DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 056 RC 006 086

AUTHOR Taeuber, Conrad
TITLE Some Current Population Trends.
PUB DATE 24 Feb 72
NOTE 13p.; Speech presented at the 1972 National Agricultural Outlook Conference, Washington, D.C., February 24, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Age Groups; Agriculture; *Demography; Family Mobility; Family Planning; Heads of Households; Housing; Migration; Negro Population Trends; *Population Trends; *Rural Urban Differences; *Socioeconomic Influences

ABSTRACT

Population trends in the 1960's and early 1970's are examined in this 1972 speech in terms of overall national trends, the growth of metropolitan areas, the rural population, geographic shifts, internal migration, the black population, and living arrangements. It is noted that population growth in the 1960's was unevenly distributed within age groups and also unevenly distributed geographically. Some rural-urban differences are also discussed: urbanization of the blacks continued at a rapid rate; rural population declined; and, although migration was an important element in the differential growth rates of states and of areas within the states, in most areas the bulk of the increase was due to the excess of births over deaths. A major conclusion is that continued population growth, though at a lower rate than in the recent past, is indicated. (PS)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Research Service

SOME CURRENT POPULATION TRENDS

Talk by Dr. Conrad Taeuber
Bureau of the Census
U. S. Department of Commerce
at the 1972 National Agricultural Outlook Conference
Washington, D. C., 9:30 A. M., February 24, 1972

On New Year's Day, last month, it was reported that we began the year 1972 with a population of 208.5 million persons. We had gained about 2 million during the year 1971--the result of 3.6 million births, 1.9 million deaths, and a net immigration of nearly 400,000 persons. The rate of growth of nearly 1 percent was much the same as it had been in other recent years. It was reported at the same time that the birth rate had continued its downward trend of recent years. Nevertheless the number of babies born was almost the same as in the baby boom of 1947 when the national population was about 50 million less. The number of babies born continues to be about double the number of deaths. It would clearly require a drop in the number of births to about half the present level, or a doubling of the number of deaths, if we were to reach zero growth in the next years.

The outlook for the next years is one of continued increase in the Nation's population, even though birth rates may continue the downward trend observed in recent years. The reason for this is the relatively large number of young adults, who will be reaching the years of family formation in the next years. This is the consequence of the baby boom of the late 1940's and the 1950's. The babies of the "boom" in 1947 are reaching their 25th birthday this year and the babies of the next 10 years will be reaching maturity during the 1970's. There were about 17 million persons between the ages of 20 and 24 in 1970, by 1975 the number will have grown to 19 million, and by 1980 it will have grown again and reached 21 million--an increase of nearly one-fourth in 10 years. The number in the next 5-year age group, 25-29, will increase by nearly one-half during the same 10 years, from 14 million in 1970 to nearly

20 million in 1980. It seems fairly clear that we can expect continued population growth, though the rate of that growth is less easily forecast. A total population of 270-280 million persons by the year 2000 would result if we continue the rates of growth experienced recently. However, if the women who will be entering childbearing in the future restrict their fertility to the replacement levels, and if there is no net immigration in the future, the total population might be about 256 million in the year 2000. Such numbers must be viewed as speculations. Birth rates might decline to less than the number needed for replacement as they had done briefly during the 1930's.

An Outlook Conference is concerned with discerning some of the developments of the future, even though everyone involved recognizes how difficult it is to peer very far into that cloudy area with any assurance of certainty. Forecasting population growth is no exception. The history of birth rates in the United States clearly shows that they can change rapidly. With increased knowledge of control and increased effectiveness of the methods which are available, changes may come more rapidly and be more marked than they were in the past. The availability of the Pill and the IUD may also result in some differences in the timing of first and subsequent births of children. The liberalization of abortions—which is coming in many States may also have some effect in reducing the number of children born. This has been the experience in other countries which have made abortions relatively easy to secure. The fact that abortions and more effective contraceptives are more readily available does not in itself presage a decline in the number of births. These are the means to an end, rather than ends in themselves. The long-term decline in the birth rate during the 19th century and the early years of the present century, as well as the decline which began in the late 1950's, occurred without benefit of these newer developments. The important question in relation to future trends deals with the attitudes of the young people who will be contributing the bulk of the children. Women who are not yet married will contribute about 80 percent of the babies born in the next 10 years. Their attitudes toward family size and spacing of children will play a very large role in determining population growth during that period and beyond.

