University of Groningen

Moving up and down the urban hierarchy

de Jong, Petra A.; Brouwer, Aleid E.; McCann, Philip

Published in:
Annals of Regional Science

DOI:
[10.1007/s00168-016-0772-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-016-0772-7)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Jong, P. A., Brouwer, A. E., & McCann, P. (2016). Moving up and down the urban hierarchy: Age-articulated interregional migration flows in the Netherlands. *Annals of Regional Science*, 57(1), 145-164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-016-0772-7>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Moving up and down the urban hierarchy: age-articulated interregional migration flows in the Netherlands

Petra A. de Jong¹ · Aleid E. Brouwer¹ ·
Philip McCann¹

Received: 25 August 2015 / Accepted: 5 May 2016 / Published online: 10 June 2016
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016

Abstract The ‘age schedule of migration’ has been studied fairly extensively. Yet, its regional implications have received only limited attention. The highly cited seminal paper of Plane and Jurjevich (Prof Geogr 61(1):4–20, 2009) was demonstrated in a novel manner on the basis of US Census data that, when interregional migration flows are disaggregated by age, radically different patterns of net population redistribution are observable in the sense of upward and downward movements within the urban hierarchy of the USA. This study aims to demonstrate how interregional migration flows play out in a different geographic setting by replicating the methodological approach of Plane and Jurjevich (2009) in the case of the Netherlands, a country with a very different urban system and spatial population pattern to the USA. Our aim was to identify whether the differing geographical context leads to different upward and downward movements. The most notably marked flows or ‘demographically effective’ flows in the Netherlands are the movements made by young adults and older adults aged 75 and over. We also observe recently emerging differences in the migration patterns of retirees, with the ‘75 and older’ age cohort oriented towards smaller towns and rural areas, while the ‘65–74’ age cohort are increasingly oriented towards urban areas. In addition, we comment on the possible consequences of these differing patterns of age-articulated interregional flows when allied with the emerging demographic changes.

JEL Classification J11 · R21 · R23

✉ Petra A. de Jong
p.a.de.jong@rug.nl

¹ Department of Economic Geography, University of Groningen, PO Box 800,
9700 AV Groningen, The Netherlands

1 Introduction

From previous research, it is known that migration propensities vary greatly over the life course (e.g. Rossi 1955; Warnes 1992a; Fischer and Malmberg 2001). As such, migration is regarded as an age-selective process, with young adults being the most mobile group (Bernard et al. 2014). Typically, the propensity to move peaks at young age, declining steadily with increasing age, potentially rising again around the age of retirement. The propensities of people to move at different stages in life constitute such a strong empirical regularity (Rogers et al. 1978; Rogers and Castro 1981), that it is regarded as an almost universal pattern (Fischer and Malmberg 2001)—as depicted by the widely—used ‘age schedule of migration’ (Wilson 2014). Figure 1 shows a stylised pattern of the age schedule of migration.

Underlying the regularities in the age schedule of migration is a collection of life course transitions (Warnes 1992b; Rowland 1979; Mulder 1993). Many of these life course transitions occur at young age, as individuals and couples move for employment, higher education, partnering, and so on, making those years ‘demographically dense’ (Rindfuss 1991). From previous studies, it is known that as adults pass through their thirties and forties, mobility progressively falls (see among others Plane et al. 2005). At this stage, good jobs, mortgages, children settled in school, and social networks act as ‘locational anchorages’, which reduce mobility (Wilson 2014). In general, the declining migration intensities of children and teenagers are tied to the declining intensities of their parents (Plane and Jurjevich 2009).

A renewed impulse for mobility takes place when the transition into ‘empty-nester’ status arises (Plane and Jurjevich 2009). At this stage, some empty-nester couples, freed from the locational ties of employment and their children’s schooling, undertake moves to scenic rural locations, favourite holiday areas, or to be close to family (as shown by the dashed line in Fig. 1) (Haas and Serow 2002; Wilson 2014). It is often thought that the traditional retirement age of 65 is the peak age of elderly migration, but much of the influx actually seems to occur at an earlier age (e.g. Bloem et al. 2008; Andersson and Abramsson 2012).

Fig. 1 Age schedule of migration (with kind permission from Springer Science+Business Media: Applied Spatial Analysis, doi:10.1007/s12061-014-9124-0, 2014, page 2, Wilson T, Figure 1)

Generally, three types of moves are typical for elderly migration (Litwak and Longino 1987). The first type of movement (i.e. retirement moves) entails the relocation of older adult after retirement and is motivated by a desire for amenities and comfort. The second type (i.e. comfort moves) centres on older adults moving closer to children or other family members able to help with care when one becomes less able to manage everyday tasks due to increased disability or worsening health (Pope and Kang 2010). Finally, a rise in mobility is sometimes seen at the highest ages (as shown by the second dashed line in Fig. 1). At this stage, older adults might relocate to a nursing home or other institutional setting when care needs increase and institutional care is required because family caregivers are no longer able to provide the appropriate level of support (i.e. care moves) (Litwak and Longino 1987; Longino et al. 2008).

While the ‘age schedule of migration’ has been studied fairly extensively, its regional implications have received only limited attention (Plane 2012). Yet, the passage through the life course not only results in different age-specific propensities to move, but also results in shifting likelihoods of residing in larger or smaller settlements. In 2009, Plane and Jurjevich demonstrated that, when interregional migration flows are disaggregated by age, quite different patterns of net upward and downward population redistributions operate within the urban hierarchy in the USA. Following this line of reasoning, interregional migration can therefore be understood and analysed as a phenomenon closely linked to the structure of the urban hierarchy (Korpi et al. 2011). Instead, Bell (1995) had previously found distinct variations in interregional migration profiles in Australia depending not only on the distance of movement, but also the direction of flows within the settlement hierarchy. More recently, Bernard et al. (2014) observed considerable cross-national differences in interregional migration profiles among 25 countries around the world and confirmed distinctive regional geographies.

