

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMERCE
PUBLICATION



Series P-23, No. 31
April 10, 1970

CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS
Special Studies

**USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY'S CONTINUOUS
WORK HISTORY SAMPLE FOR
POPULATION ESTIMATION**

**PART I: Nature, coverage, and utility
of the Work History File**

**PART II: Experimental estimates of
State population by color, based on
Work History File, July 1, 1965**

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF COMMERCE
Bureau of
the Census

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

GEORGE HAY BROWN, Director

ROBERT F. DRURY, Deputy Director
CONRAD TAEUBER, Associate Director

Population Division

HERMAN P. MILLER, Chief

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by Meyer Zitter and Elisabeth S. Nagy, Population Division, and represents an expansion of material from a paper by the authors presented at the 1969 Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association, New York City, August 19-22. (See Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, 1969, American Statistical Association.) The programming and processing of the Work History Sample data tapes which provided the basic migration matrix for States and standard metropolitan statistical areas were carried out by David Hirschberg, Regional Economics Division, Office of Business Economics. Jerome M. Glynn, Population Division, Bureau of the Census, was responsible for further computer processing for adaptability to population estimation methodology.

SUGGESTED CITATION

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 31, "Use of Social Security's Continuous Work History Sample for Population Estimation," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, 30 cents. Current Population Reports issued in Series P-20, P-23, P-25, P-26, P-27, P-28 (summaries only), P-60, and P-65 are sold as a single consolidated subscription at \$8.50 per year, \$2.50 additional for foreign mailing.

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of findings	ii
Introduction	1
Part I: Nature, coverage, and utility of the Work History File	1
Use of the File on the national level	2
Regions, divisions, and States	4
Standard metropolitan statistical areas	6
Sampling errors	7
Part II: Experimental estimates of State population by color, based on Work History File, July 1, 1965	8
Comparison of File estimates with conventional P-25 Series of estimates	8
Methodology	9

TEXT TABLES

Table	Page
A.--Summary data from Continuous Work History Sample (CWHHS) and comparison of interstate migrants from CWHHS and Current Population Survey (CPS): 1961 to 1965	2
B.--Interstate migration rates of the employed male population 18 to 64 years of age, by class of worker and occupation group, from Current Population Survey, 1960-1965 average	4
C.--Net migration rates for selected periods, by region and race	5
D.--Total and civilian net migration by metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence: 1960-1965	7

DETAILED TABLES

Table	Page
1.--Comparison of CWHHS File and census data, by race, for States: 1960	11
2.--Net migration rates from census and CWHHS data, by sex, and from independent estimates, for States: 1955-1960 and 1960-1965	12
3.--Net migration rates from census and CWHHS data, by color, for States: Selected periods, 1950-1965	13
4.--Ratio of workers from CWHHS file to census population 15 to 64 years of age, by race, for standard metropolitan statistical areas with Negro population of 50,000 or more: 1960	14
5.--Net migration rates from CWHHS data, by race, and from independent estimates, for standard metropolitan statistical areas with Negro population in 1960 of 50,000 or more: 1960-1965	14
6.--Comparison of CWHHS derived estimates with independent estimates of resident population, July 1, 1965, and net migration, 1960-1965, for States	15
7.--Estimates of the total resident population of States, July 1, 1965, and components of population change since April 1, 1960	16
8.--Estimates of the resident population of races other than white, for States, July 1, 1965, and components of population change since April 1, 1960	17
9.--Estimates of the total resident population and the resident population of races other than white, by age, for States: July 1, 1965	18
10.--Total resident population and resident population of races other than white, by age, for States: April 1, 1960	19
11.--Races other than white as a percent of the total resident population of States, by age: July 1, 1965, and April 1, 1960	20

APPENDIX TABLES

Table	Page
A-1.--Percent Negro of total population 15 to 64 years of age and of total workers in CWHHS File, for standard metropolitan statistical areas with Negro population of 50,000 or more: 1960	21
A-2.--Standard errors of 1960-1965 net migration rates based on CWHHS data, for States	21
A-3.--Standard errors of 1960-1965 net migration rates based on CWHHS data, for standard metropolitan statistical areas	22

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The data from the Social Security Continuous Work History Sample can be utilized to provide postcensal estimates of net migration (resident population) at a level of demographic and geographic detail which has not hitherto been available. There are, however, a number of limitations to the application and interpretation of CWHS-derived migration rates, particularly when considered in conjunction with their use in a regular program of postcensal population estimates such as that carried on by the Bureau of the Census. The favorable aspects of the File for measurement of migration are:

1. The broad extent of Social Security coverage, amounting to 90 percent of total civilian employment.
2. The high percentage of matched cases from year to year, i.e., of workers whose migration experience we are able to follow, accounting for 85 percent of the Continuous Work History File in the 1960-65 period.
3. Consistent annual data on a first-quarter basis from 1963 on, which allows migration to be measured for fairly precise time intervals.
4. The race detail available from the File which compares well with census population data for both States and standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) (see table 1 and appendix table A-1).
5. The consistency in net migration rates computed from different data sources for the 1955-60 and 1960-65 period (see tables C and 3).

On the negative side, there are still several problems to consider:

1. In spite of the apparent consistency between the CWHS net migration rates and those from other sources noted above, it is not possible to establish satisfactorily the extent to which migration rates based on employment changes reflect true resident migration. The 1965-70 resident migration data which will be forthcoming from the 1970 census are expected to provide a firmer basis for analysis than is now available.
2. The size of the sample, which precludes deriving rates for many States and SMSA's in which there is interest, even when cumulated over a number of years.
3. The timeliness of the data. The timing of the CWHS has to be substantially improved if migration rates derived from the File are to be useful in any regular current program of population estimation.

USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY'S CONTINUOUS WORK HISTORY SAMPLE FOR POPULATION ESTIMATION

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of the Census prepares estimates of the population of States and other geographic areas on a regular, annual basis and publishes them in Series P-25 of Current Population Reports.¹ Since data on net migration for geographic areas are not available on a current basis, the estimates are developed by several techniques which make use of a variety of data series symptomatic of population change. One of the methods, the Component method, attempts to measure net migration from available related series, such as school enrollment. Other techniques estimate total population or total population change directly.

The Bureau of the Census is continually working to improve the accuracy of its population estimates and to fill in gaps in its information sources. Lacking reported figures on migration for geographic areas, therefore, its efforts have been directed toward a search for additional data series directly or indirectly associated with population and migration, and toward the development of suitable applications of such new data. Only in recent years has it been possible to consider the complex mass of data made available through programs of the Social Security Administration and the Internal Revenue Service. These sources appear to offer direct measures of selected types

of migration and much research has been directed toward determining the means of taking advantage of this information for population estimation purposes.

The present report discusses in detail recent experimentation involving the use of data from the Social Security Administration's Continuous Work History Sample of persons in covered employment for the purpose of directly measuring net migration for States and SMSA's. Part I reviews the nature of the Work History File, its coverage, its limitations, and procedural problems associated with its use for measurement of resident migration. Estimates of net migration derived from the File for regions, States, and SMSA's by race for 1960-65 are compared with closely corresponding estimates from other sources, such as the 1960 census, post-censal surveys, and independent population estimates. Part II provides an example of the direct application of these data to the Bureau's program of population estimation. It contains estimates of the population of States by age and color for July 1, 1965, based almost entirely on Social Security data, i.e., through the use of migration rates from the Work History File to derive estimates of the population under 65, and Medicare figures to obtain the population 65 years of age and over.

PART I: NATURE, COVERAGE, AND UTILITY OF THE WORK HISTORY FILE ²

The Continuous Work History Sample (CWHs) is a 1-percent sample of all persons who have a Social Security account number and have worked in covered employment. The characteristics of persons in the sample--age, sex, and race--come from the individual's application for a Social Security account number (Form SS-5). Information on earnings and employment is obtained from the quarterly earnings reports (annually in the case of farm workers) filed by each employer for his employees in covered employment (Forms IRS-941, IRS-942, IRS-943, and OAR-S3). A separate sample file is maintained for self-employed persons. (The present study excludes the latter.)

¹The most recent estimates for States and SMSA's are given in reports, Nos. 437 and 432, respectively.

²The material presented in Part I is adapted from a paper presented by the authors at the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association in New York City, August 19-22, 1969.

The sample is selected on the basis of specified digits in the last four places of the nine-digit Social Security account number. Once an account number falls in the sample, it will reappear each year that the person works in covered employment. It is thus possible to make year-to-year comparisons for the same individual and to keep track of changes in his place of employment, coded by address of employer to State and SMSA.

In 1966 the workers in Old-Age, Survivors', Disability and Health Insurance (OASDHI) programs comprised 88 percent of total civilian employment. The great majority of workers presently excluded from coverage fall into three categories: Federal civilian employees and some State and local government employees; household workers and farm workers who do not work long enough or earn enough to meet minimum requirements; and very low income self-employed persons.

Use of the File on the national level.-- An overall summary of how well the Work History File reflects interstate migration of employed persons is provided in table A. In it, national summaries of the annual number of the Work History File's interstate migrants (reflecting change of place of employment and not necessarily change of residence) are compared with interstate migrants obtained from the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (reflecting change of residence).³

³Current Population Reports, Series P-20, annual report on mobility, of which No. 193, "Mobility of the Population of the United States: March 1968 to March 1969," is the most recent issue.

Table A illustrates the basic problems of working with the File on the national level, although the description of the limitations and meaning of File data given below applies to all geographic levels and is amplified when areas below the national level are discussed.

Length of migration period.--Data from the Work History File were available both on a "calendar-year" and "first quarter-year" basis. The "calendar-year" tabulations include everybody who worked at any time during the year in covered employment. Geographic areas are assigned on the basis of the employer with whom the employee had maximum quarterly earnings. The "first

Table A.--SUMMARY DATA FROM CONTINUOUS WORK HISTORY SAMPLE (CWHS) AND COMPARISON OF INTERSTATE MIGRANTS FROM CWHS AND CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY (CPS): 1961 TO 1965

(Numbers in thousands)

Work history and source of data	Calendar year ¹				First quarter of year ²		
	1961	1962	1963	1964	1963	1964	1965
TOTAL CWHS FILE³							
Worked in specified year.....	66,434.7	68,058.4	69,466.7	71,474.0	56,591.0	57,854.9	60,078.2
Worked in preceding year.....	59,594.7	60,515.4	61,884.5	63,415.9	48,610.9	49,684.1	50,677.5
Same State.....	55,148.3	56,082.4	57,286.5	58,675.9	45,346.3	46,402.3	47,205.0
Different State.....	4,446.4	4,433.0	4,598.0	4,740.0	3,264.6	3,281.8	3,472.5
Percent.....	7.5	7.3	7.4	7.5	6.7	6.6	6.9
CWHS FILE FOR 50-STATE AREA ONLY⁴							
Worked in specified year.....	62,969.0	64,358.5	65,676.6	67,681.7	53,351.1	54,462.8	56,431.2
Worked in preceding year.....	55,922.7	56,643.0	57,825.0	59,272.1	45,233.9	46,259.8	48,154.3
Same State.....	52,498.6	53,240.7	54,319.2	55,712.6	42,871.2	43,876.2	45,650.8
Different State.....	3,424.1	3,402.3	3,505.8	3,559.5	2,362.7	2,383.6	2,503.5
Percent.....	6.1	6.0	6.1	6.0	5.2	5.2	5.2
Contiguous State.....	1,439.2	1,450.7	1,463.5	1,492.9	994.2	1,012.4	1,080.3
Noncontiguous State.....	1,984.9	1,951.6	2,042.3	2,066.6	1,368.5	1,371.2	1,423.2
EMPLOYED INTERSTATE MIGRANTS FROM CURRENT POPULATION SURVEYS⁵							
Total, 18 to 64 years.....	1,778.0	1,702.0	2,052.0	1,894.0	2,052.0	1,894.0	1,839.0
Percent.....	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.8
Contiguous State.....	(NA)	616.0	725.0	677.0	725.0	677.0	697.0
Noncontiguous State.....	(NA)	1,086.0	1,327.0	1,217.0	1,327.0	1,217.0	1,142.0
RATIOS OF CWHS TO CPS INTERSTATE MIGRANTS							
Total.....	1.93	2.00	1.71	1.88	1.15	1.26	1.36
Contiguous State.....	(NA)	2.36	2.02	2.21	1.37	1.50	1.55
Noncontiguous State.....	(NA)	1.80	1.54	1.70	1.03	1.13	1.25

NA Not available.

¹Includes persons who worked at any time during year.

²Includes only those working in first calendar quarter.

³Includes persons working in the 50 States, U.S. territories and possessions, on ships at sea, and military personnel.

⁴Excludes military personnel and all persons working outside the 50 States.

⁵Employed at time of Current Population Survey. Excludes persons in Armed Forces.

quarter-year" figures cover only wage earners who worked in the first calendar quarter. The self-employed are excluded from both sets. For the purpose of measuring migration, comparison should be made at identical points of the year in order to obtain change over a 12-month period. From this standpoint, first-quarter data are more appropriate than calendar-year statistics. Full calendar-year data for 1961 and 1962 were nonetheless used in this study in obtaining migration rates for the 1960-65 period, as first-quarter data for those years had not been tabulated. The inclusion in table A of calendar-year statistics for 1961-64 and first-quarter statistics for 1963-65 serve to demonstrate the extent of the differences between the two time series. It is apparent, for example, that calendar-year data provide a substantially broader base to work from, since the total number of workers based on calendar-year data is 15-20 percent greater than the number derived from first-quarter data. The advantage which might be gained by using the larger number of sample cases is cancelled out, however, by greater uncertainty regarding the length of the migration period. Because of the overlap of the two series in 1963 and 1964, it is also possible to demonstrate rate differences which result from the use of different bases.

Area of coverage.--The first two blocks of information in table A refer to "total file" and "50-State area only." The total File includes persons in covered employment in the 50-State area, abroad (including Puerto Rico and other outlying areas), and the military. The 50-State area excludes the military (which are treated in the File as a separate "State") and all persons working in covered employment outside territorial United States. Thus, the 50-State universe encompasses movement between States but excludes movement between the States and the military. In this way, we are able to isolate and focus on civilian interstate migration within the United States.

