

Technical Studies

Series P-23, No. 12
July 31, 1964

SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION: 1960*

(Based on a 1/1,000 sample of 1960 Census records)

This report describes the relationship of socioeconomic status to selected demographic, social, and economic characteristics of the population. Two summary socioeconomic measures developed in connection with the 1960 Census program are used: (1) A multiple-item socioeconomic status score (which combines measures of occupation, education, and income), and (2) a status consistency type, designed to indicate whether the components of the multiple-item score are at about the same or different levels and, when at different levels, the pattern of inconsistency. Related variables included in this report are age, color, urban-rural residence, labor force status, and fertility of women. The data are based on a sample of 1-in-1,000 of the 1960 Census records and are subject to sampling variability as explained in the section on "Source and reliability of the estimates."

A brief statement of the methodology used in developing the socioeconomic measures is included in a later section of this report. A more complete statement can be found in the Bureau of the Census Working Paper No. 15, Methodology and Scores of Socioeconomic Status, Washington, D.C., 1963.

Some highlights of the findings, discussed in greater detail in later pages of this report, are as follows:

1. Nonwhite persons in 1960 constituted 42 percent of the total population in the lowest

tenth of socioeconomic scores, but only 2 percent of those in the highest tenth of socioeconomic scores.

2. Socioeconomic levels were highest in the urban fringe areas surrounding large cities and were lowest in rural areas, especially on farms. Twenty-three percent of the population in the urban fringe were in the top fifth of the range of socioeconomic status scores as compared with 3 percent of those on farms.

3. Among family heads in the top fifth of the range of socioeconomic scores, nonwhites were more likely than whites to have consistent occupation, education, and income statuses; among those in the lowest fifth of socioeconomic scores, nonwhites and whites were equally likely to have consistent statuses.

4. The percent of family heads with all statuses consistent was quite similar for each of three broad age groups and for the different residence areas shown. There was considerable variation, however, in the distribution of types of status inconsistency among these groups.

5. Rates of unemployment for males were inversely related to level of socioeconomic status. Only 1 percent of the male civilian labor force 14 years old and over with socioeconomic scores of 80 to 99 were unemployed compared with 11 percent of those with scores of 0 to 19.

* This report was prepared by Charles B. Nam, Chief, and Mary G. Powers, Statistician, Education and Social Stratification Branch, and Paul C. Glick, Assistant Chief, Population Division.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, 15 cents.
Annual subscription (Series P-20, P-23, P-25, P-27, P-28 summaries, P-60, and P-65, combined), \$4.00; foreign mailing, \$5.25.



6. The number of children ever born to married white women 35 to 44 years old living with their husbands was 3,970 per thousand for those in the lowest fifth and 2,371 for those in the highest fifth of socioeconomic scores. Among married nonwhite women in the same age group, those in the lower half of the socioeconomic scores had more children, on the average, and those in the upper half had fewer children than white women in corresponding groups.

Table A.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION, BY COLOR WITHIN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS CATEGORIES, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

Socioeconomic status score	Total	White	Nonwhite
Total population.....	100.0	88.8	11.2
90 to 99 (high).....	100.0	98.5	1.5
80 to 89.....	100.0	97.9	2.1
70 to 79.....	100.0	96.5	3.5
60 to 69.....	100.0	96.2	3.8
50 to 59.....	100.0	94.4	5.6
40 to 49.....	100.0	89.8	10.2
30 to 39.....	100.0	84.1	15.9
20 to 29.....	100.0	78.5	21.5
10 to 19.....	100.0	72.4	27.6
0 to 9 (low).....	100.0	58.4	41.6

Socioeconomic scores by color and age.--The nonwhite population was disproportionately over-represented among the population with low socioeconomic scores and underrepresented among the population with high scores (table A). Nonwhites comprised 11 percent of the total population in 1960, but only between 2 and 6 percent of all persons in the top half of socioeconomic scores were nonwhite, compared with between 10 and 40 percent of the population in the bottom half of the socioeconomic distribution. Examining the data from

another point of view, 35 percent of the nonwhites and 9 percent of the whites had socioeconomic scores of 20 or below, whereas 2 percent of the nonwhites and 15 percent of the whites had socioeconomic scores of 80 or above (table B). See section on "Procedures" for a description of the properties of the distribution of socioeconomic scores.

Table B.--SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF THE POPULATION, BY COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

Socioeconomic status score	Total	White	Nonwhite
Total population.....	100.0	100.0	100.0
90 to 99 (high).....	5.4	5.9	0.7
80 to 89.....	7.8	8.6	1.5
70 to 79.....	11.2	12.2	3.5
60 to 69.....	13.6	14.8	4.6
50 to 59.....	15.1	16.1	7.6
40 to 49.....	14.0	14.1	12.8
30 to 39.....	11.6	11.0	16.5
20 to 29.....	9.3	8.3	18.0
10 to 19.....	7.6	6.2	18.8
0 to 9 (low).....	4.3	2.8	15.9

Socioeconomic changes over the life cycle are reflected in the status scores by age (table 1). Relatively more persons age 45 and over than under 45 years of age had low status scores. The variation with age for nonwhites was similar to that of the total population, but the scores for nonwhites remained generally lower than those for the total population at each age.

Socioeconomic level and urban-rural residence.--Differences in socioeconomic scores by color tended to persist within the several types of residence areas (table C). In all areas, whites had higher scores than nonwhites; however, nonwhites showed essentially the same general pattern by residence as the total population.

Table C.--SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF THE POPULATION, BY COLOR AND TYPE OF RESIDENCE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

Socioeconomic status score and color	United States	Urbanised areas		Other urban	Rural nonfarm	Rural farm
		Central cities	Urban fringe			
Total.....thousands..	179,580	57,856	37,833	29,860	40,473	13,558
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
80 to 99.....	13.2	13.7	22.8	12.2	7.7	2.8
50 to 79.....	40.0	42.4	50.1	40.1	34.4	18.1
20 to 49.....	34.9	35.2	23.4	36.0	40.6	46.3
0 to 19.....	11.9	8.6	3.7	11.7	17.3	32.9
White.....thousands..	159,513	47,703	36,126	27,062	36,709	11,913
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
80 to 99.....	14.6	16.0	23.7	13.3	8.5	3.1
50 to 79.....	43.0	46.8	51.3	43.2	37.4	20.3
20 to 49.....	33.4	31.1	22.0	35.1	40.8	49.8
0 to 19.....	9.0	6.1	3.0	8.5	13.4	26.9
Nonwhite.....thousands..	20,067	10,153	1,707	2,798	3,764	1,645
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
80 to 99.....	2.2	3.0	3.6	1.9	0.7	0.4
50 to 79.....	15.8	21.9	25.2	10.5	4.8	2.1
20 to 49.....	47.3	54.5	52.7	44.3	38.8	21.2
0 to 19.....	34.7	20.6	18.4	43.3	55.7	76.3

Proportionately more persons with high status scores were found in the urban fringe surrounding medium-to-large-size cities than elsewhere. Central cities of urbanized areas and other urban places had the next highest proportion of persons with high status, and rural-farm areas had the smallest proportion. Conversely, rural-farm areas contained proportionately most persons with the lowest status scores and fewest with the highest scores.

The residence distribution of the top socioeconomic group varied by age. Proportionately more persons 45 years old and over with high socioeconomic scores resided in the cities than in the urban fringe of urbanized areas, whereas the reverse was true of persons under 45 years of age (table 2). These facts are consistent with those reported for 1950, based on other socioeconomic measures.¹

Status consistency patterns.--The general socioeconomic status score used in this report is a simple average of three status variables (occupation, education, and income) and, by itself, does not take into account another important dimension of status, namely, that of status consistency or inconsistency, or the degree to which the component scores are at about the same or different levels.² The concept of status consistency is described more precisely below in the section on procedures.

It might be expected, owing partly to the measurement methods used and partly to customary status relationships, that the potential for consistency would be greatest at the extremes of the range of socioeconomic scores. For example, extremely high status on one component, such as education, presumably facilitates entry into high status positions in the other components, such as occupation and income. Very low status in one hierarchy would have similar consequences with respect to consistency insofar as an extremely low educational level, for example, minimizes one's ability to compete for higher occupation and income statuses. Most persons, however, rank along the middle part of the range of possible status scores; their chances of having occupational and income

statuses either higher or lower than their educational status, for example, are greater, and status inconsistency for these persons is thus more likely than for other persons.

Data describing status consistency types were available only for family heads. The greatest consistency among component scores for family heads did occur, in fact, among those with the highest or lowest statuses. Thus, about 3 out of every 5 family heads in the top fifth of SES scores were consistently high on all three components and about 3 out of every 4 in the bottom fifth had all three scores consistently low compared to about 1 out of 5 in the middle status range. Moreover, about 38 percent of the family heads in the top fifth of status scores, and 27 percent of those in the bottom fifth, had two status components consistent and one inconsistent; among these family heads, very few in the top fifth of the range of scores had only one component high, and very few in the bottom fifth of the range had only one component low (table 3). Therefore, an extreme rank on one component was not sufficient to place many persons in either the highest or lowest status level.

Occupation was high and inconsistent for half of the family heads in the lowest fifth of the scores with two components consistent. This combination of scores may be due partly to misreporting of occupation; for example, some maintenance personnel may report themselves as sanitary engineers. On the other hand, it may show that persons who have lower than average education for their jobs tend to receive lower-than-average income.

A stronger tendency toward consistent component scores was indicated for nonwhite family heads than for white family heads. This observation is partially explained by the fact that over 80 percent of the very small number of nonwhites with scores in the top fifth of the range had all status components consistent; the corresponding proportion for white family heads was only about 60 percent (table D). This tendency toward more consistent component scores among nonwhites was similar among family heads in the three broad age groups shown.

The patterns of inconsistency among family heads with two components consistent indicate that young persons tend to have higher educational and occupational statuses than income status and older persons tend to have higher income status than educational and occupational statuses. Income was low and inconsistent with education and occupation for 35 percent of the family heads under 35 with two statuses consistent compared with 16 percent of those 35 to 54. Conversely, income was high and inconsistent for 22 percent of the latter age

See O. D. Duncan and A. J. Reiss, Jr., Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1956.

² A growing body of literature is developing on this subject. For discussion of the concept of status consistency and its effects, see Gerhard E. Lenski, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Verticle Dimension of Social Status," American Sociological Review, 19 (August 1954), pp. 405-413; and Elton F. Jackson, "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress," ibid., 27 (August 1962), pp. 469-480.

Table D.--STATUS CONSISTENCY TYPE, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND COLOR, FOR FAMILY HEADS IN THE UNITED STATES: 1960

Status consistency type and color	White					Nonwhite				
	All family heads	Socioeconomic status score				All family heads	Socioeconomic status score			
		80 to 99 (high)	50 to 79	20 to 49	0 to 19 (low)		80 to 99 (high)	50 to 79	20 to 49	0 to 19 (low)
Total.....thousands..	40,711	6,015	17,770	13,513	3,413	4,293	237	707	1,964	1,385
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All status components consistent....	28.5	61.7	20.2	13.5	73.1	37.2	81.9	16.3	13.6	73.7
Two status components consistent....	61.9	38.3	67.9	73.5	26.9	54.7	18.1	73.4	72.4	26.3
Income high.....	11.1	3.1	12.8	14.5	2.8	9.2	0.8	16.8	12.3	2.4
Income low.....	13.8	11.1	17.4	12.5	4.7	11.6	10.5	24.3	14.4	1.5
Education high.....	5.2	1.3	4.2	8.9	3.2	9.9	-	7.2	15.0	5.6
Education low.....	15.7	14.7	19.3	15.0	1.7	8.3	2.5	9.8	12.5	2.7
Occupation high.....	10.9	1.1	6.8	19.8	14.1	12.1	-	3.5	15.2	14.1
Occupation low.....	5.2	7.1	7.4	2.8	0.4	3.6	4.2	11.7	3.1	-
All status components inconsistent..	9.5	-	12.0	13.0	-	8.1	-	10.3	14.0	-

- Entry represents zero or rounds to zero.

group compared with 12 percent of the former. Analysis of consistency patterns of family heads by type of residence suggests a slight tendency toward greater consistency in the urban fringe than in central cities or in the United States as a whole.

Regional variation.--About 19 percent of the family heads in the South had scores in the lowest fifth of the range of socioeconomic scores, compared with approximately 6 percent in the Northeast and West and 9 percent in the North Central

Region (table E). Conversely, 16 percent and 18 percent of all family heads in the Northeast and West, respectively, had scores in the top fifth of the range, compared with 13 percent in the North Central Region and 11 percent in the South. All components of the status score were consistent for about 32 percent of all family heads in the South, compared with 28 percent in each of the other regions. The concentration of the nonwhite population in the South is undoubtedly related to the generally lower socioeconomic level and greater consistency of scores for Southern family heads.

