

For Release on Delivery
Wednesday, September 15, 1971
10 a.m. (C.D.T.) (11 a.m. E.D.T.)

REGIONAL GROWTH, MIGRATION, AND
ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY

A Convocation Address by

Andrew F. Brimmer
Member
Board of Governors of the
Federal Reserve System

Presented At

Bishop College
Dallas, Texas

September 15, 1971

REGIONAL GROWTH, MIGRATION, AND
ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY

By

Andrew F. Brimmer*

When I was invited to speak at this institution, I was told that I could select any topic. With such a wide choice, I could have focused readily (and easily) on the host of problems in the area of national and international economic policy. Because of my own responsibilities, I do share in the official efforts to resolve the tenacious problems of inflation, unemployment, and the persistent deficit in our country's balance of payments.

However, I decided against that route. Instead, because Bishop College is predominantly a black institution, I thought it might be useful to present the results of some work I have been doing recently on trends in economic conditions in the black community. Because this college is located in Dallas -- one of the leading cities

*Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

I am indebted to a number of persons for assistance in the preparation of these remarks. At the Board, Mr. David Wyss and Mrs. Diane Sower undertook the econometric analysis of net migration based on Census Bureau statistics. Mr. Wyss also did the analysis of gross migration patterns based on Social Security data. Miss Harriett Harper made the informal survey of welfare trends in leading cities, and Mr. Albert Teplin undertook the analysis of regional growth and income trends. In the Department of Commerce, Messrs. Robert Graham and David A. Hirschberg provided statistics on State and regional economic activity; Mr. Hirschberg also did the computer work required to obtain data from the Social Security One Per Cent Sample Survey. I am also indebted to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for sharing with me their 1970 data on patterns of employment in American industry by occupation, race and State.

in the Southwest (but which also inherited an historic legacy from the Old South) -- it might be interesting to focus particularly on the recent economic experience of blacks in the South.

Almost daily, the Nation's attention is drawn to some new aspect of the social and political revolution that is reshaping the lives of Negroes and whites in the South. The further withering of racial segregation (especially in the public schools) and the widening participation of Negroes in voting and other aspects of the political process naturally receive most of the attention. Simultaneously, however, another side of the racial revolution in the South is also of considerable importance. This is the quickening tempo of economic progress among blacks in this section of the country. From time to time, notice is taken of the wider sharing of blacks in the area's economic activity, but the breadth of the changing situation is not always fully appreciated.

On the other hand, Negroes are still leaving the South at a heavy rate. The pace of out-migration has been so strong that today just over half of the black population lives in the South -- compared to three-fifths as recently as a decade ago. This large net outflow of blacks is in sharp contrast to the sizable net inflow of whites to the South. It is true that blacks increasingly are finding the South a better place in which to live (and a few prominent Negroes have attracted national attention by returning home

to the South). Yet, on balance, the disincentives inducing blacks to leave the region still seem to out-weigh the advantages inducing them to remain or to return. And when blacks leave the South -- to a greater extent than is true of whites -- they are likely to move into the heavily populated urban areas of the North and West -- areas with a galaxy of problems that need not be catalogued here. Thus, the pattern of migration -- black and white -- in relation to economic development is interesting (and important) both regionally and nationally.

Some of the results of the studies I have had underway are presented in the rest of these remarks. It might be helpful to summarize the highlights here:

- During the decade of the 1960's, the South recorded the highest rate of economic growth among the major regions of the country. As a result, its share of the nation's income rose significantly.
- Blacks participated substantially in the South's economic progress. However, the extent of sharing was quite uneven from one State to another. There continues to be a noticeable short-fall in the proportion of nonfarm jobs held by blacks, especially in the Deep South States. Nevertheless, Negroes' share of total money income did expand during the 1960's.
- Yet, net migration of blacks from the South remains exceptionally large. Between 1960 and 1970, the net outflow from Border States moderated, but it continued heavy from Deep South States -- the same States in which the short-fall in jobs for blacks remains the largest. On the other hand, a closer look at the movement of blacks out of the South -- based on gross migration rather than on net migration figures -- suggests that the tendency

for blacks to leave the South is roughly the same as it is for whites. The observed differences in the rate of net migration are due mainly to the failure of the South to attract blacks from other regions.

- In trying to explain the heavy net outflow of Negroes from the South, most students of the question have identified better jobs and higher incomes as the main incentives. However, some observers have suggested that the movement may be partly in response to higher welfare benefits in the North and West. Still others have suggested that differences in educational opportunities may partly account for the higher rate among blacks. The results of my own work (some of it supported by computer-based econometric analysis) indicate that brighter job and income prospects are the main factors influencing the movement of blacks from the South -- the same incentives which induce most whites to move. State differences in educational expenditures seem to have a small but noticeable effect on the migration of blacks -- but not on the migration of whites. State differences in welfare payments also appear to be positively related to net migration rates for blacks, but not for whites. Yet, for blacks, the impact is extremely small. Moreover, the States with high welfare payments are also the States with high incomes and high outlays for education. So, one cannot readily unravel the joint effects of these factors on migration.

This conclusion is reinforced by the results of an informal survey of welfare trends in 25 of the leading cities with the largest Negro population. All of them have experienced large increases in recent years in the number of persons receiving public assistance. However, the number of Negroes as a proportion of all persons on welfare appears to be unrelated to the pattern of net migration experienced by the cities during the 1960's. Moreover, there seems to be no appreciable difference in the situation in Southern cities compared to those in the North and West.

- This analysis has led me to conclude that, as economic growth in the South continues, blacks will have a chance to share even more fully in the benefits of economic development. However, to realize this potential, there must be an accelerated effort -- on the part of whites as well as on the part of blacks -- to bring about genuine equality of opportunity. In response to such an improved environment, more Negroes (especially young people) would probably remain in the South. While some observers would encourage them to stay in order to lessen further pressures in the urban areas of the North and West, I would do so for another reason: since the South is making the investment in its youth -- both black and white (and although it remains inadequate compared with the national average) -- the South itself should get a larger share of the benefits from the development of its human resources.

We can now turn to a fuller discussion of these main points.

Regional Economic Growth

During the last decade, the South expanded faster than any other major region in all principal types of economic activity. The contours of this performance can be traced in the growth and distribution of civilian income from current production. On the basis of data in Table 1 (attached), it appears that income in the South expanded at an annual average rate of 8.1 per cent, between 1960 and 1970, compared with 6.6 per cent for all other regions and 6.8 per cent for the country as a whole. As a result, the South's share of income from current production rose from 15.4 per cent to 17.3 per cent of the total.

In the South, as in the rest of the Nation, the highest annual rate of growth was registered in the government sector (10.1 per cent vs. 9.6 per cent), followed by services (9.7 per cent and 8.7 per cent, respectively). But, relative to the performance of other geographic areas, the South's widest lead in the rate of growth was in the manufacturing sector. Here the annual rate of expansion in the South was 9.0 per cent, compared with 6.0 per cent for other regions and 6.4 per cent for the country. In 1960, income originating in manufacturing accounted for 24.1 per cent of the total in the South; the corresponding figures were 30.6 per cent in other regions and 29.9 per cent in the country at large. By 1970, the South had made up a substantial part of the lag. In that year, the proportions of income earned in the factory sector were: South, 26.3 per cent; other regions, 29.0 per cent; and the United States, 28.5 per cent. Paralleling the expansion in manufacturing, the South's traditionally heavier reliance on farming lessened much faster than was the case in the rest of the country. In 1960, about 7.5 per cent of the South's income from current production arose in agriculture, compared with 4.2 per cent in other regions and 4.7 per cent for the Nation. Last year, the farm share had shrunk to 4.7 per cent in the South, to 2.8 per cent in other regions, and to 3.1 per cent in the country as a whole.

Negroes Share in Regional Expansion

As indicated above, Negroes did share extensively in the expansion of economic activity in the South in the last decade. But this was also true of Negroes in the North and West. Consequently, it is necessary to ask whether blacks in the South did relatively better -- or worse -- than their brothers in the rest of the country. To obtain an answer, one must examine the evidence relating both to jobs and income in each State.

The ideal information for this purpose will be provided by the 1970 Census of Population. Since this will not be available for some time, I have relied on the data collected by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) -- based on annual reports submitted by private employers with 100 or more workers. These figures were used to calculate Negro employment as a percentage of total nonfarm employment and in principal occupations in the 28 States and the District of Columbia with a substantial proportion of Negroes in their population. The calculations were made for 1966 and 1970, so one can study employment trends during the last half of the 1960's. For comparison purposes, the percentage of Negroes in the total population in each State in 1970 was also calculated. The results are shown in Table 2.

Several important aspects of blacks' employment situation stand out in these data. The first thing to note is the rise in the

share of total jobs held by blacks in the country as a whole -- a rise from 8.2 per cent in 1966 to 10.3 per cent in 1970. Since Negroes constituted 11.2 per cent of the total population, the gap between their shares of population and jobs narrowed appreciably -- to about 1 percentage point. This relatively small spread should be kept in mind, because it will serve as a useful benchmark in the discussion below. At the national level, the position of blacks in the principal occupations differed considerably. They were greatly under-represented in the white collar fields -- and heavily over-represented in the blue collar and service occupations.