The third block of information contained in table A refers to employed interstate migrants 18 to 64 years of age as reported in the Current Population Surveys. The Social Security data include the entire working population, but for the purposes of this study, the File's population was considered to be synonymous with the age group 18 to 64. The ratios used to compare employed interstate migrants from CPS with File migrants are therefore consistent as to area of movement and employment status, but not entirely consistent as to nature of the migration (change in place of employment versus place of residence) or age of migrants.

The migration base.--Of major substantive interest for this study is the observation that about 85 percent of persons in covered employment in a

given year had also been working in the preceding year. These are the "matched cases" whose migration experience forms the core of this analysis. An 85 percent "match rate" is highly encouraging in itself; the absolute number of matched cases available from year to year produces a very substantial base for the computation of migration rates.⁴

Interstate migration and contiguity.--It is noteworthy that the Work History File generates a much larger number of interstate migrants than is found in the Current Population Surveys. (The overstatement is substantially greater when calendar-year data are used.) The excess is apparent in the Social Security data even though moves caused by interchange between the military and civilian employment have been excluded from the CWHS but not entirely from CPS. It is clear that the problem is caused primarily by changes in State of employment which are not accompanied by a change in residence. When the number of interstate movers from the two sources are compared separately for contiguous or non-contiguous States, the figures become more understandable.

If we examine moves between noncontiguous States, the number of migrants from the File does not differ greatly from the number obtained from the Current Population Survey, their ratios varying from 1.03 in 1962-63 to 1.25 in 1964-65 (first-quarter data). In the case of moves between contiguous States, the File generates from 35 percent to 55 percent more migrants than indicated by the Survey data. These data confirm what is evident, that many changes of employment between contiguous States do not involve any change in residence.

"Job migration" versus change in residence.--The problem of excess migrants being generated by the File is only one of several which arise when movements between contiguous States are examined. Indeed, excess migration would not be a matter for concern if the movement were proportionate to population and the balancing out resulted in a "true" net figure. This is not the case, since some States are in a more favorable position to gain "job migrants"

⁴Although the number of covered workers not matched in the File is not considered in this study, it should be of interest to those concerned with gross changes in the labor force. Looking ahead from year to year, unmatched cases in the 50-State area represent mainly persons who leave the labor force (or the 50-State area), shift to "noncovered" employment, enter the military, or die. Looking backward, new entrants (including persons returning from military duty) probably make up the bulk of the group.

as against migration resulting from change in residence. Several examples were chosen to illustrate the directional bias involved. Migration stream data for 1955-60 (from 1960 census data on migration) and for 1957-63 (from the Work History File) were assembled for a number of large metropolitan areas which form the nucleus of contiguous State movement. These include the New York metropolitan area (New York-New Jersey), Philadelphia (Pennsylvania-New Jersey), District of Columbia-Maryland-Virginia, and several others. The data are summarized below as follows:

Origin	Destination	All out-migrants from origin (thous.)	Out-migrants to indicated State (thous.)	Percent out-migrants to indicated State
CWHS (Social Security)				
N.Y.....	N.J.....	647.3	111.8	17.3
N.J.....	N.Y.....	271.3	94.5	34.8
Pa.....	N.J.....	379.5	64.6	17.0
N.J.....	Pa.....	271.3	39.3	14.5
D.C.....	Md.....	93.3	28.4	30.4
Md.....	D.C.....	132.5	20.0	15.1
R.I.....	Mass....	38.6	12.5	32.4
Mass....	R.I.....	187.7	15.1	8.0
Census data				
N.Y.....	N.J.....	990.5	181.3	18.3
N.J.....	N.Y.....	388.5	74.4	19.1
Pa.....	N.J.....	678.6	115.0	17.0
N.J.....	Pa.....	388.5	57.6	14.8
D.C.....	Md.....	193.3	77.5	40.1
Md.....	D.C.....	259.7	18.3	7.0
R.I.....	Mass....	86.1	17.8	20.7
Mass....	R.I.....	339.6	16.5	4.9

It is clear that the overall impact of contiguous and noncontiguous State movements is substantial and is a factor to be considered in interpreting the migration data from the CWHS.

Regions, divisions, and States.--Because of differences in the geographic distribution of industries and occupations, the Work History Sample presents a biased view of migration by State of employment, which in turn compounds the difficulties of converting job migration into residence migration. States with larger proportions of their work force in covered employment have a disproportionate influence on estimates of migration derived from the File compared to States with smaller proportions.

Comparisons of the States' representation in the Work History File with the distribution of employed persons reported in the 1960 census demonstrates the variation in worker coverage derived from the two sources. Table 1 presents ratios of one to the other. These ratios vary considerably from State to State, as expected. The lowest ratios are in the more rural Southern States and Plains States, notably Mississippi, Arkansas, North and South Dakota, and Iowa. In each of these States, the number of workers covered by Social Security provisions amounts to less than 70 percent of the working population counted by the census. At the other end of the scale, there are industrialized States like Delaware and New York whose ratios approach 100 percent.

As a result of these differences, the migration rates for States derived from the File are not of uniform validity as measures of residential migration of the total population. As the migration of covered workers represents only a portion of the migration of total employment, leaving a large uncovered category, the migration rates themselves may be biased simply because the opportunity of being reported as an out-migrant is higher in the high coverage States than in the low coverage States. Because of this differential exposure to risk, it appears more likely that the File will pick up in-migration to low coverage States from high coverage States (presuming the move is within covered employment), and less likely to reflect out-migration from low coverage States to high coverage States.

Evidence provided by the Current Population Surveys further complicates the picture by revealing sharp migration differences by occupation, even in occupations normally covered by Social Security provisions. The data in table B indicate that among wage and salary workers, farm workers

Table B.--INTERSTATE MIGRATION RATES OF THE EMPLOYED MALE POPULATION 18 TO 64 YEARS OF AGE, BY CLASS OF WORKER AND OCCUPATION GROUP, FROM CPS, 1960-1965 AVERAGE

Class of worker and occupation group	Rate (percent)
Total male civilian population 18 to 64 years of age.....	3.5
Employed.....	3.1
Wage and salary workers ¹	3.5
White-collar workers.....	4.5
Manual and service workers.....	2.8
Farm workers.....	5.5
Self-employed.....	1.2

¹Includes government workers.

had the highest interstate migration rate (5.5 percent), white collar workers the second (4.5 percent), and manual and service workers the lowest (2.8 percent). Thus, in States with the smallest proportions of workers in covered employment, there appears to be the strongest tendency toward interstate migration.

Interesting geographic differences by age and race are apparent from table 1, in which workers in covered employment are compared with State populations 15 to 64 years of age in 1960. The two racial groups used in making this comparison are those available from the Work History File: Negro and all races other than Negro (referred to in this report as "white"). Among the "white" population, Social Security workers comprised 58 percent of the national population 15 to 64 years of age in 1960. By State, the percentages were lowest in rural Southern and Plains States and highest in the industrialized Northeast, ranging from 43 percent in Kentucky to 69 percent in

New York. Negro percentages, while about the same as the white nationally, are higher than white percentages in all States except Michigan and most of the Southern States. They also have a much wider spread than white percentages, extending from a low of 44 percent in Alabama to a high of 84 percent in Connecticut.

Net migration rates for regions and States.-- Tables C, 2, and 3 present migration rates for regions and States derived from the Work History File and other sources for different periods. The rates from the File were derived by dividing the net migrants cumulated for the 1960-65 period by the average annual matched workers in the File. Since only the persons that were matched from year to year were exposed to the risk of migration, they were taken to constitute the appropriate population base for the computation of rates. Thus, persons in the File in only one of two successive years would not enter into the estimating equation at any time.

Table C.--NET MIGRATION RATES FOR SELECTED PERIODS, BY REGION AND RACE

(Percent)

Region and race	1950-60 censuses ¹	1955-60 census ²	1960-65 CWHS ³	1960-65 CPS ⁴	1960-65 independent estimate ⁵
ALL CLASSES					
United States.....	+1.8	-	-	-	+1.1
Northeast.....	+0.9	-1.7	-0.4	-0.8	+1.2
North Central.....	-0.3	-1.9	-1.6	-2.2	-1.8
South.....	-3.0	-0.1	-0.7	-1.1	+1.3
West.....	+19.1	+6.2	+4.8	+6.9	+5.6
WHITE					
United States.....	+2.0	-	-	-	(NA)
Northeast.....	-0.6	-2.1	-0.9	-1.5	(NA)
North Central.....	-1.6	-2.2	-1.8	-2.6	(NA)
South.....	+0.1	+0.7	+0.2	-0.3	(NA)
West.....	+18.7	+6.2	+4.5	+7.1	(NA)
NEGRO AND OTHER RACES					
United States.....	-0.2	-	-	-	(NA)
Northeast.....	+26.0	+3.8	+6.1	+6.4	(NA)
North Central.....	+23.8	+2.3	+1.4	+1.9	(NA)
South.....	-14.1	-3.4	-4.9	-4.2	(NA)
West.....	+23.6	+6.5	+11.8	+5.6	(NA)

- Represents zero. NA Not available.

¹All ages. Includes military and immigrants from abroad.

²Population 15 to 64 years of age in 1960. Includes military.

³Population 18 to 64 years of age. Includes an unknown number of immigrants from abroad. Excludes military. CWHS color groups are: "White," which includes all races except Negro, and "Negro."

⁴Population 1 year of age and over. Excludes Armed Forces in barracks.

⁵All ages. Includes immigrants from abroad. Excludes military.

Table C above shows closely comparable net migration rates by region. Civilian rates from the Work History File for 1960-65 are compared with rates for 1950-60, 1955-60, and 1960-65 taken from three different sources-- the censuses of 1950 and 1960, the Current Population Surveys, and independent estimates prepared at the Census Bureau. The Work History rates compare favorably with CPS rates, and less well with rates derived through independent estimates.

The net migration rates on a State-by-State basis from the Work History File and the independent estimates shown in table 2 provide some insight into the special problems of interpreting migration figures from the Work History File. The different sets of rates for Florida and the District of Columbia-Maryland-Virginia area are cases in point. In both areas, peculiar local circumstances make utilization of an employment file highly questionable. Heavy net immigration of the retired population to Florida (under 65) would not be reflected by the File. The District of Columbia area presents a unique problem, for it is not a State, but the core of a large metropolitan area marked by heavy commuting from two States, Maryland and Virginia. In addition, its chief employer, the Federal Government, is hardly covered in the Work History File at all. Use of employment data for measuring residence changes is particularly inappropriate in this case.

The net migration rates obtained from the Work History File for the States more often than not agree with or are very close to the independent State estimates for the same periods. Differences in New York State may be attributed, in part, to the New York-New Jersey stream of migration and, in part, to the role played by net immigration from abroad. Although the effect of immigration from abroad is reflected in the Work History data as well, it is not possible to isolate this component for special study. As soon as an immigrant acquires a Social Security number and enters employment, he loses his original identity (as an immigrant) and is merged with all other workers in covered employment.

Table 3 shows net migration rates for States for white and Negro separately. These rates represent the only systematic measure of State Negro migration for the period since 1960. However, the sampling errors on these rates are very often quite large and the usefulness of the rates will need to be evaluated accordingly. (See appendix table A-2.)

Net migration rates, by sex, have also been computed. These appear in table 2, where they

are compared with 1955-60 migration rates based on change of residence obtained from the census. Greater variation by sex is apparent in the Work History data than in the census data. With only one exception, Hawaii, the census migration rates by sex bear the same signs. Examples of opposing migration tendencies by sex are numerous in the Work History series; however, considerable differences in rates for males and females are also noticeable in some States, even when they are moving in the same direction.

Standard metropolitan statistical areas.--The manner in which the File is used for the derivation of migration patterns for SMSA's in the main resembles that already described for States. The size and selection of the sample, the use of first calendar quarters for measuring the migration period, the presumed age of the migrants (18 to 64), and the use of matched workers as the migration base are the same for SMSA's as for States. Analysis of Work History data for the SMSA's is likewise hampered by many of the same problems which affect the data for States. However, in the case of the SMSA's, there is the advantage that a change in area of employment is more than likely to result in a change of area of residence also.

The analysis for this report was made on the basis of the 1968 definition of SMSA's. The 1960 population figures were made to conform to the 1968 definition; new SMSA's added after April 1960 were included in the ranking and grouping which preceded the selection of SMSA's shown in tables 4 and 5, and appendix table A-1. All data drawn from the Work History File for 1960-65 similarly conform to the 1968 definition of areas.

A given SMSA's migration is classified in two ways: as movement between the SMSA and other metropolitan areas, and as movement between the SMSA and nonmetropolitan areas. The military are shown as a separate component of non-metropolitan area movement. By adding up the in- and out-migrants obtained for individual SMSA's, the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan exchange of workers in covered employment is closely approximated. Summary data rates computed for the country as a whole are shown below (table D).

Unlike the situation noted for States, the military component of SMSA migration was identified, but was not deleted from the total matched work force. Pure civilian migration rates could thus not be computed for SMSA's in the text table below. For the individual SMSA's shown in table 5, the net migration rates include movement to and from the military and can be compared directly with the 1960-65 rates from the Bureau's independent estimates which also include the military.

