

CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

August 9, 1962

Washington 25, D.C.

Series P-20, No. 118

MOBILITY OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES MARCH 1960 TO MARCH 1961

About 35.5 million, or 20.0 percent, of the 177.4 million persons 1 year old and over who were living in the United States in March 1961 had moved at least once since March 1960. Although this overall mobility rate has reflected to some slight extent some of the postwar changes in business conditions, it has remained relatively stable in the 14 successive annual surveys conducted since 1948. The percentage of reported movers in the total population 1 year old and over has ranged from 18.6 to 21.0, with an average of 19.7, and has not shown any discernible trend.

Of the 35.5 million persons 1 year old and over who were living in a different house in March 1961 from that in 1960, about 24.3 million, or 13.7 percent of the total population 1 year old and over, had moved within the same county; 5.5 million, or 3.1 percent, had moved between counties in the same State; and 5.8 million, or 3.2 percent, had moved between States. In addition to these persons who moved within the United States, about 0.6 percent of the 1961 population had been living abroad in 1960 (table 1). Like the overall mobility rate, these rates, which provide some indication of the distance moved, have remained at about the same levels over the 14-year period. The present survey, as well as the previous surveys, indicates little difference between the mobility rates of men and women (20.2 and 19.9 percent, respectively, in 1960-61), although they all indicate a slightly higher rate among men. In the 1960-61 period, nonwhites moved more frequently than whites (22.7 vs. 19.7 percent) and this difference is characteristic of the results of most of the recent mobility surveys.

Mobility rates reach a peak in the young adult ages (43.6 percent at ages 20 to 24 in 1960-61) and thereafter decline with age (9.6 percent at 65 and over in 1960-61). Among both men and women, the rates for the widowed and divorced are appreciably higher than those for married and single persons. In total, married persons had a slightly higher mobility rate

than single persons. At the young adult ages in which most marriages occur, this difference was magnified--among men 18 to 24 years old, for example, the 1960-61 mobility rate was 63.3 percent for those who were married, but only 19.6 for those who were single. At the upper age levels, however, the rate for single men was as great as, or greater than, the rate for married men. Generally, the mobility rates by sex, age, and marital status suggest that a major element in the annual mobility of our population is the mobility incident to family formation and dissolution.

The data on economic characteristics suggest that the economically disadvantaged have the higher mobility rates. Among men, the unemployed have a higher mobility rate than the employed--28.6 vs. 19.3 in 1960-61. Men 18 to 64 years old who worked 50 to 52 weeks in the previous year have a lower mobility rate than those who worked a lesser number of weeks; and, for men in this same age group, mobility rates are higher for men with incomes of less than \$5,000 than for those with incomes of \$5,000 or more. Whether low economic status generates mobility or whether high mobility has an adverse effect in the short run on economic status still is an open question.

DISTANCE MOVED

The "moves" recognized in this survey range from a move from one apartment to another in the same apartment house development, to a move from overseas to the United States or, within the United States, from New York to Los Angeles, or from Seattle to Miami. It seems reasonable to suppose that there are real differences in the circumstances under which long and short moves occur and in the characteristics of the persons moving. One obvious basis for a distinction on the distance continuum is a distinction between "local" changes of residence within the same community,

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Luther H. Hodges, *Secretary*

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Richard M. Scammon, *Director*

For sale by the Bureau of the Census

Washington 25, D.C.

Price 25 cents.

Annual subscription (Series P-20, P-23, P-25,
P-27, and P-60, combined), \$3.00.

or labor market area, which can be made without change of job, and changes of residence which involve both a change of community of residence and a change of job.

The categories of distance recognized in this survey are limited by the difficulty encountered by both respondent and enumerator in locating the former's previous residence. For this reason, the classification by distance turns essentially on whether or not the move involved crossing county lines. Once the county of previous residence has been established, a distinction can be made between persons who moved within counties and those who moved between counties; and the latter group can be divided into those who moved within States and those who moved between States, divisions, or regions. Although it is clear that, on the average, persons who move within counties move shorter distances than those who move between counties, and likewise that those who move between States move greater distances than those who move between counties within the same State, it is also clear that these are rough approximations and that the average falls somewhat short of actually describing the relative magnitudes in a fair proportion of the cases. From this perspective, however, the categories of distance used here may be described as follows:

Intracounty movers.--These are the persons who move within counties and who in recent surveys account for approximately 67 percent of all movers. Although a move from San Bernardino to Needles within San Bernardino County, California, could scarcely be regarded as a local change of residence which could be made without a change of job, a majority of local moves fall in the intracounty mover category. The category does, however, fail to include local changes of residence in the larger metropolitan areas such as New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, which may well involve crossing county if not State lines. The scope of these limitations, however, is not sufficiently great to vitiate conclusions based on the assumptions that intracounty mobility is, in large part, the type of local mobility just described.

Interstate migrants.--Persons who move between States have in recent surveys accounted for approximately 16 percent of the total number of movers; that is, approximately the same proportion of the total as intrastate migrants. It is this type of migration, of course, which accounts for the interchange of population among the various parts of the country--the phenomenal increase in the population of such States as Florida and California during the past decade, and the movement of nonwhite population out of the South.

Intrastate migrants.--Persons who moved between counties in the same State accounted for approximately 15 percent of the total number of movers. On the average, this group stands midway between intracounty movers and interstate migrants with respect to distance moved. It includes what might be regarded as purely local mobility in multi-county SMSA's on the one hand, and, on the other, moves within the larger States which may involve considerable distance.

