

Patterns of Residential Movement

Bev James

Public Policy & Research

Kay Saville-Smith

CRESA

&

Ruth Fraser

CRESA

1. Introduction

This paper explores the residential movement patterns of individuals in the four case study areas of the Building Attachment Research Programme. Using a panel method, adults living in a panel household at some point during the course of the research programme were interviewed a maximum of three times during a three year period (2004-early 2007). This paper considers how many times those household members moved, where they moved, the reasons for movement, and the impacts of movement for them.

Residential movement is defined as a change in dwelling. It can be a move over a short distance, or over a long distance. Residential movement can be planned, voluntary and predictable, or unplanned and unpredictable. There is residential movement data for 402 panel participants based on their 'first interview'. A 'first interview' could occur at any of the three interview points (called 'waves'), depending on when the individual first entered the panel. That data is based on their recall of past movement, actual movement during the period they participated in the panel interviews and their considerations of possible future movement.

Additional data on movement is available for those who participated in the panel for two or three interviews; this totals 331 participants. That data shows frequency and direction of movement that occurred during the three year panel period (2004-early 2007) for 283 participants and a two year period (either 2004-2005 or 2005-2006) for the remaining 48 participants. There is also data available for 332 people that provides information on movement over a five year period from 2001 to 2006. Those participants had an interview in the last year of the panel (2006/07), which enabled data to be collected on recalled movement since 2001, the census year.

This paper is structured as follows:

- Section 2 explains the panel method.
- Section 3 discusses the patterns of movement identified in the panel households.
- Section 4 looks at reasons for movement, both across all case study areas, and for each case study area.
- Section 5 looks at movement intentions and compares intention to move with actual movement behaviour over the course of the panel.
- Section 6 provides some concluding comments.

2. Method

Over a two year period from 2004 to 2005 a total of 155 households across four case study areas¹ were recruited to become the panel households for the Building Attachment research programme. The majority of the panel households (146) were recruited in 2004, but on the advice of the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua research reference group made up of people from the case study area, an additional nine households were recruited in the second year of the research to ensure the research captured the cultural diversity of Pacific participants. These 155 households constituted the sample frame for the research programme and household members were approached to participate in annual interviews – the panel interviews – over a three year period from 2004 to 2006/07. The interviewers approached all adult household members (those aged 16 years and over) to complete an interview.

¹ Kawerau, Opotiki, Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, and Amuri.

Adult household members first interviewed at Wave 1 could be interviewed a maximum of three times over the research period, while adult members of a household recruited in Wave 2 could be interviewed a maximum of twice. In years subsequent to Wave 1, ‘incomers’ were also interviewed. Incomers could be new adult household members or returning adult household members. In addition, if a household member turned 16 between interview waves they were included in the next interview wave.

In total 402 individuals completed one or more panel interviews. An additional 21 people were interviewed but provided insufficient information at their first interview to be included in this analysis. Consequently, they have been excluded from the counts and analysis presented in this paper.

As is typical with multi-year panel surveys not all individuals participating in Wave 1 were retained for the length of the research. In addition to people who left the panel some individuals were not available within the interviewing window in a particular wave e.g. they might be interviewed in Wave 1 and Wave 3 but were unavailable for an interview at Wave 2. Table 1 sets out the distribution of completed panel interviews for the 402 panel interviewees. As Table 1 shows, there was satisfactory retention of participants, as the majority of panel participants were interviewed in all three waves.

Table 1: Distribution of Completed Panel Interviews

Questionnaires Completed	Wave 1 Recruited Individuals	Wave 2 Recruited Individuals	Total Individuals
Wave 1 only	32	0	32
Wave 2 only	10	8	18
Wave 3 only	21	0	21
All three waves	266	0	266
Wave 1 and 2 only	20	0	20
Wave 1 and 3 only	17	0	17
Wave 2 and 3 only	17	11	28
<i>Total</i>	383	19	402

As a result of panel interviewee movement and/or incomers joining panel households the numbers of individuals interviewed at each wave varied. The total number of interviewees per wave is:

- Wave 1 – 335 interviewees
- Wave 2 – 332 interviewees
- Wave 3 – 332 interviewees.

The panel interviews collected data on past and intended movement, reasons for that movement, people’s experiences of living in their communities and their attachment to those communities. Data was also collected on the composition of households in which they lived, personal demographic details and their dwelling characteristics.

Panel interviews

A panel survey method was used to collect data on residential movement. Face-to-face in-depth interviews were conducted with a set of individuals three times over a three year period from 2004 to early 2007. The advantage of a panel survey is that it can provide direct measures of change over time at the level of the individual household member. Such information cannot be obtained from one-off or cross-sectional surveys. Some problems with panels have been identified, including attrition and interviewee fatigue. However these were

not major problems encountered with this panel process. Few people refused interviews. The main problem with following up people to interview for the second and third interviews was that they had moved and could not be traced.

Overseas and New Zealand panel surveys were consulted to develop the panel methodology. Those surveys included the British Household Panel Survey, the European Community Household Panel, the German Socio-Economic Panel, the Canada Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics, the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey, the CAEPR Household Survey conducted in two Aboriginal communities of very high and complex mobility, the New Zealand Survey of Family, Income and Employment and Te Hoe Nuku Roa, a longitudinal study of 655 Maori households.

Panel purpose and focus

The purpose of the panel surveys in each case study community was to:

- plot the residential movements of individuals and households
- identify reasons for moving and staying
- identify responses to moving
- analyse the relationship between household formation and residential movement
- identify elements of attachment to the local community
- explore whether there is a connection between attachment to the local community and moving or staying.

Panels were established in the four case study communities with a selected group of households. To establish the number of households to include, the total number of households in each case study was calculated using census area unit (CAU) data that fitted most closely with the areas. The case study area boundaries were defined by the local research reference groups in each area, based on what they considered to be the geographical area of their community.

The numbers of households in each area varied. Based on 2001 census CAUs they were as follows:

- Cannons Creek /Waitangirua – 4,023 households
- Opotiki – 3,156 households
- Kawerau – 2,412 households
- Amuri – 762 households.

Factors considered in selecting the households included: household type, age of residents, presence of dependent children, ethnicity and spread throughout the case study area. Potentially eligible households were sourced through local contacts including the local research reference group, local organisations and individuals who had already been involved in the research through focus groups. Household members were provided with written information about the research and invited to participate.

The numbers of households selected for each area were 40 each in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, Opotiki and Kawerau; and 20 in Amuri as it consisted of a much smaller number of households. An additional 9 households in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua were added in wave 2 to widen the diversity of Pacific ethnic groups participating in the panel. This introduced a further 19 adults into the panel.

The interview process

Three waves of in-depth interviews with members of the panel households were conducted in the four case study communities annually from 2004 – early 2007. The interviews were conducted between September and January in 2004/05, and during the same months in 2005/06 and 2006/07. Interviews were able to be completed within one month in Amuri, and most of the interviews within two months in Opotiki and Kawerau. However, interviewing took up to four months in Cannons Creek /Waitangirua. The long interviewing time frame enabled more panel participants to be followed up and fitted in with participants' and local interviewers' busy lives.

To be eligible for inclusion in the panel a household member had to be:

- Age 16 or older.
- Resident in one of the case study areas at their first interview.
- Resident in a private dwelling.
- 'Temporary' residence in the household was acceptable, as long as they were considered by the household to be a resident and not a short term visitor.

Those household members away for education, work, or temporary absence (e.g. hospital, holiday) were counted as household members and therefore eligible for interview, however, they were not interviewed if they were not present at the time when interviews were conducted. A few of those members were picked up in subsequent waves.

Panel interviewees were followed up for wave 2 and wave 3 interviews. This included tracing an interviewee who left the case study area as well as interviewees who moved to another address within the case study area. If a household member was not present for one interview, they were followed up in a subsequent wave.

Those household members eligible for waves 2 and 3 interviews were:

- Aged 16 years and older.
- Individuals in the household who turned 16 between waves.
- All individuals aged 16 or older moving into the household.
- All household members aged 16 or older who moved to another address.

All interviewing in wave 1 was face-to-face, as were most of the interviews in subsequent waves. Interviewees were interviewed at home or at another venue if that was preferred. A few interviews were by telephone in waves 2 and 3 where interviewees had moved and agreed to be interviewed. Telephone interviews were mainly done where individuals had moved outside of the case study area.