Table D.--TOTAL AND CIVILIAN NET MIGRATION BY METROPOLITAN-NONMETROPOLITAN RESIDENCE: 1960-1965

(Numbers in thousands. 50-State area only)

Metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence	Total ¹			Civilian ¹		
	All classes	White ²	Negro	All classes	White ²	Negro
Out-migrants from metropolitan areas.....	14,837.3	13,723.2	1,114.1	13,749.3	12,722.8	1,026.5
To other metropolitan areas.....	9,627.1	8,911.3	715.8	9,627.1	8,911.3	715.8
To nonmetropolitan areas.....	5,210.2	4,811.9	398.3	4,122.2	3,811.5	310.7
In-migrants to metropolitan areas.....	15,503.1	14,314.3	1,188.8	14,110.9	13,011.7	1,099.2
From other metropolitan areas.....	9,627.1	8,911.3	715.8	9,627.1	8,911.3	715.8
From nonmetropolitan areas.....	5,876.0	5,403.0	473.0	4,483.8	4,100.4	383.4
Net migrants to metropolitan areas from nonmetropolitan areas.....	+665.8	+591.1	+74.7	+361.6	+288.9	+72.7
Percent net migrants of base population:						
Metropolitan areas.....	+2.0	+1.9	+2.4	³ +1.1	³ +0.9	³ +2.3
Nonmetropolitan areas.....	-3.9	-3.9	-4.3	-2.1	-1.9	-4.2

¹"Total" includes moves to and from military; "civilian" excludes military moves.²All races except Negro.³Base includes military.

In compiling SMSA data for this report, we restricted our universe to the 55 metropolitan areas whose populations in 1960 included 50,000 or more Negroes. These SMSA's were subdivided into three groups ranked by the number of Negroes in 1960. Table 4 shows for these 55 areas ratios of workers from the Social Security File to 1960 census population 15 to 64 years of age by race. Surprisingly, the ratio of workers to population varies widely among the areas for both races: for whites, from a low of 30 to a high of 69; for races other than white from a low of 32 to a high of 64. One would expect somewhat less variation in coverage among metropolitan population than for States.

The question of how well statistics from the Work History Sample reflect the race and age composition of SMSA's may be answered, in part, by the comparison shown in table A-1 of the appendix. In this table, we see the percent Negro of the 1960 census population 15 to 64 years of age alongside the percent Negro of the total Work History File in 1960. The two columns are remarkably similar for most SMSA's. All except four SMSA's are within 5 percentage points' difference of one another; 44 are within 3 percentage points of one another.

Net migration rates for SMSA's.--Table 5 contrasts net migration rates produced by the Work History File with rates taken from the Bureau's independent estimates. The latter refer to total migration and to all ages only. They are not

available by race. Overall by size class, the net migration rates derived from these two sources compare very favorably. Considered individually, in 43 of the 55 SMSA's shown, there is agreement on the basic question of whether there was a net gain or a net loss of population through migration between 1960 and 1965. (Of the 12 which do not agree, 10 are in the South, and 3 of these are Florida resort or retirement centers.) In more than half of the SMSA's there is substantial correspondence (i.e., less than three percentage points difference) between the rates obtained from the independent estimates and rates yielded by the Social Security data. There is no discernible geographic or size pattern which would account for the fact that estimates for some SMSA's compare more favorably than for others or which explains the several very large differences.

Sampling errors.--Appendix tables A-2 and A-3 show sampling errors for the net migration rates computed for States and SMSA's for the 1960-65 period. The rates were derived by dividing the net migrants cumulated for the 1960-65 period by the average annual matched workers in the File, that is, the net migration rate (R) is equal to

$$\frac{\text{Estimate of in-migrants} - \text{Estimate of out-migrants}}{\text{Estimate of average annual matched workers}}$$

where the estimates are averages taken over the 5-year period. The sampling error of the net migration rate is a function of the sampling errors of: (X) the estimate of in-migrants, (Y) the estimate of out-migrants, and (Z) the estimate of average

annual matched workers. Sampling errors for X, Y, and Z can be computed using the procedure for estimating the standard error of a percentage with simple random sampling. The variance of R is given by the relationship:⁵

$$\text{Var} (R) = \left(\frac{1}{Z}\right)^2 \left[\text{Var} (x) + \text{Var} (Y) + R^2 \text{Var} (Z) \right]$$

The File usually does not provide meaningful rates (i.e., not statistically different from zero)

on an annual basis. Computed over a longer period of time, however, such as the 5-year period used here, the rates become more reliable in a large number of instances. Rates for regions shown in table C and rates for most of the large States shown in table 3 and those generating large numbers of migrants (e.g., Negroes of Southern States) are for the most part statistically significant. This is true for the large SMSA's also. Rates for some small States and SMSA's, however, fail the test of statistical significance for the period.

PART II: EXPERIMENTAL ESTIMATES OF STATE POPULATION BY COLOR, BASED ON WORK HISTORY FILE, JULY 1, 1965

Comparison of File estimates with conventional P-25 Series of estimates.--Comparison of the total population estimates prepared by use of Social Security data with the independent estimates regularly published in Series P-25 are shown in table 6. The implied net migrants and net migration rates from the two sources are also shown. Estimates of the total population and races other than white and of the components of population change for the 1960-65 period are shown in tables 7 and 8.

In general, the Work History Sample estimates compare favorably with the independent estimates, but there are a number of notable differences. Some of the differences for specific States are quite striking. On the average, the estimates differ by about 2 percent, but the differences range from an "overestimate" of 6 percent in Delaware--that is the Work History File estimate is higher than the independent one--to an "underestimate" of almost 5 percent in Georgia and New Mexico. The States in the South are generally lower according to the Work History Sample estimates than the independent estimates. Georgia and Florida are particularly low. In the case of Florida, we might expect the Work History Sample to understate the true net in-migration since in-migration of retirees to that State may be significantly larger than migration of the employed, and thus total interstate migration would not be adequately reflected in the Work History File rates.

There is no evidence of bias in the differences; 25 States were lower according to the Work History File. Perhaps this was to be expected since both sets of estimates were adjusted to the same national total.

Since the estimates are based on a sample, they are also subject to sampling error which needs to be considered in these comparisons. The

sampling errors on the original CWSHS net migration rates for the 18 to 64 year old population are given in appendix table A-2. In general, we would not expect small differences between the two sets of estimates to be statistically significant, but size of State as well as number of migrants are very important factors. (For example, California's ratio of 1.014 is statistically significant; whereas Idaho's ratio of .961 is not.) All told, the differences between the two sets of estimates were significant at the two-sigma level for 20 States.

The lack of any true population "standard" for 1965 precludes a definitive statement on the relative accuracy of the two sets of estimates. The average difference between the Work History Sample estimates and the regular Bureau series is slightly higher than the average difference noted in 1960 between estimates prepared by the present conventional methods and the Census. The difference over the 10-year period (1950 to 1960) was 1.5 percent.

Work History File estimates are also provided by broad age groups and color in table 9. The estimates were prepared separately for the population under 18 years, 18 to 64 years, and 65 years and over. In the comparisons given here, the Work History File estimates made use of the migration rate from the File to estimate the population under 18 years of age. Another set of estimates, perhaps more valid, was also prepared whereby the estimate for the group under 18 was derived using school enrollment data (which are closely associated with this age group) to measure net migration for this group. This is the procedure used in the Census Bureau's regular series of estimates, by age, for States. This application typifies the "composite" approach to population estimation whereby specific data series are used to estimate the age segment of the population with which it is most closely associated. Thus, we use births (for the population under 5) and school enrollment (for the population 5 to 17) to estimate the population under 18 years, the Work History File for those 18 to 64 years, and Medicare data for

⁵Kendall, M. G., and Stuart, A., *Advanced Theory of Statistics*, Vol. 1, London, Griffin, 1958, p. 231.

those 65 years and over. This particular set of estimates for the total population would be expected to be closer to the regular published estimate since such a large portion, i.e., those under 18, is common to both sets. The average difference between these estimates (total) and the regular P-25 Series of estimates was a little more than 1 percent, compared with the 2 percent noted above. Although the truly composite feature of this approach is appealing and is probably to be preferred in any program of population estimation, its major drawback is the present inability to prepare estimates of the population under 18 by color, and it is not clear whether this deficiency will be overcome in the 1970's.

One of the more important contributions of the Work History Sample File is the availability of data by race. At present, it represents the only source of Negro migration data on a State and area basis. Unfortunately, there are no independent estimates against which to compare File-based estimates by race. It is possible to consider the results in terms of past trends, however. To take one example, for the 1960-65 period, net out-migration of Negroes from the South appeared to be at a somewhat lower annual level than that of the 1950-60 period, but at about the same level as that estimated for the latter part of the 1950's (see table C above). Most States in the South showed net out-migration of all races other than white, according to these estimates, with rates appearing to be lower than those of the 1940's and 1950's, but as noted for the region as a whole, the rates are similar to those of the late 1950's. (As mentioned in Part I, estimates for races other than white were derived only for States which had at least 50,000 Negroes 15 to 64 years old at the time of the 1960 census.)

By mid-1965, according to the Work History Sample estimates, the regional distribution of races other than white had changed only slightly over that of 1960, with more than half of this population (53 percent) residing in the South. In 1960, 56 percent was living there.

California received a greater net in-migration of races other than white than any other State--close to 250,000 according to these estimates. Other large gaining States would be New York with about 100,000, and New Jersey with somewhat less than 100,000. The largest losses, as noted, were for States in the South (see table 8).

Methodology.--The procedure for arriving at estimates of the total population, by color, for States, for July 1, 1965 (table 9) was a combination of the Composite and Component methods. The Composite feature involved making separate

estimates for certain broad age groups, i.e., under 18 years, 18 to 64 years, and 65 years and over. Within these age groups (except for the population 65 years and over) a Component method was used which involves separate estimates of each of the components of population change, viz., births, deaths, and net migration, as well as the 1960 base population in the appropriate age groups.

Briefly, the first step was to develop annual estimates of net interstate migration for the population in the Work History File. This was accomplished by a matching of Social Security numbers for two successive years. For matched numbers, a comparison between the State of employment in one year with the State of employment for the following year provided a complete matrix of in-migration and out-migration (and nonmigrants) by State for each year between 1960 and 1965. The difference between in- and out-migrants for each State represents net migrants. These figures were converted to rates for each State by dividing them by the File population of each State exposed to the probability of migration. These rates were assumed to apply to the "employed" population 18 to 64 for each year, since the File covers only employed persons. This rate for each State was converted to a rate covering all civilians 18 to 64 years by a national factor representing the ratio of the migration rate of all persons 18 to 64 (civilian population is used in both instances) available from the annual interstate migration figures from our Current Population Survey.⁶ The same average factor was used for all States for the 1960-65 period. The number of net interstate migrants by State for each year, 1960-65, was obtained by applying the above derived migration rates to the population 18 to 64 years estimated for States at the beginning of each year starting with figures for April 1960 (Census). The annual net interstate migrants for States were summed and adjusted to add to a net interstate balance of zero.

Net immigration from abroad, for each year, was added in separately, the State distribution being based on figures of State of intended residence of immigrants arriving during the period. These distributions were developed separately by country of origin for those coming from Mexico, Cuba, Canada, and all other countries combined. Net immigration from abroad was treated as a distinct component because migration rates from the File were restricted to those persons who were in the United States in two successive years. Thus, persons entering the United States from abroad had no opportunity of being selected from the Social Security system in the year in which they arrived.

⁶See, for example, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 193.

They are exposed to interstate migration in succeeding years, however, once they enter covered employment. The particular procedure of assigning net immigration from abroad to States was decided on because the distribution by State of intended residence of immigrants differs considerably for certain countries of origin, and the overall mix of annual net immigrants has been changing during the estimating period.

The estimates of net migration (including net in-migration from abroad) for the 18- to 64-year group were combined with appropriate figures on deaths and estimates of net interchange between the civilian and military populations for the 1960-65 period and the result added to the 1960 population in the appropriate cohort to provide estimates for July 1, 1965. The estimates were also adjusted to add to the national population control independently derived. The computations were done separately for the white population and all other races combined.

The population under 18 was derived separately using the original net interstate migration rates for the population 18 to 64 years derived from the File as bases for estimating net migration rates for the population under 18. It was assumed that there is a constant relationship between the migration rate for the population 18 to 64 and the rate for the population under 18 years of age. As before, a national factor was obtained from our national data on interstate migrants from the Current Population Survey. Thus, the population under 18 is also estimated by a component method which

makes use of the 1960 census counts of those who would be under 18 in 1965, plus births during the period, minus deaths in this age group, plus the estimated net migration. Net immigration from abroad was added in separately.

The population 65 years and over by State represents mainly the reported State distribution of the population covered under the Medicare program. The first year for which such figures were available, by State, was July 1, 1966; for 1965 the figures were obtained by interpolation between the 1960 population 65 years and over and the 1966 Medicare population, separately by color.

With only very minor exceptions, Medicare includes everybody in the population 65 years of age and over. Thus, the estimates for this age group should be very accurate. Nationally, in 1967, Medicare reported 19.1 million persons compared with the national independent population figure of 18.8 million, a difference of 1.5 percent.⁷

The separate figures for age groups under 18 years, 18 to 64 years, and 65 years and over, were summed to arrive at a single estimate of the total population. Since all the component groups had been separately adjusted to national controls, the sum of the estimates of the total population of States automatically agreed with the U.S. total.

⁷U.S. Congress, House Committee on Ways and Means, First Annual Report on Medicare, 90th Congress, Second Session, House Document No. 331, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1968.