Table E.--PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY HEADS BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND STATUS CONSISTENCY, FOR THE UNITED STATES, BY REGIONS: 1960

Socioeconomic status score and status consistency type	United States	Northeast	North Central	South	West
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS SCORE					
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
90 to 99 (high).....	5.7	7.1	5.1	4.3	6.9
80 to 89.....	8.2	8.6	8.1	6.7	10.8
70 to 79.....	11.8	12.7	12.2	9.1	14.5
60 to 69.....	14.0	14.8	14.9	11.2	16.4
50 to 59.....	15.3	16.8	16.4	12.5	16.1
40 to 49.....	13.8	15.0	14.8	12.2	13.2
30 to 39.....	11.6	11.7	11.7	12.6	9.1
20 to 29.....	9.0	7.5	8.1	12.3	6.9
10 to 19.....	7.1	4.4	6.7	11.2	4.4
0 to 9 (low).....	3.5	1.3	2.0	7.9	1.7
STATUS CONSISTENCY TYPE					
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All status components consistent.....	29.4	28.2	28.4	31.8	28.3
Occupation and education consistent; income high.....	10.9	11.6	12.6	7.7	12.9
Occupation and education consistent; income low.....	13.6	12.2	12.9	15.2	13.7
Occupation and income consistent; education high.....	5.7	4.5	5.7	6.2	6.5
Occupation and income consistent; education low.....	15.0	17.5	16.0	12.5	13.9
Education and income consistent; occupation high.....	11.0	10.8	9.6	14.1	7.9
Education and income consistent; occupation low.....	5.1	4.7	5.4	3.9	7.4
All inconsistent; occupation highest, income lowest.....	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.9	1.3
All inconsistent; occupation highest, education lowest..	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.6	0.9
All inconsistent; education highest, occupation lowest..	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.6
All inconsistent; education highest, income lowest.....	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.6	1.6
All inconsistent; income highest.....	4.8	6.3	5.2	3.1	4.9

Socioeconomic status and labor force participation.--Among both the total and the nonwhite male populations, persons with scores in the top half of the socioeconomic distribution exhibited relatively high employment rates and low unemployment rates, whereas the reverse was true of those in the lower half of the distribution (tables F and 4). Both total and nonwhite males with low status scores were less likely to be in the labor force than those with high status scores. The smaller percent not in the labor force among nonwhite men (43 percent) than among all men (51 percent) in the lowest status level suggests that failure to enter the labor force may be less of a factor in determining low status level for nonwhites than for whites.

Table F.--EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF MALES 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

Socioeconomic status score and color	Males 14 years and over (thousands)	Labor force		Percent not in labor force
		Percent employed, civilian or in Armed Forces	Unemployment rate ¹	
Total.....	61,354	73.4	5.1	22.8
80 to 99.....	7,868	85.7	1.4	13.1
50 to 79.....	24,242	81.9	3.4	15.2
20 to 49.....	21,927	69.5	7.6	25.2
0 to 19.....	7,317	43.9	10.6	50.9
Nonwhite.....	6,198	65.3	9.3	28.2
80 to 99.....	148	84.5	2.4	13.5
50 to 79.....	1,053	78.9	6.1	16.1
20 to 49.....	2,963	69.7	9.7	23.2
0 to 19.....	2,034	50.6	11.6	42.7

¹ Unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force.

Women participated in the labor force to a lesser extent than men, but the pattern of their participation by socioeconomic level was similar to that for men, except that the largest percent in the labor force was among those with status scores just below the top level whereas the largest percent of men was in the top fifth (table 4). This fact might indicate that the employment of wives, with the additional income it brings to the family, tends more often to raise the socioeconomic status of the family to a point a little above average than to raise it to the top level. Proportionately more nonwhite women than all women at each status level were in the labor force. This fact is undoubtedly related to the higher unemployment rates among nonwhite than white men which make it more imperative for nonwhite than white women to contribute to the financial support of their families.

Socioeconomic level, status consistency, and fertility.--Socioeconomic status has been considered a variable of prime importance in recent

investigations of human fertility.³ In general, attention has been focused on the relationship between the three components of socioeconomic status, separately or cross-tabulated with other variables such as religion, and various aspects of fertility.⁴

The present analysis shows clearly that the fertility of white married women 35 to 44 years old, with husband present, was inversely related to their socioeconomic level (table G). Fertility rates for women in the lowest fifth of the status score indicated that they had about one and two-thirds as high a fertility rate as those in the highest fifth.

Table G.--NUMBER OF CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 1,000 MARRIED WHITE WOMEN 35 TO 44 YEARS OLD LIVING WITH HUSBAND, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960.

Socioeconomic status score	Children ever born per 1,000 women
Total.....	2,624
SES score 80 to 99 (high).....	2,371
SES score 50 to 79.....	2,464
SES score 20 to 49.....	2,915
SES score 0 to 19 (low).....	3,970

Although proportionately more nonwhite women than white women were childless, nonwhite women generally experienced higher fertility rates than white women, as measured by the number of children ever born per 1,000 women (table H). Despite the latter fact, nonwhite women in the top half of the range of possible socioeconomic scores actually had a smaller average number of children per 1,000 women (2,147) than white women at the same level (2,438). In the lower half of the range of scores, however, nonwhite women had a considerably higher fertility rate (3,643) than white women (3,046).

White women in the top half of the status scale with all components of their status scores consistent had lower fertility rates than those with all components inconsistent. The reverse

³ Recent research on this subject includes Wilson H. Grabill, Clyde V. Kiser, and P. K. Whelpton, The Fertility of American Women, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1958, and Ronald Freedman, P.K. Whelpton, and Arthur Campbell, Family Planning, Fertility and Population Growth, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1959.

⁴ For example, ch. XIII in Charles F. Westoff, Robert G. Potter, Jr., Philip Sagi, and Elliott G. Mishler, Family Growth in Metropolitan America, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1961 focuses on the relationship between the three components and number of children desired and family planning success and presents tabulations for separate religious groups as well as the total sample.

situation prevailed among white women in the lower half of the status scale. This reversal suggests a continuum of fertility rates which varies from a low level among those with consistently low scores. This pattern may be explained, in large part, however, by variation in socioeconomic level, since

most women with completely consistent statuses had socioeconomic status scores near the extremes of the distribution. In general, compared with fertility differences by socioeconomic status, there was relatively little variation by broad consistency type.

Table H.--PERCENT CHILDESS AND FERTILITY RATE FOR MARRIED WOMEN 35 TO 44 YEARS OLD LIVING WITH HUSBAND, BY COLOR, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS SCORE, AND STATUS CONSISTENCY TYPE, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

Subject	All women			White women			Nonwhite women		
	All scores	50 to 99	0 to 49	All scores	50 to 99	0 to 49	All scores	50 to 99	0 to 49
Number of married women 35 to 44 years living with husband.....thousands..	10,360	6,837	3,523	9,533	6,612	2,921	827	225	602
PERCENT CHILDESS									
Total.....	11.7	11.3	12.3	11.0	11.0	10.9	19.7	21.3	19.1
All status components consistent.....	11.4	11.0	12.8	10.8	10.7	11.2	18.5	20.3	17.9
Two components consistent.....	11.7	11.5	12.0	11.0	11.2	10.6	19.7	19.7	19.7
Income high.....	10.9	11.5	10.1	10.5	11.1	9.5	15.5	(B)	13.2
Income low.....	12.4	12.4	12.7	12.1	12.2	11.8	16.7	(B)	(B)
Education high.....	11.8	11.1	12.3	10.2	10.6	9.9	22.4	(B)	23.2
Education low.....	11.2	11.5	10.4	10.7	11.2	9.4	21.1	(B)	18.1
Occupation high.....	13.0	8.8	15.9	11.3	7.9	14.0	25.5	(B)	24.5
Occupation low.....	12.2	12.5	10.3	11.9	12.7	7.2	15.7	(B)	(B)
All status components inconsistent....	12.2	11.4	13.5	11.2	10.5	12.5	23.7	(B)	19.3
CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 1,000 MARRIED WOMEN									
Total.....	2,673	2,429	3,148	2,624	2,438	3,046	3,236	2,147	3,643
All status components consistent.....	2,689	2,409	3,523	2,599	2,419	3,287	3,691	2,078	4,268
Two components consistent.....	2,660	2,421	3,061	2,626	2,429	3,004	3,047	2,190	3,380
Income high.....	2,756	2,446	3,224	2,717	2,469	3,137	3,186	(B)	3,725
Income low.....	2,521	2,381	2,865	2,515	2,392	2,849	2,600	(B)	(B)
Education high.....	2,743	2,563	2,854	2,632	2,575	2,672	3,463	(B)	3,679
Education low.....	2,563	2,347	3,068	2,551	2,357	3,060	2,800	(B)	3,125
Occupation high.....	2,840	2,477	3,091	2,784	2,470	3,039	3,255	(B)	3,330
Occupation low.....	2,594	2,514	2,991	2,585	2,506	3,031	2,706	(B)	(B)
All status components inconsistent....	2,714	2,558	2,958	2,687	2,575	2,885	3,039	(B)	3,368

B Percent and rate not shown where base is less than 50,000.

Among both white and nonwhite women at ages 35 to 44, participation in the labor force was associated with having a relatively small number of children or none at all (tables 5 and 6). White women in the labor force averaged 2,169 children per thousand women compared with 2,881 per thousand women not in the labor force. Comparable figures for nonwhite women were 2,649 and 3,815. Within each color group, the status level or consistency type in which a woman was classified did not seem to alter this relationship between labor force participation and fertility.

PROCEDURES

Occupation, educational attainment, and income are all related, though no one of them by itself is an adequate indicator of socioeconomic status. The socioeconomic score which is presented here represents a combination of the scores which a person was assigned by virtue of the occupation and educational attainment of the chief income

recipient in his family and of the current family income. For persons not in families, socioeconomic status was based on the individual's own occupation, education, and income. The scores for the three items were developed on the basis of 1950 Census data and more recent sample survey data and were assigned to individuals in terms of reports on occupation, educational attainment, and income as given in the 1960 Census. These scores were coded in the 1-in-1,000 sample (0.1-percent sample) and also in the 5-percent sample of the 1960 Census.

The general scheme for measuring the socioeconomic status score and the status consistency type makes use of certain features of procedure found in the social science literature and, with some additions and modifications, fits them into the census framework. The following paragraphs include a description of the procedures used in deriving the new socioeconomic measures and a discussion of some of the considerations that went into the choice of procedures.

Specifications for deriving socioeconomic measures.

1. The two measures, the socioeconomic status score and the status consistency type, were obtained by combining data on: (a) Occupation, (b) educational attainment, and (c) family income (or income of persons not in families.)

2. These measures were constructed for chief income recipients. There is a chief income recipient in each family. Each unrelated individual 14 years old and over in households, and each person in group quarters (including inmates of institutions, members of the Armed Forces in military barracks, students in college dormitories, and residents in rooming houses) was treated as a chief income recipient. (See point 4 for treatment of unrelated individuals under 14 in households.)

3. The chief income recipient in a family was defined as that member of a family who had the largest total income (at least \$1 more than any other family member). If the family head and one or more other family members had identical incomes and they had the highest incomes in the family, or if no family member had reported income, the family head was considered the chief income recipient. If two or more family members other than the head had equal and highest incomes, the first one listed was regarded as the chief income recipient.

4. The socioeconomic measures for chief income recipients in families were assigned to other family members. Since a child under 14 cannot reasonably be regarded as having a socioeconomic status independent of that of the household in which he lives, unrelated individuals under 14 in households (mostly foster children) were assigned the same measures as the head of the household, on the assumption that such children generally share the living conditions of the household head. In order to complete the assignment of scores for all persons, persons under 14 years old in group quarters were arbitrarily assigned zero income and persons under 5 years old in group quarters were also assigned no school years completed. All other unrelated individuals were assigned component scores based on their own characteristics.

5. The reported occupation for a chief income recipient was used, provided he was currently in the civilian labor force or, if not, had worked since 1950. Since the rank and duties of members of the Armed Forces are not known from the census, chief income recipients currently in the Armed Forces were assigned a uniform occupation rating. For a chief income recipient who did not report his occupation or who had not worked since 1950, his score on education was assigned as his score on occupation also.

6. The socioeconomic status score was determined in the following way: (a) The occupation, education, and family income for the chief income recipient were identified. (b) The scores corresponding to the reported occupation, education, and family income of the chief income recipient were then determined by referring to a list of scores assigned to the various occupations and educational and income levels. (For list of scores, see Working Paper No. 15.) (c) A simple average of the three component scores was computed; and the result was rounded to the nearest whole score.