This study therefore aims to demonstrate the regional implications of the ‘age schedule of migration’ in the Netherlands. By replicating the highly original methodological approach of Plane and Jurjevich (2009) in a non-American context, we are able to demonstrate how interregional migration flows play out in a different geographic setting. A descriptive overview of the Dutch setting will be presented in the next section; then, the data available will be outlined. Next, we detail how the relative propensity to migrate between Dutch regions systematically varies with age, and report on the interregional migration flows up and down the Dutch urban hierarchy. In addition, we focus on the likely interactions and possible consequences of these mobility patterns when combined with demographic changes, and in particular the ageing of the Dutch population.

2 Empirical setting and data

2.1 The urban hierarchy in the Netherlands

The Netherlands is a highly urbanised and densely populated country within Europe. Rural regions in the Netherlands are relatively close to an urban centre in geographical terms and are becoming more connected by increased commuting between both regions

Table 1 Five levels of urbanity in the Netherlands, based on the residential density

Level	Density	Number of municipalities	Total population (2012)
Extremely urbanised	2500 surrounding addresses or more	14	3,301,173
Strongly urbanised	1500–2500 surrounding addresses	62	4,655,068
Moderately urbanised	1000–1500 surrounding addresses	86	3,390,263
Hardly urbanised	500–1000 surrounding addresses	145	3,571,135
Not urbanised	Fewer than 500 surrounding addresses	108	1,812,709

(Delfmann et al. 2014). The OECD defines those areas with a population density below 150 inhabitants/km² as rural (OECD 2008). According to this definition, rural areas do not exist in the Netherlands. This, however, does not correspond to the common perception among the Dutch themselves (Delfmann et al. 2014). The northern part of the county, for example, is generally considered to be a typical rural area (Haartsen 2002; OECD 2005, 2008). Therefore, we propose a different approach based on a residential density index, which is frequently used in Dutch policy (e.g. Steenbekker et al. 2008), but also in scientific papers (e.g. De Groot et al. 2011). The residential density index uses the concentration of human activities such as living, working, and utilising amenities as indicators of urbanisation: the lower the concentration of these activities, the lower the level of urbanisation (Haartsen 2002). The relationship between urban population and residential density is well known in the urban economics literature (McCann 2013).

The levels of the Dutch urban hierarchy are based on the residential density in each municipality. For each address within a given municipality, the average number of addresses per squared kilometre within a circle with a radius of 1 km is calculated (Den Dulk et al. 1992). The five levels of the Dutch urban hierarchy are based on the class limits 2500, 1500, 1000, and 500 addresses per squared kilometre and listed in Table 1. Figure 2 is a map showing the five-level hierarchy in the Netherlands.

2.2 The residential housing market in the Netherlands

Before looking at the interregional migration patterns within the Netherlands, it seems appropriate to look at the main factors determining processes on the residential housing market. The Netherlands has a long history of public involvement in the housing market and of highly interventionist housing policies with the aims of stimulating homeownership and making good-quality (rental) housing affordable to low-income households (Vandevyvere and Zenthöfer 2012). At the moment, households in both the owner-occupied sector and the rental sector receive substantial explicit or implicit subsidies. Key subsidy instruments at the national level are mortgage relief for homeowners and the income-based housing allowance for renters. In addition, the central government also influences housing through spatial planning and land policy, regulation and supervision of housing associations, rent policy, and financial guarantees (Vandevyvere and Zenthöfer 2012).

Legenda

Urban hierarchy

- Extremely urbanised
- Strongly urbanised
- Moderately urbanised
- Hardly urbanised
- Not urbanised

Fig. 2 Urban hierarchy used in the study

In response to public policies, the Dutch housing market has shifted towards higher owner occupancy over the past three decades (Vandevyvere and Zenthöfer 2012) of which a majority of the homeownership is in the more rural areas (Central Bureau of Statistics 2015). Currently, around 55 % of the 7.4 million dwellings are owner-occupied, which is still comparatively low on a European scale. The social housing represents 31 % of total housing stock, making it an important player on the Dutch residential housing market. The expansion of the social sector up to the mid-1990s was accompanied by a sharp fall in private renting, which currently accounts for 13 % of the total housing stock (Systeem woningvoorraad 2015).

Various empirical studies have addressed the relationship between the housing market and labour mobility. Micro-studies, using (longitudinal) data of individuals or households, find homeownership to be associated with lower residential mobility and lower job-to-job mobility (van Leuvesteijn and Koning 2004). For the Netherlands, van der Vlist (2001) finds that homeowners are less likely to move to another home and to change jobs. This is in line with the study of van Ommeren (1996) which concludes that homeowners are less likely to move to another home than tenants are. Herbers et al. (2014) find that this tendency increases with older homeowners, unless changes in the family force the elderly out of homeownership. In 2011, Hoj demonstrated how housing market regulations, as described above, actually harm the labour market of the Netherlands. Transaction costs, for example, have a negative effect on the labour market flexibility. Transaction costs of owner-occupied housing include property transaction taxes, fees for the registration of property, notary or other legal fees, and real estate agency fees. Transaction costs also exist in the rental market. Rules concerning social housing make it unattractive for dwellers of social housing to move to another area for a better-paid job (Vandevyvere and Zenthöfer 2012). Due to the regionalised waiting-list system, tenants of social housing cannot move to another area without losing their entitlement for social housing. Given the fact that in the Netherlands density is high and urban areas are geographically small units, commuting between them is very feasible. Therefore, in the Netherlands, people often choose to change jobs without changing residence (van Leuvesteijn and Koning 2004; van Ham and Hooimeijer 2009).