Table 1.—COMPARISON OF CWS FILE AND CENSUS DATA, BY RACE, FOR STATES: 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Region, division, and State	Total			White ¹		Negro	
	CWS, 1960 ²	CWS as a percent of population 15 to 64 years	CWS as a percent of census workers ³	CWS, 1960 ²	CWS as a percent of population 15 to 64 years	CWS, 1960 ²	CWS as a percent of population 15 to 64 years
United States.....	62,715.8	58.4	82.9	56,466.0	58.4	6,249.8	59.0
REGIONS:							
Northeastern.....	17,969.3	65.3	91.4	16,549.8	64.5	1,419.5	75.9
North Central.....	18,043.2	59.3	81.8	16,792.1	59.0	1,251.1	63.0
South.....	17,018.0	52.3	77.6	13,821.0	52.3	3,197.0	52.5
West.....	9,685.3	57.6	80.8	9,303.1	57.5	382.2	59.3
NORTHEAST:							
New England.....	4,072.7	64.3	86.5	3,960.1	63.9	112.6	78.7
Middle Atlantic.....	13,896.6	65.6	92.9	12,589.7	64.7	1,306.9	75.7
NORTH CENTRAL:							
East North Central.....	13,095.1	60.9	84.7	12,054.3	60.7	1,040.8	62.2
West North Central.....	4,948.1	55.5	74.9	4,737.8	55.0	210.3	67.2
SOUTH:							
South Atlantic.....	8,547.4	55.0	80.8	6,746.8	54.7	1,800.6	56.0
East South Central.....	3,354.1	47.8	72.1	2,721.7	48.4	632.4	45.1
West South Central.....	5,116.5	51.4	76.3	4,352.5	51.3	764.0	51.8
WEST:							
Mountain.....	2,225.5	56.1	79.4	2,179.2	56.0	46.3	65.6
Pacific.....	7,459.8	58.0	81.3	7,123.9	58.0	335.9	58.5
NEW ENGLAND:							
Maine.....	332.0	58.9	79.4	330.9	58.9	(*)	(*)
New Hampshire.....	244.7	68.1	87.6	243.9	68.2	(*)	(*)
Vermont.....	125.7	55.9	73.0	125.2	55.8	(*)	(*)
Massachusetts.....	2,015.6	64.9	87.1	1,964.9	64.9	50.7	77.2
Rhode Island.....	321.0	60.7	86.9	314.6	60.7	(*)	(*)
Connecticut.....	1,033.7	66.6	89.7	980.6	65.9	53.1	83.9
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:							
New York.....	7,318.0	69.7	97.1	6,582.7	68.6	735.3	81.4
New Jersey.....	2,353.4	62.4	88.5	2,104.2	60.8	249.2	80.3
Pennsylvania.....	4,225.2	61.0	88.8	3,902.8	60.9	322.4	63.0
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:							
Ohio.....	3,385.8	58.9	83.5	3,111.4	58.8	274.4	59.9
Indiana.....	1,671.3	60.8	84.0	1,570.3	60.5	101.0	66.3
Illinois.....	3,861.6	63.0	86.3	3,465.7	62.8	395.9	65.5
Michigan.....	2,807.4	60.9	87.5	2,570.0	61.4	237.4	56.7
Wisconsin.....	1,369.0	59.8	79.4	1,336.9	59.4	(*)	(*)
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:							
Minnesota.....	1,077.7	55.3	72.9	1,065.1	55.0	(*)	(*)
Iowa.....	836.8	52.9	69.5	825.9	52.7	(*)	(*)
Missouri.....	1,568.2	61.2	85.6	1,425.4	60.8	142.8	65.4
North Dakota.....	157.4	43.9	59.0	156.7	43.8	(*)	(*)
South Dakota.....	181.1	47.3	63.5	180.7	47.3	(*)	(*)
Nebraska.....	463.6	57.0	75.6	450.4	56.5	(*)	(*)
Kansas.....	663.3	52.1	71.8	633.6	51.8	29.7	59.0
SOUTH ATLANTIC:							
Delaware.....	185.2	69.1	98.6	157.1	67.4	28.1	80.3
Maryland.....	1,049.9	55.6	81.0	822.4	51.8	227.5	76.0
District of Columbia.....	398.5	79.3	104.9	287.1	115.2	111.4	44.0
Virginia.....	1,211.9	50.3	77.6	944.8	48.5	267.1	58.2
West Virginia.....	530.4	48.4	82.6	504.7	48.2	(*)	(*)
North Carolina.....	1,517.8	55.5	78.4	1,204.5	56.4	313.3	52.3
South Carolina.....	705.4	50.9	74.9	513.1	53.3	192.3	45.4
Georgia.....	1,305.3	56.0	81.1	989.9	57.2	315.4	52.5
Florida.....	1,643.0	55.9	81.5	1,323.2	54.2	319.8	64.2
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:							
Kentucky.....	775.3	43.7	70.5	703.2	42.6	72.1	59.5
Tennessee.....	1,124.9	52.6	77.9	955.8	52.6	169.1	52.8
Alabama.....	914.2	48.1	72.8	692.0	49.8	222.2	43.5
Mississippi.....	539.7	44.6	63.0	370.7	48.8	169.0	37.6
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:							
Arkansas.....	460.5	44.9	64.2	374.5	45.0	86.0	44.6
Louisiana.....	880.0	47.1	74.2	630.4	47.4	249.6	46.2
Oklahoma.....	718.0	51.8	77.0	674.5	51.7	43.5	53.7
Texas.....	3,058.0	53.8	79.0	2,673.1	53.3	384.9	58.2
MOUNTAIN:							
Montana.....	219.4	57.2	76.7	219.0	57.3	(*)	(*)
Idaho.....	210.1	55.4	72.7	209.4	55.4	(*)	(*)
Wyoming.....	113.4	58.7	78.3	112.8	58.7	(*)	(*)
Colorado.....	563.6	54.8	76.0	547.6	54.5	(*)	(*)
New Mexico.....	261.7	48.4	77.2	256.0	48.2	(*)	(*)
Arizona.....	430.0	56.5	84.7	415.3	56.3	(*)	(*)
Utah.....	309.5	62.0	85.5	306.7	61.8	(*)	(*)
Nevada.....	117.8	65.5	89.0	112.4	65.4	(*)	(*)
PACIFIC:							
Washington.....	972.8	57.7	79.2	957.5	57.8	(*)	(*)
Oregon.....	630.2	60.4	78.4	623.0	60.3	(*)	(*)
California.....	5,589.7	58.2	81.9	5,277.7	58.2	312.0	59.2
Alaska.....	60.0	42.7	75.8	59.2	43.7	(*)	(*)
Hawaii.....	207.1	53.6	86.2	206.5	53.9	(*)	(*)

¹Data for races other than white not shown for those States with a Negro population of less than 50,000 persons 15 to 64 years of age in 1960.²All races except Negro.³Excludes Armed Forces.⁴Civilian population 14 years of age and over who worked at all in 1959.

Table 2.—NET MIGRATION RATES FROM CENSUS AND CWHS DATA, BY SEX, AND FROM INDEPENDENT ESTIMATES, FOR STATES:
1955-1960 AND 1960-1965

Region, division, and State	Both sexes			Male		Female	
	1955-60 census ¹	1960-65 CWHS ²	1960-65 independent estimate ³	1955-60 census ¹	1960-65 CWHS ²	1955-60 census ¹	1960-65 CWHS ²
United States.....	-	-	+1.1	-	-	-	-
REGION:							
Northeast.....	-1.7	-0.4	+1.2	-2.0	-0.3	-1.4	-0.6
North Central.....	-1.9	-1.6	-1.8	-2.2	-1.5	-1.6	-1.6
South.....	-0.1	-0.7	+1.3	+0.2	-0.7	-0.3	-0.7
West.....	+6.2	+4.8	+5.6	+6.5	+4.4	+5.9	+5.5
NORTHEAST:							
New England.....	-0.7	-0.2	+0.2	-0.6	-0.1	-0.8	-0.4
Middle Atlantic.....	-1.9	-0.4	+1.5	-2.4	-0.2	-1.6	-0.7
NORTH CENTRAL:							
East North Central.....	-1.3	-1.3	-1.2	-1.7	-1.4	-1.0	-1.1
West North Central.....	-3.2	-2.3	-3.3	-3.3	-2.0	-3.2	-2.6
SOUTH:							
South Atlantic.....	+2.3	-0.6	+2.7	+2.7	-0.9	+1.9	-0.1
East South Central.....	-3.4	-1.6	-1.0	-3.2	-1.5	-3.7	-1.8
West South Central.....	-1.3	-0.2	+0.7	-1.3	+0.2	-1.4	-1.1
WEST:							
Mountain.....	+4.4	+1.5	+2.3	+4.2	+0.8	+4.7	+2.9
Pacific.....	+6.8	+5.7	+6.7	+7.2	+5.4	+6.3	+6.2
NEW ENGLAND:							
Maine.....	-3.4	-5.4	-4.7	-2.9	-5.6	-3.9	-5.1
New Hampshire.....	+1.4	-0.7	+4.8	+1.7	-1.5	+1.1	+0.7
Vermont.....	-2.8	-0.7	-2.8	-2.6	-1.5	-2.9	+1.0
Massachusetts.....	-1.4	-0.1	-1.5	-1.5	-0.6	-1.2	+0.6
Rhode Island.....	-1.6	-1.2	-1.4	-0.2	-1.4	-2.9	-1.0
Connecticut.....	+1.7	+1.7	+5.3	+1.6	+3.2	+1.9	-1.1
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:							
New York.....	-2.6	-1.9	+2.5	-3.1	-2.0	-2.1	-1.6
New Jersey.....	+2.2	+7.9	+5.9	+2.3	+6.9	+2.2	+6.0
Pennsylvania.....	-3.2	-2.5	-2.4	-3.8	-2.3	-2.7	-2.8
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:							
Ohio.....	-0.6	-2.5	-0.8	-1.0	-2.9	-0.1	-1.5
Indiana.....	-1.2	(2)	-1.9	-1.3	-0.1	-1.1	(2)
Illinois.....	-1.2	-0.4	-0.9	-1.4	-0.1	-1.0	-0.9
Michigan.....	-2.6	-1.3	-1.2	-3.2	-1.3	-2.0	-1.6
Wisconsin.....	-1.2	-2.4	-2.2	-1.5	-2.9	-0.9	-1.3
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:							
Minnesota.....	-1.1	-0.7	-3.3	-1.5	(2)	-0.8	-2.1
Iowa.....	-4.5	-6.0	-5.8	-4.8	-7.3	-4.3	-3.9
Missouri.....	-1.8	-2.3	-1.1	-1.6	-1.5	-2.1	-3.7
North Dakota.....	-7.2	-7.2	-6.7	-6.5	-4.3	-7.9	-11.2
South Dakota.....	-7.0	-6.2	-6.9	-7.1	-7.3	-7.0	-4.4
Nebraska.....	-5.1	-3.8	-3.5	-5.1	-4.9	-5.1	-2.0
Kansas.....	-4.1	+2.8	-2.5	-4.1	+3.4	-4.1	+1.6
SOUTH ATLANTIC:							
Delaware.....	+4.7	+9.2	+4.8	+4.6	+12.2	+4.9	+3.7
Maryland.....	+3.6	+7.2	+5.5	+3.7	+7.2	+3.5	+7.3
District of Columbia.....	-10.1	-19.6	-2.8	-10.8	-22.3	-9.6	-15.4
Virginia.....	+1.8	+2.4	+3.1	+2.6	+1.9	+1.0	+3.4
West Virginia.....	-9.8	-5.6	-7.9	-10.1	-5.9	-9.6	-4.8
North Carolina.....	-2.1	-2.3	-0.1	-1.4	-2.2	-2.8	-2.5
South Carolina.....	-2.2	+0.3	-1.8	-0.5	+0.6	-3.8	-0.2
Georgia.....	-1.2	-3.3	+2.1	-0.7	-4.3	-1.7	-1.5
Florida.....	+17.2	+0.4	+9.9	+16.8	(2)	+17.6	+1.1
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:							
Kentucky.....	-4.7	-0.7	-2.3	-4.3	-0.8	-5.1	-0.5
Tennessee.....	-2.9	-0.4	+0.7	-2.7	+0.9	-3.0	-2.6
Alabama.....	-2.3	-2.7	-0.9	-3.2	-3.6	-2.4	-1.1
Mississippi.....	-4.4	-3.4	-2.1	-4.0	-3.9	-4.8	-2.6
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:							
Arkansas.....	-5.4	+1.0	+1.4	-5.5	+1.0	-5.3	+1.0
Louisiana.....	-0.4	+1.8	-0.6	-0.5	+4.2	-0.2	-4.2
Oklahoma.....	-4.2	-1.6	-0.6	-4.0	-1.6	-4.4	-1.6
Texas.....	-0.2	-0.7	+1.2	-0.1	-0.7	-0.3	-0.6
MOUNTAIN:							
Montana.....	-3.1	-5.5	-4.0	-3.1	-3.9	-3.2	-8.6
Idaho.....	-2.4	-7.1	-3.9	-1.9	-7.8	-2.9	-5.6
Wyoming.....	-2.1	-8.4	-8.6	-2.5	-11.0	-1.8	-3.6
Colorado.....	+4.1	+3.5	+2.9	+3.8	+3.1	+4.5	+4.2
New Mexico.....	+5.7	-10.5	-5.7	+6.0	-13.9	+5.5	-3.3
Arizona.....	+14.0	+8.0	+9.3	+13.5	+6.8	+14.7	+10.5
Utah.....	+0.9	-0.2	-0.3	+0.7	-0.4	+1.0	+0.2
Nevada.....	+9.2	+28.7	+32.9	+8.3	+26.0	+10.1	+21.1
PACIFIC:							
Washington.....	+1.3	+1.2	-1.8	+1.6	+1.7	+1.0	+0.2
Oregon.....	-0.7	+0.4	+3.8	-0.9	+0.4	-0.5	+0.5
California.....	+8.7	+7.2	+8.7	+9.1	+6.8	+8.3	+7.9
Alaska.....	+8.3	+10.1	+3.7	+10.1	+19.3	+5.5	+16.3
Hawaii.....	+2.7	-0.4	+1.0	+5.0	-3.3	-0.2	+3.5

-Represents zero. Z Less than 0.05.

¹Net migrants as a percent of census population 15 to 64 years of age; includes military.²Net employed civilian migrants as a percent of average base population in Work History File, 1960-65. Includes an unknown number of immigrants from abroad.³Net civilian migrants as percent of midperiod population. Includes immigrants from abroad.

