CHANGES IN GROSS AND NET MIGRATION FOR STATES: 1955-60 AND 1965-70

William J. Serow, Tayloe Murphy Institute, University of Virginia

I. Introduction

If future levels of fertility in the United States remain at something like those of the present, the future population of this country will become more or less stationary. While this may suggest a host of economic and social problems (1), it also suggests a lessening of concern with the question of overpopulation for the nation as a whole. It is more likely that concern with such problems will be concentrated at the local level, since population movement and population redistribution will continue. The purpose of the present paper is to examine systematically patterns of migration at the state level for the 1955-60 and 1965-70 quinquennia. These results should provide necessary background for those dealing with the implications of future population distribution patterns.

A great deal of migration analysis deals only with net migration. While net migration is clearly of primary importance in examining the impact of migration on an area's economic or social structure, there exists the danger that potential insight might be lost by neglecting to consider in- and outmigration as separate entities. Consequently, this paper will examine changes in both in- and outmigration rates, and analyze them in terms of their importance to net and gross migration. In seeking the causes of change in these measures, the discussion will focus on changes by age and race, as well as the role of institutions such as the military in shaping these changes. Finally, reference is made to the previous history of migration to determine the role that return migration plays in these changes.

II. Data

The data employed in this paper come from printed reports stemming from both the 1960 and 1970 censuses of population (2), which deal with population mobility for the five year period immediately preceding the census. Data which relate present residence to place of birth are also employed in order to draw some inferences on the possible role of return migration (3).

Analysis of in- and outmigration, unless done with some care, can obscure more than it reveals. Consider, for example, Morrison's case of Albuquerque, New Mexico, which between 1960 and 1970 received a total of 22 'net migrants'. As Morrison notes: "...this net figure masks the comings and goings of about 14 or 15 people per hundred working-age residents every year. In fact, each year of the decade, some 44,000 residents were last year's in-migrants and 44,000 were next year's out-migrants."(4) Renshaw (5) is another case in point on the importance of using gross rather than net migration data in this context.

Changing patterns of population movements arise for many reasons. There have been a plethora of studies seeking to determine the causes and concomitants of migration, based on both streams of migration. Many of these stem from the work of Blanco (6) and Lowry (7). Another large body of literature deals only with net migration (8). The theoretical development of this area stems mainly from Lee (9) and Sjaastad (10). Our concern here will not be to advance this theory (in terms of migration being a behaviorial response to economic or social stimuli), but rather to document recent trends and to suggest how changes in the mobility behavior of different segments of the population are shaping the future pattern of population distribution.

In the analysis and discussion that follow, the data will be utilized exactly as they appear in the printed reports. It is important to remember, though, that in both periods, the data are based on samples (25 percent in 1960 and 15 percent in 1970). Hence, the data are subject to some sampling error. For example, in those cases where net migration is approximately zero, the number which would be obtained by a complete enumeration could vary somewhat in either direction. Rhode Island had about 873,000 persons aged five or over in 1970. Between 1965 and 1970, the state received some 93,200 inmigrants and lost about 92,400 outmigrants. The standard error of these data is about 1,100 to 1,200. Hence, actual net migration for Rhode Island might have varied from +3,200 (94,400- 91,200) to -1,600 (92,000-93,600).

Table 1 shows the sign of net migration and the change (in percentage points) in rates of in, out, net, and gross migration for all states and divisions for 1955-60 and 1965-70. Thus, Maine showed net outmigration for both periods. However, the rate of inmigration increased by 1.5 percentage points over the decade, while the rate of outmigration increased by 0.9 points. Hence, the rate of net migration increased slightly, while the gross migration rate increased by 2.4 points.

Gross migration for any area is simply the sum of those moving in and those moving out. The rate of gross migration increased in 42 of 51 states (including the District of Columbia) and in all divisions save the Pacific. Foremost among states with declines were six with high rates of migration during the earlier period-Florida, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, California, and Alaska. In two of the remaining three states-Arkansas and Kansas-the decline in gross migration was attributable to declines in outmigration rates. The remaining area the district of Columbia, saw substantial decline in both in- and outmigration rates. The District, of course, has been subject to high rates of net outmigration in recent decades.