Unless the women now entering the family formation and childbearing ages depart sharply from the patterns which have been set by young people throughout the last decade and a half, the number of births will continue to increase for some years to come. Under these circumstances, a stable population size and zero growth are not likely in the short-run. Even if women now entering the childbearing period should stop having children beyond the numbers needed for replacement (about 2,110 children per 1,000 women), our population will continue to increase until well into the

next century. One computation shows that under these circumstances we might reach stability in numbers some time after 2050 with a population of more than 280 million.

The post-war baby boom was not a return to the large families of our pioneer ancestors. It reflected rather a significant increase in the number and proportion of women who took part in childbearing. Compared to even a generation ago, there have been important changes in American patterns of family formation and childbearing. A larger proportion of women marry and they are marrying at a younger age. A larger proportion of women are having children and they are completing their childbearing within a shorter period of time. The no-child or the 1-child family of the thirties has given way to the 2-or 3-child family. Fashions and practices in these matters are subject to change, as they have changed during the last generation. Surveys in which women of childbearing age are asked how many children they expect to have regularly report two or three as the preferred number. If women average only two children, we would cease to grow, except as immigration would make up the deficit. If women average three children, which is near the number which young married women say they expect to have, we would grow at a rapid rate.

There have been major changes in American society since the days when a family of 10 or more children was considered desirable. We have become a predominantly urban society; our educational levels have increased substantially both for men and for women, and we have become a more prosperous society. All of these changes have served to reduce the size of families and the levels of fertility. There are still some differences in the fertility of the several groups in our population. Urban rates are below those of the rural population; the higher the educational level of a woman, the lower her fertility; and on the whole the higher the family income, the lower the fertility. There is every reason to believe that we will continue to become even more urban; that we will continue to increase the proportion of women--and of men--who finish high school and college, and that family incomes will increase. However, recent experience has shown that although differences in fertility continue to exist, they may exist under conditions when fertility is relatively high, as well as when it is relatively low. In other words, the fact that we grow more urban, better educated, and more wealthy, suggests, but does not in itself assure, that birth rates will decline.

Even though the national growth rate may decline, a continued growth of the population of the metropolitan areas in the future seems clearly indicated. If migration into these areas were to be reduced below the levels of the 1960's, there would nevertheless be a substantial growth in their population because of the excess of births over deaths. The metropolitan areas include about two-thirds of the population, and they are likely to

continue to have a substantial majority of the excess of births over deaths. Although birth rates tend to be lower in urban and suburban areas than in the more rural areas, the metropolitan areas have a relatively large proportion of young people. The black population of these areas is a particularly youthful one, with, as has been noted, large cohorts of children and youth who will be moving into adult ages in the next two decades. Unless there is a large and unprecedented movement out of the metropolitan areas, they will continue to grow, and at a rate no less than that of the Nation as a whole. Most of the analysts who have ventured into this field assume that the metropolitan areas will continue to grow more rapidly than the national rate, and that their share of the national total will continue to increase.

For purposes of discussion one might assume that by the year 2,000 we would have added about 75 million to our present numbers. If we continue our present annual rate of growth to the end of the century, this would be the total growth. Where would these additional people live? If present trends continue, at least 60 million of them would be added to our metropolitan areas. Even though the bulk of this increase would be in the suburban sections, such an increase would add serious problems to those which the metropolitan areas are facing today.

Overall National Trends

There are now about 208 million residents of the United States--a little less than twice as many as there were in 1922, only 50 years ago. We added about 24 million to that total during the 10 years 1960-1970; a larger absolute gain than in any other decade in our history, except during the 1950's. However, the rate of growth was less than that of the 1950's. In fact, it was about the same as that of the 1920's and the 1940's and double that of the depression 1930's. Overall rates of growth have varied sharply in this century. They were declining during the 1920's and dropped to all time lows in the 1930's. They recovered somewhat in the 1940's, but the war years were not favorable to population growth. After the end of World War II there was a period of relatively rapid growth, with annual increases which averaged about 1.7 percent per year. During the 1960's the rate of growth slowed down, and in the last years we have been growing at about 1 percent per year. The total growth during the decade of about 24 million resulted from 39 million births, 18 million deaths and a net in-migration of nearly 4 million.