VARIATIONS BY TYPE OF RESIDENCE

The interpretation of the present mobility rates for types of areas presents some difficulties, since these data can be related only to the area of destination and not to that of origin. In the case of a single county SMSA, the intracounty mobility rate provides a measure of the restlessness of the population in the area and the migration rate a measure of in-migration to the area; nothing is indicated however as to out-migration from the area, and thus the net effect of migration cannot be specified. If now, that part of the SMSA outside the central city is considered, the intracounty mobility rate has two components; that representing the restlessness of the population in the suburbs, and that representing the movement to the suburbs from the central city. Since information on origin is not available here, it is impossible to distinguish between these two components. In the case of the rural-nonfarm population, the intracounty rate represents (a) movement within the rural-nonfarm population of counties, (b) movement from urban to rural-nonfarm residences within counties, and (c) movement from rural farms to rural-nonfarm residences. Similarly, the migration rate for this population reflects movement across county lines from these same sources. Since it is not possible to identify the contributions of these components, the present data tell us only about the proportion of recent movers of various types living in each type of area and not about the relative mobility propensities of residents of these types of areas. There is one further complication. The area classification in the 1961 survey was still based on the 1950 area classification, with the result that the figures do not reflect changes resulting from the application of definitions to the 1960 Census data--increases in urban territory, changes in the size of urbanized areas and cities, and the like. This situation must, of course, be taken into consideration in the interpretation of the survey results.

Urban and rural residence.--During the 1960-61 period, the overall mobility rate of the rural-nonfarm population (22.1 percent) was higher than the mobility rate of the urban population (19.8 percent), which in turn was higher than that of the rural-farm population (13.6 percent). This general pattern of urban-rural difference has been characteristic of the findings of most previous surveys.

Since the intracounty mobility rates for the urban and the rural-nonfarm populations were about the same (14.2 and 14.0, respectively), the overall difference is attributable only to the higher migration rate in the rural-nonfarm population (8.1 vs. 5.6 percent).

The lower rates of total mobility, intracounty mobility, and migration in the rural-farm population in relation to either the urban or rural-nonfarm population, are consistent with the assumption that the rate of movement to farms is low, and the established fact that there is consistent out-movement from farms, since persons leaving farms appear in the mobility rates for the other segments of the population.

Population in and outside urbanized areas.--In the urban population, the mobility rate for the population outside urbanized areas was higher than that for the population in urbanized areas; and, as in the case of the urban--rural--nonfarm difference, the difference in overall mobility was primarily a reflection of the difference in the migration rate. As in the case of the urban--rural--nonfarm difference, the difference is paralleled in the contrast between the urban population in SMSA's outside central cities and the urban population outside SMSA's.

Size of urbanized area.--As in the past, the overall mobility rate, the intracounty mobility rate, and the migration rate of the population of urbanized areas of 1,000,000 or more were less than the corresponding rates for urbanized areas of less than 1,000,000. These rates suggest that the level of local mobility is higher in the smaller urbanized areas and that the volume of in-migration either from outside urbanized areas or from other urbanized areas is also greater in the smaller urbanized areas. This interpretation is consistent with the growth patterns of urbanized areas as shown by the decennial census figures, particularly when allowance is made for the fact that the survey data relate to the areas as constituted in 1950.

Standard metropolitan statistical areas.--As in previous years, the mobility of the population outside SMSA's exceeded the mobility of persons living in such areas (table 3). The difference resulted from the higher rate of migration of nonmetropolitan residents (7.7 percent vs. 5.5 percent), since the rates of local movement for the two types of areas were not significantly different. Although there was little difference in the overall mobility rate between the population of central cities and their outlying rings, the intracounty mobility rate was appreciably higher for central cities than for the rings; and, conversely, the migration rate was higher in the ring than in the central cities. This relationship may simply reflect the fact that most central cities lie within one county and thus most local movement is necessarily intracounty movement, whereas in multicounty SMSA's local movement may frequently involve crossing county lines and thus be classified as "migration."

Individual SMSA's.--In the 1960-61 period, the overall mobility rate for the Los Angeles SMSA (26.3 percent) was higher than that for the Chicago SMSA (16.9 percent) which in turn was higher than the overall rate for the New York--Northeastern New Jersey area (12.9 percent). These areas also stood in the same relationship with respect to intracounty mobility (18.7, 14.6, and 9.2 percent, respectively). The migration rate for the Los Angeles SMSA (7.6 percent) was also higher than the corresponding rates for either of the other two areas.

In the New York and Chicago SMSA's, the total mobility rates in the central cities exceeded those for the ring, whereas in the Los Angeles area the mobility rate was higher in the ring. The intracounty mobility rate for the central cities of the New York area was appreciably less than the corresponding rates for the Chicago and Los Angeles areas, which suggests

that the division of New York City into five counties has the net effect of converting an appreciable volume of local movement from intra- to intercounty movement in the classification.

MOBILITY OF WHITES AND NONWHITES

As noted earlier, the mobility rate for the nonwhite population has, in recent surveys, exceeded that of the white population. An examination of the data on distance moved, however, indicates that this difference occurs only for intracounty movers. Both rates of migration between counties in the same State and between States are higher for whites than for nonwhites. Thus, in the 1960-61 period, the intracounty rate for nonwhites was 18.4 as compared with 13.1 for whites; but the intrastate and interstate migration rates were higher for whites (3.2 and 3.4 percent, respectively) than for nonwhites (2.0 and 2.3 percent, respectively).

The mobility rates of the nonwhite population living in urban and rural areas are somewhat different from those of the white population. In the white population, the rural--nonfarm mobility rate exceeded the urban rate which, in turn, was greater than the rural--farm rate. Among nonwhites, however, the urban rate was slightly greater than the rural--nonfarm rate, which in turn was about the same as the rural--farm rate. Similarly, the pattern of mobility within metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas was different among nonwhites. Although the mobility rate for the white population in nonmetropolitan areas exceeded that for the population in metropolitan areas, this difference was reversed among nonwhites. The migration rate for the nonwhite population shows relatively little overall variation by urban--rural residence or metropolitan--nonmetropolitan residence; and the characteristic nonwhite pattern of mobility appears to reflect mainly the extensive local movement, particularly in the large urban areas of the North which have been, as the 1960 Census indicates, in large part, the destination of nonwhite migrants.