Most interviews were done by interviewers recruited from the local communities. The exception was Amuri, where the research team was advised by the local research reference group that, for reasons of confidentiality, residents would prefer interviewers to be from outside of the area. All interviewers were trained through a one day training session, and were provided with detailed guidelines on how to conduct the interviews. They were also provided with ethics and safety protocols and were required to sign an undertaking to abide by those protocols.

Tracing interviewees after the first interview

The big challenge was to trace interviewees for subsequent interviews after wave 1. To assist in tracing interviewees, the following was done:

- Prior to interviewing, a database was set up to record changes of address of interviewees.
- Multiple contact details were obtained at the interviews, in addition to residential address, postal address and phone number; e.g. e-mail address, workplace address, cell phone number.
- Interviewers asked for an alternative contact phone number (e.g. relative, friend or workplace), who can be contacted if primary contact with the interviewee was lost. This information was only used if other means of contacting interviewees failed.
- At the end of the interview, interviewers gave interviewees stamped and addressed change of address forms to send in to the research coordinator if they moved. This form was the source of much amusement for interviewees. Only about two movers filled in and sent their change of address form to the research coordinator.
- After the interview a summary of findings and form seeking confirmation or changes of address was sent to all interviewees. This resulted in a few interviewees advising of their change of address.
- Between waves, locally based interviewers were able to follow up some interviewees and get their change of address because of local knowledge about households or individuals who had moved.
- A few weeks prior to subsequent interviews, efforts were made to contact all panel participants by phone to ascertain whether they were still living at the same address or had moved. Tracing of interviewees who could not be contacted was done through the phone book (including online) and electoral roll prior to subsequent interviews.

Numbers of individuals and households in the panel

The numbers of individuals and households in each case study area varied for each interview wave, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Individuals and Household Interviewed for Each Interview Wave

Case Study Area	Wave 1		Wave 2		Wave 3	
	Individual	Household	Individual	Household	Individual	Household
Cannons Creek/ Waitangirua	117	43	126	38	131	41
Opotiki	92	43	86	43	78	43
Kawerau	85	40	82	45	84	39
Amuri	41	20	38	22	39	21
Total	335	146	332	148	332	144

Changes in the numbers of residents interviewed in waves 2 and 3 were largely due to people moving in or out of the households. Some movers could not be contacted for further interviews and were consequently were lost to the panel. There were also five refusals and six deaths.

The number of households changed because in some cases whole households could not be contacted after the first interview and were therefore lost to the panel. Eleven households were only involved in one interview.

In addition, some new households were added to the panel as panel participants formed new households (e.g. through partnering). Data was collected on the composition of those new households. Over the three waves of interviewing, a total of 32 households were added to the panel. This includes nine households recruited to the panel in wave 2.

Data collected

Three different types of questionnaires were used to collect data about panel households and household members at each wave of surveying – an individual questionnaire for adult household members, a household composition questionnaire and a dwelling questionnaire. In the first wave each household nominated one individual to be the ‘householder’. All household members surveyed completed an individual questionnaire at each wave; in addition the householder completed the household composition and dwelling questionnaires on behalf of their household.

Data collected about individuals covered:

- Demographic information – age, ethnicity.
- Residential movement.
- Involvement in paid and unpaid work.
- Travel to work.
- Views on local services.
- Social participation and contacts in the case study area.

Data collected about the household and the dwelling consisted of:

- household composition;
- usual residents;
- usual residents away at the time of the interview;
- visitors to the household;
- tenure;
- house condition; and,
- repair and maintenance practices.

In subsequent waves (Wave 2 and Wave 3) the individual questionnaire used varied depending on whether the household member had moved or not, and if they moved, whether they moved within the case study area or outside of it. For ‘stayers’ (non-movers) the questionnaire focused on any changes in their job, their views about living in the area, their living environment and whether they intended to move house in the future. For movers the questionnaire included details of numbers of moves since last interview, location moved to, reasons for moving, likes and dislikes about the area and intentions to move in future. For those moving outside the case study area information was also collected about why they chose that area and whether or not they had any previous connections with the area. For additional household members – a person who had moved into the household since the previous wave and any young person in the household who turned 16 since the previous wave – the questionnaire used was the same as the individual questionnaire used in wave 1.

Definitions and data analysis

A set of concepts are used when describing the panel data, the participants and their circumstances. The most important are set out in Infobox 1.

Infobox 1: Some Key Definitions

<i>First interview</i>	The interview completed at the first contact a panel participant had with the panel. The first interview could be completed at any of the three waves, conducted annually from 2004 to 2006.
<i>Case study</i>	The research had four case study areas – Amuri, Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, Kawerau and Opotiki. The boundaries of the four areas for the purposes of the research programme were determined in consultation with local community research reference groups.
<i>Household</i>	Household includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ related or unrelated people usually residing in the same dwelling, who regard themselves as a household and who make common provision for food and other essentials.▪ All those (including visitors) who stayed in the same dwelling the previous night.
<i>Incomer</i>	Incomers are current household members who were not interviewed in the previous wave. They include new household members, and returning household members.
<i>Panel household</i>	These are the households that took part in the research.
<i>Panel participant</i>	These are the interviewees.
<i>Wave</i>	Refers to the three times each case study area was re-visited. The first year of interviewing was wave 1 and so on.
<i>Residential movement</i>	Residential movement is defined as a change in dwelling.
<i>Research reference group</i>	A reference group of local people set up to provide advice and help guide the project in their community.
<i>Private dwelling</i>	A private dwelling accommodates a person or a group of people. It is not generally available for public use. The main purpose of a private dwelling is as a place of habitation, and it is usually built (or converted) to function as a self-contained housing unit.

Using data collected throughout the research programme, analysis of movement can be undertaken between waves, for the duration of the research programme and even retrospectively pre-dating the research period based on interviewee self-report data collected during the panel interviews. For this analysis, the existence of a completed individual interview at the interviewees' first contact with the research was used as a marker to determine eligibility for inclusion in the movement analysis.

Interviewees' completion of full interviews in subsequent waves following their first contact interview is used to determine eligibility for inclusion in different sets of analysis. Infobox 2 and Table 3 provide a description of data analysis and the eligibility matrix respectively.

Infobox 2: Description of Data Analysis Modes

Analysis Mode	Pre-requisite	Description	Number of Interviewees
Level 1 Analysis	Completion of a panel interview at first contact	Number of moves as a child, movement to the area, and duration of stay, number of moves from 2001 to first interview (variously 2004, 2005 and 2006), reasons for movement and intention to move.	402
Level 2 Analysis	Completion of a minimum of two panel interviews	A comparison of intention to move with actual movement for either a one or two year period, mapping of movement in, within and out of the case study area. Reasons for movement and intentions to move.	331
Level 3 Analysis	Completion of a panel interview in Wave 3	Movement over a 5 year period from 2001 to 2006.	332

Table 3: Matrix of Eligibility for Data Analysis

Completed Panel Interview	Level 1 Analysis	Level 2 Analysis	Level 3 Analysis
Wave 1 only	✓	✗	✗
Wave 2 only	✓	✗	✗
Wave 3 only	✓	✗	✓
All three waves	✓	✓	✓
Wave 1 and 2 only	✓	✓	✗
Wave 1 and 3 only	✓	✓	✓
Wave 2 and 3 only	✓	✓	✓

The nature of the sample frame (household level) and the use of local interviewers in community-based case study areas has resulted in some additional analysis points generated from administrative data. For instance, for the fifty individuals who completed only a single interview (in either Wave 1 or Wave 2) if the interviewer has recorded why they were unable to be interviewed in subsequent waves e.g. ‘moved overseas’ or ‘not moved – no response’ we are able to categorise them as a mover or not. However without a second interview it is not possible to look at frequency of movement or reasons for the move in more detail. For this reason the comparison of intention to move with actual movement (in Section 5) has been restricted to individuals who completed at least two interviews to ensure more detailed analysis is possible.

3. Patterns of Movement of Panel Participants

This section discusses the patterns of movement among panel participants in the three year period over which participants were interviewed.

Over the course of the interview period, some individuals joined panel households while others moved out of the household. A few individuals left a panel household and then returned within the three years. Individuals moved within the area, or moved away to another area. Some entire households moved to another dwelling. It was known that some individuals moved, but it was not known where they had moved to and they were unable to be interviewed subsequently.

The panel participants showed high rates of movement relative to national patterns. Of the 402 participants, almost a quarter (24.8 percent) had been living at their current residence for two years or less. However, while that data shows a significant sub-set of the population were movers, a large sub-population (54.5 percent of individual participants in the panel study had been living in their current dwelling for ten years or more. At the time of their first interview around three-fifths of panel participants (62.9 percent) had been living in their home for five years or longer (Table 4).