In most regions, the population-jobs gap among blacks narrowed substantially between 1966 and 1970. Leaving aside Washington, D. C., Negroes' share of population and their share of total employment reported in the EEOC statistics in 1970 differed by only one or two percentage points in all States -- except in those located in the heart of the South. In these States, the population-jobs deficit was exceptionally large, with blacks' share of population exceeding their share of jobs by the following percentage points: Tennessee, 3.3; North Carolina, 5.9; South Carolina, 9.6; Georgia, 5.3; Alabama, 7.4; Mississippi, 12.9; Louisiana, 8.9; Arkansas, 5.2. In contrast, the situation was far different in the Border States and in those making up the outer rim of the South: Virginia, 0.1; West Virginia, 1.1; Florida, 1.5; Oklahoma, 0.8; Texas, 0.9; and Kentucky, no gap at all.

In these figures, one can see a large part of the explanation of why there is a continuing heavy migration of blacks from the South. Those Southern States -- and especially those in the Deep South -- in which the deep jobs deficits prevail are also the States showing the largernet outflows of black population.

Trends in the Level of Income

The improvement in black employment has also been reflected in both their absolute and relative income positions. For example, in 1969, Negroes in the United States had a median family income of \$5,998, according to figures published by the Bureau of the Census. The median was \$9,793 for whites and \$9,433 for all families in the country. Thus, in 1969, the black-white median income ratio was 61.0 per cent, and the black-total ratio was 63.5 per cent. In 1959, the median income of Negro families was \$3,721 (expressed in 1969 prices); the median was \$7,360 for whites and \$7,058 for all families. In 1959, the median income of blacks was 50.5 per cent of the median for whites and 52.5 per cent of that for all families. So, over the decade, Negroes registered significant improvement in their relative income position in the Nation at large. However, the absolute gap between black and white incomes widened further. In 1959, the median for black families was \$3,639 below that for white families and \$2,337 below the median for all families in the country. By 1969, the margin of white over black income had risen to \$3,795, and the margin for all families had climbed to \$3,435.

Over the last decade, income trends for blacks differed significantly among the principal regions of the country. In the North and West, blacks' relative position improved somewhat -- but to a lesser extent than it did in the South. In 1959, in the North and West, the black-white median income ratio was 71.0 per cent, and the black-total ratio was 72.1 per cent. By 1969, the black vs. white ratio had risen moderately to 72.7 per cent and the black vs. total to 74.1 per cent. In the South, the proportions were: black-white, 45.5 per cent in 1959 and 56.8 per cent in 1969; black-total, 51.1 per cent in 1959 and 61.5 per cent in 1969.

Historically, the widest absolute gaps between the incomes of blacks and whites have been found in the South, and the differences were strengthened further during the last decade. For instance, in 1959, the typical white family in the South had \$3,414 more in money income than the typical black family. In the North and West, the edge favoring whites was \$2,245. By 1969, the margin had climbed to \$3,776 for whites in the South and to \$2,790 for whites in the North and West. Within each region, the trend in the income gap between blacks and whites varied somewhat, depending on the place of residence. Among families living in central cities of metropolitan areas in the South, the spread declined over the decade -- from \$3,422 in 1959 to \$3,317 in 1969. For similarly situated families in the North and West, the spread rose during the same period -- from \$2,555 to \$2,664.

In both regions, the difference in income between black and white families living in the suburban rings of metropolitan areas became even greater: in the South the spread increased from \$4,226 in 1959 to \$4,338 in 1969; in the North and West, the increase was from \$2,771 to \$2,987. Again, in both regions the trends in relative incomes of blacks and whites reflected the accelerated movement of whites from central cities to the suburbs.

Today -- as for many years -- the families with the lowest incomes are still found in the South, among both blacks and whites. For both races in the South (as in the rest of the Nation) the poor were found outside of metropolitan areas. In 1969, median family income for blacks in small Southern towns and rural areas was \$3,699, and for whites it was \$7,487. The highest incomes among blacks in the South (\$6,256) were received by those in suburban rings of metropolitan areas--which was also true of whites (\$10,594). So, within the black community, the ratio of the lowest to the highest incomes was 59 per cent; among whites it was 71 per cent.

Trends in Regional Income Distribution

During the last decade, the South made noticeable gains in its share of the Nation's total money income. This was an outcome one would expect -- given the faster pace of economic growth in the region compared with the rest of the country. Simultaneously, an

outcome that was not equally expected is the degree to which Negroes in the South shared in the overall redistribution of income. The extent of the regional shift in income shares and the division between blacks and whites can be traced in Tables 3, 4, and 5. Respectively, these tables show total money income in 1959 and 1969, total population in 1960 and 1970, and the percentage distribution of income and population -- all by region, race and, metropolitan or nonmetropolitan residence. In broad terms, of the \$605 billion of total money income in 1969, residents of the South received \$161 billion, and \$444 billion were received by residents of the North and West. In the Nation as a whole, Negroes got \$38.7 billion, whites received \$561 billion, and the remainder accrued to other races. Other details describing trends in the distribution of income are shown in the tables.

However, the essence of the story is told by comparisons of population and income distributions among regions and between blacks and whites. The results are shown in Table 5. These data indicate clearly the sizable shift in the distribution of income that occurred over the last decade. For example, the South had about the same proportion of the Nation's total population (30.5 per cent) in both 1960 and 1970. Yet, its share of total money income rose from 24.4 per cent in 1959 to 26.6 per cent in 1969; a gain of 2.2 percentage points. The North and West with the residual population

(69.5 per cent) experienced a shrinkage in its income share from 75.6 per cent to 73.4 per cent, a loss of 2.2 percentage points. While these may appear to be relatively small statistical changes, they represent a shift of over \$13 billion of total money income to the South. This shift was equal to about 8 per cent of the region's total income in 1969.

The other noticeable shift in income distribution was the rise in the share of total money income received by Negroes. They received 5.1 per cent of the total in 1959 and 6.4 per cent in 1969, a gain of 1.3 percentage points. This percentage change was equivalent to \$5 billion -- equal to 13 per cent of Negroes' total money income in 1969.

Within the black community, however, the bulk of the relative gain (three-fifths) accrued to Negroes in the North and West, and only two-fifths accrued to blacks in the South. At the beginning of the decade, three-fifths of the black population were in the South, and two-fifths were in the North and West. However, the division of income between blacks in the North and West and those in the South was 57 per cent and 43 per cent, respectively, in 1959. The same proportionate division in income prevailed in 1969. On the other hand, high net migration rates had changed drastically the distribution of the black population between the two regions --

reducing the fraction in the South from 61 per cent in 1960 to 53 per cent in 1970. Thus, a sizable improvement occurred in per capita as well as in total income of blacks in the South. For them, the change meant that their share of the Nation's total money income rose from 2.21 per cent in 1959 to 2.74 per cent in 1969. This represented a shift of about \$3.2 billion in their favor over the course of the decade.

In summary, these figures indicate that, during the 1960's, the Nation saw a significant redistribution of income with respect to both regions and racial groups. The North and West lost to the South 2.2 percentage points in relative income shares. Within the South, that gain was split roughly 25-75 per cent between blacks and whites. At the same time, however, blacks in the North and West also improved their relative position -- raising their share of the Nation's total money income from 2.87 per cent in 1959 to 3.66 per cent in 1969. Thus, there seems to have been a redistribution of relative shares from whites located in the North and West to Negroes of that region and to both whites and blacks living in the South.

Having noted these improvements, however, we should also note that blacks as a group are still lagging considerably behind whites in the Nation at large in terms of their overall share of income. In 1969, Negroes constituted 11.3 per cent of the total population, but they received only 6.4 per cent of total money income.

In 1959, the population and income proportions were 10.3 per cent and 5.1 per cent, respectively. So, while a moderate narrowing of the gap occurred over the decade, the absolute short-fall suffered by blacks remains large -- and poses one of the strongest challenges still facing the United States.

Net Migration From the South

As I indicated at the outset, the continued heavy net migration of Negroes from the South is one of the most striking characteristics of the contemporary economic scene in the United States. Between 1960 and 1970, the net outflow of blacks from the region amounted to about 1,380,000. (See Table 6.) Over the same period, net migration added 1,807,000 to the area's white population.

The large out-migration of blacks during the decade as shown in the 1970 Census of Population came as a surprise. In fact, the Census Bureau had been projecting a sharply reduced annual rate of outflow during the decade. The Bureau's estimate had put the annual rate at approximately 80,000, or substantially below the annual net outflow of 147,000 in the 1950-60 period and 160,000 in the 1940-50 years. As it developed, the annual rate of net migration of blacks from the South was about 138,000 between 1960 and 1970 -- not appreciably different from the rate recorded in the previous two decades.

Actually, the reported figures on net migration of blacks from the South as a whole fail to show the great diversity of experience

among different States. The situation in individual States is described by the statistics in Table 6, showing net migration in each of the last three decades. The general picture which emerges is easily understood: in a number of Southern States, the expected slowdown in the rate of net migration of Negroes did occur in the 1960's. In fact, the moderating trend was already evident in the 1950's. Nearly all of these were Border States. In contrast, there was virtually no slackening in the rate of outflow of blacks from the Deep South. Seven of these States (North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas and West Virginia) lost more than 15 per cent of their 1960 population through net migration during the decade of the 1960's. In five of these, the loss was nearly equal to one-quarter of their 1960 Negro population. The rate of loss was much smaller in Tennessee, Virginia, Florida, Oklahoma, and Texas. Kentucky had a small net gain through migration of blacks, and Texas almost broke even.