The scores for each component item are distributed so that about 10 percent of the persons in the universe fall in each tenth of the distribution of scores for that item. The socioeconomic scores obtained by averaging the component scores are, as one would expect from the methods employed, distributed so that larger percentages of persons are in the central part of the distribution of scores and smaller percentages are at the extremes.

7. The status consistency type was determined in the following way, using the three scores identified in 6(b) above:

- a. If the range between the highest and lowest scores was 20 or less, recode 1 was assigned.
- b. If the range between the highest and lowest scores exceeded 20, and the range between the medium and lowest scores was 20 or less and less than the range between the highest and medium scores--
 - (1) Recode 2 was assigned if the income score was highest
 - (2) Recode 4 was assigned if the education score was highest
 - (3) Recode 6 was assigned if the occupation score was highest
- c. If the range between the highest and lowest scores exceeded 20 and the range between the highest and medium scores was 20 or less and equal to or less than the range between the medium and lowest scores--
 - (1) Code 3 was assigned if the income score was lowest
 - (2) Code 5 was assigned if the education score was lowest
 - (3) Code 7 was assigned if the occupation score was lowest.

- d. If the range between the highest and medium scores and the medium and lowest scores each exceeded 20--
 - (1) Code 8 was assigned if the occupation score was highest and income score lowest.

- (2) Code 9 was assigned if the occupation score was highest and education score lowest
- (3) Code 10 was assigned if the education score was highest and occupation score lowest
- (4) Code 11 was assigned if the education score was highest and income score lowest
- (5) Code 12 was assigned if the income score was highest and occupation score lowest
- (6) Code 13 was assigned if the income score was highest and education score lowest

The resulting status consistency types may be described as follows:

Status consistency type	Characteristics
1	All three components consistent
2	Occupation and education consistent; income high
3	Occupation and education consistent; income low
4	Occupation and income consistent; education high
5	Occupation and income consistent; education low
6	Education and income consistent; occupation high
7	Education and income consistent; occupation low
8	All inconsistent; occupation highest, income lowest
9	All inconsistent; occupation highest, education lowest
10	All inconsistent; education highest, occupation lowest
11	All inconsistent; education highest, income lowest
12	All inconsistent; income highest, occupation lowest
13	All inconsistent; income highest, education lowest

The data in this report were derived from a set of 0.1-percent sample census records, which contain fewer categories of socioeconomic status and status consistency than are contained on the 5-percent sample census records; for this reason, a maximum of ten categories of socioeconomic status and twelve categories of status consistency are shown in this report.

The socioeconomic measures used here were designed for comparative analysis and have limited absolute meaning. Moreover, the use of these measures represents only one approach to studying socioeconomic status in relation to other factors. They may be most useful where the analyst wants to compare different areas or population subgroups, or where socioeconomic status is needed as a control in studying other relationships. Other approaches may be more useful for other purposes.

RELATED REPORTS

A more detailed discussion of the methodology of the socioeconomic measures used in this report as well as sources and statistical components of the measures and considerations involved in the choice of procedures is included in Bureau of the Census Working Paper No. 15, Methodology and Scores of Socioeconomic Status.

1960 Census reports.--Chapters C and D of 1960 Census of Population, Volume I, Characteristics of the Population, provide statistics based on a 25-percent sample tabulation on education, occupation, and income of the population. Additional statistics interrelating these subjects are included in 1960 Census of Population, Volume II, Subject Reports, PC(2)-4B, PC(2)-4C, PC(2)-5B, PC(2)-7A, and PC(2)-7B.

DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Urban-rural residence.--In general, the urban population comprises all persons living in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 inhabitants or more outside urbanized areas. More specifically, according to the definition adopted for use in the 1960 Census, the urban population comprises all persons living in (a) places of 2,500 inhabitants or more incorporated as cities, boroughs, villages, and towns (except towns in New England, New York, and Wisconsin); (b) the densely settled urban fringe, whether incorporated or unincorporated, of urbanized areas; (c) towns in New England and townships in New Jersey and Pennsylvania which contain no incorporated municipalities as subdivisions and have either 25,000 inhabitants or more or a population of 2,500 to 25,000 and a density of 1,500 persons or more per square mile; (d) counties in States other than the New England States, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania that have no incorporated municipalities within their boundaries and have a density of 1,500 persons or more per square mile; and (e) unincorporated places of 2,500 inhabitants or more. The population not classified as urban constitutes the rural population.

Farm-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. In the 1960 Census, the farm population consists of persons living in rural territory on places of 10 or more acres from which sales of farm products amounted to \$50 or more in 1959 or on places of less than 10 acres from which sales of farm products amounted to \$250 or more in 1959. All persons living in group quarters are classified as nonfarm except the relatively few living in workers' quarters (including quarters for migratory agricultural workers) that are located on a farm or ranch.

Urbanized area.--An urbanized area contains at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more in 1960 and the surrounding closely settled incorporated places and unincorporated areas that meet

certain criteria relating to population density or land use. An urbanized area may be thought of as divided into the central city, or cities, and the remainder of the area, or the urban fringe. All persons residing in an urbanized area are included in the urban population.

Age--The age classification is based on the age of the person in completed years as of April 1, 1960, as determined from the reply to a question on month and year of birth.

Color--The term "color" refers to the division of the population into two groups, white and nonwhite. The color group designated as "nonwhite" includes persons of Negro, American Indian, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Asian Indian, and Malayan races. Persons of Mexican birth or ancestry who are not definitely of Indian or other nonwhite race are classified as white.

Years of school completed--The data on years of school completed (also termed "education" and "educational attainment" in this report) were derived from the answers to the two questions: (a) "What is the highest grade (or year) of regular school he has ever attended?" and (b) "Did he finish this grade (or year)?" Enumerators were instructed to obtain the approximate equivalent grade in the American school system for persons whose highest grade of attendance was in a foreign school system, whose highest level of attendance was in an ungraded school, whose highest level of schooling was measured by "readers," or whose training by a tutor was regarded as qualifying under the "regular" school definition. Persons were to answer "No" to the second question if they were attending school, had completed only part of a grade before they dropped out, or failed to pass the last grade attended.

The number in each category of highest grade of school completed represents the combination of (a) persons who reported that they had attended the indicated grade and finished it, and (b) those who had attended the next higher grade but had not finished it.

As used in the present report, the category "high school graduate" comprises persons who completed 4 years of high school or beyond. The category "college graduate" comprises persons who completed 4 or more years of college.

Persons classified as having no college education or no high school education include some persons who started but did not complete the first year of college or high school, respectively.

Children ever born--The number of children ever born includes children born to the woman

before her present marriage, children no longer living, and children away from home, as well as children borne by the woman who were still living in the home. Although the question on children ever born was asked only of women reported as having been married, the data are not limited to legitimate births.

Marital status--The classification by marital status refers to the status of the person at the time of enumeration. Women classified as "married, husband present" are those whose husbands were enumerated as a member of the same household even though he may have been temporarily absent on business or vacation, visiting, in a hospital, etc.

Household, group quarters, and head of household--A household consists of all the persons who occupy a housing unit. A house, an apartment or other group of rooms, or a single room is regarded as a housing unit when it is occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters, that is, when the occupants do not live and eat with any other persons in the structure and there is either (1) direct access from the outside or through a common hall or (2) a kitchen or cooking equipment for the exclusive use of the occupants of the unit.

All persons who are not members of the household are classified as living in group quarters. Most of the persons in group quarters live in rooming houses, college dormitories, military barracks, or institutions. Inmates of institutions are persons for whom care or custody is provided in such places as homes for delinquent or dependent children; homes and schools for the mentally or physically handicapped; places providing specialized medical care for persons with mental disorders, tuberculosis, or other chronic disease; nursing and domiciliary homes for the aged and dependent; prisons; and jails.

The head of the household is the member reported as the head by the household respondent. However, if a married woman living with her husband is reported as the head, her husband is classified as the head for the purpose of census tabulations.

Family and unrelated individuals--A family consists of two or more persons in the same household who are related to each other by blood, marriage, or adoption; all persons living in one household who are related to each other are regarded as one family. An unrelated individual is a member of a household who is not related to anyone else in the household, or is a person living in group quarters who is not an inmate of an institution.

Employment status.--The data on employment status relate to the calendar week prior to the date on which the respondents filled their Household Questionnaires or were interviewed by enumerators. This week is not the same for all respondents because not all persons were enumerated during the same week.

Employed persons comprise all civilians 14 years old and over who 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 in a family business; or (b) were "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 bad weather, industrial dispute, vacation, illness, or other personal reasons.

Persons are classified as unemployed if they were 14 years old and over and not "at work" but looking for work. A person is considered as looking for work not only if he actually tried to find work but also if he had made such efforts recently (i.e., within the past 60 days) and was awaiting the results of these efforts. Persons waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off or furloughed are also counted as unemployed.

The "civilian labor force" includes all persons classified as employed or unemployed, as described above. The "labor force" also includes members of the Armed Forces (persons on active duty with the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard).

Persons "not in the labor force" comprise all those 14 years old and over who are not classified as members of the labor force, including persons doing only incidental unpaid family work (less than 15 hours during the week).

Occupation.--Information on occupation was collected for the employed, the experienced unemployed (unemployed persons who had had some previous work experience), and the labor reserve (persons not now in the labor force who had worked since 1950). For employed persons the data refer to the job held during the week for which employment status was reported. For persons employed at two or more jobs, the data refer to the job at which the person worked the greatest number of hours. For the experienced unemployed and the labor reserve, the data refer to the last job held. The occupation and industry statistics presented here are based on the detailed systems developed for the 1960 Census; see 1960 Census of Population, Classified Index of Occupations and Industries, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

The data presented in this report are based on a 1-in-1,000 sample of the 1960 Census of Population. The 1-in-1,000 sample is a subsample of the 25-percent and 5-percent samples that were used to provide many of the statistics published from the 1960 Census of Population and Housing. It was designed to take advantage of the carefully controlled sample selection and estimation processes undertaken in connection with the two larger samples. The selection processes and estimation process at each of these levels is described in more detail below.

Selection of the 25-percent sample.--For persons living in housing units at the time of the 1960 Census, the sampling unit was a housing unit and all of its occupants; for persons in group quarters, it was the person. On the first visit to an address the enumerator assigned a sample key letter (A, B, C, or D) to each housing unit, sequentially, in the order that he first visited the unit--whether or not he completed the interview. Each interviewer was given a random key letter to start his assignment and the order of canvassing was indicated in advance, although these instructions allowed some latitude in the order of visiting addresses. Each housing unit to which the key letter "A" was assigned was designated as a sample. In group quarters, the sample consisted of every fourth person in the order listed. Although the sampling procedures did not automatically insure an exact 25-percent sample of persons, the sample design was unbiased if carried through according to instructions. Biases may have arisen, however, when the enumerator failed to follow his listing and sampling instructions exactly.

Estimation procedure for the 25-percent sample.--Statistics based on the 25-percent sample were estimated through the use of a ratio estimation procedure. This procedure was carried out for each of the following 44 groups of persons in each of the smallest weighting areas (SWA's). The SWA's established for the 25-percent sample were the largest areas for which statistics could be prepared, and which could then be combined so as to produce all of the geographical detail required for the publication program of the census, such as places of 2,500 inhabitants or more, urbanized areas, standard metropolitan statistical areas, or census tracts. Typical examples of SWA's are census tracts (in tracted cities), complete cities in smaller urban places, urban fringe areas defined outside large cities, the rural balance in a minor civil division, etc. There were

roughly 33,000 SWA's involved in the estimation procedure used for the 25-percent sample.

Group	Sex, color, and age	Relationship and tenure
Male white:		
1	Under 5	
2	5 to 13	
3	14 to 24	Head of owner household
4	14 to 24	Head of renter household
5	14 to 24	Not head of household
6-8	25 to 44	Same groups as age group 14 to 24
9-11	45 and over	Same groups as age group 14 to 24
Male nonwhite:		
12-22	Same groups as male white	
Female white:		
23-33	Same groups as male white	
Female nonwhite:		
34-44	Same groups as male white	

Estimates of characteristics from the sample for a given weighting area are produced using the formula:

$$x' = \sum_{i=1}^{44} \frac{x_i}{y_i} Y_i$$

where x' is the estimate of the characteristic for the weighting area obtained through the use of the ratio estimation procedure,

x_i is the count of sample persons with the characteristic for the area in one of the 44 groups (group i),

y_i is the count of all sample persons for the area in the same one of the 44 groups, and

Y_i is the complete census count of persons for the area in the same one of the 44 groups.