Table 4: Duration of Residence at Current Dwelling as Reported by Individuals at their First Interview

Duration of Residence	Individuals	% Individuals
Less than 1 year	46	11.4
1-2 years	54	13.4
3-4 years	33	8.2
5-9 years	50	12.4
10 years or more	203	50.5
Not specified	16	4.0
<i>Total</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>99.9</i>

There were some distinct local patterns emerging in each of the four case communities of Amuri, Cannon’s Creek/Waitangarua, Kawerau, and Opotiki. Amuri panel participants were the most settled. Nearly three-quarters (71.8 percent) of panel participants there had lived at their current address for five years or longer at the time of their first interviews.

By contrast, Kawerau participants were most likely to have moved recently with over a third (35.1 percent) living at their current address for two years or less, and around a fifth of Kawerau participants had been living at their current address for less than a year. That said, two-thirds of Kawerau participants had been living at their current address for five years or longer.

Opotiki participants and those participants living in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua had similar residential duration profiles. Over half of the participants from these two case study areas (55 percent) had lived at their current address for 10 years or more. In Opotiki, over a fifth (21.6 percent) had lived at their current address for two years or less and in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua a quarter of participants (25 percent) had been living at their current address for two years or less.

Many participants moved dwellings during the three year duration of the panel interviews. Of the 402 panel participants, 158 people (40.3 percent) did so.

Residential changes could involve a variety of patterns including:

- Movement within the case study area where they resided during the panel. Sixty people moved within the case study area where they resided.
- Movement outside the case study area where they resided during the panel. Seventy people moved outside of their case study area.
- Movement into a panel household. This move could either be from outside of the case study area, or from another location within the case study area. Over the duration of the panel, 32 people moved into a panel household and consequently joined the panel. Most of those, 26, moved from outside of a case study area to a panel household.

- Movement away from the dwelling they were living in when they were first interviewed and then return to that dwelling. Three people moved away and then returned to their original dwelling.
- Movement to an unknown destination. Twenty-one people moved, however it was not known whether they had remained in the case study area or moved elsewhere.

Some participants moved more than once during the panel period. Of the 158 movers, 44 (27.8 percent) moved more than once during the panel period. Most of those (30) moved twice. The largest number of moves by a single individual was eleven. Again there was local variation.

As Table 5 shows, individuals living in Amuri were least likely to move dwellings. Only 19.1 percent moved during the three year panel duration. Individuals living in Opotiki were most likely to move over the research period (46.9 percent) followed by Cannons Creek/Waitangirua (41.5 percent of individuals) and Kawerau (39.1 percent of individuals).

Table 5: Movement during the Panel Period

Number of Moves	All panel participants		% Individuals by Case Study Area			
	Individuals	%	Amuri	CC/W	Kawerau	Opotiki
No moves	234	59.7	80.9	58.5	60.9	53.1
1 move	114	29.1	11.9	33.5	23.9	32.7
2 moves	30	7.6	2.4	6.7	8.7	10.2
3 or more moves	14	3.6	4.8	1.2	6.5	4.1
<i>Total</i>	<i>392</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>99.9</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100.1</i>

* 10 missing cases – 6 panel participants passed away during the research, 4 participants were unable to be confirmed as movers or non-movers.

The incidence of movement in the three years research period is consistent with the individual's movement history over the longer inter-censal period 2001 to 2006. Movement data for the five year period 2001-2006 was available for 332 panel participants who completed a wave 3 interview. Over two-fifths (45.5 percent) of the panel participants could be seen as relatively settled in their homes. They had not moved residential address between 2001 and 2006 (Table 6).

Table 6: Movement of Panel Members 2001-2006

Type	Individuals	% of Individuals
Mover	181	54.5
Non-Mover	151	45.5
<i>Total</i>	<i>332</i>	<i>100</i>

Nevertheless, Table 7 shows, there were some individuals who had a great propensity to move dwellings. Of the 181 movers over 2001-2006, 29.8 percent of individuals had moved once and 23.2 percent of movers moved twice. Individuals moving three or four times accounted for 28 percent of all movers. A small number moved five or more times. The greatest number of moves by a single individual in the period 2001-2006 was twelve times.

Table 7: Number of Moves 2001-2006 for Individuals Who Moved

Number of Moves	All panel participants	
	Individuals	%
1 move	54	29.8
2 moves	42	23.2
3 – 4 moves	51	28.2
5 or more moves	26	14.4
Not specified	8	4.4
<i>Total</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>100</i>

Residential movement between 2001-2006 was most common among the participants living in Kawerau where 63.9 percent of panel participants had moved. Residential movement was least common among participants living in Amuri where only 25.6 percent of panel participants moved between 2001 and 2006. Fourteen individuals from the Kawerau case study area had moved more than five times between 2001 and 2006, compared to five people from Cannons Creek, five from Opotiki and two participants from Amuri (Table 8).

Table 8: Residential Movement 2001-2006 from Dwelling to Dwelling by Case Area

Moves	Amuri		CCW*		Kawerau^		Opotiki	
	Individuals	%	Individuals	%	Individuals	%	Individuals	%
No moves	29	74.4	59	47.6	30	36.1	33	42.3
1 move	4	10.3	27	21.8	4	4.8	19	24.4
2 moves	1	2.6	22	17.7	13	15.7	6	7.7
3-4 moves	3	7.7	11	8.9	22	26.5	15	19.2
≥ 5 moves	2	5.1	5	4.0	14	16.9	5	6.4
<i>Total</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>100.1</i>	<i>124</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>100</i>

* 7 missing cases ^ 1 missing case

Much of that movement was local. Over a third of moving individuals (36 percent) had some moves at least from dwelling to dwelling within the location in which they were living at the time of their first interview. A similar proportion (34.2 percent) simply moved out of the location altogether and never moved back. In Amuri, Opotiki and Kawerau there were instances of moving out and then moving back to the location, but there were not significant differences between the communities in this regard.

4. Why Move House?

According to international research, experiences of moving in the past tend to heighten the likelihood of moving in the future. The international research suggests that the propensity for residential movement is associated with the experience of moving itself. Those that have moved in the past are more likely to move in the future. Just over half the 402 panel participants (53.9 percent), reported that they had moved house at least once as a child (before they were 16 years old). Of those who moved as a child, the largest proportion of movers (29.1 percent) had moved only once, however, 30.1 percent had moved two or three times as a child.

The most moves a participant identified as a child was fifty moves (which appeared to be simply an estimate to indicate many moves), and 14 others said that they did not know how many moves they had. The most moves others identified was 17. There were 16 participants (14.6 percent) who reported moving between 10 and 17 times as a child. Those in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua were least likely to have moved as a child; only 32.5 percent did so. Proportions moving as a child were far higher in the other three areas: 57.1 percent of the Amuri participants, 68.4 percent of the Opotiki participants and 73.7 percent of the Kawerau participants moved as a child. All those who had moved eight or more times as a child were residing in Opotiki or Kawerau when interviewed.

The international literature also suggests that life stage transitions are a major driver of residential movement. In particular, youth transition. Consistent with that international research, the panel data showed that younger were more likely to be involved in moving from dwelling to dwelling than older adults. The age groups where most movement was apparent were those under 40 years.² Of the 72 participants aged between 16 and 19 when they were first interviewed, 55.5 percent moved during the panel timeframe. The individual who had moved eleven times during the panel timeframe was in this age group. Six others had moved three times or more during the panel timeframe.

A similar pattern of residential movement is evident among the 20-29 age group. It showed more movement than those aged 30 or more. Higher proportions of this group moved relative to older participants. However, the number of residential moves in the 20-29 age group made was considerably lower than younger people. Sixty-five point two percent moved. Most of the movers moved only once. The maximum number of moves in the 20-29 age group was two residential moves.

Low proportions of movers were apparent among those aged 50 years or more. Of those 89, the majority (73 or 82 percent) did not move. Only 17.9 percent moved, and all of those moved only during the panel period (Table 9).

