each category, a sequence of moves, both within and outside a case study area were identified. The sequences are:

- *Starting within a case study area:*
 - No moves: starts within a case study area during the period and no subsequent moves
 - Moves within area: starts within a case study area during the period and moves within area
 - Moves out: starts within a case study area during the period and moves out and does not return
 - Moves within and then out: starts within a case study area during the period, moves within area and then moves out and does not return
 - Multiple moves in and out: starts within a case study area during the period and then has multiple moves in and out.
- *Starting outside a case study area:*

- Comes in and no further moves: outside the case study areas at 1 January 2001 but subsequently moves into a case study area and then does not move
- Comes in and moves within: outside the case study areas at 1 January 2001 but subsequently moves into a case study area and then moves within the area
- Comes in and moves out: outside the case study areas at 1 January 2001 but subsequently moves into a case study area and then moves out and does not return
- Comes in, moves within and moves out: outside the case study areas at 1 January 2001 but subsequently moves into a case study area, moves within the area and then moves out and does not return
- Comes in and has multiple moves in and out: outside the case study areas at 1 January 2001 but subsequently moves into a case study area and then has multiple moves in and out.

Table 11 shows that just over half the clients did not move. The next most common pattern was for a client to come into a case study area, and then to make no further moves over the period. Note that the numbers in Table 11 are slightly different to those in Tables 9 and 10. The latter tables are based on first known address. Table 11 is based on addresses within the data period.

The dominant movement patterns for each case study area were as follows:

- Like the other areas, the majority of clients in Community A did not move during the three year period.
- Clients in Community B were most likely to move, and to have multiple moves in and out of the area. That case study is part of a larger urban area. In Community B, over half the clients moved within the three-year period (59.9 percent). Under half (40.1 percent) had no moves. It is particularly noticeable that those who started in the area during the period experienced multiple moves in and out.
- The majority of clients in Community C (54 percent) did not move within the three-year period. The next most common sequence was, ‘comes in and no further moves’ (13.8 percent). However, there was some movement within the area, with 38 clients moving within the area. During the period, 50 clients moved out. Multiple moves in and out of the area during the period were experienced by 20 clients.
- The majority of clients in Community D (54 percent) did not move within the three-year period. However, more than the other areas, clients moved out (60 clients).

Table 11: Sequence of Movement 2001–2003

Sequence	Community A (n=20)		Community B (n= 147)		Community C (n=363)		Community D (n=250)		Total (n=780)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No moves	13	65.0	59	40.1	196	54.0	134	54.0	403	51.7
Moves within area	1	5.0	16	10.9	31	8.5	18	7.2	66	8.5
Moves out	1	5.0	13	8.8	24	6.6	38	15.2	76	9.7
Moves within and then out	0	0	8	5.4	4	1.1	11	4.4	23	2.9
Multiple moves in and out	1	5.0	12	8.2	10	2.8	1	0.4	24	3.1
Comes in and no further moves	4	20.0	16	10.9	50	13.8	34	13.6	104	13.3
Comes in and moves within	0	0	4	2.7	7	1.9	0	0	11	1.4
Comes in and moves out	0	0	8	5.4	23	6.3	10	4.0	41	5.3
Comes in, moves within and moves out	0	0	6	4.1	3	0.8	1	0.4	10	1.3
Comes in and has multiple moves in and out	0	0	3	2.0	10	2.8	1	0.4	14	1.8
One or more addresses unknown	0	0	2	1.4	5	1.4	1	0.4	8	1.0

Source: CYF CYRAS Database

CYF movers in the case study areas

There was an expressed view among service providers and agencies within the case study areas that people who move frequently present particular problems in relation to effective and adequate service provision. Firstly, there were concerns expressed about continuity of care because there was a perception that children stayed only relatively short periods of time at any address. An associated issue in one of the areas was a shortage of caregivers, who were often temporary rather than long term placements, or for respite as required. Consequently, some children and young people were moved several times due to caregiver availability. There was a concern that children moving from address to address within the area meant that appropriate monitoring of their care was made more difficult. Service providers noted that a minority of families they deal with move around frequently and are therefore more difficult to engage and maintain contact.

We have seen that the majority of children and young people actually stayed in place over the data period, nevertheless a substantial minority (48 percent) experienced at least one move of address in the period 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2003. To explore the issues raised by service providers and agencies, two analyses were undertaken. The first explored the extent to which concerns about compromising continuity of care because children stay only briefly in the area was reflected in the movement data.

Over the data period, movers have the potential of remaining up to 156 weeks in an area. Over all the case study areas the average total time in a case study area, albeit possibly at different addresses, during the data period was 53.5 weeks, with a median time of 43 weeks. There was some variation in the total length of residence patterns between the four case study areas. Those are set out in Table 12.