The age composition of the population in 1970 clearly reflects the variations in the number of births in previous years. Birth rates in the late 1960's had declined from earlier levels and the number of children under 5 in 1970 was less than the number in 1960. However, the number of children between 5 and 14 years of age was up by approximately 15 percent over that in 1960. The relatively high birth rates of 1947 through

1955 are reflected in an increase in the number of 15 to 24 year olds, which during the decade amounted to nearly 50 percent. These are persons in the prime ages for family formation, and entrance into the labor force, as well as college attendance. The relatively large number of persons in this age bracket is the basis for this expectation of substantial increases in household formation during the 1970's. Their younger brothers and sisters are even more numerous and they will sustain an increase in family formation into the 1980's. Reflecting the relatively lower birth rates between 1925 and 1945, the age group 25 to 44 showed only a small increase during the 1960's; the 10-year age group 30 to 39 actually showed a decline. The number of persons 65 and over increased by about 20 percent.

The Growth of Metropolitan Areas

Throughout this century the metropolitan areas have grown more rapidly than the rest of the country, and this trend was continued during the 1960's. More than four-fifths of the national growth occurred in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's), which also increased their numbers from 212 in 1960 to 243 in 1970. Within the SMSA's more than four-fifths of the growth occurred in the suburban areas; i.e. those portions of the metropolitan areas which are outside the central cities. A large number of the larger cities lost population or gained only by virtue of annexation. In spite of the losses to suburban population which resulted when cities extended their boundaries, the areas outside the central cities increased by 28 percent--more than double the national total. These areas have been increasing their population more rapidly than the central cities since 1920, but it was only in 1970 that they exceeded the central cities in total population. They now account for a total of 76 million persons, whereas the central cities have a total of 64 million. The total population outside the metropolitan areas was 63 million, which is less than the population of the central cities.

"Suburban" itself includes a wide variety of density and settlement patterns. The 76 million residents who are classified as suburban include 47 million who live in separately identified cities, and about 11 million of them live in cities of 50,000 and over, which would themselves be identified as central cities if they were not within the shadow of a larger central city. About 16 million of the suburban residents live in areas which are classified as rural, mostly outside incorporated places. In the more rural sections of the metropolitan counties there was relatively rapid growth. Nearly a third of the rural population is living within the boundaries of the SMSA's. This is the part of the rural population which increased during the 1960's. Rural population outside these areas declined. The statement that the rural population in 1970 was approximately equal to that in 1960 masks the difference in the growth of rural population in the shadow of the large cities and a decline in the areas with less ready access to these cities.

Three-fourths of the gain in population of the metropolitan areas was due to the excess of births over deaths; only one-fourth was due to migration into these areas, including both the migration from other parts of the country and that from abroad. This is net migration, and does not take into account the large volume of migration within the country which represents simply an exchange of population among metropolitan areas. The overriding importance of natural increase in the growth of the population of metropolitan areas holds for the white as well as the population of other races, though there are some differences.

One of the major population trends in the United States has been the rapid urbanization of the black population. Nearly 60 percent of all black residents live in the central cities of our metropolitan areas. The black population is more concentrated within the central cities, and also within the metropolitan areas than is the case of the white population.

The Rural Population

The 1960's saw a continuation of the decline of the proportion of the Nation's population living in rural areas. The 1920 census was the first one to report that the urban population included more than one-half of the national total. The 1970 census found that the proportion of the Nation's population which lives in rural areas has dropped to 26.5 percent. During the last 20 years there has been virtually no change in the number of persons living in rural areas--in other words virtually all of the gain occurred in the urban sector. As pointed out above, nearly a third of the rural population lives within the borders of metropolitan areas. During the 1960's there was relatively little change in the number of persons living in incorporated rural places with a population of 1,000 - 2,500, and also relatively little change in the number living outside such places, essentially the "open country."