There is also a marked difference between intracounty mobility rates for whites and nonwhites in the rural--farm population. About 16 percent of the rural--farm nonwhite population had moved within counties, in contrast to a rate of 8 percent for the rural--farm white population. This difference in all probability reflects the prevalence of frequent changes of landlords on the part of nonwhite tenants and sharecroppers.

MOBILITY AND THE FAMILY CYCLE

Mobility and age.--The 1961 survey indicates that children 1 to 4 years old had a relatively high mobility rate, 29.3 percent. The rate then declined to 16.7 percent for the age group 14 to 17, and then increased to a peak of 43.6 percent in the age group 20 to 24 years. Thereafter, there was a steady decline in the rate to about the 10-percent level at ages 65 years and over (with some suggestion of a rise after age 75). If it can be assumed that, for the most part, families move as units, and there is evidence that they do (see Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 67, table 10), then it is apparent that the high mobility

rate for children under 5 reflects the relatively high mobility of their young parents, which in part results from the appearance of the child in the family. The decline in the rate into the mid-teens likewise reflects the decline in the mobility rate of parents as they pass from the twenties into the thirties.

Mobility and marriage.--The late "teens" and the "twenties" are characterized by the exodus of children from the parental home--to the Armed Forces, to find employment outside the parental community, to college, but above all to get married. Among men 18 to 24 years old married and living with their wives, the mobility rate was 63.3 percent, whereas among single men of the same age, the mobility rate was only 19.6 percent. Among women in the same age group, the rate for wives living with their husbands was 55.2 percent as compared with 20.1 percent for women who had not yet married and were not heads of households. At ages 25 to 34, the mobility rates for both married men and women was slightly higher than for single men and women, but in the age groups 35 and over, the difference tends to disappear. In short, in the age range in which most marriages occur, mobility rates are higher for married than for single persons, and this difference would seem to reflect the change of residence which is normally incident to marriage. More explicit evidence in support of this generalization appears in the report on the 1952-53 survey. In that year, 73.5 percent of the men married during the year had moved and 71.3 percent of the women. (See Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 49, table 6.)

The close relationship between marriage and mobility is also suggested by the sex difference in mobility rates in the age range 14 to 34 years. At ages 14 to 17, the rate for boys was 15.9 and for girls 17.5. At ages 18 and 19 years, and 20 and 21 years, the rates for women were considerably in excess of those for men, and in the age group 22 to 24 years, the rates for the two sexes were about the same--approximately 45. For ages 25 to 29 and 30 to 34, however, the rates for men were in excess of those for women.

The age range 14 to 34 is the age range in which most persons get married; and, on the average, women marry at younger ages than men. (See Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 114.) The figures presented in table A, which show the relation between age

and mobility and age and percent married, suggest that mobility rates are highest in the age intervals in which the percent married increases most rapidly, and that the differences between men and women appear to reflect the sex difference in age at marriage.

Mobility and family dissolution.--The dissolution of families also contributes to mobility. In March 1961, the mobility rate for men of other marital status (i.e., widowed, divorced, and married, spouse absent) in the age groups 25 to 34, 35 to 44, and 45 to 64 was higher than for any other marital status group. Among women in the same age groups, the mobility rates for the combined total of those who were household heads and of the other ever-married group were consistently higher than those for the other household relationship and marital status groups. Since women are household heads by virtue of the absence of a husband in the household, they included, particularly in the upper age range, many women who were widowed, divorced, or separated. "Other ever married women" are also preponderantly widowed and divorced.

Single persons.--For all single persons 18 to 64 years old, the total mobility rate is not very different from the rate for persons who are married and living with their spouses. Among the single, however, there is much less variation with age than among the married. For single men 18 to 24, the rate is 19.6, at 25 to 34 it rises to 26.8, and it then decreases to 12.2 for men 45 to 64. Among single women, the rates for the 18-to-24-year and the 25-to-34-year groups approximated 20 percent and then dropped to about 10 for the two remaining age groups. Here again the figures suggest that the failure to marry makes a substantial reduction in the volume of mobility in the age range in which marriage normally occurs.

Mobility and changes in marital status.--If the number of persons who moved between March 1960 and 1961 is compared with the number expected on the basis of mobility rates for single persons, then the difference between the observed and expected number of movers provides some measure of the contribution of changes in marital status to the volume of mobility. The figures presented in table B indicate that this difference amounts to about 16 percent of all movers for the civilian noninstitutional male population 18 to 64 years old.

As might be expected from the findings of studies of the relation of residential propinquity to the selection of marriage mates, the difference relating to intracounty movers alone was larger--about 29 percent. In the age group 18 to 24 years, the age group in which a majority of persons marry, the number of intracounty movers in excess of those expected on the basis of the rate for single men constituted more than 50 percent of the total. In the case of migrants, however, there were fewer than would be expected on the basis of the migration rates for single males. At ages 18 to 24 there were more than expected, but a slight deficit is found in each of the other age groups. These figures suggest that once a man has married, family responsibilities have a restrictive effect on long-distance mobility.

Table A.--MOBILITY RATE AND PERCENT MARRIED, BY AGE AND SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES: MARCH 1961

Age	Mobility rate		Percent married ¹			
	Male	Female	Percent		Percentage point gain over preceding age	
			Male	Female	Male	Female
14 to 17 years.....	15.9	17.5	0.4	3.9
18 and 19 years.....	19.6	34.9	7.3	27.1	6.9	23.2
20 to 24 years.....	41.9	45.1	44.1	68.6	36.8	41.5
20 and 21 years...	37.0	45.0
22 to 24 years...	45.2	45.1
25 to 29 years.....	38.3	30.7	76.0	86.3	31.9	17.7
30 to 34 years.....	26.0	21.4	84.2	88.5	8.2	2.2

¹ Figures derived from Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 114, table 1.