Among those states with increases in gross migration, the largest absolute increases were located in North Dakota and Hawaii (7.3 and 7.4 points, respectively). In both cases, the rate of inmigration increased by about two and one half points, while the outmigration rate rose by nearly five percentage points. Other states with increases of three points or more were New Hampshire (4.7), Montana (3.7), and Utah (3.0). The latter two states both showed small increases in inmigration rates(about 0.5 points), but substantially higher percentage point increases in the rate of outmigration.

Net migration measures the contribution of migration to population change in the area in question (11). Between 1955-60 and 1965-70, the rate of net migration increased in 29 states and declined in 22. Furthermore, the rate of net migration rose in six of nine census divisions. The rate of net migration to an area can increase in a variety of ways: both in- and out migration rates can rise, but the former to a greater extent; both rates can decline, but the former to a lesser extent; or, the inmigration rate can go up while the outmigration rate goes down. For declines in the rate of net migration, the converse of each of these statements would hold. Table 2 classifies states and divisions in terms of the percentage point change in the net migration rate as a function of the change in the in- and outmigration rates. Three patterns are particularly important: a) increase in both in- and outmigration rates, increase in net migration; b) increase in both rates, decrease in net migration; and, c) increase in inmigration, decrease in outmigration, increase in net migration. These accounted for 11, 13, and 17 states respectively-41 of a total of 51. These patterns were also descriptive of six divisions.

The pattern of all three migration rates increasing shows some signs of regional concentration-half the New England states, three states in the upper midwest, and the two states surrounding the nation's capitol were of this type. Generally, states in this group had net outmigration during both periods, with the exceptions of New Hampshire, Colorado, Maryland, and Virginia.

Those states with increases in both in- and outmigration, but declines in the net migration rate included five industrial states in the northeast (including those which comprise the entire New York metropolitan area), both Dakotas, two gulf coast states, three Rocky Mountain states, and Hawaii. Again, most of these states had net outmigration for both periods except for Connecticut, New Jersey, Utah, and Hawaii. The latter two states, in fact, were the only ones, along with New Mexico, which experienced net inmigration during the earlier quinquennium, but net migration during the latter.

The pattern of declining net migration rates both through declines in inmigration rates and increases in outmigration rates contains four states with extremely high rates of in- and net migration for 1955-60. Net migration remained high in Florida, Arizona, and to a lesser extent, California, but the data do suggest somewhat of an abatement of what might be termed a migration boom of the late 1950's. New Mexico is somewhat of a puzzle showing the largest percentage point decline in the rate of net migration. Between 1955 and 1960, New Mexico had a net migration rate of 5.3 percent, a level surpassed by only six states. During the period between 1965 and 1970, New Mexico's rate of net migration was -6.4 percent, a level exceeded only in the Dakota, the District of Columbia, and (marginally) Wyoming.

The single most prevalent pattern was that of an increase in the net migration rate through increasing inmigration rates and decreasing outmigration rates. This pattern prevailed in most of the southeastern and south central portions of the nation, as well as in parts of New England and the Pacific Northwest. All of those states which experienced net outmigration for 1955-60 and net inmigration for 1965-70 (Vermont, Rhode Island, Missouri, the Carolinas, Georgia, Tennessee, Oklahoma, Texas, and Oregon) were included in this group. Since states in this group were the only cases where movements in both in- and outmigration rates acted to increase the net migration rate, it is not surprising that the average increase in the rate of net migration was highest for states in this group. However, the average increase in the inmigration rate was also highest for state in this category.

Morrison (12) has noted that rapidly growing cities have high rates of both in and out migration. For states, the situation seems to be that high rates of gross migration are associated with high rates of net migration, regardless of the sign of the latter. For the 1965-70 quinquennium, the simple correlation coefficient between the gross migration rate and the absolute value of the net migration rate was .49 ($t=3.92$); r for gross and net rates, considering the sign of the latter was only .22. If the concepts of gross and net migration are tied to the concept of migration efficiency, (13) there is a strong relationship between the net migration rate (absolute value) and the rate of efficiency ($r=.71$, $t=7.0$), but a rather weak one between gross migration and migration efficiency ($r=.14$, $t=0.97$). In other words, states with highly mobile populations tend to have relatively large differences between inmigration and outmigration, and, hence, high net migration (in either direction). Furthermore, the higher the rate of net migration, the more efficient the migration.