While the Southern States continued to lose a sizable share of their black population in the last decade, about a half dozen Northern and Western States (New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Michigan, Illinois, and California) were adding substantially to their Negro population through the net inflow of migrants. All of these (except Maryland) gained more than 100,000 new citizens on this basis. These inflows represented expansions in their respective 1960 black population of nearly one-third in California, about one-quarter in New York and New Jersey, and one-sixth in Maryland and Michigan.

In contrast, while blacks were moving into these six States in great numbers, whites were leaving them (except for Maryland and California) in even larger numbers. In percentage terms, the net out-migration of whites was fairly small, but the pattern was comprehensive and unmistakable.

Public Welfare and Migration

The reasons why blacks leave the South in such large numbers seems fairly obvious to most students who have studied the question; they move in search of better employment opportunities and higher incomes. These are the same factors that induce whites to migrate -- and which induce blacks to move from one area to another within the North and West.

However, some observers have suggested that many blacks move from the South into large cities of the North and West in order to obtain more generous welfare benefits. In view of the lack of evidence supporting this notion, one might have thought that it would have ceased to be current. In fact, several studies (including a comprehensive one recently published by the Urban Institute) have produced findings which cast doubt on the validity of the argument. Yet, the idea continues to flourish. The matter is of more than passing academic interest. It has been urged by a number of influential spokesmen that public welfare policies be refashioned to reduce the incentive that may be provided low income groups (meaning mainly blacks) to move into large urban areas.

As I was preparing these remarks, I thought another effort should be made to determine whether a connection can be established between the pattern of black migration and the availability of welfare benefits. The task was undertaken in two parts. The first involved an informal telephone survey of the 30 leading cities with the largest Negro population. The second involved a computer-based econometric analysis of the principal factors influencing net migration rates.

In the informal telephone inquiry (in which officials in 26 cities were finally reached^{1/}) information was requested on the total number of persons receiving public assistance and the approximate percentage which Negroes represented of the total in mid-1971. The same information was requested for five years earlier. In all 26 cities, figures were provided for the total number of persons on the welfare roles in mid-1971, and in 17 cities a rough estimate for the proportion of blacks was also obtained. The reports for earlier years (mainly 1965-1966) were less complete, and very few figures were available showing blacks as a percentage of the total.

The statistical information obtained is shown in Table 7. For comparison purposes, the table also shows for each of the 26 cities

^{1/} For a variety of reasons (such as vacations and misplaced messages) successful contact was not made in four cities: Philadelphia, Pa.; Richmond, Va.; Jacksonville, Fla.; and Milwaukee, Wisc.

the Negro population in 1970, the change during 1960-70, and the ratio of Negro to total population in 1970. Net migration during 1960-70 in each of the cities for Negroes and other races is also indicated.^{2/}

Several conclusions are suggested by these results: in each of the 17 cities reporting information, blacks do make up a substantial proportion of the total number of persons receiving welfare assistance. The smallest proportion (about one-fifth) was reported by Boston. In New York City and Buffalo, blacks represented about two-fifths. They were around one-half in Columbus, Ohio, Los Angeles, California, and in Houston and Dallas, Texas. In the remaining cities (except Washington, D. C.) the ratio was in the 70-90 per cent range. In the Nation's Capitol blacks made up virtually all of the welfare rolls.

Another striking feature of these data is the substantial variation by region and net migration experience. The cities in the South showed as much diversity as cities in the North and West. Cities which lost population by the net out-migration of blacks had proportionately as many blacks on the welfare rolls as did cities which gained population. These data suggest that, if there is a relationship between welfare benefits and black migration, it is far from obvious.

^{2/} Figures were not available for Negroes separately. In the country as a whole, Negroes constitute 92 per cent of this group. However, in particular cities (especially on the West Coast where many Orientals live) the Negro percentage would be smaller.

The same conclusion is suggested by the results produced by the computer-based econometric analysis of net migration mentioned above. The objective of the analysis was to identify and to measure quantitatively the main factors which affect interstate net migration rates of black and white people. It was assumed that the most important incentive for both races was provided by income differentials among States -- that is, migrants would move to the location of the more favorable economic climate. In addition, an attempt was made to account for migration patterns which may be in response to factors that are not purely economic -- such as racial discrimination (for blacks) or retirement conditions (for whites).

The statistical methods used are described in the appendix (attached) and need not be discussed here.^{3/} The key statistical tests performed related net migration rates to state differences in per capita personal income, welfare benefits, and expenditures on elementary and secondary education. An effort also was made to capture the effects of an observed tendency for Negroes to leave the South at above-average rates and for whites to move at above-average rates into a few states (Florida, Arizona, and Nevada) offering strong retirement and recreational incentives. The analysis was carried out with the assistance of several members of the Board's staff.

^{3/} For those with a technical interest in the subject, the estimating technique used in this study was multiple regression analysis. Tests of the models were performed using data for the continental United States and the District of Columbia for the Census decades 1950-1960 and 1960-1970. These data appear in Appendix Table 1. The regression statistics are shown in Appendix Table 2.

In general, I wanted to know the answer to the following question: By how much should one expect net migration rates to vary in response to differences in per capita personal income among states. The answer can be stated in terms of changes in the ratio of per capita income in a given state to average per capita income in the nation as a whole. The tests based on 1950-60 migration data suggested that a 1.0 percentage point change in the income ratio might induce a parallel change of 0.76 per cent in the net migration rate for blacks and of 0.31 per cent in the rate for whites. The tests based on 1960-70 data yielded roughly the same estimate (0.70 per cent) for blacks, but the second estimate for whites was much smaller (0.08 per cent).^{4/} In other words, a relative improvement in a state's income position would induce both blacks and whites to migrate into its territory -- but the response of blacks would be much stronger than that of whites.

To estimate the effects of welfare payments on the direction of migration, payment per recipient under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program was added to the basic test. The results suggest that black migrants, in fact, may respond positively to state differences in welfare programs, whereas whites may not. A 1.0 percentage point change in welfare payments per recipient may be associated with a 0.17 per cent change in the net migration rate for blacks and with a -0.11 per cent change in the rate for whites.

^{4/} In technical terms, the 1960-70 estimate for whites is not statistically significant, and may be underestimated.

In interpreting these results, extra caution is required. Welfare benefits may be positively related to per capita income, since States with high incomes also typically have high welfare benefits. Moreover, it will be noted even for blacks the estimated influence of income substantially outweighs the influence of welfare (about 0.70 per cent vs. 0.17 per cent). So, given the necessary limitations of data and the statistical estimating techniques, I assign much more importance to income as a factor affecting net migration rates among blacks than I assign to welfare payments.

A second variation in the basic test was made to estimate the effects of State differences in educational opportunities on net migration rates. For this purpose, educational expenditures per pupil in elementary and secondary schools were used instead of welfare payments. Again, it appears that black migrants might respond positively to State differences in educational outlays, but whites may not. A 1.0 percentage point change in educational outlays per pupil may be associated with a 0.19 per cent change in the net migration rate for blacks and with a -0.15 per cent change in the rate for whites. However, in this case also, I must repeat the cautionary comment made above. High education expenditures and high incomes are generally found in the same States, and the statistical tests may be attributing effects to education which are actually due to differences in income.

In summary, these several statistical tests indicate that most people (both black and white) seem to move more in response to

economic conditions than to differences in either welfare benefits or educational advantages. In fact, the statistical measures suggest that there is steady pressure for people to move out of any given state unless it is counter-balanced by a strong growth in income.

Gross Migration and Income Gains

As I indicated at the outset, it is necessary to look beyond the net migration figures if one is to get a clear understanding of the direction and cause of movements. The Census Bureau's statistics on net migration are the most readily available, so they are the ones relied on by most analysis.

Fortunately, however, there is another set of statistics which a few other investigators have used to examine migration patterns. These figures are contained in the one per cent sample of Social Security records, and I have been able to draw on them for the present study. In the first quarter of 1970, the sample contained records on approximately 800,000 individual workers, of whom more than 80,000 were Negroes. The Social Security records yielded a rich harvest of information, including data on race, sex, age, income, and region of employment. I was also able to obtain data from the sample for the first quarter of 1965. Since workers keep the same Social Security numbers throughout their lives, information from the sample can be used to answer a variety of questions relating to migration.

I have summarized in Tables 8, 9, and 10 gross and net migration rates for men by region, age, and race for the period 1965-1970.

Several aspects of black-white migration patterns, which were hidden by the Census Bureau figures on net migration, stand out most dramatically. In the first place, it is clear from Table 8 that the tendency for blacks to leave the South is not greatly different from the propensity of whites to migrate. For example, among men age 25-44, the gross out-migration rate was 15.9 per cent for blacks and 12.8 per cent for whites. On the other hand, the gross in-migration rate for blacks was far below that for whites (6.1 per cent vs. 14.1 per cent). The result was a net outflow of black men (-9.8 per cent), compared with a small net gain (1.3 per cent) for white men. On the other hand, the pattern of migration did vary considerably with age. In both races, men 45 and over had much lower migration rates (gross and net) than was the case in the younger age group.