For each of the 44 groups, the ratio of the complete census count to the sample count of the population in the group was determined. Each specific sample person in the group was assigned an integral weight so that the sum of the weights would equal the complete count for the group. For example, if the ratio for a group was 4.1, one-tenth of the persons (selected at random) within the group were assigned a weight of 5, and the remaining nine-tenths a weight of 4. The use of such combination of integral weights rather than a single fractional weight was adopted to avoid the complications involved in rounding in the final tables. Where there were fewer than 50 persons in the complete count in a group, or where the resulting weight was over 16, groups were combined in a specific order to satisfy both of these conditions and a common weight used for the combined groups.

These ratio estimates reduce the component of sampling error arising from the variation in the size of household and achieve many of the gains of stratification in the selection of the sample, with the strata being the groups for which separate ratio estimates are computed. The net effect is a reduction in the sampling error and bias of most statistics below what would be obtained by weighting the results of the 25-percent sample by a uniform factor of four. A by-product of this type of estimation procedure is that estimates for the sample are generally consistent with the complete count with respect to the total population and for the subdivisions used as groups in the estimation procedure.

Selection of the 5-percent population sample.--For some of the tabulations of the 1960 Census of Population, a subsample of one-fifth of the original 25-percent sample schedules was selected. This subsample was selected by the computer using a stratified, systematic, sample design. The strata were made up as follows: For persons in regular housing units there were 36 strata--9 household-size groups by 2 tenure groups by 2 color groups (white or nonwhite); for persons in group quarters there were 2 strata--2 color groups. Within each of these 38 strata the computer selected the sample by cumulating the weight assigned (by the ratio estimation process for the 25-percent sample) to the household head and selecting the household that caused the cumulative weight to become a multiple of 20.

Estimation procedure for the 5-percent sample.--Statistics based on the 5-percent sample were estimated through the use of a ratio estimation procedure. The procedure used for this sample was similar to the estimation process described for the 25-percent sample, with two important differences. First, larger SWA's were used for the 5-percent sample than for the 25-percent sample. They were defined as the combined total of areas within a State comprising central cities of urbanized areas, the remaining portions of urbanized areas, urban places not in urbanized areas, and rural areas. However, each urbanized area of more than 1,000,000 inhabitants made up two SWA's, the central city and the balance of the SWA. Second, groups were sometimes combined in a specific order during the ratio estimation process as in the 25-percent sample. For the 5-percent sample, this was done when there were fewer than 275 persons in the complete count in a group, or where the resulting weight was over 80.

Selection of the 1-in-1,000 subsample.--The 1-in-1,000 sample was selected as a subsample of the 5-percent population sample, using a systematic

sample of 1 in 50 selected within each of 38 strata. The strata differ slightly from the strata used in the selection of the 5-percent sample. The subsampling was done in such a way as to take into consideration the weights assigned in the ratio estimation procedures used in the 5-percent population sample as described above. Within each stratum, the 5-percent weights for each household head (or group quarters person) were cumulated and a household was selected each time the sum passed a multiple of 1,000. (For further information about estimating procedure, write to the Chief, Population Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 20233.)

Sampling variability.--The reliability of estimates made from sample data can be measured by the standard error which is used to determine confidence limits around the sample estimate. The standard error of an estimate depends on the sample size, method of sampling, and on the estimation process. In a cluster sample, the standard errors tend to vary from one type of statistic to another, depending on the homogeneity of the item within a cluster. In addition, the effectiveness

of the stratification tends to vary among items. Consequently, for sophisticated designs of this type, a simple table of standard errors cannot be constructed. Instead, items tend to fall into classes which behave in a fairly similar manner. The tables which follow contain approximations to the standard errors for each of three classes. Table J shows estimated standard errors for estimated numbers. Tables K and L contain standard errors for percentages calculated from these data.

Table J.--APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERRORS OF ESTIMATED TOTALS FOR HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS AND POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Size of estimate	Standard error for--	
	Household characteristics	Population characteristics
25,000.....	4,000	6,000
50,000.....	6,000	12,000
100,000.....	9,000	17,000
250,000.....	14,000	27,000
500,000.....	19,000	38,000
1,000,000.....	27,000	54,000
2,500,000.....	42,000	85,000
5,000,000.....	57,000	119,000
10,000,000.....	76,000	167,000
25,000,000.....	-	259,000
50,000,000.....	-	352,000

Table K.--APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE FOR HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Estimated percentage	Size of base of percentage (thousands)								
	100	250	500	1,000	2,500	5,000	10,000	25,000	50,000
1 or 99.....	0.9	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	(¹)
2 or 98.....	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
5 or 95.....	1.9	1.2	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
10 or 90.....	2.6	1.6	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1
15 or 85.....	3.1	1.9	1.4	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1
20 or 80.....	3.4	2.2	1.5	1.1	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2
25 or 75.....	3.7	2.4	1.7	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2
35 or 65.....	4.1	2.6	1.8	1.3	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2
50.....	4.3	2.7	1.9	1.4	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2

¹ Less than 0.1 percent.

Table L.--APPROXIMATE STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE FOR POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Estimated percentage	Size of base of percentage (thousands)									
	100	250	500	1,000	2,500	5,000	10,000	25,000	50,000	100,000
1 or 99.....	1.7	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
2 or 98.....	2.4	1.5	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
5 or 95.....	3.7	2.3	1.7	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1
10 or 90.....	5.1	3.2	2.3	1.6	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2
15 or 85.....	6.1	3.8	2.7	1.9	1.2	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2
20 or 80.....	6.8	4.3	3.0	2.2	1.4	1.0	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.2
25 or 75.....	7.4	4.7	3.3	2.3	1.5	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.2
35 or 65.....	8.1	5.1	3.6	2.6	1.6	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.3
50.....	8.5	5.4	3.8	2.7	1.7	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.3

The standard errors of characteristics which classify one person in a household, such as household heads, family heads, and married women have standard errors of the same order of magnitude as households. Population characteristics such as

the total number of persons tend to have higher standard errors than household characteristics for the items contained in this report. Standard errors of estimated numbers of households with a characteristic and the standard errors of the

estimated population with a characteristic are shown in appropriate columns of table J. Standard errors of estimated percentages for household characteristics are shown in table K and those for population characteristics are presented in table L. Table M gives standard errors of estimated numbers of children ever born per 1,000 women ever married.

Nonsampling errors.--Sampling error is one of the components of the total error of a survey. Further contributions may come, for example, from biases in sample selection, from errors introduced by imputations for nonreporting, and from errors introduced in the coding and other processing of the questionnaires. For estimates of totals representing relatively small proportions of the population, the major component of the total survey error tends to be the sampling error. As the estimated totals approach the level of the total population, the sampling errors decrease. This is not necessarily true of the nonsampling errors,

and they assume a relatively larger role in the total survey error. For this reason, standard errors of totals are not shown for all estimated levels even though the sampling errors are actually present.

Illustration: Table 3 shows that 28.6 percent of the families with the head under 35 years of age have all of the socioeconomic components consistent. The table also shows that there was a total of 11,336,000 family heads under 35 years of age. Table K shows that an estimate of 28.6 percent based on 11,336,000 has a standard error of 0.4 percent. This means that the chances are about 68 out of 100 the difference between the results of a complete census and the estimated 28.6 percent would not exceed 0.4 percent. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference would not be greater than 0.8 percent or twice the estimated standard error and about 99 out of 100 that the difference would be less than 1.0 percent or 2½ times the estimated standard error.

Table M.--STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 1,000 WOMEN EVER MARRIED 35 TO 44 YEARS OLD

Number of women ever married	Standard error if the number of children ever born per 1,000 women ever married is--								
	500	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500	3,000	3,500	4,000	4,500
50,000.....	105	175	240	280	350	400	450	475	510
100,000.....	55	105	140	160	195	215	250	285	310
250,000.....	50	70	110	135	160	180	205	230	245
500,000.....	35	40	55	70	90	105	120	125	140
1,000,000.....	20	30	35	40	55	65	70	85	90
2,500,000.....	5	15	20	35	40	55	65	70	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Text Tables	Page
A.--Percent distribution of the population, by color within socioeconomic status categories, for the United States: 1960.....		2
B.--Socioeconomic status of the population, by color, for the United States: 1960.....		2
C.--Socioeconomic status of the population, by color and type of residence, for the United States: 1960.....		2
D.--Status consistency type, by socioeconomic status and color, for family heads in the United States: 1960.....		4
E.--Percent distribution of family heads by socioeconomic status and status consistency, for the United States, by regions: 1960.....		4
F.--Employment status of males 14 years old and over, by socioeconomic status and color, for the United States: 1960.....		5
G.--Number of children ever born per 1,000 married white women 35 to 44 years old living with husband, by socioeconomic status, for the United States: 1960.....		5
H.--Percent childless and fertility rate for married women 35 to 44 years old living with husband, by color, socioeconomic status score, and status consistency type, for the United States: 1960.....		6

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Text Tables--Continued

Table	Page
J.--Approximate standard errors of estimated totals for household characteristics and population characteristics.....	12
K.--Approximate standard error of estimated percentage for household characteristics.....	12
L.--Approximate standard error of estimated percentage for population characteristics.....	12
M.--Standard error of estimated number of children ever born per 1,000 women ever married 35 to 44 years old.....	13

Detailed Tables

Table	Page
1.--Socioeconomic status, by age and color, for the United States: 1960.....	15
2.--Socioeconomic status, by age and color, for the United States, by type of residence: 1960....	16
3.--Status consistency type of family heads, by socioeconomic status, age, and color, for the United States, central cities of urbanized areas, and urban fringe: 1960.....	18
4.--Employment status of persons 14 years old and over, by socioeconomic status, age, color, and sex, for the United States: 1960.....	20
5.--Number childless and children ever born, for married women 35 to 44 years old living with husband, by labor force status, socioeconomic status, status consistency type, and color, for the United States: 1960.....	22

Table 1.--SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, BY AGE AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Age and color	Total population		Socioeconomic status score								
			80 to 99		50 to 79		20 to 49		0 to 19		
	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	
TOTAL											
All ages.....	179,580	100.0	23,707	13.2	71,832	40.0	62,692	34.9	21,349	11.9	
Under 14 years.....	53,155	100.0	7,702	14.5	21,851	41.1	18,238	34.3	5,364	10.1	
14 to 24 years.....	27,128	100.0	2,554	9.4	11,237	41.4	10,803	39.8	2,534	9.3	
25 to 44 years.....	46,879	100.0	7,644	16.3	21,612	46.1	14,451	30.8	3,172	6.8	
45 to 64 years.....	36,241	100.0	4,700	13.0	13,371	36.9	13,283	36.7	4,887	13.5	
65 years and over.....	16,177	100.0	1,107	6.8	3,761	23.2	5,917	36.6	5,392	33.3	
WHITE											
All ages.....	159,513	100.0	23,260	14.6	68,666	43.0	53,205	33.4	14,382	9.0	
Under 14 years.....	46,080	100.0	7,565	16.4	20,848	45.2	14,839	32.2	2,828	6.1	
14 to 24 years.....	23,818	100.0	2,510	10.5	10,713	45.0	9,071	38.1	1,524	6.4	
25 to 44 years.....	41,845	100.0	7,477	17.9	20,535	49.1	11,917	28.5	1,916	4.6	
45 to 64 years.....	32,845	100.0	4,625	14.1	12,908	39.2	11,809	36.0	3,503	10.7	
65 years and over.....	14,925	100.0	1,083	7.3	3,662	24.5	5,569	37.3	4,611	30.9	
NONWHITE											
All ages.....	20,067	100.0	447	2.2	3,166	15.8	9,487	47.3	6,967	34.7	
Under 14 years.....	7,075	100.0	137	1.9	1,003	14.2	3,399	48.0	2,536	35.8	
14 to 24 years.....	3,310	100.0	44	1.3	524	15.8	1,732	52.3	1,010	30.5	
25 to 44 years.....	5,034	100.0	167	3.3	1,077	21.4	2,534	50.3	1,256	25.0	
45 to 64 years.....	3,396	100.0	75	2.2	463	13.6	1,474	43.4	1,384	40.7	
65 years and over.....	1,252	100.0	24	1.9	99	7.9	348	27.8	781	62.4	