Table B.--OBSERVED MOVERS AND MOVERS EXPECTED ON BASIS OF MOBILITY RATES FOR SINGLE MALES: CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL MALE POPULATION 18 TO 64 YEARS OLD, MARCH 1961

(Numbers in thousands)

Age	Total popu- lation	Movers		
		Total	Intra- county	Mi- grants
OBSERVED				
Total, 18 to 64 years....	46,388	9,638	6,514	3,124
18 to 24 years.....	7,134	2,357	1,455	902
25 to 34 years.....	10,471	3,255	2,203	1,052
35 to 44 years.....	11,270	1,945	1,359	586
45 to 64 years.....	17,517	2,081	1,497	584
EXPECTED ¹				
Total, 18 to 64 years....	46,388	8,084	4,644	3,440
18 to 24 years.....	7,134	1,402	689	713
25 to 34 years.....	10,471	2,809	1,563	1,246
35 to 44 years.....	11,270	1,731	1,067	664
45 to 64 years.....	17,517	2,142	1,325	817
DIFFERENCE OF OBSERVED FROM EXPECTED				
Total, 18 to 64 years....	...	+1,554	+1,870	-316
18 to 24 years.....	...	+955	+766	+189
25 to 34 years.....	...	+446	+640	-194
35 to 44 years.....	...	+214	+292	-78
45 to 64 years.....	...	-61	+172	-233

¹ On the basis of age-specific mobility rates for single males.

Among the women 18 to 64 years old, the differences from expectation on the basis of "other never married" (single) women are of the same general character as those for men. The excess of actual movers over the number expected on the basis of the rates for single persons amounted to about 33 percent of all observed movers, the percentage was somewhat greater for intra-county movers, and 20 percent for migrants. For intra-county movers 18 to 24 years, the excess amounted to more than 50 percent of the total observed, and for migrants about 45 percent of the total. Single women are not as inclined as single men to long-distance mobility. The differences for women are not strictly comparable to those for men, since the mobility rates used as the standard were those for "other never married women," that is, single women who were not heads of households. It is possible then that the difference attributable to marriage is thereby to some degree overstated.

The use of migration rates for single persons from the Current Population Survey as a standard for evaluating the contribution of marriage to migration may also tend to overstate this contribution. In the Current Population Survey, students away at college are classified as residents of their parental homes and thus as nonmovers, whereas in the decennial census they are classified as residents of the place where they are attending college and thus at some stage in their college career are classified as movers. Since such students are concentrated in the age group 18 to 24 years and are predominantly single, it seems reasonable to assume that the migration rates of single persons in this age group in the Current Population

Survey should be lower than in the decennial census; and thus, if going away to college is regarded as migration, the implied contribution of marriage to migration is overstated. A comparison of data from the Current Population Surveys of 1950 and 1951 with those from the 1950 Census shows minor differences in the expected direction, with the census figures still showing substantially higher migration rates for married than for single persons at these ages.

The modal mobility cycle.--As the foregoing discussion suggests, the typical pattern of mobility rates by age tends to reflect the family cycle. Mobility rates are high at the ages in which children leave to find jobs, marry, and set up in their own households. After some additional mobility in response to increases in family size and increased income, mobility rates decline with age as the ties of the head of the family to his present residence are strengthened and multiplied in terms of home ownership, his stake in a particular job (the operation of this restriction on mobility is most clearly seen in the low mobility rates of the self-employed), and in terms of other advantageous contacts including the ties of the members of his family, in the particular community. Changes in marital status upset this equilibrium in the later years and contribute substantially to such mobility as occurs.

This is the modal pattern, and obviously there are relatively small segments of the population with quite different patterns of mobility. For example, the members of the Armed Forces living off post covered by this survey have overall mobility rates considerably higher than the rest of the population and show, as might be expected, a high rate of interstate mobility. If it were possible to identify Mr. Whyte's mobile corporation executives (see William H. Whyte, Jr., "The Transients," *Fortune*, May 1953, pp. 112f), they might also be found to have a unique pattern of mobility. The mobility associated with the family cycle, however, is so pervasive and persistent that it tends to obscure the differences which may exist among major segments of the population. Likewise, the effects on mobility of short-run economic changes, unless they are catastrophic, tend to be diluted in the mobility rates for the general population. Although short-run economic changes presumably do affect somewhat the kind of mobility that involves the family cycle, additional data and analysis may serve to identify certain population subgroups in which the effects of short-run economic changes are more apparent.

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Labor force participation.--Overall, men in the labor force were somewhat more mobile than those not in the labor force. In the male population 14 years old and over, the total mobility rate was 20.6 for those in the labor force and 15.9 for those not in the labor force. The same difference was also characteristic of movement within and between counties.

This difference, however, is concentrated in the age group 18 to 24 years. Here, the mobility rate for members of the labor force is more than twice that for men not in the labor force. At ages 25 to 44 (where the number of males not in the labor force is relatively small), the mobility rates for men not in the labor force are somewhat higher than those for men in the labor force.

It appears that the low mobility rates for men 18 to 24 not in the labor force reflect in part the fact that most of them, in addition to not having entered the labor market, are completing their education and are still unmarried. Of the noninstitutional population 18 to 24 years old, about 95 percent of the men not in the labor force are single, whereas among those in the labor force only 60 percent are single. In short, men in this age group who are not in the labor force seem to be persons whose departure from the parental home has not yet taken place. Beyond the age of 25, however, men not in the labor force tend to have higher mobility rates, and to move greater distances. For men 25 to 44 years old, the rate of movement between counties was 18.6 percent for those not in the labor force, as compared with 7.9 percent for those in the labor force. For this relatively small group of men not in the labor force, the lack of job ties may facilitate mobility. At ages 45 to 64 and 65 and over, the greater total mobility and intercounty mobility of men not in the labor force still persists. Here again the restrictions on mobility imposed by employment do not operate on the group not in the labor force which, at the ages under consideration, is increasingly weighted with men who have retired.