Table 3.—NET MIGRATION RATES FROM CENSUS AND CWHS DATA, BY COLOR, FOR STATES: SELECTED PERIODS, 1950-1965

Region, division, and State	White			Other races		
	1950-60 censuses ¹	1955-60 census ²	1960-65 CWHS ³	1950-60 censuses ¹	1955-60 census ²	1960-65 CWHS ³
United States.....	+2.0	-	-	-0.2	-	-
REGIONS:						
Northeast.....	-0.6	-2.1	-0.9	+26.0	+3.8	+6.1
North Central.....	-1.6	-2.2	-1.8	+23.8	+2.3	+1.4
South.....	+0.1	+0.7	+0.2	-14.1	-3.4	-4.9
West.....	+18.7	+6.2	+4.5	+23.6	+6.5	+11.8
NORTHEAST:						
New England.....	-0.5	-0.9	-0.5	+45.6	+8.8	+12.6
Middle Atlantic.....	-0.6	-2.5	-1.0	+24.5	+3.4	+5.6
NORTH CENTRAL:						
East North Central.....	+0.6	-1.7	-1.5	+28.1	+2.5	+1.9
West North Central.....	-6.3	-3.4	-2.4	+7.6	+1.3	-0.7
SOUTH:						
South Atlantic.....	+7.4	+3.5	+0.4	-10.5	-2.4	-4.5
East South Central.....	-9.6	-2.8	-0.2	-22.9	-6.2	-8.2
West South Central.....	-2.4	-1.0	+0.3	-11.8	-2.9	-3.3
WEST:						
Mountain.....	+11.3	+4.5	+1.5	+3.6	+3.1	+2.7
Pacific.....	+21.3	+6.7	+5.4	+27.4	+7.1	+12.9
NEW ENGLAND:						
Maine.....	-7.5	-3.5	-5.4	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Hampshire.....	+2.1	+1.2	-0.4	(*)	(*)	(*)
Vermont.....	-10.1	-2.8	-0.9	(*)	(*)	(*)
Massachusetts.....	-2.6	-1.6	-0.5	+32.1	+6.7	+12.1
Rhode Island.....	-3.6	-1.8	-1.5	(*)	(*)	(*)
Connecticut.....	+10.0	+1.4	+1.0	+71.1	+10.3	+14.1
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:						
New York.....	-0.5	-3.3	-2.5	+29.5	+3.9	+4.3
New Jersey.....	+10.3	+1.8	+7.0	+34.6	+6.5	+15.9
Pennsylvania.....	-5.6	-3.6	-2.7	+12.0	+0.7	+0.6
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:						
Ohio.....	+3.7	-0.9	-2.7	+25.6	+3.1	+0.3
Indiana.....	+0.5	-1.4	-0.1	+25.4	+2.5	+1.3
Illinois.....	-0.8	-1.7	-0.9	+28.3	+3.2	+4.3
Michigan.....	+0.5	-2.9	-1.4	+27.9	(Z)	+0.1
Wisconsin.....	-2.4	-1.4	-2.5	(*)	(*)	(*)
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:						
Minnesota.....	-3.4	-1.2	-0.9	(*)	(*)	(*)
Iowa.....	-9.1	-4.6	-6.1	(*)	(*)	(*)
Missouri.....	-4.3	-2.1	-2.0	+9.3	+1.0	-4.8
North Dakota.....	-16.9	-7.3	-6.6	(*)	(*)	(*)
South Dakota.....	-14.3	-7.3	-6.4	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nebraska.....	-9.3	-5.4	-3.7	(*)	(*)	(*)
Kansas.....	-2.7	-4.3	+2.1	+6.5	+0.2	+16.7
SOUTH ATLANTIC:						
Delaware.....	+21.0	+4.9	+10.7	+14.6	+3.5	-0.5
Maryland.....	+14.5	+3.9	+6.6	+9.3	+2.2	+9.8
District of Columbia.....	-41.1	-25.9	-19.0	+19.2	+4.6	-21.3
Virginia.....	+3.3	+2.9	+3.2	-9.5	-2.9	-0.3
West Virginia.....	-21.5	-9.7	-5.5	(*)	(*)	(*)
North Carolina.....	-4.0	-1.1	-0.6	-19.2	-5.6	-9.8
South Carolina.....	-0.3	+0.7	+2.2	-26.5	-8.6	-5.6
Georgia.....	-0.4	+0.1	-1.9	-19.2	-5.0	-8.0
Florida.....	+70.0	+19.8	+1.2	+16.6	+4.7	-3.3
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:						
Kentucky.....	-13.7	-4.9	-0.7	-7.6	-3.3	-1.1
Tennessee.....	-7.8	-2.8	+0.2	-10.7	-3.0	-3.7
Alabama.....	-6.9	-0.9	+0.1	-22.8	-6.0	-12.4
Mississippi.....	-9.3	-1.4	-0.7	-32.7	-9.4	-10.5
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:						
Arkansas.....	-19.1	-4.5	+2.9	-35.0	-9.3	-8.3
Louisiana.....	+2.4	+0.7	+4.7	-10.4	-3.0	-6.5
Oklahoma.....	-9.5	-4.2	-1.5	-13.0	-3.9	-2.9
Texas.....	+2.1	-0.1	-0.7	-2.7	-0.8	-0.3
MOUNTAIN:						
Montana.....	-4.0	-3.2	-5.6	(*)	(*)	(*)
Idaho.....	-7.0	-2.4	-7.0	(*)	(*)	(*)
Wyoming.....	-6.5	-2.0	-8.0	(*)	(*)	(*)
Colorado.....	+11.5	+4.0	+3.6	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Mexico.....	+8.5	+6.0	-10.8	(*)	(*)	(*)
Arizona.....	+51.9	+15.3	+8.2	(*)	(*)	(*)
Utah.....	+1.4	+0.9	(Z)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nevada.....	+53.2	+9.0	+28.8	(*)	(*)	(*)
PACIFIC:						
Washington.....	+3.0	+1.2	+1.2	(*)	(*)	(*)
Oregon.....	+0.7	-0.7	+0.1	(*)	(*)	(*)
California.....	+28.2	+8.5	+6.8	+52.7	+11.0	+13.1
Alaska.....	+45.5	+9.1	+9.7	(*)	(*)	(*)
Hawaii.....	+48.0	+15.2	-0.2	(*)	(*)	(*)

* Data for races other than white not shown for those States with a Negro population of less than 50,000 persons 15 to 64 years of age in 1960.

- Represents zero. Z Less than 0.05 percent.

¹All ages. Includes military and immigrants from abroad.

²Net migrants as a percent of census population 15 to 64 years of age; includes military.

³Net employed civilian migrants as a percent of average base population in the Work History File, 1960-65. Includes an unknown number of immigrants from abroad. CWHS color groups are: "white," which includes all races except Negro, and "Negro."

Table 4.--RATIO OF WORKERS FROM CWS FILE TO CENSUS POPULATION 15 TO 64 YEARS OF AGE, BY RACE, FOR STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS WITH NEGRO POPULATION OF 50,000 OR MORE: 1960

Standard metropolitan statistical area, rank, and size group ¹	White ²		Negro		Standard metropolitan statistical area, rank, and size group ¹	White ²		Negro	
Negro population in 1960 of 250,000 or more:					Negro population in 1960 of 50,000 to 99,000:				
New York, N.Y.....	60.3	60.5	Boston, Mass.....	66.5	60.5				
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.....	54.7	48.3	Buffalo, N.Y.....	54.8	51.8				
Chicago, Ill.....	58.9	50.4	Milwaukee, Wis.....	57.9	59.2				
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.....	52.5	47.3	Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.....	44.0	44.5				
Detroit, Mich.....	56.5	42.9	Columbus, Ohio.....	50.0	38.2				
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.....	55.5	45.9	Dayton, Ohio.....	50.8	36.5				
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.....	40.4	43.5	Louisville, Ky.-Ind.....	52.9	49.8				
Cleveland, Ohio.....	57.2	50.6	Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.....	58.3	48.4				
Baltimore, Md.....	52.2	50.3	Fort Worth, Tex.....	47.5	42.9				
Houston, Tex.....	50.7	44.6	Nashville, Tenn.....	55.6	38.0				
New Orleans, La.....	47.9	43.5							
Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.....	49.7	37.1	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.....	39.7	48.0				
			Orlando, Fla.....	44.9	38.5				
Negro population in 1960 of 100,000 to 249,000:					Charlotte, N.C.....	69.0	62.1		
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.....	49.0	33.8	Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange, Tex.....	47.5	43.5				
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	51.1	41.4	Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.....	61.2	48.9				
Newark, N.J.....	58.1	47.9	Shreveport, La.....	38.3	35.4				
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind.....	52.5	42.1	Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.....	50.7	47.9				
Dallas, Tex.....	60.5	52.5	Columbia, S.C.....	41.9	43.0				
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.....	56.0	49.0	Charleston, S.C.....	34.5	37.7				
Atlanta, Ga.....	65.5	52.8	Baton Rouge, La.....	44.2	35.9				
Indianapolis, Ind.....	60.9	48.1							
Miami, Fla.....	54.8	64.2	West Palm Beach, Fla.....	47.1	36.9				
Birmingham, Ala.....	52.1	41.6	Newport News-Hampton, Va.....	34.2	37.9				
			Jackson, Miss.....	61.0	37.6				
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.....	29.7	42.5	Columbus, Ga.-Ala.....	36.5	37.0				
Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, N.C.....	66.5	56.3	Augusta, Ga.-S.C.....	41.6	36.9				
Jacksonville, Fla.....	42.6	44.5	Montgomery, Ala.....	55.1	39.3				
Richmond, Va.....	65.8	60.4	Savannah, Ga.....	50.2	48.0				
Mobile, Ala.....	38.2	32.4	Macon, Ga.....	44.5	43.6				

¹As defined in 1968.
²All races except Negro.

Table 5.--NET MIGRATION RATES FROM CWS DATA, BY RACE, AND FROM INDEPENDENT ESTIMATES, FOR STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS WITH NEGRO POPULATION IN 1960 OF 50,000 OR MORE: 1960-1965

Standard metropolitan statistical area, rank, and size group ¹	CWS ²			Independent estimates ⁴	Standard metropolitan statistical area, rank, and size group ¹	CWS ²			Independent estimates ⁴
	All classes	White ³	Negro			All classes	White ³	Negro	
Negro population in 1960 of 250,000 or more:					Negro population in 1960 of 50,000 to 99,000:				
New York, N.Y.....	+0.3	-0.5	+6.5	+1.1	Boston, Mass.....	(Z)	-0.4	+14.0	-2.7
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.....	+10.3	+9.7	+18.6	+4.7	Buffalo, N.Y.....	-2.2	-2.7	+5.6	-4.9
Chicago, Ill.....	+0.2	-0.2	+3.5	+0.4	Milwaukee, Wis.....	-1.5	-1.9	+6.7	-4.2
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.....	-2.3	-2.6	-0.3	+1.3	Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.....	-2.1	-1.7	-4.7	+9.4
Detroit, Mich.....	-0.2	-0.7	+3.5	-1.4	Columbus, Ohio.....	+1.8	+2.0	-0.7	+3.4
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.....	+3.0	+3.2	+2.0	-0.1	Dayton, Ohio.....	+0.3	+0.1	+3.1	+1.1
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.....	+10.2	+10.5	+9.3	+10.1	Louisville, Ky.-Ind.....	+6.3	+6.8	+1.0	-1.1
Cleveland, Ohio.....	-0.5	-0.6	-0.2	-1.5	Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.....	-4.2	-6.3	+11.4	-5.0
Baltimore, Md.....	-0.3	-0.4	-0.1	+0.2	Fort Worth, Tex.....	+6.2	+5.6	+12.0	+1.5
Houston, Tex.....	+6.6	+7.5	+2.2	+8.9	Nashville, Tenn.....	+0.6	+2.0	-9.5	+3.1
New Orleans, La.....	+10.8	+13.8	+2.6	+4.6					
Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.....	+1.7	+3.2	-2.3	+0.7	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.....	+0.1	+1.4	-7.0	+22.7
Negro population in 1960 of 100,000 to 249,000:					Orlando, Fla.....	+5.1	+4.5	+8.7	+7.5
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.....	+6.8	+6.5	+12.2	+3.7	Charlotte, N.C.....	-1.9	-0.3	-8.7	+4.4
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	-0.7	-0.4	-6.5	-6.0	Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.....	-5.7	-4.3	-11.8	-5.8
Newark, N.J.....	+3.4	+2.6	+10.5	+3.8	Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.....	-4.1	-3.2	-10.2	-3.1
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind.....	-3.8	-4.5	+4.0	-1.1	Shreveport, La.....	-3.3	-3.2	-3.7	-6.0
Dallas, Tex.....	+6.5	+6.6	+6.0	+8.8	Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.....	+3.2	+6.1	-10.9	+5.4
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.....	+4.3	+4.5	+2.3	+0.8	Columbia, S.C.....	+1.1	+6.0	-14.4	+2.2
Atlanta, Ga.....	-0.4	+0.4	-4.6	+9.5	Charleston, S.C.....	-0.8	+1.9	-5.8	+4.4
Indianapolis, Ind.....	-0.2	-0.1	-2.0	-0.8	Baton Rouge, La.....	+16.0	+25.8	-19.0	+0.8
Miami, Fla.....	-7.8	-7.7	-8.1	+7.6					
Birmingham, Ala.....	-7.3	-6.4	-10.6	-4.7	West Palm Beach, Fla.....	+9.2	+10.2	+4.2	+15.7
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.....	-0.5	+4.0	-11.1	-0.3	Newport News-Hampton, Va.....	+19.5	+17.6	+24.1	+8.9
Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, N.C.....	+3.1	+4.2	-2.7	+0.4	Jackson, Miss.....	+2.0	+6.7	-11.2	+2.5
Jacksonville, Fla.....	+4.1	+5.6	-1.9	-0.2	Columbus, Ga.-Ala.....	-1.6	+0.9	-8.3	+6.7
Richmond, Va.....	+3.8	+6.2	-4.4	+4.3	Augusta, Ga.-S.C.....	+4.9	+6.7	-0.8	+0.9
Mobile, Ala.....	-1.9	-0.2	-7.4	-2.1	Montgomery, Ala.....	(Z)	+6.8	-18.8	-3.4
					Savannah, Ga.....	-11.7	-13.5	-7.4	-6.3
					Macon, Ga.....	-10.3	-5.7	-22.4	+2.1

Z Less than 0.05.
¹As defined in 1968.
²Net employed migrants as a percent of average base population, 1960-65; includes military.
³All races except Negro.
⁴Includes military.