Table 9: Age Group by Residential Movement during the Panel Period

Age Group	Number of Moves							
	0 moves		1 move		2 moves		≥ 3 moves	
	Individuals	%	Individuals	%	Individuals	%	Individuals	%
16-19 years	32	13.8	22	19.8	11	39.2	7	50.0
20-24 years	8	3.5	9	8.1	4	14.3	0	0
25-29 years	8	3.5	14	12.6	3	10.7	0	0
30-34 years	15	6.5	10	9.0	2	7.1	2	14.3
35-39 years	39	16.9	22	19.8	3	10.7	3	21.4
40-44 years	29	12.6	11	9.9	2	7.1	2	14.3
45-49 years	27	11.7	7	6.3	3	10.7	0	0
50-54 years	16	6.9	4	3.6	0	0	0	0
55-59 years	15	6.5	4	3.6	0	0	0	0
60-64 years	15	6.5	2	1.8	0	0	0	0
65+ years	27	11.7	6	5.4	0	0	0	0
Total	231	100.1	111	99.9	28	99.8	14	100

Not only are younger people in the case communities likely to experience residential moves. Table 10 shows that they are also more likely to make residential moves that take them not only around their locality but also outside it and sometimes back to it.

² Age data was available for 384 of the 402 participants.

Table 10: Trajectory Residential Movement by Age

Movement Trajectory	Age Group															
	Under 20		20-29		30-39		40-49		50-59		60-64		65+		Total	
	Indivi- duals	%	Indivi- duals	%	Indivi- duals	%	Indivi- duals	%	Indivi- duals	%	Indivi- duals	%	Indivi- duals	%	Indivi- duals	%
Moved out	16	40.0	14	46.7	8	19.0	8	32.0	3	37.5	0	0.0	3	60.0	52	34.2
Moved only within	6	15.0	6	20	23	54.8	11	44.0	5	62.5	1	50.0	2	40.0	54	35.5
Moved in	2	5.0	3	10	3	7.1	1	4.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	10	6.6
Moved into and out	1	2.5	4	13.3	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	3.9
Moved out and back	6	15.0	1	3.3	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	5.3
Moved but unknown locations	7	17.5	1	3.3	6	14.3	5	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	12.5
Moved within and out	2	5.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.0
<i>Total</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>99.9</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>152</i>	<i>100</i>

There has long been a view that one of the primary prompts for residential movements is the search for employment, in response to employment opportunities or education. But these do not emerge, in themselves, as the predominant reason for residents moving in these communities. Broader family considerations were most commonly cited, living closer to family next most commonly reported, followed by over a fifth of individuals citing poor housing conditions in their previous dwelling as a primary driver of residential movement (Table 11).

Table 11 sets out the reasons for moving to their current dwelling as reported by individuals at their first interview.

Table 11: Reasons for Moving to Current Dwelling as Reported by Individuals at their First Interview (n=398[^])

Reason for Move	Individuals	% Individuals
Family decision	121	30.4
Closer to family	101	25.4
Living conditions in last house	87	21.9
Wanted to move to this location	73	18.3
Lifestyle	66	16.6
Housing costs	58	14.6
Other family reasons	54	13.6
Environment	53	13.3
Living costs	50	12.6
Education/school for children	48	12.1
Health issues	48	12.1
Job opportunity	44	11.1
N/A- I was a baby/child at the time of the move	44	11.1
Closer to friends	42	10.6
Partners decision	39	9.8
Neighbourhood	31	7.8
Safety/security concerns	28	7.0
Business opportunity	16	4.0

* Multiple response table ^ 4 missing cases

Again there is some variation in these patterns. The four most common reasons for moving to the house in which participants were living at the time of their first interview are:

- Family decision – 30.4 percent and featured as the most common reason cited by Cannons Creek/Waitangirua participants. It was also important among Kawerau participants.
- Being close to family – 25.4 percent. This was the most common reason cited by Cannons Creek/Waitangirua participants. It was also an important reason for Opotiki participants.
- The condition of their previous dwelling – 21.9 percent. This was more likely to be mentioned by Kawerau and Cannons Creek/Waitangirua participants.
- Wanting to move to that particular location – 18.3 percent.

Overall:

- Kawerau participants were most likely to have moved to their current dwelling because of the condition of their previous house, a family decision and housing costs.
- The top reasons for Opotiki participants to have moved to their house were lifestyle, being close to family, and (equally) preference for the location and family decision.

- Cannons Creek participants were most likely have moved to their house because of a family decision, followed by being closer to family. Housing conditions was the third most important reason.
- Amuri participants were most likely to have moved to their house for business opportunities, followed by job opportunities. Lifestyle was also an important reason for their move (Table 12).

Table 12: Reasons for Moving to Current Dwelling as Reported by Individuals at their First Interview by Case Study Area

Reason for Move	% of Individuals			
	Amuri (n=42)	CC/W (n=165)	Kawerau (n=96)	Opotiki (n=99)
Family decision	4.8	36.4	38.5	22.2
Closer to family	14.3	32.1	19.8	23.2
Living conditions in last house	4.8	24.2	42.0	16.2
Wanted to move to this location	4.8	14.5	26.0	22.2
Lifestyle	19.0	10.0	16.7	26.3
Housing costs	4.8	10.0	34.4	7.1
Other family reasons	7.1	12.1	14.6	17.2
Environment	4.8	12.1	11.5	20.2
Living costs	2.4	7.9	27.1	10.1
Education/school for children	4.8	17.0	9.4	9.1
Health issues	0.0	22.4	5.2	6.1
Job opportunity	16.7	10.3	11.5	9.0
N/A - Baby/child at the time of the move	9.5	15.8	5.2	9.0
Closer to friends	0.0	21.8	4.2	2.0
Partners decision	2.4	16.4	6.3	5.1
Neighbourhood	2.4	4.8	14.6	8.1
Safety/security concerns	0.0	11.5	6.3	3.0
Business opportunity	28.6	0.6	0.0	3.0

* Multiple response table

Data on reasons for movement during the panel was available for 124 participants. The reasons given by that 30.8 percent who moved during the panel period were similar to reasons identified by those moving prior to the panel.

The main reasons were to do with improving housing circumstances, including purchasing a home; moving to take up work or business opportunities; moving to live closer to relatives; and moving for reasons of schooling and tertiary education. Often more than one reason for moving was mentioned. Some also commented that the most recent move was not ideal and they signalled future intended moves.

Reasons for movement to the house participants were living in at their first interview are examined in more detail below. The range of reasons are identified from the descriptions of movement experiences provided by participants. It should be noted that individuals often gave a combination of reasons for movement, although different reasons are discussed separately below. Where a person or couple gave several reasons, these are combined in the quotes. The reasons for movement discussed below relate to family, housing circumstances, lifestyle and environment, and employment or business opportunities.

Family related moves

Family related reasons for moving were the ones most commonly expressed. However, 'family related reasons' is a broad category that requires further exploration. Sometimes individuals simply expressed a desire to live closer to relatives. When asked about the nature of their moves, who it involved and where it was, the themes that were prominent concerned movement to be near relatives, either to give them support or to gain support from them. Specific examples included:

- Caring for a sick or frail elderly relative.
- Child or youth sent to live with relatives in order to be cared for by them, or to access desired schooling.
- Relatives providing accommodation, either temporarily or longer term.
- Assistance with living expenses.

Typical comments about movement to support or be helped by relatives included:

I got laid off from my job and just wanted to come home (D130-002)³.

My wife's family are in the area and that was an important consideration ... Lifestyle – a move out of the city. Outdoor environment. Growing our own vegetables, etc. Community – a mix of Maori/Pakeha population – I grew up with this and wanted children to do the same (D113-couple).

We need to live close to my grandchildren (D120-001)

Broke up with partner and just needed a change of life style. My family is from here and I have a sister who I am living with and my father lives here too (D128-003).

I moved to Wellington to look for employment. Then I got sick and needed to return home and moved in with my parents (D023-002).

As well as moving to be near family, some people wanted to move away from their families. Family conflict and break-up of a relationship were also family-related reasons precipitating movement.

Did not get on with step-father (D026-001)

This was going to give us the stability and security we needed ... pressure from my mother to get out of the house ... my mother was just giving me grief constantly for no reason and I had my oldest son living with me too at her house (D141-001).

Family formation or re-unification was also a reason for moving, however, this was the case for only a small number of people.

³ Quotes are not verbatim. They are taken from detailed interview notes.