2.3 Data and some preliminary results

The interregional migration patterns are analysed by using data from the Housing Research Netherlands (HRN) survey of 2002–2012. This survey is set up to provide more insights into the developments occurring on the Dutch housing market, and is carried out every 3 years by the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The HRN data are based on a large cross-sectional survey in which information is gathered about the housing situation of people living in the Netherlands. The research population is representative of the Dutch population aged 18 years and older, not living in an institution.

In total, there were 42,587 persons (14.9 %) in the HRN survey of 2002–2012, who are stated to have moved in the previous 2 years. Figure 3 shows the residential mobility for migrants from 2002 to 2012 broken down by age at the time of movement. From Fig. 3, it becomes clear that, in occurrence with the ‘age schedule of migration’, the residential mobility peaks at the age 25–34, after which it steadily decreases with age. It also demonstrates that the majority of residential mobility is intraregional (i.e. a movement within the existing municipality). This is in line with previous research which demonstrated that just one-third of the residential mobility is interregional (i.e. a movement to a different municipality) (Feijten and Visser 2005). In addition, Feijten and Visser (2005) find that 25 % of all interregional mobility occurs within a distance of a mere 10 km.

Following the argument of Plane and Jurjevich (2009), we know that the population size of the locality is of primary interest when we look at the interregional mobility.

Fig. 3 Age at the time of move (Source: Calculated by the authors from HRN data 2002–2012)

Fig. 4 Average size of origin and destination by age at the time of move (Source: Calculated by the authors from HRN data 2002–2012)

Figure 4 shows the average population of both the origin and the destination municipalities for interregional migrants from 2002 to 2012, broken down by age at the time of movement.

From Fig. 4, it becomes clear that interregional migrants, in general, move towards less populated municipalities. Interestingly, this is also true for those aged 25–34, the most geographically mobile cohort and often the group assumed to be oriented to the largest cities. In fact, only the youngest cohort moves towards the largest cities, and many do so when entering tertiary education. The pattern of movement towards smaller-sized urban centres is even more explicit for older adults: the older people are, the more they tend to move away from highly populated municipalities. This is

in line with previous research, which has shown that Dutch older adults (55+) are more likely to move away from, rather than towards, highly populated municipalities and urban areas (Fokkema 1996). van der Pers et al. (2015) underline the importance for intergenerational proximity for the oldest age groups in relocation. They find that older adults are more likely to move—in the direction of their children—when they lived further away from them. Since our data show that the children are also likely to move to and live in smaller-sized urban centres, this could explain the direction of the relocation of the elder age groups.

3 Age cohorts and mobility within the Dutch Urban hierarchy

3.1 Net flows up and down the Dutch urban hierarchy

Following the methodological approach of Plane and Jurjevich (2009), we cross-calculated level-to-level flows of migrants in each of the seven age groups by the level of urbanity of the origin and destination municipality across the five urbanity categories of the Dutch urban hierarchy. Next, we calculated the net exchange of migrants between each pair of levels of the hierarchy. For each age group, there are ten net exchanges. For each net exchange, the demographic effectiveness value is calculated, which is also known as the demographic efficiency. Demographic effectiveness is a widely used measure of the unidirectionality of movement within a migration system (Plane et al. 2005). The demographic effectiveness E_{ij} is calculated as follows:

$$E_{ij} = 100(N_{ij}/T_{ij})$$

Here, N_{ij} is the net exchange of migrants between a lower level of the urban hierarchy i and higher level j , and it is calculated as the difference between the gross upward flow M_{ij} and the gross downward flow M_{ji} . The total exchange of migrants T_{ij} is found as the sum of the gross upward and downward flows (Plane and Jurjevich 2009). Hypothetically, the demographic effectiveness varies from 0 and 100 %, in which the upper limit of 100 % would reflect the case where all migrants were moving either up or down the urban hierarchy with nobody going in the opposite direction, while a value of 0 % would reflect the situation where exactly the same number of migrants were moving downwards as were moving upwards within the urban hierarchy (Plane and Jurjevich 2009).

Figure 5 shows the demographic effectiveness of each of the various net exchanges in which the widths of the arrows are proportional to the percentage demographic effectiveness of the migration streams and counter streams.

Figure 5a ($N = 14,497$) presents a view of the total interregional movement between the different urban levels. Here, it is clear that the lion's share of the total interregional residential migration reflects an upward movement within the urban hierarchy. However, an examination of the total interregional residential migration alone misses the rich and variegated patterns of movements exhibited by persons within the different age cohorts (Plane et al. 2005). In fact, the overall pattern that we have noted in Fig. 5a is being driven by a preponderance of migration of the

A All ages **B Age 18-24** **C Age 25-34**

Fig. 5 Demographic effectiveness percentages for age-specific net migration exchanges between urban hierarchy levels (*Source:* Calculated by the authors from HNR data 2002–2012)

D Age 35-44

Extremely urbanised

Strongly urbanised

Moderately urbanised

Hardly urbanised

Not urbanised

flows up the urban hierarchy
flows down the urban hierarchy

E Age 45-54

Extremely urbanised

Strongly urbanised

Moderately urbanised

Hardly urbanised

Not urbanised

flows up the urban hierarchy
flows down the urban hierarchy

F Age 55-64

Extremely urbanised

Strongly urbanised

Moderately urbanised

Hardly urbanised

Not urbanised

flows up the urban hierarchy
flows down the urban hierarchy

Fig. 5 continued

G Age 65-74 **H Age 75+** **Fig. 5** continued

young adults. Fig. 5b ($N = 4043$) shows the mobility flows that occur in the young adult years (i.e. 18–24 years of age), for which all but one of the net exchanges point up the hierarchy, a finding which [Plane and Jurjevich \(2009\)](#) similarly found for persons 20–29 years of age. The most effective exchanges are those for movements towards the extremely urbanised areas, and especially pronounced are the flows upward from lowest two levels of the urban hierarchy to the most densely populated localities. This is most likely to be related to both the pursuit of higher education as Dutch higher educational institutions are mostly located in the larger cities, and also to employment-related migration into cities of university graduates ([Venhorst et al. 2011](#)).