Table 6.--COMPARISON OF CWS DERIVED ESTIMATES WITH INDEPENDENT ESTIMATES OF RESIDENT POPULATION, JULY 1, 1965, AND NET MIGRATION, 1960-1965, FOR STATES

Region, division, and State	Ratios of CWS estimates to independent estimates	Net migrants (thousands)		Net migration rates ¹	
		CWS estimates	Independent estimates	CWS estimates	Independent estimates
United States.....	1.000	+1,865	+1,865	+1.0	+1.0
REGIONS:					
Northeast.....	1.003	+424	+289	+0.9	+0.6
North Central.....	1.003	-760	-940	-1.4	-1.8
South.....	.990	+228	+829	+0.4	+1.4
West.....	1.009	+1,975	+1,686	+6.5	+5.6
NORTHEAST:					
New England.....	1.003	+49	+20	+0.5	+0.2
Middle Atlantic.....	1.003	+375	+269	+1.1	+0.8
NORTH CENTRAL:					
East North Central.....	1.001	-385	-436	-1.0	-1.2
West North Central.....	1.008	-374	-504	-2.4	-3.2
SOUTH:					
South Atlantic.....	.984	+341	+792	+1.3	+2.9
East South Central.....	.992	-210	-107	-1.7	-0.9
West South Central.....	.997	+92	+143	+0.5	+0.8
WEST:					
Mountain.....	.992	+123	+181	+1.7	+2.5
Pacific.....	1.014	+1,852	+1,505	+8.1	+6.6
NEW ENGLAND:					
Maine.....	.998	-47	-44	-4.8	-4.5
New Hampshire.....	.969	+9	+30	+1.4	+4.7
Vermont.....	1.035	+2	-12	+0.5	-3.0
Massachusetts.....	1.019	+19	-83	+0.4	-1.6
Rhode Island.....	1.009	-7	-15	-0.8	-1.7
Connecticut.....	.975	+71	+141	+2.7	+5.2
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:					
New York.....	1.000	+159	+153	+0.9	+0.9
New Jersey.....	1.018	+488	+367	+7.5	+5.7
Pennsylvania.....	.998	-270	-250	-2.4	-2.2
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:					
Ohio.....	.984	-250	-88	-2.5	-0.9
Indiana.....	1.018	-3	-88	-0.1	-1.8
Illinois.....	1.008	+1	-84	(Z)	-0.8
Michigan.....	1.005	-48	-87	-0.6	-1.1
Wisconsin.....	1.001	-86	-89	-2.1	-2.2
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:					
Minnesota.....	1.023	-28	-111	-0.8	-3.2
Iowa.....	.993	-173	-154	-6.3	-5.6
Missouri.....	.995	-72	-51	-1.6	-1.2
North Dakota.....	1.003	-33	-34	-5.1	-5.3
South Dakota.....	.990	-52	-46	-7.6	-6.7
Nebraska.....	1.003	-44	-48	-3.1	-3.3
Kansas.....	1.040	+26	-64	+1.2	-2.9
SOUTH ATLANTIC:					
Delaware.....	1.060	+48	+18	+9.8	+3.8
Maryland.....					
District of Columbia ²992	+224	+298	+2.7	+3.6
Virginia.....					
West Virginia.....	1.034	-77	-138	-4.1	-7.5
North Carolina.....	.980	-80	+17	-1.8	+0.3
South Carolina.....	1.013	+2	-32	+0.1	-1.3
Georgia.....	.956	-83	+110	-2.0	+2.6
Florida.....	.963	+311	+523	+5.9	+9.7
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:					
Kentucky.....	1.013	-33	-74	-1.1	-2.4
Tennessee.....	.989	-7	+34	-0.2	+0.9
Alabama.....	.982	-89	-25	-2.7	-0.7
Mississippi.....	.983	-80	-41	-3.6	-1.8
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:					
Arkansas.....	.989	+9	+31	+0.5	+1.7
Louisiana.....	1.023	+79	-3	+2.3	-0.1
Oklahoma.....	.996	-16	-6	-0.7	-0.3
Texas.....	.990	+19	+120	+0.2	+1.2
MOUNTAIN:					
Montana.....	.984	-34	-24	-5.0	-3.5
Idaho.....	.961	-53	-25	-7.9	-3.7
Wyoming.....	1.015	-21	-26	-6.3	-7.9
Colorado.....	1.009	+71	+54	+3.8	+2.9
New Mexico.....	.957	-101	-57	-10.5	-5.8
Arizona.....	1.001	+141	+140	+9.8	+9.7
Utah.....	1.004	+4	(Z)	+0.4	(Z)
Nevada.....	.998	+115	+118	+32.3	+32.5
PACIFIC:					
Washington.....	1.028	+29	-55	+1.0	-1.9
Oregon.....	.980	+30	+69	+1.6	+3.7
California.....	1.014	+1,735	+1,471	+10.1	+8.6
Alaska.....	1.161	+49	+7	+18.3	+2.8
Hawaii.....	.994	+9	+13	+1.3	+1.9

Z Less than 500 or 0.05.

¹Per 100 midperiod population.²Because Washington, D.C., is the central city of a metropolitan area with extensive suburbs in Maryland and Virginia, migration figures obtained on a State-by-State basis are not meaningful here. Numbers referring to District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia are therefore shown combined.

Table 7.—ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL RESIDENT POPULATION OF STATES, JULY 1, 1965, AND COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE SINCE APRIL 1, 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Region, division, and State	July 1, 1965	April 1, 1960 (census)	Change, 1960 to 1965		Components of change			
			Number	Percent	Births	Deaths	Net migration	
							Number	Rate ¹
United States.....	193,815	179,323	14,491	8.1	21,862	9,236	+1,865	+1.0
REGIONS:								
Northeast.....	47,563	44,678	2,885	6.5	4,983	2,522	+424	+0.9
North Central.....	54,365	51,619	2,746	5.3	6,195	2,689	-760	-1.4
South.....	59,561	54,973	4,588	8.3	7,071	2,707	+224	+0.4
West.....	32,325	28,053	4,272	15.2	3,614	1,317	+1,975	+6.5
NORTHEAST:								
New England.....	11,187	10,509	678	6.5	1,220	591	-49	+0.5
Middle Atlantic.....	36,376	34,168	2,207	6.5	3,763	1,931	+375	+1.1
NORTH CENTRAL:								
East North Central.....	38,354	36,225	2,129	5.9	4,378	1,864	-385	-1.0
West North Central.....	16,011	15,394	617	4.0	1,817	826	-374	-2.4
SOUTH:								
South Atlantic.....	28,345	25,972	2,374	9.1	3,322	1,289	+341	+1.3
East South Central.....	12,735	12,050	685	5.7	1,512	617	-210	-1.7
West South Central.....	18,480	16,951	1,529	9.0	2,238	801	+92	+0.5
WEST:								
Mountain.....	7,648	6,855	793	11.6	974	304	+123	+1.7
Pacific.....	24,677	21,198	3,479	16.4	2,640	1,013	+1,852	+8.1
NEW ENGLAND:								
Maine.....	984	969	14	1.5	118	57	-47	-4.8
New Hampshire.....	653	607	46	7.6	73	36	+9	+1.4
Vermont.....	417	390	27	6.9	48	23	+2	+0.5
Massachusetts.....	5,463	5,149	314	6.1	590	295	+19	+0.4
Rhode Island.....	899	859	40	4.6	95	48	-7	-0.8
Connecticut.....	2,772	2,535	237	9.3	296	130	+71	+2.7
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:								
New York.....	17,855	16,782	1,072	6.4	1,870	957	+159	+0.9
New Jersey.....	6,923	6,067	857	14.1	697	328	+488	+7.5
Pennsylvania.....	11,598	11,319	279	2.5	1,196	647	-270	-2.4
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Ohio.....	10,101	9,706	394	4.1	1,143	499	-250	-2.5
Indiana.....	4,987	4,662	324	6.9	570	243	-3	-0.1
Illinois.....	10,739	10,081	658	6.5	1,207	550	+1	(Z)
Michigan.....	8,373	7,823	550	7.0	967	369	-48	-0.6
Wisconsin.....	4,155	3,952	203	5.2	491	202	-86	-2.1
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Minnesota.....	3,648	3,414	234	6.9	430	168	-28	-0.8
Iowa.....	2,747	2,758	-11	-0.4	313	151	-173	-6.3
Missouri.....	4,479	4,320	159	3.7	487	256	-72	-1.6
North Dakota.....	654	632	21	3.4	82	28	-33	-5.1
South Dakota.....	682	681	2	0.2	88	34	-52	-7.6
Nebraska.....	1,464	1,411	53	3.7	172	75	-44	-3.1
Kansas.....	2,338	2,179	159	7.3	246	113	+26	+1.2
SOUTH ATLANTIC:								
Delaware.....	532	446	86	19.2	60	22	+48	+9.8
Maryland.....								
District of Columbia ²	8,691	7,832	859	11.0	1,020	385	+224	+2.7
Virginia.....								
West Virginia.....	1,881	1,860	21	1.1	196	98	-77	-4.1
North Carolina.....	4,846	4,556	290	6.4	579	206	-83	-1.8
South Carolina.....	2,598	2,383	215	9.0	322	109	+2	+0.1
Georgia.....	4,208	3,943	265	6.7	538	190	-83	-2.0
Florida.....	5,589	4,952	638	12.9	606	279	+311	+5.9
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Kentucky.....	3,213	3,038	175	5.8	368	160	-33	-1.1
Tennessee.....	3,806	3,567	239	6.7	425	179	-7	-0.2
Alabama.....	3,430	3,267	163	5.0	414	162	-89	-2.7
Mississippi.....	2,286	2,178	108	5.0	305	117	-80	-3.6
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Arkansas.....	1,925	1,786	139	7.8	228	98	+9	+0.5
Louisiana.....	3,641	3,257	384	11.8	464	159	+79	+2.3
Oklahoma.....	2,452	2,328	123	5.3	263	124	-16	-0.7
Texas.....	10,462	9,580	882	9.2	1,283	420	+19	+0.2
MOUNTAIN:								
Montana.....	692	675	18	2.6	86	34	-34	-5.0
Idaho.....	668	667	(Z)	0.1	83	30	-53	-7.9
Wyoming.....	336	330	6	1.9	42	15	-21	-6.3
Colorado.....	1,967	1,754	213	12.1	225	83	+71	+3.8
New Mexico.....	970	951	19	2.0	155	35	-101	-10.5
Arizona.....	1,587	1,302	284	21.8	202	59	+141	+9.8
Utah.....	996	891	105	11.8	134	33	+4	+0.4
Nevada.....	433	285	148	51.7	47	15	+116	+32.3
PACIFIC:								
Washington.....	3,065	2,853	212	7.4	325	142	+29	+1.0
Oregon.....	1,898	1,769	129	7.3	191	92	+30	+1.6
California.....	18,690	15,717	2,973	18.9	1,991	753	+1,735	+10.1
Alaska.....	310	226	83	36.9	41	7	+49	+18.3
Hawaii.....	715	633	82	13.0	92	19	+9	+1.3

Z Less than 500 or 0.05.

¹Per 100 midperiod population.²Because Washington, D.C., is the central city of a metropolitan area with extensive suburbs in Maryland and Virginia, migration figures obtained on a State-by-State basis are not meaningful here. Numbers referring to the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia are therefore shown combined.

Table 8.—ESTIMATES OF THE RESIDENT POPULATION OF RACES OTHER THAN WHITE, FOR STATES, JULY 1, 1965, AND COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE SINCE APRIL 1, 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Region, division, and State	July 1, 1965	April 1, 1960 (census)	Change, 1960 to 1965		Components of change			
			Number	Percent	Births	Deaths	Net migration	
							Number	Rate ¹
United States.....	23,077	20,491	+2,586	+12.6	3,561	1,118	+143	+0.7
REGIONS:								
Northeast.....	3,803	3,155	+648	+20.5	569	174	+253	+7.3
North Central.....	4,155	3,617	+539	+14.9	634	194	+99	+2.5
South.....	12,285	11,496	+789	+6.9	1,938	664	-485	-4.1
West.....	2,834	2,223	+611	+27.5	422	86	+275	+10.9
NORTHEAST:								
New England.....	357	267	+90	+33.7	55	13	+48	+15.4
Middle Atlantic.....	3,446	2,888	+558	+19.3	514	161	+205	+6.5
NORTH CENTRAL:								
East North Central.....	3,426	2,972	+454	+15.3	511	153	+96	+3.0
West North Central.....	730	645	+85	+13.1	123	41	+3	+0.4
SOUTH:								
South Atlantic.....	6,371	5,924	+447	+7.5	996	333	-216	-3.5
East South Central.....	2,811	2,711	+100	+3.7	449	167	-182	-6.6
West South Central.....	3,103	2,861	+242	+8.5	493	164	-87	-2.9
WEST:								
Mountain.....	425	341	+85	+24.8	80	15	+20	+5.2
Pacific.....	2,408	1,882	+526	+27.9	342	71	+255	+11.9
NEW ENGLAND:								
Maine.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Hampshire.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Vermont.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Massachusetts.....	166	125	+40	+32.1	25	7	+22	+15.1
Rhode Island.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Connecticut.....	152	111	+40	+36.1	24	5	+21	+15.9
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:								
New York.....	1,807	1,495	+312	+20.8	277	82	+117	+7.1
New Jersey.....	680	528	+152	+28.9	102	29	+79	+13.1
Pennsylvania.....	959	865	+94	+10.8	135	50	+9	+1.0
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Ohio.....	887	797	+90	+11.3	123	42	+9	+1.1
Indiana.....	315	274	+42	+15.2	49	15	+8	+2.7
Illinois.....	1,273	1,071	+202	+18.9	207	59	+54	+4.6
Michigan.....	841	737	+104	+14.1	110	33	+27	+3.4
Wisconsin.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Minnesota.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Iowa.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Missouri.....	430	397	+33	+8.2	71	26	-12	-2.9
North Dakota.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
South Dakota.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nebraska.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Kansas.....	128	100	+28	+27.9	17	6	+17	+14.9
SOUTH ATLANTIC:								
Delaware.....	71	62	+9	+14.4	12	4	+1	+1.5
Maryland.....	1,960	1,770	+190	+10.7	295	102	-3	-0.2
District of Columbia ²								
Virginia.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
West Virginia.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
North Carolina.....	1,194	1,157	+37	+3.2	185	61	-87	-7.4
South Carolina.....	882	832	+50	+6.0	136	45	-41	-4.8
Georgia.....	1,184	1,126	+58	+5.1	194	66	-70	-6.1
Florida.....	992	888	+104	+11.7	164	49	-11	-1.2
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Kentucky.....	231	218	+13	+5.9	32	17	-2	-0.9
Tennessee.....	633	589	+44	+7.4	96	37	-15	-2.5
Alabama.....	986	983	+3	+0.3	155	58	-94	-9.5
Mississippi.....	961	921	+40	+4.4	166	55	-71	-7.5
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Arkansas.....	406	391	+15	+3.9	67	24	-28	-7.0
Louisiana.....	1,114	1,045	+69	+6.6	185	61	-55	-5.1
Oklahoma.....	242	220	+22	+9.9	39	13	-4	-1.7
Texas.....	1,341	1,205	+136	+11.3	202	66	(Z)	(Z)
MOUNTAIN:								
Montana.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Idaho.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Wyoming.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Colorado.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Mexico.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Arizona.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Utah.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nevada.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
PACIFIC:								
Washington.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Oregon.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
California.....	1,693	1,262	+431	+34.2	238	50	+243	+16.4
Alaska.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Hawaii.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)

* Data for races other than white not shown for those States with a Negro population of less than 50,000 persons 15 to 64 years of age in 1960.
Z Less than 500 or 0.05.

