



# Patterns of Net Migration in England in the Context of the Urban\_Rural Definition, Census 2001

Professor Tony Champion  
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

For the Rural Evidence Research Centre  
April 2004

## 1. Background

- 1.1 This paper reports on an analysis of ward level migration data using the new rural definition. The data are from 2001 Census Standard Table S008, which gives migrant status for all residents by 8 age groups (0-15, 16-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60-74, 75+) and gender. The report focuses entirely on net within-UK migration and covers the following topics:
- rural aggregate versus urban aggregate, for England as a whole and by GOR, for all ages combined and the 8 age groups;
  - rural definition breakdown into Rural Towns ('urban areas' of under 10,000 usual residents) and Villages/Scattered, and by sparsity indicator (remote, not remote), for England as a whole, for all ages combined and the 8 age groups;
  - rural definition breakdown into Rural Towns and Villages/Scattered and by sparsity indicator (remote, not remote), by GOR, for all ages combined and the 8 age groups;
- 1.2 Given that this analysis is undertaken from ward-level data, the two categories of Villages and Scattered settlement recognized at Census Output Area level have to be combined. The analysis excludes 'market towns' of 10,000 residents and over, which are included in the 'urban areas of 10,000 residents and over, but can be the subject of later analysis.
- 1.3 The main measure of migration used in this initial work is net migration balance of residential moves with a known (or imputed) origin and destination within the UK. This is the single most important migration measure for rural and urban areas. Until the ONS releases the Origin-Destination Tables on migration, it is not possible to see whether migrants are moving to and from rural and urban areas. Net migration, being the difference between total inflows and outflows, is also the migration measure that is most sensitive to any inadequacies in the data, allowing a check on data quality.
- 1.4 The net migration measure omits the effect of any people for whom either the origin or the destination of the move is not known. The former comprises those people who indicated that they had 'no usual address' one year before the Census. The only people whose destination is not known are those leaving the UK during the year before the Census, whom by definition the Census cannot count. It is for this reason that the net migration measure is restricted to people who moved within the UK.
- 1.5 Attention is focused on total persons and 8 age groups. Analysis by gender can be undertaken using the dataset provided by RERC,

though in general nowadays there is rather little difference in migration behaviour between males and females (except for specific types of move such as by Armed Forces personnel and insofar as it arises from the fuller coverage of females than males in the Census – see below).

- 1.6 In due course other characteristics of migrants besides age and gender can be examined. Standard Tables relating to household type have already been released. Key Statistics Table 24 gives a breakdown of migrant type for 'people in ethnic groups other than white'. Additional characteristics are included in Theme Tables 33 and 34, but the currently available ward-level versions of these exclude out-migrants to Scotland and Northern Ireland (though including in-migrants from these countries under the heading 'from elsewhere in the UK' which includes other parts of England and Wales) and therefore cannot be used to provide meaningful data on net migration.
- 1.7 This work should be seen partly as a test of the discriminatory value of the new rural definition, as well as providing intelligence of an issue of major concern in the management of rural England. At the same time, it should be recognized that, given that this represents the first analyses of the migration data from the ward-level Standard Tables, it also represents the first test of this aspect of the 2001 Census (see the next section for a discussion of issues arising from the 'One Number Census' and the one-year change of address data on which this study is based). Confidence in both the new rural definition and the 2001 Census will be increased if the results of this analysis conform with conventional wisdom or if any departures appear to have a sound explanation.

## **2. The Data**

- 2.1 The migration data used in the analyses reported below derive from Standard Table S008 of the 2001 Census. This is from the official One Number Census figures released by ONS. In gauging the confidence that can be placed in these figures, a number of things should be noted.
  - the figures are produced by a combination of direct enumeration and estimation, the latter being used to allow for any underenumeration suggested by the subsequent Census Coverage Survey. The estimation element involved imputation of additional people by copying records of people who were actually enumerated.
  - where a person's Census form indicated a change of address but did not give details of the previous address, the latter was imputed from the record of another person with similar characteristics. Also, if the 'address one year ago' question was not completed, the record was similarly imputed. If, however, the

box 'no usual address one year ago' was ticked, then this was recorded as such in the census output.

- as part of disclosure control, no counts of 1 and 2 have been released in the 2001 Census output. Instead, these have been replaced by 0 and 3 using a randomized procedure rather than rounding. Though this procedure has not been made public, it is understood that actual cell counts of 0 and 3 and over have not been altered by this 'small cell adjustment mechanism' (SCAM). On this basis, published figures of 0 may have originally been 0, 1 or 2, and published figures of 3 may have originally been 1, 2 or 3. As the relevant panels of Standard Table S008 contained 414 data counts for 7,932 wards, a large proportion of the resulting 3.28 million cells from which the present dataset is aggregated comprise 0s and 3s. Though the procedure is meant to be unbiased, the figure of total residents derived from aggregating S008 is somewhat different from the unadjusted One Number Census total, even at national level (49,141,955, as opposed to 49,106,140 from the direct count of ward population totals). It is particularly out of line for the remote wards of the Villages/Scattered category, at 3.4% above the unadjusted total (see Annex 1).
- being the official One Number Census data, the figures analyses here do not allow for the subsequent revisions made by ONS to the 2001 population; namely, the addition of 193,000 (mainly younger adult males) to the population of England and Wales, and the addition of 20,200 to the population of the City of Manchester. Note that, following further checking exercises, ONS announced (on 7 November 2003) that it may be making further changes to the 2001 population.