III. Changes in the Demographic Components of Migration

In many cases, there might be more interest in the reasons for changes in migration rates, rather than merely the changes themselves. This section deals with changes in the rates of migration as a function of changes in rates by age and race (14). Percentage point changes in the three migration rates, by race, are shown in table 3. In the interest of preserving space, the discussion of these data will be limited to those states with a change in the direction of migration or a decline in migration between the 1955-60 and 1965-70 quinquennia.

Those states which went from a net outmigration during the latter portion of the 1950's to net inmigration ten years later generally showed increases in the rate of net migration for both races. The bulk of these states were in the southeast or southwest. The typical pattern was an increase in net inmigration rates among whites, and a decrease in the rate of net outmigration among nonwhites.

Those states which went from net inmigration to net outmigration all experienced declines in the rate of net migration for whites. In the cases of New Mexico and Utah, the direction of white migration changed as well. However, in Utah and Hawaii, the rate of nonwhite migration increased, although clearly not enough to offset the decline among

whites.

States which showed a decline in the rate of net migration between periods fell into three general categories: states with little or no population growth and low rates of migration (New York, Ohio, Illinois, Alabama, Louisiana), states with little or no population growth, but high rates of migration (the Dakotas, the District of Columbia, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah), and states with high rates of population growth during the 1950's, and generally high rates of migration, but which slowed down somewhat during the later quinquennium. These included Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Florida, Arizona, Nevada, California, Alaska, New Mexico, and Hawaii. In all cases but Utah and Hawaii, these states experienced declines in both white and nonwhite net inmigration between the 1955-60 and 1965-70 periods. The latter two states, along with Maryland, were the only instances of increased net inmigration for nonwhites accompanied by decreases in the white rate. Increases in the rate for both races were found in four midwestern states (Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Kansas),six southeastern states (Virginia, West Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Kentucky), two southwestern states (Texas and Oklahoma), and the two states of the Pacific northwest.

Another demographic variable which is important in the analysis of changing migration patterns is age. Individuals are most prone toward migratory behavior at certain stages of their life-the most obvious example being in the late teens and early twenties when persons most often leave home to take their first job, get married, further education, enter military service, and so on.

A great deal of migration of young persons is reflected in college and military migration. Military migration is of perhaps greater interest for two reasons: first, there is more of it; second, it is the result of a policy decision (not related to migration) to a greater and more systematic extant than is college migration.

During the 1955-60 quinquennium, the number of transfers of residence between states among college students totalled about 97,000; the number of such moves among military personnel was nearly 378,000 (15). The number of states gaining population appreciably through college was fairly small: Massachusetts and Indiana (12,900 each), Colorado (8,100), Utah (6,600), and California (17,400). Similarly, large losses of population due to net outmigration among college students were limited to these states: New York (24,000), New Jersey (20,000), and Illinois (15,700). In relative terms, migration of college students diminished considerably net outmigration in Massachusetts and Indiana, and added appreciably to net inmigration in Colorado and Utah. The latter, in fact, would have experienced net outmigration had it not been for college migration. Although college migration was large in the other states mentioned, only in New Jersey did it have an important effect on the total migration pattern, lowering somewhat the level of net inmigration.

Military migration had a much more widespread effect. Several states, including Rhode Island, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Florida, Texas, California, Alaska, and Hawaii had a net gain of at least 10,000 military personnel, with California gaining more than 110,000. Similarly, the number of states losing population in large amounts through military migration was quite large: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, West Virginia, and Oregon.

The combined effects of military and college migration were extremely important in many cases. In some states such as Virginia, Louisiana, Utah, Alaska, and Hawaii the effects were such as to change the sign of net migration. Except for Utah, the effects were primarily from the military, and except for Louisiana, the effect was to create net inmigration. In several other states, these factors accounted for more than one third of net migration (Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Idaho, Wyoming, and Washington). In other states, military and college trends blunted the overall level of net outmigration (Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Missouri, Kansas, the Carolinas, Georgia, Kentucky, and Texas) or bolstered the level of net inmigration (New Hampshire, Maryland, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and California). Only in the case of New Jersey and Connecticut were levels of net inmigration lowered by net outmigration of college students and military personnel.