For the age group 25–34 year olds (Fig. 5c; $N = 4976$), the movement patterns are far less unidirectional than those for 18–24 year olds. In line with the literature, the absolute mobility rates are the highest among this age group, and this stage contains many of the critical life course events that impel persons to migrate ([Rindfuss 1991](#); [Plane et al. 2005](#)) to various levels in the urban hierarchy. The migration flows display

only moderate demographic efficiency at this stage of life, although there are very large numbers of migrants moving in both directions between the different levels of the urban hierarchy. In fact, between three pairs of levels of the hierarchy, the demographic effectiveness is close to zero (and therefore not shown in Fig. 5c), indicating that the flows in both directions between these pairs of levels of the hierarchy are almost equal in size, and this could be partly explained by the need for intergenerational proximity (van der Pers et al. 2015; Bijker et al. 2012).

During the mid-career and childrearing years, we observe a pattern away from the most urbanised areas. By the ages 35–44, seven of the ten gross net exchanges point in the direction of net movements to the smaller settlement size classes (Fig. 5d; $N = 2362$). It has been suggested that during this age span, housing costs, school quality, and suburban road congestion are becoming major concerns (Plane et al. 2005), which possibly explains the preference for less populated areas. This tendency to move down the urban hierarchy is persistent until retirement ages. Figures 5e ($N = 1282$) and 5f ($N = 869$) show the interregional movement pattern of migrants in age cohort 45–54 years and the age cohort 55–64 years, respectively. These age groups move, on balance, towards the middle tier of the urban hierarchy. This observation concurs with the findings in many European countries which reveal that the older adults are more likely to leave than to move to the big cities (Fokkema 1996; Serow et al. 1996).

However, in contrast to much of the literature, for the 65–74 age cohort, we find strong evidence again of upwards movements within the urban hierarchy. As a result, Fig. 5g ($N = 461$) shows two sets of arrows: upward ones from the bottom two levels of the hierarchy, and downward ones from the highest two levels to the moderately urbanised areas. The migrants moving up the urban hierarchy are likely to be those who are moving in anticipation of getting old. As a result, the migration patterns of these cohorts appear to be directed towards the places which are large enough to have a range of public services including hospitals with a wide range of (geriatric) specialty care facilities (Plane and Jurjevich 2009). In addition, it has been suggested (Kresl and Ietri 2010) that older adults of the baby boom generation are less attracted to the sun and golf retirement locations than has been the case in recent decades. Instead, many of these young retirees may be more interested in the greater locational density and variety of public and private services which are available in cities and in urban functions of intellectual activity and culture and the arts (also compare Haas and Serow 2002). As such, the migrants moving down the urban hierarchy appear to reflect more traditional notions of retirement mobility, generally motivated by a desire for amenities and comfort (Pope and Kang 2010), while the upward flows could represent something of a new phenomenon. This new phenomenon could be explained by the retirement of the baby boom generation, which generates a whole new experience on the housing market—in the USA (Meyers and Ryu 2008) and a need to be close to children/family caused by a strong ageing-in-place policy in the Netherlands (van der Pers et al. 2015). Also, the need to be in proximity of friends and family is found in the US migration patterns of older adults as well (Serow et al. 1996), especially when the role of potential support in the vicinity becomes more pressing (Redfoot et al. 2013).

Figure 5h ($N = 310$) clearly demonstrates the demographic efficiency down the urban hierarchy of migrants aged 75 years and over.¹ However, on balance, this age group of 75 and over moves towards the middle tier of the Dutch urban hierarchy, a finding which is broadly consistent with Plane and Jurjevich (2009). Part of the explanation for this observation may relate to the fact that these medium-sized urban areas are also among the most favoured locations for people at the midcareer and child-rearing stage. As such, this suggests that the movements to medium-sized cities in Fig. 5g, h are older adults who wish to rejoin younger family members in these locations (Plane and Heins 2003; Plane and Jurjevich 2009; van der Pers et al. 2015).

A comparison of all eight panels of Fig. 5 reveals how strongly the stage of life affects the settlement size (i.e. urbanity) preferences of migrants. Again, if we look at the total interregional residential migration, this suggests a strong upward movement in the urban hierarchy. However, when we look at the patterns of movements exhibited by persons within different age cohorts, we witness a pattern in which many of the major movements in the system of interregional migration are actually flows down the urban hierarchy. Our results are based on somewhat different age cohorts and a rather different urban classification system to Plane and Jurjevich (2009), but already we see many parallels as well as a quite few differences between the age-related migration flows within the urban hierarchies of the USA and the Netherlands. We now therefore use the second empirical technique employed by Plane and Jurjevich (2009), namely the calculation of the migration destination odds, to further explore the nature of these flows.