Table 2.--SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, BY AGE AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES, BY TYPE OF RESIDENCE: 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Type of residence, age, and color	Total population		Socioeconomic status score							
			80 to 99		50 to 79		20 to 49		0 to 19	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
ALL AGES										
Total.....	179,580	100.0	23,707	13.2	71,832	40.0	62,692	34.9	21,349	11.9
Urbanized areas.....	95,689	100.0	16,568	17.3	43,500	45.5	29,227	30.5	6,394	6.7
Central cities.....	57,856	100.0	7,929	13.7	24,545	42.4	20,381	35.2	5,001	8.6
Urban fringe.....	37,833	100.0	8,639	22.8	18,955	50.1	8,846	23.4	1,393	3.7
Other urban.....	29,860	100.0	3,639	12.2	11,979	40.1	10,740	36.0	3,502	11.7
Rural nonfarm.....	40,473	100.0	3,127	7.7	13,905	34.4	16,443	40.6	6,998	17.3
Rural farm.....	13,558	100.0	373	2.8	2,448	18.1	6,282	46.3	4,455	32.9
White.....	159,513	100.0	23,260	14.6	68,666	43.0	53,205	33.4	14,382	9.0
Urbanized areas.....	83,829	100.0	16,205	19.3	40,845	48.7	22,789	27.2	3,990	4.8
Central cities.....	47,703	100.0	7,628	16.0	22,321	46.8	14,843	31.1	2,911	6.1
Urban fringe.....	36,126	100.0	8,577	23.7	18,524	51.3	7,946	22.0	1,079	3.0
Other urban.....	27,062	100.0	3,587	13.3	11,684	43.2	9,500	35.1	2,291	8.5
Rural nonfarm.....	36,709	100.0	3,102	8.5	13,723	37.4	14,983	40.8	4,901	13.4
Rural farm.....	11,913	100.0	366	3.1	2,414	20.3	5,933	49.8	3,200	26.9
Nonwhite.....	20,067	100.0	447	2.2	3,166	15.8	9,487	47.3	6,967	34.7
Urbanized areas.....	11,860	100.0	363	3.1	2,655	22.4	6,438	54.3	2,404	20.3
Central cities.....	10,153	100.0	301	3.0	2,224	21.9	5,538	54.5	2,090	20.6
Urban fringe.....	1,707	100.0	62	3.6	431	25.2	900	52.7	314	18.4
Other urban.....	2,798	100.0	52	1.9	295	10.5	1,240	44.3	1,211	43.3
Rural nonfarm.....	3,764	100.0	25	0.7	182	4.8	1,460	38.8	2,097	55.7
Rural farm.....	1,645	100.0	7	0.4	34	2.1	349	21.2	1,255	76.3
UNDER 14 YEARS OLD										
Total.....	53,155	100.0	7,702	14.5	21,851	41.1	18,238	34.3	5,364	10.1
Urbanized areas.....	27,430	100.0	5,306	19.3	12,733	46.4	8,016	29.2	1,375	5.0
Central cities.....	15,267	100.0	2,253	14.5	6,641	42.7	5,518	35.4	1,155	7.4
Urban fringe.....	11,863	100.0	3,053	25.7	6,092	51.4	2,498	21.1	220	1.9
Other urban.....	8,670	100.0	1,218	14.0	3,733	43.1	2,934	33.8	785	9.1
Rural nonfarm.....	12,878	100.0	1,064	8.3	4,655	36.1	5,266	40.9	1,893	14.7
Rural farm.....	4,177	100.0	114	2.7	730	17.5	2,022	48.4	1,311	31.4
White.....	46,080	100.0	7,565	16.4	20,848	45.2	14,839	32.2	2,828	6.1
Urbanized areas.....	23,430	100.0	5,201	22.2	11,897	50.8	5,751	24.5	581	2.5
Central cities.....	12,147	100.0	2,168	17.8	5,951	49.0	3,574	29.4	454	3.7
Urban fringe.....	11,283	100.0	3,033	26.9	5,946	52.7	2,177	19.3	127	1.1
Other urban.....	7,672	100.0	1,196	15.6	3,619	47.2	2,499	32.6	358	4.7
Rural nonfarm.....	11,489	100.0	1,055	9.2	4,607	40.1	4,715	41.0	1,112	9.7
Rural farm.....	3,489	100.0	113	3.2	725	20.8	1,874	53.7	777	22.3
Nonwhite.....	7,075	100.0	137	1.9	1,003	14.2	3,399	48.0	2,536	35.8
Urbanized areas.....	4,000	100.0	105	2.6	836	20.9	2,265	56.6	794	19.9
Central cities.....	3,420	100.0	85	2.5	690	20.2	1,944	56.8	701	20.5
Urban fringe.....	580	100.0	20	3.4	146	25.2	321	55.3	93	16.0
Other urban.....	998	100.0	22	2.2	114	11.4	435	43.6	427	42.8
Rural nonfarm.....	1,389	100.0	9	0.6	48	3.5	551	39.7	781	56.2
Rural farm.....	688	100.0	1	0.1	5	0.7	148	21.5	534	77.6
14 TO 24 YEARS OLD										
Total.....	27,128	100.0	2,554	9.4	11,237	41.4	10,803	39.8	2,534	9.3
Urbanized areas.....	13,726	100.0	1,780	13.0	6,710	48.9	4,643	33.8	593	4.3
Central cities.....	8,587	100.0	883	10.3	3,950	46.0	3,276	38.2	478	5.6
Urban fringe.....	5,139	100.0	897	17.5	2,760	53.7	1,367	26.6	115	2.2
Other urban.....	4,699	100.0	393	8.4	1,937	41.2	2,009	42.8	360	7.7
Rural nonfarm.....	6,531	100.0	339	5.2	2,183	33.4	3,070	47.0	939	14.4
Rural farm.....	2,172	100.0	42	1.9	407	18.7	1,081	49.8	642	29.6
White.....	23,818	100.0	2,510	10.5	10,713	45.0	9,071	38.1	1,524	6.4
Urbanized areas.....	11,912	100.0	1,741	14.6	6,291	52.8	3,574	30.0	306	2.6
Central cities.....	7,047	100.0	852	12.1	3,594	51.0	2,359	33.5	242	3.4
Urban fringe.....	4,865	100.0	889	18.3	2,697	55.4	1,215	25.0	64	1.3
Other urban.....	4,251	100.0	391	9.2	1,890	44.5	1,771	41.7	199	4.7
Rural nonfarm.....	5,807	100.0	336	5.8	2,130	36.7	2,727	47.0	614	10.6
Rural farm.....	1,848	100.0	42	2.3	402	21.8	999	54.1	405	21.9
Nonwhite.....	3,310	100.0	44	1.3	524	15.8	1,732	52.3	1,010	30.5
Urbanized areas.....	1,814	100.0	39	2.1	419	23.1	1,069	58.9	287	15.8
Central cities.....	1,540	100.0	31	2.0	356	23.1	917	59.5	236	15.3
Urban fringe.....	274	100.0	8	2.9	63	23.0	152	55.5	51	18.6
Other urban.....	448	100.0	2	0.4	47	10.5	238	53.1	161	35.9
Rural nonfarm.....	724	100.0	3	0.4	53	7.3	343	47.4	325	44.9
Rural farm.....	324	100.0	-	-	5	1.5	82	25.3	237	73.1

- Entry represents zero or rounds to zero.

Table 2.--SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, BY AGE AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES, BY TYPE OF RESIDENCE: 1960--Con.

(Numbers in thousands)

Type of residence, age, and color	Total population		Socioeconomic status score							
			80 to 99		50 to 79		20 to 49		0 to 19	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
25 TO 44 YEARS OLD										
Total.....	46,879	100.0	7,644	16.3	21,612	46.1	14,451	30.8	3,172	6.8
Urbanized areas.....	26,564	100.0	5,457	20.5	13,164	49.6	7,035	26.5	908	3.4
Central cities.....	15,457	100.0	2,576	16.7	7,281	47.1	4,868	31.5	732	4.7
Urban fringe.....	11,107	100.0	2,881	25.9	5,883	53.0	2,167	19.5	176	1.6
Other urban.....	7,440	100.0	1,120	15.1	3,531	47.5	2,321	31.2	468	6.3
Rural nonfarm.....	9,991	100.0	984	9.8	4,256	42.6	3,690	36.9	1,061	10.6
Rural farm.....	2,884	100.0	83	2.9	661	22.9	1,405	48.7	735	25.5
White.....	41,845	100.0	7,477	17.9	20,535	49.1	11,917	28.5	1,916	4.6
Urbanized areas.....	23,144	100.0	5,315	23.0	12,220	52.8	5,191	22.4	418	1.8
Central cities.....	12,526	100.0	2,456	19.6	6,489	51.8	3,277	26.2	304	2.4
Urban fringe.....	10,618	100.0	2,859	26.9	5,731	54.0	1,914	18.0	114	1.1
Other urban.....	6,841	100.0	1,103	16.1	3,447	50.4	2,030	29.7	261	3.8
Rural nonfarm.....	9,245	100.0	978	10.6	4,218	45.6	3,351	36.2	698	7.6
Rural farm.....	2,615	100.0	81	3.1	650	24.9	1,345	51.4	539	20.6
Nonwhite.....	5,034	100.0	167	3.3	1,077	21.4	2,534	50.3	1,256	25.0
Urbanized areas.....	3,420	100.0	142	4.2	944	27.6	1,844	53.9	490	14.3
Central cities.....	2,931	100.0	120	4.1	792	27.0	1,591	54.3	428	14.6
Urban fringe.....	489	100.0	22	4.5	152	31.1	253	51.7	62	12.7
Other urban.....	599	100.0	17	2.8	84	14.0	291	48.6	207	34.6
Rural nonfarm.....	746	100.0	6	0.8	38	5.1	339	45.4	363	48.7
Rural farm.....	269	100.0	2	0.7	11	4.1	60	22.3	196	72.9
45 TO 64 YEARS OLD										
Total.....	36,241	100.0	4,700	13.0	13,371	36.9	13,283	36.7	4,887	13.5
Urbanized areas.....	19,805	100.0	3,243	16.4	8,612	43.5	6,472	32.7	1,478	7.5
Central cities.....	12,602	100.0	1,740	13.8	5,171	41.0	4,550	36.1	1,141	9.1
Urban fringe.....	7,203	100.0	1,503	20.9	3,441	47.8	1,922	26.7	337	4.7
Other urban.....	5,881	100.0	734	12.5	2,051	34.9	2,295	39.0	801	13.6
Rural nonfarm.....	7,492	100.0	619	8.3	2,217	29.6	3,171	42.3	1,485	19.8
Rural farm.....	3,063	100.0	104	3.4	491	16.0	1,345	43.9	1,123	36.7
White.....	32,845	100.0	4,625	14.1	12,908	39.3	11,809	36.0	3,503	10.7
Urbanized areas.....	17,810	100.0	3,186	17.9	8,239	46.3	5,434	30.5	951	5.3
Central cities.....	10,889	100.0	1,694	15.6	4,860	44.6	3,652	33.5	683	6.3
Urban fringe.....	6,921	100.0	1,492	21.6	3,379	48.8	1,782	25.7	268	3.9
Other urban.....	5,349	100.0	724	13.5	2,009	37.6	2,079	38.9	537	10.0
Rural nonfarm.....	6,869	100.0	614	8.9	2,177	31.7	2,991	43.5	1,087	15.8
Rural farm.....	2,817	100.0	101	3.6	483	17.1	1,305	46.3	928	32.9
Nonwhite.....	3,396	100.0	75	2.2	463	13.6	1,474	43.4	1,384	40.8
Urbanized areas.....	1,995	100.0	57	2.9	373	18.7	1,038	52.0	527	26.4
Central cities.....	1,713	100.0	46	2.7	311	18.2	898	52.4	458	26.7
Urban fringe.....	282	100.0	11	3.9	62	22.0	140	49.6	69	24.5
Other urban.....	532	100.0	10	1.9	42	7.9	216	40.6	264	49.6
Rural nonfarm.....	623	100.0	5	0.8	40	6.4	180	28.9	398	63.9
Rural farm.....	246	100.0	3	1.2	8	3.3	40	16.3	195	79.3
65 YEARS AND OVER										
Total.....	16,177	100.0	1,107	6.8	3,761	23.2	5,917	36.6	5,392	33.3
Urbanized areas.....	8,164	100.0	782	9.6	2,281	27.9	3,061	37.5	2,040	25.0
Central cities.....	5,643	100.0	477	8.5	1,502	26.6	2,169	38.4	1,495	26.5
Urban fringe.....	2,521	100.0	305	12.1	779	30.9	892	35.4	545	21.6
Other urban.....	3,170	100.0	174	5.5	727	22.9	1,181	37.3	1,088	34.3
Rural nonfarm.....	3,581	100.0	121	3.4	594	16.6	1,246	34.8	1,620	45.2
Rural farm.....	1,262	100.0	30	2.4	159	12.6	429	34.0	644	51.0
White.....	14,925	100.0	1,083	7.3	3,662	24.5	5,569	37.3	4,611	30.9
Urbanized areas.....	7,533	100.0	762	10.1	2,198	29.2	2,839	37.7	1,734	23.0
Central cities.....	5,094	100.0	458	9.0	1,427	28.0	1,981	38.9	1,228	24.1
Urban fringe.....	2,439	100.0	304	12.5	771	31.6	858	35.2	506	20.7
Other urban.....	2,949	100.0	173	5.9	719	24.4	1,121	38.0	936	31.7
Rural nonfarm.....	3,299	100.0	119	3.6	591	17.9	1,199	36.3	1,390	42.1
Rural farm.....	1,144	100.0	29	2.5	154	13.5	410	35.8	551	48.2
Nonwhite.....	1,252	100.0	24	1.9	99	7.9	348	27.8	781	62.4
Urbanized areas.....	631	100.0	20	3.2	83	13.2	222	35.2	306	48.5
Central cities.....	549	100.0	19	3.5	75	13.7	188	34.2	267	48.6
Urban fringe.....	82	100.0	1	1.2	8	9.8	34	41.5	39	47.6
Other urban.....	221	100.0	1	0.5	8	3.6	60	27.1	152	68.8
Rural nonfarm.....	282	100.0	2	0.7	3	1.1	47	16.7	230	81.6
Rural farm.....	118	100.0	1	0.8	5	4.2	19	16.1	93	78.8