Thus, it is the South's failure to attract black people from other regions -- rather than an exceptional tendency for its black citizens to leave -- that accounts for the high net outflow reported in the Census statistics. As one would expect, when blacks do leave the South, they are likely to move to the same Northern and Western states that already have large Negro populations. This expectation is strongly supported by the data in Table 9, showing origin and destination of men who migrated in the 1965-70 period. For present purposes, however, the most valuable information from the Social Security sample relates to migration and income, presented in Table 10. In all eight

regions, the incomes of black migrants were below those of black workers who did not move. The same was true of white migrants in four of the regions, but not including the Southeast where migrants' incomes were one per cent above the incomes of those who remained at home.

In all race and age categories, wages of migrants from the South increased more over the five-year period than did incomes of non-migrants. This was especially noticeable in the 25-44 age bracket, where black male migrants averaged wages 18.5 per cent below non-migrants in 1965 and 14.5 per cent above in 1970. This represented an improvement relative to non-migrants of 33 percentage points.-- the largest gain recorded for any group. White male migrants from the South increased their relative income from one per cent above the incomes of non-migrants to 14 per cent above -- a relative increase of 13 percentage points.

In summary, the foregoing analysis strongly suggests that Negroes are not leaving the South in abnormally high numbers. About as great a proportion of whites as of blacks leave the region. The difference in net migration is caused by the fact that blacks do not migrate into the South at the same pace.

Concluding Observations

In conclusion, the analysis presented here has convinced me that, as economic growth in the South continues, blacks will have a

chance to share more fully in the benefits of economic development. However, to realize this potential, there must be an accelerated effort -- on the part of whites as well as on the part of blacks -- to bring about genuine equality of opportunity.

In response to such an improved environment, more Negroes (especially young people) would probably remain in the South. While some observers would encourage them to stay in order to lessen further pressures in urban areas of the North and West, I would do so for another reason: Since the South is making the investment in its youth -- both black and white (and although it remains inadequate compared with the national average) -- the South itself should get a larger share of the benefits from the development of its human resources.

Table 1. Civilian Income from Participation in Current Production, by Industry, and Region, 1960 and 1970.

(Billions of Dollars)

INDUSTRY	UNITED STATES				SOUTHEAST				ALL OTHER REGIONS			
	1960	1970	Change Amount	Annual Average Growth Rate	1960	1970	Change Amount	Annual Average Growth Rate	1960	1970	Change Amount	Annual Average Growth Rate
Total	319.3	617.4	298.1	6.8	49.3	106.8	57.5	8.1	270.0	510.6	240.6	6.0
Farms	14.9	19.1	4.2	2.5	3.7	5.0	1.3	3.1	11.2	14.1	2.9	2.3
Mining	4.3	6.6	2.3	4.4	1.1	1.9	0.8	5.6	3.2	4.7	1.5	3.9
Contract Construction	21.0	38.6	17.6	6.3	3.4	7.2	3.8	7.8	17.6	31.4	13.8	5.9
Manufacturing	94.6	176.1	81.5	6.4	11.9	28.1	16.2	9.0	52.7	148.0	65.3	6.0
Wholesale and Retail Trade	62.4	105.5	43.1	5.4	9.7	18.3	8.6	6.6	52.7	87.2	34.5	5.1
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	16.2	33.2	17.0	7.4	2.4	5.2	2.8	8.1	13.8	28.0	14.2	7.3
Transportation, Communi- cation, and Public Utilities	24.8	44.9	20.1	6.1	3.8	7.8	4.0	7.4	21.0	37.1	16.1	5.9
Services	41.7	96.3	54.6	8.7	6.1	15.3	9.2	9.7	35.6	81.0	45.4	8.6
Government	38.2	95.2	57.0	9.6	6.8	17.8	11.0	10.1	31.4	77.4	46.0	9.4
Other	1.0	1.9	0.9	6.6	0.2	0.4	0.2	7.2	0.8	1.5	0.7	6.5

Source: Survey of Current Business, Vol. 41, No. 8, August, 1961, Table 70, p. 19, and Vol. No. 51, No. 8, August, 1971, Table 70, p.37.

Table 2. Negro Employment as a Percentage of Total Employment in Principal Occupations in Selected States, 1966 and 1970

State	Negro As Per Cent of Total		Total Employment		White Collar		Officials & Managers		Professional		Technical		Sales Workers		Office & Clerical		Blue Collar		Craftsmen		Operatives		Laborers		Service Workers	
	Pop.		1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970
	1970	1966	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970
<u>United States</u>	11.2	8.2	10.3	2.5	4.8	0.9	1.9	1.3	2.5	4.1	6.2	2.4	4.4	3.5	7.4	10.7	13.2	3.6	5.6	10.8	14.2	21.1	21.9	23.0	26.6	
<u>New England</u>																										
Massachusetts	3.1	2.9	3.7	1.3	2.3	0.4	1.0	0.7	1.4	2.0	3.1	0.7	1.8	1.8	3.6	3.5	4.3	1.7	2.3	3.7	4.7	6.1	6.2	3.6	10.0	
Connecticut	6.0	5.3	7.3	1.8	3.4	0.6	1.1	0.7	1.4	2.6	4.1	1.7	2.5	2.8	5.7	7.2	10.0	2.7	4.5	8.1	12.5	13.4	13.7	13.9	18.8	
<u>Mideast</u>																										
New York	11.9	7.6	10.7	4.4	8.2	1.3	2.7	2.0	3.9	5.9	8.4	2.8	5.0	6.6	13.3	9.2	11.7	3.9	6.0	9.5	12.4	17.4	19.2	21.7	26.6	
New Jersey	10.9	9.8	11.3	3.1	5.1	1.3	2.2	2.1	2.7	5.2	7.3	2.7	4.1	4.0	7.7	14.3	16.1	5.4	7.2	15.3	17.9	23.7	22.9	23.6	27.5	
Pennsylvania	8.7	6.2	7.5	2.5	4.4	0.8	1.6	1.2	2.1	4.1	6.6	2.7	4.0	3.2	6.7	7.1	8.0	3.6	4.6	7.0	7.9	13.0	13.7	20.1	23.8	
Delaware	14.2	11.0	12.9	1.7	3.5	0.7	1.7	0.5	1.6	2.6	4.0	3.1	4.6	2.2	5.4	18.6	21.9	4.5	5.7	17.0	19.3	43.0	45.0	27.1	31.9	
Maryland	17.9	16.0	18.6	3.7	7.3	1.6	3.7	1.6	3.2	6.0	9.9	4.6	8.1	4.6	10.2	22.0	26.5	6.4	11.5	21.6	26.5	47.2	49.3	43.8	46.7	
District of Columbia	71.0	24.4	33.1	10.3	20.6	4.2	9.0	6.2	10.3	17.5	26.8	9.3	25.1	13.7	28.8	33.6	43.5	10.9	17.6	42.7	55.1	68.1	73.9	65.1	72.6	
<u>North Central</u>																										
Michigan	11.2	10.6	13.7	3.1	6.6	1.0	2.7	1.3	3.5	3.9	7.2	3.7	5.9	4.5	10.8	14.2	17.2	3.3	5.0	17.9	21.1	16.5	21.9	22.7	28.5	
Ohio	9.1	7.1	9.0	2.2	4.2	0.8	1.7	1.0	2.2	4.6	6.3	2.4	4.0	2.7	6.1	8.4	10.4	3.0	4.5	9.4	11.7	13.7	15.9	25.1	28.2	
Indiana	6.9	6.1	7.9	1.6	3.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	3.2	6.3	1.8	3.4	1.9	4.3	7.6	9.3	3.1	4.2	8.2	10.4	11.1	12.6	17.7	23.2	
Illinois	12.8	11.0	13.0	3.9	6.8	1.2	2.5	1.7	2.8	4.1	7.6	2.9	6.4	6.2	10.6	15.1	17.3	5.4	7.8	15.8	18.8	24.9	25.7	25.7	26.5	
Wisconsin	2.9	3.2	3.8	0.8	1.5	0.3	0.7	0.3	1.2	1.0	1.9	0.9	1.4	1.0	2.2	4.3	5.0	1.5	2.0	5.2	6.2	5.4	5.6	7.0	8.0	
Missouri	10.3	8.2	11.0	2.5	5.7	0.8	1.8	1.6	6.0	6.6	9.4	2.6	5.0	2.8	6.9	9.3	12.2	3.1	5.5	9.6	12.4	18.8	22.2	31.4	37.3	
<u>Southeast</u>																										
Virginia	18.6	16.0	18.5	2.9	5.6	1.6	2.8	1.2	3.7	6.0	8.6	3.5	6.3	3.0	7.0	20.8	24.8	7.2	11.4	16.4	23.3	48.7	46.2	43.2	47.7	
West Virginia	4.3	3.1	3.2	0.8	1.5	0.2	0.4	1.4	1.0	0.8	2.2	1.2	1.8	0.9	2.2	3.1	3.2	1.4	2.0	3.4	3.5	5.1	4.5	15.7	14.0	
Kentucky	7.5	6.9	7.5	1.6	3.2	0.7	1.2	0.9	2.3	4.2	5.5	1.7	3.4	1.7	4.1	7.5	8.2	2.8	3.3	5.8	8.7	16.1	12.7	25.5	26.2	
Tennessee	16.1	10.5	12.8	2.0	4.2	0.8	1.8	1.7	1.8	5.9	8.2	2.0	4.1	1.9	5.4	12.0	15.5	3.8	6.2	10.4	15.1	26.1	28.8	37.1	39.8	
North Carolina	22.4	12.6	16.5	2.3	5.0	0.8	1.8	1.8	4.1	6.7	6.9	2.6	6.2	2.2	6.4	14.5	19.7	4.7	8.5	10.5	18.2	42.0	41.1	45.8	50.1	
South Carolina	30.4	14.4	20.8	1.8	4.1	0.6	1.4	1.4	1.7	4.3	7.9	2.9	7.3	1.7	4.6	17.2	25.3	5.9	10.7	13.3	24.6	47.0	50.2	38.7	54.5	
Georgia	25.9	15.9	20.6	2.9	6.6	1.0	2.4	2.8	4.8	2.3	9.0	4.5	7.3	3.1	8.8	20.5	26.7	5.8	10.0	16.8	25.8	46.1	50.4	43.8	54.0	
Florida	15.5	13.3	14.0	1.7	3.9	1.1	2.0	0.7	1.7	4.1	4.8	1.8	4.3	1.6	5.3	22.9	23.2	4.6	6.6	19.5	23.3	49.3	44.0	24.3	31.9	
Alabama	26.4	16.5	19.0	3.0	5.2	2.1	2.1	1.7	3.4	8.7	12.9	4.1	6.3	2.0	5.6	20.0	23.6	6.1	9.8	17.1	22.3	49.2	48.5	49.5	52.5	
Mississippi	36.8	17.9	23.9	1.6	4.9	1.0	2.6	1.8	6.6	2.6	7.2	2.2	5.6	1.5	4.7	22.3	30.1	6.3	12.5	18.5	28.6	52.8	54.8	47.4	57.9	
Louisiana	30.1	18.2	21.2	2.4	6.1	1.0	2.6	1.1	3.3	4.9	6.8	3.2	9.2	2.7	7.6	26.2	28.4	7.0	10.3	24.8	32.3	59.6	55.7	50.1	60.2	
Arkansas	18.6	10.9	13.4	1.1	3.1	0.4	1.0	0.4	1.8	5.0	6.8	1.6	4.3	0.9	3.4	13.2	15.8	4.0	5.7	11.8	16.8	21.8	22.5	30.9	35.9	
<u>Southwest</u>																										
Oklahoma	7.0	3.6	6.2	0.9	2.4	0.3	0.7	0.5	1.1	2.2	5.1	1.0	1.6	0.9	3.4	4.3	6.9	1.4	2.7	4.2	7.3	10.9	14.6	19.5	26.4	
Texas	12.7	9.3	11.8	1.7	3.9	0.7	1.4	1.2	1.7	4.5	6.6	1.4	4.5	1.7	5.3	13.1	16.6	2.9	6.7	13.0	18.5	30.7	30.1	30.4	37.2	
<u>Far West</u>																										
California	7.0	5.5	6.8	2.4	4.1	0.7	1.6	1.1	1.9	3.7	5.5	2.3	3.9	3.5	6.2	7.5	8.7	3.2	4.7	8.7	10.3	12.8	12.3	16.3	17.9	