Table 12: Patterns of Total Residential Time of CYF Movers in Case Study Areas

Case Study Area	Mean	Median	Mode
A (n = 7)	85.0 weeks	95.0 weeks	17.0 weeks*
B (n = 86)	61.3 weeks	61.0 weeks	69.0 weeks
C (n = 162)	48.0 weeks	35.0 weeks	< 1 week*
D (n = 114)	53.6 weeks	43.0 weeks	30.0 weeks
Total (n=369)	53.5 weeks	43.0 weeks	17 weeks*

* Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown.

Table 13 shows considerable variation in the range of total time this population of CYF clients who moved were actually resident in the case study areas.

Table 13: Patterns of Total Residential Time of CYF Movers in Case Study Areas

Total Residential Time	Community A (n = 7)		Community B (n = 86)		Community C (n = 162)*		Community D (n = 114)		Total	
	Mover Clients	%	Mover Clients	%	Mover Clients	%	Mover Clients	%	Mover Clients	%
Less than 1 week	0	0.0	3	3.5	6	3.7	1	0.9	10	2.7
1 – 11 weeks	0	0.0	7	8.1	30	18.5	16	14.0	53	14.4
12 – 25 weeks	1	14.3	11	12.8	25	15.4	22	19.3	59	16.0
26 – 52 weeks	1	14.3	13	15.1	42	25.9	26	22.8	82	22.2
53 – 104 weeks	3	42.8	38	44.2	34	21.0	33	28.9	108	29.3
105 – 156 weeks	2	28.6	14	16.3	25	15.4	16	14.0	57	15.4

The majority of CYF movers associated with Community C (63.5 percent) and Community D (57 percent) actually stayed in those areas one year or less.

The issue of continuity of care when children were moved in or out of an area was only one anxiety that community members expressed around those CYF children who had a history of movement. The other anxiety was around a widespread perception within the case study communities that children who were CYF clients were moving from address to address within the case study areas.

Again it needs to be reinforced that most children and young people in these case study areas did not move over the data period. Nevertheless, it is apparent that some did move relatively frequently. Over the period 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2003, 377 clients who were associated with the case study areas moved. Looking at the length of time at any single address, wherever it was, the average time a client stayed at an address was 30.5 weeks. The median was 23 weeks and the mode was 17 weeks.

Table 14 shows mean, median and mode stays of clients associated with each case study area. Note that the data relate to a stay anywhere, it could have been outside of the case study area. The data in Table 15 relate to the average length of residence at addresses within each of the case study areas.

Table 14: Pattern of Average Length of Residence at an Address Anywhere of CYF Movers

Case Study Area	Mean of Average Length of Residence	Median Average Length of Residence	Mode Average Length of Residence
A (n = 7)	43.6 weeks	28.0 weeks	11.0 weeks*
B (n = 88)	32.1 weeks	24.0 weeks	12.0 weeks
C (n = 167)	27.0 weeks	21.0 weeks	11.0 weeks
D (n = 115)	33.6 weeks	26.0 weeks	13.0 weeks
<i>Total</i>	<i>30.5 weeks</i>	<i>23.0 weeks</i>	<i>17.0 weeks</i>

* Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown.

Table 15: Pattern of Average Length of Residence at an Address in Case Study Area of CYF Movers

Case Study Area	Mean of Average Length of Residence	Median Average Length of Residence	Mode Average Length of Residence
A (n = 7)	71.1 weeks	47.0 weeks	14.5 weeks*
B (n = 88)	32.5 weeks	25.5 weeks	<1 week*
C (n = 167)	23.9 weeks	15.5 weeks	<1 week*
D (n = 115)	34.6 weeks	23.0 weeks	13.0 weeks
<i>Total</i>	<i>30.5 weeks</i>	<i>21.0 weeks</i>	<i><1 week</i>

* Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown.

Comparison of the data presented in Table 14 and Table 15 suggests that while movers associated with Community A tended to have longer durations at addresses within that community than when residing in other areas, this is not the case for movers who lived for some period in Community C. Movers associated with Community C tended to have longer durations at addresses in other areas, compared to when they were living in Community C. The average stays at an address of the movers associated with Community B and community D were similar regardless of locality.

Origins and destinations of movers

Where did the children and young people come from and move to? An analysis of the localities of movers immediately preceding their entry into a case study area (origin) and a similar analysis of the locality where clients moved outside the case study areas (destination) provides an insight into the geographical distribution of those who moved.

Typically, all areas sent children and young people to and received them from districts adjacent to or near them. The origins and destinations of movers for each area is summarised as follows:

- Community A, the smallest case study area, only saw four clients moving in, and two clients moving out over the period. Although a small number, the clients had diverse origins and destinations, including adjacent South Island districts, the North Island and Australia.
- In Community B, 38 clients moved into the area and 50 moved out of the area during the period. By far the most moves were within the greater urban area, followed by the lower North Island and Auckland region. A few clients moved to Australia or a South Island city.
- Community C sent clients to and received clients from the most areas. This is not unexpected because it saw the biggest number of clients over the three year period, with 95 clients moving to the area. During that time, 74 clients left the area. The origins and destinations of clients were widespread throughout the North Island. However, the most common origin and destination for clients was a nearby district, followed by Auckland region.
- Forty-seven clients moved to Community D during the period. The most common origin was a nearby district, followed by Auckland region, although clients came from throughout the North Island. Sixty-two clients moved away during the period. The most common destinations were districts close by, and Gisborne District.