### 3. Migration for rural and urban areas in the year before the 2001 Census

- 3.1 Table 1 presents the England-wide picture of the migration recorded as taking place during the 12 months before the 2001 Census, differentiating between rural and urban wards, where 'rural' includes Rural Towns (urban areas of up to 10,000 residents). It can be seen that the rural population is somewhat less migratory than the urban, with 89.2% having not changed address during the year compared to 87.4% for the population living in urban wards in 2001. While the proportions of residents who had moved within the same ward were very similar for rural and urban wards, rural areas contained fewer people that had considered themselves to have no usual address the year and somewhat fewer immigrants from outside the UK.

**Table 1. Migrant status, 2000-2001, England, by urban and rural wards**

Migrant Status	Number	% Population 2001
----------------	--------	-------------------

	Rural	Urban	England	Rural	Urban	England
Population 2001	9,119,624	40,022,331	49,141,955	100.00	100.00	100.00
Living at same address	8,132,300	34,993,146	43,125,446	89.17	87.43	87.76
Moved within same ward	179,127	805,018	984,145	1.96	2.01	2.00
No usual address before	47,027	353,220	400,247	0.52	0.88	0.81
Moved in from rest of UK*	710,178	3,561,246	4,271,424	7.79	8.90	8.69
Moved out to rest of UK*	682,389	3,592,291	4,274,680	7.48	8.98	8.70
Net within-UK migration	27,789	-31,045	-3,256	0.30	-0.08	-0.01
Moved in from outside UK	50,992	309,701	360,693	0.56	0.77	0.73

\* Comprising the sum of the migrant exchanges between each England ward of the specified type and all other wards in the UK, including wards of the same type and in the same local authority district.

Source: calculated from 2001 Census Standard Table S008. Crown copyright reserved.

3.2 The main differences between rural and urban wards were the lower levels of exchange with the rest of the UK for the former – both for inflows and outflows – and the fact that rural wards, in aggregate, were a net gainer from this process at the expense of the urban wards (Table 1). In all, the rural wards gained nearly 28,000 people through their exchanges with the rest of the UK, while the urban wards lost over 31,000 people. The difference of just over 3,000 people in these net migration figures represents England’s overall net loss to the rest of the UK, though the exact figure for this exchange depends on the effects of the small cell adjustment mechanism (see previous section). It is mainly for this reason that the rest of this report focuses entirely on net within-UK migration.

3.3 It should be stressed that the 28,000 net gain by rural England from the rest of the UK is the figure derived from applying the new ward-level definition of urban and rural areas. A more precise figure for rural England would be obtained by applying the full definition on the basis of Output Areas, but that will not be possible to achieve until the 2001 Census Origin-Destination Tables (SMS3) are released. (It cannot be calculated from the Census Area Statistics for Output Areas, because the equivalent table CAS008 combines in-migration from the rest of the UK with immigration from overseas.) Note that a very different picture is obtained if ‘rural areas’ are equated with the shire counties, with net migration from London and the six former metropolitan counties of England averaging some 90,000 a year since the 1980s – much of it destined for towns of over 10,000 people rather than rural areas. Similarly, implementing a district-level distinction between urban and rural areas (such as the Tarling classification used by the Countryside Agency) would produce a different set of figures again.

3.4 Table 2 provides an age breakdown of the rural wards’ net exchanges with the rest of the UK, using an 8-fold grouping reflecting lifestage that has been shown by previous research to capture the main age differences in migration behaviour. It can be seen that rural wards are net gainers of 0-15 year olds and all the age groups from 30 years old.

This includes the older elderly aged 75+, though the rate of net gain is very small at just 0.14% of the 2001 rural population in this age group. The highest gain rate is for 30-44 year olds, followed by 0-15 year olds who are presumably mainly the children of this age group. The rate of net gain drops steeply between the 30-44 and 45-59 groups, which partly reflects the lower overall residential mobility of the latter. The rate falls less rapidly to the 60-74 year olds, whose net movement into rural areas will include people moving at, or close to, retirement.

- 3.5 Rural wards, however, are a net loser of 16-29 year olds to the rest of the UK, presumably most going to the urban areas of England (though this element cannot be distinguished from exchanges with the rest of the UK without the aid of the Origin-Destination Tables). The rate of loss is particularly high for 20-24 year olds, amounting to around 1 in 15 of the rural population in this age group in this 12-month period. The loss of 16-19 year olds is almost as high, at 1 in 19, but that for 25-29 year olds is much lower; indeed, if individual year of age data were available, it might show a switch from net loss to net gain for rural wards taking place near the midpoint of this span, say around 27 years old. This pattern conforms closely with expectations from previous research showing an exodus of school-leavers and young adults from rural areas as they move to higher education, employment, etc., but net gains of families and older people.