Table 3.--STATUS CONSISTENCY TYPE OF FAMILY HEADS, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, AGE, AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES, CENTRAL CITIES OF URBANIZED AREAS, AND URBAN FRINGE: 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Type of residence, status consistency type, age, and color	All family heads		Socioeconomic status score							
			80 to 99		50 to 79		20 to 49		0 to 19	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
UNITED STATES										
All Ages										
Total.....	45,004	100.0	6,252	100.0	18,477	100.0	15,477	100.0	4,798	100.0
All status components consistent.....	13,215	29.4	3,904	62.4	3,701	20.0	2,095	13.5	3,515	73.3
Two status components consistent.....	27,565	61.3	2,348	37.6	12,577	68.1	11,357	73.4	1,283	26.8
Income high.....	4,912	10.9	188	3.0	2,394	13.0	2,201	14.2	129	2.7
Income low.....	6,107	13.6	691	11.1	3,265	17.7	1,969	12.7	182	3.8
Education high.....	2,558	5.7	77	1.2	793	4.3	1,500	9.7	188	3.9
Education low.....	6,751	15.0	888	14.2	3,494	18.9	2,274	14.7	95	2.0
Occupation high.....	4,950	11.0	66	1.1	1,238	6.7	2,969	19.2	677	14.1
Occupation low.....	2,287	5.1	438	7.0	1,393	7.5	444	2.9	12	0.3
All status components inconsistent.....	4,224	9.4	-	-	2,199	11.9	2,025	13.1	-	-
Nonwhite.....	4,293	100.0	237	100.0	707	100.0	1,964	100.0	1,385	100.0
All status components consistent.....	1,598	37.2	194	81.9	115	16.3	268	13.6	1,021	73.7
Two status components consistent.....	2,348	54.7	43	18.1	519	73.4	1,422	72.4	364	26.3
Income high.....	396	9.2	2	0.8	119	16.8	242	12.3	33	2.4
Income low.....	500	11.6	25	10.5	172	24.3	282	14.4	21	1.5
Education high.....	423	9.9	-	-	51	7.2	294	15.0	78	5.6
Education low.....	357	8.3	6	2.5	69	9.8	245	12.5	37	2.7
Occupation high.....	518	12.1	-	-	25	3.5	298	15.2	195	14.1
Occupation low.....	154	3.6	10	4.2	83	11.7	61	3.1	-	-
All status components inconsistent.....	347	8.1	-	-	73	10.3	274	14.0	-	-
Under 35 Years Old										
Total.....	11,336	100.0	1,442	100.0	5,334	100.0	3,935	100.0	625	100.0
All status components consistent.....	3,238	28.6	884	61.3	1,369	25.7	599	15.2	386	61.8
Two status components consistent.....	7,181	63.3	558	38.7	3,533	66.2	2,851	72.5	239	38.2
Income high.....	871	7.7	32	2.2	457	8.6	362	9.2	20	3.2
Income low.....	2,523	22.3	330	22.9	1,403	26.3	753	19.1	37	5.9
Education high.....	980	8.6	25	1.7	326	6.1	567	14.4	62	9.9
Education low.....	1,010	8.9	95	6.6	504	9.4	403	10.2	8	1.3
Occupation high.....	1,141	10.1	13	0.9	391	7.3	627	15.9	110	17.6
Occupation low.....	656	5.8	63	4.4	452	8.5	139	3.5	2	0.3
All status components inconsistent.....	917	8.1	-	-	432	8.1	485	12.3	-	-
Nonwhite.....	1,244	100.0	154	100.0	214	100.0	618	100.0	258	100.0
All status components consistent.....	451	36.3	143	92.9	40	18.7	96	15.5	172	66.7
Two status components consistent.....	698	56.1	11	7.1	157	73.4	444	71.8	86	33.3
All status components inconsistent.....	95	7.6	-	-	17	7.9	78	12.6	-	-
35 to 54 Years Old										
Total.....	20,788	100.0	3,513	100.0	9,231	100.0	6,508	100.0	1,536	100.0
All status components consistent.....	6,018	28.9	2,210	62.9	1,860	20.1	866	13.3	1,082	70.4
Two status components consistent.....	12,805	61.6	1,303	37.1	6,262	67.8	4,786	73.5	454	29.6
Income high.....	2,772	13.3	113	3.2	1,498	16.2	1,120	17.2	41	2.7
Income low.....	2,107	10.1	266	7.6	1,113	12.1	657	10.1	71	4.6
Education high.....	1,072	5.2	40	1.1	336	3.6	628	9.6	68	4.4
Education low.....	3,715	17.9	559	15.9	1,966	21.3	1,147	17.6	43	2.8
Occupation high.....	1,895	9.1	38	1.1	619	6.7	1,011	15.5	227	14.8
Occupation low.....	1,244	6.0	287	8.2	730	7.9	223	3.4	4	0.3
All status components inconsistent.....	1,965	9.5	-	-	1,109	12.0	856	13.2	-	-
Nonwhite.....	1,987	100.0	66	100.0	372	100.0	960	100.0	589	100.0
All status components consistent.....	651	32.8	41	62.1	63	16.9	131	13.6	416	70.6
Two status components consistent.....	1,162	58.5	25	37.9	269	72.3	695	72.4	173	29.4
All status components inconsistent.....	174	8.8	-	-	40	10.8	134	14.0	-	-
55 Years Old and Over										
Total.....	12,880	100.0	1,297	100.0	3,912	100.0	5,034	100.0	2,637	100.0
All status components consistent.....	3,959	30.7	810	62.5	472	12.1	630	12.5	2,047	77.6
Two status components consistent.....	7,579	58.8	487	37.5	2,782	71.1	3,720	73.9	590	22.4
Income high.....	1,269	9.9	43	3.3	439	11.2	719	14.3	68	2.6
Income low.....	1,477	11.5	95	7.3	749	19.1	559	11.1	74	2.8
Education high.....	506	3.9	12	0.9	131	3.3	305	6.1	58	2.2
Education low.....	2,026	15.7	234	18.0	1,024	26.2	724	14.4	44	1.7
Occupation high.....	1,914	14.9	15	1.2	228	5.8	1,331	26.4	340	12.9
Occupation low.....	387	3.0	88	6.8	211	5.4	82	1.6	6	0.2
All status components inconsistent.....	1,342	10.4	-	-	658	16.8	684	13.6	-	-
Nonwhite.....	1,062	100.0	17	(B)	121	100.0	386	100.0	538	100.0
All status components consistent.....	496	46.7	10	(B)	12	9.9	41	10.6	433	80.5
Two status components consistent.....	488	46.0	7	(B)	93	76.9	283	73.3	105	19.5
All status components inconsistent.....	78	7.3	-	(B)	16	13.2	62	16.1	-	-

- Entry represents zero or rounds to zero.

B Percent not shown where base is less than 50,000.

Table 3.--STATUS CONSISTENCY TYPE OF FAMILY HEADS, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, AGE, AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES, CENTRAL CITIES OF URBANIZED AREAS, AND URBAN FRINGE: 1960--Con.

(Numbers in thousands)

Type of residence, status consistency type, age, and color	All family heads		Socioeconomic status score							
			80 to 99		50 to 79		20 to 49		0 to 19	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
CENTRAL CITIES OF URBANIZED AREAS										
Under 35 Years Old										
Total.....	3,750	100.0	491	100.0	1,758	100.0	1,330	100.0	171	100.0
All status components consistent.....	1,069	28.5	31.3	63.7	439	25.0	221	16.6	96	56.1
Two status components consistent.....	2,371	63.2	178	36.3	1,180	67.1	938	70.5	75	43.9
Income high.....	274	7.3	7	1.4	153	8.7	109	8.2	5	2.9
Income low.....	889	23.7	106	21.6	499	28.4	274	20.6	10	5.8
Education high.....	324	8.6	6	1.2	125	7.1	177	13.3	16	9.4
Education low.....	329	8.8	32	6.5	151	8.6	145	10.9	1	0.6
Occupation high.....	379	10.1	3	0.6	124	7.1	209	15.7	43	25.1
Occupation low.....	176	4.7	24	4.9	128	7.3	24	1.8	-	-
All status components inconsistent.....	310	8.3	-	-	139	7.9	171	12.9	-	-
35 to 54 Years Old										
Total.....	6,671	100.0	1,165	100.0	3,105	100.0	2,076	100.0	325	100.0
All status components consistent.....	1,815	27.2	745	63.9	599	19.3	272	13.1	199	61.2
Two status components consistent.....	4,135	62.0	420	36.1	2,108	67.9	1,481	71.3	126	38.8
Income high.....	919	13.8	37	3.2	522	16.8	353	17.0	7	2.2
Income low.....	683	10.2	94	8.1	349	11.2	227	10.9	13	4.0
Education high.....	269	4.0	12	1.0	105	3.4	138	6.6	14	4.3
Education low.....	1,262	18.9	184	15.8	676	21.8	381	18.4	21	6.5
Occupation high.....	642	9.6	9	0.8	233	7.5	329	15.8	71	21.8
Occupation low.....	360	5.4	84	7.2	223	7.2	53	2.6	-	-
All status components inconsistent.....	721	10.8	-	-	398	12.8	323	15.6	-	-
55 Years Old and Over										
Total.....	4,262	100.0	517	100.0	1,529	100.0	1,667	100.0	549	100.0
All status components consistent.....	1,091	25.6	326	63.1	187	12.2	185	11.1	393	71.6
Two status components consistent.....	2,635	61.8	191	37.1	1,070	70.0	1,218	73.1	156	28.4
Income high.....	462	10.8	18	3.5	196	12.8	232	13.9	16	2.9
Income low.....	482	11.3	37	7.2	240	15.7	193	11.6	12	2.2
Education high.....	127	3.0	4	0.8	49	3.2	68	4.1	6	1.1
Education low.....	823	19.3	94	18.2	429	28.1	290	17.4	10	1.8
Occupation high.....	615	14.4	4	0.8	85	5.6	416	25.0	110	20.0
Occupation low.....	126	3.0	34	6.6	71	4.6	19	1.1	2	0.4
All status components inconsistent.....	536	12.6	-	-	272	17.8	264	15.8	-	-
URBAN FRINGE										
Under 35 Years Old										
Total.....	2,540	100.0	536	100.0	1,385	100.0	593	100.0	26	(B)
All status components consistent.....	856	33.7	345	64.4	384	27.7	111	18.7	16	(B)
Two status components consistent.....	1,523	60.0	191	35.6	901	65.1	421	71.0	10	(B)
Income high.....	237	9.3	14	2.6	147	10.6	73	12.3	3	(B)
Income low.....	471	18.5	105	19.6	269	19.4	94	15.9	3	(B)
Education high.....	170	6.7	9	1.7	89	6.4	71	12.0	1	(B)
Education low.....	290	11.4	37	6.9	175	12.6	77	13.0	1	(B)
Occupation high.....	184	7.2	2	0.4	93	6.7	87	14.7	2	(B)
Occupation low.....	171	6.7	24	4.5	128	9.2	19	3.2	-	(B)
All status components inconsistent.....	161	6.3	-	-	100	7.2	61	10.3	-	(B)
35 to 54 Years Old										
Total.....	4,920	100.0	1,299	100.0	2,600	100.0	947	100.0	74	100.0
All status components consistent.....	1,517	30.8	832	64.0	532	20.5	109	11.5	44	59.5
Two status components consistent.....	2,934	59.6	467	36.0	1,755	67.5	682	72.0	30	40.5
Income high.....	701	14.2	43	3.3	480	18.5	176	18.6	2	2.7
Income low.....	401	8.2	72	5.5	246	9.5	80	8.4	3	4.1
Education high.....	146	3.0	11	0.8	84	3.2	47	5.0	4	5.4
Education low.....	1,041	21.2	222	17.1	602	23.2	216	22.8	1	1.4
Occupation high.....	317	6.4	21	1.6	139	5.3	137	14.5	20	27.0
Occupation low.....	328	6.7	98	7.5	204	7.8	26	2.7	-	-
All status components inconsistent.....	469	9.5	-	-	313	12.0	156	16.5	-	-
55 Years Old and Over										
Total.....	2,216	100.0	385	100.0	908	100.0	731	100.0	192	100.0
All status components consistent.....	599	27.0	262	68.1	124	13.7	80	10.9	133	69.3
Two status components consistent.....	1,360	61.4	123	31.9	629	69.3	549	75.1	59	30.7
Income high.....	231	10.4	14	3.6	104	11.5	104	14.2	9	4.7
Income low.....	218	9.8	19	4.9	135	14.9	62	8.5	2	1.0
Education high.....	63	2.8	3	0.8	26	2.9	26	3.6	8	4.2
Education low.....	471	21.3	63	16.4	275	30.3	125	17.1	8	4.2
Occupation high.....	307	13.9	5	1.3	55	6.1	216	29.5	31	16.1
Occupation low.....	70	3.2	19	4.9	34	3.7	16	2.2	1	0.5
All status components inconsistent.....	257	11.6	-	-	155	17.1	102	14.0	-	-

- Entry represents zero or rounds to zero.