Source: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Table 3. Total Money Income in 1969 and 1959, by Region, Race, and Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan Residence: 1970 and 1960

(In Millions of 1969 Dollars)

Region and Race	Total	1969 Metropolitan			Nonmetro- politan	Total	1959 Metropolitan			Nonmetro- politan
		Total	Inside Central Cities	Outside Central Cities			Total	Inside Central Cities	Outside Central Cities	
UNITED STATES										
Negroes	38,680	31,420	24,950	6,469	7,265	20,740	16,670	13,860	2,810	4,070
Whites	560,800	394,800	155,600	239,100	166,000	386,900	275,100	133,000	142,050	111,800
All Races	604,900	430,800	183,100	247,700	174,100	410,500	293,900	148,400	145,500	116,350
SOUTH										
Negroes	16,570	10,645	7,760	2,881	5,936	9,080	5,439	4,326	1,116	3,543
Whites	143,700	85,800	36,700	49,000	57,900	90,700	53,900	29,470	24,380	36,880
All Races	160,800	96,700	44,600	52,100	64,100	99,932	59,400	33,800	25,900	40,500
NORTH AND WEST										
Negroes	22,110	20,780	17,090	3,590	1,350	11,760	11,230	9,532	1,696	535
Whites	417,100	309,000	118,900	190,200	108,100	296,200	221,200	103,500	117,700	74,900
All Races	444,140	334,100	138,400	195,600	110,000	310,500	234,500	114,600	119,900	75,000

Source: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Social and Economic Characteristics of the Population in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas: 1970 and 1960", Current Population Reports, P-23, No. 37, June 24, 1971.

Table 4. Distribution of the United States Population, by Region, Race, and Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan Residence: 1970 and 1960

(Thousands)

Region and Race	Total	1970 Metropolitan			Nonmetro- politan	1960 Metropolitan				
		Total	Inside Central Cities	Outside Central Cities		Total	Total	Inside Central Cities	Outside Central Cities	Nonm- p- olitan
<u>Population</u>										
<u>UNITED STATES</u>										
Negroes	22,807	16,122	12,587	3,536	6,685	18,391	11,910	9,480	2,430	6,481
Whites	177,429	113,628	45,088	68,539	63,802	158,698	99,431	47,638	51,793	59,267
All Races	202,534	131,519	58,635	72,883	71,015	178,677	112,367	57,785	54,582	66,310
<u>SOUTH</u>										
Negroes	12,243	6,301	4,505	1,797	5,942	11,135	5,072	3,738	1,334	6,063
Whites	49,385	25,438	10,780	14,658	23,947	43,202	21,029	11,155	9,874	22,173
All Races	61,884	31,855	15,328	16,527	30,030	54,541	26,173	14,915	11,258	28,300
<u>NORTH AND WEST</u>										
Negroes	10,564	9,821	8,082	1,739	743	7,256	6,838	5,742	1,096	418
Whites	128,044	88,190	34,308	53,881	39,855	115,496	78,402	36,483	41,919	37,094
All Races	140,650	99,664	43,307	56,356	40,985	124,136	86,194	42,870	43,324	37,942

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Social and Economic Characteristics of the Population in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas: 1970 and 1960", Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 37, June 24, 1971, Table 2, p. 19.

Table 5. Percentage Distribution of Population, 1970 and 1960, and Total Money Income, 1969 and 1959, by Region, Race, and Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan Residence

Region and Race	Total	1970			Nonmetro- politan	Total	1960			Nonmetro- politan
		Total	Metropolitan Inside Central Cities	Outside Central Cities			Total	Metropolitan Inside Central Cities	Outside Central Cities	
UNITED STATES										
Negroes										
Population	11.26	12.26	21.47	4.85	9.41	10.29	10.60	16.41	4.45	9.77
Money Income	6.39	7.29	13.63	2.61	4.17	5.05	5.67	9.34	1.93	3.50
Whites										
Population	87.60	86.40	76.90	94.04	89.84	88.82	88.49	82.44	94.89	89.38
Money Income	92.70	91.64	84.98	96.53	95.34	94.25	93.60	89.62	97.63	96.09
All Races										
Population	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Money Income	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
SOUTH										
Negroes										
Population	6.04	4.79	7.68	2.47	8.37	6.23	4.51	6.47	2.44	9.14
Money Income	2.74	2.48	4.24	1.16	3.41	2.21	1.85	2.91	0.77	3.04
Whites										
Population	24.38	19.34	18.38	20.11	33.72	24.18	18.71	19.30	18.09	33.44
Money Income	23.76	19.92	20.04	19.78	33.26	22.10	18.34	19.86	16.76	31.69
All Races										
Population	30.56	24.22	26.14	22.68	42.29	30.52	23.29	25.81	20.63	42.78
Money Income	26.58	22.46	24.36	21.03	36.82	24.34	20.21	22.77	17.80	34.80
NORTH AND WEST										
Negroes										
Population	5.22	7.47	13.78	2.39	1.05	4.06	6.09	9.94	2.01	0.63
Money Income	3.66	4.82	9.34	1.45	0.78	2.87	3.82	6.43	1.16	0.46
Whites										
Population	63.22	67.06	58.51	73.93	56.12	64.64	69.77	63.14	76.80	55.94
Money Income	68.96	71.73	64.94	76.79	62.09	72.16	75.26	69.75	80.89	64.38
All Races										
Population	69.44	75.78	73.86	77.32	57.71	69.48	76.71	74.19	79.37	57.22
Money Income	73.42	77.55	75.59	78.97	63.18	75.64	79.79	77.22	82.41	65.24

Source: Tables 3 and 4.