Placement status of movers

The placement process can lead to a child or young person being moved from one area to another or from one address to another. CYF staff interviewed in the context of the *Building Attachment* research programme commented that inter-area movement was frequently associated with some children and young people being placed with relatives or with non-related caregivers. In addition it appears likely that movement of clients is partly related to families searching for affordable housing.

Table 16 sets out the placement status of non-movers and movers. Predictably, movers were over-represented among the clients in placement. Those in placement made up 32.8 percent of movers, compared to 16.9 percent of non-movers.

Table 16: Client Placements for Mover and Non-mover Clients

Placement Type	Movers		Non-Movers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No placement	253	67.1	335	83.1
CYF caregiver	48	12.7	26	6.5
Family/whanau	40	10.6	21	5.2
Other*	36	9.5	21	5.2

*Includes: child and family support services – bednight, family home placements, iwi social service, CYF residence, residential transfer, YSS SFH placement.

As Table 17 shows, the over-representation of movers among those in placements was most pronounced among those with the largest number of moves. Of those with three or more moves, 44.7 percent were in some type of placement, compared to 23.2 percent who moved only once.

Table 17: Client Placements by Number of Moves

Placement Type	No move		1 move		2 moves		3-11 moves	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No placement	335	83.1	126	76.8	64	64.6	63	55.3
CYF caregiver	26	6.5	13	7.9	13	13.1	22	19.3
Family/whanau	21	5.2	13	7.9	12	12.1	15	13.2
Other*	21	5.2	12	7.3	10	10.1	14	12.3

*Includes: child and family support services – bednight, family home placements, iwi social service, CYF residence, residential transfer, YSS SFH placement.

5. Summary and Concluding Comments

In reference to common perceptions among some community members that there were high numbers of children and young people placed by CYF coming into two of the case study areas, and frequent residential movement amongst that group, it can be said that in Community C and Community D in particular, children and young people who were CYF clients were a substantial group within their 0 – 17 year old population. It is not surprising that this group was visible to residents in those areas and that participants in the research highlighted issues concerning the care and support of those children and young people.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the majority of clients in each area were locally resident, rather than incomers. Furthermore, a relatively high proportion of placed clients were in family/whanau placements compared to nationally, indicating that those children and young people were connected to the four case study areas through kin.

With regard to transience, it appears that in fact most clients were settled. Those who did move within the three year period constituted less than half of clients. The majority who were already locally resident prior to the study period did not move. Those who came into the case study areas also appeared to have a stable residence history after arrival. With the exception of Community B, a majority of clients who came into a case study area, were likely to have no further moves after they arrived.

Across the four case study areas, the data provides us with the following understanding about this group of children and young people:

- Around two thirds of these CYF clients were ‘locals’; their first known address was in a case study area.
- Generally, CYF clients were settled, with the majority not moving during the three year period.
- Despite the majority not moving, a large number had moved at least once in the three year period.
- All case study areas experienced both movement of clients within, and movement out of the area.
- Clients with their first known address in the case study area were more likely to not move at all, compared to those who moved in from elsewhere.

- Clients who moved in from elsewhere were the ones most likely to move out of the area.
- All areas sent individuals to and received individuals from districts adjacent to or near them.
- A much higher percentage of clients were in a placement in the case study areas (almost 25 percent), compared to 10 percent nationally.
- Important across the four case study areas was family/whanau placement, which is a far higher proportion than nationally.

Bibliography

Brown, M. J., 2000, *Care and Protection is about adult behaviour The Ministerial Review of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services* Report to the Minister of Social Services and Employment.

Child Youth and Family, 2006, *Children and Young People in Care A user's guide to the permanency policy* Child Youth and Family, Wellington.

James, B., 2008, "What happens to research? Responses to a project on the residential movement of children and young people" *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 33.

Ministry of Social Development, 2004, *Children and Young People: Indicators of Social Wellbeing in New Zealand* Ministry of Social Development, Wellington.

Ministry of Social Development, 2002, *New Zealand's Agenda for Children* Ministry of Social Development, Wellington.

Ministry of Social Development, Child Youth and Family, The Treasury, 2003, *Report of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services First Principles Baseline Review*.

Stovel, K., and Bolan, M., 2004, "Residential Trajectories Using Optimal Alignment to Reveal the Structure of Residential Mobility." *Sociological Methods and Research* 32(4):559-598.