**Table 2. Net within-UK migration, 2000-2001, for rural and urban wards of England, by age group**

Age Group	Number			% age group population		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
All Age Groups	27,789	-31,045	-3,256	0.30	-0.08	-0.01
0-15	22,672	-24,772	-2,100	1.30	-0.30	-0.02
16-19	-21,568	21,830	262	-5.22	1.09	0.01
20-24	-24,422	31,189	6,767	-6.48	1.21	0.23
25-29	-1,916	4,302	2,386	-0.45	0.15	0.07
30-44	32,859	-36,429	-3,570	1.68	-0.40	-0.03
45-59	13,569	-17,895	-4,326	0.66	-0.25	-0.05
60-74	5,550	-7,881	-2,331	0.39	-0.15	-0.04
75+	1,045	-1,389	-344	0.14	-0.05	-0.01

Source: calculated from 2001 Census Standard Table S008. Crown copyright reserved.

- 3.6 A breakdown of these figures by GOR (Table 3) confirms this familiar pattern for rural areas. Looking first of total net migration with the rest of the UK (i.e. all ages), all but two regions recorded a gain. The exceptions were London, whose rural wards lost just 50 people in the year before the census, and the South East GOR, with a net loss of nearly 1,000 people. In terms of the 8 age groups, all 9 GORs saw their rural wards losing people aged 16-19 and all but London lost people aged 20-24. The picture for 25-29 year olds is more evenly split, with

net gains (admittedly relatively small) made by the rural wards of Yorkshire and the Humber, the East Midlands, the East of England.

**Table 3. Net within-UK migration, 2000-2001, rural wards of England, for 8 age groups by GOR**

GOR	0-15	16-19	20-24	25-29	30-44	45-59	60-74	75+	All	2001 Pop
<b>Number</b>										
North East	469	-1021	-643	-143	871	561	219	-15	298	431077
North West	2164	-1636	-2809	-447	2394	998	369	-27	1006	749116
Yorks & Humber	2797	-1521	-2166	112	3035	1765	693	137	4852	882633
East Midlands	3943	-4195	-3312	46	5573	1903	1344	212	5514	1203675
West Midlands	2264	-1110	-2263	-513	3054	1323	619	365	3739	811682
East of England	3406	-4178	-3505	258	6227	2578	1466	182	6434	1656831
London	-31	-21	13	-3	-14	-19	-14	39	-50	11767
South East	3437	-4025	-5156	-684	5868	317	-651	-129	-1023	1723096
South West	4223	-3861	-4581	-542	5851	4143	1505	281	7019	1649747
<i>All</i>	<i>22672</i>	<i>-21568</i>	<i>-24422</i>	<i>-1916</i>	<i>32859</i>	<i>13569</i>	<i>5550</i>	<i>1045</i>	<i>27789</i>	<i>9119624</i>
<b>% age group</b>										
North East	0.58	-5.19	-3.27	-0.66	0.93	0.60	0.32	-0.04	0.07	431077
North West	1.57	-4.76	-8.81	-1.26	1.49	0.59	0.31	-0.04	0.13	749116
Yorks & Humber	1.63	-3.63	-5.91	0.26	1.56	0.90	0.53	0.20	0.55	882633
East Midlands	1.69	-7.82	-6.88	0.08	2.10	0.70	0.74	0.22	0.46	1203675
West Midlands	1.51	-3.01	-6.57	-1.41	1.79	0.70	0.48	0.55	0.46	811682
East of England	1.07	-5.70	-4.95	0.32	1.74	0.70	0.58	0.13	0.39	1656831
London	-1.39	-4.32	2.44	-0.44	-0.49	-0.81	-0.79	4.59	-0.42	11767
South East	1.02	-5.09	-7.35	-0.89	1.57	0.08	-0.25	-0.09	-0.06	1723096
South West	1.37	-5.24	-7.11	-0.74	1.75	1.12	0.56	0.18	0.43	1649747
<i>All</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>-5.22</i>	<i>-6.48</i>	<i>-0.45</i>	<i>1.68</i>	<i>0.66</i>	<i>0.39</i>	<i>0.14</i>	<i>0.30</i>	<i>9119624</i>

Source: calculated from 2001 Census Standard Table S008. Crown copyright reserved.

3.7 For the age groups that saw rural gains nationally, there are relatively few exceptions from this picture at GOR level. For the 75+ age group, the low national gain rate clearly reflects the fact that this age group saw net migration loss in three of the 9 regions – North East, North West, South East. As regards 60-74 year olds, only two regions – London and the South East GORs – lost 60-74 years olds from their rural wards. London’s rural component also had a net loss of 0-15, 16-19, 30-44 and 45-59 year olds.