Table 6. Estimated Net Migration of the Negro and White Population of Major Regions and Selected States, 1960 to 1970, 1950 to 1960, and 1940 to 1950

(Numbers in Thousands)

Region and State	Negro Population						White Population					
	1960 to 1970		1950 to 1960		1940 to 1950		1960 to 1970		1950 to 1960		1940 to 1950	
	Number	Per Cent ^{1/}	Number	Per Cent ^{1/}	Number	Per Cent ^{1/}	Number	Per Cent ^{1/}	Number	Per Cent ^{1/}	Number	Per Cent ^{1/}
UNITED STATES	-85	-0.5	-131	-0.9	-180	-1.4	2,284	1.4	2,668	2.0	1,522	1.3
NORTHEAST^{2/}	612	20.2	496	24.6	463	33.8	-520	-1.3	-211	-0.6	-173	-0.5
New England	72	29.5	60	42.1	29	28.7	205	2.0	-52	-0.6	68	0.8
Middle Atlantic	540	19.4	436	23.2	434	34.2	-724	-2.3	-159	-0.6	-242	-0.9
NORTH CENTRAL^{2/}	382	11.1	541	24.3	618	43.5	-1,272	-2.6	-690	-1.6	-948	-2.5
East North Central	356	12.3	504	27.9	573	53.6	-617	-1.9	173	0.6	75	0.3
West North Central	26	4.6	37	8.8	45	12.7	-655	-4.4	-863	-6.4	-1,023	-7.8
SOUTH^{2/}	-1,380	-12.2	-1,473	-14.4	-1,599	-16.1	1,806	4.2	57	0.2	-538	-1.7
South Atlantic	-538	-9.2	-556	-10.9	-545	-11.6	1,807	9.0	1,189	7.4	604	4.6
East South Central	-560	-20.8	-622	-23.0	-596	-21.4	-153	-1.6	-346	-9.6	-694	-8.7
West South Central	-282	-10.2	-296	-12.2	-459	-18.9	152	1.1	-286	-2.4	-448	-4.2
WEST^{2/}	301	27.7	305	53.5	339	198.3	2,269	8.8	3,512	18.7	3,181	23.8
Mountain	16	12.6	27	40.6	21	58.5	295	4.5	547	11.3	155	3.9
Pacific	286	29.7	278	55.2	317	236.2	1,974	10.2	2,965	21.3	3,026	32.3
NEW ENGLAND												
Massachusetts	33	29.5	20	26.9	12	22.4	23	0.5	-122	-2.6	8	0.2
Connecticut	38	35.4	37	69.2	15	45.8	166	6.8	195	10.0	98	5.8
MIDEAST												
New York	396	27.9	255	27.7	266	46.6	-638	-4.2	-72	-0.5	-6	(2)
New Jersey	120	23.3	107	33.5	61	26.8	-336	6.1	466	10.3	231	5.9
Pennsylvania	25	2.9	75	11.7	107	22.8	-423	-4.0	-552	-5.6	-467	-4.9
Delaware	4	6.6	6	13.4	4	10.9	32	8.4	57	20.8	17	7.2
Maryland	79	15.2	31	8.1	37	12.4	290	11.3	284	14.6	231	15.2
District of Columbia	36	8.7	51	18.3	61	32.8	-137	-39.7	-213	-41.2	-14	-3.0
NORTH CENTRAL												
Michigan	124	17.3	122	27.5	186	89.4	-124	-1.7	28	0.5	146	2.9
Ohio	45	5.8	129	25.2	131	38.7	-191	-2.1	274	3.7	110	1.7
Indiana	32	12.0	42	24.3	39	32.1	-58	-1.3	17	0.4	57	1.7
Illinois	127	12.2	182	28.2	203	52.3	-215	-2.4	-64	-0.8	-142	-1.9
Wisconsin	27	36.1	29	101.5	14	112.6	-29	-0.8	-82	-2.4	-96	-3.1
Missouri	14	3.7	24	8.2	31	12.7	-25	-0.6	-161	-4.4	-222	-6.3
SOUTHEAST												
Virginia	-79	-9.7	-74	-10.0	-29	-4.4	206	6.5	85	3.3	194	9.6
West Virginia	-20	-22.2	-41	-35.4	-17	-14.0	-247	-14.0	-406	-21.5	-219	-12.3
Kentucky	1	0.5	-16	-8.0	-18	-8.3	-158	-5.6	-375	-13.7	-349	-13.3
Tennessee	-51	-8.7	-59	-11.0	-48	-9.4	1	(2)	-217	-7.9	-97	-4.0
North Carolina	-175	-15.7	-204	-19.4	-164	-16.7	81	2.4	-121	-4.0	-95	-3.7
South Carolina	-197	-23.8	-218	-26.5	-208	-25.5	44	2.8	-4	-0.3	-24	-2.2
Georgia	-154	-13.7	-205	-19.3	-243	-22.4	198	7.0	-8	-0.3	-49	-2.4
Florida	-32	-3.6	96	16.0	12	2.4	1,340	33.0	1,516	70.0	564	40.8
Alabama	-231	-23.6	-224	-22.9	-204	-20.8	-5	-0.2	-145	-7.0	-140	-7.6
Mississippi	-279	-30.4	-323	-32.7	-326	-30.3	10	0.8	-110	-9.3	-108	-9.7
Louisiana	-163	-15.7	-93	-10.5	-147	-17.3	26	1.2	43	2.4	-2	-0.2
Arkansas	-112	-28.7	-150	-35.1	-158	-32.6	38	2.7	-283	-19.1	-259	-17.6
SOUTHWEST												
Oklahoma	-3	-2.1	-21	-14.2	-47	-27.8	-4	-0.2	-193	-9.5	-361	-17.1
Texas	-4	-0.3	33	-3.3	-107	-11.6	92	1.1	147	2.2	173	3.2
FAR WEST												
California	272	30.7	255	55.2	289	232.4	1,528	10.6	2,788	28.1	2,373	36.0

NOTE: ^{1/} Base is population at beginning of period. ^{2/} Regions and divisions as defined by U.S. Bureau of the Census.
(2) Less than 0.05 per cent or 500.

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Preliminary Intercensal Estimates of States and Components of Population Change, 1960 to 1970", Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 460, June 7, 1971, Table 7, p. 17.

TABLE 7. NEGRO POPULATION TRENDS, NET MIGRATION, AND TRENDS IN WELFARE ASSISTANCE^{1/} IN SELECTED CITIES^{2/}

Area and City	POPULATION TRENDS					NET MIGRATION, 1960 TO 1970				TRENDS IN WELFARE ASSISTANCE ^{1/}				CHANGE: MID-1960'S TO 1971						
	Negro Population 1970		Change 1960-1970		Avg. An. Rate of Growth	Negro and Other Races		MID-1971		MID-1960'S		Negro and Other Races								
	Number	Per Cent of Total	Number	Per Cent Change		Number	Per Cent ^{3/}	Total Persons	Per Cent of State Total	Number (Est.)	Per Cent of Total	Total Persons	Number (Est.)	Per Cent of Total	Total Persons	Avg. An. Rate	Number (Est.)	Per Cent of Total	Avg. An. Rate	
										Year										
New England																				
Boston, Mass.	105	16	42	66.7	5.3	26	39	76,963	28.5	17,009	4/22	1965	25,465	-	-	51,498	20.0	-	-	-
Midwest																				
New York, N.Y.	1,667	21	579	53.2	4.4	436	38	840,395	65.7	5/358,008	43	1960	193,689	-	-	646,706	14.3	-	-	-
Buffalo, N.Y.	94	20	23	32.4	2.8	9	12	53,122	4.2	20,558	6/39	1965	31,181	-	-	21,941	9.3	-	-	-
Newark, N.J.	207	54	69	50.0	4.1	32	23	95,100	21.4	-	-	1965	41,694	-	-	53,406	14.7	-	-	-
Pittsburgh, Pa.	105	20	4	4.0	0.4	-6	-6	7/84,586	13.9	-	-	1965	51,396	-	-	33,190	8.7	-	-	-
Baltimore, Md.	420	46	94	28.8	2.6	32	10	31,000	18.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington, D.C.	538	71	126	30.6	2.7	38	9	75,871	100.0	73,974	8/98	1960	21,225	-	-	54,646	12.3	-	-	-
Great Lakes																				
Chicago, Ill.	1,103	33	290	35.7	3.1	113	14	440,877	79.3	348,293	9/79	1960	106,668	83,948	10/79	334,209	13.8	264,345	79	13.8
Detroit, Mich.	660	44	178	36.9	3.2	98	20	172,549	42.6	122,337	11/71	1965	68,387	-	-	104,162	16.7	-	-	-
Cleveland, Ohio	288	38	37	14.7	1.4	-3	-1	12/120,483	32.3	12/97,591	81	1966	12/50,819	-	-	12/69,664	18.9	-	-	-
Cincinnati, Ohio	125	28	16	14.7	1.4	-3	-2	13/42,008	11.3	13/28,145	67	1965	13/23,592	-	-	13/18,416	10.1	-	-	-
Columbus, Ohio	100	19	23	29.9	2.7	9	12	14/45,752	12.3	14/25,164	55	1966	14/22,218	-	-	14/23,534	15.6	-	-	-
Indianapolis, Ind.	134	18	36	36.7	3.2	15	15	15/28,035	22.1	-	-	1965	15/7,768	-	-	15/20,267	24.0	-	-	-
Gary, Ind.	93	53	24	34.8	3.1	10	14	18/33,147	26.1	-	-	1965	18/11,528	-	-	18/21,619	19.3	-	-	-
Plains																				
St. Louis, Mo.	254	41	40	18.7	1.7	-1	-	71,440	38.2	62,867	88	1965	36,446	29,521	81	34,994	11.9	33,346	95	13.4
Kansas City, Mo.	112	22	29	34.9	3.0	13	16	17/31,789	17.0	17/25,749	81	1965	17/13,167	17/9,875	75	17/18,622	15.8	17/15,874	85	17.3
Southeast																				
New Orleans, La.	267	45	33	14.1	1.3	-11	-5	92,107	39.4	68,804	75	1965	43,764	29,760	68	48,343	13.2	39,044	81	15.0
Atlanta, Ga.	255	51	69	37.1	3.2	33	18	56,441	20.4	41,377	73	1965	11,026	6,726	61	45,415	31.0	34,651	76	35.0
Memphis, Tenn.	243	39	59	32.1	2.8	23	12	18/59,058	33.4	18/51,971	88	1965	18/16,415	-	-	18/42,643	24.0	-	-	-
Birmingham, Ala.	126	42	-9	-6.7	-0.7	-23	-17	24,718	14.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nashville-Davidson, Tenn.	88	20	12	15.8	1.5	2	3	15,710	8.9	-	-	1965	4,414	-	-	11,296	24.0	-	-	-
Southwest																				
Houston, Texas	317	26	102	47.4	3.9	56	26	19/62,560	17.1	19/32,719	20/52	1965	19/7,318	-	-	19/55,446	44.0	-	-	-
Dallas, Texas	210	25	81	62.8	5.0	47	36	21/53,604	14.7	28,035	20/52	1965	8,210	-	-	45,394	37.0	-	-	-
Far West																				
Los Angeles, Ca.	304	18	169	50.5	4.2	120	29	652,619	39.8	311,299	22/48	1965	23/188,084	-	-	464,535	23.0	-	-	-
Oakland, Ca.	125	35	41	48.8	4.1	29	30	24/88,545	5.4	-	-	1965	33,943	-	-	54,602	17.3	-	-	-
San Francisco, Ca.	96	13	22	29.7	2.7	37	28	64,742	4.0	-	-	1965	26,837	-	-	37,905	15.8	-	-	-