Employment.--For the male population 14 years old and over, the unemployed were more mobile than the employed; 28.6 percent of the unemployed males had moved in contrast to 19.3 percent of the employed males. This difference was reflected in both the intracounty and intercounty rates. Among men 18 to 24 years old, there was little difference between the two groups in total mobility, whereas in the age groups above 25 the mobility rates were, in general, higher among the unemployed. Again, as in the case of men not in the labor force, the percentage of younger single men among the unemployed was higher than among the employed (72 vs. 59 percent, respectively); and the net increment from the additional marriages may have served to obscure the difference observed in older age groups.

Much of the information presented for unemployed males is based on an insufficient number of sample cases to permit the specification of differences between employed and unemployed men in terms of local mobility and migration rates. The data presented in table C, 4-year averages of annual mobility rates by employment status, may give a better indication of the differences in the mobility of employed and unemployed males. Here, at ages 18 to 24, the employed had a higher rate of intracounty mobility than the unemployed. For most other age groups, the reverse was true; in addition the average rates of migration were higher for the unemployed.

Table C.--AVERAGE ANNUAL MOBILITY RATES OF MALES 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY TYPE OF MOBILITY, EMPLOYMENT STATUS, AND AGE, FOR THE PERIOD MARCH 1957 TO 1961

Age	Intracounty movers		Migrants	
	Em- ployed	Unem- ployed	Em- ployed	Unem- ployed
14 to 17 years.....	9.7	18.1	3.8	9.3
18 to 24 years.....	24.7	19.8	13.4	15.7
25 to 34 years.....	19.5	27.0	10.0	13.4
35 to 44 years.....	11.3	16.3	4.9	9.5
45 to 64 years.....	7.6	14.2	2.9	7.0
65 years and over.....	5.3	6.1	1.0	1.5

WORK EXPERIENCE AND CLASS OF WORKER

Work experience.--For those men 18 to 64 years old who worked during 1960, there was an inverse relationship between the number of weeks worked and the migration rate. Those persons who worked 50 to 52 weeks had a rate of migration of 4.3 percent, those who worked 27 to 49 weeks had a rate of 9.9 percent, and those who worked 26 weeks or less, a rate of 13.4 percent (table 10). Likewise, men who worked 50 to 52 weeks had a lower intracounty mobility rate (12.0 percent) than those who had worked fewer weeks during 1960 (16.3 percent). For men who worked at full-time jobs during 1960, the pattern of mobility by number of weeks worked was essentially the same as that for all men who worked during that year. This similarity is not surprising since more than 90 percent of the men who worked, worked at full-time jobs.

Class of worker.--Table 11 presents data on the mobility status of males 18 to 64 years old by class of worker. Among all men who worked in 1960, the mobility rate for private wage and salary workers was 21.5 percent; for government workers, 19.3 percent; and self-employed workers, 10.3 percent. Among the self employed, the rate of mobility was slightly lower among those in agriculture than it was among those in other industries. As in the case of work experience, the pattern of mobility rates by class of worker among year-round full-time workers was essentially similar to that of all workers and for the same reason.

INCOME

In general, the mobility rates at various income levels indicate that for men 18 to 64 years old reporting on income in 1960, the mobility rate was highest among those with a total money income ranging between \$1,000 and \$3,000, and that thereafter the rate declined as income increased (table 8). Nearly 30 percent in the \$1,000 to \$3,000 level had moved during the preceding year, whereas only about 15 percent of those receiving incomes of \$15,000 or more had moved.

Among household heads with wife present, those with incomes of \$1 to \$2,999 or a loss had the highest mobility rate (29 percent); and again, as income increased mobility declined (table 9). In general, the same pattern existed for intracounty and intercounty

mobility. Those reporting an income of \$7,000 or more had a local mobility rate of 10 percent and a migration rate of 5 percent.

This inverse relationship between mobility and income, however, was not apparent among "other" men--that is, those men who were not married and living with their wives. It seems probable that the absence in this group of any significant decline in mobility rates as income increased is related to the heavy concentration of low mobility young single men at the lower income levels and a relatively great concentration of the highly mobile widowed and divorced men at higher income levels. Since almost three-quarters of all men 18 to 64 are family heads living with their wives, the mobility rate for all men generally showed the negative relation with income.

The tendency for mobility rates to decline as income increases was also observed among those men who worked in 1960. For example, 16 percent of those workers with income of \$1 to \$2,999 or less had moved within a county and 8 percent were migrants. The corresponding figures for those with incomes of \$7,000 or more were 9 and 5 percent, respectively.

Generally then, mobility rates appear to decline as income increases. It is possible that this relationship arises to some small degree from the concentration of young highly mobile persons at the lower end of the income scale. Data from the 1950 Census, however, indicate a negative relationship between migration and income at each age level, and it appears that the contribution of this age factor is slight. High mobility rates are associated not only with low incomes but also with unemployment and underemployment. It is not clear, of course, whether low income and marginal employment generates mobility or whether mobility leads in the short-run to low income and underemployment. It is clear, however, that there is a close association between these two characteristics.

REGIONS

The West had the highest rates of local mobility and migration, followed by the South, the North Central Region and the Northeast (table 12). During the period covered by this survey, March 1960 to March 1961, the West showed a gain in intracounty mobility (from 16.0 percent to 18.7 percent); the other three regions had local mobility rates not essentially different from those of the previous year.

The local mobility rate was lower for whites than nonwhites in all regions except the West. In the Northeast the migration rate for nonwhites exceeded that for whites; it was less than that for whites in the North Central and Southern Regions, and about the same in the West.

The West continued to experience a heavy net in-migration; but, in contrast to most previous years, the net out-migration from the South was relatively small, a balance between a net out-migration of nonwhites and a net in-migration of whites (table 13). Net out-migration from the North Central Region was approximately twice as great as it had been in the

previous year. The pattern of net migration for the North was not essentially different from that of the previous year. With the exception of the low level of net out-migration from the South, the pattern of inter-regional gains and loss was consistent with the annual average numbers presented for the whole period April 1953 to March 1960 (table D).