3.8 How are we to account for these exceptions to the general picture? London is obviously a very special case, with just two rural wards accounting for barely 12,000 people or 0.2% of its 7.2 million residents. As such, we will exclude it from the rest of the GOR-level analyses. The South East’s losses of both groups aged 60 and over may partly reflect longer-distance retirement migration away from the high house prices and congestion of areas south and west of London. The losses of the 75+ from the rural wards of the North East and North West may reflect the prevalence of ‘defensive’ moves by less healthy and mobile

households to urban areas with better facilities, allied to the general lack of dynamism shown by these rural areas as reflected in their low rate of net gains of all age groups of 45 years old and over compared to other regions (see the lower panel in Table 3).

**Table 4. Net within-UK migration rate, 2000-2001, rural and urban wards of England, for 8 age groups by GOR**

GOR	Ward Type	0-15	16-19	20-24	25-29	30-44	45-59	60-74	75+	All Ages	2001 Pop
NE	Rural	0.58	-5.19	-3.27	-0.66	0.93	0.60	0.32	-0.04	0.07	431077
	Urban	-0.06	2.36	-1.73	-0.47	-0.21	-0.16	-0.03	0.00	-0.10	2084339
NW	Rural	1.57	-4.76	-8.81	-1.26	1.49	0.59	0.31	-0.04	0.13	749116
	Urban	-0.09	0.11	-0.04	-0.29	-0.17	-0.15	-0.08	-0.14	-0.12	5981137
YH	Rural	1.63	-3.63	-5.91	0.26	1.56	0.90	0.53	0.20	0.55	882633
	Urban	-0.17	3.85	-0.07	-0.53	-0.28	-0.13	-0.06	-0.09	0.03	4082817
EM	Rural	1.69	-7.82	-6.88	0.08	2.10	0.70	0.74	0.22	0.46	1203675
	Urban	0.15	3.99	0.29	0.17	0.04	0.10	0.26	0.25	0.35	2968841
WM	Rural	1.51	-3.01	-6.57	-1.41	1.79	0.70	0.48	0.55	0.46	811682
	Urban	-0.15	0.63	-0.53	-0.58	-0.36	-0.26	-0.18	-0.09	-0.23	4456304
EE	Rural	1.07	-5.70	-4.95	0.32	1.74	0.70	0.58	0.13	0.39	1656831
	Urban	0.09	-0.85	0.77	0.74	0.05	-0.08	0.15	0.41	0.12	3731453
LD	Rural	-1.39	-4.32	2.44	-0.44	-0.49	-0.81	-0.79	4.59	-0.42	11767
	Urban	-1.69	-0.61	5.20	0.57	-1.70	-1.11	-1.22	-0.98	-0.73	7161003
SE	Rural	1.02	-5.09	-7.35	-0.89	1.57	0.08	-0.25	-0.09	-0.06	1723096
	Urban	-0.01	0.80	0.92	0.44	0.07	-0.20	-0.12	0.26	0.11	6277539
SW	Rural	1.37	-5.24	-7.11	-0.74	1.75	1.12	0.56	0.18	0.43	1649747
	Urban	0.39	2.65	0.86	0.51	0.32	0.41	0.57	0.31	0.54	3278898
England	Rural	1.30	-5.22	-6.48	-0.45	1.68	0.66	0.39	0.14	0.30	9119624
	Urban	-0.30	1.09	1.21	0.15	-0.40	-0.25	-0.15	-0.05	-0.08	40022331

Note: Figures show % of 2001 population in age group, except in final column.  
Source: calculated from 2001 Census Standard Table S008. Crown copyright reserved.

#### 4. Net migration for the ward-level rural classification: the national picture

4.1 This section presents, for the whole of England, net within-UK migration for a breakdown of the rural wards by settlement type and sparsity. As mentioned above, at the ward level only two settlement types can be distinguished: Rural Towns ('urban areas' of under 10,000

usual residents) and Villages/Scattered. These are then subdivided by the sparsity indicator (remote, not remote).

- 4.2 The national picture is presented in Table 5. It is found that Rural Towns are gaining the lion's share of the net within-UK migration growth of England's rural wards – nearly 20,000 in 2000-2001 and just under three times the Villages/Scattered settlement type. Given the smaller population size of the latter, the percentage rate differential is rather smaller, but even so the rate for Rural Towns is more than twice as high, at 0.41% to the Villages/Scattered's 0.18%.

**Table 5. Total net within-UK migration, 2000-2001, England, by rural classification**

Rural Classification	Population 2001	Net Migration	% Population
All Rural Wards	9,119,624	27,789	0.30
Rural Towns	4,822,280	19,958	0.41
Not Remote	4,588,579	17,603	0.38
Remote	233,701	2,355	1.01
Villages & Scattered	4,297,344	7,831	0.18
Not Remote	3,936,174	7,152	0.18
Remote	361,170	679	0.19

Source: calculated from 2001 Census Standard Table S008. Crown copyright reserved.

- 4.3 As regards the sparsity indicator, remoteness has a different effect for Towns as opposed to Villages/Scattered. The net migration gain rate for remote Towns is nearly three times that for the non-remote Towns, but for the Villages/Scattered category remoteness is similar to not remote. How this plays out in terms of the 8 age groups across the rural types is shown in Table 6.