Several participants moved for educational reasons, but there were often other motivators as well:

The family, schooling, son going to college. More opportunities for everyone ... The kid's friends are all up here, and they felt that they could not make friends in Kawerau, because lots of people their age group were just looking for trouble. So we felt that their future was more important than our own ... Initially we thought that Kawerau had plenty of business opportunities, which was one of the reasons that prompted us to move there in the first place. We would've been able open more businesses, and invest more but there just wasn't the population to support our ventures. We also realized that Auckland does have greater business opportunities for us (D029 couple)

I didn't have to move, but I would not have been able to afford petrol [if I had not moved] as I am now a full-time student and have had a drop in income (D111-003)

Wife was here in Auckland studying ... we'll stay as there is at least two years to go for my wife's study. Then I don't know where we will shift to (D017-003)

Housing related moves

Housing circumstances were the second most common source of movement. The housing reasons why panel participants moved out of their previous house concerned:

- The house they were renting was no longer available, e.g. it was sold or the landlord wanted it back to accommodate family members.
- Moving into home ownership.
- Moving to access more affordable housing.
- Dwelling not of an appropriate size.
- Poor house condition or performance.
- House lacking a required amenity.

The main housing reason was that the dwelling was no longer available to them. These comments described those circumstances:

The previous house the children and I were living in was sold. We stayed for about two weeks on and off with friends ... Then we agreed to move here until I could get or find alternative accommodation (D026-002).

We all were not impressed with this house, but as it was the only one available when the other house was sold we had no choice (D023-002).

Moving into home ownership was also a key reason for moving to the house the participant lived in at the time of their first interview. Home ownership was associated with security of tenure, managing housing costs, investment for the family's current and future wellbeing, as well as identification with a particular place. Some participants had family help to buy their home, while others had built their own home to reduced costs. Comments included:

To avoid paying "dead" money to a stranger (D027-001)

We both feel very grateful to be able to buy this house ... for the kids mainly so they would have their own home (couple D052)

The place just came up ... my husband's parents helped us to buy it (D102-001).

Because we got married – we wanted to have our own place ...[my husband] bought the site then built just enough of a house to live in – one bedroom plus bathroom/kitchen. We moved in then he built the rest around us. Again it was seen as how you did things, you didn't borrow money to buy a house you built one if you couldn't afford to buy and basically just built bit by bit as you had the money (D092-002).

Acquiring an affordable dwelling was a driver of movement for several participants. Some had deliberately chosen a particular location because of more affordable house prices or rents:

Chief thing was buying a good house for a lot cheaper than we could in Christchurch (D085-002).

We were ready to buy, but could only afford Kawerau. Surrounding areas didn't offer much for money ... Kawerau very affordable place to buy. Good opportunity (D146-002).

We needed to find a home to suit our budget in our retirement (D006-002).

It has four bedrooms and it was so cheap ... Has a garage. Basically, it met our criteria of the type of house we were looking for ... because we were living with my parents, two bedrooms with our three children and I was pregnant again (D136-001).

We wanted to have our own house before we started a family (D142-002)

Rent in Porirua is cheaper, my family are all in Porirua (D055-002).

Overall reason is because of the cheap rent and the cost effectiveness of walking distance to school saving on bus fares (D014-001).

My employment opportunity was lost, which meant we couldn't afford the rent ... We came back because we had to and the landlord offered this house back to us. ... Our preference was Whakatane, but once again it came down to affordability ... For convenience sake – church, employment, school, we want to move to Whakatane (D133 couple moved out of their home and then returned to the same home).

We looked around Levin because my daughter lives here. We could get something better for our money in this area, rather than around Porirua. More affordable ... I was visiting my daughter one day, and she said look at the Property Press and the prices (D001-001 bought house with son)

Participants also moved because they wanted a different sized house. Most of those were looking for a bigger house to accommodate their family. Several spoke of overcrowding in the previous house they had lived in:

Previous house was crowded and the parking lot was too narrow. Not enough space and rooms too small (D005-003)

A bigger house for growing family ... a larger home with the opportunity to improve it and add value (D083)

Because the house is very small for my children, because they are growing up very fast (D119-002).

I needed my own place. There were too many people coming and going at my parent's home (D135-001).

We were staying with my husband's family since moving from Samoa, and we wanted to move to be by ourselves and live our own lives (D061-002).

We first moved to an older house which we redecorated, but we found it was too small, so we moved again within the year to a larger home (D060 couple, moved twice within the panel period)

We needed more space because at our other place there was only two bedrooms and this caused a lot of frustration because of the lack of space there. Most of the family members are quite large in stature ... Often we would have our three grand-children and our daughter come to stay a few days too. Now we have this house, we have more space and now we are not as frustrated (D026-002)

We put our house on the market to see whether it would sell. We hadn't sorted looking for another house at that time. We were offered a good price for our house and decided to sell it and rent a house while we looked for another house. This is a temporary home – we have put the deposit down on a new section and are awaiting title (D059-001)

The other size-related reason why participants wanted to move, was to live in a smaller dwelling, often on a small section. This was particularly a preference of people in retirement or nearing retirement, as this person explains:

Smaller house to suit our needs and smaller yards to keep tidy ... We were down-sizing ready to retire and needed low maintenance and compact yard (D012 retired couple)

Some had moved because of poor house condition or performance, including cold and damp accommodation, dilapidation, lack of maintenance, or pest infestation.

I wanted to move my family out of the old run down house we were in (D127-001).

Water leaking inside, damp walls and windows (D025-001).

The last house was extremely cold (D043-001).

I loved the old house, but we needed a new home ... the old home was condemned (couple D045)

Previous house rooms were leaking. Rent was too high. Landlord doing no maintenance ... There are several things or issues concerning this house. Leaky

showers; the roof when it's raining. Although we advised the landlord, very little was done about it. (D080-004).

A few people moved in order to improve the amenity of their dwelling. Particular things they wished to improve were internal and external access. Some in two storey dwellings moved to a single storey dwelling. Others moved because of steps to the house or property, while one person was concerned to get adequate wheelchair access in the house.

Lifestyle and environment

Participants in all four areas mentioned how important the environment of their location was in determining their housing choice. They talked about the quality of the natural environment and local amenities, as well as the affective nature of the community.

Owned the land for a long time; we moved back to consolidate assets. We had explored NZ widely to find an environment that appealed (D016-001).

Area is good to live in. Friendly neighbours (D019-003).

We had been coming to the bach on site for some years, now moved permanently to a new home built on site. Coastal environment was important (D060-001)

I like the area very much. People are so kind (D068-001).

Some emphasised the advantages of the location for their children:

[my husband] was working long hours in last job. This was somewhere where we could work and still have time with the children. A place where we could be involved with school and community (D084-001).

I wanted to move to be closer to my immediate family ... we wanted to live in a rural area that could not have been affordable in Auckland and wanted a life style change for children ... country life environment, settled weather. Family environment to raise family ... to raise my children in the environment in which I was brought up in. The house has great space and is safe for children to have some freedom (couple D073).

For the children's sake. Had to get them out of Auckland. Could never afford to buy a house in Auckland. Even though the Auckland jobs paid more than the Opotiki jobs ... large section, large house at a low price ... parents live right next door. We left really paying jobs to come to Opotiki, so it was a huge decision to even come here. We wanted lifestyle change and my wife has family here (couple D078).

Recreational opportunities were an important consideration. It was a move for the children's well being, health, environment ... Considerations for our own immediate family. A healthier place to bring up children than a town or city. Rural location. Near water (on the harbour). Healthier environment. Wanted children to go to a small rural school (D114 couple).

Participants cited proximity to a wide range of amenities as important in their housing choices. Specific amenities they mentioned included schools, church, shops, parks and recreational areas and public transport. Some also located to be close to their place of work:

Handy for children - there are families in Cannons Creek they know the children, they can wait in families [homes] after school (D019-001).

Near to the centre, transport, dairy and church (D020-002).

The area is handy for my son's school. Close to our church (D010-001).

I was in a temporary unsuitable house and wanted to be closer to work (D011-002).

The house is close to schools, good location and well maintained. We needed to move! I had been travelling from Rotorua for work for 3 years ... cut down on travelling costs ... we really needed a four bedroom low maintenance home (D013-001).

I like the street, it's close to bus stop, and relatives (D018-002).

The area is good, close to the park, school and shops (D031-003).

Employment and business opportunities

Although less than one sixth of participants (15.4 percent) identified job or business opportunity as a reason for their moving house, it was nevertheless for those participants an important motivator of movement. Comments included:

To increase the scale of our business. Size of job was attractive (larger herd) (D086-002).

This opportunity came up we would have been dopey not to take up. Originally in partnership with dad then slowly bought him out of farm (D091-001).

It wasn't specifically the location. The driver was the business opportunity first and foremost (D099-002).

I came for the job and love the town and opportunities (D030-001).