There are 3,141 counties or county equivalents in the United States. Of these, 908 are entirely rural; that is, they include no urban place. A little more than a third of the total are at least 75 percent rural.

The farm population continued to decline during the 1960's, dropping from about 15 million at the beginning of the decade to less than 10 million at its end. The decline in the farm population reflects both continued migration from farms, as well as changes from an agricultural to a non-agricultural occupation, without giving up the previous residence, and discontinuing most of the farming activities which were formerly carried on.

Geographic Shifts

The growth of population within the country has never been evenly distributed. During the 1960's there were shifts from the center of the country to the seacoasts. In 1970 a little more than half of all our people were living within 50 miles of the seacoast, including the shores of the Great Lakes.

Changes among the States were very uneven. Three States and the District of Columbia had losses, (North and South Dakota and West Virginia). The States with gains of less than 5 percent included Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming. Alabama and Nebraska barely exceeded the 5 percent growth rate. At the other end of the scale was Nevada with a growth rate of 71.3 percent, and Arizona and Florida with about 36 percent. In terms of absolute numbers, California led all other States with an increase of 4.2 million persons, while Florida gained 1.9 million. Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Texas each gained 1 million or more.

About two-fifths of the counties lost population, and about one-third of the counties gained at less than the national average. This leaves only one-fourth of the counties which gained more rapidly than the national average. Almost two-thirds of the counties which lost population during the 1960's also had losses between 1950 and 1960, and between 1940 and 1950. In fact, there is now a considerable number of counties which have had population declines for four, five and more decades. There are many areas in which population loss is not new and for many of them it is likely to continue. There were 124 counties in which there were more deaths than births in the 1960's. Except for a few retirement areas the continued out-migration of the past has left behind an elderly population which is likely in the future to contribute more deaths than births.

Population losses occurred in a broad band of counties in the Great Plains, extending from the Canadian Border through Montana, North Dakota and Minnesota and south to Texas and then across the Southern States and into the Southern Appalachians. Interspersed among these are metropolitan areas which have continued to grow, and some smaller places which have had significant industrial growth. Some other counties with substantial growth are the sites of colleges or universities which grew significantly, or of military establishments which increased their station strength during the decade. A location with ready access to one or more of the interstate highways is also advantageous in terms of the likelihood of population growth.

Internal Migration

Americans have generally been characterized as a mobile people. At the end of a year, some 20 percent of all persons are living at an address which is different from the one at which they had lived at the beginning of the year. The 1960 census found that almost half the people had moved at least once during the preceding 5 years, and more than one-third had moved across a county line.

Differences in the rates of growth of States and of other areas are in large part the result of differences in the extent of migration. During the 1960's the North Central States generally were areas of out-migration, the Northeastern States had a small net in-migration. The West was clearly an area of in-migration. The South, which had for many years been an area of out-migration, had a net gain by migration during the 1960's. That gain was the result of a net inflow of about 1.8 million whites in contrast to a net out-migration of 1.4 million blacks. A large part of the net migration into the South was due to the movement of population into Florida, which attracted a net of 1.3 million persons. Maryland, Virginia, and Texas were the other Southern States with significant gains by migration. In contrast, Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia were States with a net out-migration.

California led all other States as the goal of migrants. It had a net gain of 2.1 million migrants during the decade. Florida with a net gain of 1.3 million was next. No other State gained as many as 1 million persons by migration, but 10 States each gained between 100,000 and 500,000 net migrants.

Pennsylvania led all other States in the number of migrants which it contributed to other States, with a total of nearly 400,000. Alabama, Mississippi and West Virginia each contributed more than 200,000. The District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, and South Carolina each contributed more than 100,000, while North Carolina and North and South Dakota each reached nearly that number.

Although on the whole, the volume of interstate migration was somewhat less than during the 1950's, numbers such as these indicate that many persons are involved in this exchange of population. The numbers cited are net figures; the total volume of migration is, of course, much larger. The figures for Mississippi illustrate one aspect of the interchange: the net out-migration of 267,000 reflects a net out-migration of about 277,000 persons of Negro and other races, but a net inflow of whites of about 10,000. Georgia's

net gain by migration of about 50,000 reflects a net out-migration of about 150,000 Negroes, but a net inflow of nearly 200,000 whites. Twenty-six States and the District of Columbia reported a net out-migration; the remaining 24 States had a net in-migration.