**Table 6. Total net within-UK migration rate, 2000-2001, England, for types of rural wards, by age group**

Rural Classification	0-15	16-19	20-24	25-29	30-44	45-59	60-74	75+	All Ages
All Rural Wards	1.30	-5.22	-6.48	-0.45	1.68	0.66	0.39	0.14	0.30
Rural Towns	1.19	-4.94	-4.28	0.05	1.45	0.59	0.73	0.52	0.41
Not Remote	1.18	-4.95	-4.38	0.09	1.46	0.53	0.68	0.44	0.38
Remote	1.48	-4.88	-2.30	-0.82	1.22	1.94	1.54	1.60	1.01
Villages & Scattered	1.43	-5.54	-9.28	-1.13	1.96	0.74	0.04	-0.33	0.18
Not Remote	1.44	-5.15	-9.18	-1.08	1.96	0.63	0.00	-0.23	0.18
Remote	1.31	-10.12	-10.54	-1.69	1.96	1.87	0.48	-1.24	0.19

Note: Figures show % of 2001 population in age group.

Source: calculated from 2001 Census Standard Table S008. Crown copyright reserved.

- 4.4 The general pattern for the rural classification is very similar to the rural total, with net losses for the three younger adult age groups (apart from a slight positive balance for 25-29 year olds for not-remote Towns) and net gains otherwise, but there are some exceptions and differences (Table 6). As regards the exceptions, the Villages/Scattered category recorded net loss of the 75+ age group and a zero balance of the 60-74 group for its not-remote element. Also pulling down the all-ages gain rate for the Villages/Scattered category compared to the Rural Towns is the former's higher net loss of 16-29 year olds, with a particularly large difference for the 20-24s. In fact, it is only for the 30-44 year olds that the Villages/Scattered category has a more positive net migration rate than the Towns.
- 4.5 Similarly, looking at the not-remote/remote distinction, a more mixed picture is found (Table 6, middle panel). The reason why the remote Rural Towns has a much higher overall net gain rate than the not-remote ones lies principally with the age groups of 45 and over, but the former also has the lower net loss of 20-24 year olds and the higher net gain of 0-15 year olds (but, surprisingly, not of the 'parental' age group 30-44). The remote Towns also perform the less strongly on the 16-19 and 25-29 year olds.
- 4.6 Turning to the Villages/Scattered category, the stronger performance switches between remote and non-remote, but in a more regular way (Table 6, lower panel). The former has the slightly more favourable balance for all age groups up to and including the 30-44s, with a particularly marked difference for the 16-19 year olds. For the 45-59 and 60-74 age groups the remote then has the advantage, but then with the 75+ year olds the rate of net loss is much the higher for the remote wards.

## **5. Net migration for the ward-level rural classification: the regional picture**

- 5.1 How do these national patterns vary across the regions? In broad terms, they are very largely replicated across all the GORs, as shown in Table 7 (NB. London is excluded, as mentioned above). But there is some small variation that we will highlight.
- 5.2 In the first place, concerning the relative contributions of Rural Towns and Villages/Scattered categories to the overall all-ages net migration balance, the former outperforms the latter in all regions but one (Table 7, final column). The exception is the North West, where the net migration balance was zero balanced for Towns but quite strongly positive for Villages/Scattered. There was only one other instance of a net migration loss – Villages/Scattered in the North East – but this was very small. In every other case, both categories were contributing to the overall rural net migration gains, but it was the Rural Towns that had the higher rates of gain.

- 5.3 Looking along the rows for Rural Towns and Villages/Scattered in Table 7, the pattern of net gains and losses by age is pretty consistent across the regions. Both categories in all 8 regions registered net losses of 16-19 and 20-24 year olds. For the 25-29 year olds, the picture was somewhat more varied. There were more instances of net loss, but net gains are found for Towns in four regions (YH, EM, EE and SE) and for V/S in just one region (EE). In terms of the difference between Towns and V/S in each region, the former generally had the more positive balance (i.e. lower net migration loss), The only cases where the V/S loss rate was smaller than for Towns in these three age groups were for 16-19 year olds in the NW and 16-19 year olds in SE.
- 5.4 There is also strong regional consistency in the highest age group of 75+. In every region the V/S category had a negative migration balance, while Towns gained (Table 7, penult column). In addition, in the 60-74 group, there were two instances of net migration loss, both involving the V/S category (NW and SE). Finally, for the remaining three age groups (0-15, 30-44 and 45-59), there were universal net migration gains at this level of the two-category split.