TABLE 7. NEGRO POPULATION TRENDS, NET MIGRATION,
AND TRENDS IN WELFARE ASSISTANCE^{1/} IN SELECTED CITIES^{2/}

FOOTNOTES

- 1/ Aid to families with dependent children.
- 2/ The 30 cities with the largest Negro population in 1970, according to the Bureau of the Census, except for Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Richmond, Virginia, Jacksonville, Florida, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, where welfare officials could not be contacted.
- 3/ Base is population at beginning of period.
- 4/ From sample taken September 1969. Ratio may have declined to 20 per cent nonwhites to 80 per cent whites, as whites are getting on welfare in increasing numbers.
- 5/ Based on actual distribution of welfare rolls as of June 1969. Puerto Ricans included in whites; whites 57.4 per cent. In 1968, family aid case load was 13 per cent white, 40 per cent Puerto Rican and 47 per cent nonwhite.
- 6/ Openings of cases. Distribution 61.3 per cent white to 38.7 per cent nonwhite. Thought to reflect current situation. Usually in past ratio was 50:50. New applications running 64 per cent white to 36 per cent nonwhite. Closings, 61.8 per cent white to 38.2 per cent nonwhites.
- 7/ Allegheny County; two-third population within the city.
- 8/ As of January 1970. Probably higher now.
- 9/ 1970 cases. Estimate is that whites are getting on faster now than nonwhites and ratio may be 78:22 or 77:23, nonwhites to whites.
- 10/ 1964 data. Families with fathers at home.
- 11/ For all welfare programs. Distribution was 70.9 per cent Negroes, 24 per cent white, 0.1 per cent American Indian, 0.4 per cent Mexican-American, and 4.6 per cent not classified.
- 12/ Cuyahoga County.
- 13/ Hamilton County.
- 14/ Franklin County.
- 15/ Marion County.

TABLE 7.
FOOTNOTES (Continued)

16/ Lake County.

17/ Jackson County.

18/ Shelby County.

19/ Harris County.

20/ Statewide survey as of July 1, 1971: Race of Payee (by family). Distribution was Anglo 14.7 per cent, Negro 52.3 per cent, Latins 32.9 per cent, American Indian 0.05 per cent, Other and Unknown 0.05 per cent. Increases in new recipients have slowed markedly in last few months of 1971. Officer in Austin could not give an explanation.

21/ Dallas County.

22/ December 1967, family groups and unemployed fathers programs. Distribution 30.44 per cent white; 47.68 per cent Negro; 20.37 per cent Mexican-American; 0.52 per cent American Indian; and 0.60 per cent Other.

23/ Los Angeles County.

24/ Alameda County.

Sources: Population and Migration. "The Social and Economic Status of Negroes in the United States, 1970," Special Studies, B.L.S. Report No. 394, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 38, U.S. Dept. of Commerce/Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Labor/Bureau of Labor Statistics, Tables 11 and 12, pp. 17 and 18.

Welfare estimates: Telephone survey of responsible welfare offices.

TABLE 8. GROSS AND NET MIGRATION RATES FOR MEN, BY REGION, AGE AND RACE, 1965-1970

(Per Cent)

Region	Age 25-44						Age 45 and over					
	Negro			White			Negro			White		
	Out Migration	In Migration	Net Migration	Out Migration	In Migration	Net Migration	Out Migration	In Migration	Net Migration	Out Migration	In Migration	Net Migration
New England	21.5	28.2	6.7	13.0	12.3	-0.7	8.9	12.6	3.7	6.9	7.5	0.6
Mideast	9.0	12.3	3.3	10.6	10.0	-0.6	4.2	5.3	1.1	5.8	5.7	-0.1
Great Lakes	8.2	19.1	10.9	11.5	11.4	-0.1	3.9	5.8	1.9	7.2	5.8	-1.4
Plains	21.3	22.0	0.7	17.7	14.5	-3.2	7.4	11.1	3.7	10.0	8.4	-1.6
Southeast	15.9	6.1	-9.8	12.8	14.1	1.3	5.7	3.1	-2.6	7.6	10.4	2.8
Southwest	13.1	13.1	0.0	15.9	19.1	3.2	7.3	6.9	-0.4	9.5	11.8	2.3
Rocky Mountain	38.2	52.9	14.7	23.9	21.3	-2.6	12.5	28.1	15.6	14.6	10.5	-4.1
Far West	13.2	22.9	9.7	14.4	14.8	0.4	7.1	9.2	2.1	8.8	8.1	
AVERAGE	12.7	-	-	13.1	-	-	5.3	-	-	7.6		-

Source: Social Security Administration, One Per Cent Sample Survey.

TABLE 9. ORIGIN AND DESTINATION OF MALE MIGRANTS, TO AND FROM THE SOUTHEAST,
BY REGION, AGE AND RACE, 1965-1970

(Percentage Distribution)

Region	Age 25-44				Age 45 and Over			
	Origin		Destination		Origin		Destination	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
New England	7.2	5.3	5.0	5.1	3.1	5.6	6.8	5.6
Midwest	48.5	28.0	38.6	28.3	45.4	29.3	37.1	33.4
Great Lakes	20.2	30.1	34.4	31.8	20.8	26.9	24.1	27.6
Plains	3.3	6.0	4.0	7.0	2.3	5.9	8.9	6.3
Southwest	12.1	11.2	8.7	16.2	16.9	10.5	15.2	15.5
Rocky Mountain	0.7	1.5	1.0	1.4	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.2
Far West	8.1	17.8	8.3	10.2	10.8	20.4	6.8	10.4
TOTAL*	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Social Security Administration, One Per Cent Sample Survey

* Totals may not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

TABLE 10. INCOME GAINS FROM MIGRATION,
1965-1970

A. Income Differentials Before and After Migration, by Region and Race
Migrant vs. Nonmigrant Males 25-44
Per Cent

REGION	BEFORE MIGRATION		AFTER MIGRATION		GAIN FROM MIGRATION	
	NEGRO	WHITE	NEGRO	WHITE	NEGRO	WHITE
New England	-16.2	0.8	-8.2	10.8	8.0	10.0
Mideast	-13.9	1.3	-13.8	5.8	0.1	4.5
Great Lakes	-22.7	-4.5	-20.5	-1.5	2.2	3.0
Plains	-6.2	1.0	-6.3	10.8	-0.1	9.8
Southeast	-18.5	1.0	14.5	14.0	33.0	13.0
Southwest	-10.9	-3.3	1.2	6.1	9.7	9.9
Rocky Mountain	-15.2	-9.2	-13.1	9.0	2.1	18.2
Far West	-20.4	-1.5	-15.7	-0.9	4.7	0.6

B. Income of Migrants from Southeast Relative to Non-Migrants

	RELATIVE INCOME IN:				INCREASE RELATIVE TO NON-MIGRANTS	
	1965		1970		NEGRO	WHITE
	NEGRO	WHITE	NEGRO	WHITE		
Males 25-44	81	101	114	114	33	13
Males 45+	95	117	100	122	5	5
Females 25-44	84	92	108	99	24	7

Source - Social Security Administration, One Per Cent Sample Survey

APPENDIX: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF NET MIGRATION RATES

This statistical analysis represents an attempt to identify and to quantify the factors which affect domestic interstate net migration rates of black and white people. It was assumed that the most important incentive for both races was provided by income differentials among States -- that is, migrants would move to the location of the more favorable economic climate. In addition, an attempt was made to account for migration patterns which may be in response to noneconomic factors -- such as racial discrimination (for blacks) or retirement conditions (for whites).

The estimating technique used in this study was multiple regression analysis. Tests of the models were performed using data for the continental United States and the District of Columbia for the Census decades 1950-1960 and 1960-1970. These data appear in the Appendix Table 1.