Although the amount of net migration is large, it was only in the West that migration contributed a significant part of the total increase for the decade. In that region, 42 percent of the growth during the decade was the result of in-migration. In the Northeast and the South the volume of net migration contributed only about 7.5 percent to the total growth. On the other hand, if there had been no net out-migration from the North Central States, their total increase would have been about one-seventh greater than it was. Clearly, the natural increase within the region was the more important element in determining the growth of the population in the region. The same statement applies to most of the States, although in the case of Florida, Nevada and New Hampshire net migration contributed more than half of the total increase, and in a number of other States, migrants accounted for more than 40 percent of the gain during the decade.

Natural increase was the dominant factor in the increase in the Negro population of most States which had an increase. In only two States, which had a black population of more than 1 million in 1970--New York and California--did migration contribute more than half the gain. In the six States which experienced a decline in their Negro population, out-migration was the factor. Without it they would have registered gains in their Negro population.

Our Largest Minority

The black population includes about 11 percent of the total, up 0.3 of a percentage point since 1960. This reflects the higher growth rate of the black population as compared with the white. The black population at one time was predominantly in the South, but that has been changing rapidly and at present the South includes only 53 percent of the black people. Three of every four black persons live in SMSA's, a higher proportion than among the white population. Outside the South nearly all of the black residents are within the SMSA's,--95 percent. In the South, too, the majority, 56 percent, are in the metropolitan areas.

Within the metropolitan areas, the black population is found chiefly in the central cities. There were some relative increases in the number of blacks in suburban areas, but the numbers involved are small, and the proportion of blacks in suburban areas was almost the same in 1970 as it had been in 1960--about 5 percent.

Within the central cities of the SMSA's there was a decline in the number of white, and an increase in the number of black residents. The number of black residents in these cities increased by 3.2 million, whereas the white population declined by 600,000. As a result, the percentage of the population of the central cities which is black increased from 16 percent in 1960 to 21 percent in 1970. The increase was especially marked in the largest cities--those with half a million or more inhabitants.

Four central cities--Washington, Gary, Newark and Atlanta--have more than half their population classified as black. Seven other large cities, Baltimore, Birmingham, Detroit, New Orleans, Richmond, St. Louis, and Wilmington have 40 percent or more of their residents classified as black.

Although there has been considerable emphasis on the role of migration, the majority of the increase in the Negro population of central cities was the result of the excess of births over deaths in that population group. About three-fifths of the increase of blacks in central cities is the result of their own natural increase--two-fifths is the result of net in-migration. There are exceptions--in New York City the black population increased by 703,000, of which more than half, 436,000, was the result of net in-migration. In Los Angeles, net migration and natural increase contributed almost equally to the increase of 225,000. Chicago, the only other city with a net in-migration of more than 100,000 blacks, added more than that number by natural increase. In Detroit the net in-migration of 98,000 was slightly more than half the total gain of 185,000.

Continued growth of the black population in metropolitan areas is clearly indicated. Even if migration into these areas were to be reduced below the levels of the 1960's, there would be a substantial growth in their black population due to excess of births over deaths. Blacks in these areas are relatively young, with large cohorts of children and youth who will be moving into adult ages in the next decades.

Living Arrangements

Increasing affluence and some decline in family size are only two of the developments during the decade which affected living arrangements. The number of households increased more rapidly than the population, with the result that there was a decline in the average size of household. A major element was the increase of 1-person households which grew by more than 50 percent. About one household in every six is a 1-person household. The increase in 1-person households reflects not only a greater tendency on the part of elderly people to maintain their own homes, but also some increase

in the proportion of young people who leave the parental roof to establish their own households. There was also a rapid increase in the number and proportion of 2-person households, reflecting the growing number of couples who maintain their own homes after the children have left home, as well as some delay in the arrival of the first child in newly established families. Increases in the number of households with more than two persons were small in comparison with the increases of 1 and 2-person households. The increase in 1-person households occurred both in metropolitan areas and elsewhere.