**Table 7. Net within-UK migration rate, 2000-2001, Government Office Regions, for types of rural settlement**

GOR	0-15	16-19	20-24	25-29	30-44	45-59	60-74	75+	All
<b>North East</b>									
<b>All rural wards</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>-5.19</b>	<b>-3.27</b>	<b>-0.66</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>-0.04</b>	<b>0.07</b>
Rural Towns	0.48	-4.13	-2.05	-0.25	0.68	0.51	0.28	0.23	0.10
<i>not remote</i>	0.49	-3.81	-2.00	-0.17	0.61	0.37	0.23	0.15	0.07
<i>remote</i>	0.36	-7.79	-2.71	-1.24	1.41	2.05	0.79	0.92	0.49
Villages/scattered	1.00	-9.62	-9.31	-2.66	1.90	0.91	0.48	-1.19	-0.07
<i>not remote</i>	2.61	-8.07	-8.06	-4.21	3.14	0.26	0.10	0.43	0.42
<i>remote</i>	-1.41	-11.93	-11.39	-0.41	0.15	1.85	0.94	-3.19	-0.75
<b>North West</b>									
<b>All rural wards</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>-4.76</b>	<b>-8.81</b>	<b>-1.26</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>-0.04</b>	<b>0.13</b>
Rural Towns	1.13	-7.83	-4.96	-1.05	0.97	0.35	0.61	0.15	0.00
<i>not remote</i>	1.00	-8.31	-5.53	-0.83	1.03	0.31	0.52	0.07	-0.07
<i>remote</i>	2.50	-3.30	-0.11	-3.32	0.35	0.74	1.39	0.76	0.65
Villages/scattered	2.16	-1.14	-13.92	-1.60	2.18	0.88	-0.06	-0.32	0.31
<i>not remote</i>	2.24	0.45	-14.76	-1.83	2.38	0.68	-0.12	-0.27	0.34
<i>remote</i>	1.82	-9.13	-9.63	-0.64	1.25	1.76	0.18	-0.54	0.21
<b>Yorks &amp; Humber</b>									
<b>All rural wards</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>-3.63</b>	<b>-5.91</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.55</b>
Rural Towns	1.60	-3.41	-5.38	0.58	1.54	0.77	0.69	0.80	0.62
<i>not remote</i>	1.69	-3.12	-5.40	0.67	1.62	0.72	0.64	0.57	0.63
<i>remote</i>	0.26	-8.38	-5.03	-0.82	0.31	1.51	1.30	3.15	0.41
Villages/scattered	1.67	-4.02	-6.95	-0.38	1.59	1.12	0.26	-0.95	0.43
<i>not remote</i>	1.59	-2.63	-6.07	-0.13	1.43	1.02	0.29	-0.71	0.49
<i>remote</i>	2.19	-12.76	-12.92	-2.05	2.64	1.64	0.12	-1.98	0.11
<b>East Midlands</b>									
<b>All rural wards</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>-7.82</b>	<b>-6.88</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.46</b>
Rural Towns	1.64	-7.32	-5.45	0.35	1.92	0.53	1.01	0.39	0.49
<i>not remote</i>	1.63	-7.39	-5.54	0.36	1.90	0.52	0.99	0.40	0.48
<i>remote</i>	2.46	0.69	3.51	-0.29	3.43	1.56	2.69	-0.50	1.98
Villages/scattered	1.78	-8.62	-9.29	-0.41	2.39	0.94	0.38	-0.03	0.41
<i>not remote</i>	1.73	-7.90	-9.01	-0.38	2.41	0.85	0.42	0.04	0.44
<i>remote</i>	2.69	-20.83	-14.21	-1.02	2.02	2.22	-0.17	-1.07	-0.09
<b>West Midlands</b>									
<b>All rural wards</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>-3.01</b>	<b>-6.57</b>	<b>-1.41</b>	<b>1.79</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.46</b>
Rural Towns	1.49	0.97	-3.41	-0.46	1.68	0.61	0.92	1.37	0.88
<i>not remote</i>	1.53	1.11	-3.28	-0.55	1.73	0.57	0.88	1.40	0.89
<i>remote</i>	0.78	-1.80	-6.05	1.01	0.70	1.31	1.62	0.95	0.66
Villages/scattered	1.53	-6.14	-9.56	-2.32	1.88	0.76	0.19	-0.05	0.16
<i>not remote</i>	1.50	-5.70	-9.59	-2.22	1.86	0.67	0.13	0.16	0.15
<i>remote</i>	1.87	-11.87	-9.20	-3.62	2.11	1.75	0.78	-2.16	0.25
<b>East of England</b>									
<b>All rural wards</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>-5.70</b>	<b>-4.95</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>1.74</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.39</b>
Rural Towns	0.80	-4.89	-3.06	0.39	1.28	0.60	0.93	0.64	0.42
<i>not remote</i>	0.80	-4.86	-3.09	0.46	1.29	0.46	0.82	0.56	0.37
<i>remote</i>	0.87	-5.44	-2.48	-1.23	0.90	3.06	2.20	1.38	1.19
Villages/scattered	1.35	-6.56	-7.18	0.23	2.24	0.80	0.24	-0.45	0.36
<i>not remote</i>	1.36	-6.83	-7.20	0.34	2.22	0.74	0.20	-0.44	0.33

