

WHAT IS NEW IN OUR EIGHTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS OF THE POPULATION?

By: Henry S. Shryock, Jr., Bureau of the Census
U. S. Department of Commerce

As Dr. Taeuber has described in his paper, the content of the decennial census expanded very rapidly in the first century after its modest beginnings in 1790. The peak in the number of inquiries was reached about a half century ago, however, as it was gradually realized that the burden upon the enumerator was becoming too great and that, in any case, some types of information could not be satisfactorily collected by enumerators with but little training and experience. In the process of reorganizing the Federal Government's attempts to obtain many different varieties of important statistics, certain broad fields of inquiry were dropped altogether from the decennial census but they sometimes became the objectives of other forms of statistical compilation. For example, the Federal Government cooperated in the establishment of Registration Areas for births, deaths, marriages, and divorces. Very recently and after a long hiatus, the National Health Survey has been developed as a much superior method of obtaining data on morbidity and related phenomena by means of household interviews. The separation of the field work of the Census of Agriculture by six months from that of the Census of Population and Housing is an innovation that will simplify the training and duties of the field staff and should contribute to improved quality of the respective data.

Other major changes in methods of data-gathering and office processing have already been mentioned. Probably more of these are being introduced in 1960 than have ever been made in any preceding decennial census. In contrast, the innovations in the content of the population schedule are relatively few. There will be a slight net increase in the number of items to be recorded for persons in sample households; but, because of the transfer of all but a few items on personal characteristics to the sample, the average number of items recorded per person in the population will be considerably less than in 1950.

The remaining statistical items to be obtained on a 100-percent basis will be relationship to head of household, sex, race, age, and marital status. Farm or nonfarm residence, birthplace, citizenship, the labor force items, and occupation and industry—all of which were on a complete-count basis in 1950—will be transferred to the sample in 1960. This will be a 25-percent sample of households rather than a 20-percent sample and a 3 1/3-percent sample of persons as before, thus making it possible to relate sample characteristics of different members of the household. For example, the wife's fertility can be related to the husband's education, occupation, or income. Incidentally, the number of children ever borne was among the few items on the 3 1/3-percent sample in 1950.

Probably the main new topic to be added to the schedule is that of place of work, which also happens to be the topic that the public has most frequently requested us to add. Although our

experience in several pretests has indicated that it is not feasible to collect as much geographic detail on place of work as is desired for some local programs, still it is expected that the resulting data should provide a major "breakthrough" in the study of commuting since for the first time a vast amount of nationally comparable data will be available for all parts of the country, not only on the prevalence of commuting and the major streams of movement but also on the characteristics of commuters as compared with those of workers who are employed nearer to their homes. The statistics should shed light on such phenomena as the journey to work and the daytime population of various kinds of areas and, moreover, should permit further reconciliation of labor force and income data obtained from household surveys with those obtained from establishment reports.

Specifically, persons currently employed will be asked to give the county of employment and also the city, if they work in a city. Furthermore, they will be asked to give the principal means of transportation used in getting to work.

Plans for tabulations from these data are still being developed and have not yet been discussed with our advisory committees. Tentatively, we have in mind something like the following:

(1) For each county of residence, the employed workers will be classified as working in the given county, as working in other counties, or as not having a fixed county of work. The feasibility of tabulating the distribution of total workers employed in each county according to whether or not they also live there is still to be investigated.

(2) Since large-scale and long-distance commuting is essentially a metropolitan phenomenon, tabulations in greater geographic detail will probably be restricted to metropolitan areas and their environs. Within each standard metropolitan area, the central city (or cities), the balance of the county containing that city, and individual counties within the so-called metropolitan ring would be distinguished. As a long-needed aid to the Federal Government's program of delineating standard metropolitan areas, the individual counties in the next tier beyond present boundaries would also be included in this tabulation. These counties and central cities would then be used as units in the cross-classification of place of work with place of residence.

There are already indications that some local agencies would like to obtain greater detail on commuting by place of residence. This could, of course, be made available if there are sufficient resources. In fact, perhaps a supplementary tabulation in the form of a standard package could be worked out that could be purchased by interested local agencies. If this were contracted for early enough, it could be planned so as to reduce the costs and to make it available fairly promptly after the regular tabulation program is concluded.