B Percent not shown where base is less than 50,000.

Table 4.--EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, age, color, and sex	Total		Socioeconomic status score							
			80 to 99		50 to 79		20 to 49		0 to 19	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL, 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER										
Male										
Total.....	61,354	100.0	7,868	100.0	24,242	100.0	21,927	100.0	7,317	100.0
Labor force.....	47,385	77.2	6,841	86.9	20,546	84.8	16,404	74.8	3,594	49.1
Civilian labor force.....	45,730	74.5	6,750	85.8	19,865	81.9	15,521	70.8	3,594	49.1
Employed.....	43,397	70.7	6,654	84.6	19,182	79.1	14,347	65.4	3,214	43.9
Unemployed.....	2,333	3.8	96	1.2	683	2.8	1,174	5.4	380	5.2
Not in labor force.....	13,969	22.8	1,027	13.1	3,696	15.2	5,523	25.2	3,723	50.9
Nonwhite.....	6,198	100.0	148	100.0	1,053	100.0	2,963	100.0	2,034	100.0
Labor force.....	4,452	71.8	128	86.5	883	83.9	2,276	76.8	1,165	57.3
Civilian labor force.....	4,331	69.9	127	85.8	849	80.6	2,190	73.9	1,165	57.3
Employed.....	3,929	63.4	124	83.8	797	75.7	1,978	66.8	1,030	50.6
Unemployed.....	402	6.5	3	2.0	52	4.9	7.2	1.35	6.6	
Not in labor force.....	1,746	28.2	20	13.5	170	16.1	687	23.2	869	42.7
Female										
Total.....	65,071	100.0	8,137	100.0	25,739	100.0	22,527	100.0	8,668	100.0
Labor force.....	22,363	34.4	2,838	34.9	10,400	40.4	7,368	32.7	1,757	20.3
Civilian labor force.....	22,322	34.3	2,838	34.9	10,387	40.4	7,356	32.7	1,741	20.1
Employed.....	21,046	32.3	2,782	34.2	9,937	38.6	6,771	30.1	1,556	18.0
Unemployed.....	1,276	2.0	56	0.7	450	1.7	585	2.6	185	2.1
Not in labor force.....	42,708	65.6	5,299	65.1	15,339	59.6	15,159	67.3	6,911	79.7
Nonwhite.....	6,794	100.0	162	100.0	1,110	100.0	3,125	100.0	2,397	100.0
Labor force.....	2,805	41.3	104	64.2	574	51.7	1,286	41.2	841	35.1
Civilian labor force.....	2,791	41.1	104	64.2	574	51.7	1,283	41.1	830	34.6
Employed.....	2,529	37.2	99	61.1	532	47.9	1,147	36.7	751	31.3
Unemployed.....	262	3.9	5	3.1	42	3.8	136	4.4	79	3.3
Not in labor force.....	3,989	58.7	58	35.8	536	48.3	1,839	58.8	1,556	64.9
14 TO 24 YEARS OLD										
Male										
Total.....	13,526	100.0	1,238	100.0	5,379	100.0	5,632	100.0	1,277	100.0
Labor force.....	7,688	56.8	547	44.2	3,260	60.6	3,351	59.5	530	41.5
Civilian labor force.....	6,791	50.2	542	43.8	3,013	56.0	2,706	48.0	530	41.5
Employed.....	6,184	45.7	512	41.4	2,798	52.0	2,407	42.7	467	36.6
Unemployed.....	607	4.5	30	2.4	215	4.0	299	1.8	63	4.9
Not in labor force.....	5,838	43.2	691	55.8	2,119	39.4	2,281	40.5	747	58.5
Nonwhite.....	1,583	100.0	21	(B)	243	100.0	828	100.0	491	100.0
Labor force.....	811	51.2	11	(B)	138	56.8	453	54.7	209	42.6
Civilian labor force.....	746	47.1	11	(B)	127	52.3	399	48.2	209	42.6
Employed.....	647	40.9	11	(B)	111	45.7	342	41.3	183	37.3
Unemployed.....	99	6.3	-	(B)	16	6.6	57	6.9	26	5.3
Not in labor force.....	772	48.8	10	(B)	105	43.2	375	45.3	282	57.4
Female										
Total.....	13,602	100.0	1,316	100.0	5,858	100.0	5,171	100.0	1,257	100.0
Labor force.....	4,346	32.0	385	29.3	2,191	37.4	1,517	29.3	253	20.1
Civilian labor force.....	4,333	31.9	385	29.3	2,189	37.4	1,506	29.1	253	20.1
Employed.....	3,968	29.2	370	28.1	2,062	35.2	1,328	25.7	208	16.5
Unemployed.....	365	2.7	15	1.1	127	2.2	178	3.4	45	3.6
Not in labor force.....	9,256	68.0	931	70.7	3,667	62.6	3,654	70.7	1,004	79.9
Nonwhite.....	1,727	100.0	23	(B)	281	100.0	904	100.0	519	100.0
Labor force.....	529	30.6	10	(B)	128	45.6	266	29.4	125	24.1
Civilian labor force.....	526	30.5	10	(B)	128	45.6	263	29.1	125	24.1
Employed.....	437	25.3	7	(B)	114	40.6	205	22.7	111	21.4
Unemployed.....	89	5.2	3	(B)	14	5.0	58	6.4	14	2.7
Not in labor force.....	1,198	69.4	13	(B)	153	54.4	638	70.6	394	75.9
25 TO 44 YEARS OLD										
Male										
Total.....	22,927	100.0	3,765	100.0	10,669	100.0	7,015	100.0	1,478	100.0
Labor force.....	21,834	95.2	3,719	98.8	10,430	97.8	6,516	92.9	1,169	79.1
Civilian labor force.....	21,141	92.2	3,651	97.0	10,030	94.0	6,291	89.7	1,169	79.1
Employed.....	20,291	88.5	3,613	96.0	9,793	91.8	5,843	83.3	1,042	70.5
Unemployed.....	850	3.7	38	1.0	237	2.2	448	6.4	127	8.6
Not in labor force.....	1,093	4.8	46	1.2	239	2.2	499	7.1	309	20.9
Nonwhite.....	2,390	100.0	80	100.0	540	100.0	1,226	100.0	544	100.0
Labor force.....	2,135	89.3	80	100.0	522	96.7	1,101	89.9	432	79.4
Civilian labor force.....	2,081	87.1	79	98.8	500	92.6	1,070	87.3	432	79.4
Employed.....	1,903	79.6	78	97.5	479	88.7	966	78.8	380	69.9
Unemployed.....	178	7.4	1	1.3	21	3.9	104	8.5	52	9.6
Not in labor force.....	255	10.7	-	-	18	3.3	125	10.2	112	20.6

- Entry represents zero or rounds to zero.

B Percent not shown where base is less than 50,000.

Table 4.--EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PERSONS 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, AGE, COLOR, AND SEX, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960--Con.

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, age, color, and sex	Total		Socioeconomic status score							
			80 to 99		50 to 79		20 to 49		0 to 19	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
25 TO 44 YEARS OLD--Con.										
Female										
Total.....	23,952	100.0	3,879	100.0	10,943	100.0	7,436	100.0	1,694	100.0
Labor force.....	9,444	39.4	1,308	33.7	4,740	43.3	2,873	38.6	523	30.9
Civilian labor force.....	9,435	39.4	1,308	33.7	4,731	43.2	2,873	38.6	523	30.9
Employed.....	8,897	37.1	1,282	33.0	4,519	41.3	2,643	35.5	453	26.7
Unemployed.....	538	2.2	26	0.7	212	1.9	230	3.1	70	4.1
Not in labor force.....	14,508	60.6	2,571	66.3	6,203	56.7	4,563	61.4	1,171	69.1
Nonwhite.....	2,644	100.0	87	100.0	537	100.0	1,308	100.0	712	100.0
Labor force.....	1,366	51.7	60	69.0	325	60.5	667	51.0	314	44.1
Civilian labor force.....	1,366	51.7	60	69.0	325	60.5	667	51.0	314	44.1
Employed.....	1,241	46.9	59	67.8	299	55.7	609	46.6	274	38.5
Unemployed.....	125	4.7	1	1.1	26	4.8	58	4.4	40	5.6
Not in labor force.....	1,278	48.3	27	31.0	212	39.5	641	49.0	398	55.9
45 TO 64 YEARS OLD										
Male										
Total.....	17,585	100.0	2,372	100.0	6,581	100.0	6,456	100.0	2,176	100.0
Labor force.....	15,621	88.8	2,308	97.3	6,216	94.5	5,614	87.0	1,483	68.2
Civilian labor force.....	15,557	88.5	2,290	96.5	6,182	93.9	5,602	86.8	1,483	68.2
Employed.....	14,807	84.2	2,264	95.4	5,984	90.9	5,236	81.1	1,323	60.8
Unemployed.....	750	4.3	26	1.1	198	3.0	366	5.7	160	7.4
Not in labor force.....	1,964	11.2	64	2.7	365	5.5	842	13.0	693	31.8
Nonwhite.....	1,636	100.0	37	(B)	226	100.0	746	100.0	627	100.0
Labor force.....	1,334	81.5	34	(B)	207	91.6	654	87.7	439	70.0
Civilian labor force.....	1,332	81.4	34	(B)	206	91.2	653	87.5	439	70.0
Employed.....	1,213	74.1	32	(B)	191	84.5	605	81.1	385	61.4
Unemployed.....	119	7.3	2	(B)	15	6.6	48	6.4	54	8.6
Not in labor force.....	302	18.5	3	(B)	19	8.4	92	12.3	188	30.0
Female										
Total.....	18,656	100.0	2,328	100.0	6,790	100.0	6,827	100.0	2,711	100.0
Labor force.....	7,698	41.3	1,065	45.7	3,235	47.6	2,646	38.8	752	27.7
Civilian labor force.....	7,695	41.2	1,065	45.7	3,233	47.6	2,645	38.7	752	27.7
Employed.....	7,359	39.4	1,051	45.1	3,133	46.1	2,480	36.3	695	25.6
Unemployed.....	336	1.8	14	0.6	100	1.5	165	2.4	57	2.1
Not in labor force.....	10,958	58.7	1,263	54.3	3,555	52.4	4,181	61.2	1,959	72.3
Nonwhite.....	1,760	100.0	38	(B)	237	100.0	728	100.0	757	100.0
Labor force.....	825	46.9	31	(B)	116	48.9	336	46.2	342	45.2
Civilian labor force.....	825	46.9	31	(B)	116	48.9	336	46.2	342	45.2
Employed.....	780	44.3	30	(B)	114	48.1	316	43.4	320	42.3
Unemployed.....	45	2.6	1	(B)	2	0.8	20	2.7	22	2.9
Not in labor force.....	935	53.1	7	(B)	121	51.1	392	53.8	415	54.8
65 YEARS OLD AND OVER										
Male										
Total.....	7,316	100.0	493	100.0	1,613	100.0	2,824	100.0	2,386	100.0
Labor force.....	2,242	30.6	267	54.2	640	39.7	923	32.7	412	17.3
Civilian labor force.....	2,241	30.6	267	54.2	640	39.7	922	32.6	412	17.3
Employed.....	2,115	28.9	265	53.8	607	37.6	861	30.5	382	16.0
Unemployed.....	126	1.7	2	0.4	33	2.0	61	2.2	30	1.3
Not in labor force.....	5,074	69.4	226	45.8	973	60.3	1,901	67.3	1,974	82.7
Nonwhite.....	589	100.0	10	(B)	44	(B)	163	100.0	372	100.0
Labor force.....	172	29.2	3	(B)	16	(B)	68	41.7	85	22.8
Civilian labor force.....	172	29.2	3	(B)	16	(B)	68	41.7	85	22.8
Employed.....	166	28.2	3	(B)	16	(B)	65	39.9	82	22.0
Unemployed.....	6	1.0	-	(B)	-	(B)	3	1.8	3	0.8
Not in labor force.....	417	70.8	7	(B)	28	(B)	95	58.3	287	77.2
Female										
Total.....	8,861	100.0	614	100.0	2,148	100.0	3,093	100.0	3,006	100.0
Labor force.....	875	9.9	80	13.0	234	10.9	332	10.7	229	7.6
Civilian labor force.....	859	9.7	80	13.0	234	10.9	332	10.7	213	7.1
Employed.....	822	9.3	79	12.9	223	10.4	320	10.3	200	6.7
Unemployed.....	37	0.4	1	0.2	11	0.5	12	0.4	13	0.4
Not in labor force.....	7,986	90.1	534	87.0	1,914	89.1	2,761	89.3	2,777	92.4
Nonwhite.....	663	100.0	14	(B)	55	100.0	185	100.0	409	100.0
Labor force.....	85	12.8	3	(B)	5	9.1	17	9.2	60	14.7
Civilian labor force.....	74	11.2	3	(B)	5	9.1	17	9.2	49	12.0
Employed.....	71	10.7	3	(B)	5	9.1	17	9.2	46	11.2
Unemployed.....	3	0.5	-	(B)	-	-	-	-	3	0.7
Not in labor force.....	578	87.2	11	(B)	50	90.9	168	90.8	349	85.3