¹Per 100 midperiod population.

²Because Washington, D.C., is the central city of a metropolitan area with extensive suburbs in Maryland and Virginia, migration figures obtained on a State-by-State basis are not meaningful here. Numbers referring to District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia are therefore shown combined.

Table 9.—ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL RESIDENT POPULATION AND THE RESIDENT POPULATION OF RACES OTHER THAN WHITE, BY AGE, FOR STATES: JULY 1, 1965

(In thousands)

Region, division, and State	All classes				Races other than white			
	All ages	Under 18 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over	All ages	Under 18 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over
United States.....	193,815	70,397	105,255	18,162	23,077	10,268	11,408	1,401
REGIONS:								
Northeast.....	47,563	16,121	26,609	4,833	3,803	1,561	2,056	186
North Central.....	54,365	19,996	28,993	5,376	4,155	1,841	2,083	232
South.....	59,561	22,349	31,979	5,233	12,285	5,630	5,799	856
West.....	32,325	11,932	17,674	2,719	2,834	1,236	1,470	127
NORTHEAST:								
New England.....	11,187	3,890	6,115	1,182	357	156	188	14
Middle Atlantic.....	36,376	12,230	20,494	3,651	3,446	1,405	1,868	172
NORTH CENTRAL:								
East North Central.....	38,354	14,165	20,623	3,566	3,426	1,510	1,735	181
West North Central.....	16,011	5,831	8,371	1,809	730	331	348	51
SOUTH:								
South Atlantic.....	28,345	10,510	15,384	2,452	6,371	2,903	3,083	386
East South Central.....	12,735	4,815	6,762	1,159	2,811	1,311	1,269	232
West South Central.....	18,480	7,024	9,833	1,623	3,103	1,417	1,448	238
WEST:								
Mountain.....	7,648	3,040	4,002	605	425	213	195	17
Pacific.....	24,677	8,891	13,672	2,114	2,408	1,023	1,275	111
NEW ENGLAND:								
Maine.....	984	357	515	112	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Hampshire.....	653	231	347	75	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Vermont.....	417	153	218	46	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Massachusetts.....	5,463	1,878	2,992	593	166	71	87	8
Rhode Island.....	899	303	500	96	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Connecticut.....	2,772	969	1,543	261	152	68	79	5
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:								
New York.....	17,855	5,915	10,108	1,832	1,807	723	1,002	82
New Jersey.....	6,923	2,373	3,917	633	680	288	361	31
Pennsylvania.....	11,598	3,942	6,469	1,186	959	394	505	59
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Ohio.....	10,101	3,737	5,437	927	887	380	456	51
Indiana.....	4,987	1,851	2,671	464	315	142	155	19
Illinois.....	10,739	3,821	5,889	1,028	1,273	570	637	66
Michigan.....	8,373	3,199	4,467	707	841	363	437	42
Wisconsin.....	4,155	1,557	2,158	440	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Minnesota.....	3,648	1,394	1,870	384	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Iowa.....	2,747	990	1,419	337	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Missouri.....	4,479	1,554	2,401	524	430	191	205	33
North Dakota.....	654	253	337	63	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
South Dakota.....	682	265	341	77	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nebraska.....	1,464	533	758	173	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Kansas.....	2,338	842	1,245	251	128	55	64	9
SOUTH ATLANTIC:								
Delaware.....	532	203	288	41	71	32	34	4
Maryland.....	8,691	3,222	4,833	636	1,960	853	996	111
District of Columbia ¹								
Virginia.....								
West Virginia.....	1,881	671	1,025	184	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
North Carolina.....	4,846	1,825	2,658	363	1,194	566	565	73
South Carolina.....	2,598	1,032	1,394	171	882	423	408	51
Georgia.....	4,208	1,622	2,262	324	1,184	549	554	81
Florida.....	5,589	1,935	2,922	732	992	453	482	56
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Kentucky.....	3,213	1,185	1,713	315	231	95	113	23
Tennessee.....	3,806	1,376	2,085	345	633	281	300	52
Alabama.....	3,430	1,319	1,819	293	986	459	447	80
Mississippi.....	2,286	935	1,145	205	961	475	409	76
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Arkansas.....	1,925	700	1,011	214	406	191	175	39
Louisiana.....	3,641	1,473	1,897	271	1,114	529	504	81
Oklahoma.....	2,452	847	1,334	271	242	110	113	19
Texas.....	10,462	4,004	5,592	866	1,341	587	656	98
MOUNTAIN:								
Montana.....	692	268	359	66	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Idaho.....	668	260	345	63	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Wyoming.....	336	129	178	29	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Colorado.....	1,967	742	1,054	171	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Mexico.....	970	421	488	62	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Arizona.....	1,587	634	830	123	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Utah.....	996	425	503	68	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nevada.....	433	163	246	24	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
PACIFIC:								
Washington.....	3,065	1,104	1,664	297	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Oregon.....	1,898	665	1,029	203	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
California.....	18,690	6,702	10,417	1,571	1,693	713	906	75
Alaska.....	310	134	170	5	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Hawaii.....	715	286	392	37	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)

* Data for races other than white not shown for those States with a Negro population of less than 50,000 persons 15 to 64 years of age in 1960.

¹Because Washington, D.C., is the central city of a metropolitan area with extensive suburbs in Maryland and Virginia, migration figures obtained on a State-by-State basis are not meaningful here. Numbers referring to District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia are therefore shown combined.

Table 10.—TOTAL RESIDENT POPULATION AND RESIDENT POPULATION OF RACES OTHER THAN WHITE, BY AGE, FOR STATES: APRIL 1, 1960

(In thousands)

Region, division, and State	All classes				Races other than white			
	All ages	Under 18 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over	All ages	Under 18 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over
United States.....	179,323	64,202	98,562	16,560	20,491	8,724	10,512	1,256
REGIONS:								
Northeast.....	44,678	14,714	25,466	4,498	3,155	1,163	1,829	163
North Central.....	51,619	18,573	27,967	5,078	3,617	1,482	1,934	200
South.....	54,973	20,754	29,637	4,582	11,496	5,161	5,546	789
West.....	28,053	10,160	15,492	2,401	2,223	918	1,202	103
NORTHEAST:								
New England.....	10,509	3,552	5,835	1,122	267	105	148	14
Middle Atlantic.....	34,168	11,161	19,630	3,377	2,888	1,058	1,681	149
NORTH CENTRAL:								
East North Central.....	36,225	13,058	19,808	3,358	2,972	1,216	1,605	151
West North Central.....	15,394	5,515	8,159	1,720	645	266	330	49
SOUTH:								
South Atlantic.....	25,972	9,667	14,205	2,099	5,924	2,651	2,925	348
East South Central.....	12,050	4,649	6,349	1,052	2,711	1,245	1,248	218
West South Central.....	16,951	6,438	9,083	1,430	2,861	1,264	1,373	224
WEST:								
Mountain.....	6,855	2,713	3,614	527	341	162	162	16
Pacific.....	21,198	7,447	11,877	1,873	1,882	755	1,040	87
NEW ENGLAND:								
Maine.....	969	349	514	107	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Hampshire.....	607	210	329	68	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Vermont.....	390	142	204	44	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Massachusetts.....	5,149	1,709	2,868	572	125	48	69	8
Rhode Island.....	859	281	489	90	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Connecticut.....	2,535	861	1,432	243	111	45	62	5
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:								
New York.....	16,782	5,336	9,758	1,688	1,495	524	902	70
New Jersey.....	6,067	2,010	3,496	560	528	203	298	27
Pennsylvania.....	11,319	3,815	6,376	1,129	865	332	481	52
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Ohio.....	9,706	3,508	5,301	897	797	319	433	45
Indiana.....	4,662	1,699	2,518	446	274	114	143	16
Illinois.....	10,081	3,439	5,667	975	1,071	433	584	55
Michigan.....	7,823	2,959	4,226	638	737	307	398	32
Wisconsin.....	3,952	1,453	2,096	403	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Minnesota.....	3,414	1,283	1,776	354	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Iowa.....	2,758	987	1,443	328	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Missouri.....	4,390	1,459	2,357	503	397	160	206	31
North Dakota.....	632	252	322	59	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
South Dakota.....	681	262	347	72	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nebraska.....	1,411	500	747	164	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Kansas.....	2,179	772	1,167	240	100	39	52	9
SOUTH ATLANTIC:								
Delaware.....	446	163	248	36	62	26	33	4
Maryland.....								
District of Columbia ¹	7,832	2,820	4,427	585	1,770	728	939	102
Virginia.....								
West Virginia.....	1,860	702	986	173	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
North Carolina.....	4,556	1,775	2,469	312	1,157	549	544	63
South Carolina.....	2,383	992	1,240	151	832	418	365	48
Georgia.....	3,943	1,533	2,119	291	1,126	513	538	75
Florida.....	4,952	1,681	2,717	553	888	380	462	46
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Kentucky.....	3,038	1,140	1,606	292	218	83	113	22
Tennessee.....	3,567	1,314	1,944	309	589	251	292	47
Alabama.....	3,267	1,290	1,716	261	983	456	452	75
Mississippi.....	2,178	905	1,083	190	921	455	391	74
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Arkansas.....	1,786	669	923	194	391	181	170	39
Louisiana.....	3,257	1,315	1,700	242	1,045	483	486	77
Oklahoma.....	2,328	815	1,264	249	220	96	104	20
Texas.....	9,580	3,639	5,196	745	1,205	504	613	88
MOUNTAIN:								
Montana.....	675	260	349	65	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Idaho.....	667	268	341	58	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Wyoming.....	330	128	177	26	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Colorado.....	1,754	649	947	158	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Mexico.....	951	409	491	51	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Arizona.....	1,302	517	695	90	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Utah.....	891	382	449	60	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nevada.....	285	100	168	18	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
PACIFIC:								
Washington.....	2,853	1,027	1,547	279	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Oregon.....	1,769	631	954	184	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
California.....	15,717	5,449	8,892	1,376	1,262	492	714	57
Alaska.....	226	89	132	5	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Hawaii.....	633	251	353	29	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)

* Data for races other than white not shown for those States with a Negro population of less than 50,000 persons 15 to 64 years of age in 1960.

¹Because Washington, D.C., is the central city of a metropolitan area with extensive suburbs in Maryland and Virginia, migration figures obtained on a State-by-State basis are not meaningful here. Numbers referring to District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia are therefore shown combined.