(3) The previously mentioned cross-classifications of commuters in terms of such characteristics as size of place of residence, occupation, industry, and class of worker, and part-time or full-time status, are of considerable analytical interest. This kind of interest might be adequately served by tabulating a subsample of cases in terms of rather gross geographic categories. In so far as this sort of data is wanted for specific areas rather than for the more conceptualized types of areas, the special-package contract tabulation just described might be an appropriate vehicle. It must be appreciated that even the restricted program of regular tabulations that I have just proposed will generate an enormous amount of data for publication.

The results of two decennial censuses make it clear that the labor force questions cannot be used there as worded in the Current Population Survey but must be simplified. The general objective, however, will still be to determine labor force status in the preceding week. For those who have worked at any time during the past 10 years, a description of the current job, or of the last job, will be obtained. This description will consist not only of the occupation, industry, and class of worker, but also of the name of the company, business, organization, or other employer. The purpose of this last item is to improve the coding of industry by making it possible to use registers that will be prepared in advance of the enumeration. Moreover, it is hoped that the economic items, in general, will be among the major beneficiaries of the prospective greater use of self-enumeration since workers who are normally absent at the time of an interview would have an opportunity to supply information about their jobs, incomes, etc. A major change in the method of collecting data does run the risk of making a noticeable impact on historical comparability, of course.

Obtaining age from date of birth seems to be a procedure that is particularly well-suited to self-enumeration and should lead to greater accuracy in the reporting of age. From a question on age at last birthday, "heaping" on favored terminal digits still persists somewhat, particularly among older people, and there are directional biases for some of the functional age groups that have created problems in the use of age data.

As part of the inquiry on population mobility each person will be asked to give his place of residence five years ago. This reversion to the five-year period of the 1940 Census from the one-year period of the 1950 Census was dictated by a desire to avoid a short and unusual period of time and by a desire to secure a larger number of migrants for analysis. The 1950 Census material on migration also provided but little information on suburbanization and other forms of population movement within metropolitan areas. The 1960 questions will aim to identify movers between central cities and outlying parts of the metropolitan area, and some of the tabulations will deal particularly with this widespread contemporary form of population redistribution. Additional material on population mobility will be obtainable from a question on the year in which each person moved into his present home.

Continued interest in our mounting educational problems is recognized by the obtaining of some additional facts in this field: (1) persons attending school will be asked whether they are attending a public or a private school, (2) the number of persons who have completed at least a year of graduate work will be ascertained, and (3) the attendance question will be extended to persons 30 to 34 years old.

There has been growing concern with the measurement of the farm population by means of the simple opinion question, "Is this house on a farm (or ranch)?" Without the support of objective criteria as to what is meant by a farm, this question leads to results that are not of very high reliability. The opinions even of persons within the same household may differ here. It was probably originally assumed that a farm was a simple entity, the existence of which is obvious to any reasonably intelligent observer. Accelerating trends in agriculture and in commuting from open-country residences have made this assumption much less valid today than it was several decades ago. Our studies have shown that perhaps a quarter of the households living on so-called "farms" have little or no connection with agriculture. The current proposal is to substitute questions on the acreage and value of agricultural products concerning the tract of land on which each rural household lives. Farm residents would then become those households living on (1) tracts of 10 acres or more from which agricultural products to the value of \$50 or more were sold last year and (2) tracts of lesser acreage from which the products sold had a value of \$250 or more. This definition would correspond very closely to the definition of a farm to be used in the 1959 Census of Agriculture. Despite the six-months' gap between censuses, it may still be possible to prepare a matched subsample of households, homes, and farms from the three censuses so that the kind of tabulations made after 1950, cross-classifying the data of these three censuses, can be run.

A new kind of collation, not restricted to the farm population, is also being considered in the form of a person-household tape. Here the characteristics of a sample of persons would be related to those of the households and dwelling units in which they live. Thus, it would be possible to examine the living arrangements of the aged, the types of homes in which children are being raised, and the relationships between labor-force participation of mothers of young children, income of husbands, and the presence of nonworking adults and older children in the home, to name a few examples.