- Entry represents zero or rounds to zero.

B Percent not shown where base is less than 50,000.

Table 5.--NUMBER CHILDLESS AND CHILDREN EVER BORN, FOR MARRIED WOMEN 35 TO 44 YEARS OLD LIVING WITH HUSBAND, BY LABOR FORCE STATUS, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, STATUS CONSISTENCY TYPE, AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Socioeconomic status score, status consistency type, and color	Labor force					Not in labor force				
	Married women 35 to 44 years old living with husband		Children ever born			Married women 35 to 44 years old living with husband		Children ever born		
	Total	Number childless	Number	Per 1,000 married women	Per 1,000 mothers	Total	Number childless	Number	Per 1,000 married women	Per 1,000 mothers
TOTAL										
White women.....	3,438	577	7,458	2,169	2,607	6,095	469	17,560	2,881	3,121
All status components consistent.....	834	148	1,741	2,088	2,538	1,882	145	5,319	2,826	3,062
Two status components consistent.....	2,210	358	4,864	2,201	2,626	3,717	295	10,703	2,879	3,128
Income high.....	714	104	1,605	2,248	2,631	702	45	2,242	3,194	3,412
Income low.....	209	45	423	2,024	2,579	575	50	1,549	2,694	2,950
Education high.....	117	14	320	2,735	3,107	315	30	817	2,594	2,867
Education low.....	714	112	1,489	2,085	2,473	1,145	87	3,253	2,841	3,075
Occupation high.....	197	31	474	2,406	2,855	591	58	1,720	2,910	3,227
Occupation low.....	259	52	553	2,135	2,671	389	25	1,122	2,884	3,082
All status components inconsistent.....	394	71	853	2,165	2,641	496	29	1,538	3,101	3,293
Occupation highest, income lowest.....	27	8	44	(B)	(B)	63	5	205	3,254	3,534
Occupation highest, education lowest..	31	3	74	(B)	(B)	85	5	301	3,541	3,763
Education highest, occupation lowest..	7	1	19	(B)	(B)	27	2	69	(B)	(B)
Education highest, income lowest.....	22	4	52	(B)	(B)	38	5	96	(B)	(B)
Income highest.....	307	55	664	2,163	2,635	283	12	867	3,064	3,199
Nonwhite women.....	410	101	1,086	2,649	3,515	417	62	1,590	3,813	4,479
All status components consistent.....	113	26	335	2,965	3,851	130	19	562	4,323	5,063
Two status components consistent.....	253	61	644	2,545	3,354	255	39	904	3,545	4,185
Income high.....	74	12	193	2,608	3,113	55	8	218	3,964	4,638
Income low.....	21	5	37	(B)	(B)	39	5	119	(B)	(B)
Education high.....	33	8	116	(B)	(B)	34	7	116	(B)	(B)
Education low.....	49	11	115	(B)	(B)	46	9	151	(B)	(B)
Occupation high.....	47	18	127	(B)	(B)	59	9	218	(B)	(B)
Occupation low.....	29	7	56	(B)	(B)	22	1	82	(B)	(B)
All status components inconsistent.....	44	14	107	(B)	(B)	32	4	124	(B)	(B)
Occupation highest, income lowest.....	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	(B)	(B)
Occupation highest, education lowest..	4	-	12	(B)	(B)	7	1	22	(B)	(B)
Education highest, occupation lowest..	3	1	5	(B)	(B)	2	-	7	(B)	(B)
Education highest, income lowest.....	3	-	13	(B)	(B)	4	-	14	(B)	(B)
Income highest.....	33	12	77	(B)	(B)	18	3	80	(B)	(B)
STATUS SCORE 80 TO 99										
White women.....	597	115	1,116	1,869	2,315	1,247	88	3,257	2,612	2,810
All status components consistent.....	343	64	649	1,892	2,326	794	53	2,080	2,620	2,807
Two status components consistent.....	254	51	467	1,839	2,300	453	35	1,177	2,598	2,316
All status components inconsistent.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nonwhite women.....	24	5	46	(B)	(B)	10	2	27	(B)	(B)
All status components consistent.....	16	5	23	(B)	(B)	9	2	23	(B)	(B)
Two status components consistent.....	8	-	23	(B)	(B)	1	-	4	(B)	(B)
All status components inconsistent.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STATUS SCORE 50 TO 79										
White women.....	1,942	312	4,034	2,077	2,475	2,826	212	7,715	2,730	2,951
All status components consistent.....	362	63	730	2,017	2,441	652	50	1,744	2,675	2,897
Two status components consistent.....	1,306	207	2,711	2,076	2,467	1,879	144	5,099	2,714	2,939
All status components inconsistent.....	274	42	593	2,164	2,556	295	18	872	2,956	3,148
Nonwhite women.....	111	28	195	1,757	2,349	80	13	215	2,688	3,209
All status components consistent.....	25	5	51	(B)	(B)	14	1	36	(B)	(B)
Two status components consistent.....	73	17	129	1,767	2,304	60	11	155	2,583	3,163
All status components inconsistent.....	13	6	15	(B)	(B)	6	1	24	(B)	(B)
STATUS SCORE 20 TO 49										
White women.....	842	139	2,114	2,542	3,007	1,718	142	5,349	3,114	3,394
All status components consistent.....	96	16	249	2,594	3,113	225	22	664	2,951	3,271
Two status components consistent.....	626	94	1,605	2,564	3,017	1,292	109	4,019	3,111	3,397
All status components inconsistent.....	120	29	260	2,167	2,857	201	11	666	3,313	3,505
Nonwhite women.....	205	54	555	2,707	3,675	221	36	813	3,679	4,395
All status components consistent.....	29	4	88	(B)	(B)	31	8	99	(B)	(B)
Two status components consistent.....	145	42	375	2,586	3,641	164	25	614	3,744	4,417
All status components inconsistent.....	31	8	92	(B)	(B)	26	3	100	(B)	(B)

- Entry represents zero or rounds to zero.

B Rate not shown where base is less than 50,000.

Table 5.--NUMBER CHILDLESS AND CHILDREN EVER BORN, FOR MARRIED WOMEN 35 TO 44 YEARS OLD LIVING WITH HUSBAND, BY LABOR FORCE STATUS, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, STATUS CONSISTENCY TYPE, AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960--Con.

(Numbers in thousands)

Socioeconomic status score, status consistency type, and color	Labor force					Not in labor force				
	Married women 35 to 44 years old living with husband		Children ever born			Married women 35 to 44 years old living with husband		Children ever born		
	Total	Number childless	Number	Per 1,000 married women	Per 1,000 mothers	Total	Number childless	Number	Per 1,000 married women	Per 1,000 mothers
STATUS SCORE 0 TO 19										
White women.....	57	11	194	3,404	4,217	304	27	1,239	4,076	4,473
All status components consistent.....	33	5	113	(B)	(B)	211	20	831	3,938	4,351
Two status components consistent.....	24	6	81	(B)	(B)	93	7	408	4,387	4,744
All status components inconsistent.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nonwhite women.....	70	14	290	4,143	5,179	106	11	535	5,047	5,632
All status components consistent.....	43	12	173	(B)	(B)	76	8	404	5,316	5,941
Two status components consistent.....	27	2	117	(B)	(B)	30	3	131	(B)	(B)
All status components inconsistent.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

- Entry represents zero or rounds to zero. B Rate not shown where base is less than 50,000.

Table 6.--PERCENT CHILDLESS AND FERTILITY RATE FOR MARRIED WOMEN 35 TO 44 YEARS OLD LIVING WITH HUSBAND, BY LABOR FORCE STATUS, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, STATUS CONSISTENCY TYPE, AND COLOR, FOR THE UNITED STATES: 1960

Subject	White					Nonwhite				
	Total	Socioeconomic status score				Total	Socioeconomic status score			
		80 to 99 (high)	50 to 79	20 to 49	0 to 19 (low)		80 to 99 (high)	50 to 79	20 to 49	0 to 19 (low)
Number of women.....thousands..	9,533	1,844	4,768	2,560	361	827	34	191	426	176
PERCENT CHILDLESS										
Total:										
Labor force.....	16.8	19.3	16.1	16.5	19.3	24.6	(B)	25.2	26.3	20.0
Not in labor force.....	7.7	7.1	7.5	8.3	8.9	14.9	(B)	16.3	16.3	10.4
All status components consistent:										
Labor force.....	17.7	18.7	17.4	16.7	(B)	23.0	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
Not in labor force.....	7.7	6.7	7.7	9.8	9.5	14.6	(B)	(B)	(B)	10.5
Two status components consistent:										
Labor force.....	16.2	20.1	15.8	15.0	(B)	24.1	(B)	23.3	29.0	(B)
Not in labor force.....	7.9	7.7	7.7	8.4	7.5	15.3	(B)	18.3	15.2	(B)
All status components inconsistent:										
Labor force.....	18.0	-	15.3	24.2	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
Not in labor force.....	5.8	-	6.1	5.5	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 1,000 WOMEN										
Total:										
Labor force.....	2,169	1,869	2,077	2,511	3,404	2,649	(B)	1,757	2,707	4,143
Not in labor force.....	2,881	2,612	2,730	3,114	4,076	3,813	(B)	2,688	3,679	5,047
All status components consistent:										
Labor force.....	2,088	1,892	2,017	2,594	(B)	2,965	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
Not in labor force.....	2,826	2,620	2,675	2,951	3,938	4,323	(B)	(B)	(B)	5,316
Two status components consistent:										
Labor force.....	2,201	1,839	2,076	2,564	(B)	2,545	(B)	1,767	2,586	(B)
Not in labor force.....	2,879	2,598	2,714	3,111	4,387	3,545	(B)	2,583	3,744	(B)
All status components inconsistent:										
Labor force.....	2,165	-	2,164	2,167	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
Not in labor force.....	3,101	-	2,956	3,313	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 1,000 MOTHERS										
Total:										
Labor force.....	2,607	2,315	2,475	3,007	(B)	3,515	(B)	2,349	3,675	5,179
Not in labor force.....	3,121	2,810	2,951	3,394	4,473	4,479	(B)	3,209	4,395	5,632
All status components consistent:										
Labor force.....	2,538	2,326	2,441	3,113	(B)	3,851	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
Not in labor force.....	3,062	2,807	2,897	3,271	4,351	5,063	(B)	(B)	(B)	5,941
Two status components consistent:										
Labor force.....	2,626	2,300	2,467	3,017	(B)	3,334	(B)	2,304	3,641	(B)
Not in labor force.....	3,128	2,816	2,939	3,397	4,744	4,185	(B)	3,163	4,417	(B)
All status components inconsistent:										
Labor force.....	2,641	-	2,556	2,857	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
Not in labor force.....	3,293	-	3,148	3,505	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)

- Entry represents zero. B Percent and rate not shown where base is less than 50,000.