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MOTIVATION and POLICY BACKGROUND
Increase in private renting

Sources:
1992 to 2008: ONS Labour Force Survey;
2008-09 onwards: English Housing Survey, full household sample
More pronounced for families with children

Households with children

- own outright
- buying with mortgage
- private renters
- social renters

Source: English Housing Survey
Reduction in housing subsidies for private renters

• From 2011, ‘Local Housing Allowance’ (LHA) was set at the 30th percentile of local market rents (so only rents for the cheapest third of homes would be fully funded)

• Weekly LHA capped at £400, regardless of household size or actual rent asked and paid

• Limiting property size for HB payments to 4 bedrooms

• From 2013, LHA caps increased in line with a new, generally less generous measure of inflation (the consumer price index)
Changes to security of tenure in social housing sector

- Localism Act 2011 abolished entitlement to secure tenancies. Five years to be offered as standard (if landlords chose) with extension dependent not only on good behaviour but on evidence of continuing housing need.

- LAs to fulfil homelessness duties by helping to arrange private sector tenancies rather than social housing.
Social sector size criteria (aka ‘bedroom tax’)

- Reduction in rent eligible for HB for ‘spare’ bedrooms (14% for one bedroom, 25% for two)
However, moves to date not as great as expected

- 94% of households affected by the bedroom tax had not moved in the first six months. Partly preference, partly because of lack of suitable smaller property (Wilcox 2014)
- In the private sector, also limited evidence of moves (mostly in London) (Beatty et al. 2013)
  - Tenants report moving as a ‘last resort’
  - Some not aware, or becoming aware and thinking about how to manage.
  - Cheaper accommodation not usually available
  - Landlords disinclined to evict but likely not to renew and to limit subsidised lettings in future
Possible longer term implications

• For middle and lower income home-owners, fewer moves (harder to move up the ladder)

• For newly forming families, long period before stable home ownership [potentially more moves in the early years or a longer period in unsuitable housing]

• Smaller homes for low income families – greater housing inequality

• And more difficult for separated parents, where one may have no space to accommodate visiting children

• Increasing hardship for families seeking to avoid moves (cutting back on other things; arrears and debt), and more evictions
MOVING HOME
IN THE EARLY YEARS
Our research

• To examine patterns of moves and child outcomes for children in the UK prior to these changes (early 2000s):
  → Using the Millennium Cohort Study

• To compare these to the US – with a much larger private rented sector and less security.
  → Using the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

• To draw out policy implications, given the current direction of UK housing policy
Why early years?

• Policy emphasis on the early years and early intervention, but housing largely absent from that agenda

• Young children (0-4) have high rates of moving:
  – in England and Wales: 11% moved between 2000-2001

• But little empirical evidence on moving and pre-school children
Families move home for many reasons:

• Events, such as new partnerships, divorce or the birth of a child
• Employment events, such as job loss or a new job
• To get a better ‘place’ – or cheaper

Moving home may have many outcomes:

• Moves often presumed an ‘adverse life event’
• Multiple moves may be detrimental
• Moves may result in worse housing and area
Some previous findings from the UK

- Moves associated with poor health in mothers of Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) and their infants. Accounted for by family characteristics and the negative circumstances associated with some moves (Tunstall et al 2002)

- Frequent moves in MCS before age 3 associated with lower uptake of immunisations, suggesting difficult to keep in touch with NHS (Pearce et al 2008)

- Many middle class parents in MCS move during their child’s pre-school years to be near better schools (Hansen 2014)

- Residential mobility did not appear to affect outcomes among children of the 1958 cohort at ages 4-17 in 1991 (Verropoulou et al 2002)
Focuses on children under 5

- Who moves, how far, how often, and for what reasons?
- Do children of frequent movers fare differently to those whose families move less?
- Are any deficits in child development accounted for by the circumstances that trigger moves?
- Are any deficits in child development accounted for by the type of destination?
- What evidence is there of other dimensions of child vulnerability?
DATA
Millennium Cohort Study (MCS)
Fragile Families & Child Wellbeing Study (FFS)

MCS
- About 19,000 children born between 2000 and 2001
- Interviews with parent(s) when the child was 9 months, 3, and 5 years (and later)
- Oversample poor & ethnic areas
- We restrict sample to complete observations on outcomes at 5
- Multiple imputation

→ Analytical sample: 14,373

FFS
- About 5,000 children born between 1998 and 2000, 20 large cities
- Interviews with parent(s) at child’s birth, and ages 1, 3, and 5 (and later)
- Oversample unmarried mothers
- Restrict sample to complete observations on outcomes at 5
- Multiple imputation