The electronic computer will also make it much cheaper than before to produce derived figures such as percentage distributions, ratios, means, and medians, which formerly had to be obtained by clerks using desk calculators. Therefore, it is expected that the 1960 publications will contain many more such figures, and hence the users of Census reports should be saved a great deal of time and greater use should be possible on the part of persons and agencies with limited time and means. Mechanical editing within the computer will permit more effective handling of unknowns and inconsistencies while, at the same time, a

record is kept of the number of allocations and edits made on each subject item.

Dr. Taeuber has already mentioned some of the forthcoming innovations in the field of statistical areas. Let me supplement his account by mentioning two or three others. Since some limitations of the farm residence concept have become apparent and since the new questions on this topic will be asked only of the sample, attention has been directed to supplementary ways of subdividing the rural population. In 1950, unincorporated villages of 1,000 inhabitants or more were first identified and given separate treatment. Under consideration is an effort to extend this program to smaller unincorporated places so that the population in villages and hamlets can be separated from a residual that might be called the "open country" population. The size and characteristics of these two major segments of the rural population could then be presented by States, counties, and economic areas. Such data should be of particular interest to rural sociologists and others who have been concerned with the heterogeneity of the rural-nonfarm population.

A different approach to reducing this heterogeneity was begun in the 1950 Census when urbanized areas were first delineated. The closely built-up suburban fringes of these areas were transferred from rural to urban territory, thus resulting in a major improvement in our urban-rural classification. In 1960, methods of bounding urbanized areas will be simplified somewhat, and an

up-to-the-moment picture of the extent of suburban development around all cities of 50,000 or more will be available. Unfortunately, it does not now seem feasible to extend the delineation of urbanized areas to smaller cities.

One of the most prominent trends in municipal development during the 1950's has been the greatly increased number of annexations to incorporated places. No account of urbanization during the period could be complete that overlooks this process, and measurement of the population involved seems to be called for. We propose to publish, for every urban place that has had one or more annexations during the decade, the 1960 population in the total annexed area. Such statistics should be particularly useful to the many persons who estimate the intercensal net migration for individual cities and for urban and rural areas. Annexation has been an uncontrolled factor in the study of the components of population change to which most analysts have been able to give merely qualitative recognition.

Finally, this will be the first census in half a century when we shall be faced with the problem of how to handle an addition to the area covered by the States. The statistical integration of Alaska will be accomplished as far as the 1960 data are concerned; and probably to a limited extent, some alternative historical revisions can be presented. We hope that a question mark will not be poised over the status of Hawaii at the time we are having to conclude our publication plans.

INQUIRIES FOR 1960 CENSUS OF POPULATION

[NOTE: Inquiries 1 - 7 will be made of all persons

Inquiries 8 - 16 will be made of all persons
(as applicable) in every fourth household

Inquiries 17 - 25 will be made only of persons
14 years old or older in every fourth household]

1. Name

Last name, first name, middle
initial

2. Address

Street, avenue, or road
House (and apartment) number

3. Relationship to head of household

What is the relationship of this
person to the head of this unit?

Head
Wife of head
Child of head
Other relative
Non relative
Inmate

4. Sex

Male
Female

5. Color or race

White
Negro
American Indian
Chinese
Japanese
Filipino
Other—give specific color or race

6. Month and year of birth

What is the month and year of
birth?

7. Marital status

Is he now:

Married?	Separated?
Widowed?	Never married?
Divorced?	

8. Farm Residence

- a. Are there 10 or more acres
in this place?
- b. (If less than 10 acres)
Did agricultural products
sold have a value of \$250
or more?
- c. (If 10 acres or more)
Did agricultural products
sold have a value of \$50
or more?

9. Place of birth

In what State or foreign coun-
try (or territory or posses-
sion) was he born?

10. Citizenship

If born in foreign country is
he a citizen of the United
States?

Naturalized citizen?
Alien?
Born abroad of American
parents?

11. Country of birth of parents

- a. Where was his father born?
U. S. or
Write name of foreign coun-
try, or U. S. territory or
possession.
- b. Where was his mother born?
U. S. or
Write name of foreign coun-
try, or U. S. territory or
possession.