The volume of both college and military migration increased substantially during the 1965-70 period. Total college movements rose to more than 218,000, while military movements increased to almost 660,000. The overall pattern remained much the same as that of the earlier quinquennium, but there were some changes. College net migration increased in northern New England, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri, much of the southeast and southwest, and on the pacific coast. Outmigration of college students increased most notably in the Middle Atlantic and East North Central divisions; in fact, these were the only divisions with net college outmigration, and the only ones where the level of net migration declined between quinquennia. The largest increases occured in the South Atlantic, West South Central (essentially Texas), and Pacific divisions.

The reason for the increase in military movement was primarily the increase in military activity in Southeast Asia. A great deal of this increase was felt in the South, which, as a whole, experienced a net military inmigration of more than 210,000. The West, particularly on the coast, gained more than 150,000 persons, with more than 100,000 of these in California. Virginia, with a net gain of nearly 75,000 was also a large beneficiary of the war, in demographic terms. Besides Virginia, there were several other states which experienced net inmigration during the 1965-70 period directly as a result of military migration: Rhode Island, both Carolinas, and Alaska.

Between 1955-60 and 1965-70, there were increases in net migration (16) in New England the East and West North and South Central divisions, and the South Atlantic states. In New England and the West North Central states, increases in college migration played a relatively small role; these were more than offset by sizeable increases in net military outmigration. In the East North Central divi-

vision, net migration increased despite decreases in both college military net migration. The three divisions which comprise the South all saw college and military net migration increases along with the total. The increase in these components was responsible for 40 percent of the total increase in the South Atlantic division, and 9 and 12 percent in the East and West South Central divisions, respectively.

The three divisions with declines in net migration over the decade were the Middle Atlantic, Mountain, and Pacific. The first of these saw substantial decline in both college and military migration-these accounted for more than 70 percent of the total decline. In the Mountain states, total migration declined despite modest increases in both college and military net migration. The substantial decline in net inmigration to the Pacific states was little affected by the small increase in college migration or the even smaller decrease in military migration (see table 4).

Migration of older persons is a subject which has received increasing scrutiny in recent years (17). Some portion of this is no doubt represented by return migration (18). Between 1955-60 and 1965-70, several portions of the country began to become alternative (to Florida, Arizona, and California) destinations for older persons. These include northern New England, the southeast, the southwest, and the northwest. As a rule, increases in migration of older persons to these areas paralleled overall increases in migration. States which have historically been important destinations of elderly migrants continued to attract large numbers, but at somewhat lower rates. Again, the experience of elderly persons is representative of overall trends in states such as California, Nevada, Florida, and Arizona (see table 5).

For our purposes, return migration may be defined as a person who moved to his/her state of birth, from another state, between 1965 and 1970. The rate of return migration (19) varied only slightly among states, both for the entire population aged five and over, as well as the 65 and over population. The mean rates of return migration were 5.7 and 2.7 percent, respectively. Particularly high rates of total return migration occured in Michigan (7.9), Maryland (8.5), Florida (10.3), Texas (8.8), Washington (9.4), Oregon (7.4), and California (11.8). Particularly low rates were found in the upper midwest and some of the Rocky Mountain states. Return migration rates for older persons were much higher in Florida (16.3 percent) and California (9.5 percent) than in any other state. The only other states with rates in excess of four percent were Maryland and Arizona.

Although rates of return migration were uniform with the exceptions noted previously, the share of inmigrants accounted for by return migration varied considerably. On the average, some 19.6 percent of all inmigrants were return migrants. For older persons, this figure was somewhat higher, 28.6 percent. As might be concluded from the relative constancy of return migration rates, and the wide dispersion of inmigration rates, return migration was a much larger share of inmigration in those states with low rates of inmigration. Conversely, those states with high rates of inmigration saw only a relatively small share accounted for by return migration. Florida, for example, had very high rates of both inmigration and return migration, but the proportion of inmigrants who were returning native Floridians was only 6.4 percent. Similar statements would also hold for other states with highly mobile populations.

IV. Summary and Conclusions

This paper has explored changes in the volume of migration for states during the 1955-60 and 1965-70 quinquennia. Those states with high rates of net migration during the earlier period generally maintained levels of migration for 1965-70 that were high relative to other states, but low relative to their own levels ten years previous. The primary areas of destination changed somewhat, with the South Atlantic states becoming the leading area of destination. The Pacific northwest, the southwest, and northern New England also experienced relatively important increases in net migration.