3.2 Migration destination odds

In addition to the diagrammatic approach depicted in Fig. 5, we use the migration destination odds measure to further illustrate how residential and mobility preferences shift across the life course, and how people situated at one level of the urban hierarchy choose to move to a different level. This measure is calculated as:

$$O_{aij} = P_{aij} / P_{.ij}$$

where O_{aij} represents the odds of a person of age group a living in a municipality at level i selecting a destination at level j . These odds are calculated as the ratio of two probabilities (Plane and Jurjevich 2009), namely the probability of a migrant of age group a originating from a municipality at hierarchy level i selecting a destination at level j , divided by the probability of a migrant of any age originating at level i choosing a destination at level j . The age group probability is calculated as:

$$P_{aij} = M_{aij} / \sum_h M_{aih}$$

while the all-age probability is given by:

¹ The most effective movement is from the very strongly urbanised areas to the non-urbanised areas. The demographic efficiency of this movement is calculated as 100 %, indicating that all migrants between these two levels were moving down the urban hierarchy, although this is also a small sample observation ($N = 5$).

$$P_{ij} = \Sigma_a M_{aij} / \Sigma_a \Sigma_h M_{aih}$$

As [Plane and Jurjevich \(2009\)](#) explain, an odds value above 1.0 indicates a greater relative attractiveness of municipalities at hierarchy level j to persons in a particular age group than to all people who are living in areas categorised at level i . On the other hand, an odds value below 1.0 suggests a relative unattractiveness of level j municipalities to those in a particular age group.

Table 2 presents the age-specific destination odds for migrants who lived in extremely urbanised municipalities (a); strongly urbanised municipalities (b); moderately urbanised municipalities (c); hardly urbanised municipalities (d); and not urbanised municipalities (e). Boldface highlights the level of origin, whereas the various rows correspond to the level of the destination of the migrants.

Note the high 1.508 value for persons aged 18–24 on the top row of Table 2a. This indicates that young adults are substantially more likely than persons of all other ages to move from one big city to another. Equally, note the cluster of high values for movement by the ‘old-elderly’ to the middle tier of the urban hierarchy. In fact, the 2.208 odds for those aged 75 and older migrating from extremely urban areas to moderately urban areas are the highest odds calculated for any age group and for any pairing of origin and destination levels. This could be indicative for the movement of elder adult to be in close proximity to family ([van der Pers et al. 2015](#)).

In contrast, Table 2e shows the age-specific migration destination odds of migrants originating from the lowest level in the Dutch urban hierarchy. Here, we observe that the age cohort 65–74 is relatively orientated to move from non-urbanised areas to moderately or even strongly urbanised areas, as it to a slightly lesser extent to the age cohort 75 and over. This could be indicative of the move towards amenities ([Serow et al. 1996](#)). Yet in Table 2d we see that the over 75 cohort living in hardly urbanised areas displays a high propensity to move to moderately or even strongly urbanised areas, this might be indicative as the move to a care institutions which are not available at all urban levels and more available on higher urban levels ([van der Pers et al. 2015](#)). As such, these two older age cohorts all show an orientation which is upwards through the urban hierarchy. In Table 2e, we also observe a high 1.791 value for persons aged 75 and older on the bottom row of Table 2e. ‘Old-elderly’ are thus more likely than persons of all other ages to move from one non-urban municipality to another, while unsurprisingly, there is a particularly low value of 0.475 for persons aged 18–24, indicating a relative unattractiveness for young people to make such a move.

For the migrants originating from strongly urbanised municipalities (Table 2b)—with the exception of persons aged 18–24—we can observe a relative attractiveness of municipalities placed lower in the urban hierarchy. Note, too, the greater relative attractiveness of medium-sized municipalities for persons aged 65–74 in Table 2c. They are substantially more likely than persons of all other ages to move between municipalities which are moderately urbanised. Since these interregional migration flows do not entail a change of level in the Dutch urban hierarchy, they do not appear in the diagrammatic approach depicted in Fig. 5. The urbanisation categories which most consistently appear to be attractive for most age groups are those defined as moderately urbanised, hardly urbanised, and not urbanised, with only the 18–24 age cohort being relatively orientated to either extremely or strongly urbanised areas.

Table 2 Age-specific migration destination odds for migrants

	18–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65–74	75+
a. Origin: extremely urbanised							
Extremely urbanised	1.508	1.077	0.808	0.742	0.714	0.518	0.416
Strongly urbanised	1.062	0.997	0.958	0.931	0.977	1.164	0.762
Moderately urbanised	0.628	0.884	1.265	1.362	1.335	1.702	2.208
Hardly urbanised	0.465	1.080	1.236	1.251	1.042	1.044	1.854
Not urbanised	0.884	0.924	0.981	1.201	1.638	1.158	1.298
b. Origin: strongly urbanised							
Extremely urbanised	1.636	0.930	0.584	0.852	0.734	0.666	0.511
Strongly urbanised	1.150	1.001	0.961	0.733	0.917	0.628	1.220
Moderately urbanised	0.714	1.045	1.205	1.104	1.290	1.516	1.218
Hardly urbanised	0.609	1.061	1.448	1.110	1.094	1.459	1.368
Not urbanised	0.543	1.002	1.291	1.759	1.282	1.340	1.058
c. Origin: moderately urbanised							
Extremely urbanised	1.653	0.887	0.806	0.649	0.445	0.697	0.581
Strongly urbanised	1.274	1.025	0.787	0.831	0.716	0.721	0.606
Moderately urbanised	0.618	1.015	1.244	1.319	1.190	1.808	1.782
Hardly urbanised	0.679	1.083	1.240	1.101	1.536	0.950	1.397
Not urbanised	0.477	1.033	1.234	1.569	2.087	1.308	1.356
d. Origin: hardly urbanised							
Extremely urbanised	1.505	0.907	0.579	0.585	0.384	0.903	0.501
Strongly urbanised	1.411	0.870	0.770	0.572	0.816	0.788	1.167
Moderately urbanised	0.765	1.173	0.990	1.432	1.286	0.826	1.359
Hardly urbanised	0.601	1.098	1.518	1.295	1.338	1.576	1.194
Not urbanised	0.677	0.978	1.494	1.558	1.434	1.179	0.599
e. Origin: not urbanised							
Extremely urbanised	1.908	0.742	0.368	0.576	0.539	0.594	0.000
Strongly urbanised	1.518	0.776	0.591	0.680	0.691	1.125	1.160
Moderately urbanised	0.746	1.053	1.382	1.205	1.402	1.184	0.677
Hardly urbanised	0.619	1.185	1.523	1.153	1.188	0.980	1.645
Not urbanised	0.475	1.322	1.356	1.535	1.294	1.067	1.791

Furthermore, the Dutch regions are quite small—especially in comparison with US regions—as such a short-distance relocation in the USA would be considered local, while in the Netherlands this might be between regions (compare [Serow et al. 1996](#)).