Table D.--ANNUAL AVERAGE OF IN-MIGRANTS AND OUT-MIGRANTS FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1953 TO MARCH 1961, FOR REGIONS

(Numbers in thousands. Minus sign (-) denotes net out-migration)

Region	In-migrants	Out-migrants	Net migration
Northeast.....	431	459	-28
North Central.....	708	797	-89
South.....	877	1,023	-146
West.....	766	503	+263

Of the net gain in the population of the West from interregional migration, about 53 percent came from the South, 35 percent from the North Central Region, and the remaining 12 percent from the Northeast. Of the net loss from the North Central Region, about 47 percent represented a loss to the West, 41 percent to the South, and 12 percent to the Northeast.

RELATED REPORTS

Statistics on the mobility status of the population 1 year old and over appear in Series P-20, No. 113 (March 1959 to 1960); No. 104 (April 1958 to 1959); No. 85 (March 1957 to 1958); No. 82 (April 1956 to 1957); No. 73 (March 1955 to 1956); No. 61 (April 1954 to 1955); No. 57 (April 1953 to 1954); No. 49 (April 1952 to 1953); No. 47 (April 1952); No. 39 (April 1950 to 1951); No. 36 (March 1949 to 1950); No. 28 (April 1948 to 1949); and No. 22 (April 1947 to 1948).

1950 Census.--Statistics on the mobility of the population for cities, counties, standard metropolitan areas, urbanized areas, States, divisions, regions, and the United States appear in Volume II of the 1950 Census of Population. Detailed statistics on mobility status by color and sex for States, divisions, regions, and the United States appear in the 1950 Census of Population, Vol. IV, Special Reports, Nos. 4B, 4C, and 4D. Other special reports of the 1950 Census entitled "Characteristics by Size of Place," "Education," and "Institutional Population" present statistics on mobility status in relation to the main subject of the report.

DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Population coverage.--The data for 1960 (covering the period March 1959 to 1960) shown in this report relate primarily to the civilian population of the United States 1 year old and over. Approximately 1,058,000 members of the Armed Forces living off post or with their families on post were also included, but

all other members of the Armed Forces were excluded. For simplicity, the group covered is called the "population" or the "civilian population" in this report. The coverage of the population for the earlier survey years was essentially the same. The data from the 1950 Census relate to the total population 1 year old and over.

Urban and rural residence.--The definition of urban and rural areas which was used in the March 1960 survey was the same as that used in the 1950 Census, but it differed substantially from that used in surveys and censuses before 1950. The territory classified as urban is the same as that in the 1950 Census.

Size of place.--The urban population is classified as living in urbanized areas or in urban places outside urbanized areas. According to the definition used in the 1950 Census and in the March 1960 Current Population Survey, the population in urbanized areas comprises all persons living in (a) cities of 50,000 inhabitants or more in 1940 or according to a special census taken between 1940 and 1950; and (b) the densely settled urban fringe, including both incorporated and unincorporated areas, surrounding these cities. Residents of urbanized areas are classified according to the size of the entire area rather than by the size of the place in which they lived. The remaining urban population is classified as living in the smaller urban places not in the urbanized areas.

Farm and nonfarm residence.--The rural population is subdivided into the rural-farm population, which comprises all rural residents living on farms, and the rural-nonfarm population, which comprises the remaining rural population. The method of determining farm and nonfarm residence in the March 1960 survey differs from that used in earlier surveys and censuses. The definition used in this survey is comparable to the definition used in the 1960 Census of Population. The change was designed to exclude from the farm population persons living on places considered farms by the occupants, but from which agricultural products were not sold or from which sales were below a specified minimum. According to the current definition, the farm population consists of all persons living in rural territory or places of more than 10 acres from which \$50.00 or more of farm products were sold in 1959 or on places of less than 10 acres from which farm products of \$250.00 or more were sold. As in the 1950 definition, which was used in surveys from March 1950 through April 1959, persons in institutions, summer camps, motels, and tourist camps and those living on rented places where no land was used for farming are classified as nonfarm. Farm-nonfarm residence according to the old definition was determined by respondents' answers to the question, "Is this house on a farm (or ranch)?"

Standard metropolitan statistical areas.--Except in New England, a standard metropolitan statistical area is a county or group of contiguous counties which contains at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more. In addition to the county, or counties, containing such a city or cities, contiguous counties are

included in a standard metropolitan statistical area if according to certain criteria they are essentially metropolitan in character and socially and economically integrated with the central city. In New England, standard metropolitan statistical areas have been defined on a town rather than county basis. Standard metropolitan statistical areas of this report are identical with the standard metropolitan areas of the 1950 Census and do not include any subsequent additions or other changes.

Mobility status.--The civilian population of the United States has been classified according to mobility status on the date of the survey on the basis of a comparison between the place of residence of each individual at the survey date and the place of residence one year earlier. This comparison restricts the classification in terms of mobility status to the population of persons 1 year old and over at the survey date.

The information on mobility status was obtained from the response to the following series of inquiries. The first of these was: "Was ... living in this house March 1 a year ago?" If the answer was "No," the enumerator asked, "Was ... living in this same county on March 1 a year ago?" If the response was "No" again, the enumerator asked, "What State (or foreign country) was ... living in on March 1 a year ago?"

In the classification three main categories are distinguished:

1. Mobile persons or movers.--This group consists of all persons who were living in a different house in the United States at the end of the period than at the beginning of the period.
2. Nonmobile persons or nonmovers.--This group consists of persons who were living in the same house at the end of the period as at the beginning of the period.
3. Persons abroad.--This group consists of persons, either citizens or aliens, whose place of residence was outside the United States at the beginning of the period, that is, in an outlying area under the jurisdiction of the United States or a foreign country. These persons are distinguished from movers, who are persons who moved from one place to another within the United States.

Mobile persons are subdivided in terms of type of mobility into the following two groups:

1. Same county (intracounty).--These are persons living in a different house but in the same county at the beginning and end of the specified period.
2. Migrants, or different county (intercounty) movers.--This group consists of persons living in a different county in the United States at the beginning and end of the period.