→ Analytical sample: 2,577
Surveys augmented with index of area social advantage

- Based on Statistical Small Areas: LSOA/Datazones/wards in NI

- PCA, factors:
  - % Highest qualification at lev 4 +
  - % in Managerial/Senior Professional occupations
  - % Unemployment (rev coded)
  - % Receiving means tested benefits (rev coded)
  - % Lone parent households (rev coded)
  - % With no qualifications (rev coded)

  Alpha = .89

  3 levels of area advantage:
  - Bottom 30%
  - Middle 40%
  - Top 30%

We created a similar bespoke index for the US
Change in the index of area social advantage

• This index is constant for a given area over the 5 years, but changes if family moves

• Change between age 9 months and age 5 years:
  1. **Stuck at bottom**: in bottom 30% at baseline and age 5
  2. **Going down**: at lower level of advantage at age 5
  3. **Stay middle**: in middle 40% at baseline and age 5
  4. **Going up**: at higher level of advantage at age 5
  5. **Stay at top**: in top 30% at baseline and age 5

[Corrects for changes <0.5 SD across categories]
RESULTS:
Home Moves
MCS children seldom moved more than once...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of moves: birth/9mths – 5yrs</th>
<th>MCS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 moves</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages are weighted
MCS children seldom moved more than once...

...but in FFS they did!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of moves: birth/9mths – 5yrs</th>
<th>MCS</th>
<th>FFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 moves</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages are weighted
### Movers by distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>MCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 2 km</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 10 km</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 km</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information missing for 5% of families*

Percentages are weighted

And a very similar pattern in FFS
...and MCS children moved very young

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves by age</th>
<th>MCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 9 months and 3 years</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 5 years</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages are weighted

While in FFS, 40% in each period
Stark differences in housing tenure

Percentages are weighted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing tenure at first survey</th>
<th>MCS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FFS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Public) Housing</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Renting</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing / Rent-free / Other</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moving most common among private tenants (and sharers)

Mobility rate by housing tenure

- **Home ownership**: 33%
- **Social housing**: 45%
- **Private renting**: 69%
- **Sharing / Other**: 67%

- **33%**
- **43%**
- **63%**
- **79%**
- **67%**
- **74%**

*in UK-MCS, by housing tenure at 9 months*

Percentages are weighted
Who moved with a child under 5?

**MCS**
- Partner change
- Workless/ losing work
- Private renters
- Young mother
- New births
- Depressed mother
- Higher income
- More educated mothers
- Not Black/South Asian

**FFS**
- Partner change
- Workless/ losing work
- Renters
- Young mother
- New births
- Depressed mother
- Poor health in mother/child
- Lower income
- Less educated mothers
- Not Black/Hispanic

Results of multiple logistic regression
RESULTS:
Outcomes of moves
Do moves result in better or worse areas?

Comparing first and age 5 surveys

- Stuck bottom 30%
- Going down
- Stay middle 40%
- Going up
- Stay at top 30%

**UK - MCS**
- Stuck bottom: 21%
- Going down: 13%
- Stay middle: 19%
- Going up: 21%

**US - FFS**
- Stuck bottom: 21%
- Going down: 10%
- Stay middle: 18%
- Going up: 18%

Percentages are weighted.
Do moves result in more housing space or better areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCS Movers</th>
<th>Better area than before or top 30%</th>
<th>Similar area as before (but not at top or bottom)</th>
<th>Worse area than before or bottom 30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bigger home</td>
<td>Gain or maintain 55.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed 17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same sized home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller home</td>
<td>Mixed 6.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double Disadvantage 20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS:
Outcomes for MCS children
Child outcomes at age 5

- **Naming vocabulary:**
  From British Ability Scales: Child asked by the interviewer to name objects in a picture book

- **Externalising behaviour:**
  Parent report on Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire:
  Sum of items from: Conduct problems (5 items); Hyperactivity/Inattention (5 items)
  $[\alpha = .79]$  

- **Internalising behaviour:**
  Parent report on Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire
  Sum of items from: Emotional symptoms (5 items); Peer problems (5 items)
  $[\alpha = .66]$
Child outcomes: Elaborating an explanatory model

Simple model:

1. Child outcome at age 5 = \( \beta(\text{Number of moves}) + \text{sex} + \text{exact age at 'Age5' survey} \)

Sequentially more complex models, to see if \( \beta \) can be explained by:

2. Family structure/change
3. Employment status/change
4. Housing tenure at baseline

Fully controlled model:

5. Child outcome = \( \beta(\text{Number of moves}) + \text{sex} + \text{age} + \text{controls} \)

Controls for Context (mostly at baseline):