Investment decision – a significant step up in property. Family circumstance led to an opportunity to run an orchard and move to Opotiki (D015-002)

Move to take up temporary work with a view to moving back to the area (D017-003)

The business and investment opportunity this town has to offer. Of course, this house and location, the amenities, semi-rural lifestyle for raising children, very good (D029-002).

Because I found work, and my girlfriend was moving here too (D075-002 young adult)

Work opportunities were greater, recreational facilities, clubs etc were better – both for me and my children. My 16 year old son has remained in Opotiki, living with his grandmother to finish his school education (D043-001)

Data on reasons for movement during the panel was available for 124 participants. The reasons given by that 30.8 percent who moved during the panel period were similar to reasons identified by those moving prior to the panel.

The main reasons were to do with improving housing circumstances, including purchasing a home; moving to take up work or business opportunities; moving to live closer to relatives; and moving for reasons of schooling and tertiary education. Often more than one reason for moving was mentioned. Some also commented that the most recent move was not ideal and they signalled future intended moves.

5. Movement, Actual, Intended, and Unintended

This section looks at movement intentions for all panel participants interviewed⁴, and compares movement intentions with actual movement (if any) for the participants that gave two or more interviews.

Intended and actual moves⁵

At each interview wave, just under three quarters of participants expressed no intention to move. At wave 1, over 74 percent had no intention of moving; and at wave 2 the proportion was similar 72.9 percent expressing intention to move. Looking at movement across the three interviews, there were 283 participants who provided an interview both at wave 1 and wave 3. Over 74 percent of those expressed no intention of moving at wave 1.

Fewer people actually moved than intended to do so. The relationship between intention to move and actual movement is complex. Those who express an intention to move are more likely to move than those who say they do not intend to move. However, some individuals moved even when they had no intention to do so.

Between Wave 1 and 2 interviews, 285 participants gave details of both their intention to move and their actual movement. Of the 285 participants, 74.1 percent did not want to move, and 25.9 percent expressed an intention to move. Forty-one individuals actually moved, 14.4 percent (Table 13).⁶ Of the 211 individuals who reported that they did not intend to move, 7.6 percent had done so in the period between their first and second interview.⁷

Table 13: Intention to Move by Actual Movement between Wave 1 and 2 (n=285*)

Intention to Move at Wave 1	Actual Movement Wave 1 to Wave 2				Total	
	Moved		Did Not Move			
	Individuals	%	Individuals	%	Individuals	%
Wants to shift	25	33.8	49	66.2	74	100.0
Does not want to shift	16	7.6	195	92.4	211	100.0

* 1 missing case

⁴ Information on movement intentions gives some insight into the dynamics of movement decisions, however intentions to move do not necessarily translate into the act of moving.

⁵ The base number for this subsection is all those interviewed at each of the three waves. That is 335 in wave 1, 332 in wave 2 and 332 in wave 3.

⁶ Included in the 41 were three people who moved sometime after the Wave 1 interview, but were back living in the same house when they were interviewed in Wave 2.

⁷ 266 participants completed three interviews and 65 participants completed two interviews.

Overall then half of the movers between Wave 1 and Wave 2 interviews were those who said they intended to move. However, two thirds of those who intended to move did not actually move. The pattern of actual moves without an intention of doing so became more prevalent in the Wave 2 and Wave 3 period.

There were 292 participants who gave details of both their intention to move and their actual movement between Wave 2 and Wave 3 interviews. Of those 72.9 percent said they had no intention to move, and 27.1 percent intended to move. Just under one quarter moved between Wave 2 and Wave 3 interviews, 16.9 percent of those who had not intention of moving actually did so.

Table 14: Intention to Move by Actual Movement between Wave 2 and 3 (n=292*)

Intention to Move at Wave 1	Actual Movement Wave 1 to Wave 2				Total	
	Moved		Did Not Move			
	Individual	%	Individual	%	Individual	%
Wants to shift	32	40.5	47	59.5	79	100.0
Does not want to shift	36	16.9	177	83.1	213	100.0

* 2 missing cases

Overall, 40.5 percent of those intending to move at their Wave 2 interview did actually move by Wave 3. Over the 283 participants who completed both a Wave 1 and a Wave 3 interview, 74.2 percent did not intend to move and 25.7 percent expressed an intention to move (Table 15). Overall, more people moved than had intended to move. 54.3 percent of those who said they did not intend to move in Wave 1. Almost one quarter of those not intending to move and 57.5 percent of those intending to move had moved over the two year period.

Table 15: Intention to Move At Wave 1 by Actual Movement between Wave 1 and 3 (n=283)

Intention to Move at Wave 1	Actual Movement Wave 1 to Wave 3				Total	
	Moved		Did Not Move			
	Individual	%	Individual	%	Individual	%
Wants to shift	42	57.5	31	42.5	73	100.0
Does not want to shift	50	23.8	160	76.2	210	100.0

Statistical analysis in the form of chi-square testing shows that there is an association between intention to move and actual movement. Those who have an intention to move are more likely to move than those who do not. This holds for the one year interval between waves, as well as the two year interval between Wave 1 and Wave 3.

Table 16: Intention to Move by Actual Movement between Wave 1 and 2 (n=285*)

Intention to Move At Wave 1	Actual Movement Wave 1 to Wave 2				Total	
	Moved		Did Not Move			
	Individual	%	Individual	%	Individual	%
Wants to shift from current dwelling AND actively looking	13	46.4	15	53.6	28	100.0
Wants to shift from current dwelling BUT NOT actively looking	12	26.1	34	73.9	46	100.0
Does not want to shift	16	7.6	195	92.4	211	100.0

* 1 missing case

Table 17: Intention to Move by Actual Movement between Wave 2 and 3 (n=292*)

Intention to Move At Wave 2	Actual Movement Wave 1 to Wave 2				Total	
	Moved		Did Not Move		Individual	%
	Individual	%	Individual	%		
Wants to shift from current dwelling AND actively looking	9	69.2	4	30.8	13	100.0
Wants to shift from current dwelling BUT NOT actively looking	23	34.8	43	65.2	66	100.0
Does not want to shift	36	16.9	177	83.1	213	100.0

* 2 missing cases

Table 18: Intention to Move At Wave 1 by Actual Movement between Wave 1 and 3 (n=283)

Intention to Move At Wave 1	Actual Movement Wave 1 to Wave 3				Total	
	Moved		Did Not Move		Individual	%
	Individual	%	Individual	%		
Wants to shift from current dwelling AND actively looking	22	73.3	8	29.7	30	100.0
Wants to shift from current dwelling BUT NOT actively looking	20	46.5	23	53.5	43	100.0
Does not want to shift	50	23.8	160	76.2	210	100.0

Unintended movement

This raises the issues of factors that prompt actual movement for individuals that reported that they had no intention of doing so. Some movement was serendipitous and was done to make the best of an opportunity. Other movement was driven by unexpected problems or external shocks. Sometimes those who moved unexpectedly were not the ones in the household who had made the decision to move.

In summary, there were four main reasons for people moving, even though they had not intended to shift:

- Movement because the decision to move was made by another household member (a partner, parent or other relative).
- Movement because of a change in their personal relationship. They had either moved to live with a partner, or because of a relationship breakup.
- Movement because of housing problems.
- Movement to take up opportunities.

Comments from people who moved because the decision to move was made by or strongly influenced by another person included:

It was my partner's decision, I think [partner's] mum pushed the decision (D007-002 Couple moved in wave 3 outside the case study area).

Did I want to move? Not really. Dad was very sick; I had to be near and look after my parents (D118-003 Mover in wave 2 outside the case study area).

My mother, uncles, and aunties told me to move in (D051-002 Mover in wave 3 within the case study area).

Comments relating to movement due to a change in personal relationship included:

No I did not want to move because the house is very basic. I moved here because it is my partner's house (D122-002 Mover in wave 3 within the case study area).

I moved back in with my partner (D042-002 Mover in wave 3 within the case study area).

I moved in with my partner and his parents (D064-002 Mover in wave 3 within the case study area).

A relationship breakup (D093-003 Mover in wave 3 into the case study area).

Comments relating to housing problems included moving because the house was no longer available, and moving out of crowded conditions:

My Nan's house where we were living was on the market, so we had no choice but to move, and this was the only house available at the time we had to move (D133-002 Mover in Wave 2 within the case study area).

My employment opportunity was lost, which meant we couldn't afford the rent (D133-001 moved away after wave 2, then returned to the same house in wave 3).