<i>remote</i>	1.07	0.71	-6.63	-2.78	2.89	2.27	0.96	-0.69	1.03
<b>South East</b>									
<b>All rural wards</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>-5.09</b>	<b>-7.35</b>	<b>-0.89</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>-0.09</b>	<b>-0.06</b>
Rural Towns*	1.03	-6.30	-5.45	0.48	1.49	0.15	0.19	0.19	0.13
Villages/scattered*	1.01	-4.00	-9.21	-2.45	1.65	0.02	-0.67	-0.39	-0.24
<b>South West</b>									
<b>All rural wards</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>-5.24</b>	<b>-7.11</b>	<b>-0.74</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.43</b>
Rural Towns	1.33	-4.05	-3.83	-0.55	1.61	1.22	1.04	0.56	0.68
<i>not remote</i>	1.22	-4.09	-4.00	-0.66	1.54	1.14	1.02	0.39	0.59
<i>remote</i>	2.76	-3.46	-1.75	0.73	2.58	2.25	1.32	2.10	1.72
Villages/scattered	1.40	-6.26	-10.25	-0.93	1.87	1.05	0.18	-0.18	0.22
<i>not remote</i>	1.46	-5.91	-10.23	-0.80	1.80	0.93	0.12	-0.10	0.20
<i>remote</i>	1.01	-8.72	-10.41	-1.82	2.43	1.89	0.55	-0.67	0.33

Note: Figures show % of 2001 population in age group. \* all wards in GOR are 'not remote'.

Source: calculated from 2001 Census Standard Table S008. Crown copyright reserved.

- 5.5 Finally is the role of remoteness/sparsity at the regional level. At national level (Table 6), it has already been shown that, for all ages combined, remoteness boosts net migration gain for Rural Towns, but maintains it for V/S, albeit by only a small margin. Looking at the final column of Table 7, the picture seems more mixed. The NE, NW and EM conform to the national pattern. For two regions (EE and SW), the difference is that remoteness confers a net-migration premium for not only Towns but also V/S. For YH, remoteness has the opposite effect for both categories. Finally, WM is the complete opposite of the national situation, with the larger gain rates being for not-remote Towns and remote V/S. (Note that there are no remote wards in the SE.)
- 5.6 Not surprisingly, the age-group patterns found using the sparsity criterion are quite complicated. The simplest thing is to compare the signs of the net migration balance with the national picture shown in Table 6. As usual, the greatest consistency is found for the younger age groups. All four types of rural ward at this level (shown in italics in Table 7) gained 0-15 year olds through their migration exchanges with the rest of the UK, with just one exceptions (remote V/S in NE). For the next three age groups the picture is mainly one of net loss, though there are somewhat more exceptions especially for the 25-29 group where nationally the gain was relatively small. These exceptions comprise: four for 16-19, not-remote Towns in WM and remote V/S in EE, not-remote V/S in NW, remote Town in EM; one for 20-24 (remote Towns in EM); and for 25-29, not-remote Towns in YH, EM, EE and SE, remote Towns in WM and SW, and not-remote V/S in EE.
- 5.7 Turning to the next two age groups spanning 30-59, universal net gains are recorded, without exception. For 60-74 year olds, the pattern is almost as uniform, with net gains everywhere except for not-remote V/S in NW and SE and remote V/S in EM. Finally, for 75+, there is a close parallel with the national pattern of net gains for Towns and

losses for V/S, irrespective of sparsity level. Indeed there is only one exception: a net loss by remote Towns in EM.

- 5.8 The general picture in terms of whether the net migration balance is positive or negative is indeed just that. Across the whole country (at GOR level at least), all four types of rural wards are very largely gaining people in the 0-15, 30-44, 45-59 and 60-74 age groups. Their Town elements are also gaining 75+, whereas their V/S elements are losing them. Virtually all parts are losing 16-19 and 20-24 year olds, but the situation is more mixed for the 25-29 year olds, albeit with more cases of loss than gain, especially for the V/S element.
- 5.9 Comparison of actual rates to see whether remoteness confers a premium or penalty for the 8 different age groups across the 8 regions which have examples of both remote and not-remote wards, however, is more complicated. Even for all ages combined, the role of remoteness varies between regions and between Towns and V/S, as already described. For each age group separately, there is considerably greater variety. At first glance, there would seem to be little scope for generalization, but this can be examined further if required and no other priority seems greater.

## **6 Summary**

- 6.1 This paper reports on an initial analysis of patterns of net within-UK migration for the 12 months before the 2001 census for census wards of England, classified into urban (urban areas of 10,000 or more residents) and rural (the remaining wards differentiated by settlement type and sparsity/remoteness according to the new rural definition). Wards have been used rather than the smaller Output Areas because virtually no migration data has been (or is even planned to be) released at that finer grain. Besides looking at the population as a whole, the study has also examined age differentials in terms of 8 age groups representing different life-course stages (0-15, 16-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60-74 and 75+). Analysis has been undertaken for England as a whole and for 8 of the 9 Government Office Regions (London, with only two rural wards, is excluded from the majority of analyses).
- 6.2 Among the main findings are:
- On average, rural wards contain a less migratory population than urban ones, with 10.8% of their population having been living at a different address one year before, compared to 12.6% for urban wards. Rural wards contain a smaller proportions of residents who were previously living at no usual address or outside the UK, but the main difference from urban wards is that fewer have moved within the UK between wards.