There has also been a substantial increase in the number of families headed by a woman. In census terms this means a group of related individuals headed by a woman who is not married, or whose husband is not a member of the family. The number of such families increased by a third during the decade. Nearly 11 percent of all families are in this category, but among black families approximately one-fifth are headed by a woman. The number of cases in which the absent man is an important source of economic support cannot be large, though there is no good information on what the number might be. The incomes and living arrangements of the majority of such families clearly reflect their disadvantages in terms of economic support.

The Nation's housing reflects some of the changes in the style of life which occurred during the decade. By 1970, about half of the housing had been built since the end of World War II. During that time, including the last 10 years, the average quality of housing increased. One index of quality is the presence of complete plumbing facilities (bathtub or shower, hot running water, flush toilet) for the exclusive use of the household. The number of units without these facilities in 1970 was only half as large as in 1960; and this followed a relatively large decline during the 1950's. In 1950, about one-third of the housing units in the country lacked these facilities, by 1970 this had been cut to 7 percent. Within the metropolitan areas, it was only half the national figure. However, there had been a substantial decline in the number and percentage of such units both in and outside the metropolitan areas. The proportion for Negro households also declined sharply during the 1960's, though it is still higher than that for whites in the central cities and outside. More than half the housing units in the South which are not in metropolitan areas and are occupied by black households do not have these facilities.

Home ownership has long been a prized value in American life. There has been a steady increase in the proportion of owner-occupied homes since the depression years of the 1930's. That percentage increased from 44 in 1940 to 62 in 1960. During the 1960's the rise in home ownership was

only 1 percent; however, this resulted in over 7,000,000 additional homeowners. Housing units in structures of 2-or-more units increased much more rapidly than those in single-family dwellings and this was particularly true in the suburbs. The number of suburban housing units in multi-unit structures almost doubled during the decade. More than half the units in multi-unit structures are still found in the central cities, but the suburban areas increased their share from 20 to 28 percent. This trend is continuing. In recent years more housing units in multi-unit structures have been erected in the suburban areas than in the central cities. Nevertheless, a little more than two-thirds of all housing units in 1970 were classified as single-family dwellings.

The increased popularity of mobile homes is reflected in the growth of the number of occupied mobile homes by about 150 percent during the 1960's. They now account for nearly 3 percent of the national housing inventory.

Despite the growing use of trailers and apartments, the average housing unit in 1970 was slightly larger in terms of number of rooms than its 1960 counterpart. With larger homes and smaller households, there was a decline in the proportion of homes which can be considered as crowded; i.e., having more persons than rooms. The proportion of crowded units declined especially rapidly in the suburbs.

Summary

The 1960's witnessed substantial growth in the Nation's population. That growth was unevenly distributed within the age groups, reflecting major variations in birth rates and numbers of births in earlier years. It was also unevenly distributed geographically, with more than four-fifths of the growth occurring in the metropolitan areas, where the suburban sections accounted for nearly all of the total. The urbanization of the blacks continued at a rapid rate, with particular increases in the larger central cities. Some substantial displacement of whites by blacks occurred in a number of the metropolitan areas, especially the largest ones. The rural population outside metropolitan areas declined; that within the metropolitan areas--i.e., within reach of the central cities--increased. Three States lost population. Altogether about two-fifths of all counties lost population. A total of about three-fourths of all counties contributed migrants to the remainder of the country. Although migration was an important element in the differential growth rates of States and of areas within the States, in most areas the bulk of the increase was due to the excess of births over deaths.

Continued population growth, though at a lower rate than in the recent past, is indicated. The babies of the postwar baby boom have grown up and are reaching marriage age and consequently we can expect an increase in

marriage and in new families through the 1970's. Increasingly these families will demand the services and facilities which have become important elements in the ever-rising levels of living. For the most part they are likely to be suburban or small city residents rather than big city or rural residents. How these additional persons are distributed and what social arrangements are developed to cope with the new situations created by the increased concentration in urban and metropolitan areas will have long range consequences for the quality of life in the United States.