12. Length of residence and migration

- a. In what year did he (last) move into this house (or apartment)?

1959 or 1960
1958
1955 to 1957
1950 to 1954
1949 or before

- b. Where did he live on April 1, 1955?

Same house (or apartment)

or

Enter city, county, and State or foreign country: and specify whether "in city limits" or "not in city limits"

13. Educational attainment

- a. What is the highest grade (or year) of regular school he has ever attended?

Never attended school
Kindergarten
Elementary school—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 years
High school—1, 2, 3, 4 years
College—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or more years

- b. Did he finish this grade (or year)?

14. School attendance

- a. Has he attended regular school at any time since February 1, 1960?

Yes, regular school
No (did not attend school or attended special school only)

Born before April 1925
(35 years old or older)

- b. If he attended school since February 1—is it a public school or private school?

Public school
Private school

15. Times married and date of marriage

If the person has ever been married—Has he been married more than once?

Yes: When did he get married for the first time?

No: When did he get married?

16. Fertility

If this is a woman who has ever been married—How many babies has she ever had (not counting stillbirths)?

None, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 or more

17. Employment status and hours worked

- a. Did he work at any time last week? (Include part-time work such as a Saturday job, helping on a farm, or delivering papers. Do not count own housework)

- b. If Yes in "a"—How many hours did he work last week?

1-14 hours
15-29 hours
30-34 hours
35-39 hours
40 hours
41-48 hours
48-59 hours
60 hours or more

- c. If No in "a"—Was he looking for work or on layoff from a job?

- d. If No in "c"—Even though he did not work last week, does he now have a job he usually works at?

18. Date last worked

When did he last work at all, even for a few days?

1960 1950-1954
1959 Before 1950
1955-1958 Never worked

19. Occupation, industry and class of worker

If he worked in 1950 or after: Describe job or business held last week, if any, and give name of employer. If no job or business last week, give the information for last job or business.

a. For whom did he work?

Write name of company, business, organization, or other employer or
If on active duty with Armed Forces, skip parts b, c, and d

b. What kind of business or industry was this?

(Examples: poultry hatchery, county junior high school, auto assembly plant, radio and TV service, retail supermarket, highway construction)

c. What kind of work was he doing?

(Examples: truck driver, 8th grade English teacher, paint sprayer, repairs TV sets, grocery checker, civil engineer)

d. Class of worker?

For private company, business or individual for wages or salary

With a Federal, State, or local government

In his own business, professional practice or farm

Without pay in a family business or farm

20. Place of work

If he worked last week: What city or county did he work in last week?

Did not work

No fixed place

Worked at: City, county, and State: and specify whether "in city limits" or "not in city limits"

21. Means of transportation

If he worked last week—How did he get to work? (Mark principal means of transportation used last week)

Railroad

Subway, elevated

Bus, streetcar

Taxicab

Private automobile

Walk only

Worked at home

Other means, specify

22. Weeks worked

a. Last year (1959) did he work at all, even for a few days?

b. If yes—How many weeks did he work in 1959, either full-time or part-time? (Include paid vacation, paid sick leave, and military service)

13 weeks or less

14-26 weeks

27-39 weeks

40-47 weeks

48-49 weeks

50-52 weeks

23. Earnings in 1959

If worked in 1959—

- a. How much did he earn in 1959 in wages, salary, commission, or tips from all jobs? (Before taxes, bond deductions, etc.)

Enter amount or none

- b. How much did he earn in 1959 working in his own business, professional practice, partnership, or farm? (Net income after business expenses)

Enter amount or none

24. Other income in 1959

Last year (1959) did he receive any income from:

Social security, pensions or veteran's payments:

Rent, interest or dividends:

Unemployment insurance or welfare payments:

Any other source not already reported

Enter amount or none

25. Veteran status

If a male—Did he ever serve in the Army, Navy, or other Armed Forces of the United States during—

- a. Korean War (June 1950 to January 1955)

- b. World War II (September 1940 to July 1947)

- c. World War I (April 1917 to November 1918)

- d. Any other time, including present service