- Nationally, rural wards are net gainers of within-UK migrants, with 28,000 more people arriving in them from England's urban wards and the other three UK countries than leaving them for these places. This net migration added 0.3% to the population of the rural wards, equivalent to a 3.0% increase if continued for a full decade. The 28,000 net gain is specific to this ward-level definition of urban areas: note that different net gains will be recorded if 'rural' was alternatively defined (e.g. using the Tarling classification of local government districts or the metropolitan/shire county split).
- Rural net gains during 2000-2001 were recorded by all regions apart from the South East (and London's two rural wards). The highest rate of net gain then was recorded by Yorkshire and the Humber's rural wards, at 0.55%, followed by East Midlands, West Midlands and the South West.
- In terms of the 8 age groups used for this analysis, nationally, three do not confirm to the overall pattern of rural gains. The rate of net loss is especially high for 16-19 and 20-24 year olds, and very much smaller for 25-29 year olds. The net gain rate is highest for 30-44 and 0-15 year olds and is only just positive for the 75+ age group.
- Age differences in the direction of net migration at regional level are very similar as for England as a whole. The rural wards of all 8 regions experienced net losses of 16-19 and 20-24 year olds and net gains of 0-15, 30-44 and 45-59 year olds. The South East was the only region with a rural loss of 60-74 year olds, but it was one of three that registered net loss of the 75+ group, the others being, North West and North East. Small gains of the 25-29 age group were made by the rural wards of the three eastern regions.
- The breakdown of rural wards into Rural Towns (urban areas with under 10,000 people) and the remainder (Villages and Scattered) indicates that it was the former that accounted for the lion's share of rural net migration gains nationally, nearly 20,000 out of the total gain of 28,000. The rate of gain, allowing for population size, was also over twice as high for Rural Towns, at 0.41% for this one-year period compared to only 0.18% for the remainder.
- The effect of 'sparsity' on net migration is found to be particularly marked for Rural Towns. For these, nationally, the remote wards recorded a net gain of 1.01%, well over twice as high as the 0.38% rate for their not-remote wards in aggregate. For the Villages/Scattered category of settlement, by contrast, remoteness is similar to not remote in rate of net gain, albeit by

only a small margin (0.19% for remote wards and 0.18% for the not-remote).

- In terms of the 8 age groups, the four-fold classification of rural wards by settlement type and sparsity yields few departures from the 'all rural wards' results for England as a whole, namely net gains for all groups except those in the range 16-29 years old. The main exception is for the 75+ group, where both not-remote and especially the remote elements of the Villages/Scattered wards registered net loss. The former also recorded a zero balance of 60-74 year olds, while the not-remote Rural Towns gained slightly in 25-29 year olds.
- A similar analysis for each of the 8 regions, not surprisingly, produces rather more varied results. For instance, the Rural Towns did not have a higher rate of net migration gain than Villages/Scattered wards in one region, the North West. Similarly, the effect of remoteness varies between regions, not always conferring a premium on the net gains of Rural Towns and not always imposing similarity influence on the migration balances of Villages/Scattered wards. Inevitably, there are more departures to general patterns by age group, but the split between net gainers and losers is pretty consistent.

6.3 In conclusion, the results conform very largely to expectations derived from previous research and anecdotal evidence. Rural England is gaining population through within-UK migration, but is losing younger adults, conforming to the well-documented life-course pattern of rural areas gaining families with children and people of around retirement age but losing school-leavers and others at the early stages of their working lives. Additionally, the areas with sparser and more scattered settlement tend to experience migration loss of their most elderly people, whereas Rural Towns – even those situated in more remote contexts – tend to gain this age group in most regions.

6.4 To the extent that this initial study of the 2001 census migration data on the basis of the new rural definition constitutes a test of both, the conclusion is positive. In almost all the findings observed at this level of analysis, the 2001 census results are generally painting a picture of differences in net migration between the rural and urban parts of England that is expected. Secondly, the classification of rural wards by settlement size and remoteness proves a powerful discriminator of net migration rates, again mainly in expected directions though with some departures that may merit further investigation.

**Annex 1. Number of residents, 2001, England, for the ward classification: unadjusted totals and totals derived from aggregation of Standard Table 8 cells**

Ward Classification		Unadjusted	Aggregated from S008	% Difference of Aggregated
Urban areas 10k+	Not Remote	39,909,991	39,918,355	0.02
	Remote	103,330	103,976	0.63
Rural Towns	Not Remote	4,581,573	4,588,579	0.15
	Remote	231,854	233,701	0.80
Villages/Scattered	Not Remote	3,930,073	3,936,174	0.16
	Remote	349,319	361,170	3.39
All Wards		49,106,140	49,141,955	0.07