A consideration of some importance was the role of military migration within the total migration stream for states. Those states with large military installations received large amounts of net inmigration due to the military build-up of the late 1960's. Although this is a subject which requires additional work, it would seem likely that, on the whole, the economic benefits of this military presence outweighed the economic costs for the primary areas of destination. Although no one would argue that the formulation of demographic policy is a major concern at the Pentagon, it is important to realize that military manpower decisions (along with similar decisions made in the private and public sectors) can have considerable impact on a area's population and its economy (20). Given the goal of a national policy of population redistribution away from the major metropolitan areas, and the apparent desire of a large segment of the population to live in small to medium sized places, (21) it would seem that this could be a policy tool capable of being weilded more effectively in coming years (22).

Footnotes

1. Joseph J. Spengler, Declining Population Growth Revisited (Chapel Hill: Carolina Population Center, 1971).
2. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Mobility for States and State Economic Areas (Washington: Government Printing Office,1963) and Mobility for States and the Nation (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973).
3. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Lifetime and Recent Migration and State of Birth (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963 and 1973).
4. Peter A. Morrison, "Guiding Urban Growth: Policy Issues and Demographic Constraints" paper presented at annual meeting of the Population Association of America, New York, 1974.
5. Vernon Renshaw, "Using Gross Migration Data from the Social Security Sample File," Demography, 11 (February 1974), 143-48.

6. Cicely Blanco, "The Determinants of Interstate Population Movements," Journal of Regional Science, 5 (Summer 1963), 77-84.
7. Ira S. Lowry, Migration and Metropolitan Growth: Two Analytical Models (Los Angeles: University of California, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, 1966).
8. Paul M. Sommers and Daniel B. Suits, "Analysis of Net Interstate Migration," Southern Economic Journal, 40 (October 1973), 193-201.
9. Everett S. Lee, "A Theory of Migration," Demography, 3 (1966), 47-57.
10. Larry A Sjaastad, "The Costs and Returns of Human Migration," Journal of Political Economy, 70 (October 1962, supplement), 80-93.
11. For a discussion of the indirect demographic effects of migration see William J. Serow, "The Potential Demographic Impact of Migration," Review of Regional Studies, 4 (Fall 1974), 16-28.
12. Peter A. Morrison, op. cit., p. 11.
13. Migration efficiency is the ratio of net to gross migration. See Henry S. Shryock, Population Mobility within the United States (Chicago" University of Chicago, Community and Family Study Center, 1964), 285-94.
14. It was necessary to estimate 1970 rates for nonwhites, since the census reports showed data only for tatal, white and negro.
15. This does not include the coincidential migration of dependents.
16. That is, either an increase in net inmigration or a decrease in net outmigration.
17. Steve L. Barsby and Dennis R. Cox, Interstate Migration of the Elderly (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1975), and Lynne Rogner Heltman, "Mobility of the Aged in the United States," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Seattle, 1975.
18. See Rex R. Campbell, Daniel M. Johnson, and Gary J. Stangler, "Return Migration of Black People to the South, "Rural Sociology, 39 (Winter 1974), 514-28 and "Counterstream Migration of Black People to the South: Data from the 1970 Public Use Sample," Review of Public Data Use, 3 (January 1975), 13-21. Also of interest in this area is Larry H. Long and Kristin A. Hansen, "Trends in Return Migration to the South," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Demographic Group, Atlanta, 1974.
19. This rate is computed by dividing the number of return migrants by the sum of return migrants and persons born in the state living outside the population at risk of return migrating: all persons born in a state known to be living elsewhere in 1965.
20. This point is explored in Peter A. Morrison, "Population Movements and the Shape of Urban Growth: Implications for Public Policy" in John Friedmann and William Alonso, eds., Regional Policy: Readings in Theory and Applications (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1975), 221-43.
21. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, Population and the American Future (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972), 25-37.
22. Many of the trends discussed throughout this article have changed since 1970 according to postcensal surveys and estimates. For an overview of these changes and their implications see Calvin L. Beale, The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America (Washington: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 1975)

Table 1. Direction of Net Migration and Percentage Point Change in Migration Rates, States:1955-60 1965-70 a/

Division	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*	6*
NEW ENGLAND	-	-	1.5	0.9	0.7	2.4
MIDDLE ATLANTIC	-	-	0.6	0.9	-0.3	1.5
E.N. CENTRAL	-	-	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.8
W. N. CENTRAL						
SOUTH ATLANTIC	+	+	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.9
E.S. CENTRAL	-	-	1.2	-0.2	1.4	1.0
W.S. CENTRAL	-	+	1.1	-0.6	1.7	0.5
MOUNTAIN	+	+	-1.2	2.1	-3.3	0.9
PACIFIC	+	+	-2.4	1.4	-3.7	-1.0