- Household: income at baseline; size at baseline; birth of additional child
- Cohort member: first born, low birth weight, health,
- Respondent (mother): age, education, ethnicity, country of birth, health, depression
Child outcomes: Elaborating an explanatory model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficits per move in standard deviations (β)</th>
<th>1. No controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (deficit)</td>
<td>0.043***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalised Problems</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalised Problems</td>
<td>0.058***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All models control for child sex and age in months
### Child outcomes: Elaborating an explanatory model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficits per move in standard deviations (β)</th>
<th>1. No controls</th>
<th>2. Plus Partnership change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary (deficit)</strong></td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externalised Problems</strong></td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalised Problems</strong></td>
<td>0.058***</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All models control for child sex and age in months
## Child outcomes: Elaborating an explanatory model

### Deficits per move in standard deviations (β)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (deficit)</td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalised Problems</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalised Problems</td>
<td>0.058***</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All models control for child sex and age in months.
## Child outcomes: Elaborating an explanatory model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (deficit)</td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalised Problems</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
<td>0.062*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalised Problems</td>
<td>0.058***</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All models control for child sex and age in months
## Child outcomes: Elaborating an explanatory model

### Deficits per move in standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary (deficit)</strong></td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externalised Problems</strong></td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
<td>0.062*</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalised Problems</strong></td>
<td>0.058***</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All models control for child sex and age in months
Child outcomes: Elaborating an explanatory model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (deficit)</td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalised Problems</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
<td>0.062*</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalised Problems</td>
<td>0.058***</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All models control for child sex and age in months

Very similar pattern of results in FFS, in USA, on three similar child outcomes
Child outcomes: Exploring type of move

Fully controlled model:

5. \( \text{Child outcome} = \beta(\text{Number of moves}) + \text{sex} + \text{age} + \text{controls} \)

Contextual controls:
- Household: income at baseline; size at baseline; birth of additional child
- Cohort member: whether first born, whether low birth weight, health, Respondent (mother): age, education, ethnicity, country of birth, health, depression

6. \( \text{Child outcome} = \beta(\text{Type of move}) + \text{gender} + \text{age} + \text{controls} \)

Type of move:
- Stayers (reference category)
- Gain or maintain place/ housing space
- Mixed outcomes
- Doubly disadvantaged – loss on at least one front not compensated by a gain on the other
Child outcomes and move type:

- Vocabulary Deficit
- Externalising
- Internalising

Gain or same as before
Mixed move outcome
Doubly disadvantaged

Standard Deviations

-0.05 -0.03 -0.01 0.01 0.03 0.05 0.07 0.09 0.11

Vocabulary Deficit
Externalising
Internalising

OLS regression. Significance: not sig; †p < .1, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
What else is significant in the full model?

Developmental deficits between illustrative rich and lower income families

- Couple, high income, home owned, mother age 35, degree
- Couple, average income, home owned, mother 29, NVQ3
- Couple, low income, social tenant, mother age 24, no quals,
- Couple, low income, social tenant mother age 24, no quals, no job
- Lone mother from start, low income, social tenant, age 24, no quals, no job

Vocabulary
Externalising
Internalising

Standard deviations
Findings from further investigations

• **Very recent moves** (less than 6 months) showed higher externalising scores (only) in full model.

• **Remaining in disadvantaged area**, whether moved or not, associated with poor outcomes.

• **Neighbourhood themselves can change**: neighbourhood decline may intensify some of the area setbacks experience by movers.

• Moving **after school age**: minor increase in internalising behaviour among older siblings of the cohort – only borderline significance.
CONCLUSIONS
Moving has many contexts

Is there a shift towards the miserable end of this spectrum?
Moving home was a common life event for children, but it was not necessarily, for 5 year olds in the early 2000s, an ‘adverse’ one in either US or UK.

But in some circumstances – family break-up, job loss, unstable tenancies, moves to smaller homes or worse neighbourhoods – outcomes for children can be adverse.

Many of these circumstances are more prevalent in the US and are likely to be more common in the UK now than they were a decade ago.
• Living in disadvantaged areas is associated with worse outcomes, for both movers and stayers, even after large set of controls.

• We confirm important social disadvantages associated with gaps in child development whether or not the family moved
Policy implications

- Policies should enable families to move to meet their changing needs, alert to the dangers of either immobility as well as mobility forced by unaffordability.

- Early years’ investment for low income families should extend to suitable housing – not just ‘child care’.

- The management of services for young children (and surveys of them) needs to make provision for their mobility.
Thank you

We look forward to the comments of the panel and the audience
Moving: gains and losses

- Better resourced families most likely to gain or maintain
- Growing families are less likely to maintain on one or both fronts
- Partnership changes such as separation and/or arrival of new partner are associated with doubly disadvantageous moves
- Private renters particularly likely to move to a worse area even if they gain space – a mixed outcome
- Social housing rules protect tenants from moving to smaller homes