Table 11.—RACES OTHER THAN WHITE AS A PERCENT OF THE TOTAL RESIDENT POPULATION OF STATES, BY AGE: JULY 1, 1965, AND APRIL 1, 1960

Region, division, and State	July 1, 1965				April 1, 1960			
	All ages	Under 18 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over	All ages	Under 18 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over
United States.....	11.9	94.6	10.8	7.7	11.4	13.6	10.7	7.6
REGIONS:								
Northeast.....	8.0	9.7	7.7	3.9	7.1	7.9	7.2	3.6
North Central.....	7.6	9.2	7.2	4.3	7.0	8.0	6.9	3.9
South.....	20.6	25.2	18.1	16.3	20.9	24.9	18.7	17.2
West.....	8.8	10.4	8.3	4.7	7.9	9.0	7.8	4.3
NORTHEAST:								
New England.....	3.2	4.0	3.1	1.2	2.5	2.9	2.5	1.3
Middle Atlantic.....	9.5	11.5	9.1	4.7	8.5	9.5	8.6	4.4
NORTH CENTRAL:								
East North Central.....	8.9	10.7	8.4	5.1	8.2	9.3	8.1	4.5
West North Central.....	4.6	5.7	4.2	2.8	4.2	4.8	4.0	2.9
SOUTH:								
South Atlantic.....	22.5	27.6	20.0	15.7	22.8	27.4	20.6	16.6
East South Central.....	22.1	27.2	18.8	20.0	22.5	26.8	19.7	20.7
West South Central.....	16.8	20.2	14.7	14.7	16.9	19.6	15.1	15.6
WEST:								
Mountain.....	5.6	7.0	4.9	2.8	5.0	6.0	4.5	3.0
Pacific.....	9.8	11.5	9.3	5.2	8.9	10.1	8.8	4.6
NEW ENGLAND:								
Maine.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Hampshire.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Vermont.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Massachusetts.....	3.0	3.8	2.9	1.3	2.4	2.8	2.4	1.4
Rhode Island.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Connecticut.....	5.5	7.0	5.1	1.8	4.4	5.2	4.3	1.9
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:								
New York.....	10.1	12.2	9.9	4.5	8.9	9.8	9.2	4.1
New Jersey.....	9.8	12.1	9.2	4.9	8.7	10.1	8.5	4.8
Pennsylvania.....	8.3	10.0	7.8	5.0	7.6	8.7	7.5	4.6
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Ohio.....	8.8	10.2	8.4	5.5	8.2	9.1	8.2	5.0
Indiana.....	6.3	7.6	5.8	4.0	5.9	6.7	5.7	3.7
Illinois.....	11.9	14.9	10.8	6.4	10.6	12.6	10.3	5.6
Michigan.....	10.0	11.3	9.8	5.9	9.4	10.4	9.4	5.0
Wisconsin.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:								
Minnesota.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Iowa.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Missouri.....	9.6	12.3	8.5	6.4	9.2	11.0	8.7	6.3
North Dakota.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
South Dakota.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nebraska.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Kansas.....	5.5	6.5	5.2	3.6	4.6	5.1	4.5	3.6
SOUTH ATLANTIC:								
Delaware.....	13.3	15.9	11.9	10.1	13.9	15.7	13.2	10.5
Maryland.....								
District of Columbia ¹	22.5	26.5	20.6	17.4	22.6	25.8	21.2	17.5
Virginia.....								
West Virginia.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
North Carolina.....	24.6	30.5	21.3	20.1	25.4	31.0	22.0	20.2
South Carolina.....	33.9	41.0	29.3	29.7	34.9	42.1	29.5	31.8
Georgia.....	28.1	33.9	24.5	24.9	28.6	33.5	25.4	25.9
Florida.....	17.7	23.4	16.5	7.7	17.9	22.6	17.0	8.4
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Kentucky.....	7.2	8.0	6.6	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.0	7.5
Tennessee.....	16.6	20.5	14.4	15.1	16.5	19.1	15.0	15.2
Alabama.....	28.8	34.8	24.6	27.4	30.1	35.4	26.4	28.6
Mississippi.....	42.0	50.8	35.7	37.2	42.3	50.3	36.1	39.1
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:								
Arkansas.....	21.1	27.3	17.3	18.4	21.9	27.1	18.4	19.9
Louisiana.....	30.6	35.9	26.6	29.9	32.1	36.7	28.6	31.9
Oklahoma.....	9.9	13.0	8.5	7.1	9.5	11.8	8.3	8.0
Texas.....	12.8	14.7	11.7	11.3	12.6	13.8	11.8	11.8
MOUNTAIN:								
Montana.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Idaho.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Wyoming.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Colorado.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
New Mexico.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Arizona.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Utah.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Nevada.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
PACIFIC:								
Washington.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Oregon.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
California.....	9.1	10.6	8.7	4.8	8.0	9.0	8.0	4.1
Alaska.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Hawaii.....	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)

* Data for races other than white not shown for those States with a Negro population of less than 50,000 persons 15 to 64 years of age in 1960.

¹Because Washington, D.C., is the central city of a metropolitan area with extensive suburbs in Maryland and Virginia, migration figures obtained on a State-by-State basis are not meaningful here. Numbers referring to District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia are therefore shown combined.

Table A-1.—PERCENT NEGRO OF TOTAL POPULATION 15 TO 64 YEARS OF AGE AND OF TOTAL WORKERS IN CWS FILE, FOR STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS WITH NEGRO POPULATION OF 50,000 OR MORE: 1960

Standard metropolitan statistical area, rank, and size group ¹	Percent Negro of total population 15 to 64 years old	Percent Negro of total workers in CWS File	Standard metropolitan statistical area, rank, and size group ¹	Percent Negro of total population 15 to 64 years old	Percent Negro of total workers in CWS File
Negro population in 1960 of 250,000 or more:			Negro population in 1960 of 50,000 to 99,000:		
New York, N.Y.....	11.5	11.5	Boston, Mass.....	2.9	2.7
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.....	7.5	6.6	Buffalo, N.Y.....	6.2	5.9
Chicago, Ill.....	13.6	11.8	Milwaukee, Wis.....	4.5	4.5
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.....	15.1	13.8	Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.....	11.6	11.8
Detroit, Mich.....	14.5	11.4	Columbus, Ohio.....	10.5	8.2
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.....	13.2	11.1	Dayton, Ohio.....	9.5	7.0
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.....	23.3	24.6	Louisville, Ky.-Ind.....	10.9	10.3
Cleveland, Ohio.....	13.3	11.9	Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.....	14.2	12.1
Baltimore, Md.....	20.3	19.7	Fort Worth, Tex.....	9.9	9.0
Houston, Tex.....	18.6	16.8	Nashville, Tenn.....	17.9	13.0
New Orleans, La.....	26.1	26.2	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.....	15.0	17.6
Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.....	34.0	27.8	Orlando, Fla.....	16.2	14.2
Negro population in 1960 of 100,000 to 249,000:			Charlotte, N.C.....	22.2	20.4
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.....	8.1	5.8	Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange, Tex.....	19.3	17.9
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	6.5	5.4	Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.....	16.4	13.6
Newark, N.J.....	12.9	10.9	Shreveport, La.....	30.4	28.7
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind.....	10.2	8.4	Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.....	17.7	16.9
Dallas, Tex.....	13.7	12.1	Columbia, S.C.....	25.9	26.4
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.....	10.2	9.1	Charleston, S.C.....	33.6	35.6
Atlanta, Ga.....	21.5	18.1	Baton Rouge, La.....	29.8	25.6
Indianapolis, Ind.....	10.5	8.5	West Palm Beach, Fla.....	23.2	24.2
Miami, Fla.....	13.9	15.9	Newport News-Hampton, Va.....	26.4	28.5
Birmingham, Ala.....	29.5	26.0	Jackson, Miss.....	36.3	25.9
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.....	23.9	31.1	Columbus, Ga.-Ala.....	26.8	27.0
Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, N.C.....	18.8	16.4	Augusta, Ga.-S.C.....	26.3	24.1
Jacksonville, Fla.....	22.0	22.7	Montgomery, Ala.....	34.1	27.0
Richmond, Va.....	25.0	23.4	Savannah, Ga.....	32.6	31.8
Mobile, Ala.....	28.4	25.2	Macon, Ga.....	28.3	27.8

¹As defined in 1968.

Table A-2.—STANDARD ERRORS OF 1960-1965 NET MIGRATION RATES BASED ON CWS DATA, FOR STATES

(1 Sigma)

Region, division, and State	All classes	White ¹	Negro	Region, division, and State	All classes	White ¹	Negro
United States.....	-	-	-	WEST NORTH CENTRAL--Continued			
REGIONS:				Missouri.....	0.7	0.7	2.0
Northeast.....	0.2	0.2	0.6	North Dakota.....	2.6	2.6	(*)
North Central.....	0.2	0.2	0.6	South Dakota.....	2.3	2.3	(*)
South.....	0.2	0.2	0.5	Nebraska.....	1.3	1.3	(*)
West.....	0.3	0.3	1.4	Kansas.....	1.2	1.2	6.3
NORTHEAST:				SOUTH ATLANTIC:			
New England.....	0.4	0.4	2.7	Delaware.....	2.4	2.6	6.2
Middle Atlantic.....	0.2	0.2	0.6	Maryland.....	0.8	1.0	1.8
NORTH CENTRAL:				District of Columbia.....	2.0	2.4	3.4
East North Central.....	0.2	0.2	0.7	Virginia.....	0.8	0.9	1.6
West North Central.....	0.4	0.4	1.9	West Virginia.....	1.2	1.2	5.1
SOUTH:				North Carolina.....	0.6	0.7	1.3
South Atlantic.....	0.3	0.3	0.6	South Carolina.....	1.0	1.1	1.9
East South Central.....	0.5	0.5	1.0	Georgia.....	0.8	0.9	1.4
West South Central.....	0.4	0.4	0.8	Florida.....	0.8	0.9	1.6
WEST:				EAST SOUTH CENTRAL:			
Mountain.....	0.7	0.8	5.9	Kentucky.....	1.0	1.1	3.0
Pacific.....	0.3	0.3	1.3	Tennessee.....	0.8	0.9	1.8
NEW ENGLAND:				Alabama.....	0.9	1.1	1.7
Maine.....	1.4	1.4	(*)	Mississippi.....	1.2	1.5	2.0
New Hampshire.....	1.8	1.8	(*)	WEST SOUTH CENTRAL:			
Vermont.....	2.6	2.6	(*)	Arkansas.....	1.4	1.6	2.8
Massachusetts.....	0.5	0.5	4.1	Louisiana.....	0.9	1.2	1.5
Rhode Island.....	1.3	1.3	(*)	Oklahoma.....	1.1	1.2	4.7
Connecticut.....	0.7	0.8	3.8	Texas.....	0.4	0.5	1.0
MIDDLE ATLANTIC:				MOUNTAIN:			
New York.....	0.2	0.3	0.8	Montana.....	2.2	2.2	(*)
New Jersey.....	0.4	0.6	1.8	Idaho.....	2.6	2.6	(*)
Pennsylvania.....	0.3	0.3	1.2	Wyoming.....	3.6	3.6	(*)
EAST NORTH CENTRAL:				Colorado.....	1.4	1.4	(*)
Ohio.....	0.4	0.4	1.3	New Mexico.....	2.4	2.4	(*)
Indiana.....	0.6	0.6	2.5	Arizona.....	1.7	1.7	(*)
Illinois.....	0.4	0.4	1.1	Utah.....	1.7	1.7	(*)
Michigan.....	0.4	0.4	1.2	Nevada.....	3.9	4.0	(*)
Wisconsin.....	0.6	0.6	(*)	PACIFIC:			
WEST NORTH CENTRAL:				Washington.....	0.9	0.9	(*)
Minnesota.....	0.7	0.7	(*)	Oregon.....	1.2	1.2	(*)
Iowa.....	0.9	0.9	(*)	California.....	0.3	0.3	1.4
				Alaska.....	3.7	3.7	(*)
				Hawaii.....	2.0	2.0	(*)

*Data for races other than white not shown for those States with a Negro population of less than 50,000 persons 15 to 64 years of age in 1960.

-Represents zero.

¹All races except Negro.

Table A-3.--STANDARD ERRORS OF 1960-1965 NET MIGRATION RATES BASED ON CWHS DATA, FOR STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS

(1 Sigma)

Standard metropolitan statistical area, rank, and size group ¹	All classes	White ²	Negro	Standard metropolitan statistical area, rank, and size group ¹	All classes	White ²	Negro
Negro population in 1960 of 250,000 or more:				Negro population in 1960 of 50,000 to 99,000:			
New York, N.Y.....	0.4	0.4	1.1	Boston, Mass.....	0.8	0.8	5.3
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.....	0.7	0.7	2.5	Buffalo, N.Y.....	1.2	1.2	4.5
Chicago, Ill.....	0.5	0.6	1.3	Milwaukee, Wis.....	1.2	1.2	5.4
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.....	0.7	0.7	1.6	Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.....	2.6	2.7	7.3
Detroit, Mich.....	0.7	0.7	1.7	Columbus, Ohio.....	2.1	2.2	6.8
St. Louis, Mo.-Ill.....	1.0	1.1	2.6	Dayton, Ohio.....	1.9	2.0	6.6
Washington, D.C.-Md.-Va.....	1.4	1.7	2.4	Louisville, Ky.-Ind.....	1.8	1.9	5.3
Cleveland, Ohio.....	1.1	1.2	2.7	Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.....	2.0	2.2	4.3
Baltimore, Md.....	1.0	1.2	2.1	Fort Worth, Tex.....	2.8	2.9	8.9
Houston, Tex.....	1.7	1.8	3.6	Nashville, Tenn.....	2.5	2.7	6.4
New Orleans, La.....	2.0	2.5	3.3	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla.....	4.6	5.0	10.7
Memphis, Tenn.-Ark.....	2.3	2.8	3.5	Orlando, Fla.....	4.5	4.8	12.4
Negro population in 1960 of 100,000 to 249,000:				Charlotte, N.C.....			
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.....	1.2	1.3	4.9	Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.....	3.0	3.4	6.3
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	0.9	1.0	3.6	Chattanooga, Tenn.-Ga.....	3.5	3.8	8.1
Newark, N.J.....	1.3	1.4	4.0	Shreveport, La.....	3.0	3.3	7.5
Cincinnati, Ohio-Ky.-Ind.....	1.4	1.4	4.2	Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.....	4.6	5.6	7.3
Dallas, Tex.....	1.7	1.8	4.7	Columbia, S.C.....	3.6	4.1	7.2
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.....	1.6	1.7	4.3	Charleston, S.C.....	3.8	4.4	7.2
Atlanta, Ga.....	1.7	1.9	3.5	Baton Rouge, La.....	4.4	5.8	6.7
Indianapolis, Ind.....	1.6	1.7	4.7	West Palm Beach, Fla.....	4.9	5.7	9.8
Miami, Fla.....	2.1	2.3	4.6	Newport News-Hampton, Va.....	5.0	5.5	11.7
Birmingham, Ala.....	2.1	2.5	3.9	Jackson, Miss.....	4.7	5.6	8.6
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.....	3.1	3.9	5.1	Columbus, Ga.-Ala.....	3.9	4.7	6.7
Greensboro--Winston-Salem--High Point, N.C.	2.1	2.3	4.8	Augusta, Ga.-S.C.....	4.7	5.7	7.6
Jacksonville, Fla.....	3.5	4.0	7.4	Montgomery, Ala.....	4.2	5.0	7.4
Richmond, Va.....	2.3	2.7	4.4	Savannah, Ga.....	4.6	5.6	7.9
Mobile, Ala.....	3.9	4.6	7.1	Macon, Ga.....	4.4	5.5	7.4
					5.2	6.5	8.6

¹As defined in 1968.²All races except Negro.

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

FIRST CLASS MAIL