4 Interactions between age-articulated interregional migration and population ageing

A current and significant demographic event we are faced with is the coming of age of the post-war baby boom generation. In the year 2015, 17.8 % of the Dutch population

will be aged 65 and older, but by the year 2040, this figure will rise to approximately 26.4 % (Central Bureau of Statistics 2015). In many Western societies, this increasing proportion of older adults is of special concern for the future (Abramsson and Andersson 2012; European Union 2012), and the Netherlands is no exception to this.

Traditionally, the residential mobility patterns among older adults have been assumed to be low, with older adults typically remaining in their current dwelling for as long as possible and with only a small minority relocating (Long 1992; Lord and Luxembourg 2007). This is reflected in the pattern revealed in Fig. 3. However, the increase in the proportion of older adults within the overall population and the discussion about lifestyle changes among older adults raise questions about possible changing patterns of residential mobility. The next generation of older adults are very different from today's older adults, and particularly the baby boomers, who have different expectations and abilities, due to their having experienced expanded education opportunities, as well as significant social, political, and economic emancipation and participation (Kramer and Pfaffenbach 2009; Meyers and Ryu 2008; Redfoot et al. 2013). Therefore, future older adults are expected to develop different lifestyles, which will likely lead them to favour different residential locations than previous generations at that age, not so much moving to sunnier climates, but keeping into mind that family proximity might be necessary and anticipated moves accordingly (Kramer and Pfaffenbach 2009; Haas and Serow 2002).

Our data and results reported here, and particularly those results which are related to the younger group of retirees, suggest that these shifts are already well underway.² The ageing cohorts approaching retirement not only display greater mobility than in the past, but also display markedly different mobility patterns than has generally been observed among previous generations. Moreover, there are several characteristics of the baby boom generations which suggests that their mobility rates are likely to increase in the near future. Firstly, their higher levels of education and income increase the probability of moving (Clark and Dieleman 1996; Bureauvrijtig 2015). However, in the USA, this trend might change with the decreased chance to sell one's house in the US housing market due to the large group of baby boomers leaving homeownership and a smaller younger cohort that is able to buy their houses (Meyers and Ryu 2008). Secondly, marital status is an important factor influencing residential mobility (Haan and Perks 2008; Richards and Rankaduwa 2008) with widowed and divorced older adults being found to have a higher probability of moving (Richards and Rankaduwa 2008; Herbers et al. 2014). Particularly, among the baby boomers, we witness a higher divorce rate than in previous generations, which has distinct effects on the housing market especially for ownership property (Hooimeijer 2007; Herbers et al. 2014). Thirdly, it is known that previous moves increase the likelihood of moving again (DaVanzo 1981; Mulder 1993), and baby boomers, in general, have a higher likelihood

² Our data sample contains 14,497 observations of inter-urban movers, but the subsets of inter-urban movers over 65 years old contain just $N = 410$ for 65–74 year olds and $N = 361$ for over 75s, which together amount to just over 5 % of the total sample moving population. However, the patterns of movers broken down by age cohort (as represented in Fig. 3) in our sample almost perfectly reflect the age-related mobility patterns evident in the UK [see Figure 3.6 on page 33 of Fielding (2012), a country which also has identical aggregate interregional mobility rates to the Netherlands (OECD 2013) at the levels of OECD-TL3 small regions]. Our sample data are therefore likely to be highly representative of the Netherlands as a whole.

of having previously undertaken moves for reasons of study or for jobs ([Andersson and Abramsson 2012](#)). Since older adults are likely to exhibit much lower levels of place attachment than their predecessors ([Fischer and Malmberg 2001](#)), it is argued that mobility among older age groups may significantly be easier than in earlier generations ([Malmberg et al. 2004](#), as cited in [Abramsson and Andersson 2012](#)).

Based on the patterns of interregional migration presented in this study, it is possible to argue that the trends revealed here are likely to be harbingers of what is yet to come. In particular, we might expect to witness an intensification of these patterns with more ‘young elderly’ (i.e. persons aged 65–75) moving up the hierarchy—in particular those originating from the lowest tiers of the urban hierarchy—and more ‘pre-elderly’ (i.e. persons aged 55–64) and ‘old-elderly’ (i.e. persons aged 75 and over) moving down the urban hierarchy.

5 Conclusion

In order to examine the patterns of age-articulated interregional mobility in the Netherlands, several analytical steps were made. Following the methodological approach of [Plane and Jurjevich \(2009\)](#), we first calculated the demographic efficiency and subsequently the age-specific destination migration odds of seven age cohorts. Our finding supports many of the age-related migration patterns evident from the migration and the life course literature, and they also highlight that the passage through successive life stages not only results in fairly predictable age-specific propensities to move, but also results in fairly predictable shifting likelihoods of residing in larger or smaller settlements.

In general, as people age through the life course, they move for very different reasons and their choices reflect different considerations and preferences ([Warnes 1992a](#); [Whisler et al. 2008](#)). At some ages, large agglomerations are preferable; at other, sparsely settled environments hold key advantages ([Plane and Jurjevich 2009](#)). As such, academic research needs to move away from modelling ‘the migration’ and ‘the migrant decision’, and instead allow more for a more varied and nuanced age-related approach.