The basic model relates per capita income differentials and a dummy variable designed to approximate both economic forces not specified in the equation and noneconomic factors which have contributed to migration patterns. For black migrants, the disincentives to remain in the Southeastern region were specified as the dummy variable with values of 1.0 for the Southeastern States (excluding Florida) and 0.0 elsewhere. White migration rates were related to a dummy variable which assumed values of 1.0 for the retirement and recreational areas of Florida, Arizona, and Nevada and 0.0 elsewhere. In all cases, the regressions were weighted by the black, white, and total populations for the respective net migration rate equations. The results appear in Appendix Table 2.

What the basic model (Equation (1)) shows for the two time periods is that migrants of both races respond to income differentials as measured by the per capita income ratio, and to other forces approximated by the dummy variables. Relatively high income States appear to attract migrants as well as maintain their own population. However, it should be noted that Equation (3) for white migrants in the 1960-70 decade shows an income coefficient which is not statistically significant at the 5.0 per cent level of confidence. This is probably the result of statistical biases and the coefficient's magnitude may be underestimated. Aside from the attraction of income, black migrants were motivated to move out of the Southern region at above average rates. This effect is shown by the negative and statistically significant coefficient on the Southern disincentive variable. White migrants responded to retirement and recreational incentives and moved in that direction at above average rates.

To test the effects of welfare payments on the direction of migration, payments per recipient under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program was added to the basic model. Equation (2) shows that black migrants responded positively to State differences in welfare programs whereas whites did not. However, welfare may be positively related to the income variable, and it may also be coincident with the trend of black movement out of the South, a low payment area, to other parts of the nation.

A second variation was tested by replacing the welfare variable with educational expenditures per pupil (as shown in Equation (3)). Again, black migrants appeared to respond positively to expenditures and whites did not. However, per pupil costs are generally lower in the South relative to the rest of the Nation.

Replacement of the welfare variable with educational expenditures appears to show no significant difference in the regression results.

The constant terms in most of these equations are large and negative. These indicate that there is steady pressure for people to move out of most States, which -- unless counterbalanced by a strong income response -- will result in net out-migrations among both races.

Appendix Table 1.
 Net Migration, 1960 to 1970, and Personal Income,
 Welfare Payments, and Expenditures on Education,
 by Region and State

Region and State	Net Migration Rate (Per Cent)		Ratio of Per Capita Personal Income in State to Per Capita Personal Income for U.S. 1969 (Per Cent)	Aid to Families With Dependent Children - Payments Per Recipient (Dec. 1970)	Annual Current Expenditure Per Pupil (Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1970)
	Negro	White			
<u>U.S. Average</u>			100.0	\$49.50	\$812
<u>New England</u>			109.0	68.58	853
Maine	0.0	-7.2	83.0	40.40	723
New Hampshire	0.0	11.2	92.0	61.35	687
Vermont	0.0	3.5	88.0	61.35	1008
Massachusetts	29.5	0.5	111.0	71.50	841
Rhode Island	12.2	0.5	100.0	61.85	915
Connecticut	35.4	6.8	124.0	65.30	916
<u>Mideast</u>			114.0	67.08	1067
New York	27.9	-4.2	122.0	77.90	1247
New Jersey	23.3	6.1	117.0	62.60	1054
Pennsylvania	2.9	-4.0	100.0	63.10	892
Delaware	6.6	8.4	110.0	36.25	891
Maryland	15.2	11.3	109.0	43.65	888
District of Columbia	8.7	-39.7	137.0	55.25	971
<u>Great Lakes</u>			104.0	51.32	825
Michigan	17.3	-1.7	104.0	53.80	890
Ohio	5.8	-2.1	101.0	43.85	729
Indiana	12.0	-1.3	96.0	35.95	731
Illinois	12.2	-2.4	115.0	58.55	872
Wisconsin	36.1	-0.8	94.0	64.20	930
<u>Plains</u>			94.0	50.55	804
Minnesota	33.3	-1.2	98.0	72.05	971
Iowa	6.0	-6.9	94.0	52.30	902
Missouri	3.7	-0.6	94.0	30.50	710
North Dakota	0.0	-15.2	76.0	61.50	665
South Dakota	0.0	-14.0	81.0	53.40	680
Nebraska	7.3	-5.6	96.0	41.60	653
Kansas	-0.9	-6.7	98.0	55.75	731
<u>Southeast</u>			81.0	27.03	628
Virginia	-9.7	6.5	92.0	47.45	753
West Virginia	-22.2	-14.0	77.0	27.15	598
Kentucky	0.5	-5.6	78.0	30.80	580
Tennessee	-8.7	0.0	79.0	29.65	571
North Carolina	-15.7	2.4	82.0	30.90	607
South Carolina	-23.8	2.8	75.0	19.70	615
Georgia	-13.7	7.0	85.0	28.45	615
Florida	-3.6	33.0	93.0	23.85	728
Alabama	-23.6	-0.2	73.0	15.20	463
Mississippi	-30.4	0.8	66.0	12.10	495
Louisiana	-15.7	1.2	78.0	20.10	747
Arkansas	-28.7	2.7	71.0	25.00	549
<u>Southwest</u>			89.0	30.78	637
Oklahoma	-2.1	-0.2	84.0	37.25	659
Texas	-0.3	1.1	90.0	28.95	599
New Mexico	-24.7	-13.8	80.0	32.50	751
Arizona	-10.2	21.2	92.0	32.00	768
<u>Rocky Mountain</u>			90.0	48.43	707
Montana	0.0	-8.7	86.0	45.85	819
Idaho	0.0	-6.6	83.0	50.60	595
Wyoming	0.0	-4.2	91.0	42.25	884
Colorado	40.9	11.0	97.0	52.15	735
Utah	0.0	-1.9	82.0	42.85	611
<u>Far West</u>			110.0	53.77	859
Washington	20.0	8.0	102.0	60.25	826
Oregon	20.9	8.4	94.0	46.85	875
Nevada	48.0	51.5	116.0	30.85	756
California	30.7	10.6	113.0	53.95	866

APPENDIX TABLE 2. REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF NET MIGRATION, 1950-60 AND 1960-70.

(See Description of Models Below)

Race		Personal Income ^{2/}	Southern Disincentives ^{3/}	Retirement, Incentives ^{4/}	Welfare Benefits ^{5/}	Educational Benefits ^{6/}	Constant	R ²	Standard Error
<u>1950-1960^{1/}</u>									
<u>Negro</u>									
Equation (1)	75.59 (5.80)	-12.97 (-2.16)	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-59.38 (-4.17)	.82	11.2
<u>White</u>									
Equation (1)	30.90 (4.25)	-- --		67.09 (9.18)	-- --	-- --	-29.80 (-3.98)	.67	9.3
<u>Both</u>									
Equation (1)	39.79 (6.11)	-- --		57.71 (8.71)	-- --	-- --	-38.44 (-5.78)	.69	8.7
<u>1960-1970^{1/}</u>									
<u>Negro</u>									
Equation (1)	69.87 (6.55)	-11.48 (-2.95)	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	60.99 (-5.29)	.82	8.1
Equation (2)	33.29 (2.12)	-12.66 (-3.49)	-- --	-- --	0.35 (2.98)	-- --	-40.10 (-3.15)	.85	7.5
Equation (3)	23.49 (2.53)	-12.96 (-3.41)	-- --	-- --	-- --	0.024 (2.20)	-52.15 (-4.43)	.84	7.8
<u>White</u>									
Equation (1)	7.79 (1.25)*	-- --		31.43 (7.35)	-- --	-- --	-7.12 (-1.13)*	.54	6.1
Equation (2)	29.39 (3.03)	-- --		27.18 (6.35)	-0.23 (-2.77)	-- --	-17.18 (-2.48)	.61	5.7
Equation (3)	16.42 (2.79)	-- --		31.09 (7.65)	-- --	-0.020 (-2.47)	-12.20 (-1.93)*	.60	5.8
<u>Both</u>									
Equation (1)	22.40 (3.97)	-- --		26.53 (6.67)	-- --	-- --	-21.31 (-3.72)	.55	5.7
Equation (2)	40.09 (4.31)	-- --		23.15 (5.70)	-0.188 (-2.33)	-- --	-29.70 (-4.54)	.60	5.5
Equation (3)	23.81 (4.36)	-- --		26.21 (6.94)	-- --	-0.018 (-2.46)	-25.90 (-4.51)	.66	5.4

NOTE: Model I: Effects of Income; Equation (1)
 Model II: Effects of Welfare; Equation (2)
 Model III: Effects of Education; Equation (3)

(t-statistics in parentheses)

* insignificant at 5 per cent level of confidence

-- not used in equation

NOTE: Footnotes are on next page.

APPENDIX TABLE 2. REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF NET MIGRATION,
1950-60 AND 1960-70.

FOOTNOTES

- 1/ Net migration rates for each State during the decade.
- 2/ Ratio of each State's per capita personal income to per capita personal income for the United States, 1969.
- 3/ Proxy for the complex of factors beyond differences in personal income which induce a high rate of net out-migration of Negroes from the South, excluding Florida.
- 4/ Proxy for the complex of factors beyond differences in personal income which induce a high rate of net in-migration of white persons into three states: Florida, Arizona, and Nevada. These States are generally retirement and recreational areas.
- 5/ Payments per recipient under program of aid to families with dependent children in each State, December, 1970.
- 6/ Annual current expenditure per pupil -- average daily membership, elementary and secondary schools, 1970-71.