No I didn't want to move, but we have because my parents' house is too full (D118-004 Family moved in wave 3 outside the case study area).

There was unintended movement to take up unexpected housing opportunities. Examples of this type of movement included taking up accommodation with affordable rent (or rent free), moving to a more suitably sized house, and improving dwelling amenity. Comments included:

[Move in wave 2 within the case study area] I saw it on the internet, a spur of the moment decision, I wasn't looking for a house before then.

[Move in wave 3 outside the case study area] we hadn't intended to move but the opportunity arose so we took it. We would have stayed if our situation hadn't changed ... and we could have animals in this house, most rentals we couldn't (D017-005/006 Couple who moved twice during the panel period).

It's a family home and was empty and we didn't have to pay any rent (D051-002 Mover in wave 3 within the case study area).

We wanted a single storey house, we didn't know when [the opportunity would arise] we thought we'd better take it ... It's the only option we got from HNZ (D034-002 Mover in wave 2 within the case study area).

We first moved to an older house which we redecorated, but we found it was too small so we moved again within the year to a larger house (D060-002 Family moved in wave 2, two moves within a year, outside the case study area).

I found a smaller place with less grounds and good neighbours (D106-001 Mover in wave 3 within the case study area).

My sister saw this house was available and let me know about it. So I am very happy to be here (D026-002 Mover in wave 3 within the case study area).

A few interviewees moved because a job or business opportunity had arisen unexpectedly.

It was a change of direction in life (D022-002 Mover in wave 3 outside the case study area).

I moved so that I can be where my work is, gain my own independence (D134-002 Mover in wave 3 outside the case study area).

Future Movement

As expressed in relation to reasons for past movement, a lot of intended movement concerned problems with house size, amenity, condition and performance, as these comments show:

The unit has really passed its use by date. Kitchen needs remodelling and modernising. Not enough storage, cupboards (D002-001)

Sick of running up and down the stairs (D004-001).

We haven't settled due to problems with owners so we are moving on. [They] will not do repairs required and have dishonoured our agreement (D038-001).

Very cold and damp home. Not good for asthma with kids (D079-001)

Often housing affordability was a critical consideration that might determine a future move.

We need to move to bigger house, but we need more money (D111-003).

If we find a house that's bigger and cheaper, we'll take it (D120-001)

Depends if the rent of the house increases, as we struggle for finance ... and there's two more years to go on my [work] contract (D068 couple)

Two participants intended to enter home ownership:

[we'll stay here] for 1-2 years. We want to buy our own home but we are prevented at the moment because we are looking for a bigger house with four bedrooms. Got to like it otherwise it's a waste of time buying it. Would still be in Porirua, this is home ... When prices settle down, it's overpriced in Cannons Creek now, even investment houses are overpriced (couple D003).

Depends on the income. If we have enough money soon, we will buy a house and move (D005-001)

A move for work was the main consideration for three participants intending to move:

I want to move to find a job. There is no work in Opotiki for me. I'm going to Wellington in two weeks to start looking for a house for me and the boys (D046-001)

[I'll stay] one more month, hope to find a job by then (D091-003)

[I'll stay] six months. The job is only that long (D122-002)

Three people said that, as they approached retirement, they were thinking of shifting closer to facilities, particularly health services:

We are thinking of selling and moving to town to be closer to the hospital, as we are getting older (D049-001).

We feel need for a change ... daughter and son in law will take over the farm ... we are planning to go to [a larger centre], we've already got a section there ... A big issue for all farming families is outcome of the farm (D103 couple)

I'll move if health reasons require me to be nearer relatives (D106-001)

6. Some Conclusions

Considerable residential movement was apparent in the panel of 402 people aged 16 years and over. For some, residential movement had started in childhood, with just over half the panel reporting that they had moved house at least once before they were 16 years old. Just over 40 percent of panel participants moved during the panel period.

Over one half (54.5 percent) of panel participants had moved in the five year period from 2001-2006. This is slightly less than for New Zealand's population as a whole over approximately the same period. In the 2006 census, 57.7 percent of the total usually resident population had moved in the previous five years.⁸

Some panel participants showed very high movement. Movement motivations are related to age group and life stage. The panel confirmed other research that shows young adults to move the most. Panel participants under the age of 30 were the most likely to move. They were also among those who moved more than once during the panel timeframe. Those aged 50 and over moved the least over the panel timeframe.

With regard to the case study areas, those living in Amuri were least likely to move and those living in Opotiki were most likely to move.

Panel participants identified a similar range and complexity of reasons for movement as found in other New Zealand and overseas studies. Their experiences confirmed that residential movement is not simply about personal preferences, but relates to the opportunities and constraints of their environment, including local housing and labour markets, and family responsibilities. Panel participants identified the main reasons for their movement as:

- Moving to be close to family in order to give or receive support.
- Housing related reasons, including:
 - Rental accommodation no longer available.
 - Moving into home ownership.

⁸ Statistics New Zealand 2006b

- Seeking more affordable housing.
- Dwelling not of an appropriate size.
- Poor house condition or performance.
- House lacking a required amenity.
- Wanting to move to a particular location. Key ‘place’ considerations were the quality of the natural environment and local amenities, as well as the affective nature of the community.

Across the case study areas, different reasons for moving were apparent:

- Kawerau participants were most likely to have moved to their current dwelling because of the condition of their previous house, a family decision and housing costs.
- The top reasons for Opotiki participants to have moved to their house were lifestyle, being close to family, and (equally) preference for the location and family decision.
- Cannons Creek participants were most likely have moved to their house because of a family decision, followed by being closer to family. Housing conditions was the third most important reason.
- Amuri participants were most likely to have moved to their house for business opportunities, followed by job opportunities. Lifestyle was also an important reason for their move.

Most of those who moved wanted to shift, however a minority did not. The main reasons why they had to move were to do with their house no longer being available to rent; relationship or family conflict; and in one case a house fire.

This study also looked at movement intentions and related those to actual movement. Over the panel timeframe, the main reasons participants gave for intending to move in future were related to housing. Housing was also a major reason for past movement. Movement was also intended for schooling or tertiary education, work, or to be closer to amenities or services.

Over the panel timeframe, just under three quarters of participants expressed no intention to move. Overall, fewer people moved than expressed an intention to move. Those who expressed an intention to move were more likely to move than those who said they would not move. However, 52 people who had not intended to move actually shifted house. Some movement was done to make the best of an opportunity. Other movement was driven by unexpected problems. Sometimes those who moved unexpectedly were not the ones in the household who had made the decision to move.

Understanding more about residential movement is useful for local level planning purposes. Who moves, where people move, and why they move, are all questions that contribute to understanding more about the factors that attract people to certain locations, and the role of amenities in influencing people’s movement decisions.

Bibliography

- Allen, M., 2003, *Into the Mainstream: Care leavers entering work, education and training*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
- Barcham, M., 2004, "The politics of Maori mobility", pp. 163-183 in J. Taylor and M. Bell (eds) *Population Mobility and indigenous Peoples in Australia and North America* New Routledge, York.
- Bartik, T.J., Butler, J.S., and Liu, J-T., 1990, Maximum Score Estimates of the Determinants of Residential Mobility: Implications for the Value of Residential Attachment and Neighborhood Amenities. *Upjohn Institute Staff Working Paper 90-01*. www.upjohninst.org/publications/wp/9001.html
- Bedford, R., 2007, *Pasifika Mobility: Pathways, Circuits and Challenges in the 21st Century*, Report for the Pasifika Project, Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- Bell, M., and Muhidin, S., 2009, *Cross-National Comparison of Internal Migration* United Nations Development Programme Human Development Reports Research Paper 2009/30.
- Belot, M., and Ermisch, J., 2006, *Friendship ties and geographical mobility, evidence from the BHPS*, ISER Working Paper 2006-33 Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Colchester.
- Boheim, R., and Taylor, M., 2000, *From the Dark End of the Street to the Bright Side of the Road? Investigating the Returns to Residential Mobility in Britain* ISER Working 2000-38 Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Colchester..
- Boheim, R., and Taylor, M., 1999, *Residential Mobility, Housing Tenure and the Labour Market in Britain* ISER Working Paper No. 35 Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, Colchester.
- Bolan, M., 1997, "The Mobility Experience and Neighborhood Attachment" *Demography*, May 1997, 34(2): 225-237.
- Bonin, H., Eichhorst, W., Florman, C., Hansen, M., Skiold L., Stuhler, J., Tatsiramos, J., Thomasen, H., Zimmerman, K., 2008, *Geographic Mobility in the European Union: Optimising its Economic and Social Benefits* IZA Research Report No. 19. Swedish National Labour Market Board (AMS) and Niras Consultants.
- British Household Panel Survey www.iser.essex.ac.uk/bhps
- Chalmers, A., and Joseph, A., 1998, "Rural Change and the Elderly in Rural Places: Commentaries from New Zealand". *Journal of Rural Studies*, 1998, 14(2): 155-165.
- Clark, W., and Davies Withers, S., 2007, "Family migration and mobility sequences in the United States: Spatial mobility in the context of the life course" *Demographic Research* 17:591-622.