The results for the Netherlands are for the most part comparable to the trends of mobility found in the USA by [Plane and Jurjevich \(2009\)](#). Even though the geographical setting and urban hierarchy levels are very much different, the overall patterns of movements exhibited by persons within different age cohorts down the urban hierarchy are strikingly similar. However, the upward flows from the lowest tiers of the urban hierarchy of the ‘young elderly’ are a new and previously unobserved pattern of mobility for the Netherlands. In the USA, such cultural and amenity-seeking relocation behaviour was observed by [Serow et al. \(1996\)](#).

Even though a full explanation of the economic and social factors underlying the interregional patterns of migration in the Netherlands lies outside the scope of the current study, we did reflect on the possible repercussions of these patterns in the light of demographic change, and notably on the ageing of the Dutch population. With the coming of age of the baby boomers, the proportion of older adults in the Dutch population will rise to approximately 26.5 % of the total population by the year 2040.

Simply due to the large numbers that these cohorts represent, their migration decisions are likely to impact spatial structures.

Our data and results, and particularly those results which are related to the ‘young elderly’, suggest that future older adults display greater mobility than in the past, but also display markedly different mobility patterns than has generally been observed among previous generations. The combination of demographic weight and high voting probability among older age cohorts makes that we might expect a significant electoral power of the grey vote and an expanding over-representation of older voters in national (and regional) elections (Goerres 2007). Such considerations are likely to have major implications for spatial planning and, in particular, for the location, organisation, and provision of public facilities and public services, private sector services, as well as the provision and design and spatial layout of housing and infrastructure. Moreover, these impacts are likely to differ markedly between different types of places according to the degree of urbanisation and the specific ageing profile of the local population.

References

- Abramsson M, Andersson E (2012) Residential mobility patterns of elderly. Leaving the house for an apartment. *Hous Stud* 27(5):582–604
- Andersson E, Abramsson M (2012) Changing residential mobility rates of older people in Sweden. *Ageing Soc* 32(6):963–982
- Bell M (1995) Migration in Australia 1986–1991. Overview report. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra
- Bernard A, Bell M, Charles-Edwards E (2014) Life course transitions and the age profile of internal migration. *Popul Dev Rev* 40(2):213–239
- Bijker RA, Haartsen T, Strijker D (2012) Migration to less-popular rural areas in the Netherlands: exploring the motivations. *J Rural Stud* 28:90–498
- Bloem B, Tilburg T, van Thomése F (2008) Residential mobility in older Dutch adults: influence of later life events. *Int J Ageing Later Life* 1(3):21–44
- Bureauvifftig (2015) Woonmonitor 2015: landelijk onderzoek naar wensen en behoeften van ouderen ten aanzien van wonen. Bureauvifftig, Utrecht
- Central Bureau of Statistics (2015) Retrieved from the Central Bureau of Statistics. Website <http://statline.cbs.nl>
- Clark WAV, Dieleman MC (1996) Households and housing. Choice and outcomes in the housing market. Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ
- DaVanzo J (1981) Repeat migration, information costs and location-specific capital. *Popul Environ* 4(1):45–73
- de Groot C, Mulder CH, Manting D (2011) Intentions to move and actual moving behaviour in the Netherlands. *Hous Stud* 26(3):307–328
- Delfmann H, Koster S, McCann P, van Dijk J (2014) Population change and new firm formation in urban and rural studies. *Reg Stud* 48(6):1030–1050
- den Dulk CJ, van de Stadt H, Vliegen JM (1992) Een nieuwe maatstaf voor stedelijkheid: De omgevingsadressendichtheid [A new measure for degree of urbanisation: the address density of the surrounding area]. *Maandstatistiek van de Bevolking* 40:14–27
- European Union (2012) The 2012 Ageing Report: economic and budgetary projections for the 27 EU Member States (2010–2060). European Union, Brussels
- Feijten P, Visser P (2005) Binnenlandse migratie: verhuismotieven en verhuisafstand. *Bevolkingstrends* 53(2):75–81
- Fielding T (2012) Migration in Britain. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham
- Fischer PA, Malmberg G (2001) Settled people don’t move: on life course and (im-) mobility in Sweden. *Int J Popul Geogr* 7(5):357–371
- Fokkema CM (1996) Residential moving behaviour of the elderly: an explanatory analysis for the Netherlands. Dissertation. VU University Amsterdam