Migrants are further classified by type of migration on the basis of a comparison of the State of residence at the end of the period with the State of residence at the beginning of the period.

1. Migrants within a State (intrastate migrants).
2. Migrants between States (interstate migrants).

Age.--The age classification is based on the age of the person at his last birthday.

Color.--The term "color" refers to the division of population into two groups, white and nonwhite. The group designated as "nonwhite" consists of Negroes, Indians, Japanese, Chinese, and other nonwhite races.

Marital status.--The marital status classification identifies four major categories: Single, married, widowed, and divorced. These terms refer to the marital status at the time of enumeration.

The category "married" is further divided into "married, spouse present," "separated," and "other married, spouse absent." A person was classified as "married, spouse present" if the husband or wife was reported as a member of the household even though he or she may have been temporarily absent on business or on vacation, visiting, in a hospital, etc., at the time of the enumeration. Persons reported as separated included those with legal separations, those living apart with intentions of obtaining a divorce, and other persons permanently or temporarily estranged from their spouse because of marital discord. The group "other married, spouse absent" includes married persons employed and living for several months at a considerable distance from their homes, those whose spouse was absent in the Armed Forces, in-migrants whose spouse remained in other areas, husbands or wives of inmates of institutions, and all other married persons (except those reported as separated) whose place of residence was not the same as that of their spouse.

For the purpose of this report the group "other marital status" includes "widowed and divorced," "separated," and "other married, spouse absent."

Household relationship

Head.--One person in each household is designated the "head." The head is usually the person regarded as the head by the members of the group. Married women are not classified as heads if their husbands are living with them at the time of the survey.

Other ever-married women.--All in the household who had been married but were neither heads of households nor wives of heads of households are designated "other ever-married women."

Other single women.--All related and unrelated women in the household who were single (i.e., had never been married) and who were not heads of households are designated as "other single women."

Employment status

Employed.--Employed persons comprise those who, during the survey week were either (a) "at work"--those who did any work, for pay or profit, or worked without pay for 15 hours or more on a family farm or business; or (b) "with a job but not at work"--those who did not work and were not looking for work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of vacation, illness, industrial dispute, or bad weather, or because they were taking time off for various other reasons.

Unemployed.--Unemployed persons include those who did not work at all during the survey week and were looking for work. Also included as unemployed are those who did not work at all during the survey week and (a) were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off, or (b) were waiting to report to a new wage or salary job scheduled to start within the following 30 days (and were not in school during the survey week), or (c) would have been looking for work except that they were temporarily ill or believed no work was available in their line of work or in the community.

Prior to 1957, part of group (a) above--those whose layoffs were for definite periods of less than 30 days--were classified as employed (with a job but not at work) rather than as unemployed, as were all of the persons in group (b) above (waiting to start new jobs within 30 days).

Labor force.--The civilian labor force comprises the total of all civilians classified as employed or unemployed in accordance with the criteria described above. Also included in this report are members of the Armed Forces who at the time of the survey were living off post or were living on post with their families.

Not in labor force.--All civilians 14 years of age and over who are not classified as employed or unemployed are defined as "not in the labor force." Included are persons "engaged in own home housework," "in school," "unable to work" because of long-term physical or mental illness, retired persons, those reported as too old to work, the voluntary idle, and seasonal workers for whom the survey week fell in an "off" season and who were not reported as unemployed. Persons doing only incidental unpaid family work (less than 15 hours) are also classified as not in the labor force.

Work experience in 1959.--A person with work experience in 1959 is one who did any civilian work for pay or profit or worked without pay on a family-operated farm or business at any time during the year, on a part-time or full-time basis.

Weeks worked in 1959.--Persons are classified according to the number of different weeks during 1959 in which they did any civilian work for pay or profit (including paid vacations and sick leave) or worked without pay on a family-operated farm or business.

Part-time or full-time jobs.--A person is classified as having worked at part-time jobs during 1959 if he worked at jobs which provided less than 35 hours of work per week in a majority of the weeks in which he worked during the year. He is classified as having worked at full-time jobs if he worked 35 hours or more per week during a majority of the weeks in which he worked.

Year-round full-time worker.--A year-round full-time worker is one who worked primarily at full-time jobs for 50 weeks or more during 1959.

Part-year worker.--A part-year worker is one who worked from 1 to 49 weeks in 1959 either at full-time or part-time jobs.

Class of worker.--The data on class of worker are for persons who worked in 1959 and refer to the job held longest during the year. Persons employed at two or more jobs were reported in the job at which they worked the greatest number of weeks. The class-of-worker classification specifies "wage and salary workers," subdivided into private and government workers "self-employed workers," where a distinction is made between those in agriculture and those in nonagricultural industries; and "unpaid family workers." Wage and salary workers receive wages, salary, commission, tips, pay in kind, or piece rates from a private employer or from a government unit. Self-employed workers have their own business, profession, or trade, or operate a farm, for profit or fees. Unpaid family workers work without pay on a farm or in a business operated by a member of the household to whom they are related by blood or marriage.

Total money income.--For persons 14 years old and over in a subsample of the civilian noninstitutional population, questions were asked on the amount of money income received in 1959 from each of the following sources: (1) Money wages or salary; (2) net income from nonfarm self-employment; (3) net income from farm self-employment; (4) Social Security, veterans' payments, or other government or private pensions; (5) interest (on bonds or savings), dividends, and income from annuities, estates, or trusts; (6) net income from boarders or lodgers, or from renting property to other; (7) all other sources such as unemployment benefits, public assistance, alimony, etc. The amounts received represent income before deductions for personal taxes, Social Security, bonds, etc. It should be noted that although income refers to receipts during 1959, the characteristics of the person, such as age, labor force status, etc., refer to March 1960.