1* Direction of net migration, 55-60
2* Direction of net migration, 65-70
3* p.p. change, inmigration rate
4* p.p. change, outmigration rate
5* p.p. change, net migration rate
6* p.p. change, gross migration

Footnote

a/ Due to space limitations, data for each state are no shown. These data are available from the author upon request (PO Box 6550, Charlottesville, Va. 22906.

Table 2. Patterns of Change in Migration Rates, States and Divisions: 1955-60 to 1965-70

Increase IMR Increase OMR Increase NMR	Increase IMR Increase OMR Decrease NMR	Increase IMR Decrease OMR Increase NMR	Decrease IMR Increase OMR Decrease NMR	Decrease IMR Decrease OMR Decrease NMR	Other
Maine	Connecticut	Vermont	Florida	District of Col.	Indiana *
New Hampshire	New York	Rhode Island	Wyoming	Nevada	Delaware**
Massachusetts	New Jersey	Michigan	New Mexico	Alaska	
Pennsylvania	Ohio	Missouri	Arizona		
Wisconsin	Illinois	Nebraska	California		
Minnesota	North Dakota	Kansas			
Iowa	South Dakota	West Virginia			
Maryland	Alabama	North Carolina			
Virginia	Louisiana	South Carolina			
Mississippi	Montana	Georgia			
Colorado	Idaho	Kentucky			
	Utah	Tennessee			
	Hawaii	Arkansas			
		Oklahoma			
		Texas			
		Washington			
		Oregon			
NEW ENGLAND E.N. CENTRAL SOUTH ATLANTIC	MIDDLE AT.	E.S. CENTRAL W.S. CENTRAL	MOUNTAIN PACIFIC		W.N. CENTRAL*
11 states 3 divisions	13 states 1 divisions	17 states 2 divisions	5 states 2 divisions	3 states	2 states 1 division
Mean Change:					
IMR 1.32	0.78	1.94	-4.86	-3.10	
OMR 0.56	2.08	-0.98	2.80	-0.87	
NMR 0.77	-1.29	2.91	-7.64	-2.22	

*increase IMR; no change OMR; increase NMR
**no change IMR; increase OMR; decrease NMR
Source: same as Table 1

Table 3. Percentage Point Changes in Migration Rates, by Race, Divisions: 1955-60 to 1965-70 a/

Division	White in	White out	White net	Nonwhite in	Nonwhite out	Nonwhite net
NEW ENGLAND	1.6	0.9	0.7	0.1	3.0	-2.9
MIDDLE ATLANTIC	0.8	1.1	-0.3	-1.6	0.6	-2.2
E. N. CENTRAL	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.0	-0.4	0.4
W. N. CENTRAL	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.7	1.6	-1.0
S. ATLANTIC	0.3	0.3	0.1	1.1	0.4	0.8
E. S. CENTRAL	1.2	-0.7	1.9	0.7	1.4	-0.7
W. S. CENTRAL	1.2	-0.8	1.9	1.0	0.5	0.4
MOUNTAIN	-1.2	2.1	-3.3	1.1	3.7	-2.6
PACIFIC	-2.2	1.4	-3.8	-1.8	1.0	-2.8

Source: same as Table 1

Table 4. Changes in the Volume of Total, College, and Military Net Migration, a/ Divisions: 1955-60 to 1965-70

Division	Total	College	Military
NEW ENGLAND	64,296	1,978	-20,094
MIDDLE ATLANTIC	-147,162	-81,058	-23,237
E. N. CENTRAL	88,592	-11,337	-21,434
W. N. CENTRAL	138,646	3,111	-11,861
S. ATLANTIC	178,392	19,826	51,584
E. S. CENTRAL	148,939	7,950	5,096
W. S. CENTRAL	264,635	13,760	18,649
MOUNTAIN	-178,278	15,051	11,606
PACIFIC	-553,060	30,719	-6,573

Source: 1960 Census, Mobility for States and State Economic Areas, Table 20 and 22
1970 Census, Mobility for States and the Nation, Tables 48 and 52