- Goerres A (2007) Why are older people more likely to vote? The impact of ageing on electoral turnout across Europe. *Brit J Polit Int Rel* 9(1):90–121
- Haan M, Perks T (2008) The housing careers of older Canadians: an investigation using cycle 16 of the general social survey. *Can Stud Popul* 35:223–242
- Haartsen T (2002) Platteland: boerenland, natuurterrein of beleidsveld? Een onderzoek naar veranderingen in functies, eigendom en representaties van het Nederlandse platteland, Dissertation. University of Groningen
- Haas WH, Serow WJ (2002) The baby boom, amenity retirement migration and retirement communities: will the golden age of retirement continue? *Res Aging* 24(1):150–164
- Herbers DJ, Mulder CH, Mödenes JA (2014) Moving out of home ownership in later life: the influence of the family and housing careers. *Hous Stud* 29(7):910–936
- Høj J (2011) Improving the flexibility of the Dutch housing market to enhance labour mobility, OECD Economics Department Working Papers No 833. OECD Publishing, Paris
- Hooimeijer P (2007) Dynamiek in de derde leeftijd: De consequenties voor het woonbeleid. Ministerie van VROM, Den Haag
- Korpi M, Clark WAV, Malmberg B (2011) The urban hierarchy and domestic migration: the interaction of internal migration, disposable income and the cost of living, Sweden 1993–2002. *J Econ Geogr* 11(6):1051–1077
- Kramer C, Pfaffenbach C (2009) Persistence preferred—on future residential (im)mobility among the generation 50plus. *Erdkunde* 63(2):161–172
- Kresl PK, Ietri D (2010) The aging population and the competitiveness of cities. Benefits to the urban economy. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham
- Litwak E, Longino CF Jr (1987) Migration patterns among the elderly: a developmental perspective. *Geron-tologist* 27:266–272
- Long L (1992) Changing residence comparative perspectives on its relationship to age, sex and marital status. *Popul Stud J Demog* 46:141–158
- Longino CF, Bradley DE, Stoller EP, Haas WH (2008) Predictors of non-local moves among older adults: a prospective study. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 63:S7–S14
- Lord S, Luxembourg N (2007) The mobility of elderly residents living in Suburban Territories: mobility experiences in Canada and France. *J Hous Elder* 20:103–121
- Malmberg B, Abramsson M, Magnusson L, Berg T (2004) Från eget småhuss till allmännyttan (From owner occupation to municipal rental housing). Report #10: Institute for Future Studies, Stockholm
- McCann P (2013) Modern urban and regional economics. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Meyers D, Ryu S (2008) Aging baby boomers and the generational bubble: foresight and mitigation of an epic transition. *J Am Plann Assoc* 74(1):17–33
- Mulder C (1993) Migration dynamics. A life course approach, Dissertation. University of Amsterdam
- OECD (2005) New approaches to rural policy: lessons from around the world. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, OECD, Paris and Washington, DC
- OECD (2008) OECD rural policy reviews: Netherlands. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, OECD, Paris and Washington, DC
- OECD (2013) Regions at a Glance 2013. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, OECD, Paris
- Plane DA (2012) What about aging in regional science? *Ann Reg Sci* 48:469–483
- Plane DA, Heins F (2003) Age articulation of U.S. inter-metropolitan migration. *Ann Reg Sci* 37:107–130
- Plane DA, Henrie CJ, Perry MJ (2005) Migration up and down the urban hierarchy and across the life course. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 102:15313–15318
- Plane DA, Jurjevich JR (2009) Ties that no longer bind? The patterns and repercussions of age-articulated migration. *Prof Geogr* 61(1):4–20
- Pope ND, Kang B (2010) Residential relocation in later life: a comparison of proactive and reactive moves. *J Hous Elder* 24(2):193–207
- Redfoot D, Fienberg L, Houser A (2013) The aging of the baby boom and the growing care gap: a look at future declines in the availability of family caregivers. AARP Public Policy Institute, Washington, DC
- Richards JL, Rankaduwa W (2008) Housing Canada's Oldest-Old: correlates of their residential status. *J Hous Elder* 22:376–403
- Rindfuss RR (1991) The young adult years: diversity, structural change, and fertility. *Demography* 28(4):493–512

- Rogers A, Castro L (1981) Age patterns of migration: cause specific profiles. In: Rogers A (ed) *Advances in multiregional demography*. International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, pp 125–159
- Rogers A, Raquillet R, Castro LJ (1978) Model migration schedules and their applications. *Environ Plan A* 10:475–502
- Rossi P (1955) *Why families move*. The Free Press, New York
- Rowland DT (1979) *Internal migration in Australia*. ABS, Canberra
- Serow WJ, Friedrich K, Haas WH (1996) Residential relocation and regional redistribution of elderly in the USA and Germany. *J Cross Cult Gerontol* 11:293–306
- Steenbekker A, Simon C, Vermeij L, Spreeuwers WJ (2008) *Het platteland van alle Nederlanders. Hoe Nederlanders het platteland zien en gebruiken*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Den Haag
- Systeem woningvoorraad (2015) Retrieved from the Systeem woningvoorraad website <http://syswov.datawonen.nl/>
- van Ham M, Hooimeijer P (2009) Regional differences in spatial flexibility: long commutes and job related migration intentions in the Netherlands. *Appl Spat Anal Policy* 2:129–146
- van Leuvesteijn M, Koning P (2004) The effect of home-ownership on labor mobility in the Netherlands. *J Urban Econ* 55:580–596
- van Ommeren JN (1996) *Commuting and relocation of jobs and residences*, Dissertation. VU University Amsterdam
- van der Pers M, Kibele E, Mulder CH (2015) Intergenerational proximity and the residential relocation of older people to care institutions and elsewhere. *Ageing Soc* 35(7):1429–1456
- van der Vlist AJ (2001) *Residential mobility and commuting*, Dissertation. VU University Amsterdam
- Vandevyvere W, Zenthöfer A (2012) *The housing market in the Netherlands*. European Commission Economic Papers, No. 457, Brussels
- Venhorst VA, van Dijk J, van Wissen JLG (2011) An analysis of trends in spatial mobility of Dutch graduates. *Spat Econ Anal* 6(1):57–82
- Warnes AM (1992a) Migration processes and patterns: research progress and prospects. In: Champion AG, Fielding AJ (eds) *Migration processes and patterns*, vol 1. Belhaven Press, London, pp 175–187
- Warnes AM (1992b) Age-related variation and temporal change in elderly migration. In: Rogers A (ed) *Elderly migration and population redistribution*. Belhaven Press, London, pp 35–57
- Whisler RL, Waldorf BS, Mulligan GF, Plane DA (2008) Quality of life and the migration of the college educated: a life-course approach. *Growth Change* 39:59–94
- Wilson T (2014) The impact of education-bound mobility on inter-regional migration age profiles in Australia. *Appl Spat Anal Policy*. doi:[10.1007/s12061-014-9124-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12061-014-9124-0)