Rounding of estimates.--Individual figures are rounded to the nearest thousand but are adjusted to group totals, which are independently rounded. Percentages are based on the rounded absolute numbers.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

Source of data.--The estimates are based on data obtained in the Current Population Survey of the Bureau of the Census. This sample is spread over 333 sample areas comprising 641 counties and independent cities with coverage in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Approximately 35,000 households are interviewed each month. Another 1,500 occupied units, on the average, are visited but interviews are not obtained because the occupants are not found at home after repeated calls or are unavailable for some other reason. There are about 5,500 sample units in an average month which are visited but are found to be vacant or otherwise not to be enumerated. The statistics for 1949 to 1953 on mobility are based on a different sample, which consisted of 24,000 to 26,000 households located in 68 areas. The mobility statis-

tics for 1954 and 1955 were based on about 24,000 to 26,000 households, and the sample was spread over 230 sample areas.

Information about the work experience and income of persons in the United States was obtained in the February 1961 Current Population Survey. For approximately 75 percent of these households, information on income and mobility was obtained in the regular March 1961 survey. The information obtained in February was matched with data secured in March for the 26,000 households who were included in both surveys. Furthermore, questions on income were not asked in March of the approximately 25 percent of the households who were introduced into the sample in that month. The reduced coverage, then, applies to tables 8 and 9 as well as to tables 10 and 11. This procedure has introduced a slight downward bias in the percent of annual movers in the various income groups shown in these tables. Persons in the March sample who moved into their residence between February 1 and March 1, 1961, could not be included in the February-March match.

The estimating procedure used in this survey involved the inflation of weighted sample results to independent estimates of the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States by age, color, and sex. Beginning with the April 1953 survey, the independent estimates used were based on statistics from the 1950 Census of Population; statistics of births, deaths, immigration and emigration; and statistics on the strength and separation records of the Armed Forces.

Reliability of the estimates.--Since the estimates are based on sample data, they are subject to sampling variability. The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability. The standard error as calculated for this report also partially measures the effect of response variance but does not reflect any systematic biases in the data. The chances are 68 out of 100 that the difference due to sampling variability between an estimate and the figure that would have been obtained from a complete enumeration is less than the standard error. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference is less than twice the standard error and about 99 out of 100 that it is less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the standard error.

The estimates of standard errors shown in this report are approximations for the 333-area sample. In order to derive standard errors which would be applicable to a wide variety of population characteristics and which could be prepared at moderate cost, a number of approximations are required. These estimates of standard errors of percentages should be interpreted as providing an indication of the order of magnitude of the standard errors rather than as providing a precise standard error for any specific item.

The reliability of an estimated percentage, computed using sample data for both numerator and denominator, depends upon both the size of the percent and the size of the total on which the percent is based. Generally, estimated percentages are relatively more reliable than corresponding absolute estimates of the numerator of the percentage, particularly if the percentage is high.

The figures presented in table E are approximations to the standard errors of various mobility characteristics as shown in tables 1 to 7, 12, and 13.

Approximations to the standard errors for characteristics of income classified by mobility and by work experience (tables 8 through 11) can be made by multiplying the approximate figure in table D by a factor of 1.15.

Illustration.--There were 5,769,000 males in the age group 30 to 34 years. The mobility rate for males 30 to 34 years of age was 26 percent. Interpolating in table D between 5 and 10 million for the base, the standard error of the estimated percentage is approximately 1.3 percent; thus the chances are about 68 out of 100 that the percent obtained from a complete census would be greater than 24.7 percent and less than 27.3 percent.

Table E.--STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE

(Range of 68 chances out of 100)

Estimated percentage	Base of percentage (thousands)								
	500	1,000	2,000	3,000	5,000	10,000	25,000	50,000	75,000
2 or 98.....	1.5	1.0	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
5 or 95.....	2.3	1.6	1.2	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2
10 or 90.....	3.2	2.2	1.6	1.3	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.3
25 or 75.....	4.6	3.2	2.3	1.9	1.4	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.4
50.....	5.2	3.7	2.6	2.1	1.6	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.4

List of Tables

Table	Page
1.--Mobility status and type of mobility of the civilian population 1 year old and over, for the United States: April 1948 to March 1961.....	12
2.--Percent distribution by mobility status and type of mobility of the civilian population 1 year old and over, by place of residence and color, for the United States: March 1961.....	14
3.--Percent distribution by mobility status and type of mobility of the civilian population 1 year old and over, by color and by metropolitan-nonmetropolitan and urban-rural residence, for the United States: March 1961.....	15
4.--Age and sex of the civilian population 1 year old and over, by mobility status and type of mobility, for the United States: March 1961.....	16
5.--Employment status and age of the male civilian population 14 years old and over, by mobility status and type of mobility, for the United States: March 1961.....	18
6.--Employment status, age, and marital status of the noninstitutional male civilian population 18 to 64 years old, by mobility status and type of mobility, for the United States: March 1961.....	20
7.--Employment status, age, and relationship to head of household of the noninstitutional female civilian population 18 to 64 years old, by mobility status and type of mobility, for the United States: March 1961.....	23
8.--Percent distribution by mobility status and type of mobility of the noninstitutional male civilian population 18 to 64 years old, by total money income in 1960, for the United States: March 1961....	26
9.--Percent distribution by mobility status and type of mobility for heads of households with wife present and other noninstitutional males 18 to 64 years old, by total money income in 1960, for the United States: March 1961.....	26
10.--Percent distribution by mobility status and type of mobility of the noninstitutional male civilian population 18 to 64 years old, by total money income in 1960 and work experience in 1960, for the United States: March 1961.....	27
11.--Percent distribution by mobility status and type of mobility for the noninstitutional male civilian population 18 to 64 years old, by total money income in 1960 and class of worker of longest job in 1960, for the United States: March 1961.....	28
12.--Percent distribution by mobility status and type of mobility for the civilian population 1 year old and over, by color and sex, for regions: March 1961.....	29
13.--Region of residence in 1961 by region of residence in 1960 of migrants in the civilian population 1 year old and over, for the United States: March 1961.....	30