- Cole, I., Robinson, D., Champion, T., Reeve, K., Bennington, J., Coward, S., Goudie, R., Hickman, P., 2006, *A Review of the Evidence Base on Frequent Moving Among Disadvantaged Groups A Report to the Social Exclusion Unit* Department of Communities and Local Government Publications, United Kingdom.
- Cuba, L., and Hummon, D., 1993, "A Place to Call Home: Identification with Dwelling, Community and Region" *The Sociological Quarterly* 1993, 34(1): 111-131.
- de Groot, C., Manting, D., and Mulder, C., 2007, *Intentions to move and actual moving behaviour in the Netherlands* Paper presented at the ENHR Conference 25-28 June, Rotterdam.
- Dieleman, F., 2001, "Modelling residential mobility: a review of recent trends in research" *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 16:249 – 265.
- Donovan, N., Pilch, T., and Rubenstein, T., 2002, *Geographic Mobility Performance and Innovation* Unit Cabinet Office. http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/strategy/assets/gm_analytical.pdf
- Dwyer, P., Smith, G., Tyler, D., and Wyn, J., 2003, *Life-Patterns, Career Outcomes and Adult Choices*, Australian Youth Research Centre, Research Report 23.
- Ermisch, J., and Jenkins, S., 1997, *Housing Adjustment in Later Life: Evidence from the British Household Panel Survey* ISER Working Paper 97-22 University of Essex, Colchester.
- European Community Household Panel <http://forum.europa.eu.int/irc/dsis/echpanel/info/data/information.html>
- German Socio-Economic Panel www.diw.de/english/sop/uebersicht
- Groves, R., Middleton, A., Murie A., and Broughton, K., 2003, *Neighbourhoods that Work: A Study of the Bournville Estate, Birmingham*. The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Gustafson, P., 2001, "Roots and Routes: Exploring the Relationship between Place Attachment and Mobility". *Environment and Behavior*, September 2001, 33(5): 667-686.
- Hau'ofa, E., 2005, "The Ocean in Us", pp.32-43 in Hooper, A. (ed) *Culture and Sustainable Development in the Pacific* Asia Pacific Press, ANU E Press, Canberra.
- Henry R., and Smith D., 2002, *Three years on: Indigenous families and the welfare system, the Kuranda community case study*. Discussion Paper series CAEPR, No. 229.
- Household, Income, and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey www.melbourneinstitute.com/hilda/
- Hunter B., and Smith D., 2000, *Surveying mobile populations: lessons from recent longitudinal surveys of indigenous Australians*. Discussion Paper series CAEPR, No. 203.

- Lidgard, J., and McLeay, C., 2002, *Population Movement Into and Out From the Western Bay of Plenty Sub-region Project Summary Migration Research Group University of Waikato, Hamilton.*
- Kan, K., 1999, "Expected and Unexpected Residential Mobility" *Journal of Urban Economics* 45:72-96.
- Kearns, A., and Parks, A., 2002, Living in and Leaving Poor Neighbourhood Conditions in England. *CNR Paper No. 8, ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research.*
- Maré, D., and Timmins, J., 2003, *Moving to Jobs?* Motu Working Paper 2003-007 Motu Economic and Public Policy Research Trust, Wellington.
- McAuley, W., and Nutty, C., 1982, "Residential Preference and Moving Behaviour: A Family Life-cycle Analysis" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1982, 44(2): 301-309.
- McAuley, W., and Nutty, C., 1985, "Residential Satisfaction, Community Integration and Risk Across the Family Life Cycle". *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1982, 47(1): 125-130.
- McLeay, C., and Lidgard, J., 2006, *How Settled are the Retired? Older Migrants moving into and out of the Western Bay of Plenty Working Paper No. 5 Enhancing Wellbeing in an Ageing Society (EWAS) Family Centre Lower Hutt, and Population Studies Centre, University of Waikato Hamilton.*
- Morrow-Jones, H., and Kim, M., 2009, "Determinants of Residential Location Decisions among the Pre-Elderly in Central Ohio" *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 2(1):47-64.
- Musharbash Y., 2001, *Indigenous families and the welfare system: The Yuendumu community case study, Stage Two.* Discussion Paper series CAEPR, No. 217.
- Office of Economic and Statistical Research Queensland Government, *Panel Surveys for Public Policy Decisions* www.oesr.qld.gov.au/data/surveys/panel_surveys.pdf
- Parkes, A., and Kearns, A., 2002, *Residential Perceptions and Housing Mobility in Scotland: an analysis of the longitudinal Scottish Housing Condition Survey 1991-1996.* CNR Working Paper No.3, ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research.
- Parkes, A., Kearns, A., and Atkinson, R., 2002, The Determinants of Neighbourhood Dissatisfaction. *CNR Paper No. 1 January 2002, ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research.* www.neighbourhoodcentre.org.uk
- Richardson, K., and Corbishley, P., 1999, *Frequent Moving: Looking for love?* YPS in association with Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Ross, C., Reynolds, J., and Geis, K., 2000, "The Contingent meaning of neighbourhood stability for residents' psychological well-being". *American Sociological Review*, August 2000, 65(4): 581-597.

- Sampson, R., 1988, "Local Friendship Ties and Community Attachment in Mass Society: A Multilevel Systemic Model" *American Sociological Review*, October 1988, 53(5): 766-779.
- Scott, K., and Kearns, R., 2000, "Coming Home: Return Migration by Maori to the Mangakahia Valley, Northland". *New Zealand Population Review*, 26: 21-44.
- Settles, B., 2001, "Being at Home in a Global Society: A Model for Families' Mobility and Immigration Decisions". *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, Autumn 2001, 32(4): 627-645.
- Shumaker, S., and Stokols, D., 1982, "Residential Mobility as a Social Issue and Research Topic". *Journal of Social Issues*, 1982, 38(3): 1-19.
- Statistics New Zealand, 2006a, *Internal Migration Report* http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/migration/internal-migration.aspx
- Statistics New Zealand, 2006b, *QuickStats about Population Mobility* <http://www.stats.govt.nz/census/2006censushomepage/quickstats/quickstats-about-a-subject/population-mobility.aspx>
- Stedman, R., 2002, "Towards a Social Psychology of Place: Predicting Behaviour from Place-based Cognitions, Attitude and Identity". *Environmental Behaviour*, September 2002, 34(5): 561-581.
- Stovel, K., and Bolan, M., 2004, "Residential Trajectories: Using Optimal Alignment to Reveal the Structure of Residential Mobility". *Sociological Methods and Research*, May 2004, 32(4): 559-598.
- Sun, I., Triplett, R., and Gainey, R., 2004, "Neighborhood Characteristics and Crime: A Test of Sampson and Groves' Model of Social Disorganisation" *Western Criminology Review*, 5:1, 1-16.
- Te Hoe Nuku Roa www.tehoenukuroa.org.nz
- Theodori, G., 2001, "Examining the effects of community satisfaction and attachment on individual well-being" *Rural Sociology* December 2001, 66(4): 618-629.
- Tourangeau, R., Zimowski, M., and Ghadialy, R., 1997, *An Introduction to Panel Surveys in Transportation Studies* Paper prepared for the Federal Highway Administration, Chicago.
- Walters, W., 2002, "Later-Life Migration in the United States: A Review of Recent Literature". *Journal of Planning Literature*, August 2002, 17(1): 37-66.
- Webber, M., 1992, *Measuring Income Dynamics: The experience of Canada's Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics*. Paper presented at Seminar of Poverty Statistics, 7 – 9 May 1992. www1.ibge.gov.br/poverty/pdf/Canada.pdf
- Wooden, M., 2001, *Design and Management of a Household Panel Survey: Lessons from the International Experience*. HILDA Project Discussion Paper Series No.2/01

Woolever, C., 1992, "A Contextual Approach to Neighbourhood Attachment". *Urban Studies*, 1992, 29(1): 99-116.